Telephus on Paros: genealogy and myth in the 'new Archilochus' poem (P. Oxy. 4708)

Journal Item

For guidance on citations see FAQs.

Version: Accepted Manuscript

TELEPHUS ON PAROS: GENEALOGY AND MYTH IN THE 'NEW ARCHILOCHUS' POEM (*P.OXY.* 4708)*

In recent years, our understanding of Archilochus has been transformed by the discovery of a major new fragment from the Oxyrhynchus collection (*P. Oxy.* 4708), first published by Dirk Obbink.[1] The new poem is not only the most substantial of Archilochus' elegiac fragments, but more importantly it is the first example we have of the poet's use of myth, for the surviving section narrates a mythological theme: the defeat of the Achaeans at the hands of Telephus during their first attempt to reach Troy. Scholars have found the choice and handling of the myth surprising, and the role that Telephus plays within the poem has been a subject of controversy. Yet this debate has tended to dwell on the Telephus myth in its general form, rather than focusing on the details of how Archilochus presents him in this particular context. This article will explore the significance Telephus could have had for a Parian audience, and will use this to investigate the political and rhetorical impact of his presentation within the poem. I will argue that Archilochus highlights the aspects of Telephus' story which connect him most closely with Parian local myth, and that he does so in order to enhance the poem's central message: criticism and implicit mockery of the mythological battle, and by implication, Parian contemporary military strategy.[2]

The surviving section of the Telephus poem appears to open with some kind of *gnômê* on the nature of flight (badly damaged).[3] The state of the papyrus improves at the point at which the myth begins, and we find a detailed narrative of the Achaeans' mistaken journey to Mysia and their defeat at the hands of Telephus:[4]

---

[1] D. Obbink, '4708. Archilochus, elegies (more of VI 854 and XXX 2507)', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* Vol. LXIX (2005), 19-42.

[2] It is possible, of course, that the poem was performed for Parian settlers on Thasos rather than on Paros, but since these new Thasian colonists were themselves Parian emigrants, and would consider their new colony as umbilically connected to Paros, the mythological resonances of the poem would be equally significant. When I refer to 'Paros' or a 'Parian' audience throughout the article, therefore, I do not mean to preclude the possibility of a Thasian performance context, but this would make little difference to the overall argument.

[3] Most scholars agree that the mythological section is included as a *paradeigma*, on the basis of the first person plural verb in line 4, which implies a separation between the 'we' outside the myth, and the third persons inside it, and the phrase καί ποτε (5), which suggests the poet is looking back to the mythological past to find a suitable example. For a counter-view, however, see E. Bowie, 'Historical narrative in archaic and early classical Greek elegy' in D. Konstan and K. A. Raaflaub (edd.), *Epic and History* (Malden, MA, 2010), 145-166 at 151.

[4] For the sake of simplicity, I print here the text of D. Obbink, 'A new Archilochus poem', *ZPE* 156 (2006): 1-9, which supersedes his original edition (n.1). Various scholars have suggested alternative readings and supplements, some of which are arguably preferable to the text of Obbink. However, my argument in this article relies on the poem's broad themes, and would still stand if alternative readings were printed, though I discuss some of the more essential textual points where they become relevant to the article. The only supplements on which my argument relies are Ἀρκα[σίδης in line 5 and Ἡρακλ]έης in line 22 (discussed below); the first is universally accepted by scholars who have studied the papyrus, and the second almost universally so. For textual discussion and alternative readings, see W. Luppe, 'Zum neuen Archilochos (P. Oxy. 4708)' *ZPE* 155

<pre>
                              ] . . . . [
εἰ δὲ] . [. . . .] . [.] . . θεοῦ κρατερῆ[ς ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης
        οὐ χρῆ] ἀν[α]λ[κείη]ν κ̣αι κακότητα λέγει[ν·
π]ήμ̣[α]τ’ εὖ̣ [εἴμ̣]εθα δ[ῆ̣]α φυγεῖν· φεύγ[ειν δέ τις ὥρη·
        κ̣αί ποτ[ε μ̣]οῦνος ἐὼν Τήλεφος Ἀρκα̣[σίδης   (5)
Ἀργείων ἐφόβησε πολὺν στρατ[όν,] ο̣[ὶ δὲ φέβοντο
        ἄ̣λκιμ̣[οι,] ἦ̣ τ̣όσα δὴ μοῖρα θεῶν ἐφόβει̣,
αἰχμητα̣ί περ ἐόντε[ς.] ἐΰρρείτης δὲ Κ[άϊκος
        π]ι̣πτ̣ό̣ντων νεκύων στείνετο καὶ [πεδίον
Μ̣ύσ̣ιο̣ν, οἱ δ’ ἐπὶ θ̣ῖ̣ν̣α πολυφλοισβοι[ο θαλάσσης   (10)
        χέρσ’] ὑπ’ ἀμειλίκτου φωτὸς ἐναιρό[μενοι
προ]τ̣ροπάδην ἀπέκλινον ἐϋκνήμ[ιδες Ἀχαιοί·
        ἀ̣]σπάσιοι δ’ ἐς νέας ὠ̣[κ̣]υ̣π̣όρ[ο]υ̣ς̣ [ἐσέβαν
π̣αῖδές τ’ ἀθανάτων κ̣α̣ὶ ἀδελφεοί, [οὓς Ἀγαμέμνων
        Ἴλιον εἰς ἱερὴν ἦγε μαχησομένο[υς·   (15)
ο]ἵ̣ δὲ τότ̣ε̣ βλαφθέντες ὁδοῦ παρὰ θ[ῖν’ ἀφίκοντο·
        Τε]ύθραντος δ’ ἐρατὴν πρὸς πόλιν [ἐ̣]ξ̣[έπεσον·
ἔ]ν̣θα [μ̣]έ̣νος πνείοντε̣ς ὅμως αὐτο[ί τε καὶ ἵπποι
        ἀ̣]φρ[αδί]ῃ μεγάλως θυμὸν ἀκηχέ[δατο·
φ]ά̣ντ̣ο̣ γὰρ ὑψίπυλον Τρώων πόλιν̣ εἰς[ἀναβαίνειν   (20)
        αἶ]ψα· μ̣[ά̣]τ̣ην δ’ἐπάτεον Μυσίδα πυροφόρο̣[ν.
Ἡρακλ]έ̣ης δ’ ἤντησ̣[ε] βοῶν ταλ̣[α]κάρδιον [υἱόν,
        οὖ̣]ρον ἀμ̣[εί]λ̣ικ̣[τον] δηίωι ἐν [πολ]έμ̣[ωι
Τ]ήλεφον ὃς Δαναο̣ῖσι κακὴν [τ̣]ὀ̣[τε φύζαν ἐνόρσας
        ἦ̣]ρειδε [πρό]μαχος, πατρὶ χαριζόμ̣[ενος   (25)
. . .] . . . . [.] . . . . . [
        . . .] . [.] . . . [. . . . . .] . . [
. . .] . . . . [. . . . . .] . θα . [
            ·   ·   ·   ·   ·
</pre>

If (one retreats?) under the powerful compulsion of a god, one shouldn't call it weakness or cowardice; we were right when we hastened to flee our dreadful suffering: there is a proper time for flight. Even Telephus Arcasides once, alone as he was, put to flight the great army of the Argives, and those powerful men fled – so great was the fate of the gods that routed them – spearmen though they were. The Caicus with its beautiful streams was crammed with the bodies as they fell, and so was the Mysian plain, but the well-greaved Achaeans, slain at the hands of a pitiless man, turned away headlong towards the shore of the much-resounding sea. Gladly did they embark on their swift ships, the sons and brothers of immortals, whom Agamemnon was leading to holy Ilios to fight. But at that time they had lost their way and come to that shore; they fell upon the lovely city of Teuthras, and there, in their folly, snorting battle-might along with

(2006), 1-4; M. L. West, 'Archilochus and Telephos', *ZPE* 156 (2006), 11-17; G. B. D'Alessio 'Note al nuovo Archiloco (POxy LXIX 4708)', *ZPE* 156 (2006), 19-22; W. B. Henry, 'Archilochus, P. Oxy. 4708 fr. 1.18-21', *ZPE* 156 (2006), 14; E. Magnelli, 'On the new fragments of Greek poetry from Oxyrhynchus', *ZPE* 158 (2006), 9-12; H. Bernsdorff, 'Halbgötter auf der Flucht - Zu P. Oxy. 4708 (Archilochos?)', *ZPE* 158 (2006), 1-7; V. Tammaro, 'Noterelle al nuovo Archiloco (*P. Oxy.* 4708)', *Eikasmos* 17 (2006), 33-35; A. Nicolosi, 'Sul nuovo Archiloco elegiaco (*P. Oxy.* 4708 fr. 1)', *Eikasmos* 17 (2006), 25-31 and *Ipponate, epodi di Strasburgo - Archiloco, epodi di Colonia (con un'appendice su P. Oxy. LXIX 4708)* (Bologna, 2007).

their horses, they were despondent in their hearts. For they thought they were quickly going up against the high-gated city of the Trojans; in vain did they tread upon wheat-bearing Mysia. And Heracles came to meet them, shouting to his brave-hearted son, Telephus, fierce and pitiless in battle, who aroused cowardly flight in the Danaans as he strove in the front ranks and pleased his father.

Given the poor quality of the end of the papyrus, we cannot be sure how much longer the mythological section may have continued after line 25. However, the section that survives demonstrates marked ring composition, both on the thematic level (the myth begins and ends with a description of Telephus' brilliance in battle, with a middle section telling the Achaeans' journey to Troy and arrival in Mysia) and on the verbal (the repetition of Telephus' name (5, 24), ἀμείλικτος (11, 23), and parallelism of μοῦνος (5) and πρόμαχος (25)), and this suggests that the mythological section is likely to be drawing to an end at about the time our papyrus gives out.[5] I will therefore proceed on the basis that the surviving section of the Telephus myth is a more-or-less complete narrative, and should bear interpretation without relying on the idea that further information was given elsewhere in the poem.

In the context of a poem whose overt moral appears to be consolatory, the choice and handling of the myth is surprising, and has prompted much debate. Thus, for example, Martin West has argued that Archilochus' choice of the myth of Telephus rather than the (apparently more suitable) retreats of the Achaean heroes at Troy is evidence that he lacked knowledge of the Iliadic tradition.[6] Other scholars have found the ambiguity in Archilochus' presentation of Telephus troubling, for his glorification of Telephus' prowess in battle seems to fit ill with the poem's opening moral that withdrawing under divine duress (θεοῦ κρατερῆ[ς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, 2) should not count as cowardice (κακότητα λέγει[ν·, 3).[7] Although the myth purports to be an *exemplum* to support this *gnômê*, the immediate focus on Telephus disrupts the consolatory effect, for rather than encouraging us to focus on the nobility of the defeated Achaeans, the paradigm is instead structured so as to present the deeds of the victor as the immediate point of interest.[8] Indeed, the problematic relationship between the *gnômê* and the myth chosen to

---

[5] Cf. Obbink (n.4), 7; P. Mayer, 'Krieg aus Versehen? Zur Funktion und Aussage der Telephos-Geschichte im neuen Archilochos (P. Oxy. 4708, fr. 1)', *ZPE* 157 (2006), 15-18, at 17. For techniques and patterns of ring-composition in epic and early poetry, cf. J. A. Notopoulos, 'Continuity and interconnexion in Homeric oral composition', *TAPhA* 82 (1951): 81-101; D. Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Berlin, 1970), 5-7; B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque: procédés et réalisations*, (Amsterdam, 1958), 52-6; W. Thalmann, *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, (Baltimore and London, 1984), ch. 1; E. Minchin, 'Ring-patterns and ring-composition: some observations on the framing of stories in Homer', *Helios* 22(1) (1995), 23-35.

[6] West (n.4), 16.

[7] Cf. Mayer (n.5), who argues that the poem is critical, rather than consolatory in tone; A. Aloni and A. Iannucci, *L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo. Con un' appendice sulla 'nuova' elegia di Archiloco* (Florence, 2007), who find the celebration of Telephus at odds with the consolatory opening, and see also C. Nobili, 'Tra epos ed elegia: il nuovo Archiloco', *Maia* 61(2) (2009), 229-249, at 231-2. For E.T.E. Barker and J.P. Christensen, 'Flight club: the new Archilochus fragment and its resonance with Homeric epic', *MD* 57 (2006), 9-41, the issue is best resolved by reading the poem as deliberately counter-cultural: they argue that the poem rejects Homeric precedent by presenting flight as something to celebrate rather than to be ashamed of.

[8] If we compare descriptions of retreat in Homer, we find that although it might in principle be logical to stress the glory of one's opponent in order to lessen culpability for defeat, in fact the poet tends to avoid this strategy (presumably because a glorious opponent risks stealing the hero's thunder): cf. e.g. *Il.* 11.544-74 where Hector is kept well away from Ajax, who retreats before an anonymous crowd of Trojans, thus allowing our emotional focus to remain entirely on him. For a fuller discussion of this issue see L.A. Swift, 'Archilochus the "anti-

illustrate it is highlighted by the later description of the Achaeans' flight as κακήν (24): a word which recalls and apparently contradicts the original moral (discussed further below). The choice and presentation of the Telephus myth, then, is the poem's central problem: why does Archilochus choose this story, rather than any other myth of battlefield retreat, and why does he tell the myth in such a way as to focus so much on Telephus' glory? To answer these questions, we must pay closer attention to Telephus himself, both in terms of the mythological tradition, and in terms of his presentation in this fragment. Antonio Aloni has convincingly argued for connections between both sides of Telephus' family line and Parian local myth, and has suggested that this lies behind Archilochus' choice of myth.[9] Thus Telephus is intrinsically a figure of potential interest to a Parian audience; as we shall see, Archilochus' presentation of Telephus in the poem makes this particularly clear.

LIMINAL TELEPHUS: MYSIAN OR GREEK?

Telephus was the son of Heracles and Auge, daughter of king Aleus and great-grand-daughter of Arcas, founder of the Arcadians. Despite his Greek pedigree, one of the most intriguing things about Telephus as a figure is how his identity sits on the borderline between Greek and barbarian, and can be developed in either direction. Some scholars have posited a gradual process of Hellenization, during which Telephus moves from being a local Mysian hero to being progressively more Greek, firstly through his parentage and secondly through the stories told about his birth and upbringing.[10] Yet the flexibility inherent in Telephus' story gives poets a great deal of choice as to how they present his ethnic identity. In the version of the myth which became canonical, Telephus was abandoned in the wilderness as an infant by his grandfather Aleus, who had received an oracle warning him that he would be overthrown by a grandson. Aleus tried initially to avoid the fulfilment of the oracle by making his daughter become a priestess of Athena Alea, and when she was seduced by Heracles, he punished her by shutting her in a box and casting her out to sea, and had the infant exposed. Telephus was miraculously suckled by a deer, and upon reaching adulthood he crossed over to Asia in search of his mother. He discovered her in Mysia, where she had married the local king, Teuthras; Telephus was welcomed, and succeeded Teuthras as king of Mysia.[11] However, our earliest source for the Telephus myth, the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, differs from other versions in that it places Telephus' conception, birth, and upbringing in Mysia rather than Arcadia ([Hesiod] fr. 165.6-10 M-W):

κούρη]ν δ' [ἐ]ν μεγάροισιν ἐὺ τρέφεν ἠδ' ἀτ[ίταλλε
δεξάμ]εν[ο]ς, ἶσον δὲ θυγατράσιν ᾗσιν ἐτίμ[α.
ἣ τέκε] Τήλεφον Ἀρκασίδην Μυσῶν βασιλῆ[α,

hero"? Heroism, flight and values in Homer and the new Archilochus fragment (P.Oxy. LXIX 4708)'. *JHS* 132 (2012), 139-55.

[9] A. Aloni, 'Storie di Telefo a Paro : a proposito di POxy. LXIX 4708 : Archilochus, Elegy', in P. A. Bernadini (ed.), *L'epos minore, le tradizioni locali e la poesia arcaica: atti dell'incontro di studio: Urbino, 7 giugno 2005* (Pisa, 2007), 73-90, at 79-80; Aloni and Iannucci (n.7), 212-16.

[10] For discussion of this idea see M. Strauss, 'Frühe Bilder des Kindes Telephos', *Ist. Mitt.* 40 (1990), 79-100; T.S. Scheer, *Mythische Vorväter: zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte* (Munich, 1993), 85-7; A. Stewart, 'Telephos/Telepinu and Dionysos: a distant light on an ancient myth', in R. Dreyfus and E. Schraudolph (edd.), *Pergamon: The Telephos frieze from the Great Altar. Vol. 2* (New York, 1996), 109-119 at 110-11.

[11] For the sources of the myth, see T. Gantz,. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, 1993), 428-31; C. Bauchhenns-Thüriedl, 'Der Mythos von Telephos in der antiken Bildkunst', *LIMC* 7.1 (1994), 856-857.

μιχθε]ῖσ’ ἐν φιλότητι βίηι Ἡρακλείηι
εὖτε μεθ’ ἵ]ππους στεῖχεν ἀγαυοῦ Λαομέδοντο[ς.

He [Teuthras] received the maiden in his halls and raised and nurtured her well, and he honoured her equally to his own daughters. She gave birth to Telephus Arcasides, king of the Mysians, having mingled in love with the mighty Heracles, when he came after the horses of noble Laomedon.

In this version of the myth, Auge is exiled while still a virgin and adopted by the Mysian king. Telephus is therefore depicted as a Mysian ruler, born and raised in Asia, albeit one with Greek parentage; indeed, in the lines which follow, he is assimilated to 'the best who were nurtured in the land of Asia' (ἄριστοι ἐν Ἀσ[ί]δι ἔτραφεν αἴηι, 15), those fighters who defeated the Greeks when they arrived in Mysia. Conversely, the version of the myth used by fifth-century tragic writers stress the hero's Greek identity: a strategy which not only makes him more appealing to a Greek audience in the period after the Persian wars, but which also lessens the potential charge of treachery in Telephus' decision to guide the Greeks to Troy, for rather than selfishly betraying his own kind to save his skin, he acts in accordance with the demands of blood and kinship. This is particularly apparent in Euripides' *Telephus*, where the question of Telephus' identity and heritage, and the contrast between Greeks and Asians, appear to be significant themes in the play.[12] In the prologue, Telephus affirms his Greek birth and upbringing, going so far as to derive his name from his status as an emigrant far from home (Euripides, *Telephus* fr. 696.11-16 Kannicht):

Τήλεφον δ’ ἐπώνυμον
καλοῦσί μ’ ἀστοὶ Μυσίαν κατὰ χθόνα·
τηλοῦ γὰρ οἰκῶν βίοτον ἐξιδρυσάμην.
Ἕλλην δὲ βαρβαροῖσιν ἦρχον ἐκπονῶν
πολλοῖς σὺν ὅπλοις πρίν <γ’> Ἀχαϊκὸς μολὼν
στρατὸς τὰ Μυσῶ[ν πε]δί ἐπ[ι]στρωφᾶι ποδί.

The citizens throughout the land of Mysia call me Telephus after my origin; for I was living far away when I established my way of life. And although a Greek, I led barbarians, fighting with many weapons, until the Achaean army came and haunted the Mysian plain.

Even before he offers to help the expedition, Telephus presents himself as a Greek, in natural opposition to the barbarians among whom he lives, and implies that his leadership over them is paradoxical. The Mysians themselves apparently share this view, for the name they give him reflects his status as an outsider. Telephus presents his anomalous status as a Greek leading barbarians as ceasing once he comes into contact with his fellow Greeks: although on a logical level this is simply because of his wounding by Achilles, it is also symbolically significant, for it paves the way for the idea that Telephus will now return to serve his Greek kinsmen. Later in the play, the Chorus also affirm Telephus' Greek identity in order to justify his decision to help the Greeks (fr. 727c.7-10 Kannicht):

σὲ γὰρ Τε[γ]εᾶτις ἡμῖν,

---

[12] Cf. C. Collard, M.J. Cropp, and K.H. Lee, *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays. Vol. 1.* (Warminster, 1995), 24; E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford, 1989), 174-5.

Ἑλλάς, οὐχὶ Μυσία, τίκτει
ναύταν σύν τινι δὴ θεῶν
καὶ πεμπτῆρ᾽ ἁλίων ἐρετμῶν.

For it was a Tegean mother, Greece, not Mysia, which gave birth to you, a sailor and guide of our seafaring oars, with the aid of a god.

The description of Telephus' birthplace as the 'Tegean woman' not only ties into the traditional idea that the land that bore you is a mother to you, but also reminds the audience that Telephus' real mother was a Greek. Telephus' connection with Mysia is rejected as commanding no true loyalty, and his willingness to act as a guide for the Greeks is therefore patriotic and in accordance with divine will.[13]

We can see, therefore, that Telephus' ethnic identity is malleable, and that Greek writers can adapt it to suit their own literary goals, as well as to reflect the ethnic politics of their day. We know of other versions of the myth which also vary the details in order to lessen or maximize Telephus' Greekness: for example in one version Telephus is born in Greece but is shut in the box along with Auge and so comes to Mysia as an infant, which puts him in a halfway position between the Telephus of the *Catalogue* and that of the *Telephus* (Strabo 13.1.69; Pausanias 8.4.9); conversely, at the most Hellenic end of the scale, we know of a version in which Telephus simply goes to Mysia to find his mother and then returns with her to Greece, making his connection with Mysia little more than a quest to a foreign land (Hyginus, *Fab.* 100). Unless we posit a strictly chronological development of the myth (which seems unlikely given the variability of myth across the Greek world at all periods), it seems likely that Archilochus too had flexibility in his presentation of Telephus, and that the hero was an intrinsically liminal figure, who could be presented as more or less Hellenized.[14]

ARCASIDS AND HERACLIDS: TELEPHUS' HERITAGE IN ARCHILOCHUS

If we turn now to the question of how Archilochus presents Telephus, we see that he too manipulates the hero's ethnicity and origins to suit his own ends.[15] Telephus is named twice in the fragment, at the beginning and end of the mythological section (5, 24), and the use of his name therefore operates as another framing device. On each occasion, Telephus is described in a way which highlights his genealogy: his first appearance alludes to his matrilineal descent from

---

[13] E.W. Handley and J. Rea, *The Telephus of Euripides. BICS* Supplement 5 (London, 1957), 33 suggest that fr. 719 Ἕλληνες ὄντες βαρβάροις δουλεύσομεν ('shall we, who are Greeks, be slaves to barbarians?') is Achilles' response to the news that Telephus will lead the expedition, and so is also connected to the theme of Telephus' ethnic identity.

[14] Of course, if one did want to posit a chronological development in which Telephus becomes partially Hellenized at an early date and fully Hellenized in response to anti-Asian sentiment after the Persian Wars, this would still be compatible with what we see in Archilochus, where Telephus is of Greek descent yet associated with Mysia: however, as I argue below, Archilochus goes out of his way to stress Telephus' Greek connections, which suggests that perceiving the Persian Wars as a sharp cut-off point is ill-advised.

[15] Nobili (n.7), 246 suggests that the celebration of the Mysian Telephus fits with the mixed nature of Thasian society after colonization. Yet as I argue below, Telephus' Mysian identity is presented as dwarfed by his Greek parentage. Nobili's reading of the poem differs from mine in seeing it as celebratory in nature, and hence suitable for public performance, whereas my interpretation places greater emphasis on the mistaken and embarrassing nature of the defeat in Mysia.

the royal house of Arcadia, and his second to his status as a son of Heracles. As we shall see, both of these family lines are of interest to a Parian audience, for both can be connected to local myth.[16]

Telephus enters the poem at line 5, where he is described with the patronymic Arcasides.[17] The epithet has often been explained as a traditional one, since it is also used of Telephus in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr. 165.8 M-W), and in both contexts it stresses Telephus' descent from the royal house of Arcadia, just as when the author of the *Catalogue* uses it of Apheidas, the son of Arcas ([Hesiod] fr. 129.16-22 M-W).[18] Yet Archilochus' use of the epithet requires further explanation. The *Catalogue of Women* is a poem which places particular emphasis on genealogies: the function of the women named is essentially their role in the foundation of dynasties, and the poem traces the origins of the major Greek lineages.[19] It is therefore unsurprising that the poet of the *Catalogue* should find Arcasides a particularly appropriate epithet for Telephus, especially since it comes in a passage which tells the story of his mother.[20] It is quite another thing for Archilochus to choose it out of all possible epithets to introduce Telephus into a narrative which focuses on his prowess as a warrior. The significance of Arcasides becomes clear, however, when we recall that the Parians traced their own origins back to Arcadia, and to a legendary figure called Paros son of Parrasios, who emigrated from Arcadia to found the new colony (cf. Stephanus of Byzantium 507.5-8 (sv Πάρος); Heraclides Lembus 25 Dilts).[21] Emphasizing Telephus' Arcadian descent on his mother's side is therefore a strategy

---

[16] For early elegy as a forum for the dissemination of local history and genealogy see E. Bowie, 'Ancestors of historiography in early Greek elegy and iambic poetry?' in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2001), 45-66.

[17] Ἀρκα[σίδης is universally accepted as the ending of line 5; the only alternative offered has been Obbink's original suggestion Ἀρκας ἐών, but as Obbink (n.4), 6 notes, the reading μ]οῦνος ἐὼν earlier in the line now makes this impossible.

[18] Etymologically, Ἀρκασίδης is problematic, for although Greek writers use the word to mean 'descendant of Arcas', the correct form would in fact be Ἀρκαδίδης; Ἀρκασίδης ought to mean 'descendant of Arcasus'. Some scholars have therefore posited a Mysian founding figure called Arcasus, from whom Telephus was originally descended before he was given a Greek genealogy: for discussion of this issue see Strauss (n.9), 79-100; Scheer (n.9), 71-94; Obbink (n.4), 6. Yet no Arcasus is attested in Greek literature, or as a personal name in Asia Minor. Later Greeks certainly seem to have identified the patronymic with Arcas: thus grammarians, who were aware that the patronymic was problematic, try to find ways to maintain the connection with Arcadia: cf. Steph. Byz.120.14-15 (sv Ἀρκαδία); see P.M. Fraser, *Greek Ethnic Terminology* (Oxford, 2009), 262. However, since Archilochus and his audience were not trained grammarians, there is no reason to suppose that they would perceive Ἀρκασίδης as an illegitimate form, and since it is used elsewhere to indicate a connection with Arcadia (cf. [Hes.] fr. 129.16-22 M-W), we can be confident that this is what it would have meant to the original audience.

[19] See M.L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford, 1985), 2-11, and 42 on Ἀρκασίδης; for the importance the *Catalogue* places on females and their desirability to men, see R. Osborne, 'Ordering women in Hesiod's *Catalogue*', in R. Hunter, (ed.) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge, 2005), 5-24, at 13-15.

[20] On genealogical techniques in the *Catalogue* and in early mythography see L. Bertelli 'Hecataeus: from genealogy to historiography', in N. Luraghi (ed.) *The Historian's Craft in theAage of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2001), 67-94 at 73-6; 2001. R.L. Fowler, 'Early *historiē* and literacy' in the same volume, 95-115 at 103-5. For the political importance of genealogy and marriage both within the *polis* and between communities see Fowler, 'Genealogical thinking, Hesiod's *Catalogue*, and the creation of the Hellenes', *PCPhS* 44 (1998), 1-19; E. Irwin 'Gods among men? The social and political dynamics of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*', in R. Hunter (ed.) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge, 2005), 35-98 at 60-5.

[21] Cf. D. Berranger *Recherches sur l'histoire et la prosopographie de Paros à l'époque archaïque,* (Clermont-Ferrand, 1992) 144; Aloni (n.8), 80; Aloni and Iannucci (n.7), 215; D. Katsonopoulou, 'Telephos Arkasides in a new poem of Archilochus', in D. Katsonopoulou, I. Petropoulos and S. Katsarou (edd.), *Archilochus and his*

designed to increase his appeal to a Parian audience, as it reminds them that they share a common origin with the hero. The initial description of Telephus is designed to emphasize his brilliance in battle and to encourage the audience to admire him: Archilochus takes care to point out that Telephus acts alone (μ]οῦνος ἐὼν, 5), yet can defeat the entire Achaean army (πολὺν στρατ[όν,] 6), while the image of Telephus bloodying the waters of the Caicus with his enemies aligns him with Achilles, the greatest hero of all (*Iliad* 21.7-221).[22] Naming Telephus as Arcasides therefore further encourages the audience to identify with him rather than the Achaeans at this point in the poem, and invites them to share in Telephus' glory through their common Arcadian heritage.[23]

The second time Telephus is named, Archilochus shifts the emphasis from the maternal to the paternal line, as he depicts him alongside his father Heracles.[24] There is evidence that Heracles played an important role in the mythological tradition of Paros, and several myths connect Heracles, Paros, and Mysia.[25] While the chronology of these mythological traditions is problematic, as we are reliant on later sources, it seems likely that at least some of these connections date back to the Archaic period. By the fifth century, a tradition existed that Heracles visited Paros on his way to punish Laomedon and founded an altar to Zeus and Apollo (cf. Pindar fr. 140a.62-8 S.-M.). In the Hesiodic tradition, this was also the journey that resulted in Telephus' conception, and if these can be connected, the myth joins Telephus' story to that of Paros, while Paros in turn is linked to the myths of Troy in which Telephus would later play his own part. Another connection between Heracles, Paros, and Mysia is found in a myth told by Apollodorus, which describes Heracles' adventures on his way to collect the girdle of the Amazon (2.5.9). Heracles is said to have stopped at Paros, where some of his companions became embroiled in a dispute with the sons of Minos resident there; two of Heracles' companions were killed in the quarrel, and in compensation two of the sons of Minos took their places on the expedition. Heracles continued on to Mysia, and then after visiting the Amazons went to Troy, where he rescued Hesione from the sea-monster and quarrelled with Laomedon over his refusal to honour his promise to give him his horses in return (hence prompting the return trip to Troy during

---

Age: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclade (Athens, 2008), 289-301, at 291.

[22] As Nicolosi (n.4) 304-5 notes, there is a later tradition in Hellenistic and Roman literature of the bloodying of the waters of the Caicus during the conflict between the Achaeans and the Mysians (adesp. ep. Alex. fr. 3.15-16; Philostr. 23.24; Ovid *Met* 12.111). As the motif does not appear elsewhere before the Hellenistic period, it is hard to judge whether these references attest to a widespread archaic tradition for which we have no other source, or whether Archilochus' poem itself could have been a source. In Ovid and Philostratus, it is Achilles who stains the water with Mysian blood: if they are drawing on an earlier tradition, then Archilochus' transference of the image to Telephus would be in keeping with his glorification of the hero.

[23] For myth and genealogy as a tool in local self-definition, see J.M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997) 67-106.

[24] Although Heracles' name appears only in a supplement, it is virtually impossible to find an alternative, and the reading Ἡρακλ]έης has been accepted by almost all scholars who have studied the papyrus. Given the syntax of the line, a proper name is required, and whoever is named here is introduced abruptly and without preparation. The person concerned must be in the singular, and has a friendly relationship to Telephus, to whom he is shouting encouragement (ἤντησ[ε] βοῶν). Moreover, the person involved ought to make sense of the reference πατρὶ χαριζόμ[ενος (25), which is very abrupt if no previous mention of Telephus' father has been involved and we are to take it in general terms. The only logical alternative therefore would be a reference to Telephus' adoptive father Teuthras, but this would bring problems of spacing on the papyrus and of metre. The only variant reading suggested is that of Luppe (n.4) 3, who reinterprets the whole start of the line as ἀλλ' ἀ[σ]το[ὶ] δμητῆρ' [ε]βόων, but this does not fit the traces well and has been rejected by other scholars who have worked on the poem.

[25] Berranger (n.19), 191-3; Aloni (n.8), 79-80; Aloni and Iannucci (n.7), 214-6.

which, according to the *Catalogue,* Heracles begot Telephus). Again, we find here the connection between Paros, Mysia and Troy, with Heracles as the figure who links the three. This story is of particular interest as it includes the detail that Heracles continued from Troy to Thasos, where he defeated the local Thracians in battle and gave the island to the descendants of Minos who had accompanied him from Paros. It seems likely, therefore, that the myth is in origin a Parian story, designed to justify Parian control of Thasos by presenting it as something directly authorized by Heracles himself. We have no evidence for this myth's existence in the Archaic period, and when dealing with a myth known only from later sources it is difficult to judge how far one can legitimately retroject its origins. Nevertheless, a myth whose purpose is to present the colonization of Thasos as an extension of the mythological past served an obvious purpose at the time of the colonization or shortly afterwards.[26] There is a hint of this connection in Archilochus fr. 89 W., a battle narrative where we have a mention of Thasos and Torone in successive lines (οἱ μὲν ἐν Θάσωι .[| καὶ Τορωναίην[, 19-20, 'some in Thasos ... and Torone') a combination that evokes Apollodorus' story that Heracles defeated the Thracians on Thasos and then went to Torone.[27] While we cannot therefore exclude the possibility that this myth grew up later in order to explain Parian control of Thasos, it is also highly plausible that the story could have been known in Archilochus' time, and that Heracles' adventures were seen as a foil for contemporary military activities. Moreover, even if the details in Apollodorus' version date from a later period, it seems likely that the choice of Heracles as proto-colonizer for the Parians grew out of an earlier association between Heracles and Paros: a relationship for which there is some evidence elsewhere in Archilochus' own poetry, for it is striking that the only attested instances of Archilochus narrating myth are all connected with Heracles and his descendants.[28]

The theory that Heracles was an important figure on Paros helps to explain his presence in the poem, which seems to be an original addition by Archilochus. Heracles' epiphany emphasizes Telephus' glory, for gods tend to favour natural winners. Nevertheless, Heracles' appearance is a detail found nowhere else in accounts of Telephus' rout of the Achaeans; indeed, the poet has gone out of his way to incorporate Heracles into the scene. After the middle section of the mythological narrative, which explains the Achaeans' mistake in confusing Mysia with Troy, it is the presence of Heracles that brings us back to the immediate situation, and the rout of the Achaeans. He is described as physically present on the battlefield and involved in the action, as we are told he 'came to meet them shouting to his brave-hearted son' (Ἡρακλ]έης δ᾽ ἤντησ[ε] βοῶν ταλ[α]κάρδιον [υἱόν, 22).[29] It is only after being identified as the son of Heracles that

---

[26] See I. Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley, 1998), who shows (with particular reference to Odysseus) how myths of journeys and returns can provide authority for community identity, and for colonization. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden, 1987), 56-9 also demonstrates how mythological and religious authority were used to retrospectively justify Parian colonization, through the use of oracle stories.

[27] A suggestion originally made by D. E. Gerber, *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry* (Amsterdam, 1970), 41-2.

[28] The other myths that we know Archilochus to have told are Heracles fighting Achelous and Nessus for the sake of Deianeira (frr. 286-8 W.) and Neoptolemus' killing of Telephus' son (and Heracles' grandson) Eurypylus (fr. 304 W.). This is further evidence of Parian interest in Heracles and the Heraclids, and in particular in Heracles' Mysian descendants: cf. Aloni and Iannucci (n.7) 212 and see also Bowie (n.14), 51-2; Bowie (n.3).

[29] As the anonymous reviewer points out, ἤντησ[ε need not mean that Heracles was actually involved in the fighting: more likely he is present but not an active participant. It is unusual to find ἀντάω used absolutely as it mostly takes a genitive or dative. There is a Homeric formula which uses the verb without expressing the object (οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε / ἤντησ᾽ οὐδὲ ἴδον, *Il.* 4.375, *Od.* 4.201) and here the verb is used to mean 'meet with' or

Telephus is named once again (24). We are reminded of his prowess in battle, as the poet returns to the motif of his rout of the Achaeans (24-5), while his description as [πρό]μαχος (25) echoes μ]οῦνος in portraying Telephus as unique and exceptional in his ability.[30] Telephus' achievements on the battlefield are then focalized through Heracles' eyes, as we are told that his fighting 'gave pleasure to his father' (πατρὶ χαριζόμ[ενος, 25); this too foregrounds Telephus' Heraclid identity as important. Thus Heracles assumes a role in the poem beyond mythological tradition or logical necessity, and Telephus is closely identified with him.

TELEPHUS AND THE WRONG WAR

If Archilochus draws attention to the aspects of Telephus' genealogy which assimilate him to the audience, we would expect Telephus to be the primary focus of the audience's emotional engagement, and the central figure of the mythological paradigm. Yet as various scholars have noted, the paradigm is presented in a surprisingly ambiguous fashion, and it remains unclear whether we are meant to be sympathizing with Telephus or with the Achaeans.[31] In this respect, Archilochus draws on the Homeric presentation of the Trojan War, where there are few sociological or cultural differences between the two sides, and the audience is encouraged to feel sympathy for both. This is striking when we compare the poem to other presentations of non-Greeks in Archilochus' poetry, where we find foreigners presented more negatively, and as different to the Greek 'self'. For example, in fr. 5 W. we find a dismissive reference to 'some Saian' who has captured the poet's shield (ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαΐων τις ἀγάλλεται, 'some Saian exalts in my shield', 1-2): here Archilochus draws on Homeric echoes, but does so to characterise the Saian as arrogant (for ἀγάλλομαι tends to be used in this sense in the *Iliad*), and to suggest an ironic mismatch between the grandeur of Iliadic heroes and the ignominy of being defeated by an anonymous barbarian warrior.[32] Distinction between Greeks and non-Greeks can be seen in fr. 93aW: though the text is problematic, we find references to tension between Greeks and Thracians; Archilochus criticises the Greeks' motivations in their dealings with the Thracians (οἰκείωι δὲ κέρδει ξύν' ἐποίησαν κακά, 'for private gain they did public harm', 3) coupled with a suggestion of indignation that the Greek leader bribed or paid the Thracians (Θρέϊξι δῶρ' ἔχων ἀκήρατον | χρυσόν, 'bringing gifts of pure gold for the Thracians').[33] Similarly, in fr. 216 W.,

---

'encounter' in a very general sense. This parallel perhaps suggests that we are meant to understand Heracles as making an appearance on the battlefield rather than physically joining in the fighting: nevertheless, his appearance is dramatic and acts as a spur to Telephus' martial prowess.

[30] Heracles' support does not contradict the earlier description of Telephus being 'alone', since divine assistance increases rather than lessens personal achievement (cf. Athena's support for Achilles at *Il.* 22.214-47); hence calling Telephus μ]οῦνος in Heracles' presence is less problematic than if we took the line to refer to a mortal character, and this is another reason to accept Heracles' name as the correct supplement in 22.

[31] Scholars have noted this double perspective but have tended to argue for one strand or the other representing the poem's dominant function: e.g. for readings of the poem as a defence of flight cf. Obbink (n.4); Barker and Christensen (n.7); for readings as critical of the Achaeans cf. Mayer (n.5).

[32] The occasions on which ἀγάλλομαι is used in a military context in the *Iliad* all use it to describe arrogant folly cf. *Il.* 12.114, 17.473, 18.132. On the negative presentation of the Saian, cf. V. Di Benedetto, 'Archil, fr. 5 W.' *Eikasmos* 2 (1991), 13-27 at 17-18, and for the humorous gulf between epic and contemporary here see P. Corrêa, *Armas e varões: a guerra na lírica de Arquíloco* (São Paulo, 2008), 127.

[33] The traditional reading of the lines, whereby the poet speaks of 'Thracian dogs' (κυσὶ Θρέϊξιν, 3) makes the reference to the non-Greeks much more pejorative in tone, but κυσὶ has recently been challenged following re-examination of the Sosthenes inscription: see K. Tsantsanoglou, 'Archilochus fighting in Thasos: frr. 93a and 94 from the Sosthenes inscription' *Hellenica* 53 (2003), 235-55, reprinted in D. Katsonopoulou, I. Petropoulos and S. Katsarou (edd.) *Archilochus and his Age: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades* (Athens, 2008), 163-179, and S. Owen, 'Of dogs and men', *PCPS* 49 (2003), 1-18. Tsantsanoglou proposes a new reading φύσι 'Thracians by nature' or 'Thracians by birth'. While

Archilochus refers in negative terms to mercenaries as 'Carians' (καὶ δὴ 'πίκουρος ὥστε Κὰρ κεκλήσομαι, 'indeed I shall be called a mercenary, like a Carian'), which further suggests an intrinsic contrast between Greeks and barbarians (the negative associations of mercenaries in Archilochus' poetry can clearly be seen from fr. 15 W.: Γλαῦκ', ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τόσσον φίλος ἔσκε μάχηται, 'Glaucus, a mercenary is a friend only as long as he is fighting'). Thus Archilochus' poetry in general suggests that he and his audience share a sense of Greekness, and identify themselves to some extent in opposition to non-Greeks, even if we do not find the developed anti-Asian feeling of the post-Persian war period.

In fact, when we examine the presentation of Telephus and the Achaeans, we find that not only are the two sides indistinguishable, but also that the the myth is told in a way which leaves it unclear where our sympathies lie, and what moral we should draw from the paradeigma. The moral which introduces the myth implies that the Achaeans are the subject, and the lesson to be drawn is the inevitability of defeat under difficult circumstances: even the great heroes of old had to retreat when fate was against them. Indeed, there are several aspects of the narrative that bolster the theme of *consolatio*: the poet stresses the courage and martial ability of the Achaeans despite their defeat (ἄλκιμ[οι,] ... αἰχμηταί περ ἐόντε[ς.], 'powerful men ... spearmen though they were', 7-8), and emphasizes that their retreat was fated (ἦ τόσα δὴ μοῖρα θεῶν ἐφόβει, 'so great was the fate of the gods that routed them' 7),[34] while later in the poem the audience is reminded that they are no ordinary mortals but demi-gods (παῖδές τ' ἀθανάτων καὶ ἀδελφεοί, 'sons and brothers of the immortals', 14).[35] Yet against this strand of *consolatio* is set a competing voice, which admires and celebrates the prowess shown by Telephus.[36] This internal conflict is signalled by the shift from the introductory moral justifying flight (φεύγ[ειν δέ τις ὥρη· 'there is a time for flight', 4) to the *exemplum* which illustrates it (καί ποτ[ε μ]οῦνος ἐὼν Τήλεφος, 'even Telephus once, alone as he was', 5). Whereas the *gnômê* leads us to expect a paradigm which identifies with the valiant defeated, instead Archilochus turns the myth on its head by using it to focus on Telephus and his single-handed excellence in combat. The poem thus weaves together two conflicting strands, and in doing so creates an unsettled narrative which leaves the audience uncertain as to where their loyalties should lie, and what message they should

---

less negative, this also presupposes a 'natural' difference between Greeks and barbarians, and an awareness of a separation between ethnic groups in the region.

[34] West (n.4) suggests the supplement ο[υδ' ἐγένοντο for the end of line 6, which would then qualify ἄλκιμ[οι]; however, this is much less satisfactory than supposing that Archilochus did describe the Achaeans as 'brave', since the point of the opening *gnômê* is that even good men can be forced to retreat. As Tammarro (n.4.) notes, ἄλκιμ[οι] and αἰχμηταί are connected, so Archilochus cannot be denying the Achaeans' bravery in this line only to reassert it in line 8; αἰχμηταί does not simply indicate a type of fighter but rather has normative overtones, implying bravery and strength: cf *Il.* 1.20, 5.602, 7.281, 22.269.

[35] I understand ἀδελφεοί to go with ἀθανάτων, following the interpretation of West (n.4) 14 and Bernsdorff (n.4), 4. The other possibility, favoured by Obbink (n.1) and Nicolosi (2006, n.4) and (2007, n.4) is to take ἀδελφεοί separately as referring to the pair of famous brothers, Agamemnon and Menelaus. However, this makes little sense if one prints [οὓς 'Αγαμέμνων at the end of the line, for how can Agamemnon be leading himself? Even if one prints a different supplement at the end of 14, it is a stretch to claim that Archilochus can expect his audience to interpret ἀδελφεοί, with no further description or qualification, as unambiguously indicating the Atridae.

[36] Aloni and Iannucci (n.7) 231-6 go so far as to suggest that the shifting between glorification of Telephus and defence of the Achaeans is evidence for two originally separate compositions: one celebratory and one consolatory. While they are right to note the two distinct tones within the poem, their proposed solution seems far too radical, and the fact that the poem contains competing perspectives need be no obstacle to reading it as a cohesive unit.

take from the paradigm.[37] This tension is exemplified by the description of the Achaean flight as κακήν (24), a word designed to evoke the opening moral on cowardice (3). The use of κακήν reinforces the degree to which the myth undermines and challenges the expectations set up by the *gnômê*, for it invites us to wonder whether this is Archilochus' own judgement or focalized through Telephus or the despondent Achaeans. The epithet, then, is carefully chosen to fit with the poem's consistent uncertainty as to whether one should criticize defeat as cowardice or regard it simply as divinely ordained misfortune, for κακός itself can hold both meanings.[38]

The reason for the central ambiguity lies in the problematic nature of the conflict, since as Archilochus takes care to point out, the battle he describes is one which ought never to have happened. For while the Achaeans imagine themselves to be fighting the Trojan war, they are in fact fighting the wrong enemy, in the wrong place. This point is made explicit throughout the poem; indeed, the purpose of the central flashback is to clarify that the Achaeans have made a mistake. As the Achaeans flee before Telephus, we are told that their intention was to fight at Troy (Ἴλιον εἰς ἱερὴν ἦγε μαχησομένο[υς, 15); Archilochus then goes into further detail to explain how they ended up in Mysia: they lost their way (βλαφθέντες ὁδοῦ, 16) and attacked the city of Teuthras (Τε]ύθραντος δ' ἐρατὴν πρὸς πόλιν [ἐ]ξ[έπεσον, 17). A few lines later the poet reiterates the Achaeans' confusion: they believe they are attacking Troy (φ]άṇṭọ γὰρ ὑψίπυλον Τρώων πόλιν εἰσ[αναβαίνειν, 20) but are in fact standing on Mysian soil (μ[ά]τ̣ην δ᾽ἐπάτεον Μυσίδα πυροφόρọ[ν, 21). It is therefore unsurprising that the poet leaves it ambiguous whether we are to side with Telephus or the Achaeans, for the overriding moral is that the conflict between them is a futile misunderstanding.[39]

Reading the poem in this light, the emphasis that Archilochus places on Telephus' Greek heritage can be seen as another way to indicate the mistaken nature of this battle, for the Achaeans have not only failed to find the Trojans, but the enemy who defeats them is another Greek. In only 20 lines of mythological narrative, Archilochus appears to use all three of the Homeric words for the Greeks (Ἀργείων, 6; Ἀχαιοί, 12; Δαṇạọῖσι, 24),[40] and this sets up an expectation of a contrast between Greeks and foreigners, with regional distinctions between groups of Greeks elided.[41] Yet the apparently Asian enemy turns out to have a purely Greek pedigree, while the other Mysians

---

[37] For a detailed analysis of the tension between these two forms of discourse, see Swift (n.8) 144-6.

[38] The effectiveness of this irony depends on West's supplement φύζαν at the end of 24 (the alternative supplements of Janko and Livrea printed in Obbink's apparatus (n.1) would have μοῖραν not φύζαν described as κακήν) but is for this reason a more poetically effective reading. In a poem with such marked ring composition, it would be surprising if κακήν was not meant to echo κακότητα and so carry normative overtones. Nevertheless, a reading which makes κακήν dependent on μοῖραν still fits into the poem's broader theme: in this case, the surviving section of the poem ends by shifting once again towards the consolatory and stressing divine intervention.

[39] A point I develop in more detail at Swift (n. 8) 151-3.

[40] Cf. West (n.4) 15. However, the reading Δạṇạọῖσι in 24 is not secure, and alternatives have been suggested: see D'Alessio (n.4) 20.

[41] J.M. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago, 2002), 125-8, questions the sense of Hellenic self-consciousness found in Homer, because of the absence of a single term for 'Greeks' and the association of the three Homeric terms with different parts of the Greek world. However as he notes (131), Archilochus fr. 102 W. uses the term Πανελλήνες, which indicates that by his time (even if not in Homer's) there is evidence for a sense of Greek identity. On the development of concepts of Hellenic or other ethnic identities, see D. Konstan, 'To Hellēnikon ethnos: ethnicity and the construction of ancient Greek identity', in I. Malkin (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, (Washington, 2001), 29-50, and J. McInerney (2001), 'Ethnos and ethnicity in early Greece', 51-73 in the same volume.

seem to play no role in the battle. This irony is brought out by the word order of lines 5-6, where the Arcadian Telephus attacks the Argives: Τήλεφος Ἀρκα[σίδης | Ἀργείων ἐφόβησε πολὺν στρατ[όν,]. The juxtaposition of words indicating Greek regional identity contributes to the idea that this is a war between Greeks. The enjambement gives greater emphasis to Ἀργείων (already in prominent position as first word in its line), and highlights the oddity of Arcadians fighting Argives in a battle which purports to be a conflict between Greeks and Asians. Similarly, the image of the Greeks being beaten back through the intervention of their own panhellenic hero Heracles again suggests that the battle is a misguided one (Ηρακλ]έης δ’ ἤντησ̣ο[ε], 22). Thus Archilochus uses his focus on Telephus’ genealogy to add weight to the poem’s central conceit that far from participating in the glorious battles at Troy, what the Greeks are involved in is no more than an embarrassing mistake.

It is tempting to take this as criticism of whatever policy led to the defeat which the contemporary audience has suffered. A myth which begins by looking like a consolatory piece of moralizing turns out to have a sting in the tail, as it suggests that the battle was fought in vain. Not only is the conflict in the wrong place, it is also against the wrong enemy, for both of the conflicting sides within the poem are simultaneously presented as analogues for the Parian audience. The opposition that the Achaeans face from Telephus and Heracles is connected to the mistaken nature of the attack on Mysia; Parian policy-makers may think that they are fighting a battle as glorious as the Trojan war, but they are in fact as misguided as the Achaeans in Mysia. Most of Archilochus’ political poetry can be connected with the colonization of Thasos, and this is therefore the most plausible context for the new fragment (especially once we consider the possible mythological connection between Thasos and Heracles discussed above). We know from Archilochus’ other Thasian poetry that he frequently tackled the subject with a strong element of criticism and abuse: thus for example fr. 93a W. attacks a political decision by a fellow Parian, the son of Peisistratus, whose allies are said to have ‘done public harm for private profit’ in his dealings with the Thracians.[42] (οἰκείωι δὲ κέρδει ξύν’ ἐποίησαν κακά, 7) In other fragments Archilochus attacks Thasos itself, calling it poor and undesirable land in fr. 22 W., and comparing its rugged and rocky terrain to a donkey’s back in fr. 21 W. Fr. 22 W. compares Thasos unfavourably to Siris in southern Italy, a site colonized by settlers from Colophon in the early seventh century (οὐ γάρ τι καλός χῶρος οὐδ’ ἐφίμερος | οὐδ’ ἐρατός, οἷος ἀμφὶ Σίριος ῥοάς, ‘It is not a fine place, nor a desirable one, nor a lovely one, like that around the streams of the Siris’). Archilochus thus draws on recent history in order to express his reservations with contemporary policy, suggesting that the Parian attempt at colonization is a feeble attempt to imitate more successful states.[43] The simile in fr. 21 W. is designed to emphasize the poverty of the island, for Archilochus says that ‘it stands like the spine of a donkey’ (ἥδε δ’ ὥστ’ ὄνου ῥάχις | ἕστηκεν, 1-2), indicating that we are to imagine an animal in poor condition with its bones clearly visible. Thasos is thus not only likened to a humble beast of burden but with a

---

[42] See Tsantsanoglou (n. 33) on these fragments, and E.L. Bowie, ‘Sex and politics in Archilochus’ poetry’, pages 133-43 in the same volume for an overview of political attack in Archilochus.
[43] For the Colophonian colonization at Siris cf. Athen. 523c, citing Timaeus and Aristotle, and see J. Bérard, *La colonisation grecque de l’Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l’antiquité* (Paris, 1957), 201-14. Some scholars have been troubled by Archilochus referring to a colony so far away from Thasos and so attempted to emend the text but the proposed changes are problematic on metrical grounds: for further discussion see L. Braccesi, ‘Σύρος ποταμός (nota ad Archil. 18 Diehl)’ *RFIC* 101 (1973): 220-224; F. Bossi, ‘Archiloco e la Propontide’ *RFIC* 103 (1973): 129-135; F. Mosino, ‘Σῖρις ποταμός (Nota ad Archil. 18 D.)’ *QUCC* 20 (1975): 157-158.

starving one, to suit the poet's implication that the island provides little livelihood.[44] Both these descriptions mock the efforts at colonization and question the decision to fight for this piece of territory, a point made still more explicitly in fr. 228 W., where Thasos is called 'thrice-wretched' (τρισοιζυρὴν). A politically critical message in the new poem would therefore be in keeping with what we know elsewhere of Archilochus' approach to current affairs in general and to Thasos in particular. Moreover, since we know from Archilochus' other poetry that the fighting around colonization involved battles with other Greeks (frr. 89, 98 W.) the Telephus myth may have a more direct resonance: Archilochus and his friends expect to fight Thracians in Thasos but find themselves, like the Achaeans at Mysia, embroiled in a conflict with Greeks. Again, this interpretation fits with Archilochus' standpoint elsewhere: as we have already seen, anti-Thracian feeling can be seen in fr. 93a W., where the implication is that the son of Peisistratus has behaved outrageously by benefitting the Thracians for personal reward. The comment in fr. 102 W. Πανελλήνων ὀϊζὺς ἐς Θάσον συνέδραμεν ('the misery of the Panhellenes has rushed to Thasos') could also be interpreted as a criticism of conflict between different groups of Greeks in the region. In the absence of any direct evidence about the Telephus elegy's historical context, this line of interpretation can only be suggested tentatively, but nevertheless reading the poem through the filter of political and ethnic tensions helps to explain both why Archilochus tells the myth of Telephus and why he presents it as he does.

CONCLUSION

The choice of Telephus as mythological exemplar in the new Archilochus fragment is not strange or unexpected, but rather fits in with Parian sensibilities and draws on local myth and heritage. Telephus is an intrinsically appealing figure to a Parian audience, since both his mother's family and his father had connections with local myth, and in the poem Archilochus draws attention to both sides of Telephus' heritage, and in doing so invites the audience to identify with him, as well as with the Achaeans whose defeat provides the ostensible cause for the *paradeigma*. As we have seen, Telephus is always a potentially liminal figure, whose identity hovers between Greek and barbarian, and the flexible nature of his story makes it possible for writers to emphasize either side of his identity. In Archilochus, Telephus' Asian identity is rooted in his connection with the local features of Mysia: the river Caicus, the plain, and the city of Telephus' adoptive father Teuthras. Yet at the crucial moments when Telephus is named, and described in his triumph over the Achaean army, it is his Greek genealogy which comes to the fore. Not only is Telephus ethnically Greek, and descended from the same race as the Parian founders, he is supported by his father Heracles, and it is under his auspices that Telephus carries out his slaughter of the Greeks. Heracles himself is presented, uniquely, as personally involved in the conflict; not only does he urge on his son but more startlingly, he too is present on the battlefield and stands against the Greeks.

The focus on Telephus' Greek (and quasi-Parian) heritage is not only a strategy to connect the myth with the contemporary audience, but also affects the function and message of the paradigm, for Archilochus' presentation of Telephus fits with his emphasis throughout the poem on the

---

[44] Plutarch quotes fr. 21 in order to criticize Archilochus for overlooking Thasos' benefits and focusing on its negative qualities, and the donkey simile should therefore be interpreted as a negative one: moreover, donkeys are associated with humility, poverty, and hard toil: see M. Griffith, 'Horsepower and donkeywork: equids and the ancient Greek imagination' *CPh* 101(3) (2006): 185-246 at 224-8. For Archilochus' presentation of Thasos as uncivilized, cf. also P. Corrêa, *Um bestiário arcaico: fábulas e imagens de animais na poesia de Arquíloco* (São Paolo, 2010), 260.

foolish and mistaken nature of the battle. Archilochus chooses the myth of the Mysian battle because it is essentially a story about a military mistake, and throughout the poem he stresses the opposition between the intended goal of Troy and the actual conflict fought in Mysia. Telephus' presentation as Greek rather than Asian is an important part of this theme, as is the image of the Greek army opposed by Heracles: a hero who fought his own war against the Trojans yet here supports the Mysians against his fellow Greeks. While we cannot know the precise details of the contemporary battle to which the poem alludes, Archilochus takes a critical stance, implying that it is analogous to the Greeks' mistaken attempt to attack Mysia, and that the enemy they have chosen has turned out to resemble Telephus. This reading further suggests that the original performance context was sympotic (as suggested by Obbink (n.4), rather than the public context envisaged by Nobili (n.4)). In the company of trusted *hetairoi*, Archilochus indulges in sly criticism and mockery of military policy, while targeting the military leaders who, like Agamemnon, led their people off course. For just as Telephus is no Paris or Hector but a Greek warrior supported by a deified Greek hero, so too the war in Mysia is an embarrassing parody of the Trojan war: a battle fought for the wrong reasons, and against the wrong enemy.

The Open University   L.A. SWIFT

laura.swift@open.ac.uk