

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Alcaeus, Pittakos ‘son of “Hyrras”’, and the Lesbian aristocracy, or ‘How to do things with words’

Alexander Dale

Concordia University

Email: alexander.dale@concordia.ca

Abstract

This paper offers a reassessment of the representation of Pittakos, tyrant of Lesbos, in Alcaeus’ verse. I begin by examining the textual evidence for Pittakos’ father, Hyrras, before progressing to re-evaluate the evidence for the aristocratic clans of Lesbos as attested in the Lesbian poets. Building on this, and with reference to the patronymic/gentilic *Arkheanaktidās* seemingly used of Pittakos in Alcaeus, I relate the preponderance of patronymic forms found in Alcaeus’ verse to the iambic and comedic use of ‘characterizing’ patronymics in -(ι)δῶς. I then argue that both Ὑρραξ and Ἀρχεανακτίδως are to be interpreted via a cross-cultural and bilingual rhetoric of kingship, with the latter being in essence a calque of a Lydian intermediary of the Luwian designation *ura-* *handawati-*, ‘great king’, with ὕρραξ and its derivatives in Alcaeus a nominalization of the Luwian adjectival stem *ura-*, ‘great’. This argument is then related to the increasing evidence for Lesbos as a central locus for Graeco-Anatolian cultural exchange. The end result is a comprehensive reassessment of historical reconstructions emanating from the texts of Sappho and Alcaeus, as well as a reassessment of Alcaeus’ poetic objectives in his attacks on Pittakos, ‘son of Hyrras’.

Keywords: Alcaeus; Sappho; Greek lyric poetry; Lydian; Greek and Anatolian language and linguistics

In memoriam: Annette Teffeteller (1944–2020)

I. Introduction

Pittakos, tyrant of Lesbos, is something of a chameleon. Already by the Classical period he was grouped together with the body of statesmen, lawgivers and all-round *sophoi* that included figures such as Thales, Solon and Periander. While the explicit identification of Pittakos as one of the ‘Seven Sages’ of Greece first occurs in Plato’s *Protagoras* (343a), Herodotus’ story of his intervention to advise Croesus against building a navy (1.27) already shows the groundwork for the later reception of Pittakos being laid. We are, however, in a somewhat unique position as regards the careers of the ἐπὶ σοφοί, for in the poetry of Alcaeus we have a largish body of contemporary verse that mentions Pittakos directly. The disparity between this contemporary evidence and the later received tradition could not be more stark. For Alcaeus, Pittakos is the paradigmatic base-born oath-breaker, a treacherous one-time accomplice of Alcaeus and his faction who betrayed them and entered into a marriage alliance with the Pentilidai, before being elected as tyrant by the ‘cowardly’ Mytileneans. With invective flair, Pittakos is lambasted as

‘pot-bellied’ (φύσκωνα), ‘drag-foot’ (σαράποδα), ‘braggart’ (γαύρηκα), ‘son of a shadowy eater’ (ζοφοδορπίδαν), all preserved for posterity by Diogenes Laertius (1.81 = Alc. 429).

Much debate, in antiquity and the modern day, has revolved around Pittakos’ paternity. This was an evident avenue of attack in Alcaeus’ poetry: in *fr.* 348 he is ‘base-born’, *fr.* 68 appears to characterize his father and father’s father as guilty of crimes, while *fr.* 72 is usually seen as a reference to the ‘barbaric’ customs of his mother and father.¹ According to Diogenes Laertius 1.4.74, Douris of Samos (*FGrH* 76 F 75) related that Pittakos’ father was a Thracian, a statement that has achieved orthodoxy in many modern accounts. It should be noted, however, that this is unlikely to have been found in the one reliable witness we can identify, namely the poetry of Alcaeus himself. If Alcaeus had explicitly identified and/or attacked Pittakos or his father as Thracian, it would hardly have taken the detective work of Douris to ascertain the fact. I think it more likely that Douris or his source is extrapolating a Thracian pedigree for Pittakos from implicit attacks in Alcaeus’ verse, as well as from external evidence which I shall address below.

When it comes to the sociopolitical history of Lesbos in the Archaic period, we are of course largely dependent on the evidence of Sappho and Alcaeus themselves. The same was no doubt true for most of our ancient sources, from Herodotus to Aristotle to Douris to Diogenes. While local and oral tradition likely retained some refracted memory of Lesbos at the turn of the sixth century BC, it is evident from the nature of our later sources that the Lesbian poets themselves would have been the best, and in many cases only, source material on which to draw. There is a tenacious habit in scholarship on Alcaeus to take much of what we read at face value, and thus to construct historical narratives, relative chronology and prosopography on the basis of what is at best questionable evidence. Had we no contemporary textual sources for Roman history in the first half of the first century BC beyond Cicero’s *De consulatu suo*, our understanding of the period would be markedly different from what it is. Whether Alcaeus was a more successful statesman than Cicero could be an amusing topic for debate, but I think that few would argue with the proposition that Alcaeus was the better poet. Thus in examining the character of Pittakos as represented in Alcaeus’ verse, the poetic agenda of Alcaeus must be privileged, which necessitates contextualizing the political poems within the constituents that define the poetic tradition: language, myth and culture, both synchronic and diachronic. Much of what follows is concerned with what might be deemed minutiae: aspiration, nominal derivation, marginal scholia and the dynamics of language contact and the morphophonology of loanwords. This cannot be helped. Greek poetry was an ‘art of the word’,² and in order to understand how Alcaeus did things with words, we must start from the ground up.

II. Ὕρρας

It is generally agreed that the name of Pittakos’ father was Ὕρρας, though both Alcaeus and the later tradition provide us with at times conflicting evidence. The *Suda* (Π 1659 Adler) gives Κάϊκος as his father’s name, while the *Suda* (loc. cit.), Diogenes Laertius, and some witnesses for Callimachus give Ὕρράδιος (i.e. a second declension noun), and a marginal scholion in *P.Berol.* 9569 (= *fr.* 112.24) appears to identify Pittakos as (A)ρχεανακτίδαν, ‘son/descendent of Arkheanax’. Ὕρρας is usually rendered as ‘Hyrras’ or ‘Hyrrhas’, though the text of Alcaeus should of course admit no other rendering than Urras, a point to which I shall return in a moment. The name is most transparently recoverable at 129.13 τὸν Ὕρραον δὲ πα[ιδ]α, where Ὕρραον appears to be a

¹ Fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus are cited from Voigt (1971) unless otherwise stated. Archilochus and Hipponax are cited from West (1989–1991). On Alcaeus’ attacks against Pittakos’ paternity and ancestry, see Page (1955) 169–73; Gomme (1957) 255–57; Davies (1985); Yatromanolakis (2008); Gagné (2009); (2013) 210–26; Ferrari (2010).

² Cf. Watkins (1995) 97–108.

typical Lesbian patronymic adjective in *-(i)os* built to a first declension masculine a-stem Ὑρρας.³ Beyond this, we have ωρραδον[at 298.47 (= SLG 262.23).⁴ Reinhold Merkelbach in the *editio princeps* articulated ὦ Ὑρραδον, while Hugh Lloyd-Jones suggested ὦ Ὑρράδ(ι)ον, both problematic in their own right;⁵ Carlo Gallavotti articulated ὦ Ὑρραδ'ον[, interpreting it as a vocative of a patronymic in *-(i)δᾶς*;⁶ Eva-Maria Voigt prints Bruno Snell's ὦ Ὑρρα δον[, interpreting it as a vocative of the simplex Ὑρρας.⁷ Lastly, we have Herrn Hofrath Seidler's conjecture at Alc. 383.1 τῶι τ' Ὑρραδῆωι for τῶ τυρρακῆωι in the manuscripts of Hephæstion.⁸ I have previously defended Seidler's conjecture,⁹ and interpreted the form as a relational adjective built to a patronymic in *-(i)δᾶς* (although the correct form would almost certainly be Ὑρραδάωι). These are the only possible attestations of Ὑρρας or a derivative thereof in the verse of Alcaeus. The secondary evidence from scholia, the grammarians and etymologica will be considered in due course.

It is evident that there was some misunderstanding about the form of the patronymic derived from Pittakos' father's name in antiquity. The *Ars grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax, as well as two derivative passages from the later grammatical tradition, provide an illuminating glimpse into the methods of ancient dialectology:

1) Dionysius Thrax, *Grammatici Graeci* 1.1 26.1–4 Uhlig

τύποι δὲ τῶν πατρωνυμικῶν ἀρσενικῶν μὲν τρεῖς ... καὶ ὁ τῶν Αἰολέων ἴδιος τύπος Ὑρράδιος: Ὑρρα γὰρ παῖς ὁ Πιττακός.

There are three types of masculine patronymics ... and the appropriate form of Aeolic (patronymics) is Ὑρράδιος; Pittakos was the son of Hyrras.

2) Heliodorus apud Scholia Marciana in Dionysium Thracem, *Grammatici Graeci* 1.2 368.13–15 Hilgard

ὁ δὲ [sc. τῶν πατρωνυμικῶν] εἰς ἀδιος τῆς Αἰολίδος: Ὑρράδιος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ Ὑρρα υἱός, Ὑρρας δὲ Μιτυληναίων ἐγένετο βασιλεύς, οὗ υἱὸς ὁ Πιττακός εἰς τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν φανείς.

The form of patronymic in *-αδιος* is from Aeolis; Hyrradios is the son of Hyrras, and Hyrras was the king of Mitylene, whose son Pittakos became one of the Seven Sages.

3) Ps.-Herodian, *Περὶ παρωνύμων*, *Grammatici Graeci* 3.2 858.26–30 Lentz

τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἀδιος [sc. πατρωνυμικά] Αἰολικά ... Ὑρράδιος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ Ὑρρα παῖς. Ὑρρας δὲ Μιτυληναίων τύραννος, οὗ υἱὸς Πιττακός εἰς τῶν ἑπτὰ φιλοσόφων.

The patronymics in *-αδιος* are Aeolic ... Hyrradios is the son of Hyrras, and Hyrras was the tyrant of Mitylene, whose son Pittakos was one of the Seven Sages.

³ In what follows I give the nom. sg. of masc. a-stems as *-ᾶς*, unless citing a specific form attested in the *paradosis* as *-αις*; see further Dale (2021) 522 n.18, following Hamm (1958) 24–25, §49; Blümel (1982) 74–75, §86 and 232–33, §247; Page (1955) 83–84 n.1; and Liberman (1999) 1.xliii n.137

⁴ The metre, last line of an Alcaic, requires *--[-]*, with *ω* in synesis.

⁵ I'm not quite sure what Ὑρραδον is meant to be, while Ὑρράδ(ι)ον (aside from the questionable status of the form Ὑρράδιος as a patronymic, which I address below) sits awkwardly with the vocative implied in ὦ, and requires a periphrasis such as ὦ Ὑρράδ(ι)ον [γένος]. See further Liberman (1999) 2.220–21.

⁶ The elision of *-α* in the vocative Ὑρραδα should not cause concern. Masculine a-stems in the Lesbian poets show both (original) *-ᾶ* and (secondary) *-ᾷ*, for which see Hamm (1958) 148, §233 and (for the development) Sihler (1995) 273–75, §267.

⁷ Note that the metre excludes a genitive singular, which in the Lesbian poets is always either uncontracted *-ᾶο* or contracted *-ᾷ*. Cf. Hamm (1958) 31, §61 and Sihler (1995) 274–75, §267.

⁸ For the corruption we can compare Pamphila fr. 3 FHG apud Diog. Laert. 1.4.76, who identifies Pittakos' son (attested only here) as Τωρραῖος, which can only reflect a misinterpretation of an original ΤΥΡΡΑΟC in Alcaeus' text, that is τ' Ὑρραος.

⁹ Dale (2011) 19–20.

Despite its uniformity of opinion, the grammatical tradition concerning ‘Aeolic’ patronymics in *-αῖδιος* is irreconcilable with our evidence for Aeolic. No such form is ever found in extant Lesbian poetry or in inscriptions from Lesbos and Aeolis. The ‘vernacular’ Aeolic patronymic, amply attested in the Lesbian poets and in inscriptions from Lesbos and Aeolis, was an adjective in *-(i)ος* in *a*-stems and *-eios* elsewhere.¹⁰ In addition to patronymic adjectives, the Lesbian poets also employ the patronymic suffix *-(i)δα*, an inherited feature of the *Kunstsprache*. Lastly, Sappho and Alcaeus are not averse to forming patronymics with the adnominal genitive of the father’s name, as was the standard practice in most dialects of the historical period. In other words, as one might expect in the highly developed poetic diction represented by the Aeolian tradition, we find every sort of patronymic formation possible, except for those in *-αῖδιος*, the one form of patronymic that the ancient grammatical tradition identified for Aeolic.¹¹ Furthermore, the sole and universal example of such patronymic formations in the grammatical and lexicographical tradition is Ἰγρράδιος. An argument in favour of the presence of a form Ἰγρράδιος in Alcaeus’ text might come from Callimachus, *Anth. Pal.* 7.89 = *Ep.* 1 Pf. = 54 Gow–Page, *GP*. However, the manuscript evidence for Callimachus’ use of the form is inconclusive. While most modern editions print παῖδα τὸν Ἰγρράδιον, taking Ἰγρράδιος as a patronymic adjective as per the grammarians, this is only the reading of the initial text scribe of the *Palatine Anthology*. The *Planudean Anthology*, the MSS of Diogenes Laertius (who quotes the epigram in full) and the corrector of the *Palatine Anthology* all read Πιττακὸν ... παῖδα τὸν Ἰγρράδιου, taking Ἰγρράδιος as a second declension noun.¹² As Gow and Page noted long ago, the grammarians’ insistence on Ἰγρράδιος as an Aeolic form might suggest that it was found in Lesbian verse. However, given the absence of any comparanda for such a patronymic formation elsewhere in the Lesbian poets or in Aeolic inscriptions, its status as a patronymic must remain suspect.

We then have the issue of aspiration. Later sources give the name or derivatives thereof with an initial aspirate, thus Ἰγρρας. Lesbian was, of course, psilotic, and there can be no question of an aspirated form either sung by Alcaeus or transmitted in the earliest texts of the poet. One would assume that the aspirated form we find later on was analogical with other attestations of the name that did contain an initial aspirate; we might compare Ἐρμαῖς vs Ἐρμᾶς/Ἐρμῆς. The problem here is that (H)yras, with or without aspiration, is nowhere else attested in the onomastic inventory of Greek. The only entry in all the volumes of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* is that for the father of Pittakos. Perhaps the aspiration was introduced through popular etymology on analogy with doublets such as σῦς/ῦς/ῶς or, to stay within the onomastic sphere of northwest Anatolia, Ἰγρτάκος, as immortalized in the splendidly Anatolian line Ἀσιάδην τ’ Ἀδάμαντα καὶ Ἄσιον Ἰγρτάκου υἱόν at *Il.* 13.759.¹³ The Hesychian gloss (υ 810 Hansen–Cunningham) Ἰγρράδιος· ἀπὸ τινος τῶν προγόνων, ἄδοξος, ἢ εἰκαῖος (which is likely connected to σ 2786 Hansen σφραδ(ι)ος· νόθος, μικτός, εἰκαῖος) might provide evidence for a separate lexeme that Alcaeus could

¹⁰ For Aeolic adjectival patronymics see in particular Morpurgo Davies (1968) and, in *nuce*, (2000) 17–20; Blümel (1982) 86; Killen (1983) and in particular p. 99 n.93; Wackernagel (2009) 486 with n.3 (Langslow).

¹¹ The grammarians’ failure to recognize the patronymic function of adjectives in *-(i)ος/-eios* is all the more surprising in the light of Theocritus 28.9, who evidently appreciated the use of possessive adjectives as a characteristic feature of Lesbian Aeolic. See further Gow (1952) *ad loc.*

¹² The corrector of the *Palatine Anthology* went through the entire manuscript after its initial transcription, collating it with a manuscript that was, in part, the autograph of Michael Chartophylax’s apograph of the autograph of Constantine Cephalas’ *Anthology*. Thus, with respect to textual constitution, the readings of the *Palatine* manuscript’s corrector are not to be dismissed lightly. See further Cameron (1993) 111 and Lauxtermann (2003) 84–85. On the epigram, and its editorial context in the *Anthology*, see Livrea (1995).

¹³ If the aspiration in Ἰγρτάκος is genuine, that is, Watkins (1986) 54–55 has suggested that the name reflects Hittite *ḫartakka-*, ‘bear’ (in which case the aspirate could be genuine), though as Watkins notes the vocalism of the initial vowel in Greek is problematic. For more on Ἰγρτάκος, see section V below.

have been punning on, and which came to inspire the aspiration in Ὕρρας. However, given the murky waters of Hesychius' sources, and the questionable nature of the probative value of dialect glosses in Hesychius, it could well be the case that ὑρράδιος reflects a garbled interpretation of a possible Ὕρράδιος in Alcaeus' text, with συρραδ(ι)ος a secondary back-formation. The only certain point is that, when talking about the textual evidence for the name of Pittakos' father in Alcaeus' text, we have a masculine a-stem *urra-* with a closed, and thus syllabically heavy, first syllable.

Greek affords no compelling candidates for a cognate for the nominal stem *urra-*, while those who have advocated for a Thracian pedigree for Pittakos have been unsuccessful in identifying anything in the exiguous body of evidence for the supposed (Dacio-)Thracian branch of Indo-European that might shed light on the name. However, when we turn our attention east, to the ancient soil of Anatolia, we find a nominal stem that would be a perfect formal match for *urra-/Ὕρρας* and, as I shall argue, an equally fitting semantic match. However, in order to make the case, it will be necessary to stay with the text of Alcaeus and examine further the evidence for both Hyrras and Pittakos, as well as the aristocratic clans of Lesbos at the turn of the sixth century.

III. Lesbian *eupatridae*

The fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus, along with the ancient exegetical tradition on their work, seem to reveal three clans that were active on Lesbos at the turn of the sixth century, the Kleanaktidai, Polyanaktidai and Arkheanaktidai. To these we can add the Penthilidai, the clan which had supposedly ruled Mytilene since the Aeolian migration, and whose overthrow set in motion the factional strife that is given voice to in the poetry of Alcaeus.¹⁴ These clans loom large in discussions of Sappho and Alcaeus, and one or more are often identified as equating to the *hetaireia* to which Sappho and Alcaeus respectively belonged, and for which they composed.¹⁵ Yet, despite some valiant attempts to delineate a prosopography of Lesbian society, there is little certainty about how any of these patronymics/gentilics relate to either Sappho and Alcaeus themselves, or to any of the individuals identified by name in their verse. It is noteworthy that there is not a single transparent use in extant Lesbian verse of any of these gentilics with any of the names that are commonly associated with them in scholarship, ancient or modern. Such identifications as we have, for instance that Gorgo is the Polyanaktid mentioned at Sappho fr. 155 πόλλα μοι τὰν Πωλυανακτιδα παῖδα χάριην, are due to secondary sources (in this case Maximus of Tyre (18.9d), who quotes the line). In addition to this line of Sappho, a form of a patronymic or gentilic derived from Polyanax occurs twice more in Lesbian poetry. The authorship of the poem in question is disputed; Edgar Lobel assigned it to Sappho, in which he is followed by Gauthier Liberman, while Voigt, following Snell, assigned it to Alcaeus.¹⁶ The two relevant passages are:

1. P.Oxy. 2291 = Alc. 303A a 2 = Sappho fr. 99.2 LP:
 δ[]οῖ Πωλυανακτιδα[].

where Lobel suggests nom. sg. m. Πωλυανακτιδαῖς, and

¹⁴ For discussion of Lesbian history in this period based on textual sources, see, for example, Mazzarino (1943); Page (1955); Ferrari (2010); Dale (2011); Gagné (2013) 210–26.

¹⁵ Thus, for example, Ferrari (2010) and Caciagli (2011), who both identify Sappho as a member of the Kleanaktidai, while Ferrari (see below) identifies Pittakos as a Polyanaktid. That Alcaeus' poetry was intended for a narrowly defined group was famously advocated by Rösler (1980), though without explicit identification with one of the named clans.

¹⁶ See Liberman (1999) 1.xcii–xciv.

2. *P.Oxy.* 2291 = Alc. 303A b 14–15 = Sappho *fr.* 99.23–4 LP:
 δειγνυ[...]ε δηῶτε Πωλυανακτίδαν
 τὸν μάργον ὄγδειξαι θέλω.

Accepting the attribution of *P.Oxy.* 2291 to Alcaeus, Franco Ferrari, comparing the reproachful tone of Πωλυανακτίδαν τὸν μάργον ὄγδειξαι θέλω ('I want to point out the rapacious Polyanaktid') to passages of invective against Pittakos, and combining this with the identification of the Πωλυανακτίδα παῖδα as Gorgo in Sappho 155, constructs a narrative in which Pittakos and Gorgo were brother and sister, both Polyanaktids, with their father Hyrras a Thracian *émigré* who had managed to establish himself amongst the Mytilenean aristocracy.¹⁷ Even if the authorship of *P.Oxy.* 2291 were beyond a shadow of a doubt, this would be a remarkably flimsy foundation for such an elaborate prosopographic reconstruction. In truth, with the guarded exception of the identification of Gorgo as a Polyanaktid, we can say nothing categorical about this supposed aristocratic clan whatsoever. Furthermore, if we ascribe *P.Oxy.* 2291 to Sappho, as there are strong reasons to do, there is then no evidence for any Polyanaktid in Alcaeus' verse.

As for the Kleanaktidai, there is a general consensus that Myrsilos and possibly Melankhros were members.¹⁸ This is largely based on three witnesses:

1. *P.Berol.* 9569 (= Alc. 112.23), where a marginal scholion identifies the Κλεανακτίδαν of line 23 as Myrsilos.

2. *P.Oxy.* 2733 (= Alc. S 263 *SLG*), an ancient commentary on Alcaeus, lines 11–12 of which read] υἱὸς τοῦ Κλεάνορος ὅτι [] ἐξῆς τὸν Μύρσιλον. εγε. [.

3. Strabo 13.2.3 (= Alc. 468) Ἀλκαῖος ... ἐλοιδορεῖτο ... Μυρσίλοι καὶ Μελάγχρωι καὶ τοῖς Κλεανακτίδαῖς καὶ ἄλλοις τισίν. On face value, this would seem to suggest that neither Myrsilos nor Melanchros was a Kleanaktid. However, Wilamowitz's deletion of the καὶ after Μελάγχρωι has proved popular, with Strabo then saying that Alcaeus abused 'the Kleanaktids Myrsilos and Melanchros and certain others'.

Other hypotheses concerning the Kleanaktids have been put forward. In Sappho 98b, the speaker of the lines laments that she is unable to provide her daughter Kleis with a ποικίλαν μιτράν(αν). The next sentence mentions 'the Mytilenean (man?)' (τῷ Μυτιληνάωι), while a few lines later we have a reference to τὰς Κλεανακτιδαῖ [φύγας. Some have seen this as a reference to the period of Sappho's supposed exile, while others have deduced an import ban on luxury items under Pittakos, whom many have identified as 'the Mytilenean man'.¹⁹ Denys Page guardedly reads the fragment as a reference to Sappho's exile which, he surmises, came about as a result of the rule of the Kleanaktidai, that is Melankhros and/or Myrsilos. Liberman sees it as a reference to sumptuary laws enacted by Pittakos and a lament for the exile of the Kleanaktidai (which necessarily presupposes a different relationship between Sappho and the Kleanaktidai than that

¹⁷ Ferrari (2010) 81–98, especially 88–89 and 92–95.

¹⁸ See Page (1955) 102, 174–75, though he expresses scepticism that Melankhros is to be included amongst them. On the Kleanaktids see also Ferrari (2010) 9–12 and 18–19, for whom Melankhros, Myrsilos and Sappho were Kleanaktids. On Myrsilos see Dale (2011), where I raise the possibility that *mursilos* might have been a title applied to both Melankhros and Pittakos.

¹⁹ Cf. Schadewaldt (1960); Ferrari (2010) 7.

assumed by Page).²⁰ For Ferrari, Sappho was herself a Kleanaktid.²¹ For scholars predisposed to such literal biographical readings of literary texts, relative chronology then becomes a problem. Antonio Aloni objected that Sappho, if her birth was to be placed ca. 650 BC,²² would have been too old to have an adolescent daughter under the rule of Pittakos, traditionally dated to ca. 597 BCE.²³ Ferrari reconciles this by advocating for the chronology of Eusebius, which places Sappho's floruit around 600–599 (thus born ca. 640 BC).²⁴ All of these readings presuppose a rigid biographical context for all fragments, from which a coherent internal chronology can be established, and reconciled with the relative chronology of the period generally.

Most ephemeral of all the supposed aristocratic clans of Lesbos are the Arkheanaktidai, for whom we have only two references:

1. Schol. Nic. *Ther.* 613 καὶ Ἀλκαῖός φησι τὲν τῶν περὶ Ἀρχεανακτίδην κατὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἐρυθραίους πόλεμον φανῆναι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα καθ' ὕπνον ἔχοντα μυρικής κλῶνα. Alcaeus says ... that Apollo appeared to the men with Arkheanaktides during the war against the Erythraians in a dream holding a branch of tamarisk.

2. A marginal scholion in *P.Berol.* 9569 (= Alc. 112.24) appears to identify the (A)ρχεανακτίδαν of line 24 as Pittakos:

× × ---] γιγε Κλεανακτίδαν
× × ---] ἢ (A)ρχεανακτίδαν.

schol. ad v. 23 τ(ὸν) Μύρσιλ(ον), ad v. 24 τ(ὸν) Φιττακ(όν).

Regarding the Nicander scholion, the general sense seems clear, despite the mild corruption, for which Theodor Bergk suggested ἐν ᾧ (i.e. in the first book), while Friedrich Welcker deleted ἐν, both taking τοῖς with φανῆναι. Another possibility might be ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀρχεανακτίδην (ποιήμασι), 'Alcaeus said in the <poems> about Arkheanaktides that Apollo appeared, etc.'. Strabo 13.599 records that a certain Archaianax (*sic*) of Mytilene fortified the walls of Sigeon with stones taken from Troy, and it would seem a safe assumption to relate this event to the Sigeon War, with Alcaeus as the source.²⁵ Given the evidence above, it would not be unreasonable to wonder whether we should read Ἀρχεάνακτα or Ἀρχεανακτίδην for the Ἀρχαίανακτα in Strabo's text: we will see below another possible conflation of an Arkheanaktid and Arkhaianaktid in later sources.

Whatever the precise tradition reflected in Strabo, we are left with the question of the identity of the Arkheanaktid(es) in the Nicander scholion, and how to reconcile the statement of the scholiast in *P.Berol.* 9569 with the tradition that Pittakos was a son of Urras, and not Arkheanax. Ferrari, eager to have us believe that Pittakos was a Polyanaktid,

²⁰ Page (1955) 97–103; Liberman (2014) 9. Mazzarino proposed that Pittakos had introduced some sort of sumptuary law that prevented the import of Lydian luxuries (*cf.* also Caciagli (2011) 210–11 and Ferrari (2010) 8–9, who talks of 'the period of austerity marked by the decade of Pittacus' government'). There is no basis for such a law in the tradition concerning Pittakos, and Mazzarino's argument is nothing more than an *ad hoc* attempt to relate this passage of Sappho to an already questionable historical reconstruction. Also unfounded is Mazzarino's suggestion that in Sappho's mother's day there was no trade between Lesbos and Lydia, and that the Kleanaktidai began trading relationships with the Sardians, which Pittakos then proscribed upon coming to power.

²¹ Ferrari (2010) 17–18.

²² As per the *Suda's* statement (Σ 107 Adler) that her floruit (not birth, *cf.* Rohde (1879)) was the 42nd Olympiad (612–609 BC).

²³ Aloni (1997) lxix.

²⁴ Ferrari (2010) 8–9 and (2014) 1. TEST 6 in Campbell. The Armenian version of Eusebius gives 595/4 for the floruit of Sappho and Alcaeus.

²⁵ Thus, for example, Page (1955) 175.

takes Ἀρχεανακτίδην in the Nicander scholion as a personal name.²⁶ As for *P.Berol.* 9569, it has been popular ever since Wilamowitz to assume that the scholiast's τ(ὸν) Φιττακ(όν) refers to something that stood in the first half of line 24, and so obviate the seeming incongruity of Ἀρχεανακτίδαν referring to Pittakos.²⁷ Yet none of the proposals is convincing. Hermann Diehls' genitive plural Ὑρραδίων (necessitated by the metre) sits awkwardly with the two homeoteleutic forms (which could be genitive or accusative) at line end, while Santo Mazzarino's Κοῦκίδαν is clutching at straws. Nor is there any reason to posit a name/patronymic/gentilic standing in the first half of the line, but for the desire not to have Pittakos identified as Ἀρχεανακτίδαν: the first member of the disjunctive pairing need be nothing other than Κλεωνακτίδαν at the end of the previous line. Ockham's razor would suggest that the Arkheanaktid(es) of the Nicander scholion and *P.Berol.* 9569 are one and the same, while the only reason not to follow the scholiast's identification of Ἀρχεανακτίδαν as Pittakos is the entrenched desire to expunge apparent inconsistencies from our historical reconstructions, even though these inconsistencies have only arisen as a result of overly biographical readings in the first place. If we could allow ourselves the liberty of granting that Pittakos might be both Ὑρραος and Αρχεανακτίδας, our troubles would disappear.

IV. Patronymic formations in Alcaeus

As mentioned above, Lesbian Aeolic formed patronymics with the suffixes -(i)os in a-stems and -eios elsewhere. Sappho and Alcaeus also preserve a number of patronymics in -(i)δῶς, which likely reflect an inheritance within the Aeolic poetic tradition rather than a borrowing from the Ionian hexameter tradition; thus we find Αἰακίδαι[ς] at Alc. 42.5, Ἄτρεῖδα[v] at Alc. 70.6,²⁸ Λατο[ῖδ]α at Alc. 67.3 and Kronidas multiple times. In addition to names drawn from the mythical tradition, we have uncertain cases, where a form in -(i)δῶς could be either a personal name or a patronymic, such as Ἀγεσιλαῖδα at Alc. 130b.4, and Αἰσιμίδα at Alc. 365 (both vocatives). As Gregory Hutchinson notes, both forms could well be patronymics in the strict sense; neither occurs anywhere as a proper name.²⁹ We also have the inscrutable Δαμοανακτίδ[] at Alc. 296b.1.

In addition to forming patronymics and gentilics, the suffix -(i)δῶς had another generically circumscribed function, to characterize people as belonging to certain categories or character types.³⁰ This use of the suffix finds its most florid development in Old Comedy. A couple of passages can serve as illustration:

Ar. *Ach.* 595–97

ὄστις; πολίτης χρηστός, οὐ σπουδαρχίδης
 ἄλλ' ἐξ ὄτουπερ ὁ πόλεμος, στρατιωνίδης,
 σὺ δ' ἐξ ὄτουπερ ὁ πόλεμος, μισθαρχίδης.

'Who am I? A good citizen, not a place-seeker, but ever since the war began, a soldier's soldier, while you, ever since the war began, are a wage-seeker'.

²⁶ Ferrari (2010) 88.

²⁷ See Page (1955) 174–75; Voigt (1971) *ad loc.*; Ferrari (2010) 88.

²⁸ And conjectured at Sappho 17.3.

²⁹ Hutchinson (2001) 207.

³⁰ See in particular Meyer (1923) 140–46; on the origin of the suffix see Keurentjes (1997). Guasti (2017) has argued that -(i)δῶς patronymics were never a productive feature of the language, but were rather a means of making names 'sound' more aristocratic and to 'make vile characters more noble', with the patronymic function discernible in poetry a secondary feature of the poetic *Kunstsprache*. A number of oversights and false assumptions render Guasti's work problematic. In particular, Guasti seems to be under the erroneous assumption that Mycenaean is simply an old form of Greek, and thus that the absence of -(i)δῶς patronymics in Mycenaean is damning (Mycenaean is of course simply one dialect, albeit the earliest attested. It forms patronymics with the adjectival suffix, which thus constitutes an isogloss between Mycenaean and Aeolic). Furthermore, Guasti's ignorance of Keurentjes (1997) is a serious flaw.

Ar. Ran. 840–44

ἄληθες, ὦ καὶ τῆς ἀρουραίας θεοῦ;
 σὺ δὴ 'μὲ ταῦτ', ὦ στωμυλιοσυλλεκτάδῃ
 καὶ πτωχοποιῇ καὶ ῥακιοσυρραπτάδῃ.

'Really, you son of the vegetable-patch goddess? You say this about me, you babble-gatherer, beggar-maker and rag-stitcher ...'.

This type of comedic patronymic is rightly seen as akin to those that we find in archaic iambus, such as Archilochus' Ἐρασμονίδῃ at fr. 168.1; Κηρυκίδῃ at fr. 185.1; σκυτοτραγίδῃς, 'son-of-a-fig-eater', ascribed to both Archilochus (fr. 250) and Hipponax (fr. 167).³¹ I suspect we can include here Hipponax's Ἐυρυμεδοντιάδῃ at fr. 128.1. The development of this type of -(ι)δᾶς formation likely represents a confluence of both the patronymic and gentilic functions of the suffix. Certain examples, such as σκυτοτραγίδῃς, are insults based on social status, for which parentage is the determinant; cf. the frequent characterization of Euripides as the son of a cabbage-seller in Aristophanes. Others, such as στωμυλιοσυλλεκτάδῃς in the *Frogs*, have a less patent patronymic force. That Euripides is the son of a 'babble-gatherer' would be of less importance than the fact that he is a, or belongs to the category of, babble-gatherer.

As it happens, we also find this type of -(ι)δᾶς formation in Alcaeus. As noted above, Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius relate that in Alcaeus' invective directed at Pittakos he called him ζοφοδορπίδαν, which one usually sees translated as if a two-termination adjective: 'dusky-diner' (Campbell), or 'dîneur-d'ombre' (Lieberman). Formally, ζοφοδορπίδαν can only be a formation along the lines of those discussed above; there are no derivatives of the nominal stem δόρπ- or denominative verb δορπε- that have a dental stem *δορπίδ- from which an adjective in -ᾶς could be abstracted, and thus ζοφοδορπίδαν can only reflect a (pseudo-)patronymic formation, 'son of a dark-diner'. This could of course have a patronymic force in the strict sense, contextualized within the rhetoric of negatively characterized paternity that we see directed against Pittakos elsewhere in Alcaeus' verse. Equally, it could have more of the non-patronymic characterizing force that we see most patently in Aristophanes. As to the underlying contextual meaning of ζοφοδορπίδαν in Alcaeus, I will have more to say on this in section VI below.

We then have κακοπατρίδαν, used of Pittakos explicitly at Alc. 348, and likely used of Pittakos at 75.12 and possibly at 67.4. Formally it is a patronymic built to the zero-grade stem of πατήρ, κακο-πατρ-ίδαν, 'son-of-a-bad-father' (presupposing *κακοπάτωρ, cf. εὐπάτωρ: εὐπατρίδῃς),³² though the definite article at 348 and 67.4 points towards an adjectival use.³³ Despite its formal structure, I think it would be foolish to disregard the prospect of polysemy in κακοπατρίδαν, with a play on a putative κακο-πατριδ-αν, 'bad for the πατρίς', 'enemy of the people', etc.³⁴ Scholars have been concerned to 'explain' why Alcaeus calls Pittakos κακοπατρίδαν. In the early 20th century, it was explained as being due to Pittakos' supposed plebeian status and politics.³⁵ Latterly, it has been taken as proof of his foreign origins.³⁶ In modern English, I could call someone 'son-of-a bitch' without imputing any particular (let alone factual) knowledge of my target's parentage. Likewise, Hector can be brother-in-law to a dog (*Il.* 6.344) without anyone supposing that Paris or

³¹ Meyer (1923) 140–46; cf. Rosen (1988) 39–40.

³² Chantraine (1968–1980) 864 s.v. πατήρ. Note that it is *not* built to the dental stem πατριδ- seen in πατρίς (though the -ιδ- suffix used in deriving areal toponyms is cognate with the -ιδ- in -(ι)δᾶς).

³³ See Lobel (1927) lxxvi and lxxxviii.

³⁴ For the structure, with an active sense for κακο-, we might compare κακοδικία at Pl. *Leg.* 938b, 'corruption of justice', but literally 'harmful to δική'.

³⁵ Thus influentially Wilamowitz (1914) 235–36.

³⁶ Thus Mazzarino (1943) 38–52; Page (1955) 170–73; Ferrari (2010) 90.

even Helen were, in fact, dogs. We should not be so literal-minded when reading Alcaeus.³⁷ As an Alcaean coinage unattested elsewhere in Greek literature, *κακοπατρίδας* can be interpreted within the framework of ‘iambic’ patronymics in *-(ι)δᾶς*, and together with *ζοφοδορίδας* furnishes us with another link between Alcaeus’ invective and the linguistic registers of the more generically defined genre of Ionian iambus.³⁸

As to the question of reconciling the evidence for Pittakos being both *Ἵγρραος* and *Ἀρχεονακτίδας*, I think the answer lies in just this sort of patronymic formation. That is to say, rather than *Ἀρχεονακτίδας* being a patronymic or gentilic in the strict sense, indicating that the historical Pittakos was descended from someone named Arkheanax, I suspect both patronymic forms in Alcaeus are to be contextualized within a framework of invective. As to how the semantics of *Ἵγρραος* and *Ἀρχεονακτίδας* are to be reconciled with a supposed invective context, this aspect of Alcaean poetic discourse can be further illuminated with reference to the cross-cultural dynamics that characterize Lesbos in the Archaic period as an important locus for Graeco-Anatolian cultural exchange, to which we now turn.

V. *Ex oriente dux*

The Luwian adjectival stem *ura/i-*, ‘great’, is widely attested in both cuneiform Luwian of the second millennium BC and in Hieroglyphic Luwian of the second and first millennia. In first-millennium western Anatolia, reflexes of *ura/i-* are a common element in personal names,³⁹ for example, Carian *urom-/wrm-*, Lycian *Ορας*, Cilician *Ουραμουτας*,⁴⁰ Pamphylian and Pisidean *Ουρος*, Lycian *Ορνπειμις* reflecting **Urnepijēmi*.⁴¹ The same is true in the second millennium, where in cuneiform documents we find ^m*Ura-ḫattuša-*, ‘Great Hattusha’; ^m*Ura-walkui-*, ‘Great lion’; ^m*Maššana-ura-*, ‘Great (one) of the gods’; ^m*Ura-ḫU-* (i.e. *Ura-Tarhunda-*), ‘Great Storm God’, or ‘Great (is) the Stormgod’.⁴² In Hieroglyphic Luwian we find MAGNUS-LEO-, reflecting **Ura-walwi-*, ‘Great lion’.

But there is one particular use of the adjectival stem *ura/i-* that is of special relevance for the present discussion. Throughout the attested use of Hieroglyphic Luwian, from Bronze Age inscriptions of the Empire period through to the late Neo-Hittite states in southern Anatolia and northern Syria in the Iron Age, *ura/i-*, written with the Luwian Hieroglyphic sign MAGNUS, is the designation for a ‘great’ king.⁴³ The Luwian title MAGNUS.REX, traditionally read as *ura-handawati-*, ‘Great King’, is equivalent to the Summerogram LUGAL.GAL used in cuneiform Hittite texts, which is traditionally read as *salli-ḫassu-*, ‘Great king’. Recent discoveries have revealed the use of this titlature in Late Bronze Age western Anatolia. An inscription discovered in 2007 in Torbalı, just south of the Karabel Pass, and first published in 2011 allows us to read the title as either MAGNUS.REX, ‘great king’, or perhaps MAGNUS.DOMINA, ‘great queen’.⁴⁴ Further south, a graffito discovered in 2000 and published in 2001 from Suratkaya in the Latmos Mountains provides the unique designation MAGNUS.REX.FILIUS, ‘son of the Great king’ or ‘Great son

³⁷ Cf. Gomme (1957) 256–57 and Davies (1985) 33–34.

³⁸ Cf. Yatromanolakis (2008), who rightly argues that the variations in register for which Alcaeus has at times been castigated reflect a generic interdiscursivity that performs both a poetic and sociopolitical function within the *hetaireia* and larger community to which Alcaeus’ verse was directed. On commonalities between Alcaeus and iambus, see Andrisano (2001).

³⁹ See generally Houwink ten Cate (1961) 164–65; Zgusta (1964); Adiego (2007) 338 and 430; Melchert (2013).

⁴⁰ ‘Having great strength’, the second element cognate with Luwian *muwa-*, ‘strength’.

⁴¹ See Schürr (2007) 36 and Melchert (2013) 48. As Schürr notes, Lycian **Urnepijēmi* (the second element is a participle of *pije-*, ‘give’, cognate with Luwian *piya-*, Lydian *pid-*) is a calque on his father’s name *Μεισιτόδοτος*.

⁴² See generally Laroche (1966) 197–98 and Melchert (2013).

⁴³ See in particular Hawkins (1995) 27–28; Yakubovich (2017).

⁴⁴ Initial publication in Işık et al. (2011). See Oreshko (2013) 373–86.

of the king'.⁴⁵ While the reading of the personal name is uncertain,⁴⁶ Rostislav Oreshko has argued that the designation MAGNUS.REX.FILIUS is equivalent to the sign PRINCEPS found in inscriptions from central and southern Anatolia which, it is generally agreed, designates the 'crown prince', heir apparent to the throne. Furthermore, in addition to the use of cognates of *ura-* in first-millennium western Anatolian onomastics discussed in the previous paragraph, we also find a continuation of the exact syntagm *ura-handawati-* in the Milyan/Lycian B personal name *xñtabura-*, 'great king'.⁴⁷

Language pertaining to kingship has a remarkable tenacity, as well as a tendency to cross ethno-linguistic boundaries. Titles and even names of kings can become culture words and *Wanderwörter*, for which there are few better examples than the developmental history of the original cognomen Caesar. We can now be fairly certain that the Luwian word for king, *handawati-*, is continued in Kandaules, the name given by Herodotus for the last Heraclid king of Sardis.⁴⁸ Furthermore, Kandaules is quite possibly a throne name or title; the 'standard' Lydian word for a king is *qałmu-*, which was borrowed into Greek as *παλμύς*.⁴⁹ There can be little doubt that the name transmitted as Kandaules in Herodotus reflects an underlying Lydian form **kandawle-*.⁵⁰ Given that the phonology of *handawati-/kandawle-* likely precludes an internal development within Lydian, Onofrio Carruba's suggestion of a borrowing into Lydian from Luwian provides the most straightforward derivational path.⁵¹ If the Luwian word for 'king' could survive to enter into Lydian as a personal name, throne name or title, there is no *prima facie* reason why *ura-*, the natural

⁴⁵ SURATKAYA graffito 2. For the inscription see Peschlow-Bindokat and Herbordt (2001) and Oreshko (2013) 346–68.

⁴⁶ Oreshko (2013) 355–58 tentatively suggests *ku-**324-*i(a)*, which he interprets as *ku-ku(wa)na/i-ia* (i.e. *Kukuni-* or *Kukuwani-*), but the phonetic value of the hieroglyphic sign **324*, and its possible presence in SURATKAYA 3, is uncertain.

⁴⁷ *Tituli Asiae Minoris I (Tituli Lyciae Linguae)* 103.2, 125b; cf. Melchert (2004) 136, Yakubovich (2017) 46. The PN can be segmented as *xñtab-ura-*, with *b* a voiced fricative (*/v/*) continuing pre-Lycian **w*. The name is rendered in Greek as *Κενδαύρα*.

⁴⁸ Hdt. 1.7, identified as *Adyattes* or *Sadyattes* by Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrH* 90 F 47. The connection between Kandaules and *handawati-* was first suggested by Szemerényi (1969). In addition to the works cited below, see the discussions in Hawkins (2013) 167–82; Högemann and Oettinger (2018) 70–71; and n.51 below.

⁴⁹ Dale (2011) 17 with further references. Following Yakubovich (2019) 310–11, the underlying stem is likely *qałmu-* rather than *qałmlu-* as previously read, while the etymology proposed by Carruba (2006), from Luwian **kuwala(n)muwa-*, 'warlord', 'having the strength of the army', would be another instance of Luwian vocabulary continued in Lydian.

⁵⁰ Or perhaps **kandawle-* vel sim., depending on the position of the accent and the extent to which loanwords are subject to diachronic phonological change. Note the alternation between *alıksäntru-/alıksantru-* in renderings of *Ἀλέξανδρος* in Lydian (texts 3.1 and 50.2 in Gusmani (1964)).

⁵¹ Luwian *handawati-* is built to the Proto-Anatolian adjectival stem **Hant-* 'front' (< PIE **h₂ent-*), and there is conflicting evidence for the preservation of PA **H* (a voiceless fricative reflecting the outcome of PIE **h₂*) in initial position in Lydian; see Melchert (1994) 361, §14.1.3.2. Thus Carruba (2003) 154 proposed Luwian *handawati-* as the source of Lydian **kandawle-*. Yakubovich (2010) 94–95 objected that the development of *t > l* in *handawati-/Kandaules* rules out a borrowing from Luwian, and instead proposed a Carian form as the source (though attested Carian *kδou-* is not a precise formal match). However, as Craig Melchert (personal comment) has pointed out to me, while Lycian A *xñtawati-* and Hieroglyphic Luwian *REX-(wa/i)-ti-* both reflect a true voiceless (*fortis*) stop */t/*, the spelling with single *t* in Cuneiform Luwian (for example, *ḫa-an-da-wa-te-eš* KUB XXXV 123 iv 1) points towards the voiced (lenis) allomorph */d/*, and in intervocalic position *d* and *l* (and *r*) fell together in Luwian by the first millennium; see Melchert (2003) 179–82; Rieken and Yakubovich (2010). Thus the phonology of the form reflected in Cuneiform Luwian *ḫandawata/i-*, with */d/*, would be a perfect formal source for Lydian **kandawle-*. More recently, Högemann and Oettinger (2018) 367–69 have argued for the preservation of both **H* (< **h₂-*) and **h* (< **h₃-*) in initial position in Lydian, given the growing list of presumed Lydian words with initial laryngeal reflexes that otherwise have to be explained as loans, including *kuka-* (→ *Γύγης*) < **HuHa-*, **kandawle-* (→ *Κανδαύλης*) < **Hant-* and **kapala-* (→ *κάπηλος, καπηλεία*) < **hap-*. The possibility is intriguing, and more evidence might tip the scales, though the absence of a reflex of initial **h₂* in forms such as e.g. *eša-* 'child' < **h₂onso-* remains problematic.

complement of *handawati-* to designate a ‘Great King’, would not have followed suit, just as it did in Mylian *xītabura-*. Presuming that *ura/i-* entered Lydian from Luwian, the phonology would have remained largely stable, and thus we can posit a Lydian form **ura-* or perhaps **wra-*, ‘great’,⁵² which could, furthermore, have maintained a certain regnal association given the widely dispersed syntagm *ura- handawati-*.

VI. A synthesis

As we saw above, Pittakos is explicitly identified as Ἀρχεονακτίδας by the scholiast in *P.Berol.* 9569, while Ockham’s razor would suggest that the Ἀρχεονακτίδης of the Nicander scholion is one and the same person. Now, Ἀρχεάναξ is about as straightforward a calque of *ura- handawati-* as anyone could hope for,⁵³ while ὕρραξ can be seen as a nominalization of the adjectival stem *ura-*. I thus propose in the first instance that Alcaeus’ designation of Pittakos as Ἀρχεονακτίδας, a characterizing patronymic formation along the lines of those discussed above, plays upon a cross-cultural and cross-linguistic rhetoric of kingship. Pittakos is Ἀρχεονακτίδας not because he is the son or descendant of Arkheanax, but because, within the rhetoric of Alcaeus’ invective, he is the ἀρχε-άναξ, the supreme ruler, the great king.⁵⁴ At *fr.* 348 Alcaeus castigates the *dāmos* for establishing Pittakos as τύραννος. Alcaeus’ choice of words is usually seen as sour grapes; smarting from his and his faction’s defeat in the Lesbian game of thrones, Alcaeus calls Pittakos τύραννος rather than *aisumnētēs*, the office to which Aristotle tells us he was elected.⁵⁵ In truth we know very little about the facts on the ground in Mytilene *ca.* 597 BC, and it might be naïve to accept at face value the later portrayal of Pittakos as a benign ruler who held a constitutionally demarcated office with a term limit and then retired into obscurity. Furthermore, while the semantic range of τύραννος is unclear at this early period, it is evident that it did not always have the pejorative connotations it developed later.⁵⁶ *Fr.* 348 is not the only passage in Alcaeus where Pittakos is associated with the concept of *turannia*. At *fr.* 75.12–13 we find κακοπάτριδ[| τ]ύραννέυ-, while in the marginal scholia of several papyri we find references to Pittakos, Myrsilos, *monarchia* and *turannos/turannia*.⁵⁷ Given the near certainty of τύραννος being a loanword from Anatolia, the designation of Pittakos

⁵² There is some evidence for the reduction of unaccented initial **u-* to */v/* in Lydian (e.g. **ustó-* > *wsta-* with Melchert (1994) 365 §14.1.5.1). While the position of the accent on a presumed Lydian/Pre-Lydian **ura-* is indiscernible, we cannot rule out a realization as **wra-*. In light of this, it is tempting to see a reflex of *ura-* in *wratós* (nom. sg. common gender, Text 13.9 and 11; possibly a personal name, cf. Schürr (2016) 85). Furthermore, in Text 41.4 we find the form *wrauλ* (transparently a dative-locative noun), long recognized as problematic in that Lydian nowhere else writes two vowels together. Brandenstein (1932) 68 n.3 suggested an error for *wra[t]uλ* (a variant of *wratós* found in Text 11.3), but I would instead suggest *wralλ* (the signs 1 (ϛ) and u (ϛ) are similar). We could then read the line as *wralλ artimulλ*, identifying the recipient of the dedication: the ‘great Artemis’, perhaps a reference to Artemis of Ephesos (more precisely, *wralλ artimulλ* are the dat.-loc. of possessive adjectives in *-li-*, and I assume an ellipsis ‘in/for [the temple of] the great Artemis’). Even allowing for **wra-* as the Lydian reflex of *ura-*, the morphophonemic alternation of *w* and *u* in Lydian, as well as the frequent realization of Lydian *w* as *v* in Greek, would make */ur-/* the most likely outcome of */vr-/* in the transmission from Lydian to Greek. See further Dale (2016) 162–63.

⁵³ Note that Ἀρχεάναξ is a determinative compound, ‘first, foremost *anax*’, and not a verbal governing compound such as e.g. Ἀρχιλόχος (‘he who leads the troop’).

⁵⁴ It could be argued that, with reference to the parodic and polemic uses of patronymic formations in Alcaeus surveyed in section IV above, it is not necessary to posit that Ἀρχεονακτίδας is a punning calque on *ura- handawati-*. I would counter by saying that within a cross-linguistic rhetoric of kingship (as further argued for below), Ἀρχεονακτίδας cannot but resonate with reference to comparable Anatolian cognates, for all that it could equally stand alone within Alcaeus’ poetic lexicon.

⁵⁵ See Liberman (1999) 2.151 n.300 with further references.

⁵⁶ Note especially Alc. 34 A 6, where the Dioscuri appear to be addressed as *turannoi*.

⁵⁷ See the discussion in Dale (2011) 16–17 with further references.

as τύραννος would resonate within the cross-cultural rhetoric of kingship and power that underlies the syntagm of Ἀρχεανακτιδᾶς/*ura-handawati*- set forth here.⁵⁸ In turn, I suggest that this invective rhetoric of kingship is a facet of what Dimitrios Yatromanolakis has described as 'an interdiscursive rhetoric of power that articulates the poet's and his comrades' superiority in the hierarchy of traditional, sanctioned sociopolitical values'.⁵⁹ It is, in other words, a facet of the sociolect of Alcaeus and his *hetaireia* in Mytilene that reflects the cultural and geopolitical realities of Lesbos at a particular point in time.

As for Ὑρραῖς, the name of Pittakos' supposed father, we can entertain a couple of possibilities. With reference to the calque discussed above, ὕρραῖς could be nothing more than a nominalized form of *ura-*, 'great', abstracted with reference to the syntagm *ura-handawati*.⁶⁰ Let us consider for a moment how this would work. As discussed near the beginning of this paper, the only securely attested forms in Alcaeus' verse are the adjectival ὕρραος at 129.13 τὸν Ὑρραον δὲ πα[ῖδ]α, and οὐρραδον[at 298.47, which is best articulated as ὦ Ὑρραδ' ὄν[. We can add the uncertain but possible Ὑρραδῆοι at fr. 383. Now, ὕρραος need not be a patronymic at all, but could simply be an adjective: the 'great' or 'regal' one, a sneering reference to the *turrania* that Pittakos holds or seeks to hold. However, in light of the patronymic form Ὑρράδας that likely lies behind 298.47 and 383, I think we could allow that ὕρραος is performing a similar function. However, ὕρραος and ὕρράδας need not be interpreted as patronymics in the strict sense, 'son of Urras', but rather along the lines of the invective patronymic formations discussed previously. Thus ὕρραος and ὕρράδας could be taken as '(son-of) the Great One', '(son-of) Mr Big'.

Yet it might be rash to rule out the possibility that Ὑρραῖς was the actual name of Pittakos' father, or at least an appellative by which he was known: 'the Great'. Here we might recall in passing the statements of Ps.-Herodian and Heliodorus (quoted above) that Ὑρραῖς was τύραννος or βασιλεύς at Mytilene. Both Mazzarino and Page warned against dismissing this out of hand, though one finds little appetite for it in recent discussions of Pittakos.⁶¹ Though *ura-* is more common as an element in compound names, we do have the simplex Οραῖς from Lycia. Meanwhile, the structure of Pittakos' name might point towards a hybridized Lydian/northwest Anatolian pedigree. We noted earlier the Trojan Ὑρτάκος. One could argue that the name contains a syncopated form of *ura-* (thus rejecting an etymological link with Hittite *hartakka-*, and positing an originally unspirated form), and thus analysable as *ur-takos*, which would allow us to analyse Pittakos as *pit-takos*. If so, I would be tempted to relate the element *pit-* in Pittakos' name to Lydian *pid-*, 'give', cognate with Luwian *piya-*, Lycian *pje-*, 'give', a particularly common element in personal names throughout the western Anatolian onomastic tradition, and functionally equivalent to -δοτος in Greek personal names.⁶² Pittakos is also attested as the name of a king of Edonia in Thrace at Thuc. 4.107. However, given the continuum of Thracian population

⁵⁸ Melchert (2019) and (2020) demonstrates beyond doubt that Greek τύραννος is an Anatolian loan ultimately deriving from Luwian *tarrawann(i)-*, an honorific title meaning 'the just/righteous one'.

⁵⁹ Yatromanolakis (2008) 180.

⁶⁰ Regarding the geminate rho in ὕρραῖς, there is nothing in the (admittedly exiguous) evidence from cuneiform spelling conventions to suggest that the initial syllable of *ura-* was long. However, the varying outcome of the initial syllable in Greek renderings (cf. Lycian Οραῖς vs Cilician Ουρα- above) suggests that the articulation and syllabic weight of *ur-* did not correspond precisely to a short upsilon + rho, but could be interpreted as a heavy/closed syllable, approximated in Lesbian Aeolic with gemination of the consonant rather than lengthening of the vowel.

⁶¹ Mazzarino (1943) 43; Page (1955) 170.

⁶² Cf. Houwink ten Cate (1961) 175–77; Laroche (1966) 141–42; Melchert (2013) 41 and 47; n.41 above. (Lydian *d*, /*ḏ*/, is the regular outcome of **ḫ* in intervocalic position, cf. Melchert (1994) 364, §14.1.4.8.). Lydian *pid-* might be continued in Πιδῶτης, a Trojan killed by Odysseus at *Il.* 6.30 (pace Kirk *ad loc.*, the name is likely non-Greek, cf. Stoevesandt on 6.29–36), as well as Πιτθεός (not to be confused with Πιτθεός from Lydia (LGPN 5A s.v.). The second member of the names, *-tako-*, would appear to have more in common with the structure of Thracian personal names, for which see further below.

groups in the north Aegean and northwest Anatolia, it would not be overly surprising to find hybridized Anatolian/Thracian elements in the onomastic inventory.

Northwest Anatolia in the first half of the first millennium is something of an ethno-linguistic grey area. Strabo (12.8.3) famously relates that the Mysians spoke a language that was a mixture of Lydian and Phrygian. Given the exiguous epigraphic remains and the perils inherent in extrapolating evidence from personal names and toponyms, the prospects of our gaining a clearer understanding of the linguistic make-up of the area are slim. That being said, the peripheral nature of northwest Anatolia in the Archaic period, with Thracians to the north, Phrygians to the east, Lydians to the south, and Greeks to the west, would likely have resulted, at least at the peripheries, in a particularly dynamic *Sprachbund*, which could well lie behind Strabo's characterization of the language of the Mysians. To this we can guardedly add a further datum. According to Diodorus Siculus 12.32.1, the kingdom of the Kimmerian Bosphorus, centred at Pantikapaion on the Straits of Kertch on the Crimean Peninsula, was ruled for some 40 years by the Archaianaktidai (possibly of Milesian origin), before their overthrow in 438 BC by a certain Spartokos,⁶³ who established the Thracian Spartokid dynasty which ruled for over 300 years before the kingdom's absorption by Mithradates VI in 108. It would be hazardous in the extreme to attempt to base any argument on such an ethereal onomastic *mélange*. All I will say is that the evidence surveyed *could* point towards a Thracian/northwest Anatolian element in the name Pittakos. Furthermore, onomastic comparanda, and the existence of an Archaianaktid dynasty in a region under Thracian hegemony, *could* have led Douris or his source to posit a Thracian origin for Pittakos 'Arkheanaktides'.

The cross-linguistic wordplay presupposed in the readings of Ἵρραξ and Ἀρχεονακτίδας argued for above is certainly not without parallel. Hipponax's use of Lydian can at times be seen to have parodic effects on a linguistic level. His invocation of Ἐρμῆ κονάγγα, Μηιονιστι Κανδαῦλα at *fr.* 3a is certainly more complex and polysemic than the syncretizing gloss it has often been taken as, and *inter alia* resonates on the phonetic level of approximation between καν-, κον- and *kân-, the predicted Lydian reflex of PIE *k̑món-, 'dog'.⁶⁴ Though beyond the scope of the present paper, it seems likely that a number of Lydian words in Hipponax entail a certain amount of cross-linguistic punning, and thus presuppose some level of familiarity with Lydian on the part of his contemporary audience.⁶⁵ Staying with Alcaeus, I have previously argued that the homeoteleuton and 12-syllable lines of Alc. 383 (the latter unparalleled in Lesbian poetry) are a subtle metalinguistic referencing of Lydian verse structures, of which vowel assonance and 12-syllable lines are a defining hallmark,⁶⁶ and that this resonates in tandem with the reading Μυρσιλήωι in line 2 of the fragment, with Pittakos' rule being given a decidedly Lydian, and pejorative, colouring.⁶⁷ I should furthermore note that the level of cross-linguistic awareness presupposed in the above discussion falls far short of full bilingualism. While it seems more than likely that there would have been Mytileneans who spoke Lydian, and Sardians who spoke Lesbian, what is at issue here is the likelihood of

⁶³ To which name we can relate Σπαραδόκος, father of Seuthis, king of Odrycian Thrace, at Thuc. 2.101.5 and, of course, Spartacus, who, Plutarch and Appian tell us, was of Thracian origin. For Pantikapaion and the Kimmerian Bosphorus, see Hansen and Nielsen (2004) 949–50, no. 705.

⁶⁴ Cf. Hawkins (2013) 167–82 and Dale (forthcoming).

⁶⁵ See further Dale (forthcoming).

⁶⁶ Dale (2011) 23; for Lydian verse structure see Eichner (1993).

⁶⁷ Typological parallels for cross-linguistic punning could be multiplied, particularly from the Roman world. Plautus, in particular, is a trove of cross-linguistic puns and wordplay (see Fontaine (2010), (2018)), while the Punic from Act V of *Poenulus* reveals a tolerance for languages that would not have been intimately familiar to a large segment of the audience.

awareness of cultural *Wanderwörter*, and the very prevalence of terms such as *πάλμος*, *τύραννος* and (arguably) *μυρσίλος* in eastern Greek sources would argue in favour of a sufficient level of awareness amongst internationalist elites in early sixth-century Lesbos.

VII. Blood will out

Having spent some time arguing against an overly historicist interpretation of the traditions concerning Pittakos and Urras and their portrayal in Alcaeus, I would like to conclude by considering how Alcaeus' invectives might nonetheless be grounded in the historical circumstances of the familial connections of Pittakos. Aside from the explicit references to Urras as Pittakos' (putative) father in Alcaeus, there is still a strong emphasis on familial affiliation and ancestral descent in Alcaeus' invective. Explicit attacks on Pittakos' ancestry or marriage alliance seem to occur in *fr.* 67, 68, 70, 72, while the preponderance of *-(i)δῶς* formations used of him, though not to be taken as patronymics in the strict sense, nonetheless operate on one level or another within a rhetorical framework of ancestry and identity. This negative characterization of the ancestry of Pittakos is counterposed to the frequent appeals to the ancestry and collected identity of Alcaeus and his *hetaireia*.⁶⁸

We can begin with *ζοφοδορπίδας*, which, as we saw above, is analogous in its formation and resonance to invective patronymics that are a recognizable feature of Ionian iambus and Old Comedy. The lemma is preserved in two sources. In the first, at *Diog. Laert.* 1.81, it is simply included in a list of abusive terms which Alcaeus used of Pittakos, and glossed as *ἄλυχνον*, 'lampless'. In the second, *Mor.* 8.3, one of Plutarch's interlocutors says that Alcaeus called Pittakos *ζοφοδορπίδας* not because he dined in the dark, but because he preferred the company of disreputable and common people, *ἀλλ' ὡς ἀδόξοις τὰ πολλὰ καὶ φαύλοισι ἠδόμενον συμπόταις*. This is a good guess, and Duccio Guasti has argued that *ζοφοδορπίδας* characterized Pittakos as being removed from the convivial sympotic space that was a defining feature of the aristocratic *hetaireia*.⁶⁹ However, I doubt this was the resonance the coinage had in Alcaeus, while the differing interpretations in our sources argue against first-hand knowledge of the context in which it was used. *ζόφος* is no ordinary word for 'dark', 'dusk', etc., but is lexically and semantically marked as the paradigmatic description of the murky gloom of the Underworld.⁷⁰ In Poseidon's cosmogonic pronouncement at *Il.* 15.184–99, in which he describes the apportionment that he, Zeus and Hades received, he states that *Ἄϊδος ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα*, and *cf.* the formulaic phrase *ὑπὸ ζόφου* (*ἠερόεντος*) at *Il.* 21.56 and 23.51, *Od.* 3.335, 11.57 and 155, used to describe the realm of the dead; at *Od.* 20.356 the shades of the dead hasten *Ἐρεβόσδε ὑπὸ ζόφου*, 'to Erebus beneath the gloom' whence, at *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 334–37, Hermes is sent to retrieve Persephone. Now, with reference to the mythological tradition and the eschatology associated with *ζόφος*, it is hard not to associate a putative **ζοφοδορπός* (*nomina agentis*) with Tantalus, whose abnegated feast in the gloom of the Underworld served as his eternal punishment for the infamous feast at which he served his own son to the gods. From his earliest mention in Greek literature, at *Od.* 11.582–92, it is this second,

⁶⁸ *Cf.* Yatromanolakis (2008) 174, who notes that the 'lineage of the members of the *hetaireia* ... is implicitly contrasted with the political manoeuvres of Pittakos and the *κακοπάτριδα* ... who wreak havoc on the old institutions of the city'.

⁶⁹ Guasti (2017). *Cf.* the characterization of Pittakos' *hetaireia* at *Alc.* 68.23 (*φιλώνων πεδ' ἄλεμ[άτων]*) and 72, where someone drinks unmixed wine in an inversion of a 'proper' sympotic context. This is often seen as a reference to the barbaric practices of Pittakos' Thracian father (*cf.* Page (1955) 169–79 and the extreme biographical reading of Ferrari (2010) 85–7). However, as Davies (1985) 35 aptly illustrates, characterizations of an adversary as a drunkard (or descendent of one) can frequently be made with little reference to reality.

⁷⁰ Various associated with Erebus, Hades and Tartaros; *cf.* West on *Hes. Theog.* 123 and *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 334–37 with Richardson.

eternal, ‘feast’ of Tantalus that stands as the paradigmatic substantiation of the requital for his uniquely blood-soaked and unholy gluttony.

Tantalus was, of course, the ultimate progenitor of the house of Atreus, from which, via Orestes’ son Penthilus, the old ruling dynasty of Lesbos, the Penthilidai, claimed descent.⁷¹ Pittakos supposedly married into the Penthilid clan, if we are to take the evidence of Alc. 70 at face value, and it is this marriage alliance with the ancestral ruling house of Mytilene that supposedly accounts for his treachery and broken oaths, ruded by Alcaeus in *fr.* 129, where he invokes the Erinyes to pursue the transgressor. Yet in *fr.* 70.6–9, in the passage in which Pittakos is said to have married into the ancestral house of Lesbos, Alcaeus does not refer (as we might expect) to the house of Penthilus,⁷² but rather to the house of Atreus:

κῆνος δὲ πάθθεις Ἀτρεΐδα[] [
 δαπτέτω πόλιν ὡς καὶ πεδὰ Μυρσί[λ]ω[
 θᾶς κ’ ἄμμε βόλλητ’ Ἄρεος ἐπιτ. ὕχε.. [
 τρόπην.

Let him, wedded to the house of Atreus, devour the city as also with Myrsilos ... until Ares is minded to turn us to arms.

As Renaud Gagné has discussed, Alcaeus’ identification of the Penthilidai as the Atreidai here is highly significant.⁷³ With onomastic sleight of hand, Alcaeus entangles Pittakos with the intergenerational and internecine bloodshed of one of the paradigmatically cursed dynasties of the mythical tradition. The image of Pittakos, an Atreid, devouring the city no doubt plays on the resonance of feasting that recurs as an intergenerational motif in the Atreid myth, from Tantalus to Thyestes. The rhetoric of the bad ruler which Pittakos embodies, devouring the people and their wealth, is thus assimilated to a mythical paradigm.⁷⁴ Pittakos, the ‘shameless ... hateful thing’ (*fr.* 65.5–6), is provided with a genealogy which can be used to damn him more powerfully than any accusation of Thracian pedigree could ever have achieved. He has become the living embodiment of an ancestral curse. Within this rhetoric of feasting and inherited guilt, ζοφοδορπίδας can only point back to the primordial crime of the Atreid line, of which Pittakos has become a living substantiation.⁷⁵

VIII. Conclusions

In the foregoing discussion I have tried, in the first instance, to reassess the evidence for the historical prosopography of Archaic Lesbos at the time of Sappho and Alcaeus, and to emphasize how tenuous the evidence is for the biographical constructs that in many

⁷¹ For the line of Tantalus see Gantz (1993) 531–65. For ancient sources on Penthilus and the Aiolian migration see Page (1955) 149; Gantz (1993) 685. For a critical reassessment of the evidence, documentary and archaeological, for an Aiolian migration to Lesbos and the Troad, see Rose (2008).

⁷² Explicitly named at *fr.* 75.10 and 302, as well as Sappho *fr.* 71.3. For the Penthilidai see Arist. *Pol.* 1311b = Alc. *fr.* 472, and previous note.

⁷³ Gagné (2009) and *cf.* (2013) 210–26.

⁷⁴ There can be no doubt that Alcaeus’ characterization of Pittakos as ‘devouring the city’ (also at *fr.* 129.23–24) draws on the same rhetorical typologies as Achilles’ denunciation of Agamemnon as a δημοβόρος βασιλεὺς at *Il.* 1.231 and Hesiod’s castigation of δωροφάγοι βασιλῆες at *Op.* 39 and 221. However, I think it highly unlikely that Alcaeus is directly evoking the *Iliad*, let alone positioning himself as Achilles to Pittakos’ Agamemnon, as Lentini (2000) 9–12 and Ferrari (2010) 90–92 have suggested.

⁷⁵ While this interpretation of ζοφοδορπίδας might appear riddling, it is in keeping with the metaphorical ambiguity that characterizes Greek poetry of all genres and periods, while context would likely have rendered it no more inscrutable than Hesiod’s ἡμερόκοιτος ἀνὴρ at *Op.* 605, or ὄς τ’ ἔπειτ’ ἔφω at Aesch. *Ag.* 171.

respects we have inherited from antiquity. At the same time, I have tried to relate Alcaeus' use of language, and in particular the many patronymic formations we find in his verse, to kindred generic typologies in archaic and classical Greek literature, and in turn to interpret Alcaeus' use of language with reference to the historical realities of intercultural contact and transmission that were and remain a defining feature of the island of Lesbos throughout history.

Both the personal name Urras and the patronymic form Ἀρχεανακτίδας are readily explicable via a cross-cultural and cross-linguistic rhetorical register, pointing towards awareness of and engagement with Anatolian, and particularly Lydian, population groups. This conclusion is in keeping with the archaeological record, which reveals Lesbos to have been a key node in East–West interaction from the Bronze Age into the Archaic period, as well as the documentary record which reveals increasing Lydian–Greek interaction at the turn of the sixth century BC.⁷⁶ The use of the patronymic formation Ἀρχεανακτίδας, along with κακοπατρίδας and ζοφοδορπίδας, can furthermore be contextualized within the generic typology of invective, akin to the patronymic formations we find in Ionian iambus and Old Comedy. While the language and rhetoric of paternity figure prominently in Alcaeus' invective against Pittakos, the evidence for this reflecting actual historical biographical reality is questionable.

Where then does this leave us with reference to our reconstructions of early Lesbian history? There is no reason to doubt that Lesbos witnessed great social, political and economic upheaval in the years of Sappho and Alcaeus. The rapid rise of Lydia in the east, along with the spread of Greek colonization and the growth of commodity trade, would have provoked challenges to the landed wealth of the earlier Archaic period, and these considerations were no doubt a factor in the factional divisions that erupted in Mytilene and elsewhere in the Greek world at the time.⁷⁷ It is likewise evident that Alcaeus' political poems provide an ideologically consistent response to the anxieties of the age as filtered through a particular subset of aristocratic society. At the same time, the prevailing interpretive model that Alcaeus' verse was largely occasional, and his audience a small *hetaireia* predicated almost exclusively on the symposium, with little to no public role,⁷⁸ is built largely on assumption and inference, and seems difficult to reconcile with the preservation and diffusion of the generically diverse body of verse that has survived. Yet, however one chooses to interpret the persona of Alcaeus and the identity of his audience, a degree of incredulity and resistance to the penchant towards biographical reconstructions and literal readings emanating out of the text of the Lesbian poets seems advisable. That the names of the three aristocratic clans of Lesbos should translate into, roughly, 'the much/many lords' (Polyanaktidai), 'the famed lords' (Kleanaktidai) and the 'foremost lords' (Arkheanaktidai), might give us pause. And if we allow for the possibility that Arkheanaktides is simply a calque on *ura-handawati-*, and is a snide speaking name applied to Pittakos, we must allow that the Polyanaktids and Kleanaktids too might be no more than convenient fictions, appellatives sarcastic in context, even if not derogatory in and of themselves, applied to whoever might be a target of invective in Alcaeus' and Sappho's verse at any given time. While the tangible personas of people such as Pittakos and even Alcaeus himself might, as a result of this reading, recede further from view,

⁷⁶ For Bronze Age Lesbos, see Houwink ten Cate (1983–1984); Mason (2008); Teffeteller (2013); for the Iron Age see Spencer (1995) and Rose (2008). On Lydian expansionism in the later seventh and earlier sixth centuries see Kerschner (2010); Dale (2016); Payne and Wintjes (2016); Högemann and Oettinger (2018). For Anatolian elements in Sappho and Alcaeus, see Watkins (2007); Dale (2020).

⁷⁷ With reference to the prominence of Lydia in the broader growth of commerce and commodity trade in this period, note Oettinger's recent argument (Högemann and Oettinger (2018) 367–69) that the very terms κάπηλος ('merchant') and καπηλεία ('retail trade') are borrowings from Lydian.

⁷⁸ Thus influentially Rösler (1980), and recently Caciagli (2011).

I hope that the arguments I have advanced will serve to shed new light on the cultural and poetic dynamics that yielded the verse that we have, and in turn suggest new ways of reading Alcaeus, Sappho and early Greek literature more generally.

Bibliography

- Adiego, I.-J. (2007) *The Carian Language* (Leiden and Boston)
- Aloni, A. (1997) *Saffo: frammenti* (Florence)
- Andrisano, A. (2001) 'Iambic motifs in Alcaeus' lyrics', in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi (eds), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (Oxford), 41–64
- Blümel, W. (1982) *Die aiolischen Dialekte* (Göttingen)
- Brandenstein, W. (1932) 'Die lydische Nominalflexion', *Causasica* 10, 67–94
- Caciagli, S. (2011) *Poeti e Società: comunicazione poetica e formazioni sociali nella Lesbo del VII/VI secolo a.C.* (Amsterdam)
- Cameron, A. (1993) *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford)
- Carruba, O. (2003) 'Λυδική ἀρχαιολογία. La lidia fra II et I millennio', in M. Giorgieri, M. Salvini, M.C. Tremouille and P. Vannicelli (eds), *Licia e Lidia prima dell'ellenizzazione. Atti del Convegno internazionale. Roma, 11–12 ottobre 1999* (Rome) 145–69
- (2006) 'Il nome della lidia e altri problemi lidii', in R. Bombi, G. Cifoletti, F. Fusco, L. Innocente and V. Orioles (eds), *Studi linguistici in onore di Roberto Gusmani* (Alessandria) 393–411
- Chantraine, P. (1968–1980) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris)
- Dale, A. (2011) 'Alcaeus on the career of Myrsilos: Greeks, Lydians, and Luwians at the East Aegean-West Anatolian interface', *JHS* 131, 15–24
- (2016) 'WALWET and KUKALIM: Lydian coin legends, dynastic succession, and the chronology of Mermnad kings', *Kadmos* 54, 151–66
- (2020) 'Venus in furs: Sappho fr. 101 Voigt between East and West', in R. Kim, J. Mynářová and P. Pavúk (eds), *Hrozny and Hittite: The First Hundred Years. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015* (Leiden and Boston) 469–83
- (2021) 'Gyges at Delphi: Herodotus 1.14', *CQ* 70, 518–23
- (forthcoming) 'Kandaules "the dog-throttler", Greco-Lydian onomastics, and the poetics of iambus: Hipponax fr. 3a West (2 Dg.) in context', in V. Cazzatto and E. Prodi (eds), *The Limping Muse*.
- Davies, M. (1985) 'Conventional topics of invective in Alcaeus', *Prometheus* 11, 31–39
- Eichner, H. (1993) 'Problem von Vers und Metrum in epichorischer Dichtung Altkleinasiens', in G. Dobesch and G. Rehrenböck (eds), *Die epigraphische und altertumskundliche Erforschung Kleinasiens* (Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 236) (Vienna) 97–169
- Ferrari, F. (2010) *Sappho's Gift: The Poet and Her Community* (tr. B. Acosta-Hughes and L. Prauscello) (Ann Arbor)
- (2014) 'Saffo e i suoi fratelli e altri brani del primo libro', *ZPE* 192, 1–19
- Fontaine, M. (2010) *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy* (Oxford)
- (2018) 'A cute illness in Epidaurus: eight sick jokes in Plautus' Gorgylio (Curculio)', in M. Fontaine, C.J. McNamara and W.M. Short (eds), *Quasi Labor Intus: Ambiguity in Latin Literature. Papers in Honor of Reginald Thomas Foster, OCD* (New York) 27–53
- Gagné, R. (2009) 'Atreid ancestors in Alkaios', *JHS* 129, 39–43
- (2013) *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge)
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore and London)
- Gomme, A.W. (1957) 'Interpretations of some poems of Alkaios and Sappho', *JHS* 77, 255–66
- Gow, A.S.F. (1952) *Theocritus* (2 vols) (2nd edition) (Cambridge)
- Guasti, D. (2017) 'Pittaco ζοφοδορπίδου ε and la storia dei sostantivi in -ιδης', *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 22, 57–67
- Gusmani, R. (1964) *Lydisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg)
- Hamm, E.-M. (1958) *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* (Berlin)
- Hansen, M.H. and Nielsen, T.H. (2004) *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford)
- Hawkins, J.D. (1995) *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)* (Wiesbaden)
- Hawkins, S. (2013) *Studies in the Language of Hipponax* (Bremen)
- Högemann, P. and Oettinger, N. (2018) *Lydien: Ein altanatolischer Staat zwischen Griechenland und dem Vorderen Orient* (Berlin)
- Houwink ten Cate, P.H.J. (1961) *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (Leiden)
- (1983–1984) 'Sidelights on the Ahhiyawa question from Hittite vassal and royal correspondence', *JVEG* 28, 33–79
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford)

- Işık, F., Atıcı, M. and Tekoğlu, R. (2011) 'Die nachhethitische Königsstele von Karakuyu beim Karabel-Pass. Zur kulturellen Kontinuität vom bronzezeitlichen Mira zum eisenzeitlichen Ionia', in E. Schwertheim (ed.), *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien VII* (Asia Minor Studien 66) (Bonn) 1–33
- Kerschner, M. (2010) 'The Lydians and their Ionian and Aiolian neighbours', in N. Cahill (ed.), *The Lydians and Their World* (Istanbul) 247–65
- Keurentjes, M.B.G. (1997) 'The Greek patronymics in -(i)δαξ/-(i)δηξ', *Mnemosyne* 50, 385–400
- Killen, J. (1983) 'Mycenaean possessive adjectives in e-jo', *TPhS* 81, 66–99
- Laroche, E. (1966) *Les noms des Hittites* (Paris)
- Lauxtermann, M.D. (2003) *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres* 1 (Vienna)
- Lentini, G. (2000) 'Pittaco erede degli Atridi: il fr. 70 V. di Alceo', *SIFC* 3rd series, 18, 3–14
- Liberman, G. (1999) *Alcée: fragments* (2 vols) (Paris)
- (2014) 'Reflections on a new poem by Sappho concerning her anguish and her brothers Charaxos and Larichos', Paper delivered at F.I.E.C Bordeaux, August 2014. <http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/Fragments/Liberman.FIEC.Bordeaux.2014.pdf>
- Livrea, E. (1995) 'From Pittacus to Byzantium: the history of a Callimachean epigram', *CQ* (n.s.) 45, 474–80
- Lobel, E. (1927) *Ἀλκαίου μέλη: The Fragments of the Lyrical Poems of Alcaeus* (Oxford)
- Mason, H. (2008) 'Hittite Lesbos?', in B.J. Collins, M. Bachvarova and I.C. Rutherford, (eds), *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks, and Their Neighbours* (Oxford) 57–62
- Mazzarino, S. (1943) 'Per la storia di Lesbo nel VI secolo a.C.', *Athenaeum* 21, 38–78
- Melchert, H.C. (1994) *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam)
- (ed.) (2003) *The Luwians* (Leiden and Boston)
- (2004) *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language* (Ann Arbor)
- (2013) 'Naming practices in second and first millennium Anatolia', in R. Parker (ed.), *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia* (Oxford) 31–49
- (2019) 'Iron Age Luwian *tarrawann(i)-*', in P.S. Avetisyan, R. Dan and Y.H. Grekyan (eds), *Over the Mountains and Far Away: Studies in Near Eastern History and Archaeology Presented to Mirjo Salvini on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday* (Oxford) 337–45
- (2020) 'Hittite *tarru-* "firm, secure" and Luwian cognates', in C. le Feuvre and D. Pettit (eds), *Ἵστοριῶν ἴστοι: mélanges offerts à Charles de Lamberterie* (Leuven) 541–53
- Meyer, G. (1923) *Die stilistische Verwendung der Nominalkomposition im griechischen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der διπλῶν ὀνόματα* (Philologus Supplement 16.3) (Leipzig)
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1968) 'Thessalian patronymic adjectives', *Glotta* 46, 85–106
- (2000) 'Greek personal names and linguistic continuity', in S. Hornblower and E. Matthews (eds), *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (PBA 104) (Oxford) 15–40
- Oreshko, R. (2013) 'Hieroglyphic inscriptions of western Anatolia: long arm of the empire or vernacular tradition(s)?', in A. Mouton, I.C. Rutherford and I. Yakubovich (eds), *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean* (Leiden and Boston) 345–420
- Page, D.L. (1955) *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford)
- Payne, A. and Wintjes, J. (2016) *Lords of Asia Minor: An Introduction to the Lydians* (Wiesbaden)
- Peschlow-Bindokat, A. and Herboldt, S. (2001) 'Ein hethitisches Großprinzeninschrift aus dem Latmos', *AA*, 363–78
- Rieken, E. and Yakubovich, I. (2010) 'The new values of the Luwian signs L 319 and L 172', in I. Singer (ed.), *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (Tel Aviv) 199–219
- Rohde, E. (1879) 'Ἐγώνε in dem Biographica des Suidas', *RhM* 33, 161–220
- Rose, C.B. (2008) 'Separating fact from fiction in the Aiolian migration', *Hesperia* 77, 399–430
- Rosen, R. (1988) 'Hippónax, Boupalos, and the conventions of the *psogos*', *TAPhA* 118, 29–41
- Rösler, W. (1980) *Dichter und Gruppe: ein Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historische Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios* (Munich)
- Schadewaldt, W. (1960) 'Sappho: an die Tochter Kleis', in *Hellas und Hesperien. Gesammelte Schriften zur Antike und neuen Literatur* (Zurich and Stuttgart) 77–85
- Schürr, D. (2007) 'Formen der Akkulturation in Lykien: Griechisch-lykische Sprachbeziehungen', in C. Schuler (ed.), *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien: ein Zwischenbilanz. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums, München, 24–26 Februar 2005* (Vienna) 27–40
- (2016) 'Vermutungen zum Namen Mantaura', *Gephyra* 13, 83–88
- Sihler, A. (1995) *A New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Oxford)
- Spencer, N. (1995) 'Early Lesbos between East and West', *ABSA* 90, 269–306
- Szemerényi, O. (1969) 'Etyma Latina II (7–18)', in *Studi Linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani* 2 (Brescia) 963–94

- Teffeteller, A. (2013) 'Singers of Lazpa: reconstructing identities on Bronze Age Lesbos', in A. Mouton, I.C. Rutherford and I. Yakubovich (eds), *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean* (Leiden and Boston) 567–89
- Voigt, E.-M. (1971) *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam)
- Wackernagel, J. (2009) *Lectures on Syntax* (tr. and edited with notes and bibliography by D. Langslow) (Oxford)
- Watkins, C. (1986) 'The language of the Trojans', in M.J. Mellink (ed.), *Troy and the Trojan War: A Symposium Held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984* (Bryn Mawr) 45–62 = L. Oliver (ed.) (1994) *Selected Writings Volume II: Culture and Poetics*, ed. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 80) (Innsbruck) 700–17
- (1995) *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford)
- (2007) 'The golden bowl: thoughts on the new Sappho and its Asianic background', *ClAnt* 26, 305–25
- West, M.L. (1989–1991) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantata* (2 vols) (2nd edition) (Oxford)
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. (1914) 'Neue lesbische Lyrik (Oxyrhynchus Papyri X)', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 33, 225–47
- Yakubovich, I. (2010) *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language* (Leiden and Boston)
- (2017) 'The Luwian title of the Great King', in A. Mouton (ed.), *Hittitology Today: Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday* (Istanbul) 39–50
- (2019) 'The Lydian dating formulae', in I.-X. Adiego, J.V.G. Trabazo, M. Vernet, B. Obrador-Cursach and E.M. Rodríguez (eds), *Luwic Dialects and Anatolian: Inheritance and Diffusion* (Barcelona) 299–316
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2008) 'Genre categories and interdiscursivity in Alkaios and Archaic Greece', *Σύγκριση* 19, 169–87
- Zgusta, L. (1964) *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prague)