Reconfiguring Archilochus. How have papyri and inscriptions changed perceptions of Archilochus’ iambic and elegiac poetry?

Ewen L. Bowie

The main part of this paper will discuss the ways in which the discovery of papyri of Archilochus’ elegiac poetry have—or have not—dramatically changed our understanding of what a book of Archilochus’ elegiac poetry would have been like. But first I glance at the ways papyri have changed our perceptions of his iambic poetry, a change that started earlier and that moved through a succession of publications in a rhythm that is (by sheer chance) quite different from that of the publication of papyri of his elegiac poetry.

A. The reshaping of Archilochus’ profile as an iambic poet

1. The century following 1891 witnessed an explosion in our understanding of Archilochus’ iambic poetry. It was in 1891 that J. P. Mahaffy published in *P. Petrie* 1.4.21 what was later to be registered as *P. Lit. Lond.* 55, fragments of war narrative in trochaic tetrameters (now fr. 91 West), written on a papyrus of the mid-third century BC. Its identification as part of a poem by Archilochus was secured by overlap with a quotation in Plutarch and the scholia on Pindar. More lines were later added by an Oxyrhynchus papyrus of the late first or early second century AD published by Lobel in 1954, *P. Oxy.* vol. 22 no. 2313.

That an important component of Archilochus poetry in iambic metres was made up of war narrative in trochaic tetrameters was further demonstrated in 1900 when Hiller von Gaertringen published in *Athenische Mitteilungen* 1900 an inscription from a monument on Paros erected by Sosthenes around 100 BC honouring Archilochus. The monument

---

1 Mahaffy 1891.
2 Fr. 91.14-15 West = Plut. praec. reip. gerendae 6 = mor. 803a, Σ Pi. Olymp. 1.91a = 1 37.22 Drachmann.
3 For the monument and its inscriptions see Clay 2004.
referred to an account of his life by the local Parian historian Demeas, who in turn had quoted lines of his poetry. Some of these excerpts came from a poem addressed to his ἑταῖρος Glaucus, already known from Heraclitus’ *Homeric Allegories* as the addressee of a tetrameter poem on a political subject (fr. 105 West). Hiller von Gaertringen later republished the inscription as *IG* xii 5 445. One of these excerpts too later turned out to overlap with a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus, *P.Oxy.* 2313, published by Lobel in 1954. Together these fragments now constitute fr. 98 West.

Half a century later still more of this type of trochaic tetrameter narrative was rediscovered on a second inscription, erected by an admirer of Archilochus with the professionally significant name Mnesipes and published by Kondoleon in the early 1950s.⁴

Three other Oxyrhynchus papyri, *P.Oxy.* vol. 22, nos 2310 and 2311 (second century AD) and 2312 (late second or early third century AD), published by Lobel in 1954, extended our understanding of Archilochus’ use of iambic trimeters for subjects apparently drawn from his private life. One fragment (24 West) gave us lines addressing a friend and celebrating his safe return across the sea from Gortyn in southern Crete: although no single line is complete, the first and last are manifestly the poem’s opening and close, establishing its length at 18 lines, our second poem of Archilochus of whose length we can be confident.⁵ The preceding poem in the roll (fr. 23 West), was almost certainly an erotic narrative: we have the end—9 lines in which the speaker addresses a woman (γόνα[ι]) and, it seems, she replies acknowledging his sexual conquest—but not the beginning, which must have had at least a speech by her, presumably one in which she tried to dissuade him from seducing her, some scene-setting narrative, and very probably an addressee. The whole poem was no shorter than 16 lines. The poem following fr. 24 West, of which we have 8 fragmentary lines, opened with a gnōmē about the variety of human sexual proclivities (fr. 25 West); the next (fr. 26 West) overlapped two quoted lines in which the speaker prayed to Apollo to punish and destroy ‘the guilty’ (τοὺς μὲν αἰτίους, 5–6) and (presumably) save or reward ‘us’ (ἡμέας . . . , 7). The remaining fragments of iambic trimeter poems are too scrappy to allow more than guesswork about how they ran (frr. 27–29 West and 49–79 West), but some are

---

⁴ See Kontoleon 1954, 1956; Peek 1955; Clay 2004.

⁵ The first was the quoted elegiac fr. 13 West (10 lines).
clearly, like many quoted iambic trimeter fragments, both sexual and coarse (e.g. fr. 67.3–4 West ἔσθλην γὰρ ἄλλην οἶδα τοιοῦτοι φυτοῦ / ἴησιν, and one (fr. 71.1 West: [ . . . ]Λυκαμ[β . . .]) mentions Lycambes or one or more of his daughters.

2. A sequence of 32 fragmentary lines, however, seemingly all from one poem, has (near what for us is its beginning) a description of two girls with perfumed hair and breasts apparently in the charge (or not?) of a ‘nurse’ (τροφός) followed at once by an address to Glaucus (surely the same as the addressee of fr. 105 West mentioned above):

τροφός κατ. ἀεσμυριχμένας κόμην
καὶ στῆθος, ὦς ἂν καὶ γέρων ἠράσσατο.
ὦ Γλαύκ.

The two lines, whose remark that girls would have aroused even an old man evokes a passage in Iliad Book 3, were already known from Athenaeus (15.688c): the papyrus adds the precious information of their location in an apparently long, sexual narrative, and of that narrative’s address to friend Glaucus.

3. In the same volume 22 P.Oxy. 2313, of the late first or early second century AD, added lines to the famous fragment of 6 trochaic tetrameters about a father and daughter quoted by Stobaeus, fr. 122 West. These additions gave a name, Archenactides, and a reference to marriage, which have been seen as confirming both that the father’s words about his daughter concerned her marriage (something that had always seemed probable), and that the father was Lycambes—which in fact it does not confirm at all. The name Archenactides corroborated the implication of the tradition making Archilochus’ father the oecist of the Parian colony of Thasos, i.e. that Archilochus’ status in Parian society was not low but high.

4. Still from volume 22 of Oxyrhynchus papyri, P.Oxy. 2315 (early second century AD) added some small pieces (frr. 175 and 181 West) to the epode haranguing Lycambes with the animal-fable of the fox and the eagle, giving us a better idea of the shape of that poem (now fr. 172–181 West) than several quoted fragments already known.

5. But it was only precisely two decades later, in 1974, that our understanding of Archilochus’ epodes was revolutionised by the publica-
tion of the Cologne papyrus which gave us the opening of a vituperative poem directed against a now ageing former lover (frr. 188–192 West) and preceding it a high proportion (including its climactic conclusion) of a narrative in which the persona loquens seduces (perhaps without taking her virginity) a younger sister of Neobule, here unnamed (frr. 196 and 196A West). Like the trimeters of fr. 23 West this poem alternated speeches by the male and by his conquest, but whereas fr. 23 West ended with words of surrender by the latter, the end of the Cologne poem focuses on the sexual act of the male speaker. Two quoted lines in the poem’s metre showed that it opened with an address to an ἑταῖρος, like fr. 13 West (elegiacs) and fr. 105 West (trochaic tetrameters).8

These 83 years completely changed our understanding of Archilochus’ iambic poetry, establishing the importance of military narrative in the tetrameters and of narrative of sexual adventures in all three metrical groups, but especially in trimeters and epodes, and greatly reducing and refining the place of invective which the ancient reception had privileged in its presentation of Archilochean iambics.9

B. The reshaping of Archilochus’ profile as an elegiac poet

The trajectory of our changing perceptions of Archilochus’ elegiac poetry has been very different. Ancient authors from the Ephesian philosopher Heraclitus in the fifth century BC, through Plato in the fourth, Antipater of Thessalonice at the end of the first century BC and Longinus perhaps a century later, all set Archilochus alongside Homer, and if what they wrote had been our only evidence for what Archilochus’ poetry was like we would probably have concluded that its subject matter was heroic narrative. I quote these to remind us of this pervasive image which the quoted fragments occluded.

1. Heraclitus

τόν τε Ὄμηρον ἔφασκεν ἄξιον ἐκ τῶν ἀγώνων ἐκβάλλεσθαι καὶ ῥαπίζεσθαι καὶ Ἀρχίλοχον ὁμοίως.

He said that Homer deserved to be ejected from the ἀγώνων and beaten with sticks, and Archilochus likewise.

Heraclitus of Ephesus fr. 42 D-K = D21 Laks-Most

---

8 In fr. 48 West the preserved address to Glaucus comes no earlier than the seventh line of the poem.
9 For the process see Rotstein 2010.
2. Plato, *Ion*

ΣΩΚ. Οὗκον σύ φής καὶ Ὀμήρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητάς, ἐν οἷς καὶ Ἁσίοδος καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ἔστιν, περὶ γε τῶν αὐτῶν λέγειν, ἀλλ’ ὀχλός ὑμών, ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν εὖ γε, τοὺς δὲ χεῖρον; ἸΩΝ. Καὶ ἀληθῆ λέγω.

Socrates And so you say that Homer and the other poets, among whom are both Hesiod and Archilochus, all speak about the same things, but not in the same way, but he does it well, and they do it worse?

Ion Yes, and I am telling the truth.

---

3. Antipater of Thessalonice

Φεύγεθ’, ὅσοι λόκκας ἢ λοφνίδας ἢ καμασῆνας ἄδετε, ποιητῶν φῦλον ἀκανθολόγων, οἵ τ’ ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ.

σήμερον Ἀρχιλόχοιο καὶ ἄρσενος Ὁμήρου σπένδομεν· ὁ κρητὴρ οὐ δέχεθ’ ὑδροπότας.

Away with you, all who sing of ‘loccae’ and ‘lophnides’ and ‘camasenes’, tribe of thorn-gathering poets, and you who drink frugal water from the holy spring, practising contortions as your verses’ ornament. Today we pour wine for the birthday of Archilochus and manly Homer; our bowl is not at home to water-drinkers.

(transl. Page)

Antipater of Thessalonice AP 11.20 = Gow–Page, *The Garland of Philip*

4. Longinus

μόνος Ἡρόδοτος Ὁμηρικώτατος ἐγένετο; Στησίχορος ἐτί πρό- τερον ὁ τε Ἀρχίλοχος, πάντων δὲ τούτων μάλιστα ὁ Πλάτων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁμηρικοῦ κείνου νάματος εἰς αὐτὸν μυρίας ὅσα παρα- τροπὰς ἀποχετευσάμενος.

Was Herodotus the only ‘most Homeric’ writer? Surely Stesichorus and Archilochus earned the name before him. So, more than any, did Plato, who diverted to himself countless rills from the Homeric spring.

Longinus, *de sublimitate* 13.3 (transl. Russell 1965)

The quoted fragments of Archilochus’ elegiac poetry encouraged a rather different picture—poetry in which ἐγὼ figured prominently and was much engaged in wars, and a poet who used sympotic elegy to sing of his abandonment of his shield in a conflict with Thracians and to
console his friend Pericles for the loss of common friends in a ship that had been wrecked by a storm or sunk by enemy action.

The canonical presentation of Archilochus’ elegies thus invariably started with the supposedly programmatic fr. 1 West. I print as an appendix frs. 1–6 and 8–17 West, which is the totality of elegiacs available to Pomtow (1885). Of these only fr. 13 West, quoted by Stobaeus, was long enough to give an adequate basis for assessment, since it does indeed seem to be a complete poem. The four-line poem about Archilochus’ abandonment of the shield was much more influential in shaping a school of Archilochean criticism that saw him as anti-Homeric and as rejecting Iliadic heroic values—an approach that has been long questioned, and even more so since the publication of the Telephus papyrus.10

How, then, did the publication of elegiac papyri impinge on modern perceptions of Archilochus’ elegies?

The first elegiac papyrus was P.Oxy. vol. 6 no. 854, found in 1897 and published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1908:

φρε[ις]
ξεινο[ι]
δεῖπνον δ’ οὐ[
οῦτ’ ἐμοὶ ωσαὶ[
ἀλλ’ ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηός
φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ’ ἄφελκε κάδων,
ἄγρει δ’ οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς
νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῇ τῇδε δυνὴσόμεθα.

It gave us the beginnings of the first 4 lines of fr. 4 West and established that what was already known from quotation by Athenaeus were lines 5–8 of a poem.11 The words ξεινο[ι] and δεῖπνον once seemed to me to hint that the real context may be a land-based symposium and the ship may be imaginary;12 but the discovery of ship-sheds in Sicilian Naxos with what appears to be an attached guard-room, whose floor is littered with fragments of sympotic pottery, has made me think again. Be that as it may, the extra words were little exploited by other scholars in interpreting fr. 4 West, and indeed were not even printed by Campbell 1967.

10 See Swift 2012, with a very full bibliography of scholarship up to that date.
11 Ath. 11.483d. The papyrus text was used in the editions of Diehl, Anthologia lyrica graeca, fasc. 3, 3rd edn 1952, repr. 1964, where it is fr. 5A; Lasserre and Bonnard 1958, where it is fr. 12; and Tarditi 1968, where it is fr. 7.
12 Bowie 1986, 16.
The next papyrus was published half a century later: \textit{P.Oxy.} vol. 23 nos 2356 (a) and (b) (late second century), edited by Lobel in 1956, gave us more of a poem about a shipwreck in which Archilochus’ brother-in-law died:

Fr. 9 West
[ ] \nu.. \epsilon \tau \omicron \pi [ ]
[ ] \epsilon \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \nu [ ]
[ ] \omega \lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \omicron \alpha [ ]
[ ] \mu \epsilon \nu \omicron \omicron [ ]
[ ] \nu \omicron \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha [ (5) ]
[ ] \epsilon \alpha [ ]
[ ] \epsilon \alpha [ ]
[ ] \nu \phi \iota \omicron \omicron [ ]
[ ] \mu \epsilon \nu \omicron [ ]
[ ] \nu \sigma \iota \iota [ ]

\textit{P.Oxy.} 2356 (b)
Fr. 10 West
[ ] \epsilon \mu [ ]
[ ] \theta \iota \alpha \ delta \ sigma \epsilon \omicron \alpha [ ]
[ ] \epsilon \xi \sigma \pi \iota \nu \nu \gamma \alpha \rho [ ]
[ ] \alpha \omicron \omicron [ ]
[ ] \alpha \gamma \nu \nu \alpha \omicron \kappa \omicron \omicron [ ]
[ ] \alpha \rho \theta \omicron \omicron [ ]

These scraps added to our understanding of a poem of which we had already known something from comment and quotation by Plutarch (frr. 9 and 11 West, printed in the Appendix) and Tzetzes (again fr. 11
West). The poem may be that referred to by Longinus (after discussing Aratus’ treatment of a storm) in *de sublimitate* 10.7: οὐκ ἄλλως ὁ Ἀρχίλοχος ἐπὶ τοῦ ναυαγίου. Although it shares its theme and reactions to loss with the elegy addressed to Pericles on the drowning of several ἑταῖροι (fr. 13 West), it clearly focused on the loss of his sister’s husband and developed the poet’s responses at greater length. The papyrus showed that it was no shorter than 27 lines—much longer than anything quoted had hinted that an Archilochus elegy might be—and that none of these lines overlapped with the Pericles poem made it very unlikely that these and the lines addressed to Pericles were from one and the same poem. That Longinus juxtaposes this comment with one on Aratus’ treatment of a storm makes more sense if he is referring to an Archilochean poem with a higher proportion of narrative—narrative of a storm—than fr. 13 West.

The next relevant papyri were also published by Lobel in 1964 in *P.Oxy.* vol. 30 as numbers 2507 (second century) and 2508 (first century). Lobel thought they might both be by Archilochus, and in Tarditi’s 1968 edition they were indeed printed as his frs. 4 and 5, though marked as *dubia*. In 1971 Martin West in *IEG* printed them among *Adespota elegiaca* as frs. 61 and 62.

*Adespota elegiaca* fr. 61 West (fr. 17i in Swift 2019)

| νοσ[ |
| λός ατε[ |
| . | ἐπὶ τοῦ ναυαγίου |
| . | ἔγωγε μ[ |
| . | θεσσαλ[ |

*Adespota elegiaca* fr. 62 West (fr. 17j in Swift 2019)

| τετράφαλον[
| τοῖσιν ἔβη ταχύ[
| γὰρ τοῦτ’ ἕπος α[|
It was only a generation later, in 1998, that Ben Henry identified P.Oxy. 2507 as in same hand and from same roll as that first elegiac papyrus, P.Oxy. 854, published 90 years earlier in 1908. That demonstrated that P.Oxy. 2507 was indeed by Archilochus, and its aorist (fr. 61.11 ἐρρύσατο, fr. 62.2 ἔβη, ? 62.18?, fr. 62.8 ἐμήσατο) and imperfect verbs (fr. 61.14 λάμπετο) offered evidence that in elegiacs, as in trochaic tetrameters, he presented battle narratives, while the verb εἶπε τάδ (fr. 62.13) showed that this narrative encapsulated speeches.

Meanwhile a small but potentially significant addition had been proposed when in 1985 Peek published a very few scraps from the Parian Sosthenes inscription restoring them as martial exhortatory elegy:

fr. 7 West ἵτω πᾶς ἡπὶ δυμενέας ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἐχων καὶ ἀμείλιχον ἐν [φρει θυμόν, ἀλ]ευάμενος

fr. 7a West ἐξ ἐλάφων ν[...]

---

If this restoration as martial exhortation were correct, then it would be the first such Archilochean elegiac fragment. But the letters that can be read could equally well be supplemented as aorist indicative verbs, i.e. it could be another example of military narrative.

Almost sixty years of papyri, then, and one tiny epigraphic contribution, changed only very little the overall impression earlier formed of Archilochus’ elegies, but that little was important, since from the theme and the aorists of adesp. el. frr. 61 and 62 West it became apparent that he used his elegiacs not only for reflection or consolatory exhortation but also for war narrative, and a shipwreck of a different sort seems likely to have been found in our very scrappy fragments 9 and 10.

In the early twenty-first century, however, elegiac Archilochus began to catch up with iambic Archilochus. Not only was P.Oxy. 2507 identified by Ben Henry as in the same hand and from the same roll as P.Oxy. 854, but so too was the Telephus fragment which Dirk Obbink published in 2005 as P.Oxy. 4708 (now Archilochus fr. 17a Swift). Here was a substantial narrative of warfare set in the heroic age, deployed either as an exemplum or presented as a self-standing quasi-epic narrative.14 Dirk commented in the opening of a discussion published the next year: ‘Archilochus is hardly allowed an existence as an elegiac poet. No one would have suspected that he composed a long poem in elegiac couplets on a mythological theme’.15

That was not quite true. In the 1980s I suggested that narrative elegy for performance at public festivals might have handled myth, and that an example was to be found in Archilochus’ telling of Heracles’ killing of Nessus when he assaulted Deianeira.16 I made the further suggestion: ‘narrative of the deeds of Heracles would be appropriate entertainment at a festival associated with Heracles, whose cult was later important in Thasos’.17

Why did I suggest that Archilochean narrative elegy might have handled myth? I revisit here some testimonia that had received less attention than they should.

The first of these, Dio of Prusa’s Oration 60 (= fr. 286 West), shows that he knew a poem in which (in the context of Heracles’ killing of Nessus) a long speech was put into the mouth of Deianeira:

---

14 The 25 lines of surviving text are printed as below as Appendix, 2.
15 Obbink 2006, 2.
16 Bowie 1986, 34.
17 Bowie 1986, n.110.
Can you solve this problem for me, whether it is with justice or not that some criticise Archilochus, and some Sophocles, concerning the story of Nessus and Deianeira? For some say that Archilochus talks nonsense when his poem has Deianeira chanting a long tale to Heracles at the point when the Centaur is trying to rape her, reminding him of the wooing of Achelous and what had happened then—so that Nessus had plenty time to accomplish his will.

Archilochus’ telling of this incident was also known to the commentary drawn on by the scholia on Apollonius Rhodius 1.1212–1219a (p.110.14-16 Wendel = fr. 288 West):

φεύγων οὖν τὸν φόνον καὶ σὺν τῇ γαμετῇ στελλόμενος ἀνεῖλεν ἐν Εὐήνῳ ποταμῷ Νέσσον Κένταυρον, ὡς καὶ Αρχίλοχος ἱστορεῖ.

So fleeing from the (consequences of the) murder [of Oeneus’ son Cyathus] and setting off with his wife he killed the Centaur Nessus in the river Euenus, as Archilochus also tells.

It is only a guess that Longinus is also thinking of this poem when at de sublimitate 33.5 he asks his readers if they would rather be Archilochus or Eratosthenes:

ἀρ’ οὖν Ὅμηρος ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐθέλοις γενέσθαι; τί δὲ; Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῇ Ἑριγόνῃ (διὰ πάντων γὰρ ἀμώμητον τὸ ποιημάτιον) Ἀρχιλόχου πολλὰ καὶ ἀνοικονόμητα παρασύροντος, κάκεινς τῆς ἐκβολῆς τοῦ δαιμονίου πνεύματος ἢν ὑπὸ νόμον τάξαι δύσκολον, ἀρα δὴ μειζων ποιητής; τί δὲ; ἐν μέλει μάλλον ἂν εἶναι Βακχυλίδης ἐλεοῦ ἢ Πίνδαρος, καὶ ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ Ἰων ὁ Χῖος ἢ νὴ Δία Σοφοκλῆς;

But would you rather be Homer or Apollonius? Is the Eratosthenes of that flawless little poem Erigone a greater poet than Archilochus, with his abundant, uncontrolled flood, that bursting forth of the divine spirit which is so hard to bring under the rule of law? Take lyric poetry: would you rather be Bacchylides
or Pindar? Take tragedy: would you rather be Ion of Chios or Sophocles? (transl. Russell 1965)

Donald Russell thought that here Archilochus’ iambic poetry was in question, and I hesitate to disagree with a scholar who is almost always right. But on this point I think he was not: the Erigone of Eratosthenes was an elegiac narrative poem whose length is admittedly unknown, and of which we have very few fragments—but its aetiological narration must have been quite substantial. For Longinus’ comparison to be meaningful, what he was weighing against the mythical narrative of the Erigone must itself have been a mythical narrative of some length.

I return, therefore, to P.Oxy. 4708, with its 25 lines of narrative about Telephus repelling the attacking Argives who had mistaken his kingdom Mysia for Troy. I do not want to go into the extent to which Archilochus’ representation of the Argives’ mistake or of Telephus’ possible over-confidence is to any extent a subversion of (or a departure from) the stance of Homeric epic—this ground has been as well-trampled as the Mysian plain.18 I simply want to observe that the narrative that we have looks much more like hexameter heroic narrative than anything we previously had of Archilochus’ elegies, though of course if we had more of adespota elegiaca fr. 61 West this might not be so surprising.

Something I have already suggested in print and to which I want briefly to return is whether our traces of the first three lines are sufficient to establish that the Telephus narrative was related by the poet to some recent military episode in his own and his fellow Parians’ or Thasians’ lives. That depends largely on whether we restore the first person plural verb in line 3 as one referring to their actions. That was what was done by Dirk, first in 2005 and differently, after Martin West’s proposal, in 2006: I continue to think that a verb like ἐπιστάμεθ’ (‘we know’) or ἐδεξάμεθ’ (‘it has been handed down to us’) is possible.19 If that is so, then we may be dealing with a poem which offered a self-standing narrative of Telephus’ heroic resistance to the Achaeans, albeit one into which Archilochus moves via a gnome. What stood before that gnome can only be guessed.

The chances that there was such a self-standing mythical narrative, like that of Heracles and Deianeira, are increased by a quotation by Sto-

---


19 The different supplements are printed below as Appendix, 3.
baeus from Telephus which he ascribed to Euripides (adespota elegiaca fr. 24 West, Kannicht, TrGrF fr. 702):

Εὐριπίδου ἐκ Τηλέφου:

tόλμ' ἀεὶ, κἂν τι τρηχὺ νέμωσι θεοὶ.

(A line) of Euripides from the Telephus:

‘Always be bold, even if the gods are dispensing something nasty’

Stobaeus 4.10.10

Nauck emended the text transmitted by the manuscripts of Stobaeus to create an iambic trimeter:

tόλμα σὺ, κἂν τι τραχὺ νείμωσιν θεοὶ.

‘be bold, even if the gods are dispensing something nasty’

If the line has been correctly transmitted as a pentameter the ascription to a play of Euripides is extremely unlikely, and it is possible that Stobaeus or a source of Stobaeus assumed that a work entitled Telephus must be the famous tragedy of Euripides (from which indeed Stobaeus elsewhere quotes several lines). But the pentameter may in fact have been from an elegiac poem on Telephus, and I have suggested that it was from Archilochus’ poem discovered on P.Oxy. 4708, and that it thus demonstrates that this poem circulated under a title.

If we can tentatively suppose the existence in the Hellenistic and Roman period of two mythological elegiac narrative poems by Archilochus, a Telephus and a Deianeira, is it a coincidence that both works give a prominent role to Heracles? I have argued elsewhere that they were composed for first performance in one of Heracles’ sanctuaries on Thasos, where his cult was one of the most important in the city founded by Parian colonists in the seventh century BC.

How, then, has our perception of Archilochus’ elegiac production changed? I think we should now believe in the transmission until at least the end of the first century AD of some mythological elegiac narrative by Archilochus, and P.Oxy. 4708 shows that, like Simonides’ Plataea poem, such a longer elegy could circulate on the same roll as shorter poems. If so, how were the shorter and longer poems arranged? The parallels of our notices on Semonides, Solon and Tyrtaeus suggest to me

---

20 Stobaeus has several citations of Euripides’ Telephus: 3.13.3, 3.20.36, 3.22.32, 3.29.10 = 3.29.25a, 3.29.55, 3.39.9, 4.31c 64, 4.33.11.
21 Bowie 2010.
that if a long poem by an early elegist were transmitted, it was placed first in a roll, then the shorter poems followed.
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 Appendix 1

Elegiac fragments of Archilochus known before the publication of papyri:

Frr. 1–6 and 8–17 West (below) are simply what was available in Pontow (1885) and Diehl (1952):

εἰμὶ δ’ ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος …
I am the attendant of the lord Enyalios and, knowing the lovely gift of the Muses …
Fr. 1 West = Athenaeus 627c, Plutarch, *Phocion* 7.6 (with ἀμφότερον in place of εἰμὶ δ’ ἐγὼ)

ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορὶ δ’ οἶνος Ἰσμαρικός· πίνω δ’ ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος.
In my spear is my kneaded bread, in my spear my wine from Ismaros; and I drink reclining, spear in hand.
Fr. 2 West = Athenaeus 30f (epitome), Synesius *epist.* 129b, Suda s.v. Ἰσμαρικός οἶνος
οὔτοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται, οὐδὲ θαμειαὶ σφενδόναι, εὖτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγηι ἐν πεδίῳ· ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον· ταύτης γὰρ κεῖνοι δάμονες εἰσι μάχης δεσπόται Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί …

I tell you, not many bows will be taut-drawn, nor will there be serried slings, when Ares brings together his melee in the plain—but there will be grievous work of swords: for that is the sort of battle in which these men are skilled the lords of Euboea famed for their spears …

Fr. 3 West = Plutarch, Theseus 5.2–3

έλ' ἂγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηὸς φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώμα' ἄφελκε κάδων, ἄγρει δ' οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῆι τῆιδε δυνησόμεθα.

But come, pass along with a bowl by the benches of the swift ship and tear the seals off the bulbous jars And slurp the red wine down to its leas: for we too will not be able to stay sober in guard duty like this.

Fr. 4 West = Athenaeus 483d

ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαΐων τις ἀγάλλεται, ἢν παρὰ θάμνωι, ἐντὸς ἀμώμητον, κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων· αὐτὸν δ' ἐξεσάωσα. τί μοι μέλει ἀσπὶς ἐκείνη; ἔρρέτω· ἐξαὐτὶς κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω.

One of the Saioi is cock-a-hoop over my shield, which beside a bush blameless weapon—I abandoned, against my will. But me myself I got to safety. What does that shield matter to me? Let it go! Next time I’ll get one that is no worse.

Fr. 5 West = Ar. Pax 1298–9, 1301 (1–3), Strabo 10.2.17 & 12.3.20 (1–2), Plutarch Inst. Lac. 34 = mor. 239b (without αὐτὸν δ' ἐξεσάωσα. τί μοι μέλει), Sextus Emp. Pyrrh. hyp. 3.216 (1–3, but in 3 reading αὐτὸς δ' ἐξέφυγον θανάτου τέλος)

— 33 —
ξείνια δυσμενέσιν λυγρὰ χαριζόμενοι
Bestowing on the foe grievous guest-gifts
Fr. 6 West = Σ Sophocles Electra 96,
Suda s.vn. ἐξένισεν and ξένια καὶ ξενίζω

πολλὰ δ’ ἐυπλοκάμου πολιῆς ἀλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι
θεσάμενοι γλυκερὸν νόστον
and many times in the expanses of the grey brine with its fair curls
they prayed for a sweet return home
Fr. 8 West = Σ Apollonius Rhodius 1.824

εἰ κείνου κεφαλὴν καὶ χαρίεντα μέλεα
“Ἡφαιστος καθαροῖσιν ἐν εἵμασιν ἀμφεπονήθη
(Archilochus, lamenting his sister’s brother lost at sea,
says that he would have borne the disaster with greater restraint)
if that man’s head and graceful limbs
had had Hephaestus do his work upon them wrapped in clean garments
Fr. 9.10–11 West = Plu. de aud.poet. 6 = mor. 23b

οὔτε τι γὰρ κλαίων ἰήσομαι, οὔτε κάκιον
θήσω τερπωλὰς καὶ θαλίας ἐφέπων.
For neither by weeping shall I heal myself, nor shall I make it worse
by going to jollifications and banquets
Fr. 11 West = Plu. de aud.poet. 12
= mor. 33ab, Tzetzes Alleg. Homer. Ω 130ff

κρύπτομεν ἄνιηρὰ Ποσειδάωνος ἄνακτος
dῶρα.
We hide away the painful gifts of the lord Poseidon
Fr. 12 West =Σ [Aes.] Prometheus Vinctus 616 on δωρεάν
τοίους γὰρ κατὰ κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης
ἐκλυσεν, οἰδαλέους δ’ ἀμφ’ ὀδύνηις ἔχομεν
πνεύμονας. ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνηκέστοις κακοῖσιν
ὡ φίλ’ ἔπι κρατερὴν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν
φάρμακον. ἀλλοτέ ἄλλοις ἔχει τόδε· υὐν μὲν ἐς ἡμέας
ἔτραπεθ’, αἴματόεν δ’ ἐλκὸς ἀναστένομεν,
ἐξαὐτής δ’ ἐτέρους ἐπαμείψεται. ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
τλῆτε, γυναικείου πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι.

Our cries of mourning for the dead, Pericles, will draw none of our fellow-citizens’ blame, and they will not take pleasure in banquets, nor the city either: for such are the men that the wave of the much-surging sea has washed down, and swollen by the pains are our lungs. But after all, the gods for irremediable woes, my friend, have set up endurance as a powerful medicine. One faces this at one time, one at another. For now it is us on whom it has turned, and we cry over a bloody wound, but another time it will move on to others. So quickly, choose endurance, thrusting away lament that is for women.

Fr. 13 West = Stobaeus 4.56 (παρηγορικά).30

Αἰσιμίδη, δήμου μὲν ἐπίρρησιν μελεδαίνων
οὐδεὶς ἂν μάλα πόλλ’ ἱμερόεντα πάθοι.

Aesimides, if one cared about the rebukes of the people nobody would enjoy very many lovely things.

Fr. 14 West = Orion, Ἐτυμολ. col.55.22.Sturz

Γλαῦκ’, ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τόσσον φίλος ἔσκε μάχηται

Glaucus, an ally is a friend only so long as he fights

Fr. 15 West = Aristotle, Ἐθ. Εὔδημ. H 2, 1236a33 (ὡσπερ ἡ παροιμία)

πάντα Τύχη καὶ Μοῖρα Περίκλεες ἀνδρὶ δίδωσιν

Chance and Fate, Pericles, give everything to a man

Fr. 16 West = Stobaeus 1.6.3
Appendix 2

The text of P.Oxy. 4708 fr. 1 lines 1–25 (= Archilochus fr. 17a Swift) as printed by Obbink (2006):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{εἰ δὲ} & . \quad [\ldots]\ldots [\ldots] . \quad [\ldots] . \quad \text{θεοὺς κρατερῆς ὑπὲρ ἀνάγκης} \\
& . \quad \text{oυ χρῆς ἀντιληπτῶν καὶ κακῶτητα λέγειν} \quad [\ldots] \\
\text{πιθηκόων} & . \quad \text{εὖς [εὐμεθα δὲ] ἑγεῖν φυγεῖν} \quad \text{εὐν δὲ τὰς ὀργαὶ καὶ ποτε} \quad \text{μοῦνος ἐσκόλων Τήλεφος Ἀρκαίδης} \\
\text{Ἀργείων} & . \quad \text{εὐρρέειν ὄρη} \quad \text{ἀλκιμωτερον \ποτε μοῦνος ἐσκόλων Τήλεφος} \\
\text{στρατόπεδον} & . \quad \text{Ἀρκαίδης} \quad \text{Ἀργείων ὑπὲρ} \quad \text{μεὶνος Τήλεφος} \\
\text{Μύσιον, οἱ δ' ἐπὶ} & . \quad \text{τὸς} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{καὶ} \quad \text{ἄλκιμωτερον} \\
& \quad \text{χήρας} \quad \text{ὑπὲρ} \quad \text{μεὶνος} \quad \text{καὶ} \quad \text{ἀλκιμωτερον} \\
\text{προτράπην} & . \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{ποτε} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \\
\text{παῖδες τ' ἀθανάτων} & . \quad \text{καὶ} \quad \text{ἄδελφοι} \quad \text{οὐς} \quad \text{Ἀγαμέμνων} \\
\text{Ἰλιον} & . \quad \text{ eius} \quad \text{ἤγεος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \\
& \quad \text{οὐς} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \\
\text{τὸς} & . \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \\
\text{ἢρείδες} & \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \\
\text{Ἥρακλῆς} & . \quad \text{ὕτως} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \\
\text{Τήλεφος} & . \quad \text{ἄρος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \quad \text{μεῖνος} \\
\end{align*}
\]
My English translation of the text of *P.Oxy.* 4078 2-25 (= Archilochus fr. 17a Swift) as it was presented in Obbink 2006:

5   Indeed once, though alone, Telephus of the stock of Arcasus terrified into flight a large host of Argives, and they fled in fear, valiant men—indeed so much fear did the gods’ destiny bring—and spearmen though they were: and the broad stream of the Caicus was choked with corpses as they fell, as was the plain of Mysia: and they to the strand of the sea with its many breakers being slaughtered by the hands of a man without mercy turned their course pell-mell, these Achaeans with fine greaves,]

and gladly climbed into their swift-travelling ships, the sons and brothers of immortals, [whom Agamemnon]

15   was leading to holy Ilion to fight. But at that time they had lost their way and reached the strand and put ashore at the lovely city of Teuthras, and there, snorting might, they and their horses alike, because of their witlessness their spirit was mightily cast down: for they thought that they were climbing up into the high-gated city of the Trojans forthwith—but to no purpose did they tread wheat-growing Mysia. [But Heracl]es came to face them, shouting to his stout-hearted [son], an implacable bulwark in the war with the foe, Telephus, who then struck cowardly flight into the Danaans as he pressed forward before the

25   lines, giving pleasure to his father.

Appendix 3

*Supplements to P.Oxy. 4708 fr. 1, line 3:*

Obbink 2005: [νῶτ’] ἐ[τρεψά]μεθ’ α[ἶψ]α φυγεῖν

‘we turned our backs immediately to take flight’
(West had proposed εἵμεθα)
‘[well did we hasten] to flee our [hostile woes]’

Bowie ap. Obbink 2006:
ἐπιστά]μεθ' α[ e.g. [νῶι δ' ἐπιστά]μεθ' α[ἰψ]α φυγεῖν,
‘we two know how to take flight immediately’ OR
[π]ή[ματ' ἐπιστά]μεθ' ἄ[λλα φυγεῖν
‘we know how to escape from other woes’

Bowie 2010: ἦ[ρω' ἐδεξά]μεθ' ἄ[νδρα φυγεῖν· φεῦγ[ον γὰρ Ἀχαιοί …
‘we have received a tradition that a warrior who was a hero fled: for the Achaean began to flee …’

Appendix 4

The order of poets’ elegiac works in notices in Diogenes Laertius and the Suda:

Semonides: Suda Σ 446
Σιμωνίδης, Κρίνεω, Αιμοργίνος, ιαμβογράφος. ἔγραψεν ἐλεγείαν ἐν βιβλίοις β', ιάμβους. γέγονε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ ϟ' καὶ υ'
He wrote an elegy in 2 books, and iamboi.

Solon: Suda Σ 776
… ἔγραψε νόμους Αθηναίοις, οὗ τινες "Ἀξονες ὑνομάσθησαν διὰ τὸ γραφήναι αὐτοὺς ἐν ἑυλίνοις ἄξοιν Αθήναις: ποίημα δι’ ἐλεγείων, ὁ Σαλαμῖς ἐπιγράφεται: 'Ὑποθήκας δι’ ἐλεγείας' καὶ ἄλλα
… a poem in elegiacs, which is entitled Salamis; Admonitions in elegy; and other things
Solon: Diogenes Laertius 1.61

γέγραφε δὲ δὴ λοι μὲν ὅτι τοὺς νόμους, καὶ δημηγορίας καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ὑποθήκας, ἐλεγεία, καὶ τὰ περὶ Σαλαμῖνος καὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας ἔπη πεντακισχίλια, καὶ ἰάμβους καὶ ἐπῳδούς

He of course wrote the laws, and public speeches and Admonitions to himself, elegies, and the work on Salamis and the constitution of Athens, 5000 lines, and iamboi and epodes.

Tyrtaeus: Suda T 1205

… ἔγραψε πολιτείαν Λακεδαιμονίοις, καὶ ὑποθήκας δι’ ἐλεγείας, καὶ μέλη πολεμιστήρια, βιβλία εʹ …

… he wrote a Constitution for the Spartans, and Admonitions in elegy, and War songs, 5 books …
Reconfiguring Archilochus.
How have papyri and inscriptions changed perceptions of Archilochus’ iambic and elegiac poetry?

Ewen L. Bowie

Abstract

This paper explores the ways in which the publication of new texts preserved on papyri and inscriptions substantially changed our understanding of what a book of Archilochus’ iambic or elegiac poetry would have been like. The papyri (of which the first was published in 1891, but the majority in the 1920s and 1950s) showed that Archilochus’ iamboi had at least as much narrative as invective—narrative relating to polis concerns like war (also attested in epigraphic snippets) and to the private, and especially sexual, life of the persona loquens. This last was most strikingly shown by the Cologne epodes published in 1974. The elegiac corpus, whose few quoted poems or fragments were chiefly sympotic and encouraged a view of Archilochus’ poetic persona as anti-heroic, benefited less than iambi from papyrus finds until in 2005 the Oxyrhynchus ‘Telephus’ was published. Its 25 lines narrating Telephus’ rout of the Achaeans who disembarked in Mysia, mistaking it for Troy, corroborated the underexploited indications of Longinus and Dio that Archilochus used elegiacs for mythical narrative.