THE PORTRAITURE OF ARCHILOCHUS

The purpose of this article is to examine the portraiture of Archilochus in two contexts: the general context of portraiture in ancient Greece and the specific context of the development of cult practices that revolved around ancient Greek poets from the early Archaic period to the middle Empire. While the portraiture of Archilochus has been studied in an important, recent publication,[1] there is more work to be done. Indeed, new considerations can both strengthen our understanding of an Archilochus-type portrait which became the most influential portrait of the Parian poet after the fifth century BC and prompt a number of different ideas concerning the complex relationship that existed between particular representations of Archilochus and the particular intellectual and visual cultures that produced them.

The Late Archaic Period

The Archaic period sees the rise of the idea of the "exceptional man". Homer never speaks of himself, but Hesiod certainly does.[2] The trend peaks with Archilochus in the second quarter of the seventh century. The poet is the protagonist of many of his own poems.[3] This autobiographical urge was important to many who followed. In the Golden Age of tyrannies, the significance of the exceptional man became entwined with the idea that the songs of poets were sacred since they were inspired by gods. This, in turn, led to the acknowledgment of heroic status for a few important poets. The ultimate consequence of these interconnected phenomena

---

[1] See D. Clay, *Archilochos Heros* (Washington, D. C. 2004). I delivered a paper on this topic on Parus, on 2. October 2004, at a symposium on Archilochus organized by D. Clay. I gave a similar lecture on Archilochus' portraiture in St. Petersburg in October of 2005, in the *Bibliotheca Classica*. I wish to thank Prof. D. Clay, Prof. A. Gavrilov, Prof. N. Kazansky, Prof. M. Kohl, Prof. A. Ohnesorg and the other scholars who discussed with me issues concerning the portraiture of Archilochus.

[2] See Hes. *Th.* 22–34 and *Op.* 10; 27–41; 213–224; 274–319; 609–662.

[3] See, e. g., Archilochus, frr. 1–2, 5, 9, 11, 13, 30–31, 38, 47, 54, 60, 108, 118–122, 129, 172–173, 188, 193, 196–200, 205–209 Gerber. Archilochus' eagerness to speak of himself in his poems was already noted by Critias, 88 B 44 DK.

was the development of cult centres devoted to individual poets. Important to the evolution of these cult centres was the carving of iconic images of the outstanding poets who were honored there, a development that should be understood within the context of the establishment of iconic statues for other exceptional individuals, such as athletes, priests, important worshippers and their families.[4]

Perhaps, the first poet who enjoyed such honours was Homer. The statue of the poet in the *Homereion* of Smyrna was a *xoanon* and may have been very ancient indeed.[5]

Likewise, the first monument of Archilochus on Parus probably dates to the last quarter of the sixth century BC.[6] A two-slabs relief from Parus (Archaeological Museum of Parus, nos. 758–759; fig. 1), usually dated to the end of the sixth century BC, is often thought to belong to the frieze of the *Archilocheion* of Parus and to represent our poet.[7] On the first slab, a *cena heroica* is represented: the heroized dead man lays on a *kline*. He has long hair, in keeping with the middle to late archaic fashion.[8] His head is in a three-quarters position and he is bearded. His upper body is bare and he holds a *phiale*. The lower part of his body is draped. In front of him, a woman is seated on a *thronos*: she is the hero's wife, identified as such by her gesture of *anakalypsis*. On the viewer's right, there is a young servant, ready to pour wine to the hero from an *oinochoe*. The background of the relief represents the interior wall of the room in which the *cena heroica* takes place. Weapons of the hero are hung on the walls. Other two objects which were represented hung on the wall are more difficult to identify: they may have been a wreath and a lyre. The second slab, which

[4] For the rise of portraiture in late archaic art, see A. Corso, "The Position of Portraiture in Early Hellenistic Art Criticism", *Eulimene* 5 (2004) 11–25. For representations of priests in the archaic period, see A. G. Mantis, *Προβλημαται της εικονογραφιας των ιερειων και των ιερεων στην αρχαια Ελλενικη τεχνη* (Athens 1990) pls. 1–6 and D. Kreikenbom, "Reifarchaische Plastik", in: P. C. Bol (ed.), *Die Geschichte der antiken Bildhauerkunst* I (Mainz 2002) 152–156. On statues of worshippers, see P. Karanastassis, "Hocharchaische Plastik", *ibid.*, 186–188 and especially C. Loehr, *Griechische Familienweihungen* (Rahden 2000) 8–25, nos. 1–21.

[5] See Strabo 14, 37, 646 C.

[6] See Clay (n. 1) 40–54. In the inscriptions of Sosthenes, it is stated that the Parians paid honours to Archilochus immediately after his death (see Clay [n. 1] 110–118, no. ii. 3).

[7] See Clay (n. 1) 40–54.

[8] See E. Schneider, *Untersuchungen zum Körperbild Attischer Kuroi* (Paderborn 1999) 202–241.

was not adjacent to the first, but certainly was part of the same frieze, represents a lion attacking a bull.

The speculative identification of the heroized dead man as Archilochus relies on the four arguments. First, the relief representation of the *cena heroica*, an Eastern tradition, became established in the Greek world after about 520 BC; thus the relief of Parus is one of the earliest examples of this genre.[9] This foreign convention, the argument goes, is likely to have been appropriated at that time by only a truly exceptional man. Second, the weapons and the possible lyre on the wall seem to refer to the definition that Archilochus gave of himself: he was simultaneously both soldier and poet.[10] Third, the representation of the poet as bearded, with bare chest and draped body, seems to characterize probable portraits of Archilochus in later times. Thus, it should be possible to trace this convention to this late archaic relief. And fourth and finally, the iconography of the lion attacking a bull is adopted more often in the religious architecture than in tombs. Therefore, it seems more likely that the frieze which included the two slabs pertained to a *heroön* than to a standard funerary monument.[11]

To these arguments two points should be added. First, it is important to remember that Archilochus was incredibly significant in sixth century Ionian culture. This can be most clearly seen in a passage of Heraclitus.[12] This kind of regard may have paved the way for the representation of the poet on the Parian relief: Archilochus was famously associated with war, drinking and poetry. Second, in Sosthenes' famous inscription, probably placed in the *Archilocheion* of Parus a little after 100 BC, the local sculptor Sostheus is mentioned as the carver of a relief in which he represented Archilochus as the "servant of the Muses" taking inspiration from the songs of the poet.[13] If the presence of a lyre in our heroic relief is ac-

---

[9] See Clay (n. 1) 43.

[10] See Archilochus, fr. 1 Gerber.

[11] See Clay (n. 1) 40–54.

[12] See Heraclitus 22 B 42 DK.

[13] See Clay (n. 1) 116 and 118, catalogue II, no. B. VII. ll. 12–17. The usual assertion that Sostheus is the metrical adaptation of the name Sosthenes (see, e. g., Clay [n. 1] 33), the Parian who wrote the inscription and would proudly declare to have carved the relief, is unlikely: Sosthenes in the inscription tries to exhibit his status as a historian and as a poet, not as a carver. However, the sculptor Sostheus may have been regarded as a remote ancestor of Sosthenes, because the fathers of both have the same name, Prosthenes, that is why Sosthenes advertizes the deeds of this carver.

cepted, it is possible that this inscription referred to this frieze. The idea is that during the late Hellenistic age this old, respected representation of the poet was endowed with recognized authority. If this suggestion is convincing, then it follows that this relief was considered so important that the name of its sculptor was recorded four centuries after its erection.

The Cimonian Period

In the Cimonian period, the need to give emphasis to the glories of exceptional noble families becomes intense. Genealogies, relics and bones attributed to heroes of the past become increasingly important; an antiquarian flavour characterizes the culture generally. The figure of the poet-soldier is also dear to the age and naturally favours the renown of Archilochus.[14] It is no surprise to find Pindar referring to Archilochus as a well-known poet at this time.[15]

Also during this period, around 460 BC, Archilochus is represented in vase-painting. On an Attic white-ground pyxis by the Hesiod Painter in Boston (Museum of Fine Arts, no. 98. 887; fig. 2), a man is represented standing next to a cow, in the presence of six Muses. This man was tentatively identified by Beazley as Hesiod with Muses on Mt. Helicon.[16] However, a late third century BC inscription found on Parus – the so-called Mnesiepes inscription – reports that one evening the Muses appeared to Archilochus while he carried a cow and gave him a lyre.[17] Since six Muses and a cow are represented on the pyxis (as opposed to Hesiod's sheep), the interpretation of the youth as Archilochus suggested by Kontoleon, is probably correct.[18] (The evocation of the epiphany of

---

[14] On the Cimonian age, I just cite J. H. Schreiner, *Hellanikos, Thukydides and the Era of Kimon* (Aarhus 1997). Concerning the bones of Theseus brought back from Scyrus to Athens, see S. Mills, *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1997) 34–42. The interest for genealogies in the Cimonian circle is best exemplified by the antiquarian writer Pherecydes of Athens. Of course, the interest for genealogies of aristocratic families is well known also thanks to the epinician poems of Pindar and Bacchylides. Finally, the figure of the poet-soldier is well expressed in the epigram on the tomb of Aeschylus (see *Vita Aeschyli* 10).

[15] See Pind. *Pyth*. 2, 52–56 and *Ol*. 9, 1–4 (and *Schol*. *ad loc*. as well as to *Nem*. 3, 1).

[16] See J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford 1963) 774, no. 1.

[17] See Clay (n. 1) 104–110, catalogue ii, no. 2, E ii, ll. 20–49.

[18] N. M. Kontoleon, "Archilochos und Paros", in: J. Pouilloux et alii (eds.), *Archiloque*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 10 (Vandoevres – Genève 1963) 37–86.

the Muses fits well into the world of the tragedy during the period of Aeschylus, a world characterized by the sudden arrival of deities in the human world.) While the figure of the poet survives only in its lower section, it does show the existence in Athens during the second quarter of the fifth century of an iconography of the poet as a standing cowherd clothed with a short cloak and shepherd's stick and high boots.[19] If this identification holds, then it becomes clear that the Cimonian period saw further development in the iconography of Archilochus.

This should not surprise. During this same period, a statue of Pindar was set up in the *agora* of Athens,[20] while a statue of Anacreon was erected on the Acropolis.[21] Athenian imperial policy clearly aimed at creating an Athenian culture which epitomized and appropriated the best of earlier Greek poetry. In this context, the creation of an Attic iconography of Archilochus becomes understandable. Both Parus and Thasus had been included in the Delian league.[22] The lyric traditions of both these islands were thus included as components of a poetic culture centralized in Athens. Claiming Archilochus as part of this "Attic" cultural heritage may have provided the impetus for the re-creation of the poet's iconography. At the very least, the representation of a renowned poet as a cowherd might be in keeping with the elevation of the peasant life in early classical Athens.[23]

---

[19] I am aware of the recent identification of the seated figure with *plektron* and lyre – usually thought to be a Muse – as Archilochus (see Clay [n. 1] 55–58). However, I find it unconvincing. The face, the hair, the dark himation and the white chiton are all similar to the corresponding features of the other Muses. The seated figure must also be a Muse. The height of this figure also corresponds to that of the other Muses. The standing Archilochus was taller. There are other cases of seating Muses holding a lyre in Attic vase-painting of the classical period (see, e. g., A. Queyrel, "Mousa, Mousai", *LIMC* 6 [1992] 657–681, nos. 1, 6, 12, 14, 20, 48 a, 153). *Ad abundantiam*, should the seating figure with a lyre be recognized as a poet, he should be a very effeminate poet, hardly a fitting representaton of the masculine Archilochus.

[20] See Aeschin. *Epist*. 4, 2–3; Paus. 1, 8, 4; Christodorus, *Anthol. Gr.* 2, 382; *IGUR* 1537.

[21] See Paus. 1, 25, 1 and *IGUR* 1499. See also the statues of Homer and Hesiod set up among statues of gods by Micythus of Rhegium in the *Altis*: Paus. 5, 26, 2–5.

[22] On the Delian league, see H. A. Reiter, *Athen und die Poleis des Delisch-Attischen Seebundes* (Regensburg 1991).

[23] On the conservative orientation of peasants in Athens in the fifth century BC, the pages of V. Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes* (Oxford ^{2}1951) 73–94 are still important.

With regards to Thasus during this period, the importance of the family of Archilochus in the Parian colonization of the island is stressed by the famous Thasian painter Polygnotus. In the *Nekyia* in the *lesche* of the Cnidians in Delphi, the painter represented Tellis, the grandfather of Archilochus, and Cleoboea who holds on her knees a chest for Demeter; Cleoboea was said to have brought the orgies of Demeter to Thasus from Parus.[24] The pairing of Tellis and Cleoboea suggests that Tellis was painted in the context of the foundation of the Parian colony of Thasus. The Polygnotan paintings in Delphi date soon after 463 BC, when Cimon defeated Thasus after the uprising of this island against Athenian rule. The inclusion of Tellis in the *Nekyia* might suggest a Cimonian desire to emphasize and honour the family of Archilochus.

Most significant here, of course, is the famous discovery of a middle fifth century version of the Parian *cena heroica* on Thasus (fig. 3).[25] This important relief has been explained as an evocation of the poet in the context of the constitution of his heroic cult on Thasus. The similarity of the two reliefs from Parus and Thasus is striking: the hero on the Thasian relief leans on the *kline*, his legs are draped while his chest is bare, his head is bearded, his right arm is brought forward and his left elbow rests on a pillow. His wife sits on the viewer's right side, his serving boy stands at left. Weapons are hung on the wall behind the *kline*. The lack of reference to the *status* of poet enjoyed by the dead may be compared with the funerary epigram of Aeschylus,[26] who records only his deeds as soldier, not as poet. This can be explained by the need to suggest that even the most prominent poets must be ready to give themselves to their homeland.[27] Ultimately, the use of Ionic and eastern traditions on the reliefs of *cena heroica* should probably also be seen within the context of the Athenian *arche*. Indeed, the use of these visual tropes can be viewed as an indicator of the growing trend toward the inclusion of the most important visual patterns of Ionic culture into a hegemonic, Attic *interpretatio*.[28]

---

[24] See Paus. 10, 28, 3.

[25] The relief is in Constantinople, National Archaeological Museum, no. 578 M (1947). On this relief, see especially C. Gasparri, "Archiloco a Taso", *QUCC* 11 (1982) 33–41. It is not irrelevant that the ally of Archilochus, Glaucus, was also honoured on Thasus as a hero at least from the late seventh century BC (see Clay [n. 1] 69).

[26] See n. 14.

[27] On the heroic message of poets in this period, see T. M. Compton, *Victim of the Muses* (Washington, D. C. 2006) 130–134.

[28] See Clay (n. 1) 43–47.

The Periclean Period

During the third quarter of the fifth century, the fame of Archilochus is particularly well documented. Archilochus is remembered by Herodotus (1, 12) and Sophocles (*El.* 96).[29] Euripides (*Med.* 679)[30] and Aristophanes (*Ach.* 119–120 and 278; *Pax* 603–604 and 1148; *Aves* 1764; *Lysistrata* 1254–1256; *Ranae* 704; *Plutus* 476)[31] quote from Archilochan expressions, particularly when the subjects of bad behaviour, death and *eros* arise. That an oligarch like Critias condemned Archilochus because of his low social rank and unethical behaviour[32] suggests that the poet may have found further favour within Pericles' radical democratic party since he did not comply with aristocratic *desiderata*. It is quite likely that this period saw the erection of the portrait that would become the template for later images of the poet.

The starting point for the identification of this portrait is a silver cup from the Boscoreale villa in Paris, Louvre, no. Bj 1923, probably made in the Claudian period (fig. 4).[33] The cup is paired with another with the same provenance; both bear carved representations of skeletons of famous Greek men of culture. The drinkers, observing the remains of great men, were reminded of the shortness of life and were thereby encouraged to drink and be merry.[34] Sophocles, Moschion, Zeno, and Epicurus are represented as skeletons on one cup, while the skeletons of Menander, Archilochus, Euripides and Monimus are carved on the other cup. Inscriptions identify the skeletons as those of specific men of learning.

Archilochus' skeleton is shown standing, holding a *chelys* lyre outwards in his left hand, with his left leg bent and brought forward as if walking. The body's weight is held by the straight right leg.

This same basic configuration is matched by a statue-type that represents a poet.

The type is known from four marble copies. First, a Hadrianic or early Antonine copy, once in the Dupret collection, then in the Gori

[29] See *Schol. ad loc.*
[30] See *Schol. ad loc.*
[31] See *Schol. ad loca*.
[32] See Critias 88 B 44 DK.
[33] See Clay (n. 1) 61–62.
[34] See Hdt. 2, 78 and Petr. 34, 8. Comments in Clay (n. 1) 61–62, with previous bibliography.

Pamilini collection in Siena, then in Paris, Louvre, no. Ma 588 (fig. 5).[35] This copy is the most complete and in the best condition. Second, a Pentelic marble headless copy, dated to the Augustan period, found in Rome on the Quirinal hill within Villa Aldobrandini. This portrait was probably set up in the area of the *tabernae* below the Constantine Baths, where it was found. It is now in the Capitoline Museum, Sala degli Orti Mecenaziani, no. 1086 (fig. 6). Third, a Pentelic marble, headless copy, dated in the late Hadrianic or early Antonine times from Corinth, now in the local Museum (fig. 7). And finally, a head, dated during the age of Domitian from Ephesus (Harbour's gymnasium/baths), now in Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, no. 853 (fig. 8). Considering how closely these four portraits correspond to the basic form of the walking poet shown on the Boscoreale cup, it is tempting to suggest that these four copies might represent Archilochus.

There is some other evidence worth considering here. The walking poet bears the same *chelys* lyre which is given to the figure of Archilochus on a late Hellenistic Parian coin.[36] This suggests that this musical instrument may have characterized the iconography of Archilochus.[37] Of course, the lyre is quite important within Archilochus' own poetry. In one poem, the lyre accompanies the erotic approach of the poet to one daughter of Lycambes (fr. 56 Gerber); in another fragment, Parian men well versed in the use of the lyre are engaged in war against a Thracian tribe (fr. 93 a Gerber). The lyre is thus a companion to both *eros* and war – the two most important topics of Archilochan poetry. It also seems worth pointing out that the *chelys* lyre was thought to have been invented by Hermes, by the god of motion and of walking life, and was thus a suitable instrument for youth.[38] It may be that this in-

---

[35] See G. M. A. Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks* I (London 1965) 69; E. Voutiras, *Studien zu Interpretation und Stil Griechischer Porträts des 5. und frühen 4. Jahrhunderts* (Bonn 1980) 194–205; K. Schefold, *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker* (Basle 1996) 94, no. 29; Clay (n. 1) 61–65; S. Dillon, *Ancient Greek Portrait Sculpture* (Cambridge 2006) 4, 34, 86, 92, 124, 149–150, no. A 14.

[36] See below p. 23 f. and fig. 11.

[37] See Clay (n. 1) 61.

[38] See, e. g., M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford 1992) 56–69; A. Alexopoulos, "Gods and Mythical Figures Associated with Music", in: L. Kolonas (ed.), *Gifts of the Muses* (Athens 2004) 30–37 and O. Themelis, "Instruments and Notation", *ibid.*, 78–84.

strument and the walking configuration of the Louvre poet were meant to express the adventurous and eventful life of Archilochus.

From a formal point of view, the stance of the walking poet and the relation between his body and his drapery generally correspond with features of figures of the Parthenon frieze.[39] The style of the drapery folds is also typical of figures on the frieze. Finally, the rectangular, elongated type of head, with short hair, long beard and moustaches is also close to heads of the frieze.[40] On the other hand, the walking poet is differentiated from the figures of the Parthenon frieze by the metallic rendering of the details, especially the drapery, which reveal that the Roman, marble copies probably derived from a bronze statue. This bronze original probably portrayed Archilochus and was made around 440 BC around the time that the Parthenon frieze was carved. It is possible that one of the sculptors of the frieze may have had a hand in the design of the important middle fifth century portrait of Archilochus.

Indeed, it may be possible to go further and to identify the master who invented this walking poet type. The Louvre type of poet is surprisingly similar to the Dresden Zeus (fig. 9).[41] The general concept of the drapery, which covers the lower parts of the body and the left side of the chest, and the curves of the folding running across the belly and between the legs in the lowest section of the drapery are so similar in the two statuary types as to suggest the attribution of both to the same workshop. The same conclusion is reached when considering the analogous rendering of the figures' chests. The similar design of the face, eyes, nose, mouth, hair, moustaches, beard and the rendering of the short locks make a connection between these two images stronger. It seems possible to suggest that the Louvre type poet was created by the same sculptor who conceived the Dresden type of Zeus.

---

[39] See, e. g., A. Delivorrias, *Η ζωοφορος του Παρθενωνα* (Athens 2004), west frieze, no. 1; north frieze, nos. 10, 17, 40, 90; south frieze, nos. 95–97, 104, 133; east frieze, nos. 1, 18, 20, 22–23, 38–39, 43, 45, 47–49, 52.

[40] See *ibid*., north frieze, nos. 38–41, and east frieze, nos. 20, 23–24, 30, 34, 37–38.

[41] On the Dresden type of Zeus, see I. Romeo, "Das Panhellenion", in: W.-D. Heilmeyer (ed.), *Die Griechische Klassik* (Berlin 2002) 675–684 and G. Dontas, "Αισθητικος και καλλιτεχνικος αντιλογος στην προταση τα ισεος των τυπων του ʿΔιος της Δρεσδης' και της 'Αθηνας Hope-Farnese' με τα αγαλματα του Διος-Αιδου και της Αθηνας Ιτονιας στη Βοιοτικη Κορονεια", *Αρχαιογνωσια* 12 (2003–2004) 223–238.

Now the Dresden Zeus has been attributed to Agoracritus of Parus, the beloved pupil of Phidias, on the basis of comparison between the Dresden Zeus and the Agoracritan Nemesis set up in Rhamnus (fig. 10). Indeed, the anatomy of the face and the folding of these two images betray many similarities.[42] These three statues – the Walking Poet, the Dresden Zeus and the Nemesis – should all be attributed to the same sculptor, Agoracritus of Parus. However, the dates of these three creations are different. The Walking Poet dates to around 440 BC, since he is stylistically the most sober of the three. The Dresden Zeus probably dates to 435, since drapery and face show a richer play of light and shade. Finally, the Nemesis, whose surfaces are even more virtuosic, should date around 430 BC.[43] The sequence of the three works suggests that their creator was not yet entirely within the Periclean world when he made the Walking Poet. However, when he made the Dresden Zeus and the Nemesis, he had totally absorbed the Periclean *Zeitgeist*. This cultural itinerary – from the margins of the Periclean experience to the working in the centre of that world – could be hypothetically suggested for Agoracritus.

It is obvious to suggest that, as a Parian who specialized in carving Parian marble,[44] he must have been initiated into the discipline of

---

[42] See G. Despinis, *Συμβολη στη μελετη του εργου του Αγορακριτου* (Athens 1971) 133–145. The original statue of the Dresden Zeus must have been a Zeus and not Hades (see Romeo [n. 41]). The original was not in a group with the original Athena Hope-Farnese (see Dontas [n. 41]). The suggestion of O. Palagia, *The Pediments of the Parthenon* (Leiden 1993) fig. 20, that the Zeus in the centre of the east pediment of the Parthenon was the original of the Dresden type, should be rejected: the copies of the Dresden type descend from the same original not only in the front, but also in the back and sides. This observation implies that the original was a free standing statue. Moreover, the Zeus in the centre of the east pediment of the Parthenon was probably enthroned: this is argued from the comparison with both the Zeus on the eastern frieze of the Parthenon and the Zeus on the Madrid *puteal* (see I. Jenkins, *Greek Architecture and its Sculpture in the British Museum* [London 2006] 86–94).

[43] On Agoracritus, see E. Paul, "Agorakritos", in: R. Vollkommer (ed.), *Künstlerlexikon der Antike* I (Munich 2001) 14–15 and D. Kreikenbom, "Der Reiche Stil", in: P. C. Bol (ed.), *Die Geschichte der antiken Bildhauerkunst.* II. *Klassische Plastik* (Mainz 2004) 204–214.

[44] On Agoracritus as a Parian, see Strabo 9, 1, 17, 396 C; Pliny, *NH* 36, 17; Zenobius 5, 82; Hesychius, Souda, Photius, s. vv. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις; Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 7, 931 and *Epistulae* 21. The Nemesis of Rhamnus was Parian marble: see Paus. 1, 33, 2. This information of the Periegetas has been confirmed by the fragments of the original statue identified by Despinis (n. 42) 6–23.

marble carving on his own island, in close contact with the marble quarries, and that later, in a second phase of career, he took permanent residence in Athens having become a student of Phidias.

If all this holds, then this image reveals that the still young Agoracritus had already absorbed the stylistic grammar of the Parthenon frieze, perhaps because he already began working in the Periclean enterprises. At the same time, he preserved the graphic animation of the surfaces, typical of the Ionic tradition, and the tense sense of expression which was inherited from the late Severe style.

The Walking Poet, with this tense expression, probably was not set up in Athens, where, in about 440 BC, the serene, Phidian gaze was almost compulsory. The two most obvious alternative locations are Parus or Thasus. Since the Walking Poet seems to have been carved by a Parian sculptor, Parus is preferable as the place where the original statue of this type was set up. It is possible that the statue was originally erected in the Parian *heroön* of the poet. As was the case for statues of Pindar, Anacreon, and Homer,[45] it is hardly surprising that a statue of Archilochus was erected in the most important cult place of the poet.

Unfortunately, the monumental activity on Parus in these decades is not well known and does not allow us to place this important portrait in its local context.[46]

However, the flourishing in the late fifth century BC of the important poet and thinker Evenus of Parus suggests that the intellectual environment of this *polis* at the time was rather lively.[47] Perhaps when the late fifth century BC orator Alcidamas asserted that the Parians honoured Archilochus (Arist. *Rhet.* 2, 23, 1398 b 11–17) he referred not only to the late Archaic *heroön* but also to the more recent statue of the Walking Poet, set up by the Parians and made by Agoracritus of Paros.

The Late Classical Period

The late Classical period sees a renaissance of monumental enterprises on Parus. By far the most famous evidence of this rebirth is the architectural complex of the Prytaneion / Sanctuary of Hestia. Sculptors

[45] On the early classical portrait of Homer, see P. C. Bol, "Die Portraits des Strengen Stils und der Hochklassik", in: Bol (n. 43) 103–104.

[46] See G. Gruben, "Paro", *EAA*, Suppl. 2. 4 (1996) 262–263. The Parian sculpture of the third quarter of the fifth century BC is known especially in the funerary realm: see Ph. Zapheiropoulou, *Πάρος* (Athens 1998) 50–52.

[47] See E. Bowie, "Euenos (1) von Paros", *Der Neue Pauly* 4 (1998) 226–227.

of renown – Aristander, Thrasymedes and especially Scopas – all contributed to this revival.[48] The decades of the second Athenian league, which included Parus from 376 until 338 BC,[49] see a growing nostalgia for the good old days of the Periclean *arche*: this attitude feeds a retrospective admiration for the art of Phidias.[50] A new conception of the temple also arises during this period; this type of building is now sometimes regarded not only as a sacred space, but in addition as the precious frame for one or several important statues and becomes destination for art tourism.[51] Keeping with this spirit on Parus, probably around 350 BC or a little later, a late Archaic column set up in the *Archilocheion* was inscribed by a certain Docimus who wrote that the column was the memorial of Archilochus who lay below it.[52] A *naïskos* built a little after 350 BC can also probably be connected with the monumentalization of the heroic sanctuary of Archilochus.[53] It is quite likely that this temple responded not only to a general trend in favour of the cults of poets,[54] but also to the desire to give a worthy architecture to the Walking statue of Archilochus made by Agoracritus.

---

[48] See D. Katsonopoulou, "Skopas and Paros", *NumAntCl* 33 (2004) 157–168.

[49] See E. Lanzillotta, *Paro dall'età arcaica all'età ellenistica* (Rome 1987) 135–150.

[50] The mentions of Phidias in the late classical literature are collected in A. Corso, "Classical, not Classicistic", *Eulimene* 3 (2002) 14, nos. 20–27.

[51] See, e. g., the examples of the round temple in Cnidus which housed Praxiteles' Cnidian Aphrodite (see A. Corso, *The Art of Praxiteles* II [Rome 2007] 28–42) and the Philippeion of Olympia, in which Leochares' statues of Macedonian royalty had been set up (see P. Schultz, "Leochares' Argead Portraits in the Philippeion", in: P. Schultz, R. von den Hoff [eds.], *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context* [Cambridge 2007] 205–233).

[52] See Clay (n. 1) 28–29 and 104, no. ii, 1.

[53] See A. Ohnesorg, "Der Dorische Prostylos des Archilocheion auf Paros", *AA* 97 (1982) 271–290. The connection of this building with the cult of Archilochus is supported by facts that the capital with the Docimus' inscription was found in the same area (the *Tris Ekklisies*) and that blocks of Parian marble with the Mnesiepes' inscription were found not far from the site (see Clay [n. 1] 104–110, no. ii, 2): the latter inscription also deals with the *heroön* of Archilochus. I believe that the *heroön* of Archilochus on Parus was in the site of the *Tris Ekklisies*, where the Docimus capital and elements of the naïskos were found.

[54] Summary of the evidence on the cult of poets see in Clay (n. 1) 94–96. The cults of Homer in Smyrna (see n. 5) and in Argus (*Cert. Hom. et Hes.* 302–314), of Archilochus on Parus, of Aesop in Delphi (see *Vita Aesopi*, *POxy* 1800. 1. 221, T 25), perhaps of Bias in Priene (Diog. Laert. 1, 82), probably of Chilon in Sparta (see A. J. B. Wace, "A Spartan Hero Relief", *AE* [1937]: 1, 217–220), of Orpheus on Lesbus (Philostr. *Heroicus* 28. 8–12 De Lannoy = T 1134 Kern) and in Libethra

The Early Hellenistic Period

In the second quarter of the third century BC, the Parian Mnesiepes monumentalized the *heroön* of Archilochus by setting up a *temenos* and by erecting altars to the poet and to the gods. He also instituted new sacrifices and made the name *Archilocheion* the official designation of the sanctuary.[55] This *renovatio* of the cultic place of Archilochus should be understood in the context of the spread of the cults of poets in the early Hellenistic period,[56] of the antiquarian interests of the times[57] and as evidence for the appeal of "old" poets typical of Alexandrian culture.[58] It is also possible that during this occasion a new statue of the poet was set up. In fact, as we shall see, on the obverse of a silver tetradrachm coin struck by Parus around 75 BC, a poet in profile seats

---

in Thrace (a *xoanon* of Orpheus is mentioned by Plut. *Alex.* 14, 8) and perhaps of Stesichorus in Catane (see Photius s. v. Πέντε ὀκτώ) are archaic. The cults of Archilochus on Thasus, of Homer on Chius and of Sappho in Mytilene (see Alcidamas in Aristot. *Rhet.* 2, 23, 1398 b 11–17), of Aeschylus in Gela (see *Vita Aeschyli* 10), of Pindar in Thebes (Aristodemus, *FGrHist* 383 F 13) and in Delphi (Paus. 9, 23, 3 and 10, 24, 5), of Empedocles in Agrigentum and Selinus (Diog. Laert. 8, 67–70) and of Sophocles in Athens (*Etym. Genuin.* 256, 6; Ister, *Vita Soph.*, *FGrHist* 334 F 38; *IG* II^2 1252–1253) may have been set up during the early classical period. The cults of Homer on Ius (see the coins mentioned by Clay [n. 1] 142) and of Aristotle in Stagira (*Vita Aristotelis Marciana* 83–90 Gigon) were created during the late Classical times. Perhaps in the same period the private cult of Plato by Aristotle should be dated, if we believe *Vita Aristotelis Marciana* p. 4 Gigon and David, *In Porphyrii Isagogen* p. 121. 13–17 (see, for the context of the episode, also Olympiodor. *In Plat. Gorg.* p. 215. 5–7 Westerink = Aristot. fr. 673 Rose), as well as the veneration of Plato by the Magi (see Sen. *Epist. mor.* 6. 58. 31). In the latter period, the cults of poets, including both those inherited from previous periods, those still flourishing and those constituted *ex novo*, must have been numerous. Late classical philosophical thought on poetry, the contemporary boom of the genre of portraiture and finally the emphasis given on the most emotional aspects of Greek culture must have paved the way to the spread of the cults of poets in the early Hellenistic period (the cults of Antigonus in Cnidus, of Aridictes on Rhodes, of Homer in Alexandria, in Amastris, on Delus, in Colophon, in Cyme, perhaps of Mimnermus in Smyrna, were constituted in the early Hellenistic period: see Clay [n. 1] 129–144).

[55] See Clay (n. 1) 104–110, no. ii. 2. The date of the Mnesiepes' inscription is argued from the observation that the *ductus* of the letters is very similar to that of the Parian Marble, which dates to 264–263 BC (see Clay [n. 1] 10–24, especially 11).

[56] See n. 54.

[57] The *marmor Parium* is the most important document of these antiquarian efforts (see n. 55).

[58] Parus at the time was in the sphere of influence of the Ptolemies (see Lanzillotta [n. 49] 157–159).

on a *diphros*. The torso is bare, while the lower part of the body is draped. The right arm is extended and holds a papyrus scroll, while the left arm is also brought forward and holds a *chelys* lyre. The head is bearded (fig. 11).[59] Since Archilochus was the poet honoured by the Parians above all, the conclusion that the seated poet represented by the Parians on their late Hellenistic coins was our poet seems likely. Moreover, the Walking Poet discussed above as Archilochus was shown with a *chelys* lyre just like that held by the poet on the late Hellenistic coin. This coin may show the reproduction of an early Hellenistic portrait of Archilochus. And since this portrait is shown on a Parian coin, it must have been set up on this island.

But there is more. The papyrus scroll is an eloquent testimony that Archilochus' poems are then conceived as written texts to be found in libraries. Also important is the fact that enthroned or seated poets are popular in the third century BC. The statues of Menander, of Epicurus, of Posidippus, of Chrysippus are the most renowned examples.[60]

The seated position associates these statues of intellectuals to those of priestesses and priests who had been represented as seated from archaic times.[61] The adoption of this convention may have communicated the sacred nature of the sitter. Moreover, the seating position is appropriate to the poet who makes his performance in the theatre and may be understood in the context of the theatrical mentality of the period. The choice of one *diphros* as the seat of the poet is probably due to the circumstance that poets recited the verses of Archilochus in theatres while sitting on this type of stool (Athen. 14, 620 c).

Finally, sitting on a *diphros* with the papyrus scroll in the right hand suggests the idea of the *didaskalos*, who teaches poetry to his pupils in a school or in a gymnasium: this institution was also dear to the age.[62] With this statue, then, the portrait of Archilochus was up-dated to the prevalent concept of the poet of the early Hellenistic times.

An early third century BC epigram describes a statue of Archilochus: *Anth. Gr.* 7, 664. This epigram has something to add to our discus-

---

[59] See Clay (n. 1) 61–62 and 122, no. vi, 1.

[60] See Dillon (n. 35) 34–36, 86–98, 113–125. The type of the so-called 'old poet' is also probably third century BC and is likely to represent Alcaeus: see, e. g., P. Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates* (Berkeley 1995) 146–149.

[61] See n. 4.

[62] See P. Scholz, "Elementarunterricht und intellektuelle Bildung im hellenistischen Gymnasion", in: D. Kahn, P. Scholz (eds.), *Das Hellenistische Gymnasion* (Berlin 2004) 103–128.

sion. The authorship of the epigram is controversial. Attributions to either Leonidas of Tarentum and Theocritus have been suggested.[63] However, the poet of the poem is almost certainly Theocritus.[64]

The epigram is the following (the translation is that of Clay, with amendments):

> ᾽Αρχίλοχον καὶ στᾶθι καὶ εἴσιδε τὸν πάλαι ποιητὰν
> τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων, οὗ τὸ μυρίον κλέος
> διῆλθε κἠπὶ νύκτα καὶ ποτ᾽ ἀῶ.
> ἦ ῥά νιν αἱ Μοῖσαι καὶ ὁ Δάλιος ἠγάπευν ᾽Απόλλων,
> ὡς ἐμμελής τ᾽ ἐγένετο κἠπιδέξιος
> ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν πρὸς λύραν τ᾽ ἀείδειν.
>
> Stop and gaze at Archilochus, the archaic poet,
> the poet of iambic verses, whose vaste fame
> extends to the night and to the dawn.
> Indeed, the Muses and Delian Apollo loved him,
> so musical and so skilled was he,
> in composing poetry and singing to the lyre.

Several phrases within the poem deserve our special attention. The word στᾶθι ("stop"), for example, expresses the situation of the visitor or art tourist who stands in front of the statue and admires it. The word εἴσιδε ("gaze at") expresses the action of the viewer as he looks upon the statue in order to detect the various details. Finally, in the last verse, the reference to Archilochus' action of playing the lyre suggests an iconography of the poet accompanied by this instrument.

By the early Hellenistic period, then, the renowned statue of Archilochus, which was a destination for art tourism, was one of the poet with the lyre. Considering what we know so far, it is quite likely that the statue described by Theocritus stood on Parus. This poem is included in a series of Theocritan epigrams in which portrait statues of old poets are described. And each of these poets stood in his own birth place. For

---

[63] See P. Waltz, *Anthologie grecque*. I. *Anthologie Palatine* 5 (Paris 1941) 136: the attribution of the poem to Leonidas (almost certainly wrong) is argued from the manuscript tradition.

[64] See A. S. F. Gow, D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge 1965) I. 187; II. 532 (Theocritus XIV). In fact, this poem should be included among the epigrams of Theocritus, in which portraits of old poets are described with similar expressions (beside a statue of Archilochus, statues of Anacreon, Pisander, Epicharmus are also evoked = nos. 14–17 Gow and Page).

example, the statue of Anacreon stood in Teos; that of Epicharmus in Syracuse; that of Pisander in Camirus; only the statue of Archilochus is without provenance, but, by analogy, probably stood on Parus.[65] Indeed, since the poems in praise of the portraits of Epicharmus and Pisander were composed for new statues and commemorated their dedications, it seems likely that the poem for the statue of Archilochus also commemorated a new statue of the poet. When we remember that Theocritus seems to like the visual arts of his age[66] and that he, like his contemporary poet Posidippus, appreciates the 'new' styles in sculpture,[67] it seems possible that Theocritus composed his poem on Parus during the dedication of a new, seating statue of our poet.

The Late Hellenistic Period

During the late Hellenistic period the Greek *poleis*, stripped of any political importance, became increasingly proud of their literary and artistic glories which reminded them of their good old days.[68] In the early first century BC, the Parian scholar Sosthenes recorded the devotion of Archilochus to Parus, his homeland.[69] This account was taken from the historian Demeas. In this account, Sosthenes proudly evokes a relief representation of Archilochus made by a certain Sostheus, possibly an ancestor of Sosthenes. Perhaps the relief mentioned was the above discussed Parian archaic relief:[70] this possibility would be consistent with the archaistic trend of the times.

During this same period, it became customary for Greek cities to celebrate their poets by portraying them on their coins.[71] As we have seen (p. 23 f.), Parus was no exception. Around 75 BC, the Parians struck a silver tetradrachm that showed on the obverse a seated Archilochus (fig. 11). The reverse showed a young Dionysus, wearing an ivy wreath.[72]

---

[65] See n. 64.

[66] See especially *Idylli* 15, 80–86 and F. Manakidou, *Beschreibung von Kunstwerken in der Hellenistischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart 1993) 51–101.

[67] See A. Corso, "The Position of Portraiture in Early Hellenistic Art", *Eulimene* 5 (2004) 19.

[68] This 'retro' attitude of many Greek cities is evoked by Cicero, *In Verrem* 2, 4, 60. 135.

[69] See Clay (n. 1) 32–34, 38–39, 110–118, no. ii. 3.

[70] Against the theory that Sostheus, the carver of the relief evoked in the late Hellenistic inscription, is the same Sosthenes, see n. 13.

[71] See Clay (n. 1) 62.

[72] See Clay (n. 1) 122, no. vi. 1.

The association of Archilochus and Dionysus is probably due to the belief that Archilochus introduced a new cult of the god to the island.[73] The late Hellenistic Parians represented an early Hellenistic portrait of the seated poet as opposed to the Classical type of the striding Archilochus on their coins because of the prevalence and preference in the period for Asian culture. This involved a preference for early or middle Hellenistic models rather than for classical ones.[74]

The 'Kopistenzeit'

From the Augustan age onwards, the idea that the visual arts peaked in the Classical period became generally accepted. Classical models, especially those attributed to the Phidian circle, became more popular than those of the Hellenistic age.

It is no surprise, then, that from this period onwards the classical representation of Archilochus, probably made by Agoracritus (our Walking Poet), became the 'definitive' iconography of the poet. It is for this reason that free standing, life size marble copies of this masterpiece began to be made.

In the Augustan period, the popularity of Archilochus in Rome is suggested by two passages of Horace. In the same period, a neo-Attic workshop carved a Pentelic marble copy of the Walking Poet (fig. 6) which was set up in Rome. The statue perhaps was displayed in the area of the *tabernae* below the Baths of Constantine on the Quirinal; it was certainly found in that context.[75] Perhaps, the *eikon* of Archilochus had been set up there as a poet who best represented the bodily pleasures. This statue evidences the interest of Augustan period Romans in possessing copies of the established portrait of this famous poet. That the copyist placed near the left leg of the statue a cylindrical case for papyri further reveals the intellectualized library culture of the age.

The enduring habit to recognize Archilochus in the Walking Poet is revealed by the representation of Archilochus as a skeleton on one of the two

---

[73] See Clay (n. 1) 16–23.

[74] This preference is clear in Vitruvius, who blatantly prefers the architectural tradition of Asia Minor of the period of Hermogenes to earlier models: see A. Corso, "Vitruvius and Attic Monuments", *BSA* 92 (1997) 400.

[75] See Hor. *Ep.* 6, 11–14; *Epist.* 1, 19, 23–31. On the find of the Capitoline statue of the Walking Poet in the area of the *tabernae* below the Baths of Constantine, see V. Vespignani, "Di alcuni edifizi scoperti nella Villa Aldobrandini e nelle sue adiacenze", *BullComm* 4 (1876) 109.

silver cups (fig. 4), probably from the Claudian period.[76] On one of these two cups, a statue of Clotho, the first of the Parcae, who supervise the life of each human, stands above a column with two skulls above its base. Two inscriptions identify the skulls as Σοφία (Wisdom) and Δόξα (Popular Repute): both are destined to perish! Among the skeletons, that of Sophocles stands in front of that of Moschion. Since the latter is associated with two comic masks, he is identified with the homonymous comic poet.[77] Thus a great tragic poet, endowed with real wisdom, is juxtaposed with a very obscure comic poet, whose renown did not survive the time: death has equalized them. The last pair of skeletons are the Stoic philosopher Zeno and Epicurus: they are represented while arguing. Despite their opposing philosophical views, death has made them similar. The right hand of Epicurus gestures towards a cake lying on a table and invites the viewer to eat and enjoy life.

The second drinking cup also has a base supporting two skulls – identified with the inscriptions Σοφία and Δόξα – and a slender column above which there is a draped, female figure. Among the skeletons, Menander holds in his right hand the torch of life, in his left hand a mask of a young courtesan: he represents the joys of *eros*. Archilochus' skeleton, identified by an inscription, looks at him: he holds the lyre in his left hand. The position of the legs, the way in which the lyre is held and the shape of the *chelys* lyre are so similar to the corresponding features of the Walking Poet, to leave no doubt that whoever conceived the skeleton of Archilochus had the iconography of the Walking Poet in his mind. Archilochus represents the joys of music and poetry. Moreover, since the poems of Archilochus often concern the spheres of the *eros* and of drinking, his presence may also invite the viewer to enjoy life before it is too late. The next skeleton is that of Euripides, with a proud attitude. It is followed by that of the cynical philosopher Monimus.[78] The inclusion of the skeleton of Archilochus in this context is important and confirms two key facts. First, in the Roman world, Archilochus was usually given the configuration of the Walking Poet. Second, his poems were thought to have a hedonistic message and to invite the audience to enjoy life.

Sometime during the age of Domitian, the marble hall of the baths / gymnasium in the harbour of Ephesus has been endowed with a large,

---

[76] See above p. 17.

[77] See R. Kassel, C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* VII (Berlin 1989) 27.

[78] See H. de Villefosse, "Le tresor de Boscoreale", *MonPiot* 5 (1899) 58–68, nos. 7–8, and F. Baratte, *Le tresor d'orfevrerie romaine de Boscoreale* (Paris 1986) 65.

marble copy of the Walking Poet. Only the head survives (fig. 8).[79] The erection of a statue of a well known poet such as Archilochus in a gymnasium is hardly surprising; the institution had an educational purpose. Moreover, the aforementioned interpretation of Archilochus as a poet concerned with earthly pleasures, such as *eros* and drinking, may have led to the decision to erect his statue in a bath, because Roman Imperial baths were understood to provide one of life's most important pleasures.[80] It is probably not by chance that, in the same period, Quintilian praised Archilochus' poetry because of its "great abundance of vitality".[81]

The remaining two copies of the Walking Poet are late Hadrianic / early Antonine (figs. 7 and 5) and were found in Corinth and in central Italy, most likely Rome. During this period, Archilochus was highly praised.[82] Moreover, early classical styles are deeply admired at this time. These two features assured during the period the success of the early classical portrait type of our poet.

There are no portraits of Archilochus which can be dated after the Antonine age. There are three possible explanations for this. First, the *heroön* of Archilochus on Parus probably ceased functioning sometime in the third century AD.[83] It is unlikely that the statues of the poet erected there survived. Second, copyist production declined sharply in the post-Antonine period. And third and finally, late antique writers reveal that the post-Antonine period saw Archilochus' poetry often condemned as immoral.[84]

Antonio Corso
Onassis Foundation, Athens

---

[79] On the baths / gymnasium of the harbour of Ephesus, see I. Nielsen, *Thermae et balnea* (Aarhus 1993) II, 36, no. C 295. For the sculptural display of the architectural complex, see H. Manderscheid, *Die Skulpturenausstattung der Kaiserzeitlichen Thermenanlagen* (Berlin 1981) 86–88, nos. 155–172: this scholar dates the head of the Walking Poet from Ephesus to the early second century AD, but the comparison forwarded by Voutiras (n. 35) suggests rather a Domitianic date. Unfortunately, no other late Flavian sculptures displayed in the marble hall of the complex are known.

[80] See *CIL* 6, 15 258: *Balnea, vina, Venus corrumpunt corpora nostra, set vitam faciunt b. v. v.*

[81] See Quint. 10, 1, 60.

[82] See Galen. *Protrept.* 9, 22; Aristid. *Orat.* 45 and 46; Lucian. *Amores* 3 and *Pseud.* 1; Paus. 7, 10, 6 and 10, 28, 3.

[83] See Clay (n. 1) 38–39.

[84] See, e. g., Origen. *Contra Celsum* 3, 25 and Euseb. *Praepar. evang.* 5, 32, 2 – 33, 9.

В статье рассматривается вопрос о портретных изображениях Архилоха. Есть основания полагать, что поэт представлен на паросском позднеархаическом рельефе на сюжет *cena heroica*, посвященном на Паросе в героон Архилоха. В кимоновский период, с ростом антикварных интересов, в вазовой живописи изображается явление Муз Архилоху, а на рельефе, который мог украшать героон поэта на Фасосе, именно он, очевидно, показан как персонаж *cena heroica*. В эпоху Перикла Архилоха изображала статуя кругового обзора, известная по римским копиям; возможно, она была воздвигнута в герооне Архилоха на Паросе и представляла собой раннее произведение местного скульптора Агоракрита. В начале эллинистической эпохи, вероятно, было создано изображение сидящего Архилоха – его упоминает Феокрит и воспроизводят на паросских монетах. Однако с развитием моды на классицизм, как показывают копии, классическому портрету Архилоха стали отдавать предпочтение перед эллинистическим. Римские копии, восходящие к этому оригиналу, подвергаются в статье детальному анализу.