Thorsten Fögen & Edmund Thomas

Interactions between Animals and Humans in Graeco-Roman Antiquity: Introduction

> "To dear Peter, most faithful of friends and dearest of companions, a dog in a thousand"
>
> Agatha Christie, *Dumb Witness* (dedication)

> "In der Geschichte ist viel zu wenig von Tieren die Rede."
>
> Elias Canetti (1943), quoted from *Über Tiere* (München & Wien 2002, 13)

To introduce this volume, several randomly selected textual excerpts may help to illustrate different types of interaction between animals and humans both in the ancient and in the modern world.

The first snippet comes from the *Geoponika*, the Byzantine compilation of agricultural lore in twenty books, assembled in the tenth century A.D. for the emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus.[1] In addition to astronomy, a calendar of the farmer's duties, viticulture, the making of oil and horticulture, a large part of this collection (Books 13–20) focuses on the significance of animals in the context of agriculture. The excerpt in question is taken from Book 13 (*Geop.* 13.9.5; ed. Heinrich Beckh, Leipzig 1895; our translation):

> Ἀπουλήϊος δέ φησι τὸν πληγέντα ὑπὸ σκορπίου ὑπὲρ ὄνου καθίσαι πρὸς τὴν οὐρὰν ἐστραμμένον, καὶ τὸν ὄνον ἀλγεῖν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ πέρδεσθαι.
>
> "Apuleius says that anyone who is stung by a scorpion should sit on a donkey, facing backwards towards its tail, and that this transfers the pain to the donkey and makes it fart."

1 On the *Geoponika*, see now Dalby (2011).

DOI 10.1515/9783110545623-001

Notwithstanding the actual origin of this advice or its usefulness, it is clear that the passage recommends the use of an animal to remedy an affliction caused to a human by another animal. The pain experienced by a human is supposed to be transferred to the animal which is attributed the function of some kind of absorber. This essentially utilitarian approach to animals is widespread in ancient medical and pharmacological literature.[2]

The second excerpt is taken from Marguerite Yourcenar's novel *Mémoires d'Hadrien* (first published in 1951), which is quoted here in the authorised English translation by Grace Frick, Yourcenar's American life partner (*Memoirs of Hadrian*, repr. London 2000, 17–18):

> "To give up riding is a greater sacrifice still: a wild beast is first of all an adversary, but my horse was a friend. If the choice of my condition had been left to me I would have decided for that of centaur. Between Borysthenes and me relations were of almost mathematical precision; he obeyed me as if I were his own brain, not his master. Have I ever obtained as much from a man? (...) My horse knew me not by the thousand approximate notions of title, function, and name which complicate human friendship, but solely by my just weight as a man. He shared my every impetus; he knew perfectly, and perhaps better than I, the point where my strength faltered under my will."

Here as in the rest of the book, the Roman Emperor Hadrian addresses his future successor Marcus Aurelius in the form of an extensive letter and reflects on his life. With a great deal of affection, Yourcenar's Hadrian emphasises the friendship and even congeniality that he had with his horse. In his view, the animal perceived him as an individual, not as the most powerful ruler of the Roman Empire; this gave the relationship between human and animal a much more straightforward and transparent character.

Although the French author's text can easily be classified as fictional, it is nonetheless based upon a very meticulous study of the ancient evidence. It is therefore unsurprising that Hadrian's fondness for Borysthenes is in fact accentuated by Greek and Roman sources. From Cassius Dio, we learn the following (*Hist.* 69.10.2; ed. & tr. Earnest Cary & Herbert B. Foster, Loeb Classical Library):

> τῆς δὲ περὶ τὰς θήρας σπουδῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ Βορυσθένης ὁ ἵππος, ᾧ μάλιστα θηρῶν ἠρέσκετο, σημεῖόν ἐστιν· ἀποθανόντι γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ τάφον κατεσκεύασε καὶ στήλην ἔστησε καὶ ἐπιγράμματα ἐπέγραψεν.

2 See e.g. Fögen (2009: 248–251) for some examples in Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis historia*.

> "Some light is thrown upon his passion for hunting by what he did for his steed Borysthenes, which was his favourite horse for the chase; when the animal died, he prepared a tomb for him, set up a slab and placed an inscription upon it."

It is interesting to note that this inscription has in fact been preserved, though perhaps as a copy or pastiche of the original epitaph.[3] Another text, a section in the *Life of Hadrian* in the Historia Augusta, is less explicit as far as the animal's name is concerned, but it goes further by including another species (*Hadr.* 20.12; our translation):

> *equos et canes sic amavit, ut iis sepulchra constitueret.*
>
> "He loved his horses and dogs so much that he provided burial-places for them."

Yourcenar's account thus carefully mirrors Hadrian's actual sympathy or even love for certain animals, illustrated in particular by commemorative monuments erected in their honour. In the texts considered here, it is evident that most of the interactions between the emperor and these animals took place in the sphere of warfare and hunting. However, neither the ancient documents nor Yourcenar's novel suggest that these dealings are purely instrumental or utilitarian. On the contrary, a deeply felt emotional component is accentuated throughout. These excerpts represent two different instances of the relationship between animals and humans in Graeco-Roman antiquity: predominantly utilitarian on the one hand, primarily affectionate on the other. However, the picture is in fact much more complex and encompasses a great deal of nuances even within the same categories.

There is hardly any area in the ancient world where animal and human lives are separated from each other. As in contemporary society, animals played a variety of different roles for humans in the ancient world: they were loved as pets, represented an attraction in public shows, were used for all kinds of work (in particular in an agricultural context), and served as a medium of transporta-

3 See *CIL* XII 1122 (= *CLE* II 1522 Bücheler), found in Apta in the province of Gallia Narbonensis: BORYSTHENES ALANVS | CAESAREVS VEREDUS | PER AEQVOR ET PALVDES | ET TVMVLOS ETRVSCOS | VOLARE QVI SOLEBAT | PANNONICOS IN APROS | NEC VLLVS INSEQVENTEM | DENT*e aper albicanti* | *ausus fuit nocere* | *vel extimam salivam* | *sparsit ab ore caudam* | *ut solet evenire:* | *sed integer iuventa* | *inviolatus artus* | *die sua peremptus* | *ho*C SITVS EST IN AGRO. See further Geist ([2]1976: 153–154); for an English translation see Duff & Duff (1934: 446–447).

tion. Animals sometimes embodied divine power or were sacrificed to the gods; they were bred or hunted and then consumed as food; they were killed because of the danger they posed for humans. They were also the objects of philosophical and anthropological theories concerning the status of humans vs. animals. Ancient authors typically refer to the criterion of language to substantiate the hypothesis that human beings, but not animals, are endowed with reason: it is humans' differentiated communicative capability that enables them to achieve a high degree of cultural refinement, the development of a social consciousness and well-considered political engagement.[4]

Visual material can illustrate the same relationships. To give just one example, an analogous epitaph from Edessa in Macedonia (second/third century A.D.) recounts how a pig died in a traffic accident, crushed under the wheels of a chariot. The text consists of six hexameters, with one foot missing in the fifth (*SEG* 25.711, see Figure 1; our translation):[5]

χοῖρος ὁ πᾶσι φίλος, τετρά-
πους νέος, ἐνθάδε κεῖ-
μαι | Δαλματίης δά-
πεδον προλιπὼν
δῶρον προσενε-
χθείς· | καὶ
Δυρρά-

4 See also Ingold (1988: 1): "All human societies, past and present, have coexisted with populations of animals of one or many species. Throughout history, people have variously killed and eaten animals, or on rarer occasions been killed and eaten by them; incorporated animals into their social groups, whether as domestic familiars or captive slaves; and drawn upon their observations of animal morphology and behaviour in the construction of their own designs for living. People's ideas about animals, and attitudes towards them, are correspondingly every bit as variable as their ways of relating to one another, in both cases reflecting that astonishing diversity of cultural tradition that is widely thought to be the hallmark of humanity." Further Ullrich, Weltzien & Fuhlbrügge (2008: 11): "Die Welt wird nicht nur von Menschen bewohnt. Tiere nehmen mit Menschen Kontakt auf und Menschen mit Tieren. Hieraus ergeben sich Kommunikationsprozesse zwischen den Spezies, tiefe Freundschaften, symbiotische Gemeinschaften, leidenschaftliche Liebesbeziehungen, wissenschaftliche Annäherungen, grausame Ausbeutungs- und Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse, körperliche Hybridisierungen – alles Formen der Kontaktaufnahme, wie wir sie auch mit Menschen pflegen. (...)" Similarly, Brantz & Mauch (2010: 7) and Marvin & McHugh (2014: 1–2).

5 On the constitution and content of this text, see Daux (1970: esp. 609–618), who rightly draws attention to the uniqueness of this document (1970: 612): "Ce qui est sûr, c'est que le document – inscription et relief – est unique en son genre. Nous n'avions ni pour la Grèce ni pour Rome aucune épitaphe de porc ou de porcelet."

χιν δὲ ἐπάτησα Ἀπολλωνίαν τε π-
οθήσας | καὶ πᾶσαν γαίην διέβην ποσὶ μοῦ-
νος ἄλιπτος· | νῦν δὲ τροχοῖο βίῃ τὸ φά-
ος προλέλοιπα· | Ἠμαθίην δὲ ποθῶν
κατιδεῖν φαλλοῖο δὲ ἅρμα | ἐνθάδε
νῦν κεῖμαι τῷ θανάτῳ μηκέτ' ὀφ-
ειλόμενος.

"A pig, loved by all, a young quadruped, here I lie, having left behind the soil of Dalmatia after being offered as a gift. I walked Dyrrhachium and longing for Apollonia I traversed the whole land on foot, alone, unfailingly. But by the force of a wheel I have now lost the light longing to see Emathia and the chariot of the phallus. Here now I lie, owing nothing more to death."

The obviously human sentiments ascribed to this pig and a scepticism that a young pig could travel alone all the way from Dalmatia to Macedonia without getting eaten by wild animals, have led some to argue that the deceased was a human, a young slave (χοῖρος). But here the epitaph is also accompanied by a relief: The pig is clearly pictured at the bottom left, below the chariot wheels. This young Dalmatian pig, on its way to a religious festival, was walking before or beside its master, either travelling on its own or possibly detached from fellow pigs straggling behind. The four asses rear up in their excitement at the impact. The driver tries to keep control of the team and perhaps seems to let go of the reins. But on the right the pig is shown again. The two images show the animal in the two stages of its life, before and after the accident: on the right, at the front of the convoy; on the left, after the wheel has passed over its body, its coat visible ruffled by frissons of pain and its feet demonstrating spasms of agony.

This volume investigates more closely several questions that illuminate the ways in which humans and animals came together in the societies of ancient Greece and Rome. What are the concrete categories of interaction between animals and humans that can be identified? In what contexts do they occur? What types of evidence can be productively used to examine the concept of interactions? This also entails a more detailed consideration of how literary genres and their conventions influence the presentation of the relationship between animals and humans in ancient literature. Furthermore, what can be deduced from visual evidence, and to what extent can a link be established between visual, literary and other types of evidence? Emphasis is put not so much on *boundaries* between animals and humans as on their actual *interactions*.[6] This approach

6 The most recent contribution dealing with *boundaries* between animals and humans is the collection of articles edited by Alexandridis, Wild & Winkler-Horaček (2008).

will help to view familiar as well as less well-known ancient documents in a different light and to establish a connection with the increasing number of contributions from modern studies on animals and humans in disciplines other than Classics.[7] How the term "interactions" may be understood with regard to animals and humans can be gathered from the preface to a recent volume on human-animal studies (Spannring, Schachinger, Kompatscher & Boucabeille 2015: 17):

> "Zentral in den HAS (i.e. Human-animal studies) ist das Erforschen und kritische Hinterfragen unserer Beziehungen mit anderen Tieren, des Zusammenspiels und der Wechselwirkung von Menschen und anderen Tieren. Nichtmenschliche Tiere werden dabei nicht

7 See, for example, Meyer (1975), Midgley (1978), Müller-Karpe (1983), Svilar (1985), Noske (1989), Becker & Bimmer (1991), Dekkers (1992), Manning & Serpell (1994), Rheinz (1994), Serpell (1996), Shepard (1996), Myers (1998), Münch & Walz (1998), Franklin (1999), Dinzelbacher (2000), Podberscek, Paul & Serpell (2000), Schneider (2001), Agamben (2002), Wiedenmann (2002), Henninger-Voss (2002), Rothfels (2002), Stiftung Deutsches Hygiene-Museum (2002), Wolfe (2003), Knight (2005), Beetz & Podberscek (2005), de Jonge & van den Bos (2005), Macho (2006), Kaplan (2006), Kalof (2007), Bekoff (2007), Philo & Wilbert (2007), Simmons & Armstrong (2007), Armstrong (2008), Flynn (2008), Haraway (2008), Wiedenmann (2009), Pollack (2009), Pöppinghege (2009), Arluke & Sanders (2009), Ach & Stephany (2009), Otterstedt & Rosenberger (2009), Kazez (2010), King (2010), Brantz (2010), Brantz & Mauch (2010), DeMello (2010), Freeman, Leane & Watt (2011), Taylor & Signal (2011), Chimaira Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies (2011), Hurn (2012), DeMello (2012), Bodenburg (2012), Wolf (2012), Birke & Hockenhull (2012), Taylor (2013), Marvin & McHugh (2014), Fehlmann, Michel & Niederhauser (2014), Bühler-Dietrich & Weingarten (2015), Spannring, Schachinger, Kompatscher & Boucabeille (2015), Spannring, Heuberger, Kompatscher, Oberprantacher, Schachinger & Boucabeille (2015), Ferrari & Petrus (2015), Brucker, Bujok, Mütherich, Seeliger & Thieme (2015), Calarco (2015), and Borgards (2016). That the significant increase of scholarly publications in the area of human-animal studies is a relatively recent phenomenon is pointed out by Kotrschal (2015: 11–12): "Die Anthrozoologie, also die naturwissenschaftlich geprägte Wissenschaft der Mensch-Tier-Beziehung mit den Disziplinen Anthropologie, Ethologie, Medizin, Psychologie, Veterinärmedizin sowie Zoologie und Biologie, entwickelte sich erst in den letzten paar Jahren rasant (...). Noch weniger sichtbar waren in der Vergangenheit die Human-Animal Studies (HAS), die sich im Wesentlichen mit der Perzeption der anderen Tiere und der Mensch-Tier-Beziehung in den Geistes-, Sozial- und Kulturwissenschaften befassen. Auch das änderte sich in den letzten paar Jahren rasant. An den Universitäten weltweit sprießen sehr rasch immer mehr Projekte und Institute, die sich mit diesen HAS befassen." See also Brantz & Mauch (2010: 10–11), Chimaira Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies (2011: 20–28), Roscher (2012), DeMello (2012: 7–9), Buschka, Gutjahr & Sebastian (2012), Birke & Hockenhull (2012a: 1–2), Marvin & McHugh (2014: 2–6), Spannring, Schachinger, Kompatscher & Boucabeille (2015: 15–16), Roscher (2015: 76–78, 94–95), Petrus (2015), and Kompatscher (2015: passim), each with further references. Instead of 'Human-animal studies', the term 'anthrozoology' is also used by some scholars; see e.g. Podberscek, Paul & Serpell (2000: 1–2).

> als kulturelle Gegenstände, Symbole oder Muster betrachtet, sondern als Lebewesen mit eigenen Erfahrungen, Empfindungen, Perspektiven und Interessen, als gesellschaftliche Akteur_innen (*sic*) und als Individuen mit einem intrinsischen Wert wahrgenommen (...). Es gilt, den Raum, den nichtmenschliche Tiere in menschlicher Kultur und Gesellschaft einnehmen, zu erforschen und zu betrachten, wie sich die Interaktionen zwischen Mensch und Tier gestalten, wie sich die Lebensformen von Tieren und Menschen miteinander verflechten und so Gesellschaft immer wieder neu hervorbringen."[8]

Alternatively, one may quote from an article on the investigation of human-animal bonds, written by the editors of a collection of papers dealing with human-animal relationships from a primarily sociological perspective (Birke & Hockenhull 2012b: 23):

> "To trace relationships means trying to understand how, together, all actors – human and nonhuman build and maintain relationships (or fail to do so). It also means seeing relationships as embedded in specific social and cultural contexts, whether that is (say) on the farm, or human coexistence with (and support of) local groups of feral animals within the local community. All our attachments are enmeshed in layers of social networks and other actors – pet food manufacturers, veterinary specialists, breeders, other animal handlers, other animals, and so forth; in that sense, the relationships are multiple and many-layered."

The contributions to this volume pursue such considerations for the period of classical antiquity. In particular, they set out to show that animals and humans are interconnected on a variety of different levels and that their encounters and interactions often result from their belonging to the same structures, 'networks' and communities or at least from finding themselves together in a certain setting, context or environment – wittingly or unwittingly. Although it may not be common among classicists to view animals as mere cultural objects or symbols, such perceptions are constantly found in ancient Greek and Roman sources. It is the object of the present collection to analyse and contextualise these ancient views in a scholarly fashion, and so to uncover their deeper socio-cultural sig-

8 Translation: "Central to HAS (i.e. Human-animal studies) is the exploration and critical scrutiny of our relations with other animals, of the interaction and interplay between humans and other animals. Non-human animals are thus seen not as cultural objects, symbols or models, but as living beings with their own experiences, perceptions, perspectives and interests, as social actors and actresses and as individuals with an intrinsic value (...). What is at stake is exploring the space occupied by non-human animals in human culture and society, how the interactions between man and animal take shape, how the life-forms of animals and humans are intertwined with one another and thus constantly regenerate society."

nificance for the Graeco-Roman world.[9] Naturally, any such approach relying upon sources from remote periods has its limits, as the material from which conclusions are drawn is necessarily incomplete.[10] But this is a methodological problem with which every classicist (and this includes the linguist, literary scholar, ancient historian and archaeologist) has to cope, and it certainly does not make research on interactions between animals and humans in Graeco-Roman antiquity impossible.

The range of animal species that appear in this volume as closely intertwined with human lives in antiquity is immense: domestic animals such as cats and dogs; beasts of instrumental value such as donkeys and horses, the latter also status symbols; animals providing food for the table, including cows, pigs and fish; objects of amusement or scientific examination, such as monkeys; birds, from parrots to pigeons; dolphins; hedgehogs; weasels; rats and other vermin; and creatures of more exotic origin, including tigers, giraffes, and even an okapi. For ease of reference, in this volume we use the simpler form 'animal' to refer to non-human animals.

The close proximity of the lives of animals and humans in antiquity lies at the heart of this collection and is the specific focus of a number of individual chapters. Sian Lewis reconsiders the parallelism of the lives of human and non-human animals in the light of recent archaeological research, which indicates that, by contrast with the modern world, the life expectancies of humans and animals followed a similar pattern in antiquity, implying their essential interdependence. This biological and environmental circumstance is fundamental to

9 See also Marvin (2010: 378): "Wenn wir an Tieren und Geschichte tatsächlich interessiert sind, dann scheint es, dass wir uns unweigerlich auf die Tiere in unserer menschlichen Geschichte konzentrieren müssen. Und diese Geschichte sollte davon handeln, wie bestimmte Völker über bestimmte Tiergruppen oder auch über einzelne Tiere dachten, wie sie sich diese Tiere vorstellen und welche Erfahrungen sie mit ihnen machten und wie beide gegenseitig aufeinander einwirkten. Eine Geschichte der Tiere muss erklären, wie diese unser und wie wir ihr Leben beeinflusst haben." While such an approach seems to be perfectly acceptable within the Humanities, certain groups of scholars might disagree with it. See, for example, Chimaira Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies (2011: 29): "Eine neutral, rein deskriptive Wissenschaft (über Mensch-Tier-Verhältnisse) zu proklamieren, verschleiert die diskurspolitische Herkunft der Forschenden und macht die eigenen Verwicklungen in anthropozentrische Denkweisen unsichtbar. Eine solche Wissenschaft schreibt die hegemoniale Geschichte der Gesellschaftlichen Mensch-Tier-Verhältnisse affirmativ fort." However, not everyone will subscribe to such a diagnosis; in particular the final sentence of this statement is rather problematic.

10 See e.g. Roscher (2015: 80): "Außerdem ist die historische Betrachtung von Tieren selbst davon beeinflusst, wie viele Quellen hinterlassen wurden, aus denen ihre Präsenz extrahierbar ist."

the ensuing studies of the volume, as it helps in part to explain why humans in antiquity were able to identify so easily with their animal fellows, and sometimes to an even greater extent than in the present day, by which time human lives have become disproportionately lengthened at the cost of their animal fellows. The basic interdependence of humans and animals for subsistence and survival is thus reflected in the terminology used for animal-human relationships, which, as Cristiana Franco explores in detail, is frequently based on feeding. Yet the language employed for the relationships between humans and animals goes well beyond this basic need, ranging from pleasure and enjoyment to friendship, passion and desire. At an extreme level, the closeness of humans to other animals results in bestiality, of which the ancient world is notorious for offering several instances, both mythological and historical. More commonly, animals found a role in human lives that can be considered analogous to modern pets, even if such a concept is sometimes regarded as anachronistic when applied to the ancient world.[11] Louise Calder and Gillian Clark consider here different aspects of this special bond between humans and animals. Calder shows how animals provided outlets for human feelings and could be regarded in some way as extensions of their owner. That raises the question of how far their lives, incorporated into the lives of their associated humans, are sufficient to constitute separate "animal biographies" of their own. Thorsten Fögen looks closely at some of those animals that were particularly individualised by ancient writers and considers how far they can be considered similar to accounts of individual human lives. He highlights how literary descriptions of particular animals disregard their outward physical appearance and focus on their emotional attributes and personalities. Such animals are defined by their relationship and attachment to particular individual humans, but the emotional nature of their animal responses to certain situations is brought into focus. Yet, even with the ass Lucius of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, for whom banal everyday human situations are seen from an animal perspective, the individual is not easily differentiated from assumptions about the generic behaviour of the species.

Given this proximity between animals and humans, the question arises of how far humans and non-human animals could ever understand each other. Gillian Clark's chapter considers the potential for humans and animals to communicate with each other and the varying ancient interpretations of animal rationality. The pair of papers by Arnaud Zucker and Kenneth Kitchell explore the cognitive dimension of human-animal mutual understanding. Zucker considers

11 Thus Gilhus (2006: 29) prefers the term "personal animals".

in detail the case of "animal envy" and the preoccupation of ancient scientific writers with the possibility that animals could begrudge humans the use of their bodies. He shows that, while it was recognised that non-human animals lacked actual knowledge of human medicine or technical activities, it was accepted that they had both a psychological awareness of human behaviour and, beyond that, also a moral consciousness. Such notions contributed to the emergence of a small section of ancient literature in which writers go beyond the idea of generic discussion of animal species, with the presumption that all animals of a certain species behave in the same way, to focus on individualised accounts of particular animals. Kitchell raises the issue of "animal literacy" and asks how far humans in the Greek and Roman worlds could properly understand animal behaviour based on common knowledge and observation. As he shows, such close awareness of the properties of particular species also contributed to the attribution in literary texts of particular animal behaviour to individual humans. This potential interchangeability of the human and animal perspectives is the focus of Sarah Miles's chapter. In exploring the co-existence of animals and humans in the staged world of Aristophanic comedy, Miles observes how humans and non-human animals each adopt characteristics of the other, with some hilarious results. Yet this waspish observation has a serious point, not only as satire against the political culture of the time, but also in bringing out the animality of human behaviour in general.

The possession of human and animal qualities is explored in more detail by Stephen T. Newmyer. Here again we see the potential interchangeability in status, with animals considered as humans and humans as animals. But it goes even further. For Plutarch, the possibility that animals can share in powers of reason is the basis for an argument that they not only have the same sense of belonging as members of the human species, but moreover have positive moral qualities which humans themselves lack. By imagining animals in familiar human situations ancient writers were able to reflect on the positive and negative aspects of human behaviour. This was very likely the context of the fable which the third-century rhetorician Hermogenes reports in a summary and an extended version about the city built by monkeys (*Progymn.* p. 2 Rabe; translation by Kennedy 2003: 74–75):

> 'οἱ πίθηκοι συνελθόντες ἐβουλεύοντο περὶ τοῦ χρῆναι πόλιν οἰκίζειν· καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς, ἤμελλον ἅπτεσθαι τοῦ ἔργου. γέρων οὖν πίθηκος ἐπέσχεν αὐτοὺς εἰπών, ὅτι ῥᾷον ἁλώσονται περιβόλων ἐντὸς ἀποληφθέντες.' οὕτως ἂν συντέμοις. εἰ δὲ ἐκτείνειν βούλοιο, ταύτῃ πρόαγε· 'οἱ πίθηκοι συνελθόντες ἐβουλεύοντο περὶ πόλεως οἰκισμοῦ. καὶ δή τις παρελθὼν ἐδημηγόρησεν, ὅτι χρὴ καὶ αὐτοὺς πόλιν ἔχειν· ὁρᾶτε γάρ, φησίν, ὡς εὐδαίμονες διὰ τοῦτο οἱ ἄνθρωποι· καὶ οἶκον ἔχει ἕκαστος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν οἱ σύμπαντες καὶ εἰς θέατρον ἀναβαίνοντες τέρπουσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν θεάμασί τε καὶ

ἀκούσμασι παντοδαποῖς', καὶ οὕτω πρόαγε διατρίβων καὶ λέγων, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἐγέγραπτο, καὶ λόγον πλάττε καὶ παρὰ τοῦ γέροντος πιθήκου. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ταύτῃ.

"'The apes gathered to deliberate about the need to found a city. Since it seemed best to do so, they were about to begin work. An old ape restrained them, saying that they will be more easily caught if hemmed in by walls.' This is how you would tell the fable concisely, but if you wanted to expand it, proceed as follows: 'The apes gathered to deliberate about building a city. One stepped forward and delivered a speech to the effect that they had need of a city: "For you see," he says, "how happy men are by living in a city. Each of them has his house, and by coming together to an assembly and a theatre all collectively delight their minds with all sights and sounds,"' and continue in this way, dwelling on each point and saying that the decree was passed; then fashion a speech also for the old ape. So much for this."

The interest of such stories for ancient readers was not just that it allowed them to imagine animals with cognitive and moral properties like humans. They were also interested in the physical appearance of such "mixed beings". One curiosity that emerges from Newmyer's study is the predisposition in antiquity for hybrid entities with part-human and part-animal features, combining human capacity for rationality with animal characteristics.

Such hybrid beings are examined more closely by Jeremy McInerney and Claudia Beier. In the Babylonian text of Berossus the hybrid fish-man Oannes is not a terrifying oppositional construct like the hybrid forms on the vases of the Edinburgh Painter, but an intermediary figure, whose amphibious qualities and possession of both human and animal characteristics allows him to reconcile these different kinds of being as an intellectually superior figure, a wise lawgiver comparable to the centaur Chiron in Greek mythology. By contrast, the scenes of combat depicted by the Edinburgh Painter, as Beier's chapter illustrates, show the bodies of animals and hybrid human-animal creatures as more lacking in "boundary integrity" and thus more "objectified" than those of humans. This objectification of animals, presented always on the losing side of the combats, stands in opposition to the more positive responses found in literature. On some vases the painter even depicts the "instrumentality" of animals, who are used not as combatants in their own right, but simply as a tool in fights with others.

Such objectification is plainest in the uses of animals of exotic origin in the Persian court. As Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones argues, the Achaemenid monarchs are presented in the celebratory texts and images of Persepolis as guardians of the animal world in general, but the Apadana reliefs show how particularly exotic animals, such as tigers, giraffes, and even an okapi from sub-Saharan Africa, were brought as tribute. This provides an interesting comparandum to the situation in imperial Rome, where, as discussed by Edmund Thomas in his chapter,

the location of exotic animals for gladiatorial games and other shows in outer spaces of the city presents a marginality comparable to modern cities. That is not to say that animals lack agency altogether. The possibility for identification with animals, even those of instrumental value, is stronger in the more central areas of the city, while in the suburban areas and rural places along the roads between cities even animals such as horses which are otherwise treated with individualisation and sympathy become alienated. Yet, like the horse of the sarcophagus from Edessa, they can have a significant agency in human lives. The opposition between the perception of rural and urban localities in their treatment of animals is evident from the early Classical period in Greece, by contrast with the presentation in the Archaic period, where the wearing of animal skins is a feature of both high and low status figures and an image of the continuing presence and interaction of humans and animals. As Alastair Harden shows in his essay, the depiction of human figures wearing animal skins on Greek vases of the Archaic period, both high-status hunters and low-status shepherds, presents vestiges of a bucolic world in which animals and humans lives together and animal skins were not evidence of exploitation and abuse, but of cohabitation and interdependence.

John Wilkins takes further the implications of this viewpoint for animals as food. Because of the lifetime bond between humans and animals the ecological consequences of the bond between humans and other animals are explored by Wilkins. Fish are a commodity regarded as lacking in justice and full of error; yet Galen's interest is in the quality of the water they come from and the impact on human bodies when they are consumed. The basic need of Graeco-Roman society for co-existence of humans and animals as a precursor for the survival of both recalls the lessons of Lewis' essay, but also goes further. The argument has ecological and environmental consequences even for us today with the awareness, already at this early date, that human well-being is best achieved from feeding off locally sourced species, rather than those contaminated by waste.

Galen is not so sanguine when it comes to one particular species of more exotic origin, the Barbary apes from coastal North Africa. Despite their capacity for being considered as surrogate humans in the city-building fable, monkeys had an ambivalent status in antiquity, as Marco Vespa illustrates in his chapter. Known by the somewhat ironic name καλλίας ('beautiful creature') which belies their notoriously ugly appearance, they were thought of as creatures to be avoided because of their perceived ill omen. Here the objectification of animals takes an extreme form: although Galen defines them at the outset by their potential instrumentality as objects to be used for developing human knowledge in the scientific laboratory, ultimately he denies them even such instrumentality. Thus this creature that physically comes closest to human beings in terms of

anatomical form and social behaviour was thus paradoxically defined by the avoidance of interaction altogether.

The volume concludes with a research bibliography on animals in the Graeco-Roman world, put together by Thorsten Fögen. Though selective by necessity, it not only lists more general studies on animals in the ancient world, but also publications dealing with animals as food, vegetarianism, hunting, spectacles (games), sacrifice, veterinary medicine, and 'monsters' in antiquity.

Bibliography

Ach, Johann S. & Martina Stephany (eds.) (2009): *Die Frage nach dem Tier. Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven auf das Mensch-Tier-Verhältnis*, Berlin.

Agamben, Giorgio (2002): *L'aperto. L'uomo e l'animale*, Torino (English translation: *The Open. Man and Animal*, Stanford 2004).

Alexandridis, Annetta, Markus Wild & Lorenz Winkler-Horaček (eds.) (2008): *Mensch und Tier in der Antike. Grenzziehung und Grenzüberschreitung*, Wiesbaden.

Arluke, Arnold & Clinton Sanders (eds.) (2009): *Between the Species. Readings in Human-Animal Relations*, Boston.

Armstrong, Philip (2008): *What Animals Mean in the Fiction of Modernity*, London & New York.

Becker, Siegfried & Andreas C. Bimmer (eds.) (1991): *Mensch und Tier. Kulturwissenschaftliche Aspekte einer Sozialbeziehung*, Marburg.

Beetz, Andrea M. & Anthony L. Podberscek (eds.) (2005): *Bestiality and Zoophilia. Sexual Relations with Animals*, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Bekoff, Marc (ed.) (2007): *Encyclopedia of Human-Animal Relationships. A Global Exploration of Our Connections with Animals* (4 vols.), Westport, Connecticut.

Birke, Lynda & Jo Hockenhull (2012a): Introduction. On investigating human-animal relationships. In: Lynda Birke & Jo Hockenhull (eds.), *Crossing Boundaries. Investigating Human-Animal Relationships*, Leiden & Boston, 1–12.

Birke, Lynda & Jo Hockenhull (2012b): On investigating human-animal bonds. Realities, relatings, research. In: Lynda Birke & Jo Hockenhull (eds.), *Crossing Boundaries. Investigating Human-Animal Relationships*, Leiden & Boston, 15–36.

Birke, Lynda & Jo Hockenhull (eds.) (2012): *Crossing Boundaries. Investigating Human-Animal Relationships*, Leiden & Boston.

Bodenburg, Julia (2012): *Tier und Mensch. Zur Disposition des Humanen und Animalischen in Literatur, Philosophie und Kultur um 2000*, Freiburg im Breisgau.

Borgards, Roland (ed.) (2016): *Tiere. Kulturwissenschaftliches Handbuch*, Stuttgart.

Brantz, Dorothee (ed.) (2010): *Beastly Natures. Animals, Humans, and the Study of History*, Charlottesville.

Brantz, Dorothee & Christof Mauch (2010): Einleitung. Das Tier in der Geschichte und die Geschichte der Tiere. In: Dorothee Brantz & Christof Mauch (eds.), *Tierische Geschichte. Die Beziehung von Mensch und Tier in der Kultur der Moderne*, Paderborn, 7–16.

Brantz, Dorothee & Christof Mauch (eds.) (2010): *Tierische Geschichte. Die Beziehung von Mensch und Tier in der Kultur der Moderne*, Paderborn.

Brucker, Renate, Melanie Bujok, Birgit Mütherich, Martin Seeliger & Frank Thieme (eds.) (2015): *Das Mensch-Tier-Verhältnis. Eine sozialwissenschaftliche Einführung*, Wiesbaden.

Bühler-Dietrich, Annette & Michael Weingarten (eds.) (2015): *Topos Tier. Neue Gestaltungen des Tier-Mensch-Verhältnisses*, Bielefeld.

Buschka, Sonja, Julia Gutjahr & Marcel Sebastian (2012): Gesellschaft und Tiere. Grundlagen und Perspektiven der Human-Animal Studies. In: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 62.8–9, 20–27.

Calarco, Matthew (2015): *Thinking Through Animals. Identity, Difference, Indistinction*, Stanford.

Chimaira Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies (2011): Eine Einführung in Gesellschaftliche Mensch-Tier-Verhältnisse und Human-Animal Studies. In: Chimaira Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies (ed.), *Human-Animal Studies. Über die gesellschaftliche Natur von Mensch-Tier-Verhältnissen*, Bielefeld, 7–42.

Chimaira Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies (ed.) (2011): *Human-Animal Studies. Über die gesellschaftliche Natur von Mensch-Tier-Verhältnissen*, Bielefeld.

Dalby, Andrew (2011): *Geoponika – Farm Work. A Modern Translation of the Roman and Byzantine Farming Handbook*, Totnes.

Daux, Georges (1970): Notes de lecture. In: *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 94, 595–623.

De Jonge, Francien & Ruud van den Bos (eds.) (2005): *The Human-Animal Relationship. Forever and a Day*, Assen.

Dekkers, Midas (1992): *Lief dier. Over bestialiteit*, Amsterdam (German translation: *Geliebtes Tier. Die Geschichte einer innigen Beziehung*, München & Wien 1994).

DeMello, Margo (2012): *Animals and Society. An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*, New York.

DeMello, Margo (ed.) (2010): *Teaching the Animal. Human-Animal Studies across the Disciplines*, New York.

Dinzelbacher, Peter (ed.) (2000): *Mensch und Tier in der Geschichte Europas*, Stuttgart.

Duff, J. Wight & Arnold M. Duff (eds.) (1934): *Minor Latin Poets*. Vol. 2 (Loeb Classical Library 434), Cambridge, Mass. & London.

Fehlmann, Meret, Margot Michel & Rebecca Niederhauser (eds.) (2014): *Tierisch! Das Tier und die Wissenschaft. Ein Streifzug durch die Disziplinen*, Zürich.

Ferrari, Arianna & Klaus Petrus (eds.) (2015): *Lexikon der Mensch/Tier-Beziehungen*, Bielefeld.

Flynn, Clifton P. (ed.) (2008): *Social Creatures. A Human and Animal Studies Reader*, New York.

Fögen, Thorsten (2009): *Wissen, Kommunikation und Selbstdarstellung. Zur Struktur und Charakteristik römischer Fachtexte der frühen Kaiserzeit*, München.

Franklin, Adrian (1999): *Animals and Modern Cultures. A Sociology of Human-Animal Relations in Modernity*, London.

Freeman, Carol, Elizabeth Leane & Yvette Watt (eds.) (2011): *Considering Animals. Contemporary Studies in Human-Animal Relations*, Farnham.

Geist, Hieronymus ([2]1976): *Römische Grabinschriften*. Gesammelt und ins Deutsche übertragen von Hieronymus Geist, betreut von Gerhard Pfohl, München.

Gilhus, Ingvild Sælid (2006): *Animals, Gods and Humans. Changing Attitudes to Animals in Greek, Roman and Early Christian Ideas*, London & New York.

Haraway, Donna J. (2008): *When Species Meet*, Minneapolis.

Henninger-Voss, Mary J. (ed.) (2002): *Animals in Human Histories. The Mirror of Nature and Culture*, Rochester.

Hurn, Samantha (2012): *Humans and Other Animals. Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Human-Animal Interactions*, London.

Ingold, Tim (1988): Introduction. In: Tim Ingold (ed.), *What is an Animal?*, London, 1–16.

Kalof, Linda (2007): *Looking at Animals in Human History*, London.

Kaplan, Astrid (2006): *Die Mensch-Tier-Beziehung. Eine irrationale Angelegenheit*, Saarbrücken.

Kazez, Jean (2010): *Animalkind. What We Owe to Animals*, Malden, Mass. & Oxford.

Kennedy, George A. (2003): *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Translated with introductions and notes, Leiden & Boston.

King, Barbara J. (2010): *Being With Animals. Why We Are Obsessed with the Furry, Scaly, Feathered Creatures Who Populate Our World*, New York.

Knight, John (ed.) (2005): *Animals in Person. Cultural Perspectives on Human-Animal Intimacy*, Oxford & New York.

Kompatscher, Gabriela (2015): Literaturwissenschaft. Die Befreiung ästhetischer Tiere. In: Reingard Spannring, Karin Schachinger, Gabriela Kompatscher & Alejandro Boucabeille (eds.), *Disziplinierte Tiere? Perspektiven der Human-Animal Studies für die wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen*, Bielefeld, 137–159.

Kotrschal, Kurt (2015): Vorwort. In: Reingard Spannring, Karin Schachinger, Gabriela Kompatscher & Alejandro Boucabeille (eds.), *Disziplinierte Tiere? Perspektiven der Human-Animal Studies für die wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen*, Bielefeld, 9–12.

Macho, Thomas (2006): *Tiere – Menschen – Maschinen. Zur Kritik der Anthropologie*, Frankfurt am Main.

Manning, Aubrey & James Serpell (eds.) (1994): *Animals and Human Society. Changing Perspectives*, London & New York.

Marvin, Garry (2010): Wölfe im Schafspelz. Eine anthropologische Sicht auf die Beziehungen zwischen Menschen und Wölfen in Albanien und Norwegen. In: Dorothee Brantz & Christof Mauch (eds.), *Tierische Geschichte. Die Beziehung von Mensch und Tier in der Kultur der Moderne*, Paderborn, 364–378.

Marvin, Garry & Susan McHugh (2014): In it together. An introduction to human-animal studies. In: Garry Marvin & Susan McHugh (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Human-Animal Studies*, London & New York, 1–9.

Marvin, Garry & Susan McHugh (eds.) (2014): *Routledge Handbook of Human-Animal Studies*, London & New York.

Meyer, Heinz (1975): *Der Mensch und das Tier. Anthropologische und kultursoziologische Aspekte*, München.

Midgley, Mary (1978): *Beast and Man. The Roots of Human Nature*, Ithaca, New York.

Müller-Karpe, Hermann (ed.) (1983): *Zur frühen Mensch-Tier-Symbiose*, München.

Münch, Paul & Rainer Walz (eds.) (1998): *Tiere und Menschen. Geschichte und Aktualität eines prekären Verhältnisses*, Paderborn.

Myers, Gene (1998): *Children and Animals. Social Development and Our Connections to Other Species*, Boulder, Colorado.

Noske, Barbara (1989): *Humans and Other Animals. Beyond the Boundaries of Anthropology*, London.

Otterstedt, Carola & Michael Rosenberger (eds.) (2009): *Gefährten – Konkurrenten – Verwandte. Die Mensch-Tier-Beziehung im wissenschaftlichen Diskurs*, Göttingen.

Petrus, Klaus (2015): Human-Animal studies. In: Arianna Ferrari & Klaus Petrus (eds.), *Lexikon der Mensch-Tier-Beziehungen*, Bielefeld, 156–160.

Philo, Chris & Chris Wilbert (eds.) (2007): *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places. New Geographies of Human-Animal Relations*, London & New York.

Podberscek, Anthony L., Elizabeth S. Paul & James A. Serpell (2000): Introduction. In: Anthony L. Podberscek, Elizabeth S. Paul & James A. Serpell (eds.), *Companion Animals and Us. Exploring the Relationships between People and Pets*, Cambridge, 1–4.

Podberscek, Anthony L., Elizabeth S. Paul & James A. Serpell (eds.) (2000): *Companion Animals and Us. Exploring the Relationships between People and Pets*, Cambridge.

Pöppinghege, Rainer (ed.) (2009): *Tiere im Krieg. Von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Paderborn.

Pollack, Ulrike (2009): *Die städtische Mensch-Tier-Beziehung. Ambivalenzen, Chancen und Risiken*, Berlin.

Rheinz, Hanna (1994): *Eine tierische Liebe. Zur Psychologie der Beziehung zwischen Mensch und Tier*, München.

Roscher, Mieke (2012): Human-Animal Studies. In: *Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte* 25 (online: https://docupedia.de/ zg/Human-Animal_Studies).

Roscher, Mieke (2015): Geschichtswissenschaft. Von einer Geschichte mit Tieren zu einer Tiergeschichte. In: Reingard Spannring, Karin Schachinger, Gabriela Kompatscher & Alejandro Boucabeille (eds.), *Disziplinierte Tiere? Perspektiven der Human-Animal Studies für die wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen*, Bielefeld, 75–100.

Rothfels, Nigel (ed.) (2002): *Representing Animals*, Bloomington.

Schneider, Manuel (ed.) (2001): *Den Tieren gerecht werden. Zur Ethik und Kultur der Mensch-Tier-Beziehung*, Witzenhausen.

Serpell, James (1996): *In the Company of Animals. A Study of Human-Animal Relationships*, Cambridge (orig. Oxford 1986).

Shepard, Paul (1996): *The Others. How Animals Made Us Human*, Washington, D.C.

Simmons, Laurence & Philip Armstrong (eds.) (2007): *Knowing Animals*, Leiden & Boston.

Spannring, Reingard, Karin Schachinger, Gabriela Kompatscher & Alejandro Boucabeille (2015): Einleitung. Disziplinierte Tiere? In: Reingard Spannring, Karin Schachinger, Gabriela Kompatscher & Alejandro Boucabeille (eds.), *Disziplinierte Tiere? Perspektiven der Human-Animal Studies für die wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen*, Bielefeld, 13–28.

Spannring, Reingard, Karin Schachinger, Gabriela Kompatscher & Alejandro Boucabeille (eds.) (2015): *Disziplinierte Tiere? Perspektiven der Human-Animal Studies für die wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen*, Bielefeld.

Spannring, Reingard, Reinhard Heuberger, Gabriela Kompatscher, Andreas Oberprantacher, Karin Schachinger & Alejandro Boucabeille (eds.) (2015): *Tiere – Texte – Transformationen. Kritische Perspektiven der Human-Animal Studies*, Bielefeld.

Stiftung Deutsches Hygiene-Museum (ed.) (2002): *Mensch und Tier: Eine paradoxe Beziehung. Begleitbuch zur Ausstellung (22. November 2002 bis 10. August 2003)*, Ostfildern-Ruit.

Svilar, Maja (ed.) (1985): *Mensch und Tier*, Bern.

Taylor, Nik (2013): *Humans, Animals, and Society. An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*, New York.

Taylor, Nik & Tania Signal (eds.) (2011): *Theorizing Animals. Re-Thinking Humanimal Relations*, Leiden & Boston.

Ullrich, Jessica, Friedrich Weltzien & Heike Fuhlbrügge (2008): Das Selbst des Tieres und die Identität des Menschen. Vorwort. In: Jessica Ullrich, Friedrich Weltzien & Heike Fuhlbrügge (eds.), *Ich, das Tier. Tiere als Persönlichkeiten in der Kulturgeschichte*, Berlin, 9–13.

Wiedenmann, Rainer E. (2002): *Die Tiere der Gesellschaft. Studien zur Soziologie und Semantik von Mensch-Tier-Beziehungen*, Konstanz.

Wiedenmann, Rainer E. (2009): *Tiere, Moral und Gesellschaft. Elemente und Ebenen humanimalischer Sozialität*, Wiesbaden.
Wolf, Ursula (2012): *Ethik der Mensch-Tier-Beziehung*, Frankfurt am Main.
Wolfe, Cary (ed.) (2003): *Zoontologies. The Question of the Animal*, Minneapolis.
Yourcenar, Marguerite (2000): *Memoirs of Hadrian*, London.

Figure 1: Pig epitaph from Edessa in Macedonia (second/third century A.D.)