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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE HOMERIC BACKGROUND

Introduction

The poets of ancient Greece, living in a close relationship with the natural world, logically made extensive use of animal imagery in their poetry. The types of imagery employed, however, reflect the individual poet’s intent and the genre(s) of his poetry. Epic poets, desiring to tell a story of gods and heroes, employed the formal dactylic hexameter, and the lofty tone of their poetry generally demanded a more dignified, remote treatment of the animal world. Proud Homeric heroes entering battle are commonly likened to spirited horses, confident in their strength, galloping freely over the plain. A more personal, often less dignified, treatment of animals can be seen in archaic Greek lyric poetry. The tone of this poetry varied somewhat with the meter employed; the more elevated elegy used the restrained elegiac couplet, while highly personal iamboi depended on the iambic meter which was thought to approximate closely everyday speech.
A discussion of the uses of animal imagery by lyric poets cannot be undertaken without first defining terminology. Generally, the term "animal imagery" is applied to the poet's use of one or more characteristics of an animal concretely or figuratively to present a more vivid description of a scene or an individual. Poets employ animal imagery in background scenes to heighten the realism of those scenes or effect a certain mood. In book eighteen of the Iliad (lines 483ff.), Homer illustrates Hephaestus' expert craftsmanship with a detailed description of Achilles' shield and the two cities depicted there. The inclusion of flocks and herds in his description of the shepherds' ambush in the city at war enables him to sketch a more natural scene than might otherwise have been represented, and to affirm Hephaestus' skill at rendering, in metal, a scene so vivid that it appears to come to life. The present survey will not treat the use made of animal imagery in background scenery except to show some of the differences between the uses of animal imagery by epic poets and lyric poets. The survey will focus on the uses of animal imagery by lyric poets, specifically Archilochus and Semonides, to describe individuals. Such descriptions are shaped by means of a comparison of the animal and the individual with regard to specific attributes. The comparison may be stated or implied, and the attributes compared may be positive,
negative, or neutral. The image is effective because it is defined by a few of the animal's characteristics and because the animal characteristics chosen for comparison are those which are perceived in common by the poet and his audience.

The fragmentary condition of Greek lyric poetry necessarily limits images discussed to those where some context is available to permit careful examination. Even with such limitations, however, the number of references to animals in the intelligible fragments is too extensive to be treated thoroughly in a short study. Therefore, the present survey will concentrate on the use of animal imagery, for derisive purposes, in the iamboi of Archilochus and Semonides, each of whom received the distinction, in antiquity, of being the first to use iambic meters in his poetry. One must exercise caution in making generalizations about these poets based upon the meager amount of their extant poetry; however, the few remaining fragments appear to indicate that both poets favored poetry of derisive intent. Although each employed animal imagery in these fragments as a vehicle for their derision, the impression one receives from reading each poet's work is different. Archilochus' invective, since it is often hurled at specific individuals, gives the impression of being more personal, and perhaps more bitter. When he assails Pasiphaile for extending
unreserved hospitality to all male guests (fr. 331 West), one could easily believe that his attack is prompted by some personal affront. Semonides' ridicule, conversely, remains impersonal and less biting by being directed at an entire class of individuals. Although his women are categorized by their resemblance to various animals, his censure (fr. 7 W) is meant to encompass all wives, not specific individuals. Before examining the derisive use of animal imagery in the iamboi of Archilochus and Semonides, it will be useful to consider briefly this imagery in the epic poetry which antedated archaic Greek lyric poetry and certainly influenced it.

Homer

In epic poetry, animal imagery is intended to enhance and advance the narrative; to achieve this, the images employed are primarily of two types: similes, in which someone's appearance or actions are likened to those of an animal for vividness of expression; and descriptive imagery, in which the animal is a natural part of the background scenery lending realism to the scene depicted. Since the animal image is meant to complement the narrative of epic poetry and the epic poet deals with larger-than-life characters and lofty themes, the epic poet tends toward a generally more positive and dignified treatment of the animal world and the use of animal
imagery for derisive purposes is rare. Κύων appears to be the most common metaphorical term of abuse taken by Homer from the animal world.⁵ A few examples of the use of animal imagery in the Iliad and the Odyssey will illustrate some of the differences between its use in epic poetry and its use in the iambic poetry to be examined in Chapters Two and Three.

The Iliad, Homer's epic about the wrath of Achilles set amid the Trojan War, abounds with similes in which warriors on both sides are likened to animals. A warrior's onslaught is often likened to the ferocious attack of a lion (λέων) or a boar (κάφρος) against passive animals, such as sheep (μῆλα) or cattle (βόσκ). The meeting of Hector and Ajax on the battlefield is compared to a clash between raw-flesh-eating lions (λιοντάτικαι...δεσμοφόροις, Il. 7. 256) or powerful wild boars (συζ φάρος, τῶν τα σφινχ δόχος δέλακαθνός, Il. 7. 257). Agamemnon advancing against the Trojans is repeatedly likened to a lion pouncing on passive beasts in book eleven of the Iliad. Like a rampant lion, he rises to face Peisander and Hippolochus (line 129); two of Priam's sons fall to his fury like fawns (ἀλέφοι...νήπιοι, line 113) crushed in a lion's strong jaws (line 114); the Trojans scatter before him like cattle (βόσκ, line 172) when a lion penetrates the herd, snapping the neck of a cow in his strong jaws (line 175).
In the *Odyssey*, the chronicle of Odysseus' wanderings and return home after the Trojan war, a similar lion simile is used; the context and tone, however, are much different. Odysseus, emerging weather-beaten, salt-encrusted (κακακωμένος ἡλμος, *Od*., 6. 137) and famished (χρεῖον γὰρ Ἰκανεῖ, *Od*., 6. 136) from a thicket on the island of Phaeacia, is likened to a rain-drenched and wind-battered mountain-lion (λέων ὅρσητροφός...ὁμίλος καὶ ἄρμανος, *Od*., 6. 130-1) who, prompted by hunger (κόλασι...ἐ γαστήρ, *Od*., 6. 133), ventures into stock pens. In this case, the "animals" who scatter out of fear are Nausicaa's young female companions. Though still inspiring fear, the lion in this image appears less ferocious than its *Iliadic* counterpart.

Although less striking than animal similes, the use of animal imagery to complete a scene or impart a certain mood is also common in Homeric epic. The following examples of Homer's use of bird imagery will illustrate this point. In the *Iliad*, birds are frequently paired with dogs as battlefield scavengers. The association of birds (and dogs) with death, begun in the opening scene of book one where Achaean corpses provide a feast for dogs and birds (ἀυτοῦς δὲ ἄλῳς τε χεῖς κύνεσσιν οὐλονόισι τε κάσι, *Iliad*, 1. lines 4-5), continues throughout the epic. Agamemnon uses the metaphor as he rouses his troops to battle, warning that any who exhibits cowardice will not
be able to escape death (οὐ οἷς ὁμοιοὶ ἦσαται ὑμῖν κύνας Ἡδ' οὐλωνοῦ, ἦλ. 2. 392-393). The gods also use this imagery: Athena, conversing with Hera, wonders how Hector will feel seeing Trojans satisfy dogs and birds with flesh and fat (τίς καὶ Τρώων κορίζει κύνας Ἡδ' οὐλωνοῦ δημῶ καὶ σάρκεσσι, ἦλ. 8. 379-380).

The generally negative associations of bird imagery in the Iliad are balanced by imagery employed by Homer in his description of Calypso's cave in book five of the Odyssey. Homer completes the picture of a lush landscape flourishing about the cave by his inclusion of a variety of birds. The broad-winged birds nesting (ὅρνιθις ταυροπτέραι ἱερής, ὄδ. 5. 65) about the cave include owls (σκῦπα, line 67) and long-tongued hawks (Ὑπηκάς τι ταυρυγαλωσσοι, line 67) and sea-cormorants (κορώνας εὐνάλιες, line 67). The presence of birds in this scene clearly enhances the feeling of serenity intended by the poet.

A discussion of animal imagery in Homer, however brief, would not be complete without some mention of dog imagery since the dog is a favored image in both epics. As guard-dog and hunter, the dog is seen performing useful, positive functions; while its appearance as a battlefield scavenger and as a term of abuse has negative connotations. As L. Saara has noted, "Those similes in the Iliad that deal with sheep dogs and hunting dogs as
illustrating the behavior of the combatants praise the
dog's fidelity and bravery. In most similes the dogs have
impressive adversaries, such as lions and wild boars,
because this makes their bravery seem greater. It is only
when the stress is laid upon the enemies' cowardliness, as
in Il. 10. 361, that he (Dolon) is compared to a young
deer or hare, which flees before two swift hounds (Tydeus
and Odysseus)."6 The Trojans who check the attack of Ajax
are likened to dogs who drive a lion away from cattle pens
and remain vigilant all night (ὥς δ' αἰώνα λέοντα βοῶν
ἀπὸ μεσσαύλοιο ἵσσευσαντο κύνες...πάννυχοι ἔγρησοντες, Il.
11. 548-51).

Perhaps the best known example of the dog as a
metaphor for fidelity appears in book seventeen of the
Odyssey. The faithful dog is Argus, Odysseus' hunting-dog
who, after waiting twenty long years for his master's
return, finally succumbs to death upon Odysseus' return.
The pathetic picture of Argus, crippled by age (ἀσον δ' οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα δυνήσατο οἶο ἄνακτος ἐλθέμεν, lines 303-304)
and neglect (τὸν δὲ γυναικὸς ἀκηδεῖς οὐ κομίσουσι, line
319), is made all the more affecting by the contrasting
description of the vigor of his youth. The dog, once
swift and strong (αἰω...ταχυτῆτα καὶ ἀλκῆν, line 315),
has now fallen on hard times (νῦν δ' ἔχεται κακότητι, line
318); once the bane of any wild beast (οὐ...τι
φύγεσκε...κνῶδαλον, lines 316-317), he now lies abandoned
in a dung heap (τότε καὶ τ’ ἀμφότερος... ἐν πολλῇ κόμψῳ, lines 295-296), covered with dog-ticks (ἵνωπλίος κυνοραστήν, line 300). His faithfulness to a master who left home when he was a puppy is shown by his immediate recognition of his master’s voice (ὥς ἴνοησαν Οδυσσέα ἵγγυς ἰόντα, line 301).

We have mentioned the negative connotations associated with the image of the dog as a battlefield scavenger in an earlier discussion of Homer’s use of bird imagery. "The repulsive behaviour of unclean scavenger dogs had presumably influenced the frequent use of κύων and kindred words as terms of abuse." As a term of abuse, κύων is used most often in the Iliad by Greek heroes to describe the Trojans, but is also used by a god to describe another god, and is even used for self-deprecation. Hector, driving on against the Greeks to set fire to their ships, is called a "mad dog" (κυναλυσσηπήρα, Άi. 8. 299) by Teucer who unsuccessfully tries to kill him. Achilles, thwarted three times by Apollo in attempts to kill Hector, is prompted to call him a "dog" (κύων, Άi. 20. 449). And when Achilles does manage finally to inflict his mortal wound and Hector pleads that he not be allowed to become food for the dogs (μή με ἵνα παρά νησὶ κύνας καταδάψαι Ἀχαῖον, Άi. 22. 339), Hector is once again addressed as dog (κύων, line 345). The gods themselves are not immune from the insult, κύων.
Athena's insolence earns her the rebuke of "fearless dog" (κύων ἄφιξ, Il. 8. 423) from Zeus when she persists in helping the Greeks against his wishes. Apollo's sister, Artemis, earns the same rebuke in response to her bitter reproach of him for cowardice in opposing Poseidon. (Il. 21. 481).

As a term of self-derision, κύων is used by Helen in her address to Hector, who has come to upbraid Paris for shirking his duty to fight. In this speech, she calls herself "dog" twice while lamenting her life and Paris' shameless acts. She is an "icy-cold, evil-devising bitch" (κυνὸς κακομηχάνων κρυσόσσης, Il. 6. 344) who should have died at birth, and a "dog" (κυνὸς, line 356) whose shamelessness has caused the toil of war. The term appears less frequently in the Odyssey and is most often applied to wanton females. Penelope's disloyal handmaids are rebuked as "reckless dogs" (κύνας οὐκ ἄλιγούσας, Od. 19. 154) because they reveal the deception involving the shroud. The adjective, κυνωπίς, is applied to both Clytemnestra and Aphrodite by their husbands. In book eleven of the Odyssey, when Odysseus confronts Agamemnon in Hades and asks how he came to be in that place, he is told of the treachery of Agamemnon's "dog-eyed" wife (line 424). Hephaestus, angered by Aphrodite's shameless conduct, demands a return, from Zeus, of the gifts given for his "dog-eyed" wife (Od. 8. 319)
The present survey is not meant to be a thorough examination of the uses of animal imagery in epic poetry; therefore, the foregoing discussion of Homer's uses of this imagery is by no means comprehensive. Rather, the choice of representative examples of the animal imagery that appears in the Iliad and the Odyssey aims to illustrate the primary function of animal imagery in epic poetry; namely, complementing the narrative. Animal images so employed commonly describe an individual by way of simile or help to form a more realistic backdrop for the action of the narrative. The occasional use of animal imagery by one character to deride another character serves to enhance the narrative but cannot be interpreted as the personal utterance of the poet. In Chapters Two and Three we shall examine the derisive use of animal imagery in the personal iambic poetry of Archilochus and Semonides. We will investigate some of the differences between epic and lyric poets, as well as those between two individual lyric poets in their treatment of animal imagery.
CHAPTER II
ARCHILochUS

Archilochus is the earliest (mid-seventh century) archaic Greek lyric poet whose work has survived, much of it in very fragmentary condition. A versatile poet who varied the verse forms, meters, and content of his poetry, he is, nevertheless, most closely associated with poetry in iambic meters whose content is clearly derogatory. It is in this poetry that he commonly employs animal imagery to deride individuals, often by name.8 It is perhaps for this reason that Archilochus' poetry is seen as more personal and more caustic than Semonides'. Men and women alike are censured for their faithlessness; however, the men are most often reproached for breach of an oath, while the women are derided for their shameless conduct. Dog imagery figures prominently in two of the fragments which we will presently examine. Other fragments whose content is clearly sexual will then be considered. Finally, the fragments which contain animal-fable narrative or proverb will be discussed.

The dog (κύων), which we have seen is a favored image in Homeric epic, is relatively scarce in
Archilochean iamboi. It appears in only two epodes, the Strasbourg papyrus (fr. 115 W), and the Cologne epode (Col. Pap. 7511); in each case, it is meant to evoke different associations. The Strasbourg epode is a mock "propeμptikon", but the petition for a safe voyage common to the propeμptikon form is perverted to a wish that the would-be traveler suffer a shipwreck. The addressee of this fragment is unknown since the beginning, which may have contained his name, has not survived; it is clear, however, that one who was once esteemed as a friend (τὸ μὴν ἰταῖος [ὁ]ῶν, line 16) is herein reviled for transgressing against sworn oaths (λ[ῳ] ἐ δ ἵππος ὥρκοις Ὑθη, line 15). The petitioner specifies both the place for the shipwreck to occur and the traveler's subsequent fate. The oath-breaker, battered by waves (κῦματι πλα[ζῷ]νος, line 4), is to wash up on the beach at Salmydessus (line 5) on the Black Sea. Once there, pierced with cold (δήμης πισπηγοῦ τοῦτον, line 9) and covered with seaweed (φυκὴ πάλα ἱπίχοι, line 10), he will suffer enslavement at the hands of barbarous Thracians (ῥῖκες ἄκρο[κ]ομοι, line 6). When Archilochus likens the traveler to a powerless dog lying muzzle-down on the beach (ὡς [κ]ύων ἐπὶ στόμα καὶμενος ἄκρασης, νν. 11-12), he conjures the image of the dog as pariah, a common image for the battlefield scavenger of the Iliad, to support his lengthy prayer that the transgressor of
sworn oaths suffer a fate befitting an outcast.

The Cologne epode (Col. Pap. 7511), one of the many fragments whose subject matter is sexual, provides the only other example of dog imagery used derisively by Archilochus.11 The extant portion of this dialogue poem begins with the closing remarks of a young woman’s refusal to engage in sexual intercourse. The male narrator, continuing his entreaty, contrasts the girl’s innocence with a second woman’s spent charms. The second woman, named Neobule or "New Counsel", is likened to a bitch who brings forth her pups hastily and blind ([δί]δοιχ’ διως μὴ τυφλὰ καλιτήμαρα [σπ]ουθή ἐπειγόμενος τῶς ὀπισθ ἐκ [ὦν τέκῳ, lines 39-41]).12 The identification of Neobule as the bitch is an indictment of both Neobule and the progeny which might come of a union with her and provides an image which befits her perceived shamelessness. A second animal image, that of the fawn (νιφρός, line 47), is introduced to represent the addressee, and is a metaphor for sexual innocence.

The contrast between the wanton Neobule and the chaste daughter of Amphimedo is maintained by the opposite associations of the bitch and the fawn. The Neobule of this epode has lost her former grace (χάρις ἡ πρόν ἐπην, line 28) and the bloom of her maidenhood (ἐνθος δ’ ἀφερόμενα παρενήσιον, line 27); she is frenzied by lust (μαυνόλις, line 30) and insatiable (κόρον...οὐκ, line 29),
as well as faithless and duplicitous. By likening her to a hasty bitch, "Archilochus exploits...the full natural aroma of the canine female...a lewd and quarrelsome female creature compounded of dirt and dugs and crawling newborn things, and she cannot even properly perform the one function that might justify her repulsive existence."\(^{13}\)

The daughter of Amphimodo, on the other hand, is neither faithless nor double-dealing (οὕτ' ἀπιστοῖος οὕτ' διπλόν, line 36); she is seen as fresh and youthful (ἠφνυνύς νεόν ἡβης ἰπήλυτος χρόα, lines 49-50) and full of fear (δειμαρτί, line 46) over participating in a sexual act. The image of the innocent girl as fawn is effective because of the numerous associations the fawn evokes. Its obvious associations as a symbol of virginity and a type for fear accord well with the naive girl's fear at engaging in sexual activity and her reluctance to do so.\(^{14}\) In addition, the fawn's frequent appearance in Homeric simile "brings suggestions that are epic and legendary, rather than popular" as the fabled bitch.\(^{15}\) It is noteworthy that animals which we have seen in adversarial roles in the Iliad, with fawn as prey and dog as predator, should appear in similar roles in the Cologne epode. Archilochus varies the epic pattern, however, by introducing a narrator to prey upon the fawn and become prey for the bitch. The narrator's speech apparently achieves its goal as the narrator effects a sexual union.
with the desired girl in the closing lines of the fragment (lines 51-53).

There are other fragments, aside from the Cologne epode, whose animal images are sexual metaphors. That the fragments are meant as personal abuse is obvious from their sexual subject matter. While the sexual metaphor may be obvious, the context for the abuse is not always apparent.¹⁶ The blind eels which someone receives (πολλὰς δὲ τυφλὰς ἤγχηλος ἀδέξω) in epodic fragment 189 W are an obvious sexual metaphor for the penis. This fragment is quoted by Athenaeus (Deipn. 299a) completely out of context to illustrate the use of the plural form of the word, ἤγχηλος. Use of a second person verb indicates that the speaker is abusing someone directly although the addressee is neither identified nor likened to an animal. West has suggested that the context of this "hate poem" be supplied by the aging prostitute of frr. 188 and 190 W and by the desire for sex (φιλὼντος ὑφως) which has stolen the speaker's wits in fr. 191 W.¹⁷ The eel is a particularly apt metaphor because of its obvious physical resemblance to the penis. In addition, the largest eels were apparently a special delicacy and their reproductive habits were often mentioned in antiquity. The numerous references in ancient literature show that they were common, and hence, an image which the audience would readily recognize.¹⁸
Fr. 331 W has been mentioned as an illustration of the point that Archilochus' invective is more personal than Semonides'. Athenaeus (Deipn. 594 c, d) remarks that the fourth century Milesian courtesan, Plangon, is called Pasiphile, citing Archilochus as author of the verse: συκή πατραίη πολλὰς βόσκουσα κορώνας, εὐθῆς ξένων δίκτρια σαφείς. 19 Punning on the name Pasiphile, "Dear to all", Archilochus likens the woman's hospitality to a "fig tree on the rock feeding many crows." οὐχὶ πατραίη may be a parody of the σκύλλην πατραίην of Od. 12. 231 as some assert; in any event, as Gerber and others have noted, the fig (σοκόν) is a symbol for the pudenda. 20 By identifying Pasiphile's male callers as crows, birds whose monogamous habits and constancy were noted in antiquity by Aelian (N. A. 3. 9), Archilochus strengthens his reproach, contrasting Pasiphile's wantonness with her callers' constancy. 21

The halcyon (κηρύλος) figures in another erotic fragment (fr. 41 W) which appears to deride an unidentified woman. In this case the context cannot be determined; however the ancient source for the fragment, the scholiast for Aratus, helps to elucidate the sexual metaphor. The image of the halcyon flapping its wings as it alights should be taken to represent the movement of a woman, perhaps a prostitute, straddling a man. West points out that the participle used by the scholiast,
σαλσυμίνη, "shaking with joy", is elsewhere a sexual metaphor. The success of the image as a reproach lies in the association of the commonplace (the action of the bird) with the cheap (the prostitute's motion astride her "trick").

In two of the fragments just examined, fr. 189 W and fr. 331 W, the individuals reproached are not directly likened to animals; it is clear nonetheless that the function of the animal image is personal abuse. The last fragment to be considered before examining Archilochus' use of animal-fable itself contains an allusion to fable. Rather than operating to abuse someone, the animal image appears to function as a defense against calumny. P. Oxy. 2310, fr. 1, col. i. 1-21 (23 W) is part of a longer dialogue poem written in iambic trimeters. The extant portion appears to be a male's enjoiinder to a woman to discount the base rumor circulating against him. He indignantly states that he is not "like that" (line 13) and that he "knows how to love his friends and hate his enemies" (lines 14-15). At line 16, he boldly asserts: μύρης. λόγων νυν τ[ως' ἀληθὴς πάρα. This is taken to mean; "I am an ant. There's truth to this story." With the briefest of allusions, Archilochus skillfully invokes the aid of the fable of the ant and the dove (235 Perry) to illustrate his point. The speaker equates himself with the homely ant who thwarts the
capture of a friendly dove by biting the bird-catcher's foot. As A. P. Burnett points out, the device works on two levels; the poem's speaker as ant defeats the calumny levelled against him just as the poet as ant promises that the retaliatory bite of his invective will defeat any slander leveled at him and his profession.25

It has been noted that animal fable is employed by Archilochus in P. Oxy. 2310 and Col. Pap. 7511. In each of these highly personal dialogue poems, an allusion to animal-fable is used by a male narrator as part of a petition addressed to a woman.26 The use of brief allusion helps to preserve the personal nature of the fragments. In the fragments which we shall presently examine, Archilochus uses longer animal-fable narratives to deride individuals. Although the individuals are mentioned by name in frs. 172 and 185 W, the presence of longer animal-fable narratives enables Archilochus to generalize his abuse. Since fable is, by nature, exemplary, Archilochus effects an impersonal pose with his use of animal-fable narrative. Before we consider the two examples of Archilochus' use of animal-fable narratives, it will be useful to discuss briefly animal-fable in general and note its characteristics.

Animal fable, or ἄιβος, as we have already seen, provided an effective device for the derisive use of animal imagery in Greek lyric. Although commonly
associated with Aesop in the sixth century, Hesiod's retelling of the fable of the hawk and the nightingale in his didactic work, the Works and Days, lines 202ff., is acknowledged as the first extant use of animal fable in Greek literature. The extent to which fable was utilized by archaic lyric poets remains a matter for speculation since the surviving poetry is largely fragmentary and was often quoted by ancient authors out of its original context to illustrate another point. For instance, fr. 178 W, which probably belongs to the epode detailing the fable of the fox and the eagle, is quoted by Porphyrius in his discussion of the word μελάμφυγος.

Perry lists three features of fable: 1) that it must be obviously and deliberately fictitious; 2) that it must convey, through particular characters, a certain action, series of actions, or an utterance that took place in past time; 3) that it must be told for the sake of a point that is moral, paraenetic, or personal. Therefore, animal-fables can be distinguished from animal stories and Homeric similes, which are told for their own sake, and proverbs, which illustrate a general truth but do not necessarily convey a certain action. As Perry points out, early fable did not exist as an independent literary form but as a rhetorical device shaped by the needs and occasions of the poets using it. Therefore, it appears only in a context and is used as occasional
Archilochus was the first lyric poet to make conscious use of animal fable. His allusions to animal-fables, those of the bitch and the sow, in Col. Pap. 7511 and the ant and the dove in P. Oxy. 2310, have already been discussed. The two remaining examples of Archilochus' use of animal-fable exhibit some similarities: each is an example of narrative fable; each was written in epode form; each has the fox as a protagonist. In one instance, however, the fox appears as the victim; in the other, as antagonist. H. T. Archibald explains the frequent appearance of the fox as follows: "It is because of his great versatility that the Fox is so good a type of human nature as to be the most frequent of all Fable characters." As will be shown, Archilochus uses the fox image in poems where the distinction between poet and narrator is difficult to determine.

Although the animal-protagonists are specifically identified in only one fragment, 174 W, the fable of the fox and the eagle is spun out in a series of epodic fragments (172-181 W), whose content allows the reasonable assumption that they belong to the same fable and may, in fact, be pieces of one epode. Frs. 172 and 173 give the occasion for the narration of the fable and the addressee of the fable. Lycambeb, obviously out of his mind, has become a laughingstock to everyone (fr. 172 W) because he
has foresworn a binding oath (fr. 173 W). Using the fable as presented in Perry's *Aesopica* (1 Perry) as a guide, the sequence of events of Archilochus' version can be reconstructed from the often very damaged fragments.\(^{32}\) The fable is illustrative of the consequences of oath-breaking for the eagle who has set aside a pact made with the fox in fr. 174 W. A badly damaged fr. 175 W seems to detail the eagle's transgression--feeding the fox's cubs to the eaglets. Fr. 176 W may contain words spoken about the eagle to the fox by a third animal as Campbell supposes, or may be the words of the fox in the throes of a debate with itself as West concludes.\(^{33}\) The fox appeals to Zeus in fr. 177 W, a second meal of meat stolen from the sacrificial fire is conveyed to its young by the eagle in fr. 179 W, and the eagle's nest catches fire in fr. 180 W. Fr. 181 W is connected with the other fragments by its mention of aerial flight. With the concluding words, "your heart hopes" (σῶς δὲ θυμὸς Ἑλπιᾶσαι, line 12), the narrator returns to the addressee of the reproach.\(^{34}\)

Archibald, propounding the view that all fable characters represent "types", sees the eagle in this fable as the type character of haughty sovereignty and unassailable might, while the fox represents fair-play.\(^{35}\) Holding to the traditional view that Lycambes intervened in the planned marriage of his daughter Neobule to
Archilochus, he further identifies the eagle as Lycambes and the fox as Archilochus and sees Archilochus' use of fable in this epode as highly personal. Burnett, applying a less strictly biographical approach to the interpretation of the fragment, notes that the offense of the eagle in the fable, that is, stealing the fox's cubs, does not accord with the traditional offense of Lycambes, which was failure to give his daughter's hand in marriage. It seems, as Burnett suggests, that the "listener is asked to scorn, not a particular man, but a general trait that may even be one of his own".

When the Greek orator, Aristeides, spoke of the "apes of Archilochus" (Aristeides 2. 397. 3, ed. Dind.), he may very well have been referring to more than one ape fable which Archilochus had composed. That tradition has been accepted by many scholars, notably Bergk; however, only one ape fable seems to have been transmitted to us.

The fable of the fox and the ape is recounted in perhaps three epodic fragments (185-187 W) in Archilochus. In the longest of these fragments, 185 W, someone addresses Kerukides, "Herald's son", promising to tell him a fable (ἀγος, line 1). The ape (πθηκος, line 3) is somehow separated from the other beasts and goes off alone into the wilderness. He is met by a cunning fox (ἀλωνης καπδαλη, line 5) with a shrewd mind (πυκνον νοον, line 6). This is the end of the fragment. The second
fragment, 186 W, has only the words: ἰσιδόμανυν, "firmly fixed in a trap". The last fragment, 187 W, says only τοιήνδε. 5' ἔγειρε τήν πυγήν ἔχων, "Oh, ape, with such a rump." Archilochus' version of the fable is generally associated with the Aesopic fable of the fox and the ape chosen king (Perry 81). In this fable, an ape is elected king by an assembly of animals. The fox, envying him, contrives to make him appear foolish. In the end, his ploy succeeds and he ensnares the ape.

It is not clear who the protagonists in the fable are meant to represent. Lasserre and Bonnard view the fable as part of an epode addressed to Archilochus' brother, Pericles, but as Gerber points out, there is no evidence to support this view. Archibald's explanation once again incorporates all of the biographical traditions. Lycambe is the "cunning fox", the low-born Archilochus is the "pretentious ape" whose aim to marry into aristocracy is foiled by the fox. This interpretation appears to be inadequate. While Archilochus is capable of laughing at himself, he does not appear in that posture in the other fragments which contain animal fable. The narrator as fox in this fragment carries out the action that the narrator as ant promises in P. Oxy. 2310 and recalls the sentiment expressed in fr. 126 W (Ὡν 6' ἔπισταμαι μάγα, τὸν κακὸς <μ'> ἔρδοντα δίνοις ἄνταμε(βίσθαι κακοῖς). We should
avoid applying too precise an interpretation to this fable since no context for the epode exists outside of the one provided by the fable itself.

One further mention of Archilochus' use of the fox image may help to strengthen the assertion that the fox rather than the ape represents the poet in this fragment. Fr. 201 W, quoted by Zenobius as a proverb (παροιμία) and part of an epode, contrasts the many wiles of the fox (πολλ' οίδ' ἄλωνις) with the hedgehog's sole means of defense (ἄλλ' ἵκινος ἐν ὑγα), his ability to roll himself into a ball when threatened and protect himself with the stiff spines covering his back. Although it also lacks a context, the fragment echoes the sentiment of fr. 126 W, "I know one great thing, how to repay, with evils, the one who wrongs me." The proverb serves notice that, like the spines of the hedgehog, the poet's iambic will prick, and it recalls the image of the lowly ant whose sharp bite can inflict great pain. The fox and the hedgehog, though traditional enemies, are not meant to be seen in adversarial roles here. Rather, as Bowra points out, the fragment is meant to show the poet's different postures and "proclaims both his resource in attack and stubborn resistance in defense."

Animal imagery was to Archilochus, then, an effective weapon for personal abuse and a defense against calumny. By focusing on specific physical attributes of
the animals, such as the reproductive capabilities of the bitch or the action of the halycon flapping its wings, Archilochus was able to inflict personal wounds on specific individuals. Occasionally and animal image was used to describe an individual other than the intended victim. We have seen, too, that Archilochus uses animal-fable for derisive purposes. Since, by its very nature, fable is exemplary, when he uses animal-fable, Archilochus is able to generalize his anger. In addition, the fragments employing fable narrative seem to stress the mental processes of his animal characters (i.e., the resourcefulness of the fox) over their physical attributes. If some fragments where animal fable is employed seem more personal, it may be that, where the subject matter is highly personal, allusions were used in place of the longer fable narratives.
CHAPTER III

SEMONIDES

The extant fragments of Semonides' iambic poetry attest to the seventh-century poet's fondness for using animal imagery. Many of the more than forty fragments of his two books of iamboi contain a reference to an animal; however, only a few of these provide enough substance to allow for an analysis of Semonides' use of this imagery. Like Archilochus, Semonides seems to favor using animal images in poems whose intent is derisive and to use the image to define the limits of the intended ridicule by focusing on qualities which the animal possessed or was perceived by the poet and his audience to possess. Since the object of the poem is scorn or ridicule, Semonides stresses traits of the animal which are negative or made to appear so within the context of the poem. Unlike Archilochus, Semonides directs his ridicule at an entire class of people, rather than at a specific individual.

In fr. 1 W, Semonides censures mankind for their complaisancy, likening them to cattle (βοῦδα). By choosing grass-eating beasts rather than carnivores (θηρίων), he
obviates the need for a lengthy characterization; one word conjures the image of passivity and inertia which he ascribes to mankind. Semonides provides the basis for comparing men to dull-witted cattle in lines 5-7: men lack intelligence (νοος δ' οὐκ Ἰπ' ἄνθρωποςιν) and are short-sighted (ἀπήμαροι...οὐδὲν ἔλθεται ὅκως ἤκαστον ἄκτιστος ἥσσος). Man’s inertia is manifested in his willingness to ponder an unprofitable desire (ἐπηρηκτὸν ὅρμα (νοντας, line 7), always waiting for "next year" (νέως, line 9) when his fortunes will improve. Men lead a passive existence, prey to old age (line 11), disease and war (line 13), countless deaths, miseries, and woes (line 20-22). In describing these miseries and woes as unthought of (ἄνειφραστοι, line 21), Semonides returns to his opening reproach, that mankind has no νοος.

Semonides underscores man’s ability to act in his own behalf by presenting him as the passive recipient of the actions of others. Vain hope and confidence nourish him (ἄλπις...κάπιτεςθεή τράφει, line 6), old age overtakes him (φθάνει...γῆρος, line 11), diseases waste him (φθινοσι νοοσι, line 13), Death sends him beneath the earth (πέμπει...Αἴδης ὑπὸ χθόνος, line 14). Participles in the passive voice further illustrate man’s inertia: men are subdued by Ares (τοὺς 5' Ἀρεί δεσμήμυνοις, line 13) and driven in confusion by a storm (λαλαπι κλονζόμενοι, line 15). The final reproach for
these men, unable to live (μὴ δυνᾶσθαι ζών, line 15), is their willingness (ἀνέγρατοι, line 19) to die by their own hands. That Semonides holds himself apart from the class of μὲν who suffers his censure is evidenced by his use of the third person throughout the fragment. With his use of the first person plural in the closing lines of the poem, he finally includes himself, as he counsels that these men should, following his own example, presumably, not look for troubles (οὐκ... ἂν κακῶν ἄρωμα, line 23) or allow themselves to be tormented (οὔτ'... ἁκαῖς ὑμῖν, line 24). The image of mankind as complaisant cattle is thus sustained by the poet's offer of himself, and in a larger sense, his poem as a goad to prick these men toward action.

Semonides makes liberal use of animals imagery to deprecate women in a lengthy iambic fragment, fr. 7 W, wherein he likens their νόος, or character, to various animals, as well as the earth and the sea. The opening reproach, though reminiscent of fr. 1 W, seems mild by comparison: men lack νόος, or intelligence, in fr. 1; here, women's νόος, is made separate (χωρίς). It is through the animal imagery that Semonides intensifies his ridicule. Semonides' women derive their distinctive characters from animals: familiar, predominately negative, physical and mental attributes of the animals provide the basis for comparison. Even animal traits which are generally accounted as favorable are made to
appear odious as Semonides derides women, and by association, the men who marry them.

Since the animals that endow women with their characters belong to two distinct groups, they will be discussed separately. The animals which possess and exhibit only negative qualities will be considered first. These are: the sow, the she-ass, the weasel, and the ape. Semonides appears to judge each of these animal-women on two criteria: physical appearance and industry.

The sow (ἡ) is the first animal to make an appearance in the poem. She is described as long-bristled (τανύτριχος, line 2) and unwashed (ἐλοωτος, line 5) and exhibits a preference for sitting in dunghills (ἐν κοπρήνισιν ἡμενη, line 6), which, as Hugh Lloyd-Jones points out, may signify her indifference to her surroundings.49 Her unkempt house (πάντ᾽...ἐκοσμα, lines 3-4) and unwashed clothing (ἀπλύτοις ἐν ἐμασιν, line 5) attest to her favorite, and only, activity, eating (μια(ναται, line 6). In this characterization, there seems to be no separation of animal and woman; clearly, the woman is a pig.50

The she-ass (δνος) is characterized as a stubborn animal whose back, one may imagine, is scarred by frequent beatings (παλιντριβος, line 43). Her human counterpart is equally obstinate and submits only with force or
rebukes (ἀνάγκη...τ’ ἐνισθήσιν, linr 44). She interrupts her non-stop (προνύξ προθύμαρ, line 47) eating only to cuckold her husband by engaging in sex (Ὑργον ἄφροδίσιον, line 48) with any of his comrades. Since it was thought to possess these attributes itself, the ass provides the perfect image of a stubborn woman with an insatiable appetite for both food and sex.51

The woman derived from a weasel (γαλή) shares with the ass-woman a mania for sex (εύνης δ' ἀλήνης ἄφροδισίης, line 54).52 Not merely content to consume her husband's stores, she can be found snatching the sacrificial meat from the fire. There is nothing attractive about her (οὐ τι καλόν...οὐδ' ἱράσιον, lines 51-52); in fact, she makes her husband nauseous (ναοσήτη διδοῖ, line 54). The weasel's later traditional association with magic spells and the prevention of conception and birth, as well as the superstitious notion that the weasel was bad luck, could explain the illness the woman inflicts on her husband, as well as the evils she perpetrates on her neighbors (Ὑρδεὶ πολλὰ γυῖτονας κακά, line 55).53

The last of Semonide's catalog of animal-women worthy of censure is also the one whose appearance and conduct are cause for the greatest opprobrium. This woman, derived from the ape (πηθων), is the greatest evil (μέγιστον κακόν, line 72) given to men. Her appearance
excites laughter, but she remains indifferent (οὐδὲ οἱ γέλως μέλει, line 74); with her horrible face (ἀγχιστα πρόσωπα, line 73) and short neck (αὐχάνα βραχία, line 75), she moves awkwardly (κινεῖται μόις, line 75) among the townspeople: she is "all legs" (αὐτόκωλος, line 75) and no rump (ἐμυγος, line 75). Although conversant in all arts and ways of acting (δηναι δὲ πάντα καὶ τρόπους ἐπισταί, line 78), she expends her energies counterproductively (οὐδ᾽...ιὸ ὑρξίεν, line 80), planning to do the greatest evil (μέγιστον ὑρξίεν κακὸν, line 82.)

The reason for according the ape-woman the status of διακρίσοντο μέγιστον κακὸν can be explained in terms of Semonides' criteria for judging woman-kind by their physical attractiveness and utility. W. C. Mc Dermott points out that the "most dominant feature at the basis of the use of the ape in literary humor and satire is its striking likeness to man combined with a marked distinction from man." Semonides singles out the ape's distinctive physical features--its facial features, human yet distorted, and its clumsy upright gait--to emphasize the visual contrast with man. He stresses the ape-woman's lack of a shapely rump to provide a more striking contrast with the apparent Greek ideal of the ample rump as a sign of a woman's comeliness. Mc Dermott also points out that the ape "was entirely useless,...a pet,...a curiosity, depending for its vogue on its amusement value." Since
the worth of a woman was apparently assessed by her skill at increasing her husband’s wealth (Θάλλεί δ’ ὅπ’ αὐτής κάμαξεν βαίν, line 85), the choice of a woman derived from the ape provides the perfect illustration of the uselessness on which Semonides bases his reproach. In addition, the indifference that the ape-woman experiences at being the butt of laughter appears to contradict the traditional Greek sentiment making it base to suffer ridicule by others. Semonides’ ape-woman, then has easily earned the reproach of διακριδόν μὴ γινότον κακόν with which he begins his characterization of her.

In addition to using animals that possess only negative qualities to characterize women in fr. 7, Semonides employs animals whose attributes may be considered positive; in the context of this poem censuring women, however, the attributes are made to seem decidedly negative. Semonides accomplishes this by endowing his animal-women with those attributes which, when carried to extreme, manifest themselves in immoderate modes of behavior and often inhibit the animal-woman’s usefulness. The women he reproaches in this manner are: the vixen-woman, the bitch-woman, and the mare-woman.

The vixen-woman is described as skillful or cunning (Υψίν, v. 8), a trait often regarded as favorable. The intensity of her perceptive skill is stressed by Semonides’ pleonastic repetition of the negative oδηγή:
οὐδὲ μιὰ κακῶν. λέληθεν οὔδὲν οὔδὲ τῶν ἀμείνονων, line 8-9. Like the fox, whose application of cunning to good or evil apparently depends upon its variable temperament, the vixen-woman often uses her cleverness to practice deception as her mood suits (τὸ μὲν...εἰπες πολλάκις κακῶν, τὸ δ' ἐσθλὸν ὑπῆρ 5' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοιν ἔχει, line 10-11). 60 That Semonides sees the vixen-woman's cunning and changeability of temperament as negative is evidenced by his initial description of her as derived from the wicked fox (ἀλητρῆς ἀλώπεκος, line 7).

Semonides refers to the bitch (κύων) in two separate passages whose imagery appears to be related, although the two types of women are derived from separate sources: one, from a bitch; the other, from the sea. The sea-woman has two opposing humors: in her disagreeable state of mind, she ranges like a bitch protecting her pups (μαίνεται τότε ἡπλητον ὁσπερ ὁμίλεν τέκνοισιν κύων, line 33-4). The protective instinct which a mother displays toward her offspring is generally viewed as a positive trait; Semonides' woman, however, is implacable and unpleasant to all (ἀμωλεῖχος δὲ πᾶσι κάμοθυμη, line 35), as well as unbearable (οὐκ ἄνεκτός, line 32) to behold or approach. As S. Lilja has observed, "Though this is actually a praise of the dog's parental devotion and bravery..., μαίνεται gives it a noticeably negative nuance." 61
Similar imagery is employed in the passage describing the bitch-woman, a woman whose principal traits are inquisitiveness and ceaseless vocalizing. Following a rebuke of the animal-woman for her prying, in which she is called "mischiefous" (ἀτοργόν, line 12) and a "busybody" (αὐτομητόρα, line 12), Semonides censures the woman for her incessant "yapping". 62 The bitch-woman is in no way deterred by physical abuse (οὐδ’... ἔσσεξειν λῆσσιν ἀδόντας, line 17-8), threats (παύσει... ὑμίν οὐτ’ ἀπιλήσας ἀνήρ, line 16), or persuasive speech (μελλεῖ... μιδομήνος, line 18). Whether she sees no one present (καὶ μὴ δὲν’ ἄνθρωπων ὄρατι, line 15) or whether she is sitting amid guests (εἰ παρὰ ἐνοίοις ἡμένη, τόχη, line 19), she persists in her behavior.

The barking of the dog can be viewed as a positive trait in a watch-dog or protective parent; in such a situation, the dog barks to keep intruders at a distance. 63 Semonides distorts the image for negative effect: behavior that passes for vigilance in the guard-dog becomes snooping and ranging about (πάντη... ἵν παπαλυνοῦσα καὶ πλανσμένη, line 14) in the bitch-woman; effective action by the guard-dog is seen as unprofitable (ἐπηρηκτὸν, line 20) in the bitch-woman. 64

The last animal-woman singled out for reproach by Semonides for what is apparently a positive attribute is the mare-woman. The trait which she inherits from her
progenitress, the mare (Ὑπωνος), is beauty. Along with beauty, she acquires an excessive concern for her appearance which totally inhibits her capacity for productive work. Since the horse’s mane was thought to be an important characteristic for judging its beauty, Semonides uses the mare-woman’s preoccupation with her coiffure to show her affinity with the horse and highlight her vanity.65 The adjective, ἄβρη, "delicate" or "graceful", with which the horse is described (line 57), is as ideally suited to the mare-woman, for it connotes the extravagant luxury which is her wont (λοῦται πάσης ἡμέρης...δ(?), ἔλιος τρις, καὶ μύροις ἄλειψεται, line 63-4).66 Like a thoroughbred, this animal-woman would grace the halls of a tyrant or sceptered king: only they could afford to keep a woman who will not apply her hands to useful work (κοῦτ' ἄν μύρης ψαύσειν, οὔτε κόσκινον ἁπειν, οὔτε κόπρον...ἐς οἴκον βάλοι, line 59-60). She provides the perfect contrast to the last of Semonides’ animal-women, the bee-woman.

The woman derived from the bee (μῆλισσα) belongs to the only race of animal-women which Semonides does not directly attack in the poem. He emphasizes the dissimilarity of this woman to the other animal-woman types by placing her character at the end of the catalogue of animal-women and by pronouncing her aversion to sitting among the others (οὖς' ἐν γυναιξὶν ἢδεται καθημένη, line
90.) Her attributes appear to be wholly positive; however, the ambiguity of Semonides' phrasing in this section itself becomes a mild rebuke. The poet does not actually say that the bee-woman is unworthy of blame; only that "blame does not settle on her" (κινητι γάρ οἰη μῶμος οὐ προσιζάνσι, line 84.) The reason for this is simple: like the proverbial "busy bee", the bee-woman does not alight long enough for blame to attach itself to her. This animal-woman does not merely possess divine grace; it "runs round" or "surrounds" her (ἀμφιδίδρομων, line 89), implying both that it must rush to keep up with her and finally does so only by fencing her in. She not only lacks the time but also the desire (οὐδ'... ηδετα, line 90) to commit any of the lustful (ἄφοδισσους, line 91) acts which other women chatter about.67

In describing the industry of the bee-woman, Semonides identifies her with the worker bee whose exertions sustain the hive.68 Her wisdom (πολυφραδιστάτας, line 93) is evidenced by the way her husband's livelihood (βος, line 85) flourishes and increases under her management and her pre-eminence (ἀριστής, line 88) among women is measured by her noble and renowned progeny (καλὸν κόνομάκλυτον γίνος, line 87). Semonides' acceptance of the bee-woman alone as a fitting companion for man (τὴν τίς εὕμερεί λαβών, line 83) confirms the notion that the principal worth of a woman is
measured by an economic yardstick. That his acceptance is grudgingly given can be seen in the poem’s conclusion. Having reproached the individual types of women by likening them to different animal species, Semonides voices his censure of woman-kind as a whole in the remaining twenty-five lines of the fragment. Included in this censure are not only "all the other races" (τὰ ξέλλα φολα...πάντα, line 94) but those who "seem to help their husband" (καὶ δοκῶσιν φασίζειν ἔχοντι, lines 97-98) and those "who seem to possess the greatest self-control" (ητίζ...μάλιστα σωφρονεῖν δοκεῖ, line 108). Now the ape-woman shares, with all women, the ignominy of being the "greatest evil that Zeus made" (lines 96 and 115); nor does Semonides spare men from his reproach.

Men experience only transitory happiness (ἀνήρ θυμηδεῖν δοξή, line 103), contention is the norm (ἐφρούσα μόνον ἵς μάχην κορύσσεται, line 105.) A man stands by, oblivious (κεχνύτοσ...ἀνδρός, line 110) to his wife's outrage (ἀμβωμένη, line 109), while perceptive neighbors laugh at his obtuseness (χαίροντες...ἴσ ταχάνεις, line 111). Men quick to blame other men's wives (τὴν δὲ τοῦτον μωμήσεται, line 113), overlook their own wives' faults and even praise them (ἔχοστος αἴνηστι γυναῖκα, lines 112-113.) By including himself among men who lack the foresight to know that, in marrying, all men suffer the same, unavoidable ill fate
Semonides takes the sharp edge off his reproach. In the last two lines of the poem, he flatters his male audience by reminding them that they form an unbroken line stretching back to the heroes who died in battle for the sake of a single woman, Helen (ιε οδ του...γυναικος ενεκι δηπερωνους, lines 117-18.) Semonides' use of Helen here, whose self-reproach for shamelessness (κυνωνιδος, II. 3. 180) was surely well-known to his audience, enables them to identify their own wives with the most famous animal-wife and helps to return his focus to the animal-like character (νοσ) of all women.70

We have seen that Semonides uses animal imagery liberally in his iamboi to deride individuals and that, at least in his extant fragments, he focuses his censure at entire groups of individuals. On the whole, he maintains an impersonal attitude in his fragments. Personal address is held to a minimum; the addressee of fr. 1 W is neither identified by name nor mentioned again after the opening address. Semonides' use of the first person, however uncommon, serves to take the sharp edge off his rebuke, and enables him to achieve a humorous tone. Semonides uses familiar animal images to define the limits of his ridicule. He does not, however, restrict himself to purely negative animal attributes, but also takes neutral or positive characteristics and makes them appear negative.
Any conclusions to be drawn about the uses of animal imagery in epic and lyric poetry, their differences, and the differences among individual lyric poets must be qualified. The number of lyric poetry fragments which have survived is small and in many cases those fragments have been badly damaged. In addition, the modern reader is dependent upon an ancient author's recollections of the poet's actual words and these may be faulty. Therefore, one must use caution in making absolute statements about the use of animal imagery by lyric poets.

It is obvious that animal imagery was an important device for both epic and lyric poets. We have seen that the selection of animal imagery and its use are a reflection of the poet's intent. Epic poets, principally concerned with narrating a story whose themes tend to be lofty, choose images which will complement their narrative. The animal imagery used aids in describing background scenes or individuals more vividly; in the case of individuals, animal simile is used. Abusive animal imagery, when used, supplements the narrative and is not intended to be taken as the poet's personal statement. There are no animal-fables in the Odyssey.

Animal imagery is especially prominent in the personal iamboi of Archilochus and Semonides and is an effective vehicle for their abuse. The reproach, which
may be personal or impersonal, is most often delivered by means of a simile-like comparison between the individual and the animal with regard to specific attributes that are positive, negative, or neutral. The abuse is effective because the animals and their attributes are chosen for their familiar associations to the audience. Many of these associations, such as the dog as pariah, result from earlier use of the imagery in epic poetry.

Archilochus and Semonides differ somewhat in their treatment of animal imagery. Archilochus is, by far, the more personal poet, frequently directing his abuse at specific, named individuals while Semonides targets whole groups of individuals for his censure. Animal fable is most conspicuous in Archilochus' poetry. He uses the fable to effect the impersonal posture which characterizes Semonides in his poetry. That Archilochus favors using the fox image in his poetry may reflect his own identification with the variable temperament of the fox. Semonides does not seem to have a preference for a specific animal. Finally, Archilochus uses implied comparisons more often than does Semonides.

This survey has set out to explore the ways in which animal imagery is used derisively in the iambic poetry of Archilochus and Semonides. While the poetry has long interested scholars, no one has sought to compare and
contrast these poets with regard to the imagery that appears to have been most common in the iambic poetry which each was credited with originating.
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16. There is no doubt about the subject matter of fr. 43 W, an iambic trimeter fragment with sexually explicit language. It is not clear what circumstances prompted the words, "His penis rose like that of a corn-fed ass from Priene." The ass (ἔψωγ) was commonly associated with sexual insatiability.


20. E. Riess, "Comment and Conjecture on Ancient Poetry: the Crow", *CW* 37 (1943-1944) 178-179, for his view that Archilochus interpreted Homer's line in an obscene fashion; also discussion of the ritual "korone" of Aelian.


22. West, (supra n 2) 123f. West prefers to obelize the κορώνας of the scholiast which Dover accepts as another of Archilochus' terms for prostitute.

23. The papyrus is very fragmentary but West's reading is reasonable.

24. The numbering system employed by Perry is adopted throughout, B. E. Perry, *Aesopica* (Urbana: 1952) 413.

26. For a discussion of the possible sexual context of this fragment in view of the recent discovery of the Cologne Papyrus, see Burnett, (supra n. 9) 74f.

27. The story told by Odysseus to Eumaeus in the Odyssey, 14. 459ff., qualifies as a fable by its form and function, but may be of late date; B. E. Perry, "Fable", *Studium Generale* 12 (1959) 23.

28. Perry, (supra n. 24) ix.

29. Perry, (supra n. 27) 20.

30. Perry, (supra n. 27) 24. For the two other phases in the development of fable, 29.

32. Few words of the fragment are readable. The meal and children of the eagle are an emendation.


34. West, (supra n. 2) 134, sees this line as an articulation of the real transgressor's hope to go unpunished. Also West, "Archilochus' Fox and Eagle: More Echoes in Later Poetry", ZPE 45 (1982) 30-32.

35. Archibald (supra n. 31) 11ff. has a list of fable "types" and a discussion of the classification of these types as highly personal, somewhat personal, and impersonal.

36. Archibald, (supra n. 31) 51.

37. Burnett, (supra n. 9) 64.


40. Archibald, (supra n. 31) 52.

41. See fr. 5 W for an example of Archilochus laughing at himself.

42. Campbell, (supra n. ) 160, points out that Bowra has suggested that this is part of a fable. (Perry 427), the fable of the hedgehog, the fox and the dog-ticks does not appear to be related.

43. For the adversarial role of the fox and the hedgehog, see Aelian, N. A. 6. 24, 64.


45. Burnett, (supra n. 9) 60.
46. Many fragments lack any context at all. Athenaeus quotes several fragments which may deal with food imagery. The eel figures in two fragments, 8 W and 9.1 W. Fr. 8 W may be sexual in nature. It says only, "like an eel beneath the sediment". Fr. 9.1 W may have contained an animal fable. It says only, "For a heron (ἀρσενικός) finding a hawk (τριφόρος) eating a Maeandrian eel (ἴγχελαν) took it away." Another fr., 24 W, speaks of butchering a pig and cutting it in ritual fashion. It is not clear in what context any of these fragments may have been recited, but they seem somehow Aristophanic.

47. The variant reading, δὴ βρωτόλ ζώομεν, at line 4, is accepted by other authors, including Campbell. This survey adopts West's reading of ἄ δὴ βοτὰ ζώονειν.

48. Placement of the words χωρίς and νός at the beginning and end of the first line of the poem seem to emphasize this separateness.


50. Lloyd-Jones, (supra n. 49) 65 n. 3. "Marg and Verdenius both think the poet writes as if the animal and the woman were the same...".

51. This image recalls the Homeric simile in which Ajax, driven from battle reluctantly, is compared to a stubborn ass who is reluctantly driven from a cornfield (Il. 11. 558f.).

52. Reading ἀληνής with Lloyd-Jones, based on the gloss of Hesychius which gives μαγιστρόνος as a synonym. West text has ἀδηνής, "unskilled", but as Lloyd-Jones points out, "frenzied" makes better sense in the context, Lloyd-Jones, (supra n. 49) 77f.


56. Hesiod, Op. 373, cautions against being deceived by a woman who pads her bottom (πυγοστόλος).


58. Lloyd-Jones, (supra n. 49) 83f. n. 79, points this out, citing Euripides' character, Medea, as possessing this sentiment.

59. Compare with the use in Homeric simile, Od. 6. 233ff., where an ἄνθρωο is described as "taught every sort of art by Hephaestus and Pallas Athena"; Hes. Op. 778, where the ant is called "the provident one", using this adjective.

60. Archilochus' use of fox image in animal fable and proverb illustrates this variability of temperament.

61. Saara, (supra n. 6) 45.

62. Both λιτοργόν and ἄφροκωλος are "hapax legomena" and difficult to translate. West's interpretation, "a very mother", or "busybody", is adopted here. West, (supra n. 2) 178.

63. Compare with Od. 14. 29ff., where Odysseus is held at bay by barking dogs at Eumæus' hut; Od. 20. 14ff., where Odysseus is likened to bitch protecting her pups who barks and wants to attack strangers.
64. Some scholars interpret this passage as referring to the bitch-woman's shamelessness, citing Helen's likening herself to bitch in the Iliad, or identifying the bitch-woman to Scylla. There appears to be nothing in the passage to indicate shamelessness is implied. Semonides' image is very close to the Od. 14 image cited above (n. 63), including stones and threats hurled against dogs.

65. Paris going into battle, Il. 6. 506ff., is likened to a proud stallion who tosses its mane. For citations of later authors on the vanity of horses regarding their manes, see Gerber, (supra n. 19) 61 n. 57.

66. Lloyd-Jones, on the adjective and its use in Sappho, Anacreon, and Alcaeus. It is used to derogate a servant in Bacchylides. Washing in warm water was seen at least as early as fifth-century, in Athens, Lloyd-Jones (supra n. 49) 79f.

67. M. Detienne, The Gardens of Adonis, trans. J. Lloyd (Sussex, England: 1977), 78f., "The married women who take part in the Thesmophoria are given the ritual title of Melissai...and this insect—which, on an animal level symbolises the wife, the epitomy of domestic virtues—has an uncontrollable aversion to seduction and debauchery."

68. Hesiod, Theog. 594ff., likens women to the drones who enjoy the fruits of the labor of the worker bees, to whom men are likened.

69. Pietro Pucci, Hesiod and the Language of Poetry (Baltimore: 1977) 109, on Hesiod's portrayal of women in the Theogony and Works and Days, says "Women, sitting where they do not belong, inside the houses of men, appropriate and waste the property of others, the fruit of others' labor. They contradict, therefore, the principle of gathering wealth, which depends on the patient accumulation of things inside the house, brought in little by little from outside".

70. It is not certain whether the poem continued with further examples of famous females who illustrate specific features of the animal character.
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