

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE APOLLODORAN DATE FOR ARCHILOCHUS

In his seminal article on the date of Archilochus, Felix Jacoby fixed the poet's *floruit* in the middle third of the seventh century B.C.E.: in fact, he went so far as to proclaim that "... the poet was a young man about 652 B.C."¹ What Jacoby established has become *communis opinio* inasmuch as scholars now generally accept that Archilochus' acme should be dated around the mid-seventh century.² Jacoby based his conclusion mainly upon the ancient synchronism of Archilochus with Gyges, the first Mermnad king of Lydia, a synchronism he thought had been suggested to ancient chronographers by the poet's own mention of Gyges in fragment 19 W and reinforced by allusions such as Herodotus' to their contemporaneity.³ Assuming that Gyges died in 652—an assumption by no means certain on the Assyrian evidence for him—and, on the basis of the Armenian version of Eusebius, that the beginning date of Gyges' reign was thirty-five years before his death, Jacoby could thus accommodate the evidence of "the most trustworthy ancient chronographer," Apollodorus of Athens.⁴ Apollodorus' date for Archilochus, also preserved in Eusebius, is precisely fixed at the first year of the twenty-ninth Olympiad.⁵ However, while Jacoby could establish Archilochus' life span roughly and so incorporate Apollodorus' date into the proposed

I thank Professor David Tandy for his very helpful comments upon an earlier draft of this paper, as well as the anonymous referee for *Classical Philology* for his/her very useful remarks. I am very grateful, too, to the editors of *CP*. As always, errors that remain in this paper are entirely my own.

1. F. Jacoby, "The Date of Archilochos," *CQ* 35 (1941): 97–109 (quotation p. 107; Jacoby's italics).

2. Cf., for example, D. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (London, 1967), 137; D. Gerber, *Euterpe* (Leiden, 1970), 8; H. D. Rankin, *Archilochus of Paros* (Park Ridge, N.J., 1977), 22–23 and 25–28 ("Archilochus was adult and practising his art about the middle of the seventh century B.C. and he probably died before the age of sixty") and C. G. Brown in *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, ed. D. Gerber (Leiden, 1997), 43–44.

3. Hdt. 1.12.2; cf. Jacoby, "Date of Archilochos" (n. 1 above), p. 99 and n. 1; cf. also idem, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin, 1902), p. 143, n. 2. On frag. 19 cf. V. Parker, "Τύπαννος," *Hermes* 126 (1998): 150–51. All poetic fragments of Archilochus in this paper are referenced according to M. L. West, ed., *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1971).

4. Jacoby, "Date of Archilochos," 99; *Apollodors Chronik* (n. 3 above), 142–50; on Apollodorus, his life, *Χρονικά*, and methodology see *Apollodors Chronik*, 1–59; see further R. Münzel, "Apollodoros (61)," *RE* 1.2 (1912): 2855–56; J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*³, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1921), 137; and R. Pfeiffer, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1968), 252–66. Jacoby seems to have relied for this date upon the conclusions of M. Gelzer, "Das Zeitalter des Gyges," *RhM* 30 (1875): 230–68, esp. 249–56; and F. C. Lehmann-Haupt, "Gyges (2)," *RE* 7.2 (1912): 1956–66, adding (p. 99, n. 3): "If not 652, a little later; there is no need to go into the detail." Quite to the contrary, there is need, for the date of Gyges' death is not so easily fixed: cf. M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, "Gyges and Ashurbanipal," *Orientalia* 46 (1977): pp. 78–79, n. 25 ("... not before 650"), and p. 84; and A. Spalinger, "The Date of the Death of Gyges and its Historical Implications," *JAOS* 98 (1978): 401–9 (Gyges' death = after 645), all of whom adduce and interpret Assyrian historical records in contradiction to Jacoby's dating. Cf. also H. Kaletsch, "Zur lydischen Chronologie," *Historia* 7 (1958): 25–34, who nonetheless opts for 652 as Gyges' death date; Rankin, *Archilochus* (n. 2 above), 22–23; and F. Lasserre and A. Bonnard, *Archiloque: Fragments* (Paris, 1958), xxvi–xxvii; and cf. n. 6 below.

5. See A. Schoene, ed., *Eusebi: Chronicorum Canonum*, vol. 2 (Zurich, 1967), 86–87 (Olym. 29.1): Ἀρχίλοχος καὶ Σιμωνίδης καὶ Ἀριστοξένος οἱ μουσικοὶ ἐγνωρίζοντο ("Archilochus et Simonides et Aris-

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

range of years (i.e., Gyges' reign), he could not explain why Apollodorus exactly dated Archilochus to 664/3 B.C.E.⁶

In a later attempt to unravel the ancient dating of Archilochus, Alden Mosshammer observed that the poet's synchronism with Olympiad 29.1 could not have derived from an Apollodoran one with Gyges, since, for Apollodorus, as for Herodotus, Gyges ruled from 716 to 679 B.C.E.⁷ Mosshammer suggested that Apollodorus worked instead from the "woes of Magnesia" poem (frag. 20 W), Archilochus' notice of that city's destruction by marauding Cimmerians. Apollodorus inferred from Herodotus, whose *Histories* he well knew, that Magnesia-on-the-Maeander was taken during the reign of Gyges' successor, Ardys (679–631 B.C.E.); thus Archilochus should be dated after the disaster he noticed and within that reign, not Gyges'.

The chronographer achieved a fitting date for Archilochus by applying his theorem of forty-year literary and philosophical successions beginning with Thales' acme (585/4). Reckoning inclusively backward from that first to Thales' birth (624/3), Apollodorus then arrived at 663/62, that is, Olymp. 29.2, his date for Archilochus. To explain the discrepancy of dates, Mosshammer ventured that, while Eusebius derived his date for Archilochus from Apollodorus, the latter "established an approximate date," adducing the chronographic formula to compute the year only within the required interval. The implication apparently is that Eusebius (or an intermediary) then made the date for Archilochus Olympiad 29.1 instead of 29.2. Mosshammer's attempt, though ingenious, is unsatisfying because of the discrepancy between the precise Apollodoran date as stated in the Eusebian tradition, and the date achieved by the calculation he proposes—another precise one. The disagreement subverts the notion that Apollodorus himself reckoned in this way in this case.⁸ Apollodorus' date for Archilochus has thus eluded satisfactory explanation.

to xenus musici inlustres habentur"); cf. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, 142–43. Cf. A. Hauvette, *Archilochus: Sa vie et ses poésies* (Paris, 1905), 36–40; and A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Cranbury, N.J., 1979), 214–17. Both Jacoby and Mosshammer agree that it is Archilochus to whom the specific date refers and that the two other poets (i.e., Simonides/Semonides of Amorgus and Aristoxenus of Selinus) are attached to him rather than the reverse. See n. 16 below.

6. Cf. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, 150: "warum Apollodor gerade das Jahr 664/63 gewählt hat, ist nicht zu sagen"; cf. also Rankin, *Archilochus*, 25–28. Although, as Jacoby, "Date of Archilochus," p. 101, n. 1, and Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius* (n. 5 above), 214, observe, Eusebius dated the last year of Gyges to 664 in the *Canons*, and both believe that he followed Apollodorus in dating Archilochus, Mosshammer (215) points out that Apollodorus dated the end of Gyges' reign to 679 (see n. 7 below). This means that (1) Apollodorus did not date Archilochus in respect of Gyges (so Mosshammer) and (2) that Eusebius did not follow Apollodorus for Gyges' reign. Jacoby's suggestion, that the Apollodoran date for Archilochus was fixed in accordance with the end of Gyges' reign (see n. 1 above), therefore cannot be correct. It is possible that Eusebius adopted (quite logically) a Lydian chronological source for Lydian chronology, thus rejecting and so conflicting with the (arguably no more secure) Alexandrian chronology for Gyges; cf. however n. 16 below. At all events, the death date of Gyges seems to have been a remarkably variable one in antiquity—and is perhaps even more so modernly; cf. Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*; and n. 8 below.

7. Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*, 215–16 (after Gelzer's suggestion?); cf. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, p. 150, n. 21.

8. Mosshammer (*Chronicle of Eusebius*, 159) observes that Diogenes Laertius used a handbook version of Apollodorus' chronology, Ἀπολλόδορος ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς, which specified precise years in Olympiads, but the source "most nearly akin to the sources of Eusebius' Olympiad chronicler" was one that expressed "the dates with an Olympiad number." Eusebius lived and worked before Diogenes and so had, at the very least, access to the same chronographic sources available to Diogenes: he was a chronographer specifically, obviously much interested in the chronographic sources available and presumably more in their

What then can account for Apollodorus' date? As a preliminary to this paper's address to that question, an observation of Jacoby's must be restated. For the ancients, the primary evidence for dating Archilochus must have been the poems themselves. That observation makes a great deal of sense and will be operative in this paper.⁹ On the other hand, Jacoby's rather contradictory assertion, that "the authority for Apollodorus is almost certainly" one Glaucus of Rhegium, will not hold up.¹⁰ Jacoby observed that the work of Glaucus, an *auletes* who lived around 400 B.C.E., entitled *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν*, was quoted by Apollodorus for the life of Empedocles; as for Empedocles, so for Archilochus and his date: the source is Glaucus.¹¹ But Apollodorus was himself a pupil of the great Alexandrian scholar Aristarchus of Samothrace, who, among other works, produced what must have been a fairly thorough commentary on Archilochus' poems.¹² Aristarchus' scholarship and productivity were prodigious; the number and nature of his works illustrate the scope of his knowledge of and his facility with ancient Greek literature generally. As for his other works, so for the commentary: Aristarchus made use of the sources available for Archilochus in the Alexandrian libraries. Minimally these will have included more (and possibly many more) of Archilochus' poems than were extant even in later antiquity. Aristarchus, who was undoubtedly concerned with Archilochus' dates, could at least compare his reckoning with other authors if he did not rely entirely upon his own calculations and deductions based on the poet's own *oeuvre*.¹³ Even if Apollodorus did not have access to Aristarchus' commentary on Archilochus while in Alexandria, he did have access both to his teacher and the libraries while he resided there. The dating of Archilochus was obviously significant for Apollodorus and, following the methodological lead of his master, he should have at least consulted the evidence available in Alexandria. It seems reasonable to think then that Apollodorus relied for Archilochus' date either directly upon his poems, upon Aristarchus' commentary on the poems, if this were available, upon Aristarchus' sources for his commentary (including Aristophanes of Byzantium?), if not the commentary itself, or upon a combi-

precision than was Diogenes. In view of the evidence, there seems no good reason to discount any of the possible sources for Eusebius, including ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς; cf. Rankin, *Archilochus*, 25–28.

Magnesia-on-the-Maeander fell sometime after Sardis and after Gyges was slain. But when precisely? Mosshammer (216) does not explain why the "woes of Magnesia" poem (frag. 20 W) would be a better chronologic anchor for Apollodorus to date Archilochus than the Gyges poem (frag. 19). On the Cimmerians see Hdt. 1.6.3 and 1.15 (cf. W. W. How and J. Wells, eds. *A Commentary on Herodotus*, vol. 1 [Oxford, 1912], 60–62); cf. Spalinger, "Date of the Death of Gyges" (n. 4 above), 402–4, on Cimmerian invasion chronology.

9. Cf. Jacoby, "Date of Archilochos," 98; but cf. Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*, 216–17, on computation; see n. 13 below.

10. Jacoby, "Date of Archilochos," p. 100, n. 1; cf. also id., *Apollodors Chronik*, 148–49.

11. On Glaucus see E. Hiller, "Die Fragmente des Glaukos von Rhegion," *RhM* 41 (1886): 398–436; F. Jacoby, "Glaukos (36)," *RE* 7.1 (1912): 1417–20; and K. Ziegler, "Glaukos (6)," *Der Kleine Pauly*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1967), 812; cf. Rankin, *Archilochus*, 2.

12. On Aristarchus: L. Cohn, "Aristarchos (22)," *RE* 2.1 (1896): 862–73; Sandys, *History* (n. 4 above), 131–36; and Pfeiffer, *History* (n. 4 above), 210–33. On Apollodorus' association with Aristarchus: *Suda*, s.v. Ἀπολλόδοτος; cf. also Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, 1–9; and Rankin (*Archilochus*, 6), who notes Aristarchus' interest in Archilochus (cf. Quint. 10.1.159).

13. On the alleged Aristarchan maxim, that "each author is his own best interpreter" (or, perhaps more precisely, "Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν"), cf. Sandys, *History*, 132; and Pfeiffer (*History*, 225–27), who admits that the sentiment is Aristarchan in spirit, if not actually to be attributed to Aristarchus. If Aristarchan and actually a working principle of Aristarchus' scholarship, the maxim supports Jacoby's implication that Aristarchus, the teacher of Apollodorus, dated Archilochus by means of the contents of his poems.

nation of these. Glaucus of Rhegium may have been one source among others for Apollodorus; he was surely not the only one.

Other premises established by scholars will also be in operation in this paper. First, Apollodorus, like Aristarchus, was familiar with Herodotus, a primary source for the archaic period, but one who did not provide precise dates for the period.¹⁴ Second, rather than merely random or calculated, the chronographer's dating of Archilochus is, as Jacoby has pointed out, most reasonably an instance of "the doctrine of Apollodoros employing the usual artifice of assigning the *floruit* of a literary man, for whom an accurate date was not available, to the first, the middle, or the last year of a contemporary personage. . . ."¹⁵ That the chronographer merely calculated Archilochus' date, as Mosshammer has argued, appears quite unlikely in view of the resources available to him, and especially since 664/3 B.C.E. does not appear to fit well any scheme of calculation so far advanced. This must be expanded to include the possibility that the date for Archilochus' *floruit* could also have been coordinated with a memorable event occurring during the second quarter of the seventh century, with a luminous personage contemporary with what one (or more) of Archilochus' poems said or implied about him and his date, or with both in tandem. If randomness and calculation are eliminated from consideration, there is no other reasonable alternative and such inferences—and this latest premise for proceeding—are in line with those made by ancients and moderns alike about Archilochus' synchronism with, for example, Gyges, the "woes" of Magnesia, or an eclipse of the seventh century B.C.E. Finally, in spite of the linkage of Gyges and Archilochus by others, Apollodorus did not adopt that synchronism or, it seems, the Lydian tradition to date Archilochus, since the Apollodoran date for Archilochus can be neither that of Gyges' accession, his acme, nor his death on any sound reckoning.¹⁶ That fact indicates that Apollodorus, though undoubtedly aware of the Herodotean synchronism of Gyges and Archilochus, rejected it for another. The rejection is really not surprising, since Apollodorus (and his teacher Aristarchus) had another very compelling chronographic tradition to draw upon in Alexandria—the Egyptian one.

What his Alexandrian resources permitted, in addition to Archilochus' own poems, must have provided Apollodorus (or Aristarchus) with reasons enough for dating Archilochus' *floruit* to 664/3 without apparent regard to Gyges or his reign. We are thus directed to seek a renowned contemporary event or personage connected with Archilochus by the chronographer or his source because of a mention of or an allusion to it, him, or her, in Archilochus' own poems, which, presumably, aligned with Egyptian chronology. In order to find him, her, it, or them, we must look beyond the unsuitable Gyges reference (frag. 19), the only vaguely datable "woes of Magnesia" fragment (frag. 20), and the eclipse citation (frag. 122), really a modern synchronism as Jacoby observes, since none of these is apt for dating Archilochus' acme. In fact,

14. Cf. Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*, 117–18.

15. Jacoby, "Date of Archilochos," p. 101, n. 1; cf. Sandys, *History*, 137; and Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*, 117 (somewhat contradictory of 216–17); cf. also nn. 6 and 13 above and n. 16 below.

16. It is true that, in Eusebius, Archilochus' *floruit* corresponds to the last year of Gyges' reign (see n. 6 above), but Eusebius' dates for Gyges are at variance with those of other ancient chronographers (notably Apollodorus; cf. Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*, 215; cf. also Jacoby, "Date of Archilochos," 101). It is certainly possible that, rather than dating Archilochus in accordance with Gyges, Eusebius or his source synchronized the last year of the elusive reign of Gyges with the otherwise derived (and apparently more secure?) Apollodoran date for Archilochus; cf. nn. 6 and 8 above and pp. 350–51 and n. 35 below.

we seem to possess just such a reference in Archilochus fragment 216 W, a fragment that, taken in conjunction with the testimonies of Herodotus' *Histories*, implies both a memorable event and a notable and datable personage, each with connections to Egypt and each contemporary with the Apollodoran date for Archilochus:

καὶ δὴ ἑπίκουρος ὥστε Κάρ κεκλήσομαι

And indeed (an) *epikouros* just like a Carian I shall be called.¹⁷

Scholars have tended to construe the fragment as Archilochus' pessimistic, indeed self-loathing, admission of his occupation as mercenary; the construction is based upon the fact that Carians were slighted as warriors in the classical period and, perhaps no less, upon modern disapproval of mercenary soldiering.¹⁸ However, a quite different interpretation is not only possible, but called for inasmuch as the key words Κάρ and ἐπίκουρος possessed specific, quite positive connotations in Archilochus' time.¹⁹

On the evidence, Carian warriors were not only not disdained or ridiculed by the Greeks of the mid-seventh century: they were esteemed. Their martial virtues are actually most notably depicted in the pages of Herodotus, who preserves Ionian traditions about them from then and after. The Carians were considered stout fighters, all but professionals, in fact, who traveled long distances away from their homes to fight on behalf of others. (Herodotus explicitly terms them ἐπίκουροι, thus attesting the positive connotations of Κάρ and ἐπίκουρος.²⁰) Warrior paragons, they were credited by the Greeks with the invention of hoplite armor.²¹ Herodotus records in some detail a most memorable expedition of Carian ἐπίκουροι to Egypt occurring around the mid-seventh century B.C.E., the very context for Archilochus' life and poems.²²

Herodotus tells us that, very early in the reign of Psammetichus (Psamtik, 664/3–610 B.C.E.), the first pharaoh of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, freebooting Carian and Ionian ἐπίκουροι came ashore in the Nile Delta to plunder.²³ An exile in the marshes, at deadly odds with the other Delta kings, Psammetichus hired the ἐπίκουροι on the spot to fight for him. The likeliest time for Psammetichus' enlistment of the Carians and Ionians was very late in 664 or early in 663, for it was then that he was isolated and without resources, in the greatest danger and so in most need of the foreign ἐπίκουροι.²⁴ (Like all aliens, these were hated by the Egyptians and it can only have been special circumstances that prompted Psammetichus to hire and settle the ἐπίκουροι

17. Quoted at *schol.* ad Pl. *Lach.* 187b (cf. n. 18 below); cf. Hauvette, *Archiloque* (n. 5 above), 65; Lasserre and Bonnard, *Archiloque* (n. 4 above), 9–10; M. Treu, *Archilochos* (Munich, 1959), 195; J. Tarditi, *Archilochus: Fragmenti* (Rome, 1968), 83; cf. also Gerber, *Euterpe* (n. 2 above), 3 and 24.

18. This negative appraisal seems grounded in a *scholion* whose ancient author misconstrued *Il.* 9.378 (τίω δέ μιν ἐν καρὸς αἴσῃ); cf. B. M. Lavelle, "Epikouros and epikouroi in Early Greek Literature and History," *GRBS* 38 (1997): p. 241, n. 30; cf. further, p. 236, n. 20, and pp. 239–40, nn. 26–28.

19. Cf. Lavelle, "Epikouros" (n. 18 above), 241–47.

20. Cf. Hdt. 5.111–12 on a valiant Carian ἐπίκουρος fighting in the Ionian Revolt for the Cypriot tyrant Onesilus; cf. B. M. Lavelle, "Herodotos on the Argives of Kourion," *AJP* 112 (1984): 249–52, and, "Epikouros," 248–49.

21. Inventors of weapons: Hdt. 1.171; cf. Lavelle, "Epikouros," p. 248, n. 47.

22. Hdt. 2.61, 152.4–5, 154; cf. Lavelle, "Epikouros," 250–56 and p. 250, n. 52.

23. On Psammetichus' dates see A. Spalinger, "Psammetichus, King of Egypt," *JARCE* 23 (1976): p. 133 and p. 143, n. 1; K. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 B.C.)* (Warminster, 1986), 406, 550, and 553.

24. Although early 663 to mid-663 seems more reasonable for the arrival of the ἐπίκουροι, very late 664 is just possible: cf. Lavelle, "Epikouros," p. 251, n. 54.

permanently in Egypt.²⁵) Psammetichus and his successors stationed the Carian and Ionian fighters and those who came after them in camps along the Nile, drawing upon them as their services were required.

The reign of Psammetichus and the expedition of the Carian and Ionian ἐπικούροι marked the “opening” of Egypt to the Greeks.²⁶ It was a momentous event for the Greek world and its results may be measured from the second half of the seventh century. Greek *kouroi* make their first appearance then, as do increasingly larger lithic temples: both had obvious prototypes in Egypt and their appearance in Greece must be due to the stimulus of contact with the Egyptians.²⁷ The florescence of Greek science at the end of the century owed a great deal to Egypt and to the heightened commercial contact with other eastern Mediterranean lands that regular contact with Egypt produced.²⁸ Of course the pharaoh who enrolled the *epikouroi* made special impact upon the Greeks, his name occurring among them.²⁹ What most impressed the Greeks and Carians initially, however, must have been the enormous fertility of Egypt, which contrasted sharply with the relative impoverishment of their own lands.³⁰ Indeed, Book 2 of Herodotus’ *Histories* is but a pale reflection of the wonder that Egypt must have created among the earliest of the Carian and Ionian ἐπικούροι.

Reports of returning *epikouroi* will have stimulated interest in Egypt at home in Ionia, especially among warriors like themselves. Relatively light duty with generous pay and land to work were surely powerful inducements for others who fancied that their own fortunes could be made in Egypt. The celebrity of the first expedition is actually guaranteed by the tradition that Herodotus preserves, a tradition that owed its beginnings to those who participated in it and reported about it, but its longevity to the Greeks at home who learned of it, whose imaginations were fired by it, and who passed along the information they had gotten to others, presumably the young and the warriors of the Ionian world. The first expedition became instantly renowned and remained so: its date was undoubtedly preserved in memory and possibly even in documentation in Ionia (and Caria), just as it surely was in Egypt. The advent of these Greek and Carian newcomers to xenophobic Egypt and their permanent establishment in camps along the Nile will not have escaped notice in the records associated with Psammetichus’ reign.

Archilochus, we know, was very much aware of current events affecting Ionia, and his penchant for remarking upon them or personages of interest to Ionians (e.g., the destruction of Magnesia and Gyges’ wealth), as well as upon conditions influencing the Greek warrior’s life, is vividly displayed in his poems. In view of that penchant, it is

25. Cf., e.g., Hdt. 2.39, 79.1, 91.1; cf. Lavelle, “*Epikouros*,” p. 255, n. 62.

26. Hdt. 2.154.3; cf. Diod. Sic. 1.66.12; Polyaeus 7.2.3. Cf. M. M. Austin, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age* (Cambridge, 1969), 15–34; T. F. R. G. Braun, “The Greeks in Egypt,” in *CAH*, vol. 3.3 (Cambridge, 1982), 44–48.

27. Cf. Braun, “Greeks” (n. 26 above), 55–56, for a synopsis of Egyptian influence on Greek visual arts. See also J. Boardman, *Greek Sculpture: The Archaic Period* (London, 1978), 18–20; S. Woodford, *An Introduction to Greek Art* (Ithaca, 1986), 39–42; and A. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*, vol. 1 (New Haven, Conn., 1990), 108–9, for Egyptian influence on Greek sculpture, specifically Greek *kouroi*. On architecture cf. R. Hahn, *Anaximander and the Architects: The Contributions of Egyptian and Greek Architectural Techniques to the Origin of Greek Philosophy* (Buffalo, N.Y., 2001); cf. also R. Osborne, *Greece in the Making: 1200–479 B.C.* (London, 1996), 208–14; and Lavelle, “*Epikouros*,” p. 259, n. 66; and n. 28 below.

28. On Egyptian science and Ionians cf. Diog. Laert. 1.24, 27 (Thales); cf. Braun, “Greeks,” 54–55; on Greek trade and merchantry in Egypt cf. Austin, *Greece and Egypt* (n. 26 above), 35–42; and n. 27 above.

29. Cf. Austin, *Greece and Egypt*, p. 52, n. 1; Lavelle, “*Epikouros*,” p. 259, n. 68.

30. Richness of Egypt: cf. Hdt. 2.14.2 (cf. also Braun, “Greeks,” 33–35).

difficult to believe that the famous Carian-Ionian ἐπικούρῖα to Egypt (or its follow-ups) went unnoticed in his poetry.³¹ After all, unlike the other current events that Archilochus noticed in his poems, which affected Archilochus and Greeks only obliquely if at all, this event had direct repercussions for Ionian warriors like himself. Even if Archilochus' poetic warrior persona was invented and such warriors as travelled to Egypt were not actually his real comrades-in-arms or adversaries, they were those whose lives he described, those with whom he obviously consorted and knew well, and, of course, those with whom he was most identified by others in antiquity.³²

In sum, because of the connotations of ἐπικούρος and Κάρ in the mid-seventh century B.C.E. and, most especially, the impact that the renowned Carian-Ionian expedition to Egypt had upon the Greeks, the fragment of poetry we know as Archilochus 216 should be understood in light of the reputation of the Carians as preeminent fighters and of that famous ἐπικούρῖα to Egypt. With this line, Archilochus appears both to allude to a celebrated contemporary historical event and, by linking ἐπικούρος and Κάρ, artfully—and quite characteristically—to play upon the Homeric usage of the words by disrupting their Homeric connections.³³ Rather than negative in sentiment, fragment 216 appears to be the poet's quite positive response to information about the expedition, an asseveration that Archilochus' "I" would at least seek to emulate the famous Carian ἐπικούροι as a warrior (as other Ionians apparently did), if "he" did not actually intend to go to Egypt as they had done in fact.³⁴

How precisely is Apollodorus' dating of Archilochus to be linked to this fragment? In fragment 216 we have what appears to be an allusion to a famous event and its participants and, in the event, a link to that Psammetichus who was celebrated among the Greeks as the pharaoh who permitted the first entry into Egypt of the Greeks and who was known to the Egyptians as the reunifier of their land. In view of the fame of that first expedition, which is indexed by Herodotus' report of it some two hundred years later, and of the "opening" of Egypt, which the expedition occasioned, the coupling of ἐπικούρος and Κάρ in the extant line of the fragment may have suggested the dating for Archilochus to Apollodorus (or perhaps to Aristarchus or his sources), especially if, as seems the case, the ancients identified the poet's "I" here with the poet himself. As the famous expedition was known from Herodotus to have occurred during what must have seemed the earliest part of Psammetichus' reign, since the pharaoh's regnal years and signal events of that reign were available to the Alexandrian scholars, and because, as Jacoby noted, it was Apollodorus' wont to align figures like Archilochus with contemporary famous personages, even an allusion to the expedition of the Carian ἐπικούροι such as fragment 216 could easily have suggested the synchronism of Archilochus with Psammetichus. Archilochus may well have spoken further about the Egyptian ἐπικούρῖα in lines preceding our fragment 216 or perhaps in other poetry no longer extant. At all events, the Apollodoran year given for Archilochus (664/3 B.C.E.) is exactly that of Psammetichus' first year of rule and the coincidence is ex-

31. Cf. Lavelle, "*Epikouros*," p. 260, n. 71.

32. Whether he actually was a soldier or merely purports to have been one, Archilochus, by turns, celebrates and deplores the Ionian warrior's life; cf. Archilochus frags. 2, 3, 5, 113.

33. Inasmuch as the most famous ἐπικούροι in the Homeric tradition are Glaucus, Sarpedon, and the Lycians at Troy, Archilochus alters Homeric sentiment in the line by substituting the anti-Homeric Κάρ for his audience where, influenced by the *Iliad*, that audience would probably have expected Λύκτιος; cf. Lavelle, "*Epikouros*," pp. 232–33, n. 12, and 239–47.

34. Cf. R. Drews, "The First Tyrants in Greece," *Historia* 41 (1972): 140–44.

plained if Apollodorus (or Aristarchus or another), using Egyptian chronology along with Herodotus' testimony and Archilochus' own poem(s) to date the poet's acme, aligned Archilochus with the famous pharaoh's inaugural year.³⁵

There is yet a further point to be made here. From the information they could gather, the Alexandrians concluded that Archilochus was a well-known poet and mature man circa 664/3 B.C.E.: obviously there was nothing in their researches to suggest otherwise. Presumably, the scholars also believed that Archilochus was actively producing poetry sometime before that. To Apollodorus and Aristarchus then, who had available to them the considerable resources of the Alexandrian Libraries, Archilochus was a "young man" rather earlier than Jacoby's 652 B.C.E.³⁶

B. M. LAVELLE

Loyola University of Chicago

35. Since Apollodorus dedicated the Χρονικά to Attalus II of Pergamon "just a year after the catastrophe in Alexandria" (cf. Pfeiffer, *History*, 254), obviously much (and perhaps even most) of the material in it will have derived from work done by him in Egypt.

36. A birth year of 704/3 B.C.E. thus seems to be indicated for Archilochus (cf. Lasserre and Bonnard, *Archiloque*, xxiii–xxiv, who propose 705 B.C.E. as the date of Archilochus' birth). Whether such a date could actually be right is, like that of Archilochus' acme, an entirely different question. It would appear, however, that the Alexandrians conceived of Archilochus, his poetry and his activity, as belonging more to the first half of the seventh century, in particular to its second quarter, than to its middle third as Jacoby and others would have it.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS' *DE IMITATIONE* AND *EPISTULA AD POMPEIUM*

At *Ad Pompeium* 3.1, Dionysius informs us that his discussion of Herodotus and Thucydides there reproduces the relevant section of his *De imitatione*. Scholars have been reluctant to believe that the text we have is the fulfillment of that promise. Comparison between the *Ad Pompeium* and the extant epitome of the second book of the lost *De imitatione*, it is argued, reveals differences too striking for the *Ad Pompeium* to represent the text the epitomator had before him or her.¹ There are three competing views that purport to account for these differences. The first, proposed by Usener² and recently defended by Heath,³ is that the *Ad Pompeium* was drawn from an early, unfinished, version of the *De imitatione*'s second book; the epitomator had the final version, into which Dionysius had introduced several changes. The second view, that of Sacks,⁴ is that the differences are so substantial that they have to be explained by

An earlier and somewhat different version of this argument appeared as part of my dissertation "Studies in Sallust's Historical Selectivity in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*" (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000). I am grateful for the comments of my dissertation committee, Professors J. K. Newman, William M. Calder III, Richard Mitchell, and Miriam R. Pittenger Pelikan. My thanks are also due to CP's anonymous reader, whose comments and suggestions were very helpful. None of the above should be blamed for any remaining flaws.

1. The epitome perhaps dates from the third century C.E.: so H. Usener, *Dionysii Halicarnassensis "Librorum de imitatione" reliquiae epistulaeque criticae duae* (Bonn, 1889), 7.

2. Usener, "De imitatione" (n. 1 above), 8.

3. M. Heath, "Dionysius of Halicarnassus On Imitation," *Hermes* 117 (1989): 370–73; this is also the view of S. Fornaro, *Dionisio di Alicarnasso "Epistola a Pompeo Gemino": Introduzione e commento* (Stuttgart, 1997), 164.

4. K. S. Sacks, "Historiography in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus," *Athenaeum* 61 (1989): 66–80.