

S. R. SLINGS

ANONYMUS, PARALLEL LINES FROM HOMER AND ARCHILOCHUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 1–8

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ANONYMUS, PARALLEL LINES FROM HOMER AND ARCHILOCHUS

Source: P.Hibeh 173 = P.Lond.inv. 2946, edited by E.G.Turner, P.Hibeh ii; Pack² 136. A scrap of 9 by 14 cm., "all of its edges torn, and a large parallelogram cut out of its centre" (Turner). Provenance: probably Oxyrhynchus. Dated by Turner to ca. 270-240 B.C., with a preference for an early date. All in all there are twenty-two lines, of which Turner edited only fourteen (without indicating that there are more): Turner's line 1 is in fact line 8, and there is just one letter from a line underneath Turner's line 14.

I examined the papyrus at the British Library in October 1981 with a binocular microscope. I wish to thank Dr Walter Cockle for the help he so generously gave.

First I shall give a new diplomatic transcript (see below), then comment on some of the lines, and finally pay attention to the Anonymus' intention in writing out these parallels.

	· · · · ·	
		...]ηθ[
2		
		ομη[
4]....τμ[
6		
		.]·ουρ[
8		ομηρ[
		..].γocδουχραιcμ[
10		αρχι.[
		χραιcμηceδουτεπ.[
12		ομηρου [
		ωcπ.[.]ετιceρρειτ...εμ...χ[
14		αρχιλοχου
	].εμοιτοθηδεγηχ[
16		ομηρου
	].θανατοιcιθε[
18		αρχιλοχου
		.ουδειcδεπειταcυνθεο.[
20		ομηρου
]τ[...].οπ.ν[.]πιχ[
22]υ[
		· · · · ·

1. η: perhaps μ, but the combination μθ is impossible. θ almost certain (no horizontal bar, but letter too big for omicron).

2-3. Most of the papyrus torn off; surface of the rest too damaged for traces to be preserved. There may be three lines instead of two.

4. Ὅμηρος a logical supplement, but the surface before omicron is again too damaged to verify the absence of writing.

5. Only the tops of the letters preserved.] : horizontal shaft extending above the line (φ, ψ); ... : two specks of ink flanking a curved letter top, but there may be only two letters; τ : a horizontal bar, slightly curved, which fits tau better than pi in this type of hand.

6. Surface damaged.

7.] : a tiny horizontal bar at half-letter height, epsilon possible; ο : only bottom of curve preserved (at half-letter height, as normal in this hand), omega not entirely excluded, but if so, the next letter becomes very hard to interpret; υ : vertical bar extending below the line and an oblique stroke to the left; ρ : I seem to see a serif at the bottom, which does not fit.

If -εουρ- is correctly identified, it looks as if a new word begins with rho. Given the space, -εου can only be the genitive of the interrogative pronoun τεοῦ, found also fr. 210.

9.] : there is some ink but rho cannot be confirmed. Then gamma certain. Turner identified the line with Ξ 66 τεῖχος δ' οὐκ ἔχραιμε τετυγμένον οὐδέ τι τάφος. But his dotted chi is out of the question. Turner's identification of the line still stands, but we have to assume that the Anonymus quoted Homer from memory, and adopted his quotation unconsciously to the Archilochus parallel, which had πύργος and χραίμμε instead of the τεῖχος and ἔχραιμε of the Homeric MSS. (There is a variant τεῖχος δ' οὐ χραίμμε χθαμαλώτατον, cf. N 683, but it is not found before s. xiii). Note the elided spelling (as in line 15, and perhaps 19 and 21); contrast line 11 δεουτε.

11. Fr. 219 West. Apparently Archilochus thought it desirable to get rid of the very eccentric aorist form ἔχραιμμε (Homer has both the sigmatic and the thematic aorist), even though this involved suppression of the syllabic augment. For this phenomenon in general I may refer to my note in J.M.Bremer-A.M. van Erp Taalman Kip-S.R.Slings, Some recently found Greek poems, Leiden 1987 (henceforth: SRFGP), 47; it is attested in Archilochus' elegies (fr. 5,2 κάλλιπον), epodes (fr. 192 λίπε, dactylic colon), trochaic tetrameters (fr. 98,9 - cf. W.Peek, ZPE 59,1985,22 - κείτο), but not for his poems in stichic iambic trimeters, which may be a reason not to attribute this fragment to that genre.

Both π [and π[are possible.] γος in line 9 establishes π[ύργος here beyond any doubt. (West's οὐτ' ἔπ[αλις proves wrong). Turner's suggestion to supply a second οὔτε after πύργος has become more attractive since the publication of the 'First Cologne Epode', which has a line with very similar rhythm and structure (P.Köln 58,24 = fr. 196A,36 cὸ μὲν γὰρ οὐτ' ἄπιτος οὔτε διπλόη). The simplest noun to supply after the second οὔτε is τεῖχος: a bulwark is no good unless you have a wall as well. It should be borne in mind, though, that in Homeric Greek πύργος can be used in the singular for city walls cum

bulwarks (e.g. Γ 153). Disyllabic εα is acceptable at verse end in all Archilochean poetry (this goes for all types of 'contraction' in Ionic poetry in general).

13. Δ 182 ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει. τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρέϊα χθών. Cf. Θ 150; Z 282; P 417.

15. Fr. 220 West. Five or six (hardly seven) letters missing before] , which itself is a dot at letter-top height. This means that only two syllables have been lost at the beginning of the line, e.g. [ἐρέουσι γὰρ] | [οὔτω]c· ἐμοὶ τόθ' ἦδε γῆ χ[. This would lend emphasis to ἦδε γῆ, placed between the penthemimeres and the third anceps (cf. SRFGP, 58,2.5.2.). But as West saw, the most obvious supplement of χ[, to wit χ[άνοι (cf. line 13), is out of the question since it violates Wilamowitz' bridge (unless followed by one or two postpositives, but I can think of nothing suitable). Hence his supplement χαμωμένη, against which it must be noted that χαμώομαι, derived from χάσμη, normally refers to yawning in the literal sense of the word: "may the earth yawn and swallow me" is vulgar epic parody as found in Hipponax (fr. 128 West = 126 Degani), but not in Archilochus.

The line may just possibly be a trochaic tetrameter, e.g. ὥς ἐρέου]c· ἐμοὶ τόθ' ἦδε γῆ χ[άνοι x - v -; this possibility would circumvent the metrical objection against χάνοι.

Homer's line is often paraphrased, sometimes in a way which reminds one of this fragment, e.g. Luc. Adv. Ind. (31),18 οὐκ εὔζηι τότε χανεῖν σοι τὴν γῆν; Conv. (17),28.

17. Four lines in Homer meet the requirements:

E 130	μή τι κύ γ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς ἀντικρὺ μάχεσθαι
Y 292	αὐτίκα δ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπεν
β 432	λεῖβον δ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς ἀιειγενέτησιν
ω 371	ὥς ἴδεν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιον ἄντην

The first one is by far the most likely candidate for imitation by Archilochus.

19. Fr. 221 West. Turner reconstructed κούδεις δ' ἔπειτα σὺν θεοῖς μαχήσεται, but as he himself points out, neither καί ... δέ (very rare in poetry, cf. Denniston, 200) nor μάχομαι σὺν 'to fight against' (one very dubious occurrence in Xen. Cyr. I 3,5) are to be expected in Archilochus. Other proposals meet only one of these two objections: δούλους δ' ἔπειτα σὺν θεοῖς μαχευμένους Turner: κούδεις δ' ἔπειτα σὺν θεοῖς ἄψει μάχην Page (CR 7, 1957, 192, on the unwarranted assumption that -οισ within the line is not allowed, for which see my remarks ZPE 53,1983,33-36, and violating Wilamowitz' bridge): κούδεις δ' ἔπειτα σὺν θεοῖς ἐβάλλετο Treu, Archilochos, München 1979², 176: σὺν θεοῖς ἀντήσεται Lasserre (but συνάντομαι, from which he derives the expression, always means simply 'to meet', whether in battle (Φ 34) or elsewhere (e.g. fr. 185,5); the same goes for Pfeiffer's σὺν θεοῖσιν ἦντετο, History of classical scholarship ..., Oxford 1968, 145 n.4 and much the same for the latter's alternative σὺν θεοῖς ἐμίγχετο): West's reading ἐξουδένιζ' introduces a very late word (first found in Plutarch) and does not fit the traces (I do not see room for two letters before the first omicron, and what is more, -νιζ- cannot be read): I had thought myself of κοῦ δεῖ μ' ἔπειτα σὺν θεοῖσιν ἐστάναι, but the mu is out of the question. If we accept σὺν θεοῖς μαχήσεται it will have to mean "(no-one) will fight

with help of (or: side by side with) the gods". This makes good sense, but cannot be extracted from any of the four Homeric lines.

Although I can neither confirm or reject an initial kappa, logically it is the only letter that can be supplied at the beginning, given the fact that after οὐδεῖ, cδ is certain. But κούδεῖς δ' is very unattractive, and probably downright impossible, not only because καί ... δέ is unparalleled for lyric poetry, but also because it does not seem to fit here: the combination normally means 'and ... as well', the word or words whose addition is stressed standing between καί and δέ. οὐδεῖς can hardly be stressed in this way (and why not simply οὐδέ τις?). I see two remedies, neither of them very attractive. First we may suppose the initial letter was a cancelled one; the traces of ink defy interpretation so this is possible - if so, it is not even necessary to assume that the cancelled letter was a kappa. Or the second delta will have to go, but it is much harder to explain why it is there. It did not occur to me when I checked the papyrus to exclude cε (for cδ), and in fact κού δεῖ c' ἔπειτα (scriptio plena as in 11) fits in very well with μή τι κύ from the imitated line E 130.

If οὐδεῖς is accepted, the latter half of the line may be supplied cὺν θεοῖ[cιν ἵσταται. Cf. LSJ s.v. cυνίctημι B II 2 (attested in the meaning 'to fight' from Aeschylus onwards). Tmesis is not found in Archilochus' trimeters, cf. West, *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus*, Berlin-New York 1974, 108; SRFGP, 36; 85. But once a form of μάχομαι is rejected as a possible supplement, it is inevitable to assume tmesis here. Therefore, we have another slight indication (cf. line 11) for epodic provenance.

A similar thought is expressed Adesp. iamb. fr. 38,11 West θεοὺς γὰρ οὐκ ἐνίκ[ησεν βροτόc.

21. As West was the first to see (IEG I, p.83), this line fits Hy. Dem. 480 ὄλβιος ὃc τὰδ' ὄπωπεν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων and my examination of the papyrus backs up the identification. I am reasonably certain about]τ[and its place in the papyrus fits the tau in the line, though the preceding space is a little cramped. The traces before the one-letter lacuna tally with nu.

The line is a famous one, ideally suitable for imitation. If we could be certain that Archilochus did imitate this specific line (as we are certain that he imitated certain specific passages from *Odyssey*), not just any μακαρισμός, this would be important evidence for the date of the Hymn to Demeter, which is usually assigned to the end of the seventh century. However, I see no way of establishing the truth of this assumption. There is nothing in the extant fragments of Archilochus which looks like an imitation of this line. Fr. 60,6 ὦ τρι]cμακά]ριος ὅστιc comes closest, but is from an attack on Lycambes (cf. line 2 Λυκ[)], who is taunted with his children's behaviour (cf. line 7 τοι]αῦτα τέκ[να), presumably Neoboule and her younger sister, who figures in the 'First Cologne Epode'. If this is imitation it is highly ironical, but I see no satisfactory way of supplying at least an echo of the Hymn's ὄπωπεν in fr. 60,6.

22.]υ[: the exact spot for the upsilon of Ἄρχιλόχο]υ[.

The hand of the scribe is called by Turner "rapid, careless ... intermediate between a literary and a documentary hand". However, this is not a series of parallels jotted down in the course of reading Archilochus (not Homer, cf. ad 9) by the scribe. The layout of the papyrus is too regular for that (the entries ΟΜΗΡΟΥ and ΑΡΧΙΛΟΧΟΥ are exactly underneath each other for twenty-two lines, and so are the first letters of the quotations (I see no effect of what is called Maas' law). In other words, though this papyrus may be an extract of some kind, it was written in one stretch. The lay-out, with author's name in εἰςθετικῆς in the genitive, is that of the anthology throughout Antiquity (for a parallel from this period, cf. P.Petrie I 3 (1) quoted below). Even if this anthology is an extract of a longer text, not a regular copy of a published literary (sub-literary) text, it presupposes such a text. The question then has to be answered, what kind of text.

A Line-by-line comparison of Archilochus and Homer could be part of six kinds of works:

(a) A literary treatise on the influence of Homer on Archilochus (and possibly on other poets as well) or of earlier poets on Archilochus in general. The lines are not quoted in the order in which they occur in Homer, so the emphasis would be on the imitator(s). Of such works known to us, three date from before 240 B.C.: Heraclides Ponticus Περὶ Ἀρχιλόχου καὶ Ὀμήρου α'β' (fr. 178 Wehrli); Aristotle Ἀπορήματα Ἀρχιλόχου Εὐριπίδου Χοιρίλου ἐν βιβλίῳ γ' (A.144; probably identical with the Κύκλος περὶ ποιητῶν γ', A.115, cf. P.Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote*, Louvain 1951, 252); Apollonius Rhodius Περὶ Ἀρχιλόχου (fr. xxii Michaelis). Of the first two works we know the title only, from the third, Athenaeus reports a 'sufficient explanation' (εἴρηκεν ἱκανῶς) of the Spartan κτυτάλη (presumably in connection with fr. 185,2 ἀχθυμένη κτυτάλη; cf. Pfeiffer, o.c. 144f.; 181).

(b) A treatise on plagiarism (κλοπή). What we know about ancient works on plagiarism is derived from three fragments of Book I of Porphyry's Φιλολόγος Ἀκρόασις preserved by Eusebius (PE I 561,12-567,6 Mras). Though accusations of κλοπή are as old as the fifth century B.C. (cf. Ar. Nub. 553-559; Ran. 78f.; 1301-1303), the oldest author named by Porphyry is Aristophanes of Byzantium, in a book perhaps called Παράλληλοι Μενάνδρου τε καὶ ἄφ' ὧν ἔκλεψεν ἐκλογαί (but cf. Ziegler, PWRE, s.v. Plagiat, 1979) or possibly just Παράλληλοι ἐκλογαί. Maybe this book belonged to a related but less malevolent genre:

(c) Literature on parallel places (συνεμπτόσεις), chiefly in poets. We know only of one Ptolemaeus, an Alexandrian grammarian of the first century B.C., who wrote (according to the Suda) Τὰ ὁμοίως εἰρημένα τοῖς τραγικοῖς. Presumably, Aretades' Περὶ συνεμπτόσεως (mentioned by Porphyry, second century B.C.) and Ammonius' Περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος μετενηνεγμένων ἐξ Ὀμήρου (cf. Longin. 13,3; Ammonius was the successor of Aristarchus) belong here rather than in the literature about κλοπή (cf. Ziegler,

1978; 1982f.; 1992). The aim of this genre was pure scholarship; its results were used by the authors on plagiarism as well as by:

(d) rhetorical treatises on the use of *μετάφρασις*. Our only example is Theon, who gives a series of parallel places to illustrate this in the introduction of the *Προγυμνάσματα* (Rhet. Gr. II 62,24-64,28 Spengel). Theo quotes Archil. fr. 131 as an imitation of c 136f.

(e) Finally, considering the gnostic character of the lines quoted in this papyrus, it may be assigned to the genre of the gnomology. This was mainly a by-product of philosophical literature, as may be seen from the disposition of its most voluminous representative, Stobaeus. Quite a few of these have been preserved on papyrus, two of them (P.Hibeh 7 = Pack² 1569; P.Hibeh 224 = Pack² 1613) from the third century B.C.; cf. J.Barns, CQ N.S. 1,1951,1. There have been attempts to connect the origin of gnomologies with specific historical figures of the third century B.C., e.g. Chrysippus (A.Elter, *De Gnomologiorum Graecorum historia atque origine*, I, Bonnae 1893,16-70) and Cercidas (cf. O.Guéraud-P.Jouget, *Un livre d'écolier du IIIe siècle avant J.-C.*, Le Caire 1938, xxix and n.1). Yet the early date of some gnomologies found on papyri suggests that we should look rather in the Classical age. Barns (o.c., 3-5) not implausibly suggests the sophists. A passage from the seventh book of Plato's *Nomoi* (810e6-811a5) certainly implies the existence of anthologies and these were probably gnomological (they had an ethical outlook anyway).

Most scholars opt for possibility (a) in the interpretation of this papyrus; J.A.Davison (MPER N.S. 5,1956,51), M.Fernandez Galiano (*Actas I Congr. Esp. Est. Cl. 1956,77*) and Treu (o.c., 175) more specifically for Heraclides. Pfeiffer (o.c., 145) points out that what we know of Heraclides' books on literature suggests "that he was mainly interested in the life and chronology of the poets and in the subject-matter of their poems". Yet it is hard so see how a work called *Περὶ Ἀρχιλόχου καὶ Ὀμήρου* (note the order of the names), in two books at that, could *not* deal with parallels from these two authors. Pfeiffer himself prefers a combination of (d) and (e): "its aim may have been educational, not only in a moral but also in a rhetorical sense, in so far as it presents examples of the art of *μεταφράζειν*". Elsewhere (o.c., 55; 191) he associates the papyrus with Aristophanes' book on plagiarism. W.Bühler (*Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung der Schrift vom Erhabenen*, Göttingen 1964,95) connects the papyrus more generally with the literature on *κλοπή* and thinks that perhaps Heraclides' book belongs to this genre as well. In the following lines, I shall argue that the Anonymus does indeed intend to show that Archilochus plagiarized Homer.

Lasserre (apud Turner) points out that a similar series of fragments of Archilochus preceded by parallel lines from Homer is to be found in the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria (425,11-426,6 Stählin). Turner's wording ("usually of a gnostic nature") suggests that his preference is (e). But this series is only part of a large excerpt of parallels, which run from 'Orpheus' through the whole of Greek literature (the latest author quoted is Menander); this excerpt forms the whole of the second chapter of Book vi (423,30-443,21). Clement sets out to prove that not only have the Greeks made themselves guilty of *κλοπή*

τῆς ἀληθείας (i.e. the Bible), but also of κλοπή among themselves: οἱ γὰρ τὰ οἰκεία οὕτως ἀντικρυς παρ' ἀλλήλων ὑφαιρούμενοι βεβαιοῦσι μὲν τὸ κλέπται εἶναι, σφετερίζεσθαι δ' ὅμως καὶ ἄκοντες τὴν παρ' ἡμῶν ἀλήθειαν εἰς τοὺς ὁμοφύλους λάθραι διαδείκνυνται. οἷ [not οἱ] γὰρ μηδὲ ἑαυτῶν, χολῆι γ' ἂν τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀφέξονται (424,11-15).

For a discussion of the whole excerpt from Clement, cf. Elter, *De Gnomologiorum Graecorum historia atque origine (...)* ramenta, Bonnæ 1897,17-36; Ziegler, o.c., 1985-1991. Though Clement's material is used to prove κλοπή among the Greeks, this does not necessarily mean that it was derived from a book about κλοπή - Elter (29) suggests a gnomology. But a similar, if far shorter, collection of parallels in Porphyry (apud Eus. PE I 565,3-566,11 Mras) was certainly derived from one or more authors Περὶ κλοπῆς (cf. 566,19; Ziegler, o.c., 1982).

For our papyrus a gnomology seems definitely an unlikely supposition: it is hard to see why a gnomology should cite the same thought in pairs from two poets only - besides, there is no systematical arrangement in thought (Treu, o.c., 175), which is obviously present in the closest gnomological parallel to our papyrus, the very late *Κύγκρισις Μενάνδρου καὶ Φιλιππίωνος* (a dangerous parallel, because its ascriptions are completely arbitrary).

There is one very interesting, hitherto neglected parallel from a papyrus from the first half of the third century B.C., in other words, the same period: P.Petrie I 3 (1) = Pack² 1572:

ΕΠΙΧΑΡΜΟΥ (fr. 297 Kaibel)

[αἶ μὴ πάνυ γὰ] τις δυστυχῶν βίον τ' ἔχων
 [μηδὲν καλό]ν τε κάγαθὸν ψυχᾷ διδῶι,
 [ἐγὼν γὰ τῆνο]ν οὔτι φασὼ μακάριον,
 [φυλακὰν δὲ μ]ᾶλλον χρημάτων ἄλλωι τε[λεῖν.]

ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ (fr. 198 N.2)

[εἰ δ' εὐτυχῶν] τις καὶ βίον κεκτημένος
 [μηδὲν δόμοις]ι τῶν καλῶν θηράσεται,
 [ἐγὼ μὲν αὐ]τὸν οὔποτ' ὄλβιον καλῶ,
 [φύλακα δὲ μ]ᾶλλον χρημάτων εὐδαίμονα.]

I have dealt with this papyrus at length in this journal (33,1979,41-45), and I must refer the reader to that paper for more detailed argument and for the constitution of the Epicharmus text. In this case the suspicion that the parallel passages were written one after the other in order to show plagiarism, on the part of Euripides, was advanced already by G.Kaibel (*Hermes* 28,1893,62-64), though, again, others have thought of a gnomology as well. Here the suspicion is backed up by two facts: (a) the 'Epicharmus' quotation is a patent fourth-century fraud, as is apparent from some recent locutions; (b) there is a parallel case, again in Clement's excerpt (427,10-18), where Euripides is charged with having plagiarized 'Epicharmus'; that charge, too, is obviously fraudulent. Since the Epicharmus passage in the

Petrie papyrus is a fabrication, that papyrus belongs to the κλοπή literature: we cannot interpret it as part of a collection of parallels made for scholarly or rhetorical purposes.

Now, the Hibeh and the Petrie papyrus are very close in date (the latter is dated by Mahaffy to the reign of Philadelphus), and both have parallels in the lengthy excerpt from Clement. The Clement excerpt intends to show plagiarism, as does the Petrie papyrus. The most obvious inference is that our Anonymus, too, compiled his parallels in order to show that Archilochus was guilty of plagiarizing Homer. If the inference is correct, the κλοπή literature, of which Ziegler and Pfeiffer somewhat reluctantly make Aristophanes of Byzantium the πρῶτος εὐρετής, is at least half a century older than he. The suspicions uttered already by Bühler and Pfeiffer about our papyrus and those of Kaibel (which I think can be proved) about the Petrie papyrus, reinforce each other mutually.

A final word about the Anonymus' *modus operandi*. As I noted above, the Anonymus does not present the lines from Homer in the order of the text, and his variants in Ξ 66 show that he did not even have a text of Homer before him. Also, there is no thematic coherence between the successive parallels. It then becomes a distinct possibility that the order of the parallels is that of the edition of Archilochus used by him. This is the position of Lasserre (apud Turner) and Treu (o.c., 175); Lasserre even went as far as suggesting that the three Archilochean lines come from the same poem (in his edition, note on fr. 52-54). In view of the fact that I have given reasons for thinking that the first and third line are epodic, this may seem attractive, although the assumption of epodic provenance does not solve the metrical problem of the second line.

But on closer reflection the inference that the Anonymus did follow the order of his Archilochus text does not impose itself. For one thing, can we be certain that there was already an edition (in our sense of the term) of Archilochus by the time he collected his material (for which the papyrus is the *terminus post quem*)? But this is a side-issue. Since the papyrus is an excerpt, the excerptor may have found his cases of alleged κλοπαί anywhere, for example in secondary literature, like the books on Archilochus by Heraclides and Aristotle.