

## On the Authorship of the Strasbourg Epodes: Archilochus, Hipponax, or Both?

From the time of their first publication by Reitzenstein in 1899 the authorship of the Strasbourg Epodes (115-117W) has been a point of rigorous debate among scholars. At different times and with a variety of evidence from the available text, scholars attempting to ascribe authorship have fallen into one of three camps: some (Galli and Diehl) have asserted that the poems' somber power and Homeric undertones are distinctly Archilochean; others (Degani and Rosen) have insisted with equal vigor that, based metrical and thematic evidence, Hipponax must have composed the poems; finally, a few scholars (Cantarella and Kirkwood) have argued that Archilochus wrote fragment 115W, Hipponax wrote fragment 117W, and thus the papyrus comes from an anthology containing more than one author. The position that each fragment was composed by a different author has been frequently dismissed by textual editors and scholars based on deviations in the papyrus from the format more commonly found in ancient anthologies. While the matter is far from settled with consensus, modern scholars more typically support Hipponactean authorship for both poems over Archilochean.

However, after briefly recalling the evidence upon which these positions are founded, in this paper I will challenge these conclusions in two ways. First, I will demonstrate that the possibility of multiple authorship should not be dismissed as quickly and with as much certainty as it commonly has been. While proponents of this position have met stiff resistance from critics pointing out how poorly the manuscript conforms to the format of other surviving anthologies, here I demonstrate that although at a handful of points these discrepancies are difficult to reconcile they should not preclude us from entertaining the notion that we can ascribe multiple authorship. Second, I will propose a handful of critical points—some new, others simply underutilized—that reemphasize the strong possibility that the poems were composed by

different authors. While it will remain impossible to ascribe authorship with complete certainty, taken altogether the evidence allows us to determine with confidence that it is quite a bit more likely that Archilochus composed 115W and Hipponax 117W. Here I highlight several of the specifically Archilochean aspects of 115W, simultaneously noting elements that do not conform to what we might expect from Hipponax. Further, I argue that in addition to the presence of Hipponax's name in 117W, stronger evidence that Hipponax is the author can be found in the personal conflict mentioned in the small bit of surviving text, a conflict more resembling the one arising between Hipponax and his target Bupalus than the one between Archilochus and Lycambes. Finally, I suggest that rather than serving as an obstacle to modern readers, the inconsistencies between the Strasbourg Epodes and more traditionally formatted anthologies could have much to offer our understanding of the literary organization, textual circulation, and indeed entire book culture of the second century hand that copied the manuscript.

#### Working Bibliography

Cantarella, R. (1950). "Di Archiloico, e di alteri pretesti." *Aevum* 24, 415-17.

Compton, T. (2006). *Victim of the Muses: Poet as Scapegoat, Warrior, and Hero in Greco-Roman and Indo-European Myth and History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Degani, E. (1991). *Hipponax Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Gerber, D. (1999). *Greek Iambic Poetry*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kirkwood, G. (1961). "The Authorship of the Strasbourg Epodes." *TAPhA* 92, 267-82.

Nicolosi, Anika (2007). *Ipponatte, Epodi di Strasburgo; Archiloco, Epodi di Colonia*. Bologna: Patron.

West, M. L. (1980). *Delectus ex Iambis et Elegis Graecis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.