SOCIETAS DANICA INDAGATIONIS ANTIQVITATIS ET MEDII AEVI

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA

Danish Journal of Philology and History

EDITED BY

Thomas Heine Nielsen & Christian Ammitzbøll Thomsen

EDITORIAL BOARD

George Hinge · Heine Hansen · Jesper Carlsen · Leo Catana

Marianne Pade · Réka Forrai · Trine Arlund Hass · William Kynan-Wilson

VOLUME 68

2020

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA · VOL. 68

© 2020

Composition by George Hinge

ISSN 0106-5815

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PHEREKYDES VON ATHEN: STRUKTUR DER *HISTORIAI* (ODER: DER LÄNGERE WEG VON ATHEN BIS ALEXANDRIA)*

Von Jordi Pàmias

Summary: The original structure of Pherekydes' mythographical collection remains a controversial issue. Its rearrangement in the Hellenistic period did not merely consist of a new division of the books by taking the length of the rolls into account. The article attempts to show that the overall structure of the *Historiai* underwent a major revision in the library of Alexandria. The author advances the theory that Pherekydes' work was reorganized into an encyclopaedia of *historiai* arranged alphabetically.

§ 0. Nach der trefflichen Behandlung von Fowler (1999) kann die Existenz von zwei Pherekydes (nämlich, Pherekydes von Syros: Theologe und Kosmologe; und Pherekydes von Athen: Mythograph und Genealoge) als *verité acquise* gelten.[1] Wir wollen uns mit dieser Frage also nicht aufhalten. Dennoch bleibt das Ordnungsprinzip der *Historiai*, das weitgehend zum Hauptproblem der pherekydeischen Forschung geworden ist, noch

* Meine Forschungen zu Pherekydes begannen dank eines DAAD Stipendiums im Jahre 2003 am Institut für Altertumskunde der Universität zu Köln. Meinem Betreuer, Prof. José L. García Ramón, danke ich für die freundschaftliche Zusammenarbeit. Einige vorläufige Resultate wurden auf den mythographischen Master-Seminaren in Paris Ouest-Nanterre (mit Charles Delattre und Michel Briand) vorgestellt. Weitere Aspekte der Scholienliteratur konnte ich mit Bob Fowler, Nereida Villagra und Joan Pagès diskutieren. Für die Korrekturen des deutschen Textes danke ich Miroslav Angelov und dem anonymen Gutachter dieser Zeitschrift.

1 S. auch Pàmias 2005.

immer ungeklärt. Sturz, Jacoby, von Gutschmid, Bertsch, Wilamowitz, Uhl, Fritz und Fowler haben sich mit dieser Frage mannigfaltig auseinandergesetzt, sind aber zu völlig verschiedenen Schlussfolgerungen gekommen. Die Auffassungen reichen von radikalen Aussichten, denen zufolge keinerlei Ordnung gegeben ist (Wilamowitz), über solche, die *grosso modo* auf der Struktur der Apollodorischen *Bibliothek* basieren (Jacoby, Sturz), bis hin zu solchen, die anspruchsvoll sind (die *Historiai* seien nach breiten Genealogien ausgebildet: Uhl, Dolcetti, Fowler). Wir wollen aber auch auf diese Frage nicht weiter eingehen.[2] In allen Fällen wird das pherekydeische Werk als eine historische Invarianz betrachtet. Es wird ja eine Überarbeitung des Werkes im alexandrinischen Zeitalter angenommen. Nach der *communis opinio* besteht diese Überarbeitung jedoch nur in einer rein mechanisch neu vorgenommenen Verteilung auf 10 Bücher nach der Länge der Rolle.[3]

Nicht eingehen möchte ich auf eine solche nicht klärbare Frage, da die ursprüngliche Form des pherekydeischen Textes, nach den spärlichen Überresten, die wir lesen können, nicht wiederherzustellen ist. Abgesehen von der Struktur, die das ursprüngliche pherekydeische Werk gehabt haben könnte, soll dieser Beitrag zeigen, dass die *Historiai* in der hellenistischen Zeit vollkommen umstrukturiert worden sind. Das Ordnungsprinzip dieses als eine mythische Enzyklopädie konzipierten Werkes wurde dadurch modifiziert, dass es zu einem Nachschlagewerk umgearbeitet wurde. Im Folgenden soll aufgezeigt werden, dass die neue Anordnung grundsätzlich alphabetisch war.

§ 1. Eine einfache Beobachtung ist bisher ohne Schlussfolgerung geblieben: Pherekydes von Athen, der vor Eratosthenes nicht explizit erwähnt worden ist, wird erst seit dem alexandrinischen Zeitalter reichlich zitiert, umgeschrieben und verschiedenartig benutzt.[4] Besonders häufig rezipierten ihn die Scholiasten und Grammatiker, aber auch Mythographen und Philosophen (als Beispiel sei Philodemos genannt: s. fr. 35c, 83,

2 Ein *status quaestionis* befindet sich in Uhl 1963. Die Struktur der *Historiai* ist zuletzt von Fowler (2013: 710-15) behandelt worden.

3 Fritz 1967b: 63.

4 Obwohl Pherekydes (nach Ruschenbusch 1995; 1999; 2000) im fünften Jahrhundert bekannt war (kritisch: Fowler 2013: 710).

91, 130, 165, 166).[5] Wie ist dieses neue Interesse an seinem Werk zu erklären? Natürlich werten Wilamowitz und Toye diese Tatsache zu Gunsten ihrer Hypothese, Pherekydes sei eine alexandrinische Konstruktion, nämlich ein Produkt der eratosthenischen Philologie.[6]

Eine neue Behandlung dieses Phänomens sollte davon ausgehen, dass im alexandrinischen Zeitalter neue Leseformen und Arten der Wissensproduktion sowie des Wissenskonsums entstanden sind. Wie allgemein anerkannt, entwickelte sich dieser neue Umgang mit den Texten in der alexandrinischen Bibliothek, einem Zentrum, in dem die schriftliche Erinnerung der griechischen und barbarischen Welt ausgewertet wurde.

Die außerordentliche Menge der in der Bibliothek gesammelten Bücher forderte von vornherein neue Verfahren der Informationsbearbeitung und -behandlung. Wie Christian Jacob gezeigt hat, sind solche Operationen weit komplizierter, als es aussieht, da sie Prozesse von Extraktion, Dekontextualisierung und neu vorgenommener Distribution von mannigfaltigen Materialien voraussetzen, die zu neuen *dispositifs intertextuels* umgearbeitet werden.[7] Die dadurch hergestellten Produkte verdinglichen und kondensieren die Daten in einem neuen Rahmen, einer intertextuellen Kreuzung, die ein verwendbares und leicht zugängliches Nachschlagewerk darstellt: Lexika, Kataloge, Genealogien, Chronologien, Enzyklopädien und jede Art von Listenliteratur.[8] Der Konsum von Wissen wird also durch ökonomisches Lesen ermöglicht. So ist ein neues Profil eines Lesers entstanden, der auf der Suche nach präzisen und benutzerfreundlichen Informationen kein lineares bzw. sequenzielles Lesen ausübt, sondern vielmehr ein fragmentarisches oder diskontinuierliches.

Um ein voluminöses und enzyklopädisches Werk wie das von Pherekydes (das 10 Rollen umfasste; vgl. die auf 9 Bücher verteilten *Historiai* Herodots) zugänglich und handlich zu machen, muss das gesamte mythographische Material so angeordnet sein, dass es praktisch zu lesen und ökonomisch nachzuschlagen ist. Worin bestand dieses Ordnungs-

5 Was Apollodoros angeht, s. Van der Valk 1958.

6 S. Wilamowitz 1926; Toye 1997.

7 Jacob 1998.

8 Für die Liste als Weg zur „domestication of the savage mind" s. Goody 1977: 80-111.

prinzip des pherekydeischen Werkes? Wie ist diese auf 10 Bücher verteilte Enzyklopädie der heldischen und olympischen Mythologie der Griechen konzipiert?[9]

Von nun an basiert unsere Behandlung des mythographischen Materials auf den folgenden zwei methodologischen Grundlagen:

a) Jeder Rekonstruktions- und Anordnungsversuch des Werkes muss sich ausschließlich auf die Fragmente konzentrieren, deren Buchnummer durch die handschriftliche Überlieferung eindeutig belegt ist. Fragmente ohne Buchnummer und Fragmente, deren Nummer durch die moderne Textkritik wiederhergestellt worden sind, sollen beiseite gelassen werden. Zum Beispiel wird fr. 24 seit Müllers Ausgabe in das 5. Buch eingeordnet. Die Handschrift enthält jedoch lediglich ἐνεω (ἐν πέμπτῳ entsteht bloß als Konjektur). Es muss daher unklar bleiben, zu welchem Buch der *Historiai* fr. 24 gehört.
b) Fragmentsammler vergessen oft den Kontext, in dem ein Autor zitiert wird. Dabei müssen die Zusammenhänge der Zitate analysiert und aufgearbeitet werden. Die Operationen bzw. ihre innere Logik, wie sie die Kommentatoren, Mythographen, Grammatiker und Scholiasten beim Zitieren angewandt haben, sollen also wiederhergestellt werden. Dabei ist zu berücksichtigen, dass sie als Autoren und nicht bloß als Vermittler zwischen der Quelle (Pherekydes) und uns behandelt werden müssen. Es ist also notwendig:
    i) die Ziele zu bestimmen, die sich ein Autor (Kommentator, Grammatiker usw.) setzt, wenn er auf eine Quelle zurückgreift.
    ii) einzuschätzen, inwieweit eine solche *auctoritas* den Text aufklären kann, den es zu interpretieren gilt (z. B. die *Argonautika* des Apollonios Rhodios)
    iii) das Verfahren zurückzuverfolgen, durch das der Kommentator die Quelle erreicht hat (in diesem Fall Pherekydes).

9 Vgl. Fritz 1967b: 62-63: „so ist gleich zu Anfang schwer zu sagen, warum im ersten Buch Achilles, Aias und Asklepios behandelt wurden und im zweiten Buch Perseus und Herakles darauf folgten“.

Erst wenn wir im Stande sind, den Prozess wiederherzustellen, durch den ein Autor eine Quelle herausgefunden hat, können wir den *locus*, von dem ein bestimmtes Zitat herkommt, identifizieren und in das Werk einordnen. Unsere Untersuchung verschiebt also den Aufmerksamkeitsfokus vom zitierten zum zitierenden Autor. Oder besser gesagt: unsere Auffassung hält das Zitierverfahren für eine multidirektionelle Lesepraxis, die den kommentierten Autor (z. B. Apollonios Rhodios), den zitierten Autor (in diesem Fall Pherekydes) und den zitierenden Autor (der Scholiast zu den *Argonautika* des Apollonios Rhodios) in einer intertextuellen Kreuzung verbindet. Der Aufbau und die Anordnung der Fragmente ergeben sich nicht aus einer vertikalen unidirektionalen Quellenforschung, sondern vielmehr aus den vielfältigen und reziproken Reflexen, die die drei Fokusse dieses hermeneutischen Dreiecks ausstrahlen.

§ 2. Jetzt seien einige Fragmente beobachtet, die das Verfahren der Kommentatoren bzw. Scholiasten klar widerspiegeln.[10]

> Φερεκύδης ἐν τῇ θ′ φησὶν ὅτι Ἔλατος ὁ Ἰκαρίου γαμεῖ Ἐριμήδην τὴν Δαμασίκλου· τῶν δὲ γίνεται Ταίναρος, ἀφ᾽ οὗ Ταίναρον καλεῖται ἡ πόλις καὶ ἡ ἄκρη καὶ ὁ λιμήν. (Pherekydes fr. 39 Fowler = *Sch. A.R.* 1.101-104b)[11]

Der Scholiast versucht hiermit, das Adjektiv Ταιναρίην in den *Argonautika* des Apollonios zu erklären (1.101-102: Θησέα δ᾽ … / Ταιναρίην ἀίδηλος ὑπὸ χθόνα δεσμὸς ἔρυκε). Darauf führt er den eponymen Helden zurück. Diesbezüglich ist die Verfolgung der Genealogie von Tainaros, die von dem pherekydeischen Fragment überliefert wird, jedoch absolut belanglos, weil es nur darum geht, einen Grund für den Ortsnamen Tainaros anzuführen. Genau durch die willkürliche Belanglosigkeit dieser überflüssigen Information wird jedoch die Zitierweise des Kommentators deutlich. Wie hat er die Genealogie des Tainaros in den zehnbändigen monumentalen *Historiai* des Pherekydes tatsächlich herausgefun-

10 Über die Kontinuität zwischen Kommentatoren und Scholiasten s. Arrighetti 1987: 191; Wilson 2007.

11 Der griechische Text wird aus der Ausgabe Fowlers (2000) zitiert.

den? Es ist zu vermuten, dass der Apollonioskommentator über ein System zur Datenwiederfindung der *Historiai* verfügt, das ihm ermöglicht, die Information verhältnismäßig leicht wiederzugewinnen. Diese ist möglicherweise durch ein *lemma* Ταίναρος angeführt, da dieser Begriff *der einzige Anhaltspunkt* ist, der den pherekydeischen Text mit dem Apollonios-Text verknüpft.

Ebenso geht der Odysseescholiast vor (11.264-265: ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν ἀπύργωτόν γ' ἐδύναντο / ναιέμεν εὐρύχορον Θήβην):

> διὰ τί οὐκ ἠδύναντο κατοικεῖν ἀπυργώτου οὔσης; διὰ τὸ πλησιόχωρα εἶναι ἔθνη πολλὰ δηλονότι τοὺς Φλεγύας. μετὰ δὲ τὴν τελευτὴν αὐτῶν Εὐρύμαχος ἠρήμωσε τὰς Θήβας, ὥς φησι Φερεκύδης ἐν τῇ δεκάτῃ (Pherekydes fr. 41b Fowler = *Sch. Hom. Od.* 11.264)

Der Kommentator stellt rhetorisch die Frage, weshalb Amphion und Zethos eine unbefestigte Stadt Theben nicht bewohnen könnten (διὰ τί οὐκ ἠδύναντο κατοικεῖν ἀπυργώτου οὔσης;). Die Antwort liegt bei den Phlegyen, einem brutalen und skrupellosen Volk. Die Tatsache, dass das Scholion bedeutungslose Einzelheiten zum Verständnis des homerischen Verses enthält (z. B. die Erwähnung von Eurymachos) soll uns nicht vom Wesentlichen ablenken. Dem Scholiasten ist es gelungen, eine Verbindung zwischen der *Odyssee* und Pherekydes zu schaffen, indem er die Phlegyen erwähnt. Es kann also mit einem von dem Stichwort Φλεγύαι angeführten Artikel im zehnten Buch der *Historiai* des Pherekydes (ὥς φησι Φερεκύδης ἐν τῇ δεκάτῃ) gerechnet werden.

Wir können das Verfahren, dem der Iliasscholiast auch gefolgt ist (24.617), um den Schmerz der in Stein verwandelten Niobe zu erklären (ἔνθα λίθος περ ἐοῦσα θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει), in den folgenden Textpassage beobachten:

> Φερεκύδης δὲ ἐν η′· ἡ δὲ Νιόβη ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄχεος ἀναχωρεῖ εἰς Σίπυλον καὶ ὁρᾷ τὴν πόλιν ἀνεστραμμένην καὶ Ταντάλῳ λίθον ἐπικρεμάμενον· ἀρᾶται δὲ τῷ Διΐ λίθος γενέσθαι. ῥεῖ δὲ ἐξ αὐτῆς δάκρυα καὶ πρὸς ἄρκτον ὁρᾷ (Pherekydes fr. 38 Fowler = *Sch. Hom. Il.* 24.617)

Um die ἱστορία der Niobe in *irgendeinem* der 10 Bücher des Pherekydes ausfindig zu machen, musste der Zugang zu dieser Information offensichtlich durch ein Suchsystem erleichtert werden. Ein λῆμμα, das die ἱστορία von Niobe anführte, befand sich also im 8. Buch der *Historiai*.

Ein letztes Beispiel sei behandelt. Es ist anzunehmen, dass das λῆμμα Kadmos die Genealogie und die wichtigsten Episoden des Kadmosstammbaumes einführte. Diese erstreckten sich über das 4. und 5. Buch (fr. 21-22). Κάδμος und sein Agenoriden-Geschlecht ist tatsächlich der Verbindungspunkt, der den Text von Apollonios (3.1186: Κάδμος Ἀγηνορίδης) und den Text von Pherekydes vereinigt (fr. 21):

> Ἀγήνωρ δὲ ὁ Ποσειδῶνος γαμεῖ Δαμνὼ τὴν Βήλου. τῶν δὲ γίνονται Φοῖνιξ καὶ Ἰσαίη, ἣν ἴσχει Αἴγυπτος, καὶ Μελία, ἣν ἴσχει Δαναός. ἔπειτεν ἴσχει Ἀγήνωρ Ἀργιόπην τὴν Νείλου τοῦ ποταμοῦ· τῶν δὲ γίνεται Κάδμος.

Um dem Einwand zuvorzukommen, es gäbe eigentlich zwei Worte, die Pherekydes und Apollonios verknüpfen (Κάδμος und Ἀγηνορίδης) und folglich zwei mögliche λήμματα in den *Historiai*, sei der Zwiespalt genauer betrachtet, in dem sich der Kommentator befunden haben mag. Das Scholion lautet: οἱ μὲν Ἀγήνορος λέγουσι τὸν Κάδμον, οἱ δὲ Φοίνικος. Φερεκύδης δὲ ἐν δ' οὕτω φησίν· Ἀγήνωρ – Κάδμος. Vor die Frage gestellt, wer nun eigentlich die Vorfahren des Kadmos gewesen sind, sucht der Kommentator die Antwort unter dem λῆμμα Kadmos bei Pherekydes, das sich im Buch 4 befindet. Die zwischen γαμεῖ und Δαναός liegende Information, die übrigens für das Verständnis des Adjektivs Ἀγηνορίδης bei Apollonios irrelevant ist, lässt die Annahme zu, dass die *Historiai* den genealogischen Aufbau des pherekydeischen Originalwerkes auch nach der von den alexandrinischen Gelehrten vorgenommenen Umstrukturierung zu Teilen beibehielten.

§ 3. Mit anderen Worten: um einen Zugang zur Quelle zu erhalten, benötigt der Kommentator ein praktisches und leistungsfähiges Lokalisierungs- und Durchsuchungssystem. Eine praktikable und möglicherweise die praktischste Klassifizierungsform der kompilatorischen Werke ist die

alphabetische. Die alphabetische Anordnung war in Alexandria tatsächlich bekannt und weitgehend benutzt (z. B. von Kallimachos bei den Πίνακες).[12] Aber auch schon vorher wurden lexikalische und glossographische Arbeiten alphabetisch zusammengesetzt. Das erste alphabetisch angelegte Wörterbuch waren die Γλῶσσαι des Zenodotos von Ephesos.[13] Auch wurden weitere kompilatorische Werke unterschiedlicher Art nach diesem Ordnungsprinzip umgeordnet. Als Beispiel seien die Attizisten genannt (für Aelius s. fr. 323 Schwabe; für Pausanias s. fr. 151 Schwabe); Autorenglossaren und -lexika (wie das Hippokrateslexikon von Erotian oder jenes von Herodot). Ähnliches geschah mit den homerischen Epimerismen, mit den parömiographischen Sammlungen (wie der des Zenobios) und mit den paradoxographischen Sammlungen (z. B. Philons Παράδοξος ἱστορία).[14] Dasselbe ist ebenfalls bei den Fabelkompilationen (wie einige von Aisopos, wo die Fabeln alphabetisch nach den ersten Buchstaben des erstes Wortes der Erzählung umgeordnet werden) zu beobachten.[15]

Die alphabetische Anordnung literarischer Produktionen jeder Art breitete sich also nach dem ersten alexandrinischen Zeitalter aus.[16] Ein gutes Beispiel dafür sind die komplizierten Tätigkeiten, die die exegetischen und monographischen Werke der alexandrinischen Gelehrten (ὑπομνήματα) in die lexikalischen Sammlungen verwandelten (λέξεις).[17] Man muss ebenso annehmen, dass die gigantische Umsetzungsarbeit eines umfassenden Werkes, wie dasjenige des Pherekydes, zahlreiche Hände und verschiedene Phasen erforderte. Und zwar: a) Gliederung des ursprünglichen Diskurses in verschiedene Einheiten, die die Scholienli-

12 S. Schmidt 1922: 86-89; Blum 1977: 234-35; 262; Krevans 2011: 122; Dubischar 2015, 571-73.

13 Vgl. Alpers 1975: 113.

14 Vgl. *Suda s.v.* Παλαίφατος Ἀβυδηνός [...] ὡς Φίλων ἐν τῷ ει στοιχείῳ (vgl. Schepens 1996: 395).

15 Ein Überblick befindet sich in Daly 1967: 26-44.

16 Daly 1967: 41.

17 S. Arrighetti 1987: 194-204; Tosi 1994: 172-74. Dieses Verfahren war alles andere als eine „normal, common-sense epitomization", wie West (1970: 289) es wollte.

teratur unter dem t.t. ἱστορίαι kennt. Sie können außer Mythen auch ethnische bzw. geographische Nachrichten enthalten (s. fr. 5);[18] b) Eintragung eines λῆμμα, das die jeweilige ἱστορία einleitet; c) alphabetische Umordnung dieser Einheiten (möglicherweise nach dem ersten Buchstaben, da die Zwei- bzw. Dreibuchstabenordnung und die vollkommene Ordnung eine verhältnismäßig neue Errungenschaft ist).[19]

Der Vergleich zwischen den umstrukturierten *Historiai* des Pherekydes und den hypomnematischen und exegetischen Werken ist damit nicht willkürlich. Einige durch Didymos überlieferte Zitate sind ein gutes Beispiel dafür, wie die Fachwerke exzerpiert und umgeordnet wurden, um zu zugänglichen Nachschlagewerken überarbeitet werden zu können.[20] Einige von ihnen seien jetzt behandelt:

> λέξις Ἀριστάρχου ἐκ τοῦ Α τῆς Ἰλιάδος ὑπομνήματος· ‘τὸ μὲν μετ’ ἀμύμονας κτλ.’ (*Sch. Hom. Il.* 1.423-24; p. 119 Erbse)
>
> τούτῳ καὶ λέξις ὑπόκειται διὰ τοῦ Β τῶν ὑπομνημάτων (*Sch. Hom. Il.* 2.420; p. 274 Erbse)
>
> Ἀριστάρχου λέξεις ἐκ ὑπομνημάτων: ‘ἐὰν καὶ τὰ παιδία κτλ.’ (*Sch. Hom. Il.* 2.125; p. 206 Erbse)

Didymos hatte also eine Auswahl der exegetischen Werke des Aristarchos vor Augen, die unter dem Namen λέξις bekannt war und höchstwahrscheinlich alphabetisch angeordnet wurde. Ebenso waren die umgearbeiteten ἱστορίαι des Pherekydes nach dem λῆμμα, das sie jeweils einleitete, alphabetisch angelegt. Die nummerierten Fragmente des Pherekydes können bequem nach den Kriterien eingeordnet werden, die wir gerade wiederhergestellt haben. Wie wir gezeigt haben, enthielt

18 Die alexandrinischen Gelehrten, die das Werk überarbeiteten, haben auf die Bewahrung der Genealogien des pherekydeischen Originals geachtet (z. B. fr. 2, 8, 21). Darum mussten sich Namen und Personen wiederholen. In der Fachliteratur ist Pherekydes als Genealoge bekannt.

19 Daly 1967: 32-44. Der erste Beleg einer vollkommenen alphabetischen Ordnung ist Galens Hippokrateslexikon (τῶν Ἱπποκράτους γλώσσων ἐξήγησις: Daly 1967: 34-35).

20 S. Arrighetti 1987: 200.

das 10. Buch der *Historiai* die Stichwörter, die mit dem Buchstaben Φ anfangen (Φλεγύαι; s. *supra* fr. 41b); das 9. Buch enthielt mindestens den Buchstaben T (Ταίναρος; *supra* fr. 39); das 8. Buch hatte das N (s. *supra* fr. 38: Νιόβη) und das 4. umfasste das K (Κάδμος); die Heraklesabenteuer (H) verteilten sich auf einen Teil des 2. und einen Teil des 3. Buches; das 1. Buch behandelte Αἴας, Ἀχιλλεύς (s. fr. 1-3; vgl. oben Anm. n. 9) und vielleicht auch Ἀσκληπιός, obwohl die Götter und die Theogonie in den *Historiai* einen geringen Raum einnahmen. Pherekydes ist als Genealoge bekannt und tatsächlich befassen sich seine Fragmente größtenteils mit der Heldenmythologie und -genealogie.[21]

Es ist daher nachvollziehbar, dass diejenigen Philologen, die glauben, dass die *Historiai* des Pherekydes ursprünglich eine genealogische Struktur hatten, die historisch tradiert wurde, sich vergeblich mit einer besonderen Herausforderung auseinandersetzen müssen: einen Raum für die Theogonie (im ersten Buch?) zu finden. In dem letzten Versuch einer Wiederherstellung des pherekydeischen Werkes (nämlich im monumentalen Kommentar von Robert Fowler) wird auf ein konkretes Ergebnis verzichtet: „On any reconstruction there is too much already assigned to book 1 to leave sufficient room for a theogony."[22] Im Gegensatz dazu befanden sich nach unserer Einstellung die Behandlung der Götter und eventuell ihre genealogischen Verbindungen je nach der alphabetischen Ordnung des Namen an verschiedenen Orten des Textes.

Für die Zielsetzung dieses Beitrags ist es nicht notwendig, auf weitere Beispiele einzugehen oder zu versuchen, jedes nicht nummerierte Fragment in das Prokrustesbett hineinzuzwängen, denn es wird nur eine Untersuchungsmethode vorgeschlagen. Unabhängig davon, welches die ursprüngliche Struktur der pherekydeischen *Historiai* gewesen sei, versucht unsere Annäherung an die älteste Form des Textes heranzukommen, sofern diese sich rekonstruieren lässt. Das führt uns zu der hellenistischen Periode zurück, als zum ersten Mal in der griechischen Literatur die Gelehrten aus Alexandria den Mythographen Pherekydes erwähnten und benutzten. Die ursprünglichen *Historiai* erlitten in der raf-

21 S. Anm. 18.

22 Fowler 2013: 715. Vgl. Fowler 2013: 713: "To turn finally to the problematic book 1, the attributed fragments present us with a bewildering variety of subjects".

finierten und gelehrten Atmosphäre der Bibliothek einen Umstrukturierungsprozess, der es ermöglichte, von da an diese monumentale Kollektion von Mythen als Nachschlagewerk und als Inspirationsquelle zu nutzen.[23]

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Alpers, K. 1975. 'Lloyd W. Daly: Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Brüssel: Latomus 1967' *Gnomon* 47, 113-17.

Arrighetti, G. 1977. 'Fra erudizione e biografia' *SCO* 26, 13-67.

Arrighetti, G. 1987. *Poeti, eruditi e biografi. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*. Pisa.

Bertsch, H. 1898. *Pherekydeische Studien*. Tauberbischofsheim.

Blum, R. 1977. *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnung bei den Griechen. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Bibliographie*. Frankfurt am Main.

Daly, L.W. 1967. *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Bruxelles.

Dolcetti, P. 2004. *Ferecide di Atene. Testimonianze e frammenti. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*. Alessandria.

Dubischar, M. 2015. 'Typology of Philological Writings' in F. Montanari, S. Matthaios & A. Rengakos (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Volume 1. *History. Disciplinary Profiles*. Leiden & Boston, 545-99.

Fowler, R.L. 1999. 'The Authors Named Pherekydes' *Mnemosyne* 52, 1-15.

Fowler, R.L. 2000. *Early Greek Mythography. I. Texts*. Oxford.

Fowler, R.L. 2013. *Early Greek Mythography. II. Commentary*. Oxford.

Fritz, K. von 1967a. *Die Griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Band I. Von den Anfängen bis Thukydides. Text*. Berlin.

Fritz, K. von 1967b. *Die Griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Band I. Von den Anfängen bis Thukydides. Anmerkungen*. Berlin.

Goody, J. 1977. *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge, MA.

Gutschmid, A. von 1893. 'Aus Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der griechischen Historiographie' in F. Rühl (ed.) *Kleine Schriften von Alfred von Gutschmid. Vierter Band*. Leipzig, 279-335.

23 S. Pàmias 2008: 20-26.

Jacob, Ch. 1998. 'La bibliothèque, la carte et le traité. Les formes de l'accumulation du savoir à Alexandrie' in G. Argoud & J.-Y. Guillaumin (eds.) *Sciences exactes et sciences appliquées à Alexandrie*. Saint-Étienne, 19-37.

Jacoby, F. 1947. 'The First Athenian Prose-Writer' *Mnemosyne* 13, 13-64.

Krevans, N. 2011. 'Callimachus' Philology' in B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus & S. Stephens (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*. Leiden & Boston, 118-33.

Pàmias, J. 2005. 'Ferecides de Siros y Ferecides de Atenas. Una nueva aproximación' *CFC(G)* 15, 27-34.

Pàmias, J. 2008. *Ferecides d'Atenes, Històries*. Vol. I. *Introducció, edició crítica, traducció i notes*. Barcelona.

Regenbogen, O. 1950. 'Πίναξ (3)' *RE* XX.2. Stuttgart, 1409-82.

Ruschenbusch, E. 1995. 'Eine schriftliche Quelle im Werk Herodots (FGrHist 3, Pherekydes von Athen)' in M. Weinmann-Walser (ed.) *Historische Interpretationen. Gerold Walser zum 75. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. Stuttgart, 131-49.

Ruschenbusch, E. 1999. 'Neue Beobachtungen zu Pherekydes von Athen (FGRH 3)' in R. Mellor & L. Tritle (eds.) *Text & Tradition. Studies in Greek History & Historiography in Honor of Mortimer Chambers*. Claremont, 219-37.

Ruschenbusch, E. 2000. 'Weitere Untersuchungen zu Pherekydes von Athen (FGrHist 3)' *Klio* 82, 335-43.

Schepens, G. 1996. 'Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production and Reception. Part I. The Hellenistic Period' in O. Pecere & A. Stramaglia (eds.) *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*. Cassino, 375-409.

Schmidt, F. 1922. *Die Pinakes des Kallimachos*. Berlin.

Sturz, F.W. 1824. *Pherecydis Fragmenta. Editio altera aucta et emendata*. Lipsiae.

Tosi, R. 1994. 'La lessicografia e la paremiografia in età alessandrina ed il loro sviluppo successivo' in F. Montanari (ed.) *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique XL*. Genève, 143-209.

Toye, D.L. 1997. 'Pherekydes of Syros: Ancient Theologian and Genealogist' *Mnemosyne* 50, 530-60.

Uhl, A. 1963. *Pherekydes von Athen. Grundriß und Einheit des Werkes*. München.
Van der Valk, M. 1958. 'On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*' *REG* 71, 100-68.
West, S. 1979. 'Chalcenteric Negligence?' *CQ* 20, 288-96.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von 1905. 'Die griechische Literatur des Altertums' in U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, K. Krumbacher, J. Wackernagel, F. Leo, E. Norden & F. Skutsch *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache. Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Teil I. Abteilung VIII*. Berlin & Leipzig.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von 1926. 'Pherekydes' *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 125-46 [= *Kleine Schriften* V/2. Berlin 1971, 127-56].
Wilson, N.G. 2007. 'Scholiasts and Commentators' *GRBS* 47, 39-70.

Jordi Pàmias
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Jordi.Pamias@uab.cat

CRITICISM AND REWORK OF HOMERIC NARRATIVE IN DIO'S TROJAN DISCOURSE

By Giampiero Scafoglio

Summary: Dio Chrysostom, in his *Trojan Discourse* (speech 11) rewrites the story of the Trojan War in a new and different way (with Trojans' victory over Greeks, the murder of Hector by Achilles, and so on), in contrast with the tale of the *Iliad* and under the pretense of an historical reconstruction. He preys on Homeric narrative techniques (such as the selective and motivated plot of the *Iliad*, and the first-person tale in the *Odyssey*), in order to disprove the traditional version of the legend and to pave the way for a new view. Dio takes a metaliterary and intertextual approach to Homeric epics, insofar as he criticizes and deconstructs their narratives (bearing in mind Homeric criticism by Aristotle and by Alexandrine grammarians), in order to rebuild the story anew. He also provides a *specimen* of generic crossing, since he frames an epic subject in the context of a prose speech that belongs to epidictic oratory and that simulates some historiographical practices.

The *Trojan Discourse* (speech 11) by Dio Chrysostom is a striking example of a 'critical' and 'creative' approach to the Trojan myth and Homeric epics,[1] taking place against the background of the Second Sophistic with its corrosive criticism of the cultural tradition.[2] Indeed, Dio rewrites the story of the Trojan War in a new and different way, in contrast with the

1 On Dio's profile as an intellectual and writer cf. Desideri 1978; Jones 1978; Amato 2014. The *Trojan discourse* is edited with Italian translation and an excellent commentary by Vagnone 2003, from which I quote.

2 On the innovative and 'polemical' reworking of Homeric themes in the cultural context of the Second Sophistic cf. Kindstrand 1973: esp. 13-44, 113-62; Zeitlin 2001; Favreau-Linder 2013; Briand 2015; Bär 2018.

Giampiero Scafoglio 'Criticism and Rework of Homeric Narrative in Dio's *Trojan Discourse*' *C&M* 68 (2020) 15-36.

tale of the *Iliad* and under the pretense of historical objectivity.[3] Evidently imitating Herodotus, he claims to have learned the true story from an Egyptian priest, who in turn found it written in the temples or heard it from an oral tradition handed down from generation to generation: it was Menelaus himself who disclosed the true events, when he came to Egypt after the war.[4]

In this speech, Dio examines some narrative techniques applied in the Homeric epics and tries to prove that they pursue a deceptive aim. In doing so, he conducts a narratological analysis (albeit in an embryonic form) of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. I will focus on Dio's arguments in order to show how he anticipates some approaches and methodological features of modern narratology and, at the same time, how he manipulates and even 'perverts' them, so to say, by interpreting Homeric techniques as deceptive strategies.

The rewriting of the Trojan legend is carried out in two phases: a *pars destruens* (a negative part with criticizing views, notably 1-37) and a *pars construens* (a positive part, stating a new position and arguments, 38-154). The *pars destruens* builds on the defamation of Homer as a poor wanderer accustomed to flattery and adulation because of his misery: a beggar and a liar for a living. Here Dio surprisingly and maliciously manipulates the same tradition on Homer's biography that he appreciated and praised elsewhere.[5] Then he finds all the inconsistencies and contradictions that can be found in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: the same inconsistencies and contradictions that Alexandrian grammarians had found and discussed at the time.[6] Dio handles Alexandrian criticism (the issues and doubts

3 On Dio's reworking of the Trojan myth and Homeric epics in the *Trojan Discourse* cf. Kindstrand 1973: 141-62; Seeck 1990; Gangloff 2006: 122-36; Hunter 2009; Kim 2010: 85-139; Scafoglio 2016.

4 Cf. Dio, *Tro.* 37.2-38.7, taking the cue from Herodotus' λόγος on Egypt (book 2 of the *History*) and in particular from his 'alternative version' about Helen, told by the Egyptian priests (2.112-20: Helen never went to Troy, but stayed in Egypt). On Herodotus' approach to the figure and myth of Helen: de Jong 2012; Saïd 2012.

5 Cf. Dio, *Tro.* 15-16, with Vagnone's commentary 2003: 116. Compare, for instance, the positive view of Homer's life and customs expressed by Dio in his speech 53 (esp. 9).

6 On Homeric criticism in the Hellenistic schools of thought and cultural currents cf. Pasquali 1952: 187-247; Montanari 1998: 1-17. On Dio's approach to this learned material: Vagnone 2003: 17-19.

raised by ancient scholars about many Homeric episodes and passages) as evidence that the two poems are full of lies.[7] In addition, and perhaps more importantly, Dio joins Plato's criticism of Homer's description of the gods (as he already did elsewhere, especially in his *Olympic Discourse*),[8] merging the tool and the aim of the *pars destruens*. He claims that what Homes says about the gods, namely the unworthy feelings and actions that he attributes to them, absolutely cannot be true[9]. This is precisely the reason why Dio disproves and refutes Homer: he cannot accept the mythological view of the gods (with human faults and blemishes) belonging to religious and cultural tradition.[10]

The new and astonishing version of the Trojan legend established by Dio is mainly based on three points:

1) Paris did not abduct Helen: he was her lawful wedded husband; the Greek kings did not accept that the most beautiful girl in the world was married to a foreigner and organized the military expedition, with the real purpose to take over the great wealth of Troy.
2) Achilles did not kill Hector in the decisive duel: on the contrary, it was Hector who killed Achilles; but Homer told exactly the opposite in order to save the honor of the best Greek warrior. Indeed Homer put the (fake) murder of Patroclus by Hector in the place of the (true) murder of Achilles by Hector himself, and then he invented the story of the killing of Hector as Achilles' vengeance.
3) Troy was never conquered by the Greeks. On the contrary, the Trojans won the war and turned the Greeks away. However, at the end of the war, the two peoples were exhausted because of to the

7 Cf. Hunter 2009: 43, who concludes that "the whole project" of the *Trojan discourse* is "a distortion of a recurrent theme of ancient Homeric criticism", namely "the skillfulness and quality of Homer's lies".

8 Cf. Desideri 1980. On Plato's criticism to Homer's anthropomorphic description of the gods (esp. *Resp.* 3.398a-b): Murray 1996: 19-24; Cavarero 2002; Lacore 2003.

9 On Dio's criticism of Homeric religion in the *Trojan Discourse* (esp. 18), in the wake of Plato's remarks, cf. Scafoglio 2016: 457-59.

10 About Homer's authority in Greek religion, it suffices to recall Herodotus, 2.53, and Strabo, 8.3.30. On Dio's religious views, in general, cf. Desideri 2000; Van Nuffelen 2011: 84-90, 147-56.

> fighting and violence: thus, they established peace pacts and treaties, undertaking to never fight again.

The affirmation of these points is made possible by the defamation of Homer as a character and as a poet (based on the surreptitious interpretation of ancient Homeric biographies), and by the exposure of his narrative devices as a deceptive strategy. The latter expedient relies not only on Dio's critical approach to the myth and its specific arrangement in the epic tale, but also on the analysis of Homeric techniques that had previously been carried out at first instance by Plato and Aristotle, and secondarily by Alexandrian philologists.

Aristotle in the *Poetics* (1459a) praises Homer since "he did not make the whole war of Troy the subject of his poem, though that war had a beginning and an end: indeed the tale risked becoming too extended and not easy to embrace in an overall view"[11] (τῷ μηδὲ τὸν πόλεμον καίπερ ἔχοντα ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἐπιχειρῆσαι ποιεῖν ὅλον· λίαν γὰρ ἂν μέγας καὶ οὐκ εὐσύνοπτος ἔμελλεν ἔσεσθαι ὁ μῦθος); Homer quite rightly detached "a single portion" of the whole story (ἓν μέρος), improving consistency and narrative cohesion.[12] Aristotle compares Homer's selective and coherent tale with the systematic and comprehensive accounts of the Trojan War provided by "other poets" (i.e. the poets of the Epic Cycle), who fashioned weak and fragmentary stories, "made up of several parts" (πολυμερῆ), such as the *Cypria* and the *Ilias parva* (1459b).[13] Alexandrian scholars further develop Aristotle's criticism, but they overturn his judgement, questioning the reasons and results of Homer's arrangement of the tale, with particular attention to the beginning *in medias res* and the choice of subject matter.[14] The Aristotelian tradition is well known to Roman scholars and poets, such as Horace, who in his *Ars poetica* states the need for a unitary and cohesive structure in literary works

11 All translations of Greek texts are mine unless otherwise stated.

12 Cf. Else 1957: 582-88. On Aristotle's judgement of Homer as the paradigm of epic poetry par excellence: Young 1983: 156-70; Richardson 1992: 30-40; Stroud & Robertson 1996: 179-96.

13 For a reconstruction and interpretation of this problematic passage of Aristotle's *Poetics* cf. Scafoglio 2007: 287-98.

14 On the critical issue of the beginning of the *Iliad* cf. for instance the D-scholia *ad Il.* 1.1. On the Aristotelian background of Alexandrian criticism: Richardson 1994: 7-38.

(l. 23, *simplex dumtaxat et unum*), mentioning Homer's poems as a positive example and the Epic Cycle as their negative counterpart (ll. 136-152, *nec sic incipies ut scriptor cyclicus olim: / 'Fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum'* etc.).[15]

Dio knows Aristotle's theory and the resulting critical tradition: he reworks such observations and even overturns their outcome, in order to devalue Homer's strategic choice and to reveal his true purpose, consisting in deceiving his audience. Indeed Homer, according to Dio, "did not start his tale right from the beginning, but from an event chosen at random, as almost all liars usually do, who with insertions and circumlocutions avoid telling a linear tale" (οὐκ εὐθὺς ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἀλλ' ὅθεν ἔτυχεν· ὃ ποιοῦσι πάντες οἱ ψευδόμενοι σχεδόν, ἐμπλέκοντες καὶ περιπλέκοντες καὶ οὐθὲν βουλόμενοι λέγειν ἐφεξῆς, 24.4-7). Thus, Dio points out Homer's selective approach to Trojan myth, in the wake of Aristotle and his later followers; but he interprets it as a tendentious expedient, a well-planned ruse aiming to exclude some 'inconvenient accidents' (viz. events that may reveal the truth) from the tale, and to deceive the audience: "otherwise the deception would be exposed by the events themselves" (εἰ δὲ μή, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος ἐξελέγχονται).

Dio accuses Homer of "deceptively reworking in particular the beginning and the end" of the story (ὅτι τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ τέλος μάλιστα ἐπεβούλευσεν, 25.5-6), since they are the hardest parts to manage in the re-elaboration of the myth. Indeed the beginning of the story covers the causes of the war, while the end affects the overall interpretation of the events. This is why Homer removes these parts and merely narrates a limited section of the war (26.1-4; 27.5-6):

> ὅθεν οὔτε τὴν ἀρχὴν οὔτε τὸ τέλος ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν ἐκ τοῦ εὐθέος, οὐδὲ ὑπέσχετο ὑπὲρ τούτων οὐδὲν ἐρεῖν, ἀλλ' εἴ που καὶ μέμνηται, παρέργως καὶ βραχέως, καὶ δῆλός ἐστιν ἐπιταράττων· οὐ γὰρ ἐθάρρει πρὸς αὐτὰ οὐδὲ ἐδύνατο εἰπεῖν ἑτοίμως. [...] οὔτε οὖν τὰ περὶ τὴν

15 It is not clear whether Horace has a particular poem in mind (such as the *Ilias Parva*), or not. In any case, he refers to the comprehensive structure that was typical of the Epic Cycle and that is already criticized by Aristotle. Cf. Brink 1971: 213-14; Rudd 1989: 172; Fantuzzi 2015: 420-22.

> ἁρπαγὴν τῆς Ἑλένης Ὅμηρος εἴρηκεν ἐκ τοῦ εὐθέος οὐδὲ παρρησίαν ἄγων ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς οὔτε τὰ περὶ τῆς ἁλώσεως τῆς πόλεως.
>
> "For this reason he did not dare to tell neither the beginning nor the end in a straightforward way; nor did he promise to say anything about them, but if he mentions them anywhere, it is incidentally and briefly. It is evident that he is trying to confuse. Indeed, he was not at ease with respect to these parts and was unable to speak freely. [...] Homer did not talk in a clear and sincere way either about the abduction of Helen or about the fall of Troy."

Dio thus overturns Aristotle's judgement, with two remarkable consequences. On the one hand, the question arises as to what is the appropriate literary genre for the tale of the Trojan War. Dio (implicitly, but definitely) recognizes the primacy of history over poetry with respect to Aristotle's theory, under which history is concerned with actual events and implies the systematic and comprehensive account of such matter, while poetry deals with "general truths" (that means possible events and not real facts) and has a more flexible and creative approach to its subjects.[16] Dio challenges the incompleteness of Homer's tale and claims the need of an exhaustive account of the Trojan War, under the principles of history. It is therefore not by chance that he rewrites the myth in prose and not in poetry, following Herodotus and Thucydides as models. He states that the Trojan War is a historical matter[17] and, as such, belongs to historiographical genre. The *Trojan Discourse* is, in fact, a rework of Homer's tale in a (pseudo)historiographical form.[18]

16 On the difference between history and poetry (and the superiority of the latter on the former) according to Aristotle cf. Rosenmeyer 1982: 239-59; Heath 1991: 389-402; Carli 2010: 303-36.

17 Cf. e.g. 37.2-3: "I will give the account as I learned it from a very aged priest, one of the priests in [the Egyptian city of] Onuphis" (ἐγὼ οὖν ὡς ἐπυθόμην παρὰ τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἱερέων ἑνὸς εὖ μάλα γέροντος ἐν τῇ Ὀνούφι); 38.1-2: "He told me that all the history of earlier times was recorded in Egypt, in part in the temples, in part upon certain columns" (ἔφη δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν πρότερον ἱστορίαν γεγράφθαι παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς, τὴν μὲν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς, τὴν δ᾽ ἐν στήλαις τισί).

18 One might say that Dio reworks Homer's tale in the spirit of Herodotus, who was indeed considered "the prose Homer" since antiquity: Priestley 2014: 187-220. On the

On the other hand, Dio corrects and even reverses Aristotle's judgement on the *Iliad* compared to the epic cycle. Dio deplores the inadequacy of Homer's tale and indirectly affirms the primacy of the Epic Cycle for precisely the same reason (selective approach to subject matter vs a comprehensive account), while Aristotle praises the former and devalues the latter. Moreover, Dio gives a sample of how an account of the Trojan War should be, reviewing the events of the conquest of Troy that would be a suitable subject for such a tale (29.3-30.4):

> τί μεῖζον ἢ δεινότερον εἶχεν εἰπεῖν τῆς ἁλώσεως; οὔτε ἀνθρώπους πλείους ἀποθνήσκοντας οὐδὲ οἰκτρότερον τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς τῶν θεῶν καταφεύγοντας, τοὺς δὲ ἀμυνομένους ὑπὲρ τῶν τέκνων καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν, οὔτε γυναῖκας ἢ παρθένους ἄλλοτε ἀγομένας βασιλίδας ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ τε καὶ αἰσχύνῃ, τὰς μὲν ἀνδρῶν, τὰς δὲ πατέρων, τὰς δὲ ἀδελφῶν ἀποσπωμένας, τὰς δέ τινας αὐτῶν τῶν ἀγαλμάτων, ὁρώσας μὲν τοὺς φιλτάτους ἄνδρας ἐν φόνῳ κειμένους καὶ μὴ δυναμένας ἀσπάσασθαι μηδὲ καθελεῖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, ὁρώσας δὲ τὰ νήπια βρέφη πρὸς τῇ γῇ παιόμενα ὠμῶς, οὔτε ἱερὰ πορθούμενα θεῶν οὔτε χρημάτων πλῆθος ἁρπαζόμενον οὔτε κατ᾽ ἄκρας ὅλην ἐμπιμπραμένην τὴν πόλιν οὔτε μείζονα βοὴν ἢ κτύπον χαλκοῦ τε καὶ πυρὸς τῶν μὲν φθειρομένων, τῶν δὲ ῥιπτουμένων.
>
> "What greater or more dreadful subject could he have chosen than the capture of the city? In no event a greater number of people died or more pitifully men fled to the altars of gods, or fought to save their children and wives; women and maidens of the royal family were dragged away to slavery and disgrace in foreign countries, some torn from their husbands, others from their fathers or brothers, and some even from the holy statues, while they beheld their beloved husbands lying in their blood without being able to embrace them or to close their eyes, and beheld their helpless kids thrown cruelly against the ground; and still, the desecration and looting of the temples of the gods, the plundering of a massive amount of wealth, the city burnt to the ground by the flames, the cries of agonizing men, the clash of

key role of Herodotus and Thucydides in Dio's speech cf. Hunter 2009: 43-61; Kim 2010: 85-190.

bronze and the roar of the flames while some were perishing in them and others were being hurled upon them."

Actually, these are the same events that were covered by some poems of the Epic Cycle (as far as we can learn from fragments and evidence): Arctinus' *Iliupersis* and Lesches' *Ilias parva*.[19] However, Dio's purpose is not so much to rehabilitate the Epic Cycle, but rather to denounce Homer's deceptive strategy and, in general, the failure of his poem.

It should be noted, however, that this is not the only point on which Dio accuses Homer of hiding a part of the Trojan story in order to deceive the audience. He also criticizes the sudden interruption of scenes that would be decisive, if pursued to their supposed conclusion. Homer sometimes starts to recount a major event (mostly, a death match between two important warriors), but at some stage he interrupts the narrative on a pretext, without probable cause, in order to eclipse the true outcome (e.g. the murder of one of the two characters) and to continue his tale in an arbitrary and misleading way (82.1-83.3):

οὐ γὰρ δυνάμενος εἰπεῖν ὡς ἀπέκτεινε τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ὁ Μενέλαος, κενὰς αὐτῷ χαρίζεται χάριτας καὶ νίκην γελοίαν, ὡς τοῦ ξίφους καταχθέντος. οὐ γὰρ ἦν τῷ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου χρήσασθαι, τοσοῦτόν γε κρείττονα ὄντα, ὡς ἕλκειν αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν ὅπλων, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπάγχειν ἔδει τῷ ἱμάντι; ψευδὴς δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Αἴαντος καὶ τοῦ Ἕκτορος μονομαχία καὶ πάνυ εὐήθης ἡ διάλυσις, πάλιν ἐκεῖ τοῦ Αἴαντος νικῶντος, πέρας δὲ οὐδέν, καὶ δῶρα δόντων ἀλλήλοις ὥσπερ φίλων.

"Since Homer could not say that Menelaus killed Paris, he rewarded him with an empty honor and with a ridiculous victory by pretending that his sword broke. Was it impossible for him to use Paris's sword, given that he was strong enough to drag him alive with all his armor to the camps of the Achaeans? Did he have to choke him necessarily by the strap of his helmet? The duel between Ajax and Hector is also an invention, and its outcome is truly absurd. Here again Ajax takes

19 Fragments and evidence: Bernabé 1987: 71-92; Davies 1988: 49-66; West 2003: 118-52. Cf. Davies 1989: 61-76; Scafoglio 2017: 86-94.

> over, but there is no real result, and the two warriors offer gifts to one another as if they were friends!"

Dio refers to the duels between Menelaus and Paris (*Il.* 3.245-382) and between Ajax and Hector (7.181-312). Both duels have the potential to lead to major breakthroughs, with the victory of the Achaean warrior and the death of his Trojan opponent, but they are interrupted on flimsy grounds: the first one for the intervention of Aphrodite, who saves Paris just in time; the other one for the arrival of heralds who ask the warriors to stop the fight as the night is falling down (just when Ajax looms over Hector and is about to kill him).[20] Actually, this is a narrative technique, typical of the epic genre, developed to build a wide-ranging poem by means of preexisting mythological material that is originally passed on orally: some scenes fulfil a merely retarding function, raising and frustrating the expectations of the audience, in order to extend the tale (or rather to entertain the listeners for longer, in the oral perspective), without adding anything of any actual importance.[21] Dio detects this technique, but he interprets it once again as a deceptive strategy.

However, the most remarkable expedient in the narrative economy of the *Iliad*, according to Dio, is the invention of the character of Patroclus as a "double" of Achilles (102.5-8):

> τὸ γὰρ ψεῦδος ἐξ αὑτοῦ φανερόν ἐστι τοῖς προσέχουσιν· ὥστε οὐδενὶ ἄδηλον καὶ τῶν ὀλίγον νοῦν ἐχόντων ὅτι σχεδὸν ὑπόβλητός ἐστιν ὁ Πάτροκλος καὶ τοῦτον ἀντήλλαξεν Ὅμηρος τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως, βουλόμενος τὸ κατ᾽ ἐκεῖνον κρύψαι.
>
> "The falsehood is self-evident to any careful observer, so much so that anyone with a modicum of intelligence can realize that Patroclus is a fictional character that Homer has substituted for Achilles in order to hide the truth concerning the latter."

Dio argues that, in reality, Hector killed Achilles in a death match; but Homer invented the character of Patroclus who acts as a "substitute" of

20 On this scene cf. Scafoglio 2017: 31-35.

21 Cf. Kirk 1990: 15-27; Edwards 1992: 284-330; Rengakos 1999: 308-38.

Achilles. Thus, in the seeming fake tale of the *Iliad* (notably in book 16), Hector kills Patroclus instead of Achilles (103.6-104.5):

> μάλιστα μὲν οὖν ἐβούλετο Ὅμηρος ἀφανίσαι τὴν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως τελευτὴν ὡς οὐκ ἀποθανόντος ἐν Ἰλίῳ. τοῦτο δὲ ἐπεὶ ἀδύνατον ἐώρα, τῆς φήμης ἐπικρατούσης καὶ τοῦ τάφου δεικνυμένου, τό γε ὑφ' Ἕκτορος αὐτὸν ἀποθανεῖν ἀφείλετο καὶ τοὐναντίον ἐκεῖνον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ἀναιρεθῆναί φησιν [ὃς τοσοῦτον ὑπερεῖχε τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἁπάντων] καὶ προσέτι αἰκισθῆναι τὸν νεκρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ συρῆναι μέχρι τῶν τειχῶν.
>
> "Homer's primary purpose was to hide the murder of Achilles, pretending that he had not died at Troy; but he saw that it was not possible, since the rumour prevailed and his tomb was pointed out by the people. Then Homer suppressed the account of his death by Hector's hand and told, on the contrary, that the latter [who was so far superior to all other warriors] was slain by Achilles and even that his corpse was dishonored and dragged as far as the walls."

Dio comprehends the nature of Patroclus as a character complementary and even subordinate to Achilles: as a matter of fact, Patroclus is considered as a sort of "double" or "other half" of Achilles by many modern scholars, who regard him as a new or "added" character, invented by Homer and not originally coming from the myth.[22] Dio's brilliant insight is to turn the advisor and helper (whether or not created by Homer) into a stand-in for Achilles.[23] Patroclus plays a crucial role in the plot of the *Iliad*, as a main cog in the narrative machine, so to say, since his murder by Hector's hand unblocks the situation and resolves the impasse caused by Achilles' anger. Dio realizes that the narrative structure of the *Iliad*

22 The idea that Patroclus is invented by Homer or at least that his role is enhanced to fit the plot of the *Iliad* is argued with different reasoning and wording by Schadewaldt 1951: 178-81; Kullmann 1960: 44-45, 193-94; Dihle 1970: 159-160; Erbse 1983.

23 Arnould 1990: 187-89 seems to follow Dio's interpretation, suggesting that "la mort de Patrocle est le substitut de la mort d'Achille."

does not work without Patroclus: he brands this character as a surreptitious invention in order to delete him from the story and to destroy Homer's plot construction.

Dio shows that he possesses a high degree of awareness regarding the narrative peculiarities of the *Iliad*, but he uses such skill not so much to highlight Homer's strengths (as Aristotle does) and not even to bring out his real weaknesses (as is often the case in Homeric criticism), but rather to undermine his cultural authority and to disprove his side of the story, in order to establish another version under the pretense of finding and defending the historical truth (or better, what he wants his reader to believe as the historical truth).

However, the target of Dio's attack on mythological and cultural tradition is not only the *Iliad*: the *Odyssey* is also at issue. In this poem he focuses on the first-person account of Odysseus as a secondary, homodiegetic narrator (scil. in books 9-12). It is an important narrative technique which provides a major formal variation (in order to liven up the account) and also achieves the aim of further removing the story from reality, thus allowing the poet to introduce fanciful and supernatural characters and events in the tale.[24] Plato was the first to appreciate Odysseus' role as a (temporary) homodiegetic narrator: in Book 3 of the *Republic* he praises Homer for his capacity to identify with his characters and to make them speak in their own voice (μίμησις);[25] he also stresses the masterful exploitation of both extradiegetic and metadiegetic narrative in the *Odyssey*, as he says that "in this form", i.e. alternating the two manners, Homer "has cast the entire narrative of the events that occurred at Troy and in Ithaca, and throughout the *Odyssey*" (τὴν ἄλλην δὴ πᾶσαν σχεδόν τι οὕτω πεποίηται διήγησιν περί τε τῶν ἐν Ἰλίῳ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰθάκῃ καὶ ὅλῃ Ὀδυσσείᾳ παθημάτων, 393b).[26] In his turn, Aristotle praises Homer on the ground that he "has the special merit of being the only poet who rightly appreciates the part he should take himself",

24 Cf. Parry 1994: 1-22; Olson 1995: 43-64; de Jong 2001: 221-27 and passim; Burgess 2017: 95-120.

25 Cf. Marušič 2011: 217-40; Collobert 2013: 463-76.

26 This interpretation of Plato's arguments is supported, among others, by Halliwell 2009: 15-41.

which means that he does not always "speak in his own person," but "after a few prefatory words, at once he leaves the task of speaking to a man, or a woman, or another personage," thus bringing his epics close to tragedy (*Poet.* 1460a5-11).[27] Both Plato and Aristotle, however, focus on Homer's capacity to identify with his characters and make them speak appropriately (in coherence with their own personality):[28] they substantially appreciate Homer's aptitude for psychological insight; Aristotle goes just a little further on the issue of narrative structure through the comparison between epic and tragedy.[29]

Dio seems to be the first who completely understands the extent of Odysseus' metadiegetic account in a narratological perspective, although it is fairly certain that he found some remarks of this sort in Homeric criticism.[30] On the other side, he uses this insight to discredit the poet and undermine his tale in the *Odyssey*, just like he does with the *Iliad*. Indeed, Dio presents Odysseus' metadiegetic insert as another deceptive expedient (34):

> οὕτως γὰρ καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ τὰ μὲν περὶ τὴν Ἰθάκην καὶ τὸν θάνατον τῶν μνηστήρων αὐτὸς λέγει, τὰ δὲ μέγιστα τῶν ψευσμάτων οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν εἰπεῖν, τὰ περὶ τὴν Σκύλλαν καὶ τὸν Κύκλωπα καὶ τὰ φάρμακα τῆς Κίρκης, ἔτι δὲ τὴν εἰς Ἅιδου κατάβασιν τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα ἐποίησε διηγούμενον τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀλκίνοον· ἐκεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν ἵππον καὶ τὴν ἅλωσιν τῆς Τροίας διεξιόντα τὸν Δημόδοκον ἐν ᾠδῇ δι' ὀλίγων ἐπῶν.
>
> "In the same way, in the *Odyssey* he tells of events in Ithaca and of the death of the suitors in his own person, but has not dared to mention

27 Ὅμηρος δὲ ἄλλα τε πολλὰ ἄξιος ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ δὴ καὶ ὅτι μόνος τῶν ποιητῶν οὐκ ἀγνοεῖ ὃ δεῖ ποιεῖν αὐτόν. αὐτὸν γὰρ δεῖ τὸν ποιητὴν ἐλάχιστα λέγειν. οὐ γάρ ἐστι κατὰ ταῦτα μιμητής. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι αὐτοὶ μὲν δι' ὅλου ἀγωνίζονται, μιμοῦνται δὲ ὀλίγα καὶ ὀλιγάκις. ὁ δὲ ὀλίγα φροιμιασάμενος εὐθὺς εἰσάγει ἄνδρα ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἄλλο τι ἦθος, καὶ οὐδέν' ἀήθη ἀλλ' ἔχοντα ἦθος. Cf. Rabel 1997: 12-21 and passim.

28 On the 'character speech' in Homer's epics cf. Scodel 2004: 45-55; Beck 2008: 162-83.

29 Cf. *Poet.* 1459b9, ἔτι δὲ τὰ εἴδη ταὐτὰ δεῖ ἔχειν τὴν ἐποποιίαν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ: "then, epic must have the same types of narration as tragedy." Actually epic comes close to tragedy, when events are told by a character rather than by the poet.

30 Cf. Nünlist 2009: 94-135 and especially 116-35.

> the greatest of his falsehoods, notably the story of Scylla, the Cyclops, the magic charms of Circe, and even further, the descent of Odysseus into the Underworld. He makes Odysseus narrate these stories to Alcinous and his court: there too he had Demodocus tell the story of the horse and the conquest of Troy in a song of only a few lines."

Homer is a liar, but he invents so great falsehoods that he does not dare to tell them in first person: then, Odysseus does his "dirty work", so to speak. Dio also notices that, still at Alcinous' court, the same aim is pursued by Homer on a smaller scale with Demodocus' song, recounting the conquest of Troy that is missing in the plot of the *Iliad*. While Plato and Aristotle appreciate the homodiegetic narrator as a character speaking in his own voice, Dio considers him as the spokesperson for the poet and as an important part of Homer's deceptive strategy. It is also true, however, that Aristotle does not hesitate to recognize Homer's aptitude for the wonderful and irrational (τὸ θαυμαστόν, 1460a12-18): soon after, talking about the παραλογισμός, he claims that "Homer has chiefly taught other poets the art of telling lies skilfully" (δεδίδαχεν δὲ μάλιστα Ὅμηρος καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ψευδῆ λέγειν ὡς δεῖ, 1460a19). It goes without saying that Dio fully agrees with him, at least on this point.

Dio has no doubts on the efficiency of metadiegetic narrative: in fact, he takes it over and uses it to achieve his own ends, pretending to put this expedient at the service of historical truth. Dio claims to have learned his version of the Trojan story from an Egyptian priest: in doing so, he does not follow Homer, but Herodotus, who builds his λόγος on Egypt by means of eyewitness evidence of local priests (2.99-146).[31] Actually, Herodotus does not entirely leave the field to these witnesses, hiding behind them to the point of disappearing altogether, as Homer does with Odysseus in books 9-12 of the *Odyssey*: Herodotus often uses *verba dicendi* in the account of the priests' information, in order to indicate his presence as their interlocutor and to remind the reader that he is the one

31 Cf. Ellis 2017: 104-29, esp. 105-10. Herodotus' debt to Homer in many respects, including metadiegetic narrative, is recognized by scholars: e.g. de Jong 2002: 245-66.

listening to the priests and recording their testimony.[32] He resorts to this expedient to ensure the reliability of the λόγος (besides the purpose of *variatio*).

Dio's speech is on the same line as Herodotus, insofar as it maintains the co-presence of the author's own voice (as primary narrator) and as a witness (as secondary narrator). Dio goes even further, given that he does not limit the role of the Egyptian priest to providing reliable information: Dio also makes him utter disparaging and ironical comments about the Greek people, which constitute the audience, or at least a part of the audience, of the speech.[33] For instance, through the voice of the priest, he accuses the Greeks to be "ignorant and loudmouthed" (39.2-3), and stigmatizes their "love of pleasure" (42.1-5):

> τούτου δὲ αἴτιον ἔφη εἶναι ὅτι φιλήκοοί εἰσιν οἱ Ἕλληνες· ἃ δ' ἂν ἀκούσωσιν ἡδέως τινὸς λέγοντος, ταῦτα καὶ ἀληθῆ νομίζουσι, καὶ τοῖς μὲν ποιηταῖς ἐπιτρέπουσιν ὅ τι ἂν θέλωσι ψεύδεσθαι καί φασιν ἐξεῖναι αὐτοῖς, ὅμως δὲ πιστεύουσιν οἷς ἂν ἐκεῖνοι λέγωσι, καὶ μάρτυρας αὐτοὺς ἐπάγονται ἐνίοτε περὶ ὧν ἀμφισβητοῦσι.
>
> "He claimed that it happened (scil. Homer's success in deception) because of Greek love of pleasure: they easily believe to be true whatever they delight to hear from anyone's lips; they allow poets to tell any untruth they wish, and they consider such prerogative as poetic license. Yet they trust them in everything they say and even quote their words at times as evidence in matters of dispute."

Dio reuses therefore Herodotus' expedient in an innovative way, not only as a guarantee of reliability for his version (against Homer's tale), but

32 On the difference between "secondary narrators" and "reported narrators" cf. de Jong 2004: 107-10); on the alternance of the former and the latter in Herodotus' λόγος on the Egypt: de Jong 2012: 127-42, esp. 129-141.

33 In the beginning (4) Dio addresses his speech to the Trojans (ἄνδρες Ἰλιεῖς), but shortly after (6.1-2) he recognises that it "will be necessarily given in other places too" and that "many people will know it" (προλέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἀνάγκη καὶ παρ' ἑτέροις ῥηθῆναι καὶ πολλοὺς πυθέσθαι): it is clear that he refers to Greeks, to which he belongs in terms of language and culture.

also as a clever strategy to convey a message uncomfortable to the audience: the priest's evidence works as an 'alternative' voice that enters the account and articulates what the author cannot say in the first person.[34] Accordingly, it seems clear that Dio follows both Homer and Herodotus, or better, he corrects Homer with Herodotus' help. It is nevertheless true that the idea of attributing an awkward statement to a "substitute" or "stand-in" for the poet ultimately stems from the *Odyssey*, or rather from Dio's individual interpretation of Odysseus' role in this poem. Dio does exactly what he blames Homer for.

Dio thus achieves a systematic denial of Homer's tale, largely corresponding to the traditional version of the legend;[35] but this process is not an end in itself: the *pars destruens* is aimed at discovering the historical truth, which is the *pars construens* of the *Trojan discourse*. Hence, from a narratological perspective, Dio's reworking of the story generates a problematic doubling of tales concerning the same subject, i.e. Homer's fiction and the true version, which co-exist within the *Trojan discourse*.[36] The true version is built with the story elements forming the plot of the *Iliad*, which is deconstructed and reassembled in a brand new pattern. The major point of Homer's narrative is reversed: it is Hector who kills Achilles, and not the opposite. Likewise, the main events of the myth before and after the time span of the *Iliad* are overturned: the marriage between Helen and Paris takes the place of the abduction of the latter as the leading cause of hostility; the victory of the Trojans over the Greeks becomes the outcome of the war.

However, this is not only an entertainment: Dio's reworking of the myth is not a mere exercise in rhetoric, and not pure virtuosity, as some

34 Actually, Herodotus already attributes to Egyptian priests unflattering references to the cultural baggage of the Greeks, most notably on the Trojan myth (in particular 2.118.1). Cf. Saïd 2012: 87-105.

35 As for Patroclus, I call "the traditional version" the one established by Homer and almost universally endorsed from the *Iliad* onwards, rather than the original (pre-Homeric) legend, in which Achilles was paired with Antilochus. For an overview of neo-analytic criticism about this subject cf. Burgess 1997: 1-19; Scafoglio 2017: 41-47 and passim.

36 Cf. Phillips 2012: 95-106, esp. 98-99, discussing Hunter 2009: 43-61.

scholars believe.[37] The supposed recovery of historical truth is full of consequences. The legitimate wedding of Paris and Helen relieves not only the Trojans, but also the gods, of the responsibility for the war: there was no judgment of Paris, no abduction of Helen, no vengeance of the goddesses. The responsibility lies with the Greeks, but the most important consequence is the exposure of the real underlying causes of the war, that is the appetite for power and wealth, the wish to take over by force a thriving and prosperous city (64.1-4):

> ταῦτα δὴ ἀκούοντες, οἱ μέν τινες ὠργίζοντο καὶ ἀτιμίαν τῷ ὄντι ἐνόμιζον τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὸ γεγονός, οἱ δέ τινες ἤλπιζον ὠφεληθήσεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς στρατείας· δόξα γὰρ ἦν τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πραγμάτων ὡς μεγάλων καὶ πλούτου ὑπερβάλλοντος.
>
> "Some <suitors of Helen> were furious at hearing <about her marriage with Paris>: they felt it was a shame to Greek people, while others expected to profit from war: there was rumor, indeed, that great wealth and a lot of assets were in Asia."

Dio seems to suggest that this is the real reason not only for the Trojan War, but for all the wars; and probably he is not wrong.

The murder of Achilles by Hector calls for a reflection on the Homeric conception of heroism, and perhaps on heroism in general. What is heroism? It seems to be a construction, or even a deception, carefully built to make the war look good, noble, beautiful, and appealing. Indeed, Achilles is the hero par excellence: he is the model hero not only in the Homeric epics, but in the entire literary tradition that starts from Homer.[38] Yet his best deed turns out to be a fake.

The rewriting of the end of the war, with the victory of the Trojans, can be interpreted as a restoration of justice: the right outcome of a wrong process. It can be interpreted as the final evidence of a high-minded and often neglected ideal: war, unfairness and violence do not

37 E.g. Szarmach 1978: 195-202; del Cerro Calderón 1997: 95-106; Bolonyai 2001: 25-34. Contra, Kindstrand 1973: 141-62; Desideri 1978: 431-34, 496-503; Gangloff 2006: 122-36; Scafoglio 2016.

38 Cf. Schein 1984: 89-167; Callen King 1987: esp. 1-45; Nagy 2005: 71-89.

bring anything but trouble and defeat. This also leads to a reflection on history, which runs the risk of turning out to be a construction too: an ideological and propagandist construction, pursuing the aim of rehabilitating and celebrating the war, hiding its real outcome and consequences.

Thus, the analysis of Homeric narrative techniques conducted by Dio in his *Trojan Discourse* is not merely a rhetorical exercise (in the spirit of virtuosity and self-complacency that is typical of the Second Sophistic), as some scholars believe.[39] Dio develops critical skills and tools preluding (in embryonic form, as I said) to modern narratology, in order to disprove the traditional version of the Trojan legend, based on the Homeric epics – but he does it for an ethical purpose, notably to reject the bellicose ideology arising from these poems. He realizes a kind of tendentious (or 'perverted', I would say) criticism that is the first step of a rework of Homeric narrative, a rework aimed at establishing a new set of values and ideals – first of all, the ideal of peace.

39 E.g. Szarmach 1978: 195-202; Bolonyai 2001: 25-34. Contra, Desideri 1978: 431-34, 496-503.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amato, E. 2014. *Traiani praeceptor. Studi su biografia, cronologia e fortuna di Dione Crisostomo*. Besançon.

Arnould, D. 1990. *Le rire et les larmes dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Platon*. Paris.

Bär, S. 2018. 'Diktys und Dares vor dem Hintergrund des zweitsophistischen Homerrevisionismus' in G. Brescia, M. Lentano, G. Scafoglio & V. Zanusso (eds.) *Revival and Revision of the Trojan Myth: Studies on Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius*. Hildesheim-New York, 151-76.

Beck, D. (2008). 'Character-Quoted Direct Speech in the *Iliad*' *Phoenix* 62, 162-83.

Bernabé A. 1987. *Poetae epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta*. Leipzig.

Bolonyai, G. 2001. 'The uses of progymnasmata: the case of "refutations" and Dio's *Trojan Oration*' *AAntHung* 41, 25-34.

Briand, M. 2015. 'L'Homère paradoxal de Lucien. Un dialogue, entre imitation et satire' in S. Dubel, A.-M. Favreau-Linder & E. Oudot (eds.) *À l'école d'Homère. La culture des orateurs et des sophistes*. Paris, 163-72.

Brink C.O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica*. Cambridge.

Burgess, J. 1997. 'Beyond Neo-Analysis: Problems with the Vengeance Theory' *AJPh* 118, 1-19.

Burgess, J. 2017. 'The Apologos of Odysseus: Tradition and Conspiracy Theories' in C. Tsagalis & A. Markantonatos (eds.) *The Winnowing Oar. New Perspectives in Homeric Studies*. Berlin & Boston, 95-120.

Callen King, K. 1987. *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages*. Berkeley-Los Angeles.

Carli, S. 2010. 'Poetry is more Philosophical than History: Aristotle on Mimesis and Form' *Review of Metaphysics* 64, 303-36.

Cavarero, A. 2002. 'The Envied Muse: Plato versus Homer' in E. Spentzou & D. Fowler (eds.) *Cultivating the Muse*. Oxford, 47-67.

Collobert, C. 2013. 'La littérarité platonicienne : instances et modes narratifs dans les dialogues' *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 4, 463-76.

Davies, M. 1988. *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Göttingen.

Davies, M. 1989. *The Greek Epic Cycle*. Bristol.

De Jong, I. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.

De Jong, I. 2002. 'Narrative unity and units' in E. Bakker, I. de Jong & H. van Wees (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden & Boston, 245-66.

De Jong, I. 2004. 'Herodotus' in I. de Jong, R. Nünlist & A. Bowie (eds.) *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden & Boston, 101-14.

De Jong, I. 2012. 'The Helen *logos* and Herodotus' fingerprint', in E. Baragwanath & M. de Bakker (eds.) *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford, 127-42.

Del Cerro Calderón, G. 1997. 'Las claves del *Discurso Troyano* de Dión de Prusa' *Habis* 28, 95-106.

Desideri, P. 1978. *Dione di Prusa. Un intellettuale greco nell'impero romano*. Messina & Firenze.

Desideri, P. 1980. 'Religione e politica nell'*Olimpico* di Dione' *Quaderni storici* 15, 141-61.

Desideri, P. 2000. 'Dione di Prusa uomo religioso' *ARYS* 3, 203-14.

Dihle, A. 1970. *Homer-Probleme*. Opladen.

Edwards, M.W. 1992. 'Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene' *Oral Tradition* 7, 284-330.

Ellis, A. 2017. 'Fictional Truth and Factual Truth in Herodotus' in L. Hau & I. Ruffell (eds.) *Truth and History in the Ancient World: Pluralizing the Past*. London, 104-29.

Else, G. F. 1957. *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. Cambridge.

Erbse, H. 1983. '*Ilias* und *Patroklie*' *Hermes* 111, 1-15.

Fantuzzi, M. 2015. 'The aesthetics of sequentiality and its discontents' in M. Fantuzzi & C. Tsagalis (eds.) *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*. Cambridge, 405-29.

Favreau-Linder, A.-M. 2013. 'Citations poétiques et stratégies rhétoriques: la parole poétique comme instrument de mise en scène du sophiste' in H. Vial (ed.) *Poètes et orateurs dans l'Antiquité. Mises en scène réciproques*. Clermont Ferrand, 375-97.

Fornaro, S. 2000. 'Accuse e difese d'Omero: Platone nell'orazione undicesima di Dione Crisostomo' *Eikasmos* 11, 248-65.

Fornaro, S. 2002. 'Omero cattivo storico: l'orazione XI di Dione Crisostomo' in F. Montanari & P. Ascheri (eds.) *Omero tremila anni dopo*. Roma, 547-60.

Gangloff, A. 2006. *Dion Chrysostome et les mythes. Hellénisme, communication et philosophie politique*. Grenoble.

Halliwell, F.S. 2009, 'The theory and practice of narrative in Plato' in J. Grethlein & A. Rengakos (eds.) *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Berlin & Boston, 15-41.

Hart, J. 2012, *Fictional and Historical Worlds*. New York.

Heath, M. 1991. 'The Universality of Poetry in Aristotle's *Poetics*' *CQ* 41, 389-402.

Hunter R. 2009. 'The *Trojan Oration* of Dio Chrysostom and Ancient Homeric criticism' in J. Grethlein & A. Rengakos (eds.) *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Berlin-New York, 43-61.

Jones, C.P. 1978. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*. Cambridge, MA & London.

Kim, L. 2010. *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Cambridge.

Kindstrand, J.F. 1973. *Homer in der zweiten Sophistik*. Uppsala.

Kirk, G.S. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. II: *Books 5-8*. Cambridge.

Kullmann, W. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias*. Wiesbaden.

Lacore, M. 2003. 'La théologie d'Homère jugée par Platon' in J. Laurent (ed.) *Les dieux de Platon*. Caen, 79-95.

Marušič, J. 2011. 'Poets and Mimesis in the *Republic*' in P. Destrée & F.-G. Herrmann (eds.) *Plato and the Poets*. Leiden & Boston, 217-40.

Montanari F. 1998. 'Antichi commenti a Omero. Alcune riflessioni' in F. Montanari (ed.) *Omero. Gli aedi, i poemi, gli interpreti*. Firenze, 1-17.

Murray, P. 1996. *Plato on Poetry: Ion, Republic 376e-398b, Republic 595-608b*. Cambridge.

Nagy, G. 2005. 'The Epic Hero' in J.M. Foley (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Epic*. Oxford, 71-89.

Nünlist, R. 2009. *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge.

Olson, S.D. 1995. *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey*. Leiden.

Parry, H. 1994. 'The Apologos of Odysseus: Lies, All Lies?' *Phoenix* 48, 1-20.

Pasquali, G. 1952. *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*. 2nd ed. Firenze.

Phillips, T. 2012. 'J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. 2009' *Ancient Narrative* 10, 95-106.

Priestley, J. 2014. *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*. Oxford.

Rabel, R.J. 1997. *Plot and Point of View in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor.

Rengakos, A. 1999. 'Spannungsstrategien in den homerischen Epen' in J. N. Kazazis & A. Rengakos (eds.) *Euphrosyne. Studies on Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of D.N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart, 308-38.

Richardson, N. 1992. 'Aristotle's Reading of Homer and its Background' in R.W. Lamberton & J. Keaney (eds.) *Homer's Ancient Readers*. Princeton, 30-40.

Richardson, N.J. 1994. 'Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship' in F. Montanari (ed.) *La Philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*. Vandœuvres-Genève, 7-38.

Rosenmeyer, T.G. 1982. 'History or Poetry? The Example of Herodotus' *Clio* 11, 239-59.

Rudd N. 1989. Horace, *Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones (Ars Poetica)*. Cambridge.

Saïd, S. 2012. 'Herodotus and the Myth of the Trojan War' in E. Baragwanath & M. de Bakker (eds.) *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford, 87-105.

Scafoglio, G. 2007. 'Aristotele e il ciclo epico. Una nota a *Poet.* 1459a37-b7' *RHT* 2, 287-98.

Scafoglio, G. 2016. 'Il riuso del testo omerico e del ciclo epico nel *Troiano* di Dione. Osservazioni metodologiche ed esemplificazione' in E. Amato, G. Ventrella & L. Thévenet (eds.) *Dion de Pruse : l'homme, son œuvre et sa postérité*. Hildesheim & New York, 435-63.

Scafoglio, G. 2017. *Ajax. Un héros qui vient de loin*. Amsterdam.

Schadewaldt, W. 1951. *Von Homers Welt und Werk*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart.

Schein, S.L. 1984. *The Mortal Hero. An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*. Berkeley & Los Angeles.

Scodel, R. 2004. 'The Story-teller and his Audience' in R. Fowler (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge, 45–55.

Seeck, G.A. 1990. 'Dion Chrysostomos als Homerkritiker (*Or.* XI)' *RhM* 133, 97-107.

Stroud, T.A. & E. Robertson. 1996. 'Aristotle's *Poetics* and the Plot of the *Iliad*' *CW* 89, 179-96.
Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World, A.D. 50-250*. Oxford.
Szarmach, M. 1978. 'Le *Discours Troyen* de Dion de Pruse' *Eos* 66, 195-202.
Vagnone, G. 2003. *Dione di Prusa, Troiano (Or. XI)*. Roma.
Van Nuffelen P. 2011. *Rethinking the Gods: Philosophical Readings of Religion in the Post-Hellenistic Period*. Cambridge.
Ward, A. 2013, *Socrates and Dionysus: Philosophy and Art in Dialogue*. Cambridge.
West, M.L. 2003. *Greek Epic Fragments*. Cambridge, MA & London.
Young, D.C. 1983. 'Pindar, Aristotle and Homer: A Study in Ancient Criticism' *ClAnt* 2, 156-70.
Zeitlin, F.I. 2001. 'Visions and revisions of Homer in the Second Sophistic' in S. Goldhill (ed.) *Greek Identity in the Second Sophistic*. Cambridge, 195-266.

Giampiero Scafoglio
Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis
Giampiero.Scafoglio@unice.fr

SACRIFICE, POLITICS AND ANIMAL IMAGERY IN THE ORESTEIA*

By Dimitrios Kanellakis

Summary: In this paper I explore how sacrifice and politics, two central aspects of the *Oresteia*, are presented through animal imagery and how they are indissolubly linked. In the first section I discuss how the animal imagery attributed to Cassandra constructs a semantic parallelism between her and Iphigenia, the two of them being the only innocent victims in the bloody circle of this trilogy. In the second section I examine how animals are linked to governments and how the quantitative, temporal, and spatial arrangement of animal imagery reveals their sequence.

Animal imagery is a significant aspect of the *Oresteia*, both stylistically important and thematically meaningful.[1] It appears in the first lines of the *Agamemnon* (ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην, 3) but we soon realise its symbolic intention.[2] The omen of the eagles (49-57) and the fable of the lion cub (717-31) are the most polyvalent and discussed images of the trilogy; at first glance, both refer to the abduction of Helen and its consequences,

* I wish to express my gratitude to Angus Bowie and the anonymous reviewer for their substantial contribution.

1 See Fowler 1967: 29-39, 56-58, and 68-69 for the three tragedies, respectively. A useful but incomplete catalogue, including only apparent allusions, is Earp 1948: 104. For a complete catalogue, see Appendix.

2 In that first occasion, the animal metaphor has no special semiology, except (perhaps) for 'triggering pre-existing associations between κυνός and δίκη(ν), and of preparing the way for their further development in the trilogy', Wilson 2006: 193. ἄγκαθεν only reoccurs in *Eum.* 80, but this is too far to claim a connection and it clearly has a different meaning (holding 'in the arms' instead of standing 'on the elbows'). Rose 1958 ad loc. maintains that the actor is not actually bending on his elbows like a dog, but this is based on misreading ἄγκαθεν as a form of ἀνέκαθεν (after Mazon).

Dimitrios Kanellakis 'Sacrifice, Politics and Animal Imagery in the *Oresteia*' *C&M* 68 (2020) 37-69.

but many more layers are readable, so that all characters can be involved.[3] In discussing the omen of the eagles in particular, Ferrari articulates how to deal with such complex imagery: 'Instead of trying to reconcile at all costs the opening metaphor with what follows, or take refuge in a broad notion of polysemy [...] a cunning mind, on the other hand, would realise that the true meaning of the utterance lies beneath the surface. The awareness that there is a hidden story in which the troubling elements fit to perfection is the first step towards understanding'.[4]

From a quantitative perspective, the number of lines occupied by animal imagery is over 7% of the *Agamemnon*, and 2% of the *Choephori* and of the *Eumenides* (a proportion which is still higher than in Aeschylus' other tragedies). Within this imagery, the eagle and the lion prevail in the first play (50% of relevant lines), the snake in the second (40%), whereas the *Eumenides* has more balanced references. The animals cited, domestic and wild, represent all parts of the natural space (from the sea and land to the sky), almost all animal classes (with the exception of amphibians) and all sizes, putting a whole ecosystem before us. The vast majority of the animal references appear in similes, metaphors, personifications, proverbial expressions and passages superficially referring to actual animals but having a symbolic purpose (dreams, fables or adages). Thus, the animal imagery metonymically presents, or better organises, the abstract concepts of the trilogy: revenge, sacrifice, antagonism, cannibalism, punishment etc. Only a few literal uses exist, almost all of which are located in the end of the *Eumenides*, signifying the definitive separation of the human and bestial element, from the domination of the civic law.[5]

3 Knox 1952 and Peradotto 1969 remain the most illuminating readings on the lion-cub and eagle images, respectively. Van Dijk 1997: 171-76 and Erp Taalman Kip 1996: 122-23 and 136 n. 2 alone deny the polysemy of each of these images, the former on textual grounds (saying that the fable of the lion-cub can only refer to Helen and illustrate, more abstractly, the vicious circle of impiety) and the latter on grounds of dramatic economy (saying that the audience does not know yet the role of Iphigenia's sacrifice to correlate it with the omen of the eagles).

4 Ferrari 1997: 30.

5 For the assimilation of human and bestial element in the trilogy, see Peradotto 1969: 264; Rosenmeyer 1982: 138-41; Moreau 1985: 61-99, 267-91; Heath 1999b.

In their symbolic usage, there is no one-to-one analogy between animals and characters. The same character 'transforms' itself, i.e. is attached to properties of different animals throughout individual plays and the trilogy as a whole. In the first tragedy for instance, 'Agamemnon is a vulture (*Ag.* 49), eagle (112-37), hound (135, 896), horse (218), bull (1126), and lion (1259; cf. 824 ff.). Clytemnestra, as one might expect, displays tremendous versatility:[6] a watchdog and bitch (607, 1093, 1228; cf. *Ch.* 420), cow (1125), serpent (1233), lioness (1258), crow (1472-74), spider (1492), and hen (1671). Even a minor character like Aegisthus changes from lion (1224) to wolf (1259) to cock (1671) only to end up a decapitated serpent (*Ch.* 1046-47)'.[7] Conversely, an animal can stand to symbolise for many characters, with the dog being attached to most of them (the watchman, Clytemnestra, Agamemnon, Cassandra, Chorus, Electra, Erinyes).[8]

In this paper, advocating the symbolic dimensions of the animal imagery in the *Oresteia*, I will discuss how sacrifice and politics, two central aspects of the trilogy, are presented through animals and how they are indissolubly linked.

SACRIFICE[9]

The *Oresteia* is full of deaths, all of which are violent. Agamemnon's murder by Clytemnestra (with Aegisthus' support) and Aegisthus' and Clytemnestra's murder by Orestes are all motivated by revenge. The victims

6 That this versatility is 'tremendous' might seem an overstatement given that Agamemnon is resembled to almost the same number of animals, and given that he remains on stage for a short time. However, 'tremendous' should be understood here in terms of intensity rather than number: the tradition of comparing women to animals entailed fixed types of women (Semonides 7) or static hybrids (Sirens, Chimaera, Lamia, Harpies, Echidna etc.), but here we have the dynamic compilation of the worst qualities of all animals.

7 Heath 1999b: 30.

8 For a catalogue, by animal, see Thumiger 2008. Especially for the dog, see Raeburn & Thomas 2011: lxvi-lxix and Saayman 1993.

9 For an overall discussion on the imagery of sacrifice, see Zeitlin 1965 and Lebeck 1971: 32-36, 60-3.

in each case are guilty of dreadful deeds, so their murders seem somehow vindicated: Clytemnestra kills in the name of her daughter Iphigenia (*Ag.* 1432-36, 1521-29), Aegisthus in the name of his father Thyestes (*Ag.* 1578-86), and Orestes in the name of his father Agamemnon (*Ch.* 435-38). In contrast to this complexity, which causes both disgust and sympathy for the killers, the only unquestionably unfair and pitiful murders are Iphigenia's and Cassandra's, for both victims are innocent (indeed, the only innocents in this bloody circle).[10] Because of that very innocence and the fact that their murders are described in religious terms, as will be shown, these deaths are differentiated from all the others: they are sacrifices. In the following sections I am discussing how the animal imagery attributed to Cassandra constructs a semantic parallelism between her and Iphigenia.

a. Reversing the mythical background (nightingale)

Shortly before Cassandra is sacrificed, the chorus sarcastically attaches to her the mythological nightingale simile. Procne was transformed by the gods into a nightingale, crying for her son Itys, whom she had killed as a revenge on her husband Tereus for raping her sister Philomela.

ΧΟ. φρενομανής τις εἶ θεοφόρητος, ἀμ- 1140
φὶ δ' αὐτᾶς θροεῖς
νόμον ἄνομον οἷά τις ξουθὰ
ἀκόρετος βοᾶς, φεῦ, ταλαίναις φρεσὶν
Ἴτυν Ἴτυν στένουσ' ἀμφιθαλῆ κακοῖς
ἀηδὼν μόρον.

Cassandra is now accused of selfishly and ostentatiously crying for herself. The hapax legomenon φρενομανής, the rare θεοφόρητος and the oxymoron νόμον ἄνομον fit the mythic context, but also the offensive intentions of the chorus. Beyond the accumulation of insults (φρενομανής,

10 Zeitlin 1966: 29: 'Iphigenia was one motive for Clytemnestra's action. Cassandra was another. But Cassandra, like Iphigenia, was Agamemnon's victim. She was also the victim of Apollo, of Paris and Troy, of the entire war'. One could add Thyestes' eating his children (*Ag.* 1242-43, *Ch.* 1068-69), but his action was unconscious.

θεοφόρητος, ἀκόρετος etc.), the repetition of Ἴτυν and the alliteration of φ parody her lamentation. Cassandra, in turn, objects to the comparison, for there is no magical escape for her, as there was for Procne.

ΚΑ. ἰὼ ἰὼ λιγείας βίος ἀηδόνος· 1146
περέβαλον γάρ οἱ πτεροφόρον δέμας
θεοὶ γλυκύν τ᾽ αἰῶνα κλαυμάτων ἄτερ·
ἐμοὶ δὲ μίμνει σχισμὸς ἀμφήκει δορί.

κλαυμάτων ἄτερ seems unsuitable for Procne's fortune, for her song as a nightingale was regarded to be a lament for Itys. One option would be to understand κλαύματα as troubles or misfortunes (LSJ *II*); indeed, in this sense, Procne gains a bird-life without further troubles. But in a context about Procne, κλαύματα is inevitably perceived as weeping. Given that, we could say that Cassandra here undermines the myth, saying that the bird is not actually crying, in order to emphasise her own very real, very human lament. Alternatively, 'she views the [nightingale's] lifetime of song as "sweet" precisely because it is alive. However lugubrious this song may be its sound implies the ongoing fact of living'.[11] In either case, ἐμοὶ δέ must bring a striking antithesis, and for that purpose Procne's tragedy has to be blunt. Cassandra's fortune is what Procne's would have been, had not she been transfigured: σχισμός, and indeed with δορί.[12] Therefore, Cassandra is not a fake Procne, as the chorus implies, but another Procne; one with a worse ending.

The inescapability from murder also characterises Iphigenia. Cassandra does not escape murder by being transfigured into a nightingale by the gods as Procne did; and Iphigenia (in Aeschylus' version) did not escape sacrifice by being replaced by a deer by Artemis.[13] Thus, in both cases, the poet reverses the mythic tradition to construct a tragic

11 Nooter 2017: 142.

12 Terus hunted his wife with an ἀκόντιον (Ar. *Lys.* 564). A relevant detail would probably exist in Sophocles' lost tragedy *Tereus*, on which see Dobrov 2001: 110-17; Hourmouziades 1986; Stähler 2000; Fitzpatrick 2001; Hofmann 2006; Luppe 2007; Coo 2013; Finglass 2016. Later sources speak of an axe (Apollod. 3.14.8), which also has a parallelism with ἀμφήκει δορί (two-edged weapons). Aeschylus uses Procne's myth in *Supp.* 58-67 as well (with no reference to the weapon).

13 That version was already known (Hes. fr.23a, Stesich. fr. 215 P., *Cypria*).

paraprosdokian for his characters: there is no miraculous salvation for them.

b. Linking the characters (cattle)

That Cassandra becomes an alter ego of Iphigenia through animal imagery clearly emerges through comparing the following passages, which describe their murders:

For Iphigenia

ΧΟ φράσεν δ' ἀόζοις πατὴρ μετ' εὐχὰν
δίκαν χιμαίρας ὕπερθε βωμοῦ
πέπλοισι περιπετῆ παντὶ θυμῷ
προνωπῆ λαβεῖν ἀέρδην,
στόματός τε καλλιπρῴ-
ρου φυλακᾷ κατασχεῖν
φθόγγον ἀραῖον οἴκοις,
βίᾳ χαλινῶν τ' ἀναύδῳ μένει,
[...]
ΚΛ. οὐδὲν τότ' ἀνδρὶ τῷδ' ἐναντίον φέρων,
ὃς οὐ προτιμῶν, ὡσπερεὶ βοτοῦ μόρον,
μήλων φλεόντων εὐπόκοις νομεύμασιν,
ἔθυσεν αὑτοῦ παῖδα...

For Cassandra

ΚΑ. ἐπεύχομαι δὲ καιρίας πληγῆς τυχεῖν,
ὡς ἀσφάδαστος, αἱμάτων εὐθνησίμων
ἀπορρυέντων, ὄμμα συμβάλω τόδε.
ΧΟ. ὦ πολλὰ μὲν τάλαινα, πολλὰ δ' αὖ σοφὴ
γύναι, μακρὰν ἔτεινας. εἰ δ' ἐτητύμως
μόρον τὸν αὑτῆς οἶσθα, πῶς θεηλάτου
βοὸς δίκην πρὸς βωμὸν εὐτόλμως πατεῖς;

The parallels are striking: the animals, though different (χιμαίρας,[14] βοτοῦ ~ βοός), are equally domestic and sacrificial; both must remain silent (φυλακᾷ, βίᾳ χαλινῶν, ἀναύδῳ ~ μακρὰν ἔτεινας); the place of murder is the same, an altar (ὕπερθε βωμοῦ ~ πρὸς βωμόν); the killing method is the same, slaughter (ἔθυσεν ~ πληγῆς, αἱμάτων εὐθνησίμων ἀποῤῥυέντων); there is involvement of a divine element in the procedure (μετ' εὐχάν ~ θεηλάτου); in the core of the similes, the verbal structure is similar (δίκαν χιμαίρας ὕπερθε βωμοῦ ~ βοὸς δίκην πρὸς βωμόν). All these converge to turn both murders to sacrificial rituals: they are sacrifices organised by Agamemnon and Clytemnestra respectively, and executed with most reverence on their part. And as humans have replaced animals in these rituals, sacredness becomes shamelessness.

c. Justification of the link (swan)

After having killed Agamemnon and Cassandra, Clytemnestra compares the latter to a swan:

κεῖται γυναικὸς τῆσδ' ὁ λυμαντήριος,
Χρυσηίδων μείλιγμα τῶν ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ,
ἥ τ' αἰχμάλωτος ἥδε καὶ τερασκόπος
καὶ κοινόλεκτρος τοῦδε, θεσφατηλόγος,
πιστὴ ξύνευνος, ναυτίλων δὲ σελμάτων
ἰσοτριβής· ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην,
ὁ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως, ἡ δέ τοι κύκνου δίκην
τὸν ὕστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόον
κεῖται φιλήτωρ τοῦδ'· ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπήγαγεν
εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῇ.

14 Raeburn & Thomas 2011: 93: 'The passage probably evoked two related Attic cults of Artemis, at Brauron and Mounychia. The latter's foundation-myth involves a goat being substituted for a daughter who is about to be sacrificed'.

The swan fits Cassandra in many ways. Firstly, for its link with Apollo, which is already testified to in Pindar and Bacchylides.[15] Cassandra reveals she flirted with Apollo in order to learn prophesy: μάντις μ' Ἀπόλλων τῷδ' ἐπέστησεν τέλει ... ξυναινέσασα Λοξίαν ἐψευσάμην (1202-8).[16] Secondly, for its prophetic mourning; this is the earliest testimony in Greek literature of the concept of the swan's song before its death.[17] Cassandra also forecasts her murder (κτενεῖ με τὴν τάλαιναν, 1260) in a way that resembles a song: τὰ δ' ἐπίφοβα δυσφάτῳ κλαγγᾷ | μελοτυπεῖς ὁμοῦ τ' ὀρθίοις ἐν νόμοις (1052-53). Thirdly, for its admittedly enchanting beauty: it is even comparable to Helen's beauty (Eur. *Or.* 1386); as for Cassandra, already in Homer she is Πριάμοιο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην (*Il.* 13.365). Therefore, on multiple levels, the correlation of the woman with this bird is clear.

What surprises here is the use of the swan simile by Clytemnestra; from her perspective, how is it justified that her enemy is compared to such a beautiful bird? The progression of Clytemnestra's emotions, as reflected in her speech, is telling: until 1403 she is upset and angry, because she is thinking of her husband's adultery. Her anger is expressed through an accumulation of invectives, compound words and ribaldry (λυμαντήριος, αἰχμάλωτος, τερασκόπος, κοινόλεκτρος, θεσφατηλόγος, ξύνευνος). But abruptly (ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην) she reverts to the present: both Agamemnon and his 'mistress' are dead, as she desired. From now on we have neither insults nor irony;[18] in serenity, she treats her

15 Pind. *Pae.* 3.10-14; Bacchyl. *Dithyr.* 16.5-7; *Hom. Hymn* 21.1. Also see: τοιάδε κύκνοι ... πτεροῖς κρέκοντες ἴακχον Ἀπόλλω (Ar. *Av.* 769-72); ἀλλ' ἅτε οἶμαι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὄντες, μαντικοί τέ εἰσι καὶ προειδότες τὰ ἐν Ἅιδου ἀγαθὰ ᾄδουσι (Pl. *Phd.* 85b). For Apollo and the swan, see Krappe 1942 and Ahí 1982.

16 The version in Apollod. 3.12.5 is roughly the same.

17 The concept must probably be ascribed to a previous written (but lost) or oral tradition, rather than be considered as Aeschylus' invention. Harris 2012 argues in favour of the oral tradition.

18 As for φιλήτωρ in 1446, I doubt that this is supposed to be an insult about Cassandra being the dominant partner and Agamemnon unmanly, as per Raeburn & Thomas 2011 and Sommerstein 2008 n. 308 ad loc. φιλήτωρ is an extremely rare word (attested only here and once in Aristotle, in the classical era) and its only association with the active sexual role is made by Strabo, who claims to cite Ephorus, who spoke about how the Cretans used the word – i.e. nothing reliable or relevant.

enemies – now victims– with tenderness (note the alliteration of λ). Cassandra thus becomes a swan in her eyes, a pleasant image, just because she is a swan's corpse. The sexual atmosphere (γυναικός, μείλιγμα, κοινόλεκτρος, ξύνευνος, ἰσοτριβής) shockingly becomes necrophiliac; death and pleasure become inextricable. The view of the two corpses is explicitly linked with orgasm for the killer (εὐνῆς παροψώνημα, χλιδῇ).[19] Therefore, the swan-simile and the whole tenderness are anything but the poet's voice, expressing sympathy for Cassandra.[20] It is the murderer's voice which, with gruesome calmness, rejoices in lyric and erotic terms over the corpses.

An explanation of her reaction, and a partial justification of her deed, has been prepared earlier, expressed also in terms of beauty and tenderness. Clytemnestra essentially gets revenge for her daughter's sacrifice. Iphigenia has been described in movingly affectionate words by the chorus (στόματός τε καλλιπρῴρου, 235; πρέπουσα τὼς ἐν γραφαῖς, 242) and by her mother (φιλτάτην ἐμοὶ ὠδῖν', 1417). Thus, Cassandra's beautiful swan-corpse becomes for Clytemnestra the repayment for her daughter's lost beauty. And the mourning of the mistress-swan is the repayment for the laudable song of the virgin Iphigenia:

ΧΟ. ἔμελψεν, ἁγνᾷ δ' ἀταύρωτος αὐδᾷ πατρὸς 245
φίλου τριτόσπονδον εὔποτμον
παιῶνα φίλως ἐτίμα.

Back in the happy days, Iphigenia used to sing the *paean* – a genre associated with Apollo – for the entertainment of her father. Now Cassandra is singing a swan song – which is also associated with Apollo – for the entertainment of Clytemnestra. The *paean* is a genre that 'hovers between triumph and disaster, anxiety and jubilation, expressing man's dependence on the gods and his hopes and fears regarding their beneficence'[21] and thus becomes appropriate as a background music for Iphigenia's fate: what used to be a celebratory song back then is now recalled

19 See Rutherford 2014: 306 n. 71.

20 That alternative is articulated, but not accepted, by Fraenkel.

21 Swift 2010: 63.

as a requiem.[22] And what *is* actually a requiem, the swan song, now sounds like a celebratory ode to the ears of Clytemnestra, who thus claims back her right to the sound of happiness.

***

In the *Eumenides*, where murders are over, there are two actual sacrifices: Orestes' purification sacrifice on his way from Delphi to Athens (235-39, 445-52) and Athena's celebratory sacrifice in the exodus (1007). Their function is discussed in the end.

POLITICS

There is no doubt that the political element is more evident and explicit in the *Eumenides*. Yet it is anything but absent in the preceding tragedies. In fact, it is this gradual preparation that enables a coherent political interpretation, which suggests 'that the political developments of the last play are not something "stitched on the outside" of the trilogy'.[23] The *Oresteia* can be read as a constitutional progression, from the fall of kingship to the rise of democracy: Agamemnon, the hereditary ruler, is forcibly overthrown by Clytemnestra and Aegisthus; popular discontent rises until Orestes, whom the people support, comes to liberate them from the tyrants, but again, by unlawful means; in this crisis, a legislator (Athena) comes to establish a democratic state. In this section I will discuss how the animal imagery contributes to the construction of this political progression throughout the trilogy. Specifically, I examine how

22 See Rutherford 2014: 49.

23 Dodds 1960: 247. However, he focuses on the politics of Aeschylus' time, obscuring his point. Macleod 1982: 132 responds that a wider treatment of politics will 'do much to bridge the apparent gap between the *Eumenides* and the other plays. For if in the *Eumenides* Athens is above all an ideal presentation of human society which pointedly reverses the social disorder of the *Agamemnon* and *Choephoroi*, then the unity of the trilogy is in essence vindicated'. For politics in the *Oresteia*, also see Dover 1957; Podlecki 1966: 63-100; Cole 1977; Calder 1981; Sommerstein 1989: 25-32; Sommerstein 1993; Schaps 1993; Bowie 1993; Meier 1993: 102-37; Griffith 1995; Goldhill 2000.

animals are linked to governments and how the quantitative, temporal, and spatial arrangement of animal imagery reveals their sequence.

a. Kingship

Agamemnon is mostly likened to an eagle (49-57, 111-19, 138) and a lion (827, 1224, 1258-59), because these animals are regarded as the kings of the animal kingdom, the aerial and the terrestrial respectively.[24] They also bear connotations of strength, wealth, and divinity, which supplement the royal metaphor: the eagle is linked to Zeus (the latter transformed the legendary king of Attica, Periphas, into an eagle);[25] the lion is linked to the demi-god Hercules and was the emblem of the Lydian dynasty of Pelops.[26] By extension, these animals stand for kingship generally.

The first extensive animal images of the trilogy, the vulture simile (49-59) and the corresponding omen of the eagles (111-38), expressly refer to Agamemnon and Menelaus (123-24):

μεγάλ' ἐκ θυμοῦ κλάζοντες Ἄρη,
τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν οἵτ' ἐκπατίοις
ἄλγεσι παίδων ὕπατοι λεχέων
στροφοδινοῦνται
πτερύγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι,
δεμνιοτήρη
πόνον ὀρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες·
ὕπατος δ' ἀίων ἤ τις Ἀπόλλων
ἢ Πὰν ἢ Ζεὺς οἰωνόθροον
γόον ὀξυβόαν τῶνδε μετοίκων,
.....

24 εὕδει δ' ἀνὰ σκάπτῳ Διὸς αἰετός, [...] ἀρχὸς οἰωνῶν (Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 6–7; cf. *Isthm.* 6. 50); βασιλεύς ἐστι τῶν πτηνῶν ὁ ἀετός (*Vita Aes.* G 91.6); λέων τὸ ἀλκιμώτατον τῶν θηρίων ἐστί (Cornutus *Nat. D.* 63.20); λέων ὢν ὁ τῶν ζῴων βασιλεὺς (Ael. *NA* 3.1); ἄναξ δ' ὁ λέων (Aesop 338.3 Chambry).

25 Ant.Lib. *Met.* 6; Ov. *Met.* 7.400. See Cook 1925: 1122.

26 Φόβος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος τῇ ἀσπίδι ἔπεστιν, ἔχων τὴν κεφαλὴν λέοντος (Paus. 5.19.4). See Knox 1952: 20.

ὅπως Ἀχαιῶν δίθρονον κράτος, Ἑλλάδος ἥβας
ξύμφρονα ταγάν, 110
πέμπει ξὺν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι
θούριος ὄρνις Τευκρίδ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αἶαν,
οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς βασιλεῦσι νε-
ῶν, ὁ κελαινὸς ὅ τ᾽ ἐξόπιν ἀργᾶς, ...

... βοσκομένω λαγίναν ... 118

... Ἄρτεμις ... 134
στυγεῖ δὲ δεῖπνον αἰετῶν. 137

As for the difference of the two bird species (αἰγυπιῶν ~ αἰετῶν), the poet manages to make it rather unnoticeable, moving from one to the other gradually: the vulture (49) develops into a warlike bird (112), then king of birds (113) and finally an eagle (138).[27] I thus take for granted the unity of the images, regarding the vulture as a metonymy for the eagle, or vice versa. What is important in this complex, for our purpose, is the kinglike qualities of the eagles coming forward: their divinity is implied with ὕπατοι, 'highest, uppermost', an epithet attached to Zeus,[28] and (here) to Apollo and Pan as well, and with μετοίκων, 'co-residents of gods'. Their strength is given both as an acoustic image (ἐκ θυμοῦ κλάζοντες, γόον ὀξυβόαν) and by their mauling of the hare. Agamemnon especially is the κελαινός one (μελανάετος), whom Aristotle describes as the strongest and 'hare-killer'.[29] Finally, the birds' royalty is directly expressed by the striking chiasmus οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς βασιλεῦσι νεῶν. Thus, their linking to the kings is more than a typical stylistic option, since in that case a short simile would be enough; it is a metonymic description of kingship.

27 The vulture simile is modelled on *Od.* 16.216-18 (Odysseus and Telemachus crying louder than οἰωνοί. ωῆναι ἢ αἰνυπιοὶ ναυψώνυχες whose children have been abducted from their nests). Αἰγυπιοί cannot be consistently identified with a modern species: Raeburn & Thomas 2011: 73. See also Finglass 2011 ad 169-170; Arnott 2007: 2-4 (on *aietos*) and 6-7 (on *aigypion*).

28 *Il.* 19.258; *Od.* 1.45.

29 *HA* 8(9).32.618b.26-31.

The lion imagery, in turn, illuminates the contrast of kingship with the forthcoming tyranny. With this meaning, it first emerges in 825-28, where Agamemnon compares the Greek army (led by himself) to a lion,[30] eating raw flesh, which jumped over and sucked the tyrannical blood of Troy:[31]

ἵππου νεοσσός, ἀσπιδηφόρος λεώς, 825
πήδημ᾽ ὀρούσας ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύσιν·
ὑπερθορὼν δὲ πύργον ὠμηστὴς λέων
ἄδην ἔλειξεν αἵματος τυραννικοῦ.

The significance of this image is that it expressly establishes a political status for the lion metaphor (specifically the lion's supremacy over tyranny), which will be exploited later, with reference to interior politics. This exploitation comes when Cassandra, prophesying Agamemnon's and her own murder, vividly describes Clytemnestra's adultery with a lion love-triangle:

ἐκ τῶνδε ποινάς φημι βουλεύειν τινὰ
λέοντ᾽ ἄναλκιν ἐν λέχει στρωφώμενον
οἰκουρόν, οἴμοι, τῷ μολόντι δεσπότῃ 1225
ἐμῷ·
.....
αὕτη δίπους λέαινα συγκοιμωμένη
λύκῳ, λέοντος εὐγενοῦς ἀπουσίᾳ,

30 Agamemnon is already known as a lion from *Il.* 11.113-19.

31 It is well known that τύραννος means an absolute ruler without necessarily entailing negative connotations, but within the network of references in the play (e.g. 1355, 1365) the hostile tone is clear; Fraenkel ad loc. Moreover, the very form of the adjective in this passage (-ικός, first attested here) may have been chosen precisely to denote deviation from a proper kind of ruling. Seaford 2003: 100-1: 'Aegisthus' and Clytemnestra's tyrannical coup involves in fact all three of our tyrannical practices: killing family, power through money, and the abuse (or perversion) of ritual'. For the blood-drinking imagery, see Fowler 1991: 99: 'The power of the juxtaposition of the creatures and the blood throughout the *Oresteia* lies in the fact that it is not completely metaphorical. The human beings who drink blood do, almost literally, become their own Erinyes'.

κτενεῖ με τὴν τάλαιναν· 1260

Aegisthus is firstly called a cowardly lion (almost an oxymoron), roaming in bed (instead of the wild), and guarding the house (a feminine or servile role).[32] The proper lion is Agamemnon, whose juxtaposition with the fake one is striking (λύκῳ, λέοντος). That Aegisthus 'suddenly' becomes a wolf is not some negligence of the poet, but a more accurate retelling; in other words, calling him a lion was just a euphemism, which no longer stands, after the comparison with the real lion.[33] Note that Clytemnestra is also a paradoxical beast, a two-footed lioness.[34] It is crucial here that political terms invade this bestial comparison: the lion Agamemnon is δεσπότης and εὐγενῆς, a king in other words. Then what is Aegisthus? The conclusion of this 'visual argument' is precise: Aegisthus is no more a true king than he is a true lion. And if we recall the 'lion *vs* tyrant' motif from before, what he actually is becomes clear. Indeed, not much later, he is expressly called a tyrant:

ΧΟ. ὁρᾶν πάρεστι· φροιμιάζονται γὰρ ὡς
τυραννίδος σημεῖα πράσσοντες πόλει. 1355
...
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνεκτόν, ἀλλὰ κατθανεῖν κρατεῖ·
πεπαιτέρα γὰρ μοῖρα τῆς τυραννίδος. 1365

32 Cf. 1625-26. On the cowardly lion, see also West 2003. In the light of the lion-cub fable in 717-33, Aegisthus' being compared to a lion is telling; though primarily referring to Helen, the fable can also be applied to Aegisthus: saved as an infant and raised up inside the Atreus' house, he now wreaks vengeance on Agamemnon.

33 Not perceiving it as a comparison, Denniston & Page (ad loc.) were deceived: '[it] is most unexpected, particularly since the same metaphor is applied to Agamemnon in 1259; and the phrase as a whole, "a cowardly lion", is so unlikely that corruption of the text may well be supposed here'.

34 For the crescendo in Cassandra's description of Clytemnestra in bestial terms, in 1235-37, see Zeitlin 1966.

b. Uprising

The overthrow of Agamemnon is repeated once more early in the *Choephori*, again through an animal metaphor.

ΟΡ. Ζεῦ Ζεῦ, θεωρὸς τῶνδε πραγμάτων γενοῦ, 246
ἰδοῦ δὲ γένναν εὖνιν αἰετοῦ πατρὸς
θανόντος ἐν πλεκταῖσι καὶ σπειράμασιν
δεινῆς ἐχίδνης·

The link with the former play emerges from the comparison of Agamemnon to an eagle. What is introduced now is the snake imagery: the snake-Clytemnestra attacks πλεκταῖσι καὶ σπειράμασιν the eagle-Agamemnon.[35] A political reading of the passage is already promoted by the polysemy of πράγματα (246), which apart from 'things' or 'sufferings' also means 'the state-affairs', 'the government'.[36] Indeed, in the course of the play, the snake simile explicitly receives political connotations, denoting Clytemnestra and Aegisthus' tyranny:

ΟΡ. ἴδεσθε χώρας τὴν διπλῆν τυραννίδα 973
πατροκτόνους τε δωμάτων πορθήτορας·
.....
ΧΟ. ἠλευθέρωσας πᾶσαν Ἀργείων πόλιν 1046
δυοῖν δρακόντοιν εὐπετῶς τεμὼν κάρα.

If the *Agamemnon* presents the tyrannical overthrowing of the King, in the *Choephoroi* the operation of this lawless deviation is described. The snake imagery (which is the dominant imagery in this play)[37] illuminates how tyranny works, that is, with recurring seditions through murder and

35 It was known that eagles ate snakes (*Il.* 12.200-7, Arist. *HA* 609a4-5) but also that snakes devoured eggs and fledglings from the eagles' nests.

36 Mostly in historiography and oratory, but also cf. *Pers.* 714; Eur. *IA* 366; *Supp.* 749; Ar. *Lys.* 32; *Eccl.* 552. In *Eum.* πρᾶγμα in singular means 'a legal case' (470, 575, 630).

37 On the snake imagery, see Whallon 1958; Dumortier 1975: 88-100; Petrounias 1976: 162–73; Sancassano 1997: 159-84; Heath 1999a.

popular usurpation; and as Greek history itself shows, the 'successor' tyrant was often the former's kin. Thus, it is essential to accept that 'The killing of Agamemnon and of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus are both acts of *stasis*... The king's death is pitiful and fearful because it represents the inversion or destruction of so many social values. The same applies, though on a smaller scale, to the death of Clytemnestra. She is, though her husband's murderer and a usurper, still the mother killed by her son'.[38] Although Orestes cannot be called a tyrant, his means are equally unlawful and for that reason he turns out to be a snake, just like Clytemnestra and Aegisthus.

The conflict among kin through the snake imagery emerges in Clytemnestra's dream and its fulfilment:

ΧΟ. τεκεῖν δράκοντ᾽ ἔδοξεν, ὡς αὐτὴ λέγει ... 527
ἐν σπαργάνοισι παιδὸς ὁρμίσαι δίκην ... 529
αὐτὴ προσέσχε μαστὸν ἐν τὠνείρατι ... 531
ὥστ᾽ ἐν γάλακτι θρόμβον αἵματος σπάσαι. 533

ΟΡ. ... κρίνω δέ τοί νιν ὥστε συγκόλλως ἔχειν.
εἰ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν χῶρον ἐκλιπὼν ἐμοὶ
οὖφις †επᾶσα σπαργανηπλείζετο†
καὶ μαστὸν ἀμφέχασκ᾽ ἐμὸν θρεπτήριον, 545
θρόμβῳ τ᾽ ἔμειξεν αἵματος φίλον γάλα,
ἡ δ᾽ ἀμφὶ τάρβει τῷδ᾽ ἐπώμωξεν πάθει,
δεῖ τοί νιν, ὡς ἔθρεψεν ἔκπαγλον τέρας,
θανεῖν βιαίως· ἐκδρακοντωθεὶς δ᾽ ἐγὼ
κτείνω νιν, ὡς τοὔνειρον ἐννέπει τόδε. 550

The hapax ἐκδρακοντωθείς is momentous: now Orestes 'transforms himself into a snake, victim of a snake, and snake-killer'.[39] It is important that Orestes himself perceives Clytemnestra as a snake (δεινῆς ἐχίδνης, 249; μύραινά γ᾽ εἴτ᾽ ἔχιδν᾽ ἔφυ, 994) and that he identifies himself with the

38 Macleod 1982: 130, 142.
39 Heath 1999b: 30.

snake of the dream, since 'the matricidal act requires him to shed something of his humanity'.[40] At the same time, the passage emphasises the kinship (τεκεῖν, παιδός, μαστὸν θρεπτήριον, φίλον γάλα etc.) between him and Clytemnestra, or better, between the two snakes. Whereas in the Agamemnon we had eagles eating hares, or lions eating sheep, we now have a snake killing another snake. This cannibalistic conception classifies tyranny (which is clearly indicated by θανεῖν βιαίως) as doubly unnatural: among the inhuman polities, this is the most corrupt.[41] From Clytemnestra's perspective, only after Aegisthus' murder does she understand her dream; tragically, it was not a dream but a prophesy, and the snake was Orestes: οἳ ᾽γώ, τεκοῦσα τόνδ᾽ ὄφιν ἐθρεψάμην (928).[42]

c. The road towards Democracy

The final stage of this evolutionary course is the gradual foundation of democratic institutions, represented by Athena; for this purpose, it is essential that in the *Eumenides*, alone among Greek tragedies, Athens lacks

40 Rutherford 2014: 1.

41 'King snakes' are indeed cannibalistic. Goldhill 1990: 106–8 notes that in folklore the female viper was said to destroy the male in copulation, and that the children eat their way out of the womb in revenge.

42 For O'Neill 1998, the latter occurrence of the snake imagery is an extension of 896-98 (Clytemnestra exposes her breast to Orestes but fails to persuade him) and a reworking of *Il.* 22.82-83 (the same with Hecuba and Hector) with its continuation in 22.92-93 (Hector lurking like a snake against Achilles). Therefore, he argues, the Homeric intertext foreshadows Orestes' forthcoming attack. I find this fourfold linking somewhat unconvincing; first, because as O'Neill admits, there are big differences on the level of characterisation (Hecuba worries about her son, whereas Clytemnestra about herself; Hector enjoys normal relationships with his family); second, because a three-party scheme (Hecuba – Hector – Achilles) can hardly fit into a two-party scheme (Clytemnestra – Orestes – Clytemnestra) without confusion; third and most important, a lurking snake is dangerous anyway – why does it have to be a Homeric one?

a king.[43] Only Athena is called ἄνασσα (288, 443), which is a rather stereotypical address to goddesses,[44] and only before the establishment of the civil court (482). Many scholars avoid using the term democracy for what Aeschylus presents in this play (neither does he), probably for its oddity within the mythological setting of tragedy as a genre; even though they acknowledge that this is what he propagandises/idealises, instead they use vague politic terms, such as εὐνομία or ideal society.[45] It is noteworthy that not only the judicial power of a supreme court emerges in this new polity, but also election procedures (487) and legislative power assigned to citizens (693).[46] Not an accomplished democracy yet (despite some anachronistic references to the post-Ephialtean Areopagus and the

43 Dodds 1960: 247. Sommerstein 1989 ad 288: 'The function which would naturally be the king's (and which in Aeschylus' own time belonged to the βασιλεύς) of organising and presiding over a homicide trial is assumed by Athena herself.'

44 *Od*. 3.380, 6.175.

45 E.g. Zeitlin 1965: 508: 'the triumph of good persuasion, true justice, love, light, healing, and propitious sacrifice'; Podlecki 1966: 78: 'the new and higher morality of the *polis*'; Macleod 1982: 132: 'an ideal representation of human society... ideal city... goodness achieved'; Winnington-Ingram 1983: 164: 'a triumph of good over evil'; Sommerstein 1989: 183: 'a new kind of Justice'; Goldhill 1986: 30: 'the triumph of the established civic discourse'; Griffith 1995: 64: 'an idealized triumph of legal process over vendetta and blood-feud, the instantiation of a new kind of divine justice on earth, or the crude reassertion of male domination in the home, in the city, and on Mount Olympus'. For Heath 1999b: 17-18 with n. 2, the end of the trilogy marks 'the rise of the polis' as opposed to 'the pre-polis arena', but only in a footnote does he explain that in his study the term polis 'refers to the mature polis, the functioning, democratic institutions that a contemporary of Aeschylus would associate with Athens'.

46 When Athena says κρίνασα δ' ἀστῶν τῶν ἐμῶν τὰ βέλτατα (487), it is not a personal, despotic decision but a democratic election, for Athena stands metonymically for the Athenians; Areopagus' judges were the outgoing, elected ἄρχοντες, coming from the higher financial classes – hence βέλτατα. Of course, after 487 BC, the archons where selected by lot rather than election (Arist. *Ath. Pol*. 43.5), but the trilogy is set in a mythological past. Whether Aeschylus wanted to oppose to this reformation is not clear, but we should remember that the *Oresteia* was written thirty years later. Sommerstein (ad loc.) rejects any political significance in these lines.

Argive alliance), this phase of the trilogy represents the phase of the *diallaktai*, and especially of Solon.[47] Athena declares the direction of this government: τὸ μήτ' ἄναρχον μήτε δεσποτούμενον ἀστοῖς περιστέλλουσι βουλεύω σέβειν (696-97).

Moving to the animal presentation of this political transition, in the *Eumenides* no animal prevails as an image overall or is symbolically linked to democracy, in contrast to the preceding tragedies and polities. This is not to say that the political aspect of the animal imagery-system now collapses; it is exactly this discrepancy that completes this 'system', through antithesis. Firstly, the distribution of the animal imagery in this tragedy is telling: the majority of bestial images are gathered in the first third of the play, whereas they become rarer after Athena's entrance. Secondly, what changes with Athena is the function of the imagery: it was symbolic in the first half, usually attached to Orestes (111, 246: fawn, 147: beast, 326: hare) and the Erinyes (128: snake, 131, 246: hound, 197: hated flock), but now animals are used literally, and metaphors and similes almost disappear. The only example of metaphorical use of animal imagery in the later part of the Eumenides is when Athena denounces a potential civil war, comparing it to fighting cocks. 'Cockfight gave expression to oligarchic aspirations and democratic fears by translating a competition between equals into a vivid demonstration of domination and enslavement'.[48] This simile is doubly appropriate here, because the bird is domestic (like civil war is internal) and rather seedy-looking (οὐκ ἔρως):[49]

> μήτ' †ἐξελοῦσ'† ὡς καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων
> ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἀστοῖσιν ἱδρύσῃς Ἄρη
> ἐμφύλιόν τε καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους θρασύν.
> θυραῖος ἔστω πόλεμος, οὐ μόλις παρών,

47 As a 'mediator', Solon introduced some 'most democratic' reforms (*Ath. Pol.* 9.1) and refused to become a tyrant (Solon fr. 34; *Ath. Pol.* 6.3; Plut. *Sol.* 15.1). Similar to the *diallaktēs* is the title *aisymnētēs*, traditionally ascribed to Pittacus. For Aristotle, this is a kind of monarchy that resembles tyranny in being despotic, but kingship in being elective and constitutional (*Pol.* 1285a, 29-30). See McGlew 1993: 79-81, 94-96.

48 Csapo 1993: 26-27.

49 Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 12.14-15.

ἐν ᾧ τις ἔσται δεινὸς εὐκλείας ἔρως·
ἐνοικίου δ' ὄρνιθος οὐ λέγω μάχην. 865

In all other cases, in the later part of the *Eumenides*, animals are just animals. So it is in Orestes' purification sacrifice, σφαγαὶ καθαιμάξωσι νεοθήλου βοτοῦ (450), in Athena's wishes for her citizens' prosperity, καρπόν τε γαίας καὶ βοτῶν ἐπίρρυτον (907) and μῆλὰ εὐθενοῦντα (943), and of course, in her celebratory offerings (1006). In fact, it is here only in the trilogy that animals refer to real animals.[50] This stylistic shift in the animal imagery, from density to rarity and from symbolism to literalism, is meaningful for a political reading: no animal stands for democracy or for its personification, Athena, because in contrast to kingship and uprising, this constitution alone preserves human coexistence. And as a parenthetical warning for the future, civil war within democracy is characterised in the same terms (i.e. in bestial terms) as kingship and tyranny.

Other scholars interpret this shift as a movement from vendetta to law courts, from lawlessness to δίκη, from amorality to morality, from matriarchy to patriarchy, or from pre-polis to polis, rather than from kingship to democracy.[51] Especially the connection of the animal imagery with δίκη might seem inevitable, given the similes κυνὸς δίκην, δίκαν χιμαίρας, βοὸς δίκην, κύκνου δίκη, λαγὼ δίκην etc.[52] The specific

50 For Dolgert 2012, the *Oresteia* does not show (to us moderns) a progression from brutality to civilization, because sacrificing animals is no less problematic or political than sacrificing people. He clarifies that the problem is with 'contemporary theorists' who are 'explicitly praising the Greek tragedies in light of their use of the Greek ritual of blood sacrifice' (269). Indeed, we cannot ascribe such animal-rights concerns to the ancient Greeks – and therefore I confine this interpretation to the footnotes. Nevertheless, his argument still contains a fallacy, that 'the Furies *themselves* are sacrificed' (269), a reading which is only based on 'textual polyvalence' and 'textual ambiguity' (277-78) and no serious classicist, to my knowledge, has proposed – Dolgert himself is a political scientist.

51 See above at footnote 45, for the conclusion of *Eum*. in general; and for the progression of the animal imagery in particular, see Peradotto 1969: 246 n. 32; Heath 1999b: 42-43; Macleod 1982: 138 (on natural imagery, more generally).

52 Introducing comparisons with δίκην ('like', 'in the manner of') is decidedly Aeschylean and overwhelmingly represented in the *Oresteia*, in which ten of the twenty-four comparisons of this form involve animals (Wilson 2006: 188-90). Wilson argues

political reading which I propose here – only as an additional interpretation – is promoted by the fact that the temporal arrangement of the imagery throughout the trilogy is historically consistent: the polities/animals in the trilogy succeed each other in a linear progression that reflects the evolution of Athenian history. Thus, after the fall of Agamemnon/kingship, the lion disappears; there is no reference to it in the *Choephori* and only a random one (non-symbolic) in the *Eumenides*.[53] In the same way, the snake imagery/uprising which prevails in the *Choephori* is fading away in the *Eumenides.* The narrative of the plays is explanatory: kingship (Agamemnon, lion, eagle) is located in the first tragedy and is set in the past, brought up by the chorus as a flashback; uprising (Clytemnestra, Aegisthus, Orestes, snakes) emerges at the end of the *Agamemnon* and is developed in the second tragedy, which is set in the present; democracy (Athena, non-animal) is gradually established in the *Eumenides* and is set in the future (ἔσται δὲ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν Αἰγέως στρατῷ | αἰεὶ δικαστῶν τοῦτο βουλευτήριον. 683-4). The link with the theme of sacrifice now becomes evident. Iphigenia's sacrifice is located in the past (narrated as a flashback) and executed by Agamemnon: she is the victim of kingship. Cassandra's sacrifice is located in the present and executed by Clytemnestra: she is the victim of tyranny. Eventually, Athena's offerings are a holy sacrifice for the future, which closes definitely a circle of shameless murders; σφαγίων τῶνδ' (1006) is an emphatic formalisation of the establishment of normality, of democracy. Exploiting artfully the animal imagery and the theme of sacrifice in the *Oresteia*, Aeschylus offers a poetic expression of the historic evolution of governments and praises democracy. The other option is a bestial society, or a human jungle.

that, even though the δίκην-similes decrease in the course of the trilogy and thus contribute to the general progress from bestial to human justice, the remembrance of the initial use of δίκη(ν) undermines the happy end. This is a compelling argument, but its verbal premises are rather weak: the connection between the adverbial δίκην and δίκη as justice seems like a pun conceived in English – 'just like a dog' and '*just* like a dog'. I am more inclined towards Garvie 1986 ad 195: 'it is going too far to connect this with the general δίκη-motif of the trilogy'. For the ambiguities of δίκη in the trilogy, see Goldhill 1986: 33-56.

53 λέοντος ἄντρον αἱματορρόφου | οἰκεῖν τοιαύτας εἰκός (*Eum.* 193-94), said by Apollo for the Erinyes.

This animalistic conception of political progress can be seen in dialogue with the tale of Prometheus and Epimetheus in Plato's *Protagoras*. There, the human being, alone among all other species, has been given the *political virtue* (comprising *shame* and *justice*) in order to live in security and prosperity. This is presented as the final of three stages of development (322b-c), just like in the *Oresteia*: first, 'there were no cities; so they [humans] begun to be destroyed by the wild beasts'; subsequently, 'when they came together, they treated each other with injustice, not possessing the art of running a city, so they scattered and began to be destroyed once again'; finally, 'Zeus... sent Hermes bringing conscience and justice to mankind, to be the principles of organization of cities and the bonds of friendship'.[54] One can easily see some correspondence between these three stages and the kingship–tyranny–democracy pattern of the *Oresteia*, such as: (a) the disastrous consequences of the first two conditions and the rightfulness of the third one; (b) the self-destructive nature of the second condition where humans destroy each other; (c) the intervention of the gods for the establishment of the rightful; and (d) the need to separate humans from animals. Of course, it is hard to argue for a direct influence between the two texts, given their temporal distance (the *Oresteia* was composed in 458 and *Protagoras* in the 380s with a dramatic date in the 430s) and their individual political focus (pre-civic to civic organisation in the *Protagoras* and different forms of civic organisation in the *Oresteia*). However, given the prevalence of animal imagery in political philosophy in general, as also exemplified by Aristotle's statement ὁ ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῶον, it becomes evident that Aeschylus' political imagery has intentional philosophical reflections.

54 Trans. Taylor 1976.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahí, F.M. 1982. 'Amber, Avallon and Apollo's Singing Swan' *AJPh* 103, 373-411.
Arnott, W.G. 2007. *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z*. London.
Bowie, A.M. 1993. 'Religion and Politics in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*' *CQ* 43, 10-31.
Calder, W. 1981. 'The Anti-Periklean Intent of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*' in E. Schmidt (ed.) *Aischylos und Pindar*. Berlin, 220-23.
Cole, J.R. 1977. 'The *Oresteia* and Cimon' *HSPh* 81, 99-111.
Coo, L. 2013. 'A Tale of Two Sisters: Studies in Sophocles' *Tereus*' *TAPhA* 143, 349-84.
Cook, A.B. 1925. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*. Cambridge.
Csapo, E. 1993. 'Deep Ambivalence: Notes on a Greek Cockfight' *Phoenix* 47, 1-28 and 115-24.
Denniston, J.D. & D. Page (eds.). 1957. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. Oxford.
Dobrov, G.W. 2001. *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*. Oxford & New York.
Dodds, E.R. 1960. 'Morals and Politics in the *Oresteia*' *PCPhS* 6, 19-31.
Dolgert, S. 2012. 'Sacrificing Justice: Suffering Animals, the *Oresteia*, and the Masks of Consent' *Political Theory* 40, 263–89.
Dover, K.J. 1957. 'The Political Aspect of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*' *JHS* 77, 230-37.
Dumortier, J. 1975. *Les images dans la poésie d'Eschyle*. Paris.
Earp, F.R. 1948. *The Style of Aeschylus*. Cambridge.
Erp Taalman Kip, A.M. van. 1996. 'The Unity of the *Oresteia*' in M.S. Silk (ed.) *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond*. Oxford, 119-48.
Ferrari, G. 1997. 'Figures in the Text: Metaphors and Riddles in the *Agamemnon*' *CPh* 92, 1-45.
Finglass, P.J. 2011. *Ajax*. Cambridge.
Finglass, P.J. 2016. 'A New Fragment of Sophocles' *Tereus*' *ZPE* 200, 61-85.
Fitzpatrick, D. 2001. 'Sophocles' *Tereus*' *CQ* 51, 90-101.
Fowler, B.H. 1967. 'Aeschylus' Imagery' *C&M* 28, 1-74.
Fowler, B.H. 1991. 'The Creatures and the Blood' *ICS* 16, 85-100.
Fraenkel, E. 1950. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, 3 vols. Oxford.
Garvie, A. 1986. *Choephori*. Oxford.

Goldhill, S. 1986. *Reading Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.
Goldhill, S. 1990. 'Character and Action, Representation and Reading: Greek Tragedy and its Critics' in C. Pelling (ed.) *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford, 100-27.
Goldhill, S. 2000. 'Civic Ideology and the Problem of Difference: The Politics of Aeschylean Tragedy, Once Again' *JHS* 120, 34-56.
Griffith, M. 1995. 'Brilliant Dynasts: Power and Politics in the *Oresteia*' *ClAnt* 14, 62-129.
Harris, J.P. 2012. 'Cassandra's Swan Song: Aeschylus' Use of Fable in *Agamemnon*' *GRBS* 52, 540-58.
Heath, J. 1999a. 'The Serpent and the Sparrows: Homer and the Parodos of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*' *CQ* 49, 396-407.
Heath, J. 1999b. 'Disentangling the Beast: Humans and Other Animals in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*' *JHS* 119, 17-47.
Hofmann, H. 2006. 'Kritische Nachlese zur Hypothesis des Sophokleischen *Tereus* (P. Oxy. 3013)' in S. Eklund (ed.) *Syncharmata: Studies in Honour of J. F. Kindstrand*. Uppsala, 87-112.
Hourmouziades, N.C. 1986. 'Sophocles' *Tereus*' in J.H. Betts, J.T. Hooker & J.R. Green (eds.) *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster*. Bristol, 134-42.
Knox, B.M.W. 1952. 'The Lion in the House: *Agamemnon* 717-36' *CPh* 47, 17-25.
Krappe, A.H. 1942. 'Ἀπόλλων κύκνος' *CPh* 37, 353-70.
Lebeck, A. 1971. *The Oresteia: A Study in Language and Structure*. London.
Luppe, W. 2007. 'Die *Tereus*: Hypothesis P.Oxy. XLII 3013' *APF* 53, 1-5.
Macleod, C.W. 1982. 'Politics in the *Oresteia*' *JHS* 102, 124-44.
McGlew, J. 1993. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca, NY.
Meier, C. 1993. *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*. Baltimore, MD.
Moreau, A.M. 1985. *Eschyle: la violence et le chaos*. Paris.
Nooter, S. 2017. *The Mortal Voice in the Tragedies of Aeschylus*. Cambridge & New York.
O'Neill, K. 1998. 'Aeschylus, Homer, and the Serpent at the Breast' *Phoenix* 52, 216-29.
Peradotto, J.J. 1969. 'The Omen of the Eagles and the ἦθος of Agamemnon' *Phoenix* 23, 237-63.
Petrounias, E. 1976. *Funktion und Thematik der Bilder bei Aischylos.* Gottingen.

Podlecki, A.J. 1966. *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy*. Ann Arbor.
Raeburn, D. & O. Thomas (eds). 2011. *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*. Oxford.
Rose, H.J. 1958. *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus*. Amsterdam.
Rosenmeyer, T.G. 1982. *The Art of Aeschylus*. Berkeley.
Rutherford, R.B. 2014. *Greek Tragic Style.* Cambridge.
Saayman, F. 1993. 'Dogs and Lions in the *Oresteia*' *Akroterion* 38, 11-18.
Sancassano, M.L. 1997. *Il serpente e le sue immagini*. Como.
Schaps, D. 1993. 'Aeschylus' Politics and the Theme of the *Oresteia*' in R. Rosen & J. Farrell (eds.) *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*. Ann Arbor, 505-15.
Seaford, R. 2003. 'Tragic Tyranny' in K. Morgan (ed.) *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece*. Austin, TX, 95-115.
Sommerstein, A.H. 1989. *Eumenides*. Cambridge.
Sommerstein, A.H. 1993. 'Sleeping Safe in Our Beds: Stasis, Assassination and the *Oresteia*' in J. Molyneux (ed.) *Literary Responses to Civil Discord*. Nottingham, 1-24.
Sommerstein, A.H. 2008. *Aeschylus II: Oresteia* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, MA & London.
Stähler, K. 2000. 'Prokne: eine Mythosgestalt in Drama und Skulptur klassischer Zeit' in S. Gödde & T. Heinze (eds.) *Skenika: Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption*. Darmstadt, 175-88.
Swift, L. 2010. *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford.
Taylor, C.C.W. 1976. *Plato: Protagoras*. Oxford.
Thumiger, C. 2008. 'ἀνάγκης ζεύγματ' ἐμπεπτώκαμεν: Greek Tragedy Between Human and Animal' *Leeds International Classical Studies* 7.3.
Van Dijk, G.J. 1997. *Αἶνοι, Λόγοι, Μῦθοι: Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature*. Leiden.
West, S.R. 2003. 'Aegisthus the Cowardly Lion: A Note on Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1224' *Mnemosyne* 56, 480-84.
Whallon, W. 1958. 'The Serpent at the Breast' *TAPhA* 89, 271-75.
Wilson, P. 2006. 'Dikēn in the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus' in J. Davidson et al (eds.) *Greek Drama III: Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee*. London, 187-201.
Winnington-Ingram, R.P. 1983. *Studies in Aeschylus*. Cambridge.

Zeitlin, F.I. 1965. 'The Motif of the Corrupted Sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*' *TAPhA* 96, 463-508.
Zeitlin, F.I. 1966. 'Postscript to Sacrificial Imagery in the *Oresteia* (*Ag.* 1235-37)' *TAPhA* 97, 645-53.

Dimitrios Kanellakis
University of Oxford
dimitrios.kanellakis@queens.ox.ac.uk

APPENDIX

L= literalism, M= metaphor, S= simile, SL = symbolic literalism (dreams, fables etc.), PE= proverbial expression

Agamemnon

Lines	Speaker	Greek Text (Page 1972)	Translation (Sommerstein 2008)	Trope	Refers to
2-3	Watch-man	ἦν κοιμώμενος στέγαις Ἀτρειδῶν ἄγκαθεν, κυνὸς δίκην,	*I've spent my nights on the Atreidae's roof,* *resting on my elbows like a dog*	S	Himself
36-37	Watch-man	βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ μέγας / βέβηκεν·	*a great ox has stepped upon my tongue*	PE	
48-57	Chorus	μεγάλ' ἐκ θυμοῦ κλάζοντες Ἄρη, τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν οἵτ' ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι παίδων ὕπατοι λεχέων στροφοδινοῦνται πτερύγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι, δεμνιοτήρη πόνον ὀρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες· ὕπατος δ' ἀίων ἤ τις Ἀπόλλων ἢ Πὰν ἢ Ζεὺς οἰωνόθροον γόον ὀξυβόαν...	*uttering from their hearts a great cry for war,* *like birds of prey* *who, crazed by grief for their children,* *wheel around high above their eyries,* *having seen the toil of watching over* *their nestlings' beds go for nothing;* *and some Apollo on high,* *or Pan, or Zeus, hearing the loud shrill* *wailing cries of the birds...*	S	Atreidae, for Helen
111-19	Chorus	πέμπει ξὺν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι θούριος ὄρνις Τευκρίδ' ἐπ' αἶαν, οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς βασιλεῦσι νε- ῶν, ὁ κελαινὸς ὅ τ' ἐξόπιν ἀργᾶς, φανέντες ἴ- κταρ μελάθρων χερὸς ἐκ δοριπάλτου παμπρέπτοις ἐν ἕδραισιν, βοσκομένω λαγίναν, ἐρικύμονα φέρματι γένναν,	*(they) were sped with avenging spear and hand* *to the Teucrian land by a fierce warlike bird of omen,* *the king of birds appearing to the kings of ships,* *one black, one white in the hind parts, near the house,* *on the side of the spear-wielding hand,* *settling where they were conspicuous to all,* *eating a scion of the hare tribe, pregnant with many offspring,*	SL	Agamemnon & Menelaus against Troy
124	Chorus	ἐδάη λαγοδαίτας	*(he) recognized [...] the feasters of the hare.*	SL	Agam & Menel
132	Calchas	στόμιον μέγα Τροίας	*the great curb of Troy* [see Raeburn & Thomas 2011 ad loc.]	M	The Greek army

134-38	Chorus (Calchas' words)	οἴκτῳ γὰρ ἐπίφθονος Ἄρτεμις ἁγνὰ πτανοῖσιν κυσὶ πατρὸς αὐτότοκον πρὸ λόχου μογερὰν πτάκα θυομένοισιν· στυγεῖ δὲ δεῖπνον αἰετῶν.	*For holy Artemis, out of pity, bears a grudge against the winged hounds of her Father who slaughtered the wretched hare, litter and all, bifore it could give birth; she loathes the eagles' feast.*	SL	Atreidae killing Trojans/ Iphigenia
140-3	Chorus (Calchas' words)	τόσον περ εὔφρων ἁ καλὰ δρόσοις ἀέπτοις μαλερῶν λεόντων πάντων τ' ἀγρονόμων φιλομάστοις θηρῶν ὀβρικάλοισι τερπνά	*So very kindly disposed is the Fair One to the unfledged seed of fiery lions, and so delightsome to the suckling whelps of all beasts that roam the wild.*	SL	Iphigenia
157	Chorus	ἀπ' ὀρνίθων ὁδίων	*by the birds seen by the way*	L	
232	Chorus	δίκαν χιμαίρας	*like a yearling goat*	S	Iphigenia
394	Chorus	διώκει παῖς ποτανὸν ὄρνιν,	*he is a boy chasing a bird on the wing*	PE	Paris
449	Chorus	τάδε σῖγά τις βαΰζει	*That is what they are snarling, under their breath*	M	The Argives
563	Herald	χειμῶνα δ' εἰ λέγοι τις οἰωνοκτόνον,	*And if one were to mention the unendurable cold of winter that killed the birds,*	L	
607	Clytem	δωμάτων κύνα	*A watchdog of the house*	M	Himself
655-57	Herald	αἱ δὲ κεροτυπούμεναι βίᾳ [...] ᾠχονθ' ἅφαντοι ποιμένος κακοῦ στρόβῳ	*They were savagely gashed and disappeared unseen, whirled about by a perverse shepherd.*	M	Greek ships & Poseidon
717-31	Chorus	ἔθρεψεν δὲ λέοντος ἶ- νιν δόμοις ἀγάλακτον οὕ- τως ἀνὴρ φιλόμαστον, ἐν βιότου προτελείοις ἄμερον, εὐφιλόπαιδα, καὶ γεραροῖς ἐπίχαρτον· πολέα δ' ἔσχ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις νεοτρόφου τέκνου δίκαν, φαιδρωπὸς ποτὶ χεῖρα σαί- νων τε γαστρὸς ἀνάγκαις. χρονισθεὶς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἦ- θος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων· χάριν γὰρ τροφεῦσιν ἀμείβων μηλοφόνοισι σὺν ἄταις δαῖτ' ἀκέλευστος ἔτευξεν·	*Just so a man once* *reared in his home an infant lion,* *fond of the nipple but deprived of its milk,* *in its undeveloped time of life* *tame, well loved by children* *and a delight to the old:* *it was much in his arms* *like a young suckling baby,* *gazing bright-eyed at his hand* *and fawning when hunger pressed it.* *But in time it displayed the character inherited* *from its parents; it returned thanks to its nurturers* *by making, with destructive slaughter of sheep,* *a feast, unbidden.*	LS	Paris-Helen (and Clytemnestra-Agamemnon, Orestes-Clytemnestra, Aegisthus-Agamemnon)
795	Chorus	ὅστις δ' ἀγαθὸς προβατογνώμων,	*But whoever is a good judge of his flock...*	M	Anyone/ themselves

824-25	Agam	πόλιν διημάθυνεν Ἀργεῖον δάκος, ἵππου νεοσσός,	*A city has been ground into dust by the Argive beast, the offspring of the Horse*	M+L	Greek army Trojan horse
827	Agam	ὠμηστὴς λέων	*A lion, eater of the raw flesh*	M	Greek army
892-93	Clytem	λεπταῖς ὑπαὶ κώνωπος ἐξηγειρόμην ῥιπαῖσι θωύσσοντος	*I kept being awakened by the light buzz of a trumpeting mosquito*	L	
896	Clytem	λέγοιμ᾽ ἂν ἄνδρα τόνδε τῶν σταθμῶν κύνα,	*I shall speak of this man as the watchdog of his homestead*	M	Agamemnon
1050-51	Clytem	ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἐστὶ μὴ χελιδόνος δίκην ἀγνῶτα φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη,	*Well, unless she has some unintelligible barbarian language, like the swallows do, ...*	PE	Cassandra
1057	Clytem	ἕστηκεν ἤδη μῆλα †πρὸς σφαγὰς† πυρός	*The sheep are already standing, ready for slaughter*	L/M?	Sheep/Agam?
1063	Chorus	τρόπος δὲ θηρὸς ὡς νεαιρέτου.	*She has the manner of a wild beast just trapped.*	S	Cassandra
1066-67	Chorus	χαλινὸν δ᾽ οὐκ ἐπίσταται φέρειν πρὶν αἱματηρὸν ἐξαφρίζεσθαι μένος.	*she doesn't yet know how to bear the bridle not till she's foamed out her rage in blood.*	M	Cassandra
1093	Chorus	ἔοικεν εὔρις ἡ ξένη κυνὸς δίκην	*The foreign woman seems to be as keen-scented as a hound*	S	Cassamdra
1125-28	Cassandra	ἄπεχε τῆς βοὸς τὸν ταῦρον· ἐν πέπλοισιν μελαγκέρῳ λαβοῦσα μηχανήματι τύπτει·	*Keep the bull away from the cow! She traps him in the robe, the black-horned contrivance, and strikes.*	M	Agamemnon & Clytemnestra
1142-48	Chorus Cassandra	... οἷά τις ξουθὰ ἀκόρετος βοᾶς, φεῦ, ταλαίναις φρεσὶν Ἴτυν Ἴτυν στένουσ᾽ ἀμφιθαλῆ κακοῖς ἀηδὼν μόρον. ἰὼ ἰὼ λιγείας βίος ἀηδόνος· περέβαλον γάρ οἱ πτεροφόρον δέμας θεοὶ γλυκύν τ᾽ αἰῶνα κλαυμάτων ἄτερ·	*...like a vibrant-throated bird wailing insatiably, alas, with a heart fond of grieving, the nightingale lamenting "Itys, Itys!" for a death in which both parents did evil.* *Ió ió, the life of the clear-voiced nightingale! The gods have clothed her with a feathered form and given her a pleasant life with no cause to grieve;*	S	Cassandra for Agamemnon
1224	Cassandra	λέοντ᾽ ἄναλκιν ἐν λέχει στρωφώμενον	*a cowardly [lion]*	M	Aegisthus
1228-29	Cassandra	οὐκ οἶδεν οἵα γλῶσσα μισητῆς κυνός, λέξασα κἀκτείνασα φαιδρόνους δίκην,	*He does not know what kind of bite comes after the fawning tongue of that hateful bitch and the cheerful inclination of her ear.*	S	Clytemnestra
1233	Cassandra	ἀμφίσβαιναν ἢ Σκύλλαν τινὰ	*An amphisbaena, or some Scylla*	S	Clytemnestra
1245	Chorus	τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ ἀκούσας ἐκ δρόμου πεσὼν τρέχω.	*I am running, having fallen out of the chase (= I'm running like a hound that's lost the scent).*	M	Chorus

1258-59	Cassandra	αὕτη δίπους λέαινα συγκοιμωμένη λύκῳ, λέοντος εὐγενοῦς ἀπουσίᾳ,	*This is the two-footed lioness, sleeping with a wolf while the noble lion was away,*	M	Clytem, Aegist, Agam
1297-98	Chorus	πῶς θελάτου βοὸς δίκην πρὸς βωμὸν εὐτόλμως πατεῖς;	*How comes it that you are walking boldly towards it like an ox driven by god to the altar?*	S	Cassandra
1310	Chorus	τόδ' ὄζει θυμάτων ἐφεστίων.	*That's the smell of sacrifices at the hearth.*	L/M?	Sheep/Agam?
1316	Cassandra	οὗτοι δυσοίζω θάμνον ὡς ὄρνις φόβῳ,	*I am not shying away out of my empty terror, as a bird does from a bush*	S	Herself
1382	Clytem	ἄπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον, ὥσπερ ἰχθύων,	*an endless net, as one does for fish*	S	Agamemnon
1415-16	Clytem	ὡσπερεὶ βοτοῦ μόρον, μήλων φλεόντων εὐπόκοις νομεύμασιν,	*treating her death as if it were the death of one beast out of large flocks of well-fleeced sheep*	S	Iphigenia
1444-45	Clytem	ἡ δέ τοι κύκνου δίκην τὸν ὕστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόον	*she, after singing, swan-like, her final dirge of death,*	S	Cassandra
1473	Chorus	δίκαν / κόρακος ἐχθροῦ σταθεῖσ' ἐκνόμως ὕμνον ὑμνεῖν ἐπεύχεται < >.	*In the manner of a loathsome raven, it glories* *in tunelessly singing a song <of joy>*	S	Daimon/ Clytemnestra
1492, 1516	Chorus	κεῖσαι δ' ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷδ'	*Here you lie in this spider's web*	M	Clytemnestra
1631-32	Aegisthus	σὺ δ' ἐξορίνας νηπίοις ὑλάγμασιν ἄξῃ· κρατηθεὶς δ' ἡμερώτερος φανῇ.	*if you anger me with your childish barkings you'll be led off under arrest—and once under control, you'll show yourself a bit tamer!*	M	Chorus
1639-41	Aegisthus	τὸν δὲ μὴ πειθάνορα ζεύξω βαρείαις, οὗ τι μὴ σειραφόρον κριθῶντα πῶλον,	*Anyone who will not obey his master I will yoke with heavy straps—he certainly won't be a young trace-horse high on barley;*	M	Chorus
1660	Clytem	δαίμονος χηλῇ βαρείᾳ δυστυχῶς πεπληγμένοι.	*wretchedly struck by the heavy talon of the evil spirit.*	M	The Argives
1671-72	Chorus Clytem	κόμπασον θαρσῶν, ἀλέκτωρ ὥστε θηλείας πέλας. μὴ προτιμήσῃς ματαίων τῶνδ' ὑλαγμάτων·	*Brag away confidently, like a cock standing next to his hen!* *Don't take any notice of these empty barkings.*	S M	Aegisthus Chorus

Choephori

Lines	Speaker	Greek Text (Page 1972)	Translation (Sommerstein 2008)	Trope	Refers to
247	Orestes	ἰδοῦ δὲ γένναν εὖνιν αἰετοῦ πατρὸς	*Behold the orphan brood of the eagle father*	M	Agamemnon
249	Orestes	δεινῆς ἐχίδνης	*fearsome viper*	M	Clytemnestra
250-51	Orestes	οὐ γὰρ ἐντελεῖς θήραν πατρῴαν προσφέρειν σκηνήμασιν.	*for they are not yet full-grown so as to be able to bring home to the nest the prey their father hunted.*	M	Himself & Electra
256	Orestes	νεοσσοὺς τούσδ' ἀποφθείρας	*if you allow us nestlings to perish*		
[275]277	Orestes	ἀποχρημάτοισι ζημίαις ταυρούμενον	[enraged like a bull by the loss of my possessions]	M	Orestes
421-22	Electra	λύκος γὰρ ὥστ' ὠμόφρων ἄσαντος ἐκ ματρός ἐστι θυμός.	*for like a savage-hearted wolf, we have a rage,caused by our mother, that is past fawning.*	S	Herself
446	Nurse	μυχῷ δ' ἄφερκτος πολυσινοῦς κυνὸς δίκαν	*shut up in the bowels of the house, like a dangerous dog*	S	Herself
501	Electra	ἰδὼν νεοσσοὺς τούσδ' ἐφημένους τάφῳ	*see these nestlings perched on your tomb*	M	Herself & Orestes
527	Chorus	τεκεῖν δράκοντ' ἔδοξεν	*she imagined she gave birth to a snake*	SL	Orestes
544	Orestes	οὖφις †επᾶσα σπαργανηπλείζετο†	*the snake[...]found a welcoming home in my swaddling clothes*		
549	Orestes	ἐκδρακοντωθεὶς δ' ἐγὼ	*I become the serpent*		
601	Chorus	κνωδάλων τε καὶ βροτῶν	*both among beasts and among men*	SL	Anyone
621	Chorus	ἁ κυνόφρων	*the woman with a bitch's heart!*	M	Skyla
753-54	Cilissa	τὸ μὴ φρονοῦν γὰρ ὡσπερεὶ βοτὸν τρέφειν ἀνάγκη,	*A child without intelligence must be reared like an animal*	S	Orestes
794-95	Chorus	πῶλον εὖνιν ζυγέντ' ἐν ἅρμασιν	*the orphaned colt yoked to the chariot*	M	Orestes
924-25	Cytem. Orestes	φύλαξαι μητρὸς ἐγκότους κύνας. τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς δὲ πῶς φύγω παρεὶς τάδε;	*Beware your mother's wrathful hounds!* *But how am I to escape my fathers', if I fail to do this?*	M	Erinyes
928	Clytem	οἳ 'γώ, τεκοῦσα τόνδ' ὄφιν ἐθρεψάμην·	*Ah me, this is the snake I bore and nourished!*	M	Orestes
937-38	Chorus	ἔμολε δ' ἐς δόμον τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος διπλοῦς λέων, διπλοῦς Ἄρης.	*and now to the house of Agamemnon there has come a twofold lion, a twofold spirit of violence*	M	Orestes & Pylades
962	Chorus	μέγα τ' ἀφῃρέθη ψάλιον οἴκων	*the great curb has been taken away from the house*	M	Aegisthus & Clyt
994	Orestes	μύραινά γ' εἴτ' ἔχιδν' ἔφυ,	*if she were a morsy-eel or a viper*	SL	Clytemnestra
1047	Chorus	δυοῖν δρακόντοιν εὐπετῶς τεμὼν κάρα.	*deftly cutting off the heads of that pair of serpents*	M	Aegisthus & Clyt
1050	Orestes	πυκνοῖς δράκουσιν	*thickly wreathed with serpents*	L	Erinyes
1054	Orestes	σαφῶς γὰρ αἵδε μητρὸς ἔγκοτοι κύνες.	*these are plainly my mother's wrathful hounds!*	M	Erinyes

Eumenides

Lines	Speaker	Greek Text (Page 1972)	Translation (Sommerstein 2008)	Trope	Refers to
23	Pythia	φίλορνις	*loved by birds*	L	Parnassus
26	Pythia	λαγὼ δίκην Πενθεῖ καταρράψας μόρον.	*netted Pentheus in death like a hare*	S	Pentheus
69-70	Apollo	αἷς οὐ μείγνυται θεῶν τις οὐδ' ἄνθρωπος οὐδὲ θήρ ποτε	*with whom no god ever holds any intercourse, nor man nor beast either*	SL	Anyone
111-13	Ghost of Clytem	ὁ δ' ἐξαλύξας οἴχεται νεβροῦ δίκην, καὶ ταῦτα κούφως ἐκ μέσων ἀρκυστάτων ὥρουσεν, ὑμῖν ἐγκατιλλώψας μέγα.	*and he has got away, escaped like a hunted fawn, and done it, moreover, by jumping lightly right out of the net, making big mocking eyes at you.*	S	Orestes
128	Ghost of Clytem	δεινῆς δρακαίνης ἐξεκήραναν μένος.	*sapped the strength of the fearsome serpent!*	M	Erinyes/Herself
131	Ghost of Clytem	ὄναρ διώκεις θῆρα, κλαγγαίνεις δ' ἅπερ κύων μέριμναν οὔποτ' ἐκλείπων φόνου.	*You are chasing a beast in your dreams, and giving tongue like a hound who can never desist from thinking of blood.*	S	Erinyes
147	Chorus	ἐξ ἀρκύων πέπτωκεν, οἴχεται δ' ὁ θήρ·	*He's slipped out of the net – the beast is gone!*	M	Orestes
181	Apollo	πτηνὸν ἀργηστὴν ὄφιν	*a winged flashing snake*	M	Apollo's arrow
193	Apollo	λέοντος ἄντρον αἱματορρόφου	*in the den of some blood-swilling lion*	L	
196-97	Apollo	χωρεῖτ' ἄνευ βοτῆρος αἰπολούμεναι· ποίμνης τοιαύτης δ' οὔτις εὐφιλὴς θεῶν.	*Off you go, and wander like a herd with no herdsman! None of the gods is friendly to a flock like you.*	M	Erinyes
246	Chorus	τετραυματισμένον γὰρ ὡς κύων νεβρὸν	*Like a hound on the trail of a wounded fawn*	S	Orestes
283	Orestes	καθαρμοῖς ἠλάθη χοιροκτόνοις	*it was expelled by means of the purification-sacrifice of a young pig.*	L	
325-26	Chorus	τόνδ' ἀφαιρούμενος / πτῶκα	*snatching away from me this hare*	M	Orestes
450	Orestes	σφαγαὶ καθαιμάξωσι νεοθηλοῦς βοτοῦ	*the slaughter of a young sucking beast*	L	
452	Orestes	καὶ βοτοῖσι καὶ ῥυτοῖς πόροις	*both by animal victims and by flowing streams.*	L	
644	Apollo	ὦ παντομισῆ κνώδαλα, στύγη θεῶν,	*You utterly loathsome beasts, hated by the gods!*	M	Erinyes
660	Apollo	τίκτει δ' ὁ θρῴσκων	*The parent is he who mounts* [see Sommerstein 1989 ad loc.]	SL	Any man
861	Athena	ὡς καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων	*the hearts [...] of fighting-cocks*	S	Athenians
866	Athena	ἐνοικίου δ' ὄρνιθος οὐ λέγω μάχην.	*I make no account of the fighting of a cock on its own midden.*	M	Athenians
907	Athena	καρπόν τε γαίας καὶ βοτῶν ἐπίρρυτον	*and for the fruitfulness of the citizens' land and livestock to thrive in abundance*	L	
943-5	Chorus	μῆλά τ' εὐθενοῦντα Πὰν ξὺν διπλοῖσιν ἐμβρύοις	*may their flocks flourish, and may Pan* *rear them to bear twin young*	L	

		τρέφοι χρόνῳ τεταγμένῳ·	*at the appointed time;*		
1001	Chorus	Παλλάδος δ’ ὑπὸ πτεροῖς	*under the wings of Pallas*	M	Athena
1006	Athena	σφαγίων τῶνδ’	*these solemn sacrifices*	L	

LA FEMME VOYAGEUSE DANS LES HÉROÏDES 10, 12 ET 21: LECTURES INTRA-OVIDIENNES

Par Stella Alekou

Summary: In this paper, the discussion centres on the portrayal of the female traveller in Ovid's *Heroides* 10, 12 and 21. Notwithstanding the predominance of travelling narratives in the collection, most letters tend to focus on the description of the heroes' journeys as passively attested by the abandoned *puellae*, whereas the epistles of Ariadne, Medea and Cydippe explicitly address the issue of travelling as – also – a feminine activity. The examination of the travel motif will encourage us to review critically the well-established and quite restricted perception of women in Ovid's *Heroides* as mere elegiac *puellae* in love. The paper will tackle the recontextualisation of the travel metaphor from the text of two exiled women to Cydippe's final words – possibly written during Ovid's *relegatio* –, to examine the poet's plea for survival and commemoration.

Pour celui qui cherche à interpréter la représentation de la figure féminine chez Ovide, le recueil des *Héroïdes* demeure une source essentielle et inépuisable d'herméneutique. Nous examinerons dans les pages suivantes la nature que revêt la présentation de l'héroïne ovidienne, à partir des lettres qui n'ont pas fait le sujet d'une étude systématique jusqu'à présent. En effet, bien que le poète de Sulmone attribue à Médée tout comme à Cydippe le rôle de l'écrivain fictif,[1] la moindre association en ce

1 La lettre 12 a suscité des études se focalisant sur la mise en question de son authenticité, comme, par exemple, Knox 1986: 207-23. Les arguments mentionnés, bien que stimulants, nous paraissent peu convaincants. Nous traiterons donc ce texte en tant que composition ovidienne, tout comme la lettre double d'Acontius et Cydippe. Sur l'authenticité des lettres doubles voir Burton 1908: 121-55.

Stella Alekou 'La femme voyageuse dans les *Héroïdes* 10, 12 et 21: lectures intra-ovidiennes' *C&M* 68 (2020) 71-97.

qui concerne l'illustration ovidienne des deux figures semblerait paradoxale: d'un côté, la princesse barbare, une des femmes mythologiques les plus discutées, est auto-décrite dans sa lettre pseudo-biographique comme meurtrière;[2] de l'autre, peu commentée dans la tradition littéraire, la jeune et innocente Cydippe se présente dans une paire épistolaire comme 'l'Autre' d'Acontius, étant, lors de son voyage à Délos, la victime d'une ruse malfaisante.[3] Le choix d'étudier ces lettres paraît toutefois moins surprenant dès lors qu'elles sont comparées avec l'épître d'Ariane, la femme abandonnée, ayant été endormie, sur une île déserte. Car le parallélisme entre les épîtres des deux femmes 'en exil', notamment Ariane et Médée, et la dernière lettre du recueil, celle de Cydippe souffrant d'une maladie grave, ouvre la voie vers une perspective que les spécialistes d'Ovide ont omis d'observer et qui mérite toute notre attention: celle de la femme voyageuse.

Plus exactement, le voyage permet le déplacement des héroïnes et favorise leur approchement, privilégié par des liens préexistants, géographiques ou bien généalogiques: la fuite d'Ariane, fille de Pasiphaé, à Naxos, la ville d'origine de Cydippe, introduit le lecteur à un rite de passage et la relie ainsi de surcroît à Médée, nièce de Pasiphaé, souvent étudiée comme sa 'Doppelgänger'.[4] Notre lecture vise à traiter Cydippe

2 Sur cette illustration de Médée voir le travail de Michalopoulos 2004: 97-124.

3 La trame dramatique du mythe que traite la lettre double, entre Acontius et Cydippe, se constitue de manière générale de la façon suivante: un jeune homme de Céos, Acontius, voit pendant les fêtes de Diane et dans le temple de la déesse une fille de Délos, Cydippe, et lance une pomme à ses pieds, après avoir écrit la formule suivante de serment: 'Je jure par Artémis d'épouser Acontius'. La ramassant, la nourrice la donne à sa maîtresse, qui lit l'inscription à voix haute. Par conséquent, chaque fois que son père Céyx fait le nécessaire pour la préparation du mariage de sa fille et des prétendants autres qu'Acontius, elle est prise d'une fièvre violente. Ayant consulté l'oracle d'Apollon, Céyx obéit à la prescription du dieu et exécute la promesse de sa fille. Voir Call. *Aet.* 67-75. Nous soulignons également la version transmise par l'épistolier Aristaenète (1.10) dérivée de Callimaque. Le mythe en question est évoqué allusivement dans Verg. *Ecl.* 2, ainsi que plus explicitement dans Prop. 1.18.

4 Les légendes de Médée et d'Ariane mettent l'accent sur les instants du sacrifice et de la trahison, la promesse, la perfidie et l'abandon. Voir Dangel 2002: 127-41. Voir aussi Fulkerson 2005: 35-36. Sur les thèmes élégiaques que les héroïnes du recueil partagent voir Landolfi 2000. Voir en particulier pp. 193 sqq. sur le sujet de l'abandon, pp. 204 sqq. sur le sujet de l'amour et p. 208 sur le sujet de l'attente. Sur les liens entre

comme une lectrice érudite d'Ovide et donc une lectrice des lettres d'Ariane et de Médée. La problématique de notre travail réside dans le statut polyvalent que les trois textes accordent à la métaphore du voyage, comme lieu de transition entre l'art scriptural et l'art sculptural, dans une étude différenciée des *artes memoriae*. Les quatre axes principaux – le voyage, la mémoire, l'*ecphrasis* et la parole métapoétique et juridique – visent à mettre en relief un jeu polyphonique d'identifications et de distanciations, d'abord, entre Cydippe et les autres 'locutrices', ensuite, entre les 'épistolières' et leurs lecteurs, et, enfin, entre le poète et ses intertextes. Les lettres seront donc étudiées dans leur double fonction, à la fois comme œuvres statiques absorbant les qualités de l'*ecphrasis* et en mouvement, privilégiant la reprise créative du souvenir et l'originalité ingénieuse que revêt la parole-défense de la femme ovidienne.

1. LE VOYAGE: À LA RECHERCHE DES CAUSES

Le déplacement est une activité-clé dans les trois légendes[5], mais surtout dans celle de la fille d'Æétès, constituée d'une succession de crimes et ponctuée d'un nombre considérable de fuites. Nous rappelons que de Colchide, où, amoureuse de Jason, Médée aide les Argonautes à accomplir 'les tâches impossibles' imposées par son père, la princesse barbare met en œuvre une première fuite pendant laquelle elle tue son frère; à Iolcos elle met fin à la vie de Pélias et ensuite à Corinthe, où elle est réfugiée avec son époux, elle tue sa rivale et ses enfants. La lettre 12 s'arrête à Corinthe, lors du deuxième mariage de Jason (12.137 sqq.) et avant la réalisation des meurtres de Créuse et des enfants de Médée. L'épître ne traite donc pas les évènements déroulés à Athènes où l'héroïne s'enfuit

l'illustration de Médée chez Apollonios de Rhodes et Euripide et celle d'Ariane de Catulle voir Armstrong 2006: 204-12; Clare 1996: 75; DeBrohun 1999: 427-29 ainsi que Theodorakopoulos 2000: 121-29, qui se réfère également à la tragédie d'Ennius, *Medea Exul*.

5 Sur la métaphore du voyage, présente dans presque toutes les lettres, voir Jouteur 2007: 93-120.

encore, pour retourner, à la fin, à sa ville natale; le lecteur est appelé à tracer le voyage intertextuel de l'*epistula* afin de combler les lacunes.[6]

L'introduction *in medias res* de la lettre 12 est marquée par l'arrivée du grand héros des Argonautes en Colchide (12.7-11: *Ei mihi! cur umquam iuvenalibus acta lacertis / Phrixeam petiit Pelias arbor ovem ? / Cur umquam Colchi Magnetida vidimus Argon / Turbaque Phasiacam Graia bibistis aquam ? / Cur mihi plus aequo flavi placuere capilli*;).[7] Bien que cette introduction semble à première vue définir ses liens intertextuels avec les textes fondateurs,[8] la lettre dépasse les limites 'médéocentriques' de son histoire, lorsque son auteur fictif mène subtilement le récit du périple vers la reconfiguration du voyage traité dans un autre texte. La présentation du voyage Argonautique dans la narration de Médée renvoie explicitement à l'ouverture du *Carmen* 64 de Catulle, qui traite ce même sujet afin d'introduire au lecteur le mythe de Thétis et Pélée (64.1-13).[9]

L'illustration de l'arrivée de l'Argo dans le territoire barbare où règne Æétès fait allusion au texte catullien en écho inversé, puisqu'elle se focalise moins sur une union, celle de Thétis et Pélée, et plus sur une séparation, illustrée par un départ de Naxos et présenté dans le *Carmen* 64 sous la forme d'une *ecphrasis*: celui de la nef de Thésée, tissé sur le couvre-lit des mariés. Le compte est repris dans l'épitre ovidienne d'Ariane (10.3-4: *Quae legis, ex illo, Theseu, tibi litore mitto, / Vnde tuam sine me vela tulere ratem*). Située dans la perspective du voyage, qui conduit à une expérience et une aventure non-ordinaires, la lettre d'Ariane, qui aide Thésée, meurtrier de son demi-frère, le Minotaure, à s'échapper du Labyrinthe, s'arrête, elle aussi, lorsque son 'épistolière' se trouve, tout comme Médée, trahie et abandonnée (10.5-6: *In quo me somnusque meus male prodidit et tu, / Per facinus somnis insidiate meis*). La description des deux voyages est

6 Nous notons les œuvres d'Ennius, *Medea Exul*, d'Accius, *Medea sive Argonautae*, ainsi que les œuvres de Pacuvius (*Médus*), de Sénèque (*Médée*) et de Valérius Flaccus (*Argonautiques*). Voir aussi Cic. *Cael.*; Pi. *P.* 4; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.*; E. *Med.*

7 Pour le texte et la traduction nous avons utilisé l'édition de Bornecque 2005.

8 Voir les introductions du mythe chez Ennius, *Medea Exul* 103, 208-16 et chez Accius, *Medea sive Argonautae* 1.467-78. Cf. E. *Med.* 1-8 et Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.169-74 et 549-54.

9 Voir Dufallo 2012: 41.

marquée par le besoin des 'épistolières' de définir les causes de leur malheur – et de leur exil (10.66: *exul*; 12.110: *in exilio*)[10] – : chez Médée, des questions rhétoriques, introduites par *cur* à trois reprises, abordent le sujet de son regret (12.7, 9, 11); chez Ariane, la triple réitération du terme *crudelis* met l'accent sur la personnification des *somnus*, *ventus* et *dextera*, présentés comme la cause de son abandon à l'île de Naxos (10.111-116: *Crudeles somni, quid me tenuistis inertem? / Ah! semel aeterna nocte premenda fui. / Vos quoque crudeles venti, nimiumque parati / Flaminaque in lacrimas officiosa meas; / Dextera crudelis, quae me fratremque necavit, / Et data poscenti, nomen inane, fides*).

Naxos, ville natale de la dernière des héroïnes ovidiennes, ainsi que lieu de départ et destination finale, accueille les lamentations de deux figures face à la mort: Ariane abandonnée et Cydippe souffrant d'une maladie grave. La maladie de Cydippe est directement liée à la lecture involontaire: ayant juré à son insu d'épouser Acontius, elle est prise d'une fièvre lors des préparatifs de son mariage avec un autre homme, alors qu'Acontius ne peut surmonter sa passion et fuit dans la solitude des forêts, gravant le nom de sa bien-aimée sur l'écorce des arbres. Le lecteur ovidien connaît la source principale du mythe, notamment les *Aitia* de Callimaque, qui traitent les causes des symptômes, dans une démystification de la 'maladie sacrée' (3.75.11-19). Ovide reprend le mythe au moment où, malade et ayant reçu une lettre de la part d'Acontius, l'héroïne compose –à l'exemple d'Ariane – à Naxos elle aussi, un texte-réponse qui la conduit ainsi à la recherche des causes de son état de santé. L'interrogation portant sur son voyage de Naxos à Délos reprend la formule du trio des lettres 10 et 12, par la répétition du nom *pede*, terme-indice du déplacement (21.71-72: *Quo pede processi? quo me pede limine movi? / Picta citae tetigi quo pede texta ratis?*).[11] L'image des *pedes*, sur lesquels la pomme fut jetée (21.109: *Mittitur ante pedes malum cum carmine tali*), lie subtilement à la métaphore du voyage le mouvement accompli dans l'envoi de

10 Cf. Ov. *Her.* 7.115. Didon se présente dans le recueil en tant que femme exilée, tout comme Médée et Ariane; toutefois, son épître s'achève lors de son suicide, annoncé et décrit aux derniers vers. Contrairement donc aux 'locutrices' des Lettres 10 et 12, la fin de sa lettre limite son statut de femme voyageuse dans le passé.

11 Cf. Ov. *Her.* 21.98: *Erramusque vago per loca sacra pede*.

la lettre et de la pomme porteuse d'une inscription[12]. Ariane se sert de la même métonymie[13], lorsque le sable piégeant ses pieds de jeune fille la retarde dans son effort pour courir, faisant ainsi allusion non plus au mouvement, mais à la nature statique du texte (10.19-20: *Nunc huc, nunc illuc, et utroque sine ordine, curro; / Alta puellares tardat harena pedes*).[14] Son illustration à l'heure de la rédaction de la lettre se trouve en opposition avec l'emploi du terme *mitto* au début de son texte (10.1), qui renvoie également au fil (μίτος) qu'elle avait offert à Thésée, pour que le héros sorte sauf et vainqueur du labyrinthe (10.103-4: *Cum tibi, ne victor tecto morerere recurvo, / Quae regerent passus, pro duce fila dedi*).[15]

Cydippe va encore plus loin dans la subversion de sa reprise: en réponse à l'allégation de l'héroïne 10, selon laquelle les sommeils et les vents cruels (10.111: *crudeles somni*, 10.113: *crudeles venti*) ont provoqué sa souffrance, la dernière des *Héroïnes* précise que 'c'est folie d'accuser l'inconstance des vents' (21.78: *Sed stultum est venti de levitate queri*)[16], et que le sommeil, le meilleur prétexte d'une longue solitude, cesse d'être crédible (21.23-24: *Mox, ubi, secreti longi causa optima, somnus / Credibilis tarda desinit esse mora*). Invitant le lecteur à une première mise en question des causes (10.111-116; 12.7-11), elle l'encourage à se focaliser sur la distanciation ovidienne vis à vis du texte source,[17] mais aussi des autres lettres. Ainsi, Cydippe ajoute encore que la cause est cachée (21.55: *causa latet*) et se focalise non plus sur le 'pourquoi' que traitent les héroïnes 10 et 12, mais sur le 'comment' (21.71-72: *quo*).

12 Sur la métaphore du voyage voir Höschele 2007: 333.

13 Sur la métonymie dans les *Héroïdes* voir Casanova-Robin 2007: 60.

14 L'état statique fait aussi allusion à l'illustration d'Ariane enfermée dans une *ecphrasis* chez Catulle (*carm.* 64.50 sqq.).

15 Voir Michalopoulos 2002: 95-97 sur le jeu de mots en question. Le verbe *mitto* est principal dans la construction des héroïnes et des héros en voyage. Cf. Ov. *Her.* 1.1, 1.36, 1.64-65, 2.133, 3.64, 3.127, 4.2, 4.37, 5.2, 6.8, 7.72, 9.1, 10.4, 11.2, 11.95, 13.1, 14.1, 15.168, 15.185.

16 Voir Jouteur 2007: 2 sur les variantes autour du vent et la loi de répétition dans le recueil.

17 L'accent mis sur les *causae*, un terme clé dans la lettre d'Acontius, apparaissant 11 fois, dévoile, dans ce contexte en particulier, les rapports de la version ovidienne avec l'œuvre-source, notamment les *Aitia* de Callimaque. Voir sur ce rapport Michalopoulos 2014: 263.

L'interrogation sur les moyens et les raisons des causalités dans les narrations d'Ariane, Médée et Cydippe nous permet donc de les observer comme une interférence de plusieurs points de vue.[18] De caractère complémentaire, le récit du voyage fait naître une écriture qui n'est qu'une composition de plusieurs aperçus partiaux et sélectifs du souvenir, lesquels, une fois 'revus' ensemble, forment un tout cohérent et mémorable.[19]

2. L'ART DE REVOIR ET L'ART DE MÉMOIRE

La complémentarité des trois textes que l'on examine réside dans la construction de l'image d'un voyage, souvenu et décrit en train de se réaliser, lors de ses deux phases, l'accent étant mis sur un départ (lettre 10), sur un itinéraire (lettre 21) et une arrivée (lettre 12). Dans les pages suivantes, nous montrerons que ce que présentent ces textes concerne moins l'esquisse du monde extérieur – notamment le paysage[20] – que des figures féminines, décrites lorsqu'elles sont en train d'apercevoir.[21] Trois

18 Sur l'interférence de plusieurs points de vue dans la narration voir Bordas 2010: 20.

19 Spentzou 2003: 28 remarque que les modes narratifs dans les *Héroïdes* permettent à plusieurs destinataires, à différents moments dans le temps, de se livrer à des lectures imprévisibles et transgressives. Cydippe est la seule des *Héroïdes* à ne pas avoir employé les termes *epistula* et *littera* pour sa lettre. *Scriptum* paraît plus apte à décrire la multitude des textes qui y surgissent, selon Michalopoulos 2014: 257.

20 Jouteur 2007: 120 mentionne que "[s]i la mer, si le vent sont si changeants, c'est que leurs multiples variations ne font que refléter le remous des pensées et des sentiments dans un rapport analogique intime entre l'intérieur et l'extérieur. La poésie, soumise à l'empire de la rhétorique, quitte la sphère référentielle pour s'afficher comme autotélique." La critique ajoute : "Le véritable paysage des *Héroïdes* est intérieur. Ce paysage est celui du champ infini de l'attente, qui suscite la parole 'inépuisable'." Voir aussi Tola 2005: 66 sur l'image de l'eau dans les *Héroïdes*.

21 Ariane est à la fois protagoniste et spectatrice de son histoire; elle devient l'objet de son propre regard, selon Vaiopoulos 2017: 33. Voir aussi Goldhill 2007: 2: "There is a highly developed *discourse of viewing* in Hellenistic culture, for which the notion of *phantasia* – impression – is crucial. It offers a philosophical and physiological explanation of how viewing functions, and is related to psychological processes and the production of speech. This demands that *ekphrasis* also be related to the idea of spectacle, displaying in art galleries, museums, rhetorical performance."

perspectives attirent le regard du lecteur: le paysage comme objet de focalisation, le personnage, tantôt objet décrit, tantôt spectateur actif, et le texte, à la fois véhicule d'accès à l'image souvenue et image mémorable en soi.

La mémoire est un terme clé chez les trois héroïnes[22]: Médée commence son œuvre pseudo-biographique déclarant qu'elle s'en souvient (12.1: *memini*) – en se référant à son aide offerte à Jason –, alors qu'Ariane exprime le besoin de ne plus être oubliée par Thésée, l'oubli ayant suscité l'écriture de sa lettre (10.129-30: *Me quoque narrato sola in tellure relictam. / Non ego sum titulis subripienda tuis*). Paradoxalement, Cydippe met l'accent sur son amnésie intentionnelle et sa mémoire volontairement courte, précisant qu'elle ne se rappelle rien, et qu'elle ne veut nullement rapporter tout ce qu'elle y a vu (21.103-4: *Neque enim meminive libetve / Quidquid ibi vidi dicere*). Elle offre donc un regard distancié non seulement sur son passé – aussi intertextuel –, mais également sur les héroïnes qui l'ont précédée, ainsi que sur leurs souvenirs. Cette posture privilégie une lecture interdépendante des trois textes, puisque l'écriture de la dernière lettre se trouve liée à la réception de plusieurs textes: de l'inscription sur la pomme, mais aussi de la lettre d'Ariane et celle de Médée, ainsi que de l'intertexte ovidien.

En décrivant son voyage à Délos, Cydippe met l'accent sur les statues qu'elle admire sur l'autel ainsi que sur le lieu sacré qui l'entoure, dans un intéressant mélange d'éléments de nature et de créations artistiques (21.100-2: *Miror et in cunctis stantia signa locis. / Miror et innumeris structam de cornibus aram. / Et de qua pariens arbore nixa dea est,*). Sa double focalisation est mise en évidence par le verbe *miror* à deux reprises (21.100-1). De manière peu différente, Médée et Ariane se placent dans le passé afin de décrire leur perception visuelle de l'être aimé, par l'emploi du verbe *vidi*, de nouveau à deux reprises (12.31: *Tunc ego te vidi; tunc coepi scire quis esses;* 12.33 *Et vidi et perii nec notis ignibus arsi*; 10. 29-32: *Inde ego (nam ventis quoque sum crudelibus usa) / Vidi praecipiti carbasa tenta Noto / Aut vidi aut*

22 Sur la mémoire dans les *Héroïdes* voir Stroh 1991: 201-44. Cf. Jouteur 2007: 2 sur la mémoire visuelle et Davis 2012: 33-48 sur la mémoire en tant que note alexandrine. Voir aussi Conte 1986: 23-24 sur la mémoire et l'allusion. Sur l'emploi de la notion de mémoire dans les *Héroïdes* voir Ov. *Her*. 3.101, 5.23-24, 6.64, 8.75, 10.92, 12.1, 15.43.

acie tamquam [quae me] vidisse putarem / Frigidior glacie semianimisque fui).[23] La présence dédoublée du verbe dans la lettre 10, ne concernant plus une première, mais une dernière rencontre avec son amant, décrit ce que la jeune femme voit (10.30), ou ce que son regard croit voir (10.31: *vidisse putarem*); il est ainsi insinué que l'image peut causer la perte d'objectivité, l'aperçu étant propre à perturber le sujet de focalisation, comme dans le cas de Médée (12.33: *et vidi et perii*). L'étude parallèle du souvenir, en ce qui concerne le déplacement de Cydippe de Naxos à Délos, l'arrivée de Jason à Colchide et le départ de Thésée de Naxos, permet donc la mise en évidence d'un jeu de dédoublement et dévoile ainsi une double transmission de l'image: ce que le lecteur voit à travers le texte et connaît sur l'histoire, et ce que l'héroïne enregistre avec ses yeux s'entrecroisent à partir d'une chaine lexicale de rapports souvent conflictuels.

Le conflit entre le réel, ce que l'on voit donc par les yeux, et le fictif, qui renvoie à ce qu'on croit connaître ou que l'on construit par l'esprit, reflété dans les doubles points de vue qui semblent subjectifs (*vidi*, *miror*), est également ressenti dans les effets indésirables de la vue, qui varient, eux aussi: l'image du feu dans le cas de Médée (12.33-34: *Et uidi et perii nec notis ignibus arsi, / Ardet ut ad magnos pinea taeda deos*) et de la glace dans le cas d'Ariane (10.49: *Aut mare prospiciens in saxo frigida sedi,*) s'allient dans l'illustration de Cydippe, dont le visage, à partir du moment où elle voit l'inscription sur le fruit, crée par son ton un intéressant mélange de rouge et de blanc, renvoyant ainsi, d'un côté, aux teintes de la pomme, et, de l'autre, aux nuances des statues (21.217-22: *Concidimus macie; color est sine sanguine, qualem / In pomo refero mente fuisse tuo. / Candida nec mixto sublucent ora rubore. / Forma noui talis marmoris esse solet; / Argenti color est inter conuiuia talis, / Quod tactum gelidae frigore pallet aquae*).[24] La lecture et la réception d'un texte malfaisant produisent alors des effets comparables à ceux de l'expérience de la première et dernière rencontre, une dynamique d'interaction qui permet au discours polyphonique de l'héroïne ovidienne de progresser.[25] Mais son effet réitéré dévoile d'abord

23 La symétrie entre les deux passages, qui prennent approximativement la même place dans les deux textes, est remarquable.

24 Voir Casanova-Robin 2008: 74.

25 Sur les effets désastreux de la vue pendant la première rencontre entre Médée et Jason dans la lettre 12 voir Aresi 2017: 31-36.

une posture cognitive: pour mieux comprendre sa place, Cydippe prend celle d'Ariane et de Médée, faisant ainsi retour sur la sienne et, en même temps, faisant émerger un point de vue qui semble être partagé, revu et établi comme 'vrai'. Comme le précise l'héroïne de la lettre 21, si les causes du malheur sont cachées, les maux sont bien visibles (21.55: *mala nostra patent*).

Bien que l'illustration de la figure féminine soit matérielle, l'absence de l'être aimé dicte la mise en œuvre d'illusions. Adonnées à la recherche d'objets symboliques apparaissant comme des métonymes de l'amant disparu,[26] Ariane et Médée font agir les simulacres, par la répétition de mots dégageant une image constante. Le terme *simulacrum* est employé dans la lettre 10 pour décrire les simulacres des dieux préoccupant l'esprit d'Ariane, en suscitant en elle la peur (10.95: *timeo simulacra deorum*),[27] alors que, dans la lettre 12, définie de manière quasi étymologique, la similitude de l'image entre père et fils (12.189: *Et nimium similes tibi sunt et imagine tangor*) génère le simulacre qui bouleverse Médée (12.190: *lumina madent*). Finalement, non plus au sens figuré, la double lettre d'Acontius et Cydippe met l'accent sur le simulacre de la pomme porteuse d'une nouvelle inscription, terrifiante pour Cydippe (20.239-42: *Aurea ponetur mali felicis imago, / Causaque versiculis scripta duobus erit: / 'Effigie pomi testatur Acontius huius / Quae fuerint in eo scripta, fuisse rata.'*). Faisant partie d'une paire, sa lettre apparaît comme un texte dédoublé en soi, une note inachevée qui renvoie le lecteur en arrière.[28] La nature autoréférentielle du dernier texte ovidien, qui met en relief le procédé de son écriture et de sa lecture, témoignant de la crainte de l''épistolière' de se répéter, est exprimée dès le début de l'épître (21.3-4: *... Pertimui scriptumque tuum sine murmure legi, / Iuraret ne quos inscia lingua deos*). Celle-ci reflète, de surcroît, l'inquiétude de l'artiste effectuant une introspection subjective sur l'originalité d'une œuvre qui semble contenir des histoires similaires,[29]

26 Casanova-Robin 2008: 85. En ce qui concerne la présence et l'absence dans le cadre épistolaire des *Héroïdes* voir Hardie 2002: 106-42; Lindheim 2003: 20-22; Jolivet 2001: 233.

27 Voir Volk 2003: 349 et Knox 1995: 250 sur les simulacres dans la lettre d'Ariane.

28 Rimell 2006: 171.

29 Sur la signification de la répétition dans les lettres doubles voir Rimell 2006: 158 et Jouteur 2007: 2, qui note que les mots "se répondent et s'entrecroisent pour ressasser un signifié identique ou proche". Cf. Michel 1994[2]: 65.

ou bien des histoires déjà traitées dans d'autres textes. La mise en relief des effets de la vue fait ainsi avancer la réflexion du lecteur sur les sentiments que procure l'image des doubles. Le procès d'imitation est aussi abordé lorsque l'auteur insiste tout particulièrement sur la polysémie du terme *simulacrum*, un terme qui dessine également 'la statue',[30] dans un essai de dissociation entre le texte et l'intertexte, ou bien entre le 'vrai' et le vraisemblable.

3. L'*ECPHRASIS*: À LA RECHERCHE DU 'MOI' ET DE L' 'AUTRE'

L'interaction de Cydippe avec les figures en marbre (21.101-2) renvoie au texte de Callimaque, qui se réfère explicitement à la vénération d'une statue qui illustre Ariane à Naxos, dans son traitement du mythe d'Acontius et Cydippe (*Aet.* 3.67.13-14: ἠοῖ εἰδομένη μάλιον ῥέθος οὐδ' Ἀριήδης / ἐς χ]ορὸν εὐδούσης ἁβρὸν ἔθηκε πόδα). Ce rapport est aussi inspiré par la lettre ovidienne d'Acontius, qui emploie dans sa description de la beauté de Cydippe des termes renvoyant à une figure en marbre (20.57-62: *Tu facis hoc oculique tui, quibus ignea cedunt / Sidera, qui flammae causa fuere meae; / Hoc faciunt flavi crines et eburnea cervix, / Quaeque, precor, veniant in mea colla manus, /Et decor et motus sine rusticitate pudentes, / Et, Thetidis qualis vix rear esse, pedes*). Le moment et le lieu ne sont pas choisis au hasard: Acontius parle de la jeune femme de cette manière à Naxos, pendant qu'elle admire les statues dans le temple de Diane. Naxos est formée de roches métamorphiques et est célèbre dans l'Antiquité grâce à son marbre,[31] un élément géologique qui privilégie la métamorphose rhéto-

30 *OLD* s.v. *simulacrum* 3. Voir Barchiesi 2001: 23, sur une triple interprétation du terme.

31 Voir sur Naxos par rapport au mythe d'Ariane le travail de Vaiopoulos 2017: 27-43. Sur l'illustration d'Ariane par rapport aux arts visuels voir Vaiopoulos 2017: 27. Cf. Verducci 1985: 244. Selon Beye 1982: 43-44, "[i]n the original story, the *Argo* is sailing out of the known world into the stream of the ocean which surrounds the world. It is sailing beyond the physical world, bounded by time, into the spirit world, and the Clashing Rocks are the point of entry. Pindar says (4.210-11) that the voyage of the Argonauts brought *teleutē* ('death') to the rocks; they never moved again. That *teleutē* is, it is argued, some kind of initiation, a *rite de passage*. The voyage through the rocks

rique de la figure en *ecphrasis* sculpturale, déjà mise en œuvre chez Catulle (64.60-1: *Quem procul ex alga maestis Minois ocellis, / Saxea ut effigies bacchantis, prospicit, eheu!*).[32]

À l'exemple de l'illustration de la femme catullienne, chez Ovide, la reconstruction de la figure féminine adopte elle aussi les qualités des statues, d'abord dans la lettre d'Ariane, et devient ainsi le simulacre d'une œuvre de sculpture. Oubliée et délaissée, sur un roc (10.49: *in saxo*) ou 'en tant que roc elle-même' (10.50: *Quamque lapis sedes, tam lapis ipsa fui*), la princesse ovidienne dirige le regard du lecteur / spectateur vers son intertexte: en s'identifiant en tant que l' 'autre' de la Bacchante catullienne (10.48-49: *Qualis ab Ogygio concita Baccha deo / Aut mare prospiciens in saxo frigida sedi,*), elle rappelle qu'elle fait partie d'un projet plus grand, dans un autre contexte – celui de la Bacchante illustrée sur la broderie, offerte comme cadeau au mariage de Thétis et Pélée (64.61: *Saxea ut effigies bacchantis, prospicit, eheu!*).[33] Mais la réitération du terme *lapis* (10.50), lorsque l'héroïne devient pierre en soi, absorbant les traits du matériel sculptural, nous conduit à apercevoir son corps à travers son fonctionnement artistique, dans une transmutation créative de l'élément de la nature en art.[34] En effet, face à l'abandon, la figure, soigneusement travaillée, devient une expression artistique qui traduit sa 'solitude endeuillée', dans une 'sublimation picturale'.[35]

Enfin, une autre princesse, Médée de Colchide, spectatrice forcée de l'abandon et témoin passif d'une rupture violente, participe, elle aussi involontairement, à la cérémonie matrimoniale entre son époux et la fille de Créon (12.137-39: *Vt subito nostras Hymen cantatus ad aures / Venit et accenso lampades igne micant / Tibiaque effundit socialia carmina vobis*).

is a *teleutē* for the Argonauts as well, an ordeal, and thereafter they move to a new sphere". Voir aussi Lindsay 1965: 10-11. Cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.553-54.

32 Sur l'originalité de cette *ecphrasis* voir Laird 1993: 20. Sur le rapport entre le regard et *l'ecphrasis* catullienne voir Elsner 2007: 20.

33 Sur le symbolisme du roc voir Knox 1998: 72-83. Sur les connotations élégiaques du terme *frigida* voir Bolton 2009: 285 n. 29, qui le présente comme *topos* ovidien. Cf. Ov. *Ars am.* 2.1.5, 2.7.9, 3.5.42; Ov. *Rem.* 492; Ov. *Her.* 1.7, 2.123, 10.49, 11.117, 14.38, 14.40, 18.116, 19.69.

34 Cf. Ov. *Her.* 21.217-22.

35 Voir Casanova-Robin 2005: 126. Sur la représentation artistique d'Ariane dans l'art gréco-romain voir McNally 1985: 152-55.

'Hors scène', cachée à l'intérieur de sa demeure, elle réagit au témoignage de son fils, qui décrit naïvement ce qu'il voit (12.151-52: *'Huc mihi, mater, adi! pompam pater, inquit, Iason / Ducit et adiunctos aureus urget equos.'*). Bien que l'accent semble à première vue être mis sur la cérémonie lumineuse du mariage,[36] le lecteur est vite emporté par la violence de l'image de la femme en coulisses: les vêtements déchirés, le visage arraché, Médée échevelée imite la pétrification de la statue en *lamentatio* et renvoie ainsi à la figure en pierre de la lettre 10 (12.153-58: *Protinus abscissa planxi mea pectora veste / Tuta nec a digitis ora fuere meis. / Ire animus mediae suadebat in agmina turbae / Sertaque compositis demere rapta comis; / Vix me continui quin sic laniata capillos / Clamarem 'meus est' iniceremque manus*). L'image acoustique et visuelle de la cérémonie devient secondaire face à celle, non visible et sans son, de Médée; l'héroïne s'éloigne ainsi de son illustration traditionnelle de pauvre, barbare et coupable qu'elle attribue à son lecteur fictif ou bien réel (12.160: *Nunc tibi sum pauper, nunc tibi visa nocens*) et demande, par écrit, d'être vue différemment.

Dans un autre cadre mythologique, Cydippe devient aussi objet de focalisation (21.223: *Si me nunc videas, visam prius esse negabis*),[37] en se situant dans un contexte peu différent, celui donc d'un mariage auquel elle assiste, tout comme Médée, contre sa propre volonté, lors du rituel à l'heure des cérémonies religieuses, traduisant le processus de sa propre toilette nuptiale (21.89-92: *Quos idem solitos postquam revocavit ad ortus, / Comuntur nostrae matre iubente comae; / Ipsa dedit gemmas digitis et crinibus aurum / Et vestes umeris induit ipsa meis*).[38] L'écho dans la description de l'héroïne 21 (21.223: *nunc ... visam*), renvoyant plus aux funérailles qu'au mariage, avec le texte de Médée (12.106: *nunc ... visa*), qui enregistre sa réception personnelle des chants nuptiaux comme funéraires (12.140-41: *Ei mihi! funerea flebiliora tuba, / Pertimui nec adhuc tantum scelus esse putabam;*),[39] se confirme aussi par la focalisation des deux 'épistolières' sur

36 Jouteur 2009: 77-78: "C'est la musique de la fête qui informe de l'événement, avec un contraste ironique, entre la cacophonie joyeuse de la foule et la contrition frustrée de l'héroïne."

37 Cf. Ov. *Her.* 21.106: *Si, tibi deformis, quod mallem, visa fuissem*.

38 Voir Casanova-Robin 2008: 80.

39 Cette illustration du mariage, qui fait allusion à la mort de Créuse, symbolise surtout la fin du mariage de Médée avec Jason, selon la loi romaine. Sur les conditions en ce

leur 'moi dé/construit' (12.153-58 et 21.90-92). Contrairement à l'auto-description de Médée, la coiffure de la jeune fille est bien arrangée, ses doigts se présentent comme subtilement décorés et le vêtement paraît couvrant ses épaules. L'inversion de l'image est mise au surplus en relief par l'inversion de l'ordre des mots (*veste*, *digitis* et *capillos* dans la lettre 12 et *comae*, *digitis*, *vestes* dans la lettre 21).

L'accent mis sur le tissu couvrant le corps féminin confirme le rapport du texte ovidien avec sa source, notamment le *Carmen* 64, et plus exactement le couvre-lit du mariage de Thétis (64.47-51: *Pulvinar vero divae geniale locatur / Sedibus in mediis, Indo quod dente politum / Tincta tegit roseo conchyli purpura fuco. / Haec vestis priscis hominum variata figuris / Herorum mira virtutes indicat arte*), mais aussi avec le voile entourant la figure à demi nue, esquissée dans une *ecphrasis* (64.63-67: *Non flavo retinens subtilem vertice mitram, / Non contecta levi nudatum pectus amictu. / Non tereti strophio lactentis vincta papillas, / Omnia quae toto delapsa e corpore passim / Ipsius ante pedes fluctus salis adludebant*).[40] La valeur symbolique du tissu,[41] qui associe en opposition l'histoire de mariage de Thétis à celle de la séparation d'Ariane,[42] suggère un rite de passage d'un contexte mythologique à un autre et, paradoxalement, d'une union à une séparation. Le caractère ritualiste du voile dans la perspective d'un mariage ou des funérailles[43] permet surtout à Ovide d'éloigner son épistolière fictive de son intertexte catullien, dont l'esthétique du dénudement semble être

qui concerne la validité du mariage romain voir Cic. *de Orat.* 1.40.183: *Si iudicaretur certis quibusdam verbis, non novis nuptiis fieri cum superiore divortium*.

40 La mise en abyme d'une deuxième *ecphrasis* concerne la statue d'une Bacchante alors qu'une troisième *ecphrasis* concerne les vêtements de la jeune femme (64.63-65); le tissu se trouve, grâce à sa finesse ainsi qu'à son mouvement équilibré et rythmique, en dialogue avec les flots de la mer et le corps à demi nu (64.68 sqq.). Cette *mimesis* ingénieuse du tissage, 'composée' sur le texte démontre la puissance de la poésie confrontée à un art d'imitation par l'image. Voir Barbaud 2006: 56.

41 Voir Scheid & Svenbro 1994: 97-98 sur ce sujet.

42 Sur la question de composition dans le *Carmen* 64, et en particulier sur le plan général du poème, voir Waltz 1945: 95-97 et Ramain 1922: 137. Cf. Armstrong 2006: 190; Deroux 1986: 247-58; Duban 1980: 777-78; Kinsey 1965: 911-12; Putnam 1972: 225-65; Warden 1998: 398-413.

43 Sur une interprétation ritualiste du voile voir Cairns 2002: 73-93.

insinuée dans l'illustration de l'héroïne 12 (12.153: *Protinus abscissa planxi mea pectora veste*).

Le refus de l'"épistolière' 10 de se débarrasser de son voile, qui, mouillé et lourd de larmes, se retient sur son corps en pierre (10.138: *Et tunicas lacrimis sicut ab imbre gravis*), devient source d'inspiration pour Cydippe (21.92: *Et vestes umeris induit ipsa meis*), qui incorpore dans son moi l'esthétique retracée dans l'image élégante de la description que l'on trouve dans la lettre 10: évoquant à la fois le 'réel' et l'imaginaire, dans une *ecphrasis* qui se rejoint avec la présentation des silhouettes statiques sculptées à la main, l'image quasi mystique de la figure que couvre le voile, qui ne renvoie plus à l'union, mais aux préparatifs conduisant la victime-offre en sacrifice à l'autel,[44] s'y éclaircit. Par l'intervention du souvenir intratextuel que favorise l'emploi du voile, Cydippe impose la présence maudite d'Ariane dans la construction de son portrait et voue ainsi à l'échec son union avec Acontius. Symbole de séparation dans la pratique de l'initiation, le voile permet donc à la dernière des héroïnes de mettre l'accent sur la fluidité qui existe entre les étapes de transition: entre l'union et la rupture se trouve la liminalité, dont l'ambiguïté et l'ambivalence relèvent le souci d'identité.

Par la triple reprise épistolaire de l'*ecphrasis*, le poète de Sulmone donne la parole en écriture à la figure callimaquéenne[45] comme Catulle l'avait fait à une silhouette muette en marbre,[46] et confère à la femme meurtrière une esthétisation qui ne devient évidente qu'à partir d'une lecture intra-ovidienne; Ovide favorise ainsi l'éloignement de Médée de son portrait traditionnel de femme criminelle. La distance que prend le poète à l'égard des histoires précédentes lui permet d'exploiter l'*ecphrasis* dans un large spectre, en donnant une dimension spectaculaire à ces héroïnes, dimension dont la reconstruction se situe entre illusion, allusion et réalisme.

44 Cf. Lucr. 1.80-101.

45 Sur les différences entre les deux versions voir Michalopoulos 2014: 48-49.

46 Barbaud 2006: 57 et 62.

4. ACTIO RHÉTORIQUE ET VRAISEMBLANCE JURIDIQUE

La polysémie et la polyphonie de l'image allusive sont mises au service de la défense ultime de l'héroïne ovidienne. Comme nous le montrerons dans les pages suivantes, Ariane, Médée et Cydippe abordent souvent le sujet du discours et révèlent fréquemment sa nature trompeuse, afin de défendre leur cause. Inscrite sur la pomme ou la lettre, prononcée dans les normes d'un contrat contraignant ou simplement sous la forme d'une promesse, la parole se manifeste en tant que stratagème rhétorique et art poétique qui vise à la victimisation des 'locutrices'.

C'est surtout Cydippe qui met l'accent sur le danger de la 'relecture', en réponse à la lettre d'Acontius qui, comme la nourrice dans le temple, lui ordonne de la lire jusqu'au bout (20.5 et 21.111: *perlege*).[47] Elle explique que la lecture des paroles qui jurent ne devrait pas avoir l'effet d'un serment juré (21.145), d'une voix sans âme (21.143), et des mots dénués de leur force (21.144), et précise que celle qui jure c'est l'âme (21.137: *Quae iurat, mens est*).[48] L'emploi du terme *mens* pour illustrer l'opposition entre la sphère spirituelle et la sphère physique apparaît bien avant dans les lettres d'Ariane et de Médée: vers la fin des épîtres, la princesse de Crète demande que Thésée l'aperçoive, non plus avec les yeux, mais avec l'esprit (10.135: *non oculis, sed, qua potes, adspice mente*) et la princesse de Colchis note que, bien que son cœur soit bouleversé, sa *mens* médite quelque chose de plus grand (12.212: *Nescio quid certe mens mea maius agit*).

À l'exemple d'Ariane, Médée juxtapose d'abord les *oculi* de Jason à ses *lumina* (12.36), faisant apparaître la dualité en conflit déjà présentée dans

47 Sur le dialogue des ouvertures des lettres 20 et 21 voir Michalopoulos 2014: 257, qui se focalise sur le sentiment de la peur, illustré dans les deux textes.

48 Cf. l'opposition entre le corps et l'esprit chez Titus Livius, 57-60. Selon Ducos 1984: 304 sqq. et 205, "[l]'opposition de la lettre et de l'esprit n'est assurément pas analysée clairement comme elle le sera au temps de Cicéron. [...] Et, à la fin de la République, juristes et écrivains n'ignoreront pas que certains actes peuvent respecter la loi dans sa forme sans le faire dans son esprit." La critique ajoute que la question la plus importante demeure celle de la controverse entre la lettre et l'esprit: *scriptum et sententia*; Cicéron s'y attache en nous montrant dans le *De inventione* comment on peut défendre l'une ou l'autre.

la lettre 10; car *oculus* désigne les yeux en tant que partie du corps,[49] tandis que le terme *lumina* représente 'la compréhension', 'l'illumination mentale',[50] 'les yeux actifs grâce auxquels on possède le pouvoir de la vision'.[51] De manière similaire, la dualité par rapport au sens de la vue réapparait en juxtaposition – aussi temporelle par le *tunc* (12.3) et le *nunc* (12.211) – entre l'art de mémoire, la capacité donc de revoir le passé (12.1: *ars*, *memini*), et le pouvoir divin de prévoir l'avenir (12.212: *Viderit ista deus*). Cette dualité est appuyée aussi par la répétition de l'image du 'détournement' à l'ouverture (12.4: *debuerant fusos evoluisse*) et à la fin de l'épître (12.211: *versat*), qui nous invite à lire le texte jusqu'au bout, comme dans le cas de Cydippe (21.111: *perlege*), ou de s'en apercevoir et d'en tenir compte, comme dans le cas d'Ariane (10.135: *adspice mente*). La lettre de Médée devient *ars memoriae* (12.1: *memini*; 12.1: *ars*) qui établit ses liens avec la figure en pierre de la lettre 10, comme le montre la répétition du terme *vertere* tout à la fin des deux épîtres (10.149 et 12.211).[52] Le dialogue nous permet de constater que la demande de l'héroïne délaissée de ne pas être oubliée (10.129: *me quoque narrato sola tellure relictam*) et son besoin d'être aperçue (10.135: *adspice mente*) seront satisfaits dans la lettre de Médée (12.212: *Viderit ista deus*), qui s'en souviendra (12.1: *memini*).

Contrairement à Médée, Ariane et Cydippe ne soulignent pas à l'ouverture de leur texte la notion de la mémoire, mais celle de l'oubli, en la reliant à l'art de la fraude (*insidias*). Cydippe *insidiata* (21.2)[53] reprend le jeu de polysémie que revêt l'*ars* de la parole, à première vue en réponse à Acontius, qui joue sur l'alternance des termes et leurs synonymes et qui définit à son gré l'art en tant que *bonus dolus* et la fraude en tant qu'écriture épistolaire (20.33-36: *Si fraus huic facto nomen dicarque dolosus, / Si tamen est, quod ames, velle tenere, dolus. / En, iterum scribo mittoque rogantia verba, / Altera fraus haec est, quodque queraris habes*).[54] À la fin de la lettre

49 Sur cette traduction voir *OLD* s.v. *oculus* 1.

50 Voir *OLD* s.v. *lumen* 10.

51 Sur cette lecture voir *OLD* s.v. *lumen* 9.

52 Le terme apparaît à l'avant-dernier vers dans les deux textes.

53 Sur ce vers voir l'édition de Showerman 1984[2].

54 Videau 2004: 7 suggère qu'on détermine si l'acte d'Acontius est un *bonus dolus* ou un *malus dolus,* mettant en évidence que dans le droit romain le plus ancien, tromper, par exemple, pour obtenir un meilleur prix d'un objet constitue un *bonus dolus*.

21, l'emploi du terme *artus* (21.247: *Iam satis invalidos calamo lassavimus artus,*) suscite une identification paradoxale entre la figure de la femme et sa texture poétique, lorsqu'*artus* désignant les membres du corps et *ars* en tant que *corpus* textuel s'entrecroisent dans un synchronisme autant acoustique qu'optique; l'art de la parole paraît ainsi propre à séduire *parce qu*'il devient constitutif de l'autoportrait féminin.[55]

Le fruit, tout comme la double lettre, est porteur d'un message, d'un *carmen* (21.237-38: *Hoc deus et vates, hoc et mea carmina dicunt. / A! desunt voto carmina nulla tuo*),[56] qui implique un charme, une parole d'essence incantatoire ou poétique, comme pour *vates* (21.237).[57] De fait, plus que les vers inscrits sur la pomme et donc la formule inventée par Acontius, et plus que les vers qui composent la lettre de Cydippe, *carmen* désigne la

Kenney 1970: 395 souligne l'invalidité selon les principes du droit romain des revendications fondées sur le *dolus*. Sur le terme *dolus* dans les lettres d'Acontius et Cydippe voir aussi Frechet 2004: 97-113.

55 Selon Gavoille 2004: 209, "[l]a pomme, tout à la fois cadeau érotique, mythique objet de tentation, et même symbole de la perte d'innocence, porte ici un message très particulier (*littera*), qui dans l'*Art d'aimer* fournit le modèle de la séduction par lettre." Les histoires de pommes font figure de symbole érotique étant souvent annonciatrices de mariage. Voir Viarre 1988: 772-73, qui mentionne également que Catulle déjà ouvrait la voie à Ovide en faisant précéder sa traduction de *La boucle de Bérénice* par un autre poème (65), où la fuite des souvenirs est comparée à celle d'une pomme s'échappant de la tunique d'une jeune fille qui l'a reçue en cadeau furtif et qui rougit d'un aveu involontaire.

56 Sur la signification du terme *carmen* voir Guittard 2007: 6 qui mentionne que "[l]e *carmen* est lié à toutes les formes de la vie juridique et religieuse de la cité et on le trouve associé à la transcription des prophéties ou des réponses rendues par les dieux aux questions que les hommes leur ont posées, dans un cadre officiel ou privé." Le critique ajoute également que "les formules qui transcrivent des prophéties, c'est-à-dire le langage des dieux devenu accessible et rendu intelligible aux hommes." Voir aussi Dangel 1997: 114. Sur le terme *carmen* par rapport à la poésie et à la magie voir Fulkerson 2002: 61-87.

57 Sur la signification du terme *vates*, désignant le poète lui-même et conservant sa valeur magico-religieuse, voir Foulon 1990: 66-79. Sur la notion de *vates* chez Ovide voir Newman 1967: 100 sqq.

prophétie d'Apollon,[58] qui dévoile le vrai ou qui construit une forme nouvelle de vérité, celle-ci étant, selon les critiques, une parole dotée d'efficacité pragmatique,[59] comme pour *poeta*. Le titre de *magnus poeta* dans le texte de Cydippe (21.112), chargé d'hommage respectueux autant que d'ironie, permet de célébrer non seulement le stratagème du héros, mais aussi l'astuce de Callimaque;[60] poète au sens étymologique, l'épistolier fictif a fait preuve de sa capacité à créer une réalité, par la seule force des mots.[61]

La réalité qu'Acontius a créée se dévoile à partir de ses effets sur la santé de Cydippe: à l'heure de la rédaction, ses mains malades et privées de force refusent un plus long office (21.248: *Et manus officium longius aegra negat*). Les mains sont ici porteuses d'un symbolisme autant métapoétique que juridique: l'inefficacité de l'héroïne d'achever son texte révèle son incapacité à offrir sa main, au sens figuré et au sens propre, à celui qui est prétendument son futur époux, et donc d'effectuer un mariage *cum manu*.[62] La personnification dans son texte du dieu du Mariage qui s'enfuit (21.159-60: *Ter mihi iam veniens positas Hymenaeus ad aras / Fugit,*) et la focalisation sur la main paresseuse (21.160-62: *et a thalami limine terga dedit, / Vixque manu pigra totiens infusa resurgunt / Lumina,*) privilégient ainsi de surcroît une lecture juridique du terme.

Le lexique du droit et de la *manus* en particulier domine également la lettre de Médée, qui, victime de la parole fallacieuse, d'un *carmen* frauduleux, rappelle que Jason, se remettant entre ses mains, se livra à elle en tant que propriété (12.73-74: *Ius tibi et arbitrium nostrae fortuna salutis /*

58 Bornecque 2005: 158, n. 3. Voir Call. *Aet.* 3.75.20-21: τέτρατον [ο]ὐκέτ' ἔμεινε πατὴρ ἐ....φ..ο...[/ Φοῖβον· [Le père n'attendit pas une quatrième épreuve; il fit voile vers Delphes, vers Phoibos.].

59 Gavoille 2004: 224.

60 Barchiesi 1993: 357.

61 Bopp 1966. La figure métapoétique d'Acontius a été soulignée à maintes reprises par les critiques. Voir en particulier Gavoille 2004: 225.

62 Selon le mariage *sine manu*, la femme peut rester liée à sa famille d'origine, tandis qu'avec le passage dans la *manus* (le mariage *cum manu*), elle est obligée de perdre ses liens avec sa famille. Même si c'est la femme qui veille sur sa fortune et administre ses propres biens, l'époux contrôle les actes; l'*auctoritas* du tuteur est nécessaire pour intenter des actions en justice, ou s'engager dans un contrat. Sur ce sujet voir Ducos 1996: 50 sqq.

Tradidit inque tua est vitaque morsque manu).[63] La riposte juridique de l'héroïne vis à vis de ce geste prend à l'heure de la rédaction la forme d'une *actio* d'asservissement non réalisée (12.157-58: *Vix me continui quin sic lamiata capillos / Clamarem 'meus est' iniceremque manus*), qui consiste en la *manus iniectio*, une action juridique selon laquelle le créancier pose sa main sur le débiteur.[64] Le geste est, en effet, retenu; Médée se contient juste assez pour ne pas crier 'Il est à moi' en jetant la main sur le héros[65]. Cependant, en écrivant '*meus est*' (158) elle fait agir son texte, qui parle à son insu, silencieusement – à la façon de Cydippe (21.1: *sine murmure*).

De manière similaire, Ariane étale sa main vers Thésée (10.40: *iactactae manus*; 10.146: *tendo manus*) et évoque le *pactum* (10.92: *memini quae tibi pacta fui*), dans une illustration ambiguë qui révèle à la fois une revendication de celui qui lui avait été promis et une offrande symbolique qui rappelle le fil offert dans le labyrinthe (10.104: *fila dedi*). Il devient néanmoins progressivement évident qu'Ariane et Médée ne partagent pas tout à fait le même raisonnement: Médée exige que Jason restitue son aide et ajoute que l'acquisition du héros a été bien méritée (12.102: *Per meritum* et 12.197: *Te peto, quem merui*), alors qu'Ariane précise qu'elle ne conjure pas Thésée au nom de ses bienfaits (10.141: *Non te per meritum [...] adoro*). En effet, la figure plastique d'Ariane n'a pas la posture animée de Médée; jeune, faible et isolée, elle rappelle la figure dévastée de la dernière 'écrivaine' du recueil, qui, malheureuse, les membres brûlant de fièvre, focalise ses derniers mots sur son état de santé et offre finalement,

63 En prononçant *Effice me [...] tuum* (82), le héros s'offre à Médée et joue ainsi le rôle d'un esclave qui appartient à son maître et qui est défini comme une *res*. Sur la définition du terme *res* voir Ducos 1996: 33 et suiv. qui précise qu'il s'agit d'un bien "sur lequel s'exerce pleinement le droit de propriété".

64 Sur la *manus iniectio* voir Ducos 1996: 184. Voir également Berger 1991, s.v. *Legis actio per Manus Iniectionem*: 'This *legis actio* was a form of a personal execution on the debtor for specific claims. Its name comes from a symbolical seizure on the debtor by the laying of a hand (*manum inicere*) upon him'. Voir également p. 577, sur la *manus iniectio,* la *manus iniectio iudicati,* la *manus iniectio pro iudicato,* et la *manus iniectio pura.*

65 Ducos 1996: 33-34 précise que "(l'esclave) peut être revendiqué en justice. Son maître possède sur lui une puissance absolue exprimée en général par le terme de *potestas*. Ce substantif, qui s'utilise pour désigner toute puissance reconnue par le droit, apparaît pour rendre manifeste le pouvoir du maître, qui est à la fois droit de coercition et pouvoir de vie et de mort."

inconditionnellement, ses mains malades à Acontius (21.242: *Doque libens victas in tua vota manus*).

La *manus* se transforme ainsi de *modus* rhétorique en *actio* juridique qui fait appel à la revendication, qui proteste au mariage, qui rappelle l'offre, mais qui est aussi propice à une anamorphose de l'écriture. De fait, s'appuyant sur la référence aux mains fatiguées de l'écrivain, des spécialistes d'Ovide ont mis en exergue que la dernière des héroïnes cède éventuellement au stratagème de l'homme orateur.[66] Néanmoins, une lecture intratextuelle favorise des interprétations différenciées. Dans la lettre 20, Acontius se réfère au simulacre de la pomme, et met en évidence la forme épigrammatique de l'inscription, afin d'imposer sa réalisation, notamment son union avec l'héroïne (20.239-42: *Aurea ponetur mali felicis imago, / Causaque versiculis scripta duobus erit: / 'Effigie pomi testatur Acontius huius, / Quae fuerint in eo scripta, fuisse rata.'*).[67] Cydippe y répond, en se référant au simulacre non plus d'une pomme mais d'une autre lettre: elle crée donc l'illusion qu'un autre texte stratégique du héros aurait pu la faire encore survivre (21.239-40: *Vnde tibi favor hic? nisi si nova forte reperta est. / Quae capiat magnos littera lecta deos;*), précisant que le reste relève d'Acontius (21.245: *cetera cura tua es*). L'héroïne rétablit ainsi ses liens dialogiques autant avec le texte de Médée – qui explique qu'en ce qui concerne le reste, elle 'laisse faire au dieu' (12.212: *Viderit ista deus*) – qu'avec le texte d'Ariane, qui exprime son besoin d'être aperçue par l'esprit (10.135: *adspice mente*), afin d'être sauvée – par un dieu, notamment Dionysos. Plus encore, cette illusion scripturale génère une série d'allusions, en dépliant la menace de Médée et celle d'Ariane, ailleurs réalisées: d'une part le tissu empoisonné à être offert à Créuse (12.179-80: *Rideat et Tyrio iaceat sublimis in ostro. / Flebit et ardores vincet adusta meos*) et d'autre part le voile noir qui conduira Égée à la mort (Catull. 64.199-201: *Vos nolite pati nostrum vanescere luctum, / Sed quali solam Theseus me*

66 Selon Ziogas 2016: 229: 'Even within the fictional world the likeness of the apple is merely a fantasy, yet its realization depends on Acontius marrying Cydippe, a happy ending known to the reader, who can thus entertain the realization of the golden apple by indulging in Acontius' fantasy'. Voir aussi Barchiesi 1999: 53-67, qui a remarqué que, "[m]ince et fragile, consumée par la fatigue de l'écriture, Cydippe incarne un modèle de poétique callimaquéenne (XXI, 15-28)."

67 Sur l'association générique entre l'épigramme et les *Héroïdes* voir Casanova-Robin 2005: 131.

mente reliquit, / Tali mente, deae, funestet seque suosque.»). Par cette menace réitérée en puissance, Cydippe encourage Acontius, le grand poète (21.112), à ne pas imiter Jason et Thésée, et à devenir le *vates* (21.237) qui l'aura sauvée.

En donnant suite à l'œuvre ovidienne par un nouveau texte et en privilégiant une lecture différenciée de la lettre 'féminine', Cydippe met potentiellement fin à cette 'généalogie littéraire' des femmes malheureuses. Bien que le regard de chacune des 'épistolières' soit différent, cette posture polyphonique devient un lien unissant les trois personnages. Ainsi, en plaidant sa cause jusqu'au bout (21.154: *causa peracta mei est*), Cydippe a 'déjà dit plus que ne doit dire une jeune fille' (21.245: *plus hoc quoque virgine factum*), parce qu'elle a déjà évoqué dans son épître les voyages souvenus par Médée et Ariane, les aperçus et les aspirations de ces héroïnes. En rejetant la rhétorique du silence féminin que représente l'intertexte callimaquéen, elle trouve finalement refuge dans le monde ovidien, où la femme voyageuse et exilée, placée en marge de la société, est évoquée et ainsi revue. Cydippe renvoie à Ariane, la *puella* abandonnée par excellence qui rompt ses liens avec son *alter ego*, l'*ecphrasis* catullienne, et à Médée, la femme criminelle, qui exploite la puissance du discours juridique pour défendre sa cause. Les jeux d'identifications et de distanciations entre la dernière héroïne et les deux femmes exilées permettent surtout à Ovide, peut-être déjà en exil,[68] de demander d'être aussi aperçu par l'esprit (10.135: *mente*, donc lu 'jusqu'au bout': 21.154), lorsque la lettre demeure son seul moyen de réparation. En déclarant, à travers le texte de Cydippe, que 'le reste est ton affaire' (21.245: *cetera cura tua est*), le poète semble insinuer que l'avenir de l'auteur incombe à la réception de son œuvre. Le lecteur est ainsi appelé à voyager vers l'ailleurs des espace-temps radicalement autres, inattendus mais ingénieux, afin de faire encore survivre les *Epistulae Heroidum*, comme une poésie du seuil et une poésie du transitoire.

68 La date de la composition et celle de la publication du recueil ne peuvent pas être établies avec certitude, mais les lettres doubles sont plus récentes que les lettres simples. Voir une discussion chez Fulkerson 2009: 78-80. Cf. Casanova-Robin 2007: 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Aresi, L. 2017. *Nel giardino di Pomona. Le "Metamorfosi" di Ovidio e l'invenzione di una mitologia in terra d'Italia*. Heidelberg.

Armstrong, R. 2006. *Cretan Women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin Poetry*. Oxford.

Barbaud, T. 2006. *Catulle: une vie poétique de l'indicible* (Bibliothèque d'Etudes Classiques 47). Paris & Leuven.

Barchiesi, A. 1993. 'Future Reflexive: Two modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*' *HSPh* 95, 333-65.

Barchiesi, A. 1999. 'Vers une histoire à rebours de l'élégie latine: les *Héroïdes* «doubles» (16-21)' in J. Fabre-Serris & A. Deremetz (eds.) *Elégie et épopée dans la poésie ovidienne (*Héroïdes *et* Amours*), en hommage à Simone Viarre*. Villeneuve d'Ascq, 53-67.

Barchiesi, A. 2001. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets*. London.

Berger, A. 1991. *Encyclopedic dictionary of Roman Law.* Vol. 43. Philadelphia.

Beye, C.R. 1982. *Epic and Romance in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius.* Carbondale & Edwardsville.

Bolton, M.C. 2009. 'Gendered Spaces in Ovid's *Heroides*' *CW* 102.3, 273-90.

Bopp, H. 1966. *Inscia capta puella*, *Akontios und Kydippe bei Kallimacbos und bei Ovid*. Diss. Münster.

Bordas, É. 2010. 'Sujet narrant: l'effet point de vue' *L'Information grammaticale* 124, 54-55.

Bornecque H. 2005 [1928]. *Ovide,* Héroïdes. Traduit par M. Prévost, 5e tirage de la 5e édition revue, corrigée et augmentée par D. Porte. Paris.

Burton, C. 1908. 'The Authorship and the Date of the Double Letters in Ovid's *Heroides*' *HSPh* 19, 121-55.

Cairns, D.L. 2002. 'The Meaning of the Veil in Ancient Greek Culture' in L. Llewellyn-Jones (ed.) *Women's Dress in the Ancient Greek World*. London & Swansea, 73-93.

Casanova-Robin, H. 2005. 'Le simulacre et l'empreinte: poétique de l'image de l'autre dans les *Héroïdes* d'Ovide' *BAGB* 2, 117-34.

Casanova-Robin (ed.), H. 2007. Amor scribendi*. Lectures des* Héroïdes *d'Ovide*. Grenoble.

Casanova-Robin, H. 2007. 'Poétique du corps et représentation de soi dans les *Héroïdes* d'Ovide' in H. Casanova-Robin (ed.) Amor scribendi. *Lectures des* Héroïdes *d'Ovide*, 53-79.

Casanova-Robin, H. 2008. 'Duel singulier dans les *Héroïdes* d'Ovide (XX et XXI): symétries et divergences autour de l'herméneutique du signe' *Euphrosyne* 36, 71-85.

Clare, R.J. 1996. 'Catullus 64 and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius: Allusion and Exemplarity' *PCPhS* 42, 60-88.

Conte, G.B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca & London.

Dangel, J. 1997. 'Le *carmen* latin: rhétorique, poétique et poésie' *Euphrosyne* 25, 113-31.

Dangel, J. 2002. 'Catulle, *carmen* LXIV: mythe, amour et art poétique' in P. Defosse (ed.) *Hommages à Carl Deroux.* Vol. 1 (Latomus 266). Bruxelles, 127-41.

Davis, P. 2012. 'A Simple Girl'? Medea in Ovid *Heroides* 12', *Ramus* 41.1-2, 33-48.

DeBrohun, J.B. 1999. 'Ariadne and the Whirlwind of Fate: Figures of Confusion in Catullus 64. 149-57' *CPh* 94.4, 427-29.

Deroux, C. 1986. 'Some Remarks on the Handling of *Ekphrasis* in Catullus 64' in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*. Vol. 4. Brussels, 247-58.

Duban, J. 1980. 'Verbal Links and Imagistic Undercurrent in Catullus 64' *Latomus* 39, 777-802.

Ducos, M. 1984. *Les Romains et la loi. Recherches sur les rapports de la philosophie grecque et de la tradition romaine à la fin de la République.* Paris.

Ducos, M. 1996. *Rome et le droit*. Paris.

Duffalo, B. 2012. *The Captor's Image: Greek Culture in Roman* Ecphrasis. Oxford.

Elsner, J. 2007. Viewing Ariadne: from *Ekphrasis* to Wall paintings in the Roman World' *CPh* 102.1, 20-44.

Foulon, A. 1990. 'L'art poétique de Tibulle' *REL* 68, 66-79.

Fréchet, C. 2004. 'Quelques réflexions sur un vers des *Héroïdes* (*Hér*. XX, 123)' *Dictynna* 1, 97-113.

Fulkerson, L. 2002. '(Un)Sympathetic Magic: A Study in *Heroides* 13' *AJPh* 123.1, 61-87.

Fulkerson, L. 2005. *The Ovidian Heroine as Author*. Cambridge.
Fulkerson, L. 2009. 'The *Heroides*: Female Elegy?' in P.E. Knox (ed.), *A Companion to Ovid*. Oxford, 78-89.
Gavoille, É. 2004. 'Acontius et Cydippe: Une pièce épistolaire (Ovide, *Héroïdes* XX-XXI)' in L. Nadjo & É. Gavoille (eds.) *Epistulae Antique* 3. Actes du IIIe Colloque International *L'Epistolaire Antique et ses Prolongements Européens*, Université François – Rabelais, Tours, 25-27 septembre 2002. Louvain, 207-28.
Glare, P.G.W. (ed.) 1968. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford. [*OLD*]
Guittard, C. 2007. Carmen *et prophéties à Rome.* Turnhout.
Goldhill, S. 2007. 'What is *Ekphrasis* for?' *CPh* 102.1, 1-19.
Hardie, Ph. 2002. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge.
Höschele, R. 2007. 'The Traveling Reader: Journeys Through Ancient Epigram Books' *TAPhA* 137.2, 333-69.
Jolivet, J.C. 2001. *Allusion et Fiction Épistolaire dans les* Héroïdes*: Recherches sur l' intertextualité Ovidienne*. Rome.
Jouteur, I. 2007. 'Le paysage marin des *Héroïdes*' in H. Casanova-Robin (ed.) Amor Scribendi. *Lectures des* Héroïdes *d'Ovide*. Grenoble, 93-120.
Jouteur, I. 2009. 'Une lettre dans les coulisses de la tragédie (*Hér.* XII)' in I. Jouteur (ed.) *La théâtralité de l'œuvre ovidienne*. Paris, 67-88.
Kenney, E.J. 1970. 'Love and Legalism: Ovid, *Heroides* 20 and 21' *Arion* 9, 388-414.
Kinsey, T. E. 1965. 'Irony and Structure in Catullus 64' *Latomus* 24, 911-31.
Knox, P.E. 1986. 'Ovid's Medea and the Authenticity of *Heroides* 12' *HSPh* 90, 207-23.
Knox, P.E. 1995. *Ovid* Heroides*: Select Epistles*. Cambridge.
Knox. P.E. 1998. 'Ariadne on the Rocks: Influences on Ovid, *Her.* 10' in P. E. Knox & C. Foss (eds.) *Style and Tradition: Studies in honour of Wendell Clausen.* Stuttgart, 72-83.
Landolfi, L. 2000. Scribentis imago – *Eroine ovidiane e lamento epistolare*. Bologna.
Laird, A. 1993. 'Sounding out *Ecphrasis*: Art and Text in Catullus 64' *JRS* 83, 18-30.
Lindheim, S.H. 2003. *Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's* Heroides. Madison.

Lindsay, J. 1965. *The clashing rocks: a Study of Early Greek Religion and Culture and the Origins of Drama*. London.

McNally, S. 1985. 'Ariadne and Others: Images of Sleep in Greek and Early Roman Art' *ClAnt* 4.2, 152-92.

Michalopoulos, A.N. 2002. 'Ovid *Heroides* 10.1-4: Ariadne's ΜΙΤΟΣ' *Mnemosyne* 55.1, 95-97.

Michalopoulos, A.N. 2004. 'Fighting against a witch: the importance of magic in Hypsipyle's letter to Jason (Ov. *Her*. 6)' *MHNH Revista Internacional de Investigación sobre Magia y Astrología Antiguas* 4, 97-124.

Michalopoulos, A.N. 2014. *Ovid* Heroides *20-21: Acontius and Cydippe. Introduction, Text, Translation, Commentary*. Athens 2014.

Michel, A. 1994[2]. *La Parole et la Beauté. Rhétorique et esthétique dans la tradition occidentale*. Paris.

Newman, J.K. 1967. *The concept of* Vates *in Augustan Poetry.* Bruxelles.

Putnam, M.C.J. 1972. 'The Art of Catullus 64' in K. Quinn (ed.) *Approaches to Catullus*. Cambridge, 225-65.

Ramain, G. 1992. 'Sur la signification et la composition du poème 64' *RPh*, 46, 1922.

Rimell, V. 2006. *Ovid's Lovers: Desire, Difference and the Poetic Imagination.* Cambridge.

Scheid, J. & J. Svenbro 1994. *Le métier de Zeus: mythe du tissage et du tissu dans le monde gréco-romain*. Paris.

Showerman, G. 1984[2] [1914]. *Ovid.* Heroides. Amores. Revised by G.P. Goold. Cambridge, MA.

Spentzou, E. 2003. *Readers and Writers in Ovid's* Heroides*: Transgressions of Genre and Gender*. Oxford.

Stroh, W. 1991. '*Heroides Ovidianae cur epistulas scribant*' in G. Papponetti (ed.) *Ovidio poeta della memoria, atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Sulmona, 19-21 ottobre 1989*. Roma, 201-44.

Theodorakopoulos, E. 2000. 'Catullus, 64: Footprints in the Labyrinth' in A. Sharrock & H. Morales (eds.) *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford, 114-41.

Tola, E. 2005. *La métamorphose poétique chez Ovide,* Tristes *et* Pontiques*. Le poème inépuisable*. Paris.

Vaiopoulos, V. 2017. 'Η Αριάδνη στη Νάξο. Ov. *Her*. X' in M.G. Sergis & V.I. Frangopoulos (ed.) *Η Νάξος δια μέσου των αιώνων. Πρακτικά του Ε'*

Πανελλήνιου Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου. Απεράθου Νάξου, 31 Αυγούστου – 2 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013, Athens & Naxos, 27-43.

Verducci, F. 1985. *Ovid's toyshop of the heart.* Epistulae Heroidum. Princeton.

Viarre, S. 1988. 'Acontius et Cydippe ou la métamorphose d'un thème alexandrin dans les *Héroides* d'Ovide' *Latomus* 47, 772-84.

Videau, A. 2004. 'L'écriture juridique d'Ovide des élégies amoureuses (*Amours* et *Héroïdes*) aux *Tristes* de l'exil' *Ars Scribendi* 2, Le juridique, = http://ars-scribendi.ens-lyon.fr/article.php3?id_article=19.

Volk, K. 2003. '*Timeo simulacra deorum* (*Ovid,* Heroides *10.95*)' *Mnemosyne* 56.3, 348-53.

Waltz, R. 1945. 'Caractère, sens et composition du poème LXIV de Catulle' *REL* 23, 92-109.

Warden, J. 1998. 'Catullus 64: Structure and Meaning' *CJ* 93.4, 398-413.

Ziogas, I. 2016. 'Love elegy and legal language in Ovid' in Ph. Mitsis & I. Ziogas (eds.) *Wordplay and powerplay in Latin poetry*. Berlin & Boston, 213-40.

Stella Alekou
University of Cyprus
alekou.stella@ucy.ac.cy

CAMPAIGN *AGONES*: TOWARDS A CLASSIFICATION OF GREEK ATHLETIC COMPETITIONS

By Christian Mann

Summary: At several occasions during his campaigns, Alexander the Great staged gymnic, hippic and musical competitions. Until now scholars have assumed that the king founded new festivals, but the ancient evidence makes it quite clear that it were singular, non-recurrent events. Competitions like that, for which I suggest the term "campaign *agones*", are also known from other Greek armies. "Campaign *agones*" should be added to the well-known categories (competitions at recurrent festivals, funeral contests, gymnasium *agones*) as a distinct, although less important, category in the Greek agonistic world.

When it comes to the classification of ancient athletic competitions, historians have devoted nearly all their attention to the differences between "crown contests" (*agones stephanitai*) and "prize contests" (*agones thematikoi*). There are different opinions how these terms should be understood and whether they provide us with historically useful analytical categories.[1] However, both expressions refer to a type of competition that was held in a certain location and within a fixed cycle of one, two, or four years. These competitions typically involved predetermined disciplines and age groups and were dedicated to particular deities, for example Zeus Olympios, Apollon Pythios, or to deified kings. They bore

* I am indebted to Thomas Heine Nielsen and Sebastian Scharff for corrections and remarks to an earlier draft of this article. The article has also profited from the anonymous reviewer's comments.

1 Fundamental work on this subject was done by Harry Pleket (1975: 56-71; 2004: 80-83). For the *status quaestionis* see Parker 2004; Remijsen 2011; Slater 2013.

names derived from the deity in question, like Olympia, Pythia, or from monarchs such as *Basileia*. These cyclic *agones* were doubtlessly the most important and prestigious events in ancient Greek sport – which explains why research has so far been concerned mostly with them. However, there were other types of athletic competition that merit attention.

In a recent study, Thomas Heine Nielsen presented a catalogue of athletic competitions in Archaic and Classical Greece, laying a new foundation for further investigation.[2] Nielsen demonstrates conclusively that even before the celebrated "explosion agonistique"[3] in the Hellenistic and the Roman Imperial Era, the number of *agones* was very high. Nielsen differentiates between "competitions at recurrent religious festivals" (chapter 1.3.1), i.e. the cyclic *agones* mentioned above, and "funeral contests" (chapter 1.2), which are prominent in Homer and attested also in Archaic inscriptions as a rather common element of aristocratic funerary practices. During the Classical period, funeral games fell into disuse but were still held at some occasions, e.g. in 374/3 B.C. for King Euagoras of Salamis in Cyprus.[4] Because of Nielsen's focus on the earlier periods of Greek history, he makes no mention of the contests in gymnasia, which were important during the Hellenistic and the Roman Imperial Era.

But there is another kind of athletic contests, mentioned by Nielsen only in passing: Non-cyclic competitions that took place at one single occasion, but not as part of a funeral reception: "... contests which were staged only once, to mark victory in war, the burial of a great man, or some other important event".[5] Nielsen refers to the competitions staged by the "Ten Thousand" after reaching the Black Sea and to five sets of *agones* during the campaigns of Alexander the Great. It is this type of athletic contests, rarely mentioned in publications on ancient sport, that will be discussed in this article, the goal being to analyze its defining characteristics and to establish it as a new category of Greek athletics. I want to suggest the term "campaign *agones*" to identify this category.

2 Nielsen 2018a; cf. id. 2016.

3 Robert 1984: 38.

4 Isoc. *Euagoras* 1. Roller 1981a is fundamental on athletic funeral games, providing an overview of the literary and epigraphic sources. For funeral games on black-figure ceramic see Roller 1981b.

5 Nielsen 2018a: 28.

The most detailed description of a campaign *agon* in Greek literature is a passage in Xenophon's *Anabasis.* Early in 400 B.C., when the Greek army reaches Trapezus on the Black Sea and the end of danger and all their troubles seems near, the men celebrate this fortunate turn of events. They offer sacrifices to Zeus Soter, Heracles, and other divinities; afterwards, they elect the Spartan Dracontius to be the leader of the upcoming competitions:

> [26] When, accordingly, the sacrifice had been completed, they turned over the hides to Dracontius and bade him lead the way to the place he had fixed upon for his race-course. He pointed out the precise spot where they chanced to be standing, and said, "This hill is superb for running, wherever you please." "How, then," they said, "can men wrestle on ground so hard and overgrown as this is?" And he replied, "The one that is thrown will get hurt a bit more." [27] The events were, a stadium race for boys, most of them belonging to the captives, a long race, in which more than sixty Cretans took part, wrestling, boxing, and the pancratium ...; and it made a fine spectacle; for there were a great many entries and, inasmuch as the comrades of the contestants were looking on, there was a great deal of rivalry. [28] There were horseraces also, and the riders had to drive their horses down the steep slope, turn them around on the shore, and bring them back again to the altar. And on the way down most of the horses rolled over and over, while on the way up, against the exceedingly steep incline, they found it hard to keep on at a walk; so there was much shouting and laughter and cheering.[6]

6 Xen. *An.* 4.8.26-28 (transl. C.L. Brownson): [26] ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡ θυσία ἐγένετο, τὰ δέρματα παρέδοσαν τῷ Δρακοντίῳ, καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι ἐκέλευον ὅπου τὸν δρόμον πεποιηκὼς εἴη. ὁ δὲ δείξας οὗπερ ἑστηκότες ἐτύγχανον οὗτος ὁ λόφος, ἔφη, κάλλιστος τρέχειν ὅπου ἄν τις βούληται. πῶς οὖν, ἔφασαν, δυνήσονται παλαίειν ἐν σκληρῷ καὶ δασεῖ οὕτως; ὁ δ' εἶπε· μᾶλλόν τι ἀνιάσεται ὁ καταπεσών. [27] ἠγωνίζοντο δὲ παῖδες μὲν στάδιον τῶν αἰχμαλώτων οἱ πλεῖστοι, δόλιχον δὲ Κρῆτες πλείους ἢ ἑξήκοντα ἔθεον, πάλην δὲ καὶ πυγμὴν καὶ παγκράτιον †ἕτεροι†, καὶ καλὴ θέα ἐγένετο· πολλοὶ γὰρ κατέβησαν καὶ ἅτε θεωμένων τῶν ἑταίρων πολλὴ φιλονικία ἐγίγνετο. [28] ἔθεον δὲ καὶ ἵπποι καὶ ἔδει αὐτοὺς κατὰ τοῦ πρανοῦς ἐλάσαντας ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ ἀποστρέψαντας πάλιν πρὸς τὸν βωμὸν ἄγειν. καὶ κάτω μὲν οἱ πολλοὶ ἐκαλινδοῦντο: ἄνω δὲ πρὸς τὸ

Here we find some of the events familiar from Olympia and other big festivals: foot races, wrestling, boxing, pancratium, and horse races. There were no chariot races, which is hardly surprising, but other disciplines too, such as the *diaulos* and the *hoplites*, the jump, the discus throw, and the javelin throw, are absent as well unless they were mentioned in the lacuna after the pancratium.[7] Naturally, the soldiers did not have access to a stadium or a hippodrome, and Xenophon makes a point of emphasizing the challenges posed by their improvised sports venues. As far as the competitors are concerned, he explicitly states that the stadium race among boys was mostly, but not exclusively, undertaken by prisoners of war. In the other disciplines it was the soldiers themselves who competed. The Cretans among them dominated the long-distance run since this discipline was very popular on their island.[8] The audience was the army, including perhaps the female camp-followers, if we follow the emendation of τῶν ἑταίρων to τῶν ἑταιρῶν.[9] We can probably concur that the hides of the sacrificed animals were offered as prizes since there can hardly be any other explanation of why these were handed over to Dracontius. Furthermore, there are other attestations of hides being used in this manner; Homer already mentions them as common prizes for runners.[10]

Xenophon chronicles two other *agones* in his *Anabasis*, though very briefly. In March of 401 B.C.,[11] when the army camped at Peltae, sacrifices were offered according to the Arcadian Lycaea and under the direction

ἰσχυρῶς ὄρθιον μόλις βάδην ἐπορεύοντο οἱ ἵπποι· ἔνθα πολλὴ κραυγὴ καὶ γέλως καὶ παρακέλευσις ἐγίγνετο. Cf. Diod. Sic. 14.30.3.
For this *agon*, see Golden 1998: 1-5 (cf. Golden 1997: 327-31); Nielsen 2007: 16; Kyle 2016: 224.

7 A lack of *diskoi and halteres* might have prevented two of the disciplines, but we know that officers of Alexander's army had athletic equipment carried during the campaigns (Ath. 12.539c; Plut. *Alex.* 40.1).

8 Nielsen 2018a: 81-82, with references. The famous Ergoteles of Himera, Olympic victor in 472 and 464 B.C., was a citizen of Cnossus before he moved to Sicily.

9 Golden 1998: 5.

10 Hom. *Il.* 22.159-61.

11 Dated according to the chart in Lee 2007: table 1.

of the Arcadian Xenias, followed by an athletic contest with golden strigils as prizes. Xenophon explicitly states that Cyrus himself was among the spectators, so the Persian prince attended his mercenaries' typically Greek spectacle.[12] This *agon* was inspired by a festival held back in Greece, but it was not intended as precise imitation. For example, during the Arcadian Lycaea, the winners were offered bronze shields and not golden strigils.[13] The third *agon* in Xenophon's *Anabasis* took place in March 400 B.C. when the Greek soldiers held processions and gymnic contests at Cotyora, separated according to their ethnic origins.[14]

By far the largest number of campaign *agones* attested in the ancient sources refers to another famous *anabasis*, that of Alexander the Great and his army. Arrian mentions 16 sets of competitions from the passage over the Hellespont in 334 B.C. to Alexander's death in Babylon in 323 B.C. For most of them, Arrian is the only source, but some are referred to by other authors:

- 333 B.C. at Soli/Cilicia: gymnic and musical contests (Arr. *Anab.* 2.5.8; Curt. 3.7.3f.)
- 332 B.C. at Tyre: gymnic contests (Arr. *Anab.* 2.24.6)
- 332 B.C. at Memphis: gymnic and musical contests (Arr. *Anab.* 3.1.4)
- 331 B.C. at Memphis: gymnic and musical contests (Arr. *Anab.* 3.5.2)
- 331 B.C. at Tyre: gymnic and musical contests (Arr. *Anab.* 3.6.1; Plut. *Alex.* 29)
- 331 B.C. at Susa: gymnic contests (Arr. *Anab.* 3.16.9)
- 330 B.C.: at Zadracarta/Hyrcania: gymnic contests (Arr. *Anab.* 3.25.1)
- 329 B.C. at Alexandria Eschate: gymnic and hippic contests (Arr. *Anab.* 4.4.1)

12 Xen. *An.* 1.2.10: ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει σταθμοὺς δύο παρασάγγας δέκα εἰς Πέλτας, πόλιν οἰκουμένην. ἐνταῦθ' ἔμεινεν ἡμέρας τρεῖς· ἐν αἷς Ξενίας ὁ Ἀρκὰς τὰ Λύκαια ἔθυσε καὶ ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε· τὰ δὲ ἆθλα ἦσαν στλεγγίδες χρυσαῖ· ἐθεώρει δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ Κῦρος. For Cyrus' eventual motives, see Nielsen 2015: 251-52.

13 Pind. *Nem.* 10.45-48; cf. Ringwood 1927: 97; Nielsen 2018b: 412.

14 Xen. *An.* 5.5.6: ἐν δὲ ταύταις πρῶτον μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς ἔθυσαν, καὶ πομπὰς ἐποίησαν κατὰ ἔθνος ἕκαστοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ ἀγῶνας γυμνικούς.

- 327 B.C. at the Indus River: gymnic and hippic contests (Arr. *Anab.* 5.3.5f.)
- 326 B.C. at Taxila: gymnic and hippic contests (Arr. *Anab.* 5.8.3)
- 326 B.C. at the Hydaspes River: gymnic and hippic contests (Arr. *Anab.* 5.20.1)
- 326 B.C. at the Hyphasis River: gymnic and hippic contests (Arr. *Anab.* 5.29.1f.)
- 325 B.C. at the Indus River, before the departure of Nearchus' fleet: gymnic contests, organized by Nearchus (Arr. *Ind.* 21.2)
- 325/4 B.C. in Carmania: gymnic and musical contests (Arr. *Anab.* 6.28.3; Arr. *Ind.* 36.3; Diod. Sic. 17.106.4f.)
- 324 B.C. at Ecbatana: gymnic and musical contests, drinking contest (Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.1; Plut. *Alex.* 72.1; Diod. Sic. 17.110.7f.)
- 323 B.C. at Babylon: gymnic and musical contests (Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.8-10)
- 323 B.C. at Babylon: naval contest (Arr. *Anab.* 7.23.5)

The attribution of sources to events is not entirely clear in all cases, and there is a debate whether the two *agones* at Memphis might have been a single one, and so other historians reach slightly different numbers.[15] However, the overall result, i.e. the very high number of agonistic events during the campaigns of Alexander the Great, remains the same. A crucial element of these competitions is their non-recurrent character. It is important to emphasize the fact that they were not intended as foundations of new festivals since they have often been misinterpreted as such – even by experts of ancient sport like Louis Robert and Luigi Moretti. According to Robert, Alexander founded the *Basileia* in Egypt, Moretti

15 Will 1986: 82-83; Oliva 1993: 95-96; Miller 2004: 196-97; Adams 2007: 130-38; Di Nanni Durante 2015: 17-20; Lehmann 2015: 208-13. So far, there is no debate on Alexander's *agones* since the studies mentioned here ignore the results obtained by the other authors.
The *agon* that Alexander is said to have organized to honor the Indian sage Calanus is unanimously excluded from the list, since its historicity seems fairly questionable: The competition is mentioned only by Athenaeus (10, 437a) and Claudius Aelianus (*VH* 2.41), but not by Arrian, despite the fact that he describes the death of Calanus in great detail (*Anab.* 7.3; cf. 7.18.1). In addition, it would have been the only *agon* that included musical disciplines during Alexander's campaign east of the Persian heartland.

says the same for the *Asclepieia* at Soli and the *Heracleia* at Tyre; building on these statements, Di Nanni Durante recently asserted that Alexander instituted new *agones* from Asia Minor to India.[16] Without a category like campaign *agones* in mind, such a misinterpretation is hardly surprising. However, the ancient sources do not support this point of view. Quite the contrary, in fact: with regard to the *agon* in Soli, for example, Arrian states that Alexander – after recovering from a serious illness – offered sacrifices to Asclepius and held competitions.[17] This is something entirely different from the foundation of a new festival called *Asclepieia*. Similar phrasing is used to describe the first *agon* at Tyre when Alexander sacrificed to Heracles/Melqart and held gymnic contests as well as a torch relay.[18] Nothing points to continuity with the penteteric *Heracleia* mentioned in 2 Maccabees; as was the case with the Egyptian *Basileia*, the festival is most likely a Hellenistic creation.[19] Founding *agones* was not uncommon to Greek monarchs and tyrants before Alexander, even in the house of the Argeads: King Archelaus had instituted an *agon* at Dium that Philipp II and Alexander himself held as well.[20] And in the Hellenistic period, the establishment of agonistic festivals was a popular method of rulers' self-presentation;[21] however, no initiatives of this kind can be traced back to Alexander.[22]

16 Robert 1933: 136; Moretti 1975: 106; Di Nanni Durante 2015: 11.

17 Arr. *Anab*. 2.5.8: Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐν Σόλοις θύσας τε τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ πομπεύσας αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ στρατιὰ πᾶσα καὶ λαμπάδα ἐπιτελέσας καὶ ἀγῶνα διαθεὶς γυμνικὸν καὶ μουσικόν.

18 Arr. *Anab*. 2.24.6: Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ ἔθυσέ τε καὶ πομπὴν ἔστειλε ξὺν τῇ δυνάμει ὡπλισμένῃ· καὶ αἱ νῆες ξυνεπόμπευσαν τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ, καὶ ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ λαμπάδα ἐποίησε.

19 2 Macc. 4.18-20; in the commentaries on this passage, we consistently find the postulate of continuity (e.g. Schwartz 2008: 226-27).

20 Diod. Sic. 17.16.3; Arr. *Anab*. 1.11.1.

21 See Mann 2018a: 466-73, with further bibliography.

22 By choosing to neither establish *agones* nor take part in horse and chariot races himself, Alexander deviates from the usual behavior of Greek monarchs; see Mann forthcoming.

Another argument for the non-recurrent, situational nature of Alexander's agonistic events is the victory of a Macedonian who competed successfully during the first *agon* at Tyre:[23]

> When Alexander conquered with the spear the island-city of Tyre and exalted Heracles with prize-bringing competitions, Antigonus, son of Callas, was the first of the *hetairoi* to win double wreaths for the hoplite and the stadium race.

This inscription, the only epigraphic testimony for the competitions during Alexander's campaigns, provides us with important information on the participants and disciplines. Antigonus was the champion of not one but two disciplines, which were also part of the standard program of the Olympic Games and numerous other *agones*. Obviously he considered his agonistic triumph at Tyre a major achievement so he spent money on a poet and a monument to have it remembered after his return to Macedonia. The main goal of the poem is to present Antigonus as the first (of all the *hetairoi*) who won two victories in Alexander's campaign *agones*.[24] The contest itself is connected to the situation, the conquest of Tyre; although ἡνίκα makes it clear that some time had passed between the contest and the erection of the monument, there is no hint in the epigram that points at a recurrent festival.

It stands to reason that we can generalize and assume that the gymnic contests held during Alexander's campaigns included the usual combat sports and races, analogous to the competition of Greek soldiers mentioned in Xenophon's *Anabasis.* As far as the hippic contests are concerned, we can expect them to have been horse races, not chariot races, since the latter require much more elaborate preparations: suitable terrain, chariots, and trained charioteers are essential and it is unclear how

23 This is an inscription on the base of a statue in Amphipolis (C. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, AD 26 Mel. (1971) [1973] 120-27; Moretti 1975: no. 113; SEG XXXXVIII 716bis):
ἡνίκα Ἀλέξανδρος Τυρίαν δορὶ νῆσον ἐρεί[ψας]
Ἡρακλέα τιμαῖς ηὔξεν ἀεθλοφόροις,
Ἀντίγονος Κάλλα δισσοὺς τόθι, πρῶτος ἑταίρων,
ὁπλίτου σταδίου τ' ἀμφέθετο στεφάνους.

24 Being the "first" (woman, Ionian etc.) is a common motif in agonistic epigrams, see the examples collected in Ebert 1972.

these could have been provided at the spur of a moment.[25] During the second competitions at Tyre, dithyramb and tragedy are verified as musical disciplines.[26] The sources even name famous actors who arrived from Greece, specifically to take part in the competitions. The same is reported for the first *agon* at Memphis and the *agon* at Ecbatana; for the latter, the number of actors who showed up is specified as 3,000.[27] The literary sources offer no information on the participants who competed in the gymnic and hippic competitions but we can safely assume that it was the soldiers themselves who competed here. The inscription found in Amphipolis proves that even high-ranking Macedonians were involved since, even though this Antigonus is not mentioned anywhere else, he doubtlessly was one of the *hetairoi* and was able to afford a victory monument after returning to Macedonia. According to Arrian, a gymnic *agon* for boys was held in 324 B.C. in Ecbatana;[28] as was the case in Trapezus, its participants may partly have been prisoners of war.

Apart from the two most famous *anabaseis* there is only sporadic evidence of campaign *agones*. According to Herodotus, Xerxes, who had previously already held a naval competition,[29] after arriving in Thessaly organized a horse race in which the Persian riders competed with their Thessalian allies. Even though the latter were considered the best horse breeders in all of Greece, they fell far behind the Persians.[30] Thucydides chronicles a competition that never took place but that can indicate an established practice: when, in the winter of 418/7 B.C., the Argives had joined forces with the Spartans, they urged Athens to retreat from the fortress built close to Epidaurus. The Athenians sent Demosthenes to bring home the troops. However, he had different plans and cunningly

25 Günther 2013: 296 assumes chariot races while providing neither proof nor arguments.

26 Plut. *Alex*. 29.

27 Arr. *Anab*. 3.1.4 (Memphis); Arr. *Anab*. 7.14.8-10; Plut. *Alex*. 72.1 (Ecbatana). Here, Plutarch obviously confused the *agon* during which Hephaistion died with the funeral games held in his honor.

28 Arr. *Anab*. 7.14.1.

29 Hdt. 7.44.

30 Hdt. 7.196: ἐν Θεσσαλίῃ μὲν ἄμιλλαν ποιησάμενος ἵππων τῶν τε ἑωυτοῦ ἀποπειρώμενος καὶ τῆς Θεσσαλίης ἵππου, πυθόμενος ὡς ἀρίστη εἴη τῶν ἐν Ἕλλησι· ἔνθα δὴ αἱ Ἑλληνίδες ἵπποι ἐλείποντο πολλόν.

used a ruse: seeing that the Athenians were a minority among the garrison's soldiers and knowing they would surely be defeated in case of a conflict, he lured the soldiers out of the fortress under the pretense of organizing a gymnic *agon*. Afterwards, he locked the gates and let no-one back in except the Athenians.[31] Thucydides also details that during their departure for the fatal Sicilian expedition in 415 B.C., the ships raced to the island Aegina.[32] In both cases, the *agones* are mentioned only in passing, which actually is an important point: Thucydides apparently felt no need to explain to his readers why a ruse that included a competition was successful in the first case and why the Athenian fleet held a rowing race at the start of such an important campaign.

In the Hellenistic period, quite surprisingly, sources for campaign *agones* are scarce,[33] but there is one important passage explaining the commander's motivation: in 226 B.C., the Spartan king Cleomenes invaded the territory of Megalopolis and ravaged the land. Moreover, in a hastily constructed theater, he organized musical competitions, forcefully recruiting a group of actors that had just happened to pass by and offering a prize of 40 minae. Plutarch clarifies that it wasn't Cleomenes' need for entertainment that made him stage this performance; instead, he wanted to demean his enemies and show the world that he had everything under control.[34] Therefore, organizing an *agon* in enemy territory seems to have been a demonstration of power.

31 Thuc. 5.80.3: ἀσκῆσαι δ' αὐτὸ βουλόμενος ἆθλα προύθηκε ταῖς τε ὁπλιτικαῖς τάξεσιν, ἥτις ἄριστα σωμάτων ἔχοι, καὶ ταῖς ἱππικαῖς, ἥτις κράτιστα ἱππεύοι· καὶ πελτασταῖς δὲ καὶ τοξόταις ἆθλα προύθηκεν, ὅσοι κράτιστοι πρὸς τὰ προσήκοντα ἔργα φανεῖεν. Cf. Hornblower 2008: 206: "the trick depends on Greek inability to resist watching an athletic tournament."

32 Thuc. 6.32.2: ἄμιλλαν ἤδη μέχρι Αἰγίνης ἐποιοῦντο.

33 A TLG search has not led to any results for Polybius and other Hellenistic historians, but there might be references beyond the agonistic keywords.

34 Plut. *Cleom.* 12: ἐμβαλὼν οὖν εἰς τὴν Μεγαλοπολιτικὴν ὠφελείας τε μεγάλας ἤθροισε καὶ φθορὰν πολλὴν ἀπειργάσατο τῆς χώρας, τέλος δὲ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίτας ἐκ Μεσσήνης διαπορευομένους λαβών, καὶ πηξάμενος θέατρον ἐν τῇ πολεμίᾳ, καὶ προθεὶς ἀπὸ τετταράκοντα μνῶν ἀγῶνα, μίαν ἡμέραν ἐθεᾶτο καθήμενος, οὐ δεόμενος θέας, ἀλλ' οἷον ἐντρυφῶν τοῖς πολεμίοις καὶ περιουσίαν τινὰ τοῦ κρατεῖν πολὺ τῷ καταφρονεῖν ἐπιδεικνύμενος.

Let us now recapitulate the characteristics of campaign *agones*: they took place on provisionally prepared grounds that served as a substitute for stadiums, theaters, and hippodromes. The gymnic, hippic, and musical disciplines of the campaign *agones* are those found on the programs of recurrent festivals celebrated in Greek sanctuaries, but their number was reduced, as armies usually did not enact the full catalogue of disciplines and the competitions did not consistently include multiple age groups. However, if a fleet was present, rowing regattas could be added to the program.[35] Victors were rewarded with material prizes such as strigils and hides or with monetary prizes. We cannot rule out prize wreaths, but they are not conclusively documented since the reference to a winner's wreath in the epigram of Antigonus, son of Callas, may also have been meant as a metaphor. As for the participants, we have to differentiate between the various disciplines: the soldiers usually competed in the gymnic and hippic contests; prisoners of war also competed, especially during the boys' competitions. On the other hand, the musical performances were delivered by professionals who were either specifically recruited for the occasion or who permanently accompanied the army.

Determining the functions of such campaign *agones* is made difficult by the fact that only few explicit statements concerning them can be found in the sources. The connection to the gods was important, but, as sacrifices and prayers do not need competitions, Greek religion cannot explain the campaign *agones*. First, we need to differentiate between horse and boat races on the one side and musical and gymnic disciplines on the other. The former can be seen as training for the subsequent battles since the velocity of triremes and cavalry were crucial to military success. It therefore makes sense from a functional point of view to test and improve the troops' performance. An entirely different case must be made for musical disciplines, which bring no military advantage,[36] and the gymnic disciplines, which are only loosely connected to battle scenarios. A good soldier, like a good athlete, did indeed have to be in excellent physical shape; however, Greek individual sports were rather ill

35 Regattas were also added to the agonistic disciplines during the funeral games for Euagoras (Isoc. *Euagoras* 1).

36 The *aulos* was important for the hoplite phalanx (e.g. Thuc. 5.70), but the musical competitions were not connected to this military function.

suited as a preparation for battle.[37] Drilling exercises that improved coordination between several troop contingencies, as the Spartan King Agesilaus organized in 395 B.C. at Ephesus, for example, are more efficient by far. After assembling his army for the subsequent Persian campaign, Agesilaus offered prizes to the best units of the individual troop categories while refraining from organizing individual sports competitions.[38]

As for the function of the musical and gymnic competitions during campaigns, scholars have developed some hypotheses regarding Alexander's *agones*. This focus is understandable, since the comparatively high number of competitions connected to Alexander's campaigns suggests that they were of particular importance to this king and his army. Some scholars assume that they provided relaxation for the soldiers,[39] others suppose that they were intended to introduce the Oriental 'barbarians' to Greek culture.[40] The first idea could certainly hold true in some cases; however, it offers no definitive explanation, since soldiers could have also relaxed on rest days without these competitions. On the other hand, the second theory cannot explain the many competitions that took place far from any major settlement. If we look for characteristics that all campaign *agones* have in common, we first have to dismiss the idea that campaign *agones* developed as victory celebrations. It is true that Alexander staged gymnic and hippic competitions after the battle at the Hydaspes River, but there were no such events following the big battles of the Granicus River, Issus, or Gaugamela. Therefore, Bosworth's rather curt comment "Alexander's usual reaction to happy events"[41] has to be refined. If we do try to find a common denominator, we must conclude that campaign *agones* mostly took place before or after important stages of the campaign: before the Athenian fleet set sail for Sicily, before Alexander and his army left the Mediterranean coast to set out for the Persian

37 On the complex relation between war and sports in ancient Greece, see the detailed discussion provided by Angeli Bernardini 2016.

38 Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.16-19.

39 Weiler 1975: 275; Adams 2007: 131.

40 Oliva 1993: 101; Di Nanni Durante 2015: 11.

41 Bosworth 1995: 27.

heartland, and before he crossed the Indus River, after the Greek mercenaries had reached the Black Sea, after Alexander had recovered from a serious illness, and after his army had crossed the Gedrosian desert.

So it seems that one motif was to accentuate certain stages of the campaign by holding competitions with special reference to the king, since any campaign *agon* would be explicitly traced back to the king if he was the leader of the army, be it Alexander or Cleomenes. Another purpose of these *agones* was to strengthen the army's coherence. During any competition, the soldiers, despite the competitive nature of the event, felt like a community – more so with sports competitions than with musical disciplines. Xenophon's report of the interaction between participants and audience highlights this explicitly.[42] Another motive may have been that organizing an *agon* was to symbolically take possession of the place in which it was held. This could have been one of the reasons behind Alexander's competitions at Memphis, since Egypt was conquered without a fight, which meant that that the Egyptians had never gotten to see the full power of the Macedonian army. As for Cleomenes' spectacle, we are explicitly told that his motive was to assert his dominance over Megalopolis, a *polis* that had been a thorn in the Spartans' side ever since its foundation.

As is clear, the competitions discussed here show some major differences: there is a variety of disciplines and a variety of functions. Nevertheless, there are enough common features to assign them an agonistic category of their own. Most of the evidence concerning the campaign *agones* refers to Alexander the Great, and it needs an explanation why this kind of competition was so important for him.[43] On the other hand side, there is also evidence for campaign *agones* before and after Alexander, and other scholars might find more examples in the sources once the new category is established.

I will conclude with a brief look on the spectrum of Greek *agones*. Building on the definition of campaign *agones* suggested here, I classify the Greek athletic competitions as follows:

42 Xen. *An.* 4.8.27f.

43 See Mann forthcoming.

1. Competitions at recurrent religious festivals, in Nielsen's terminology (2018a), were by far the most important group. A specific characteristic is their cyclic repetition. It would be misleading to call them "religious competitions" because, even though they were always combined with ritual acts like sacrifices and processions, this was not a unique characteristic: funeral games and campaign *agones*, too, were always accompanied by ritual acts.[44] The feature that sets this group apart from all others is its connection to a sacred place: be it a big Panhellenic sanctuary for an Olympian deity or a *heroon* for an *oikistes*, for example for Miltiades the Elder on the Thracian Chersonese or for Brasidas in Amphipolis.[45] Even just the statue of a heroized man, located in a gymnasium, sufficed as a cultic location, as the example of Aigiale on Amorgos shows: here, a father organized a sacrificial celebration with processions and gymnic competitions for his deceased son.[46] Equally diverse were the prizes[47] and the disciplines included, and diverse were the competitions' prestige in the Greek world and, of course, the social and regional origins of the participants. But nevertheless they share common features, recurrent competitions of this kind took place from the Archaic period until late Antiquity.
2. Funeral contests were, *per definitionem*, connected to a burial. However, the competitions did not necessarily take place immediately after the person's death; instead, they could be announced far and wide so that athletes from other *poleis* and regions had a chance to attend as well[48] and thus make the event more prestigious. Contrary to cyclic *agones* held in honor of the dead, funeral games did not require the heroization of the deceased. This type of competitions might have been the earliest one, from which other *agones*

44 The question of whether the ritualistic context had any influence on the athletic performance has so far sparked various research positions but no debate (see Mann 2017: 429-34, with bibliography).

45 Hdt. 6.38; Thuc. 5.11.

46 *IG* XII(7), 515 (= Laum 1964: no. 50); for a discussion and interpretation of the long inscription, see Helmis 2003; Ekroth 2017: 391-92.

47 Overviews by Papakonstantinou 2002; Mann 2018b.

48 On the regions the participants of funeral games came from, see the collection of sources by Roller 1981a: 1-5.

developed; at any rate, ancient sources attribute such an origin to many recurrent *agones*. For example, the Nemean and Isthmian games were said to have had their roots in the burials for Opheltes and Melicertes.

3. Gymnasium *agones*: This category can already be found in Klee's study of 1918, who lists the *Theseia*, the *Herakleia* of Chalkis and an *agon* in Chios.[49] Their defining features are special disciplines like *euexia*, *philoponia*, and *eutaxia*,[50] the combination of athletic disciplines with artistic skills like reading[51] or with military disciplines like using a catapult or a slingshot, and the restriction of participation to certain age groups of young *polis* citizens.[52] Gymnasium *agones* could either be held as part of an annual festival for the gods like the *Hermaia* in the gymnasium of Beroia,[53] which makes them resemble cyclic *agones* (category 1), or they could take place without explicit reference to a deity. For instance, the same gymnasiarchical decree from Beroia does not only mention the *Hermaia*, but also that the *paides* were supposed to demonstrate their prowess thrice a year, the winners being honored with wreaths.[54] An honorary decree from Sestos praises the gymnasiarch Menas for having organized monthly competitions in gymnasia and for therefore having led the youth of the *polis* to *andreia* and *philoponia*; the disciplines mentioned are javelin throwing, archery, and foot races.[55] Gymnasium *agones* are on record from the 4th century B.C., reaching their peak during the Hellenistic and the Roman Imperial Era.

49 Klee 1918: 42-45.

50 See Crowther 1991; Gauthier & Hatzopoulos 1993: 102-5.

51 *Syll.*³ 959 (Chios, 3rd/2nd cent. B.C.).

52 *Syll.*³ 1061 (Samos, 2nd cent. B.C.). On military exercises in Hellenistic gymnasia, see Chankowski 2004; Kah 2004.

53 *EKM 1. Beroia* 1, ll. B 45-71.

54 Ibid. ll. B 23-26: ἐπαναγ|κ̣αζέτω{ι} δὲ καὶ τοὺς παιδοτρίβας ποιεῖσθαι ἀπόδειξιν τῶν παῖδων | [τ]ρὶς ἐν τῶι ἐνιαυτῶι κατὰ τετράμηνον καὶ καθιστάτω αὐτοῖς κριτάς, | [τ]ὸν δὲ νικῶντα στεφανούτω θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι. For a commentary and references to similar epigraphical inscriptions, see Gauthier & Hatzopoulos 1993: 75-76.

55 *IK Sestos* 1, ll. 30-43, 53-74.

4. Campaign *agones*: Their defining characteristics are the campaign context and their non-recurrent nature: they were not intended for repetition. Hippic and gymnic competitions were common, musical performances are also documented, and even regattas could occur in the case of naval forces. The sources mainly report campaign *agones* during the 5th and 4th century B.C., the campaigns of Alexander the Great marking the peak period for this type of competition, at least as far as documentation goes.

The classification presented above is in no way intended to suggest a hermetical division between the individual types of *agones*. Naturally, there were overlaps and borderline cases: the competition in Babylon during Hephaistion's funeral mentioned above can be interpreted as a funeral contest, even though it shares some features with campaign *agones*; the *Hermaia* and *Herakleia* in Hellenistic gymnasia, named after the most important deities of this institution, can be seen as competitions at recurrent religious festivals as well as gymnasium *agones*. The classification detailed above is therefore not meant to overly systematize; instead, it should much rather serve as an reminder of the great variety of the Greek agonistic world apart from the Olympic and other cyclic competitions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, W.L. 2007. 'The Games of Alexander the Great' in W. Heckel, L.A. Tritle & P. Wheatley (eds.) *Alexander's Empire. Formulation to Decay*. Claremont, 125-38.

Angeli Bernardini, P. 2016. *Il soldato e l'atleta: guerra e sport nella Grecia antica*. Bologna.

Bosworth, A.B. 1995. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander, Vol. 2: Commentary on Books IV-V*. Oxford.

Chankowski, A.S. 2004. 'L'entraînement militaire des éphèbes dans les cités grecques d'Asie mineure à l'époque hellénistique: nécessité pratique ou tradition atrophée' in J.-C. Couvenhes & H.-L. Fernoux (eds.)

Les cités grecques et la guerre en Asie Mineure à l'époque hellénistique. Tours, 55-76.
Crowther, N.B. 1991. '*Euexia*, *eutaxia*, *philoponia*: Three Contests of the Greek Gymnasium' *ZPE* 85, 301-4.
Di Nanni Durante, D. 2015. *Concorsi sportivi e propaganda politica in età ellenistica*. Ariccia.
Ebert, J. 1972. *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*. Berlin.
Ekroth, G. 2017. 'Heroes - Living or Dead?' in E. Eidinow & J. Kindt (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion*. Oxford, 383-96.
Gauthier, P. & M.B. Hatzopoulos 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia*. Athens.
Golden, M. 1997. 'Equestrian Competition in Ancient Greece: Difference, Dissent, Democracy' *Phoenix* 51, 327-44.
Golden, M. 1998. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
Günther, L.-M. 2013. 'Alexanders III. Agone in Asia. Quellen- und interpretationskritische Überlegungen' in P. Mauritsch & C. Ulf (eds.) *Kultur(en). Formen des Alltäglichen in der Antike (Festschrift I. Weiler)*. Graz, 287-300.
Helmis, A. 2003. 'Entre les vivants et les morts. La fondation à la mémoire d'Aleximachos fils de Critolaous (IG XII. 7. 515; IIe siècle av. J.-C.)' in G. Thür & F.J. Fernández Nieto (eds.) *Symposion 1999. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*. Köln et al., 463-80.
Hornblower, S. 2008. *A Commentary on Thucydides, III (Books 5.25-8.109)*. Oxford.
Kah, D. 2004. 'Militärische Ausbildung im hellenistischen Gymnasion' in D. Kah & P. Scholz (eds.) *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Berlin, 47-90.
Klee, T. 1918. *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen*. Leipzig & Berlin.
Kyle, D.G. 2015. *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*. Malden².
Laum, B. 1964. *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike: ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte; ursprünglich in 2 Bänden*. Aalen.
Lee, J.W.I. 2007. *A Greek Army on the March: Soldiers and Survival in Xenophon's Anabasis*. Cambridge.
Lehmann, G.A. 2015. *Alexander der Große und die 'Freiheit der Hellenen'*. Berlin et al.

Mann, C. 2017. 'Losverfahren in der antiken Agonistik. Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Religion und Sport' *Gymnasium* 124, 429-48.
Mann, C. 2018a. 'Könige, Poleis und Athleten in hellenistischer Zeit' *Klio* 100, 447-79.
Mann, C. 2018b. 'Cash and Crowns: A Network Approach to Greek Athletic Prizes' in M. Canevaro, A. Erskine, B. Gray & J. Ober (eds.) *Ancient Greek History and Contemporary Social Science*. Edinburgh, 293-312.
Mann, C. forthcoming. 'Alexander the Great and Athletics' in A. Meeus & K. Trampedach (eds.) *Alexander the Great: The Legitimation of Conquest*. Stuttgart.
Miller, S.G. 2004. *Ancient Greek Athletics*. New Haven & London.
Moretti, L. 1975. *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche. Vol. 2: Grecia centrale e settentrionale*. Florence.
Nielsen, T.H. 2007. *Olympia and the Classical Hellenic City-State Culture*. Copenhagen.
Nielsen, T.H. 2015. 'The Arkadian Confederacy' in H. Beck & P. Funke (eds.) *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge, 250-68.
Nielsen, T.H. 2016. 'Reflections on the Number of Athletic Festivals in Pre-Hellenistic Greece' in C. Mann, S. Remijsen & S. Scharff (eds.) *Athletics in the Hellenistic World*. Stuttgart, 31-41.
Nielsen, T.H. 2018a. *Two Studies in the History of Ancient Greek Athletics*. Copenhagen.
Nielsen, T.H. 2018b. 'Athletics in Late-Archaic and Classical Arcadia' in K. Tausend (ed.) *Arkadien im Altertum/Ancient Arcadia*. Graz, 407-40.
Oliva, A. 1993. 'Agoni sportivi e musicali nell'Anabasi di Arriano' *Nikephoros* 6, 93-104.
Papakonstantinou, Z. 2002. 'Prizes in Early Greek Sport' *Nikephoros* 15, 51-67.
Parker, R. 2004. 'New 'Panhellenic' Festivals in Hellenistic Greece' in R. Schlesier & U. Zellmann (eds.) *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. Münster, 9-22.
Pleket, H.W. 1975. 'Games, Prizes, Athletes and Ideology. Some Aspects of the History of Sport in the Greco-Roman World' *Stadion* 1, 9-89.
Pleket, H.W. 2004. 'Einige Betrachtungen zum Thema 'Geld' und 'Sport'' *Nikephoros* 17, 77-89.

Remijsen, S. 2011. 'The So-Called 'Crown-Games': Terminology and Historical Context of the Ancient Categories for Agones' *ZPE* 177, 97-109.
Ringwood, I.C. 1927. *Agonistic Features of Local Greek Festivals, Chiefly from Inscriptional Evidence*. New York.
Robert, L. 1933. 'Inscriptions grecques inédites au Musée du Louvre' *RA*, 121-47 (= *OMS* 3, 1969, 1576-1602).
Robert, L. 1984, 'Discours d'ouverture' in *Actes du VIII^e Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine, I*. Athens, 35-45.
Roller, L.E. 1981a. 'Funeral Games for Historical Persons' *Stadion* 7, 1-18.
Roller, L.E. 1981b. 'Funeral Games in Greek Art' *AJA* 85, 107-19.
Schwartz, D. 2008. *2 Maccabees*. Berlin.
Slater, W. 2013. 'The Victor's Return, and the Categories of Games' in P. Martzavou & N. Papazarkadas (eds.) *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-classical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*. Oxford, 139-63.
Weiler, I. 1975. 'War Alexander der Große wirklich ein "Sportsmann"?' in F. Thaller (ed.) *Signale der Zeit (Festschrift J. Recla)*. Schorndorf, 271-79.
Will, W. 1986. *Alexander der Große*. Stuttgart.

Christian Mann
Universität Mannheim
mann@uni-mannheim.de

THE SON OF PHARNABAZOS AND PARAPITA, A PERSIAN COMPETING IN THE OLYMPIC GAMES: XENOPHON *HELLENICA* 4.1.39-40*

By James Roy

Summary: This article seeks to develop, with some significant change, the arguments put forward by Bresson to show that a Persian boy, the son of Pharnabazos, was allowed to compete in the Olympic Games. It is argued that at Olympia his admission was supported by his older Spartan lover, himself an Olympic athlete, and by the Spartan king Agesilaos who acted as the boy's guardian. These arguments support the view recently advanced by Nielsen and, at greater length, by Remijsen that non-Greeks were not excluded from competing in the Olympic Games.

In recent years the widely held view that only Greeks were allowed to compete in the ancient Olympic Games has been challenged. First, Nielsen (2014: 136) wrote that "the Olympic authorities seem to have taken an inclusive rather than an exclusive view of who was a Greek, and there is no known instance of an athlete denied admission on account of his ethnic identity." Then, very recently, Remijsen has presented at length arguments that "the so-called 'Panhellenic' games never knew a rule excluding non-Greeks from participation" (Remijsen 2019: 1). One case that would be important for this argument, if accepted, is the participation in

* This article has benefited greatly from helpful comments and other assistance from Alain Bresson (and indirectly his colleague Helma Dik), Paul Christesen, Thomas Heine Nielsen, Annalisa Paradiso, and Sofie Remijsen, and I am very grateful to them all. I am also grateful to the anonymous referee of *Classica et Mediaevalia* for perceptive comments and helpful suggestions. Of course, responsibility for the views expressed here remains entirely my own.

James Roy 'The son of Pharnabazos and Parapita, a Persian competing in the Olympic Games: Xenophon *Hellenica* 4.1.39-40.' *C&M* 68 (2020) 119-134.

the Olympic Games in the early fourth century of a Persian boy, the son of Pharnabazos. Already in 2002 Bresson had argued that this boy was admitted as a contestant, but his argument has attracted surprisingly little attention.[1] (His article is commented on by Remijsen 2019: 20 with note 61, but not developed as a major argument.) It is the purpose of this paper to support Bresson's arguments, with some modification, and so to agree with Nielsen and Remijsen that the Games were not exclusively for Greeks.

The crucial text is Xenophon's *Hellenica* 4.1.39-40, where Xenophon gives a brief account of the relations between Agesilaos II, king of Sparta, and an unnamed son of the Persian satrap Pharnabazos and his wife Parapita. (Although the boy's parents are both named, his own name is never mentioned: he will be referred to henceforth as "the Son".) The text reads:

> καὶ ὁ μὲν Φαρνάβαζος ἀναβὰς ἐπὶ τὸν ἵππον ἀπῄει, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς Παραπίτας υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, καλὸς ἔτι ὤν, ὑπολειφθεὶς καὶ προσδραμών, Ξένον σε, ἔφη, ὦ Ἀγησίλαε, ποιοῦμαι. Ἐγὼ δέ γε δέχομαι. Μέμνησό νυν, ἔφη. καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ παλτόν (εἶχε δὲ καλόν) ἔδωκε τῷ Ἀγησιλάῳ. ὁ δὲ δεξάμενος, φάλαρα ἔχοντος περὶ τῷ ἵππῳ Ἰδαίου τοῦ γραφέως πάγκαλα, περιελὼν ἀντέδωκεν αὐτῷ. Τότε μὲν οὖν ὁ παῖς ἀναπηδήσας ἐπὶ τὸν ἵππον μετεδίωκε τὸν πατέρα. ὡς δ' ἐν τῇ τοῦ Φαρναβάζου ἀποδημίᾳ ἀποστερῶν ἀδελφὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν φυγάδα ἐποίησε τὸν τῆς Παραπίτας υἱόν, τά τ' ἄλλα ὁ Ἀγησίλαος ἐπεμελεῖτο αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐρασθέντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Εὐάλκους υἱέος Ἀθηναίου, πάντ' ἐποίησεν ὅπως ἂν δι'ἐκεῖνον ἐγκριθείη τὸ στάδιον ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, μέγιστος ὢν τῶν παίδων.
>
> Pharnabazos mounted his horse and went away, but his son by Parapita, who was still a handsome boy, remained behind and, running up, said, "Agesilaos, I make you my *xenos*." "And I accept." "Then remember," he said. And immediately he gave his javelin (he had a fine one) to Agesilaos. He accepted, and, since Idaios the secretary had very fine

1 The title of Bresson's article ('Un «Athénien» à Sparte ou Plutarque lecteur de Xénophon') does not reveal the article's important contribution to the study of the Olympic Games.

> trappings on his horse, he took them off and gave them to him in exchange. Then the boy jumped on his horse and went after his father. As, during the absence of Pharnabazos, his brother deprived the son of Parapita of his position and made him an exile, Agesilaos took care of him generally, and in particular, after Athenaios son of Eualkes had fallen in love with him, used every effort so that on his account[2] he might be entered for the *stadion* at Olympia, since he was the biggest of the boys.[3]

The interpretation of this passage poses numerous problems, but a very acute and careful analysis by Bresson (2002) has done much to clarify these difficulties. The present article accepts Bresson's conclusions, except on one major issue, namely the nature of the relationship between the Son and Athenaios son of Eualkes.

The Persian boy's story is also presented in a passage of Plutarch (*Ages.* 13.1-4), which ends as follows:

> καί τι καὶ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν αὐτῷ συνέπραξεν. ἠράσθη γὰρ ἀθλητοῦ παιδὸς ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν· ἐπεὶ δὲ μέγας ὢν καὶ σκληρὸς Ὀλυμπίασιν ἐκινδύνευσεν ἐκκριθῆναι, καταφεύγει πρὸς τὸν Ἀγησίλαον ὁ Πέρσης δεόμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδός· ὁ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο βουλόμενος αὐτῷ χαρίζεσθαι μάλα μόλις διεπράξατο σὺν πολλῇ πραγματείᾳ.
> And he also gave him some assistance in matters of love. For he fell in love with a boy athlete from Athens; and, since, because he was big and strong, he risked being excluded at the Olympic Games, the Persian turned to Agesilaos with a request on the boy's behalf; and, since Agesilaos wanted to do him this favour, with great difficulty and much trouble he arranged it.

Some of Plutarch's text will be discussed later, but it is clear (Bresson 2002: 24) that Plutarch's account is taken from that of Xenophon, even if

2 Bresson 2002: 39-40 proposed as a translation of διά in δι' ἐκεῖνον "au même titre que". He now suggests (pers. comm.) for δι' ἐκεῖνον the translation "on his account", which I have adopted.

3 Xenophon's wording in this passage is brief but dense and complex, which causes difficulties in translation. The most difficult phrases are discussed below.

it gives a rather different tone to some of the story. While Plutarch's account shows how a highly intelligent Greek with strong literary interests (or possibly a reader employed to make preliminary notes and extracts for Plutarch's use) read and understood Xenophon's text, it has no independent authority and cannot be used to correct or supplement Xenophon's version of the events.

Xenophon relates that Agesilaos and the Son first met in Asia Minor, an event that can be dated in 395/4.[4] The Son, then still a boy, made Agesilaos his guest-friend (*xenos*), and Agesilaos accepted a mutual relationship of *xenia*. (Clearly, in addition to the purely personal relationship between Agesilaos and the Son, their mutual *xenia* had considerable political importance,[5] which will have given Agesilaos an additional motive for maintaining the link.) Later, at a time when Pharnabazos was absent, the Son was driven into exile. Bresson argues that, when in exile, the Son made his way to Sparta and entered the *agoge*, the system of education for juvenile Spartiates;[6] there he formed a homosexual relationship with Athenaios son of Eualkes, who was a boy from an eminent Spartiate family; and, when Athenaios entered for the boys' sprint (*stadion*) at the Olympic Games, thanks to the efforts of Agesilaos, the Son was also admitted to the same race. This reading of the Greek differs notably from that of Plutarch (which has been, as Bresson 2002: 26-28 notes, very influential in modern scholarship) because Plutarch takes Xenophon to mean that the Son fell in love with an Athenian boy, and persuaded Agesilaos to intervene in order to have the Athenian boy admitted to the boys' sprint at the Olympics.

Xenophon's statement (repeated by Plutarch) that, when the Son became an exile, Agesilaos took great care of him suggests strongly that the Son came to Sparta. Bresson's demonstration (2002: 30-31) that the name Eualkes, in that form, is well attested in Sparta (and other areas of the Greek world), while at Athens the form Eualkos is found but not Eualkes,

4 For the chronology of Agesilaos' life see Cartledge 1987: 432-60.

5 On the political and diplomatic importance of Agesilaos' *xenia* with the Son see Cartledge 1987: 193, echoed by Bresson 2002: 25-26.

6 The *agoge* normally began at the age of seven, but the Son would presumably join it at a point suitable to his age when he arrived in Sparta. On the *agoge* and the age-categories within it see Kennell 1995: 115-42 and Lupi 2000: 27-46.

strongly supports the argument, put forward by Bresson, that in Xenophon's text the Son's lover is Spartan and so Athenaios is the personal name of a Spartan and not a statement of Athenian ethnic status. There is then the difficulty of knowing whether Eualkes is son of Athenaios or vice versa: Bresson (2002: 32-34) argues persuasively that Athenaios is the Son. Plutarch, who omits the name Eualkes and replaces 'son' by 'boy', evidently understands Athenaios as an ethnic, rendering it in his text as 'from Athens', but that reading, as Bresson observes (2002: 28 with notes 16 and 17), would make Xenophon's original phrase very odd Greek.

Nonetheless, there remain difficulties in understanding what Xenophon's text says about the Son and the Spartan called Athenaios. In particular, the following words need to be read very carefully:

> τά τ' ἄλλα ὁ Ἀγησίλαος ἐπεμελεῖτο αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐρασθέντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Εὐάλκους υἱέος Ἀθηναίου, πάντ' ἐποίησεν ὅπως ἂν δι' ἐκεῖνον ἐγκριθείη τὸ στάδιον ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, μέγιστος ὢν τῶν παίδων.
> [The translation given above is: *Agesilaos took care of him generally, and in particular, after Athenaios son of Eualkes had fallen in love with him, used every effort so that on his account*[7] *he might be entered for the stadion at Olympia, since he was the biggest of the boys.* This interpretation of the words depends on arguments that follow.]

Since the verb ἔραμαι takes an object in the genitive case, in the genitive absolute phrase ἐρασθέντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Εὐάλκους υἱέος Ἀθηναίου every single word is in the genitive case, and so the phrase could mean that the Son (to whom αὐτοῦ clearly refers) fell in love with Athenaios, or that Athenaios fell in love with the Son. Bresson (2002: 39 with note 49) envisages the possibility that Athenaios fell in love with the Son, but rejects it. His main reason is the parallels to be found elsewhere in Xenophon's works for the use of αὐτοῦ in a genitive absolute, although the only example actually cited is a phrase from *Hell.* 3.3.4, where the first word is a participle and the second is αὐτοῦ, referring to Agesilaos who is performing the action. A search in *TLG* shows that Xenophon did indeed use many

7 The phrase "on his account" I owe to Alain Bresson: see note 3 above.

such genitive absolute phrases, beginning with a participle followed immediately by αὐτοῦ as the subject of the phrase. It does not follow, however, that the words ἐρασθέντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Εὐάλκους υἱέος Ἀθηναίου must necessarily be read in the same way. Firstly, any oblique case of αὐτός used as an unemphatic pronoun is usually put second in its phrase, and this would presumably be the case in a genitive absolute whether the pronoun was the subject or the object of the verb;[8] and, secondly, a word search of Xenophon's writings in *TLG* shows no example, other than Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.40, of a genitive absolute including the word αὐτοῦ in which the verb has a genitive object: in other words, there is no parallel case by which the present text can be elucidated. In fact, in Xenophon's work this genitive absolute ἐρασθέντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Εὐάλκους υἱέος Ἀθηναίου is uniquely complex. However, a careful reading of the Greek shows that Xenophon did not write a phrase that was hopelessly ambiguous.

The reader might be guided by the fact that immediately before the genitive absolute there are the words ὁ Ἀγησίλαος ἐπεμελεῖτο αὐτοῦ, in which αὐτοῦ is the object in the genitive of the verb, so that when ἐρασθέντος αὐτοῦ follows immediately αὐτοῦ might again be taken as the genitive object of the verb. (Clearly in both cases the pronoun refers to the Son.) However, the words following the genitive absolute give a clearer indication. The pronoun ἐκεῖνος is defined in the lexicon *LSJ* as a "demonstr[ative] Pron[oun] ... generally with reference to what has gone immediately before".[9] Thus, according to normal usage, in the words quoted the pronoun will refer to Athenaios, the last person previously mentioned. It follows that the subject of the verb ἐγκριθείη is not Athenaios and must be the Son, who is described by the phrase "being the biggest of the boys." Athenaios' role here is significant. In the passage as a whole the two important figures are Agesilaos and the Son, and Athenaios' role must be subordinate to these two leading figures, but Athe-

8 Mastronarde 2013: 6: "The enclitic form of the personal pronouns (and also oblique forms of αὐτός as unemphatic pronoun) are usually found in second position within a colon".

9 This usage of ἐκεῖνος is pointed out by Bresson 2002: 40, citing *LSJ* sv 1-2. The meaning of ἐκεῖνος is of course different when it is contrasted with οὗτος, but that is not the case in the passage under discussion.

naios cannot be insignificant, since in this brief and highly selective account of Agesilaos' dealings with the Son Xenophon takes the trouble to include the homosexual relationship between Athenaios and the Son, and then to refer again to Athenaios in the phrase δι' ἐκεῖνον. Nonetheless, that phrase cannot mean that at Olympia Agesilaos interceded on behalf of the Son "because of Athenaios" (i.e. that Athenaios was somehow the prime reason for Agesilaos' intervention) since Agesilaos was acting for the sake of the Son.[10] However, Bresson (2002: 39-44) has shown that a Greek idiom found in other texts allows us to read Xenophon's phrase differently.

Bresson cites the following two texts:

Demosthenes 20.84:
ὑμεῖς, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τιμῶντές ποτ' Ἰφικράτην, οὐ μόνον αὐτὸν ἐτιμήσατε, ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἐκεῖνον Στράβακα καὶ Πολύστρατον· καὶ πάλιν, Τιμοθέῳ διδόντες τὴν δωρειάν, δι' ἐκεῖνον ἐδώκατε καὶ Κλεάρχῳ καί τισιν ἄλλοις πολιτείαν· Χαβρίας δ' αὐτὸς ἐτιμήθη παρ' ὑμῖν μόνος.
You, men of Athens, when on one occasion you were honouring Iphikrates, honoured not only him but also on his account Strabax and Polystratos; and again, when making the award to Timotheos, on his account you granted citizenship to Klearchos and some others; but Chabrias himself was honoured by you on his own.

Demosthenes 23.141:
ὑμεῖς ἐποιήσασθ' ἔν τισι καιροῖς καὶ χρόνοις Ἀριοβαρζάνην πολίτην καὶ δι' ἐκεῖνον Φιλίσκον, ὥσπερ νῦν διὰ Κερσοβλέπτην Χαριδήμον.

10 Since Athenaios was clearly a leading Spartiate athlete, it is highly likely that Agesilaos was personally acquainted with him before the question of the Son's admission to the Olympic Games arose, and may have been moved by friendship for Athenaios as well as by concern for the Son when he intervened to have the Son admitted to the Games. Nonetheless Xenophon clearly states that Agesilaos acted at Olympia in the interests of the Son, and makes no mention of any desire to help Athenaios as a motive for Agesilaos' action.

> Once, on a certain occasion, you made Ariobarzanes a citizen, and, on his account, Philiskos, just as now Charidemos on account of Kersobleptes.

The idiom is evidently used when an award is made to a leading figure, and, on account of that leading figure, a similar or comparable award is also made to some other less prominent person(s) associated with him. The final phrase of the second passage cited shows that an abbreviated version of the idiom could be used: in that text an award to Kersobleptes is not explicitly mentioned, but clearly he received one and, on account of Kersobleptes, Charidemos also received an award. These examples allow us to interpret the words of Xenophon about Agesilaos' intercession, where the abbreviated version of the idiom is used. At Olympia a privilege was granted to Athenaios but is not explicitly stated by Xenophon, and, on account of Athenaios, a similar grant was made to the Son. The privilege received by Athenaios must be evident from the context, since Xenophon does not think it necessary to specify it, and it must therefore be admission as a competitor for the *stadion*. Then, on account of Athenaios, with whom he was clearly known to be associated, the Son was also admitted to the *stadion*. Since, however, there were two such races, one for boys and one for men, there remains the question of which race, or races, Athenaios and the Son ran in. Bresson (2002: 34-40), after a long discussion, concludes that both ran in the boys' *stadion*, but that raises a major difficulty about the nature of their relationship.

If at the time of the Olympic Games at which they competed both were still teenagers,[11] their relationship would be very different from the typical homosexual relationship of an adolescent Spartiate. The role of pederasty in Spartiate education has often been discussed by modern scholars.[12] The prevailing view is that typically a young Spartiate man in his

11 On the age-category of boys at the Olympic Games see Frisch 1988: 179-85 and Crowther 2004: 87-92. See also Bresson 2002: 34-35 on the age-categories in Greek sport and the fact that a distinction between boys and men must have depended largely on physical appearance, since there would be no documentary attestation of age. On the procedures for the admission of boys see Remijsen 2019: 19-23.

12 See for example Lupi 2000: 192-94; Cartledge 2001: 91-105; Ducat 2006: 196-201; and Hodkinson 2007: 55-58. See also Lear 2014: 246-57 on pederasty in Greek sport.

twenties (the *erastes*) formed a relationship with a boy in his teens (the *eromenos*). This relationship was publicly acknowledged and accepted and was extremely important in preparing the *eromenos* for his role in Spartiate society. The behaviour of Spartiate adolescents was kept under observation by Spartiates generally, and any failure by a boy to live up to expectations could damage his reputation and his future prospects (Hodkinson 2007: 55-58). Since Xenophon, in his account, takes the trouble not only to mention the relationship between the Son and Athenaios but also to link it directly to Agesilaos' intervention at Olympia to help the Son, we can assume that the relationship between the two was, by Spartan standards, thoroughly respectable. It is certainly possible that occasionally two Spartiate adolescents undergoing the *agoge* were sexually attracted to each other, though there does not appear to be a known example; but it seems very unlikely that such a relationship would have met with public approval.[13] The situation described by Xenophon would be much easier to understand if Athenaios and the Son had the normal Spartiate relationship between *erastes* and *eromenos*, one being in his twenties and the other an adolescent.

There is also the significance of the verb used by Xenophon about admission to the *stadion*, namely ἐγκριθείη. As shown by Remijsen (2019: 19-23) in an extended analysis, the verb ἐγκρίνω and the related noun ἔγκρισις referred to the process by which organisers of athletic contests decided whether a candidate could be admitted to the boys' category. In addition to the passages analysed by Remijsen, there are in fact others where *enkrisis* might be taken to refer to athletes of all ages: Aristides, *Or.* 29(40).18 says: "we make *enkriseis* of athletes so that whichever of them is bad (*phaulos*) departs having put himself to shame", and Lucian, *Pro imaginibus* 11 has: "many say that ... even at the Olympic Games victors are not allowed to erect statues greater than life-size, but the Hellanodi-

13 Bresson 2002: 37-38 refers to the relationship between Kleonymos son of Sphodrias and Archidamos son of Agesilaos (Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.25-33) as an example of "amitiés entre garçons", but, at the time of the incident discussed by Xenophon (the notorious trial of Sphodrias), Kleonymos was still a boy but Archidamos was a young man (Cartledge 1987: 146-48, 157-58): Archidamos was clearly the *erastes* in this relationship – note the word ἐρῶν at Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.25.

kai see to it that not one exceeds the true size; and that the scrutiny (*exetasis*) of the statues is stricter than the checking (*enkrisis*) of the athletes." Neither of these two passages explicitly says that *enkrisis* referred to men as well as to boys, but both are much more effective as arguments if taken to refer to all athletes. It thus appears that the term *enkrisis* was occasionally used by some writers more loosely (even if possibly incorrectly) to refer to the admission of both men and boys to athletic competitions. However, it is likely that in recounting Agesilaos' intervention at Olympia on behalf of the Son, a context where precise adherence to Olympic practice was at stake and the issue concerned the age and maturity of the Son, Xenophon would use the technical terminology with care. In that case the use of ἐγκριθείη would mean that the Son was being assessed for admission to the boys' *stadion*. It is important to note that, as Remijsen (2019: 21) has pointed out, the *enkrisis* was not an assessment of whether a candidate should be admitted to the boys' category or to the men's: it was simply an assessment for admission to the boys' category, and exclusion (*ekkrisis*) did not in itself give admission to the men's category. That explains why Agesilaos went to such trouble to ensure that the Son was accepted at the *enkrisis*: if rejected he might have been excluded completely from competition at the Games.

We thus have three pieces of evidence bearing on the relative ages of the Son and Athenaios. The normal pattern of homosexual relationships between young Spartans was between an adult *erastes* and an adolescent *eromenos*. The Son was admitted to the Olympic *stadion* 'on account of' (διά) Athenaios: in other words, Athenaios was a more prominent figure at Olympia than the Son. The Son was subject to *enkrisis*, i.e. he was assessed for admission to the boys' *stadion*. In the light of that evidence we can conclude that Athenaios was the *erastes* and the Son, still adolescent, was the *eromenos*. It follows that Athenaios would have been too old to run in the boys' race and must have competed with the men, while the Son will have run in the corresponding race for boys.

The relationship between Athenaios and the Son must have been evident to the Olympic officials, and no doubt to the wider public at Olympia, and Agesilaos' acknowledgement of the relationship must have been equally evident. Xenophon certainly makes it very plain in his account.

However, general awareness of the relationship would have been an advantage rather than a disadvantage to the Son since at Sparta relations between *erastes* and *eromenos* were normal, even desirable, and publicly acknowledged, and the Eleians (according to the speaker Pausanias in Plato's *Symposium*) approved of paederastic relationships[14] The Son would have been seen as the *eromenos* of a Spartan athlete who was himself good enough to compete in the Olympic Games, and as the protégé of a Spartan king. In other words, although he was Persian the Son clearly had standing in the Greek world. In fact, Agesilaos presumably acted as the boy's guardian. Whereas adult athletes at the Olympics took an oath at the statue of Zeus Horkios, in the case of boy competitors the oath was taken for them by an accompanying adult (Paus. 5.24.9, Remijsen 2019: 30): presumably Agesilaos, who was clearly present at Olympia, will have taken the oath for the Son. A Spartan king should have had no difficulty in getting access to Olympic officials, but Agesilaos will in any case have been in direct contact with the officials over the admission of the Son as a competitor. In the period that followed Sparta's decisive victory over Elis around 400,[15] a Spartan king could speak with great authority to Eleians, but Agesilaos could also speak as the Son's *xenos* and as his *de facto* guardian. Whether Agesilaos could offer clear evidence about the Son's precise age would hardly matter if he used his considerable influence to urge the Eleian officials to treat the Son as a boy. Agesilaos evidently used the argument – no doubt among others not mentioned by Xenophon – that since there was a close personal relationship between Athenaios and the Son, and since Athenaios had been admitted to the men's *stadion*, the Son should therefore be admitted to the boys' *stadion* "on account of" Athenaios. Admitting the Son on that basis would avoid an all-too-obvious Eleian capitulation to pressure from a Spartan king.

For the Son to compete at the Olympics he would need to be familiar with Greek sport. Xenophon's account of the first meeting between the

14 Pl. *Symp.* 182B. There may have been an élite Eleian military unit composed of homosexual lovers like the Theban Sacred Band: Xen. *Symp.* 8.34, see Ogden 1996: 115 and Alonso & Freitag 2001: 211.

15 I have argued elsewhere (Roy 2009) that the war was fought from 402 to 400, but, whatever the precise date, the war clearly ended some few years before the Son sought admission to the Olympics.

Son and Agesilaos shows the Son already familiar with at least some Greek customs. He may have spoken Greek: in the whole episode of Agesilaos' meeting with Pharnabazos, at the end of which the Son spoke to Agesilaos (Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.29-40), Xenophon never mentions an interpreter, and the Son runs up to Agesilaos and speaks to him directly. Xenophon's account also requires that the Son be familiar with the Greek custom of *xenia*, since it is the Son who first says "I make you my *xenos*, Agesilaos" (Xen. *Hell.* 4.39). The Son's knowledge of the institution is not surprising, since he would have seen his father's ties of *xenia* with Greeks. The meeting between Agesilaos and Pharnabazos was set up by Apollophanes of Kyzikos, who had long been a *xenos* of Pharnabazos, and during the discussion, when Agesilaos touched on the fact that in Greek cities *xenoi* might find themselves fighting on opposite sides if their cities were at war, he was aware that Pharnabazos already knew that (Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.29, 34). The Son even knew in detail the words and actions needed to establish a tie of *xenia*, as Herman (1987: 58-61) has shown. Nonetheless, despite the Son's familiarity with at least some Greek customs, the Persians, as presented by Xenophon in this encounter, are very different from the Greeks. Agesilaos and his companions arrived first at the rendezvous and lay down on the grass to wait. Pharnabazos then arrived wearing clothes "worth much gold" and his servants spread out the embroidered rugs on which Persians liked to sit in comfort, but Pharnabazos, seeing Agesilaos' simplicity, also lay down on the grass (Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.30). Xenophon chooses here to show the contrast between the normal luxury of the Persians and Agesilaos' austerity (praiseworthy in Xenophon's view). The Son is thus depicted at that point as familiar with Greeks and at least some Greek customs, but still far from having adopted entirely a Greek life-style.[16]

To compete in the Olympics the Son must have trained as an athlete in the Greek manner and must also have accepted Greek athletic nudity.[17] The simplest explanation of the Son's thoroughgoing assimilation of Greek patterns of behaviour is to assume, as Bresson (2002: 41) does, that

16 Bresson 2002: 42 points out that the Son's family, the Pharnacids, had numerous contacts with Greeks over several generations.

17 On Hellenic athletic nudity see Christesen 2007: 63-65 and Nielsen 2007: 22-28. On sport at Sparta see Christesen 2014.

as an exile the Son had followed the Spartiate *agoge*. Non-Spartan boys, including Xenophon's sons, were admitted to the *agoge*, and Agesilaos could presumably have arranged the admission of the Son, as he must have arranged the admission of Xenophon's sons, having invited Xenophon to send his sons to Sparta (Plut. *Ages*. 20.2). Indeed the Son, as a *xenos* of Agesilaos, could have been treated as a member of Agesilaos' household.[18] Such a process of assimilation would however have taken time, as Bresson notes, and more time must be allowed for the (unknown) period between 395/4, when Agesilaos and the Son first met, and the beginning of the Son's exile.[19] Given that the Son first met Agesilaos in 395/4, and that he could still be described at Olympia as a boy ("the biggest of the boys"), the Games at which the Son could have competed were those of 392, 388, and 384. The short period between 395/4 and 392 leaves little time for all that must have happened in the Son's life before he competed at the Olympics. To be still considered a boy in 384, the Son would have had to be less than ten years old in 395/4, and Bresson (2002: 41) favours that solution. However, it seems questionable that Xenophon would have described the Son at the time of the first meeting as "still *kalos*" (καλὸς ἔτι ὤν) if he was so young,[20] and one might also wonder whether Agesilaos would have taken seriously an offer of *xenia* from a small boy. For these reasons there is a strong possibility that it was in the Games of 388 that the Son competed.

It is noteworthy that, as Bresson observes, Xenophon's account of what happened at Olympia avoids drawing attention to the fact that the

18 On non-Spartan boys in the *agoge,* and *xenoi* acting as foster-parents, see Hodkinson 2000: 342 with n. 11. Herman 1987: 152 supposes that the Son became a member of Agesilaos' household. There is no reason to think that education in the *agoge* made a non-Spartan boy a Spartan citizen: after the *agoge* Xenophon's son Gryllos returned to Athens and died fighting in the Athenian cavalry near Mantinea in 362 (Ollier 1959).

19 Bresson 2002: 41 notes that assimilation would take time, and (45-53) examines carefully the evidence for events in the family of Pharnabazos: however, given the limited evidence, it is difficult to date the beginning of the Son's exile with any confidence.

20 Bresson 2002: 41 n. 56 argues that "still *kalo*s" should be interpreted in comparison to "biggest of the boys" later in the text and describing the boy years later: the point is valid, but hardly suggests a difference of about ten years.

boy admitted to the Games was Persian, a barbarian.[21] What is stressed instead is that, when Agesilaos interceded with the Olympic authorities on the Son's behalf, he made every effort to secure the Son's admission to a particular event. In fact, concentration in Xenophon's account on whether the Son was qualified by age and physique to enter the boys' *stadion* would divert readers' attention away from any question of ethnicity. As Bresson observes, Xenophon had no interest in presenting the Son as a barbarian at the Olympics, and that may explain the clearly deliberate failure to give the Son's name (though in this short passage Xenophon names both the Son's father and his mother, twice each). At any rate Xenophon says nothing to suggest that in the Son's admission to the Olympic Games his ethnicity was a subject of discussion, let alone a matter of controversy.

To conclude. It appears that in the early fourth century a Persian boy, the son of a famous Persian father, was allowed to compete in the Olympic Games. Arguments that non-Greeks were not excluded from the Olympics are therefore strengthened. When he competed the Son had clearly adopted much of the Greek way of life, and in particular much of the Greeks' athletic culture, and moreover in seeking admission to the games he had the support of his Spartan *erastes*, himself an Olympic athlete, and of a Spartan king acting in effect as his guardian. Xenophon writes of the Son's presence at the Games not as a matter of controversy at Olympia but as an interesting event – caring for the exiled son of a leading Persian – in the life of Agesilaos, to whom Xenophon devoted great attention. There may have been other non-Greek athletes at Panhellenic games in the classical period, though it seems unlikely that many non-Greeks would have become sufficiently adept in any Greek sport to compete at the highest level. Nonetheless, there is good reason to challenge the widely held view that the ancient Olympic Games were exclusively Greek.

21 Bresson 2002: 44. The same point is made by Remijsen 2019: 20 n. 61.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alonso, V. & K. Freitag 2001. 'Prolegomena zur Erforschung der Bedeutung der Eliteeinheiten im archaischen und klassischen Griechenland' *Gerión* 19, 199-219.

Bresson, A. 2002. 'Un « Athénien » à Sparte ou Plutarque lecteur de Xénophon' *REG* 115, 22-57.

Cartledge, P. 1987. *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta.* Baltimore.

Cartledge, P. 2001. *Spartan Reflections.* London [91-105: 'The Politics of Spartan Pederasty', a revised version of a paper originally published in 1981].

Christesen, P. 2007. 'The Transformation of Athletics in Sixth-century Greece' in G. Schaus & S. Wenn (eds.) *Onward to the Olympics. Historical Perspectives on the Olympic Games.* Waterloo, 59-68.

Christesen, P. 2014. 'Sport and Society in Sparta' in P. Christesen & D. Kyle (eds.) *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity.* Malden MA, Oxford & Chichester, 146-58.

Crowther, N. 2004. 'The Age-category of Boys at Olympia' in N. Crowther *Athletika: Studies on the Olympic Games and Greek Athletics* (Nikephoros Beiheft 11). Hildesheim, 87-92 [= *Phoenix* 42, 1988, 304-8].

Ducat, J. 2006. *Spartan Education: Youth and Society in the Classical Period.* Swansea.

Frisch, P. 1988. 'Die Klassifikation der Paides bei den griechischen Agonen' *ZPE* 75, 179–85.

Herman, G. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City.* Cambridge.

Hodkinson, S. 2000. *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta.* Swansea.

Hodkinson, S. 2007. 'The Episode of Sphodrias as a Source for Spartan Social History' in N. Sekunda (ed.) *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald.* Gdańsk, 43-65.

Kennell, N. 1995. *The Gymnasium of Virtue. Education and Culture in Ancient Sparta.* Chapel Hill & London.

Lear, A. 2014. 'Eros and Greek Sport' in P. Christesen & D. Kyle (eds.) *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity.* Malden MA, Oxford and Chichester, 246-57.

Lupi, M. 2000. *L'ordine delle generazioni. Classi di età e costumi matrimoniali nell'antica Sparta.* Bari.

Mastronarde, D. 2013. 'Word Order in Ancient Greek (Especially Attic Prose)' in *Ancient Greek Tutorials @ AtticGreek.org* (download at: http://atticgreek.org/downloads/WordOrder.pdf).
Nielsen, T. H. 2014. 'Panhellenic Athletics at Olympia' in P. Christesen & D. Kyle (eds.) *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity.* Malden MA, Oxford & Chichester, 133-45.
Ogden, D. 1996. 'Homosexuality and Warfare in Ancient Greece' in A. Lloyd (ed.) *Battle in Antiquity.* London, 107-68.
Ollier, F. 1959. 'La renommée posthume de Gryllos, fils de Xénophon' *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* 18.4, 425-437.
Remijsen, S. 2019. 'Only Greeks at the Olympics? Reconsidering the Rule against Non-Greeks at 'Panhellenic' Games' *C&M* 67, 1-61.
Roy, J. 2009. 'The Spartan-Elean War of c. 400' *Athenaeum* 97, 69-86.

James Roy
University of Nottingham
james.roy@nottingham.ac.uk