

ἀνάγκης ζεύγματ' ἐμπεπτώκαμεν:
Greek tragedy between human and animal

CHIARA THUMIGER (UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON)

ABSTRACT: This article examines references to the animal world and animal imagery in Greek tragedy in the light of ancient ideas on animals. Many scholars have explored how, at the time of tragedy, animals and humans appeared to share a range of emotions and qualities much wider than modern Western audiences tend to afford. As a consequence, I propose, much of animal imagery in ancient literature would benefit from being interpreted on the basis of such similarities and analogies, rather than as decoration or as a conventional device. On these premises, I explore how a ‘middle ground’ between animal and human is established in tragedy, in various ways: through the usage of generic terms for animal with reference to humans; through the motif of animals feeding on human cadavers; and through instances in which feelings are animalised, and the affected subject is represented as an animal. Finally, I analyse the motif of the ‘yoke’ as image of burden and partnership, an instance that joins together humans and animals in the face of crisis and necessity.

In the present study I focus on animals and animal imagery in the genre of tragedy.¹ This field has been comparatively under-explored: there are studies on animal similes in Homer, or on most notable clusters of imagery in tragedy, such as the lion in the *Oresteia*. Comprehensive attention has not been paid, however, to the presence of animals in the genre of tragedy as a whole.² Greek tragedy

¹ I would like to thank the Leeds International Classics Seminar for inviting me to give a version of this paper in May 2008. The feedback I received on that day and the ideas discussed in other presentations on the topic of ‘humans and other animals in the ancient world’ helped me greatly to improve this article. In particular, I would like to thank Malcolm Heath for his extremely helpful comments on several aspects of the final draft—even though any remaining flaw, of course, is my own responsibility.

² Many works have contributed to the study of ancient animals in the past fifty years. Much has been published, from the point of view of myths and folklore (see Lonsdale 1979 for a review of animals in myth; Cingano *et al.* 2005 for a varied collection on animals in ancient life, myth and culture); in connection with religion and sacrifice (see Burkert’s biologist approach in *Homo Necans*, 1983; Bremmer 1996 on sacrifice and sacrificial animals, especially 274-9 for an engagement with Burkert’s concept of human *Angst* in killing animals); from a literary perspective, focusing on animal imagery in specific genres (e.g. Knox 1952 on lion imagery in the *Oresteia*, and likewise more recently Heath (1999); Rose (1979) on the patterns of dog imagery in the *Odyssey*; Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1981) on animals in Homer; Lonsdale (1990) on herding and hunting similes in the *Iliad*; Clarke (1995) on lion and man as qualifying the hero in the *Iliad*; Furlanetto (2005) on the prophetic connection between animals and language; Lelli (2006) 16-17, 41-8, 75-85, 120 on animal proverbs in Greek poetry, especially comedy, and on the genre-related specialisation of ‘high’ animals, like lions and horses, and ‘low’ animals, like insects; Sifakis (1971) and Rothwell (2007) on animal choruses in comedy); on animal terminology, with reference to specific categories (Thompson 1936 and Arnott 2007 on birds, Davies and

seems to be an especially suitable object of inquiry for a study of animal imagery, as it allows an analysis in relation to a genre, first of all, whose conventions we know sufficiently well; moreover, in tragedy the presence of animals is arguably made more significant than elsewhere by the nature of the medium, a self-contained text of such length as to allow complex developments in patterns of imagery, sustained metaphors and interactions between ‘literal’ animals (actual animals reportedly acting within a play) and ‘figurative’ animals (animals in imagery of various kind).

My main thesis is that animals in tragedy are more than a mere decoration or an element of the world, of ‘reference’ ancillary to human experience. On the contrary, both as imagery (e.g., in similes and metaphors) and as part of reference (as ‘literal’ animals) animals participate in the world of the play, impinging on the definition of humanity in a way comparable to no other semantic group—not, for instance, vegetation, or other natural elements such as the stars or the sea, nor features of civilisation or social organisation, such as the nautical, money or the military, to quote only a few verbal clusters associated with tragic idiom.

Kathirithamby 1986 on insects). A further selection of books and articles discusses philosophical issues in relation to man within the realm of living beings: Lloyd (1961, 1970, 1985) on the definition and classification of animals in Greek philosophy up to Aristotle; Pellegrin (1986) on the aims and significance of Aristotle’s classification of animals; Sorabji (1993) on the changing attitude to animals from the pre-Socratics to the Stoics as shaping the modern debate, ultimately creating a community of man which defines itself against animals; Castignone and Lanata (1994) for an edited collection on animals in ancient philosophy; Heath (2005) on the definition of animals from Homer to Plato by virtue of their lack of speech; Gilhus (2006) on late antique developments in attitudes towards animals; Osborne’s (2007) history of humane attitudes towards animals, from a philosophical point of view but strongly arguing for the importance of poetry and storytelling in shaping beliefs. Ancient mythological figures of the ‘human-animal hybrid’ have been interpreted as an expression of how ‘our continuities with, and our differences from, the earth’s other animals are mysterious and profound’ (Dinnerstein 1976, 2, quoted in Gottschall 2001, 279). One might draw the same conclusion from the ‘animal life of early man as a basic feature in the historians of human progress’ (Forbes Irving 1990, 94 n.121). Also interesting are the instances of exotic ‘humans’ that ancient ethnographers and anthropologists reported in remote places, animal-like in their behaviour (Aristotle *NE* 7.5, 1149a9-11) or morphology: see Campbell (2006) 114-6 on Ctesias’ reports on the ‘Dog-heads’, inhabitants of India ‘who have the head of a dog... they speak no language, but bark like dogs, and in this way understand one another’s speech’ (*FGrH* 688F45.37 = Photius *Bibl.* 72, 47a19-22); and Campbell (2006) 129-32 on the ‘Island of the Sun’ and the description of its inhabitants by Iambulus as reported by Diodorus Siculus 2.55-60, similarly displaying a mixture of human and animal characteristics). Gottschall (2001) 278 sees a parallel in such ancient ideas to the Darwinian ‘monkey-man’ (the common ancestor of monkeys and men), which scandalised nineteenth-century audiences. (The evolutionary component is, of course, not shared: against evolutionary readings of ancient theories see Campbell (2006) 26-7, especially on Anaximander.) Developing the project of ‘evolutionary literary criticism’, Gottschall (2001) assesses the duels in the *Iliad* in terms of ‘ritual combat’ and of ‘intra-species sub-lethal animal fighting’, focusing on ‘the tragedy of being a human animal’ in Homer (see also Gottschall and Wilson 2005, vii-xv for a theoretical discussion). The obvious (and acknowledged) risk is of reducing the ‘human’ to a biologically determined pattern of behaviour, rather than enriching the animal in terms of emotional or intellectual faculties. The outcome is liable to be a reductionist representation of animals and humans, possibly unfair to both. A search for interactions between human and animal on the ground of projections, symbols and metaphors appears to be more fruitful.

I will focus on two aspects of how animals have an impact on tragic representation. First of all, in tragedy a middle ground between human and animal rather than a sharp opposition is established. Secondly, animals appear at crucial moments in the plot, signposting crisis, change and inescapable necessity. These two levels of interaction between animals and humans in the text are obviously interconnected, as character and critical moments in the plot are not sharply separable in the tragic text.

The relevance of animals to the representation of man is obviously not exclusive to ancient literature: animals have always been an important part of man's self-definition, across different cultures and historical periods. The development of human culture implies a definition of the boundaries between man and animal, a discussion that is permanently in process. A study of the representation and use of animals in tragedy, therefore, has to take into account these shifting boundaries, and the fact that the animals we are dealing with are, first and foremost, historical constructions.³ Animals in tragedy are *not* the same as those we read about in modern literature, or see around us in the countryside or on television, or enjoy as pets.

Our own view of animals, which is the result of a narrowing of the ancient concept at the expense of their participation both in the human and the divine spheres, has often succeeded in making them disappear entirely from the text, and withdraw into the realm of solely poetic ornament.⁴ The fact that animals in tragic texts (and not only there) tend to be reduced, in the perception of readers and audiences, to a stylistic device and a mere linguistic feature, often ignored in translation or assimilated to non-animal expressions, says much about us as scholars, readers of tragedy and human beings.

A shift in the perception of animals is in fact already reflected in the development of the ancient philosophical debate, which is relevant to the wider history of thought. Even though the viewer of tragedy would not be familiar with the details of such debate, we can assume that the raw material the philosophers used to frame their reflections about animals was the same as the cultural background of the average Athenian theatre-goer.⁵ For our purpose it suffices to summarise here the following developments in ancient ideas about animals:

³ See Baker (1993) on the gap between real animals and animals as construction in the history of *mentalité*.

⁴ See Baker (1993) 8 on this disappearance as a product of what Barthes called *mythologies*, a 'naturalisation' of the historical and the cultural.

⁵ This is diametrically opposed to the status of science today: the language and acquisitions of modern scientific discourse are a constant demystification of the everyday experience. See Lloyd (1985) 246 on the importance of joining 'high' and 'low' knowledge (i.e., philosophical and everyday knowledge) in our scrutiny of early scientific approaches, and Osborne (2007) 11, more radically, arguing that 'poetry and art, rather than science and argument, are the kind of things that can change our sense of which features of the world demand our attention and our love'.

- (1) In the great age of tragedy animals were not opposed to humans as sharply as they are today in terms of intellectual and emotional faculties or of overall import within the realm of beings.⁶ Animals shared with humans a much wider range of emotional affections that most would concede nowadays (with the exception of the personalised emotional projections of modern pet owners, whereby animals appear to share, or respond to the feelings of the concerned human individual, rather than being the source of independent affections and predilections).⁷ The representation in poetic texts is confirmed by the evidence offered by Platonic philosophy, where a dignified view of animals is found. Plato allows animals a degree of *logos* (as the doctrine of *metempsychosis*, the transmigration of the soul from one organism to the other, including human to animal, testifies).⁸ The opposition in Plato is between animals (human and non-human) and plants, or between contrasting elements in the soul,⁹ rather than between humans and other creatures.
- (2) Animals were afforded a connection with the divine through the practices of sacrifice and divination, and as epiphanic form of a god.
- (3) The view of animals as soulless tools to exploit or fictionalised in the closeness between man and pet, still largely characteristic of Western, twenty-first century outlook, is heir to a very specific, and partial development of the rich tradition of thought about animals in antiquity. This philosophical development was marked, as Sorabji explores, by the fading away of the ‘pro-animal’ side of the ancient debate. In particular, our Christian-based view is heir to the Stoic claim that ‘animals and humans are categorically different’.¹⁰

⁶ See Heath’s (2005) work on animals in Homer and tragedy, focusing on speech as qualifier of humanity against animal. For the Greeks, he argues, speech and the logical qualities related to speech are at the core of civilization and political virtues. Lack of speech, on the other hand, characterises animals and their relationship to men. Heath’s conclusion is that, as far as the ancient Greeks were concerned, animals are differentiated from man by the lack of this fundamental social and political skill, the ability to talk, rather than on the basis of features of consciousness, *logos*, and a metaphysical status markedly different from humans.

⁷ See Lonsdale (1990), esp. 133-35 for a list of human emotive states attributed to animals in the *Iliad*; Pinotti (1994) on the promiscuity of man and animals in Plato; Clarke (1995) on the common ground between beasts, especially lions, and warriors in the *Iliad*: the two have ‘analogous cognitive-emotional apparatus’. Gottschall (2001) on the representation of the Homeric hero as modelled on animal behaviour, and Brelich (1958) 278-83, 319; 298; 304-5 on the ‘animal monstrosity’ of the hero; Heath (2005) 45, who argues that the same emotional range of ‘inner forces’ drive man and animals (though he argues for a sharper distinction between man and animals than other readers are inclined to allow, albeit on the grounds of lack of speech); Gilhus (2006) 76.

⁸ See Sorabji (1993) 10-11. Compare *Rep.* 375a-6c, where dog and man (σκύλαξ and φύλαξ) are equated in terms of political virtues.

⁹ See Pinotti (1994) on animal taxonomy in Plato as mirroring the composite nature of the soul, and revealing ‘not a radical difference between human and animal, rather a disquieting ontological proximity’ (104).

¹⁰ Gilhus (2006) 39, and 37-63. On developments in views on animals based on the attribution of *logos*, *doxa*, and ‘perceptual content’ (the ability to receive content from perceptual experiences—visual, auditory, tactile—that conveys a form of contextual knowledge) see Sorabji (1993) 17-29 on Platonic, Aristotelian and Stoic conceptions; Osborne (2007) 63-97, arguing that ‘for both Plato

The modern view of animals as irreducibly ‘other’ from us (still generally held, at least, at a ‘popular’ level, if strongly challenged by the impact of Darwinism), therefore, does not derive from a consistent and univocal ancient conception.¹¹

- (4) If animals were closer to man than they are in our modern outlook, consideration for animals *per se*, as independent creatures, endowed with individual character and ruled by biological principles of their own, seems to be lacking in the fifth century. While modern observers indeed consider animals *per se*, as objects of scientific inquiry, animals in tragedy are reified as ancillary and functional to human existence, only acknowledged by virtue of their usefulness, threat, analogy, significance or opposition to humans. Not only we do not find interest for animals *per se*, independent of man, but we do not even find the Romantic instantiation of animals as ‘individuals’ of the kind presented in modern literature—Emily Dickinson’s bee, for example, or Melville’s malicious whale. In these examples, animals become mere projections, symbols of human drives and expectations. All the same, they are focused on as objects independent from the observer, leading an independent life and pursuing idiosyncratic, non-stereotypical intentions; they are objects that the human subject spies on, or hunts, respectively. Animals in Greek poetry, instead, are never ‘spied on’ by the naturalist or the romantic onlooker, but are integrated among the tools and background features of everyday life or are a direct *figura* for human emotions and experiences which can be deciphered straightforwardly. Although remaining indebted to elements of traditional thought and experience, it was Aristotle who first introduced an empirical approach to animals as *phainomena* to be observed in and of themselves, and judged by their own measure.

and Aristotle conceptual capacities are continuous between humans and other animals’; cf. also 70 n.17 and 73 n.21 for her discussion of Sorabji’s views on perceptual content. See Gilhus (2006) on the devaluation of animals from the reflections of the Stoics, through the definition of Christian identities, to the late antique period. In the process that led from the archaic-classical world to Christianity, she argues, animals passed from being sacralized channels of communication with the divine, endowed with an important proximity to man by virtue of sacrifices and prophetic practices (as well as providing labour and food) to a devaluation and secularisation of animal killing and to the attribution of a status of lower beings to animals (see the classic Burkert 1983 on the original links between hunting and sacrifice, and the basis of equality, respect and guilt on which the relationship between humans and animals in sacrifice are played out; see Bremmer 1996, 274-9 for an updated discussion). This change took place in parallel to the sacralisation of the human body and the emphasis on its purity and chastity that largely characterises Christian ethics. This development, the rejection of animal sacrifice, became a prerogative of Christian cultures not much by virtue of an enlightened compassion towards animals, but of the need to define Christian identities against the pagan tradition and within a newly founded anthropocentrism. Consistent with this is the symbolic construction of animals as ‘others’ to be slaughtered in the arena or ignored, and no longer dignified as offerings for the gods, in the Roman and Christian worlds.

¹¹ For some examples of these ‘roads not taken’, see Gilhus (2006) 41-52 on the ‘pro-animal’ articulation in Platonist thought versus the Stoics, Lanata (1994) on Lucretius’ sympathetic rendition of animals as connected to the Epicurean rejection of a teleologically ordinate cosmos (36-41), and the critique of anthropocentrism in Celsus (*The True Doctrine* 4.23, edited by Lanata 1987, 43-5). These voices remain largely unheard in Western tradition.

The middle ground¹²

In tragic texts generic words for animals, beasts, and reptiles are often used with reference to human beings: most of all θήρ, ‘wild beast/prey’ (e.g. in *Bacchae*, to describe Dionysus and Pentheus, or Polymestor at *Hec.* 1173); κνώδαλον, ‘a monster’ (Aesch. *Su.* 762, the Egyptian men; at *Eu.* 644 the Erinyes); δάκος, a ‘biting animal’ (e.g. *Tro.* 283, Odysseus; at *Ag.* 1232, Clytemnestra); βότον, ‘an animal of pasture’ (to signify Iphigenia, at *Ag.* 1415; Orestes at *Cho.* 753); ἄγρα, ‘prey’ (*Eu.* 148, Orestes; *Sept.* 322, the captured city; *Ba.* 434, the stranger);¹³ θρέμμα, a ‘fed animal’ (in Sophocles’ *Electra* 622, Electra in Clytemnestra’s words; in *Andr.* 261, Andromache; in *IA* 598, the women of Calchis); τετράποδος (Polymestor again, in *Hec.* 1057); σκύμνος, ‘cub’ (at *Andr.* 1170, Neoptolemus; at *Aj.* 987, Ajax’s son)¹⁴ and νεοσσός, ‘young animal’, mostly ‘chick’ (at *Sept.* 503, the Theban citizens protected from the attack of the δρόκων by Artemis; at *Cho.* 256, Orestes and Electra);¹⁵ ἀγέλη, ‘herd’ or ‘pack’ (*Ba.* 1022, the women; *HF* 1276, the dead); λεία, ‘cattle’, ‘prey’, ‘booty’ (at *Tro.* 614, where Andromache’s child is snatched from her like a piece of booty; at *Andr.* 15, where Andromache is herself a prey to the winner). These instances of generic nouns for ‘animal’/‘beast’ used for humans determine the neutral, middle ground between man and animal, the context within which specific pieces of animal imagery are used. This interplay has a distancing effect. When a human being is labelled θρέμμα, or δάκος, or θήρ, the reader is brought to contemplate his or her behaviour, or his or her experience, in an objectified way, in its external output rather than in its (supposed) inner, hidden motivations. Character is summed up and concentrated in the dumb expression of a behaviour, in the objectified reception of his or her action from the outside, rather than in a set of pondered motivations. Animals, paradoxically, serve to objectify the human.

Another stock motif of ancient literature participates in this neutral, middle ground: the recurrent horror at animals (mostly birds and dogs) eating cadavers. The threat of, the fear of, the risk of, or the ultimate experience of being exposed to scavengers is in fact one of the most vivid in human sensibility in tragedy (or indeed epic).¹⁶ Within the generally pervasive presence of animals in the plays this recurring threat is not simply a cliché to describe death and the transitory nature of human life, but assumes a more general significance, sealing that closeness, that grey area between man and animal to which we are no longer used, and that we easily take for a literary feature. The visual and concrete incorporation

¹² See Appendix 1 for a complete list of relevant animal imagery in the extant tragedies.

¹³ See also *Hec.* 881, the Greek women; *Or.* 1346, Hermione; *OC* 950, Antigone and Ismene.

¹⁴ See also *Or.* 1213 and 1493, Hermione; *Hec.* 205, Polyxena.

¹⁵ See also *HF* 72, the children of Heracles; Andromache’s child, at *Andr.* 441 and 505, σῶ πτέρυγι συγκαταβαίνω.

¹⁶ For tragedy, see *Pho.* 1634, 1650; *HF* 568; *Tro.* 450, 600; *Aj.* 830, 1065, 1297; *Ant.* 29, 205, 206, 257, 697, 698, 1017, 1021, 1081, 1082; Aesch. *Su.* 800, 801; *Sept.* 1014, 1020, 1036; Eur. *El.* 897; *Ion* 903, 917, 1494.

of the dead body into that of a beast symbolises in all evidence the risk to which we are always exposed of the reduction of human to animal.¹⁷

The middle ground is also confirmed by the fact that human emotions themselves can be animalised: especially (but not exclusively) in the image of the bird.¹⁸ We find states of violent mental or emotional affection, or even critical experiences represented as winged and feathered, and the subject as ‘flying away’—an exchange that underlines the equation between the animalised subject and the animalised emotional affection.¹⁹ In Aesch. *Su.* 329 pain is a winged bird, ‘varied is human suffering, you could not find two pains with the same feathers’, τὰν πτερόν; at *IT* 571, dreams are winged and untrustworthy, πτηνῶν ὀνείρων.²⁰ In *Sept.* 597 voluble destiny is imagined as a bird, φεῦ τοῦ ξυναλλάσσοντος ὄρνιθος βροτοῖς;²¹ the Erinyes are represented as winged (e.g. *Or.* 276; *IT* 289); likewise, Hades is winged (*Alc.* 262);²² escape and regret are connected to flight (at *Or.* 1593 Menelaus mocks Orestes, ‘you won’t rejoice, unless you have wings to fly away’, ἦν γε μὴ φύγῃς πτεροῖς; at *Ag.* 394, the guilty ‘runs after a bird’s flight’, δικαιοθεῖς, ἐπεὶ διώκει | παῖς ποτανὸν ὄρνιν).²³ οἰστρος, ‘gadfly’ and cognates for madness and distress is also relevant, from the literal instance with reference to Io’s myth (*PV* 566, *IT* 394, Aesch. *Su.*

¹⁷ The motif of cannibalism and teknophagy, akin to that of animals eating cadavers, is relevant here as exposition of a contiguity between human and animal. Forbes Irving (1990) 103 connects this mythological element to incest and familial disorder. This motif is present in the tragedians, and does signpost familial transgressions (the feast of Thyestes, at *Ag.* 1584, 1588, 1242, *Ch.* 1069, *Or.* 1008, Eur. *El.* 10, 613, 719, 773, *IT* 812, engendering the chain of murders within the house of Atreus; the myth of Tereus and Procne at Aesch. *Su.* 62, qualifying the struggle between the Danaids and their cousins, and at *HF* 1021, to contrast Heracles’ unwitting slaughter of his own children).

¹⁸ See Padel (1992) 114-61 for an account of ‘zoology’ and ‘daimonology’, where animal is used to define the human and acts as a daemonic presence ‘invading man at all points’ (150). Padel connects her analysis to the representation of human feeling and experiences as externalised; I prefer to shift the focus on animals as free-standing items alongside man.

¹⁹ Tragic language offers verbs such as τανύρω (‘to turn into a bull’, expressing strong emotions and affections: *Cho.* 275, *Me.* 92), ἐκδρακοντόμοι (for Orestes embracing his doom of revenge, *Ch.* 549); πέτομαι at *Ba.* 214 and 332, with reference to Pentheus’ irascible temper and then derangement (cf. Seaford 2001, 170-71 on line 214 on ‘fluttering nervous excitement’ as one of Pentheus’ experiences which reflect initiation into the Dionysiac mysteries. For initiatory πτόησις, ‘excitement’, Seaford compares Plut. *Mor.* 943c, Arist. Quint. *De Mus.* 3.25, Pl. *Phd.* 108b1, Ar. *Nu.* 319).

²⁰ Relevant here is also the adjective ὁμόπτερος, ‘having the same plumage’ to signify proximity, familiarity or similarity: at *Pho.* 328 Oedipus is ὁμόπτερος, in his grief, to one who sees two horses (his children) leaving the yoke; at *Cho.* 174 the hair of Orestes and Electra are ὁμόπτερος (and likewise at Eur. *El.* 530).

²¹ Likewise, at *HF* 1186, the subject hit by misfortune is ‘winged’, and carried away on wings, οἰχόμεθα πτανοί.

²² Compare *Hi.* 828, where Phaedra ‘flies to Hades’.

²³ Flight is especially relevant to ‘escape choruses’: see also *Hi.* 733, where the chorus wishes they could fly away, a stock expression for grief, fear and regret; similarly, Hermione at *Andr.* 862, ‘I wish I could be a bird [and fly away]’; at *IT* 1141 the chorus long for escape, ἐν νότοις ἄμοις πτέρυγας λήξαιμι θοάζουσα; at *HF* 649-54 the chorus hopes old age would fly away, γῆρας... πτεροῖσι φορέισθω.

307, 541) to metaphorical uses: for fury and mania (*Ba.* 119 and 1229, *Or.* 791, *HF* 862, for lightning and mania, and 1144); for a range of human passions (*Hi.* 1300 and *IA* 775 and 47 for erotic madness; *Tra.* 653 for warlike fury embodied by Ares; *OT* 1318 for Oedipus' sufferings).²⁴

Crisis and necessity

We have seen how various textual instantiations establish a continuity rather than an opposition between man and animal. Within this background, animals can convey emotional experiences and represent human vulnerability, representing the human condition in a moment of crisis, or under the constraints of necessity—not only for the obvious reason that animals are subject to the constriction of human control. Both animals and humans, in fact, are subject to fate. These connection is especially evident in an image which recurs often in tragic idiom and imagery, that of the yoke and yoking. The yoke brings together various suggestions: imposition; burden and doom; partnership; oppression; as well as the division into two parts, related to choice and the importance of balance. The yoke image is applied to duty (at *Aj.* 24, as Odysseus says τῷδ' ὑπεζύγην πόνω, 'I volunteered to undertake this task')²⁵ and necessity, in several instances, often with reference to Agamemnon: at *Ag.* 218-9 we find ἀνάγκας... λέπαδνον, the king's unwelcome decision;²⁶ at *Hec.* 376 the yoke is the burden of misfortune for the Trojan women (αὐχέν' ἐντιθεὶς ζυγῶ). A similar image is found in *Aj.* 123, where the hero is 'yoked to misfortune', συγκατέζευγται, and at *HF* 453 where the yoke is again the burden of misfortune (ἀγόμεθα ζεύγος οὐ καλὸν νεκρῶν). Then, there is a positive side to the yoke, the element of sharing: at *HF* 121 each member of the chorus is ζυγοφόρος, sharing a common burden of longing and grief; at 1403 'yoke of friendship' is the companionship between Heracles and Theseus, ζεύγος γε φίλιον; at *Ag.* 44, the yoke is used of the Atrides, bound together by brotherhood and a common guilt (τιμῆς... ζεύγος), as at *Hel.* 392 (κλεινὸν ζυγόν);²⁷ at *Andr.* 495, the yoke describes the bond between Andromache and her child under a death threat (τόδε σύγκρατον ζεύγος πρὸ δόμων ψήφω θανάτου κατακεκριμένον, 494-6); at *Pho.* 330, Eteocles and Polynices are two horses that Oedipus regrets to have let go (ἀποζυγείσας); in *Or.* 1017, Pylades helps Orestes

²⁴ On οἶστρος see also Davies and Kathirithamby (1986) 162-3.

²⁵ Cf. also *Ag.* 842, where Odysseus is forced to go to Troy against his will (ζευχθείς), likewise at *Phil.* 1025 (κλοπῆ τε κἀνάγκη ζυγείς).

²⁶ See also *IA* 443, where the yoke is again used in connection with Agamemnon's decision (ἀνάγκης ζεύγματ' ἐμπεπτόκαμεν); *Or.* 1330, where Electra and her brother are bound to the yoke of their destiny, to be executed by the will of the city; *Cho.* 795, where Orestes is yoked to his doom (ζυγέντ').

²⁷ For a non-poetic usage of the yoke to indicate a shared task, compare the description of the Spartan army in Thucydides 5.68.3, where the *zeugitai* or 'yoked hoplites' are referred to as fighting 'at first yoke', ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ζυγῶ (which would support the interpretation of the word ζευγίται as 'class of citizens who are yoked together in the phalanx' as opposed to 'owing a yoke of oxen').

like two horses support each other's steps, ποδὶ κηδοσύνῳ παράσειρος.²⁸ The yoke can also apply to a psychological affection, or constraint to which the individual is subject: at *Or.* 45, in his mad attack, Orestes is likened to the horse resisting the yoke. In a similar sense, yoke is applied to anguish and guilt at *Cho.* 1043-4, when Orestes, horrified after the matricide, is comforted by the chorus of maidens: 'do not bind your tongue to the yoke of these grim voices [accusing you]', μηδ' ἐπιζευχθῆς στόμα | φήμη πονηρᾶ. Then, the yoke conveys oppression and constraint: slavery,²⁹ military occupation,³⁰ political repression and power.³¹ Finally, at Aesch. *Su.* 822 the yoke is the pole of the scale held by Zeus that assigns destiny by lot, and also alludes to the decision-making, the reduction from two options to one that Pelasgus has to perform.³²

The yoke and union of two animals thus shows several inseparable facets, which say much about Greek views on human and fate: destiny, companionship and justice as a matter of balance between two sides are inseparable components. The interconnections of these meanings qualify humanity in tragedy, and their combination in moments of crisis is more effective than a description: the tie that binds Agamemnon and Menelaus, for instance, is both fatal constraint and the bond of brotherhood, of common responsibility.

We can safely claim that animals in antiquity prior to Aristotle were considered in a very different way from today in their relationship to man. This difference is barely perceived by the modern reader of tragedy other than the philosopher who has a specific concern with the topic. First, animals were considered as sharing with man a number of emotional experiences; secondly, they were not reified as independent creatures, such as those we observe in modern documentaries, and scientific or fictional narratives. Animals were considered closer to man, and exclusively in connection to their usefulness for practical purposes, for religious and divinatory practices, and for their symbolic significance. This is reflected in the importance that animals play in tragedy to qualify humanity. They are presented in a proximity, rather than in opposition to man, instantiating human experiences and emotions; they signpost moments of crisis; in summary, they offer a paradigm and a counterpoint to the human story. The representation of the animate world that is the result has humans and beasts at

²⁸ Partnership is also evident in the clichés where yoke/yoking means marriage (cf. Eur. *El.* 99; *Pho.* 338; *Me.* 242; *Tro.* 670; *OT* 826).

²⁹ *Ag.* 953, 1071, 1226, with reference to Cassandra; *Se.* 75, 471, 793, the city of Thebes under siege; *Andr.* 301 and *Tro.* 678, the destiny of the defeated Trojans; *Aj.* 944, the destiny of Ajax's son.

³⁰ The occupation of Troy (*Ag.* 529, *Tro.* 600); control over Hellas, and the joining of the two continents under one ruler (*Pe.* 50, 71, 196, 736); finally, the undermined authority of the Persian ruler over his people (*Pe.* 594).

³¹ At *Ag.* 1618, 1640 the repression of dissent in Argos ruled by Aegisthus; at *Pho.* 74, power over Thebes.

³² The visual level of yoke imagery brings all these aspects together. Compare Halliwell's (1986) observations on the crossing between 'three-roads' where Oedipus kills Laius.

the two extremes of the same continuum—with much of human experience dangerously placed in the muddled area in between the two.

Appendix 1: Relevant animals and animal imagery in the extant tragedies

Aeschylus, *Persians*

bee, ἀνθεμουργός (612), σμήνος μελισσῶν (127);
birds, eagle, αἰετός (205), hawk, κίρκος (207);
bovine, βοῦς (611);
fish, [ἀσπαίρουσι χέρσῳ] (977), ἰχθύς (424), θύννος (424);
horse, ἵππος (18, 32, 302);
sheep, μηλοτρόφος (763);
snake, δράκων (81).

Aeschylus, *Seven at Thebes*

animal, generic, ἄγρα (322), θρέμμα (181);
bird, οἰωνός (24, 1020), ὄρνις (26, 597), chick, νεοσσός (503), dove, πέλεια (294);
bovine, ἱππηδόν (328), ταυροκτόνος (276), ταυροσφάγων (43);
dog, κύων (1014);
horse, ἱππικός (61, 245, 475), ἵππος (393, 461), ἵππιος (122, 130);
lion, λέων (53, 291);
sheep, μῆλον (275);
snake, δράκων (291, 381, 503), ὄφιν (495);
wolf, λύκειος (145), λύκος (1036).

Aeschylus, *Suppliants*

animal, generic, βότον (691), θήρ (999), κνώδαλον (264, 762, 1000), swarm, flock, ἔσμός (30, 223, 684, 1034);
bird, οἰωνοπόλος (57), ὄρνις (226, 801), πτερόν (329), πτέρυξ (783), dove, πέλεια (223), hawk, κικλήλατος (62), κίρκος (224), κνώδαλα πτεροῦντα (1000), nightingale, ἀηδών (62), raven, κόραξ (751), vulture, γύψ (796), πτερωτῶν ἀρπαγαῖς (510);
bovine, βουθύτος (706), βοῦς (17, 42, 170, 275, 299, 306, 314, 569), δάμαλις (351), ἱπάς (431), πόρτις (41, 314), ταῦρος (301);
camel, κάμηλος (285);
cattle/flock, ποιμνη (642);
dog, κυνοθρασής (758), κύων (760, 800);
[deserted by] goat, αἰγίλιψ (794);
horse, ἵππος (183);

insect, βοηλάτης μύωψ (306), βουκόλος πτερόεις (557), οἶστρος (307, 541);
snake, δρακονθόμιλος (267), δράκων (511), ἔχιδνα (896), ὄφις (894);
wolf, λύκος (760).

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*

animal, generic, βότον (1169, 1415), δάκος (824, 1232), θήρ (143, 1063);
bird, οἰωνός (113), οἰωνοκτόνος (563), ὄρνις (112, 157, 1316), cock, ἀλέκτωρ (1671), chick, ὀρτάλιχος (54), eagle, αἰετός (137), nightingale, ἀηδών (1145, 1146), raven, κόραξ (1473), swallow, χελιδών (1050), swan, κύκνος (1444), vulture, αἰγυπιός (49), πτέρυξ (52), πτανός κύων (135);
bovine, βοῦς (36, 1125, 1298), ταῦρος (1126);
dog, κύων (3, 607, 896, 967, 1093, 1228);
fish, ἰχθύς (1382);
goat, χίμαιρα (232);
hare, λαγίνη (119), λαγοδαίτης (124);
horse, ἵππος (825), πῶλος (1641);
insect, [ἔνθηρον τρίχα] (562), κώνωψ (892);
lion, λέων (141, 717, 827, 1224, 1259), λέαινα (1258);
sheep, μῆλον (1057, 1416), μηλοφόνος (730), προβατογνώμων (795);
sponge, σπόγγος (1329);
wolf, λύκος (1259).

Aeschylus, *Choephoroi*

animal, generic, βότον (753), δάκος (530), θήρ (998), θήρα (251), κνώδαλον (587, 601), πεδάορος (590);
bird, πτηνός (591), chick, νεοσσός (256, 501), eagle, αἰετός (247, 258);
bovine, ταυρόω (275);
dog, κυνόφρων (621), κύων (446, 924, 1054);
horse, ἵππος (1022);
lamprey, μύραινα (994);
snake, δράκων (527, 1047, 1050), ἐκδρακοντόομαι (549-50), ἔχιδνα (249, 994), ὄφις (928);
wolf, λύκος (421).

Aeschylus, *Eumenides*

animal, generic, ἄγρα (148), βότον (450, 452, 907), θήρ (70, 131, 147), κνώδαλον (644);
bird, ὄρνις (866), πάρορνις (770), φίλορνις (23), cock, ἀλέκτωρ (861);
cattle/flock, ποιμνη (197);
deer/fawn, νεβρός (111, 246);
dog, κύων (132, 246);
hare, λαγώς (26), πτώξ (326);

horse, πῶλος (405);
lion, λέων (193);
pig, χοιροκτόνος (283);
sheep, μῆλον (943);
snake, ὄφις (181).

Aeschylus, *Prometheus Vincit*

animal, generic, δάκος (583), κνώδαλον (462);
ant, μύρμηξ (453);
bird, οἰωνός (280, 286, 395, 488), πτερόν (394), πτέρυξ (126, 129), πτηνός (488),
eagle, αἰετός (1022), hawk, κίρκος (857), dove, πέλεια (857), vulture, γαμψῶνυξ
(488), Ζηνός κύων (803), πτηνός κύων (1022);
bovine, βούκερον (588), βουφόνος (531);
cattle/flock, ποιμνη (653);
horse, ἵππος (466), πῶλος (1010);
insect, οἶστρος (566, 879).

Sophocles, *Ajax*

animal, generic, ἄγρα (64, 93, 297, 407, 880), βότον (145, 231, 324, 453), θήρ
(366);
bird, οἰωνός (830), ὄρνις (1065), πτηνός (168), dove, πέλεια (140), hawk,
αἰγυπιός (169), nightingale, ἀηδών (628);
bovine, βοῦς (62, 175, 374, 1253), ταυροπόλα (172), ταῦρος (297, 322);
cattle/flock, ἀγέλη (175), λεία (26, 54, 145), ποιμνη (27, 42, 53, 63, 184, 234,
300, 1061);
deer, ἐλαφαβολία (178);
dog, κύων (8, 297, 830);
fish, ἰχθύς (1297);
goat, αἰπόλιον (375), κριός (237);
horse, ἵππικός (1030), ἵππομανής (143), λευκόπωλος (673);
lion-cub, σκύμνος λεαίνας (987);
sheep, ἄρνειος (309), μῆλον (1061).

Sophocles, *Electra*

animal, generic, θρέμμα (622);
bird, οἰωνός (1058), ὄρνις (18, 149), πτέρυξ (242), nightingale, ἀηδών (107,
1077);
deer, ἔλαφος (568), θήρ (572);
dog, κύων (1388);
horse, ἵππος (25, 704, 712, 722, 744), ἵππικός (698, 717, 719, 730, 740, 754,
1444), πῶλος (705, 725, 735, 738, 748);
insect, οἶστροπλήξ (5);

sheep, μηλοσφαγέω (280).

Sophocles, *OT*

animal, generic, θρέμμα (1143);

bird, οϊωνός (310, 395, 398), ὄρνις (52, 175, 966), vulture, γαμψῶνυξ (1199);

bovine, ἀγέλαι βουνόμοι (26), ταῦρος (478);

dog, κύων (391);

flock, ποίμνη (761, 1028, 1125, 1135);

horse, ἵππος (467), πωλική (802);

insect, οἴσμημα (1318).

Sophocles, *Antigone*

animal, generic, θήρ (257, 344, 350, 1082);

bird, οϊωνός (29, 205, 698, 1017, 1082), ὀρνιθοσκόπος (999), ὄρνις (342-43, 424, 1001, 1021), πτερὸν (1004), πτέρυξ (114), πτηνός (1082), chick, νεοσσός (425), eagle, αἰετός (113, 1040);

bovine, ταῦρος (352);

dog, κύων (206, 257, 697, 1017, 1081);

fish, εἰναλίαν φύσιν (345);

horse, ἵππος (351, 478), ἵππειος (341), ἄμιππος (985);

insect, οἴσμητρος (1002);

snake, δράκων (126, 1125), ἔχιδνα (531).

Sophocles, *Trachiniae*

animal, generic, θήρ (556, 662, 568, 680, 707, 935, 1096, 1097, 1162), θρέμμα (574, 1093, 1099), κνώδαλον (716), λεία (761);

bird, ὄρνις (105), dove, πέλεια (172), nightingale, ἀηδών (963);

bovine, βούπρωρος (13), βοῦς (761), πόρτις (530), ταῦρος (11, 509), ταύρειος (518), ταυροσφάγος (609);

dog, σκύλαξ (1098);

horse, ἵππος (271);

insect, οἴσμηθηθείς (653), οἴσμητρος (1254);

lion, λέων (1093);

sheep, βοτόν (690);

snake, δράκων (12, 834, 1100), ἔχιδνα (771), θρέμμα (574, 1099), ὕδρα (836, 1094).

Sophocles, *Philoctetes*

animal, generic, θήρ (185, 937, 955, 1147), θήρα (609, 839, 1146), θηρατέος (116), θηροβολέω (165), θρέμμα (243), οὔρεσιβώτης (1148);

bird, ὄρνις (955), πτηνός (955), dove, πέλεια (289);

bovine, ταυροκτόνος (400);

lion, λέων (401, 1436);
snake, ἔχιδνα (267, 632), ὄφις (1328).

Sophocles, *OC*

animal, generic, ἄγρα (950), θήρ (1569);
bee, μέλισσα (481);
bird, οἰωνός (1314), πτερόν (97), πτερωτός (1460), dove, πέλεια (1081),
nightingale, ἀηδών (18, 672-73);
bovine, βούθυτος (1495);
deer, ἔλαφος, (1094);
horse, εὐπιππος (668, 711), εὐπωλος (711), ἵππος (714), ἵππιος (1070), πῶλος
(313, 1062, 1069);
sheep, οἷς (475).

Euripides, *Alcestis*

animal, generic, θήρ (495);
bird, πτερωτός (262), chick, νεοσσός (403);
bovine, βούθυτος (1156), βουφόρβια (1031);
dog, κύων (360);
fawn, νεβρός (585);
horse, ἵππος (486, 495, 1021, 1030), πῶλος (429, 491, 504), τέθριππος (428);
lion, λέων (580);
lynx, λύγξ (579);
sheep, μηλοθύτης (120);
snake, ἔχιδνα (310).

Euripides, *Medea*

bird, πτηνός (1297);
bovine, ταῦρος (478), ταυρόω (92);
lioness, λέαινα (187, 1342, 1358, 1407);
snake, δράκων (480).

Euripides, *Heraclides*

bird, ὄρνις (730), πτερόν (10), chick, νεοσσός (239);
bovine, βόειος (822), μόσχος (489), ταῦρος (489);
dog, κύων (1050);
horse, ἵππιος (845), ἵππικός (854), πῶλος (847), τέθριππος (802);
lion, λέων (950, 1006);
snake, ὕδρα (950).

Euripides, *Hippolytus*

animal, generic, ἀγέλη (734), βότον (75), δάκος (646), θήρ (647), θήρα (18), σκύλαξ (1277);

bee, μέλισσα (77, 563);

bird, οἰωνός (873), ὄρνις (733, 828, 1059), πτερόν (1271), πτηνός (1275, 1292);

bovine, ταῦρος (338, 1214, 1229, 1248);

cattle/flock, ποιμνη (75);

deer, ἔλαφος (218);

dog, κύων (18, 217, 219, 1127);

horse, ἵππειος (1355), ἵππικός (1219), ἵππος (1134, 1174, 1183, 1204, 1247), ἵππόκροτος (229), ἵππονώμας (1399), φιλίππος (581), πῶλος (231, 235, 546, 1132, 1187, 1195, 1218), τέθριππος (1212);

insect, οἶστρος (1300).

Euripides, *Andromache*

animal, generic, θρέμμα (261), λεία (15), σκύμνος (1170);

bird, ὄρνις (862), chick, νεοσσός (441), πτέρυξ (505), dove, πέλεια (1140), hawk, ἰέραξ (1141), vulture, γύψ (75);

bovine, βοῦς (720), βούτης (280), μόσχος (711);

dog, κύων (630);

horse, ἵππικός (759), ἵππος (1012, 1019, 1229), πωλικός (992), πῶλος (621);

lion, λέων (720);

snake, ἔχιδνα (271), ἔρπετόν (269);

sheep, μῆλον (1100), οἶς (557), ὕπαρνος (557).

Euripides, *Hecuba*

animal, generic, ἄγρα (881), θήρ (1057, 1072, 1173), τετράποδος, (1057), cub, σκύμνος (205);

bird, ὄρνις (178), nightingale, ἀηδών (337);

bovine, μόσχος (206, 526);

deer, ἔλαφος (90);

dog, κύων (1077, 1173, 1265, 1273);

horse, εὔιππος (1090), πῶλος (142, 469), φίλιππος (9, 428);

wolf, λύκος (90).

Euripides, *Supplices*

animal, generic, θήρ (267, 282), κνώδαλον (146);

bird, οἰωνός (213), ὄρνις (1046);

boar, κάπρος (140), σῦς (316);

bovine, πόρις (629);

horse, ἵππικός (682), ἵπόβοτος (365), ἵππος (694, 886), πῶλος (679), τέθριππος (501, 927);

lion, λέων (140), σκύμνοι λεόντων (1223);
sheep, μῆλον (1201);
snake, δράκων (579), ὄφις (703).

Euripides, *Electra*

animal, generic, ἄγρα (471);
bird, οἰωνός (897), swan, κύκνος (151);
bovine, βούθυτος (785), βοῦς (79), βουσφαγέω (627), μοσχία (811), μόσχος (813, 822), ταῦρος (816, 1143);
cattle/flock, ποίμνη (412, 726);
dog, κυνῶπις (1252), κύων (1342);
dolphin, δελφίς (435-36);
fawn, νεβρός (574, 860);
horse, ἵππος (476, 817, 866) ἰππότης (449), ἵπποφόρβιον (623), πῶλος (475);
lion, λέαινα (474, 1163);
sheep, ἀρήν (705, 719), μήλειος (92), οἷς (513), ποίμνης νεογνόν (495), θρέμμα (495);
snake, δράκων (1256), χειροδράκων (1345).

Euripides, *HF*

animal, generic, ἀγέλη (1276), θήρ (153, 158, 363, 465, 611, 614, 700);
bee, μέλισσα (488);
bird, ὄρνις (72, 111, 596, 974, 1039), πτερόν (71, 510, 654), πτερωτός (628, 1158), πτηνός (1186), chick, νεοσσός (72, 224, 982), swan, κύκνος (692);
bovine, ταῦρος (869, 1327);
dog, κύων (24, 420, 568, 860, 1274, 1277, 1386);
gazelle, δορκάς (376);
horse, λευκόπωλος (29), πῶλος (121, 123, 381-82), τέθριππος (177, 380);
insect, οἶστρος (862, 1144);
lion, λέων (360, 466, 579, 1211, 1271);
snake, δράκων (253, 397), ὄφις (1266), ὕδρα (152, 421, 579, 1188, 1275).

Euripides, *Trojan Women*

animal, generic, δάκος (284), θήρ (450), λεία (614);
bee, μελισσοτρόφος (799);
bird, οἰωνός (829), ὄρνις (147), πτερόν (1086), πτέρυξ (751, 1298, 1320), πτηνός (146), chick, νεοσσός (751), bird of prey, γύψ (600);
bovine, βοῦς (439);
horse, ἰππόβοτος (1087), ἵππος (11, 14, 519), πῶλος (669, 810), τέθριππος (855);
pig, σῦς (437).

Euripides, *IT*

bee, μέλισσα (165, 635);

bird, οἰωνός (662), ὄρνις (1089, 1095), πολυόρνιθος (435), πτερόν (32, 289), πτέρυξ (1141), πτηνός (571), swan, κύκνος (1104);

bovine, βοῦς (255, 261), βουφόρβια (301), μόσχος (162, 293, 297, 359), Ταυρικός (85, 1454), Ταῦροι (30), ταυροπόλος (1457);

deer, ἔλαφος (28, 783);

dog, κύων (293);

horse, ἵπóδρομος (1138), ἵππος (192, 1423), πῶλος (1423);

insect, οἶστρος (394, 1456);

sheep, ἀρήν (196, 813, 1223), μηλοθύτης (1116);

snake, δράκαινα (286), δράκων (1245), ἔχιδνα (287).

Euripides, *Ion*

animal, generic, θήρ (505);

bird, οἰωνός (377, 917, 1191, 1333, 1494), ὄρνις (159, 170, 1206), πτερόν (377), πτέρυξ (123, 166, 1143), dove, πέλεια (1197), πτηνός (106, 155, 504, 903), nightingale, ἀηδόνιος (1482), bird of prey, ἄρπη (192), γαμφηλαί (159, 1495), swan, κύκνος (162);

bovine, βούθυτος (664), μόσχος (1132), ταυρόμορφος (1261);

deer, ἔλαφος (1162);

horse, ἵππειος (1161), ἵππος (202, 1148), τέθριππος (82, 1241);

lion, λέων (1161);

sheep, μῆλον (229, 377);

snake, Γοργώ (224), δράκων (23, 1015, 1263), ἔχιδνα (993, 1233, 1262), ὄφις (25, 1423, 1427), ὕδρα (191).

Euripides, *Helen*

animal, generic, ἀγέλη (1260), θήρ (378, 1169, 1310), θήρα (981);

bird, ὄρνις (19, 1051, 1109), πτερόν (1516), πτερωτός (747), πτηνός (1145), chick, νεοσσός (258), eagle, αἰετός (20), crane, Λίβυες οἰωνοί (1479-80), οἰωνός (1480), nightingale, ἀηδών (1110), swan, κύκνος (19, 215);

bovine, βούθυτος (1474), μόσχος (1476), ταύρειος (1555, 1562, 1582, 1591), ταῦρος (1258, 1566);

deer, ἔλαφος (382);

dog, κύων (154, 1169);

fawn, νεβρός (1358);

horse, ἵππικός (1180), ἵππος (1495), ἵππόκροτος (207), ἵππος (724, 1258), πῶλος (543), τέθριππος (341-2, 386);

lion, λέαινα (379).

Euripides, *Phoenician Women*

animal, generic, θήρ (412, 420, 1603);

bird, οἰώνισμα (839), οἰωνός (839, 858, 1634), ὁμόπτερος (328), ὄρνις (839, 1515), πτερόν (806);

boar, κάπρος (411, 1108, 1380);

bovine, μόσχος (640);

dog, κύων (1650);

horse, εὔπιπος (17), ἰππεία (794), ἵππος (3, 113, 522), λευκόπωλος (606), πῶλος (41, 178, 792, 947, 1125), τέθριππος (1562);

lion, λέων (411, 1120, 1573);

sheep, μῆλον (1255);

snake, δρακόντειος (1315), δράκων (232, 657, 820, 931, 935, 941, 1011, 1062, 1138), ἔχιδνα (1020, 1135), ὕδρα (1136).

Euripides, *Orestes*

animal, generic, ἄγρα (1346), θήρ / θήρα (1272);

bird, οἰωνός (788), πτερόν (276, 1001, 1593), πτερωτός (274), chick, σκύμνος (1387), swan, κυκνόπτερος (1387), ὀρνιθόγονος (1385);

boar, κάπρος (1460);

bovine, ταυρόκρανος (1378);

cub, σκύμνος (1213, 1493a);

dog, κυνῶπις (260);

horse, ἰππικός (1449), ἵπποβότης (1000), παράσειρος (1017), πῶλος (45, 989), τέθριππος (990);

insect, οἶστρος (791);

lion, λέων (1402, 1555);

sheep, ἀρήν (812-3, 998);

snake, δρακοντώδης (256), δράκων (479, 1406, 1424).

Euripides, *Bacchae*

animal, generic, ἄγρα (102, 434, 1196, 1201, 1203), ἐκθηριώω (1331), θήρ (436, 922, 1085, 1108, 1183, 1188, 1204, 1210);

bee, μέλισσα (143);

bird, ὄρνις (748, 957, 1365), πτέρυξ (372), πτερωτός (257), dove, πέλεια (1090), 'drone', κηφήν (1365), swan, κύκνος (1365);

bovine, ἀγελαῖος (677), ἀγέλη (1022), βοῦς (691), δάμαλις (739), μόσχος (678, 736, 1185, 1333), πόρις (737), ταυρόκερος (100), ταῦρος (618, 743, 920, 1017, 1159), ταυρόω (922);

dog, κύων (731, 872, 977, 1291), σκύλαξ (338);

fawn, νεβρός (176, 835, 866);

gazelle, δορκάς (699);

goat, τραγοκτόνος (139);
horse, εὔιππος (574), ἵππικός (509), ἵππος (782), πῶλος (165, 1056);
insect, οἰστροηθείς (119), οἰστροπλήξ (1229);
lion, λέαινα (990), λεοντοφυής (1196), λέων (1019, 1142, 1215, 1278, 1283);
snake, δράκαινα (1358), δράκων (101, 768, 1017-8, 1026, 1155, 1330, 1358),
ὄφις (698, 1026, 1331);
wolf, σκύμνος λύκος (699).

Euripides, IA

animal, generic, θρέμμα (598);
bird, οἰωνός (1347), ὄρνις (9, 607, 796, 988), πτέρυξ (120), πτερωτός (250-1),
chick, νεοσσός (1248), swan, κύκνος (794);
bovine, βοῦς (579, 1292), μόσχος (575, 1083, 1113, 1623), ταυρόπους (275);
deer, ἔλαφος (1587, 1593);
horse, ἵππος (83, 1154), μῶνυξ (250), πωλικός (422, 613, 619, 620, 623), πῶλος
(220), τέθριππος (159);
insect, οἰστράω (77), οἶστρος (547);
snake, δράκων (257).

Bibliography

- Allen, J.T. and Italic, G.A. (1954) *Concordance to Euripides*. Berkeley.
- Arnott, W.G. (2007) *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z*. London.
- Baker, S. (1993) *Picturing the Beast: animals, identity and representation*. Manchester.
- Brelich, A. (1958) *Gli Eroi Greci. Un Problema Storico-religioso*. Roma.
- Bremmer, J. (1996) 'Modi di comunicazione con il divino: la preghiera, la divinazione e il sacrificio nella civiltà greca', in *Greci (I) Storia Cultura Arte Società*. Vol. I. *Noi e i Greci* (Torino 1996), 239-83.
- Burkert, W. (1983) *Homo Necans: interpretations of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*. Berkeley.
- Campbell, G. (2006) *Strange Creatures: anthropology in antiquity*. London.
- Castignone, S. and Lanata, G. (ed.) (1994) *Filosofi e Animali nel Mondo Antico*. Genova.
- Cingano, E., Ghersetti, A. and Milano, L. (ed.) (2005) *Animali tra Zoologia, Mito e Letterature nella Cultura Classica e Orientale*. Padova.
- Clarke, M. (1995) 'Between lions and man: images of the hero in the *Iliad*', *GRBS* 36, 137-59.
- Davies, M. and Kathirithamby, J. (1986) *Greek Insects*. Oxford.

- Dinnerstein, D. (1976) *The Mermaid and the Minotaur: sexual arrangements and the human malaise*. New York.
- Ellendt, F. (1872) *Lexicon Sophocleum*. Berlin.
- Forbes Irving, P.M.C. (1990) *Metamorphosis in Greek myths*. Oxford.
- Furlanetto, A. (2005) 'I linguaggi degli animali in storie di iniziazione profetica', in Cingano (2005), 155-63.
- Gilhus, I.S. (2006) *Animals, Gods, and Humans: changing attitudes to animals in Greek, Roman, and early Christian ideas*. London.
- Gottschall, J. (2001) 'Homer's human animal: ritual combat in the *Iliad*', *Philosophy and Literature* 25, 278-94.
- Gottschall, J. and Wilson, D.S. (ed.) (2005) *The Literary Animal: evolution and the nature of narrative*. Evanston, IL.
- Halliwell, S. (1986) 'Where three roads meet: a neglected detail in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*', *JHS* 106, 187-90.
- Heath, J. (1999) 'Disentangling the beast: humans and other animals in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *JHS* 119, 17-48.
- (2005) *The Talking Greeks: speech, animals, and the Other in Homer, Aeschylus and Plato*. Cambridge.
- Italie, G. (1955) *Index Aeschyleus*. Leiden.
- Knox, B.M.W. (1952) 'The lion in the House (*Agamemnon* 717-36 [Murray])', *CP* 47, 17-25.
- Lanata, G. (1987) *Celso. Il Discorso Vero*. Milano.
- (1994) 'Antropocentrismo e cosmocentrismo nel mondo antico', in Castignone and Lanata (1994), 15-49.
- Lelli, E. (2006) *Volpe e leone. Il proverbio nella poesia greca (Alceo, Cratino, Callimaco)*. Roma.
- Lloyd, G.E.R. (1961) 'The development of Aristotle's theory of the classification of animals', *Phronesis* 6, 59-80. Reprinted in *Methods and Problems in Greek Science: selected papers* (Cambridge 1991), 1-26.
- (1970) *Early Greek science: Thales to Aristotle*. London.
- (1985) 'Animali e piante', in M. Vegetti (ed.), *Il Sapere degli Antichi* (Torino 1985), 246-61.
- Lonsdale, S.H. (1979) 'Attitudes towards animals in ancient Greece', *G&R* 26, 146-59.
- (1990) *Creatures of Speech: lion, herding and hunting similes in the Iliad*. Stuttgart.
- Osborne, C. (2007) *Dumb Beasts and Dead Philosophers: humanity and the humane in ancient philosophy and literature*. Oxford.

Padel, R. (1992) *In and Out of the Mind: Greek images of the tragic self*. Princeton.

Pellegrin, P. (1986) *Aristotle's Classification of Animals: biology and the conceptual unity of the Aristotelian Corpus*. London.

Pinotti, P. (1994) 'Gli animali in Platone: metafore e tassonomie', in Castignone and Lanata (1994) 101-22.

Rose, G.P. (1979) 'Odysseus' barking heart', *TAPA* 109, 215-30.

Rothwell, K.S. (2007) *Nature, Culture and the Origins of Greek Comedy: a study of animal choruses*. Cambridge.

Schnapp-Gourbeillon, A. (1981) *Lions, héros, masques: les représentations de l'animal chez Homère*. Paris.

Seaford, R. (1994) *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state*. Oxford.

——— (2001) *Bacchae* (reprinted with corrections). Warminster.

Sifakis, G.M. (1971) *Parabasis and Animal Choruses: a contribution to the history of attic comedy*. London.

Sorabji, R. (1993) *Animal Minds and Human Morals*. Ithaca.

Thompson, D'Arcy Wentworth (1936) *A Glossary of Greek Birds*. Oxford.

Texts used

Diggle, J. (ed.) (1981-1994) *Euripidis Fabulae*. 3 vols. Oxford.

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N.G. (ed.) (1990) *Sophoclis Fabulae*. Oxford.

Page D.L. (ed.) (1972) *Aeschylus. Opera*. Oxford.