

Constantine and Lee discusses the opposite side and the often uneasy relation of Christianity with the other religions.

Section III deals with “Bureaucracy and Government” (by Christopher Kelly, pp. 183–204); “Civil Law and Social Life” (by Caroline Humfress, 205–225); “Economy and Society” (by George Depeyrot, pp. 226–254). Kelly stresses the importance of Constantine’s administrative reforms, which were to have an impact on Roman governance for a century to come. In contrast, Humfress points out Constantine’s conservative stance on civil legislation. Depeyrot sums up Constantine’s efforts to keep the failing economy afloat.

Section IV consists of chapters on “Perspective in Art” (by Jaś Elsner, pp. 255–277); “Architecture of Empire” (by Mark J. Johnson, pp. 278–297); “Constantine in Legendary Literature” (by Samuel N. C. Lieu, pp. 298–324). Elsner discusses briefly the artistic developments of the period and the problems of labeling late antique art as art in decline, as has been done for the past centuries. There is some relief for Elsner’s lament concerning the absence of a late antique corpus of private portraiture: Martin Kovacs’ *Kaiser, Senatoren und Gelehrte: Untersuchungen zum spätantiken männlichen Privatporträt* (Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag 2014, reviewed in this volume), and, of course, the LSA-database based in Oxford. Johnson lists the most important examples of Constantine’s imperial building program, emphasizing that Constantine did build what he was supposed to have built. However, during this period there was probably more architectural innovation than Johnson lets us believe. Lieu concludes the section with a discussion of Constantine in legendary literature, such as the Sylvester Legend, the Donation of Constantine and the Conversion of Helena.

Section V includes “Warfare and the military” (by Hugh Elton, pp. 325–348); “Constantine and the Northern barbarians” (by Michael Kulikowski, pp. 347–376); “Constantine and the Peoples of the Eastern Frontier” (by Elizabeth Fowden, pp. 377–398).

This volume was published at about the same time as Jonathan Bardill’s *Constantine, Divine Emperor of the Christian Golden Age* (Cambridge University Press, New York 2012. See review: *Arctos* Vol. 51, 2017). Together these two volumes, especially because they contradict each other in some details, give a comprehensive picture of Constantine and his reign in its proper context. However, this volume seems to be aimed mainly to Anglophone readers and the otherwise very good “Further Reading” sections accordingly do not offer more advanced students capable of reading languages other than English the possibility of becoming acquainted with up-to-date research literature in Italian, German and French.

*Juhana Heikonen*

*Interactions between animals and humans in Graeco-Roman antiquity*. Edited by THORSTEN FÖGEN – EDMUND THOMAS. De Gruyter, Berlin 2017. ISBN 978-3-11-054416-9. VIII, 498 pp. EUR 129.95 (hc).

This conference *acta* – the conference was held at Durham University (UK) 20–25 June 2015 – includes guest lectures held at the same university in the same year. The volume can be seen as a good supplement to the Oxford handbook on animals in antiquity edited by Steven Campbell in 2014, containing many of the same writers.

The Introduction (pp. 1–18) gives among other examples the now famous “pig epitaph” from Edessa, first presented in 1969. The stele is enigmatic both because of its textual and visual aspects but also because its interpretation has not reached any consensus yet. Questions like whether it is about a pig or a freed slave, or how sincere as an animal epitaph the text is, are not raised by the editors (they are also convinced that the other animal in the relief is a pig). One may wonder how the pig stele from Edessa, then, illuminates the concept of interaction? And what is interaction? Is the term chosen because it is a loose enough one to approach complicated human-animal issues? Human and non-human animal interaction can be many things, like reciprocal action (e.g. humans and non-humans working together), encountering, communication and affects. Fögen and Thomas see interaction from a broad, non-theoretical point of view: “the ways in which humans and animals came together in the societies” (p. 5), “animals and humans interconnected on a variety of different levels” (p. 7).

One footnote (p. 6n7, see also p. 90n3) presents the basic studies on animals in antiquity from the point of view of Human-Animal Studies (HAS). The list also contains valuable research in German, including the first German textbook of HAS. I would like to add the article by one of the contributors of this volume, namely Christiana Franco’s “Appendix: Reflections on Theory and Method in Studying Animals in the Ancient World” in her *Shameless: The Canine and Feminine in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley [US], 2014), not only because it gives some important treatises published in Italian, but because it reports the writer’s progress from the one interested in animals in antiquity to a researcher focusing on the human-animal interaction – the core of Human-Animal Studies.

The articles, 16 in all, with contributions also by the editors, are not ordered under sections. If we think about the distinction between ‘literature’ and ‘life’, which dominates the *Oxford Handbook*, there are in this volume more papers in the first category, with the emphasis on Greek writers. The volume begins, emphatically, with a paper belonging to the ‘life’ category: “A Lifetime Together? Temporal Perspectives on Animal-Human Interactions” by Sian Lewis (pp. 19–37). Lewis discusses the converging life expectancies of humans and domesticated animals, questioning how the human-animal bond between man and his dog, or cow, would change if their lives were equal in length? At a time when the life expectancy of ordinary people was around 40, this was not much more than a well-kept horse’s life. In general, domesticated animals lived longer than in our age of agribusiness (cf. p. 23 and *Ar. Hist. an.* 6.18.573b15–7).

Natural philosophies approaching the *mirabilia* genre (e.g., Antigonus, Pliny, Aelian) are one of the sources for scholars intrigued by Graeco-Roman attitudes – often quite anthropocentric – to animals. In his “Psychological, cognitive and philosophical aspects of animal ‘envy’ towards humans in Theophrastus and beyond” (pp. 159–182), Arnaud Zucker presents the peculiar concept of φθόνος (begrudging or “begrudging refusal” [p. 161]), which appears in stories on the use of animal parts for medical or technological purposes. Theophrastus’ *περὶ τῶν λεγομένων ζῴων φθονεῖν* (*apud* Photius) mentions the popular example of the stag burying his horn in order that humans could not use it as an antidote. Zucker points out that, although, for Theophrastus, the phenomenon raises questions about rational intentionality in non-human animals, the main concern for the follower of the great zoologist, Aristotle, as the leader of the Peripatetic school, was to question human ability to read animal conduct. The idea that φθόνος cannot be an intraspecies emotion (between human and non-human) is implied in Aristotle’s elaborate discussion on this emotion, claiming that it

could be felt only towards “those like ourselves” in his *Rhetoric* (Book II, chapter 11). Zucker refers to the chapter in a footnote but only incompletely (as *Rhet.* 1387b25, p. 173n30).

Kenneth F. Kitchell’s critique with his concept ‘animal literacy’ does not point so much to the fact that classicists, among other interpreters of the past, are often blind to animal agencies in their material. We are all deficient in our ‘animal literacy’ because we – quite obviously – do not comprehend the scope of connotations around the representations of different species in different cultures (“‘Animal literacy’ and the Greeks: Philoctetes the hedgehog and Dolon the weasel”, pp. 183–204). Of his two examples, Philoctetes’ ‘animality’ has, however, been discussed by many scholars lately. Kitchell points out that Sophocles describes Philoctetes’ cave having two openings (*Phil.* 15–9) – like a hedgehog burrow reported by Aristotle and Theophrastus (p. 191–2, cf. *Arist. Hist. anim.* 8.6. 612b1–9, *Theophr. De sign.* 30). However, instead of a small, invertebrate-eating hedgehog, Philoctetes is clearly more like a large predator in Lemnos, capable of supporting himself with his divine bow; he is also proud of his survival, which reflects his heroism (*Phil.* 299). Kitchell’s other example, Dolon’s weasel cap (cf. *Hom. Il.* 10.333–5), is more convincing; Dolon wearing a wolf skin and a weasel cap indicates his ambushing “method”: he sneaks up like a wolf and then intends to kill his sleeping prey like a weasel (Kitchell gives a reference to *Nic. Ther.* 196 of the weasel in the henhouse).

This interpretation does not, of course, exhaust the meaning of why warriors wore animal skins. Alastair Harden also treats the issue in his “‘Wild men’ and animal skins in Archaic Greek imagery” (pp. 370–388) by noting the changing semantics from positive – animal skins lending the strength and fierceness of predators to upper-class warriors – to pejorative, when animal skins had begun to be associated with rustic and ignorant shepherds, ‘wild men’ as Harden calls the group. However, were not shepherds part of their community, although on its margins? To think of them as ‘wild’ seems inappropriate. Irrespective of this, the semantic change reflects the change in attitudes to people living in the vicinity of animals.

Mario Vespa concentrates on the question of why Galen, who largely used monkeys in his animal experiments (yes, also vivisections) did not seem to use them in his medical shows on, e.g., functions of voice. These shows were targeted to a larger audience than his colleagues (“Why avoid a monkey: The refusal of interaction in Galen’s *Epideixis*”, pp. 409–434). Vespa analyses the suggested answers: the socio-economic (pigs are cheaper to use than exotic monkeys), the functional (pigs cry are louder than monkeys), and the emotional hypothesis (monkeys are too human-like). Vespa discusses properly, however, only the first two before offering his “emic” hypothesis, namely that monkeys were thought not only to be ugly and mischievous but also creatures of ill omen. They were conceived as ambiguous creatures like eunuchs and *kinaidoi*, which was the reason for the euphemistic term *καλλιίας* instead of *πίθηκος* in certain contexts. All in all, the emic hypothesis could be part of the picture. Yet, why cannot the adjective *εἰδεχθής* (‘hideous, of hateful look’), as an attribute for an anatomical show including monkeys (*Gal. Anat. adm.* 8.8, p. 416), refer to the fact that it is ghastly – at least for non-professionals – to witness primates struggle for their life, e.g. using their human-like hands for defence? Romans were used to seeing pigs killed in sacrificial scenes, but monkeys were not sacrificial animals. Or is this kind of attitude a token of modern sensitivity, which was quite alien to the people admiring animal killing in the *venationes*?

Another paper on Galen, “Galen on the relationship between human beings and fish” (pp. 389–408) by John Wilkins, concentrates on Galen’s ideas on edible fish, especially those which are

“good to eat”, supposedly good for the equilibrium of the human body. Interestingly, Galen takes note of the correlation between the environment of fish and their nutritive value. However, Wilkins begins his paper with oddly human-centred claims by stating that eating non-human animals is also extending our knowledge about them, and that films and animal cartoons (like Mickey Mouse) are ways of “bringing animals closer” to humans (p. 392). As a contribution to the ever-present problem of how extensively fish was part of the diet of Greeks and Romans, Wilkins mentions the United Kingdom, where people prefer eating pork to eating fish (like ancient Romans) despite the proximity of the sea.

Stephen T. Newmyer, an expert on Plutarch and animals, presents in his “Human-animal interactions in Plutarch as commentary on human moral failings” (pp. 233–252) the stimulating notion – introduced by David Larmour – that the method of *syncrisis* (“compare and contrast”) was in use not only in Plutarch’s biographies but to a certain extent also in his treatises on animals. While presenting his subject, Newmyer gives in a footnote the valuable contributions of Italian and French scholars on Plutarch and animals (p. 238n6). Besides *De sollertia* and *Gryllus*, Newmyer analyses *The Dinner of Seven Wise Men*. Plutarch, however, wrote so much (and, fortunately, so much is preserved) that while reading Plutarch’s oeuvre one often comes across passages (e.g., *Mor.* 493a, *Mor.* 98b–c, *Mor.* 91c–d) that seem to contradict the views on animal intelligence and moral capacities presented in these well-known animal treatises. These short passages seem to reflect the common worldview of the human-animal divide and the self-evident superiority of humans over animals, which Plutarch more or less criticized in his animal treatises.

Old comedy contains fruitful material for considering ‘animality’ in literature. Sarah Miles’ paper (“Cultured animals and wild humans? Talking with the animals in Aristophanes’ *Wasps*” [pp. 205–232]) argues, quite convincingly, that the *Wasps* is, in fact, the most pervasive Aristophanic comedy considering the blurring of the human-animal divide (e.g. Philocleon’s near transformations into different animals while trying to escape his home, as well as an animal trial with a speaking dog). Miles notes how the chorus of jurors proceeds from the mere simile (jurors are *like* aggressive wasps), to metaphor, and even to “metamorphosis concerning the identity, behaviour and characterization” of the chorus (p. 219). Although Miles seems to see the animalization of human and culture as opposite notions, she stresses the “multifaceted human-animal identity” of Philocleon (p. 223). The animal Philocleon is most often compared with is a donkey and it is thought-provoking that it is also done in an endearing way (*Vesp.* 1305–6, donkeys as exuberant and life-enjoying living beings).

Instead, Thomas Fögen’s example of the donkey’s life in antiquity introduces merely instrumental attitudes to this work animal. His article (“Lives in interaction: Animal ‘biographies’ in Graeco-Roman literature?” pp. 89–138) considers how far we can speak of animal biographies in the ancient context where references to living animals are usually scarce and human-centred. Except for Alexander the Great’s horse, Bucephalus, Fögen presents fictional or semi-fictional animal lives (e.g., Arrian’s dog Horme in the *Cynegeticus*, which is, by the way, one of the most lively descriptions of dog behaviour in the entirety of ancient literature) concluding with Apuleius’ Lucius in the *Golden Ass*, which has attracted considerable attention recently – overshadowing once again the pseudo-Lucian Greek version of the story. Fögen’s observations make stimulating reading but the article could have benefitted from a cross-cultural overview of the beginning of animal biographies as a literary genre in the 19th-century literature (*Black Beauty* and others).

The story of Lucius the donkey has the Milesian erotic tales about sexual intercourse between a woman and a donkey as one of its roots. Christiana Franco's article "Greek and Latin words for human-animal bonds: Metaphors and taboos" (pp. 39–60) ranges over even this aspect although her concept of "interspecies love" is non-erotic as well. Her focus is on vocabulary, and she concludes that a "specific vocabulary" is lacking for the spectrum of human-animal bonds in Western cultures in general (p. 57). That is, we seem not to have special words for our affections towards animals – not even today when it is customary for people to invest intensive emotions in their pets. (NB: I missed Steven D. Smith's article published in *Erôs in Ancient Greece* [Oxford 2013] in Franco's bibliography.)

Pet (or personal companion) animals are in the focus in two papers. "Philosopher's pets: Porphyry's partridge and Augustine's dog" (pp. 139–157) by Gillian Clark, the English translator of Porphyrius' *De abstinentia*, focuses not only on these two philosophers (although one may perhaps ask whether Augustine is a philosopher), but also discusses briefly the power of Christian holy men over wild animals they encountered. As is well known, Porphyrius' work is a basic reading for understanding the opinions about animal intelligence in antiquity. Augustine's opinion of the subject is surely opposite to Porphyrius. His city of God is not for non-rational beings, and the Church Father is convinced that animals do not possess any reason. However, Augustine surprisingly sees the difference of (verbal) languages as such a great hindrance for communication between humans that a person would, in his view, prefer the company of a dog to a foreigner because of the language barrier (*De civ.* 19.7, p. 150). In her "Pet and image in the Greek world: The use of domesticated animals in human interaction" (pp. 61–88), Louise Calder presents many already familiar passages on ancient pet-keeping and its possible unique features, such as pets as erotic gifts or means of communication (reminding me of the enigmatic scene in Dostoyevsky's *The Idiot*, when Aglaya sends a hedgehog to prince Myshkin). As in her *Cruelty and Sentimentality* (2011), Calder refers convincingly to iconographical material as evidence.

Iconography – namely images of *Tierkampfszenen* during the Archaic period – is Claudia Beier's special object of analysis ("Fighting animals: An analysis of the intersections between human self and animal otherness on Attic vases", pp. 275–304). Beginning with a paraphrase of Jacques Derrida ("there is diversity not just within human identities, but also otherness", p. 275), Beier analyses physical appearance, body postures and physical contact, creating a fresh approach to looking at non-human animals in this material. One conclusion is that there is less corporeal "boundary integrity" in animal representations.

Two papers discuss Near Eastern cultures. In his "Fish or man, Babylonian or Greek? Oannes between cultures" (pp. 253–274), Jeremy McInerney ponders the reception of the Babylonian fish-man divinity Apkallu, which Berossus, a Babylonian, translated into Greek with the name Oannes in his *Babyloniaca*. McInerney's interest lies in how the Greeks possibly understood this god and culture hero instructing mankind. Another paper going beyond the confines of the Graeco-Roman cultures is Lloyd Lewellyn-Jones' "Keeping and displaying royal tribute animals in ancient Persia and the Near East" (pp. 305–338). The article would have benefitted from elaborating what the difference between gift and tribute is. (Do tribute animals indicate a special homage paid to *the receiver*?) Lewellyn-Jones discusses the acquisition of and caring for these kinds of display animals and ponders the suitability of the term 'zoo' or 'menagerie' in this context. Because of the scarcity of textual material, Lewellyn-Jones uses a cross-cultural method by quoting the account of "zoo" in

imperial China by an official of the court during the 17th century. Lewellyn-Jones also argues that the lions' den in the Book of Daniel (6:16–17) is in fact a sunken pen for lions kept by Persian kings (pp. 327–328).

Edmund Thomas, the other editor, also uses the cross-cultural approach successfully in his “Urban geographies of human-animal relations in classical antiquity” (pp. 339–368) by presenting the painting of one Italian 19th-century artist on street-life in Rome. Thomas concentrates on Roman material which may be one reason why, when referring to Emperor Julian's passage on too much independence or freedom of donkeys and other pack animals in the streets of Antioch (*Mis.* 26.355b–c, p. 344), he fails to refer to the similar passage in Plato (*Resp.* 8.563c). That both Plato and Julian most certainly had a moral purpose for their sketch of urban life casts doubt on how useful the description is as evidence of everyday life in the ancient past. Thomas employs Jennifer Wolch's term *zoopolis* (used by her already in 1996, and later as the title of the influential book by Will Kymlicka and Sue Danielson in 2011) for discussing the possibilities of cohabitation of different species in urban spaces and societies.

At the end, Fögen's bibliography on studies of animals in antiquity, thus far available on the Internet and a valuable help for beginners, has been elaborated, enlarged and divided into sections for this volume (pp. 435–474). Besides *Index nominum (personarum sive animalium)* (pp. 486–8 thus also including names of non-humans, like the ox named Aiolos), the volume contains an *Index animalium*. This is a successful decision, as one does not need to search for names of animal species among things (*Index rerum*).

Tua Korhonen

HENNING WIRTH: *Die linke Hand: Wahrnehmung und Bewertung in der griechischen und römischen Antike*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2010. ISBN 978-3-515-09449-8. 271 S., 12 Taf. EUR 51.

Every now and then, ancient historians are tempted to study quite specific phenomena that must have undoubtedly existed in the past, but are regrettably overlooked in historical studies. Such books have turned their attention to, e.g., dwarfs, twins, or prostheses [V. Dasen, *Dwarfs in Ancient Egypt and Greece* (Oxford, 1993); V. Dasen, *Jumeaux, jumelles dans l'Antiquité grecque et romaine* (Zürich, 2005); J. Draycott (ed.), *Prostheses in Antiquity* (London, New York, 2018) to name only three noteworthy examples]. Monographs on these topics have been a great success, due to the effective combination of insights from literary evidence, epigraphy, papyrology and the archaeological/iconographical records. They prove that, above all, an ancient historian should be a jack-of-all-trades: out of the sometimes very fragmentary pieces of evidence, he manages to build up a mosaic that offers a sketch of daily life and the thoughts/views of the Greeks and Romans.

Wirth's study undoubtedly fits into this tradition, and shares all the merits of the studies referred to above. Though it is not explicitly stated, the author inscribes himself in the French approach of *histoire des mentalités* and the late French historian Michel Vovelle (1933–2018). After a thorough analysis of Greek and Latin terminology, vocabulary, and semantic fields denoting ‘the left side’ and left-handedness (p. 13–48), Wirth continues with a study of the concept in biology, religion, divination, and the army/thoughts about strategy (p. 49–112). He goes on with the level of