Thorsten Fögen

Lives in Interaction: Animal 'Biographies' in Graeco-Roman Literature?

> "Why are there no entries for animals in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (*DNB*)? Clearly, an animal's life can be recorded; but the concept of biography has always been applied uniquely to humans (...)."
>
> (Fudge 2004: 21)

Abstract: This paper analyses some representative examples of literary texts in which a tendency towards an individualisation of animals can be discerned. It considers Odysseus' dog Argus in Homer's *Odyssey*, Arrian's dog Horme in his *Cynegeticus*, King Alexander's horse Bucephalas in Plutarch and Arrian, Corinna's (unnamed) parrot in Ovid's *Amores* 2.6, and the 'donkey' Lucius in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. Special attention is given to the questions of what kind of details on the lives of the animals in question are conveyed, and in what way these lives are related to the human sphere. The paper also examines to what extent such accounts may be categorised as 'biographies' and how they differ from each other. Wherever possible, there will be some reflexions on the specific historical and socio-political background of the texts discussed.

1 Introduction

Graeco-Roman literature offers abundant source material on animals in the ancient world. Although this corpus comprises rather diverse texts from different literary genres and different periods ranging from the archaic age to late antiquity, most of these documents illustrate that there was hardly any area where animal and human lives were separated from each other. Furthermore, they shed light on the very diverse roles and functions that animals had, including, for example, those of pets and entertainers, of labourers (especially in an agricultural context), of being a medium of transportation, and of creatures embodying divine power or being sacrificed to the gods. However, the majority of these sources focus on 'prototypical' representatives of certain species and talk about them in a rather general fashion; they pay relatively little attention to *in-*

DOI 10.1515/9783110545623-005

dividual animals and their particular lives and circumstances. In ancient literature, most animals do not even have any proper names.

It is the few exceptions in this regard that constitute the subject of this paper. I will consider some representative examples of literary texts in which a tendency towards an individualisation of animals can be discerned. Among other things, I would like to pursue the question of how such cases are presented, what kind of details on the life of a particular animal are conveyed, and in what way such a life is related to the human sphere. I will also discuss to what extent such accounts may be categorised as 'biographies' and how they differ from each other.[1] On another level, one may ask to what extent they can be related to the established ancient biographical tradition dealing with well-known human individuals.[2]

Whether and how 'biographies' of animals can be written has recently been asked by scholars engaged in the field of human-animal studies.[3] Relying upon

1 Modern definitions of what a 'biography' is range from very short statements such as "Biography is about individuals" (Pelling 2009: 608) to more extensive classifications such as "a literary text of book length telling the life story of an historical individual from cradle to grave (or a substantial part of it)" (Hägg 2012: ix) or the "Darstellung der Lebensgeschichte einer Persönlichkeit, v.a. in ihrer geist.-seel. Entwicklung, ihren Leistungen und ihrer Wirkung auf die Umwelt" (Hölzle [2]1990: 55); see also Swain (1997: 1–2), Sonnabend (2002: 2–3, 8–9, 13–15, 17–19), and Hägg (2012: 2–8). As Hölzle ([2]1990) further points out, there are different types and forms of biographies, or as Pelling (2009: 612–613) puts it, "'biography' is an extremely broad genre – indeed, it is so broad that it may be misleading to count it as a single genre at all, rather than a range of texts linked only in that they do whatever they do through the filter of a person's life." It may be added that ancient authors perceived a certain difference between historiography and biography; see, for example, Polybius, *Hist*. 10.21.2–8, Plutarch, *Alex*. 1.1–3, and Nepos, *Pelop*. 1.1. See further Sonnabend (2002: 4–8) and Stadter (2007), the latter of whom rightly says that "it is often quite difficult to distinguish history from biography, even with the most careful analysis, nor did the ancients do so consistently. Historiography itself is protean, and biography no less so: not surprisingly, they frequently overlap (...)" (Stadter 2007: 528). See also Pelling (2011: 13–25).

2 There is a vast amount of secondary literature on the ancient biographical tradition. One may single out the volumes by Gentili & Cerri (1983), Edwards & Swain (1997), Ehlers (1998), Sonnabend (2002), and Hägg (2012). See also the articles by Stadter (2007) and Pelling (2009), already quoted in n. 1 (above).

3 On human-animal studies, see the recent overview by Petrus (2015), who defines this relatively new discipline as follows (2015: 157): "Die HAS [i.e. Human-Animal Studies] stehen für eine multidisziplinäre Erforschung der Mannigfaltigkeit der Mensch-Tier-Beziehungen. Dabei geht es zum einen um ganz *konkrete* Beziehungen zwischen menschlichen und nichtmenschlichen Individuen (...). Zum anderen wird aber auch die Gesamtheit an Mensch-Tier-Beziehungen sowie deren Einbettung in kulturelle, gesellschaftliche und politische Strukturen untersucht (...)." For further definitions and references, see the introduction to this volume.

various types of sources, they have attempted to reconstruct the lives of individual animals such as dogs, horses, cats or hippopotami in order to make them visible as distinctive entities and independent actors, and to trace their impact on certain cultures and communities as well as their ideas and concepts. In other words, analytical criteria such as *agency* ("Handlungsfähigkeit" and "Handlungsmacht"), as opposed to being mere objects or targets of mostly human actions ("Einschreibeflächen von Macht- und Wissensprozeduren"), and *historicity* or, taken together, even the *power to make history* ("Geschichtsmächtigkeit") have been given serious thought.[4] One of the methodological issues that researchers have grappled with is the question of what types of information or sources need to be factored in to investigate the individuality of animals from a historical perspective. The following quotation from Roscher (2011: 127–128) is a good example of this challenge:

> "Tiere hinterlassen keine schriftlichen Überlieferungen, fürwahr. Sie schreiben keine Briefe, Biografien oder literarische Werke noch geben sie Auskunft darüber, wie sie leben, wo sie leben und mit wem sie unter welchen Bedingungen leben und lebten. Sie geben uns auch nicht ästhetische Formen wie Bilder bekannt, welche Eindrücke sie von ihrer Umwelt gehabt haben. Aber dieser Mangel authentischer Ego-Dokumente trifft, zumindest zum Teil, auf ganze Gruppen von Menschen zu, die sozial benachteiligt worden sind und es daher schwer hatten und haben, in den Annalen der Geschichte aufzutauchen. Sollte man sie also deshalb ignorieren? Natürlich nicht! (...) Es gilt also, Quellen zu finden, die es zulassen, das Leben der Tiere aus historischer Perspektive zu interpretieren. Zu denken wäre beispielsweise an Zuchtbücher, Frachtpapiere, Stadtrechte und Marktordnungen, Tagesprotokolle von zoologischen Gärten, Beobachtungsprotokolle von Ornitholog_innen und Naturforscher_innen, die Vermerke von Tierheimen, Gerichtsakten, in denen Tiere thematisiert sind, Akten aus Tierkliniken, normative Regelwerke wie Gesetzessammlungen oder Steuerordnungen usw. Dies sind textliche Quellen, die genauso wenig von den Subjekten der Untersuchung angefertigt worden sind wie es bei den zuvor genannten menschlichen Versklavten der Fall war. Auch sie müssen gegen den Strich gelesen werden."[5]

---

4 The German terms are borrowed from Steinbrecher (2012: 16). On animal biographies, see Fudge (2004), Ullrich, Weltzien & Fuhlbrügge (2008b), Pycior (2010), Roscher (2011), Steinbrecher (2012), and Roscher (2015), to select but a few. To give a very recent example, "Animal Biographies: Recovering Animal Selfhood through Interdisciplinary Narration?" was the topic of a conference held at the University of Kassel (Germany) from 9 until 11 March 2016; for details see https://www.uni-kassel.de/fb05/fachgruppen/geschichte/human-animal-studies/konferenzen.html.

5 Translation: "Animals leave no written records, for sure. They write no letters, biographies or works of literature, nor do they give any information about how, where, with whom or under what conditions they live today or have ever lived in the past. They also give us no aesthetic forms like images that might intimate the kind of impressions they have had of their environ-

Among other concerns that scholars have had about the biographical approach is the general viability and usefulness of the biographical genre for a stronger focus on the personality and uniqueness of individual animals. Do the sources, whatever they may be, actually allow for the creation of such 'life stories'? How extensive and detailed, and how reliable, are they? How many different creatures can be accounted for through biographies, or is it just a few exceptional ones? What about the mass of animals for which very little or no information is available? And does the species matter – or in other words, do smaller animals such as insects receive the same degree of attention as larger ones, wild ones the same as domesticated ones?[6] Furthermore, what does the desire to extrapolate animal biographies entail for disciplines such as Classics that work with remote source material, both literary and visual?

With these issues in mind, I will concentrate on various literary narratives, spanning the period from the archaic Greek world to the time of the High Roman Empire, in which individualised animals play a significant role. For reasons of space, I will limit my analysis to Odysseus' dog Argus in Homer's *Odyssey*, Ar-

---

ment. But this absence of authentic documents about the self is also, at least partially, true for entire groups of human beings who have become socially marginalised and therefore find and have found it difficult to figure in the annals of history. Should they therefore be disregarded? Of course not! (...) So it is worth finding source material which allows the lives of animals to be interpreted from a historical perspective. Such sources might include stud books, shipping documents, municipal laws and market orders, daily protocols of zoos, observation notes of ornithologists and natural scientists, the registers of animal shelters, judicial records in which animals are discussed, proceedings of animal hospitals, normative rule books such as statutes or tax orders, etc. These are textual sources which have been as little fabricated by the subjects of the investigation as used to be the case with the former category of human slaves. They too must be read against the grain."

6 On differences between species, see e.g. Ullrich, Weltzien & Fuhlbrügge (2008a: 9): "Der Unterschied zwischen Schimpansen und Menschen ist vermutlich in jeder Hinsicht kleiner als der zwischen einem Schimpansen und einem Seepferdchen oder zwischen einem Grashüpfer und einem Wal." See also Ullrich, Weltzien & Fuhlbrügge (2008a: 12): "Daran zeigt sich schon, dass uns Menschen Tier nicht gleich Tier ist. Wer etwas zu bieten hat – sei dies Nahrung, Schutz oder Unterhaltung –, der steht näher an einem Einschlussangebot in die humane Lebensgemeinschaft, als derjenige, der Gefahr bedeutet, Krankheiten überträgt oder schlicht abstoßend aussieht. Es wird immer wieder über Menschenrechte für Menschenaffen diskutiert, im Hinblick auf Moskitos oder Borkenkäfer eine eher selten gestellte Forderung. (...) Hinzu kommt, dass sich Einzelgänger zur Namensgebung und damit zur Individualisierung eher eignen, als leicht verwechselbare Mitglieder einer großen Herde, eines Schwarms oder Staats, auch wenn das massenweise Auftreten eine besondere Ästhetik erzeugt und im Vergleich mit humanen Sozialwesen Fragen nach dem Verhältnis von Einzelnem und Gesellschaft provozieren kann."

rian's dog Horme in his *Cynegeticus*, King Alexander's horse Bucephalas in Plutarch and Arrian, Corinna's (unnamed) parrot in Ovid's *Amores* 2.6, and the 'donkey' Lucius in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. For each case, the literary and thematic context will be taken into account; wherever possible, there will also be some reflexions on the specific historical and socio-political background of the texts considered.[7]

2 Odysseus' dog Argus in Homer's *Odyssey*

One of the first examples of animals in ancient literature that are given names is the dog Argus in Homer's *Odyssey*,[8] and what is more, he is the only dog in Homer who has a name, as Lilja (1976: 31) has noted.[9] The scene in Book 17 is famous and describes the dog's death after his master's return to Ithaca. However, despite its moving character, it is a very short episode of no more than thirty-eight lines which does not say very much about the dog's actual life.[10]

---

7 On the indispensability of the historical and poetological contextualisation of literary documents on animals, see Borgards (2012: 96–103), who stresses that "(e)ine Anreicherung mit möglichst vielen Kontexten ist im Grunde bei jedem einzelnen literarischen Tier geboten. (...) Von Interesse sind hier für den Literaturwissenschaftler alle Felder, auf denen sich die Menschen in praktischer oder theoretischer Hinsicht mit den Tieren auseinandersetzen (...)" (2012: 97). On the poetological level, it is crucial to take into account "die formalen Eigenheiten der Texte (...), (...) die rhetorischen Strategien, die argumentativen Muster, die Verfahren der Repräsentation" (2012: 100).

8 On the dog's name, see Mentz (1933: 112): "Natürlich aus ἀργός ‚hell, schimmernd, glänzend, schnell', mit Zurückziehung des Akzentes, wie bei Eigennamen häufig. Ob bei dem HN. die Bedeutung des hellen Glanzes oder der Schnelligkeit vorwiegt, ist nicht leicht zu entscheiden. (...) Ich möchte (...) behaupten, daß Homer gerade die Doppelbedeutung von ἀργός bei der Wahl des Namens in Auge gehabt hat. Betont doch Odysseus bei der Frage nach dem Namen, der er natürlich kennt, ausdrücklich, des Hundes schönes Aussehen (...) und fragt, ob er ἐπὶ εἴδεϊ τῷδε auch ταχύς gewesen sei." See also Baecker (1884: 14–26, esp. 14–21), Körner (^{2}1930: 18–19), Lilja (1976: 26–28, 33), Mainoldi (1984: 118–119, 124 n. 81), Schneider (2000: 26), and Wernicke (1895: 797): "Als Hundename bedeutet A. ‚Flink' oder ‚Weiss' und hat mit mythischen Vorstellungen überhaupt nichts zu thun."

9 See also Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1981: 164): "Seul de toute la gent canine homérique, il possède un nom, comme un cheval." Repeated almost verbatim by Mainoldi (1984: 113).

10 On dogs in Greek and Roman antiquity, see esp. von Keitz (1883: 15–17), Keller (1909: 91–151), Orth (1910), Hull (1964), Merlen (1971: esp. 25–89), Toynbee (1973: 102–124, 330–331), Lilja (1976), Lonsdale (1979: 149–152, 153–154), Bodson (1980), Zaganiaris (1980/81), Perfahl (1983),

The text mentions that Odysseus had raised the animal, but because of his participation in the Trojan War he did not have the opportunity to use him as a hunting dog, as one would have expected under normal circumstances.[11] Due to his master's absence, Argus is utterly neglected and very weak, but he nonetheless recognises Odysseus disguised as a beggar to avoid immediate confrontation with the suitors who have established themselves at his court. However, the dog's lack of strength does not permit him to move towards the hero who identifies his animal and asks the swineherd Eumaeus why he lies in a pile of dung and is in such bad shape.[12] Eumaeus replies that the dog's state is the result of his master's absence who, as he thinks, has died abroad; otherwise, his beauty, strength and speed would be admirable (*Od.* 17.312–323; transl. Arthur T. Murray & George E. Dimock, Loeb Classical Library):

> "καὶ λίην ἀνδρός γε κύων ὅδε τῆλε θανόντος.
> εἰ τοιόσδ' εἴη ἠμὲν δέμας ἠδὲ καὶ ἔργα,
> οἷόν μιν Τροίηνδε κιὼν κατέλειπεν Ὀδυσσεύς,
> αἶψά κε θηήσαιο ἰδὼν ταχυτῆτα καὶ ἀλκήν.
> οὐ μὲν γάρ τι φύγεσκε βαθείης βένθεσιν ὕλης
> κνώδαλον, ὅττι δίοιτο· καὶ ἴχνεσι γὰρ περιῄδη·
> νῦν δ' ἔχεται κακότητι, ἄναξ δέ οἱ ἄλλοθι πάτρης
> ὤλετο, τὸν δὲ γυναῖκες ἀκηδέες οὐ κομέουσι.
> δμῶες δ', εὖτ' ἂν μηκέτ' ἐπικρατέωσιν ἄνακτες,
> οὐκέτ' ἔπειτ' ἐθέλουσιν ἐναίσιμα ἐργάζεσθαι·
> ἥμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίνυται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
> ἀνέρος, εὖτ' ἄν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἕλῃσιν."

Mainoldi (1984: passim), Peters (1998: 166–187), Brewer, Clark & Phillips (2001: esp. 83–106), Amat (2002: 25–92, 225–226), Franco (2003), Giebel (2003: 120–128), and Franco (2014). On dogs in Homer, see Körner ([2]1930: 18–23, 35–36), Rahn (1953/54: 456–461, 469–473, 476), Lilja (1976: 13–36), Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1981: 162–169), Mainoldi (1984: 104–126), Beck (1991), Schneider (2000: 24–28), Dumont (2001: 65–66, 68, 74, 92–96), Franco (2003: esp. 37–50), and Franco (2014: 17–25, 37–38, 54–61, 63–67, 72–79, 82–87, 99–105, 118–120); see also Hainsworth (1961).

11 Homer, *Od.* 17.292–295: Ἄργος, Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, ὃν ῥά ποτ' αὐτὸς / θρέψε μέν, οὐδ' ἀπόνητο, πάρος δ' εἰς Ἴλιον ἱρὴν / ὤχετο. τὸν δὲ πάροιθεν ἀγίνεσκον νέοι ἄνδρες / αἶγας ἐπ' ἀγροτέρας ἠδὲ πρόκας ἠδὲ λαγωούς.

12 Homer, *Od.* 17.296–304: δὴ τότε κεῖτ' ἀπόθεστος ἀποιχομένοιο ἄνακτος, / ἐν πολλῇ κόπρῳ, ἥ οἱ προπάροιθε θυράων / ἡμιόνων τε βοῶν τε ἅλις κέχυτ', ὄφρ' ἂν ἄγοιεν / δμῶες Ὀδυσσῆος τέμενος μέγα κοπρήσοντες· / ἔνθα κύων κεῖτ' Ἄργος, ἐνίπλειος κυνοραιστέων. / δὴ τότε γ', ὡς ἐνόησεν Ὀδυσσέα ἐγγὺς ἐόντα, / οὐρῇ μέν ῥ' ὅ γ' ἔσηνε καὶ οὔατα κάββαλεν ἄμφω, / ἆσσον δ' οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα δυνήσατο οἷο ἄνακτος / ἐλθέμεν.

> "Yes, truly this is the dog of a man who has died in a far land. If he were but in form and action such as he was when Odysseus left him and went to Troy, you would soon be amazed at seeing his speed and his strength. No creature that he startled in the depths of the thick wood could escape him, and in tracking too he was keen of scent. But now he is in evil plight, and his master has perished far from his native land, and the heedless women give him no care. Slaves, when their masters cease to direct them, no longer wish to do their work properly, for Zeus, whose voice is borne afar, takes away half his worth from a man when the day of slavery comes upon him."

As Rose (1979: 222–223) has shown, the character and superior qualities of the dog, outlined in *Od.* 17.313–317, are similar to those of his master: he used to have great speed (ταχυτῆτα), strength (ἀλκήν) and intelligence (καὶ ἴχνεσι γὰρ περιήδη) – virtues that Odysseus himself demonstrated in a variety of situations. In other words, "(t)he poet has linked hound and master in a bond not only of affection but of likeness as well. (...) he has endowed Argos here with the canine counterparts to Odysseus' *aretai* (...)" (Rose 1979: 223).

At the same time, the animal who does not receive any attention from the negligent maids is presented as a mirror of Odysseus' supposed fate and of the devastating situation at his residence in Ithaca.[13] Furthermore, Eumaeus uses the specific case of Argus to elaborate on what usually happens in the household of a master who is no longer there to exercise control over his slaves. Implicitly, this comment, taken together with other passages in the *Odyssey*, proves that he himself does not belong to the category of careless servants. Eumaeus is thus presented as one of the few conscientious and trustworthy individuals living at Odysseus' court whom the hero may rely upon in order to regain power over Ithaca.[14]

The episode concludes with the death of the dog: there is a reference to his age of twenty years,[15] but nothing is said of Odysseus' reaction to the loss of his

---

13 See Rahn (1953/54: 458): "in dem Hunde Argos tritt ihm [sc. Odysseus] das Einst und Jetzt unmittelbar anschaulich vor die Seele". Similarly Köhnken (2003: 391–392): "Argos einst (V. 314 ...) und Argos jetzt (V. 318f. ...) rücken dem Hörer exemplarisch den Zustand des Haushalts einst (mit Odysseus) und jetzt (ohne Odysseus) plastisch vor Augen (...)." Further Köhnken (2003: 393): "So vernachlässigt wie der Hund durch die Abwesenheit seines Herrn ist der Haushalt des Odysseus, und so vergessen wie Argos ist der verschollene Odysseus selbst."

14 See Rohdich (1980: 37–38) who argues that "(d)ie Existenz des Sauhirten ist ganz von der Erinnerung an Odysseus geprägt."

15 Homer's remark on Argus' age is questioned by Aelian, *De nat. anim.* 4.40: κυνὶ δὲ βίος ὁ μήκιστος τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ἔτη. Ἄργος δὲ ὁ Ὀδυσσέως καὶ ἡ περὶ αὐτὸν ἱστορία ἔοικε παιδιὰ Ὁμήρου εἶναι. See also *De nat. anim.* 7.29 on the credibility of the Argus story as a whole. But see Aristotle, *Hist. anim.* VI 20 574b30–575a2: ζῇ δ' ἡ μὲν Λακωνικὴ κύων ὁ μὲν ἄρρην περὶ

animal. However, it must be added that his disguise would not even permit him to express grief, as it would have immediately revealed his identity. Nonetheless, the passage makes it sufficiently clear that the hero is indeed touched by the bad state of his dog and that he hides his tears from Eumaeus (*Od.* 17.304–305: αὐτὰρ ὁ νόσφιν ἰδὼν ἀπομόρξατο δάκρυ, / ῥεῖα λαθὼν Εὔμαιον).[16] At the same time, this expression of feelings should not lead to the assumption that the animal is some kind of lapdog or pet.[17] Homer's verses leave no doubt about the fact that Argus belongs to the category of hunting dogs which were primarily used for practical purposes,[18] and as such, he must have represented a status symbol for his owner – at least when he was still in proper shape.[19] This

---

ἔτη δέκα, ἡ δὲ θήλεια περὶ ἔτη δώδεκα, τῶν δ' ἄλλων κυνῶν αἱ μὲν πλεῖσται περὶ ἔτη τετταρακαίδεκα ἢ πεντεκαίδεκα, ἔνιαι δὲ καὶ εἴκοσιν· διὸ καὶ Ὅμηρον οἴονταί τινες ἀόρθως ποιῆσαι τῷ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει ἀποθανόντα τὸν κύνα τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως. On the defensive approach of the later scholiasts, see Most (1991: 154, 164). See also Körner ([2]1930: 21–22).

16 See Dumont (2001: 94): "La scène des retrouvailles entre Ulysse et le vieil Argos (...) est un chef d'œuvre de profondeur psychologique." See also Most (1991: 145–146): "Die ganze Szene ist mit größter Kunst auf die Erzielung eines Pathos angelegt – äußeres Zeichen dafür ist Odysseus' Träne, die das Ereignis wortlos aber beredt kommentiert und sicherlich eine ähnliche Reaktion beim Zuhörer programmieren soll." See further Wirshbo (1983: 12–13), with references to earlier scholarship, and Schneider (2000: 25): "Eine ähnlich tiefe Gefühlsregung zeigt Odysseus bei seiner Heimkehr nur Penelope gegenüber (Od. XIX 203ff.)." Rahn (1967: 100) speaks of a "Gefühlsansturm reinster Sympathie" and maintains that "(f)ür einen Augenblick scheint die Grenze zwischen Mensch und Tier aufgehoben", a claim that seems exaggerated because it is not supported by the Homeric text. As Franco (2003: 48) has pointed out, one of the reasons why Odysseus is moved to tears is that Argus is the first to recognise him: "(...) prima e unica creatura dell'isola a riconoscere l'eroe nonostante il suo travestimento e i lunghi anni di assenza, Argo riesce a commuovere Odisseo fino alle lacrime." But see already Marg (1973: 9) and Most (1991: 146), to name but two scholars. With Köhnken (2003: 393) it should be added that the Argus scene is "die einzige ἀναγνώρισις in der Odyssee, in der sich beide Partner sofort und gleichzeitig erkennen: Argos den Odysseus und Odysseus den Argos."

17 For definitions of the term 'pet', see Fögen (2016c: 342–343 n. 77). To the secondary literature listed there, one may now add Wischermann (2014: esp. 108–113) and Grier (2014: esp. 125).

18 See also Most (1991: 146): "(...) kein an der Tafel verwöhnter Weichling wie die Freier (...), sondern ein harter Kämpfer, ausdauernd wie sein Herr (...)." Similarly Rohdich (1980: 34).

19 Scrutinising the Argus scene and other passages in Homer, Schneider (2000: 28) concludes that the dog was "ein aristokratisches Statussymbol in der homerischen Gesellschaft (...), das den erwachsenen Mann von seinem ersten Auftreten vor seinen Standesgenossen bis ins hohe Alter begleitet." He adds that a similar verdict can be applied to the later literary sources such as the elegies of Solon and Theognis as well as the visual evidence offered by vases of the sixth century B.C. (Schneider 2000: 29) and the sepulchral *stelai* of the archaic period (Schneider 2000: esp. 29–36). See also Mainoldi (1984: esp. 114) and L'Allier (2009: 9–11).

certainly does not rule out that their owners may have developed a certain emotional attachment to them, but their central function was defined by utilitarian concerns of the humans to whom they belonged. Such a diagnosis is also confirmed by ancient technical works on hunting and the use of hunting dogs such as Xenophon's and Arrian's *Cynegeticus* as well as the didactic poems by Grattius, Nemesianus and Oppian, all entitled *Cynegetica*.[20] As will be expounded in the next section, this conclusion even applies to Arrian's highly sympathetic portrayal of his dog Horme in his *Cynegeticus*.

Although the impressive skills and the noble nature of the dog Argus are clearly accentuated in the Homeric scene, there is altogether far too little information to call it a proper biography of an animal. The text does not even explain exactly what Argus looks like and is limited to a very general classification of the animal as a hunting dog.[21] Instead, the episode fulfils several other narrative functions. Above all, it serves the characterisation of the protagonist of the epic poem, but also of his loyal servant Eumaeus, whose praise of the dog's qualities has been compared to a 'funerary' lamentation.[22] At the same time, it cannot be denied that Odysseus' encounter with Argus is conceived of as a miniature tragedy which appeals to the reader's emotions and even incorporates an established element of ancient drama, the recognition

20 For an edition and translation of Xenophon's and Arrian's *Cynegeticus*, see Phillips & Willcock (1999). Hull (1964: 107–140, 161–184) offers an English rendering of these two works. L'Allier (2009) provides French translations of Arrian's *Cynegeticus* and Oppian's *Cynegetica*, accompanied by brief notes. The original texts and English translations of Grattius', Nemesianus' and Oppian's *Cynegetica* are most easily accessible in the Loeb Classical Library series: for Grattius and Nemesianus see Duff & Duff (1934), for Oppian see Mair (1928). On ancient literature on hunting with the assistance of dogs, see e.g. Aymard (1951), Hull (1964), Merlen (1971: 27–36, 48–62, 65–72), Effe (1977: 154–183), Phillips & Willcock (1999: 21–25), Dumont (2001: esp. 284–299, 404–418), Brewer, Clark & Phillips (2001: 84, 87–90, 100–101), and Amat (2002: 45–63).

21 But see Orth (1910: 20): "Da (...) gesagt wird, daß Argos zur Jagd auf wilde Ziegen, Hirsche und Hasen geführt wurde, der Keiler, das wichtigste Wild des altgriechischen Weidmannes, aber nicht genannt wird, so kann Argos jedenfalls keiner besonders großen, starken Rasse angehört haben." See also the more general observation made by Körner ([2]1930: 19): "Wenn wir auch aus dem späteren Altertum Bildwerke und Beschreibungen verschiedener Hunderassen haben, so fehlen uns doch solche für die homerische Zeit gänzlich, und Ilias wie Odyssee enthalten nichts über die Verschiedenheiten in Färbung, Größe und Gestalt der Hunde. Das schließt natürlich nicht aus, daß es schon damals verschiedene Hunderassen gegeben hat."

22 See Dumont (2001: 95–96): "Eumée (...) fait son éloge, chantant ses qualités et sa malchance, comme une lamentation funèbre, durant ses derniers instants."

scene (ἀναγνώρισις). However, what makes this recognition special is the fact that it is a short scene which ends with the death of one of the two subjects involved in it. Ultimately, it has no further immediate consequences other than contributing to the picture that Odysseus gets of the state of his court. In that regard, it differs from the later recognition between Odysseus and Penelope which paves the way for further action, namely the killing of the suitors and the restoration of Odysseus' full power and control over Ithaca.

It is certainly easy to contend that Odysseus' dog Argus is a purely fictional animal which is part of a mythical story. While it would be futile to discard such an argument, it may be worth remembering that, unlike many other creatures of the *Odyssey*, Argus is portrayed as a genuine and authentic ('real') dog; his portrayal had a basis in reality and is thus compelling for the reader. That he must have enjoyed a considerable renown in antiquity can be deduced from the fact that he appeared on one of the so-called Campana reliefs and on some sarcophagus reliefs,[23] but also in a satirical poem written by the first-century A.D. epigrammatist Lucillius, in which the dog's recognition of his master Odysseus is used as a humorous point of comparison.[24] As Most (1991) has documented, there are several other strands of how later authors used Argus for their purposes: he occurs in philosophical debates on the intelligence and reason of animals as well as in texts that assess the fidelity of dogs. Furthermore, Argus was also the object of much later contemplations on the Homeric *Odyssey* (see Most 1991: 157–161, 166–168).

---

23 See Campana relief, British Museum, reg. no. 1951, 11–23, 1 (first/second century A.D.) and the sarcophagus fragment showing Odysseus and Argus, Museo Nazionale di San Martino, Napoli (late second century A.D.). For details see Robert (1890: 161–162, 216–217), Higgins (1953) and Perfahl (1983: 60–61). Further references in Most (1991: 148 n. 13), who rightly remarks that "Darstellungen des Odysseus zusammen mit einem Hund sind ausschließlich aus der etruskischen und römischen Kunst bekannt. Da in allen solchen Denkmälern der Hund noch lebt und in den meisten in Begleitung von Odysseus und Penelope zusammen auftritt, dürfte es sich vielleicht um eine von der griechischen abweichende etruskische Variante der Legende handeln; jedenfalls können diese nicht als Illustrationen der uns bekannten Argos-Szene gelten."

24 Lucillius, *Anth. Pal.* 11.77: Εἰκοσέτους σωθέντος Ὀδυσσέος εἰς τὰ πατρῷα / ἔγνω τὴν μορφὴν Ἄργος ἰδὼν ὁ κύων· / ἀλλὰ σὺ πυκτεύσας, Στρατοφῶν, ἐπὶ τέσσαρας ὥρας, / οὐ κυσὶν ἄγνωστος, τῇ δὲ πόλει γέγονας. / ἦν ἐθέλῃς τὸ πρόσωπον ἰδεῖν ἐς ἔσοπτρον ἑαυτοῦ, / "Οὐκ εἰμὶ Στρατοφῶν", αὐτὸς ἐρεῖς ὁμόσας. See also Martial 11.69 (epitaph of the hunting dog Lydia), esp. 11.69.7–8: *non me longa dies nec inutilis abstulit aetas, / qualia Dulichio fata fuere cani.* For the full text and translation of this epigram, see Lewis (in this volume).

3 Arrian's dog Horme in his *Cynegeticus*

Another prominent example of a hunting dog that was given a name is Arrian's Horme, described in a chapter of his short treatise on hunting, the *Cynegeticus* (§§ 5.1–6).[25] As the author, whose full name was Flavius Arrianus Xenophon and who is best-known for his *Anabasis* of Alexander and other historiographical works, sets out in the introduction, he conceived this little work as a supplement to Xenophon's eponymous work, composed much earlier.[26] With his predecessor he shares an interest in the same areas, including hunting with dogs (κυνηγέσια).[27] Repeatedly, he advertises himself as an expert in this discipline and takes over the role of an instructor who transmits his personal knowledge to his readers.[28]

---

25 The work comprises altogether no more than 36 chapters, many of which contain just a few paragraphs. For editions and translations of Arrian's *Cynegeticus*, see n. 20 (above). The only full-scale monograph on Arrian as a whole is Stadter (1980), which also provides a short overview of his works (Stadter 1980: 171–172) and a separate chapter on the *Cynegeticus* (Stadter 1980: 50–59). The massive book of Tonnet (1988) is more selective and includes an extensive analysis of Arrian's language and style (1988: 297–421), but also has two sections on the *Cynegeticus* (1988: 65–67, 266–280). On Arrian's life and career, see Stadter (1980: esp. 1–18, 173–174), Syme (1982), Tonnet (1988: 5–101), and Bosworth (1993: 226–233). On the *opera minora*, see also Bosworth (1993).

26 Burliga (2009: 36) surmises that Arrian's *Cynegeticus* was "written probably ca. AD 145 (that's almost 550 years after Xenophon's essay)", but fails to provide any evidence for such a date. However, one may agree with Bosworth (1993: 233) that "(t)he so-called minor works all come relatively late in Arrian's career"; see also Tonnet (1988: 65–67), who argues for the period between A.D. 137 and 145/146 (1988: 67). On Arrian's name, see Stadter (1976: 158, with n. 3), Stadter (1980: 2–3), Syme (1982: 184), and Tonnet (1988: 17–19).

27 Arrian, *Cyn.* 1.1–2.5, esp. 1.4: ὅσα δὲ ἐλλείπειν μοι δοκεῖ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, οὐχὶ ἀμελείᾳ ἀλλ' ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ γένους τῶν κυνῶν τοῦ Κελτικοῦ καὶ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἵππων τοῦ Σκυθικοῦ τε καὶ Λιβυκοῦ, ταῦτα λέξω, ὁμώνυμός τε ὢν αὐτῷ καὶ πόλεως τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ ἀμφὶ ταὐτὰ ἀπὸ νέου ἐσπουδακώς, κυνηγέσια καὶ στρατηγίαν καὶ σοφίαν. On Xenophon's *Cynegeticus*, whose authenticity has occasionally been questioned by modern scholarship, see Stadter (1976) and Fögen (2016a: 275–276).

28 See e.g. Arrian, *Cyn.* 4.1–2: λέξω δὲ καὶ αὐτός, ἀφ' οἵων τινῶν χρὴ τεκμαίρεσθαι τὰς ὠκείας τε καὶ γενναίας, καὶ τίσιν αὖ προσέχων τις τὸν νοῦν τὰς ἀγεννεῖς τε καὶ βραδείας ἀποκρίνοι αὐτῶν. πρῶτα μὲν δὴ μακραὶ ἔστωσαν ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἐπ' οὐράν· ἓν γὰρ οὐδὲν οὕτω τεκμήριον ἐς ὠκύτητά τε καὶ γενναιότητα εὕροις ἂν ἐπιλεγόμενος ταὐτὸν ἐπὶ πάσῃ ἰδέᾳ κυνός, ὡς τὸ μῆκος, καὶ τοὐναντίον τὴν βραχύτητα ἐς τὸ βραδὺ καὶ ἀγεννές. ὥστε ἤδη ἔγωγε εἶδον πολλὰ ἄλλα κακὰ ἐχούσας κύνας, ὅτι δὲ μακραὶ ἐτύγχανον, ὠκεῖαι ἦσαν καὶ θυμοειδεῖς. See also *Cyn.* 3.5–6 and 7.2: ἤδη δὲ ἔγνων κύνα, ἥτις οἴκοι μὲν κατηφὴς ἦν καὶ οὐδενὶ τῶν πλησιαζόντων ἔχαιρεν, ἐπὶ θήραν δὲ ἐξαγομένη ὑπερευφραίνετο καὶ παντὶ τῷ προσελθόντι προσμειδιῶσα καὶ

A paragraph on the shape and colour of the eyes of dogs (*Cyn.* 4.5) leads him over to an excursus on a dog that he owned previously, and it is indeed this animal's very grey eyes that are singled out first of all.[29] But this is followed by a series of other qualities (*Cyn.* 5.1–2; transl. Hull 1964: 166):

> ἐπεί τοι ἀνέθρεψα ἐγὼ κύνα χαροπὴν οἵαν χαροπωτάτην, καὶ αὕτη ὠκεῖά τε ἦν καὶ φιλόπονος καὶ εὔψυχος καὶ εὔπους, ὥστε καὶ τέτταρσιν ἤδη ποτὲ λαγωοῖς ἐφ᾽ ἡλικίας ἀντήρκεσεν. καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δὲ πραοτάτη τέ ἐστιν (ἔτι γάρ μοι ἦν, ὁπότε ταῦτα ἔγραφον) καὶ φιλανθρωποτάτη, καὶ οὔπω πρόσθεν ἄλλη κύων ὡς αὐτὴ οὔτε ἐμὲ ἐπόθησεν οὔτε τὸν ἑταῖρον τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ σύνθηρον τὸν Μέγιλλον. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ δρόμου ἀπεπαύσατο, οὐκ ἔτι ἡμῶν ἢ θατέρου γε ἀπαλλάττεται.
>
> "For I myself, you know, raised a hound with eyes as grey as the greyest, and she was both fast and diligent and of good spirit and had good feet, so at one time before this in youthful vigour she even held out after chasing four hares. And as to other qualities, she is very gentle (for she was still mine when I was writing this) and very fond of people; never before did any other hound yearn as she did for either me or my companion and fellow hunter, Megillus. For when she quit her course she still did not leave either of us."

That this is a very special dog is evident from the fact that she was raised by Arrian himself, an activity for which he uses the same verb as Homer did in the Argus episode.[30] The above paragraphs combine comments on some of the animal's physical attributes and her overall character which are all to be seen as ideal for a hunting dog, but they also draw attention to her emotional disposition. She was very affectionate, devoted and "loved people very much",

---

προσσαίνουσα διεδήλου ὅτι ἀνιᾶται οἵκοι μένουσα· καὶ τοῦτο ἀγαθόν. Further *Cyn.* 16.1 (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν), 16.5 (πολλάκις ἤδη ἔγωγε ...), 16.6 (disagreement with his predecessor Xenophon: οὐ ξύμφημι τῷ ἐμαυτοῦ ὁμωνύμῳ), 16.8 (οἶδα), 17.2 (μοι δοκῶ), 24.5 (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν), 31.1 (ὀρθῶς ξυμβουλεύει), 31.2 (καὶ τοῦτο χρὴ πείθεσθαι αὐτῷ ... δεξιῶς ἀναγέγραφεν), 31.5 (κράτιστον περιμεῖναι, ... ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ), 32.2 (μοι δοκεῖ), and 35.1 (καὶ ἐγὼ ἅμα τοῖς συνθήροις ἕπομαι τῷ Κελτῶν νόμῳ, καὶ ἀποφαίνω ὡς οὐδὲν ἄνευ θεῶν γιγνόμενον ἀνθρώποις ἐς ἀγαθὸν ἀποτελευτᾷ). The words printed in bold in the longer quotations highlight the author's ἐμπειρία and/or αὐτοψία (on which see n. 38 below).

29 For Xenophon, grey eyes of a dog are a physical defect, entailing bad sight (Cyn. 3.2–3): χείρους δὲ καὶ πλείους αἱ τοιαίδε, μικραί, γρυπαί, **χαροποί**, μυωποί, ἄμορφοι, σκληραί, ἀσθενεῖς, ψιλαί, ὑψηλαί, ἀσύμμετροι, ἄψυχοι, ἄρρινες, οὐκ εὔποδες. (...) **χαροποὶ** δὲ καὶ μυωποὶ χείρω τὰ ὄμματα ἔχουσιν (...). According to Stadter (1980: 57), it is precisely "Xenophon's stricture against gray eyes" that provoked Arrian's "warm description of the excellent qualities of his favorite hound".

30 Homer, *Od.* 17.292–294: Ἄργος, Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, ὃν ῥά ποτ᾽ αὐτὸς / **θρέψε** μέν, οὐδ᾽ ἀπόνητο, πάρος δ᾽ εἰς Ἴλιον ἱρὴν / ᾤχετο.

as is expressed by the emphatic superlative φιλανθρωποτάτη.[31] This astonishing fondness did not just pertain to Arrian as her owner, but also to his companion Megillus with whom he went hunting. Together with the subsequent paragraphs, it creates the image of a highly loyal and committed animal (*Cyn.* 5.3–4; transl. Hull 1964: 167, with some modifications):

> ἀλλὰ εἰ μὲν ἐγὼ ἔνδον εἴην, ἅμα ἐμοὶ διατρίβει, καὶ προϊόντα ποι παραπέμπει, καὶ ἐπὶ γυμνάσιον ἰόντι ἐφομαρτεῖ, καὶ γυμναζομένῳ παρακάθηται, καὶ ἐπανιόντος πρόεισιν, θαμινὰ ἐπιστρεφομένη, ὡς καταμανθάνειν μή πη ἄρα ἐξετράπην τῆς ὁδοῦ· ἰδοῦσα δὲ καὶ ἐπιμειδιάσασα αὖθις αὖ πρόεισιν. εἰ δὲ ἐπί τι ἔργον πολιτικὸν ἴοιμι, ἢ δὲ τῷ ἑταίρῳ τῷ ἐμῷ ξύνεστιν, καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον τὰ αὐτὰ ταῦτα δρᾷ. ὁπότερος δὲ ἡμῶν κάμνοι τὸ σῶμα, ἐκείνου αὖ οὐκ ἀπαλλάσσεται. εἰ δὲ καὶ δι' ὀλίγου χρόνου ἴδοι, ἐπιπηδᾷ ἀτρέμα, ὥσπερ ἀσπαζομένη, καὶ τῷ ἀσπασμῷ ἐπιφθέγγεται, οἷα φιλοφρονουμένη. καὶ δειπνοῦντι ξυνοῦσα ἐφάπτεται ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ τοῖν ποδοῖν, ὑπομιμνήσκουσα ὅτι καὶ αὐτῇ ἄρα μεταδοτέον εἴη τῶν σιτίων. καὶ μὴν πολύφθογγός ἐστιν, ὡς οὔπω ἐγὼ ἰδεῖν μοι δοκῶ ἄλλην κύνα· καὶ ὅσων δεῖται τῇ φωνῇ σημαίνει.
>
> "But if I were at home, she would pass her time with me and escort me when I went out somewhere and follow closely after me when I went to school. She would sit beside me while exercising; and when I returned, she would go ahead, frequently turning around so as to make sure that I did not perhaps turn off the road. But when she saw me, she would smile and at once go ahead again. Then if I should go out upon some civic task, she would join my companion and do the same things for him. Then if she should see him after even a little time, she would jump gently, just as if greeting him, and respond to his greeting, showing great affection; and when staying with him while dining, she would lay hold of him with her feet, first this way and then that, reminding him that some of the food must be shared with her also. And truly there would be such immense variety of voice as I think I have never before perceived in another hound, for whatever she wants she indicates with her voice."

This excerpt leaves no doubt about the fact that this was a clear master-dog relationship, with the animal accompanying his owner and friend wherever they go. The dog's life was completely centred around Arrian's, and the environment in which she moved was defined by her master's routines and where-

31 "Fondness of people" (φιλανθρωπία) is a sign of a dog's excellence, as Arrian says later on (*Cyn.* 7.3): κράτισται δὲ αἱ φιλανθρωπόταται καὶ ὅσαις οὐκ ἔστιν ξένον ὄψις ἀνθρώπου οὐδενός. ὅσαι δὲ ἀνθρώπους δεδίασιν καὶ ὑπὸ ψόφου ἐκπλήττονται καὶ θορυβώδεις εἰσὶν καὶ ἐπὶ πολλὰ καὶ εἰκῇ κινοῦνται – καὶ ταῦτα ἀλογίστων ἐστὶν καὶ οὐκ ἐμφρόνων –, καθάπερ ἄνθρωποι εἰ δειλοὶ καὶ ἔκφρονες, οὕτω δὲ καὶ αἱ κύνες αἱ τοιαῦται οὔποτε ἂν εἶεν γενναῖαι. See also *Cyn.* 9.1.

abouts.[32] Moreover, it is noticeable that neither here nor anywhere else in his treatise does Arrian speak of his own feelings for his dog (see also Franco, in this volume). This certainly does not mean that he did not reciprocate her affection, but he does not explicitly say how much he liked her; it can only be inferred from his very positive portrayal of her. One feels somewhat reminded of a passage in Columella (*De re rust*. 7.12.1), where he exalts the devotion of farm dogs to their owners without explicitly referring to the farmers' feelings for them (see Fögen 2016c: 342). However, as in Arrian, Columella's eulogy on dogs in *De re rust*. 7.12–13 exposes his own very positive attitude towards them, and since he writes as a knowledgeable estate owner, his judgement expresses an attitude to be adopted by any farmer interested in the efficient and profitable organisation of his estate, to which dogs contributed in no small way.

The aforementioned passage is also interesting in other respects. It comments on the dog's vocal and non-verbal behaviour which includes smiling (*Cyn*. 5.3: ἰδοῦσα δὲ καὶ ἐπιμειδιάσασα αὖθις αὖ πρόεισιν), showing affection through jumping up and down which is compared to greeting (*Cyn*. 5.4: εἰ δὲ καὶ δι᾽ ὀλίγου χρόνου ἴδοι, ἐπιπηδᾷ ἀτρέμα, ὥσπερ ἀσπαζομένη, καὶ τῷ ἀσπασμῷ ἐπιφθέγγεται, οἷα φιλοφρονουμένη), and the use of her feet and voice to beg for food (*Cyn*. 5.4: καὶ δειπνοῦντι ξυνοῦσα ἐφάπτεται ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ τοῖν ποδοῖν, ὑπομιμνήσκουσα ὅτι καὶ αὐτῇ ἄρα μεταδοτέον εἴη τῶν σιτίων. καὶ μὴν πολύφθογγός ἐστιν, ὡς οὔπω ἐγὼ ἰδεῖν μοι δοκῶ ἄλλην κύνα· καὶ ὅσων δεῖται τῇ φωνῇ σημαίνει). In conjunction with the reference to the dog's voice which is said to be used to signify whatever she wanted, the word πολύφθογγος is particularly instructive: Rather than implying "a great outcry", as Hull (1964: 167) has put it in his translation, it seems to mean that the dog was able to produce all kinds of voices or sounds to achieve her goal. Hence, the word does not refer to the volume of the animal's voice, but its impressive capacity for variation and nuance.[33] Besides, anyone who has ever witnessed dogs begging for food will be

32 See also Orth (1910: 25): "Sie [sc. Horme] kennt kein anderes Bestreben, als ihrem Herrn mit allen Kräften zu dienen, und während sie auf der Jagd es mit vier Hasen aufnimmt, ist sie daheim das anschmiegendste, sanftmütigste Tier, das in einem Kusse des Herrn auf den Kopf seine größte Belohnung findet."

33 Correctly translated by L'Allier (2009: 23): "Elle produit beaucoup de sons différents"; similarly Phillips & Willcock (1999: 97): "And indeed she makes many different noises". See Eric A. Barber's *Supplement* (p. 123) to Henry G. Liddell, Robert Scott & Henry S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford [9]1940 (repr. 1968): "add 'II. *with an expressive voice*, Arr. *Cyn*. 5.4.'" One may, however, doubt whether "expressive" really captures the meaning. In Aelian, *De nat. anim*. 5.51 the word πολύφθογγος refers to the many different voices and sounds produced by *different*, not one and the same species of animals.

likely to confirm that they use different scales or tones of whining and yelping rather than a loud voice for that purpose.

The penultimate paragraph of this digression on Arrian's dog briefly takes the reader back to the animal's youth (*Cyn.* 5.5; transl. Hull 1964: 167):

> καὶ ὅτι σκυλακευομένη μάστιγι ἐκολάζετο, εἴ τις εἰς τοῦτο ἔτι μάστιγα ὀνομάσειεν, πρόσεισιν τῷ ὀνομάσαντι, καὶ ὑποπτήξασα λιπαρεῖ, καὶ τὸ στόμα ἐφαρμόζει τῷ στόματι ὡς φιλοῦσα, καὶ ἐπιπηδήσασα ἐκκρέμαται τοῦ αὐχένος, καὶ οὐ πρόσθεν ἀνίησιν πρὶν τῆς ἀπειλῆς ἀποπαῦσαι τὸν θυμούμενον.
>
> "And because when she was a puppy she used to be punished with a whip, if anyone even now mentions a whip for this purpose, she approaches him who mentions it, cringes, and entreats him, puts her face to his face as if to kiss him, jumps on him, clings to his neck, and will not let go until she stops the wrathful man from his threat."

The passive verb ἐκολάζετο used here does not specify who performed the chastisement of the animal, but the imperfect tense implies that it must have been done on a regular basis.[34] At any rate, the practice clearly had a traumatic effect on the dog: with her body language she will try to win that person's sympathy and prevent him from punishing her that way. This description of her non-verbal behaviour nicely complements the references to her emotional character in the previous paragraphs.

Surprisingly, Arrian does not disclose his dog's name until the very end of the excursus (*Cyn.* 5.6; transl. Hull 1964: 167):

> ὥστε οὐκ ἂν ὀκνῆσαί μοι δοκῶ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἀναγράψαι τῆς κυνός, ὡς καὶ ἐς ὕστερον ἀπολελεῖφθαι αὐτῆς, ὅτι ἦν ἄρα Ξενοφῶντι τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ κύων, Ὁρμὴ ὄνομα, ὠκυτάτη τε καὶ σοφωτάτη καὶ ἱερωτάτη.
>
> "And so I think I should not hesitate to record the name of the hound, as later I was parted from her, because truly Xenophon the Athenian had a most swift, most wise, and most wonderful hound, 'Impulse' by name."

The tricolon of superlatives (ὠκυτάτη τε καὶ σοφωτάτη καὶ ἱερωτάτη), placed at the very end of this sentence, contributes to the laudatory tone of the entire digression which, despite its backward-looking perspective, sketches a very vivid and memorable portrayal of Horme. To some extent, the structure of the excur-

34 It should be noted that corporal punishment of dogs has no place in Arrian's treatise. But see *Cyn.* 11.1–2 on tying them up.

sus is reminiscent of an epigram which creates a certain suspense (*Erwartung*, to use Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's terminology) and then resolves it at the very end (*Aufschluß*): everything amounts to the mention of the animal's name which represents the climax of the digression. The name itself, which may be translated as "Impetus" or "Rush" and which recurs in a later chapter,[35] connotes Horme's suitability as a hunting dog.[36]

It is not entirely certain whether Horme was a female dog. According to Stadter (1976: 163 n. 15), "Horme was probably male, despite the feminine pronouns used. κύων in Xenophon and Arrian is regularly feminine, but Arrian considered male dogs much more valuable: see Arr. 32.1–2."[37] While this is generally correct, the passage quoted by Stadter also says at the very beginning that "a bitch is faster than a doghound" (*Cyn.* 32.1: κύων θήλεια μὲν ὠκυτέρα ἄρρενος), and that is a quality which Arrian ascribes to Horme – both in the text and through her very name. The gender of the name is, of course, feminine, but it is an abstract which makes it difficult to automatically equate it with the name of a female dog. Ὁρμή is mentioned at the very end of Xenophon's list of dog names (*Cyn.* 7.5), but unlike Columella (*De re rust.* 7.12.13; see Fögen 2016c: 342), Xenophon does not explicitly differentiate between male and female dog names; at the same time, all three Greek dog names given by Columella (Σπουδή, Ἀλκή, Ῥώμη) are abstract female substantives, as is Ὁρμή. Hence it cannot be completely ruled out that Horme was a female dog.

To summarise this section, except for the reference to Horme's grey eyes and her swift feet, Arrian tells the reader nothing about her outward appearance such as the colour of her fur, size or shape of the body. This is only little more than what we learn about Homer's Argus. Much more emphasis is given to her temperament or emotional nature which leads to a very sympathetic charac-

35 Arrian, *Cyn.* 18.1: ἔχουσαν δὲ τὴν κύνα ἢ καὶ ἄλλως κρατήσασαν τῷ δρόμῳ καταπηδήσαντα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου καταψᾶν χρὴ ἐπευφημοῦντα, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν φιλεῖν, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ἀποτείνειν, καὶ ὀνομαστὶ ἐπιλέγειν "εὖγε ὦ Κιρρά, εὖγε ὦ Βόννα, καλῶς γε ὦ Ὁρμή," καὶ ὅ τι περ ἄλλο ἑκάστῃ ὄνομα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀνακαλοῦντα· χαίρουσιν γὰρ ἐπαινούμεναι, καθάπερ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ γενναῖοι. The analogy between animal and human joy about praise, expressed in the final sentence of this quotation, is noteworthy.

36 See also Mentz (1933: 435): "Die Freude am mutigen Draufgehen, am Jagdeifer der Hunde äußert sich in abstr. Namen wie Θυμός, Ὀργή, Ὁρμή, Σπουδή (...)." For a fuller treatment of ancient dogs' names more generally, see Baecker (1884) and Mentz (1933), already referred to in n. 6 (above).

37 In his English translation of *Cyn.* 5.1–6 which Stadter prints in his monograph (1980: 54–55), all pronouns referring to Horme are masculine. On the gender of the Greek substantive κύων, see Franco (2014: 142–153).

terisation of the animal. This, in turn, may have repercussions for how Arrian as her owner and the author of this treatise is perceived by his target audience. It not only adds a very personal note to a technical treatise, but also commends him as an experienced authority in all matters related to dogs and their use for hunting, and it is their competence (*auctoritas*) and experience (ἐμπειρία or *usus* / *experientia*) that ancient writers of technical literature were eager to promote.[38] Thus, it is certainly not inappropriate to assert that "(i)n no work does Arrian reveal himself more directly and personally than in his little treatise on hunting" (Stadter 1980: 50; similarly 1980: 55). However, one may add that he does so with the intention of self-advertisement in mind, at least to some extent. Such a purpose may have been motivated by his desire to commend himself to upper-class Romans as his target audience, and especially by his friendship with the emperor Hadrian (regn. A.D. 117–138), who took a keen interest in hunting.[39] About Hadrian the Historia Augusta reports that he loved his horses and dogs so much that he had burial places erected for them.[40] Therefore, the emperor will have been very likely to welcome Arrian's chapter on Horme. Although Arrian's *Cynegeticus* is not dedicated to Hadrian, it is not impossible to envisage him as one of its potential readers. Arrian may have written his work with the emperor in mind.[41] After all, many ancient technical treatises were dedicated to important political figures.[42]

38 See Fögen (2009a: passim), Fögen (2016a: 267, 272, 275–276), Fögen (2016b: 962–964, 966, 968), and Fögen (2016c: 321–322, 330, 343–344), with detailed references.

39 See Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 69.10.2 (quoted in the introduction to this volume) and Historia Augusta, *Hadr.* 2.1: *quintodecimo anno ad patriam rediit ac statim militiam iniit, venandi usque ad reprehesionem studiosus*. Further *Hadr.* 20.13: *oppidum Hadrianotheras in quodam loco, quod illic et feliciter esset venatus et ursam occidisset aliquando, constituit*. Also *Hadr.* 26.3–4: *venatus frequentissime leonem manu sua occidit. venando autem iugulum et costam fregit. venationem semper cum amicis participavit*. See further Stadter (1980: 50–52). On Arrian and Hadrian more generally, see Syme (1982: 185–186, 189–190) and Tonnet (1988: 33–36). It may be added that Hadrian's predecessor Trajan, during whose reign (A.D. 98–117) Arrian began his career (see Stadter 1980: 9), also had a penchant for hunting, as is attested by Pliny, *Paneg.* 81.1–3.

40 Historia Augusta, *Hadr.* 20.12: *equos et canes sic amavit ut iis sepulchra constitueret*. One may compare Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 69.10.2. See also the introduction to this volume.

41 As regards Hadrian's presence in Arrian's works, his *Periplus of the Black Sea* and a lost work on Roman infantry exercises were addressed to Hadrian (see Stadter 1980: 32–33, 36, 42; Bosworth 1993: 249–250), and the *Ars tactica* was composed with the emperor in mind (see Stadter 1980: 44–45; Bosworth 1993: 259–260).

42 See Fögen (2009a: passim; see index, s.v. "Herrscher") and Fögen (2016a: 270).

That animals other than dogs also had a certain appeal for Arrian can be gathered from a longer section in his work on India, "the most distant and most exotic of Alexander's conquests", as Stadter (1980: 115) has put it.[43] In the so-called *Indica*, which follow the ethnographic tradition of Herodotus, roughly five out of forty-three chapters are reserved for the animals of that country, in particular elephants (*Ind.* 13–14), but also tigers, ants, parrots, apes, and snakes (*Ind.* 15); later sections deal with the methods of fish-hunting common among the Ἰχθυοφάγοι (*Ind.* 29.9–16) and with whales (*Ind.* 30). That animals figure quite prominently in this work is also manifest from a reference in Arrian's earlier *Anabasis* (5.4.3; transl. Peter A. Brunt, Loeb Classical Library):

> ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐγὼ οὔτε οἷστισι νόμοις διαχρῶνται ἐν τῇδε τῇ συγγραφῇ ἀνέγραψα, οὔτε ζῷα εἰ δή τινα ἄτοπα ἡ χώρα αὐτοῖς ἐκφέρει, οὔτε ἰχθύας ἢ κήτη ὅσα ἢ οἷα ὁ Ἰνδὸς ἢ ὁ Ὑδάσπης ἢ ὁ Γάγγης ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἰνδῶν ποταμοὶ φέρουσιν, οὐδὲ τοὺς μύρμηκας τοὺς τὸν χρυσόν σφισιν ἐργαζομένους, οὐδὲ τοὺς γρῦπας τοὺς φύλακας, οὐδὲ ὅσα ἄλλα ἐφ' ἡδονῇ μᾶλλόν τι πεποίηται ἢ ἐς ἀφήγησιν τῶν ὄντων, ὡς τά γε κατ' Ἰνδοὺς ὅσα ἂν ἄτοπα ψεύσωνται, οὐκ ἐξελεγχθησόμενα πρὸς οὐδαμῶν. (…) Ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ Ἰνδῶν ἰδίᾳ μοι γεγράψεται ὅσα πιστότατα ἐς ἀφήγησιν οἵ τε ξὺν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ στρατεύσαντες (…), ἐπὶ δὲ ὅσα Μεγασθένης τε καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης (…) ξυνεγραψάτην, καὶ νόμιμα ἄττα Ἰνδοῖς ἐστι καὶ εἰ δή τινα ἄτοπα ζῷα αὐτόθι φύεται καὶ τὸν παράπλουν αὐτὸν τῆς ἔξω θαλάσσης. νῦν δὲ ὅσον ἐς τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα ἀποχρῶν ἐφαίνετο, τοσόνδε μοι ἀναγεγράφθω.
>
> "In this history I have not recorded their customs, nor whether their country produces any strange animals, nor the size or kinds of fishes or water monsters which the Indus, Hydaspes, Ganges or other Indian rivers produce, nor the ants that mine their gold, nor the griffons that guard it, nor all the other stories which have been made up for amusement rather than as a description of reality, on the basis that whatever ridiculous lies men may tell about the Indians will not be refuted by anyone. (…) However, I shall write a special monograph about India including the most reliable descriptions given by Alexander's fellow-campaigners (…), and further all that Megasthenes and Eratosthenes (…) have written, and I shall record the customs of India, any strange beasts which are bred there and the actual voyage along the coast of the Outer Sea. But the present record must be restricted to what appears sufficient to explain Alexander's achievements."

The very first paragraph of the section in the *Indica* starts with the remark that the hunting of wild animals is also common among the Indians, the difference to the Greeks being that their methods are as unique as the animals themselves

43 On Arrian's *Indica*, see in particular Stadter (1980: 115–132), who also provides an outline of the structure of the work (1980: 118, 126) and tackles the issue of the author's originality (1980: esp. 132). In *Anab.* 5.6.8 and 6.16.5 Arrian refers to his work as Ἰνδικὴ ξυγγραφή; on the title, see Stadter (1980: 116, 224 n. 4).

(*Ind.* 13.1). Hence it is the context of hunting that provides the basis for the section on creatures occurring in India, and to some degree, this background topic may be used to bridge the general thematic gap between the *Indica* and the *Cynegeticus*. At the same time, this does not prevent Arrian from supplying some information on the characteristics, ways of life and habitats of these animals, although it has to be admitted that these details are much closer to what we find in Books 8–11 of Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis historia* or Aelian's *Περὶ ζῴων ἰδιότητος* (*De natura animalium*), with their tendency towards *mirabilia*, than to Aristotle's zoological works.[44]

4 Alexander's horse Bucephalas in Plutarch and Arrian

Another well-known example of an animal with a personal name is the horse Bucephalas which belonged to the Macedonian king Alexander the Great (356–323 B.C.). Apart from Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Life of Alexander*, which is passed over here for convenience,[45] the two most extensive accounts are to be found in Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* and in Arrian's *Anabasis*.[46]

Plutarch's first report on Bucephalas focuses on Alexander's initial encounter with the horse which is presented as savage and altogether intractable (*Alex.* 6.1: ἐδόκει τε χαλεπὸς εἶναι καὶ κομιδῇ δύσχρηστος). It turns out that the young Alexander is the only one who is able to manage the animal, which he does by

44 On the different agendas and narrative structures of the works of Aristotle, Pliny the Elder, and Aelian, see Fögen (2007a), with further references. On Pliny the Elder, see also Fögen (2009a: 201–264).

45 A serious discussion of this work, also for the questions pursued in this article, would involve a more thorough examination of its different versions. For details and secondary literature, see Hägg (2012: 117–134, 399–401), who also has two brief sections on Alexander and Bucephalas (Hägg 2012: 124, 126).

46 For a concise overview on Plutarch the biographer, see Stadter (2007: 532, 536–540); for a more extensive analysis, see e.g. Sonnabend (2002: 146–168) and Hägg (2012: 239–281). On Arrian's *Anabasis*, see Stadter (1980: 60–114) and Hammond (1993: 189–333). On the reliability of these two authors as sources on Alexander, see Demandt (2009: 4–7); with regard to Arrian, Demandt points out: "Er ist unsere mit Abstand beste Quelle für Alexander. (...) Arrian wollte für Alexander das leisten, was Homer für Achill getan hatte; er ist der letzte Autor, der uns über den historischen Alexander zuverlässig unterrichtet." Very similarly Stadter (1980: 1); see also Hammond (1993: 317–333).

means of a simple trick (*Alex*. 6.3–4; transl. Bernadotte Perrin, Loeb Classical Library, slightly modified):

> (...) εὐθὺς προσδραμὼν τῷ ἵππῳ καὶ παραλαβὼν τὴν ἡνίαν ἐπέστρεψε πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐννοήσας ὅτι τὴν σκιὰν προπίπτουσαν καὶ σαλευομένην ὁρῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ διαταράττοιτο. μικρὰ δὲ οὕτω παρακαλπάσας καὶ καταψήσας, ὡς ἑώρα πληρούμενον θυμοῦ καὶ πνεύματος, ἀπορρίψας ἡσυχῇ τὴν χλαμύδα καὶ μετεωρίσας αὐτὸν ἀσφαλῶς περιέβη. καὶ μικρὰ μὲν περιλαβὼν ταῖς ἡνίαις τὸν χαλινὸν ἄνευ πληγῆς καὶ σπαραγμοῦ προσανέστειλεν· ὡς δὲ ἑώρα τὸν ἵππον ἀφεικότα τὴν ἀπειλήν, ὀργῶντα δὲ πρὸς τὸν δρόμον, ἐφεὶς ἐδίωκεν ἤδη φωνῇ θρασυτέρᾳ καὶ ποδὸς κρούσει χρώμενος.
>
> "(...) and at once Alexander ran to the horse, took hold of his bridle-rein, and turned him towards the sun; for he had noticed, as it would seem, that the horse was greatly disturbed by the sight of his own shadow falling in front of him and dancing about. And after he had calmed the horse a little in this way, and had stroked him with his hand, when he saw that he was full of spirit and courage, he quietly cast aside his mantle and with a light spring safely bestrode him. Then, with a little pressure of the reins on the bit, and without striking him or tearing his mouth, he held him in hand; but when he saw that the horse was rid of the fear that had beset him, and was impatient for the course, he let him go, and at last urged him on with sterner tone and thrust of foot."

This excerpt, taken together with the ensuing description of the bystanders' positive reaction to Alexander's endeavour, demonstrates that the horse and its new owner work in perfect synergy. Alexander is presented not only as confident and courageous, but also as skilled and knowledgeable. This case shows that he accomplishes what no one else does; it thus makes him stand out from the crowd.[47] At the same time, the anecdote singles out the animal's characteristics which are portrayed as in harmony with his owner. Bucephalas is as special as Alexander and can only be handled by a human who is, as it were, on the same level.[48] However, the passage gives the reader no more than just a glimpse

47 See Demandt (2009: 81): "Berichte über die Frühzeit großer Männer wollen gern deren spätere Bedeutung schon in Begebenheiten aus ihrer Kindheit zeigen. (...) Den Frühbeweis für Alexanders Herrscherqualitäten bringt die legendär ausgestaltete Bukephalas-Episode." See also Martin & Blackwell (2012: 17): "The story describes a competition, pitting Alexander against a horse, against the grown Macedonian men, and, especially, against his father. The youth pitted his judgment against that of his elders and won, based on an ability to observe what others did not see. (...) Alexander's actions show unshakeable confidence. From his youth on, then, Alexander's life was dedicated to facing risks, assessing them, and winning."

48 Bucephalas' uniqueness – literally, his 'rarity' – is also declared by Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist*. 8.154 (part of a longer section on famous horses): *Eidem Alexandro et* ***equi magna raritas*** *contigit*. Slightly further on, it is said that the horse's beauty captivated the young Alexander: *XVI talentis ferunt ex Philonici Pharsalii grege emptum etiam tum puero* ***capto eius decore***.

at the initial stages of the almost symbiotic relationship between the Macedonian king and his horse. Furthermore, the narrative perspective of this little text, which constitutes a short chapter within a much more extensive biography, makes it obvious that Plutarch is more interested in Alexander than in the horse. It must not be forgotten either that the wondrous taming of wild animals is an established motif in folklore literature, as Moravcsik (1961: 99–103, 108–110), who also looks at later variants of the Bucephalas story, has convincingly shown.[49]

Bucephalas is referred to in a few other chapters of Plutarch's Alexander biography. Apart from two relatively insignificant passages (*Alex*. 16.7 and 32.7; on the latter see Lewis, in this volume), there is a paragraph on the abduction of the horse by barbarians (*Alex*. 44.3), which is similar to the report given by Arrian (see below), and a separate chapter on Bucephalas' death (*Alex*. 61; transl. Bernadotte Perrin, Loeb Classical Library):

> Ἐκ δὲ τῆς πρὸς Πῶρον μάχης καὶ ὁ Βουκεφάλας ἐτελεύτησεν, οὐκ εὐθύς, ἀλλ᾽ ὕστερον, ὡς οἱ πλεῖστοι λέγουσιν ἀπὸ τραυμάτων θεραπευόμενος, ὡς δὲ Ὀνησίκριτος, διὰ γῆρας ὑπέρπονος γενόμενος· τριάκοντα γὰρ ἐτῶν ἀποθανεῖν αὐτόν. ἐδήχθη δ᾽ ἰσχυρῶς Ἀλέξανδρος, **οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ <u>συνήθη καὶ φίλον</u> ἀποβεβληκέναι νομίζων**· καὶ πόλιν οἰκίσας ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ παρὰ τὸν Ὑδάσπην Βουκεφαλίαν προσηγόρευσε.
>
> "After the battle with Porus, too, Bucephalas died, not at once, but some time afterwards, as most writers say, from wounds for which he was under treatment, but according to Onesicritus, from old age, having become quite worn out; for he was thirty years old when he died. His death grieved Alexander mightily, **who felt that he had lost nothing less than <u>a comrade and friend</u>**; he also built a city in his memory on the banks of the Hydaspes and called it Bucephalia."

Plutarch is careful to indicate what he found in the variant sources on the reasons for the horse's death, but seems to give preference to Onesicritus' account.[50] By providing a more specific historical context, he also narrows down

49 The fairly topical character of the story makes it somewhat difficult to agree with Hammond (1993: 21–22) who finds the account "so vivid that it must have come ultimately from an eyewitness. (...) The mastering of Bucephalus was told by someone who understood horses as well as A[lexander] himself did. The details are convincing." The scene was nonetheless powerful enough to inspire later painters such as André Castaigne (*The Taming of Bucephalus*, 1888/89) and François Schommer (*Alexandre le Grand domptant Bucéphale*, c. 1900), to name but two examples (see appendix: Figures 1 and 2).

50 For a discussion of this passage and competing versions of the horse's death in other authors, see Hammond (1993: 110–113).

the time of Bucephalas' death. Such a meticulous approach corroborates that this is not just any animal, but a rather unique creature. However, what is perhaps most intriguing in this passage is Plutarch's description of Alexander's sentiments who is said to have seen the horse as his "comrade and friend" and to have commemorated him through the foundation of a city named after him.[51] This puts Bucephalas more or less on the same level as a human being, without actually anthropomorphising him.[52] It should be added that the paragraph on the horse's death also contains a brief remark on Alexander's dog Peritas for whom the king felt love and founded a city after the animal's death.[53] Although the information given here is very condensed, the pattern is similar to the Bucephalas story, and it likewise underlines that Alexander was capable of deep emotions for animals and that he viewed them as his companions. Plutarch used such evidence not simply to tell his readers about the lives of animals, although he did take a lively interest in them, as is shown in particular by his treatises *De sollertia animalium* and *Bruta animalia ratione uti* (see e.g. Giebel 2003: 198–208; further Newmyer, in this volume), but also *De esu carnium*. The stories also enabled him to draw a nuanced portrayal of Alexander and to offer a counterbalance to the king as a warrior which would exhibit his personal feelings and thus show the more humane side of a celebrated public figure.[54]

A slightly different approach is taken by Arrian in the fifth book of his *Anabasis*. He dedicates three coherent paragraphs to a miniature biography of Bucephalas which starts with his death at the age of thirty years. Like Plutarch,

---

51 On Bucephalas' death and the foundation of the city named after him, see also Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 8.154 (without direct reference to the city's name), and Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* 5.2.4–5 (where the city is called 'Bucephalon' instead of 'Bucephalia'). Pliny even speaks of a funeral procession headed by the king: (…) *rex defuncto ei duxit exequias urbemque tumulo circumdedit nomine eius*. On horse burials in that period, see Antikas & Alifakiotis (2002).

52 The word συνήθη is quite strong; it implies living together and suggests shared habits or even intimacy. For that reason, Perrin's translation ("comrade") is perhaps a bit weak and might be replaced with "intimate".

53 Plutarch, *Alex.* 61: λέγεται δὲ καὶ κύνα Περίταν ὄνομα τεθραμμένον ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ στεργόμενον ἀποβαλὼν κτίσαι πόλιν ἐπώνυμον. τοῦτο δὲ Σωτίων φησὶ Ποτάμωνος ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ Λεσβίου. It is unlikely that any of the dogs mentioned in conjunction with Alexander the Great by Pliny the Elder (*Nat. hist.* 8.149–150), Diodorus Siculus (*Hist.* 17.92), Plutarch (*De soll. anim.* 15 970f), and Aelian (*De nat. anim.* 8.1) are identical with Peritas.

54 See also Sonnabend (2002: 168): "So ist Plutarch eine wahre Fundgrube für antike Anekdoten und Pointen, die (…) alle den Hintergrund haben, Charaktere zu erhellen (…). Denn gerade die Anekdoten (…) lassen die Größen der Antike eben nicht nur als unnahbare Heroen, sondern auch als Menschen erscheinen."

Arrian emphasises the companionship between Alexander and his horse who had experienced numerous exertions and dangers with his master in war scenarios and did not allow anyone else to mount him. The special status of the animal is underscored by the fact that the city in which he died was named after him – an act through which Alexander paid tribute to his faithful companion.[55] A few words are added on the horse's outward appearance and character, and on the meaning and origin of his name, but Arrian admits that the sources he relies upon for those details do not provide the same kind of information.[56] The author concludes his account with an anecdote also found in Plutarch,[57] which is suitable enough to illustrate the meaning and value that Bucephalas had for Alexander (*Anab*. 5.19.6; transl. Peter A. Brunt, Loeb Classical Library):

> οὗτος ὁ ἵππος ἐν τῇ Οὐξίων χώρᾳ ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος προεκήρυξεν ἀνὰ τὴν χώραν πάντας ἀποκτενεῖν Οὐξίους, εἰ μὴ ἀπάξουσιν αὐτῷ τὸν ἵππον· καὶ ἀπήχθη εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τῷ κηρύγματι. τοσήδε μὲν σπουδὴ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἦν, τόσος δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου φόβος τοῖς βαρβάροις. καὶ ἐμοὶ ἐς τοσόνδε τετιμήσθω ὁ Βουκεφάλας οὗτος Ἀλεξάνδρου ἕνεκα.
>
> "In the Uxian country Alexander once lost him, and issued a proclamation throughout the country that he would kill every Uxian unless they brought him back his horse; he was brought back immediately after the proclamation. Such was Alexander's devotion to him, and such was the terror he inspired in the barbarians. So much I had to say in praise of this Bucephalas for Alexander's sake."

55 Arrian, *Anab*. 5.19.4–5: Ἵνα δὲ ἡ μάχη ξυνέβη καὶ ἔνθεν ὁρμηθεὶς ἐπέρασε τὸν Ὑδάσπην ποταμὸν πόλεις ἔκτισεν Ἀλέξανδρος. καὶ τὴν μὲν Νίκαιαν τῆς νίκης τῆς κατ' Ἰνδῶν ἐπώνυμον ὠνόμασε, τὴν δὲ Βουκεφάλαν ἐς τοῦ ἵππου τοῦ Βουκεφάλα τὴν μνήμην, ὃς ἀπέθανεν αὐτοῦ, οὐ βληθεὶς πρὸς οὐδενός, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ καύματος τε καὶ ἡλικίας (ἦν γάρ ἀμφὶ τὰ τριάκοντα ἔτη) καματηρὸς γενόμενος, πολλὰ δὲ πρόσθεν ξυγκαμών τε καὶ συγκινδυνεύσας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, ἀναβαινόμενός τε πρὸς μόνου Ἀλεξάνδρου [ὁ Βουκεφάλας οὗτος], ὅτι τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας ἀπηξίου ἀμβάτας.

56 Arrian, *Anab*. 5.19.5: καὶ μεγέθει μέγας καὶ τῷ θυμῷ γενναῖος. σημεῖον δέ οἱ ἦν βοὸς κεφαλὴ ἐγκεχαραγμένη, ἐφ' ὅτῳ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο λέγουσιν ὅτι ἔφερεν· οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι λευκὸν σῆμα εἶχεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, μέλας ὢν αὐτός, ἐς βοὸς κεφαλὴν μάλιστα εἰκασμένον. Further sources dealing with the horse's name are discussed by Anderson (1930: 3–7).

57 Plutarch, *Alex*. 44.3: Ἐνταῦθα τῶν βαρβάρων τινὲς ἀπροσδοκήτως περιτυχόντες τοῖς ἄγουσι τὸν ἵππον αὐτοῦ τὸν Βουκεφάλαν λαμβάνουσιν. ὁ δὲ ἤνεγκεν οὐ μετρίως, ἀλλὰ κήρυκα πέμψας ἠπείλησε πάντας ἀποκτενεῖν μετὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν, εἰ τὸν ἵππον αὐτῷ μὴ ἀναπέμψειαν. ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἵππον ἄγοντες ἦκον καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐγχειρίζοντες, ἐχρήσατο φιλανθρώπως πᾶσι καὶ τοῦ ἵππου λύτρα τοῖς λαβοῦσιν ἔδωκεν. On the differences between Plutarch and other sources on this incident, see Hammond (1993: 77–78).

The king's threat to kill the inhabitants of an entire region is a drastic but effective measure, justified by Alexander's high esteem (σπουδή) for his horse. His attachment to Bucephalas is well appreciated by Arrian who stresses in the final sentence that this passage is to be understood as a homage to the animal.

Although the testimonies presented by Plutarch and Arrian are of a rather different nature, they have in common that they portray Bucephalas as "the equine counterpart of Alexander" (Anderson 1930: 1), the exceptional animal companion of a powerful leader figure whose life is worth reporting, though perhaps not quite to the same extent as the life of Alexander himself.[58] This symbiosis has also been captured by the Alexander mosaic (c. 150–100 B.C., Pompei, Casa del Fauno) and the Alexander sarcophagus (c. 325 B.C., Sidon, Lebanon) which show the king together with his horse. The most obvious model for ancient literary sources on Bucephalas such as Plutarch and Arrian may have been the portrayal of heroes' horses in Homer's *Iliad*, in particular of Achilles' horse Xanthus who prophesies his master's death at the end of Book 19 (*Il.* 19.404–418).[59] And it is indeed telling that a parallel between Alexander and Achilles is evoked several times in Arrian's *Anabasis* and in Plutarch's *Life of Alexander*.[60] In Arrian, the Macedonian king's emulation of the Homeric character, as indicated for instance by his visit to Achilles' tomb (*Anab.* 1.12.1–2) or by his grief for his deceased friend Hephaestion who is to resemble Patroclus (*Anab.* 7.14.1–4), forcefully contributes to his own heroisation.[61] The episode about Alexander paying tribute to Achilles' gravestone is also testified by Plutarch and conveys a similar impression.[62]

---

58 For a sociological analysis of present-day horse-human relationships, see the recent study by Birke & Hockenhull (2015), who state that "relationships are processes, they produce biographies: they both happen in context and create context themselves" (2015: 94).

59 See also Vergil, *Aen.* 11.89–90 on the horse Aethon mourning for his dead master Pallas. On horses in Homer's *Iliad*, see Chomel (1900: esp. 90–95), Delebecque (1951), Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1981: 169–178), and Dumont (2001: 52–60), the latter of whom argues that in the heroic world "le cheval (…) est le compagnon, le serviteur noble, presque le confident" and "c'est un animal de prestige, voué à faire valoir la noblesse de son maître" (2001: 52). See also Körner ([2]1930: 23–29), Rahn (1953/54: 295–296, 456, 458–459), Giebel (2003: 105–112), Griffith (2006: esp. 199–202, 313–314), and Gregory (2007: 195–200). For horses in later epic texts, in particular in the 'Prose Lancelot', see Ackermann-Arlt (1990).

60 On Achilles as Alexander's model in Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Life of Alexander*, see Hägg (2012: 125, 131).

61 See also Hamilton (1965: 118), Stadter (1980: 74–75, 103, 169), Tonnet (1988: 19–21, 69–70, 89, 526), and Hammond (1993: 138–140, 158, 218).

62 See Plutarch, *Alex.* 15.4–5. See also Plutarch, *Alex.* 5.8: ὁ δὲ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν ὑποποιούμενος ἦν Λυσίμαχος, τῷ γένει Ἀκαρνάν, ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν ἔχων

From a comment in Aelian it is apparent that the extraordinary character of the relationship between Bucephalas and Alexander was very well-known among the ancients, although it is by no means the only instance of a strong bond between a horse and a powerful leader figure, as the examples of the Roman emperor Hadrian and his horse Borysthenes, referred to in the introduction to this volume,[63] and of several others such as Caesar, Augustus, a Scythian chieftain, and the kings Nicomedes, Antiochus and Dionysius attest.[64] At the

---

ἀστεῖον, ὅτι δ' ἑαυτὸν μὲν ὠνόμαζε Φοίνικα, τὸν δὲ Ἀλέξανδρον Ἀχιλλέα, Πηλέα δὲ τὸν Φίλιππον, ἠγαπᾶτο καὶ δευτέραν εἶχε χώραν.

63 See Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 69.10.2, and Historia Augusta, *Hadr.* 20.12, together with the inscription on the horse's tomb found in Apta in the province of Gallia Narbonensis (*CIL* XII 1122 [= *CLE* II 1522 Bücheler]). For the text and translation of the inscription, see further Duff & Duff (1934 [vol. 2]: 446–447) and Geist (^{2}1976: 153–154); see also Herrlinger (1930: 48–50).

64 Pliny the Elder offers a comprehensive list which begins with Alexander and Bucephalas (*Nat. hist.* 8.154) and then moves on to similar examples (*Nat. hist.* 8.155–158): *nec Caesaris dictatoris quemquam alium recepisse dorso equus traditur, idemque similis humanis pedes priores habuisse, hac effigie locatus ante Veneris Genetricis aedem. fecit et divus Augustus equo tumulum, de quo Germanici Caesaris carmen est. Agrigenti conplurium equorum tumuli pyramides habent. equum adamatum a Samiramide usque in coitum Iuba auctor est. Scythici quidem equitatus equorum gloria strepunt: occiso regulo ex provocatione dimicantem hostem, cum ad spoliandum venisset, ab equo eius ictibus morsuque confectum* (...). *idem praesagiunt pugnam, et amissos lugent dominos: lacrimas interdum desiderio fundunt. interfecto Nicomede rege equos eius inedia vitam finivit. Phylarchus refert Centaretum e Galatis in proelio occiso Antiocho potitum equo eius conscendisse ovantem, at illum indignatione accensum domitis frenis ne regi posset praecipitem in abrupta isse exanimatumque una; Philistus a Dionysio relictum in caeno haerentem, ut se evellisset, secutum vestigia domini examine apium iubae inhaerente, eoque ostento tyrannidem a Dionysio occupatam.* See also Silius Italicus, *Pun.* 10.454–475 on Cloelius and his horse. – What Pliny writes about Caesar and his horse in the above passage (*Nat. hist.* 8.155) is somewhat reminiscent of Plutarch's report on Alexander and Bucephalas, albeit much more compressed. Conspicuously, there is nothing on such a special horse in Plutarch's parallel *Life of Caesar*, apart from brief references to horsemanship having been easy for him from boyhood (*Caes.* 17.4; similarly Suetonius, *Div. Iul.* 57) and to a (nameless) horse being brought to him shortly before a fight (*Caes.* 18.2). During the latter incident, Caesar does not have time to devote any attention to the animal and goes straight against the enemy, and although he does say that he wants to use the horse for the pursuit after his victory, no further reference is made to this animal later on in the text. However, there is an account very similar to, but slightly more elaborate than that of Pliny the Elder in Suetonius' *Life of Caesar* (*Div. Iul.* 61): *utebatur autem* ***equo insigni****, pedibus prope humanis et in modum digitorum ungulis fissis, quem natum apud se, cum haruspices imperium orbis terrae significare domino pronuntiassent, magna cura aluit nec patientem sessoris alterius primus ascendit; cuius etiam instar pro aede Veneris Genetricis postea dedicavit.* Perhaps Plutarch was simply not aware of these details, for otherwise he would have been likely to include them, in particular since they would have constituted an interesting analogy to Alexander and Bucephalas. Or was

beginning of a chapter in which Aelian is about to give some examples of horses' devotion to their masters, he states that he does not want to repeat a story that is "current everywhere".[65] Similarly, he decides to avoid a comparable case, namely the report about the horse of Antiochus Soter, founder of the Seleucid dynasty (reigned 280–261 B.C.), who was avenged by the animal after being killed in battle by the Gaul Centoarates.[66] Instead, he prefers to narrate the less famous story about the handsome young Athenian Socles and his horse (*De nat. anim.* 6.44; transl. Alwyn F. Scholfield, Loeb Classical Library):

> Σωκλῆς δὲ ἄρα (οὐ γάρ τί που πολλοὶ τόνδε μοι δοκοῦσιν ἐγνωκέναι) Ἀθηναῖος μὲν ἦν, καλὸς δὲ καὶ ἐδόκει καὶ ἐπεφύκει. οὗτος οὖν ἐπρίατο ἵππον ὡραῖον μὲν καὶ αὐτόν, **ἐρωτικὸν** δὲ **ἰσχυρῶς** καὶ οἷον σοφώτερον ἢ κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἵππους. οὐκοῦν **ἐρᾷ τοῦ δεσπότου δριμύτατα**, καὶ προσιόντος ἐφριμάττετο καὶ ἐπικροτοῦντος ἐφρυάττετο, καὶ ἀναβαίνοντος ἑαυτὸν παρεῖχεν εὐπειθῆ, καὶ παρεστῶτος **κατὰ πρόσωπον ὁ δὲ ὑγρὸν ἐώρα**. καὶ **ταῦτα μὲν ἐρωτικὰ ὄντα ἤδη ὅμως τερπνὰ ἐδόκει**· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦν ὥς τι καὶ δρασείων ἐς τὸ μειράκιον προπετέστερος, καὶ διέρρει λόγος ὑπὲρ ἀμφοῖν ἀτοπώτερος, ὁ Σωκλῆς οὐκ ἐνεγκὼν τὸ ἀπόφημον, ὡς **ἐραστὴν ἀκόλαστον** μισήσας ἀπημπόλησε τὸν ἵππον. ὁ δὲ οὐ φέρων τὴν ἐρημίαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ καλοῦ, ἑαυτὸν τοῦ ζῆν ἀπήλλαξε λιμῷ βιαιοτάτῳ.
>
> "Socles then, about whom not many seem to know, was an Athenian who was esteemed, and indeed was, a comely boy. Now he bought a horse, handsome too like its master but **of a violently amorous disposition** and with a far sharper eye than other horses. Hence **it conceived a passionate love for its master**, and when he approached, it would snort; and if he patted it, it would neigh; when he mounted, it would be docile; when he stood before it, **it would cast languishing glances at him**. **These actions already savoured of love, but were thought pleasing**. When however the horse, becoming too reckless, seemed to be meditating an assault upon the boy, and tales about the pair of a too monstrous nature began to circulate, Socles would not tolerate the slander, and in his detestation of **a licentious lover** sold the horse. But the animal could not bear to be separated from the beautiful boy and ended its days by a rigorous starvation."

---

the omission intentional, conducive to creating the impression of Alexander having a much stronger emotional rapport to animals than Caesar? The fact that these two *Lives* were published as parallel pieces does indeed invite comparison (including on an ethical level), but it may be questioned whether this also extends to the aspect of love for animals. On Plutarch, *Caes.* 17.4 and 18.2, see also Pelling (2011: 216, 225–226).

65 On Aelian, see Fögen (2009b: esp. 49–50, 59–61), with further references, to which Smith (2014) may now be added (see the review of Fögen 2016d).

66 Aelian, *De nat. anim.* 6.44: Ἵππος εἰ τυγχάνοι κηδεμονίας, ἀμείβεται τὸν εὐεργέτην εὐνοίᾳ τε καὶ φιλίᾳ. Ἵππος εἰ τυγχάνοι κηδεμονίας, ἀμείβεται τὸν εὐεργέτην εὐνοίᾳ τε καὶ φιλίᾳ. καὶ ὁποῖος μὲν ἦν ὁ Βουκεφάλας ἐς Ἀλέξανδρον διαρρεῖ πανταχόσε ὁ λόγος, καὶ οὔ μοι λέγειν αὐτὸν ἴδιόν ἐστι. καὶ τὸν Ἀντιόχου δὲ ἵππον τὸν τιμωρήσαντα τῷ δεσπότῃ καὶ ἀποκτείναντα τὸν Γαλάτην ὅσπερ οὖν ἀπέσφαξε τὸν Ἀντίοχον ἐν τῇ μάχῃ (ὄνομα δὲ τῷ Γαλάτῃ Κεντοαράτης ἦν) ἐῶ καὶ τοῦτον.

Given the accumulation of words derived from the verb ἐρᾶν and the horse's strong physical reaction to his master's presence, the emphasis on the sexual nature of the animal's emotions is impossible to ignore. And although the young man and the horse have a remarkable beauty in common, the text signals from the beginning that this love is excessive (see the words ἰσχυρῶς, δριμύτατα and ἀκόλαστον); it is also one-directional, and eventually Socles himself finds the animal's behaviour unacceptable and decides to get rid of it in order to avoid a bad reputation.[67] This account, which ends with the tragic suicide of the horse,[68] touches upon a taboo that was widespread in the ancient world: sexual intercourse between humans and animals.[69]

---

67 One may compare this story to a passage in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* where a sadist boy falsely accuses the donkey Lucius of his excessive lust towards humans (*Met*. 7.21): *Ut quemque enim viatorem prospexerit, sive illa scitula mulier seu virgo nubilis seu tener puellus est, ilico disturbato gestamine, nonnunquam etiam ipsis stramentis abiectis, furens incurrit et homines amator talis appetit, et humi prostratis illis inhians* ***illicitas atque incognitas temptat libidines*** *et ferinas voluptates* ***aversa****que* ***Venere*** *invitat ad nuptias. Nam imaginem etiam savii mentiendo ore improbo compulsat ac morsicat. Quae res nobis* ***non mediocris lites atque iurgia****, immo forsitan et* ***crimina*** *pariet* (…). See also *Met*. 7.22: *Denique unus ex illis: 'Quin igitur publicum istum maritum' inquit 'immo communem omnium adulterum* ***illis suis monstruosis nuptiis*** *condignam victimamus hostiam?'*. Later on, the donkey does have sexual intercourse with a wealthy lady (*Met*. 10.19–22), but with the woman taking the initiative, for which she is compared to Pasiphae (*Met*. 10.19); on that scene, see e.g. Goguey (2003: 59–60) and Hindermann (2011: 20–26). On the *Metamorphoses*, see below.

68 Other examples of animal suicide can be found in Aristotle, *Hist. anim*. VIII 47 631a1–8 (stallion); Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist*. 8.143–144 (dogs), 8.156 (horse), 8.158 (horse) and 10.18 (eagle); Plutarch, *Coniug. praec*. 45 144e, *De superst*. 5 167c (tiger), *De soll. anim*. 14 970c (dog and eagle) and 36 984f (dolphin); Athenaeus, *Deipn*. 9 388c (bird Porphyrion); Aelian, *De nat. anim*. 4.7 (mare and her foal, after being forced by their owner to mate), 6.25 (dogs), 7.28 (dog), 7.40 (dogs), 10.41 (Eupolis' dog), and 11.13 (Daphnis' dogs); and Nonnus, *Dion*. 47.219–245 (Erigone's dog). See also Fögen (2015: 23 n. 11), with further literature.

69 On the Socles episode, see Williams (2013: 218, 230–231). See also Griffith (2006: 328): "Aelian's narrative seems to compliment the horse on its good taste in noticing Socles' beauty; indeed their erotic affair, it seems, was initially decorous and even somewhat mutual, similar to that between any human *erastes*/*eromenos* pair. But it went a little too far. The conclusion of the story confirms the essential nobility of the lovesick horse (…)." However, Griffith's expression "a little too far" is a clear understatement of what Aelian's text actually says. In particular words and phrases such as ἐρωτικὸν δὲ **ἰσχυρῶς**, διέρρει λόγος ὑπὲρ ἀμφοῖν **ἀτοπώτερος**, τὸ **ἀπόφημον**, and ἐραστὴν **ἀκόλαστον μισήσας** do not suggest that the Greeks and Romans would have viewed this horse as 'noble'. At least with regard to Aelian, Hindermann (2011: 19) is thus wrong to claim that "Zoophilie, die vom Tier ausgeht, (…) erfährt (…) in keinem Fall explizite oder implizite Kritik." See also Korhonen (2012: 73, 74, 76).

For the purposes of this paper, it is crucial that the episode about Socles and his horse is introduced by a reference to Bucephalas and Alexander. However short this prelude may be, it does not simply fulfil the purely rhetorical function of a *praeteritio*; through its juxtaposition with the Socles story, it may also reflect the perception that the strong attachment between animal and human is not wholly unlikely to have an erotic or even sexual component. Such an association is not directly suggested by the above passages from Plutarch or Arrian, but it might be mirrored by Aelian's chapter which also indicates the transgressive nature of such relationships.[70]

5 Corinna's (unnamed) parrot in Ovid's *Amores* 2.6

Some of the few instances of ancient texts that resemble most closely what one may call 'animal biography' fall under the category of the so-called *epicedion*, the funerary song or dirge for deceased animals. One of the most extensive examples is Ovid's poem on the dead parrot of Corinna, the beloved of the *amator* (*Amores* 2.6).[71] To some extent this text is indebted to the genre of the funerary oration (*laudatio funebris*), which usually praised the exemplary behaviour and character of the deceased human. Such speeches addressed a variety of standard themes such as origin (*ortus*), family background (*genus*), outward appearance (*forma corporis*), education and talent (*ingenium*), public osts and honours

70 That it is indeed a taboo is also confirmed by *De nat. anim.* 4.8, the story of a man falling in love with a young mare. That it constitutes the transgression of a natural boundary is difficult to disregard: καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐγκαρτερεῖν, τελευτῶντα δὲ ἐπιτολμῆσαι τῷ **λέχει** τῷ ξένῳ καὶ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτῇ. The end of the story is similarly revealing: the man gets killed by the mare's foal which observed their intercourse, and even after his death, his corpse is dug up and maimed by the foal. On this report, see Griffith (2006: 328–329) and Korhonen (2012: 74); see also Williams (2013: 229–230, with n. 71). One may compare *De nat. anim.* 6.42, an anecdote about the sexual relationship between the goatherd Crathis and a she-goat which even results in the birth of a hybrid creature (γίνεται δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὁμιλίας τῆς πρὸς τὴν αἶγα παιδίον, καὶ ἦν αἴξ τὰ σκέλη, τὸ πρόσωπον ἄνθρωπος); in the end Crathis is killed by the leading he-goat of the flock who had become jealous of the goatherd. On "zoophilia" in the ancient world more generally, see e.g. Goguey (2003: 59–62), Hindermann (2011), and Korhonen (2012), with further references.

71 On this poem see Fögen (2007b: 62–64), with detailed references to secondary literature (esp. in 63 n. 83).

(*habiti honores*), and character (*mores*).[72] Ovid dwells upon the bird's exotic origin (India), the beautiful colours of its feathers and its beak, and its numerous virtues, in particular its imitative skills which are underscored from the very first line onwards (*Am.* 2.6.1: *imitatrix ales*) and resumed throughout the poem: The parrot is depicted as so garrulous that it hardly found time to eat (*Am.* 2.6.29–30); it had a voice adept in mimicry of sounds (*Am.* 2.6.18) and could moreover render human words (*Am.* 2.6.23–24). Among its other qualities, Ovid refers to its peace-loving nature (*Am.* 2.6.25–28) and its frugality (*Am.* 2.6.29–32). Through the comparison with other, less virtuous birds the parrot is extolled for its outstanding character. The connection with its loving owner, the girl Corinna, is brought out in particular in the final part of the poem: the parrot's last words were addressed to her (*Am.* 2.6.43–48),[73] and even the inscription on his gravestone thematises Corinna's love for the bird and its 'linguistic' skills (*Am.* 2.6.59–62).

The question is, of course, to what extent this dirge should be taken seriously. In particular a comparison with Catullus' poem on Lesbia's dead sparrow (*Carm.* 3) may suggest that Ovid is parodying the established elements of the funerary song. Not only is the parrot highly anthropomorphised, it also has certain comic traits, especially his extreme garrulity. At the same time, it cannot be denied that the text is not without moving elements and that it serves as a consolation for the elegiac *puella* for the loss of her pet. It does not completely differ from other dirges on deceased animals, and with its short epigram at the end (*Am.* 2.6.61–62), it may be linked with numerous poems and inscriptions on ancient tombs for animals which revere and glorify their special skills and talents.[74] To apprehend the intricate character of this poem, one may subscribe to the following statement of Amat (2002: 123): "Le poème d'Ovide unit une sympathie véritable à une pointe d'ironie, destinée à distraire la jeune fille de sa tristesse."

Also, one may argue that Corinna's parrot is recognisable as an individual, although Ovid does not even mention the animal's name. The poem is long

72 On these *topoi*, see Esteve-Forriol (1962: 131–136). On the *laudatio funebris* more generally, see Kierdorf (1980), Sonnabend (2002: 87–88), and Hägg (2012: 234–236).

73 On the significance of *ultima verba* in ancient literature, see Fögen (2015: 25–26, with n. 19, 27 n. 25, 33–34).

74 See e.g. Herrlinger (1930: esp. 106–120), Geist ([2]1976: 150–154), Toynbee (1973: 110–122), Lilja (1976: 111–116, 123–124), Perfahl (1983: 88–90), Bodson (2000: passim, esp. 31–33), Amat (2002: 62–63, 66–67), and Goguey (2003: 63–68). See also n. 63 (above) on the tomb of Hadrian's horse Borysthenes and the sixth section of Lewis' article (in this volume).

enough to draw a memorable picture of the bird, and to do so, it utilises a number of topical elements from the literary tradition of the funerary speech. It is also much longer and more detailed than Catullus' sparrow poem (*Carm.* 3) with its eighteen lines or than most other epigrammatic poems and inscriptions on deceased animals. Nonetheless, it is debatable whether this is really enough to call it a proper 'biography'.

6 The 'donkey' Lucius in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*

Apart from the above examples, there is one particularly intriguing text that deserves consideration for the purposes of this paper: Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, which relates the story of a human temporarily transformed into a donkey.[75] This is, of course, a special case: it is not a separate animal associated with a human, but the human himself changed into an animal; it is therefore a hybrid form with human characteristics and rationality. Nonetheless, this extensive tale, which is normally seen as a representative of the Roman novel, may also be classified as an animal's 'autobiography'.[76] At any rate, it is a unique literary experiment which forces the narrator to adopt the donkey's perspective and describe the events that he experiences as seen through the animal's eyes.[77]

---

75 Scholarship on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* has seen a real explosion in the past thirty years or so. See e.g. the monographs by Tatum (1979), Winkler (1985), Schlam (1992), Harrison (2000: 9–10, 210–259), Frangoulidis (2001), Graverini (2007 [2012]), Kirichenko (2010), Harrison (2013), and Tilg (2014); see also Walsh (1970: esp. 141–223). For a convenient summary of the plot of the novel, see Harrison (2000: 211–215), further Tatum (1979: 23–24, 37–38, 40, 47–48, 51, 58–59, 68, 71–72, 73–74, 76–77, 80–81). On Apuleius' numerous other works, both extant and lost, see Harrison (2000: 10–38); these works included zoological writings, presumably following the model of Aristotle (see Harrison 2000: 29–30).

76 On modern animal autobiographical writing, see the contributions in DeMello (2013b), who writes in her introduction (De Mello 2013a: 10): "(...) what is important about literary representations of animal minds isn't whether or not they're accurate; it's what they reveal about how humans think about other animals, and what the consequences of that thinking is."

77 On donkeys in the ancient world, see Olck (1907), Opelt (1966), Toynbee (1973: 193–197), Bodson (1986), Griffith (2006: esp. 205, 213–228), Gregory (2007), and Calder (2008); on donkeys and mules in an agricultural context, see e.g. Bodson (1986: 7–9) and Fögen (2016c: 336). Opelt (1966: 571) rightly says that the donkey was "billiger als das Pferd, daher für Arme erschwinglich." With Olck (1907: 650), it is important to remember that "der E.[sel] schon im

In the first book of the *Metamorphoses*, the protagonist of the novel, Lucius, comes to Thessaly, the homeland of magic and witchcraft. He persuades the maid of a sorceress (Photis), with whom he has a sexual affair, to transform him into a bird, but the experiment fails and Lucius is turned into a donkey who can only regain his human shape if he eats roses.[78] However, before he finally achieves this goal, he has to undergo numerous adventures, which may be read as a donkey's *Odyssey*.[79] The final book of the *Metamorphoses* (Book 11) culminates in Lucius' initiation into the mystery cult of the Egyptian goddess Isis. It is thus clear that Apuleius has composed a complex text which can be interpreted in various different ways: it combines elements of the picaresque novel weaving together numerous individual stories, the account of someone's personal development and salvation (in the sense of the modern *Entwicklungsroman*), and certain philosophical and religious ideas.[80]

Altertum mit derselben Mißachtung behandelt wurde, wie heute meist in Europa." See also Opelt (1966: esp. 572–579), Griffith (2006: 227–228), Gregory (2007: 193–194), and Bodson (1986: 8): "Entêté, stupide, paresseux, ridicule, telles sont les épithètes qui lui sont régulièrement décernées dans les fables, les proverbes, les récits romanesque ou les épisodes mythologiques (...)." To these character traits commonly associated with donkeys one needs to add lasciviousness (see e.g. Opelt 1966: 572–574, 586, 589). On the symbolic value of the ass within the Isis cult, see Tatum (1979: 43–47); in *Met*. 11.6 the instructions given by the goddess Isis to Lucius before his re-transformation into a human include the following command: ***pessimae*** *mihique iam dudum* ***detestabilis beluae*** *istius corio te protinus exue*. Lucius himself says in *Met*. 7.3: *Ego denique, quem saevissimus eius* [sc. *Fortunae*] *impetus in* ***bestiam et extremae sortis quadripedem*** *deduxerat cuiusque casus etiam quovis iniquissimo dolendus atque miserandus merito videretur* (...). See also *Met*. 11.13 (scene of Lucius' re-transformation into a human): *protinus mihi delabitur* ***deformis et ferina facies***.

78 See Apuleius, *Met*. 3.25 (Photis' words): *Sed bene quod facilior reformationis huius medela suppeditat. Nam rosis tantum demorsicatis exibis asinum statimque in meum Lucium postliminio redibis*.

79 On Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Homer's *Odyssey*, see e.g. Tatum (1979: 18–19, 35–36, 75–76, 89–91), Schlam (1992: 19–21, 68–69), Harrison (2000: 222–223), Graverini (2012: 141–154), Harrison (2013: 125–134, 257–258), and Tilg (2014: 52–54, 94–95), with references to previous scholarship.

80 Book 11 of the *Metamorphoses* has been interpreted in various ways. While some scholars view it as satire, others have pleaded for a serious religious meaning. For details, see e.g. Walsh (1970: 143–146, 149, 174–176, 182–189), Tatum (1979: 19–20, 81–91), Schlam (1992: 1–4, 8–9, 25, 38–39, 113–125), Harrison (2000: 210 n. 4, 235–252, 259), Frangoulidis (2001: 149–150, 161–176), Graverini (2012: 51–94, 118–132), Harrison (2013: 26–27, 108–122), and Tilg (2014: 7–18, 85–105, 116–125, 149–150, 155–158); see also Kirichenko (2010: esp. 4–6, 71–105, 135–141).

Repeatedly, Lucius' unbound curiosity is referred to,[81] and it is this inquisitive attitude, in particular his interest in anything related to magic, which ultimately leads him into trouble. After his arrival in Thessaly, he has the impression that every object he perceives, whether animate or inanimate, is the result of the transformation of a human being (*Met.* 2.1; transl. J. Arthur Hanson, Loeb Classical Library):

> *Nec fuit in illa civitate quod aspiciens id esse crederem quod esset, sed omnia prorsus ferali murmure in aliam effigiem translata, ut et lapides quos offenderem de homine duratos, et aves quas audirem indidem plumatas, et arbores quae pomerium ambirent similiter foliatas, et fontanos latices de corporibus humanis fluxos crederem; iam statuas et imagines incessuras, parietes locuturos, boves et id genus pecua dicturas praesagium, de ipso vero caelo et iubaris orbe subito venturum oraculum.*
>
> "Nothing I looked at in that city seemed to me to be what it was; but I believed that absolutely everything had been transformed into another shape by some deadly mumbo-jumbo: the rocks I hit upon were petrified human beings, the birds I heard were feathered humans, the trees that surrounded the city wall were humans with leaves, and the liquid in the fountains had flowed from human bodies. Soon the statues and pictures would begin to walk, the walls to speak, the oxen and other animals of that sort to prophesy; and from the sky itself and the sun's orb there would suddenly come an oracle."

To some extent, this statement anticipates Lucius' own fate. But there are other forebodings of his transformation into an animal. For example, when Lucius visits the house of his aunt Byrrhena, he sees a statue of Actaeon being changed into a stag while watching the goddess Diana stepping into her bath (*Met.* 2.4). His aunt then remarks that everything he sees is "his own" – a comment which a knowledgeable reader can understand in two different ways, in particular when taken together with Byrrhena's subsequent warning that Lucius watch out carefully for his host's wife Pamphile who is a witch keen to seduce young and attractive men and not afraid of using magic to transform them into rocks or animals if they resist her.[82] However, with her advice Byrrhena achieves the ex-

---

81 See esp. Apuleius, *Met.* 2.1: (...) *anxius alioquin et* ***nimis cupidus cognoscendi quae rara miraque sunt****, reputansque me media Thessaliae loca tenere, quo artis magicae nativa cantamina totius orbis consono ore celebrentur, fabulamque illam optimi comitis Aristomenis de situ civitatis huius exortam, suspensus alioquin et voto simul et studio,* ***curiose singula considerabam***. On *curiositas* in the *Metamorphoses*, see e.g. Tatum (1979: 22, 34–36, 88–89), Schlam (1992: 48–57, 97–98, 119–120, 124–125), and Harrison (2000: 219, 221, 239, 252–253).

82 Apuleius, *Met.* 2.5: *Dum haec identidem rimabundus eximie delector, "Tua sunt" ait Byrrhena "cuncta quae vides." Et cum dicto ceteros omnes sermone secreto decedere praecipit. Quibus dispulsis omnibus, "Per hanc" inquit "deam, o Luci carissime, ut anxie tibi metuo et ut*

act opposite and kindles Lucius' interest in magic even further. As is signalled in the text, Lucius is not prepared at all to exercise caution, but this also means that he will have to live with the consequences.[83]

The actual transformation of the protagonist happens in the final part of Book 3 of the *Metamorphoses* (3.22–25). Here is the key scene (*Met*. 3.24–25):

> *Haec identidem asseverans summa cum trepidatione irrepit cubiculum et pyxidem depromit arcula. Quam ego amplexus ac deosculatus prius, utque mihi prosperis faveret volatibus deprecatus, abiectis propere laciniis totis, avide manus immersi et haurito plusculo cuncta corporis mei membra perfricui. Iamque alternis conatibus libratis bracchiis in avem similem gestiebam. Nec ullae plumulae nec usquam pinnulae, sed plane pili mei crassantur in setas, et cutis tenella duratur in corium, et in extimis palmulis perdito numero toti digiti coguntur in singulas ungulas, et de spinae meae termino grandis cauda procedit. Iam facies enormis et os prolixum et nares hiantes et labiae pendulae; sic et aures immodicis horripilant auctibus. Nec ullum miserae reformationis video solacium, nisi quod mihi iam nequeunti tenere Photidem natura crescebat. Ac dum salutis inopia cuncta corporis mei considerans non avem me sed asinum video, querens de facto Photidis, sed iam humano gestu simul et voce privatus, quod solum poteram, postrema deiecta labia, umidis tamen oculis obliquum respiciens ad illam tacitus expostulabam.*
>
> "After repeating this recipe several times, she crept very nervously into the room and removed a jar from the box. First I embraced and kissed the jar and prayed to it to bless me with a lucky flight. Then I hastily threw off all my clothes, greedily plunged my hand into the jar, pulled out a largish daub, and rubbed my body all over. Next I spread out my arms and pumped them alternately, trying hard to become a bird like Pamphile. No down appeared, not a single feather. Instead my body hair was thickening into bristles and my soft skin hardening into hide. At the ends of my palms my fingers were losing their number and being all compressed together into single hoofs, and from the end of my spine came forth a great tail. My face was immense now, mouth spread, nostrils gaping, lips sagging. My ears too grew immoderately long and bristly. I saw no consolation in my wretched

pote pignori meo longe provisum cupio, cave tibi, sed cave fortiter a malis artibus et facinorosis illecebris Pamphiles illius, quae cum Milone isto, quem dicis hospitem, nupta est. Maga primi nominis et omnis carminis sepulcralis magistra creditur, quae surculis et lapillis et id genus frivolis inhalatis omnem istam lucem mundi sideralis imis Tartari et in vetustum Chaos summergere novit. Nam simul quemque conspexerit speciosae formae iuvenem, venustate eius sumitur et ilico in eum et oculum et animum detorquet. Serit blanditias, invadit spiritum, amoris profundi pedicis aeternis alligat. Tunc minus morigeros et viles fastidio in saxa et in pecua et quodvis animal puncto reformat, alios vero prorsus exstinguit. (...). On this passage see Harrison (2013: 34, 114, 141–143), with references to earlier secondary literature; see also Walsh (1970: 178) and Tatum (1979: 38–39).

83 Apuleius, *Met*. 2.6: *At ego curiosus alioquin, ut primum artis magicae semper optatum nomen audivi, tantum a cautela Pamphiles afui ut etiam ultro gestirem tali magisterio me volens ampla cum mercede tradere et prorsus in ipsum barathrum saltu concito praecipitare*.

> metamorphosis except for the fact that, although I could not now embrace Photis, my generative organ was growing. Helplessly I examined every part of my body and saw that I was not a bird, but an ass. I wanted to complain about what Photis had done, but I lacked human gestures as well as words. Still, I did the only thing I could: I hung my lower lip, looked askance at her with moist eyes, and berated her in silence."

Lucius' reaction to his asinine shape, though lamentable on the surface, is without doubt rather comical from the reader's point of view – not just because of his sudden lack of words, but also because of the reference to his enlarged sexual organ. Furthermore, the narrator's explicit comment that he has retained his human intelligence makes his situation less tragic than it may appear at first sight.[84] It is this gift of rational thinking that allows him to carefully ponder on an appropriate solution and to reject a response that would be typical of a donkey (*Met.* 3.26):

> *Ego vero, quamquam perfectus asinus et pro Lucio iumentum, sensum tamen retinebam humanum. Diu denique ac multum mecum ipse deliberavi an nequissimam facinerosissimamque illam feminam spissis calcibus feriens et mordicus appetens necare deberem. Sed ab incepto temerario melior me sententia revocavit, ne morte multata Photide salutares mihi suppetias rursus exstinguerem. Deiecto itaque et quassanti capite ac demussata temporali contumelia, durissimo casui meo serviens ad equum illum vectorem meum probissimum in stabulum concedo, ubi alium etiam Milonis quondam hospitis mei asinum stabulantem inveni.*
>
> "For my part, although I was a complete ass and a beast of burden instead of Lucius, I still retained my human intelligence; and so I held a long, earnest debate with myself concerning that utterly worthless and criminal woman. Should I kick her repeatedly with my hoofs, assault her with my teeth, and kill her? But that was a rash idea and better thinking brought me back to my senses, lest, by punishing Photis with death, I also destroy the assistance I needed for recovery. So, lowering and shaking my head, I silently swallowed my temporary humiliation, and accommodating myself to my harsh misfortune, I went off to the stable to join my horse, my most excellent mount."

This is, of course, also a strategic device of the author, for if Lucius had lost his intellect (λόγος / *ratio*), he would no longer be able to tell his story. Nevertheless, as a donkey, he cannot speak and is limited to non-verbal communication, and when he does try to make himself understood, all he is able to produce is a bray-

84 But see Tatum (1979: 47): "A transformation at once amusing and ghastly: there is no difficulty in seeing it as simple poetic justice for all of Lucius' rashness and curiosity (...). But devotees of the Isis cult would read a more sinister meaning into the metamorphosis." On this scene, see also Tilg (2015: 16–18), who views Lucius' transformation as "the beginning of a serious crisis of identity" (2015: 17).

ing sound (see *Met*. 3.29 [quoted in n. 94, below], 7.3 and 8.29). Another comical effect is achieved by his attempt to share the stable with his horse: he presupposes that there is some kind of natural bond between animals and that his horse would recognise him and be hospitable towards him, but instead the horse and another donkey attack him when he tries to get close to their barley rations, which he had given to them himself when he was still human.[85]

However, it would be misguided to believe that such comical effects are the only function of Lucius' transformation into a donkey. Rather, it also allows the author to confront the animal with situations that a human being might not normally experience, or at least not in the same way. Most of the other human characters of the novel do not know that the donkey is in fact a bewitched human; they will thus behave and say things in its presence as if no human observer were around. The first example of such a setting is the reaction of Lucius' own slave when the donkey tries to reach garlands of roses through the window of his stable and is held back by the servant who gets very angry with the animal and beats him relentlessly (*Met*. 3.27; with Hanson's translation slightly modified):

> *Quod me pessima scilicet sorte conantem servulus meus, cui semper equi cura mandata fuerat, repente conspiciens, indignatus exsurgit, et "Quo usque tandem" inquit "cantherium patiemur istum paulo ante cibariis iumentorum, nunc etiam simulacris deorum infestum? Quin iam ego istum sacrilegum debilem claudumque reddam." Et statim telum aliquod quaeritans temere fascem lignorum positum offendit, rimatusque frondosum* ***fustem cunctis vastiorem****, non prius miserum me tundere desiit quam, sonitu vehementi et largo strepitu percussis ianuis, trepido etiam rumore viciniae conclamatis latronibus profugit territus.*
>
> "But as I was making the attempt – this was bad luck, of course – my slave, who had always been in charge of caring for my horse, noticed me immediately. He stood up angrily and exclaimed: 'How long, pray, shall we put up with this old gelding who attacks first the animals' food and now even the gods' statues? No, I shall now maim and cripple that temple-robber!' And as he quickly began to look round for some weapon, he stumbled on a bundle of sticks which happened to be lying there. Hunting out a leafy branch for **a club, the thickest of them all**, he began to beat poor me unceasingly, stopping only when he heard a crashing noise and the loud din of doors being battered, along with nearby cries of alarm and shouts of 'Thieves! Thieves!' At this he fled in terror."

85 Apuleius, *Met*. 3.26: *Atque ego rebar, si quod inesset mutis animalibus tacitum ac naturale sacramentum, agnitione ac miseratione quadam inductum equum illum meum hospitium ac loca lautia mihi praebiturum. Sed pro Iuppiter hospitalis et Fidei secreta numina! Praeclarus ille vector meus cum asino capita conferunt in meamque perniciem ilico consentiunt et, verentes scilicet cibariis suis, vix me praesepio videre proximantem: deiectis auribus iam furentes infestis calcibus insequuntur, et abigor quam procul ab hordeo, quod apposueram vesperi meis manibus illi gratissimo famulo.*

This is the kind of behaviour a slave would never exhibit towards his master. To some extent, the passage may also be interpreted as an indirect reflexion on the widespread cruelty towards animals in the ancient world. In order to hold the donkey back, the slave would not have been forced to resort to this extremely brutal treatment, which is further illustrated through the adjective *miserum* (not rendered in Hanson's translation).[86]

At the same time, such incidents seem to mirror common practice in Roman farming and other dealings with animals used for work, as a passage on the lesser donkey (*asellus*) from Columella's agricultural treatise *De re rustica* proves (*De re rust*. 7.1.1–3; see Fögen 2016c: 336). According to this testimony, this animal was particularly useful for the farmer because it was cheap, robust, satisfied with very little, and able to endure all kinds of hardship. Praised by Columella as a *maxime necessarium instrumentum* for every farm (*De re rust*. 7.1.3), it even tolerates bad treatment, as the following excerpt bears out (*De re rust*. 7.1.2; transl. Edward S. Forster & Edward H. Heffner, Loeb Classical Library):

> *Tum imprudentis custodis negligentiam fortissime sustinet: plagarum et penuriae tolerantissimus: propter quae tardius deficit, quam ullum aliud armentum. Nam laboris et famis maxime patiens raro morbis afficitur. Huius animalis tam exiguae tutelae plurima et necessaria opera supra portionem respondent, cum et facilem terram qualis in Baetica totaque Libye sit levibus aratris proscindat, et non minima pondera vehiculo trahat.*
>
> "Further, it endures most bravely the neglect of a careless master and tolerates blows and want most patiently; for which reasons it is slower in breaking down than any other animal used for ploughing, for, since it shows the utmost endurance of toil and hunger, it is rarely affected by disease. The performance by this animal of very many essential tasks beyond its share is as remarkable as the very little care which it requires, since it can both break up with a light plough easily worked soil, such as is found in Baetica and all over Libya, and can draw on vehicles loads which are far from being small."

Columella's voice is that of a country estate owner whose duty it is to look after the economic well-being of his farm.[87] The 'donkey' Lucius, on the other hand,

86 With regard to modern animal autobiographical writing, see also De Mello (2013a: 8): "Another theme found in animal autobiographical writing is suffering. It should not surprise us that when animals are ultimately given a voice, even if that voice is a literary device, it sometimes articulates pain, neglect, or abuse."

87 However, see already Semonides, *fr*. 7.43–46 West: τὴν δ' ἔκ †τε σποδιῆς† καὶ **παλιντριβέος** ὄνου, / ἣ σύν τ' ἀνάγκηι σύν τ' ἐνιπῆισιν μόγις / ἔστερξεν ὧν ἅπαντα κἀπονήσατο / ἀρεστά. The passage is discussed by Gregory (2007: 202–206).

articulates a rather different perception of the condition of work animals and indirectly censures their often violent and exploitative treatment. The topic of violence towards the ass recurs so frequently and is sometimes recounted so elaborately that the reader of the *Metamorphoses* is forced to reflect on these issues.[88] An engagement with such matters is further stimulated by a passage at the beginning of the novel which exemplifies not only how Lucius, being on his way to Thessaly and still having his human shape, takes good care of his horse after an exhausting ride, but also how thoughtful and gentle he is with everything he does and how he even caresses the animal.[89]

Related to this are two scenes of mules and horses performing extremely hard and exhausting work in a grinding mill. Both passages, a shorter (*Met.* 7.15) and a longer one (*Met.* 9.10–13), give a graphic picture of the conditions of animals forced to do this kind of monotonous and unhealthy labour, which also exposes them to considerable danger. Their lack of freedom is enhanced through the direct comparison of the animals' situation to 'slavery', and the

88 See in particular Apuleius, *Met.* 4.3–4 (a young man, a woman and eventually an entire village), 6.29–30 (robbers), and 7.17–20 (a sadist boy torturing the donkey); the latter passage is an evocative *ekphrasis* of a human gone out of control, capable of devising all sorts of brutalities. See further *Met.* 6.25, 7.15, 7.25, 7.28, 8.30, 9.11 (quoted in n. 90), and 9.15. On the maltreatment of donkeys see also Plautus, *Pseud. 136*: *neque ego homines magis asinos numquam vidi, ita plagis costae callent*; further Ovid, *Am.* 2.7.15–16: *adspice, ut auritus miserandae sortis asellus* / ***adsiduo domitus verbere*** *lentus eat!* The kindness that the donkey Lucius experiences from his last owner Thiasus (*Met.* 10.16–19) is a stark divergence from the treatment that he has to suffer from others. At the same time, the keeper, a freedman to whom the animal has been entrusted, uses Lucius for his personal material gain: When Thiasus visits Corinth with Lucius, his overseer makes large sums of money by charging others to be admitted to the donkey who has turned out to be almost like a human and thus become a 'celebrity' whose performances people are eager to watch (*Met.* 10.19). The keeper even rents out the animal to a wealthy lady who wants to have sex with Lucius (*Met.* 10.19; see also n. 66, above). The man's materialistic mindset is plainly brought to light in that passage: *At ille nequaquam anxius ecquid posset de me suave provenire,* ***lucro suo tantum contentus****, annuit*. See also *Met.* 10.23: *Nec gravate magister meus voluptates ex eius arbitrio largiebatur, partim* ***mercedes amplissimas acceptando****, partim novum spectaculum domino praeparando*. On the parallel to the sexual exploitation of human slaves, see Bradley (2000: 115–116).

89 Apuleius, *Met.* 1.2: *Postquam ardua montium et lubrica vallium et roscida caespitum et glebosa camporum emersi, in equo indigena peralbo vehens, iam eo quoque admodum fesso, ut ipse etiam fatigationem sedentariam incessus vegetatione discuterem in pedes desilio, equi sudorem frontem curiose effrico,* ***aures remulceo****, frenos detraho, in gradum lenem sensim proveho, quoad lassitudinis incommodum alvi solitum ac naturale praesidium eliquaret*. On Lucius' horse, see also *Met.* 11.20.

constant threat of being beaten is also touched upon.[90] The more extensive of the two passages comprises a depressing account of the harmful impact that the work in the grinding mill has on equids (*Met*. 9.13):

> *Iam de meo iumentario contubernio quid vel ad quem modum memorem? Quales illi muli senes vel cantherii debiles! Circa praesepium capita demersi contruncabant moles palearum, cervices cariosa vulnerum putredine follicantes, nares languidas adsiduo pulsu tussedinis hiulci, pectora copulae sparteae tritura continua exulcerati, costas perpetua castigatione ossium tenus renudati, ungulas multivia circumcursione in enorme vestigium porrecti, totumque corium veterno atque scabiosa macie exasperati.*
>
> "As for my comrades, the animals, what can I say? How can I describe their condition? What a sight! Those old mules and feeble geldings stood round the manger with their heads sunk down, munching through piles of chaff; their necks sagged from the rotting decay of sores; their flabby nostrils were distended from constant coughing; their chests were ulcerated from the continual rubbing of the rope harnesses; their flanks were bare to the bone from everlasting whipping, their hoofs stretched out to abnormal dimensions from their multiple circling, and their entire hide rough with decay and mangy starvation."

Although the language of this excerpt is highly rhetoricised, it would be wrong to assume that its content is grossly exaggerated or even far from reality. Moreover, speaking as a human, Lucius is in fear of the consequences that the work in the mill might have on his own well-being.[91] This evaluation of his personal circumstances may be read as an appeal to the reader to consider what it is like for an animal to be condemned to such an existence. However, one feels likewise reminded of the life of a Roman slave, and as Bradley (2000) has demon-

---

90 Apuleius, *Met*. 7.15: *Sed ubi me procul a civitate gregarius ille perduxerat, nullae deliciae ac ne ulla quidem libertas excipit*. Further *Met*. 9.11: *Ibi complurium iumentorum multivii circuitus intorquebant molas ambage varia, nec die tantum, verum perpeti etiam nocte prorsus instabili machinarum vertigine lucubrabant pervigilem farinam. Sed mihi, ne rudimentum* ***servitii*** *perhorrescerem scilicet, novus dominus loca lautia prolixe praebuit*. On beating, see the final part of *Met*. 9.11: *Complures enim protinus baculis armati me circumsteterunt atque, ut eram luminibus obtectis securus etiamnunc, repente signo dato et clamore conserto, plagas ingerentes acervatim, adeo me strepitu turbulentant, ut cunctis consiliis abiectis ilico scitissime taeniae sparteae totus innixus discursus alacres obirem*. One may compare Secundus of Tarentum, *Anth. Pal*. 9.301: Τίπτε τὸν ὀγκηστὴν βραδύπουν ὄνον ἄμμιγ᾽ ἐν ἵπποις / γυρὸν ἀλωεινᾶις ἐξελάατε δρόμον; / οὐχ ἅλις, ὅττι μύλοιο περίδρομον ἄχθος ἀνάγκης / σπειρηδὸν σκοτόεις κυκλοδίωκτος ἔχω; / ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι καὶ πώλοισιν ἐρίζομεν. ἦ ῥ᾽ ἔτι λοιπὸν / νῦν μοι τὴν σκολιὴν αὐχένι γαῖαν ἀροῦν. Note that this epigram is also spoken by a donkey in the first person.

91 Apuleius, *Met*. 9.13: *Talis familiae funestum mihi etiam metuens exemplum veterisque Lucii fortunam recordatus et ad ultimam salutis metam detrusus summisso capite maerebam.*

strated, the parallels evoked by Apuleius are hard to miss,[92] especially in *Met.* 9.12–13 where Lucius' description of his co-worker animals cited above is preceded by a grim portrayal of the human slaves toiling in the mill.[93]

With his animal shape, Lucius is furthermore able to observe the conduct and actions of the thieves who steal him in the above scene. The donkey thus manages to uncover their unethical and antisocial behaviour, including their bad treatment of animals. For instance, when Lucius tries to make himself understood and utters nothing but typical donkey sounds, the robbers flog him vigorously.[94] On another occasion, he criticises their excessive and dissolute comportment during a meal and compares them to 'half-beasts' – a somewhat amusing dictum from the mouth of a donkey which plays with the notion of the sometimes rather vague boundary between animal and human.[95] Further on in the novel, the ass proclaims even greater indignation at the sight of priests of the 'Syrian Goddess' (Atargatis) performing violent rites of self-laceration (*Met.* 8.27–28) and then being engaged in an ecstatic orgy (*Met.* 8.29). With his comments, Lucius the animal unmasks the priests' feigned chastity and religious devotion.[96] The donkey has similar scorn for the debauched and adulterous wife

92 See in particular Bradley (2000: 113): "the transformation of Lucius can be taken as a paradigmatic illustration of the animalization of the slave in real life, and as a guide to the meaning of animalization in the master-slave relationship."

93 Apuleius, *Met.* 9.12: *Dii boni, quales illic homunculi vibicibus lividis totam cutem depicti, dorsumque plagosum scissili centunculo magis inumbrati quam obtecti, nonnulli exiguo tegili tantum modo pubem iniecti, cuncti tamen sic tunicati, ut essent per pannulos manifesti, frontes litterati et capillum semirasi et pedes anulati, tum lurore deformes et fumosis tenebris vaporosae caliginis palpebras adesi atque adeo male luminati, et in modum pugilum, qui pulvisculo perspersi dimicant farinulenta cinere sordide candidati.*

94 Apuleius, *Met.* 3.29: *Et "O" quidem tantum disertum ac validum clamitavi, reliquum autem Caesaris nomen enuntiare non potui. Aspernati latrones clamorem absonum meum, caedentes hinc inde miserum corium nec cribris iam idoneum relinquunt.*

95 Apuleius, *Met.* 4.8: *Estur ac potatur incondite, pulmentis acervatim, panibus aggeratim, poculis agminatim ingestis. Clamore ludunt, strepitu cantilant, conviciis iocantur, ac iam cetera* ***semiferis Lapithis Centaurisque*** *similia.* The double tricolon in these two sentences, combined with strict syntactic parallelism, adds emphasis to Lucius' condemnation of the robbers. See also *Met.* 6.30: *Quam quidem detractam protinus cum suo sibi funiculo devinctam dedere praecipitem, puellaque statim distenta vinculis cenam, quam postuma diligentia praeparaverat infelix anicula,* ***ferinis*** *invadunt* ***animis***.

96 See esp. Apuleius, *Met.* 8.29: *Paucisque admodum praegustatis holusculis ante ipsam mensam,* ***spurcissima illa propudia ad illicitae libidinis extrema flagitia infandis uriginibus efferantur****, passimque circumfusi nudatum supinatumque iuvenem exsecrandis oribus flagitabant* (...). *Iamiamque vicinos undique percientes* ***turpissimam scaenam*** *patefaciunt, insuper ridicule sacerdotum purissimam laudantes castimoniam.* In some respects, this scene, sum-

of the baker to whom he is sold to work in his grinding mill (*Met.* 9.14–31, esp. 9.14–17 and 9.22–31). He also despises the Phaedra-like stepmother lusting after her young son (*Met.* 10.2–12) and reviles her as "an extreme example of stepmotherly wickedness".[97] He has yet another negative verdict for the vicious woman who poisoned her husband and murdered others, and who has been condemned to a public sexual performance with the donkey in the arena (*Met.* 10.23–28), a staged show which is not carried out in the end because Lucius manages to escape (*Met.* 10.29–35).

Given that Lucius' transformation does not take place until Book 3, the novel as a whole should not be viewed as an 'animal autobiography' *stricto sensu*. However, the major portion of the narrative is presented through the eyes of the donkey, which makes this classification not altogether inappropriate. At the same time, the question is to what extent the portrayal of the donkey Lucius carries truly individual traits. In many instances, the animal seems to embody not much more than a prototypical representative of its species which is difficult to distinguish from other donkeys.[98]

7 Conclusion

In this paper, I have looked at various 'test cases' in order to ascertain to what extent animals occurring in representative examples of Graeco-Roman literature are individualised. For that purpose, I have considered texts belonging to the genres of epic poetry, technical literature, biography, historiography, love elegy (making use of the form of the *epicedion* and the *laudatio funebris*), and the novel. With the exception of Corinna's parrot, all of the animals discussed here have proper names. Despite the generic differences of the source material, one may argue that all texts offer portraits of animals which are sufficiently differentiated to let them appear as individuals, though perhaps to a varying degree.

---

marised in *Met.* 8.30 as *infamia*, is reminiscent of certain lines in Juvenal, *Sat.* 2, which thematises the contradiction between public and private forms of behaviour; see Fögen (2014: 83–85).

97 Apuleius, *Met.* 10.5: *dira illa femina et malitiae novercalis exemplum unicum* (...).

98 In this regard, Lucius the ass is similar to donkeys occurring in the ancient fable. Another parallel to this literary genre lies in the fact that fables "present animals thinking and speaking", and it may be argued that this feature "probably affected the way the story of Lucius was conceived" (Schlam 1992: 28). On donkeys in the ancient fable, see Opelt (1966: 574–576).

Especially in Bucephalas' case, the historicity of the animal is indisputable: the horse participates in battles (as Alexander's 'fellow combatant', as it were) and its death is the motive for the foundation of a city. Moreover, the literary tradition delineated here throws light upon various stages of this animal's life. That, too, is the case for Arrian's hound Horme, and it is also she who epitomises a good example of animal agency, despite the fact that her life is very much determined by the activities of her master.[99] The literary evidence provided by Plutarch and Arrian spells out that Bucephalas and Horme are anything but "auswechselbare Objekte", to use Steinbrecher's phrase (2012: 20). Also, in both instances, the reciprocity of interactions between animal and human is unmistakeable. On a more general level, Bucephalas and Horme are idiosyncratic representatives of cultural institutions and practices of Greek society, namely of warfare and hunting respectively.

The term 'historicity' is more difficult to apply to fictional animals such as Odysseus' dog Argus, Corinna's parrot, or the "donkey" Lucius in Apuleius. Yet it is not entirely off the mark to argue that the portrayals of Argus and Corinna's parrot are credible images of 'real' animals of their respective times, the archaic period and the early Roman Empire, and that the donkey's story is not too far-fetched with regard to its numerous allusions to the often dire conditions of farm and work animals.

It may, however, be questioned whether all this justifies the use of the term 'biography'. In most cases, all that is offered is a glimpse at certain episodes in the life of an animal; a fuller picture is not really provided – not even in the case of the parrot, although its dirge follows relatively closely the tradition of the funerary speech and addresses many of its parameters. The only exception is perhaps the 'autobiography' of the donkey Lucius which turns out to be the story of a man who, by going through a whole series of obstacles in the shape of an animal, eventually finds his true destination in the form of his devotion to the goddess Isis. Therefore, it may be more apposite to subsume the texts examined in this paper under the category of anecdotes, but with the additional

99 To justify the use of the term *agency* for actions performed by animals, the intentionality of such actions is not regarded as absolutely relevant by many scholars working in human-animal studies. See, for example, Roscher (2011: 123) and Steinbrecher (2012: 21–22), the latter of whom writes that "auch nicht-intentionales Handeln (oder die Reaktion auf menschliches Handeln) dazu führen kann, Geschichte in die eine oder andere Richtung zu beeinflussen und damit auch zu verändern" (Steinbrecher 2012: 22) and also notes that "Tiere sind lebendige, von der Geschichte veränderte Wesen, die selbst wiederum Geschichte verändern" (Steinbrecher 2012: 29). See also Borgards (2012: 103–105), Krüger, Steinbrecher & Wischermann (2014: 12–15, 30–33) and Steinbrecher (2016: 7–8, 9–10, 12–13).

qualification that these anecdotes can be seen as antecedents of proper biographies.[100] As such, they are more than ordinary digressions serving as a humorous or quirky interruption of the main narrative and contributing for the most part to the entertainment of the reader. Such a notion is especially valid for Ovid's poem which, though connected to other elegies of the corpus of the *Amores*, may be read as an independent literary piece.

What matters in all cases is the interaction between animals and humans. The ancient narratives about the lives of animals considered here have in common that they often shed light on the humans with whom these animals are in direct contact. These interactions may illustrate their character, behaviour and moral convictions. Without those humans, the stories of the animals' lives would be incomplete. But this is also true for the humans: their animals are an essential part of their own 'biography'. Among other things, it is this mutual dependency that makes it difficult to speak of autonomous animal biographies in the context of Graeco-Roman literature.[101]

Bibliography

Editions, translations and commentaries

Ash, Harrison Boyd, Edward S. Forster & Edward H. Heffner (eds.) (1941–1955): *Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella: On Agriculture* (Loeb Classical Library 361, 407 & 408), Cambridge, Mass. & London (vol. 2 & 3 revised and reprinted in 1968).

Brunt, Peter A. (1976–1983): *Arrian: Anabasis of Alexander – Indica*. With an English translation (Loeb Classical Library 236 & 269), Cambridge, Mass. & London.

Duff, J. Wight & Arnold M. Duff (eds.) (1934): *Minor Latin Poets* (Loeb Classical Library 284 & 434), Cambridge, Mass. & London.

100 On anecdotes and episodes as antecedents of ancient biography, see Wehrli (1973). On "biographische Kleinformen" more generally, see Richter & Hamacher (2009).

101 Drafts of this paper were presented at the University of Kassel (March 2016), the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (NIAS) in Wassenaar (April 2016), the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (June 2016), and the University of Cologne (November 2016). I would like to thank the members of the audiences, but also Stephen Newmyer and Edmund Thomas for their valuable comments and suggestions. The generous funding for my research was provided by the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen) where I held a Senior Research Fellowship from September 2015 until June 2016. I am extremely grateful to NIAS staff for their kind support, in particular to the librarians Dindy van Maanen and Erwin Nolet.

Geist, Hieronymus (²1976): *Römische Grabinschriften*. Gesammelt und ins Deutsche übertragen von Hieronymus Geist, betreut von Gerhard Pfohl, München.
Hanson, J. Arthur (1989–1996): *Apuleius: Metamorphoses* (Loeb Classical Library 44 & 453), Cambridge, Mass. & London.
L'Allier, Louis (2009): *Arrien & Oppien d'Apamée: L'art de la chasse – Cynégétiques*. Introduction, traduction et notes, Paris.
Mair, Alexander W. (ed.) (1928): *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus*. With an English translation (Loeb Classical Library 219), Cambridge, Mass. & London.
Murray, Arthur T. & George E. Dimock (1919): *Homer: Odyssey*. Vol. 2: *Books 13–24*. Translated by Arthur T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock (Loeb Classical Library 105), Cambridge, Mass. & London.
Pelling, Christopher (2011): *Plutarch: Caesar*. Translated with an introduction and commentary, Oxford.
Perrin, Bernadotte (1919): *Plutarch: Lives*. Vol. 7: *Demosthenes and Cicero. Alexander and Caesar* (Loeb Classical Library 99), Cambridge, Mass. & London.
Phillips, Adrian A. & Malcolm M. Willcock (1999): *Xenophon & Arrian: On Hunting*. Edited with an introduction, translation and commentary, Warminster.
Scholfield, Alwyn F. (1958–1959): *Aelian: On the Characteristics of Animals*. With an English translation (Loeb Classical Library 446, 448 & 449), Cambridge, Mass. & London.

Secondary literature

Ackermann-Arlt, Beate (1990): *Das Pferd und seine epische Funktion im mittelhochdeutschen ‚Prosa-Lancelot'*, Berlin & New York.
Amat, Jacqueline (2002): *Les animaux familiers dans la Rome antique*, Paris.
Anderson, Andrew R. (1930): Bucephalas and his legend. In: *American Journal of Philology* 51, 1–21.
Antikas, Theo & Thomas Alifakiotis (2002): Was the burial of Bucephalas for real? Recent finds of horse burials in King Philip's tomb at the Great Tumulus of Aigai, Greece. In: Keith Dobney & Terry O'Connor (eds.), *Bones and the Man. Studies in Honour of Don Brothwell*, Oxford, 72–78.
Aymard, Jacques (1951): *Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins (Cynegetica)*, Paris.
Baecker, Elmar (1884): *De canum nominibus Graecis*, Diss. Königsberg.
Beck, William (1991): Dogs, dwellings, and masters. Ensemble and symbol in the *Odyssey*. In: *Hermes* 119, 158–167.
Birke, Lynda & Jo Hockenhull (2015): Journeys together. Horses and humans in partnership. In: *Society & Animals* 23, 81–100.
Bodson, Liliane (1980): Place et fonctions du chien dans le monde antique. In: *Ethnozootechnie* 25, 13–21.
Bodson, Liliane (1986): L'utilisation de l'âne dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine. In: *Ethnozootechnie* 37, 7–14.
Bodson, Liliane (2000): Motivations for pet-keeping in Ancient Greece and Rome. A preliminary survey. In: Anthony L. Podberscek, Elizabeth S. Paul & James A. Serpell (eds.), *Companion Animals and Us. Exploring the Relationships between People and Pets*, Cambridge, 27–41.

Borgards, Roland (2012): Tiere in der Literatur. Eine methodische Standortbestimmung. In: Herwig Grimm & Carola Otterstedt (eds.), *Das Tier an sich. Disziplinenübergreifende Perspektiven für neue Wege im wissenschaftsbasierten Tierschutz*, Göttingen, 87–118.

Bosworth, Albert B. (1993): Arrian and Rome. The minor works. In: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 34.1, 226–275.

Bradley Keith (2000): Animalizing the slave. The truth of fiction. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 90, 110–125.

Brewer, Douglas, Terence Clark & Adrian Phillips (2001): *Dogs in Antiquity: Anubis to Cerberus. The Origins of the Domestic Dog*, Warminster.

Burliga, Bogdan (2009): The aristocratic aspect of hunting in Arrian's *Cynegeticus*. In: *Fasciculi Archaeologiae Historicae* 22, 35–39.

Calder, Louise (2008): The asses' lot. In: Donna Kurtz (ed.), *Essays in Classical Archaeology for Eleni Hatzivassiliou 1977–2007*, Oxford, 155–164.

Chomel, Claude (1900): *Histoire du cheval dans l'antiquité et son rôle dans la civilisation*, Paris.

Delebecque, Édouard (1951): *Le cheval dans l'Iliade. Suivi d'un lexique du cheval chez Homère et d'un essai sur le cheval pré-homérique*, Paris.

Demandt, Alexander (2009): *Alexander der Große. Leben und Legende*, München.

DeMello, Margo (2013a): Introduction. In: Margo DeMello (ed.), *Speaking for Animals. Animal Autobiographical Writing*, New York & London, 1–14.

DeMello, Margo (ed.) (2013b): *Speaking for Animals. Animal Autobiographical Writing*, New York & London.

Dumont, Jacques (2001): *Les animaux dans l'Antiquité grecque*, Paris.

Edwards, Mark J. & Simon Swain (eds.) (1997): *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, Oxford.

Effe, Bernd (1977): *Dichtung und Lehre. Untersuchungen zur Typologie des antiken Lehrgedichts*, München.

Ehlers, Widu-Wolfgang (ed.) (1998): *La biographie antique* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 44), Vandœuvres & Genève.

Esteve-Forriol, José (1962): *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz*. Diss. München.

Fögen, Thorsten (2007a): Pliny the Elder's animals. Some remarks on the narrative structure of *Nat. hist.* 8–11. In: *Hermes* 135, 184–198.

Fögen, Thorsten (2007b): Antike Zeugnisse zu Kommunikationsformen von Tieren. In: *Antike & Abendland* 53, 39–75.

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

Fögen, Thorsten (2009b): The implications of animal nomenclature in Aelian's *De natura animalium*. In: *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 152, 49–62.

Fögen, Thorsten (2014): Sprache und Kommunikation als Gegenstand der Satiren Juvenals. In: *L'Antiquité Classique* 83, 79–99.

Fögen, Thorsten (2015): *Ars moriendi*. Literarische Portraits von Selbsttötung bei Plinius dem Jüngeren und Tacitus. In: *Antike & Abendland* 61, 21–56.

Fögen, Thorsten (2016a): Technical literature. In: Martin Hose & David Schenker (eds.), *A Companion to Greek Literature*, Malden, Mass. & Oxford, 266–279.

Fögen, Thorsten (2016b): Roman responses to Greek science and scholarship as a cultural and political phenomenon. In: Georgia L. Irby (ed.), *A Companion to Science, Technology and Medicine in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Malden, Mass. & Oxford, 958–972.

Fögen, Thorsten (2016c): *All Creatures Great and Small*. On the roles and functions of animals in Columella's *De re rustica*. In: *Hermes* 144, 321–351.
Fögen, Thorsten (2016d): Review of Steven D. Smith, *Man and Animal in Severan Rome. The Literary Imagination of Claudius Aelianus* (Cambridge 2014). In: *Mnemosyne* 69, 349–355.
Franco, Cristiana (2003): *Senza ritegno. Il cane e la donna nell'immaginario della Grecia antica*, Bologna.
Franco, Cristiana (2014): *Shameless. The Canine and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*, Oakland.
Frangoulidis, Stavros (2001): *Roles and Performances in Apuleius' 'Metamorphoses'*, Stuttgart & Weimar.
Fudge, Erica (2004): Animal lives. In: *History Today* 54.10, 21–26.
Gentili, Bruno & Giovanni Cerri (1983): *Storia e biografia nel pensiero antico*, Roma (English translation: *History and Biography in Ancient Thought*, Amsterdam 1988).
Giebel, Marion (2003): *Tiere in der Antike. Von Fabelwesen, Opfertieren und treuen Begleitern*. Stuttgart.
Goguey, Dominique (2003): *Les animaux dans la mentalité romaine*, Bruxelles.
Graverini, Luca (2007): *Le 'Metamorfosi' di Apuleio. Letteratura e identità*, Ospedaletto (English translation: *Literature and Identity in 'The Golden Ass' of Apuleius*, Columbus, Ohio 2012).
Green, Peter (1992): *Alexander of Macedon. A Historical Biography*, Los Angeles & London.
Gregory, Justina (2007): Donkeys and the equine hierarchy in archaic Greek literature. In: *Classical Journal* 102, 193–212.
Grier, Katherine C. (2014): The material culture of pet keeping. In: Garry Marvin & Susan McHugh (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Human-Animal Studies*, London & New York, 124–138.
Griffith, Mark (2006): Horsepower and donkeywork. Equids and the ancient Greek imagination. In: *Classical Philology* 101, 185–246 and 307–358.
Hägg, Tomas (2012): *The Art of Biography in Antiquity*, Cambridge.
Hainsworth, John Bryan (1961): Odysseus and the dogs. In: *Greece & Rome* 8, 122–125.
Hamilton, James R. (1965): Alexander's early life. In: *Greece & Rome* 12, 117–124.
Hammond, Nicholas G. L. (1993): *Sources for Alexander the Great. An Analysis of Plutarch's 'Life' and Arrian's 'Anabasis Alexandrou'*, Cambridge.
Harrison, Stephen J. (2000): *Apuleius. A Latin Sophist*, Oxford.
Harrison, Stephen J. (2013): *Framing the Ass. Literary Texture in Apuleius' 'Metamorphoses'*, Oxford.
Herrlinger, Gerhard (1930): *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung. Mit einem Anhang byzantinischer, mittellateinischer und neuhochdeutscher Tierepikedien*, Stuttgart.
Higgins, Reynold (1953): Two Campana reliefs. In: *British Museum Quarterly* 18.2, 57–59.
Hindermann, Judith (2011): Zoophilie in Zoologie und Roman. Sex und Liebe zwischen Mensch und Tier bei Plutarch, Plinius dem Älteren, Aelian und Apuleius. In: *Dictynna* 8 (http://dictynna.revues.org/717).
Hölzle, Peter ([2]1990): s.v. "Biographie". In: Günther Schweikle & Irmgard Schweikle (eds.), *Metzler-Literatur-Lexikon. Begriffe und Definitionen*, Stuttgart, 55–56.
Hull, Denison B. (1964): *Hounds and Hunting in Ancient Greece*, Chicago & London.
Keitz, Emil von (1883): *Ueber Tierliebhaberei im Altertume* (Beilage zum Oster-Programm des Königlichen Realprogymnasiums zu Duderstadt 1883), Duderstadt.
Keller, Otto (1909–1913): *Die antike Tierwelt* (2 vols.), Leipzig (repr. Hildesheim 1963).
Kierdorf, Wilhelm (1980): *Laudatio funebris. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede*, Meisenheim am Glan.

Kirichenko, Alexander (2010): *A Comedy of Storytelling. Theatricality and Narrative in Apuleius' 'Golden Ass'*, Heidelberg.

Köhnken, Adolf (2003): Perspektivisches Erzählen im homerischen Epos. Die Wiedererkennung Odysseus–Argos. In: *Hermes* 131, 385–396.

Körner, Otto ([2]1930): *Die homerische Tierwelt*, München (first ed. Berlin 1880).

Korhonen, Tua (2012): On human-animal sexual relationships in Aelian's *De natura animalium*. In: *Arctos* 46, 65–77.

Krüger, Gesine, Aline Steinbrecher & Clemens Wischermann (2014): *Animate History*. Zugänge und Konzepte einer Geschichte zwischen Menschen und Tieren. In: Gesine Krüger, Aline Steinbrecher & Clemens Wischermann (eds.), *Tiere und Geschichte. Konturen einer 'Animate History'*, Stuttgart, 9–33.

Lilja, Saara (1976): *Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry*, Helsinki.

Lonsdale, Steven H. (1979): Attitudes towards animals in ancient Greece, in: *Greece & Rome* 26, 146–159.

Mainoldi, Carla (1984): *L'image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce ancienne d'Homère à Platon*, Paris.

Marg, Walter (1973): Zur Eigenart der Odyssee. In: *Antike & Abendland* 18, 1–14.

Martin, Thomas R. & Christopher W. Blackwell (2012): *Alexander the Great. The Story of an Ancient Life*, Cambridge.

Mentz, Ferdinand (1933): Die klassischen Hundenamen. In: *Philologus* 88, 104–129, 181–202 and 415–442.

Merlen, René H. A. (1971): *De canibus. Dog and Hound in Antiquity*, London.

Moravcsik, Gyula (1961): Sagen und Legenden über Kaiser Basileios I. In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 15, 59–126.

Most, Glenn W. (1991): Ansichten über einen Hund. Zu einigen Strukturen der Homerrezeption zwischen Antike und Neuzeit. In: *Antike & Abendland* 37, 144–168.

Olck, Franz (1907): s.v. "Esel". In: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* VI.1, Stuttgart, 626–676.

Opelt, Ilona (1966): s.v. "Esel". In: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (vol. 6), Stuttgart, 564–595.

Orth, Ferdinand (1910): *Der Hund im Altertum* (Königlich Preussisches Hennebergisches Gymnasium zu Schleusingen. Beilage zum Berichte für das Schuljahr 1909/1910), Schleusingen.

Pelling, Christopher (2009): Biography. In: George Boys-Stones, Barbara Graziosi & Phiroze Vasunia (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*, Oxford, 608–616.

Perfahl, Jost (ed.) (1983): *Wiedersehen mit Argos und andere Nachrichten über Hunde in der Antike*, Mainz.

Peters, Joris (1998): *Römische Tierhaltung und Tierzucht. Eine Synthese aus archäozoologischer Untersuchung und schriftlich-bildlicher Überlieferung*, Münster.

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

Pycior, Helena M. (2010): Hunde im Weißen Haus. Warren G. Hardings Laddie Boy und Franklin D. Roosevelts Fala. In: Dorothee Brantz & Christof Mauch (eds.), *Tierische Geschichte. Die Beziehung von Mensch und Tier in der Kultur der Moderne*, Paderborn, 79–102.

Rahn, Helmut (1953/54): Tier und Mensch in der homerischen Auffassung der Wirklichkeit. Ein Beitrag zur geisteswissenschaftlichen Selbstkritik. In: *Paideuma. Mitteilungen zur Kulturkunde* 5, 277–297 and 431–480.

Rahn, Helmut (1967): Das Tier in der homerischen Dichtung. In: *Studium generale* 20, 90–105.
Richter, Myriam & Bernd Hamacher (2009): Biographische Kleinformen. In: Christian Klein (ed.), *Handbuch Biographie. Methoden, Traditionen, Theorien*, Stuttgart & Weimar, 137–142.
Robert, Carl (1890): *Die antiken Sarkophag-Reliefs*. Vol. 2: *Mythologische Cyklen*, Berlin.
Rohdich, Hermann (1980): Der Hund Argos und die Anfänge des bürgerlichen Selbstbewußtseins. In: *Antike & Abendland* 26, 33–50.
Roscher, Mieke (2011): Where is the animal in this text? Chancen und Grenzen einer Tiergeschichtsschreibung. In: Chimaira Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies (ed.), *Human-Animal Studies. Über die gesellschaftliche Natur von Mensch-Tier-Verhältnissen*, Bielefeld, 121–150.
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.
Rose, Gilbert P. (1979): Odysseus' barking heart. In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109, 215–230.
Schlam, Carl C. (1992): *The 'Metamorphoses' of Apuleius. On Making an Ass of Oneself*, Chapel Hill & London.
Schnapp-Gourbeillon, Annie (1981): *Lions, héros, masques. Les représentations de l'animal chez Homère*, Paris.
Schneider, Carsten (2000): Herr und Hund auf archaischen Grabstelen. In: *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 115, 1–36.
Smith, Steven D. (2014): *Man and Animal in Severan Rome. The Literary Imagination of Claudius Aelianus*, Cambridge.
Sonnabend, Holger (2002): *Geschichte der antiken Biographie. Von Isokrates bis zur Historia Augusta*, Stuttgart & Weimar.
Stadter, Philip A. (1976): Xenophon in Arrian's *Cynegeticus*. In: *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 17, 157–167.
Stadter, Philip A. (1980): *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill.
Stadter, Philip A. (2007): Biography and history. In: John Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (vol. 2), Malden, Mass. & Oxford, 528–540.
Steinbrecher, Aline (2012): Auf Spurensuche. Die Geschichtswissenschaft und ihre Auseinandersetzung mit den Tieren. In: *Westfälische Forschungen* 62, 9–29.
Steinbrecher, Aline (2016): Tiere und Geschichte. In: Roland Borgards (ed.), *Tiere. Kulturwissenschaftliches Handbuch*, Stuttgart, 7–16.
Swain, Simon (1997): Biography and biographic in the literature of the Roman Empire. In: Mark J. Edwards & Simon Swain (eds.), *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1–37.
Syme, Ronald (1982): The career of Arrian. In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86, 181–211.
Tatum, James (1979): *Apuleius and 'The Golden Ass'*, Ithaca & London.
Tilg, Stefan (2014): *Apuleius' 'Metamorphoses'. A Study in Roman Fiction*, Oxford.
Tilg, Stefan (2015): Lucius as ass (*Metamorphoses* Books 3–11). In: Stephen J. Harrison (ed.), *Characterisation in Apuleius' 'Metamorphoses'. Nine Studies*, Newcastle upon Tyne, 15–28.
Tonnet, Henry (1988): *Recherches sur Arrien, sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes* (2 vols.), Amsterdam.

Toynbee, Jocelyn M. C. (1973): *Animals in Roman Life and Art*, London.
Ullrich, Jessica, Friedrich Weltzien & Heike Fuhlbrügge (2008a): 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.
Ullrich, Jessica, Friedrich Weltzien & Heike Fuhlbrügge (eds.) (2008b): *Ich, das Tier. Tiere als Persönlichkeiten in der Kulturgeschichte*, Berlin.
Walsh, Patrick G. (1970): *The Roman Novel. The 'Satyricon' of Petronius and the 'Metamorphoses' of Apuleius*, Cambridge.
Wehrli, Fritz (1973): Gnome, Anekdote und Biographie. In: *Museum Helveticum* 30, 193–208.
Wernicke, Konrad (1895): s.v. "Argos 27". In: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* II.1, Stuttgart, 796–798.
Williams, Craig A. (2013): When a dolphin loves a boy. Some Greco-Roman and native American love stories. In: *Classical Antiquity* 32, 200–242.
Winkler, John J. (1985): *Auctor & Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius's 'Golden Ass'*, Berkeley.
Wirshbo, Eliot (1983): The Argus scene in the *Odyssey*. In: *Classical Bulletin* 59, 12–15.
Wischermann, Clemens (2014): Tiere und Gesellschaft. Menschen und Tiere in sozialen Nahbeziehungen. In: Gesine Krüger, Aline Steinbrecher & Clemens Wischermann (eds.), *Tiere und Geschichte. Konturen einer 'Animate History'*, Stuttgart, 105–126.
Zaganiaris, Nicolas J. (1980/81): Le chien dans la mythologie et la littérature gréco-latines. In: *Platon* 32/33, 52–85.

Illustrations

Figure 1: André Castaigne (1861–1929), *The Taming of Bucephalus* (1888/89)
© Wikimedia (public domain)

Figure 2: François Schommer (1850–1935),
Alexandre le Grand domptant Bucéphale (c. 1900)
© Wikimedia (public domain)