

If the jugs found in the Aegean did not come there directly from Egypt in the Bronze Age, then they probably arrived by way of the Levantine coast and Cyprus. The one possible example of a squat lotus-handled jug from a non-Greek, Iron Age provenance is the jug handle from Cyprus in the Cesnola collection (PLATE Id), which exactly resembles the handle from the Idaean Cave (PLATE Ib). The carriers who brought the jugs from the east Mediterranean could have been the Euboians who left their pendent semi-circle cups at Levantine ports or the Phoenicians who installed a shrine at Kommos on the south coast of Crete.<sup>29</sup> The little jugs seem genuinely Egyptian, but they almost certainly did not come straight from Egypt in the tenth or ninth century BC.

JANE B. CARTER

*Tulane University*

ILLUSTRATIONS (PLATE I)

- (a) Bronze jug from the Idaean Cave. After the drawing from *Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica* 2 (1888), *Atlante*, pl. 12, 9.
- (b) Bronze handle with lotus blossom. From the Idaean Cave. Athens NM 18221.
- (c) Bronze jug with lotus blossom on the handle. From Lefkandi, Toumba Tomb 33. By courtesy of the Chalkis Museum.
- (d) Bronze handle with openwork lotus blossom. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Cesnola Collection, purchased by subscription, 1874-76. (74.51.5461)
- (e) Wine service from Thebes in Egypt, consisting of a bronze lotus-handled jug and hemispherical bowl. Dynasty XVIII. Cincinnati Museum of Art, accession no. 1947.341.2. Gift of Millard F. and Edna F. Shelt.

<sup>29</sup> Sackett thinks that 'the family using the Toumba graveyard included a number of wealthy traders, who may themselves have penetrated to the Near East as early as the tenth century BC' (Popham, Touloupa, and Sackett [n. 8] 237). J.W. Shaw, 'Phoenicians in southern Crete', *AJA* 93 (1989) 165-83.

**Biography, fiction, and the Archilochean *ainos*\***

That articles on Archilochus begin with a historical overview of the approaches to his 'I' and the issue of the historicity of the characters who occupy his poems is a tradition in its own right.<sup>1</sup> Scholarly debate on Archilochus oscillates between total disbelief in and defensive support of the actuality of these figures and an autobiographical stance for the poet. The positions of the respective scholars have often been uncompromising and the language passionate, mirroring perhaps the generic requirements of *iambos*, or inspired perhaps by the 'roguish Archilochus' himself.<sup>2</sup>

This note similarly engages in this debate. It consists of three parts: first, reflections on the shape of this debate over the biographical tradition of the poet; next, a reinterpretation of a particular epode of Archilochus, that of the fox and the eagle, which attempts to bypass the polarities of the debate by illustrating how aspects of the biographical tradition may yield greater meaning for this poem; and finally, a return to issues about biography and the 'I' which considers the benefits that an open approach has overall for an interpretation of the sophistication and artistry of Archilochus.

I

In 1964, Kenneth Dover, as if prophesying the discovery of the Cologne epode and the concerns it would elicit, advanced the notion that the poet's 'I' need not be his own.<sup>3</sup> And yet despite the relative novelty of this stance—'agnostic to the point of nihilism' as Dover anticipates some will argue—Dover's own formulation was far less controversial or prescriptive than the positions that would follow in the next decade. He suggested, '[T]he poet's own standpoint is only *one among the standpoints which he adopted* in the composition of poetry'.<sup>4</sup>

The Cologne Epode and the famous words of Merkelbach pushed the issue to a crisis in the early seventies. Merkelbach tipped the scales of Archilochean debate, when he called Archilochus 'ein schwerer Psychopath' and continued, 'As a bastard himself, he presumably had to endure much neglect in his youth and through this experience his character was shaped: What

\* Versions of this article have been presented to the annual meetings of the American Philological Association (New York 1996) and the Classical Association (Royal Holloway 1997). I thank those audiences for helpful comments. I am also grateful to those who have commented on earlier drafts: E.L. Bowie, P.E. Easterling, B. Graziosi, L.M. Slatkin and M. Stears. I would like to thank also the Editor and anonymous referees of *JHS*.

<sup>1</sup> Some examples: H. Rankin, 'The new Archilochus and some Archilochean questions', *QUCC* 28 (1978) 7-27; G. Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore 1979); C. Carey, 'Archilochus and Lycambes', *CQ* 36 (1986) 60-7; J. van Sickle, 'Praise and blame for a "full commentary" on Archilochus' first epode', *BICS* 36 (1989) 104-8; S. Slings, 'The I in personal archaic lyric: an introduction,' in S. Slings (ed.), *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric* (Amsterdam 1990) 1-30.

<sup>2</sup> As G. Nagy has recently referred to him, *Poetry as Performance* (Cambridge 1995) 219.

<sup>3</sup> K. Dover, 'The poetry of Archilochus', *Fond. Hardt* 10 (1964) 181-212.

<sup>4</sup> Dover (n.3) 211-2 (italics are mine).

he and his mother suffered then, others would have to atone for later'.<sup>5</sup> In the face of what seemed to be the logical consequence of both taking the poet's 'I' to be his own and accepting his characters as actual people, most scholars positioned themselves at the opposite extreme. West quickly distanced himself from his colleague's view, reiterating his theory, at that time recent, about stock figures on the basis of the -amb- root of Lycambes' name.<sup>6</sup> Nagy followed suit, discussing how the genre of *iambos* dictated the person of the poet and the content of the poetry.<sup>7</sup> Fairweather and Lefkowitz explored this issue in other directions by arguing that biographical traditions of the poets' lives are largely fabricated from their own poetry and therefore must also be fictions.<sup>8</sup>

The state of affairs by the early eighties was well illustrated by the reflections of a historian, viewing ironically the debates of his literary colleagues. W.G. Forrest wrote, 'For, it is now very properly insisted, the words of a lyric poet must not be taken too literally, must certainly not be taken autobiographically. It is no longer permitted to say "Archilochus was an aristocrat, but a bastard aristocrat", "Archilochus rejected the accepted code of military honour by boasting that he had thrown away his shield in battle to save his own skin", "Archilochus loved to dance when drunk" and so on. Rather we must say that society now recognized the existence of and could sing about drunken bastard shield-throwers. That takes away a bit of the spice, but the fact remains and is important'.<sup>9</sup>

The pendulum swung again, and since that time there has been considerable dissension from the view that Archilochus' characters are stock or fictional, as seen in the work of Carey and Slings.<sup>10</sup> Their discussions, reacting to the prevailing, mainly one-sided treatment of the Cologne Epode, Archilochus *SLG* 478, raised the concern that the venomous and sophisticated, often subtle, attack which the poem represents is compromised if the people involved are fictional. The debate has reached the point where more recent work, such as that of Bowie, can only document the two sides and admit our *aporia* about the problem.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>5</sup> R. Merkelbach 'Epilog des einen der Herausgeber' 113 (my translation), added to R. Merkelbach and M. West, 'Ein Archilochos Papyrus', *ZPE* 14 (1974) 97-112.

<sup>6</sup> West asks, 'Who, when he meditates upon that mysterious group of words, *iambos*, *Dithyrambos*, *Thriambos*, *Ithymbos*, can feel entirely sure that Lycambes was a real person?', M.L. West, 'Archilochus *ludens*: epilogue of the other editor', *ZPE* 16 (1975) 217-19, reiterating the position presented in *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin 1974) 23-30.

<sup>7</sup> G. Nagy, 'Iambos: typologies of invective and praise', *Arethusa* 9 (1976), 191-205. Rewritten as Ch. 13 of *Best* (n.1).

<sup>8</sup> J. Fairweather, 'Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers', *Ancient Society* 5 (1974) 234-55; M. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London 1981). See also Lefkowitz, 'Fictions in literary biography: the new poem and the Archilochus legend', *Arethusa* 9 (1976) 181-9. Fairweather's discussion precedes the particular flurry of activity on Archilochus which arose in the mid-seventies, and as a result is thorough and cautionary rather than reductive as are some later discussions.

<sup>9</sup> W.G. Forrest, 'Euboea and the islands', in *The Cambridge Ancient History* 3.3 (Cambridge 1982) 255.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. n. 1.

<sup>11</sup> E.L. Bowie, 'Lies, fiction, and slander in early Greek poetry', in C. Gill and T.P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter 1993) 1-37 (esp. 33-5).

Although the question of the autobiographical stance of the poet and the conjoined issue of its historicity are exciting and important, the extreme positions within the debate have had two unfortunate consequences. First, as a result of the polarity of the terms of this debate, certain options or approaches have been lost in the division. There are in fact several variables: the fictionality of the characters, the fictionality of the names, the fictionality of the events. A flow chart could generate the several possible scenarios and there is no reason to expect that the poet was restricted to only one of these. Some possibilities have been overlooked or underemphasised.<sup>12</sup> For instance, the invention of meaningful names for actual people (the coining of which could be a function of the genre) renders problematic the arguments of West and Nagy which assume a fictional character based on the assumed significance, and therefore creation, of the name Lycambes.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, although these scholars acknowledge Old Comedy's debt to *iambos*, the presence in this later genre of historical figures side by side with stock or fictional characters is little acknowledged in Archilochean debate.<sup>14</sup>

The second casualty of this debate has been Archilochus' poetry itself and the interpretation of its artistry. Each side uses the poems as tools with which to explore the issue of the autobiographical stance of the poet, leaving little room for considering how these poems 'work'. Van Sickle in 1989, despairing over the discussions of *SLG* 478, could still comment, '[W]hether the ground is personal or social, we still want to know what kind of story is being told'.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Although some work has been done in this direction: M. Bonanno, 'Nomi e soprannomi archilochei', *MH* 37 (1980) 65-88 investigates the possibility of nicknames in Archilochus.

<sup>13</sup> Carey (n.1) 63, esp. n. 19 responds in detail to their arguments. Such a possibility also puts a different spin on Nagy's work on genre. For example, Nagy, *Best* (n.1) 247 posits a stark dichotomy: 'Shall we say, then, that this persona is Archilochus, whose actions determined the narrative of this iambic composition? Or rather, shall we say that the function of the composition determined the narrative, which in turn determined the persona that acts and speaks within? The first alternative leads us to approach Archilochean poems as biographical documents, and we then find ourselves taking the same attitude as most of the ancient commentaries that have survived ... The second alternative leads us to ask whether the details and essentials about the persona of the composer are to be derived from his role as composer of blame poetry'. But certainly, one can occupy a middle ground and speculate on how the 'function of the composition' can determine how 'actual' experience, people or events, may be 'recreated' in song or for performance.

<sup>14</sup> See most recently Nagy, *Poetry* (n.2) 218. For ancient discussion on comedy's debt to *iambos* see Arist. *Poetics* 1448b32-1449a6; for modern discussion see R. Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition* (Atlanta 1988). For views which acknowledge the simultaneous presence in Old Comedy of fictional and historical characters as relevant to discussions of the characters of *iambos* see Bonanno (n.12) and the brief comment of Rankin (n.1) 13.

<sup>15</sup> Van Sickle (n.1) 105. Rankin commented to little avail on this tendency (n.1) 8: 'This attitude, in short, concedes to the formal "structure" of *iambos*, and to the social and ritual context in which it is supposed to have performed a much greater share of importance than the contents themselves are allowed to possess'.

Nowhere is this problem more obvious than in discussions regarding Lycambes and his daughters. The pursuit of their story has become equated with a search for historical reality, or a naïveté about the biographical tradition. Few attempts have been made at interpretations which synthesise what we know from the biographical tradition with the poems, although this approach would be permissible by both sides, either on the grounds that the tradition is a product of the poetry and thus reflects the poetry's content, or because the tradition has some historical reality, however slight, which in turn is reflected within the poetry. The second section of this paper will harness the elements of the biographical tradition in the interpretation of Archilochus' *ainos* of the fox and the eagle, and argue that by not accepting the terms of the debate, one can derive more from this poem than has been previously allowed.

## II

This *ainos* of Archilochus has been underemployed in this debate. Some consider it only as an *ainos*, looking either at what its existence says about the genre of *iambos* or at the function of *ainoi* in instruction or in defining the group of sympotic *philoí*.<sup>16</sup> Others, like Carey, are only interested in the *ainos* in as much as it proves that the Lycambids were portrayed consistently in Archilochus' poetry and that such consistency confirms their reality. In his otherwise excellent discussion, Carey passes over the content of the *ainos*, commenting, 'The details of the fable need not concern us here'.<sup>17</sup> More recently Bowie has played a Solonic role in summing up the two different camps of thought, but even from this position all he can say of the *ainos* is that while clearly representing a broken agreement, the 'fable is not an obvious choice to illustrate the broken engagement of the tradition'.<sup>18</sup> This section will show how closely and intricately the *ainos* itself corresponds to our knowledge of the tradition—the broken engagement between Archilochus and Lycambes' daughter, Archilochus' invective which follows, and the disaster for the house of Lycambes.

The *ainos*, *fr.* 172-81W, is fragmentary, but the general plot can be reconstructed through the fragments, the authors who cite them, and the story as it appears in the *Aesopica*.<sup>19</sup> The fox and eagle make an agreement, the eagle breaks the agreement by eating the fox's young, the fox calls for justice, and in the end gets his vengeance when the eagle's nest falls to the ground and the fox is able to retaliate against the eagle's young. The essence of the fable is this: the eagle breaks a solemn agreement and he is eventually punished. Ancient and modern commentators connect this *ainos* with the tradition of the broken marriage agreement between Archilochus himself and Lycambes' daughter. As most do, Carey identifies the eagle with Lycambes.<sup>20</sup> The ancient sources confirm the connection with the tradition

as we know it: Origen mentions a betrayal enacted by Lycambes before citing *fr.* 173W, and Dio cites the betrayal in *fr.* 173 as being linked to marriage.<sup>21</sup> Despite Carey's and Bowie's dismissal of the details of this *ainos*, the destruction of the children of a faithless eagle seems too suggestive to be coincidence, when the account we have of Lycambes is, precisely one of broken agreements and death for his daughters.<sup>22</sup>

Commentators have been reluctant to interpret the *ainos* in any sense literally, and thus a consistent interpretation has continually proved elusive. And yet associating the biographical tradition closely with our *ainos* reveals invective of sophistication comparable to the Cologne Epode.<sup>23</sup> The fox in our story loses its young as a result of a broken pact; he calls for vengeance, and achieves it through the destruction of his enemy's young. The tradition tells of the deaths of the Lycambids, brought on by Archilochus' invective, which in turn was fuelled by his anger at the broken agreement. This paper suggests a solution that reconsiders the relationship of the biographical tradition with this poem. It proposes that Archilochus' *ainos* evokes both the tradition of the loss of children as a result of a broken marriage pact and the poet's role in bringing about the destruction of his foe's children by his invective. Here the correspondence is pressed further: for the poet, as for the fox, his children are 'destroyed' through treachery, but, in line with the biographical tradition, these are the *potential* children which marriage represents.

The reading of 'potential' children into this story may be difficult for some,<sup>24</sup> but that children appeared as an element in the story is indicated both by Archilochus' poetry, and by the indirect tradition. The Cologne Epode shows the speaker rejecting Neoboule as a possible marriage partner: 'Let another man have her' (*ἄλλος ἄνθρωπος ἐχέτω*, 17) and the Hesiodic line, 'Having such a wife, I will be a source of joy to my neighbours' (*γυναῖκα τοιαύτην ἔχων / γείτοσι χάρμ' ἔσομαι*, 22-3).<sup>25</sup> He follows this up in the somewhat obscure passage about the kind of offspring such a union would produce: *δέ]δοιχ' ὄπως μὴ τυφλὰ κάλιτμερα/ σπιουδῆι ἐπειγόμενος/ τῶς ὡσπερ ἡ κύ[ων τέκω* ('I don't want babies blind and premature, like the proverbial

<sup>21</sup> Origen *c. Celsum* 2.21; Dio Chrys. 74.16. See Carey's (n.1) comprehensive discussion regarding the consistency of the story and its characters as related in the ancient sources.

<sup>22</sup> See especially *AP* 7. 69-71, 351-2; Horace *Epod.* 6. 11-3 with scholia *ad loc.*, P. Dublin 193a, Eust. in *Od.* 1684.45. See West (n.19) 15 (*ad fr.* 30-87) and 63-4 (*ad fr.* 172-81) for a collection of testimony involving the Lycambids.

<sup>23</sup> Slings (n.1) 25 and Carey (n.1) 62-3, esp. n. 14, for comments on the intricacy of the invective in *SLG* 478.

<sup>24</sup> That marriage implies children or the potential for children is attested in the story of the wife of Itaphernes as recorded in *Hdt.* 3. 119, and in Soph. *Antigone* 909-10. There are conversely numerous examples where the status of one's marriage is held to be confirmed or questioned by the presence or absence of children. See, for instance, Aesch. *Ag.* 877-8, Lysias 1.6-7, *Hdt.* 1.61.1-2. I thank the anonymous referee for discussion of this point.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *WD* 701 and Carey's discussion of the marriage theme in the Cologne Epode (1986) 62.

<sup>16</sup> Nagy, *Best* (n.1) 235-41 and *passim*.

<sup>17</sup> Carey (n.1) 61.

<sup>18</sup> Bowie (n.11) 35 n.44.

<sup>19</sup> All references to Archilochus' poetry are based on M. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* 1 (Oxford 1971).

<sup>20</sup> Carey (n.1) 61

bitch, from showing too much haste', 26-7).<sup>26</sup> The text is fragmentary, but whatever the exact meaning it seems clear that within this tale of broken marriage agreements Archilochus includes children, at least once, as the obvious product of marriage.

This point is corroborated in a less direct way by two Hellenistic epigrams. These epigrams portray the daughters of Lycambes pleading their innocence, one attributed to Dioscorides and the other possibly to Meleager.<sup>27</sup> The extent to which the content of these epigrams corresponds both in wording and in content to the poetry of Archilochus and the tradition concerning him we have received<sup>28</sup> recommend them as invaluable windows into the poetry we are missing.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore the close relationship of these epigrams to one another invites consideration of them together in this discussion. The poem attributed to Meleager shows affinity with such aspects of the biographical tradition and Archilochus' own poetry as are privileged in the inscriptions from Paros, which were found in an area quite likely to be a precinct dedicated to the poet:<sup>30</sup>

δεξιτερὴν Ἀΐδαο θεοῦ χέρα καὶ τὰ κελαϊνὰ  
 δμνυμέν ἄρρητου δέμνια Περσεφόνης,  
 παρθένοι ὡς ἔτυμον καὶ ὑπὸ χθονί· πολλὰ  
 δ' ὁ πικρὸς  
 αἰσχρὰ καθ' ἡμετέρης ἔφλυσε παρθενίης  
 Ἀρχίλοχος, ἐπέων δὲ καλὴν φάτιν οὐκ  
 ἐπὶ καλὰ  
 ἔργα, γυναικεῖον δ' ἔτραπεν ἐς πόλεμον.  
 Πιερίδες, τί κόρησιν ἐφ' ὕβριστήρας ἰάμβους  
 ἐτρέπεται, οὐχ ὅστωι φωτὶ χαριζόμεναι;

<sup>26</sup> West's translation (*Greek Lyric Poetry* [Oxford 1993] 4) and reading which he supports primarily with the scholia to Aristophanes' *Peace*, 1078: ἡ κῶν σπεύδουσα τυφλά τι κτεῖ ('The bitch in haste bears blind pups'), (n.19) 77a. The expression is of course metaphorical and perhaps, even at this date, proverbial, but the choice of imagery is not fortuitous in the context of this poem. Cf. Carey (n.1) 62.

<sup>27</sup> *AP* 7.351 and 352; West (n.19) 15.

<sup>28</sup> More so than the epigrams on Archilochus (*AP* 7. 69-71) which are by far more general.

<sup>29</sup> Given the amount of poetry that the Hellenistic epigrammatists had at their disposal and the sophistication with which poetry was read, we should expect intricate play in several other epigrams for poets. Such play is obvious in the epigram for Pindar (*AP* 7.34), but the ease of detecting such allusion in the epigram for a poet is of course related to the amount of his/her poetry which survives. Along another line, Callimachus' use of the iambographic genre, including the *ainos* as in *Ia*. 4, would no doubt reveal interesting play and manipulation of his Archaic predecessors' use of the genre, particularly of the *ainos* and its relationship to its frame. A comprehensive study of both these topics is, however, outside the scope of the present discussion. For discussion of Callimachean iambs see most recently R. Hunter, '(B)ionic man: Callimachus' iambic programme', *PCPS* 43 (1997) 41-52 (with bibliography). For a discussion of Callimachus' *ainos* of the olive and laurel, *Ia*. 4, see D. Clayman, 'Callimachus' Fourth Iamb', *CJ* 74 (1978) 142-8.

<sup>30</sup> For the inscriptions of Mnesiepes (the Elitas inscriptions, *SEG* xv 517) and Sosthenes (*Monumentum Archilochi*, *SEG* xv 518) see Tarditi, *Archilochus* (Rome 1968) 4-11. On the Mnesiepes inscription see N.M. Kondoleon, *Arch. Eph.* 1952, 32-95; 'Archilochos und Paros', *Fond. Hardt* 10 (1964) 39-54. Cf. also *Bull. Epig.* 1955, 178 and M. Treu, *Archilochos* (Munich 1959) 152-4.

By the right hand of Hades and the dark couch of Persephone, whom none may name, we swear that we are truly maidens even under the ground. But bitter Archilochus poured much abuse on our virginity, turning his beautiful voice not to noble deeds, but to war with women. Muses, why in favouring this impious man did you turn violent iambs against girls?

The special relationship of the Muses to the poet is a prominent subject of the Mnesiepes inscription which describes Archilochus' *Dichterweihe*—his encounter with the disguised Muses on the way to the market. Furthermore, the question posed to the Muses, 'why do they show favour to a man who is impious (οὐχ ὄσιος)', is pointed: οὐχ ὄσιος confronts and contradicts the traditions of the Muses' and Delphi's favour toward Archilochus as related in several sources: the Mnesiepes inscription, the tradition of Delphi's part in censuring Archilochus' killer, and the material and literary evidence for his special status, and probable worship, in Paros after his death. The phrase γυναικεῖον δ' ἔτραπεν ἐς πόλεμον with its ambiguities—'a war against women', 'a womanly war'—can be read as responding to another part of the tradition apparent to us from the Sosthenes inscription, and as such may be read as a neat counterpoint to, or undermining of, the tradition of Archilochus as a brave and patriotic hero.<sup>31</sup>

Turning to the epigram of Dioscorides, we see complementarily intricate play with the poet's own material:

οὐ μὰ τὸδε φθιμένων σέβας ὄρκιον, αἶδε  
 Λυκάμβεω,  
 αἰ λάχομεν στυγερὴν κληδὼνα, θυγατέρες,  
 οὔτε τι παρθενίην ἠισχύναμεν, οὔτε τοκήας,  
 οὔτε Πάρον νήσων αἰπυτάτην ἱερῶν.  
 ἀλλὰ καθ' ἡμετέρης γενεῆς ῥιγηλὸν δνειδος  
 φήμην τε στυγερὴν ἔφλυσεν Ἀρχίλοχος,  
 Ἀρχίλοχον, μὰ θεοῦς καὶ δαίμονας, οὔτ' ἐν  
 ἀγυαῖς  
 εἶδομεν, οὔθ' Ἡρῆς ἐν μεγάλῳι τεμένει.  
 εἰ δ' ἤμεν μάχλοι καὶ ἀτάσθαλοι, οὐκ ἂν  
 ἐκεῖνος  
 ἦθελεν ἐξ ἡμέων γνήσια τέκνα τεκεῖν.

By the solemn oath of the dead, neither did we the daughters of Lycambes, who have received a hateful name, shame our virginity, nor our parents, nor Paros, highest of islands. But upon our family Archilochus poured terrible reproach and hateful report. By the gods and daimons neither did we see Archilochus in the streets, nor in the great precinct of Hera. If we were lewd and reckless, that man would not have wanted to beget legitimate children from us.

<sup>31</sup> For Archilochus' special status with Delphi, see the Mnesiepes inscription, *Plut. Sera Num. Vind.* 17, *Heracleides Pol.* 8 (*FGrH* 2.214), *Dio Chrys.* 33. 12, *AP* 7.664 (Leonidas). For his status in Paros, see the Mnesiepes inscription, *Arist. Rh.* 1398b and *Kontoleon* (n. 28). For Archilochus as patriotic hero, see both the Sosthenes and Mnesiepes inscriptions and A.J. Graham, 'The foundation of Thasos', *BSA* 73 (1978) 61-98 (esp. 83-4), *Lefkowitz* (n.8) 31.

Lines 7 and 8 suggest different settings for the intrigues with the Lycambids which Archilochus may have described, as West and Gow-Page have acknowledged.<sup>32</sup> The verb φλώω while here primarily having its metaphorical meaning, 'overflow with words, babble', may simultaneously evoke Archilochus' own material, such as the apparently, but not definitely, sexual fragment *fr.* 45W which uses the verb ἀπέφλυσαν ('sputter out').<sup>33</sup> For our purposes the last two couplets are significant. Gow-Page comment on their likely relationship to Archilochean poetry: 'The remainder of the couplet [lines 7-8], and the adjectives in 9, no doubt summarise the slanders with which Archilochus spattered the Lycambids. Μυσάχνη, ἐργάτις, δῆμος, παχεία (*fr.* 184) appear to have been among the terms applied to Neobule'. *Fr.* 56W, though partial, suggests that μάχλος was in fact used by the poet, but of course we cannot be sure that it referred to the Lycambids, either or both. What is significant for our discussion is that the daughters in this poem complete their defence by arguing, εἰ δ' ἦμεν μάχλοι καὶ ἀτάσθαλοι, οὐκ ἂν ἐκεῖνος/ἠθέλεν ἐξ ἡμέων γνήσια τέκνα τεκεῖν. ('If we were lewd and reckless, that man would not have wanted to beget legitimate children from us'). When we return to our *ainos*, and to the allusions to marriage in the Cologne Epode, we may see as the implication of these lines that the theme of marriage was spelled out in some detail in Archilochus' poetry, to the extent of referring to prospective offspring from it.

<sup>32</sup> West (n.19) cites these epigrams prior to *fr.* 30-87W, fragments which he places under the heading 'De Lycambae filiabus', thus indicating his belief that they relate to the content of Archilochus' poetry. A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic epigrams 2* (Cambridge 1965) 249, quoted below.

<sup>33</sup> *LSJ* s.v. φλώω II. Archilochus *fr.* 45W - κύψαντες ὄβριον ἄθροην ἀπέφλυσαν ('They stooped and sputtered off all their accumulated wantonness' (West's translation, *Greek* (n.28)). ἀπεφλοσαν cod. but emended by Schleusner, *Curae Noviss. ad Phot.* (1812) 161, and accepted by modern editors, primarily on the basis of this epigram and Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica* 3.583 which seems dependent on this line: ἀλεγεινήν / ὄβριον ἀποφλύζωσιν ὑπέρβια μηχανώ- ντες ('so that those who laid insolent schemes would be made to splutter out their wretched presumption', R. Hunter's translation, *Jason and the Golden Fleece* (Oxford 1993)). While *fr.* 45W is not at all certainly about Neoboule, it is still worth asking whether this line of Apollonius', the conclusion of Aetes threat to destroy the Argo after Jason is slaughtered by the oxen, however briefly, is meant to evoke some parallelism between Jason, Medea, Aetes and his *hetairoi* and Archilochus, Neoboule, Lycambes and Archilochus' presumable audience of *philoï hetairoi*.

φλώω may serve several functions. In addition to both operating with its metaphorical meaning, and referring to a word used by the poet, it may refer to sexual scenes in Archilochus like the conclusion of *SLG* 478, making a double entendre which draws an analogy, or rather blurs the distinction, between the metaphorical and literal uses of the word, drawing a parallelism between the *acts* which Archilochus describes himself as performing and the *poetry/language* with which he describes it. This parallelism is important because the two are interconnected in the account and are together responsible for the supposed/reported deaths of these young women, and such parallelism may in fact be responding to Archilochus' own formulation.

If destruction of offspring as applied to Archilochus refers to potential children, the theme of the death of offspring as applied to the figure of Lycambes is a metaphorical one, and one accomplished through invective. The fox in his anger and frustration calls on Zeus as witness,

ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος,  
σὺ δ' ἐργ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὄρατις  
λεωργὰ καὶ θεμιστά, σοὶ δὲ θηρίων  
ὑβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει.

O Zeus, father Zeus, yours is the power in the heavens, and you look upon the deeds of men, wicked and lawful, and both the insolence and justice of animals is your concern.

Most commentators refer to Hesiod's statement in *WD* 276-80:<sup>34</sup>

τόνδε γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι νόμον διέταξε Κρονίων,  
ἰχθύσι μὲν καὶ θηροῖ καὶ οἰωνοῖς πετενηοῖς  
ἔσθθιν ἀλλήλους, ἐπεὶ οὐ δίκη ἐστὶ μετ'  
αὐτοῖς·  
ἀνθρώποισι δ' ἔδωκε δίκην, ἢ πολλὸν ἀρίστη  
γίγνεται·

For the son of Kronos has laid down this law for men, that fishes and beasts and winged birds eat one another, since there is no *dike* among them, but he gave *dike* to men, which is by far the best.

By this account, animals, in marked contrast to humans, do not have *dike*, and therefore prey on one another, but I am aware of none who elucidate the point that the poet may be making by this allusion: namely that the role of poetry is implicit in Archilochus' poem. Archilochus' tie to Hesiod is strong and clear: Hesiod's statements about *dike* are tied to his *ainos* of the hawk and the nightingale.<sup>35</sup> The presence of the *ainoi* creates a generic connection between the two poets.<sup>36</sup> This connection operates on a thematic level, and manifests itself in the consequent parallelism to Hesiod of the stance adopted by Archilochus.

Archilochus' reformulation of Hesiod is pointed, almost polemical: the fox's prayer, in direct contrast to Hesiod, unquestionably implies that animals do have *dike*, and that this is a concern to Zeus. The assertion of *dike* in the animal world also has a function in Archilochus' story: such an assertion heaps abuse upon Lycambes who has no *dike* and therefore is *worse* than an animal. This is considerably stronger than Hesiod's moral, whose message is that one ought not to behave

<sup>34</sup> For example, D.A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (2nd ed., Bristol 1982) 162.

<sup>35</sup> Although separated by some lines, they must be connected, for otherwise the *ainos* of the hawk and nightingale becomes a tale encouraging *basileis* with the abuses they can perform, free from retribution.

<sup>36</sup> The affinity of Archilochus and Hesiod in their use of *ainoi* is implicit in Schol. T. Hom. *Il.* 19.407 in which their fables about the eagle and hawk respectively are grouped together. Furthermore, *ainoi* appear to have been a feature of Archilochean poetry, see *fr.* 185-7W.

like an animal. The overall moral however seems to be shared with Hesiod if the *Aesopica* likewise reflect Archilochus' version in its conclusion: κεν τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἡδικημένων ἐκφύγῳσι κόλασιν δι' ἀσθένειαν, ἀλλ' οὖν γε τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ τιμωρίαν οὐ διακρούοντα ('Even if they flee punishment at the hands of those they have wronged because of the latter's helplessness, they do not then evade the vengeance from god').<sup>37</sup> On the level of the poet's stance, this use of Hesiod ties the fox to the poet more strongly, for what is the fox uttering if not poetry, Hesiodic poetry (albeit 'improved')? This point has interesting correspondence with Hesiod: Hesiod's *ainos* also explicitly incorporates the figure of the poet within his fable, calling the nightingale *aoidos*.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, Archilochus may be asserting his own poetic superiority in redefining Hesiod's concept of *dike* and its representation through *ainoi*—a case of poetic one-upmanship.<sup>39</sup>

Integrating the thematic and poetic concerns yields further results. The tale from the *Aesopica* renders a more complete version of the revenge of the fox on the eagle. The eagle's theft of sacrificial meat from an altar causes disaster for his young. This crime of violating a sacrifice suggests that Zeus plays an active role in the punishment beyond his nominal appearance in the prayer. In terms of the narrative of the *ainos*, the fox's call to Zeus is answered by the vengeance granted. It is remarkable that the function of the *ainos* in the story of the relationship of Archilochus and Lycambes is exactly parallel to the prayer of the fox within the *ainos*: as the poetic speech of the fox achieves revenge—that is, Zeus answers his prayer—so too, according to the biographical tradition, Archilochus' poetry achieves his revenge.<sup>40</sup> Revenge is the function of the *ainos* itself, as revealed in what is likely to be the opening of the epode:  $\nu\upsilon\upsilon$

δὲ δὴ πολλὸς ἀστοῖσι φαίνεαι γέλως ('Now you become a big laugh to your neighbours').<sup>41</sup> The poem ostensibly identifies the reception of Lycambes which Lycambes through his *own* actions has *himself* created, but in fact is also in itself an instrument of ensuring such a reception. Furthermore, in the moral of the tale, as summarised in the *Aesopica* and quoted above, we can detect a shared, almost ironic, stance between Hesiod and Archilochus on the subject of their poetry: both poets relate *ainoi* which on the surface suggest their weakness, but in actuality both poets maintain a stance which asserts the strength of their poetry and the power of their role as poet, particularly in the assessment of what is *dikaion*.

This reading of the metaphorical deaths of the Lycambids into the *ainos* allows us to address some issues regarding the biographical tradition. Within this tradition the suicides of the daughters have always been the most susceptible to scepticism. Following the work of Fairweather and later Lefkowitz, we may infer that this feature of the story has been developed from the poems themselves.<sup>42</sup> In such a case, the interpretation of the *ainos* rendered here suggests how such an element may have entered the tradition: metaphorical deaths may have been misconstrued as literal, on the basis of a poem referring to destroyed offspring.<sup>43</sup> If this poem was not the basis of these stories, the biographical tradition at least suggests that the theme was explored in other poems. But as *SLG* 478 revealed a hitherto unknown direction of Archilochus' invective, so too this *ainos* may finally show us how the topic of the broken marriage-agreement was played out within the poems.

### III

This brings us back to the debates on the historicity of the personages and begins our final section. The Cologne Epode and the *ainos* of the fox and eagle demonstrate the sophistication and variety of the treatment of the story of Lycambes within the poetry of Archilochus. Without presupposing a definite answer to the issue of real or fictional figures, we have been able

<sup>37</sup> B. Perry, *Aesopica* (Urbana 1952) 321. West (n.19) 65 includes the fable from Perry's edition but omits the conclusion.

<sup>38</sup> *WD* 207.

<sup>39</sup> The close link argued here between the *ainoi* of Hesiod and Archilochus may have significant consequences for the much-debated possible relationship between the poets' *Dichterweihen*, which I hope to explore further elsewhere. For discussion about the possible links between the poets' *Dichterweihen*, see C.W. Müller 'Die Archilochoslegende', *RhM* 128 (1985) 99-151.

<sup>40</sup> It may be thought that to depict, even within an *ainos*, the killing of children, drastic in its finality, as the revenge for the deprivation of potential children represents so great an incommensurability between the revenge and the initial insult as to render this interpretation problematic on these grounds. This point can be addressed on two levels. Taking into account cultural factors, I would agree with Carey ((n.1) 67 n.31) that the breaking of a marriage, whether in a constructed fiction or in reality, would constitute 'a public affront', to which the requital of reciprocal public humiliation was expected, if not by our standards appropriate. Addressing the consequences to the portrayal of the poet's persona which this interpretation introduces, I find no problem, given antiquity's assessment of Archilochus' poetry, in having the poet represent himself thus. Critias reportedly censured Archilochus for speaking  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$  about himself (Ael. *VH* 10.13). Likewise, Horace (*AP* 79, *Ep.* 1. 19), Ovid (*Ib.* 53), and an epigram of Gaetulicus (*AP* 1.71), among others, testify in vivid terms to the severity of the poet's invective and his poetic persona.

<sup>41</sup> *fr.* 172W.3-4

<sup>42</sup> *Cf.* n.8.

<sup>43</sup> It could be argued that, if one accepts the interpretation advanced here, the *ainos* may imply not the metaphorical deaths of the Lycambids, but, as in the case of Archilochus, the destruction of their potential offspring through the damage to their marriage prospects which such poetry as *SLG* 478 could have had the ability to effect (whether actually or within the constructed fiction of their story). Such a view supports my interpretation of this *ainos* as evoking potential children on Archilochus' part, extending this to the Lycambids as well. This view is also not in disagreement with the suggestion posited here that the misconstrual of this *ainos* may have introduced the suicides into the tradition. The choice between these views—the metaphorical deaths of the children of the Lycambes, or the destruction of the potential offspring of the Lycambids—is difficult to make. I have argued for the former on the basis of the address of the *ainos* to Lycambes and the 'neatness' of the parallelism between the two 'fathers', Archilochus and Lycambes, and the fates of their 'children', but this alternative offers another 'neat' parallelism of reciprocal destruction of potential offspring and could likewise easily follow from the interpretation argued in this article.

to push interpretation further. If these figures are understood as a fiction of Archilochus', we are fitting the *ainos* within a consistent but fictional drama conveyed in the biographical tradition, and as a result come to a greater appreciation of the poet's exploitation of the genre. If, however, we consider that actual individuals were the poem's target, then we may say that metaphorical death through invective might well correspond to character assassination.<sup>44</sup> As an attendant result, we gain insights both into how the poet can exploit genre and tradition in the service of an aim—an aim which may be generically the job of *iambos*—and into what the conception of the power of invective, and more generally poetry, was for the archaic poet and his society.

The question of the reality of these characters remains unresolved. As Slings writes, 'the major stumbling-block will always be our almost complete ignorance of the extralinguistic context of the poem at the time of its performance. The problem of the 'I' is often our problem'.<sup>45</sup> Beyond a doubt there is an elegant parallelism between the events in this *ainos* and those recorded by the tradition. Either we may say that this parallelism represents a fictional drama, which generations of audiences and clever readers of Archilochus have created and/or fostered, or rather that there is an element of history behind this drama, which the poet, supremely clever, has explored and exploited in the traditional forms of poetry available to him. The choice remains open.

ELIZABETH IRWIN

Girton College, Cambridge

### 'Joint sacrifice' at Iasus and Side

The institution of *sunthusiâ*, 'joint sacrifice', appears in many forms in Graeco-Roman antiquity, but takes a special shape in the period of the Roman empire. After a brief outline of the practice, I address particular problems in inscriptions of Iasus in Caria and Side in Pamphylia.<sup>1</sup>

In the Hellenistic period, the verb *sunthûein* and its related nouns, *sunthutês*, *sunthusiâ*, are mainly used in two senses. In the private sphere, devotees of particular gods or groups of gods may form standing associations of 'joint sacrificers', sometimes with common ownership of property. In the public one, a community, or sometimes another kind of association, may send envoys to sacrifice at a festival held by a second such group; when this happens, those sent may be called either *theôroi*, the usual name of sacred envoys in this period, or *sunthutai*. The overlapping of the two terms is shown in an inscription of the second century BC from Hermione in the Argolid. When the city of Asine resolves to send *sunthutai* to Hermione in order to sacrifice to the latter's Demeter Chthonia, Hermione reciprocates by appointing a *theârodokos* 'to receive the *sunthutai* who come to the sacrifice of the Chthoneia'. In this second sense, the importance accorded to sacrifice marks it out as the constitutive element of the occasion, the one item that could not be omitted.<sup>2</sup>

In the Roman period, this group of words seems not to be found in reference to private associations.<sup>3</sup> By contrast, the public or communal sacrifice which corresponds to the second sense above continues, but under a different aspect. Now 'joint sacrifice' is usually associated with the emperors and imperial benefaction. The occasions include the establishment of a new festival

<sup>1</sup> I have used the following special abbreviations: *ANRW* = *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*; *IGSK* = *Inscriptionen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*; *OMS* = L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta* 1-7 (Amsterdam 1969-90); *Bull. épigr.* = *Bulletin épigraphique*, appearing annually in *REG*. This subject was an abiding interest of L. Robert, whose last and fullest discussion is in *CRAI* (1982) 228-9, 232-5 = *OMS* 5.791-2, 795-8; the most important additions are by S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power* (Cambridge 1984) 126-8, M. Wörle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien, Vestigia* 39 (Munich 1988) 198-200, and P. Weiss, *Chiron* 21 (1991) 362-4; the article by S. Karwiese, 'Synthysia', *LIMC* 7.1 (Zurich & Munich 1994) 829-30, is incomplete. I am grateful to Glen Bowersock and to two anonymous referees for *JHS*.

<sup>2</sup> Hermione: O. Curty, *Les Parentés légendaires entre cités grecques, Hautes études du monde gréco-romain* 20 (Geneva 1995) n. 2 (*JG* iv.679.14-17; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1051). Cf. C. Michel, 'Théôroi', *Daremberg-Saglio* 5 (1912) 208-11; F. Poland, 'συνθύται', *RE* 4A.1462-3; L. Ziehen, 'θεωροί', *RE* 5A.2239-44. Sacrifice: L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) 465 = *Documents d'Asie Mineure, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 139 bis (Paris 1987) 161, 'Le sacrifice est l'élément essentiel de la fête, le seul qui ne puisse manquer'.

<sup>3</sup> In the charter of the Iobacchoi of Athens, of the second century AD, the genitive *συνθυσίας* surely means 'appointment as a (public) *sunthutês*', not 'appointment to a college of sacrificers': *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1109.134 (J.H. Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius: Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East [Hesperia Suppl.* 13, Princeton, New Jersey 1970] n. 17, with further bibliography).

<sup>44</sup> In this scenario it is not necessary to think that a broken marriage-agreement was the sole, primary, or even the literal cause for grievance with the figure known as Lycambes. It may, for instance, be a metaphor for some other kind of treachery, or have a synecdochal connection to a larger betrayal by that figure.

<sup>45</sup> Slings (n.1) 16.