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Abstract: This paper argues that the Aeolic inf. νηφέμεν, used instead of expected νήφειν at the beginning of the pentameter verse (where a contracted biceps is admissible), should be viewed as modeled on πινέμεν (Hes. Op. 592, construed with αἴθοπα οἶνον): the combination of the high-flown ending, best known from the epic dialect, with a root νηφ- that otherwise belongs to the colloquial language must have both produced a comic effect in the context of an invitation to get drunk on duty and served as an allusion to the midsummer picnic scene in Hesiod.
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ἀλλ’ ἄγε σὺν κώθων θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νῆός
φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ’ ἄφελκε κάδων,
ἄγρει δ’ οἶνον ἐφυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός’ οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς
νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακή τῇδε δυνησόμεθα.

But come, make many a trip with a cup through the thwarts of the swift ship,
pull off the covers of the hollow casks, and draw the red wine from the lees;
we won’t be able to stay sober on this watch¹.

1. Athenaeus, who quotes lines 6–9 of the fragment for the use of κώθων ‘cup’ has νήφειν μὲν in the last line, which Musurus emended into νηφέιν ἐν, adopted by most subsequent editors. However, P. Oxy. 854 gives a different reading: even though the letters are mutilated for the most part², the form clearly shows an accent on the second syllable, which must have been the main reason why

---

¹ Here and in the passages that follow translations have been taken from the relevant volume of the Loeb Classical Library.
² Digital images can be found at http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk.
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M. L. West in his edition of iambic and elegiac poets admitted νηφέμεν in his text. As later joins have made clear (P. Oxy. 2507 and 4708), this papyrus roll contained an extensive critical edition, equipped with coronides, paragraphoi, accents, and marginal critical signs; the text does not otherwise show mistakes and is unlikely to have been produced by a careless scribe who would place a wrong accent over such a familiar form as the present infinitive (*νηφεῖν instead of νήφειν). Athenaeus’ version νήφεν μὲν could be an oral variant, viz. a misquotation, or simply a scribal error, the source of which is entirely clear if the original text had νηφέμεν ἐν.

West’s solution is very plausible, but neither he nor later commentators have discussed the problem that arises from adopting a non-Ionic infinitive form into Archilochus’ text. Even though fr. 4 is written in elegiac distich and elegy admits occasional epicisms (whether or not solely because of the dactylic meter), νηφέμεν cannot be an epic reminiscence, since there is nothing to reminisce; the form is not attested elsewhere. Moreover, neither the infinitive nor any other form of the verb νήφω ‘to be sober’ is likely to have been known to Archilochus from a lost epic poem because this verb, hardly found outside sympotic poetry and comedy and completely lacking in the epic language, was anything but a lofty word.

3 W. Henry’s attempt to restore ἑνανόνες (1998, 94 n. 4) and his arguments in favor of the original oxytones in νήφον do not stand scrutiny in the light of what we know about the origin of νήφων: as Weiss 1994 has shown, the word originated in a possessive compound *p-h₁g-

4 E. g. Gerber (1981) 9 duly noted that infinitives in -έμεν or -έμεναι are not found elsewhere in the remains of Archilochus, but did not elaborate on this observation; similarly, in his review of West’s edition Young (1973) 222 signaled and commended the choice of the dialectal form νηφέμεν, but did not seem to appreciate the conundrum. Adkins (1985) 215 limits himself to informing the reader about manuscript variants, without discussing the implications of different editorial choices.

5 That νήφω is a lowly verb has been noticed before, e. g. Monaco (1960) 19 (“verbo d’uso commune e non poetico”); Romano (1974) 77 and da Cunha Corrêa (2009) 109, but the morphological problem at hand has not been commented upon. The argument above is not countered by the following passage from Ps. Longinus (Subl. 34. 4. 1): ἄλλα ἐπειδῆτερα, ὦμα, τὰ μὲν θατέρων καλά, καὶ εἰ πολλὰ ὄμως ἁμεγέςθη, καρδιῇ νήφοντος ἀργά καὶ τὸν ἄφοβον ἤρεμαν ἐωντα (σούδεις γοῦν ὶπερείδην ἄναγινώσκων φαβεῖται). “The beauties of Hyperides, however numerous, are devoid of greatness, they produce no effect ‘on a sober man’s heart,’ and allow the hearer to rest unmoved (who feels fear when he reads Hyperides?).” The Ionic form καρδῆ (not Attic καρδία)
the reading νηφέμεν is correct, one would like to know the reason why an Aeolic form appears in Archilochus’ text.

2. It is important to emphasize that a thematic infinitive in -έμεν does not come entirely for free in the language of elegy. Differently from the situation in Homer and Hesiod, where these forms serve as useful metrical alternatives for the ending -ειν, the reason for choosing the form νηφέμεν over νήφειν in our case could not have been metrical: in elegiac distich a contracted biceps is entirely admissible in the first colon of the pentameter and there is no shortage of examples in Archilochus.

In the very few cases where we find thematic infinitives in -έμεν in elegists, they can be shown to come directly from epic or be due to epic influence. In fact, West (1974: 106) lists only two such forms: one is ἔχεμεν in the Theognidea, that at least at 924 is clearly owed to Hes. Op. 457 (which likewise contains μελέτην ἔχεμεν ‘take care’), and the other is the future infinitive γηράσεμεν (Simon. 20. 7 W.2 = 7. 12 G.–P.) which presents a more complicated case. Here is the text:

οὔτε γὰρ ἐλπίδ’ ἔχει γηρασέμεν οὔτε θανεῖσθαι
He has no expectation of old age or death.

has led students of Longinus to assume that καρδίη νήφοντος ἀργά is a poetic quotation (as first argued by Ellis 1894–1896, 387; Russell 1970, 164 thinks of Anacreon; West prints the line as Adesp. iamb. 39), but this is hardly necessary and there does not have to be a direct connection with the proverb τὸ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ νήφοντος ἐπὶ τῆς γλώττης ἐστὶ τοῦ μεθύοντος (Plu. De garr. 503).

6 Among all dialects of Ancient Greek, only in mainland Aeolic was the originally athematic infinitive suffix -μεν transferred to thematic stems: from epichoric Aeolic one may compare East Thessalian ὑπαρχεμεν, μενεμεν, ἀγαγεμεν, Boeotian ἀγιρεμεν, καταβαλλεμεν, πεμπεμεν, and an infinitive φερεμεν is found in Corinna. See Thumb/Scherer (1959) 43; 71; Blümel (1982) 208–210.

7 The suffix of Aeolic infinitives in -έμεν for the most part occupies the biceps of the fourth or the fifth foot (before a vowel), conforming to the well-known preference for a dactylic word-end before the bucolic dieresis and before the sixth foot. By using these Aeolic forms the bards were able to avoid Ionic -ειν that would fill the biceps, resulting in an undesirable spondaic fourth (or fifth) foot.

8 Archil. 1. 2 καὶ Μουσάων ἐρατόν | 3. 4 ταύτης γὰρ κείνοι | ; 9. 10 εἰ κείνοι κεφαλήν | ; 11. 2 θῆσον τερτολάς | ; 14. 2 οὐδεὶς ἄν μάλα πόλλα’ |. See West (1982) 45.

9 κρύπτεμεν<αι δ’> recently conjectured by Gärtner (2008) 1 in Archil. fr. 12 W. instead of transmitted κρύπτομεν appears particularly risky in view of the argument developed in this paper (even though an infinitive would be entirely conceivable, see West 1974, 118). Bossi’s (1997) 37 κρύπτομέν<ων> is a viable alternative.

10 Here and below the translation of Simon. 20 W.2 follows Sider (2001) 273.
This time a purely metrical explanation appears entirely plausible (the infinitive in -έμεν helps to avoid a spondaic fourth foot with diaeresis) and one might argue that Simonides simply used an epic form as a convenient metrical variant. But in my opinion, thematic considerations, too, must have played a role, since there are reasons to think that Simonides could intentionally be striking a Homeric note in this particular elegy. With the publication of P. Oxy. 3965 in 1992 it became clear that the poem continues by a recommendation to consider something Homer once said (or, less likely, did):

- ἥ λήθην] γλώσσης ἔκφυγ' 'Ομηρ[ος φέρε

Consider [the account of the man of] old: Homer escaped [the forgetting of his words]

Moreover, it is likely that the same poem included an actual quote from Homer, namely, οἵ περ φύλλων γενετή, τοίῃ δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν (II. 6. 146 = Simon. 19. 2 W. = 7. 2 G. – P.); note that Stobaeus presents frs. 19 and 20. 5–12 as one continuous passage. In the light of this explicit Homeric echo in this poem the assumption would no longer be outlandish that Simonides coined the form γηράσέμεν in order to set the right tone and prepare his audience for a Homeric reminiscence which they would immediately recognize.

11 Future infinitives in -σέμεν are amply attested in Homer: 44 in the Iliad, 23 in the Odyssey.

12 Text printed in W. West (1993) 10 gives a slightly different conjectural restoration:
- ἥ λήθην] γλώσσης ἔκφυγ' 'Ομηρ[ος φέρε

13 West (1993) 10–11 suggested, following Parsons, that fr. 19 contains the actual Homeric words that the poet urges his audience to pay heed to and as such should follow fr. 20 rather than precede it (accepted by Gigante 1994, 61; Sider 2001, 279 is skeptical); according to West’s reconstruction, Simonides is contrasting Homer’s art with that of contemporary poetry, performed in symposia (l. 17 ἐν θαλήσῃ ‘in feasts’), full of lies and pliability (l. 16 ψιλόν ‘false’, l. 18 ἐνστρέπτων ‘well-plaited’).

14 The non-Ionic long [ἄ] in γηράσέμεν which troubled Bergk (1882) 426 who contemplated γηράσεμεν and West (1974) 78 who called the form a special case, has nothing to do with the dialectal problem at hand and is in fact unproblematic. The same [ἄ] recurs in Ionic in other verbal forms: perf. γεγήρασα, fut. γήρασα and γήρασόμαι, aor. ἐγήρασα and verbal adjective ἀγήρατος. All these forms are based on aor. ἐγήρα that was perceived by the speakers as a root aorist of the type ἔδω or ἔβη made from a long-vowel root: the aor. ἐγήρασα can therefore be viewed as a sigmatic extension of ἐγήρα, on par with κατέδωκα: κατέδωκα, ἐβη : ἐβησα or ἐβιώ : ἐβιώσε (see Schmidt 1968, 15–16 with references to earlier works).
One more form of the same kind may be discussed here, even though it is found in a piece from a different genre: the aorist infinitive εὑρέμεν is used in a hyporcheme of contested authorship; Simonides appears a likely candidate (Simon. 255.6 Poltera = Pi. fr. 107a. 5 S–M):

(Πελασγών ἵππον ἥ κύνα
 Αμυκλάιαν ...
 οίος <8> ἀνα Δώτιον ἀνθεμέν
 πεδίον πέταται θάνατον κεράστα
 εὑρέμεν μανίων ἐλάφῳ

(The Pelasgian horse or dog from Amyklai)
even as it flies over the flowery
Dotian plain, enraged, in order to find death
for the horned deer.

It is a Thessalian horse that pursues the deer and it is this context that may have triggered the use of a specifically Thessalian form, familiar to Simonides who likely lived at the courts of the ruling families of Thessaly for many years. This dialect awareness might appear striking, but is in fact no more so than the Homeric use of unassibilated βωτιάνειρα applied solely to Thessalian Phthia, the homeland of Achilles or the use of Aeolic φήρ in Homeric and post-Homeric poetry as a designation of Centaurs, endemic to the mountains of Thessaly. As in the case of γηράσμεν, the use of εὑρέμεν is determined by a combination of metrical and contextual factors.

15 On the authorship of this variously attributed poem see Poltera (2003) 211–214 who brings forth a new argument in favor of ascription to Simonides (following Boeckh) and not Pindar (Wilamowitz 1922, 502–505) or Bacchylides (Reinach 1898, 416–418).
16 Poltera’s colometry is different from Maehler’s; for other differences from Maehler’s text (κεράστα instead of κεροάστα, μανίων instead of ματείον) see Gallavotti (1962) 39–40.
17 The subject of πέταται has been traditionally understood as the horse and not the dog (see Poltera 2008, 432); the verb πέτα/ομαι in metaphorical meaning ‘to move swiftly’ is frequently applied to horses, cf. Il. 23. 372–449 ἵπποις ό δ’ ἐπέτοντο κονίντες πεδίον ‘and the horses flew through the dust of the flat land’ or the verse final formula τῷ δ’ οὐκ ἄκοντες πετέσθην ‘and they winged their way unreluctant’ that occurs in early Greek epic eleven times. From lyric poetry one may compare Bacch. 1. 19–20 ἐξευξεν ὕφρ’ ἀργόσαι ἵππους / οί δὲ πέτοντο ‘he yoked his horses under his chariot and they flew’.
18 See Molyneux (1992) 117–145. In addition to the evidence assembled by Molyneux, note that the name of Echecratidas, the ruler of Thessaly and the father of Antiochus for whom Simonides wrote a threnos (PMG 528), is attested in fr. 22 W. (see recently Livrea 2006).
20 Including Simonides (PMG 587).
Let us review the argument thus far. Aeolic infinitives in -έμεν are as a rule avoided in early elegiac poetry, so the form νηφέμεν in Archil. fr. 4. 9 requires an explanation. Νηφω is a colloquial verb, so the form cannot be put down as an epicism. The form cannot simply be a metrical variant, since Ionic νήφειν would be unimpeachable in the first part of a pentameter colon. The rare instances of Aeolic infinitives -έμεν in elegy can be shown to have been triggered by dependency on epic models of one kind or another. Assuming that the form is Archilochus’ own coinage, therefore, the question is whether the poet intended the final distich of fr. 4 to resonate with the epic tradition; and if so, whether it was a specific allusion to a fixed text or a reference to a broader tradition21.

3. Before we can answer these questions, we should briefly address two more non-Ionic (viz. epic-Aeolic) elements in the language of Archilochus: the apocope of preverbs and the dative plural in -εσσι. The former is represented by one example, the aorist κάλλιπον (fr. 5,2 W.). Why did Archilochus use it? Is it because “he has no choice; his technique is wholly that of the oral Epic”,22 and he simply chose the form that was most convenient to open the second colon of the pentameter line? Probably not. Despite Treu’s skepticism (1979, 192), I agree with Letoublon (2008) 56 that what we find here is mock-epic23. While Archilochus is certainly not trying to compose his poem in the epic dialect24, he engages with epic material and epic themes; by intentionally choosing a Homeric form (κάλλιπον is attested 11 times in Homer) he emphasizes his antagonistic relationship to the tradition of epic poetry, while possibly creating an additional comic effect25.

As for the Aeolic datives in -εσσι, apart from ἀλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι (8.1), a phrase borrowed from the epic tradition26, we find the form τηλεθάεσσι in the Cologne Epode, a poem that has several other examples where humor results from the usage of elevated epic vocabulary in sexual context27.

21 See Barker/Christensen (2006) for the notion of traditional referentiality.
22 Page (1964) 133.
23 For the notion see Harvey (1947); Fowler (1987). Letoublon, just as Jaeger (1934) 165 before her, actually uses the word ἱρονύμος. Compare Barker/Christensen (2006).
24 Note the absence of many characteristic epic-Aeolic forms in the poem, e.g. as κε, -οιο, θεά.
25 Anderson (2008) discusses another interesting detail in this fragment and reaches conclusions that seem to support Letoublon’s interpretation: the fact that the protagonist of the poem did not toss his shield away to flee, but left it by a bush (παρὰ θάμνῳ) must have added a comic dimension to the poem.
26 ἀλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι is found at Od. 5. 335; Hymn. Ap. 73; Hymn. Diosc. 15.
27 See Fowler (1987) 41–42: l. 3 καὶ σε θυμός ἰδύει, l. 7 εἶδος ἄμωμον, l. 11–12 ἐσθλῆς [...] γυναικός, l. 12 ἣν νῦν γῆ κατ’ εὐρώσεσσ’ ἐξει, l. 23 ἐς ποιηφόρους / κήπους.
Archil. 196a. 42–44 W.):

τοσὺ ὑπὲνον· παρθένον δ’ ἐν ἄνθεσιν
τηλεθάσσοι λαβὼν ἐκλίνα.

So much I said. I took the maiden
and laid her down in the blooming flowers.

Making this case more interesting than κάλλιστον is the fact that τηλεθάσσοι is not simply an epicism, or, rather, not an epicism at all: the epic form is the participle τηλεθάων ‘flourishing, blooming’\(^\text{28}\). τηλεθάσσοι has a short vowel before the ending -εσσι (carefully noted as such on the papyrus), which has been a source of major confusion for the commentators: the form was mechanically derived from a nominative *τηλεθάεις with an original suffix *-ent-, an adjective of the type that in Greek is normally formed from ā- or o-stems, rarely from s-stems. Neither of these derivational patterns would elicit the purported *τηλεθάεις: a second declension noun would not provide the right vowel timbre (στόνος → στονόεις), while a first declension noun would fail to provide the right quantity, since the derivatives of ā-stems keep their long vowel intact. The expected Ionic form would therefore have been either *τηλεθήεις (cf. τιμήεις < *τιμάεις) or *τηλεθείες with later prevocalic shortening (cf. ἤχεντα (Archil. fr. 122.8 W.) < *ἐκέεις < *μάκεεις < *μάκε-αμέεις ← ἤχη).\(^\text{29}\)

It is also important to note that an expectable Ionic uncontracted dative plural *τηλεθάουσι\(^\text{30}\) and Archilochus’ “epic” τηλεθάσσοι are metrically equivalent. This observation combined with the preceding one makes it clear that τηλεθάσσοι and νηφεμεν are birds of a feather: both look like epic forms, neither is explicable by metrical reasons alone and, as we will see momentarily, neither could belong to any spoken dialect.

But how exactly is τηλεθάσσοι formed? Scholars who noticed the problem of the short -ά- preferred to circumvent it by listing several alleged exceptions to the rule that warrants either a long -ά/η- or an -ο- before the suffix *-ent-\(^\text{31}\). The

\(^{28}\) The form is also attested as distracted τηλεθάων.

\(^{29}\) A noun *τηλεθή is not attested, perhaps, by accident, but this is not necessarily a problem: in theory, a speaker of Greek could derive *τηλεθήεις directly from the verb *τηλεθάω, since denominative verbs in -άω, themselves derived from ā-stems, often coexisted with adjectives in *-άες (τιμή: τιμάω: τιμήεις, αὐθή: αὐθάω: αὐθήεις, etc., see Risch 1974, 154).

\(^{30}\) τηλεθάουσι was independently conjectured here by Kamerbeek (1976) 125 and Gallavotti (1973–74) 28, but it is hard to see how the presumed corruption could have taken place.

\(^{31}\) Degani (1974) 126 n. 8; Risch (1975) 224–225.
authority of these scholars, in particular, of the linguist E. Risch, must have led students of Archilochus to the belief that there was no problem at all\(^2\). But the alleged examples of -δεῖς seem not to have been examined with sufficient care: in fact, all of them are either voces nihili or products of analogies that would not produce *τηλεθάεις\(^3\). The Archilochean form thus remains completely isolated.

\(^{2}\) In a recent linguistic commentary on the poem Risch is cited as the author of a definitive explanation (Colvin 2007, 209), but ironically he is credited with a solution via analogy which is in fact due to Ruigh (see below, n. 35).

\(^{3}\) According to Risch (1975) 224 “-άεις mit kurzem a [ist] nur spärlich bezeugt” in καταέως, χαιτάεις, ύψικρανάεις, εύναεις, γονάεις and -(ή)φάεις. (1) καταέωσαν ‘rich in mint’, given by the dictionaries as Zenodotus’ reading at Od. 4. 1 for κητάεωσαν of the paradoxis (so printed by Dindorf after Eustath. 1478. 38), should be corrected to κατάεσσαν (with å): this is the reading actually found both in the mss. of the HMQR scholia and in P. Oxy. 2377.6 containing the verse from Callimachus’ Hecale quoted by Zenodotus (fr. 639 Pfeiffer = fr. 47 Hollis = SH 286), see Rengakos (1992) 27. An Ionic κατέσσα corresponding to Doric κατάεσσα probably lurks behind Nicander’s καλάμυνθον χαιτέσσαν (Th. 60; see Cazzaniga 1963). (2) χαιτέσσα ‘long-maned’ is transmitted at Ael. H. A. 16. 24 in a quote from Semon. 7. 57 W. ’where Meineke’s (1830) 63 conjecture χαιτέσσα is almost certainly right from the viewpoint of textual criticism (the mss. of the other source for Semonides’ passage, Stob. 4. 22. 193, have χαιτής and χαιτίον), meter (a short vowel is required before -εσσα’) and linguistics (a prevocalic shortening in a properly formed form χαιτέσσα, cf. τελέεντα Tyrt. 4. 2 and Πετρέντονος Inscr. v. Magnesia 116. 37). The origin of Aelian’s hyper-Attic variant χαιτέσσα can be explained in the following way: the reading of the archetype of Historia Animalium seems to have been not ἀβρη χαιτέσσα, but ἀβρα χαιτέσσα (see Jacobs 1832, 549 for the mss. readings). Since Aelian, renowned and commended for his Atticismus, used an Attic form of the first adjective, he may just as well have wanted to atticize the second one: the word for ‘mane’ was of course χάιτη both in Attic and Ionic, but since 1) adjectives in -ήεις > -έεις often coexisted with denominative verbs in -άω and 2) corresponding verbs in Ionic are mostly verbs in -έω, the relation between Attic adjectives in -έεις and Ionic adjectives in -έεις (e. g. ἐλακάεις vs. ἐλακέεις) could have been reinterpreted as the same that obtains between Attic νικά and Ionic νικέ, and as a result, Ionic χαιτέεις could engender a hyper-Attic χαιτεις. (3) ύψικρανάεις ‘high rugged’ is known from a papyrus commentary on a piece by Antimachus of Colophon (Antim. fr. 113 Matthews = 188 Wyss); the letter preceding the suffix -εσσα on the papyrus is mutilated. There is no *κράνη from which -κράνεις could have been derived. Rather, Antimachus’ ψαλνικ is an extended form of the poetic word κράναος ‘rocky’, a metrical Streckform (cf. Homeric φασιμόντες, απήσσαν or μεσής). The expected shape of the adjective is thus *(ψι)κράναεις and not *(ψι)κράναεις; the word is thus irrelevant for the present discussion. *-κράναεντ with a tribrach became *-κρανάεντ through hyphaeresis (compare *δενδρεντ ‘rich in trees’ > *δενδρεντ reshaped into δενδρεντ in order to avoid a cretic shape), and the word could be employed in hexameter as ψικράναεσσα (the commentator insists that the word should be spelled together, and muta cum liquida word internally always makes position in Antimachus). (4) εὐφάεις (accent uncertain) is a hapax at Aesch. fr. 44. 3 Radt ὃμβρος δ’ ἀπ’ ἑυναέντος τάυρονοι πεσόν / ἔκοψε γαιάν (ἐυφάντοντος Athen. 13. 73 (600A), cod. A: εὐφάντος cod. C sec. m., Eusth. ad II. 978. 25). This epithet of the sky does not have to have anything to do with εὐφή ‘bed’ and ἵμηρος γόμος between the earth and the sky; it may rather have meant simply ‘fair flowing’ and be a participle from an intransitive aorist νάη, analogically
In my opinion, we should take the form τηλεθάεσσα at face value, namely, as a nonce form, created by the poet himself. Assuming that Archilochus’ intention was for the entire seduction scene to have an epic flavor, something that the vernacular form *τηλεθῶσι would be unlikely to convey, it can be argued that τηλεθάεσσα is an artificial morphological creation. This solution was put forth by C. Ruijgh, who pointed out, quite correctly, that a stem like ἥχεςντι – thanks to the vowel changes in Ionic – could be perceived as derived directly from the verb of ἥχεω, and therefore a four-part analogy could have generated a form in -άεσσα on the basis of a verb in -αετ–: ἥχεω: ἥχεςι = θηλεθῶ: Χ, X = θηλεθάεις. Archilochus’ τηλεθάεσσα is thus an artificial form of the kind abounding in Homer; the difference is that in the language of Homer such singularities were for the most part triggered by the meter, whereas in Archilochus the factor responsible for the appearance of the irregular form τηλεθάεσσα was his desire to use a form that would resonate with the epic tradition.

34 It is not unlikely that the poet wanted to make his audience think of Διός Ἀπάτη (see e.g. van Sickle 1975, 11–12; Slings 1987, 45).


36 Another example of an artificial nonce-form in Archilochean corpus is the neuter adjective ὑλέξειν ‘wooded’ (scil. ὄρος; Archil. fr. 122. 8–9 W.), necessitated by the meter (trochaic tetrameter, -έιν stands in the princible). Unfortunately, the form is not completely certain: Stobaeus’ text is corrupt (4. 46. 10 ἡδον ην) and P. Oxy. 2313 fr.1 (a) has tantalizing | ἐν. West prints ὑλέξειν, but thinks that the reading of the papyrus may have been ὑλήςειν citable from Cheirob. ii. 214. 18 Hilgard (cf. τυμήσειν Hdn. ii. 275). The form ὑλέξειν / ὑλήςειν (instead of expected ὑλέει /ὑλήςειν), labeled by Risch (1975) 221 n. 6 as an überraschende Dehnung, was generated by a proportional analogy with other adjectives in -ντος, e.g. παξ: πάν = ὑλέ/ἡςει: Χ, X = ὑλήςειν (neuter πάν is itself analogical, cf. πᾶν). ὑλήςειν / ὑλέξειν would probably still be uncontracted in Archilochus’ time, cf. παρήκμερε Archil. 94. 2, τυμήσει Call. 1. 6, τυμήσεια Mimn. 5. 5, τυμήσειος 12. 7; but if the spoken language already had contracted ὑλέειν, one could think of ὑλέειν as a case of distraction, again due to an analogy.

Several neuters in -έιν are found in Hellenistic poetry (ὄφρυφεσιν ‘rich in hills’ Call. fr. 186. 20 Pfeiffer, σκιώσειν ‘shaded’ Ap. Rh. 2. 404, δακρυσειν ‘weeping’ 4. 1291, πυρόσειν ‘fiery’ Nic. Ther. 748, etc.), but despite Smyth (1894) 277, these forms are not exactly comparable to ὑλήςειν:...
4. We can now return to the problem of νηφέμεν in the Archilochus’ fragment. The following hypothesis may be advanced: νηφέμεν is Archilochus’ own coinage which is best explained as another instance of mock-epic, with a combination of epic elevated grammar with a low-level vocabulary item being used to produce a comic effect in the context of an invitation to get drunk on duty. In support of this theory one might point to other epicisms in the poem, such as θοῆς διὰ σέλαμα νήός in line 6 which may hark back to epic νῆς θοαί (Il. 1. 12+); however, doing so would amount to begging the question, because νῆς θοαί may well have been conventional language in the 7th century and the fact that this also was a Homeric phrase does not need to mean much.

There is a much more significant indication of a real allusion to epic in our case: it appears that we can identify the specific point of contact with epic poetry which may have served as the model for the Aeolic form νηφέμεν in our elegy, namely, the midsummer festival scene in Hesiod (Op. 582–594), where in line 592 we read αἴθοπα πινέμεν οἶνον “drink some gleaming wine!” In view of the general similarity in spirit between the two passages as well as other thematic and stylistic parallels, to be discussed momentarily, it appears entirely plausible that Archilochus’ νηφέμεν owes its unexpected morphological make-up precisely to the Aeolic infinitive πινέμεν in Hesiod.

5. Despite the fact that the study of parallels between archaic epic and Archilochus has a very long tradition, the view that Archilochus knew an oral or written version of Works and Days and actively engaged with this text has rather, they are modeled on the Homeric use of forms like ὀμφαλόν before tritrochaic caesura, where lengthening is not uncommon (Il. 24. 269 ὀμφαλόν εὖ; see Marxer 1935, 29 and a somewhat garbled summary of her views in Livrea 1973, 364). Some Homeric mss. that Apollonius had access to may have spelled such forms with -ειν: the notation of metrically lengthened -εν as -ειν would in any event follow the model of ἐν(-) ~ εἰν(-) ‘in’.

37 Note that both Hesiodic αἴθοπα οἶνον and οἶνον ἐρυθρόν in Archilochus’ text are well-established epic formulae: αἴθοπα οἶνον (12x Il., 12x Od., 2x Hes. Op.), οἶνον ἐρυθρόν (5x Od., H. Cer. 208). The ratio existendi of πινέμεν in the fifth foot of hexameter is Meister’s bridge, see above, n. 7.

38 I am not certain why Burnett (1983) 39 interprets the Archilochean elegy as occasioned by a storm at sea: if she were right and the point of the fragment was the drunken defiance of both danger and order, the suggested comparison with the relaxed scene in Hesiod would be seriously undermined, but as far as I can see, there is nothing in the text to support her reading. The ship here is quite possibly a metaphor: for this nautical image in early Greek poetry see Nünlist (1998) 317–325.
certainly not become orthodox\textsuperscript{39}. Since our hypothesis implies precisely that, it behooves us to offer a few remarks on this topic.\textsuperscript{40}

Indeed, many of the parallels assembled by Renner 1871 and Steffen 1952–53\textsuperscript{41} may just as well be viewed as elements of conventional language and therefore have little bearing on the question of purported literary relationship between Hesiod and Archilochus. It seems, however, that we are in a somewhat better situation with the picnic scene from Hesiod. This passage, combining an invitation to drink with the theme of sexual desire, has impressed at least one other poet of comparable temperament, namely Alcaeus (fr. 347 Voigt)\textsuperscript{42}, and perhaps even two (Sappho fr. 101A Voigt\textsuperscript{43}); more importantly, the passage has probably left traces elsewhere in Archilochus’ oeuvre. In order to better appreciate these, it will be convenient to quote the Hesiodic text here in full:

\begin{verse}
\textsuperscript{590} Ἡμῶς δὲ σκόλυμος τ’ ἀνθεῖ καὶ ἡχέτα τέττις
dενδρέω ἐφεξόμενος λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ’ ἀοιδὴν
πυκνὸν ὑπὸ πετρόγνων θέρεος καματῶδες ἄρη,
tήμος πόσταται τ’ αίγες, καὶ οίνος ἄριστος,
μαχλόταται δὲ γυναίκες, ἀφαυρότατοι δὲ τοι ἄνδρες
eἰσιν, ἐπεὶ κεφαλῆς καὶ γούνατα Σείριος ἄξει,
αὐσαλέος δὲ τε χρώς ὑπὸ καμάτως· ἀλλὰ τότ’ ἡδη
ἐὰν πετραῖ τε σκῆ τι καὶ βιβλίνος οίνος
μάζα τ’ ἀμολγαί γάλα τ’ αἰγῶν οβεβνυμένων
καὶ βοὸς ὑλοφάγοιο κρέας μὴ πω τετοκυῆς
πρωτογόνων τ’ ἐρίφων· ἐπὶ δ’ αἴθοσα πινέμεν οίνον,
\end{verse}

\textsuperscript{39} The most recent study of the subject by Breitenstein (1971) has received several harsh reviews, all of which agree in that despite the amount of documentation assembled by the author the real proof is still lacking.

\textsuperscript{40} For the resonances of \textit{Works and Days} in other early Greek poetry see West (1978) 61 (e.g. Minn. fr. 6 W. – Op. 91–92; Tyrt. fr. 10. 3–6 – Op. 399–400; on Sem. fr. 6 W. – Op. 702–703 see also Janko 1982, 97–98).

\textsuperscript{41} E. g. ἀνήκεστοι κακοίς (Archil. 13. 5) vs. ἀνήκεστον κακόν (Hes. \textit{Th.} 612) or ἀλλά μ’ ὁ λυσιμελής ὑπαίη δάμαινα πόθος (Archil. 196) vs. ἤδ’ ἔρος, δ’ ἀκάλλατος ἐν ἀθανάταιοι θεοῖς / λυσιμελής, πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ’ ἄνθρώπων / δάμαινα ἐν στήθεσι νόν καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν (Hes. \textit{Th.} 120–122).

\textsuperscript{42} See the excellent monographic treatment by Petropoulos (1994). For our purposes the similarity between lines 4–5 νῦν δὲ γυναίκες μιρώται | λέπτοι δ’ ἄνδρες “now women most pestilential, but men are feeble” and Op. 586 μαχλόταται δὲ γυναίκες, ἀφαυρότατοι δὲ τοι ἄνδρες is most important. It has been debated whether Hesiod’s and Alcaeus’ passages derive from the same stock of thematic material (so Hooker 1977, 81–2 and, with a different approach, Nagy 1990, 462) or Alcaeus imitates Hesiod (e.g. Page 1955, 303–306; Kassel 1981, 11–18; Burnett, 1983, 133). E. Bowie recently suggested that the poem was composed for a performance in a Boeotian symposium (2009, 119), which would explain the reason for imitation.

\textsuperscript{43} See Liberman (1992).
When the golden thistle blooms and the chirping cicada,
sitting in a tree, incessantly pours out its clear-sounding song
from under its wings in the season of toilsome summer,
at that time goats are fattest and wine is best,
and women are most lascivious, and men are weakest,
for Sirius parches their head and knees,
and their skin is dry from the heat.
At that time let there be a rock’s shadow and Bibline wine,
bread made with milk, cheese from goats that are just drying up,
and the meat of a forest-grazing cow that has not yet calved
and of newly born kids. Drink some gleaming wine, too,
sitting in the shade, when you have eaten to your heart’s content,
with your face turned towards fresh-blowing Zephyrus.

While one may be skeptical towards drawing a parallel between τέττιξ in l. 582
and the cicada in Archil. fr. 223 W.² (where the poet associates himself with the
shrilling insect), there are other, more plausible cases of parallelism between this
passage and Archilochus’ poems⁴⁴. One of them in my opinion is fr. 107 W.³:

έλπομαι, πολλοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν Σείριος καθαυανεῖ
δὲς ἐλλάμπωνν

Many of them, I expect, will be dried up
by the Dog Star’s fierce rays

We do not have a clear context for the fragment⁴⁵, but the mention of the Sirius is
a promising lead. The parching effect of the Dog Star is frequently mentioned in

---

⁴⁴ An allusion to the summer picnic scene in the Works and Days with its erotic subtext has been
found in Archil. fr. spur. 331, for which “more than one indecent interpretation is possible” (Dover
1964, 185 n. 1): συκῆς πετραίας πολλάς βόσκουσα κορώνας, / εὐήθεις ξείων δέκτρα Πασιφή Like
a fig-tree on rocky ground that feeds many crows, good-natured Pasiphile takes on strangers. The
similarity between συκῆς πετραίας and πετραίας σκιή (Op. 581) has been duly noted (see e.g.
Breitenstein 1971, 54 n. 135) and this comparison may be valid (on the obscene fig-symbolism see
Buchheit 1960), but it appears fairly certain that the ascription of Pasiphile epigram to Archilo-
chus is erroneous: see West (1974) 139–140 and Silk (1985) for an additional linguistic argument.

⁴⁵ The fragment is quoted by Plu. Quest. Conv. 3. 10. 2 (= Mor. 658b) in the context of a discussion
of desiccation of bodies (τὸν δ’ ἥλιον ἀναρατήσειν μᾶλλον ἐκ τῶν αὐξάτων τὸ νοτερὸν διὰ τὴν
πύρωσιν but the sun by its burning heat draws rather all moisture from the bodies). According to
Hawkins (2009) 8, σῶματα in this passage are corpses, but it is hardly possible to exclude the
meaning ‘bodies of living people’ (on the use of σῶμα see Renehan 1979).
Greek literature: it is mostly said to threaten crops and livestock\(^46\), but it is only in Hesiod and Alceus (fr. 347 Voigt) that its destructive heat is said to affect humans. The disastrous effect is rather specific: as has been noticed, κεφαλὴν καὶ γοῦνατα (Σείριος ἄξει) in Hesiod (Op. 587) refers to procreation and semen\(^47\). The similarity between the passages in Archilochus and Hesiod in respect to Sirius has, too, long been noticed\(^48\), but has not, to my knowledge, been explained. In my opinion it would not be unreasonable to speculate that πολλούς ἀντίων in Archilochus is unlikely to refer to crops and the poet rather uses καθαυανεῖ (Hesiod’s ἄξει, having the passage from the Works and Days in mind: he hopes (ἔλπομαι) that his enemies become driest of semen (Hesiod’s ἄφαυροτάτοι\(^49\)), the inability to perform sexually being a fitting topic for an iambic invective\(^50\).

Another echo of the Hesiodic picnic scene may be found in the much-discussed Archilochus’ fragment 2 (ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μάξα μεμαγμένη...): D. Arnould and F. Bossi have independently pointed out a number of parallels between this fragment and Op. 589–593, such as Βίβλινος οἶνος ~ οἶνος Ἰομαρικός, μάξα ἀμολγαίη ~ μάξα μεμαγμένη, ἐν σκηνῇ ἐξόμενον ~ ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος\(^51\). These similarities become particularly significant in view of the closeness between Archil. fr. 2 and our fragment 4: as is well known, the idea of joining these two Archilochean fragments has been on the market for a while\(^52\).

6. We can thus conclude that the form νηφέμεν in Archil. fr. 4.9 is not an epicism, but rather the poet’s own coinage, modeled on the epic-Aeolic infinitive πινέμεν in Hesiod (Op. 592). This artificial form had a two fold effect: a lowly root adorned with a high-flown epic ending added a comic dimension to the poem and


\(^{48}\) See West (1978) 305.

\(^{49}\) On ἄφαυροτάτος see Renehan (1980) 356.

\(^{50}\) One is reminded of the narrative in Mnesipes’ inscription (SEG XV 517, col. iii, 41–46) according to which the men of the Paros who put Archilochus on trial for his too iambic poem (fr. 251 W’) were punished with impotence (in addition to Nagy 1979, 297–308 see the recent discussion by Clay 2004, 10–26).


\(^{52}\) Mentioned by Diehl as a possibility and later independently argued by Bowra (1954) 43 (= 1970, 71) and Gentili (1965) 132–134 (and in several subsequent publications); accepted by Aloni (1981) 49; 57; Bossi (1990) 70–71 and, in a more reserved way, Russo (1973–1974) 714. Skeptical or uncertain are van Groningen (1930) 77 n. 2; Davison 1960; Giannini (1988) 43–44; Lasserle 1979; Lennartz (2010) 457 n. 1642. In view of the paragraphos and coronis that stand in the papyrus, fr. 4 was considered a separate poem in the Alexandrian edition of Archilochus (by Aristophanes of Byzantium or Aristarchus).
served as a specific allusion to the midsummer picnic scene in Hesiod, a passage for which Archilochus had a special interest.
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