

### XVIII. The Authorship of the Strasbourg Epodes

G. M. KIRKWOOD

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

In the new Budé edition of Archilochus, published in 1958, just one sentence is devoted to the Strasbourg Epodes: "As to the three fragments known as the Strasbourg Epodes, . . . it seems to us that their case has been judged, after fifty years of debate and the recent revision of their texts: they must be ascribed to Hipponax."<sup>1</sup> In his edition of Archilochus in the Tusculum-Bücherei series, published in 1959, Max Treu ascribes all three poems to Archilochus.<sup>2</sup> It seems that the controversy is not yet settled. The present study takes its rise from a reading of the fragments of Archilochus and Hipponax in close conjunction, and the resulting conviction that the first of the epodes in question, No. 79a in Diehl's *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*,<sup>3</sup> has a strong resemblance, in style and spirit, to other known poetry of Archilochus and is strikingly unlike everything else that we know of Hipponax. This conviction led to a re-examination of the evidence that has been used in the course of the controversy to assign the poems to one or another of the two poets, and my re-examination has made me believe that the available evidence has not yet been properly evaluated. Specifically, I am convinced that the grounds that have been used to deny the first poem to Archilochus have been inadequate, that evidence pointing clearly to Archilochus as author of this poem has been undervalued, and that the possibility that these fragments are from an anthology has been too readily dismissed. I shall argue that Epode One (79a) is by Archilochus, Epode Three (80) by Hipponax. Epode Two (79b), consisting of a few scattered

<sup>1</sup> *Archiloque, Fragments*, texte établi par François Lasserre, traduit et commenté par André Bonnard (Paris 1958) xci. The revision referred to is presumably that of Schwartz, on which see below, note 6. There are two fragments of papyrus containing fragments of three poems.

<sup>2</sup> *Archilochos* (Munich 1959) 227. Treu's note (224-28) on the controversy over these fragments gives a good summary of its history and present state.

<sup>3</sup> Numbers referring to Greek poems throughout this paper are to Diehl except in the case of Alcaeus and Sappho, where they are to Lobel-Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*.

letters of the first three verses of a poem, provides no usable evidence and can appropriately be omitted from discussion.<sup>4</sup>

The epodes are written on two small pieces of papyrus which were first edited by R. Reitzenstein in 1899<sup>5</sup> with the collaboration of Bruno Keil, H. Diels and Wilamowitz. The two pieces are from the same papyrus roll but not from the same column, though perhaps from adjacent columns. The text of the two fragments is by the same hand. The text of the first fragment consists of the last thirteen lines of an epode in a fairly good state of preservation, preceded by traces showing that there were at least three lines before these thirteen,<sup>6</sup> and followed by three extremely fragmentary lines beginning a second poem. There is little or no extra space to mark the division between these poems, but there is a *paragraphus*. The second fragment consists of ten rather poorly preserved lines, including neither the beginning nor the end of the poem, which is almost certainly in the same meter as the first fragment. Both fragments have scholia, legible for the most part, written interlinearly (Poems One and Three) and in the right margin (Poem One only), and two other notes, illegible, in the left margin of the first fragment, one at the top of the fragment, the other just above and below the *paragraphus*. Reitzenstein called these two notes "Inhaltsangabe," thinking that they might be somehow introductory to the two poems; but they may simply be explanatory notes to individual passages as the other notes are. All the notes are written in a different hand from that of the text.

The first poem is a curse, uttered by the poet against a former comrade who has betrayed him and for whom the poet wishes shipwreck, capture by the Thracians in far-off Salmydessus and a life of slavery. The intensity of feeling, the clarity of utterance and the Homeric echoes all make the poem Archilochian; it is by far the best example of invective poetry extant from the archaic period. The second fragment is much less readily comprehensible,

<sup>4</sup> F. Lasserre, *Les Épodes d' Archiloque* (Paris 1950) 280-83, finds in the scraps of Poem Two grounds of metrical usage and dialect against Archilochian authorship, but his arguments are based on so much hazardous reconstruction of words that they cannot be regarded as serious evidence. Cf. O. Masson, *REG* 64 (1951) 432.

<sup>5</sup> "Zwei neue Fragmente der Epoden des Archilochos," *Sitzungsb. d. könig. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin*, 1899, pages 857-64, with one plate.

<sup>6</sup> Some points in the description of the fragments are taken from an examination made by J. Schwartz, curator of papyri at the University of Strasbourg, on behalf of Olivier Masson, and described by Masson in his article "Encore les 'Épodes de Strasbourg'," *REG* 64 (1951) 427-42.

both because it is less well preserved and because its diction is intrinsically less clear and flowing. Two facts about its contents are beyond dispute: it contains a good deal of abuse, and it contains several personal names, among them in all probability the name Hipponax in line 3.<sup>7</sup>

Reitzenstein ascribed both fragments to Archilochus. Although he did not suggest the possibility of different authorship for the two fragments, he noticed the marked difference in style.<sup>8</sup> Thus the *editio princeps* established one of the three classic positions in the controversy to come. The other two were proposed within a year. F. Blass<sup>9</sup> ascribed both fragments to Hipponax; H. Jurenka,<sup>10</sup> the first to Archilochus and the second to Hipponax. There have been some deviators from these three positions, G. Coppola,<sup>11</sup> for example, in 1929 assigning both fragments to a Hellenistic imitator of the iambists; but debate has clung mainly to these three positions. To mention only the most important contributions, G. Perrotta<sup>12</sup> in 1938 made out a case for Hipponax, relying mainly on stylistic criteria and on the presence of *corruptio Attica* in both poems, this last point having been introduced incidentally by R. Pfeiffer in the course of an article on new fragments of Callimachus.<sup>13</sup> In 1944 R. Cantarella<sup>14</sup> renewed Jurenka's proposal that the first fragment be assigned to Archilochus, the second to Hipponax. Olivier Masson at first in 1947 agreed with

<sup>7</sup> The most extensively restored text is that of J. M. Edmonds, *Elegy and Iambus* 2 (1931) 150, 152. Even with his perhaps over-optimistic readings and restorations, the lines are enigmatic.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 5) 864. In spite of the presence of the name Hipponax (which is by no means a common name; the poet is the only Hipponax in Pape-Benseler), neither Reitzenstein nor his learned collaborators appear to have considered ascription to Hipponax, probably because they thought that a scholion indicated that the Hipponax of line 3 was a "digger," and restored line 3 as 'Ἰππῶναξ σκαφεύς, thus ruling out the poet. Schwartz' re-examination of the papyrus has yielded a different reading of this scholion, and the restoration σκαφεύς is no longer worth considering.

<sup>9</sup> "Die neuen Fragmente griechischen Epoden," *RhM* 55 (1900) 341-47.

<sup>10</sup> *Archilochos von Paros*, Progr. Wien 1900. Jurenka, unlike subsequent critics who propose a division, ascribes to Hipponax not only the second fragment but (under the influence of Blass' reading of a marginal note, on which see below, page 270) also the second poem of the first fragment. Thus he does not quite represent what I have called a classic position, but the difference is of no importance for the present study.

<sup>11</sup> "Archiloco o imitazione ellenistica?" *Stud. ital. di filol. class.* n. s. 7 (1929) 155-68.

<sup>12</sup> "Il poeta degli epodi di Strasburgo," *Stud. ital. di filol. class.* n. s. 15 (1938) 3-41.

<sup>13</sup> *Philologus* 88 (1933) 269-71.

<sup>14</sup> "Gli epodi di Strasburgo," *Aegyptus* 24 (1944) 1-112.

this decision,<sup>15</sup> but then in 1951<sup>16</sup> changed his mind and named Hipponax author of both, chiefly because he thought it improbable that these fragments belonged to an anthology. In the third edition of Diehl's *Anthologia lyrica Graeca* (1952) both fragments, though they keep their place among the fragments of Archilochus, are bracketed as being non-Archilochian. This is another reversal, the second edition having ascribed them to Archilochus. Finally, as I mentioned at the outset, the new Budé text names Hipponax author; and the even newer edition by Treu names Archilochus.

It is easy to trace the general drift of thought in these varying ascriptions. Reitzenstein was chiefly influenced by the first poem, the only readily readable passage, and because of its somber power and intensity of feeling quite naturally assigned it to Archilochus. If the first poem were an isolated fragment, or even if only the first fragment existed, the attribution would probably never have been seriously questioned. But there is the second fragment, from the same roll, and containing, in all likelihood, the name Hipponax in its third line. Hipponax is not a common name;<sup>17</sup> Hipponax the poet liked to mention himself in his verse; Hipponax as well as Archilochus wrote epodes. Probably only the misinterpretation of a scholion (see note 8, above) kept Reitzenstein from thinking of the possibility that Hipponax was author of the second fragment. The presence of the name is the first point made by the first proposer of Hipponax as author, Blass in 1900, and this remains the most telling point for Hipponax. Blass made another point which he thought decisive; he read the left-margin note opposite line 14 of Poem One and line 1 of Poem Two as *ση]μαίνει τὸν Βού]παλον* and took it to be a note to lines 13 and 14, explaining *ἐταῖρον* as referring to Boupalus and thus clearly establishing Hipponax as author of this poem too. It was this reading that caused Blass to assign both fragments to Hipponax, and the august authority of his name has regularly been invoked by those who ascribe both fragments to Hipponax. It is therefore pertinent to observe that Blass' reading of this note was not confirmed but shown to be most improbable by Schwartz' re-exami-

<sup>15</sup> "Les 'Épodes de Strasbourg': Archiloque ou Hipponax?" *REG* 59 (1947) 8-27.

<sup>16</sup> "Encore les 'Épodes de Strasbourg'," *REG* 64 (1951) 427-42.

<sup>17</sup> No name other than Hipponax that begins with *Ἰππῶνα-* is listed in Pape-Benseler or in the indices of the relevant volumes of *IG*.

nation of the papyrus, which confirms Reitzenstein's reading, ]λαινει. Moreover, the position of the note makes it more likely to be a heading to the second poem, as Reitzenstein took it to be, than a note to lines 13-14.

Not only Reitzenstein but the other critics who ascribe both fragments to Archilochus have been influenced most by Poem One. Conversely, those critics who think Hipponax wrote both have been swayed chiefly by the second fragment. The principal grounds that have been used to deny Archilochian authorship of the first poem are precisely two in number: the presence of Attic correction in Fragment One as well as in Fragment Two, and the alleged improbability of the papyrus' having been an anthology. Points of diction and style in Poem One have been offered as arguments against Archilochus, especially in Perrotta's study (above, note 12), but they are by no means convincing. Such arguments are always doubtful in connection with a fragmentarily preserved author, and further recovery of the author's works has a way of contradicting assumptions made on too narrow a basis. Thus, in this case, one of Perrotta's grounds of diction is the use of the definite article. He maintained that Archilochus never used it as an article but always with its original demonstrative force,<sup>18</sup> and that its use in line 7 of Poem One is therefore un-Archilochian. There are, in fact, two apparent examples of this word as an article in known fragments of Archilochus, which Perrotta satisfies himself to be not what they seem but to have demonstrative force. There is, moreover, some doubt as to whether this "article" in line 7 has not some demonstrative force. But all these doubts are unnecessary, since the entire question is settled by the most recent major papyrus recovery of poetry of Archilochus, *POxy.* 2310, Fr. 1, which is now the longest passage of Archilochus that we have, and which contains two more evident examples of the article.<sup>19</sup> Like so many pronouncements made on little evidence, this one requires modification in the light of further information. It remains true that Archilochus usually employs the definite article with its original or Homeric demonstrative force, but we cannot regard exceptions to this usage as evidence against Archilochian

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 12) 8.

<sup>19</sup> *POxy.* 22 (1954) 2310, Fr. 1(a), line 11, τῆς ἀνολβείης, line 15 τὸ]ν ἐχθρόν. Both have the same degree of possibility that the article may be demonstrative as the example under consideration has.

authorship. Questions of usage must be left aside as criteria of authenticity, unless they are much more striking than this.

Let us consider now the two grounds which have been taken as serious evidence against Archilochus as author of Poem One. First there is the matter of *correptio Attica*, the phenomenon, common in classical and later prosody, whereby mute plus liquid does not make metrical length, as in line 2 of this poem, κύμασσι πλαζόμενος. The general picture in Homer and in early lyric, iambic, and elegiac is that mute plus liquid nearly always makes length but occasionally does not. Examples of this correption are not rare in Homer, even though in the enormous majority of cases the syllable is long.<sup>20</sup> There are one or two examples in Alcman (48, perhaps 71), four in Sappho (16, line 19; 44, lines 8 and 14; 105), one in Alcaeus (Z 8, line 1), one in Mimnermus (2, line 10); one in Semonides (1, line 13), and two in other extant fragments of Archilochus (14, 28). Several of these occurrences have been questioned by some critics, including both the Archilochian examples. In Fragment 14 the grounds are that the line is not Archilochian because of the use of μελέτη. But the word occurs in a similar sense in Hesiod and is, later, quite particularly an Ionic word, much used in the Hippocratic works; and since this line is ascribed to Archilochus by an ancient writer, the grounds for denying its authenticity are not convincing. In Fragment 28, the word involved in the correption is a *hapax* and has been emended away variously, most persuasively by Wilamowitz.<sup>21</sup> The tendency to emend *correptio Attica* out of existence is very strong. Thus in Sappho 16, line 19, Page arbitrarily alters κὰν ὄπλοισι to καὶ πανόπλοισι. For a while Sappho 44 was thought to be spurious, and so the two examples there were not disturbing. No recent editor or critic has suggested, and nobody is likely to suggest, that the poem is spurious; but refuge can now be had in the fact that 44, like 105, which has the fourth Sapphic instance of correption, belongs to what Lobel has named the "abnormal" style of Sappho. The example in Alcaeus (Z 8, line 1) has been emended away by Lobel.<sup>22</sup> The example in

<sup>20</sup> Correption in Homer: ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*passim*); μή μ' ἔρεθε, σχετλή, *Iliad* 3.414; often in names.

<sup>21</sup> For ἔβρυζε Wilamowitz proposed ἔμυζε. For discussion see Diehl<sup>3</sup>, *ad. loc.* Not only Diehl<sup>3</sup>, but Lasserre-Bonnard and Treu print this conjecture. Yet as Diehl<sup>2</sup> points out, there is much to be said stylistically for ἔμυζε.

<sup>22</sup> The emendation is πέρ βίαν for πρὸς βίαν. But it is by no means certain that πρὸς βίαν cannot convey much the same meaning as πέρ βίαν.

Semonides of Amorgus is daggered in Diehl<sup>3</sup>, and various unsatisfactory conjectures have been proposed. Surely it is more reasonable to accept the fact that now and then the early lyric poets admit this metrical exception, just as Homer does, than to maintain this desperate resistance against a mounting tide of instances. If we turn to the Strasbourg fragments, we find in Poem One five instances of mute plus liquid making length, and one case of correption. In Poem Three there is one instance and perhaps a second of correption, no clear cases of length. The usage of Poem Three would be surprising for Archilochus but not for Hipponax. The usage of Poem One accords with the pattern of early usage that we have been observing. Not for a moment would I suggest that the proportion of lengthening to correption is an argument for Archilochus as author, but I insist that it is no argument at all against Archilochus as author.

A far more substantial problem is present in the other argument which has been widely used to deny Epode One to Archilochus, the belief that the Strasbourg fragments cannot be, or are most unlikely to be, pieces of an anthology. Masson in his 1951 article (above, note 16) declares that, while those who have supposed that the two fragments are by different authors have had to accept the idea of an anthology, they have not defended this possibility with much conviction. Lasserre brands the notion of an anthology as "entirely improbable";<sup>23</sup> and Treu, undaunted by correption, assigns both fragments to Archilochus with the comment that the possibility of an anthology is very probably to be ruled out.<sup>24</sup> Yet even without papyrological experience one can readily see, by reading what the papyrologists tell us about anthologies found in papyri, that the grounds on which this possibility have been dismissed are very far from being conclusive. Only two writers on the present topic have given any grounds at all for ruling out an anthology. These are Masson and Treu, and indeed Treu simply accepts Masson's grounds.

One begins, of course, with the undeniable fact that two fragments from the same roll and apparently in the same meter are likely to be by the same author. But when against this general probability there is set the fact that in this case the second fragment contains a piece of evidence that strongly suggests that it is

<sup>23</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 4) 278, note.

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 2) 225.

by one author, Hipponax, while the first fragment is foreign to Hipponax and akin to another author, Archilochus, then it seems necessary to examine the evidence concerning anthologies to see just how improbable this possibility, which the other circumstances of the case strongly suggest, really is.

Masson<sup>25</sup> gives several particulars in which the Strasbourg fragments seem unlike an anthology: two poems presumably by the same author are separated by only the *paragraphus* (Poem One and Poem Two); there are notes of various kinds; and the poems have nothing in common except the meter. No anthology found on papyrus, according to Masson, possesses these characteristics. Masson must mean that no one anthology has been found that possesses all three characteristics, for, as I shall presently show, there are in fact several papyrus anthologies paralleling two of these three characteristics. Masson adds that one expects to find poems reproduced more or less fragmentarily and on the verso of a previously used papyrus.

I do not question the validity of Masson's list of characteristics of a normal papyrus anthology. Yet it is clear to whoever examines some of the available evidence that there is much diversity among anthologies that have turned up in the papyri, that most of the grounds on which the Strasbourg fragments are dismissed can be repeatedly paralleled, and that anthologies diverging far more conspicuously from Masson's norm than this one have been found.

The classic anthologies such as Stobaeus or the *Palatine Anthology* have, of course, a high degree of organization, with adjacent poems or excerpts closely related in subject matter, with the name of the author at the head of each piece or, when two or more consecutive selections are by the same author, with the heading τοῦ αὐτοῦ. But exceptions to this degree of organization, and even to this pattern of arrangement, are common. Even without recourse to papyri, one anthology can be mentioned that probably had no ascriptions and very little unity of content, the collection of Attic scholia preserved in Book 15 of Athenaeus. Since Athenaeus mentions the author, Hybrias of Crete, of just one poem, the final one given, presumably he did not have the names of the authors of the rest of the group of poems. These poems are not all alike in meter, nor have they unity of subject, apart from the rather

<sup>25</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 16) 439-40.

general fact that all are suitable for singing at a symposium. Yet they were, presumably, an anthology.

Among anthologies preserved in papyri, there are at least four examples that fit Masson's criteria less well than the Strasbourg fragments. But perhaps more important than these individual cases, which I shall describe briefly in a moment, is the opinion of a scholar who has devoted much research to papyrus anthologies. John Barns, in an article published in 1950 in which a description of a newly discovered gnomic anthology is followed by some general remarks on gnomic anthologies, stresses the variety which characterizes ancient anthologies:

If we examine them individually, it will be at once apparent that the term has been applied to compilations so widely different that the only thing which all have in common is the fact that they are compilations. Some contain short pieces each complete in itself, others mainly selected passages from longer works; some have only verse, some only prose, others both; some confine themselves to the works of a single author, others draw from many; the length of the pieces chosen also varies extremely.<sup>26</sup>

Barns finds one unifying principle in all the anthologies known to him, unity of purpose; and he divides these collections into two categories, those which he calls the *stephanos* type of anthology, such as the Garland of Meleager, which were designed to entertain, and those called *gnomologia*, which are devoted to moral wisdom and were designed to edify; the *Florilegium* of Stobaeus is an example. Masson quotes Barns' twofold classification with apparent approval, and says that the Strasbourg Epodes cannot be accommodated in either group.<sup>27</sup> I would be inclined to say, rather, that if the Strasbourg fragments are pieces of an anthology, they provide so little evidence about that anthology that it would be impossible to exclude it from either class. It is surely wrong to say that there is no apparent connection in content between the two poems. Poem One is quite obviously an example of invective poetry, and it is certainly of a quality that would make it anthology material. There are not very many things clear about Poem Three, but one of the few things that can be detected for sure in it is personal abuse or invective. It is not very difficult to suppose

<sup>26</sup> J. Barns, "A New Gnomologium: with Some Remarks on Gnomic Anthologies (I)," *CQ* 44 (1950) 126-37.

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 16) 441-42.

that these are parts of an anthology of invective poetry, perhaps all short poems (as these *appear* to be), but perhaps not all even complete poems, perhaps all in the same meter, but more likely not (since we have very few examples of poetry in just this meter), perhaps all epodes, perhaps not.

On the general grounds of Barns' criteria, there seems little justification for ruling out the possibility of an anthology, especially since there is a known anthology whose contents seem to have just about the same kind of unifying principle. I refer to the anthology of choliambic poems found in *PHeid.* 310 and published in G. A. Gerhard's *Phoinix von Kolophon*,<sup>28</sup> with a plate illustrating the principal fragments of the papyrus. It contains three pieces, of which the first and third are incomplete. All three are in scazons, the first is by an unknown writer and is an attack on avarice; the second, on the false sense of values men have, is headed "Ἰαμβος Φοίνικος; the third, again anonymous, seems to be an attack on pederasty. The left margin is missing at the beginning of the third piece, so we cannot tell how or whether it was given a heading as the poem by Phoenix is. Here, then, is an anthology consisting of three poems or pieces in the same meter, with some kind of unity of idea but only the slightest connection of content. None of the pieces is of high poetic merit. "Doggerel," A. D. Knox unkindly, but not unjustly, called the lines on avarice.<sup>29</sup> This anthology is on the recto of the papyrus, there being only a few scattered words written on the verso.

*PTeb.* 1 is another comparable anthology.<sup>30</sup> It consists of several excerpts written on the recto of the papyrus. The extracts are divided only by the *paragraphus*; there is no extra space left, and there is no identification of the author. The pieces are totally unlike in form and content; "a curiously heterogeneous collection," Page calls it and comments that Wilamowitz suggested that it "may be the result of a writing-lesson (pieces dictated by a master to a pupil learning orthography)."<sup>31</sup> The first selection is a lyric piece in cretic meter, probably not a complete

<sup>28</sup> Leipzig, 1901. Cf. also A. D. Knox, *Herodas, Cercidas and the Greek Choliambic Poets* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1946) (Loeb Cl. Libr.).

<sup>29</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 28) 229.

<sup>30</sup> *The Tebtunis Papyri*, edited by B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and J. G. Smyly (London 1902) 1-5 and Plate 1. See also D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri* 1 (Cambridge [Mass.] 1950) 410-13.

<sup>31</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 30) 411.

poem, in which Helen reproaches Menelaus for deserting her; the setting appears to be some time after the Trojan War. The second is also lyric but in different meter, and is a description of the woodlands in summer. Then follow three couplets "of an epigrammatic sort"<sup>32</sup> in various lyric meters on aspects of love. Finally, there is a sentence in prose, also more or less on the theme of love.<sup>33</sup> We are very far indeed from the standards of organization and unity that Masson gives for anthologies.

*Strasbourg Papyrus* W.G. 306<sup>34</sup> is on the verso of an anthology of selections from tragic lyrics and is itself an anthology, consisting first of a trimeter passage from Philemon, which appears also in Stobaeus, on the topic that all other species of the animal kingdom are consistent in their natures, while in mankind every individual is different. This is followed by nineteen paroemiatic verses of a Spartan paeon to Eurys. The two selections are separated by one vacant line and the *paragaphus*. Thus there is in this case again no unity of subject matter, no unity of form and no indication of authorship. Here again we find less organization and much less unity than in the Strasbourg Epodes.

My final example is admittedly a strange one. It will demonstrate that papyrus anthologies include some odd documents and that we must therefore hesitate to rule out what does not seem in accord with orthodox usage. The papyrus, edited by O. Guéraud and P. Jouguet,<sup>35</sup> is clearly a school text of some sort, probably, as Barns suggests, "a primer of pronunciation or orthography."<sup>36</sup> Here once more consecutive literary selections occur without indication of author and without unity of content; this time there are short quotations from tragedy, nine verses from the *Odyssey*, two epigrams, and several comic fragments.<sup>37</sup> There is not a trace of any literary unifying principle.

It is time to sum up the exceptions we have found to Masson's specifications for anthologies.

<sup>32</sup> Page, *ibid.*, of the first two couplets. He does not print the rest.

<sup>33</sup> A pederast gives instructions for the cremation of his bones, which are to be used as a remedy by other pederasts.

<sup>34</sup> Edited by Bruno Snell, *Hermes*, Einzelschriften 5 (1937) 90-92.

<sup>35</sup> *Un livre d'écolier du m<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C.*, Publications de la Société Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie, Textes et Documents 2, Cairo, 1938. See also Barns (above, note 26) 135-36, and Page (above, note 30) 448-53.

<sup>36</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 26) 135.

<sup>37</sup> Guéraud and Jouguet, *op. cit.* (above, note 35) xxiv-xxvi, emphasize, as Barns does in his article, the great variety that exists in anthologies preserved in papyri.

1. We have found separation of poems by the *paragraphus* only, not just between two poems by the same author, but, in the Tebtunis anthology, in the Strasbourg anthology, and in the school text of Guéraud and Jouguet, between selections not even by the same author. Moreover, it is not quite certain that Poem One and Poem Two of the Strasbourg Epodes are divided only by the *paragraphus*; the second illegible left marginal note is as likely to be some sort of introductory note to Poem Two, as Reitzenstein took it to be, as it is to be anything else that can be suggested. Thus it is not sure that the Strasbourg Epodes fall short of this specification; and if they do, other anthologies fall farther short of it.

2. There is the matter of poems with nothing in common except the meter. Here again our defense can be twofold. It is not accurate to say that Poems One and Three have nothing more than meter in common, for both are poems of invective; but even if they were unrelated, they would have company. The two extracts in the Strasbourg lyric anthology, the lines from Philemon and the paean to Eurys, have nothing in common, and, furthermore, they have not even the slightest similarity of meter; indeed all four anthologies I have cited have less unity of form or of content than the Strasbourg Epodes.

3. Masson further maintains that anthologies are likely to be found on the verso of a previously used papyrus. Of our four examples, only one is on the verso, the Strasbourg lyric anthology; and on the recto of that papyrus is another anthology, consisting mainly of lyrics from tragedy.

4. Selections in anthologies are likely to be incomplete excerpts. Whether the anthology from which we have the Strasbourg Epodes consisted of excerpts or not we cannot tell; all that can be said is that no complete poem has been preserved. But even supposing that there were, originally, complete poems, the choliambic anthology is just as likely to have consisted of complete poems.

Of Masson's criteria, the only one for which we do not find parallels, indeed in respect of which we do not find other collections even farther from the norm, is the presence of notes. While it would be unwise to disregard this criterion, it seems unreasonable to rule out the possibility of an anthology or even to consider

it improbable on the strength of this feature alone, when so many characteristics of collections are demonstrably variable.

It must be remembered that it is not our purpose to establish the probability *per se* of an anthology, but only to show that it is not necessary to reject on the grounds of anthological form a solution to the problem posed by these fragments that is suggested by other considerations. We have in this part of our argument supported the principle stated by Barns, that anthologies are extremely varied in form; we have done so by describing anthologies exemplifying aspects of form relevant to the papyrus under consideration.

If, then, Attic correction does not rule out Archilochus as author of Poem One, and the form and contents of the fragments do not rule out an anthology, it is possible to be guided by the indications of style and content and assign Poem One to Archilochus, Poem Three to Hipponax. The arguments offered in this paper have been mainly defensive, and it does not seem appropriate to add any general analysis of the poems in order to justify the attributions made. Such analysis is already abundant in previous essays on the problem. Moreover, recent ascriptions of both poems to Hipponax have been grounded on the issues discussed above, not on considerations of style. The one recent attributor to Archilochus, Max Treu, while untroubled by correction, believes himself forced by the improbability of an anthology to ascribe both fragments to Archilochus, because Poem One is so clearly Archilochian in style.

By way of appendix to the foregoing defensive argument of this paper, I add two points of style, one minor, one important, neither new, but both undervalued.

In the first of our epodes in the course of the poet's wish that his betrayer may be enslaved, there occurs a particularly strong and vivid phrase. The poet hopes that his enemy will experience many ills while "eating the bread of slavery," δούλιον ἄρτον ἔδων (line 6). The phrase goes back to the Homeric δούλιον ἡμαρ, and has a long train of subsequent echoes, whether deliberate or chance. One of the most striking of the chance echoes comes in Cacciaguida's prophecy of Dante's exile, *Paradiso* 17.58-59:

Tu proverai sì come sa di sale  
Lo pane altrui . . .

In both poets the words are intense and memorable through the

very simplicity of the phrases used; both have the mark of great poetry. Related phrases are numerous in later Greek poetry, and there are instances in all three tragic poets which may very likely take their origin from this passage.<sup>38</sup> Related words occur in Hipponax<sup>39</sup> too:

. . . σῦκα μέτρια τρώγων  
καὶ κρίθινον κόλλικα, δούλιον χόρτον.

Thus for δούλιον ἄρτον, "the bread of slavery," Hipponax has δούλιον χόρτον, "the fodder of slavery"; for ἔδων he has τρώγων, "devouring." Hipponax writes, as one would expect of him, words that are a plebeian mockery of the simple and somber phrase of the Strasbourg Epode. Whether the parody is deliberate or not is unimportant. Presumably it is; but, related by design or chance, the two phrases are typical of Archilochus and Hipponax respectively, and the difference between them is a measure of the difference between the poetry of Archilochus and that of Hipponax. The man who wrote τρώγων . . . δούλιον χόρτον is not the man who wrote δούλιον ἄρτον ἔδων.

Finally, there is an imitation of Epode One that provides very strong evidence of Archilochian authorship and has been much too readily dismissed by those who argue for Hipponax. I do not mean the echo in Horace's *Epode* 10, for though that imitation clearly exists, we cannot know which writer Horace is imitating, since he acknowledges both as models. If our poems are from an anthology, Horace perhaps imitates both Archilochus and Hipponax in *Epode* 10, since, as has often been observed,<sup>40</sup> Horace's reference in that poem to *olens Maevius* may derive from γράσσω πνέοντα φῶρα in Poem Three, line 7. A much more pervasive imitation of Poem One than this of Horace's is Alcaeus' curse of Pittacus for having betrayed his *hetairoi* (G 1).<sup>41</sup> The closest verbal similarity is between λὰξ δ' ἐπ' ὀρκίοισ' ἔβη in the Strasbourg poem and ἔμβαυς ἐπ' ὀρκίοισι in Alcaeus (lines 22–23). But the likeness is much more basic and much broader than this one verbal approximation. Just as the Strasbourg poem is

<sup>38</sup> For references see note *ad loc.* in Diehl<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> Fr. 39, lines 5–6. Knox (above, note 28) 262 assigns the lines to Phoenix on grounds of style and meter. But the ascription to Hipponax is definite in Athenaeus and should not be over-ruled on grounds as questionable as Knox's.

<sup>40</sup> First by Blass (above, note 9).

<sup>41</sup> The imitation has been much discussed, first by Diehl, *RhM* 92 (1944) 6, 12.

inspired by one who was the poet's *hetairos* and betrayed him, so Alcaeus' poem is aimed at one who betrayed his *hetairoi*. Whether the circumstances behind the poems were also alike we cannot know. The treachery in the case of Alcaeus' poem was political; we know nothing about the man attacked in the Strasbourg poem and nothing about the circumstances. What we know is that the two poems are alike in the phrase by which the act of treachery is characterized, in the fact that enemies who were once friends and have betrayed their *hetairoi* are cursed, and in the depth of feeling conveyed in the two poems. The probability of imitation seems very high. Since Alcaeus cannot have imitated Hipponax, who lived after him,<sup>42</sup> this would seem to be extremely important confirmation of the authorship of Archilochus.

It has been alleged that it is just as likely that the Strasbourg poem is the imitation, not the original, and that Hipponax is thus here imitating Alcaeus.<sup>43</sup> It is exceedingly improbable that such is the case. The decision as to which is likelier to be an imitator, Alcaeus or Hipponax, is a very easy one. Hipponax elsewhere is not an imitator; he is an inveterate and skillful parodist. His *τρώγων* and *χόρτος* for *ἔδων* and *ἄρτος* are exactly what one would expect of him. They are akin to his wry, half-joking use of the Lydian word *παλμύς* as an epithet for a Greek god, to his low-life phrase, "dog-throttling Hermes," (i.e. helper of thieves, a parody of an epic epithet), and to much of his self-consciously derogatory and plebeian attitude and language. This penchant for parody has been further demonstrated very substantially in the recently published fragments of the epodes of Hipponax.<sup>44</sup> Not much is clear in these mutilated lines, but one certain feature of them is elaborate parody of the *Odyssey* and of the deeds of Heracles. If Hipponax is a habitual parodist, Alcaeus is a skilled imitator or borrower. His debts to Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns* are well known,<sup>45</sup> and, above all, he has elsewhere quite

<sup>42</sup> The available evidence places Hipponax firmly in the middle of the sixth century. Cf. Gerhard in *RE* 8 (1913) 1890-91.

<sup>43</sup> So argues Lasserre (above, note 4) 276.

<sup>44</sup> There is a mock epic proem (not imitation!) in Fr. 77. *Odyssey*-scenes in the new epodes: *POxy* 2174 Fr. 5 (title), 6 ("embers," *ψωμόν*, which in *Odyssey* 9 means a piece of human flesh), 8 ("Phaeacians," "he sailed," *Kypso*; cf. the wording in *Odyssey* 5.275 ff.).

<sup>45</sup> Z 23 is a very close imitation of Hesiod, *Op.* 582-88; B 2, a hymn to the Dioscuri, s strongly reminiscent of *H. Hom.* 33, and *α2*, to Hermes, may owe something to *H. Hom.* 4.

clearly borrowed from Archilochus in the motif of shield-throwing, in phrases on the power of wine as a solace, in the use of the allegory of the ship of state and elsewhere also.<sup>46</sup> What could be more natural than that in a poem of invective he should find inspiration and letter in a master of the art, a poet who was in other respects a model for him?

The Strasbourg Epodes, if one takes the obvious indications at face value, are poems written by Archilochus and Hipponax. The presence of Attic correption in Poem One does not rule it out for Archilochus. The necessity of supposing an anthology raises no difficulty, for several anthologies less conventional than this one have been found. In style and spirit there are strong indications that Poem One is by Archilochus. The presence of the name Hipponax in Poem Three virtually secures it for Hipponax. The case for an anthology is strong enough to call for acceptance.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Diehl, *RhM* 92 (1944) 12, who justifiably declares, "hac similitudine poetae Parii auctoritas epodi Argenteratensis contra Hipponactem confirmatur." Diehl was not, apparently, considering Poem Three at all; otherwise he would surely have specifically limited his comment to Poem One.