

ARCHILOCHUS, STRABO AND THE LELANTINE WAR

WALTER DONLAN

The Pennsylvania State University

Fragment 3D of Archilochus:

Οὐ τοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται οὐδὲ θαμειαί
σφενδόναι, εἴτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγῃ
ἐν πεδίῳ· ξιφείων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον·
ταύτης γὰρ κείνοι δαίμονές εἰσι μάχης
δεσπόται Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί

was quoted by Plutarch (*Theseus* 5.1–4) to show that the ancient Abantes of Euboea were war-like and close-in fighters. Plutarch says also that the Abantes were the first to shave the fore part of their heads in order not to give their enemies a hand-hold in war. For this fact he gives as his authority Homer, referring, apparently, to *Iliad* 2.542, where the Abantes are called ὄπιθεν κομῶντες. The *Iliad* (2.543–44) is also the *locus classicus* for the fame of the Abantes as close-in fighters:

αἰχμηταὶ μεμαῶτες ὄρεκτῆσιν μελήσιν
θώρηκας ῥήξιν δηῖων ἀμφὶ στήθεσσι.

These lines are quoted by Strabo (10.1.13) as evidence of the ancient Euboeans' skill in hand-to-hand combat. Elsewhere, Strabo (10.3.6), drawing on the Euboean historian Archemachus (third century B.C.), notes that the "Curetes" settled at Chalcis, and in the continual warfare over the Lelantine plain they let their hair grow long behind, but cut it off in front to deny their opponents a hand-hold (hence their name). From the Homeric echo, ὄπιθεν κομῶντας, it is clear that Strabo (or Archemachus) identified the Curetes with the Abantes. All these citations, it should be noted, are concerned with the same thing—the fighting style of the early Euboeans—and reflect their traditional

reputation in antiquity as fierce warriors who fought at close quarters.

The poem of Archilochus just quoted has also been linked to another bit of ancient evidence supplied by Strabo. In 10.1.12 Strabo tells that in early times Chalcis and Eretria generally agreed with one another, and when they quarreled over Lelanton they did not cease agreement completely, but came to an accord on the conditions for conducting the contest. He gives as evidence for this "a certain *stèle*" in Amarynthus: *φράζουσα μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις*. Scholars have associated this agreement "banning" missile weapons with Archilochus' fragment and have used the relationship variously: to date the Lelantine War, to date Archilochus, and, especially, to illustrate the nature of the war and the conduct of the fighting.¹

At first glance a connection between the inscription and the first two lines of the poem seems very likely—a remarkable coincidence, whereby epigraphical evidence and the literary remains supplement one another and throw light on an early event, apparently important, but depressingly obscure.² There is, however, no evidence that connects Strabo's mention of the agreement between Chalcis and Eretria with Archilochus' statement about missiles. First of all, it is unlikely that Strabo himself had in mind the poem of Archilochus when he mentioned the *stèle*; he cites only Homer to show that the Euboeans were good at fighting hand-to-hand (while Plutarch cites both Homer and Archilochus). The improbability seems all the stronger when we consider that, in the same passage (10.1.13) where Strabo quotes Homer to show that the Euboeans excelled at close combat, he also quotes from *Iliad* 13.713–16, which tells that the Locrians did not fight in this way but relied on bow and sling. If Strabo knew the poem of Archilochus, and thought that it referred to the Lelantine War or to the use of missiles in war, he would most

¹ To date the war: A. R. Burn, "The So-called 'Trade Leagues' in Early Greek History and the Lelantine War," *JHS* 49 (1929) 33; D. W. Bradeen, "The Lelantine War and Pheidon of Argos," *TAPA* 78 (1947) 227, in recent times. To date Archilochus: most notably A. Blakeway, "The Date of Archilochus," in *Greek Poetry and Life* (Oxford 1936) 47. For attempts to use the two statements to reconstruct the character of the fighting see below, note 5.

² Bradeen (above, note 1) gives a convenient summary of the ancient evidence and modern views of the war. Burn's 1929 study (above, note 1) is still valuable; both treatments show how dependent we are on conjecture to flesh out the scattered ancient notices.

likely have included it here.³ In addition, all the ancient notices say (or imply) simply that the Euboeans fought at close quarters.

Homer (*Il.* 2.542–44): The Abantes wore their hair long behind; they were eager close-in fighters with the spear.

Archilochus (fr. 3): The “lords of Euboea, spear-famed” were masters at close fighting; a coming battle would see little fighting with bow and sling, but with the sword.

Strabo (10.1.13): The Euboeans were good at hand-to-hand combat (quoting *Il.* 2.543–44).

Strabo (10.3.6): The Curetes of Chalcis fought for the Lelantine plain; they wore their hair long in back, short in front, for military advantage.

Plutarch (*Theseus* 5.1–4): The Abantes shaved their hair in front (Homer) for military reasons; they were war-like, close-in fighters (quoting Archilochus fr. 3).

The absence of any apparent link, literary or otherwise, between the statements of Archilochus and Strabo about missiles makes the attempt to connect them extremely dubious.⁴ Nevertheless, the two statements exist, and the weight of modern authority has presumed a connection—not totally without reason, for the coincidence is striking and the temptation to see references to the same event is great. If we examine each independently, it may be possible to give a logically consistent reason for the apparent relationship more in line with other data that have come down concerning this early period. First, Archilochus.

It can be shown that Archilochus’ reference to the restricted use of bow and sling is based on considerations entirely different from those usually adduced. Most scholars who link the two passages say that the use of missiles was prohibited because the contestants were knightly gentlemen who considered it more chivalrous to fight hand-to-hand than at long range.⁵ But this reasoning depends for its force on the *a*

³ Strabo, of course, knew of Archilochus. He quotes from fr. 6D twice (10.2.17; 12.3.20) and is the source of fr. 19D (14.1.40). Cf. also 10.5.7.

⁴ W. G. Forrest, “Colonisation and the Rise of Delphi,” *Historia* 6 (1957) 163–64, also denying the connection, notes first, that seventh century inscriptions are few, and second, if such an inscription existed Strabo would probably have been incapable of reading it. Forrest’s explanation of the apparent relationship between Archilochus and Strabo will be discussed below.

⁵ E.g., H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte*² (Munich 1960) 105; Glotz-Cohen, *Histoire Grecque*, 1 (Paris 1925) 313; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*³, 3 (Stuttgart 1936) 498. It must be emphasized that these assume a connection between Archilochus

priori establishment of a connection between the two statements. Strabo says only that there was an agreement not to use long-range weapons; it is Archilochus' lines which give Strabo's testimony life—the "lords of Euboea," the Hippobotae, prefer to fight in the knightly manner, with lance and sword. We have already seen that a connection between the two statements is not supported by evidence, and the fact remains that the evidence of Strabo or Archilochus alone could not warrant any firm conclusion regarding the use of missiles in the Lelantine War.

On the other hand, it is a simple matter to show that Archilochus did not refer to a deliberate banning of missiles. He does not say there will be no bows stretched, he says *οὐ πολλά*. Nor does he say that slings will not be used; rather they will not be *θαμειαί*. It is difficult to see how these lines are concerned with a solemn pact between two cities. The meaning of the opening lines in relation to the rest of the fragment is clear enough, both from the tone of the poem and the context in which it is given by Plutarch—that the Abantes were *πολεμικοὶ καὶ ἀγχέμαχοι*. When the battle is joined on the plain there will be little fighting from afar, the grim "work" will be that of the sword. Archilochus' emphasis on the fact that the fighting will be at close range is best understood in connection with the other war poems, where again and again the poet reveals himself as an unromantic, realistic observer of the danger and brutality of combat.⁶ This battle he sizes up as a professional with the professional's eye for the salient feature—that the combatants will be found fighting toe-to-toe on the plain.

To place the fragment in its historical setting is much more difficult; but an examination of the background, so far as it can be reconstructed, will help to put Archilochus' poem into an historical context, and possibly provide a more plausible explanation of the *stèle* which Strabo saw in Amarynthus. Archilochus' dates are not certain, but

and Strabo; by adding the two bits of evidence the nature of the war is reconstructed, sometimes rather fancifully. Büchner, "Chalkis," *RE* 3 (1899) 2081 is typical: "Ein ritterliche Zug geht durch diesen 'Ielantischen Krieg,' nur das Schwert und die Stosslanze, deren kundige Führung . . . Archil. frg. 3 besingt, sollten im Nahkampf entscheiden, verpönt war der Gebrauch aller Wurfaffen, wie Wurfspeer, Bogen und Schleuder, und eine feierliche Vertragsurkunde . . . heiligte das Übereinkommen."

⁶ Frgs. 4, 6, 31, 38, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64. Cf. A. Hauvette, *Archiloque* (Paris 1905) 175, 246-47; A. R. Burn, *The Lyric Age of Greece* (London 1960) 167.

it is generally agreed that he flourished during the first half of the seventh century.⁷ The dates of the Lelantine War are even less well established, but most estimates give termini of the late eighth through the first third of the seventh century, or beyond.⁸ If these datings are essentially correct, then Archilochus was active during the course of the war; and, if the struggle was as important as later tradition recorded, it is not unlikely that Archilochus was in some way or another concerned with it, or, at least, aware of it.

There is no guarantee that fragment 3 refers to this war, but the few facts that can be mustered favor the conclusion that it does. The poem speaks of a battle in a plain; it mentions the lords of Euboea, and during Archilochus' lifetime these could only be from the dominant states of Chalcis and Eretria. In addition, the implication that both sides in the battle were to be Euboeans is strong. By calling them *daimones tautês machês* he appears to be alluding to the established fame of the Abantes, whose traditional center was around Chalcis and

⁷ The problems are discussed thoroughly by Blakeway (above, note 1) and by F. Jacoby, "The Date of Archilochus," *CQ* 35 (1941) 97-109. Blakeway's attempt to establish an eighth century date for Archilochus (740-730 to 670-660 B.C.) has found little acceptance, but he is right in cautioning us not to ignore the literary tradition which dates Archilochus early. Nevertheless, Jacoby is probably correct in determining the poet's *floruit* as 664/3 (p. 99), concluding that the evidence "brings the activity of Archilochus, either wholly or partly, into the middle third of the seventh century" (p. 101). There seems little need, however, to restrict the limits of Archilochus' life to 680-640 as Jacoby does. If 680 were the poet's birthdate, then at his *floruit* he would still be in his teens. There is nothing in the evidence to preclude his being a young man, active in war and poetry, in the 70's of the century.

⁸ G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, 1² (Gotha 1893) 456, dates it from the end of the eighth through the first half of the seventh century; similar dates are given by Bengtson, 91; Glotz-Cohen, 313; Meyer, 497 (above, note 5). Cary, *CAH* III (1925) 622, places it simply in the eighth or seventh centuries. Büchner (above, note 5) 2081, says that it broke out at the end of the eighth and was decided in the middle of the seventh. A late eighth century date is given by A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London 1956) 40. Blakeway (above, note 1) 48, opts for "an eighth- rather than a seventh-century date," and gives in his chronological table a date of ca. 700 (p. 53), "in progress or about to take place," and is followed by Forrest (above, note 4) 161, and Jacoby (above, note 7) 109: "the first third of the seventh or even to the last of the eighth century." Bradeen (above, note 1) dates more closely, between 704 and 660, and sees its outbreak about 675 (pp. 237, 239). The problem of the date is aptly summed up by Burn (above, note 1) 34: "The war began before the end of the eighth century and continued well into the seventh. More we cannot say." Attempts to establish a late seventh or sixth century date for the war are not convincing, and I hope that what follows in the text will confirm the traditional dates.

Eretria, as good close-in fighters.⁹ And, if a recently discovered fragment (*P. Oxy.* 2508), assigned very tentatively by Lobel to Archilochus, is, in fact, really by the poet, then the case for fragment 3 as a reference to the Lelantine struggle is even stronger. Two Euboean place-names are mentioned (lines 6–7): “(as far as) the Carystian (plain, ridge?) stretches . . . the land of the Eretrians.” The fragment is about a battle, the words *τετράφαλον* (1), *ἀσπίδας* (5), *ἀντι/πάλων* (9), *δυσμενέων* (11), *ἐνοπήν* and *θωρή[κων]* (14), are legible.¹⁰ All things considered, it is at least a strong likelihood that fragment 3 is concerned with some aspect of the Lelantine War.¹¹

Little is known in detail of the methods of fighting and types of weapons in the early period; however, careful examination of the archaeological remains, especially of vase scenes, has made it possible to reconstruct the broad outlines, which may be briefly summarized. The monuments show that during the eighth century (as in the ninth) fighting was essentially at long-range—the principal weapon being the throwing spear.¹² In this type of warfare the bow and (to a lesser degree) the sling would be very effective offensive weapons.¹³

⁹ Toepffer, “Abantes,” *RE* I (1894) 13–14.

¹⁰ Cf. A. J. Podlecki, “Three Greek Soldier-Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Solon,” *CW* 63 (1969) 75–76. The meter may be elegiac, but what little can be deciphered makes it unlikely that it is a portion of fr. 3.

¹¹ Forrest argues (above, note 4, 163–64), that fr. 3 does not refer to the Lelantine War: first, Archilochus mentions only the *possibility* of an outbreak of fighting; second, by suggesting the possibility of future fighting he implies that there was fighting in the past; and this past fighting should be identified with the Lelantine War, to which Archilochus looks back. The coming war, Forrest concludes (p. 164), “is perhaps the dispute between Chalkis and Andros for the site of Akanthos in the middle of the century, a dispute which in fact did not lead to war.” Cf. H. T. Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the Iliad* (Cambridge, Eng. 1952) 61, note 1. But a reference to a war which didn’t occur seems less likely than that the poet is referring to a coming battle in a continuing war. Jacoby (above, note 7) 108, sees the fragment as possibly a *paradeigma* of chivalrous fighting, “comparing the perfidious weapons of the barbarians in Thrace with the knightly swords and lances of the Euboean *hippobotai*,” in which the poet advises himself or a friend to leave Thasos or Thrace and go to Euboea.

¹² H. L. Lorimer, “The Hoplite Phalanx with Special Reference to the Poems of Archilochus and Tyrtæus,” *BSA* 42 (1947) 76, 118 (hereafter, Lorimer *BSA*); A. M. Snodgrass, *Early Greek Armour and Weapons* (Edinburgh, 1964) 138–39, 192–93 (hereafter, Snodgrass, 1964); A. M. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks* (Ithaca, 1967) 38–39 (hereafter, Snodgrass, 1967).

¹³ Lorimer *BSA*, 115; Snodgrass 1964, 143–44, 156; Snodgrass 1967, 40, 47, who notes that the use of the bow in war experienced a revival in the eighth century. Evidence for the sling is very rare; cf. Snodgrass 1964, 167.

The poverty of evidence for protective body armor suggests also that during this period there was little heavy metal armor in use.¹⁴ In certain areas cavalry was an important arm; the horse, however, was used mainly for transport to the field of battle, whereupon the rider dismounted and fought on foot.¹⁵ Mounted troops might also be effective for impact against unprotected archers, slingers and stone-throwers, or for pursuit. No real fighting could be done on horse-back, however, because of the lack of horseshoes and stirrups (without which there can be no serviceable seat);¹⁶ and once dismounted the knightly warrior probably fought with throwing spear and long cutting sword in individual combat against his opponent. The state of warfare during the mid-eighth century is summed up by Snodgrass thus: "There is no sign of uniformity or organization . . . battles are indiscriminate affairs, partly of missile-warfare with archery prominent, partly of sword- and spear-fights."¹⁷ Around 700 B.C. a change in armament and tactics becomes evident, and the hoplite soldier, armed principally with thrusting spear and "porpax" shield, drawn up in massed formation, begins to appear.¹⁸ With the adoption of the hoplite phalanx the importance of long-range missiles and cavalry was reduced, since neither was decisively effective against a massed formation of heavily armored pike-men.¹⁹

¹⁴ Snodgrass 1967, 41, notes that the bronze plate-corselet reappears in Greece (Argos) near the end of the eighth century and seems to be absent in the earlier period; cf. Snodgrass 1964, 72-86, 89. The somewhat dramatic reappearance of the heavy corselet (not connected with the hoplite shield) suggests that about this time the need for heavy chest armor was felt, and this implies a closing of range in combat. Evidence for greaves is much the same as for the corselet, except that their re-introduction appears to be later; see Snodgrass 1964, 196; also A. M. Snodgrass, "The Hoplite Reform and History," *JHS* 85 (1965) 110 (hereafter, Snodgrass *JHS*).

¹⁵ Snodgrass 1964, 163, 199; Snodgrass 1967, 85; Snodgrass *JHS*, III, 114.

¹⁶ Snodgrass 1967, 85.

¹⁷ (1967), 47; cf. Snodgrass *JHS*, III.

¹⁸ Lorimer *BSA*, 128; Snodgrass 1967, 74 concludes that by the late eighth century hoplites had begun to appear, and a phalanx formation organized at least by the middle of the seventh. He cautions, however, that the evolution was gradual, and that the introduction (or re-introduction) of heavy armor does not automatically imply an immediate change in tactics (Snodgrass *JHS*, 110-14).

¹⁹ This is not to imply that missile weapons or cavalry ceased to be used with effect during the seventh and subsequent centuries, merely that the prevailing arm became the foot soldier. Lorimer *BSA*, 115, 118 overstates the effectiveness of archers against the phalanx; according to Snodgrass 1964, 156 the quality of arrows improved in the seventh century—no doubt because the targets became heavily armored—and it is

This picture, pieced together from the monuments, accords with the scanty literary tradition; Aristotle mentions that the Chalcidians and Eretrians fought mainly with cavalry; Plutarch tells that a contingent of cavalry from Thessaly won an important victory for Chalcis in the Lelantine War. Strabo mentions an ancient *stèle* from Amarynthus on which was inscribed that the Eretrians made a procession with 3000 hoplites, 600 cavalry and 60 chariots.²⁰ The large number of cavalry and the presence of the obsolete chariots suggests that cavalry was important even when the infantry soldier formed the bulk of the fighting force. The Chalcidian and Eretrian nobles were styled Hippobotae and Hippeis, and the plain on which the war was fought was better suited for cavalry than other mainland regions.²¹ All these considerations point to the conclusion that the Lelantine War was fought in the old style described above, with a heavier emphasis on cavalry, perhaps, than elsewhere in Greece. And if, as the evidence seems to indicate, Chalcis and Eretria fought mainly as cavalry, this is proof that fighting was essentially at long range, for a mounted warrior could not be heavily armed nor wield a long spear.

Archilochus' fragment 3 gives a different picture. There is no mention of cavalry and it is explicitly stated that close combat will replace long-range missiles; in other words, the battle which is coming will be fought in a manner which suggests hoplite tactics and weapons.²²

also true, as Snodgrass (*ibid.*) notes, that the solid phalanx offered a tempting target. Nevertheless, missile fire was seldom lethal and the invincibility of the phalanx against both cavalry and missiles is not disputed; cf. Snodgrass 1967, 56, 60, 102. At Marathon the Athenian hoplites, with no archers of their own, successfully charged the Persian bowmen (Herod. 6.112), and a passage in Xenophon (*Anabasis* 3.2.18-19) neatly demonstrates the superiority of the hoplite over cavalry.

²⁰ Aristotle *Politics* 1289 B, 35-40; cf. 1297 B, 17 ff., on the preeminence of cavalry in early times. Plutarch *Moralia* 760 E-761 A.; Strabo 10.1.10.

²¹ Herod. 5.77; Strabo 10.1.8; *Ath. Pol.* 15.2.

²² Lorimer *BSA*, 115 feels that it is unlikely that fr. 3 refers to the introduction of hoplite weapons, since the spear, thrusting or throwing, is not mentioned. Snodgrass' (1964, 179-80) main points are that the sword is not characteristic of true hoplite fighting and the spear is not mentioned; these suggest to him a date for the poem before the introduction of hoplite tactics. On the contrary, the epithet *douriklutoi*, placed so emphatically in the fragment, must be more than a conventional Homeric echo; it is surely significant that in the epics the singular only is found, applied to individual warriors, never to a group. Also, for Archilochus the *doru* is the hoplite thrusting spear (fr. 20; cf. Lorimer *BSA*, 115). The use of the sword is at least as characteristic of hoplite warfare as it is of long-range combat. See Strabo 10.1.13, and especially Tyrtaeus 8.27-34D, where the fighting is unquestionably hoplite, and where the spear and sword

The use of the future tense throughout may mean that the poet is contrasting past battles with the coming one. In any case the fragment contains two important items of historical evidence: first, a battle on a plain (probably in Euboea) will be a hoplite type of battle, and second, that this is a different kind of fighting.

It is very possible that fragment 3 records a transition from the old to the new manner of warfare, and that Archilochus has caught a moment in a long war—a war which no doubt saw a good deal of experimentation in military tactics and weapons, stimulated by the cross-fertilization of military expertise from other participating states. Certainly many of the difficulties in interpreting the literary and archaeological evidence disappear once it is accepted that the period from ca. 700 to 650 B.C. was a transitional stage in arms and tactics.²³ The combined factors of length of time, number of participants and the innovations in military matters which were taking place at the end of the eighth and beginning of the seventh century would make this war a fertile testing ground for weapons and tactics. The plain itself, suitable for massed formations, may also have contributed to the development. Archilochus' reference to the reputation of the Euboeans as especially adept at close fighting is probably more than a reminiscence of Homer and may reflect an early tendency of the Euboean warriors to close quickly with their opponents, a tendency that would make the transition to hoplite fighting more natural.²⁴ This accords with the tradition that Chalcis was an early center for the development of armor.²⁵ The fragment itself conveys the impression that the poet anticipates a particularly savage and unremitting conflict, especially in the striking combination of *ξιφέων πολύστονον ἔργον*, which underscores the essential nature of the fighting, hand-to-hand combat from beginning to end.²⁶

are described as equal weapons. Forrest (above, note 4) 164 concludes that hoplite fighting is meant.

²³ See Snodgrass *JHS*, 111-13; also J. Boardman, "Early Euboean Pottery and History," *BSA* 52 (1957) 29, whose suggestion that there were two phases in the protracted war, a cavalry and then a hoplite conflict, has much merit.

²⁴ Lorimer *BSA*, 114 thinks that *Il.* 2.542 ff. is an interpolation celebrating the triumph of hoplite tactics; but see Snodgrass 1964, 177.

²⁵ Alcaeus fr. 357 (L-P); Strabo 10.3.19; see Snodgrass 1964, 202, 265, notes 44, 45; Snodgrass 1967, 70.

²⁶ Cf. Hauvette (above, note 6) 174-75. M. Treu, *Archilochos* (Munich 1959) 191 notes the presence of the "un-Homeric" *polustonon ergon*.

It is in light of the above that the puzzling inscription which Strabo saw can be interpreted. As has already been remarked, a banning of missiles on ethical grounds is highly unlikely, if only because they would be less effective against the heavily armed foot soldier after the introduction of hoplite armor, or would have been the normal mode of fighting before the appearance of the hoplite. The other possible reason for a deliberate ban, a "gentleman's agreement" to ensure that the fighting would be of a knightly character, does not convince, for the only conceivable purpose would be to reduce the fighting to a kind of jousting tourney for selected combatants.²⁷ Such a pact would be unique in Greek history, while the theory that the war was fought by a small number of knightly contestants runs counter to the tradition that it involved a large number of states, was protracted, and was fought over a fertile plain of vital importance to the rival cities.²⁸

To explain the *stele* W. G. Forrest suggests that the later Euboeans, not knowing about the introduction of hoplite warfare, were puzzled by Archilochus' lines and invented the story of the compact to account for them.²⁹ This hypothesis does not explain why the later Euboeans would have felt compelled to record this story on stone, but Forrest's argument that the inscription reported by Strabo is unlikely to date from the seventh century is persuasive.³⁰ An alternate conjecture may be offered: an ancient inscription had, indeed, contained the information, not that missiles were banned by agreement, but that either side had ceased to employ them at some point in the War. In other words, the seventh century Euboeans had recorded a noteworthy event, the transition from long-range to close combat. We can only speculate why and in what form the change in tactics was so noted. It is possible that the early inscription detailed a new military division of the Eretrians—a re-organization of the available man-power into units which reflected the general replacement of slingers and archers

²⁷ For an example of this extreme position see P. Gardner, "A Numismatic Note on the Lelantian War," *CR* 34 (1920) 90-91: "It was a kind of fighting-match or ordeal by combat."

²⁸ Cf. Burn (above, note 1) 32. If the war involved conflicting commercial and overseas interests, as many maintain, the notion of a chivalrous contest is even less tenable.

²⁹ (above, note 4) 164.

³⁰ See above, note 4.

by hoplite troops. Perhaps actual comparative numbers were given; we are reminded here of the other inscription from Amarynthus, reported by Strabo (10.1.10), which listed the number of hoplites, cavalry and chariots in a religious procession. Or, the inscription might have been a victory monument, casualty list or epitaph for the fallen which told that the fighting was at close quarters and that long-range weapons were little used.

Despite our uncertainty regarding the actual form of the recording we are justified in concluding that the significance of the change-over made sufficient impression on the generation that witnessed it for it to be memorialized. To later generations the momentousness of the change would have become unclear, and it is reasonable to conjecture that the *stele* seen by Strabo was a later copy in which the original message had been misinterpreted. In Archilochus' poem we fortunately have a contemporary and expert witness' report of the same event.

SUMMARY

The arguments presented above have tried to show 1), that the connection, commonly made by scholars, between Archilochus fragment 3D and Strabo 10.1.12 is incorrect; 2), that Archilochus' lines, usually assumed as evidence of the chivalrous character of Euboean warfare, actually refer to the introduction of the new and more deadly hoplite fighting; 3), that the inscription that Strabo saw concerns not a voluntary ban on missiles in the Lelantine War but the garbled remembrance that close combat replaced long-range fighting at some point in the war.

Finally, if the interpretation of the evidence presented above is correct, then it is possible to fix the dates of both Archilochus and the Lelantine War more firmly. The events described by Archilochus should be placed after 700, but before 650, because by the middle of the century hoplite tactics had become standard on the mainland. If, as seems reasonable, fragment 3 describes a transitional stage, we may give a more precise date of the first third of the seventh century.

The chain of evidence is slender and much is conjectural. Nevertheless, the usual explanations of the relationship between the fragment of Archilochus and the statement of Strabo are at variance with what is

known about the conditions of battle at the turning of the century. During the period of Archilochus' active life war entered a new stage of grimness and reality; he and Tyrtaeus are potent witnesses to this. It is more persuasive to see in fragment 3 the young soldier-poet's trained assessment of a new and frightening type of warfare, the genesis of which he observed and the importance of which he understood.

N.B. I wish to thank Professor A. J. Podlecki for reading this paper and for his many valuable criticisms.