ARCHILOCHUS AND LYCAMBES

A persistent ancient tradition has it that a man named Lycambes promised his daughter Neoboule in marriage to the poet Archilochus of Paros, that he subsequently refused Archilochus, and that the poet attacked Lycambes and his daughters with such ferocity that they all committed suicide.[1] When we reflect that the iambographer Hipponax drove his enemies Bupalus and Athenis and Old Comedy a man named Poliager to suicide, that the ancestress of iambos, Iambe, killed herself,[2] and that all these suicides, like those of Lycambes and his daughters, took the form of hanging, we will not take too seriously the ending of the story of Archilochus' relations with Lycambes and his family.

However, it seems now to be generally accepted, at least among English-speaking scholars, that the whole Lycambes tradition is to be rejected.[3] The present note seeks to demonstrate that this extreme scepticism is misguided. I shall begin with a survey of Archilochus' references to Lycambes and his family to ascertain how far the indirect tradition is consistent with the surviving fragments.

Lycambes appears to have played a consistent role in Archilochus, as far as the fragments allow us to see. In fr. 38[4] he appears as the father of two daughters (οἵην Λυκάμβεω παῖδα τὴν ὑπερτέρην), in fr. 33 (where the voice of 'the daughter of Lycambes' is mentioned) as the father of at least one daughter. In fr. 71 his role cannot be determined. But in fr. 54, if his name is correctly restored in v. 8, he may again figure as the father of a daughter, for a female is mentioned in the fragment, whether for good or ill. If his patronymic is correctly supplied in fr. 57.7, it may be significant that the letters πατρ occur in the same verse. In fr. 60, if Lycambes' name is correctly restored by Lobel in v. 2, he is again in all probability a father, according to West's plausible supplement in v. 7 τοι]αῦτα τέκ[να. It is scarcely straining credulity to suppose a reference to the two daughters of fr. 38.

The fragments of the Lycambes epode (frr. 172–81) confirm this role for Lycambes and add further details. Lycambes is addressed directly in fr. 172:

> πάτερ Λυκάμβα, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε;
> τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας
> ἧις τὸ πρὶν ἠρήρησθα; νῦν δὲ δὴ πολὺς
> ἀστοῖσι φαίνεαι γέλως.

The term πάτερ can be used as a mark of respect in addressing an older man.[5] Here Archilochus may be using it in irony; but it is surely no coincidence that the epode opens with a word which fixes Lycambes in the role he plays elsewhere in Archilochus, that of father. In these verses Lycambes is represented as a man who until now has

---

[1] See especially P. Dublin 193a, ed. G. W. Bond, *Hermathena* 80 (1952), 1ff., *A.P.* 7.351 (Dioscorides), 352 (possibly Meleager), Horace, *Epod.* 6.11ff. with schol. *ad* v. 13, *Epist.* 1.19.23ff., Ovid, *Ibis* 54 with schol., *A.P.* 7.71 (Gaetulicus), 69–70 (Julian of Egypt).

[2] See Pliny, *H.N.* 36.11, pseudo-Acron *ad* Horace, *Epod.* 6.13, Aelian, *V.H.* 5.8, schol. Hephaest. p. 281.8 Consbruch, Eustath. in Hom. *Od.* 1684.45.

[3] Cf. notes 15, 17, 23, 25 below. See however H. D. Rankin, *QUCC* 28 (1978), 7ff. Continental scholars have in general been less eager to reject the biographical tradition. See W. Rösler, *RhM* 119 (1976), 300ff., M. G. Bonanno, *MH* 37 (1980), 65ff., B. Gentili, *QUCC* n.s. 11 (1982), 24 n. 50.

[4] All references to iambic and elegiac poets are based on M. L. West, *Iambi et elegi Graeci* (Oxford, 1971–2). I ignore fr. 151, where only circular reasoning can justify the restoration of Lycambes' patronymic.   [5] E.g. Hom. *Il.* 24.362, *Od.* 7.28, 17.553.

shown sense, but has now made himself an object of ridicule. Fr. 173 (whose reference to Lycambes is independently confirmed by the author who quotes it)[6] gives further detail:

$$\text{ὅρκον δ' ἐνοσφίσθης μέγαν}$$
$$\text{ἅλας τε καὶ τράπεζαν.}$$

Lycambes has broken an oath and has betrayed their fellowship. Dio Chrysostom[7] indicates that the agreement concerned a marriage. Dio's words (τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον οὐδὲν ὤνησαν οἱ ἅλες καὶ ἡ τράπεζα πρὸς τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῶν γάμων, ὥς φησιν αὐτός) strongly suggest that this was made explicit in the lost portion of the poem. But even without Dio's aid we could reasonably have inferred this from the fragments. It is in his capacity as father that Lycambes is pilloried[8] by Archilochus, and it is legitimate to conclude that it was in this capacity that he betrayed his oath to Archilochus; add the fact that Lycambes is known from other fragments as a father of daughters and it seems reasonable to conclude that the betrayal concerned one of these daughters. Archilochus goes on (frr. 174ff.) to use beast-fable in the way that other archaic poets use myth,[9] to draw general lessons from Lycambes' conduct. The fable is that of the fox and the eagle. The details of the fable need not concern us here. What is clear is that the eagle, like Lycambes, breaks a solemn agreement, and that he is eventually punished. What is not clear is whether the punishment of Lycambes is represented as having happened or is simply threatened.[10] Actual rather than potential punishment is suggested by 172.3–4, but the present tense may be prophetic, or we may simply have wishful thinking on Archilochus' part. The punishment may take the form of a mishap resulting from the breaking of the agreement, or it may be Archilochus' mockery of Lycambes, in this poem or others. The latter seems more likely, since in Aesop's version of this fable the fox has the pleasure of eating the eagle's

---

[6] Origen, c. Celsum 2.21.   [7] Dio Chrys. 74.16.

[8] A. P. Burnett, Three Archaic Poets (London, 1983), 63f. finds this poem ineffectual as abuse and concludes therefore that 'direct personal abuse was never part of the poet's true purpose here': A. J. Podlecki, The Early Greek Poets and their Times (Vancouver, 1984), 49 finds fr. 172 'rather mild'. Certainly the poem contains no abusive language; it was not meant merely to insult. But it was meant to condemn, for Lycambes is accused of betrayal of friendship (no slight offence in aristocratic society – cf. Theogn. 91ff., 575f., 811ff.), and made to look ridiculous (fr. 172), thus losing both his reputation and his dignity. There is nothing 'mild' in the assertion that Lycambes is a laughing stock. Mockery by the public, or public mockery by an enemy, was something to be feared; cf. e.g. Pind. O. 8.69, P. 8.86f., Soph. El. 1133, 1295, Aj. 367, 382, O.C. 902f., Eur. Med. 381ff., 1049f., Ar. Ach. 221f., 1195ff. Whatever the form of Lycambes' punishment, the eagle in the fable is severely punished, for its young are destroyed; viewed in anthropomorphic terms (as the fable form invites) this is a catastrophe in a society which placed immense value on the survival of the oikos.

[9] K. Latte, Hermes 92 (1964), 387 n. 2 argues that this fable does not belong to the epode attacking Lycambes. But we know from Philostratus, Imag. 1.3 that Archilochus used beast fable against Lycambes; given the identical metre and the aptness of a fable dealing with betrayal to the behaviour of Lycambes in frr. 172–3 it is difficult not to link the fable fragment with the attack on Lycambes.

[10] If West is correct in locating fr. 181 at the end of Archilochus' narrative, the words σὸς δὲ θυμὸς ἔλπεται at 181.12 are presumably addressed to Lycambes by the poet, and his punishment is placed in the future. West argues, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (Berlin, 1974), 134, that κλύσας v. 9 makes sense only 'in connexion with the burning nest'. However, the ending of the fable is then disagreeably abrupt and anticlimactic, and his reconstruction of the content of the passage (the eagle extinguishes the burning nest before flying away) introduces an otiose detail. I suspect that we should place this fragment earlier in the narrative, and that the words σὸς δὲ θυμὸς ἔλπεται are spoken by the eagle in exultation ('you hope to see me punished, but...') or the fox in recrimination ('you expect to escape punishment but...'). The fragmentary nature of the text rules out confident speculation about the meaning of κλύσας.

young in revenge for the killing of her own:[11] if the fable is being applied strictly by Archilochus, then we should expect the part of the poem concerned directly with Lycambes to deal with revenge inflicted by Archilochus himself.

It can be seen from this brief survey that Lycambes' role in Archilochus is both consistent in itself and compatible with the indirect tradition. Neoboule, his daughter according to the indirect tradition, appears in an enigmatic tetrameter, fr. 118, εἰ γὰρ ὣς ἐμοὶ γένοιτο χεῖρα Νεοβούλης θιγεῖν.[12] If we may trust Hesychius, Archilochus attacked her in graphic language as a prostitute (fr. 206 with testimonia). This was all we had until the discovery of the Cologne epode,[13] a first-person narrative in which a male describes a sexual conquest. The fragment does not confirm Neoboule's connection with Lycambes, since her father is not named. But what is said of Neoboule is in general consistent with indirect tradition. The girl who figures in the epode appears to offer Neoboule to the narrator (vv. 3ff.) as an alternative to herself as a sexual partner, describing her in glowing terms. He however rejects Neoboule outright:

τὸ δὴ νῦν γνῶθι· Νεοβούλη[ν
25 ἄ]λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω·
     αἰαῖ πέπειρα δ. [
     ἄν]θος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήιον
     κ]αὶ χάρις ἣ πρὶν ἐπῆν·
     κόρον γὰρ οὐκ[
30 . .]ης δὲ μέτρ' ἔφηνε μαινόλις γυνή·
     ἐς] κόρακας ἄπεχε·
     μὴ τοῦτ' ἐφοῖτ' ἀν[
     ὅ]πως ἐγὼ γυναῖκα τ[ο]ιαύτην ἔχων
     γεί]τοσι χάρμ' ἔσομαι·
35 πολλὸν σὲ βούλο[μαι
     σὺ μὲν γὰρ οὔτ' ἄπιστος οὔτε διπλόη,
     ἡ δ]ὲ μάλ' ὀξυτέρη,
     πολλοὺς δὲ ποιεῖτα[ι
     δέ]δοιχ' ὅπως μὴ τυφλὰ κἀλιτήμερα
40 σπ]ουδῆι ἐπειγόμενος
     τὼς ὥσπερ ἡ κ[ύων τέκω.

Neoboule is both physically and morally corrupt. She is past her prime (26ff.). She is promiscuous (29ff., perhaps v. 38), untrustworthy and duplicitous (36f.). The role in which she is rejected is significant. In v. 25 ἄλλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω is ambiguous; it implies, but need not describe, marriage. But vv. 33–4 are quite clear, for Archilochus is there paraphrasing Hesiod, who is certainly talking about marriage (Erga 701, πάντα μάλ' ἀμφὶς ἰδών, μὴ γείτοσι χάρματα γήμηις). It is the idea of marriage which prompts the choice of proverb in vv. 39–41. [τέκω] there is metaphorical (haste may bring disaster), but the image fits nicely into a context in which alternative brides are considered. Nothing here contradicts the indirect tradition. That Neoboule is here rejected while in the indirect tradition she (or her father) rejects Archilochus is of little moment, for the bitter terms in which she is dismissed (especially the condemnation of her faithlessness) presuppose a strong hostility consistent with betrayal by Neoboule, and certainly too strong for a young lover's fastidiousness; we should also bear in mind that the rejection of what is not offered or what is refused is a common response to disappointment (i.e. 'I do not want Neoboule' means 'I never wanted

[11] Fab. 1 (Hausrath).
[12] See G. M. Kirkwood, Early Greek Monody (Ithaca and London, 1974), 41.
[13] This fragment now appears as fr. 196a in West's Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis (Oxford, 1980).

her anyway'). The indirect tradition receives further support from Neoboule's character; she is unreliable and duplicitous. One is reminded of the arch-betrayer Lycambes. Thus even without an explicit statement from Archilochus that Neoboule is Lycambes' daughter, we may feel justified in connecting the two, and in supposing that ancient writers based their statements about Neoboule and Lycambes on a firmer foundation than mere guesswork.[14]

Until recently, it was always assumed that Archilochus had been personally betrayed by Lycambes. However, M. L. West has argued[15] that Lycambes and his daughters were not real people but stock characters belonging to a local Parian entertainment. The principal evidence for this is the name Lycambes ($\Lambda v\kappa\acute{a}\mu\beta\eta s$) and his patronymic Dotades ($\Delta\omega\tau\acute{a}\delta\eta s$). The former West would connect with $\H{\iota}a\mu\beta os$ and also with $\delta\iota\theta\acute{v}\rho a\mu\beta os$, $\theta\rho\acute{\iota}a\mu\beta os$, $\H{\iota}\theta v\mu\beta os$, words associated with the worship of Dionysus. The latter he would connect with the pseudonym adopted by Demeter at h. Hom. Dem. 122 ($\Delta\acute{\omega}s$ or $\Delta\omega\sigma\acute{\omega}$).[16] In addition, West points out that Aristotle (fr. 558) connects the rise of tyranny on Naxos with an occasion on which a rich man and his two marriageable daughters were insulted; on the basis of the shared elements between Naxian history and Archilochus' poetry West conjectures 'that there existed on Naxos a traditional entertainment similar to what existed on Paros'. West has been followed recently by Nagy.[17]

Though superficially attractive, this theory is open to a number of objections.

(i) The name Lycambes shares with the words associated with Dionysus and Demeter only the jingle -mb-. Though interesting, this fact need have no etymological significance, for there are many words ending in $-\mu\beta\eta/-\mu\beta os/-\mu\beta ov$ which appear to have no connection with the group $\H{\iota}a\mu\beta os$, $\theta\rho\acute{\iota}a\mu\beta os$, $\delta\iota\theta\acute{v}\rho a\mu\beta os$, $\H{\iota}\theta v\mu\beta os$.[18] Nor need the patronymic be significant. The name Dotades was actually borne by a Messenian who won the footrace at Olympia in 740 B.C. (Euseb. Chron. i. 196).[19]

[14] I assume with most scholars that the poet's interlocutor is Neoboule's sister. The two girls belong to the same household (v. 4 $\acute{\epsilon}v$ $\H{\eta}\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho ov$; parallels indicate a household rather than a larger social or religious unit – cf. Hdt. 1.35.4, 7.8.δ, also Od. 2.55, 7.301, 8.39, 15.513, 17.534, h. Hom. Herm. 370) and the man's respectful address (10ff.) indicates that his interlocutor is no slave. The two girls must be related. Conceivably one is an orphaned cousin or more distant relative living in the other's house, but it is more likely that the two are sisters. This appears to raise a problem. How do the man's respectful tone and physical tenderness to the girl square with Archilochus' hostility towards Lycambes and his family? However, the problem is illusory. In a society which valued chastity (n. 27 below) an unmarried girl's readiness to be seduced will have met with less indulgence than it receives from modern scholars. That she does not submit to full intercourse ($\pi a\rho\grave{\epsilon}\xi$ $\tau\grave{o}$ $\theta\epsilon\hat{\iota}ov$ $\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\mu a$ v. 15, for which see E. Degani, QUCC 20 (1975), 229) is hardly relevant. She is moreover persuaded to supplant her sister, thus adding betrayal to unchastity; treachery is again revealed as a family characteristic, and the man's praise of her innocence (v. 36) becomes ironic. If M. L. West, ZPE 26 (1977), 44ff. is correct to link fr. 196 with the epode, the poem began as a simple declaration of love. This is entirely conjectural, but if correct this merely confirms the evidence of the Cologne fragment that Archilochus described his seduction of Neoboule's sister (real or imagined) without any explicit criticism of the girl; to do otherwise would reduce the plausiblity of the narrative.

[15] West, Studies 27f.

[16] For the text of this verse see N. J. Richardson, The Homeric Hymn to Demeter (Oxford, 1974), 188.

[17] G. Nagy, The Best of the Achaeans (Baltimore, 1979), 243ff. See also J. Van Sickle, QUCC 20 (1975), 152, J. Henderson, Arethusa 9 (1976), 160, M. R. Lefkowitz, ibid. 184f.

[18] See C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives (Chicago, 1945), 386f., 389. Archilochus himself has $\chi\eta\rho\acute{a}\mu\beta\eta$ fr. 285.

[19] There is thus no reason to take the patronymic as a pseudonym invented by Archilochus, with Bonanno 78ff. (cf. already C. Gallavotti, PP 4 (1949), 139 n. 2). Of patronymics or names patronymic in form found in Archilochus, only $\Sigma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\acute{\iota}\delta\eta s$ fr. 183 (< $\Sigma\epsilon\lambda\lambda o\acute{\iota}$) can confidently be

(ii) The Naxian 'parallel' is not very helpful. The shared element seems a very flimsy foundation on which to build so large a guess. There is no hint in the Naxian tradition of a betrothal, nor of betrayal, nor yet of suicide. The contact between the poetry of Archilochus and the incident reported by Aristotle is trivial. There is no objective evidence for a traditional entertainment featuring a father and marriageable daughters on Naxos any more than on Paros.

(iii) In favour of the historicity of Lycambes is his appearance in the Mnesiepes inscription.[20] Lycambes was believed on Paros itself to have been a real person, and a man of influence. It is difficult to believe that local tradition could be duped to the extent not only of accepting the historicity of a fictional character derived from local ritual song but of giving him a high place in Parian society.

(iv) The role of Lycambes in Archilochus is too narrow for him and his family to have formed the sum total of Archilochus' fictional prosopography. Unless we suppose that Archilochus' fictional situations were limited to attacks on faithless fathers and faithless daughters there must have been other such characters. Yet these figures have left no mark whatsoever on the indirect tradition. Lycambes and Neoboule were remembered, but these other stock characters were forgotten, it seems. Aristides tells us (Or. 3.611 Lenz–Behr) that Archilochus slandered not only Lycambes but also Charilaus and Pericles.[21] At fr. 117 we see him good-humouredly mocking his friend Glaucus. Fr. 25 may attack a number of targets. At fr. 185 a certain Cerycides may be mocked. Fr. 115 appears to mock a man named Leophilus. A prophet named Batusiades is mocked in frr. 182–3. In fr. 270 we find a flautist named Myclus attacked for his lasciviousness, in fr. 294 a man named Sabaeus or Sazaeus. A man designated 'son of Peisistratus' is criticised in fr. 93a. Some of these people, Glaucus, the son of Peisistratus, Charilaus, Pericles, are real enough.[22] Whether all are real we cannot say. But we may note that few of the names are repeated in the surviving fragments and citations; there is no evidence of a gallery of typical figures.

(v) The attack on Lycambes is in spirit, manner and language quite inappropriate

viewed as Archilochus' invention. With names such as Ἐράσινος, Ἐρατίων, Ἐράτων, Αἴσιμος, Αἰσιμίδης, Αἴσιος, Αἰσίων, Κηρυκίων attested (see J. Kirchner, Prosopographia attica (Berlin, 1901–3) s.vv.), it would be rash to dismiss Ἐρασμονίδης (fr. 168), Αἰσιμίδης (fr. 14), Κηρυκίδης (fr. 185) as inventions. Νεοβούλη is at first sight a suspiciously apt name for a girl who rejects her suitor, but both νέος and βουλή are commonly found as elements in female names; see F. Bechtel, Die attischen Frauennamen (Göttingen, 1905), 9,28. None of this proves that the names in Archilochus were real names, but it should make us pause before assuming that they are inventions, especially when we reflect that the etymological aptness of a name is no argument against its historicity in a society where most names had meaning (cf. e.g. the famous politician Pericles, the wise poet Sophocles, the successful general Nicias); cf. Rankin 17.

[20] SEG 15.517.45. Cf. Burnett 22.

[21] MSS have Χειδόν. Χαρίλαον is Liebel's conjecture (cf. Athen. 415d), accepted by West ad fr. 167. This may be the poem which began with fr. 168; if so, τέρψεαι v. 4 will be ironic, and πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων possibly so.

[22] Glaucus' existence is proved by an inscription bearing his name (Meiggs–Lewis no. 3). Pericles' historicity is strongly suggested by the nature of the elegy addressed to him, fr. 13 (Archilochus is unlikely to share the grief of a figment). Nagy 244 regards Charilaus as a fictitious character. 'In this particular instance, the target of reproach may have been the Kharí-laos figure himself, whose very name suggests the notion of "mirth for the lāos".' 'Mirth' is of course a mistranslation of the first element of the name; the semantic range of χάρις suggests that the name means 'kindly/gracious to the people' or 'welcome to/favoured by the people', but hardly 'amusing to the people'. The name itself is no more an argument against the historicity of this character than is the almost identical name of the fourth-century general, Χαρίδημος. On the other hand, the historicity of Archilochus' other ἑταῖροι (Pericles, Glaucus) strongly suggests that Charilaus is a real man.

for the stylised abuse of a stock character. The language in which Lycambes is criticised is solemn and dignified, and appeal is made to the importance of oaths and fellowship (fr. 173) and (indirectly) to the role of Zeus as the ultimate sanction of justice among mankind (fr. 177). This is not entertaining abuse but solemn poetry. Moreover, the fable is used in this poem, as myth is used by other archaic poets, to place the individual circumstances of the speaker against the background of a general truth. The fable was evidently narrated at some length, not glanced at as in fr. 23.16. If Lycambes is a fiction, the fable becomes the main purpose of the poem rather than an illustration. It is unlikely that Archilochus would devote a whole poem simply to retelling a traditional fable which was presumably familiar to his audience. The attack on Neoboule in the Cologne epode is also disquieting. It displays the same venom which we find in Alcaeus' attacks on Pittacus, and I for one find it easier to suppose that Archilochus' venom, like that of Alcaeus, was directed against real enemies than against stock characters.[23]

I do not doubt that archaic iambos had its origin in the *aischrologia* of fertility ritual. This origin had a vital role in shaping the proprieties of the genre, for iambos shares with Athenian Old Comedy a frank approach to matters which are either exiled from other poetic genres or dealt with in hints and circumlocutions. But already for Archilochus iambos had broken free of its connection with ritual to become an independent poetic genre.

Burnett accepts that Lycambes was a real man, but agrees with West and Nagy in rejecting the tradition of the broken betrothal. Of the Cologne epode, she remarks:[24] 'It was read as a crude instrument of destruction – an artifact, not a work of art – and its Neoboule was regarded, not as a projection of poetic emotion, but as a target external to the song'. Again: '...it will be best to forget the scant and probably false information that we have about the Lycambid family'.[25] Burnett suggests that though

---

[23] Nagy 248 finds the iambic blame poetry of Archilochus, Semonides and Hipponax 'replete with a great variety of stock situations and stock characters'. It has been demonstrated above that this is not true of Archilochus. Semonides does not offer us any 'stock characters'. His attack on women (fr. 7) divides the sex into types, but there are no stock characters, if by that term we mean recurrent names attached to specific and recurring character types. Hipponax however does seem to deal with stock characters and stock situations. He represents himself as living in the lowest echelons of society. This is unlikely for a Greek poet. Composing poetry requires time as well as talent, and for this reason it is generally confined (professional rhapsodes excepted) to those whose livelihood is assured, the upper classes; even Hesiod, though no man of leisure, is far above the social and financial level of Hipponax's milieu. In addition, the poet places himself in situations which are criminal or ridiculous; the former would be exceedingly dangerous if the events narrated were true, while the latter would not accord with the Greek sense of personal dignity. Either we have here a chronological development (much as Anacreon presents love as a stylised game where Sappho had presented it as a serious experience), or a geographical difference. We know that in some areas iambos remained closely connected with ritual (cf. the *iamboi* in Semus of Delos *ap.* Athenaeus 621f; for versified jesting at Eleusis see Richardson 214), and it is possible that at Clazomenae it developed into a scurrilous narrative form depicting immoral, anti-social and ridiculous behaviour and offering, like Attic Old Comedy, vicarious freedom from the restraints of society within the context of a religious festival.

[24] Burnett 89. The distinction between artefact and work of art is artificial when dealing with an age when all literature is verse literature. The political and military poems of Archilochus, Alcaeus, Tyrtaeus, Callinus and Solon are oratorical artefacts intended to persuade as well as works of art.

[25] Burnett 91. Her view of the Lycambes tradition in general and its significance for the Cologne epode in particular has the approval of M. Davies, *CR* n.s. 34 (1984), 169f. Podlecki 49 appears to conclude, like Burnett, that Lycambes and his daughters were real, but is disinclined to accept 'the whole series of incidents recorded by the later biographical tradition'.

Lycambes himself was real 'much of the scorn that Archilochus lavished upon him was of a traditional sort'.[26] Lycambes' name ('Wolf-walker') made him 'a ready target for an abusive poet who liked to exploit animal fables as a mode of attack, and it looks as if he was used as the frequent representative of whatever masculine failing the poet wished to condemn'. There is however no truth in the suggestion that Lycambes served as the representative of a variety of failings. As we have seen, his role in Archilochus is both narrow and consistent. The role of Neoboule is equally narrow; she is the faithless daughter of a faithless father. Why this narrowness, if Archilochus simply required a target for traditional abuse of human failings? Alternatively, why are equally narrow roles not assigned to the rest of Archilochus' acquaintance? Moreover, it seems imprudent to abuse an influential citizen solely because of his name. And if Neoboule too is historical, it seems that Archilochus slandered an innocent girl because her father had a convenient name. Even if Lycambes tolerated abuse of himself, it is unlikely that he would allow his daughter to be slandered. [27] I conclude that Lycambes and Neoboule are attacked for specific wrongs they have committed or are believed to have committed.

A question remains. Granted that Lycambes and his family are real people, accused of specific misconduct, does Archilochus represent the broken promise as a personal experience of his own or does he assume the role of their victim to make his criticism more telling? It is often assumed that it was common for the archaic monodist to adopt an identity, real or fictitious, other than his own.[28] It is of course true that the poet adopts a *role* (lover, soldier, counsellor, moralist) for each poem. It is also true that he need not be in love to sing a love song; common sense suggests that he may represent a past love as present, or praise in a single beloved any or every person, male or female, whom he has ever loved. It is further true, given the generalising tendency of archaic Greek poetry, that when he presents himself as a lover the archaic poet appears as a typical lover. But there is no evidence that it was common for a poet to assume a different identity. There is a handful of possible examples, but in no case can we be sure that the poet assumes an identity other than his own *throughout* a poem of any substantial length. In Alcaeus fr. 10V the feminine gender identifies the speaker as a female; the same is true of Theogn. 257–60, 579–80 (or 579–82), 861–4, Anacreon 385 PMG. In Archil. fr. 19 we are told by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1418 b 27ff.) that the speaker is not Archilochus but Charon the carpenter; since the speaker is actually named by Aristotle we must suppose that he was named somewhere in the poem. Aristotle also tells us that the speaker in fr. 122 is a father discussing his daughter. In none of these cases can we be sure that we are dealing with an identity assumed by the poet for the whole of the poem rather than a speech by a third party narrated within a poem.[29] But even if we accept, as clearly we must, the possibility of the assumed identity, we should note that in general where the speaker of the poem as a whole can be identified in the fragmentary remains of Archilochus this speaker is

---

[26] Burnett 22.

[27] We know from Archilochus himself that public reputation was very important in his society (fr. 172.3f); we also know that female chastity was prized (indicated by the criticism of promiscuity in vv. 29ff. of the Cologne epode; cf. frr. 206–9). It is unlikely that in this society a father would tolerate an attack on his daughter's reputation simply as a poetic exercise, or indeed that such a procedure would be acceptable to public opinion.

[28] K. J. Dover in *Archiloque, Entretiens* 10 (Geneva 1964), 206ff., West, *Studies* 27, Burnett 31, Gentili 20. Nagy 248 is rightly sceptical.

[29] The examples from the *Theognidea* are presumably complete, but they are too brief to be of any significance.

identifiable as the poet.[30] Thus the balance of probability is that Archilochus speaks of his own experience when he criticises Lycambes and Neoboule. Whether Archilochus' version of the facts is objectively true (did Lycambes gratuitously betray Archilochus' trust or did he come to consider Archilochus unsuitable for personal or other reasons?) is unknowable; and even if we could discover the reality behind Archilochus' verse we might find that, fascinating as it would doubtless be, it would tell us more about the man than about the poet. But the probability remains that Archilochus asks us to believe that he was personally wronged by Lycambes and his daughter.[31]

This defence of the tale of Lycambes and Neoboule is not due to any interest in Archilochus' biography for its own sake. My reason for concentrating on biographical details is that to ignore or dismiss such details where they are offered by the poet is to blur a fundamental paradox in early archaic personal poetry, namely that it is remarkably impersonal. As a general rule, the archaic solo poet uses his own person and represents the events he narrates or judges as belonging to his own life or the lives of those around him. But though he writes about himself he usually sees two aspects to his experience, the individual and the general. It is as a rule true that the archaic monodists use their own experience to express a truth of general validity. The poet rarely concentrates upon the details of his life; he seeks rather to use his own experience to inform others. In a poem on the death of dear ones at sea (fr. 13) Archilochus dwells on the grief only long enough to convince us of its reality, then looks for a means of containing grief, which he finds in an awareness of human experience in general. In the Lycambes epode (frr. 172ff.), instead of simply abusing Lycambes Archilochus uses him as proof that the gods watch over and punish acts of injustice. This tension between the individual and the general is lost if we treat his polemic merely as a literary exercise.[32]

University of St Andrews C. CAREY