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ABSTRACT

This thesis offers a reinterpretation of the martial fragments of the archaic poet Archilochus. Drawing particularly upon a fresh analysis of the new Telephus-fragment (P. Oxy. LXIX 4708), it is argued that the poet consistently advocates an ethos of cautious courage, in accordance with which every warrior is required to remain with the fighting unit and individual action is discouraged. This ethos is situated within the context of the historical development of the hoplite phalanx, and it is suggested further that a similar ideology is to be found in the Homeric epics.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Archilochus fragment 111 W has attracted little commentary, no doubt because it is only a single line, the latter half of which seems to reflect a most conventional Greek attitude. Indeed, the survival of the fragment is owed to its citation by Clement as a paraphrase of Homer, though the Homeric phrase he gives appears to be garbled.¹

καὶ νέους θάρσουσε· νίκης δ’ ἐν θεοίᾳ πείρατα. (111 W).

“And encourage the young, but the determination of victory lies with the gods.”²

But the collocation of the sentiment that, one’s efforts aside, success ultimately depends upon the will of the gods, with the advice or admonishment to exhort the young, seems to be not a trite commonplace but a thoughtful recommendation to strike a careful balance between zealous action and sober caution.³ The second phrase should be viewed as a

¹ West (1989) ad loc. adds ll. 7.102 parenthetically to Clement’s citation.

² The translation “determination of victory” follows the analysis of the phrase by Bergren (1975) 34-35; 115-19; 186-87, who suggests it has a legal sense, with the gods serving as judges, though she takes the phrase as an exhortation to be bold.

³ Note that fr. 110 W also comes from Clement and is identified with a Homeric parallel: ἄρξεται ἐτήσιμον γὰρ ξυνός ἀνθρώπως Ἀρής. “…for truly Ares is common (i.e. dispassionate) to men”. The Iliad passage comes from Hector’s optimistic speech before facing Achilles: ξυνός ἔνυάλιος· καὶ τε κτενέόντα κατέκτα (18.309). Hector’s point is that he, the presumptive loser against Achilles, may yet be victorious; Aristotle (Rhet. 1395a11-16) attests to the proverbial status of ξυνός ἔνυάλιος, used to encourage the weak to run a risk. Yet if we read 110 W in the spirit of 111 W, it has the opposite sense and is cautionary: ‘despite your eagerness, you are as likely to be killed – don’t be arrogant’. Note too that Hector’s (over)confidence is proved to be unjustified, so the gnome, like his boast that he will never flee Achilles (18.306-7), is perhaps ironic.
qualification to the first: rouse the youths (to fight bravely), but make clear to them as well that sometimes the gods are averse and their own efforts will be futile. Indeed, if the gods are opposed, no amount of exhortation will alter the outcome. We cannot, unfortunately, know who uttered this line and in what context, but I believe that the ethos it exhibits is identifiable in several other fragments of Archilochus such that a roughly consistent attitude from the poet may be outlined.

This single tetrameter verse is not only representative of Archilochus’ ideas about warfare, but, as I shall argue, it also matches the ethos of the Iliad. As a preliminary grounding for such an equation, let us examine the context of the Iliad verse (7.102, in a speech by Menelaus) that contains phraseology similar to the fragment cited by Clement. At the opening of Iliad 7 Hector and Alexander join battle, but almost immediately Athena and Apollo take counsel and decide to halt the fighting temporarily. Apollo’s plan is to rouse the spirit of Hector to challenge one of the Danaans to single combat (7.38-42). The poet states that Helenus, the Trojan seer, understands the plan of the gods, and so he goes to advise Hector (7.44-46). Yet Helenus finishes his exhortation by telling Hector that he is not yet allotted to die, [and he knows this] for he heard the voice of the ever-living gods (7.52-53). As Kirk notes, the knowledge that Hector will not die in the duel is nowhere

---

4 Archilochus is generally dated to the mid-seventh century B.C.; see Brown (1997) 43-44; Kivilo (2010) 111-15 discusses his dating in antiquity, especially his synchronization with Gyges and Homer. The dating of Homer, or rather the poet of the Iliad, is vexed, though two general opinions are current: eighth-century (e.g. Kirk [1985] 1-16); mid-seventh and so roughly contemporary with Archilochus (e.g. West [1995] 203-19). I am inclined to agree with the latter assessment; any difference in date between the two cannot have been too great.
mentioned in the gods’ exchange. This detail, viewed in light of Menelaus’ subsequent speech, may be relevant. At any rate, Helenus’ exhortation is successful and Hector offers the challenge for one champion to fight him (7.67-91). The Achaeans sit in silence, shamed to refuse but afraid to accept (7.92-93). It is Menelaus who accepts the challenge, makes a short speech, mostly in rebuke of his comrades, but finishes by declaring:

αὐτὰρ ὑπερθεύν

νίκης πείρατ’ ἔχονται ἐν ἄθανάτοισι θεοῖσι (7.101-2).

“But the determination of victory is with the deathless gods above.”

Evidently, Menelaus is as hesitant as the others to oppose Hector, and with good reason. In one of the well-known apostrophes of Menelaus, the poet states that he would then have met his end at Hector’s hand, since the latter was much stronger, had not the Achaean kings jumped up and restrained him (7.104-6). Menelaus is thus presented as courageous, if foolhardy. He is saved from what the poet knows would be certain death by the intervention of his comrades and especially that of his brother Agamemnon, who chides him as foolish and instructs him to endure (sc. to refuse the challenge), though suffering:

5 Kirk (1990) ad 52-53 supposes this is either an oversight by the poet, or the conversation was fuller than the poet chose to record. I do not quite understand the reasoning of the latter; a better way to frame the poet’s choice here would be to consider the audience’s interpretive options: a) Helenus heard something other than what the poet has just attributed to the gods (Kirk [ibid.] views this as unlikely), b) the difference is missed, or c) the poet deliberately has Helenus misrepresent the gods’ conversation. That the last is a possibility is suggested by Priam’s speech to Hecuba 24.218-27 in which he admits he would reject the advice of diviners or priests had they given him the message Iris has.
οὐδὲ τί σε χρή / ταύτης ἀφροσύνης· ἀνὰ δὲ σχέο κηδόμενός περ (7.109-10). In fact, Agamemnon’s concern for his brother is seen elsewhere: in book 10, when the expedition to the Trojan camp is being prepared and Menelaus volunteers, Agamemnon, fearing for his brother, bids Diomedes to pay no heed for noble rank but to choose the best companion (10.234-40).6 In book 5 Menelaus pities two fallen comrades and goes to face Aeneas, their killer (5.561-64). It is not Agamemnon but Nestor’s son who fears for him, moves to the front lines, and stands alongside him in support (5.565-70). Menelaus repeatedly inspires the support and protection of his comrades.7 Yet the advice given in book 7 is unusual, and the closest parallels for the language are, in fact, found directed at the immortals Hera and Aphrodite.

In the first instance, Hephaestus cautions his mother Hera against challenging Zeus, for, he predicts, she could not contend with him and prevail: τέτλαθι μὴτερ ἐμή, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ (1.586). Like Agamemnon’s advice, the concern shown here is between family members, and Hera is exhorted to be cautious and restrain her impulses. The second example is a close parallel to the duel situation, for it occurs during a battle in progress. Aphrodite, wounded by Diomedes, complains to her mother Dione that mortals are now hurting even gods. Dione responds so as to restrain her daughter from rash behavior: τέτλαθι τέκνον ἐμόν, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ (5.382). She goes on to console her by listing other occasions when mortals have injured gods, but ends by indirectly

6 Willcock (2002) 223 notes that even if book 10 is by another poet, that author was clearly aware of the ethos of the rest of the Iliad.

7 Cf. Willcock (2002) 221-23, who discusses these and other similar passages.
cautioning Diomedes that one who fights with the gods does not return home from battle (5.406-9), and to beware lest he fight one stronger than Aphrodite (5.411).

Agamemnon ends his speech with a similar prediction: even if Hector is now fearless and insatiate of battle, he will be glad to bend his knee (in rest), if he can escape from the coming combat (7.117-19). Unlike Helenus’ assurance of victory to Hector, Agamemnon’s prediction reflects the uncertainty Menelaus himself has shown, that victory depends upon the gods: the duel, if fought by comparable fighters, will be a close one.\(^8\) Just as the foolish Diomedes is spurred on by Athena, so Hector is encouraged by Helenus, who alleges divine favor. The Atreidae exhibit here a greater respect for their own mortality, and this stance is not censured by any of the others. Menelaus is simply not as strong a warrior as Hector (7.111), and though he is nevertheless willing to fight, his comrades feel bound by duty and affection to restrain him. The Achaeans would gain nothing by his likely death, and so restraint and caution are believed to be the better course. Rather paradoxically, then, Menelaus’ praiseworthiness consists both in his conspicuous willingness to take on a better fighter than himself and his acceptance of Agamemnon’s prudent restraint (i.e., the fact that he does not actually do anything so foolhardy). We can be sure that Menelaus’ behavior is actually praised by the poet because of his frequent apostrophes.\(^9\) As M. Willcock has suggested, the poet goes out of his way to present a realistic and sympathetic character who must be quite different from the traditional, pre-

\(^8\) Indeed, this is how the duel eventually plays out; Ajax and Hector fight to a draw as night falls and the heralds intervene.

\(^9\) See Edwards (1991) 3; Richardson (1990) 170-74 discusses how sympathy for the character is produced by means of the apostrophe.
Menelaus who vengefully seeks the return of his wife.\textsuperscript{10} Part of his sympathy and appeal as a character, I submit, is owed to his familiarity to the audience: he fights as they do in real life, and the fact that he is a hero elevates this mode of fighting. Indeed, on one occasion Menelaus even contemplates capturing alive one of the enemy who begs for mercy, but Agamemnon intervenes to chide his brother’s indulgence and succeeds in changing his mind (6.37-65). This episode demonstrates both the sensitivity of Menelaus and his willingness to be reasonable and accept sound advice. We shall in the last chapter consider further the warfare represented by Menelaus in \textit{Iliad 17}.

I submit that it is the attitude of what we may call cautious courage that is behind the one-line fragment of Archilochus. That is, it is good and proper to encourage the young to fight (here we may think, of course, of the exhortations of Tyrtaeus frr. 10-3 W and Callinus fr. 1 W), but in a measured tone that is indicative of the uncertainties of combat and the apparent caprice of the gods. This ethos is to be found in other fragments of the poet, particularly the newly discovered Telephus-fragment.\textsuperscript{11} In addition, just as in the \textit{Iliad} Menelaus is saved through the intervention of his comrades, so too does Archilochus emphasize the necessity of fighting only with the support of one’s fellows. Such a style of

\textsuperscript{10} Willcock (2002) 224-25, who notes the fact that Menelaus receives by far the most stock epithets for ‘warlike,’ though he is one of the less conspicuous warlike in the \textit{Iliad}.

\textsuperscript{11} I am not ignoring Dover’s warning (1963) 205-12 that not every sentiment expressed in the fragments is the poet’s own. As Dover (ibid.) 211-12 concedes, certain fragments probably do represent the poet’s voice (such as an address to Pericles or Glaucus). The task, therefore, is to make a case for those that do show the poet’s ethos; the evidence is the cumulative weight of those fragments that are mutually reinforcing.
fighting is found also in the martial elegies of Callinus and Tyrtaeus, though they exhibit relatively unbridled exhortation, in contrast to the cautious courage ethos of Archilochus. Such a difference in focus is probably not owed to a fundamental divergence of ethos, but rather to the context of performance. One can easily imagine how poetry performed in the tent of the Spartan king before a battle would have a very different emphasis from elegies delivered at a symposium, perhaps after the completion of a conflict; D.E. Gerber even dubs Tyrtaeus “a kind of poet laureate for the state.”12

As with the preliminary analysis of fragment 111 W, some of the subsequent argumentation will depend upon comparisons with the Iliad and Odyssey. As already indicated, what I hope also to demonstrate is that the Archilochean ethos is neither anti-

12 Gerber (1997) 104. The performance context for early elegy is open to debate: West (1974) 10-13 imagines exhortation prior to a battle as distinct from “a less formal military setting”, the civilian symposium, et al. Bowie (1986) 15-16 proposes that the symposium is fundamental and martial exhortation is only a sub-species of exhortatory elegy; he elaborates (1990) 221-29 on the possibility of martial elegy being performed at the Spartan king’s campaign tent, though not necessarily in anticipation of a specific battle. The preservation and transmission of Tyrtaeus in antiquity was probably not accidental: what was best suited for Spartan ideology (especially hoplite protreptic) was preserved – perhaps at the exclusion of other works – though Bowie (1990) 224-29 suggests any popular song (theme aside) might join the repertoire. This begs the question of the grounds for Tyrtaeus’ popularity: modern critics, at least, charge him with being relatively untalented – see e.g. Adkins (1985) 67-68. The lyric poetry of Alcman, by contrast, survived in the Alexandrian canon because of its high quality and widespread appeal: Carey (2011) 437-60 argues that his poetry was both epichoric and attractive to a pan-Hellenic audience, and that it was preserved in book form early and in Sparta.
nor even un-Iliadic. Rather, the poet(s) of the two epics are from essentially the same world as Archilochus, though the former are bound by epic convention to portray the fantastical heroic world, its warrior ethic, and its methods of fighting within certain generic parameters. The celebration and propagation of the exploits of individual fighters such as Achilles, Hector, and Diomedes are not made to provide the poet’s audience with realistic role models. Their deeds are extolled precisely because they are superhuman and from a legendary, bygone age.

Moreover, in addition to figures such as Achilles there are other fighters, not un-heroic, but who are more representative of real, archaic period combat, in which warriors fight not as individuals but as a member of a group. Thus, even when ‘individualized’ fighting is described (i.e., warriors are specified by name), it often entails fighting in pairs and with the support of comrades (sometimes also specified by name, others not). We thus find a concern with individual fighters (the *kleos* of Achilles) in addition to a more realistic account of fighting (and I do not mean here tactics alone), for *monomachia* is in fact exceptional and is treated as such by the poet.

Unlike epic, the surviving fragments of Archilochus’ elegies and his iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters do not seem to discuss combat in quite the same terms as heroic epic – there is no mention of fighting for *kleos*, for example. This is not, I think, because Archilochus is especially ignoring or spurning such language, but because he is operating in a different poetic tradition, which has its own conventions. And not every element is different between the genres. As we shall see below, for example, the presence of the gods
in war that is so familiar from epic is found also in Archilochus (both in elegiacs and
tetrameters).\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} The 'new' Simonides (11 W), by contrast, shows a novel combination of epic and narrative elegiac
in which the Plataean dead are compared with Achilles and his immortal fame.
CHAPTER 2. ORIGINS OF THE HOPLITE PHALANX

In this chapter, it is necessary to consider briefly the sharply contested issue of the history of phalanx warfare and its relation to Homeric epic and martial elegy. In particular, we must ask whether some form of phalanx warfare was known to the poet of the *Iliad*, and if a similar manner of fighting was the norm for Archilochus and his contemporaries. I believe the answer to both questions is broadly affirmative, but certain cautions and qualifications should be acknowledged. The methodological problem we face is that our texts are poetic, though some elegy and perhaps Archilochus’ martial tetrameters have an historical bent (and thus some historical reliability).\(^{14}\) Moreover, as we shall see, it is not even agreed among scholars what the nature of the hoplite phalanx was, so our terminology remains rough and relative.

Much debate was generated by Joachim Latacz’ study of warfare in the *Iliad*, in which he identified discrete stages of combat, the most decisive of which was mass fighting that is reflective of historical phalanx warfare.\(^{15}\) Critics of this account, proposing a post-Homeric ‘hoplite reform’, fall roughly into one of two camps. Some see a technical development of the hoplite panoply, particularly the hoplite shield, as a direct response to the needs of existing tactics (i.e., phalanx fighting).\(^{16}\) Others reject altogether the existence

---

\(^{14}\) We see elegy addressing both old history and recent, and some of Archilochus’ tetrameters seem to focus upon recent events; see Bowie (2001) 50-60.

\(^{15}\) Latacz (1977).

\(^{16}\) E.g., Hanson (1991) 63-84.
of phalanx tactics in the *Iliad*,\(^{17}\) and it has recently been suggested that such warfare did not exist until the fifth century.\(^ {18}\)

There has even been disagreement about the nature of the hoplite phalanx in the classical period. G.L. Cawkwell has proposed, contrary to the orthodox image of hoplite fighting, that there were different phases of combat in lengthy hoplite contests, and that fighters might break into open order for hand-to-hand combat and later re-form the hoplite formation.\(^ {19}\) Holladay restated the orthodox view of the phalanx,\(^ {20}\) but van Wees has

---

\(^{17}\) Snodgrass (1993) 49-54 accepts the importance of mass-fighting in the *Iliad*, but disputes the identification with phalanx warfare. He allows that technical development was significant, but believes mechanisms for hoplite enrolment were decisive for the development of the hoplite phalanx (59-61). Van Wees (1988) 2-14 dismantles the discrete phases of combat envisioned by Latacz and argues that the mass of men and the foremost fighters are really the same group, members of which repeatedly move forward to fight and withdraw to the mass for rest. Van Wees (1986) 292-95 argues that there is no complex tactical organization of the forces in the *Iliad* and that the terms *phalanx* and *stix* refer generically to a ‘segment’ and a ‘column’ of the army, respectively.

\(^{18}\) Van Wees (2000) 125-66, esp.155-56 proposes lowering the date of the ‘developed’ hoplite phalanx, perhaps even after the Persian wars. Krentz (2002) 23-39 argues further for such a dating, suggesting that the unwritten rules of phalanx warfare (not just tactics) develop only as non-hoplite arms are excluded from the phalanx, starting perhaps with the battle of Marathon, but not completed until after 480 (he notes [ibid.] 36-37 the relatively open style apparently still used by the Spartans at Thermopylae). See also Krentz (2010) 43-62, particularly the case against the prominence of the *othismos* (massed shoving) tactic.

argued further that open order fighting was the rule for hoplites until rather late.\textsuperscript{21} In response to the analysis of van Wees, a recent case has been made by Schwartz\textsuperscript{22} that in the phalanx a fully frontal stance, with overlapping shields (the ‘traditional’ understanding of the phalanx), was used sometimes, as in the charge, but that this stance could alter to a shoulder-on position that allowed some greater freedom to parry and assault, though not open-order fighting.

From this overview, we may note the general lines of disagreement. First, there is no consensus as to what constitutes ‘hoplite warfare’ – is it the mere presence of (certain elements of?) the panoply, or the use of phalanx tactics? Nor is it agreed how close phalanx fighting was, and how much the development of this depended on the use of the panoply. My own inclination is to suppose a longer, more diffuse development of both armor and tactics. It should be evident that whatever elements in the \textit{Iliad} and early elegy could be argued to be reflective of ‘phalanx warfare’ are not to be identified with what we call the hoplite phalanx in the Classical period.

It has been observed that iconographic representations of hoplite armor from the seventh and sixth centuries do not depict a uniformly attired fighting group; if absolutely consistent use of the panoply was required for its success, it becomes exceedingly difficult

\textsuperscript{20} Holladay (1982) 94-103


\textsuperscript{22} Schwartz (2002) 31-64, who restates the case that the panoply was created specifically for use with the (already existing) phalanx tactics.
to explain such depictions.\textsuperscript{23} Two striking examples of such representations of diversely equipped fighting groups are found on recently published vases from Paros, dated to the end of the eighth century.\textsuperscript{24} Note that these vessels are quite close to Archilochus both geographically (his home island) and chronologically. One vessel depicts on the belly two chariots driven by nude figures, men on horseback with round shields – one attacking with spear and another with sword – and a single warrior with a huge Dipylon shield who

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{23} See van Wees (2000) 132-35 and (2004) 50-52; Krentz (2002) 29-30. I too do not find very convincing the suggestion (e.g., by Snodgrass [1964] 58-59) that the Boeotian shield is an artistic convention and not grounded in reality. If uniform armament were so essential for the success of the ‘phalanx’, such mixed depictions would be incoherent and anything but heroic (though Snodgrass argues for a prolonged development of these tactics). On the other hand, van Wees’ explanation (2000) 132 of ‘heroic’ nudity as indicative of lighter armed fighters is unlikely to find much acceptance (Langdon [2008] 245 refers to the overriding desire to demarcate gender in art). On balance, artistic conventions no doubt distort historical reality, but it is implausible that a very vivid, exclusively artistic remembrance of a bronze age type (the so-called figure-eight shield) would find expression in a consistently altered form that is itself a development of the intermediate Dipylon shield (as Snodgrass [1964] 58 suggests). Indeed, Snodgrass (1999) 45 would rather accept the Dipylon (than the Boeotian) as real, presumably because it is the older type, despite its exaggerated appearance. Boardman (1983) 27-36 argues (persuasively to me) that neither the Dipylon nor the Boeotian shield is a heroic marker and both reflected real types. Van Wees (2000) 134 n17 corrects the mischaracterization of the Boeotian shield as impractical and unrealistic (as by Snodgrass [1999] 55).

\textsuperscript{24} Zaphiropoulou (2006) 271-77.
\end{flushright}
attacks a smaller unarmed figure with a sword.\textsuperscript{25} The second vase shows on the belly two
opposed forces with a single fallen warrior in between. To the left of the dead is first an
archer with round shield, then a shield-less archer, six horsemen variously equipped, and
finally heavily armed hoplites. Opposing the archer from the other side of the corpse are
first three sling-throwers without shields, followed by two hoplites, at which point the
rearmost fighters of the opposition appear (oriented toward the corpse in the middle).\textsuperscript{26}
Particularly on the second vessel, organized, equally opposed warriors are depicted
fighting with what is identified as hoplite tactics, though again they fight with diverse
equipment.\textsuperscript{27}

Moreover, such mixed-arms representations are well matched by literary accounts.
In the \textit{Iliad} spears are both thrown and thrust, and certain contingents are portrayed as
having a particular style of armament.\textsuperscript{28} Notably, the Lokrians fight with bows and slings,
but do not possess helmets, shields or spears (13.714-18). They are specifically contrasted
with fighters in front, who fight with embellished arms, behind whom they cast their
missiles in relative safety (13.719-21). We may also note in passing here that their decision

\textsuperscript{25} Zaphiropoulou (2006) 271, with figs. 1-4 and 11 (Paros Museum, inv. no. B 3523). What is
identified as a Dipylon shield is not so stylized as certain Attic examples (it reaches beyond the
knees and the arc cut-outs on the side are not so deep).

\textsuperscript{26} Zaphiropoulou (2006) 271, with figs. 5-8 (Paros Museum, inv. no. B 3524); van Wees (2004) 167
sees only two sling-throwers, identifying the first figure as a spearman with three javelins.


\textsuperscript{28} See Krentz (2002) 30 n29 for further examples. Lorimer (1947) 111-32 rejected both hoplite
arms and tactics for the \textit{Iliad} and labeled passages problematic for such a view as interpolated.
to not remain in close combat (13.713) is ultimately tactically advantageous, but it would be wrong to suggest, I think, that not fighting closely is *prima facie* shameful *until* the poet states that this is a successful tactic.\textsuperscript{29} The poet, in fact, gives immediately the explanation for their withdrawal: for (γάπ) they did not have helmets for defense (13.714). Not only is their action not shameful, it would be the height of folly for them to fight at close quarters, equipped as they are.\textsuperscript{30}

It may be objected that such passages are few in the *Iliad*, that the typical mode of Homeric warfare is characterized by ritualized *monomachia*, war chariots, and the deeds of a select few heroes. Yet I am not the first to believe that the ‘later’ elements, characteristic of the seventh century, are real in the *Iliad*, and I find it excessively skeptical to suspect reflexively such elements as interpolated.\textsuperscript{31} As K. Raaflaub has recently observed, the

\textsuperscript{29} *pace* Janko (1992) *ad* 712-18.

\textsuperscript{30} This may seem at odds with the second of the Parian vessels discussed above (Paros Museum, inv. no. B 3524), on which missile fighters appear fighting in the front of each force, and might lead one to imagine that distinct phases of combat, as outlined by Latacz (1977) esp. 118-29, are meant to be shown, with missile warfare occurring first. But archers at least are depicted in the front ranks on Geometric (Athenian) vases (van Wees [2004] 166-67), and these may have shields for protection (ibid.) 167 n.6. The sling-throwers are exceptional anyhow and may be thought of as moving forward only to throw.

In any case, Zaphiropoulou (2006) 271, 275-76 suggests that the scene on the shoulder shows the recovery of the same corpse as on the belly (cf. [ibid.] fig 10) and that the neck has the prothesis, so we have a unified narrative focused upon a single fighter.

\textsuperscript{31} Raaflaub (2008) 469-83; van Wees (2004) 249-52, the two of whom disagree, however, on the nature of archaic warfare. Schwartz (2009) 108-15 sees such elements in the *Iliad* and believes the
'standard' picture of warfare in the *Iliad* is a fabrication that is motivated by the desire to present in epic an exaggerated, superhuman age that is distinctly separate from that of the poet and his audience. The extraordinary feats attributed to heroes are thus owed to the conventions of the genre, though contemporary, realistic elements are injected by the poet as well. It would be wrong, therefore, to label only the one category 'Iliadic' or 'heroic' because the realistic elements are equally ascribed to this heroic age by the poet.

Realistic, archaic period warfare is prominent in martial elegy, whereas the superhuman elements native to epic are generally few. Tyrtaeus (11.29-30, 34 W) refers to warriors holding either sword or spear, as though either of these might be expected, and he encourages the light armed (γυμνήτες) to cast stones and javelins while crouching behind the shield of another and standing near the *panhoploi* (11.35-38 W). For Archilochus we need mention here only in brief the possible use of a single spear (2 W), the shield that is left behind (5 W), and especially the close quarters sword fighting of the Euboeans (who are also called spear-famed), which is contrasted with the use of long-range phalanx itself to be eighth century, but is skeptical about dating the poem and using it as an historical source. Most succinct on the issue is West (1966) 46 n2.


33 Note, for example, that the model warrior for Callinus (fr. 1.19 W) is worthy of the *demigods*; no fighter is θεοειδής in elegy, and the Spartan kings are only "honored by the gods" (Tyrtaeus fr. 4.3 W).

34 Rock-throwers also may appear at Tyrtaeus 19.2 W, and γυμνομάχοι at 23a.14 W.
slings and bows (3 W). The case of the Euboeans attests to the fact that certain localities might be known for particular weaponry or tactics, though the poet does not suggest that the other side will be *unequipped* for such combat (i.e. without swords). Such local specialization can, however, be exaggerated, as was seen with the example of the Lokrian contingent, who are all similarly (ill-)equipped, whereas a mixture of arms was probably normal in reality. We thus find hoplite arms alongside weaponry not generally found with the fully developed phalanx of the Classical period, together with seemingly proto-hoplite tactics.  

One thing that remains elusive is agreement on the meaning of ‘proto-hoplite tactics’. Although the profusion of bronze weaponry, chariots, and *monomachia* in the *Iliad* speaks against aligning the epic closely with what we find in Tyrtaeus, Archilochus, and  

---  

Snodgrass (1964) 180 suggests that the poem predates (pre-)hoplite warfare, in part on the argument that slings are not attested before the seventh century (doubting [ibid.] 167 the *Iliad* reference 13.716), but the new Paros vase with sling-throwers discussed above moots the case. Donlan (1970) 131-42 finds it likely that the Lelantine war is discussed in 3 W (though the historicity of this war is quite uncertain), and he concludes that the transition to close-range hoplite warfare (in which long-range weapons would be used less) is here reflected.

Snodgrass (1993) 56-58 sees such weaponry and tactics in Tyrtaeus, but remains skeptical about the *Iliad*. Cf. Anderson (1991) 15-19, who includes also Archilochus in the proto-hoplite category. Schwartz (2009) 115-23 finds the (essentially developed) phalanx in Tyrtaeus and Callinus, but sees with it a radical departure from the heroic value system. Lorimer (1947) 121-28 believed that Tyrtaeus was compelled to describe the contemporary phalanx using epic language that was ignorant of it; difficult passages (which seem to contain archaizing details) are explained as pastiche (ibid.) 126-28.
vase painting of the eighth-sixth centuries, I believe that the hints in favor of such an
alignment are real and decisive. Although I generally do not wish to invoke vague
reminisces of the Bronze Age to explain the ‘older’ elements of Homeric warfare, I believe
that these elements are conventional to heroic epic and not reflective of contemporary
reality.\textsuperscript{37} The poet of the \textit{Iliad} was a product of essentially the same world as Archilochus,
and, as I shall argue particularly in the final chapter, despite differences motivated by
generic considerations, they shared a similar ethos with respect to war. That they both
show awareness of a similar type of warfare (however we wish to term it) also points to
their shared background.

\textsuperscript{37} Though van Wees (2004) 158-60 and (1994) 9-13 attempts to find a plausible, contemporary
role even for the chariot.
CHAPTER 3. ARCHILOCUS AND TELEPHUS

Let us now turn to the key fragments of Archilochus. Probably more than any other, the famous ‘shield poem’ (5 W), has led to the interpretation of Archilochus as representing a break from epic tradition and its values.\(^{38}\) Yet another view has it, conversely, that the sentiment of 5 W is closely aligned with that of epic, though some downplay the significance of the poetic ‘I’ here, whereas others identify it with an epic individualism.\(^{39}\) A recent interpretation even views it as a joke: Archilochus is caught unawares as he attends to nature behind a bush.\(^{40}\) Let us reconsider the poem.

άσπίδι μὲν Σαίων τις ἀγάλλεται, ἢν παρὰ θάμνωι,

ἐντὸς ἀμώμητον, κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων·

\(^{38}\) E.g., Page (1963) 132-33, who considers it a contemporary theme in epic language (his proposal [ibid.] 286, that warfare may not be involved is rightly rejected by Dover [ibid.] 287). Cf. Gerber (1970) 15, who remarks, on the one hand, that the poem shows a “flippant attitude towards warfare” but, “that under certain circumstances discretion is the better part of valour”, statements that seem to me to be mutually incompatible. Burnett (1983) 41-42 states that the singer claims guilt of an epic ‘crime’ for which he in turn gives justification; I see no admission of a crime in the fragment. Cf. Adkins (1985) 51.

\(^{39}\) Schwertfeger (1982) 253-80 argues that the sentiment of the fragment is not in conflict with epic and shares its values, but he thinks divine responsibility for flight is confined to epic, whereas for Archilochus it is a personal choice. See Dover (1963) 205-12 on the poetic ‘I’. Rankin (1977) 42-44 treads a sort of middle course, that Archilochus’ view transcends the heroic code but also reflects what Rankin sees as the individualism of Odysseus or Achilles.

\(^{40}\) Anderson (2008) 255-60. Jaeger (1939) 118-19 too sees humor, but as a manifestation of the poet’s perceived inadequacy to the heroic warrior ideal.
αὐτὸν δὲ ἐξεσάωσα. τί μοι μέλει ἀσπίς ἐκείνη;  
ἐρρέτω· ἐξαώτις κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω.

“Some Saian rejoices in the shield, which – blameless weapon – I left behind beside a bush against my will. But I saved myself. Why should I care about that shield? To hell with it. Once more, I will get one not worse.”

Particular attention should be paid to the remark against my will. The train of thought begins with the fact of the object’s loss, then turns to the speaker’s role in its loss: he left it (and fled), but not by choice. It has been suggested that the mention of the speaker’s unwillingness refers to the compulsion of a god, and we may consider further this possibility in the context of the Telephus poem, below. At any rate, the speaker does not explain why he had to leave his shield, but it seems reasonable to venture that it would have hindered his flight from battle: flight entails shield-tossing. The qualification is not apologetic or pleading, but indicates the speaker’s priorities: he would rather have kept his shield and fought, but circumstances (whatever they were) forced his flight. The second couplet reaffirms these priorities; if he had kept his shield, he would have lost his life.

But Archilochus is not here rejecting wholesale the value of martial courage (i.e., the heroic ethos), as we see in the last line of the fragment. ἐξαώτις gets mistranslated as

42 See, e.g., Lorimer (1947) 79.
43 Lavelle (2008) 148 accepts (following van Wees [2004] 172) that no particular shame was attached to the act of leaving behind one’s shield, as it later became (notably at Athens), but he nevertheless reads the fragment as a ‘rationalizing apology’. I prefer to view the fragment as a boast that next time he will be victorious, that his weaponry is incidental to his success or failure.
'another time,'\textsuperscript{44} or ‘another [sc. shield],’\textsuperscript{45} but really it means ‘again,’ ‘once more.’\textsuperscript{46} 
κτήσομαι should refer, I believe, to despoiling the enemy, and the litotes naturally suggests the new shield will be even better. For the force of the verb, we may compare its occurrence in Achilles’ speech rejecting the embassy of Agamemnon. He declines Agamemnon’s offer of a bride, for Peleus will find him a suitable one instead (9.388-97). Indeed, he continues, his heart has been eager to delight such a wife with the possessions which the aged Peleus has won (κτήματα τέρπεσθαι τὰ γέρων ἐκτίσατο Πηλεύς, 9.400). The contrast Achilles here draws is between the legitimate \textit{winnings} that Peleus earned and that will be Achilles’ patrimony, and the \textit{ex post facto} bribe of Agamemnon that is meant to secure Achilles’ participation. As B. Hainsworth notes, this rhetoric seems to stand in contrast to the concern elsewhere shown in the \textit{Iliad} for material possessions.\textsuperscript{47} But the key factor is the \textit{legitimacy} of one’s possessions – the κτήματα with Helen are at issue because they were lawlessly stolen.\textsuperscript{48} Tripods are thus \textit{won} (κτήτοι, 9.406), not simply gotten or acquired, and so the verb is marked. In fragment 5 W, then, the speaker hints at

\textsuperscript{44} Gerber (1999a) 83.
\textsuperscript{45} West (1993) 14.
\textsuperscript{46} See \textit{Iliad} 3.433, Helen telling Paris to challenge Menelaus to fight \textit{again} (cf. 1.223, 13.531); at 5.134 the sense of repetition is combined with a physical return to the fighting. At Archilochus 13.9 repetition is implicit: misfortune ever moves on to a new victim; so at Hes. \textit{Th.} 915 Zeus \textit{again} conceives a passion (this time for Mnemosyne).
\textsuperscript{47} Hainsworth (1993) ad 393-400.
\textsuperscript{48} Note, however, that plundering and cattle rustling are viewed as legitimate means of acquisition; see e.g. \textit{Il.} 9.406.
the fact that his now lost shield was itself legitimately won (i.e. in combat), for, he says, he will be legitimately winning one again. And not only does he say he will win another, but he boasts that it will be as good or better, which suggests his notional combatant will be correspondingly worthy. Such boasting, if that is what we may call it, is then quite in keeping with the heroic stance of the epic warrior.

What stands out, however, is the emphatic statement that the speaker saved himself. As I shall attempt to demonstrate, Archilochus focuses upon the cohesion of the fighting group; individual exploits are discouraged and fighters must look out for one another. I would speculate that there is another contrast implied in this fragment beyond that of the fate of the warrior and the shield. The speaker saved himself; no comrade assisted him. As noted below, even when in rout the warriors of the Iliad help to rescue one another (e.g. Menelaus and Odysseus, 11.456-71; Nestor and Diomedes, 8.79-171), and such a scenario is not entirely unrealistic. There may then be a remonstration here that others fled first, leaving the speaker to fend for himself.49 Such a situation would give meaning also to the oblique οὐκ ἔθελων (such an interpretation, that his comrades fled first, would not be incompatible with the notion of divine compulsion). Without further context, however, this scenario must remain a possibility, though in the last chapter we will return to this theme.

________________________

49 At Iliad 17.597 the poet specifies the warrior, Peneleos, who initiates the flight of the Achaeans, but, as if to excuse, he makes clear that Zeus with the aegis was the ultimate cause (17.593-96) and Peneleos' wounding by Polydmas the proximate one (17.598-600). As Edwards (1991) ad 597 observes, it is even noted by the scholia that Peneleos is not a coward: οὐ δειλός, ἐὰν εἴπερ εἶκεί Δί. Archilochus may thus have judged the initial flight of his comrades unwarranted (inasmuch as there was no divine compulsion), but once the rout is begun, all are forced to flee or else be killed.
I should, nevertheless, maintain that the phrasing of saving oneself is not about the valuing of the self qua individual, as others have maintained.\(^{50}\) Rather, the self is valued inasmuch as he belongs to a fighting group – the loss of each member correspondingly diminishes the integrity of the whole.

The sentiment that the loss of an individual equates to a loss for the fighting group is found in the \textit{Iliad} as well. The poet describes Odysseus wounded, and the sight of his blood draws on all of the Trojans (11.456-60); Odysseus three times calls out for help, and three times Menelaus hears him (11.461-63). Yet instead of immediately running to his aid, Menelaus calls on Telamonian Ajax for reinforcements (11.464-71). Note again that Menelaus is loyal and reliable, but like a real-life warrior he realizes he needs the help of his comrades, even though he is a hero himself. In his address to Ajax, he remarkably conjectures the situation – Odysseus is alone (μονωθείς) and surrounded by Trojans (11.467-68). He exhorts Ajax to come with him and help, but he reiterates and expands upon his concern:

\[\text{δείδω μή τι πάθησιν ἐνὶ Τρώεσσι μονωθείς} \]
\[\text{ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖς γένηται (11.470-71).} \]

Odysseus is again stressed as being alone, and I note that the participle μονωθείς is found only here in the \textit{Iliad} and once in the \textit{Odyssey} (15.386; the finite verb at 16.117, discussed in chapter 4), so Menelaus is being quite emphatic here about his concern for Odysseus. The corollary to Menelaus’ fear that Odysseus will euphemistically ‘suffer something’ is the result his death will have on the Danaans. In one respect this yearning (ποθή) for the hypothetically lost Odysseus can be understood simply as sorrow for the loss of a friend,

\(^{50}\) So Rankin (1977) 43-44.
but in the context of battle in which Menelaus is presently engaged it makes sense too that
the loss of Odysseus will have an immediate consequence for his comrades. Objectively,
they would be at a disadvantage for the loss of one of their best fighters, but it hardly needs
documenting how the loss of a leader has an enormously deleterious effect on morale. We
may presume, therefore, that the yearning felt by the group for a lost comrade is directly
proportional to his military value to them. Menelaus does not sentimentally refer to the
yearning to be felt by himself as a friend, but rather that of the host at large.

The tension between the actions and interests of the individual and those of the
group or army are explored by Archilochus in the new Telephus-poem, and again the poet’s
focus is on the issue of flight. I provide as a baseline the most recent text and translation of
Obbink, though alternatives to some of the readings will be adduced in the discussion as
needed.51

εἰ δὲ [ . . . ] . [ . ] . θεοῦ κρατερῆς ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης
οὐ χρὴ ἀν[αλ]κεί[ν] καὶ κακότητα λέγει[ν,
καὶ ποτ[ε] μ[οῦν]ος ἔως Τήλεφος Ἀρκας[ίδης
’Ἀργείων ἐφόβησε πολὺν στρατ[όν] ὁ[ι] δὲ φέβοντο
ἀλκ[ω][οι] ἡ τόσα δὴ μοῖρα θεῶν ἐφόβει,
αἰχμηταῖ περ ἐόντε[ς] ἐὕρρειτης δὲ Κ[ά]κος
π[ιπτόγ]των νεκὺων στείνετο καὶ [πεδίον

Μύσιον, οἱ δ’ ἐπὶ θῖνας πολυφλοίσβοι[ο] θαλάσσης
χέρσ’] ὑπ’ ἀμειλίκτου φωτός ἐναιρό[μενοι

προτροπάδην ἀπέκλινον ἑυκνήμ[ιδες Ἁχαιοί·
παιδές τ’ ἀθανάτων καὶ ἀδελφοί, [οὖς Ἀγαμέμνων
15 Ἰμιον εἰς ἱερὴν ἦγε μαχησμοένο[υς.
ο]ῇ δὲ τότε βλαφθέντες ὅδοι παρὰ θ[ιν’ ἀφίκοντο,
Τε]ύθραντος δ’ ἐρατὴν πρὸς πόλιν [ἐ]ξέπεσον,
ἐγ]θα [μ]ένος πνείοντες ὁμός αὐτο[ί τε καὶ ἵπποι
ἀφρ[αδί]ῃ μεγάλως θυμὸν ἀσηχεὶ[δατο·
20 φ]άντο γὰρ ψιπτολον Τρώων πόλιν εἰσ[αναβαίνειν
αἰ]ψα’ μ[ά]την δ’ ἐπάτεον Μυσίδα πυροφόρο[ν.
’Ηρακ]λ]ῆς δ’ ἠγητ[ὲ] βοῶν ταλ[α]κάρδιον [υἱόν,
Τ]ῆλεφον, ὃς Δαναοί[σι κακήν [τ]ό[τε φύζαν ἐνόρσας

"If there is no need to call it weakness and cowardice, (to suffer) under the compulsion of a god, then we did well to hasten to flee our dire pains: there exists a proper time for flight. Even once Telephus, descendant of Arkasos, by himself put to flight the great army of Argives, and they fled – indeed, so greatly was the fate of the gods routing them – powerful spear-men though they were. The fair-flowing river Kaikos and the plain of Mysia were stuffed with the falling corpses, while the well-greaved Achaeans, being slain at the hands of the relentless man (Telephus), turned off with headlong speed to the shore of the much-resounding sea. Gladly did they embark on their swift ships, the sons of the immortals and brothers, whom
Agamemnon was leading to holy Ilios to wage war. But on that occasion, because they had lost their way, they had arrived at that shore. They had set upon the lovely city of Teuthras, and there, snorting fury with their horses, alike in their delusion, came in distress of spirit. For they thought they were quickly mounting the high-gated city of Troy, but in vain were they treading on wheat-bearing Mysia. And Heracles came to face (them), as he shouted to his brave-hearted son Telephus, fierce and pitiless in cruel battle, who, inciting unfortunate flight in the Danaans, strove in the front ranks on that occasion to gratify his father.”

It must be acknowledged that much of the interpretation of the fragment depends upon the reconstruction of lines 2-4, particularly the first person plural verb [εὑρ]θα, which, if correct, references the outcome of a contemporary battle that is compared with the mythical exemplum that follows. West adduces adesp. iamb. 38 (discussed in chapter 4) as a parallel for the view that there is a proper time for flight.52 I also consider these fragments to support one another, and the identification of Archilochus as author, guaranteed by identification of the hand with that of P. Oxy. VI 854 (containing scraps of fr. 4 W, ascribed to Archilochus by Athenaeus), is reinforced by the resemblance with the sentiment of fr. 5 W.

What has not received comment, however, is how disproportionately great is the attention paid to the theme of flight in the fragments we now possess for Archilochus. The new fragment is characterized by editors as Archilochus’ defense of himself and his fellows for fleeing in battle – a sort of *apologia*.53 Are the events described at the beginning of the


fragment the same as fr. 5 W, or are these two separate occasions when flight was necessary? If the same event is referenced, it would seem strange to compose two separate poems – one quite elaborate – for an occasion perhaps better forgotten. Obbink tentatively suggests a connection between Archilochus, who leaves his shield by a bush, and Telephus, who is tripped by a vine and loses his shield. Although I agree with Obbink that Telephus’ own flight follows after the fragment breaks off, I do not see a very strong connection between Archilochus’ shield-propping bush and a vine shoot tripping Telephus when he is already in flight; nor does Telephus save himself, for he is wounded.

If, on the other hand, the circumstances of the new fragment are different from those of fr. 5 W, we may begin to suspect that this is a common theme for the poet. If adesp. iamb. 38 is also ascribed to Archilochus, he broaches the topic in both elegy and iambus. Although these poems may be described as justifying flight in (a particular) battle, the recurrence of the theme suggests that self-defense is not the driving motive, and the poet is not pleading. Rather, the new fragment in particular might be seen as primarily didactic in purpose, an instance of the sentiment of fr. 111 W to be courageous but mindful that success or victory lies with the gods.

The role of the gods in determining the outcome of a battle seems to figure at the opening of the new fragment (v. 2). It is noteworthy that the god is apparently not specified, presumably because the poet and his comrades are hesitant to assign particular blame without cause (cf. Achilles’ exhortation to consult the experts to determine what has caused Apollo’s wrath, II.1.62-67). Similarly, the dispensation of the gods is made literally

---

54 Obbink (2005) 21 and (2006) 7-8, noting, however, that the shield detail is only explicitly mentioned in Philostratus’ Heroicus (13.4-14.1; 23.1; 23.24).
responsible for turning the Argives to flight (v. 7). The gods appear elsewhere in battle narratives in Archilochus, and when the propitiousness of the god is being described, the deity may be named (notably Athena).\footnote{See fr. 94.1-3 W; perhaps 91.30; 98.7, 13; adesp. el. 61.3, 9, which is now assigned with certainty to Archilochus; see Obbink (2006) 1. In fr. 108 W the poet calls on Hephaestus, begging him to become his propitious ally. Bowie (2001) 57 discusses the role of the gods in elegy and Archilochus’ tetrameters; he suggests that recent history (battles) may have been discussed in terms similar to those of epic, e.g., with the appearance of divinities. Obbink (2005) 21 cites fr. 16 W, in which the poet reminds Pericles how the quasi-divinities τύχη and μοῖρα grant all things to mortals.}

Of course, when it comes to the mythical material in the new fragment, different conventions apply, and the interventions of divinities can be recalled by the poet with the same certainty as the epic bard. In all likelihood, Heracles appears in an epiphany to his son (v. 22), and if we follow the standard treatments of the myth, Dionysus will manifest as the vine-shoot that trips Telephus.\footnote{The detail of the vine-shoot is not found in Proclus’ summary, where we are only told that Telephus comes out to defend the city, kills Thersander son of Polynices, and is himself wounded by Achilles. Apollodorus \textit{epit.} 3.17 states that Telephus armed the Mysians and killed many Greeks, including Thersander, but fled before Achilles and became entangled in the vine-shoot, whereupon he was wounded. The A scholia to \textit{Iliad} 1.59 = \textit{Cypria} fr. 20 Bernabé (\textit{PEG} I) essentially agree with Apollodorus, adding that Dionysus was angered at Telephus’ failure to offer honors. See Gantz (1993) 578-79, who argues for the antiquity of the Achilles-Telopeus episode; so also Preiser (2000) 41-48.}
As for the appearance of Heracles, the reading Ἡρακλῆς ἐπὶ ἠντις[ε] needs comment. West reads ἡπτησε on the papyrus, but he emends because ἀντίω gives better sense.\(^{57}\) I agree that, assuming the relative clause of vv. 24-25 is correct, an accusative object or infinitive to go with the verb of asking would be too far away in v. 26. Yet both West and Obbink translate ‘and Heracles came to face them’, by which I assume the Achaeans are understood as object.\(^{58}\) This seems to me very difficult to supply, for βοῶν has Telephus as object.\(^{59}\) I think it easier to understand rather that Heracles is coming to meet his son, and that this is an epiphany. In fact, ἀντίω can refer to the meeting of family members in epic: notably, \textit{Il.} 6.399, of Andromache meeting Hector; \textit{Od.} 4.201, of Nestor never having met his brother Antilochus (~\textit{Il.} 4.375, of Agamemnon never having met Tydeus).\(^{60}\) As for meeting in the sense of epiphany, the related verb ἀντίω occurs with this meaning in the \textit{Odyssey}: 13.292, of a god (i.e. Athena) meeting Odysseus and 13.312, of a man (i.e. Odysseus) meeting Athena; 24.56 of Thetis coming to mourn over the dead Achilles.\(^{61}\)

Thus, Heracles appears, exhorting (and supporting) his son, who is temporarily successful at routing the Achaeans. In the Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue of Women} there seems to be

\(^{57}\) West (2006) 15.


\(^{59}\) See Obbink (2005) 39 for the accusative with βοῶν. ἀντίω doesn't take an acc. object; E. \textit{IA} 150 is corrupt.

\(^{60}\) Cf. also \textit{Il.} 7.423, where the armies meet, but for the purpose of gathering their dead.

\(^{61}\) Cf. \textit{Od.} 12.88, of a god meeting Scylla (in a possibly hostile sense).
a correspondence between the exploits of Heracles and those of his son, in part no doubt to reinforce the genealogical connection:

η τέκε] Τήλεφον Ἀρκασίδην Μυσῶν βασιλὴ[α,  
μιθήσειο' ἐν φιλότητι βίοι Ἡρακλησίη  
έτε μεθ' ἦπι ποὺς στείχεν ἀγαυοῦ Λαομέδοντο[ς,  
οἵ ἅριστοι ἐν Ἀσ[ί] διὰ ἔτραφεν αὕτη-  
Δαρδαν]ιδῶν μεγαθύμων φύλον ἕναιρ[  
k]εῖνης δὲ τε γῆς ἔξηλασε πάσης.  
αὐτὸρ Τήλεφος] ἔτραπ' Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτῶν[ων  
]ἐ μελανῶν ἐπὶ νη[ῶν  
]πέλασεν χθονὶ βω[τιανεῖρη  
]ἐ βίη τ' ἀνδροκτασίη τ[ε (165.8-17 M-W).62

“Who bore Telephus, descendant of Arcasus, king of the Mysians, after she mingled with the might of Heracles, when he was going after noble Laomedon’s horses, which were the finest reared in the land of Asia...slew the race of great-hearted Dardanians...drove out from the whole of that land. But Telephus routed...of the bronze tunic-wearing Acheans...upon dark ships...brought to the nourishing earth...force and manslaughter.”

Auge has sex with Heracles, but the detail is added that he attacked the Dardanians (vv. 8-13). In the next lines, it seems, Telephus’ rout of the Acheans is described (vv. 14-17),

---

62 I omit the first seven lines; 18-25 yield little that is intelligible.
though his name must be supplied and the papyrus becomes less intelligible at this point.\textsuperscript{63} The detail of Heracles’ rout of the Dardanians may have been included because the poet had in mind his role in the later Telephus episode, which was by contrast only partially successful.

The sequel to the Archilochus fragment probably included the loss of Telephus’ support from Heracles, or we might imagine Heracles and Dionysus feuding from opposite sides, much as we find the gods doing in the \textit{Iliad}. Perhaps the simplest way to reverse the action would be a narrative interruption such as ‘but then the scales of Zeus tipped against Telephus….\textsuperscript{64} Interestingly, in a fragment of a Hellenistic or later hexameter epic we find a retrospective discussion of the Achaeans’ conflict with Telephus, how the former would never have come to Troy had Telephus successfully killed them all:

\begin{quote}

[ἐξ]ξαπίνης ἐπέδησεν ἀνωϊστο[ι]ς κλάδοιςιν,
[οὗ] κεν ἑτὶ ζώοντες ἐς Ἰλιον ἦλθον [Ἀχαοί,
[ἐ]νθα δὲ κεν Μενέλαος ἐκέκλιτο, ἐν[θ]' Ἀγαμέμνον
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{63} See Hirschberger (2004) 340 for the identification of the Telephus-story. I am not sure on what grounds Most (2007) 185 bases his translation, “Then Telephus] fled from the Achaeans with their bronze tunics”. Supplements proposed for 165.15 M-W are e.g. ἀσπιστάς καὶ ἔβησ[ε] (Grenfell-Hunt) and λαὸν ὃ περ τοῦτ’ ἐπήλ[θ]ε (Rzach), either providing the direct object of ἔτραπε (= he [i.e. Telephus] put to rout the host/shield-bearers of the bronze tunic-wearing Achaeans). The active ἔτραπε used intransitively is rejected at \textit{ll.} 16.658, for it rather governs δί[φ[ρ]ον; see Janko (1992) ad loc. Euripides \textit{Suppl.} 718 ἔτρεψαν ἐς φυγήν πόδα is exceptional in the sense ‘fled’, but πόδα as direct object makes the difference; see Collard (1975) ad loc.

\textsuperscript{64} For the scales of Zeus in Archilochus, cf. frr. 91.30 W; 144.2 W(?).
[ὡ]λετο, καὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοις [Ἀχιλῆα
Τήλεφος ἐξενάριξε πρὶν Ἐκτόρ[ος ἀντίον ἐλθεῖν (P. Oxy. 214.1-5 = P. Lond. 1181 =
Coll. Alex. epica adesp. 3 [76-78 Powell]).
“Suddenly (he?) bound him with unexpected shoots; the Achaeans would not have
stayed alive and come to Ilium, but there Menelaus would have fallen, there
Agamemnon would have perished, and the best among the Argives, (Achilles),
Telephus would have slain before he came face to face with Hector.”

Included among those who would have been killed is “the best among the Argives,” and
Achilles’ name is suitably supplied at the end of the line (v. 4). At the start of the fragment
what actually occurred seems to be described (v. 1). Although the binder is unnamed, it is
most likely Dionysus, and there is, it seems, a reference to vine shoots. At least according to
this epic, then, it is not the overpowering might of Achilles that clinches victory, but the
intervention of the god. I therefore suggest that the scene is not one lone warrior coming
upon another in monomachia, but a sudden turn of events brought about by the gods.
However this may be, I think it entirely likely that the narrative in the Archilochus fragment
does not break off short of Telephus’ flight and wounding. We must, therefore,
reconsider the point of the mythical exemplum, if that is what it is, and decide just what
message Archilochus is conveying.

65 The fragment continues for another 16 lines, but the focus is upon the speaker’s present plight –
there is a prayer for a truce between Trojans and Argives (vv. 12-13).
66 Powell, unlike Grenfell-Hunt, prints the end of the line without a bracket.
67 West (2006) 17 thinks the point of the myth is simply to illustrate a rout of the Achaeans, so he
supposes the narration does not continue much beyond the end of the fragment.
The opening of the mythical narrative gives us our first clue as to theme: Telephus is alone (v. 5), but puts to flight a great host (v. 6). There seems to be a sharp contrast between the lone fighter, Telephus, assaulting the great forces of the Achaeans, much as we find in the *Iliad* with the exploits of Diomedes, Hector, and Achilles. That Telephus fights alone is perhaps prefigured by his parentage, for Heracles is the lone warrior *par excellence*. This may also have been the standard version of the myth already for Archilochus: Proclus in his summary of the *Cypria* simply has him come out to defend his city (no other force is mentioned), though Apollodoros (*epit.* 3.17) does refer to Telephus arming the Mysians. In Philostratus the narrator states that the poets relate how the Achaeans plundered Mysia, and how Telephus was wounded while fighting *on behalf of* his people – not, for example, leading his army (*Heroicus* 23.4), but the narrator seems to go on to give a different version, in which the Achaeans can barely land (let alone go about plundering) because of Mysian arrows (23.14), and in which Telephus musters a great force, an alliance greater than that at Troy (23.9-13). When Telephus’ wounding is actually described, however, it is said that he would have died, had not the Mysians run together to take him from the battle (23.24). This last detail suggests perhaps that there is a contrast between Telephus (possibly fighting alone) and the rest of the Mysians who must act as one to save their king.

In addition, Pindar curiously describes Patroclus standing alongside the other Greeks (Achilles and the Atreidae), yet somehow *alone*, against Telephus:

...τοῦ παῖς ἄμ’ Ἀτρέιδας
Τεύθραντος πεδίον μολὼν ἔστα σὺν Ἀχιλλεί
μόνος, ὅτ’ ἀλκάεντας Δαναοῦς τρέψαις ἄλαισιν
πρόμναις Τήλεφος ἐμβαλεν. (Pi. O. 9.70-73).

“...whose child (i.e., Patroclus) together with the Atreidae, coming to the plain of Teuthras, stood with Achilles, alone, when Telephus, putting to flight the brave Danaans, set upon their sea-going prows.”

There may be a special point to μόνος here, emphatically placed between the ostensibly lone Patroclus and the actually solitary Telephus, who defends his town. Perhaps Pindar is echoing a tradition that Telephus was compelled to fight without assistance. At least in the Archilochus fragment, aside from the appearance of Heracles, Telephus is not said to have any support. In line 25 μονος was read in the editio princeps and labeled an instance of ‘ring composition’; Obbink now confirms the reading [πρό]μαχος but he suggests this amounts to the same.68 We shall consider in chapter 4 the significance of the terms πρόμαχος and μονος particularly in comparison with the Iliad. It suffices to note for the moment that Telephus is specifically alone, against the mass of the Achaean army.

At first glance, such references to the solitary hero seem to be of a piece with, e.g. Callinus fr. 1.18-21 W, a description of the people’s longing for the lost fighter who, being alone, performs deeds worthy of many men. Yet how could Archilochus employ Telephus as the paradigm of the undefeatable enemy (before whom it is right to flee) without also calling to mind the immediate sequel – Telephus’ own flight? I suggest that there are hints to what follows even in the fragment we possess.

τόσα in line 7 should, I think, be adverbial (limitative), “and those brave men were fleeing, indeed, so far (long) as the dispensation of gods was routing them, though they

---

were spearmen”.69 The parallel for this use is τόσσον in fr. 15 W. Obbink suggests the word may correlate the μοῖρα θεῶν of the narrative with that of the poet and his audience: “so great a fate as this (i.e. our present predicament).”70 Yet I doubt that an adjective strictly of size (not quality) is appropriate to describe μοῖρα. And Obbink seems to translate as an adverb (but not limitatively): “indeed, so greatly was the fate of the gods routing them.”71 West reads instead ἔξις τόσσα and translates “so greatly did the divine doom frighten them.”72 But this assumes three letters in the gap instead of two (though one is iota), and Obbink affirms his own reading: “dispexit R. Janko.”73 A. Nicolosi suggests this is but a general reference to the supremacy of fate decided by the gods over men.74 But the context is essential, for the poet has also just said that Telephus routed the army (ἔφοβησε v. 6). If the two imperfects (though φέβοντο of v. 6 is wholly reconstructed)75 are taken

69 Suggested by Obbink (2005) 34, who notes also the parallel in 15 W.
70 Obbink (2005) 34.
73 Obbink (2006) 2 ap. crit. For the combination ἗...δῆ in Archilochus, cf. fr. 188.4 W (with πολλά); cf. Sem. 22.1 W.
75 West (2006) 11 supplies ο[ῦδέ] ἔγενοντο at the end of line 6, but it would not seem to really suit the poet’s message to say that the Argives were not brave. The same difficulty applies to West’s alternative (2006) 13, ο[Ἅδε] ἐλάθωντο | ἀλκη[ς], which also leaves unfilled the gap of two letters before Ἡ τόσσα. The suggestion of Magnelli (2006) 9 ο[ῦδέ] ἐπι μείναν / ἐπι ἐμεῖναν conflates ‘nor did the brave remain’ and ‘nor did they remain brave.’ The parallel which he cites ἐνθ’ ὑδέ ζημιοι Λύκουι μένον (Il. 16.659) is different because Λύκοι provides the subject, which I doubt ἀλκη[ς] (v.
closely together, they serve to explain and somewhat correct the aorist: the Argives did not flee *full stop*, but *were fleeing* so long as the gods were against them (and favoring Telephus).\textsuperscript{76}

In addition, Telephus is twice called ἀμείλικτος (vv. 11, 23), which is not a very common word and seems quite strong (also in Archilochus at fr. 159.1 \textit{W(?), without context). We should compare ἀμείλικιον (fr. 7.2 \textit{W}) with which West reads (after Peek) ἐν [φρεσὶ θυμόν.\textsuperscript{77} Slings doubts that fragment 7 \textit{W} is military paraenesis (as is suggested by Peek and West), and supposes that such a word is generally negative and so should apply to the enemy.\textsuperscript{78} In its two occurrences in the \textit{Iliad} ἀμείλικτος modifies ὁπα; the first instance (11.137) refers to Agamemnon’s pitiless response to the pleas of Peisander and Hippolochus for mercy (with gentle words, ibid.). The second occurrence is with Achilles’ response in the famous scene of Lycaon begging for mercy (21.98). At \textit{h. Cer.} 259 the water of Styx, by which the gods swear their oaths, is similarly described as unyielding. The application to a human, then, indicates that the warrior is not to be pleaded with for mercy or restraint. In Hesiod (\textit{Th.} 659), however, the adjective is used of the bonds holding the

---

\textsuperscript{7} can do without the article. Rather: ‘the brave (Achaeans) *were fleeing*, despite being spearman’ (the thought continued by the appositive in v. 8).

\textsuperscript{76} We may compare \textit{Iliad} 15.343-45, Ὄφρ’ οἱ τοὺς ἐνάριζον ἀπ’ ἕντεα, τὸφρα δ’ Ἀχαιῶ...φέβαντο (while the Trojans stop to strips arms, the Achaeans were fleeing). My explanation also dispels the objection of Luppe (2006) 2 to the imperfect after the aorist; the lack of an explicit direct object for ἐφόβη does not seem problematic to me.

\textsuperscript{77} West (1985) 9; Peek (1985) 15.

\textsuperscript{78} Slings (1986) 1-2; cf. West (1985) 9-10; Peek (1985) 15.
Hundred-Handers, and the point emphasized there is that their escape was possible only through the contrivances of Zeus (cf. 653, 658); that is, the unbreakable bonds were in fact broken.\textsuperscript{79} Perhaps, therefore, the repeated use of the adjective with Telephus is another set-up for the reversal of the narrative: Telephus may be implacable against the great host of the Achaeans, but then the designs of the god(s) turn against him, Achilles appears, and so forth.

Moreover, the second (apparent) use of the adjective (v. 23) occurs with the supplement o\~{\i}]|rov, made by West.\textsuperscript{80} I am less certain, however, that another substantive is absolutely required to stand at the beginning of 23 in apposition to το\~{\i}λ[\i]κάρδιον [υιόν, as West wants.\textsuperscript{81} I compare frr. 193.1-3 and 114.4 W for the asyndeton of two adjectives and a participle; in any case, if an appositive is desired, Τ]ήλεφον stands at the beginning of 24. I suggest δη]ρόν (sc. χρόνον) at the start of 23, yielding the sense “for a long time implacable in cruel battle.”\textsuperscript{82} This would then give another hint to the sequel – Telephus is successful for a time at warding off alone the attackers, but eventually the tide of battle will turn. Interestingly, δηρόν often occurs in the \textit{Iliad} with a negative in phrases such as

\textsuperscript{79} Cf. West (1966) ad 659, who notes that elsewhere in early epic the adjective applies only to things that might be object of μελίσσειν.

\textsuperscript{80} Note that Obbink’s (2006) 5 translation “fierce and pitiless” is loose; rather “implacable watcher/guardian”.

\textsuperscript{81} West (2006) 15.

\textsuperscript{82} For δηρόν with an adjective, cf. \textit{Il}. 17.41; with a participle at \textit{Od}. 5.396. It is often line-initial e.g. \textit{Il}. 5.120, 5.285, 10.371; cf. now Si. 17.5 W, perhaps from the (elegiac) Plataea poem, but see Kowerski (2005) 54-56.
’remaining long in battle’ or ‘living long (i.e. surviving combat)’ (e.g. 2.298; 5.120; 5.285; 10.371; 16.852). The phrase would, however, be ambiguous here (it could be taken in the sense “he remained steadfast in cruel battle”), keeping the audience in suspense about what will follow.

If, on the other hand, οὖρον is retained, we should consider its implications. In the Iliad, it is only applied to Nestor (four times). The first instance (8.80) is noteworthy, for the context is one of flight: the Achaeans are gripped by fear, and the heroes Idomeneus, Agamemnon, and the Ajaxes, though attendants of Ares, (cf. vv. 7, 8 of the Telephus fragment) do not remain steadfast (8.76-79). But things are otherwise for Nestor:

Nέστωρ οἶος ἔμμενε Γερήνιος, οὖρος Ἀχαιῶν,
οὐ τι ἐκών, ἀλλ’ ἵππος ἐτείρετο... (8.79-80).

“Gerenian Nestor remained alone, watcher of the Achaeans, in no way willingly, but his horse was distressed....”

Note that the scene presented is far more ‘cowardly, un-heroic’ than that supposedly found in Archilochus’ shield poem, for Nestor doesn’t want to remain in battle, and the poet must explain why he is compelled to stay, whereas the flight of Archilochus was made against his will.

There is also a double meaning with οἶος ἔμμενε, for it may be taken to mean that Nestor out of all the other frightened Achaeans alone remained (i.e. courageously), and this is perhaps the more obvious interpretation until the next line clarifies the situation. In

---

83 West (2006) 15 refers to line 17 of the Hellenistic or later hexameter epic (P. Oxy 241, sup. cit.) where, as he translates, “bulwark of the Achaeans” may be read (though, as here, the first two letters of οὐρον are missing), but it is not obvious that Telephus is still being discussed there.
context, the second interpretation is that Nestor remained alone, isolated, and the sequel bears out this sense. For the poet states that Nestor would then have died, had not Diomedes noticed his plight (8.90-91). Interestingly, Diomedes calls to Odysseus for assistance, upbraiding him for his flight (8.92-96), and it is lines such as these that have given rise, I suspect, to the notion that flight from combat is always considered cowardly in heroic epic. But Odysseus doesn’t turn to help; the poet states that he doesn’t hear Diomedes but continues on to the ships (8.97-98), and no further mention is made of the issue.

By a rare phrasing (αὐτός πέρ ἐών 8.99) Diomedes is described as facing the Trojans alone, much as Nestor has been left alone. Yet the context matters, for the bravery that apparently attaches to Diomedes’ lone stand is not the same type as is found with his offensive, manic aristeia (in book 5). Rather, he is here turning to help a comrade to escape from battle, for the other Achaeans have already fled. In rescuing Nestor with his horses, he notes how they know both how to pursue and to flee swiftly (8.104-5), and it is the latter that we expect them to undertake at this point. Diomedes, however, has other ideas, and decides to attack the Trojans head-on with Nestor, envisioning Hector coming to know how his spear rages (μαίνεται 8.109-11), which is no doubt meant to recall Diomedes’ mania from book 5.

It is easy to lose track of where the narrative was going, for the battle is renewed. But lest we forget the flight of the Achaeans, Zeus perceives the situation and accordingly throws a lightening bolt immediately in front of the swift horses of Diomedes (8.130-35), as
though to return the story to its proper course. Nestor, wise as is he is, understands the portent for what it is. Growing afraid, he exhorts Diomedes to flight (8.137-44), and the latter, for all his eagerness, eventually seems to comply, though Zeus must thrice more thunder in warning (8.167-71).

As for the epithet οὖσος, I suggest that it is applied to Nestor here as a marker of the situation generally: the warriors are in flight, and must look out one for another. Ironically, it is the ‘guardian of the Achaeans’ who needs rescuing by Diomedes, and he returns the favor, as it were, by encouraging him to flight at the proper time, guarding the well-being of the army. This interpretation is reinforced by the next occurrence in the Iliad (11.840), where Patroclus is on a mission to deliver a message from Nestor, guardian of the Achaeans, but stops to help rescue his wounded comrade Eurypylus, which behavior is similar to the Diomedes-Nestor episode. And again, Nestor (15.370) is watching over the host as he leads the prayer to Zeus for salvation, where the context suggests protectiveness in time of distress.

If, then, the word is read in the Archilochus poem, I propose that it has something of an ironic meaning. On the face of it, he is acting as a guardian of his people, defending

---

84 Fenik (1968) 220-22 discusses how untypical elements, such as Zeus hurling his lightning bolts, are prominent in this book, though the reversal of a battle through divine intervention is typical.

85 Of course, it is not a total victory for the Trojans, for once the Achaeans are all returned to their ships, Hera intervenes to prevent their destruction by rousing Agamemnon (8.217-19).
Mysia from the attacking Achaians.\textsuperscript{86} If I am correct, however, that Archilochus is putting at least some emphasis on the flight of Telephus and his essential failure, then his role as guardian of his people is unfulfilled. The blame for this failure, as I have been suggesting, is owed to his decision to fight \textit{alone} against the Achaians.

In v. 25, there is an apparent reference to Telephus gratifying his father. It seems reasonable to assume the father is Heracles, not Telephus’ adoptive father Teuthras.\textsuperscript{87} Yet we should be cautious about taking the phrase at face value. In fr. 6 \textit{W} we find the ironic expression:

\begin{quote}
ξείνια δυσμενέσιν λυργρὰ χαριζόμενοι
\end{quote}

“gratifying the enemy with guest-gifts of grief.”

There both ξείνiα and χαριζόμενοι are not to be taken literally, and we find a similar phrase also in a martial context at 146.6 \textit{W}: ξεινίων φειδοίατο “they were sparing of guest-gifts.”\textsuperscript{88}

In fr. 108 the speaker calls on Hephaestus:

\begin{quote}
κλῶθ’ ἄναξ Ἡφαίστε, καὶ μοι σύμμαχος γονυομένωι

Íλαος γενέο, χαρίζεο δ’ οἶά περ χαρίζεαι

“Hearken, Lord Hephaestus, and become my propitious ally as I implore you; grant me the sort of favors you grant.”
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{86} See Engelmann and Merkelbach (1971) 97-103 on οὗρος (watcher), which is also Ionic for ὁρος (boundary), as originally ‘boundary-guard’. Cf. \textit{Il.} 13.450 where Minos is called ἐπίουρος over Crete.

\textsuperscript{87} Obbink (2005) 40.

\textsuperscript{88} Lavelle (1981) 197-99 suggests that fr. 6 refers to a victory over ‘gift-taking’ Thracians, hence the ‘guest-gifts of grief.’ For the optative –οίατο see West (1974) 106.
It is not clear just what sort of favor the poet thinks Hephaestus is particularly known for (cf. Hephaestus as fire, fr. 9.10-11 W), but one good possibility is that the poet is seeking a woman, given Hephaestus’ role in fashioning Pandora (Hes. Op. 57-82). Possibly, then, χαρίζει δ’ οἷς χαρίζεις is again ironic, for the favor, Pandora, is both gift and bane; we may think of the frustrating Lycaenids, with whom Archilochus is nevertheless perpetually obsessed. I suggest that in v. 25 of the Telephus-fragment the poet is being ironic (though in a way practically the converse of fr. 6 W): Telephus obeys and hence gratifies the exhorting Heracles, but in doing so, by fighting alone, he also prepares for his own wounding, which of course will not please his father. In the same line, Telephus is described as fighting at close quarters (ἡπείδε) with the enemy and as a promachos. We shall consider below the significance of the latter term, but the poet seems to specify again that Telephus is fighting on his own against the Danaans. Archilochus’ audience is surely now anticipating the sequel, for why else has the poet drawn out the action as he does?

Yet if Telephus is made by Archilochus to serve as a negative example, as the warrior who fights without support of comrades, what do we make of the fate of the Achaean army in the poem as we have it? It has been suggested by P. Mayer that the Achaean of the poem reflect the contemporary Thasians (or perhaps Parians) who are engaged in some struggle that the poet believes they should not be. On this view, the mistaken landing at Mysia and the ensuing fighting is the corollary of a present conflict that has resulted in needless bloodshed and that should be broken off. Archilochus’ poem would thus convey a dissuasive, political message, not unlike the elegies of Solon.

---


Although I would not deny that Archilochus conveyed politically relevant messages in some of his poems, the scenario sketched by Mayer takes too literally the details of the poem that are really essential features of the tale. According to a summary of the story as it was told in the Cypria, the Greeks attacked Mysia in ignorance, believing it to be Troy: ἐν Τροίαν πλέοντες οἱ Ἑλληνες Μυσία προσίσχουσι, καὶ ἄγνοοντες αὐτὴν ἑπόρθουν, Τροίαν εἶναι νομίζοντες (Schol.Hom. A 59 = Cypria fr. 20 Bernabé). This summary matches quite closely the scenario described in the Archilochus version (vv. 16-21), so it would seem that the Achaeans’ ignorance in making their attack on Mysia is a basic element of the myth.  

It is of course possible that Archilochus found and selected the mythical exemplum that precisely matched the contemporary events he wished to comment upon, but this seems to me rather unlikely.

In addition, we have evidence of Archilochus using mythical allusion in what is probably a discussion of contemporary Thasian issues. Fragment 91 W survives in part from a quotation by Plutarch:

δέχεται δ’ ὁ πολιτικὸς λόγος δικανικὸς μᾶλλον καὶ γνωμολογίας καὶ ἱστορίας καὶ μύθους καὶ μεταφοράς, αὕς μάλιστα κινοῦσιν οἱ χρώμενοι μετρίως καὶ κατὰ καιρόν, ὡς…Ἀρχίλοχος, “μηδ’ ὁ Ταντάλου λίθος / τῆσδ’ ὑπὲρ νήσου κρεμάσθω” (Plut. praecepta gerendae reipublicae 803a).  

---

91 Indeed, the narrator of Philostratus’ Heroicus objects to the account given by the poets (23.4) that the Achaeans landed at Mysia in ignorance (23.5-7); he reasons that they intentionally attacked for profit and to prevent an alliance with the Trojans (23.8).

92 Translation by Gerber (1999a) 135.
“And political oratory, much more than that used in a court of law, admits maxims, historical and mythical tales, and metaphors, by means of which those who use them moderately and at the appropriate time move their audience exceedingly, as ... did Archilochus, "let the stone of Tantalus not hang over this island."

But a papyrus-find (P. Lit. Lond. 55)\(^3\) that includes the line-ends of the verses quoted by Plutarch (14-15) has helped to provide some context: the following line appears to end in a first-person plural verb (\(\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha\) 16 – the poet and his audience or fellow islanders?), and the beginning of line 44 ..] \(\tau\alpha\ \Theta\acute{a}\phi\varsigma\varsigma\) suggests that the island in question at line 15 is Thasos. A wish also seems to be expressed (\(\epsilon\iota\ \gamma\acute{a}\rho\ \nu\nu\) v. 26). Although a coherent narrative cannot be gleaned from the scraps, it seems that the political circumstances (especially matters relating to warfare) of Thasos are being discussed.\(^4\) From the appearances of this fragment, however, Archilochus makes an allusive, metaphorical reference to a mythical element.

Another parallel for the poet’s use of allegory is 105 W, cited by Heraclitus (\textit{Alleg. Hom.} 5.2), who specifically states that the comparison has to do with fighting in Thrace: ‘\(\text{Αρχίλοχος\ μὲν\ ἐν\ τοῖς\ Θραϊκοῖς\ ἀπειλημμένος\ δεινοῖς\ τὸν\ πόλεμον\ εἰκάζει\ θαλαττίωι\ κλύδωνι.} \) The fragment reads:

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
\text{Γλαῦχ’ ὅρα: βαθὺς γὰρ ἤδη κόμασιν ταράσσεται} \\
\text{πόντος, ἀμφὶ δ’ ἀκρα Γυρέων ὀρθὸν ἱσταται νέφος,} \\
\text{σῆμα χειμῶνος, κιχάνει δ’ ἐξ ἀελπτίης φόβος.}
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

\(^3\) P. Oxy. 2313 also contains fragments of lines 2-13.

\(^4\) See Sider (2006) 332, who argues that \textit{all} of the features of political oratory mentioned by Plutarch were included in the Archilochus poem from which he quotes.
“Glaucus, behold. For the deep sea is already stirred up with waves, and a cloud stands tall around the promontory of Gyrae, a sign of storm: fear arrives from the unexpected.”

J.S. Clay cogently argues that Heraclitus’ identification of this fragment as allegory rests upon mention of the mythical promontory of Gyrae (and not an actual place known to the poet).95 This is the place where Ajax is killed by Poseidon for boasting that he escaped the sea against the will of the gods (*Od. 4.499-511*). Archilochus’ mention of storm and promontory both allude to the poet’s present circumstances in war.96 I suggest, therefore, that there is no very literal correspondence between myth and contemporary situation in the Telephus-fragment, for this would be too artless and uncharacteristic of Archilochus’ style.

I propose instead that the mythical exemplum offered by Archilochus operates on a broader, more general level. This is not to say, however, that the message is not complex. In answer to the question I posed above, if Telephus serves as a negative example, then it is the Achaeans with whom the audience is meant to identify positively. The unified army, though facing a terrible setback and temporarily defeated, will fight again another day. The theme of the army hindered in their journey to Troy (v. 16) does not correspond to a mistaken or misguided attack by contemporary Thasians, but simply to a setback in war


96 Fr. 213 W may also refer to men in a dangerous situation (in battle?) through allusive language: ψυχάς ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις “having their lives in the embrace of waves.” Pörtulas (1982) 29-32 suggests that the language of a loving embrace is appropriated to describe violent grasping, which he takes to be a suitable metaphor for political turmoil.
experienced by Thasos. The correspondence between the myth and reality lies in the
general theme of the variability of fortune and the dispensation of the gods. There is,
however, one fault of the Achaeans that I think is highlighted: they believed (wrongly) that
they were attacking Troy and would win a quick victory (cf. v. 21 αἵματα).97 The poet thus
discourages over-confidence, particularly in matters of war. Despite this caution, the
mythical example will end on a positive note for the Achaeans (and hence Archilochus’
audience). Telephus will be wounded, and the better part of the army will be saved. Again,
this does not fit exactly the contours of a contemporary battle: the Thasians have
presumably just faced a defeat, a battle in which they were forced to flee. The end of the
mythical exemplum is thus prospective – the Thasians, for their part, will (gods willing)
have their day of victory yet, provided they remain a united force in combat. Let us now
return to the fragment to see what support may be found for the interpretation I have
sketched.

Lines 5-13 have largely been discussed above; they describe the defeat and flight of
the army. The couplet (14-15) seems at first almost to be filler, for it is already clear who
these routed Achaeans are. H. Bernsdorff proposes interpreting these lines as a reference
to the impending destruction of the Achaeans (and indeed the whole race of demigods)
upon reaching Troy.98 In line with this view, he suggests the more pointed supplement
μόρος αἰνός for the end of verse 14.99 While such an interpretation is intriguing, the sense

97 Henry (2006) 14 suggests μάχαιρα, to be taken with φρικτόν in 20, which would instead emphasize
further the wrong-headedness of the Achaeans.


seems out of place in the poem, particularly given what follows. The future participle μαχησομένους (v. 15) is rather to be contrasted with the present setback of the Achaeans: οἳ δὲ τὸτε ἔλαφθεντες ὀδοῦ (v. 16). The Achaeans should be attacking Troy, and indeed that is what is fated for them to do. The participle thus reminds the audience that the Achaeans are not totally defeated on this occasion, and will go on to eventual victory.

Yet the supplement Ἀγαμέμνων (v. 14) seems a bit lacking in point. Somewhat differently from Bernsdorff’s suggestion, we might try instead Διὸς αἰσχρα, already suggested by Livrea and reported in Obbink’s second edition.100 This reading would further underscore the role of fate and the gods in matters of war. ‘Fate’ here is not specifically the doom of death, but rather the sum of one’s fortunes (both good and bad), one’s allotted share. I suggested above that μοῖρα θεῶν (v. 7) is significant and points to the transience of Telephus’ victory. A reference then to the subsequent destiny of the Achaeans would amplify this message: Telephus’ good fortune will soon vanish, whereas success in war will eventually come to the Achaeans.

Twice in the Iliad the ‘allotment of Zeus’ refers to the proportion of the warrior’s success in battle. Achilles refers to the (sufficient) honor he has attained by the allotment of Zeus (9.608), and the counterfactual prospect of the Achaeans winning battle glory beyond the allotment of Zeus is raised, but is of course rejected (17.319-23). If supplemented in verse 14 of the fragment, the phrase will also point to the fact that victory at Mysia is not allotted to the Achaeans. The losses they suffer there are in part owed to their mistaken assumption that it is Troy (v. 20), and their initial trust in a swift victory (v.

100 Obbink (2006) 2 ap. crit.
21) is, I suggest, blameworthy. The message then seems to be: 'be conservative, mind how swiftly fortunes change.'

But the Achaeans are not entirely to blame for the loss at Mysia. As the poet tells, they were on this occasion hindered from their course (v. 16) – perhaps by a storm or the designs of a god – but he does not specify. In all probability, however, the agency of the gods is in the poet’s mind; cf. Od. 1.195 θεοί βλάπτουσι κελεύθου (cited in the ed. pr.).

Several supplements have been proposed for the end of v. 16: παρά θ[υ]ν’ ἀφίκοντο ‘they had arrived at shore’;102 θ[υ]να μὲν ἤκον ‘they had come to shore’;103 θ[υ] ὁρμὸν ἐλασσάν ‘they had overshot their mooring’104. As West points out, mention here of the Achaeans’ arrival at shore is pointless because the Achaeans would have similarly landed on shore at Troy, and so there is no contrast.105 Nor, however, do we need to be told that they overshot their moorings (and the needed interpretation ‘proper moorings’ strains the language), for the poet already says they are off-course.

What precedes is key: the Achaeans are on their way to Troy, where they will do battle, as fated. At this time (τότε), however, they are making an attack on Mysia, but in error. I suggest παρά θ[υ]μὸν ἔθεντο ‘they risked their lives’.106 The participle

101 See also Fraenkel (1950) ad Ag. 120 (the lemma λοισθῶν δρόμων).


(παρθέμενοι) is so used in the *Odyssey*: the suitors risking their heads (2.237); of pirates risking their lives (ψυχάς, 3.74 = 9.255), all of which suggest an *unwarranted* risk. Yet Tyrtaeus makes it a positive characteristic of the soldier who bravely risks his life in battle: ψυχήν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος (12.18 W). And Archilochus has in a martial context μ’γαν ἑθεντο θυμὸν ‘they made their hearts great (i.e. roused their spirits)’ (98.16 W). If my suggestion is read here, the phrase would be initially ambiguous: the Achaeans *bravely* risked their lives (the sense in Tyrtaeus), and they *foolishly* risked their lives. That the latter is the ‘true’ sense becomes clear in the poet’s manner of describing the action: in vain, without reason did they tread on wheat-bearing Mysia (v. 21). The participial phrase in the first half of 16 could then have a concessive sense: even though they are in the wrong place, the Achaeans are eager for battle. Note too how the result of their attack, θυμὸν ἀκηχέ[δατο (or ἀκηχέ[μενοι) in line 19 would ‘echo’ the θυμὸν of v. 16: men with high spirits soon become grief-stricken. This supplement also mitigates the repetition of the

---

107 It is not agreed whether the participle has the same meaning with both objects, “laying his life and stout heart on the line” (West [1993] 26), or different, “risking his life and displaying a steadfast spirit” (Gerber [1999b] 59). Given that we find both κεφαλάς (Od. 2.237) and ψυχάς (Od. 3.74 = 9.255) as object, it is perhaps easier to assume it has the meaning ‘risk’ with both objects in Tyrtaeus.

108 Cf. I. 9.629 ὁγιοι ἐν στήθεσι θέτο μεγαλήτορα θυμόν, where the sense seems to be both ‘place heart in breast’ and ‘make his heart savage’; [Hesiod] fr. 204.95–96 M-W πάντες δὲ θεοὶ δίχα θυμόν ἑθεντο / ἐξ ἐρίδος, where the gods set themselves at odds, in strife.

tale, for the poet does not really go back to the beginning of the episode (the arrival at shore) but supplements his initial narrative with key details.

ἀφορ[αδί]η in line 19 would also go to support the interpretation that the Achaeans attack in folly. Yet W.B. Henry points out that the spacing does not suit such a reading, and he proposes ἀμφρ’ Ἐ[λέν]η.\textsuperscript{110} I do not, however, see the point of Helen here, unless it is heavily ironic (which, it is true, would not be inappropriate to Archilochus) – they suffered for Helen or so they thought. I propose reading ἀμφρ’ ὀ[δόν]η ‘with pain’, amplifying the distress and suffering of the Achaeans. Such a ‘full’ description of suffering is found in another of Archilochus’ elegies: οἴδαλέους δ’ ἀμφ’ ὀδόνης ἔχομεν / πνεύμωνας (13.4-5 W).\textsuperscript{111} The singular is thus found at A.R. 2.96, and, with different construction, at Iliad 11.398 and 15.25. Alternatively, sigma may easily be restored for the dative plural (the plural is far more common); at 13.4 W the singular is in fact read in Par. 1985.\textsuperscript{112}

Supplementing 18-19 is difficult: West prefers the participle ἀκηκχ[μενοι] in v. 19, which he makes depend along with 18 on the verb from v. 17 (with δρμό tentatively in place of Janko’s ἑνθα in 18).\textsuperscript{113} I am not so sure, however, about accepting ἀυτ[ί τε καὶ ἱπποι (v. 18). The parallel ἵππος χαλινών ὡς κατασθμαίνων μένει (Aesch. Sept. 793) for the

\textsuperscript{110} Henry (2006) 14.

\textsuperscript{111} Where the pain felt is emotional, not physical. Both senses are perhaps meant in the Telephus-fragment: grief over loss of comrades and their failed, misguided assault, as well as physical distress from battle.

\textsuperscript{112} Archilochus uses both the long and short form of the dative plural of alpha-stems; see West (1974) 93 and Slings (1983) 33-36 (whose analysis concludes the short form is an epicism).

\textsuperscript{113} West (2006) 14.
fury-breathing horse is not so close, for the verb (panting) is different, as is the construction (with/out of fury). We might then try for a finite verb here instead, keeping ἐνθα, and reading rather ὁμως (nevertheless, v. 18) and the participle in v. 19 with West.\(^{114}\) I have thought of αὐτοὶ περίδεισαν, yielding a line rather similar to I. 11.508: τῶι ῥα περίδεισαν μένεα πνείοντες Ἀχαιοί. The sense would thus be: ‘and they set upon the lovely city of Teuthras, where, breathing fury, nevertheless on the spot they became terrified, being greatly distressed at heart with pain.’ μένος again points at the unrestrained, frenzied eagerness of the Achaean for battle, for which they immediately suffer defeat. Admittedly, περιδείδω αλλὰ always has lengthened iota in Homer (in observance of original digamma), but the practice of Archilochus is not certain.\(^{115}\) Such a reading (along with ἄθαφ’ ὁδήνη in place of ἀφρ[αδί]η in v. 19) would also remove the objection raised by West that the narrative is a bit confused here (i.e. that the Achaean become sore at heart before they realize their mistake).\(^{116}\) Rather, verses 16-19 together rapidly summarize the Achaean defeat: lost but eager for battle, they swiftly suffer. The explanation (γάρ) in vv. 20-21 refers to the situation as a whole, not just the Achaean suffering: why were they (a) eager to attack and (b) quickly routed? Because they thought it was Troy, but it was in fact

---

\(^{114}\) Considered in the editio princeps: Obbink (2005) 37.

\(^{115}\) See West (1974) 88, who notes Sem. 14.2 and Hi. 73.7 for a short syllable before δε (not guaranteed by metre). Add now Archilochus 196a.39 (again not guaranteed by metre). For ἐνθα...αὐτοῦ cf. Solon 36.13 ἐνθάδ’ αὐτοῦ; I. 8.207 αὐτοῦ κ’ ἐνθ’ where, however, ἐνθα is demonstrative not relative.

Mysia.\textsuperscript{117} \(\mu[\acute{\alpha}]\tau\eta\nu\) (v. 21) then points to the fact that Mysia was not destined to be sacked then by the Achaeans.

There are thus several hints in our text that the present defeat at Mysia for the Achaeans and the corresponding victory of Telephus will be short-lived. To recapitulate: the dispensation of the gods puts the Achaeans to flight for a time (v. 7); clear mention of the future fighting to occur at Troy (possibly guided by divine authority, vv. 14-15); the emphasis that on that occasion they were off-course (v. 16); and, if [τ]ό[τε] is correct in v. 24, Telephus’ rout of the Achaeans is again set in a particular, limited period of time.

We might also suppose that ἀπέκλινον of v. 12 is carefully chosen by Archilochus. It is not a very common word in general, and the intransitive use in a context of rout and flight is not found in epic. West refers to \textit{h. Ven.} 168 as the closest parallel, but the verb is actually transitive there.\textsuperscript{118} The best parallels for the sense at issue here are in fact from prose.\textsuperscript{119} We find in Xenophon \textit{Κλέαρχος δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πολεμίους οὐκ ἤγεν... οὐ μέντοι οὐδὲ ἀπέκλινε, φυλαττόμενοι μὴ δοκοῖς φεύγειν} (\textit{An.} 2.2.16), and from Demosthenes οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ ῥαιτυμέειν ἀπέκλινεν, ἀλλ’ εὔθὺς Ὀλυνθίως ἐπεχείρησεν (1.13). In both cases the verb suggests retreat (though rather metaphorical in the latter example) and is contrasted with making an attack. In Theocritus (ἀποκλίνας ἐπ’ ἀριστερά, 7.130), however, it means ‘turning, changing direction’. Of the Achaeans’ flight, therefore, the sense is ‘turning back headlong (to their ships).’ The word suggests a forced ‘course correction’, which is

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{117} \textit{Pace} Nicolosi (2007) 315, γάρ does not introduce the explanation of their error – their error is the explanation of their eagerness for battle and resultant suffering.
  \item \textsuperscript{118} West (2006) 14; cf. Obbink (2005) 35.
  \item \textsuperscript{119} Cf. Nicolosi (2007) 308-9.
\end{itemize}
contrasted then with v. 16 βλαφθέντες ὀδοὺ: ironically, their rout by Telephus puts them back on track to Troy, which is where they ought to be fighting.

It is true that Archilochus acknowledges the superiority of fate and the will of the gods over man. Yet the myth of Telephus is not introduced exclusively to underscore this fact, to demonstrate that flight is sometimes necessary. Rather, the myth also shows the reversal of fortunes, in particular how the great army of the Achaeans suffers a setback but goes on to victory. I have already noted above the instances in which the gods feature in Archilochus' battle narratives. More generally, however, the theme of the transience of fortunes and man's ignorance about the future occurs frequently in the fragments.

In the elegies, we find fortune and destiny giving all (both good and ill, as I take it) to mortals: πάντα Τύχη καὶ Μοῖρα, Περίκλεες, ἄνδρι δίδωσιν (16 W).120 Interestingly, fr. 17 W, a version of which is ascribed by John of Sicily to Archilochus, seems initially to convey precisely the opposite sense, that man's own hard work produces all: πάντα πόνος τεύχει θνητοῖς μελέτη τε βροτείη.121 But the context in Syrianus, who quotes the fragment, also

120 The single hexameter is not assigned with certainty to Archilochus, but the sentiment seems appropriate to the poet, and the address to Pericles supports the assignment (cf. frr. 13.1; 28.4 [?]; 124 [Ath. 1.7f]).

121 The assignment of this verse to Archilochus is suspected because of the short scansion τε βρ, but see West (1974) 114.
suggests that it is the gods who ultimately provide, though man must work (1.6.8-14 Rabe).122 And again, in consoling Pericles, the poet remarks:

... ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνηκέστοις κακοῖσιν

ὁ φίλ’ ἐπὶ κρατερήν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν

φάρμακον. ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τόδε· νῦν μὲν ἐς ἡμέας

ἐτράπεθ’, αἰματόν δ’ ἔλκος ἀναστένομεν,

ἐξαὐτὶς δ’ ἐτέρους ἐπαμείψεται. ἀλλὰ τάχιστα

τλῆτε, γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι (13.5-10 W).

“But the gods have set for incurable ills, my friend, mighty endurance as a medicine. Different men at different times have this (woe). Now it has turned upon us, and we bemoan a bloody wound, but it will again turn to others. But endure most swiftly, putting aside womanly lamentation!”

The reminder that suffering and sorrow are only temporary is meant to dispel grief over comrades lost at sea. In the Telephus-poem, Archilochus seems to provide similar consolation for a recent military loss – ‘the gods were against us too today, but we must endure’. I have suggested that the mythical exemplum will end on a positive note for the audience: Telephus will be wounded and the Achaeans go on their way to Troy. A similar effect is produced at the end of 13 W.123 The gentle words of consolation turn to a forceful

122 Plato is also quoted for the notion that the gods trade men good things for their labors, and Ps.-Phocylides 162, a sentiment similar to Archilochus 17 W which it precedes, is introduced καὶ ἐν Μιλήτῳ ὁ θεός.

123 It has been suggested by e.g. Adkins (1985) 36 that 13 W is a complete poem; see also Faraone (2008) 17-19 for discussion.
command to cease from grief quickly. The gods do send woes, but they have also given the 
means to cope, which man must choose to exercise (note how τλήτε refers back to 
tλημοσύνην). Just as the Achaeans manage to survive a setback, keep their forces together, 
and reach their true goal, so Archilochus’ audience (his fighting comrades) must keep from 
becoming demoralized by their flight from battle.

Outside of his elegies, Archilochus treats at length the theme that anything may happen in fr. 122 W:

χρημάτων ᾠδικτον οὖδέν ἐστιν οὐδ’ ἀπώμοτον
οὐδὲ θαυμάσιον, ἐπειδὴ Ζεὺς πατήρ Ὀλυμπίων
ἐκ μεσαμβρίας ἐθηκε νύκτ’, ἀποκρύψας φάσος
ἡλίου ἠλάμποντος, λυγρὸν ἥλθε ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους δέος.
ἐκ δὲ τοῦ καὶ πιστὰ πάντα κάπιελπτα γίνεται
ἀνδράσιν· μηδεῖς ἐθ’ ὑμέων εἰσορέων θαυμαζέτω... (122.1-6 W).

“Nothing is unexpected or sworn impossible or a source of wonder, since Zeus 
father of Olympians made night out of mid-day, hiding the light of the sun, and fear 
came upon men. But after this everything is believable and expected for men; let 
none of you still wonder as you gaze...”

In the last lines of the fragment (7-9), even the ‘impossible' scenario of dolphins switching 
their watery haunts with creatures of land is contemplated. Like the image of Zeus making 
night out of day, the poet imagines a change from the regular and expected to the 
unexpected. Aristotle cites the first line, and says that a father speaks about his daughter 
(Rhet. 3.17.1418b28). It is difficult to decide whether Aristotle means the father is 
speaking throughout or that he speaks at some point in the poem that begins thus.
Whichever is the case, the fragment we possess is probably not simply general musings by
the poet, but remarks applicable to a particular situation. The message would be: although
the present circumstances seem certainly thus, matters may still change. We may again
have exhortation and the suggestion to beware how fortunes change.

Still more pointedly, the poet describes how man’s fate – both good and bad –
changes dramatically because of the gods:

τοῖς θεοῖς ἄνατεν πολλάκις μὲν ἐκ κακῶν
ἄνδρας ὁρθοῦσιν μελαίνη κεμένους ἐπὶ χθονὶ,
πολλάκις δ’ ἀνατρέπουσι καὶ μάλ’ ἔδει βεβηκότας
ὑπτίους, κεῖνος <δ’> ἔπειτα πολλά γίνεται κακά,
καὶ βίου χρήμη πλανᾶται καὶ νόου παρῆλθος (130 W).¹²⁴

"... Many times they set aright out of ills men who are lying on the dark earth, and
many times they overturn on their backs even men who stand quite firm; for them
then there are many ills, and he (such a man) wanders in need of livelihood, his
mind distraught."

Once again, these sentiments are probably being expressed in the context of a particular
situation – perhaps Archilochus is encouraging a friend that his bad fortune is bound to
end, or warning a personal enemy that his luck will soon run out. It has been observed that
many of our early poetic fragments survive in anthologists; fragments 13, 122, and 130 are
all preserved by Stobaeus, who seems to have consciously selected passages that are

¹²⁴ The subject of the verbs in 2 and 3 must be the gods; see West (1974) 131-32 for discussion of
the various emendations proposed for v. 1.
general and gnomic, perhaps even modifying the text to eliminate specific details. It is likely, therefore, that many such fragments have been stripped of their original contexts, in which the gnome was adduced as but one means for the poet to deliver his message.

Where we can discern some context, as in 13 W, the underlying message is not that the gods are in control (though this is affirmed), but that present circumstances will change, which provides some hope and comfort. Archilochus seems to have this outlook as well in the new fragment, and he introduces the mythical exemplum in part to illustrate this point.

---

CHAPTER 4. THE IDEAL WARRIOR: STEADY AND RELIABLE

If in the new fragment Archilochus is encouraging his comrades that their fortunes in war will soon change, he is also providing guidance as to how the army must behave in order for them to attain future victory. I have already suggested that two models are presented in the Telephus-myth: Telephus, the negative example of a warrior who fights alone, and the Achaean army, which is consistently presented in the fragment as a unified group. In this last section, I will provide further evidence for the poet’s ideas about the ideal warrior and the need for the fighting unit to remain cohesive. In addition, examples from epic will be adduced as a point of comparison for the ethos that Archilochus represents.

First, it should be said that there is some evidence that Archilochus engaged in military paraenesis, perhaps of the same sort found in Tyrtæus and Callinus. Two fragments from the Sosthenes monument are suggestive:

\[
\text{ιτω πᾶς ἔ]τι δυσμεν[έας}
\]

\[
\text{ἀλκιμὼν ἦτορ ἔχων καὶ ἂ]μείλιχον ἐν [φρεσὶ θυμόν,}
\]

\[
\text{ἀλ]ευμένος (7 W).}
\]

“(let each man go) against the enemy, (having a brave heart and) implacable (spirit) in (his breast)...warding off.”

Peek understands a brief prose introduction before the next quotation:

\[
\text{πο[ἀλῶν δ’ ἀθυμήσαντων πάλιν λέ]γει· ἔξ ἐλάφων ν[ (7a W).}^{126}
\]

---

\(^{126}\) Peek (1985) 14 supplies ν[όν ἐσχετ’ ἐνι φρεσί but the preposition is then hard to construe.

Perhaps then tmesis with a verb such as ‘drive out (the spirit) of deer (from your breast)’; cf. West (1985) 9; Slings (1986) 2.
“(and when many lost heart again he says): from (?) deer.”

It seems likely enough that deer is a reference here to cowardice, for in fr. 280 W Archilochus is said to have called someone a deer because of his cowardice: παρ’ ὑι (Ἀρχιλόχωι) καὶ τις διὰ δειλίαν προσωνομάσθη πρόξ. 7a W is also probably from a war context because Sosthenes is primarily recording the military exploits of the poet. Slings objects to the identification of paraenesis in 7 W, suggesting instead that the poet narrates his own success in battle. Indeed the fragments are scanty, but even supposing that prior exploits are described, we can still imagine the poet doing so in order to encourage his comrades. On the other hand, 3 W appears to show the poet looking forward to a coming fight in which close combat will be the norm:

οὗτοι πόλλ’ ἐπὶ τόξα ταυτύσσεται, οὐδὲ θαμεια

σφενδόναι, εὖ τ’ ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγη

ἐν πεδίωι· ξυρέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον-

ταύτης γὰρ κεῖνοι δάμονές εἰσι μάχης

δεσπόται Εὔβοιης δουρκλυτοί.

“There certainly won’t be many bows stretched, nor will slings be frequent, whenever Ares brings together the moil of war on the plain, but there will be the grievous work of swords. For those spear-famed masters of Euboea are experts in that combat.”

Aside from the future tense, another hint that a real battle is being predicted is the pronoun κεῖνοι (v. 4), which suggests that the enemy is both real, immediate, and to be contrasted with an implied ‘we’.

---

In addition, a tetrameter fragment from the same inscription as frr. 7 and 7a W suggests a direct address to another party (a comrade?):

\[ δέδουκας \text{[to]} \dot{ι} \dot{α} \dot{ρ} \dot{ι} \dot{s}[\text{τ} \dot{ε}[\dot{υ} \dot{σ} \dot{α}s \dot{π} \dot{ά} \dot{ρ} \dot{ο}s] \]

\[ ] δέδροικα[ς] (97a W). \]

“you're afraid, (though previously) excellent at such things...you're afraid.”

Taking this to be exhortation, we might understand a rhetorical question: ‘are you (really) afraid, when previously you were excellent?’ And, in an address to Glaucus (cf. frr. 15, 48.7, 105.1, 117, 131.1), we find evidence for the poet encouraging a named comrade:

Γλαῦκε, τίς σε θεῶν νόμον

καὶ φρένας τρέψ[ας]

γῆς ἐπιμνήσαιο τ[ῆςδε]

δειμάε τολμήσας μεθ[]

\[ ] ἴν εἴλες αἰχμῆι καὶ λ[\]

\[ ] σον {δ} ἐσκέν καὶ χαλ[ (96 W). \]

“(Glaucus, which of the gods) turning your mind and thoughts...may you think of this land...having endured dangers...which you at spear-point...and...was and”

The supplement of Glaucus’ name in v. 1 is secured by the prose account that names him in the Sosthenes inscription (A IVa 6). The poet seems to exhort Glaucus to remember the land (his homeland, Thasos, Paros?), and reminds him that he previously captured something by spear (the land again, a city, a woman?). In v. 4 we might take the aorist participle to refer also to Glaucus’ past actions; the supplement μεθ[ ἰμέων (by Friedländer) I find very attractive, for Glaucus’ brave deeds would then be associated with his role as member of the group. Perhaps Glaucus has proposed abandoning the land
which they once captured, and Archilochus is encouraging him to defend it. We should note the possibility that the poet addresses a single comrade, but still in the context of the larger group. This would diminish Slings’ objection (on 7 W) that paraenesis should be addressed only to the group (i.e. second or first person plural).  

For the poet’s manner of addressing the group (not necessarily in martial exhortation), we may compare 13 W, where Pericles is addressed directly, but the first person plural (v. 4 ἐχομεν; v. 7 ἡμέας) is employed along with the second person (v. 10 τλήτε). In fr. 4 W, which is at least nominally set aboard ship during a watch (v. 6 νηος v. 9 ἐν φυλακῇ) we find another combination of first and second person address:

οὔτ’ ἐμοὶ ὕσσα[  
ἀλλ’ ἄγε σὺν κόσμοιν θοής διὰ σέλματα νηος
φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ’ ἀφελκε κάδων,
ἀγγει δ’ οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὔδὲ γάρ ἡμεῖς
νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῇ τῇ̄δε δυνησόμεθα (4.5-9 W).

“nor for me...But keep going along the deck of the swift ship; yank away the lids of the hollow casks, and seize the red wine from the dregs. For we won’t be able to stay sober on this watch.”

The first person singular pronoun in v. 5 is followed by several second person singular imperatives in vv. 6-8, but the poet switches to an emphatic (ἡμεῖς) first person plural in vv. 8-9.  


129 Bowie (2001) 66 notes how the poet’s use of the first person plural aligns the performer with others from his city.
If it may be supposed that Archilochus was engaged in some of his poems in a type of military paraenesis, we must now ask what ideas he had about combat and the ideal fighter. Naturally, Archilochus does not provide explicit comments as to such matters, but some hints are to be found in the fragments. Perhaps most famous is Archilochus’ opinion about the ‘big general’:

οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγόν οὐδὲ διαπεπληγμένον
οὐδὲ βοστρύχοις γαύρον οὐδ’ ὑπεξυρημένον,
άλλα μοι σμικρός τις εἶ καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
ρουκός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκὼς ποσσί, καρδίης πλέως (114 W).

“I am not fond of a general who is big or trots about proudly or exults in his locks or is partly shaved; but let me have a small one who looks bent around the shins, has a sure gait, full of heart.”

We needn’t dwell on the details, but the contrast is clear enough: Archilochus prefers a general who is steadfast, reliable, and not concerned with preening for attention. It seems reasonable to infer that the preference for a sure-footed and courageous general can be generalized to the average soldier as well. The sort of reliable warrior described here is also found in fr. 15 W:

Γλαῦκ’, ἐπίκουρος ἀνήρ τόσον φίλος ἔσκε μάχηται

“Glaucus, an ally remains your friend so long as he fights.”

This is not, I think, a bitter remark “that kinsman, ally, and boon companion might all prove cowards if life were at stake,” for such a reading reverses the subject and predicate.

130 Aristotle Eth. Eudem. 7.1236a35 calls the line a proverb, but it is assigned (probably safely) to Archilochus because of the address to Glaucus.
Rather, your comrade in arms is only truly a comrade (and therefore friend) if he fulfills his duty in combat. This is not a cynical statement, but reflects the simple reality that when in battle every man must do his part and satisfy the epithet ἐπίκουρος; the big general is thus no true comrade, and certainly no friend.

Finally, the poet’s emphasis on fighting together (i.e. with ἐπίκουροι) may be inferred from fr. 259 W, from Aristides (or. 45, ii.137.17 Dindorf):

καὶ ὁ μὲν γε κατ’ ἱσχύν προφέρων, εἰ καὶ ἐνὸς ἐϱὴ κρείττων, ὑπὸ δυοὶν γ’ ἄν αὐτὸν κατείργεσθαι φήσι καὶ Ἀρχιλόχος καὶ ἡ παροιμία.

“As to one who is outstanding in strength, even if he should be stronger than one, that he would at any rate be checked by two, both Archilochus and the proverb say.”

The scholiast here (iii.429.17 Dindorf) reports that the proverb is οὔδε Ἡρακλῆς πρὸς δύο, “not even Heracles against two,” but he does not know the corresponding expression from Archilochus. It is quite possible that the proverb in fact originated with Archilochus.  

Without knowing the context, we cannot be certain how Archilochus employed the expression. One possibility that has been suggested is that the two are the demanding daughters of Lycambs, though I do not find this particularly satisfying. As Aristides indicates, physical strength is at issue, which most naturally suggests combat. The thought is that even the absolutely strongest individual can be bested by two who fight together.

---

131 Burnett (1983) 44.

132 West (1989) ad loc. notes that the proverb is expounded in two ways. The earliest attested version is from Plato, Phaedo 89c: πρὸς δύο λέγεται οὐδ’ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς οἶος τε ἐἶναι; the second version reads οὐδὲ(ν) Ἡρακλῆς πρὸς δύο.

The idea that allies must fight together, that two can beat a single strong opponent, that a steady warrior is best, is a general one. If it were to be articulated in tactical terms, how might it appear? One answer might be found in the paraenesis of Tyrtaeus and Callinus, for example:

οὔτε ἄνήρ διαβάς ἐν προμάχοισι μένη
νωλεμέως, αἰσχρῆς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθηται,
ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος,
θαρσύνη τε ἐπεσιν τὸν πλησίον ἄνδρα παρεστὼς· (Tyrt. 12.16-19 W)

“The sort of man who stands firm among the foremost fighters without pause and is utterly unmindful of shameful flight, risking his life and daring spirit, and who speaks words of encouragement to his neighbor as he stands next to him.”

Here the warrior who stands firm among the front ranks is praised; he is to risk his life, but as a member of the group. We find a still more specific implementation of this principle in the words of Nestor in the Iliad:

κράν᾽ ἄνδρας κατὰ φύλα, κατὰ φρήτρας Ἀγάμεμνον,
ὡς φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν ἀρήγητι, φύλα δὲ φύλοις.
eἰ δὲ κεν ὃς ἔρξης καὶ τοι πείθωνται Ἀχαιοί,
γνώσει ἔπειθ᾽, ὡς θ᾽ ἡγεμόνων κακὸς ὃς τὲ νυ λαῶν,
ηδ᾽ ὃς κ᾽ ἐσθλὸς ἔσισι· κατὰ σφέας γὰρ μαχέονται.
γνώσει καὶ θεσπεσίῃ πόλιν οὐκ ἀλαπάζεις,
ὅ ἄνδρῳν κακότητι καὶ ἀφραδήπι πολέμιοι. (2.362-68).

“Divide the men into tribes, into phratries, Agamemnon, since phratry aids phratry, and tribe aids tribe. If you do this and the Achaeans then obey, you will know then
who among the leaders is a coward, and who among the people, and who is brave, since they will fight by themselves. You will know if you don’t sack the city by divine will, or by the men’s cowardice and senselessness in war.”

Whatever the exact composition of tribes and phratries is, the idea is that members of the same group will feel encouraged to help one another (ἀρήγη). Like Archilochus’ preferences for a general and his thoughts on the duty of a generic ally, the advice of Nestor is egalitarian in its application: Agamemnon will be able to see who is good and bad among the leaders and the masses alike. It is noteworthy that individual achievement (good fighter and bad) is to be evaluated in the context of group fighting. That is, excellence in war is determined by how well one fights with and aids one’s comrades.

Such advice is reiterated by Nestor in a much-discussed passage from book 4. One recommendation he makes is to place the cowards in the middle so that they are compelled to fight (4.299-300). The principle, as I take it, is that every man, even the lousy fighters, counts; placed in the middle, they will not lead the course of the battle (either in advancing or retreating), but will fight with the group perforce. Nestor then gives instructions for the charioteers:

ίππεύουσιν μὲν πρῶτ’ ἐπετέλλετο· τοὺς μὲν ἀνώγει
σφούς ἵππους ἔχεμεν μηδὲ κλονέεσθαι ὀμίλωι.

134 Kirk (1985) ad 362-63 discusses some of the interpretations of these terms. The fact that they are almost without parallel in the Iliad suggests that they are designations of the poet’s day (and not traditional), so perhaps the tactical advice is contemporary as well. See Raaflaub (2008) 477.

135 Tyrtaeus fr. 9 W (Eustratius ad Arist. Eth. Nic. 3.8.5.1116a36) indicates that the poet describes the Lacedaemonians (in their fight against the Messenians) compelling the troops to fight.
“μηδὲ τις ἰπποσύνη τε καὶ ἴνορέψῃ πεποιθώς
ὁδὸς πρόσθ᾽ ἄλλων μεμάτω Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι,
μηδ’ ἀναχωρείτω· ἀλαπαδνότεροι γὰρ ἔσεσθε.
δε δὲ κ’ ἄνηρ ἀπὸ ὧν ὀχέων ἔτερ’ ἁρμαθ’ ἵκαται,
ἔγχει ὀρεξάσθω, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερον οὕτω.
ὡδὲ καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι πόλιας καὶ τείχε’ ἐπόρθεον,
tόνδε νόον καὶ θυμὸν ἔνι στήθεσσιν ἔχοντες.” (4.301-9).

“He gave orders first to the charioteers: he encouraged them to check their horses and not to run rampant in the crowd; ‘Let none, trusting in his horsemanship and bravery, be eager to fight the Trojans alone, in front of the others, nor let him retreat, for you will be weaker. And whichever man reaches, from his own chariot, another chariot, let him attack with spear, since this is much better. In this way, previous generations too, having this mind and spirit in their breasts, sacked cities and walls.”

The advice given is unparalleled, and commentators offer various interpretations. Are the men to fight at close range from their chariots and only lunge (not throw) their spears? If so, this seems to be a rather poor strategy.136 Perhaps, however, the charioteers are meant to remain as a unit (neither advancing nor retreating), and, when reaching the enemy chariots, dismount (ἀπὸ ὧν ὀχέων) and attack.137 Indeed, the contrast Nestor appears to draw is between one who either draws ahead (and attacks alone) or withdraws (and does not attack), and one who, when reaching the enemy, attacks. The charioteers are meant to

---


do their fighting as a unit: if anyone breaks off – either to attack or retreat –, the group will be weaker (άλαπαδνότεροι γὰρ ἔσεσθε).

It has been observed that there is a close correspondence between certain Iliad passages and fragments of martial elegy; West argues that the relationship is not one-way, and that the poet of the Iliad likely modeled some lines on elegiac poems (though not necessarily any we possess). It has also been noticed that in Nestor’s speech to the charioteers there is an unusual slip from narrative into direct speech. Perhaps here we have an example of elegiac paraenesis adapted into hexameters. The advice is exceptional for the Iliad, and the direct address is jarring. The exhortation for each man to thrust his spear, for example, is reminiscent of Callinus fr. 1.9-11 W; that no charioteer is to advance or retreat, for such would weaken them all, is similar to Tyrtaeus fr. 11.11-13, where the soldiers are told to remain together since fewer will thus die. Whether we choose to posit conscious adaptation or not, the similarities at least indicate a general shared ethos.

Let us now consider the converse of the unified fighting group, the occasion on which an individual is left alone, particularly in a dangerous situation. We have already noted above some instances from the Iliad in which a fighter becomes isolated among the enemy and must be rescued by a comrade (Odysseus, rescued by Menelaus 11.456-71; Nestor, rescued by Diomedes, 8.79-171), and it is clearly a common motif. One element that is emphasized is that the hero is alone and in trouble. This emphasis is significant because it must stand in contrast to those scenes in which a hero fights miraculously on his

---

138 West (2011) 35-36


140 For the typical elements of these scenes, see the analysis of Fenik (1968) 58-60; 96-100; 221.
own and achieves astonishing feats; Callinus describes such a fighter (as a real figure) doing the deeds of many though alone: ἔρηξεν γὰρ πολλῶν ἄξια μοῦνος ἐόν (1.21 W). A. Kahane examines the semantics of the terms oios and mounos and concludes that in Homer the former is marked and points to the narrator’s amazement at the hero’s extraordinary abilities, whereas the latter is unmarked and has broader application.\textsuperscript{141} What this analysis suggests to me is that Homer was probably himself aware of the different connotations; a hero can be alone in two very different senses, and word choice can in part be a guide to sense.

The participle μοῦῳθείς occurs only once in the Iliad, when Menelaus imagines Odysseus’ dangerous situation (11.470-71; see above). It seems, then, to be a stronger term than μοῦνος, and I submit that it indicates something special about the poet’s characterization of Menelaus – he is especially concerned for the well being of his comrades. The word occurs also in the Odyssey (15.386), and it there similarly shows the affection and protectiveness of the speaker. Odysseus is asking his faithful swineherd Eumaeus about his past, for the latter has just revealed that he was brought up by Odysseus’ mother (15.361-70). Wondering at how young he must have been, Odysseus asks whether his home city had been sacked or if he had been taken by enemies while alone (μοῦῳθείντα) with his flocks (15.381-88). Such care and sympathy for one of his dependents shows that Odysseus is similar to the kind and sympathetic Menelaus of the Iliad.

Most strikingly, however, μοῦνος and the verb μοῦνώ are collocated in book 16 of the Odyssey, when Odysseus (in disguise) probes his son Telemachus. Upon hearing of the

\textsuperscript{141} Kahane (1997) 118-35.
behavior of the suitors, Odysseus asks if Telemachus intentionally withstands this
treatment, or if he is hated by the people, or is at odds with his brothers – *just the ones a
man should trust in a fight* (16.91-98). He continues by wishing that he were one of
Odysseus’ sons, or Odysseus himself, so that he would then attack the suitors in his own
halls, for even if he should be killed because fighting alone (μοῦνον ἔόντα), he would rather
die than behold the outrages of the suitors (16.99-111). Odysseus thus tests Telemachus,
to allow him in part to explain the situation, why he has endured the suitors for so long. In
answer, Telemachus describes how he has had nobody else to depend upon:

ὤδε γὰρ ἠμετέρην γενεὴν μοῦνωσε Κρονίων·
μοῦνον Λαέρτην Ἀρκείσιος υἱὸν ἔτικτε,
μοῦνον δ’ αὐτ’ Ὀδυσῆα πατήρ τέκεν· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεῦς
μοῦνον ἐμί ἐν μεγάροις τεκὼν λίπεν οὐδ’ ἀπόνητο.
τῶν δὲν δυσμενές μάλα μυρίοι εἶσ’ ἐνὶ οἰκῳ. (16.117-21).

“For the son of Cronus thus made our family solitary: Arceius begat Laertes alone,
and in turn Odysseus’ father begat Odysseus alone, and then Odysseus begat and left
me alone in his halls, nor did he have joy of me. So now there are countless enemies
in his home.”

Here, Telemachus describes himself as alone in two, related ways: he was born an only
child, and he was left alone by his father. He thus obliquely answers the tacit challenge of
the disguised Odysseus, who claims to be willing to face the suitors alone: it would be futile
for the lone Telemachus to attack the innumerable enemy. In context, we realize this is
really Odysseus’ opinion as well. His entire purpose at this point is to gain the support of
Telemachus so that the two of them *together* can eventually face the suitors.
Although forms of μουνώω are markedly rare in the Iliad and Odyssey, the verb in fact occurs in the fragments of Archilochus. In fr. 24 W the speaker addresses a friend who is returning from Gortyn. In the latter half of the fragment, it appears that the loss of cargo is contrasted with the speaker’s fear that his friend be killed:

\[\text{μουσας} \varphi[ο]\text{ρτων} \delta \ \text{μοι} \ \muε[λ] \text{ei} \]
\[\text{ος} \ \text{ειτ’} \ \text{απόλετο} \]
\[\text{ν} \ \text{εστι} \ \text{μηχανή} \]
\[\delta’ \ \text{αν} \ \text{άλλων} \ \text{ουτιν’} \ \text{ευροίμην} \ \text{γγώ} \]
\[\text{ει} \ \sigma[ε] \ \text{κυμ’} \ \text{άλος} \ \text{κατέκλυσεν} \]
\[\eta \ ]\ \text{ν} \ \text{χερσιν} \ \text{αίχμητεων} \ \text{ύπο} \]
\[\eta[βην} \ \text{άγλ[α]ήν} \ \text{άπ[ώ]λεσσ[α]ς}. \]
\[\nuν’ \ \delta’ \ \text{θεί καί} \ \text{σε} \ \text{θε[δς} \ \text{έρ]} \ \text{ρύσατο} \]
\[\text{κάμε} \ \text{μουνωθέντ’} \ \text{ιδ’.} \]
\[\text{ν, έν} \ \text{ζόφωι} \ \text{δε} \ \text{κείμενό} \]
\[\text{αυτίς} \ ]\ \text{φά[ος} \ \text{κατεστάθην.} \ (24.8-18 \ W).} \]

“The cargo doesn’t matter to me...whether it was destroyed...there is a way...but I would not find any other...if the wave of the sea had washed over you, or...you lost your splendid youth at the hands of spearmen...and a god has saved you...and me left alone...but lying in the gloom...I am set aright in the light.”

In vv. 16 and 17 the speaker seems to draw attention to the suffering he experienced when his comrade was still away, his fate unknown. Perhaps some of this is exaggerated, but μουνωθέντ’ seems to have the same force as it does in the Iliad and Odyssey passages: it underscores the bond between comrades, though here the speaker elicits sympathy from
his friend for causing him such anxiety and heartache. The scene presented in this poem is not martial, but the fear expressed in vv. 13-14 is suggestive of such a context: while the speaker is left behind alone, his comrade has ventured out to face unknown perils without his friend, and one of the dangers that is imagined is an attack by enemy spearmen.

Archilochus emphasizes the solitariness of an individual in yet another type of poem, the fable:

ερέω τιν' ὑμν αὖν, ὦ Κηρυκίδη,
ἀχνμένη σκυτάλη,
πίθηκος ἦμει θηρίων ἀποκριθείς
μοῦνος ἂν' ἔσχατήν,
τῶι δ' ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλῆ συνήντετο,
πυκνὸν ἠξουσα νόον. (185 W).

“[I’ll tell you a certain tale, Cerycides (Herald-son), with grieving message stick (?)2; a monkey was going, separated from the beasts, alone through the frontier, and a clever fox with a shrewd mind met him.”

The fable of the fox and the monkey is known from Aesop (fab. 81 Perry), who tells how the monkey, when elected king, provokes the anger of the fox, who lays a trap for the monkey. The beginning of Archilochus’ version seems to be different, for the two animals meet right away. We cannot, of course, know to what purpose the poet told the fable, but the opening is suggestive. With three expressions (θηρίων ἀποκριθείς; μοῦνος; ἠει... ἂν' ἔσχατήν), the poet emphasizes the isolation of the monkey. This, it seems, provides the opportunity for

142 Perhaps the phrase is nominative (in apposition with the subject).
the fox to come upon him and prepare his trap.\textsuperscript{143} Perhaps, then, one motive for telling the fable is to illustrate the folly of travelling alone.

In a clearly martial context (a tetrameter fragment from the Mnesiepes inscription, fr. 89 W), Archilochus describes a conflict between Thasians and Naxians. In line 4 θράσος ‘boldness’ is discernable, and in 5 οἱ μὲν ἰμεῖροντες ‘who desiring greatly’, whereas v. 8 reads ἄνδρες ἵσχυσιν ‘men check’. West tentatively proposes a scenario that makes sense of these and other scraps: “Daring and courage fill the νέοι, who long to get onto Naxos and destroy their orchards, but the older men restrain them?”\textsuperscript{144} Two further elements from the fragment indicate that some such situation is being described: in two places ‘brothers’ are mentioned (v. 11 καὶ κασιγνήτων; v. 23 καὶ κασιγγη[τ]), which is perhaps a reference to kinsmen and their need to remain together;\textsuperscript{145} we may compare the words of Odysseus, mentioned above, how one particularly relies upon brothers in combat (16.97-98). At v. 10 is read ὡς ἀμηνητεὶ παρη [‘so that without wrath’; the hapax is interesting – might the poet be urging unity within the army?

Admittedly, such fragments can only provide glimpses, but with these in mind we may now return to the Telephus-poem to consider how he is presented by the poet. A. Aloni and A. Iannucci, in their study of the fragment, note how μοῦνος can be used in different senses, but they understand it in v. 5 as a reference to the superhuman ability of

\textsuperscript{143} The trap is perhaps mentioned in fr. 186 W.

\textsuperscript{144} West (1974) 126, who notes that the combination of future and present verb forms suggest the crisis continues.

\textsuperscript{145} Line 19 οἱ μὲν ἐν Θάσωι and 22 καὶ ... ἐκ Πάρου suggest there may be contingents from each island represented in the fighting.
the hero to rout the Achaians.\textsuperscript{146} By contrast, the reading of πρόμαχος in v. 25 they take to be a reference to hoplite-style fighting in ranks.\textsuperscript{147} As indicated above in the discussion of the origins of phalanx tactics, I too prefer such an interpretation of fighting in the front lines. Yet their discussion of the significance of πρόμαχος obscures a crucial fact: πρόμαχος does not occur in the singular in the \textit{Iliad}.\textsuperscript{148} The word of course occurs frequently, and typically with a preposition (with/among the foremost fighters). It appears too in elegy, though again never in the singular. The earliest example of the singular I have found is in Ibycus (298 \textit{PMG}), where the poet is said to have called Heracles the πρόμαχος of Zeus. As already observed, Heracles is especially known for being a lone fighter, and he is not a model for real combat. Based on its usage, the word denotes fighting alongside comrades. For it to appear in the singular is practically a contradiction in terms. Its occurrence at v. 25 of the Telephus-fragment is thus marked and, I think, ironic. Telephus ought to be fighting with his Mysians, but he is not. μοῦνος (v. 5) makes the same point.

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{147} Aloni and Iannucci (2007) 228-30. They suggest that the two words function quite differently in the fragment, and they conclude that we in fact have two separate poems – one referring to the flight of the Achaians as justification for a recent rout and the other celebrating the πρόμαχος and Heracles as city founder (230-36). I cannot follow either scenario they suggest for how the two poems became fused (236).

\textsuperscript{148} There is however a Boeotian fighter named Promachus at \textit{Il}. 14.476; the name may be an ad hoc invention, see Janko (1992) ad 475-78 and West (2011) ad 476. He is killed by Acamas in retaliation for the killing of his brother (14.476-85).
The related verb προμάχομαι occurs twice in the *Iliad*. The first instance is after a rally of the Trojans, when the armies are prepared to reengage. Agamemnon, the poet tells, wished to fight far ahead of all: ἔθελεν δὲ πολὺ προμάχεσθαι ἀπάντων (11.217). This line initiates the *aristeia* of Agamemnon. Here, the emphasis is upon the solo exploits of one of the heroes. This is the traditional presentation of a hero, fundamental to heroic epic. It is not, however, the only manner of presenting the hero. The other occurrence of the verb is from book 17, the struggle over Patroclus. Ajax orchestrates the protection of the corpse, as the Achaeans are surrounded by Trojans:

Αἴας γὰρ μᾶλα πάντας ἐπώξετο πολλὰ κελεύων·
οὔτε τιν’ ἔξοπίσω νεκροῦ χάζεσθαι ἀνώγει
οὔτε τινα προμάχεσθαι Ἀχαιῶν ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
ἄλλα μᾶλ’ ἀμφ’ αὐτῶι βεβάμεν, σχεδόθεν τε μάχεσθαι. (17.356-59).

“Ajax went among all the men, giving many orders: he urged that none withdraw behind the corpse, and that none fight well in front of the other Achaeans, but to remain quite firm around it and to fight at close quarters.”

The orders Ajax gives are quite reminiscent of Nestor’s tactics from book 4. Note too that the Achaeans are essentially still πρόμαχοι, warding off the attacking Trojans. What Ajax discourages is a single fighter standing out from the rest (ἐξοχον ἄλλων), which is what Agamemnon does in book 11. Also significant is that the Achaeans are on the

---

149 And cf. 17.469-73, where Alcimedon chastises Automedon for attempting to fight alone in his chariot against the Trojans in the front of the throng (οἶν πρὸς Τρώας μάχει πρῶτωι ἐν ὀμίλωι / μοῦνος, ἀτάρ τοι ἐταῖρος ἀπέκτατο 17.471-72).
defensive, protecting the fallen Patroclus. This behavior is motivated by the same sense of camaraderie that inspires a fighter to come to the rescue of an isolated friend.

We have already observed how frequently Menelaus is the recipient of such aid and protectiveness. In book 17 we find Menelaus returning, as it were, the favor. The title given to this book in the manuscripts is Μενελάου ἀριστεία. Modern scholars call this a misnomer, but who are we to judge?150 Let us try to make sense of this title. The struggle for the corpse is quite drawn out, but we may focus upon two episodes. Early in the action Hector rouses the Trojans after Menelaus has killed several men. Menelaus addresses a remarkable speech to himself in which he contemplates whether to flee or to remain with the body (91-105).151 He decides, in fact, to retreat:

άλλα τίς μοι ταύτα φίλοι διελέξατο θυμός;
одοπότ’ ἄνηρ ἐθέλη πρὸς δαίμονα φωτι μάχεσθαι

ὁν κε θεοῖς τιμαί, τάχα οι μέγα πῆμα κυλίσθη.

τῷ μ’ οὐ τις Δαναῶν νεμεσίσεται, ὡς κεν ἤδηται


“But why is my heart debating this? Whenever someone wishes contrary to a divinity to fight a man whom god honors, quickly he is embroiled in great trouble. So none of the Danaans, whoever sees me retreating before Hector, will grudge me, since he is fighting with divine favor.”

His plan, however, is to get reinforcements: he retreats before Hector, but he turns around and stands firm when he reaches his companions (ἔθνος ἐταίρων), and looks about for


151 See Fenik (1968) 96-98 for parallel speeches, none of which conclude with flight.
Telamonian Ajax (114-15). He rouses Ajax to help him recover the body, and the two return to continue the struggle (120-24). Menelaus’ speech and behavior are revealing of his character: he realizes that however much he wishes to remain by Patroclus, he cannot oppose a divinely supported enemy, and his solution is to get the help of his comrade. This is much the same sentiment we have observed in Archilochus. After further struggle, the scene is repeated, for Ajax decides that even the two of them are insufficient (238-45). So Menelaus calls out for more help; the poet names Oilean Ajax, Idomeneus, and Meriones, but claims that no man could list all the fighters who then came to help (248-61). We note again the support that Menelaus (and Patroclus) can inspire.

Yet again in book 17 the combat goes poorly for the Achaeans, and Athena descends in the guise of Phoenix to inspire the troops. She first addresses Menelaus, and in response he makes a wish that Athena would give him strength (17.561-66). This, naturally, delights Athena, so she provides the resolve he has requested:

έν δὲ βίην ὤμοισι καὶ ἐν γούνεσσιν ἐθηκεν,
καὶ οἱ μυίης θάρσος ἐνι στήθεσσιν ἐνήκεν,
ἠ τε καὶ ἐργομένη μάλα περ χροὸς ἄνδρομέοιο
ιχανάαι δακέειν· λαρόν τε οἱ ἄιμ’ ἄνθρωπον· (17.569-72).152

“She put force into his shoulders and knees, and she placed in his breast the courage of a fly, which, though forcefully shooed away, desires human flesh, to bite it; the blood of man tastes sweet to it.”

---

152 West reads ἵχανάαι, ‘desires’, to be taken with the preceding genetive, but Edwards (1991) ad 570-73 reasonably defends ἵσχανάαι and translates: “...which, though vigorously (μάλα) kept away from a man’s flesh, persits in biting, for human blood is sweet to her.”
The comparison with a fly is unusual but vivid. Indeed, Menelaus goes and stands firm over Patroclus (17.574); even though he is not the best fighter, his dedication is admirable.

In a private context, the same persistence displayed by Menelaus seems to be claimed by Archilochus. The speaker of 23 W addresses a woman, and he appears to defend himself against a charge that he has conducted himself poorly and contrary to his usual noble nature (23.11-13). The speaker protests:

επισταμαί τοι τὸν φυλήγόρα μὲν φιλεῖν,
τὸ δ’ ἔχον ἔχον [τοῦ] τὸ κακὸ

“I indeed know how both to show affection to my friend and to show enmity and ill- (... to my enemy – as an ant. Now there is truth in this speech.”

The ant has not, to my knowledge, been adequately explained. The ancients often noted the sociability of the ant, but this cannot be the only point of comparison here because Archilochus elaborates on his behavior toward his enemies. 154 Davies and Kathirithamy

153 Various supplements are proposed for the end of v. 15: see West’s (1989) ap. crit. and Slings (1982) 69-70 and (1983) 31-32. Without certainty on the reading in 15, I assume that the ant of v. 16 stands in apposition with the subject. For the idea of treating an enemy ill in return, cf. Archilochus 126 W. See Blundell (1989) 26-59, esp. 57-59, where she observes that ‘harm enemies’ is descriptive (for this is really a natural impulse), whereas ‘help friends’ is prescriptive and essential for the maintenance of social cohesion.

154 On sociability, see Beavis (1988) 204-5; Davies and Kathirithamy (1986) 38-42. Morel (1971) 143-44 suggests the ant is not aggressive toward other ants; as Slings (1982) 70 points out, the
suggest the emphasis is upon the enmity: “even an ant has venom’,” and they note the corresponding English proverb: “the fly has spleen, the ant gall.” The correlation of fly and ant in this regard in English is interesting, and perhaps the comparison with a diminutive insect is appropriate for both Archilochus and Menelaus (who is typically presented as a second rate warrior), but we must still account for the ‘help friends’ aspect. I suggest that the point of comparison is essentially the dogged consistency of the ant; the notion of both sociability and venomousness are likely present too, but secondarily. The speaker defends himself against an accusation of being unlike himself: he retorts that he is remarkably consistent – he is both dedicated friend and enemy, never relenting on either front. Menelaus as fly is a similar comparrison because in context he is both helping his friend (defending the corpse of Patroclus) and harming his enemies (the Trojans). The blood of the enemy is sweet (i.e. Menelaus craves revenge), and the fly, like the tireless ant, is unrelenting in its mission. Archilochus the ant is thus similar to Menelaus the determined fly. Archilochus’ enemy is personal, not a combatant, but the principle is essentially the same.

comparison should be threefold, so we must also understand the violence of the ant towards non-ants (he call the comparison “not strikingly apt”).


156 The observation of the ant’s tireless industry was often made in antiquity – see Beavis (1988) 203-4.

Let us now consider an unattributed iambic fragment (38 W). I indicated above the possibility that it belongs to Archilochus. The text provided here incorporates some of West’s more tentative supplements exempli gratia:

..ἐ[...]ποιεί[...]υπαντ[ων[  
..νος [.δ[...]ομε....[  
.... ] ἐπικροτέων[  
..]εβαμβάλυζε' πολλ[ά  
καὶ τὸ μὲν φυγεῖν ὅταν δῆ[χρεώ τις, οἳ καὶ τὸ τε  
ἀνδράσιν κείνους χολωθεῖ[ς θεός ἐπώτρυνε στρατόν  
δυσμενέων κομῆτα παῖδ[ων,  
où σὲ τοῦτ' ἤμισχυνεν οὐδὲ ν[ἐμεσίς ἑστιν, ἀσπίδα  
ὁς ἄπ' εὔρεγεα τινάξας ἐτρ[άπης  
καὶ γὰρ ἀλκιμωτέρους σέο κατα[λαβόντα δείματα  
tαῦτ' ἐπηβόλη[ς] θεοὺς γὰρ οὐκ ἐνίκ[ησεν βροτός·  
ἀλλ' ὀτεύνεκεν πρὸ πάντων ἐκ[κλπὼν στρατη[ν  
ἄλθες ἐκπ[...]ς ἔρ[ ύγρ[ κύματ' εὔρ[ές ἄλ[  
ἀδρυφ[ς, οὐ[...]νσε[......]εκλε[  
ἀλλαπαρθ[ε[......]δεμ[  
..]π[...]όλιν π[......]νογγ[ (adesp. iamb. 38.1-16).\(^{158}\)

"making (?)...all...chattering...he shivered; many...and as for flight, when (there is some necessity, as on that occasion,) angered with those men, (the god roused against them the army) of the enemy, long-haired boy...this did not bring shame on

\(^{158}\) I omit the last two lines of the fragment.
you, nor (is there resentment) that you shook off your well-made (shield) and
turn(ed in flight), for braver men than you have been (overtaken) and mastered by
these (panics,) for (a mortal) cannot beat the gods. But because before all...you
(sailing?) over the watery waves of the broad sea came without being torn
up...city.”\textsuperscript{159}

Despite the poor state of the fragment, the thought in vv. 8-9, that flight did not shame the
addressee, seems clear enough. The expression in v. 11 is suitable for Archilochus, and the
presence of the gods there supports West’s supplement in v. 6 that the gods were aiding the
the enemy. Yet the speaker appears to draw a contrast in v. 12 – something \textit{has} brought shame
to the long-haired boy. There may be a crucial detail in v. 12 πρό πάντων, which perhaps is
related to πάντων in v. 1: the boy has travelled somewhere over the sea, apparently
without being injured (the hapax ἀδρυφής), whereas all the others seem to have a different
fate. I propose that what the speaker may be referring to is the boy’s abandonment of his
fellow soldiers. The distinction is between a mass rout in a battle and desertion from the
army’s camp – the boy sailed away over the sea. The behavior of the boy seems to be
contrasted with that of all the rest – he was acting \textit{alone}.

I offered above a scenario as background to fr. 5 W to explain the poet’s statement
that he did not wish to leave his shield and flee (οὐκ ἑθέλων): he was compelled to do so
because one of his supposed ἐπίκουροι broke ranks and fled. There was no general flight,
but Archilochus’ comrade left him alone. In such a situation, he made the same calculation
that Menelaus does at Patroclus’ corpse, and realized he had to flee in order to save his life.
The alternative was certain death, and his safe return becomes a source of joy for his

\textsuperscript{159}Translation after West (2006) 12 and Gerber (1999a) 541.
comrades, for he is indeed a loyal friend. Such a scenario, if highly speculative, suits the poet’s warrior ethos as I have tried to define it.

Let us conclude with an example of the poet’s courage. In fr. 128 W the poet addresses his own heart with an exhortatory speech:

\[
\text{θυμέ, θύμ’, ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε,}
\]
\[
\text{†άναδεν δυσμενῶν† δ’ ἀλέξεο προσβαλῶν ἐναντίον}
\]
\[
\text{στέρνον †ένδοκοισιν ἔχθρῶν πλησίον κατασταθείς}
\]
\[
\text{άσφαλέως· καὶ μήτε νικέων ἀμφάδην ἀγάλλεο,}
\]
\[
\text{μηδὲ νικηθείς ἐν οἴκωι καταπεσῶν ὀδύρεο,}
\]
\[
\text{ἄλλα χαρτοῖσιν τε χαίρε καὶ κακοῖσιν ἁσχάλα}
\]
\[
\text{μὴ λίθην, γίνωσκε δ’ οίος ρυσμός ἀνθρώπους ἔχει.}
\]

“My heart, my heart, embroiled in unmanageable troubles, rise up (?), defend yourself by placing your breast opposite the foes (?), as you stand steadfastly near the ambushes (?) of your enemies. And neither delight excessively in victory, nor, when conquered, fall down and lament at home, but rejoice at your joys and grieve at your woes in moderation. Recognize the sort of rhythm that holds men.”

We find here a mixture of martial and personal themes: the exhortation to stand fast is combined with acknowledgement of personal cares (κήδεσιν), and perhaps enemy combatants (δυσμενῶν?) with personal enemies (ἔχθρῶν). For the poet, these categories seem to overlap, and the same principle of loyalty and comradeship is applicable to both. Just as the poet realizes how victory in battle rests with the gods (111 W), the pattern of human life shows that successes are always mingled with defeat. The best policy,
Archilochus knows, is to be moderate and constant, and this is the recommendation he makes to his fellows.
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