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 ámbοθή γάρ σε πάμπαν οὐ διάξομεν

The trimeter is quoted by Apollonius Dyscolus because of the short final iota in ámbοθή and he gives no indication of the context. It is not surprising, therefore, that critics have postulated a variety of contexts, and it is the purpose of this note both to assess their arguments and to defend what seems to me to be the likeliest interpretation.

In 1846 Friedrich Schneidewin,¹ who has been followed by many others right up to the present, saw in this fragment a reference to the myth of the Centaur Nessus who ferried Deianeira across the river Euenus. Nessus is addressing Deianeira and ámbοθή is said to have a ‘doppelsinnige Bedeutung’. Schneidewin does not elaborate on the nature of this ambiguity, but presumably he means that Nessus, who was accustomed to demand payment (µισθός) for his ferry-service,² was prevailed upon in this instance to provide his service without a fee and that he spoke this line to Deianeira just before he attempted to violate her: In other words, Nessus is saying that if he cannot have his usual µισθός, he will have Deianeira herself instead.

At first glance, this interpretation looks plausible, since both ámbοθή and διάξομεν are appropriate words in the context of a ferry-service. Consider, for example, the lines on Charon, the ferryman of the dead, in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* 139–40:

ἐν πλοιαρίῳ τυννοντῶι σ’ ἄνηρ γέρων
ναότις διάξει δό’ ὀβολό µισθόν λαβῶν.

Two objections, however, were raised by Lasserre,³ the plural verb and the necessity of assuming ‘un dialogue entre Nessus et Déjanire que je ne puis me résoudre à admettre, était donné la forme et le propos de l’histoire
d'Héraclès'. The first objection has considerable weight, since nowhere in the extant remains of Archilochus do we find an example of the first person plural with singular force. In addition, as Gildersleeve points out, 'the use of the first person plural for the first person singular is due to modesty', a trait which obviously ill suits a ravishing centaur. I suppose one might argue that, since in this use of the plural 'the particular is sunk in the generic, the individual in the class', as Gildersleeve goes on to say, Nessus is in effect making a statement which would be true of centaurs as a class, but in this instance at least such an explanation would surely be special pleading. Lasserre's second objection is of little weight, since no dialogue between Nessus and Deianeira need be assumed. Nessus might have spoken fr. 34 to Deianeira, whereupon she launched into the long appeal to Heracles which is criticized in Dio Chrysostom 60.1 (Arch. fr. 286). A more serious objection to Schneidewin's interpretation is that in none of the surviving accounts of the myth do we find any reference to Heracles' having refused to pay Nessus for his service. Nevertheless, in view of how frequently these accounts differ in many of the details, we should not completely rule out the possibility that such a version could have been given by Archilochus.

Lasserre, as has just been mentioned, rejected Schneidewin's interpretation, but his own is based on a much shakier foundation. He assumes that Archilochus wished to travel to Delphi, that two sailors offered to transport him for a fee, that another sailor was willing to provide the same service without payment, and that Archilochus related to the two sailors Aesop's fable of the wasps and partridges who offer their service to a farmer if he will give them something to drink (215 Perry). There is little or no evidence for any of these assumptions and Adrados rightly describes the reconstruction as 'completamente fantástico'.

Gallavotti explains the fragment by connecting it with a different fable (426 Perry), one which relates how a fox invited a crane to dinner, but served her soup on a flat stone which she was unable to drink because of the shape of her bill. In retaliation she invited the fox to dinner and served him food in a jar with a long, narrow neck. Our fragment is assumed to represent the crane's sarcastic invitation to the fox: 'non ti faremo campare (o tragittare) senza mercede alcuna'. He justifies the plural by arguing that the crane represents the people of Thasos and by seeing a reference to the dispute between the Thasians and the Maroneans of Thrace, which, according to Philochorus, was related by Archilochus (fr. 291). The fable is said to be directed against the Maroneans, whose territorial appetite will be punished by the Greeks of Thasos just as the fox was punished by the crane. Such an interpretation is based on no less shaky a foundation than Lasserre's. Apart from the unlikely translation given for διάξομαι, there is no evidence that Archilochus was acquainted with this fable. It may be
significant that the fable is not recorded before Plutarch \((Mor. 614e)\).

The only other attempt at an interpretation was made by Martin West.\(^{10}\) He suggests that the daughters of Lycambes are the subject and that ‘they are demanding a fee, the verb \(\delta\acute{\alpha}γ\omega\) meaning “ferry” as a sexual metaphor’. If, however, this is the correct meaning, a better parallel is required for the sexual metaphor than West’s tentative comparison with Semonides fr. 7.54: \(\tauον \delta' \acute{\alpha}ν\varphiα \tauον \piα\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha} \nu\acute{\omicron} \beta\delta\omicron\). This is said of the weasel-woman who makes her partner sick. West proposes \(\piα\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha} \nu\acute{\omicron} \beta\delta\omicron\) ‘in the double sense “penetrate” … and “cross over” as on a ferry (cf. \(\nu\alphaυσιτ\))’, but I have argued elsewhere that \(\piα\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha}\) is to be retained.\(^{11}\)

Let us see, therefore, whether better parallels can be found for West’s interpretation. First of all, although \(\delta\acute{\alpha}γ\omega\) has various meanings, the fact that in the verb’s sole occurrence in Homer \((Od. 20.187)\) it denotes a ferrying across water suggests that on one level at least we have a similar idea here. What remains is to find examples in which ferrying and sexual activity are combined. Perhaps the closest parallel is in Aristophanes’ \(Ecclesiazusae\) 1086–87:

\[
\text{Ne. } \chiαλεπαλ γ' \delta\nu \acute{\omicron}νομεναι πορ\thetaυμ\varphi_. \text{ Γρ. } \tau\eta; \\
\text{Ne. } έλκουντε τως πλω\της \delta\nu \alpha\acute{\omicron}κανετε. 
\]

Two amorous old hags are attempting to drag off a handsome young man. The young man describes them as ‘rough ferrymen’ and when one hag asks ‘why?’, the youth replies ‘you would wear away your passengers with your tugging’. The old hags are called \(\piα\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha} \nu\acute{\omicron} \beta\delta\omicron\) primarily because they are tugging at the youth in the manner of ferrymen trying to attract customers, but in this case the ferrymen are women and the young man fears that they will wear him out or grind him up with their sexual demands.\(^{12}\)

It is not uncommon for prostitutes to be compared with ships, as in \(Anth. \text{ Pal. } 5.204\), a poem in which various parts of an aged prostitute’s body are compared with parts of a ship that has seen better days.\(^{13}\) In \(Anth. \text{ Pal. } 5.161\) aged prostitutes are called \(\delta\lambda\acute{\alpha}δ\omicron\omicron\nu\) ‘transport-ships, merchantmen’, i.e., they carry their customers just as \(\delta\lambda\acute{\alpha}δ\omicron\omicron\nu\) carry cargo. Similar is \(Anth. \text{ Pal. } 5.44\) where two prostitutes are called \(\Lambda\acute{\omicron}μ\beta\omicron\nu\) and \(\Κερ\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\), names formed from \(\Lambda\acute{\omicron}μ\beta\omicron\nu\) and \(\chiερ\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\). The latter was primarily a cargo-carrier, but the former was also sometimes used for this purpose.\(^{14}\) In \(Anth. \text{ Pal. } 9.416\) a ship built \(\delta\nu \acute{\omicron}γ\varphiων \Κορ\pi\theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) is represented as saying \(\acute{\omicron}μ\beta\omicron\nu\ \thetaαρ\rho\omicron\nu\), \(\muι\sigma\theta\omicron\ \acute{\omicron}ν\acute{\omicron} \alpha\omicron\zeta \sigma\omicron\ \beta\rho\omicron\nu\), a passage in which \(\muι\sigma\theta\omicron\) has the same twofold reference (prostitute’s fee and ferryman’s fee) as it would have in our fragment of Archilochus, if West’s interpretation is correct. Demosthenes (59.20) and Aeschines (1.154) use the verb \(\muι\sigma\theta\alphaρ\nu\acute{\omicron}ν\omicron\) of the fee charged by a prostitute.

Partially analogous are passages such as \(Anth. \text{ Pal. } 5.285\) where a \(\acute{\omicron}ων\) held between two lovers and kissed by each is described as \(\piα\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha}\) ...
where a κεστός is called a πορθμός Ἐρώτον (the same expression appears in 42.43).

None of all these examples of sexual imagery provides a precise parallel for West's interpretation of our fragment of Archilochus, but they do seem to me to offer more support for it than has been offered for any of the other interpretations that have been proposed. Since δύναμις can be used of ferry-service and since prostitutes can be described as ships taking customers on board for a fee, I see no reason why fr. 34 could not have been spoken by women who are refusing their sexual services unless they receive payment. It is stated in Anth. Pal. 7.351 and 352 that Archilochus accused the daughters of Lycambe of compromising their virginity and of doing so in public (ἐν ἄγιοις, 7.351.7). This might suggest that his accusations included charges of prostitution and it is not difficult to imagine a poem in which Archilochus represented the daughters of Lycambe as refusing to engage in sexual activity unless they were paid a fee.

NOTES

2. Soph. Trach. 560, Apollod. 2.7.6, Diod. Sic. 4.363.
4. B.L. Gildersleeve, Syntax of Classical Greek 1, New York 1900, 27. See also P. Chantraine, Grammaire homérique 2, Paris 1963, 33–34. A referee points out to me that Nessus uses the first person plural of himself in Ovid Met. 9.131 ('neque enim moriemur inulti'), but I do not think that this can be treated as evidence for Archilochian usage.
5. There is of course no reason to dispute the possibility of dialogue per se in the poetry of Archilochus, given the evidence of the Cologne epode. See B. Gentili, Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece, trans. A.T. Cole, Baltimore 1988, 184 with note 28 (pp. 292 ff.).
7. Lasserre (above, n. 3) 222–24.
12. See J. Henderson, The Maculate Muse, New Haven 1975, 163–64 and 174. See also pp. 161–66 for further examples of 'nautical metaphors for sexual congress'. Latin examples are cited by H.D. Jocelyn, 'Boats, Women, and Horace Odes 1.14', CPh 77 (1982) 330–35. He points out that in the 'many identifications of women with boats' in both Greek and Latin 'the identifier always seeks to arouse among his hearers a hostile attitude to the person identified'.

102
13. The reverse situation, in which an old and battered ship (no doubt the ship of state) is being compared with an aged prostitute, may be the subject of Alcaeus fr. 306i col. II Voigt. For a detailed treatment of the fragment see Gentili (above, note 5) 209–12. See also W.J. Slater, ‘Symposium at Sea’, *HSPh* 80 (1976) 161–70, where several of the passages I cite here are mentioned and discussed.


15. According to Hesychius (s.v. ἐργήτης), Archilochus represented Neoboule as a prostitute (fr. 208).

16. A version of this article formed part of a paper delivered at Rand Afrikaans University and the University of Cape Town in September, 1988. I take this opportunity to record publicly my gratitude for the hospitality shown to me by these two universities and by all the others at which I lectured in South Africa.
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**ENKELE VOORBEELDE VAN TO ΠΡΕΠΙΟΝ (PASLIKHEID) IN AD DIOGNETUM 2**

**SUMMARY:** The aim of this article is to indicate how the stylistic virtue τὸ πρέπον is employed in the attack on the Greek gods in *Ad Diognetum* 2. In the first passage (2,3–4a) the author argues that the form of the gods can change at any given time. This mutation is suggested by disturbance in the expected word order (hyperbaton) and use of the optative mood. In the next passage (2.4b) the author emphasizes the depravity of the gods. An intensification of the criticism on the semantic level correlates with an increase of the length of the cola on a syntactical and the agreement of sound on a phonological level. In the third passage the author argues that worship of the gods leads to identification with them. Cola 1–3 are the means leading to the result in colon 4. Not only the contents, but also the similarities on syntactical and phonological levels show the unity of the first three cola and differentiate them from the fourth.

Die term τὸ πρέπον du Roy gepastheid of ooreenkoms tussen stof en styl, sowel as—veral in poesie—tussen skrywer en styl, karakter en styl ens.¹

Aristoteles het die term ἁρμόττω as 'n alternatiewe vorm vir τὸ πρέπον gebruik. Nóg ἁρμόττω, nóg τὸ πρέπον is egter deur hom as 'n kategorie van styl beskou.²

Dit was Theophrastus wat τὸ πρέπον eerste as 'n stytleug aangedui het, tesame met nog drie ander ἀρέται: ἐλληνισμός (suwerheid van taal), σαφήνεια (duitdlikheid) en κεχοσμημένον (versiering). Later het die Stoa 'n vyfde deug, nl. συντομία (bondigheid) bygevoeg.³

Dionysius van Halicarnassus (eerste eeu n.C.) het τὸ πρέπον beskou as die belangrikste van alle stydleugde. Hy skryf in sy *De Lys* 9, 34; 27–29: τὸ πρέπον...κρατίστην ἀπαθῶν ἀρετήν καί...τελειοτάτην. A.D. Leeman is
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