

A New Poem of Archilochus: *P.Colon. inv. 7511*

Miroslav Marcovich

A RECENTLY DISCOVERED second-century papyrus of Archilochus in the collection at Cologne (inv. 7511) has received its first publication by R. Merkelbach and M. L. West in *ZPE* 14 (1974) 97–113 with plate v (= M–W).¹ It is of great importance since it comprises the first known almost complete poem by Archilochus (35 lines), in addition to the beginning of another (5 lines). The text presents some difficulties, but clearly the content and the literary value of the poem deserve the closest attention.

The meter of this epode is a hemiepes sandwiched between an iambic trimeter and an iambic dimeter, and was imitated by Horace in his eleventh epode. The poem contains a dialogue between the younger sister of Neobule, daughter of Lycambes and Amphimedo (lines 1–5; the beginning of the girl's speech is missing), and the young Archilochus (lines 6–27), and ends with a selective description of a love-affair between them (lines 28–35).

Merkelbach saw in the poem a story of hate, of vengeance by Archilochus on Lycambes and Neobule. I am in strong disagreement with his interpretation. I think we have to do with a fresh and naïve love story.

The main purpose of this paper, however, is to improve our text of the poem by offering a somewhat different edition of the papyrus and to provide it a literary-philological commentary. The time for a definitive literary assessment of the poem has not yet come.

TEXT

“ . . . πάμπαν ἀποσχόμενος· ἴσον δὲ τόλμ[ησον ποθεῖν.]
εἰ δ' ὦν ἐπέιγεται καὶ σε θυμὸς ἰθύει,
ἔστιν ἐν ἡμετέρου, ἢ νῦν μέγ' ἰμείρ[ει σέθεν.]

¹ This is a revised and enlarged version of a paper read at the 106th annual meeting of the American Philological Association. I am indebted to Professors Ludwig Koenen, Hugh Lloyd-Jones, David F. Bright, as well as to three anonymous readers appointed by this journal, for healthy criticism and for several suggestions. For any possible mistake, however, the responsibility is mine alone.

- καλή τέρεινα παρθένος· δοκέω δέ μι[ν]
 5 εἶδος ἄμωμον ἔχειν· τὴν δὴ cὺ προίη[σαι φίλην.]”
 τοσαῦτ’ ἐφώνει· τὴν δ’ ἐγώνταμει[βόμεν·]
 “” Ἀμφιμεδοῦς θύγατερ, ἐσθλῆς τε καὶ [σαόφρονος]
 γυναικός, ἦν νῦν γῆ κατ’ εὐρώεσσ’ ἔ[χει,]
 [τ]έρψιές εἰσι θεῆς πολλαὶ νέοισιν ἀνδ[ράσιν]
 10 παρῆξ [ε] τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα· τῶν τις ἀρκέσει[ι·]
 [τ]αῦτα δ’ ἐφ’ ἡσυχίης, εὐτ’ ἂν μελανθῆ[ι μοι γένυς,]
 [ἐ]γὼ τε καὶ cὺ cὺν θεῶι βουλευόμε[ν·]
 [π]είσομαι ὥς με κέλευαι; πολλόν μ’ ἐ[ποτρύνει δ’ ἔρωσ]
 [θρ]ιγκοῦ τ’ ἔνερθε καὶ πυλέων ὑποφ[θάνειν·]
 15 [μ]ή τι μέγαιρε, φίλη· cχήσω γὰρ ἐς ποη[φόρους]
 [κ]ήπους· τὸ δὴ νῦν γνῶθι· Νεοβούλη[ν μὲν ὦν]
 [ἄ]λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω· αἰαὶ πέπειρα δ[ὴ πέλεν,]
 [ἄν]θος δ’ ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήϊον
 [κ]αὶ χάρις, ἦ πρὶν ἐπῆν· κόρον γὰρ οὐκ [ἡρύκακεν,]
 20 [ἄτ]ης δὲ μέτρ’ ἔφηγε μαινόλις γυνή·
 [ἐς] κόρακάς (ἐ) ἄπεχε· μὴ τοῦτ’ ἐφεῖτ’ ἄν[αξ θεῶν,]
 [ὄ]πως ἐγὼ γυναῖκα τ[ο]ιαύτην ἔχων
 [γεί]τοσι χάριμ’ ἔσομαι· πολλὸν cὲ βούλο[μαι, φίλη·]
 [cὺ] μὲν γὰρ οὐτ’ ἄπιστος οὔτε διπλόη,
 25 [ἡ] δ’ ἐ μάλ’ ὄξυτέρη, πολλοὺς τε ποιεῖτα[ι φίλους·]
 [δέ]δοιχ’ ὅπως μὴ τυφλὰ κάλιτήμερα
 [cτ]ρουδῆι ἐπειγόμενος τῶς ὥσπερ ἡ κ[ύων τέκω.]”
 [τος]αὐτ’ ἐφώνειν· παρθένον δ’ ἐν ἀνθε[σιν]
 [τηλ]εθάεσσι λαβὼν ἔκλινα, μαλθακῆι δ[έμας]
 30 [χλαί]νηι καλύψας, αὐχέν’ ἀγκάλῃς ἔχω[ν]
 [δεί]ματι παυ[σ]αμένης τῶς ὥστε νεβρ[ὸς -ο-ο-·]
 [μαζ]ῶν τε χερσὶν ἡπίως ἐφηψάμην,
 [ἡ] δ’ ὑπ[ε]φήνηξ [·] νέον, ἦβης ἐπήλυσις, χροά·
 [ἄπαν τ]ε cῶμα καλὸν ἀμφαφώμενος,
 35 [λευκ]ὸν ἀφήκα μένος ξανθῆς ἐπιψαύ[ων τριχός·]

TRANSLATION

“ . . . while you abstain completely; but engage in a requited [love]. If, however, you are so eager and your heart’s desire drives you on, there is a girl in our house, beautiful and delicate, who now very much yearns for [you]. I would say she has shape without blemish: [make] her [your beloved wife].”

(6) So much she said, but I replied to her: “Daughter of Amphimedo, that noble and [chaste] lady whom now the dank earth covers: there are many forms of pleasure which Aphrodite gives to young men apart from the marriage rite; one such will do now. As for marriage, with god’s help you and I will consider it at our ease some day, when [my cheeks are bronzed].

(13) Shall I obey your request? [Yet] an immense [desire urges] me on to come as first beneath your lintel and through your portal. Do not begrudge me this, my darling, for I shall light upon your garden abounding in grass.

(16) But know this: another man may have Neobule. Alas, she has become overripe. Gone is her maidenly bloom, gone her former charm. For she could not [curb] her desires, and in her madness the woman revealed the scope of her [folly].

(21) Let her begone to destruction! May not [the Lord of heaven] lay a behest on me to take such a wife and become the laughingstock of my neighbors. By far, [my darling,] I prefer you. For you are not faithless or double-dealing, while she is much too sharp and she makes too many [friends]. I am afraid, if I pursue her in reckless haste, [I may beget] children blind or untimely born, like the proverbial bitch.”

(28) I said no more, but took the girl and laid her down amidst the blooming flowers, covering her [body] with a soft [cloak] and encircling her neck with my arms, while she [fell silent in fear] like a fawn [before a wolf?]. Then gently I touched her [breasts] with my hands, and she revealed a part of her young flesh, the harbinger of her prime. And caressing her beautiful body [all] round I released the [white] life-force, lightly touching her fair [hair].

COMMENTARY

LINE 1. ἀπο- *P^{pc}*: ἀνα- *P^{ac}*. τόλμ[ησον ποθεῖν] e.g. M–W. For the phrase ἴκων . . . ποθεῖν or πόθον, ‘to engage in a requited love’, cf. *par amor* in *Ov. Met.* 4.192, 12.416; *Pont.* 3.2.69.

LINE 2. θυμός: there is no need to see in the word a pun (“Wortspiel”) with θυμός = τὸ πέος, as M–W do, referring to Hipponax fr.10 West. It does not seem likely to me that Archilochus would put such a pun in the mouth of an innocent young girl whom he opposes at length to the licentious Neobule in lines 16–27.

LINE 3. [κέθεν] *scripsi*. Cf. Ariphron fr.813.10 Page (*PMG*) κέθεν δέ

χωρὶς οὔτις εὐδαίμων ἔφν. Sappho fr.49 L-P ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω κέθεν:
[γάμου] M-W.

LINE 4. Cf. Hipponax fr.119 W. εἴ μοι γένοιτο παρθένος καλή τε καὶ
τέρεινα (M-W).

LINE 5. εἶδος ἄμωμον: cf. Hes. Theog. 259 Εὐάρνη τε φνὴν ἐρατὴ καὶ
εἶδος ἄμωμος. ποίη[σαι φίλην] J. Ebert and W. Luppe: πένθ[ωρον φιλεῖς]
("seit 4 Jahren") and πένθ[εσιν διδοῖς] M-W.

LINE 6. ἔφωνει P^{pc}: ἔφωνεε P^{ac}. 'εγ'ωντ'αμει[βόμην]=ἐγὼ ἀνταμει-
[βόμην] P, Snell.

LINE 7. Ἀμφιμεδοῦς: The name Ἀμφιμεδώ is not elsewhere known
to me, but cf. Ἀμφιμέδουσα, ἡ Δαναοῦ in *Scholiaminora* (D) ad Il. 2.499
Bekker. (Incidentally, the name Ἀμφιμέδων occurs twice on inscrip-
tions from Thasos, a colony of Paros: IG XII.8 279.12 and 376.7).

ἐθλῆς τε καὶ [καόφρονος] | γυναικός scripsi: cf. Eur. Alc. 615f ἐθλῆς ...
καὶ κώφρονος | γυναικός: [πεπνυμένης] Merkelbach: [μακαρτάτης]
West: [κοφωτάτης] Snell: [περίφρονος] Page, all e.g. The fact that the
poet addresses the desired girl by her mother's (instead of her father's)
name, followed by complimentary epithets ("that noble and [chaste]
lady"), may be due to the conventional motif: "such mother, such
daughter." Cf. Eur. Andr. 623 ἐθλῆς θυγατέρ' ἐκ μητρὸς λαβεῖν. Pl.
Menex. 237A6 ἀγαθοὶ δὲ ἐγένοντο διὰ τὸ φῦναι ἐξ ἀγαθῶν. Soph. Phil. 874
ἀλλ' εὐγενῆς γὰρ ἡ φύσις καὶ εὐγενῶν. Eur. fr.75.2 N.² ἐθλῶν ἀπ'
ἀνδρῶν ἐθλὰ γίγνεσθαι τέκνα. Rhés. 388 χαῖρ', ἐθλόσ ἐθλοῦ παῖς.
Heracl. 324f. Hor. Carm. 1.16.1 O matre pulchra filia pulchrior (and
Nisbet-Hubbard ad loc.); 4.4.29 fortes creantur fortibus et bonis (and
Keller-Holder ad loc.).

LINE 10. τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα: the phrase is puzzling. I take it to mean
'the holy matter', i.e. 'the marriage rite, wedding'. Evidently, so also
Snell: "auch ohne kultische Hochzeit." If so, then ταῦτα in line 11
must refer to this θεῖον χρῆμα, implying 'marriage'. So also Merkel-
bach ("all dies, nämlich die Hochzeit"). West, however, takes the
phrase to mean the same as τὰ μέγιστα at Theoc. Id. 2.143 ἐπράχθη τὰ
μέγιστα, καὶ ἐς πόθον ἦνθομεσ ἄμφω. There the phrase clearly implies
'sexual intercourse' (cf. *Scholiaminora* ad loc.: τὰ μέγιστα· τὰ τῆς συνου-
σίας). With West's interpretation ταῦτα must refer to something in
the lost opening part of the poem.

LINE 11. μελανθῆ[ι μοι γένυς] M-W. I think this is the most likely
restoration in view of Od. 16.175 ἄψ δὲ μελαγχροῖς γένετο (sc. Ὀδυσ-
σεύς); Pl. Resp. 474E1 μέλανα δὲ (sc. φατὲ) ἀνδρικοὺς ἰδεῖν. Cf. also

μελάμπυγος at, e.g., Archil. fr.178 West. I think the phrase means ‘when my cheeks are sunburned, bronzed or tanned’, which is a sign of full manliness, rather than ‘when my chin grows dark with beard’. Both interpretations, however, are possible.

LINE 12. *σὺν θεῶι*: the fact that this phrase, implying ‘with divine aid’, along with the phrase in line 21, *ἐς κόρακας*, ‘begone to destruction’, are common only after the fifth century B.C. does not, I think, speak against Archilochus’ authorship of the poem nor for attributing it, e.g., to the Anacreontea. As for the former phrase, cf. *Il.* 9.49 *σὺν γὰρ θεῶι εἰλήλουθμεν*. As for the latter (18 instances in Aristophanes; *Lys.* 13.8), cf. *Theog.* 833 *πάντα τὰδ’ ἐν κοράκεσσι καὶ ἐν φθόρωι*.

LINE 13. [π]είσομαι et [φ]είσομαι J. R. Rea: [σπ]είσομαι Merkelbach. *κέλεαι*; *scripsi*: *κέλεαι* P, M–W. *ἐ[ποτρύνει δ’ ἔρωσ]* *scripsi*: *ἐ[ποτρύνει πόθος]* *servato* v.14 δ’ L. Koenen: *ἔ[χει]* M–W: *ἔ[ρωσ]* W. D. Lebek.

The way we restore this line seems to be the key to the understanding of the whole poem. There seem to be at least three possibilities:

1. [σπ]είσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι· πολλόν μ’ ἔ[ρωσ] . . . | ὑπ’ ὀφ[ρύας]
2. [φ]είσομαι, ὥς με κέλεαι, πολλόν μ’ ἔ[χοντος ἡμέρου] | . . . ὑποφ[θάνειν]
3. [π]είσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι; πολλόν μ’ ἐ[ποτρύνει δ’ ἔρωσ] | . . . ὑποφ[θάνειν]

1. The first possibility was suggested by Merkelbach. By restoring [σπ]είσομαι he sees in the line a case for the rape (and, at the same time, for a pun as well). According to him, in the lost part of the poem the girl had suggested to Archilochus: “Let us make peace!” (*σπειώμεθα*). To which he replies in line 13: “Yes, let us make peace, but in my own way: by pouring libation into your womb!” (*σπείσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι*): “Ich werde Frieden schliessen und die Opferflüssigkeit vergiessen—aber in deinen Schoss”; “Dem Mädchen, das (etwa) gesagt hatte ‘σπειώμεθα, wir wollen uns wieder vertragen’, hat er geantwortet ‘σπείσομαι, ja, aber nur sexuell’; die Versöhnung hat er weit von sich gewiesen” (pp.105, 113).

Accordingly, Merkelbach sees in Archilochus “an extreme psychopath” (“ein schwerer Psychopath”), interpreting the poem as describing Archilochus’ own act of violence against the younger daughter of Lycambes. Archilochus did ‘have’ the girl, and he did so only to take vengeance on Lycambes and his older daughter Neobule: “Das erste der neuen Gedichte zeigt nun, dass Archilochos die Schwester der Neobule, die sichtlich noch ein Kind war, überwältigt hat, offenbar

nur um sich an Lykambes und Neobule zu rächen . . . Er hat rücksichtslos bekannt gemacht, dass er das Mädchen ‘gehabt’ hatte, um auf diese Weise die ganze Familie des Lykambes zu blamieren . . . So hat Archilochos den Lykambes und seine Töchter—die beide seine Geliebten gewesen waren und deren Jüngere ihm gar nichts getan hatte—in den Tod getrieben” (p.113). Merkelbach concludes his commentary on the poem by referring to Maximus of Tyre 18.9: τὸν δὲ Ἀρχιλόχου ἔρωτα, ὑβριστῆς γάρ, χαίρειν ἐῶ (p.111).

Fortunately enough, this interpretation of the poem (by itself unlikely to me) falls on palaeographical grounds: there is insufficient space on the papyrus to accommodate two letters at the beginning of line 13 (*sigma* and *pi* of [σπ]είσομαι)—there is room for only one.

2. The second possibility (which was my first attempt to solve the problem) would yield this meaning: “I will spare you (*i.e.*, your virginity), *though* an immense desire lays hold on me to come as first . . . through your portal.” Archilochus honors the girl’s virginity and eventually comes to his sexual satisfaction while ‘lighting’ upon her *mons Veneris* (*cf.* vv.15f *σχίγω γὰρ ἐς ποη[φόρους] | [κ]ήπους*) without deflowering her. The advantage of this interpretation seems to be that it goes well with the fact that the *διακόρησις* is not mentioned in the description of the action itself (lines 28–35), the verb *ἀμφαφάομαι* in line 34 implying no more than ‘to touch, feel or caress the body with hands’. But the disadvantages prevail. For one thing, the phrase of line 15: [μ]ή τι μέγαιρε, φίλη, remains unclear. “Do not begrudge me this, my darling!” What? Obviously, the *penis immissio* implied in the previous line.

3. Consequently, I would like to suggest a third possibility, mentioned above, with the following meaning: “Shall I obey your request?,” “Shall I hearken even as you bid me?,” *i.e.*, to refrain from sexual intercourse with the girl, as she asked the poet in the lost opening part of the poem ending with line 1: “while you abstain completely.” As for the restoration [π]είσομαι ὡς με κέλει, *cf.* Il. 23.96 *πέισομαι ὡς cū* (: ὡς με *h n γρ.* A U⁴ ed. Allen) *κελεύει*.

The answer to this deliberative question is a ‘No’, implied by a lost δὲ (‘but, however’) at the end of the same line. And this ‘No’ depends on “the many forms of (sexual) pleasure which Aphrodite gives to young men apart from the marriage rite,” mentioned in lines 9f. One such form, which “will do now,” is the *coitus interruptus*, saving the girl from premarital pregnancy.

We can now better understand the words of line 15: “Do not begrudge me this, my darling,” ‘this’ implying sexual intercourse. The poet-lover knows a special form of sexual pleasure. The γὰρ in line 15 is of importance: “For I shall end my journey by lighting upon your *mons Veneris*.” That is why the girl should not object to the love-affair.

However, if we accept this restoration and interpretation, how can we explain the fact that the *coitus* is not explicitly mentioned in the description of the act itself in lines 28–35? I think by an old conventional device of the lyric poets: their description of the sexual act is discreet, selective and intentionally elliptic. Here are some examples. Theoc. *Id.* 2.140–43:

καὶ ταχὺ χρώς ἐπὶ χρωτὶ πεπαίνεται, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα
θερμότερ' ἤς ἢ πρόσθε, καὶ ἐψιθυρίσδομες ἀδύ.
ὡς καὶ τοι μὴ μακρὰ φίλα θρυλέοιμι Σελάνα,
ἐπράχθη τὰ μέγιστα, καὶ ἐς πόθον ἦνθομες ἄμφω.

The same euphemistic device (“And to tell thee no long tale, dear Moon . . .”) recurs in the Greek Anthology, 5.128 (Marcus Argentarius):

Στέρνα περὶ στέρνοις, μαστῶι δ' ἐπὶ μαστὸν ἐρείσας
χείλεά τε γλυκεροῖς χείλεσι συμπιέσας
Ἀντιγόνης καὶ χρωῶτα λαβὼν πρὸς χρωῶτα, τὰ λοιπὰ
σιγῶ, μάρτυς ἐφ' οἷς λύχνος ἐπεγράφετο.

5.252.5f (Paulus Silentarius):

στήθεα δ' ἐζεύχθω τά τε χεῖλεα· τὰλλα δὲ σιγῆι
κρυπτόν· ἐχθαίρω τὴν ἀθυροστομίην.

5.4.6 (Philodemus) ἤδη τῆς Παφίης ἴσθι τὰ λειπόμενα. 12.94.4 (Meleager) τὸν δὲ—τὸ λειπόμενον. Cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.5.23–25 *singula quid referam? . . . cetera quis nescit?* The same holds good for Ovid’s description of love-affairs in the *Metamorphoses*. Consequently, I would take the verb ἀμφαφάομαι in line 34 for a euphemism implying the sexual act. Πολλὸν is an adverb, as in line 23.

LINE 14. τ' *scripsi*: δ P. ὑποφ[θάνειν] as depending on the verb at the end of line 13, Marcovich: ὑποφ[θάνειν] but as depending on μέγαυρε in line 15, West: ὑπ' ὀφ[ρύας] et ὑπ' ὀφ[ρύειν] Merkelbach.

LINE 15. σχῆσω . . . ἐς must mean ‘I shall land on’ (cf., e.g., Hdt. 6.92.1). Right are M–W: “landen bei; nautische Metapher.” As a

matter of fact, if the man's sexual action is metaphorically envisaged as a 'rowing process' (cf. the expression *Κύπριδος εἰρεσίη* at Meleager, *Anth.Gr.* 5.204.2; *περῶντα*, West, and *ναυσίη* at Semon. fr.7.54 West), then 'the final landing or lighting' must imply 'ejaculation', and this will take place upon the girl's *mons Veneris*. It seems clear to me that *coitus interruptus* is meant. *ποη[φόρους]* M–W: *ποη[τρόφους]* Snell.

LINE 16. *[κ]ήπους* = *hortus puellae*, *Anth.Lat.* 885 Riese; cf. Diog.Laert. 2.116 and M–W (p.106). The image of a flat land for the *mons Veneris* (cf. *τὸ πεδίον* at Ar. *Lys.* 88; *Av.* 507; *λειμών* at Eur. *Cyc.* 171) favors the meaning 'landing; lighting' for *ἔχειν* . . . *ἐς* in line 15. *Νεοβούλη[ν μὲν ὦν]* H. Lloyd-Jones: *-η[ν γε νῦν]* Snell: *-η[ν δέ τις]* et *Νεοβούλη[ς γάμον]* M–W: *-η[ς λέχος]* Lebek.

LINE 17. *πέπειρα* 'overripe' = *γραῖα* Hesych.; schol. in Ar. *Eccl.* 896. Cf. Anac. fr.432 Page; Theoc. *Id.* 7.120f:

*καὶ δὴ μὰν ἀπίοιο πεπαίτερος, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες
“αἰαῖ” φαντί “Φιλῖνε, τό τοι καλὸν ἔνθος ἀπορρεῖ”*

a close parallel, adduced by J. Griffith. *δ[ὴ πέλεν]* *scripsi*: *δ[ὴ] [ἐστ' ἄγαν]* Ebert and Luppe.

LINE 19. *οὐκ [ἡρύκακεν]* *scripsi* (cf. *Od.* 11.105 *σὸν θυμὸν ἐρυκακέειν*, 'to curb your desire'): *οὐ κ[ατέσχε πω]* M–W with reference to Solon fr.4.9 W. *οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται κατέχειν κόρον.*

LINE 20. *[ἄτ]ης* Snell: *[ἡβ]ης* Lebek: *[ἄς]ης* Page: *[φυ]ῆς* Lloyd-Jones. As for the image of *ἄτης μέτρα*, 'the huge size or scope of her folly', cf. *μεγάλη ἄτη* at Solon fr.13.68 W.; Soph. *Trach.* 851.

LINE 21. *[ἐς] κόρακάς (έ)* M–W: an elided *έ* combined with a lengthening of *κόρακάς* after the loss of the *digamma* in *Fe*. Another possibility may be to read *[ἐς] κόρακάς <ς>* *ἄπεχε. μὴ τοῦτ' ἐφεῖτ'* *scripsi* et *ἄν[αξ θεῶν]* Page: *μητουτοεφ. ιταν[P: μὴ τοῦτ' ἐφοῖτ' ἄν[ῆρ φίλος]* M–W: *μὴ τοῦτ' ἐφεστα<ι>η [ποτέ]* Koenen.

LINE 22. *[ὄ]πως* Koenen.

LINE 23. *[γεί]τοσι χάρμ' ἔσομαι*: cf. Hes. *Op.* 701 *μὴ γείτοσι χάρματα γήμησις* (M–W). As for the expressional force of this hemiepes, cf. Hor. *Erod.* 11.8 *fabula quanta fui*. *[φίλη]* et *[πάρος]* M–W: "a proper name" Snell: *[ἔχειν]* Ebert and Luppe. *Πολλὸν σὲ βούλομαι* ('I prefer you'), cf. *Il.* 1.112f *πολὸν βούλομαι αὐτὴν | οἴκοι ἔχειν.*

LINE 24. *[σὺ] μὲν* Lebek and West.

LINE 25. *[ἡ δ]᾽* M–W. *μάλ' ὀξυτέρη*: in view of the presence of such derogatory words as 'faithless' and 'double-dealing' or 'treacherous'

in the previous line, it seems preferable to take *ὄξυτέρη* to mean ‘sharp’= ‘cunning, shifty’ than ‘quick to anger’ (= *ὄξύχολος*, Solon fr.13.26), “allzu leidenschaftlich, allzu rasch” M–W. As for the use of the comparative *ὄξυτέρη* for *ὄξεια*, cf. Theog. 366 (almost identical with 1030) West *καρδίη ὄξυτέρη*, in addition to the instances adduced by M–W. *τε scripsi*: δε P. [*φίλους*] M–W.

LINE 27. *ἐπειγόμενος* P, M–W: *ἐπειγομένη* M. Gronewald: *ἐπειγομένο<ι>ς* Koenen and M. Treu. *κ[ύων τέκω]* M–W: *κ[ύων τέκηι]* Gronewald, Koenen and Treu. *τὼς ὥσπερ ἡ κύων*: cf. line 31: *τὼς ὥστε νεβρ[ός]*, and Archil. frs.224 (*πτώσσουσαν ὥστε πέρδικα*) and 21.1 (*ἦδε δ’ ὥστ’ ὄνου ράχισ | ἔστηκεν*). I think M–W are right in restoring [*τέκω*] and referring it to Archilochus with the meaning of ‘beget, engender’. M. Gronewald, L. Koenen and M. Treu, however, restore [*τέκηι*] and refer it to Neobule with the meaning of ‘bring forth, give birth to’, trying to bring the text closer to the proverb hinted at by Archilochus: *κύων σπεύδουσα τυφλὰ τίκτει* (*ἐπὶ τῶν διὰ σπουδὴν ἀμαρτανόντων*) Macarius 5.32 (CPG II, p.181); Aesopus 223 Perry= 251 Hausrath. I find the plural *ἐπειγομένοις* weak in sense (I would expect then *ἐπειγομένωι*), and the witness which Dioscorides put into the mouth of Lycambes’ daughters (*Anth.Gr.* 7.351.7–10, adduced by M–W) most welcome:

Ἄρχιλοχον, μὰ θεοὺς καὶ δαίμονας, οὐτ’ ἐν ἀγνυαῖς
 εἶδομεν οὐθ’ Ἡρῆς ἐν μεγάλῳ τεμένει.
 εἰ δ’ ἦμεν μάχλοι καὶ ἀτάσθαλοι, οὐκ ἂν ἐκεῖνος
 ἦθελεν ἐξ ἡμέων γνήσια τέκνα τεκεῖν.

LINE 28. *ἐφώνευν* P: *ἐφώνεον* M–W.

LINE 29. [*τηλ*]εθάετσι M–W. *δ[έμας]* *scripsi*: *δ[έμιν]* M–W.

LINE 30. [*χλαί*]νηι M–W with reference to Athen. 13, 604DE. *ἀγκάλησις* M–W: *αγκάλης* P.

LINE 31. [*δεί*]ματι West: [*τραύ*]ματι, [*σφάλ*]ματι, [*πτώ*]ματι, [*βλή*]ματι all e.g. Merkelbach. *παυ[ς]αμένης* (to be taken with v.30 *αὐχέν’*) *scripsi*: *παυ[ς]αμένην* P, M–W. *τὼς ὥστε νεβρ[ός πρὸς λύκον]* *coniecetim*: *τὼς ὥστε νεβρ[ὸν ἐκ φυγῆς]* West: *νεβρ[ὸν εἰλόμην]* Page: *νέβρ[ιον τρέμειν]* Koenen. As for the image of a fawn silent in fear, cf. Il. 4.243 *τίφθ’ οὕτως ἔστητε τεθηπότες ἥντε νεβροί*; Anac. fr.408 Page *νεβρὸν . . . ὄς τ’ ἐν ὕληι . . . ἐπτοήθη*. Hor. *Carm.* 1.23 *Vitas inuleo me similis, Chloe . . . non sine vano . . . metu*.

LINE 32. [*μαζ*]ῶν West: [*μηρ*]ῶν Merkelbach.

LINE 33. [ἡ δ' ὑπ]έφηγε scripsi: [ἡ πα]ρέφηγε West:].έφαι. (α corr. in η) P.

LINE 34. [ἄπαν τ]ε West: [ἐγὼ δ]ε Snell: [ἦδη τ]ε Koenen. ἀμφαφώμενος: cf. ad line 13 supra.

LINE 35. [λευκ]ὸν Merkelbach, with reference to *Anth.Gr.* 5.55.7f:

μέχρις ἀπεσπείσθη λευκὸν μένος ἀμφοτέροισιν,
καὶ Δωρὶς παρέτοις ἐξεχύθη μέλεσι

and to Hes. *Theog.* 190f λευκός | ἀφρός: [θερμ]ὸν West. [τριχός] M–W. Most probably this ‘fair hair’ refers to the hair of the girl’s head, not to her pubic hair, as M–W seem to take it in referring to line 16 [κ]ήπους.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Since there is not sufficient space on the papyrus for Merkelbach’s restoration of [σπ]είσομαι in line 13, I think his interpretation of the whole poem as a *hate* story, as a vengeance of Archilochus against Lycambes and Neobule (“... offenbar nur um sich an Lykambes und Neobule zu rächen”) must be discarded.

2. But if we read in line 13 [π]είσομαι ὡς με κέλεαι; (“Shall I hearken even as you bid me?”), while bearing in mind the phrase πείσομαι ὡς cὺ (or ὡς με) κελεύεις (*Iliad* 23.96), then the way may be open for the interpretation of the poem as a *love* story instead. Archilochus falls in love with the younger daughter of Lycambes and Amphimedo (cf. perhaps Archilochus fr.38 West: οἴην Λυκάμβεω παῖδα τὴν ὑπερτέρην [sc., e.g., φιλέω], “I love only the younger daughter of Lycambes”), and he asks her to satisfy his sexual desire. He treats the girl as an ‘honest woman’ (ἐσθλή γυνή: cf. the commentary on line 7), and he claims to know a special form of sexual pleasure given to young men by Aphrodite. This form seems to be *coitus interruptus*, which will save the girl from premarital pregnancy. The lover will ‘light’ upon the girl’s *mons Veneris* (v.15f. χήσω γὰρ ἐς . . . κήπους). Consequently, Archilochus does show certain consideration for the beloved girl.

3. The description of the sexual act itself in lines 28–35 is selective and euphemistic, due to a conventional device of Greek lyric poets (cf. point 3 of the commentary on line 13).