RADICAL SEMANTIC SHIFTS IN ARCHILOCHUS

θυμέ, θύμ' ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε,
ἄνα τε, δυσμενῶν θ' ἀλέξευ προσβαλὼν ἐναντίον
στέρνον, ἐν λοχοῖσιν ἐχθρῶν πλησίον κατασταθείς
ἀσφαλέως· καὶ μήτε νικῶν ἀμφάδην ἀγάλλεο
μηδὲ νικηθείς ἐν οἴκῳ καταπεσὼν ὀδύρεο.
ἀλλὰ χαρτοῖσίν τε χαῖρε καὶ κακοῖσιν ἀσχάλα
μὴ λίην· γίγνωσκε δ' οἷος ῥυσμὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔχει.

Much of the power of this poem, frag. 67a (Diehl), derives from the subtle manner in which Archilochus exploits the various meanings of the word θυμός. In the archaic period θυμός had, in fact, a wide range of significations. Among its basic meanings, all attested as early as Homer, are: the heart, as the seat of emotions, esp. joy and grief; spirit, courage; and mind, soul, as the seat of thought.[1] Here I argue that, in frag. 67a, Archilochus exploits this generally acknowledged polysemy of θυμός by combining repetition at the textual level with discrepancy at the semantic level to emphasize these radical shifts in meaning. Normally, as in Homer, the word did not have all its fundamental meanings in the compass of one passage, and the audience therefore would not have witnessed it changing, but rather would have possessed and held ready a whole range of possible meanings, to be evoked by specific words in a context. In Archilochus, however, the shifts occur within a single 7-line poem, and constitute an important poetic device. Archilochus uses this device not only in frag. 67a, but in frag. 2 as well. In each of these two poems, he sets up a "norm" and then deviates from it in interesting and meaningful ways, much as, in other instances, he utilizes Homer (especially the *Odyssey*) as a traditional norm, first invoking an epic passage or situation by allusion, and then deviating from it in a marked and often ironic way.[2] In my two examples, the "norm" is presented *within* the poems themselves, and its presence is felt even without any tacit reference or allusion to a prior literary text.

In section 1 I discuss frag. 67a, in section 2, frag. 2, and in section 3 I draw some conclusions about the poetic device of combining textual repetition with semantic discrepancy.

1. Archil. 67a (Diehl) = 128 (West)

The speaker addresses his θυμός in this poem in the manner of Odysseus

For the text and numbering of the fragments I have used E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, rev. R. Beutler (Leipzig 1949-52); for alternate readings and emendations I have consulted M.L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1971). For ἄνα τε in line 2, see below note 9.

[1]LSJ, s.v. θυμός. These meanings are further delineated in the text below and in note 5.

[2]For a discussion of allusion in Archilochus see Bernd Seidensticker, "Archilochus and Odysseus," *GRBS* 19 (1978) 5-22; on Archilochean irony, ibid. 11 and note 26 and cf. my note 23 below.

(*Od.* 5.407 and 20.18[3]) and Hector (*Il.* 22.98). Here, however, the meanings of the implied θυμός shift three times—from the heart (as seat of emotions) to spirit or courage to heart again and finally to mind or soul (as the seat of thought). The word θυμός derives from PIE *dhev (ə)=, "breath," and has cognates signifying rapid movement and smoke, the latter in turn linked to breath.[4] In Homer the contexts of θυμός are varied and fall under three main domains: emotions, the will, and the intellect. The attestations listed by Böhme under these three categories show that the θυμός was the seat of the affective as well as the cognitive functions, though he only finds seven clear examples of the word collocated with verbs of knowing, foreknowing, noticing, reminding oneself or believing and a few examples each with verbs of misunderstanding, reflecting, or persuading.[5]

In light of the consensus of opinion that θυμός had a variety of meanings in Homeric epic, we should reconsider Snell's rather too sharp distinction between ψυχή as "that which forsakes man at the moment of death and loss of consciousness" and θυμός as the "mental organ which causes emotion" and

[3]Seidensticker, ibid. 17, joins R. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*[2] (Zetemata 2, München 1969) 231 and M. Treu, *Archilochos* (München 1959) 21 in asserting that the first line of our poem seems to recall the equally famous self-address of the πολύτλας Ὀδυσσεύς at *Od.* 20.18 (τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη, καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης) and that Archilochus in this poem may have intended to allude to the figure of Odysseus.

[4]So J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern 1959) 261; H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1960), s.v. θυμός; and E.L. Harrison, "Notes on Homeric Psychology," *Phoenix* 14 (1960) 65ff. G. Nagy, "Patroklos, Concepts of Afterlife, and the Indic Triple Fire," *Arethusa* 13.2 (1980) 184, citing Latin *fūmus* and Indic *dhumá-*, both meaning "smoke," as cognate with Greek θυμός, argues that "we can understand such semantic specialization only when we envision the exhaust of sacrificial fire as it transforms the breath of life into wind." He sees θυμός and μένος as synonymous with ψυχή only at the time of death.

[5]See Joachim Böhme, *Die Seele und das Ich im homerischen Epos* (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner 1929) 69-83 for attestations from Homer of θυμός in its three fundamental domains: emotions (69-70, n. 1), arousal of the will (70-71, n. 1), and intellectual experiences (72, n. 1). A number of scholars support the view that in Homer 1) θυμός was polysemous and occurred in all three domains assigned it by LSJ and Böhme and 2) the boundaries separating contexts for psychological terms (θυμός, ψυχή, φρήν and φρένες, and νοῦς) were not clearly demarcated.

Cf. D.J. Furley, "The Early History of the Concept of the Soul," *BICS* 3 (1956) 1-18; T.B.L. Webster, "Some Psychological Terms in Greek Tragedy," *JHS* 77 (1957) 149-54; Harrison (above note 4); Shirley M. Darcus, "*-phron* Epithets of *thumos*," *Glotta* 55 (1977) 178-82, where she asserts that "the *thumos*, often located in the *phrenes*, could also apparently absorb some of the range of *phrēn* . . . In Homer the *thumos* is an organ of emotion, intellect, and will with no special emphasis on any of these activities"; Shirley M. Darcus, "A Person's Relation to φρήν in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets," *Glotta* 57:1/2, 159-173, where she defines the φρήν and φρένες as "the location where a person performs certain emotional, volitional, and intellectual functions."; James M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: the Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago 1975) 173, who views the θυμός as a "substance which fills an organ, viz. the φρένες," and as the seat not only of the "affective life—of passions, wishes, hopes and inclinations" but also of "the whole practical consciousness, from instant rage and pain to deliberation on the basis of lessons laboriously learned." Nagy (above note 4) affirms the polysemy of θυμός in Homer but concentrates on establishing a synonymy of μένος and θυμός with ψυχή at the moment of swooning or death; see note 14 below.

For a fuller bibliography on the other psychological terms see Shirley M. Darcus, "*Noos* Precedes *Phren* in Greek Lyric Poetry," *AntCl* (1977) 41-51, "A Person's Relation to ψυχή in

νοῦς as the "recipient of images."[6] Snell, however, rejects the notion of polysemy of these psychological terms in Homer, and sees Archilochus as breaking new ground in frag. 67a when he collocates θυμός with γίγνωσκε.[7]

It is indeed less controversial that such potential for polysemy existed in early Greek lyric than in Homeric epic. Since Archilocus' active exploitation of semantic differences presupposes a marked degree of differentiation, the question so pertinent to Homeric epic of whether polysemy is possible where semantic fields have not yet been clearly differentiated or have fuzzy boundaries is not at issue here.[8]

The vocative θυμέ, θύμ' opens the poem, and seven serially arranged imperatives sustain the θυμός as addressee on a textual level. These are: †ἀναδευ†,[9] ἀλέξευ, μήτε . . . ἀγάλλεο, μηδὲ . . . ὀδύρεο, χαῖρε, ἀσχάλα, and γίγνωσκε. The repetition of imperatives causes a swift linear passage from the poem's beginning to its end. Moreover, this pronounced linear flow of the poem, achieved through repetition at a syntactic level, assures the persistence of the repeatedly addressed θυμός. Thus, even though the word θυμός never literally recurs after line 1, it remains implicitly present throughout the poem, hence providing a linear or syntagmatic unity.

Even as this grammatical repetition of the imperative sustains the lexeme θυμός, its sense undergoes several radical semantic shifts: each new meaning, however, is compatible with the three definitions attested in LSJ (as cited earlier). Moreover, current scholarly opinions, since Böhme, about the possible fields of reference for this word from Homer on are not at odds with the meanings in Archilochus' poem.

At the beginning of the poem θυμός is the seat of emotion: it is "disturbed by senseless woes" or "distressed by troubles hard to cope with." The adjectival phrase, ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε,[10] by its presence at the

Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets," *Glotta* 57: 1/2 (1979) 30-39, and "How a Person relates to νόος in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets," *Glotta* 58: 1/2 (1980) 33-44.

[6]Bruno Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer (Cambridge, Mass. 1953) 8ff.

[7]Snell himself comments (ibid., p. 15) that his definitions are "merely in the nature of abbreviations." He reaffirms this view in "Wie die Griechen lernten, was geistige Tätigkeit ist," *JHS* 93 (1973) 172-84 (see below note 17).

[8]In fact, one can argue inversely that, if a poet as early as Archilochus makes such conscious rhetorical use of the several meanings of θυμός, then it is likely that polysemy was already present in Homeric usage.

For a discussion of θυμός in lyric see Darcus, (above note 5), "*-phrôn* Epithets of *thumos*," ". . . ψυχή in Homer, Hesiod and the Greek Lyric Poets," and "*Noos* Precedes *Phren*. . .". See also O.M. Saveljeva, "The value of the word '*thumos*' in archaic lyric poetry," *Voprosy klassicheskoi filologii* 6 (Moscow U. 1976) 197-208 (trans. from the Russian by my colleague Kenneth Klotz). For θυμός in tragedy, Webster (note 5, above) provides an excellent overview.

[9]The MSS. is corrupt, and yet the presence of an imperative idea seems certain. Recently, Anastasios A. Nikitas "Zur Archilochos, Fragm. 67D (=128 West)" *Wurzb. Jahrb. f. die Altertumswiss.* 5 (1979) 33-46, has argued persuasively for ἄνα τε, an emendation which I have adopted.

[10]Κυκάω, of unknown etymology, means "stir" (*Il.* 5.903, of milk curdling), "stir up," and hence "throw into confusion or disorder" (LSJ, s.v. κυκάω II). It is a forceful word, used in

beginning of the poem, identifies the "battle" of the θυμός as emotional rather than military. The speaker next invokes his θυμός as the seat of courage and endurance, and, in addition, anthropomorphizes it by synecdoche as a warrior fighting at the battle-front, whom he exhorts as follows: "Rise and defend, confronting breast-to-breast your enemy, while you are stationed close at hand, firmly set[11] midst their ambushes."[12] Then, reverting to the original sense in the poem of θυμός as the seat of emotion, he urges his θυμός to react with moderation: "And do not, if you win, rejoice openly, nor if you lose, grieve, sinking into your home. But at joyful events rejoice and in misfortunes lament, though not too much."

Here, through synecdoche, the speaker transforms his θυμός from seat of emotion to individual winner or loser having that emotion. The anthropomorphization of the mental organ seems consciously figurative and rhetorical, and not simply to reflect a poorly differentiated concept of the self.[13] Moreover, the phrase ἐν οἴκῳ καταπεσὼν strengthens the anthropomorphization already implicit in the four imperatives (ἀγάλλεο, ὀδύρεο, χαῖρε and ἀσχάλα), and even suggests, particularly by the substitution of "sinking into your home" for the more usual "sinking into your chest" or "sinking into your feet,"[14] the sense of shame felt by losers in athletic or military competitions.[15]

Homer (in the passive) of highly charged emotional states: see *Il.*11.129 (of two Trojans who are panic stricken) and 20.489 (of horses bolting in fear). It is also used of Charybdis seething (*Od.* 12.38). Cf. *Il.* 9.612: μή μοι σύγχει θυμὸν ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων, where Achilles tells Phoenix to stop confusing his heart by lamenting and sorrowing.

[11]Cf. frag. 114.4 West (= 234 Diehl), where ἀσφαλέως is used of the stance of a well-trained hoplite.

[12]See Werner Jaeger, "Archilochus, Fr. 67," *CR* 60 (1946) 103, who emends the MSS. †ἐν δοκοῖσιν † to ἐν λοχοῖσιν, following Klinger (*Przyczynki do fragmentów tetrametrycznych Archilocha*, Poznan 1922, 12). Nikitas (above note 9) 35, accepts this reading. The sense is clear: the θυμός as warrior is urged to remain right up front next to the enemy. Thus ἐν λοχοῖσιν ἐχθρῶν replaces ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν as the context of the courageous defense. The aorist participles, προσβαλὼν and καταστα θείς, give vivid immediacy to the emotional battle.

This exhortation to be stalwart, with its military vocabulary in lines 2 and 3 and the graphic participle, καταστα θείς, places the poem in the same generic tradition as Callinus and Tyrtaeus, though Archilochus' exhortatory poem functions entirely differently from their literally militaristic ones.

[13]So Hermann Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (München 1962²) 85-87; cf. the discussion by Joseph Russo and Bennett Simon, "Homeric Psychology and the Oral Epic Tradition," *J. Hist. Ideas* 29 (1968) 483-98.

[14]For the idiom of the heart sinking in the chest or to the feet, see Harrison (above note 4) 68f, who discusses "swoon-terminology" in Homer, and A. Nehring, "Homer's Description of Syncopes," *CP* 42 (1947) 106ff, who attributes this terminology to a "weakening" rather than a "breathing out." But see Nagy (above note 4) esp. n. 28 and n. 31 for the association of θυμός, μένος, and ψυχή with breathing and the consequent appropriateness of θυμός/μένος/ψυχή to both swooning and dying.

[15]Pi.*Py*.8.85-91 provides a particularly poignant parallel: "In the Pythian games you pinned four wrestlers unrelentingly, and sent them home in losers' gloom (τοῖς οὔτε νόστος ἔπαλπνος); no pleasant laughter cheered them as they reached their mothers' sides; shunning ridicule they took to alleys, licking losers' wounds." (tr. Arthur Swanson)

In 67a the image of the loser sulking in his home (ἐν οἴκῳ) contrasts nicely with that of the victor rejoicing publicly or openly (ἀμφάδην): both are excessive reactions.

As he elicits the proper responses to victory and defeat (*νικῶν* and *νικηθείς*) and to joyous and unfortunate situations (*χαρτοῖσίν* and *κακοῖσιν*), the speaker pairs disparate experiences; by then appending *μὴ λίην*, "not too much," he qualifies or tempers these appropriate responses and simultaneously reaffirms the earlier warning tone (*καὶ μήτε . . . μηδὲ*). But those two prohibitions occurred early in their sentence and were expressed individually; here *μὴ λίην* negates later (by postponement to the end of its sentence and by enjambement) and collectively. In this way it tempers but does not preclude the rejoicing and lamenting responses just elicited. And in tempering these two disparate emotional reactions by identifying both as potentially excessive, *μὴ λίην* conjoins them, and, at the same time, anticipates the *ῥυσμός* principle invoked in the final sentence, in the last of the poem's imperatives.[16]

In this final segment the sense of *θυμός* shifts yet again, and this radical semantic shift is accompanied by sharp syntactic deviations from all that precedes. *Γίγνωσκε* invokes the *θυμός* in its third sense (mind, soul, as the seat of thought) in a request for the *θυμός* to understand.[17] *Οἷος*, "what sort of," introduces the only indirect clause in the poem, and in it the speaker implies that some sort of *ῥυσμός* does indeed govern mankind. This implication is strengthened because *ῥυσμός* is the subject of the only indicative verb in the poem, *ἔχει*, "holds." Like *μὴ λίην*, *ῥυσμός* pertains to human responses. It represents a principle of the universe, a law existing outside mankind and thus able to constrain him and perhaps offer him some solace. Renehan, following Jaeger, has suggested that *ῥυσμός* is derived from the root **eru-*, **ru-*, "to hold," and means "schema," "shape," "constraint," ". . . that which imposes limit on flow or change,"[18] rather than, as LSJ and others contend, flux or alternation itself.[19] In this poem the word recalls

For a comparable motif of shame upon returning from battle unvictorious see Callinus 1.14-17 and Tyrtaeus 10.3-12.

[16]On the connection of the *ῥυσμός* principle and of the admonition to accept and endure to the concept of *tlemosyne*, "endurance," as embodied in Odysseus, see G.M. Kirkwood, *Early Greek Monody: The History of a Poetic Type* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1974) 36. Kirkwood, however, equates *ῥυσμός* in 67a with the oscillation of fortune, rather than with a principle controlling mankind.

[17]According to Snell (above note 7 "Wie die Griechen . . .") 173, it is first with Archilochus, and in frag. 67a, that we find *γιγνώσκειν* used of an intellectual exertion, and because it is in the present tense, it means "understand" rather than the punctual "recognize." Snell (174, n. 10) dismisses the counter-example from Il.16.119 (*γνῶ δ' Αἴας κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα, ῥίγησέν τε*) but without adequate justification or explanation.

[18]Jaeger, *Paideia* (Eng. ed.[2]) (Oxford 1945) I, 123-24, defines *ῥυθμός* as "that which imposes bonds on movement and confines the flux of things." He remarks that "the original conception which lies beneath the Greek discovery of rhythm in music and dancing is not flow but pause, the steady limitation of movement." Robert Renehan ("The derivation of *ῥυσμός*," *CP* 58 [1963] 36-38) supports Jaeger's definition with additional evidence, including the argument that *ῥυσμός* meaning "flow" or "rhythm" would make little sense in Archil. 67a. See Seidensticker (above note 3) 17-18 for the opposite and traditional view of *ῥυσμός*.

[19]LSJ, s.v. '*ῥυθμός*'; see the discussion by E. Benveniste, "La notion de 'rhythme' dans son expression linguistique," *Journ. psych. norm. et path.* 44 (1951) 401-410, and espec, Renehan's convincing rebuttal (*ibid*).

the two adverbial expressions, both similarly emphasized by enjambement, ἀσφαλέως and μὴ λίην. The one depicts the non-fluctuation of a warrior (or of the θυμός as warrior, the other the appropriate, moderate response to success or failure.

If we now re-read the poem, and acknowledge that the meaning of θυμός as seat of emotions frames the meaning of seat of courage, it becomes clear that the poem moves in a linear fashion from emotion to understanding. This movement accompanies a movement from individual θυμός to generic ἀνθρώπους, suggesting a progression from the very specific and concrete seat of emotions (θυμέ, θύμ') to the universal principle governing mankind, signified by ῥυσμός. The chain of imperatives addressed to the θυμός is broken only in the climactic final line, where a shift in syntax accompanying the semantic shift from specific to general signals the dramatic change. A command to behave steadily and not too emotionally precedes the order to understand the principle behind such action. It is the understanding, however, that will initiate a change from ἀμηχανία (line 1) to εὐπορία or εὐμηχανία (implied).

The shifts in meanings for θυμός occur at the level of the signified, while at the level of the signifier the implicit word θυμός persists unchanged throughout the poem, reinvoked by each new imperative. Thus this poem of Archilochus exemplifies one type of repetition, repetition of the signifier with a different signified.[20] Technically, only the grammatical form, the imperative, is repeated: repetition of the signifier can be verbal, grammatical, phonetic, metrical, etc. A second example of repetition of the signifier with a different signified can be seen in Archil. frag. 2, where we find not only grammatical but also verbal recurrences.

2. *Archil. 2 (Diehl)*

ἐν δορὶ μέν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος
Ἰσμαρικός· πίνω δ'ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος.

Here the phrase itself, ἐν δορί, is repeated three times, in the first two instances with a consistent signified, but in the third with a clear semantic shift.[21] The

[20]Jean Cohen, "Poésie et Redondance," *Poétique* (1976) 413-422, distinguishes among repetitions of the sign, of the signifier, and of the signified—a distinction useful to the point I am making here. (I am indebted to Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan of the Hebrew University for citing Cohen's remarks in her paper "Les paradoxes sur la repetition" delivered at Symposium 2, "Narrative Theory and Poetics of Fiction," Tel Aviv/Jerusalem, June, 1979.)

[21]I join D.A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (London 1967) 142 in taking strong issue with those who think that in these lines ἐν δορί ought to be capable of bearing the same meaning every time it occurs. For that view, which still dominates the literature on this poem, see Maurice Bowra, *Anal. Fil. Cl.* 6 (1954) 37, whose reading J.A. Davison, *CR* 74 (1960) 1-4 and Victor Ehrenberg, *CP* 57 (1962) 239-40 vigorously support. Moreover, Bruno Gentili, *RFIC* 93, ser. 3 (1965) 129-34, after providing extensive attestations against Archilochean (or Homeric) use of κλίνω with ἐν + the dative, states (p. 130): "La giustificazione addotta che ἐν è attratto dagli ἐν δορί precenenti, ossia è imposto dall'esigenza dell'anafora, non è plausibile: in tutti e tre i casi ἐν δορί deve, proprio per l'anafora, avere lo stesso valore" and later asks (in the addendum, p. 134) "E se il valore non è identico, in che cosa consisterebbe l'efficacia del l'anafora?" The efficacy of the anaphora lies in the *deliberate* semantic shift, of which this is certainly an early example.

consistency of meaning for the first two instances of ἐν δορί is reinforced by the presence of μοι as dative of possession for μᾶζα and for οἶνος Ἰσμαρικός as well; this dative implies the copulative verb ἐστι, "there is," which would then be understood for the first two ἐν δορί phrases, but not for the third, which already has a finite verb, πίνω. The sense of the first two clauses is that for both bread and wine the soldier/poet depends on his spear, i.e., by metonymy, on his skill at war. By mentioning wine second, Archilochus leads conveniently to the verb πίνω, "I drink." The location in the poem of πίνω as the first explicit verb, the presence of an implied personal subject, "I" (whereas the prior μοι indicates an unexpressed verb, ἐστι), and the caesura after πίνω (which segments that second line) all serve to emphasize the verb. In addition, "I drink, leaning on my spear" does not reflect the usual activity of a soldier: rather deliberately, it undercuts the activity alluded to in the first two instances of ἐν δορί, where the spear is a proper tool for obtaining food and drink. Thus the changes in the third clause give us a clue not to take the triple ἐν δορί as having the same meaning in each clause, much as syntactic differences signal a shift in meaning for the final θυμός in Archil. 67a. The brilliance of frag. 2 results from a single but dramatic semantic shift against a background of surface anaphora which had led the audience to expect semantic consistency—and to be surprised or disappointed.

Thus I am in agreement with Rankin's interpretation of the fragment insofar as he argues that a poet such as Archilochus may use anaphora in unconventional and unexpected ways.[22] "In the anaphora of ἐν δορί," he suggests, ". . . we are not faced with an example of 'traditional' anaphora but with an expression which was very carefully framed to achieve certain effects. The process which the poet employed was a play upon meanings of ἐν + Dative within the field which we usually characterize as locative. . . ." Whether the distich is, as Rankin contends, the beginning of a skolion or, more plausibly, a self-contained couplet, it *is* full of irony and humor.[23] Appreciation of this irony and humor requires recognition of the radical semantic shift for the third ἐν δορί.[24]

3. *Conclusion*

In these two compact poems, frags. 67a and 2, Archilochus utilizes repetition at the level of the signifier in order to shift from a conventional to an

[22]See H.D. Rankin, "Archilochus fg. 2D," *Emerita* 40 (1972) 460-74 who states (473-74): "Archilochus wants his auditors first of all to be deceived into thinking that all three occurrences (of ἐν δορί) are precisely the same in meaning, and subsequently to realise, with amusement, that they are not all the same. . . . He was interested in anaphora, onomatopoeia and other forms of verbal technique, and did not hesitate to use these figures boldly."

[23]L.G. Pocock, "Archilochus fragment 2," *CR* n.s. 1 (1961) 179-80, also perceives the humor and irony of this couplet, even though he is not aware of the semantic shift from which, I argue, the humor and irony arise. See above note 2.

[24]For alternate readings of fragment 2 (mainly based on various interpretations of ἐν δορί) see Douglas E. Gerber, "Studies in Greek Lyric Poetry: 1967-1975," *CW* 70.2 (Oct. 1976) 86-87; Bruno Gentili, "La Lancia di Archiloco e le Figurazioni Vascolàri" in *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi Sexagenario Oblata* (Edizioni dell'Ateneo: Roma 1970) 115-20; and Gentili (above note 21).

Archilochean perspective on events. The first instance of the grammatical form (the imperative in 67a; the prepositional phrase in 2) or phrase (*ἐν δορί* in 2) establishes a homebase for, or grounds, the thought; by the last occurrence (*γίγνωσκε* in 67a, the third *ἐν δορί* in 2), a radical shift in meaning has taken place.

In the longer poem a command to behave steadily and not too emotionally precedes the order to understand, almost as if appropriate action leads to comprehending the principle behind that action; we presume that the new understanding elicited by *γίγνωσκε* will, in turn, initiate a change from *ἀμηχανία* to *εὐμηχανία*. In the shorter poem the shift from an abstract to a concrete and spatial use of *ἐν δορί* makes light of a soldier's means of livelihood, offering a humorous and unconventional perspective on that livelihood, along with the suggestion that he not take his trade too seriously. In both poems, syntactic changes that accompany the last "repetition with difference" give emphasis to the new insight or perception.

It would be interesting to examine the corpus of Greek lyric to see to what extent this device, repetition of a signifier with a different signified, is exploited elsewhere. Such a search would reveal the degree to which Archilochus and other early lyric poets manipulate, in a sophisticated fashion, polysemous words, phrases, and grammatical forms.[25]

NANCY FELSON RUBIN

University of Georgia

[25]I am grateful to Marylin B. Arthur, Gregory Nagy, John Van Sickle, and Leonard Woodbury for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.