ETHNOGRAPHY AND THE COLONIAL WORLD IN THEOCRITUS AND LUCIAN

by

CHRISTOPHER S. PARMENTER

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Classics
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts

June 2013

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Christopher S. Parmenter

Title: Ethnography and the Colonial World in Theocritus and Lucian

This thesis has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in the Department of Classics by:

P. Lowell Bowditch   Chair
Christopher Eckerman   Member

and

Kimberly Andrews Espy   Vice President of Research and Innovation; Dean of the
                            Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded June 2013

THESIS ABSTRACT

Christopher S. Parmenter

Master of Arts

Department of Classics

June 2013

Title: Ethnography and the Colonial World in Theocritus and Lucian

Scholars of migration, colonization, and cultural interaction in antiquity have increasingly turned towards a variety of concepts (such as hybridity, negotiations, and middle grounds) developed by postcolonial theorists to describe the dynamics of ancient civilizations beyond the major centers of Athens and Rome. Whereas older models of identity saw the ancient world as a series of geographically distinct cultural units with attendant language, religion, and practices—that is to say, a model of identity rooted in the modern concept of the nation state— recently classicists have come to see ancient identities as abstractions of a series of individual choices that take place over long periods of time and that are always mediated by contact with different groups. Focusing on two authors from what I shall define as the 'colonial worlds' of antiquity (Theocritus from Sicily and Lucian from Syria) this study will explore how representations of physical difference and cultural practice negotiate the presence of non-Greek peoples into Greek literary culture.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Christopher S. Parmenter

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Hamilton College, Clinton, New York
Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies, Catania, Italy

DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Arts, Classics, University of Oregon, 2013
Artium Baccalaureus, Classical studies and English, Hamilton College, 2010

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Greek historiography
Greek ethnography
Social identity in antiquity
Second Sophistic
Postcolonialism

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Graduate Teaching Fellow, University of Oregon, 2011-2013

State Development Office Intern, Pennsylvania Small Business Development Centers, Philadelphia, PA, 2010-2011

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Henry H. MacCracken Fellowship (New York University, 2013-2017)
John Winkler Prize, runner up (Oberlin, 2013)
Sean Kelley Memorial Fund (Oregon, 2012)
Eta Sigma Phi (Hamilton, 2010)
The Winchell Prize in Greek (Hamilton, 2010)
The Franklin D. Locke Fellowship in Greek (Hamilton, 2010)
Emerson Fellowship (Hamilton, 2009)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: ANCIENT COLONIALISM AND COLONIAL NARRATIVE

Postcoloniality, hybridity, negotiations, third spaces, middle grounds, networks—these are all increasingly programmatic terms in the study of migration, colonization, and cultural interaction in antiquity. Eschewing firm lines of periodization and specialty, classicists are increasingly paying attention not only to the links between the different linguistic, social, and economic cultures of antiquity, but also how they are formed, in awareness of each other, from the very beginning.[1] Whereas older models of identity saw the ancient world as a series of geographically distinct cultural units with attendant language, religion, and practices—that is to say, a model of identity rooted in the modern concept of the nation state— recently classicists have come to see ancient identities as abstractions of a series of individual choices that take place over long periods of time and that are always mediated by contact with different groups. Focusing on two authors from what I shall define as the 'colonial worlds' of antiquity—Theocritus, from Sicily, and Lucian, from Syria—I will explore how representations of physical difference and cultural practice negotiate the presence of non-Greek peoples into Greek literary culture. Though these authors are removed from each other by several centuries, both spent their careers in regions where ethnic Greeks (that is to say, Greeks by ancestry) were in the minority, but where Greek cultural practices were relatively widespread.

Theocritus' shepherds in several of his pastoral *Idylls* (3, 6, 10, and 11) and Lucian's imaginary foreigners in the *True histories* emerge out of a context of the copresence of Greek and non-Greek populations. Using the language of cultural poetics (identified with the work of Leslie Kurke and Carol Dougherty),[2] I will investigate how Theocritus and Lucian situate their works within the class, status, ethnic, and possibly racial politics of the colonial city. Moreover, borrowing concepts of hybridity and ambivalence from the work of Homi Bhabha,[3] I will make the case that the literary cultures of ancient colonial worlds can and should be interpreted in the comparative

---

[1] Recent works include Malkin 2011, Gruen 2011, 2011b, Woolf 2011, Skinner 2012, McCoskey 2012.

[2] Kurke and Dougherty 1993, 2003; Kurke 1999, 2007, 2011, Dougherty 1993, 2003.

[3] Bhabha 1994. For a discussion of hybridity, see chapter II below.

context of nineteenth and twentieth century colonization. As Bhabha has explored, representations of colonial populations by colonists both draw lines between those represented and their viewers as well as serve as sites of negotiation and compromise between colonizer and colonized.

Before discussing the overall framework of this study, however, I would like to begin with an example of the different strategies of colonial thought. As I will discuss to a larger extent in the first chapter of this study, though colonial contexts are historically bound—there can be no direct translation of the experience of ancient colonialism to that of the early modern period—strategies of representing colonial encounters in antiquity are strikingly similar to strategies used in early history of the United States. Rather than framing a contrast between the pious settler and the barbarous savage, early accounts of the settlement of New England bear a striking level of negotiation, or even accommodation, of native languages and culture. Though later events precluded the establishment of a hybrid colony, such an establishment was not far removed from the consciousness of some of Massachusetts' original settlers.

Trojans in the Wilderness

In the summer of 1621, the separatist Puritan leader Edward Winslow set out on a diplomatic mission to Massasoit, king of the Wampanoags, who then lived in modern Bristol, Rhode Island. The Wampanoags had been decimated by disease brought by English fishermen in prior years, and the neighboring Narragansetts had become increasingly aggressive in the power vacuum. Although the Wampanoags had been reduced to a semi-nomadic lifestyle by the time of the Puritan arrival, and most of their land had gone fallow, Winslow nonetheless marveled at how the landscape had been transformed by human habitation.

> As we passed along, we observed that there were few places by the river but had been inhabited, by reason whereof much ground was clear, save of weeds which grew higher than our heads. There is much good timber, both oak, walnut tree, beech, and exceedingly great chestnut trees. The country, in respect of the lying of it, is both champaign and hilly, like many places in England.[4]

---

[4] [Winslow] 1963.64.

Winslow depicts a landscape that is altogether not unfamiliar to Englishmen: it has adequate timber, good soil, and has only recently been abandoned by its former inhabitants.[5] Compare this with his close friend and associate, William Bradford, who had fashioned the precolonial landscape of New England as "a hidious & desolate wildernes, full of wild beasts & wild men" akin to what the Hebrews faced in their wanderings through the Sinai.[6] Though Bradford might have indeed found the landscape foreboding after landing in the windswept dunescape of Provincetown in November 1620, Winslow imagines a friendly colonial landscape, lying supine and waiting in their absence.   Different audiences expect different accounts, to be sure: Winslow's account of his trip was published in 1624, while Bradford's account remained unpublished into the nineteenth century, although the manuscript was known to exist. That said, despite the personal closeness of Winslow and Bradford, they exhibit two drastically different strategies of depicting New England, albeit sharing the singular perspective of the newcomer. While Bradford sees a landscape with no history, Winslow understands that they are only the newest generation of inhabitants.

When the Puritan separatists land in Provincetown, they arrive as latecomers in the (pre-)colonial history of North America. The Nausets were initially hostile to the separatists because they had previously been raided by a variety of English adventurers.[7] In their first winter the separatists encounter three natives (Samoset, Squanto, and Hobamack) who spoke English, and one (Squanto) who had even spent years in England. Their presence sets in motion a series of power struggles among the native peoples, first between Squanto, Hobamack, and Massasoit, and later between the neighboring tribes.[8] Yet despite Bradford's lack of interest in native politics—aside from his impassioned belief that he had introduced covetousness to the natives[9]—neither Bradford nor Winslow's accounts attempt to downplay the fact that they have rivals in colonization.

[5] Cf. Dougherty 1993.7 on describing the new world with the language of the old.

[6] Bradford 1962.60.

[7] See Bradford 1962.73-75, [Winslow] 1963.52; cf. the separatists' belief they had found a buried European sailor in modern Truro ([Winslow] 1963.28) as well as trade goods ([Winslow] 1963.29).

[8] See Bradford 1962.83-85.

[9] Bradford 1962.138-39.

Massachusetts Bay and the Gulf of Maine had been periodically settled for almost a century by English fishermen, and in recent years—in the Elizabeth Islands, in Penobscot—there had been recent attempts by English businessmen to establish year-round settlements. At least two full-time English settlements (in Weymouth and Quincy) had been established contemporaneously with the founding of Plymouth, and the settlers there engage in periodic trade with passing ships coasting from settlement to settlement.

One of these deserves particular attention. In 1622, the lawyer and associate of Ben Jonson, Thomas Morton, joined one Captain Wollaston on a colonial venture to the site of modern Quincy, Massachusetts, leading a band of indentured servants to trade for furs with the natives.[10] Facing disappointing returns on the investment, Wollaston began to sell his servants into slavery and boarded them on passing ships going to Jamestown. Leading an uprising, Morton ousted Wollaston and reestablished the plantation as his own, becoming a rival of the nearby separatist foundations in Plymouth, and after 1628, Salem. Renaming his colony Mar-re Mount, adapting a native toponym (Bradford refers to it as Merrymount), Morton began to extensively and profitably trade with the natives for commodities. The separatists, led by Miles Standish, shortly after launched a raid on the plantation, accusing Morton of selling guns and alcohol to the natives.[11] Bradford's account of the destruction of Merrymount (which he alternately refers to as 'Mounte-Dagon') is ideologically charged on a number of levels:

> And Morton became lord of misrule, and maintained (as it were) a scholle of Athisme. And after they hadd gott some good into their hands, and gott much by trading with the Indeans, they spent it as vainly, in quaffing & drinking both wine & strong waters in great exsess, &, as some reported, 10. pounds with in a morning. They also set up a May-pole, drinking and dancing aboute it many days togeather, inviting the Indean women, for their consorts, dancing and frisking togeather, (like so many fairies, or furies rather,) and worse practises. As if they had anew revived & celebrated the feasts of the Roman Godess Flora, or the beasly practieses of the madd Bachinalians. Morton likewise (to shew his poetrie) composed sundry rimes & verses, some tending to lisciviousnes, and others to the

---

[10] For a timeline of Morton's career and conflict with the Puritans, see Connors 1969.13-29. For Bradford's account, see 1962.140-44.

[11] Morton explicitly denies this charge (1972.54), although he notes that the natives are interested in guns and alcohol and that his rivals trade them. It is likely he was selling to the natives as well.

detraction & scandal of some persons, which he affixed to this idle or idoll May-polle.[12]

As Michelle Burnham has suggested, Bradford's open disparagement of Morton's colonial experiment is one heavily grounded in the class and status politics that were rapidly leading to civil war in the home country.[13] Morton's three-book *New English Canaan* (1637) reciprocates the feeling. While Bradford's account of the Plymouth colony emphasizes the centrality of labor, suffering, and isolation in the wilderness to the colonial experience, Morton, like Winslow, emphasizes the ease with which the countryside has already been tamed. Although certainly an exaggeration, the threat Bradford sees in Morton's fusion of medievalizing English customs (the infamous 80-foot tall maypole), Roman religion, and the presence of native women is very real: by enacting his own version of traditional English spring festivities shared between his colonists and the native population (which almost certainly included sex with the natives),[14] Morton creates the image of himself as the lord of a manor.[15] Burnham has argued that Morton's image of New England country life is firmly rooted in the ongoing transformation of the English nobility—and the ideology of nobility that members of the lower gentry like Morton aspired to—into a proto-capitalist class that earned its leisure off the work of others.[16] Labor is indeed not absent from Morton's pastoral landscape, but in his writings it is the province of other people, namely the natives, and in the Puritan valorization of labor Morton sees a type of illegitimate class assertion by the peasant class.[17] By incorporating the natives into his colony by the use of medieval and

---

[12] Bradford 1962.141.

[13] Burnham 2006.406.

[14] "This harmeles mirth made by younge men (that lived in hope to have wifes brought over to them, that would save them a laboure to make a voyage to fetch any over) was much distasted [by the seperatists]." (Morton 1972.135).

[15] Burnham 2006.416. For Morton's account of the revels, and examples of his pastoral poetry, see Morton 1972.132-33.

[16] Burnham 2006.410.

[17] Burnham 2006.419-20. Bradford is quite critical of Morton's business success, calling him a "gaine-thirstie murderer" (1962.143) while Morton disparages the Puritan separatists for their inability to subsist in such a bountiful landscape.

Roman rituals, Morton covers up the exploitative nature of his enterprise (the natives, after all, did the trapping for him, while he at least planned to make massive profits off their labor). Similar to how the Romans used communal rituals in their territories as a means of incorporating different peoples into the ideological framework of Rome, the natives' participation in Morton's rituals of power serves (at least from his perspective) to represent consent for their position within the new colony.[18] The Puritan rejection of Morton's enthusiasm for Roman rites and Latin pastoral confirms their own worthlessness in his eyes.[19]

Morton has other classicizing means of conceptualizing the natives. Dismissing a nameless writer who proposes that the natives are actually Tartars, in his ethnography Morton proposes that the natives are wayward Trojans.[20] Invoking Geoffrey of Monmouth's tale of the founding of the English nation by one Brutus, a follower of Aeneas, Morton proposes that some of Brutus' comrades went in another direction, sailing to the new world by way of Jerusalem. Morton bases this judgment off what he perceives as a similarity between the language of the Wampanoags and various words in Latin and particularly Greek.[21] Although older commentators have written off Morton's constructed genealogy of the natives as ridiculous and contrived,[22] Morton's construction of the natives serves an important purpose. The English, the natives, and Rome are all descendants of the Trojans. By joining with the native population, and solidifying the bond through pseudo-Roman rites, Morton creates a putatively hybrid civilization in the new world that has a legitimate claim on the landscape—thus enabling Morton to reject separatist claims to the land by divine mandate. Echoing the multiplicity of foundation legends and hybrid tribal origins in Livy's own account of the founding of Rome, Morton

---

[18] On ritual and consensus, see Ando 2000.199-205.

[19] Morton 1972.134.

[20] Morton 1972.20-21.

[21] Morton, in fact, believes that Brutus spoke a Greco-Latin hybrid language (Morton 1972.18). This is an ancient practice: on Herodotus and 'metarhythmic' translation, see Chamberlain 1999, Munson 2005.30-66. Learning Native American languages was a rarely accomplished fascination of nineteenth century philologists; the mission of the APA originally included their study, for instance.

[22] Adams 1882.128 n1.

proposes a counter-narrative to Plymouth that combined with his selling of guns to potential enemies makes Morton too dangerous to tolerate in Massachusetts.

Ancient Colonial Narrative

Thomas Morton's legitimization of his presence in Massachusetts with his classical education belies the presence of an ideological strategy that is surprisingly common across different colonial contexts. Drawing on the deep well of cultural knowledge—or rather, *his* culture's knowledge—Morton fits the native Americans into a readily available paradigm to explain their presence in the world. Morton's representation of the colonial native becomes a site of engagement with the colonial native. Although his work fashions the Wampanoags into what he wants them to be (and Morton's representation of the Wampanoags undoubtedly serves to legitimize his own actions), Morton's representations are not projections. They are negotiations. At least in Morton's eyes, by participating in his rituals, the native Americans accept their fashioning into Trojans in the wilderness. In colonial America, no less than on the frontiers of antiquity, myth becomes a bridge between cultures. Ideological conceptions of the native Americans as various peoples from the old world are certainly not unique in American history. Both Thomas Jefferson and the self-proclaimed prophet Joseph Smith, for instance, thought that the natives were descendants of the ancient Hebrews. Myth and genealogy also becomes a means of explaining—and to some extent, explaining away— the presence of non-Greeks in large portions of the Mediterranean littoral settled by Greeks from the eighth century B.C.E. onward.

Though the two authors that form the heart of this study write long after the period when Greek merchantmen were making their initial contacts with the inhabitants of the lands later colonized by Greeks, stories of precolonial contact and colonial foundation are important in establishing the later pattern of representation. While the west is savage and uncivilized, the east is home to people with alien customs. Lucian's representation, for instance, of the half-human natives of the whale in the *True histories* (1.31-39), operates in stark contrast to his depiction of the inhabitants of the moon (1.21-27), who resemble the various peoples of the east Herodotus so memorably describes. At the same time as foreign regions can be zones of difference, however, they, as Morton's representations suggest, can be made similar through, among other things, genealogy and

myth. Irad Malkin, Greg Woolf, and others have demonstrated how ancient colonists used genealogy to conceptualize both their place and the places of foreigners in the Mediterranean basin.[23] For instance, Josephus (*Ant.* 1.329-41) cites an otherwise unknown Hellenistic historian who fashions the Jews as descendants of both Abraham *and* Heracles, and elsewhere (1 *Macc.* 12-14), as Erich Gruen explains, a priest of the temple in Jerusalem attempts to establish kinship with the Spartans in the third century B.C.E.[24]

Both the discursive strategies of Morton and third century Jews' attempt to create what the historian of North America Richard White refers to as a 'middle ground—' a discursive space between different cultural identities and political units wherein different groups can negotiate on equal footing.[25] White's definition of the colonial middle ground, used to describe the frontiers of colonial North America, is similar to the concept of 'hybridity' deployed by the postcolonial critic Homi K. Bhabha,[26] and while there are important differences, which will be more extensively explained in the next chapter, what they fundamentally share is a tendency to situate the centrality of frontiers and colonized space within larger cultural strategies of identification (who is Greek, Roman, or English, who is native or foreign, and who falls in between).

In this respect, despite the dangers of overly synchronic or structural approaches to narrative strategies, we can see a variety of similarities between the framing of seventeenth century colonial narratives and ancient colonial narratives. In her 1993 *Poetics of Colonization,* Carol Dougherty identifies a common narrative pattern in the foundation legends of Greek cities in Sicily, southern Italy, and other parts of the Mediterranean. The colonial founder (the *oikistês),* usually an exile or impaired individual, having received divine approval for his actions from Delphi, sets out with a

---

[23] J.M. Hall 1997, 2002; Malkin 1998, 2004, 2012, Woolf 2011. Gruen 2011.

[24] Gruen 2011.304-6.

[25] White 1991. See Malkin 2004.356-359, 2011.45-48, Woolf 2011.17-19 for applications of White's work. In White's use of the term the middle ground can be literal space as well.

[26] See chapter II below.

band of colonists to establish a new city.[27] These accounts usually contain some sort of warfare with the native inhabitants of the new land and at their conclusion the oikist receives the unusual honor of burial in the agora and hero-cult worship. Dougherty sees these myths as symbolic, usually conveying various narratives of political discord, intermarriage with native peoples, and warfare in a largely predetermined framework.[28] Although Dougherty's work has come under criticism for its schematic approach to Greek memories of colonial foundations,[29] the pattern of colonial narrative generally holds, reappearing in places as various as Plutarch's life of Timoleon or Herodotus' entry in the *Suda*.[30]

Dougherty's study of narratives will be important to this study, both in their continual reuse in Greek historiography—chapter V, on Lucian's *True histories,* will discuss this further—but also in that they appear as one of many ways for Greeks to conceptualize the presence of foreigners in the colonial world. Though for the most part, neither Theocritus nor Lucian specifically allude to narratives of contact and foundation, they do preexist both of their attempts to negotiate the presence of colonial narratives in the works. The fact that Lucian can so clearly invoke a colonial foundation narrative in the *True histories* (1.31-39) testifies to the continuing functionality of these myths in establishing a sense of place in the colonial world. They also set patterns of engagement with native cultures: in the colonial west, for instance, native cultures are rarely conceived of as separate entities, while in the east, where substantial immigration of Greek populations took place much later in the wake of Alexander, foreign populations are specifically conceived of as different.[31] The paranoid screed of Theocritus' character Praxinoa against the Egyptians in *Idyll* 15.45-64 is hard to imagine taking place in the west. In the east, a long history of representation had taken place before Greeks had

---

[27] Dougherty 1993.15-16.

[28] Dougherty 1993.17.

[29] Malkin 1998.24-25.

[30] See chapter V below.

[31] On Sicily, see J.M. Hall 2002.45, Antonaccio 2004.60-61.

begun to permanently live in Egypt and intermarry.[32] In this sense, even if narratives such as those of colonial foundation are symbolic, they go a long way in explaining the history of representation of colonized peoples in Greek literary culture.

Ethnography and Stereotypes

An important question that has loomed large in the study of representations of colonized peoples by postcolonial theorists such as Homi K. Bhabha and Edward Said is how judgments and assumptions about the Other shapes the construction of the self. One of the ongoing projects of postcolonial scholarship has been to study how representations of colonized people shape everyday interaction. Bhabha's work on the stereotype, for instance, has substantially complicated how the logic of representation works in situations when the self and Other live in close quarters.[33] Speaking in stereotypes, according to Bhabha, is an attempt to view the complex negotiations of everyday interaction with people that are in some way different through the lens of unverifiable, unchanging knowledge claims (such as the duplicity of the Asian or barbarity of the African). Bhabha's discussion of everyday representation in colonial worlds of the twentieth century carries resonance when compared with the situation of antiquity, particularly in large multi-ethnic cities like Alexandria. How do largely unchanging patterns of representation of foreigners in antiquity (the effeminacy of the Persian, or the passivity of the Egyptian) either reflect or reject the reality of Greeks living side-by-side with members of the represented group? This question looms large not just in manifestly ethnographic discourse, as in Lucian's *True histories,* but also in Theocritus, where (as I argue) his physical descriptions are heavily influenced by ethnographic description. Ethnographic representation operates as a tool not just of explaining foreigners far away in antiquity, but also those that are near. Moreover, as I will explain, it also, as time goes on, comes to bear a function within Greek societies. In that sense both 'Greekness' and 'foreignness' are shifting labels of cultural identity, constantly being renegotiated by parties within Greek societies.

---

[32] See Vasunia 2001. On Praxinoa and *Id.* 15 see chapter III below.

[33] Bhabha 2004.66-84.

Recent work on ethnography and encounters between Greeks and foreigners by Greg Woolf and Joseph Skinner has substantially deepened existing paradigms for the study of Greek contact with various non-Greeks.[34] As I will explain in subsequent chapters, there has been increasing backlash against the model of self/Other, wherein Greek ethnographers looked outwards to non-Greek peoples living at the margins of the world—the Scythians, the Egyptians—as mirrors of their own values, as Francois Hartog so memorably illustrated.[35] The practice of Greek ethnography consists of a spectrum of discourses ranging from 'Othering' to genealogical negotiation that Greek writers use to conceive of foreigners, their languages, and practices.[36] Additionally, studies of Greek ethnic identification around the turn of the millennium—particularly the work of Jonathan Hall—has effectively established as conventional wisdom that Greeks deployed ideas of ethnic identity instrumentally (in ways appropriate to the various situations in which ethnic identification matters) and discursively (there is never one idea of 'ethnicity,' but rather one that is generated within larger discussions of geography, class, and status).[37]

Another strand of studies of identity in antiquity has looked at how Greek intellectuals under the Roman empire fashioned themselves between Greece and Rome. Tim Whitmarsh has deployed the heuristic of *paideia*—Greek elite cultural performance—as a means of conceiving how in the second century C.E., during the period Philostratus calls the "Second Sophistic" (Philost. *VS* 481), Greek speakers from the margins of the Roman Empire were able to assert their Hellenicity.[38] Whitmarsh's account of the Second Sophistic is decidedly upbeat: "the Hellenization enacted by *paideia*," he notes, "is never simply a consolidation of an anterior identity but the creation of a new, 'foreign,' one."[39] In this sense, in a world with a distinct imperial

---

[34] Woolf 2011, Skinner 2012.

[35] See Hartog 1988.8-11.

[36] Woolf 2011.13-17, Skinner 2012.5-19.

[37] J.M. Hall 2002.9-19; see also Skinner 2012.19-30.

[38] Whitmarsh 2001.

[39] Whitmarsh 2001.129.

center (Rome), and a politically and militarily emasculated cultural center (Athens), participation in either political or intellectual culture by their very natures makes one a foreigner. Genetic ethnic identities then become far less important than the cultural politics of performing a Greek identity.

This optimism about identity in the Second Sophistic operates in stark contrast to the general pessimism about issues of gender and ethnic identity in studies of classical Athens. Indeed Whitmarsh finds the opposition between the exclusivity of fifth century B.C.E. Athens and the inclusivity of second century C.E. Hellenicity something to be noticed and celebrated.[40] This enthusiasm is visible in approaches to other periods as well, such as in Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's study of personal identity in late Republican Rome.[41] Although the fact that these identities are subject to perennial contestation is lost on neither scholar, *paideia* as a paradigm has its limits. Recent works on racism in antiquity by Benjamin Isaac and Denise McCoskey have questioned the extent to which this ecumenical worldview is able to be uniformly applied: if there is no ancient equivalent of Jim Crow, there certainly are active stereotypes applied to non-Greek speakers and genetically ethnic non-Greeks, as well as other minorities such as eunuchs.[42]

As I will explain in my second and third chapters, the tools of ethnography are increasingly used to describe and stereotype people *within* elite Greek society in the second century C.E., and this process arguably was taking place much earlier than that. Theocritus, in his description of the Cyclops Polyphemus (*Ids.* 6 and 11) and Lucian, in his *True histories,* reflects an uncertainty to what extent nature (*phusis*) predetermines the ability of the individual to engage in proper cultural practices. This ambivalence on the part of both writers is engendered by the experience of living in the colonial world and engaging regularly with native, non-Greek or non-Greek-speaking populations.

---

[40] Whitmarsh 2001.22-23.

[41] Wallace-Hadrill 2008.1-6.

[42] Isaac 2004, McCoskey 2012; see also Gleason 1995, Romeo 2002.

The Question of Terminology

There has been an ongoing debate between scholars of ancient colonialism over whether the terminology of 'colonialism' is at all relevant in antiquity. A common judgment rendered has been to express some level of discomfort about the term because of its connotations of nineteenth and twentieth century European imperialism.[43] It is also debated whether it is appropriate to identify 'colonialism' as a coherently identifiable process in antiquity.[44] The colonial foundation narratives that develop in the fifth century, for instance, are standardized narratives that develop in concord with the tribal foundation narratives (such as the stories related to the migration of the Heracleidae) of mainland Greek cities.[45] Both types of narratives attempt to portray the heterogeneous origins of Greek cities as a single, coherent process. Even to focus primarily on the dynamics of *early* Greek colonialism obscures the sheer variety of colonialisms of antiquity (the focus on this period is engendered by the amount of scholarly attention this period has received). While Hellenistic foundations in the east or Roman *coloniae* had some level of state sponsorship, much of the migration of Greeks to Italy, Sicily, and other regions of the Mediterranean littoral was precisely that: migration.[46] So to speak of ancient colonialism is to use a term that is not ideal.[47] With that being said, however, as we have seen in the case of Morton and the Plymouth colony, colonial foundations tend to have long prehistories of contact, and only rarely (as is the case with the 'Pilgrims') do certain narratives reach canonical status. In the sense that I use the term 'colonial world,'

---

[43] See Osborne 1998.265-69, Malkin 2004.363; see also de Angelis 2009.49-54 for a more recent summary of the debate on the term 'colonization.'

[44] There has been a tradition going back to Marx of associating the phenomenon of colonialism with the capitalist mode of production. Steadfastly linking colonialism with capitalism obscures the multiplicity of colonial experiences even in our own time, and certainly privileges nineteenth and twentieth century imperialism over colonial contact in early periods. See De Angelis 2009.49-54.

[45] Osborne 1998.265, J.M. Hall 2002.96-97.

[46] Even in periods of state-sponsored colonialism, ancient colonies, unlike their modern counterparts, were usually not established with economic considerations in mind; see de Angelis 2009.52.

[47] Although the model of early European colonization of North America in some respects (in that it is disorganized, involves migration, and has no state sponsorship) is perhaps a better parallel for Greek colonialism of the archaic period than nineteenth century colonization of Africa and Asia.

then, I loosely mean regions of Greek migration and intermingling with non-Greek populations along the Mediterranean littoral.

The term 'postcoloniality' similarly draws skepticism among some classicists, who tend to see postcolonial critique as both time-discrete (referring to the legacy of nineteenth and twentieth century colonialism) and ideologically loaded.[48] As I will explain in greater detail in the next chapter, postcolonialism refers to a set of critical approaches to understanding both the larger phenomenon of colonialism, the effects of colonialism on individual identity, and the structure of power between imperial centers, whether real (Rome) or imagined (Athens) and their peripheries. Postcolonial critique, particularly that of Bhabha, provides a useful set of tools for accessing the different experiences of colonial encounters, from acceptance, negotiation, or tolerance, to bias and the logic(s) of exclusion.

Review of Chapters

This work adopts a broad methodological framework that will inevitably be subject to expansion and reevaluation as scholars continue to become more interested in the intersections between Classics and postcolonialism. Although Theocritus and Lucian are at the heart of this study, many of my conclusions are equally applicable to other authors 'between cultures,' ranging from Apuleius to Plautus to Livy. Hence rather than working towards a literary evaluation of two authors, I undertake this as part of a broader project of situating Greek and Latin literary cultures within their broader Mediterranean context.

In my first chapter, I will survey existing uses and approaches to postcolonial thought by classical scholars. While there has been a certain level of awareness of postcolonialism by classicists since the mid-1990s, it is only recently that classicists have begun to extensively employ postcolonial critique. I divide current approaches to postcolonialism in Classics into two main schools: reception, which is the study of how audiences living in formerly colonized countries have made literary use of classical themes and motifs, and an approach that uses ideas from postcolonial theorists—particularly Edward Said—to study Greek and Roman representations of foreign

---

[48] i.e. Ando 2000.60, Malkin 2004. For a review see Greenwood 2009.

countries. Finally, I will propose a method of using postcolonial critique in conjunction with a cultural poetics approach of Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke to better understand how cultural practices are wielded as political acts in both Roman and Greek literary cultures.

In my second chapter, I argue that Theocritus' portrayal of Polyphemus as a lovelorn romantic hero (*Ids.* 6 and 11) emerges out of the context of Greek settlement of Sicily and Egypt. Observing that Theocritus' descriptions of shepherds and female agricultural workers in some of his other bucolic *Idylls* (particularly *Ids.* 3 and 10) deploy concepts of both male and female beauty associated with racial characteristics in contemporary Greek artwork, I explore how the language of ethnographic description becomes a larger discourse for ideas of beauty and character. When large numbers of Greek speakers emigrate to the near east and Egypt, they find themselves as neighbors of peoples that had been subject to ethnographic speculation—including 'Othering'—by Greeks for centuries. Theocritus' depiction of his Cyclops draws heavily on the ethnographic language of physical description, and unlike Homer's description in the *Odyssey* which fashions the Cyclops as uncivilized and lawless, Theocritus' description presents his monstrous body as a physical limitation to his ability to become civilized. Defined by his single eye, the Cyclops cannot possibly become civilized however much he might desire. Theocritus' contrast between the monstrosity and the attempted civility of the Cyclops joins in a larger discourse of the extent to which genetic non-Greeks can participate in Greek culture and reflects ambivalence on the part of the poet about the ability of ethnographic description to identify Greek from non-Greek. In this sense I will argue that Theocritus' use of physical description can meaningfully be interpreted in the light of race, and that the development of ancient ideas of racial identity took place in light of the experience of colonialism.

Finally, I will devote two chapters to an extended study of the first book of Lucian's *True histories*. Lucian's *True histories* is a satirical account of an imaginary journey beyond the Pillars of Heracles, extensively parodying the *Odyssey,* Ctesias' account of the Persians, but most importantly the ethnographic accounts of Herodotus. In chapter V, I will examine how Lucian locates ethnographic discourse at the heart of his conception of *historiê* in both the *True histories* and his prescriptive treatise on

historiography, *How to write history*. I will then examine how Lucian's accounts of the strange people he meets in the west—tree nymphs, moon people, sun people, and lamp people—mimic Herodotean ethnographic practice, circulating concepts of language (*phonê*), customs (*nomoi)*, and nature (*phusis)* as heuristics for determining what defines culture. Lucian draws attention to the ambiguity of his own identity and to speculations by his contemporaries, including Favorinus and Polemon of Laodicea, about whether Hellenicity is restricted by birth (*genos)* or accessible through cultural performance (*paideia)*. Building on a discussion started in my second chapter, I argue that inclusive discourses of elite cultural identity (those that emphasize *paideia)* only have meaning in the context of attempts to exclude Hellenizing elites in the Roman empire from claiming to be Greek.

My fourth chapter, then, discusses the colonial narrative sequence of the end of the first book of the *True histories* (1.31-39) as an extended satire on the inability of contemporary Greek historiography to account for the presence of non-Greeks in the east except through adversarial narratives (Greek vs. Persian, for instance). Imitating the pattern of colonial narrative found in Herodotus and other fifth century historians, Lucian follows a group of colonists as they attempt to settle the belly of an enormous whale and fight with the half-human, half-fish natives. Lucian specifically emphasizes the civility of the Greek settlers while depicting the natives as monstrous in body and barbarous in custom. Lucian's narrator, deciding to launch an attack on the native inhabitants, massacres them to a man(-fish), eliminating them from the colonial landscape and rendering the country ready for colonization. In his obliteration of the native peoples, Lucian's narrator mimics the representational obliteration of the native peoples in colonial foundation narratives. Yet by turning a narrative trend into a justification for an actual act of ethnic cleansing, Lucian pushes the representational logic of colonial narrative to the greatest extent possible. As I shall explore, by ceasing to discuss the presence of natives, colonial narratives give native peoples room to be integrated into the body politic of the colony. Comparing Lucian's fictive instance of ethnic cleansing in the *True histories* to an apparent instance of ethnic cleansing in Herodotus' account of early fifth-century Syracuse (Hdt. 7.153-36), I will demonstrate how Greek historiography uses preexisting paradigms of knowledge, like colonial foundation narratives, to contextualize

16

historical events that take place on the margins. Through his mock colonial narrative, Lucian parodies—though does not necessarily condemn—the incongruities of using already-determined paradigms of knowledge to interpret history.

In this study I mean not so much to create a counter-narrative to Whitmarsh's model of *paideia* than to ground the ancient reality of multiethnic and multicultural societies within a less optimistic view of ancient strategies of representing difference. Writers in the middle ground between Greek and Syrian or Siciliot and Macedonian, like Lucian and Theocritus, are able to hold the space between integration of non-Greeks into a Greek cultural framework and apprehension over whether a genetic non-Greek could ever *be* Greek, or even whether it is possible to tell a genetic Greek from a genetic non-Greek at all. In a twenty-first century that has cast off many of its apprehensions about difference—when the facile structures of twentieth century national identities have gradually eroded and global mobility has reached unprecedented heights—we may still recognize that ethnic and racial biases persist as discourses of exclusion, even if they no longer function as absolute barriers. As Whitmarsh reminds, cultural practice—the phenomenon that we call "culture"—unfolds within discourses of power: there are stakes in who performs culture successfully and who is excluded from that performance.[49] Postcolonial critique will then be able to help classicists better understand the complications of and limits to diversity in antiquity and the extent to which we can speak to the *personal* experience of colonialism in antiquity.

---

[49] Whitmarsh 2001.37. See also Henderson 2011 on sub-elite cultural performance in the Second Sophistic.

CHAPTER II

POSTCOLONIALISM AND THE CLASSICS: TOWARDS A NEW POETICS OF CULTURE

This chapter will provide a model for how postcolonial theory can be deployed by classicists to explore questions of identity and diversity in antiquity. Thus far, postcolonialism has been intermittently employed by classical scholars over the past two decades, including in important pieces by Jane Webster,[1] Phiroze Vasunia,[2] Carla Antonaccio,[3] Barbara Goff,[4] and Emily Greenwood.[5] There has, however, been confusion on what exactly postcolonialism means for classicists: is it the study of receptions of classical texts by writers influenced by modern European colonialism, or is it deployable as a broader methodology of reading antiquity itself?[6] Increasingly, historians that study identity in antiquity, as well as literary scholars of ancient ethnography, have turned to postcolonial theory to conceptualize how not only ancient Greeks and Romans, but also Phoenicians, Egyptians, Sicels, and others conceptualized their place in the Mediterranean basin.[7] Borrowing from applications of postcolonial theory in English studies, and tracing the uses and precursors of postcolonial theory in Classics over the last twenty years, I shall demonstrate how classical texts can be read in the light of the experiences of those who lived in the great colonial empires of the nineteenth and twentieth century.

This study means to develop postcolonial critique as a historically sensitive means of accessing the extent to which writers living in the colonial worlds of antiquity—Sicily, Egypt, or the near east, where large numbers of Greeks, and later Romans, had come to settle with native populations—reflect the presence of both non-Greek-speaking and non-

---

[1] Webster 1996, 1997, 2001.

[2] Vasunia 2001, 2003.

[3] Antonaccio 2003.

[4] Goff 2005, Goff and Simpson 2007.

[5] Greenwood 2009.

[6] See Goff 2005.2, Greenwood 2009.654-56 on the debates surrounding the term 'postcolonialism.'

[7] Malkin 1998, 2004, 2011; Wallace-Hadrill 2008.213-58, Gruen 2011, Woolf 2011, Skinner 2012.

elite groups in their practices of representation. In his *Orientalism,* Edward Said explored how representations of the colonial world by western scholars sought to turn the colonial natives into the putative 'Other.' Postcolonial theorists such as Homi K. Bhabha have subsequently theorized the complex negotiations that take place within colonial societies, particularly between colonists and native, non-white elites. Despite the readily apparent differences between ancient and modern colonialisms, the use of postcolonial theory promises to offer a window into the actual dynamics of living in an ancient society. Chapters III and IV of this thesis, for instance, focus on the developing logic of ethnic exclusion in two different eras of ancient colonialism (in Theocritus during the Hellenistic period and in Lucian during the Second Sophistic).

There are limits to the functionality of postcolonial theory. The most influential strand of postcolonial literary scholarship has been that which focuses on the representation of colonial natives.[8] As I have already discussed, longstanding patterns of representation or tropes undoubtedly had an effect on shaping how ancient Greeks and Romans interpreted foreigners, and particularly in historiography these tropes loomed large as means of interpreting the past.[9] That being said, representation carries with it certain communicative properties. Representations, even if they are shaped by longstanding stereotypes, tropes, or strategies (such as the practice of 'Othering'), are inherently time-discrete and contextual.[10] When Greeks of the second century C.E. engage in stereotypes of the effeminate Asiatic, as for instance Plutarch does when he discusses the habit of the Asiatic orator (as in Plut. *Ant.* 2.8), is the point of the stereotype that the speaker either believes all 'Asiatics' are effeminate, or that the use of the slur carries with it a range of judgments and associations that are operative within a particular context? Bhabha has explored the functionality of stereotypes as an ambivalent means of representation (as will be discussed below),[11] but what is important for classicists is that

---

[8] This is not true for the entire field. Postcolonial historians like Partha Chatterjee (1993), for instance, have focused more intently on how colonized peoples sought to create their own identities outside of the structure of European representation.

[9] Isaac 2004.37-38.

[10] Cf. Bhabha's critique of Said's attack on the practice of Orientalism as overdetermined (1994.72). On stereotyping in antiquity see Skinner 2012.116.

[11] Bhabha 1994.66-84; see below. On stereotyping in antiquity see also Skinner 2012.116.

that the historically discrete nature of representation be observed. This attention to the historically discrete marks a divergence for this study from a larger group of works that have sought to track the history of Greek and Roman representations of foreigners through relatively broad strokes.[12] As postcolonial theory has come to emphasize, identity is the culmination of a long series of individual (and instrumental) choices—choices, that though they may be determined in recognizable patterns, ultimately come back to individual expediency. In this light, I have turned to the cultural poetics school of Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke. By analyzing how questions of identity and cultural practice are determined by political instrumentality within societies, classicists working with postcolonial theory can ground representation in its historical setting.

Cultural Poetics at the Margins

'Cultural politics,' 'cultural poetics,' and 'cultural materialism' are terms that emerge out of the dissatisfaction with dehistoricized modes of reading in the 1980s.[13] A group of scholars informally led by Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke began to work on a methodology in the early 1990s that would allow literary scholars to read the cultural conflicts apparent within archaic and classical texts, particularly those surrounding the expression of aristocratic values. Heavily influenced by Foucault, by Stephen Greenblatt's new historicism (from whom they take much of their terminology), and by the anthropology of Clifford Geertz, in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*,[14] Dougherty and Kurke seek to investigate the "cultural negotiations" by which competing groups within a cultural body exercise certain practices and make certain statements as parts of a larger communicative framework.[15] Cultural expression and cultural practice are embedded within a broader dynamic of political discourse that takes place within societies. Certain statements, such as, for instance, the love of luxury (*habros*) professed in many of the archaic lyric poets, represent a type of class or status assertion that

---

[12] For instance, E. Hall 1989, Vasunia 2001, Issac 2004.

[13] Dougherty and Kurke 1993.3-6, 2003.2-6. The cultural poetics school of Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke has periodically come under fire for overreliance on structural paradigms; see Malkin 1998.23-24; for a postcolonial critique of the new historicism, see Goff and Simpson 2007.36.

[14] Dougherty and Kurke 1993.

[15] Dougherty and Kurke 1993.4-6; 2003.6-7.

expresses its polemical meaning only within a specific historical context.[16] Even if ancient literary culture was only ever written and disseminated by a small percentage of the population of antiquity (and of course, most of it is lost), ancient literary texts can serve as a zone of contact between the voice of the writer and those who are represented by the writer.[17] That is to say, texts written by elites, through representation, carry with them the voices of the subaltern, even if they are adversative or even absent.[18] In their subsequent volume, *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture,*[19] Dougherty and Kurke expand their focus to the cultural negotiations that take place on the frontiers of Greek life. Carol Dougherty's contribution, for instance, details how the Aristonothos Crater, a vessel found in an Etruscan tomb that depicts Odysseus and the Cyclops on one side and a sea battle between Greeks and non-Greeks on the other, serves as a locus of competing interpretations by a variety of Greek and non-Greek readers.[20]

New historicist interpretations of cultural interaction in classical literature participate in a larger body of scholarship across the humanities on the topic of identity and otherness that arose in the 1970s and 1980s. It had been increasingly a commonplace that 'Greeks' (free male citizen Athenians?) identified themselves in opposition to an 'Other' (whether non-Greek, female, or slave), but the actual theoretical models to map these distinctions were for the most part not forthcoming in the Anglophone Classics community until the end of the 1980s.[21] For instance, Francois Hartog's *Mirror of Herodotus* (translated in 1988, but originally published in 1980) investigates how Herodotus constructs his worldview using a series of cultural oppositions (self vs. Other) between Greeks, Scythians, and Egyptians. Likewise, Edith Hall's 1989 *Inventing the Barbarian*, an early application of Edward Said's work in Classics, begins with a discussion about the fifth-century Greek definition of Greekness before engaging in her

---

[16] Morris 1996, Kurke 2006.

[17] Dougherty and Kurke 2003.8.

[18] Following Dougherty 1993, later in this paper I will look at how colonial narratives accomplish this end with colonial native populations. On subaltern studies, see Gopal 2004.

[19] Dougherty and Kurke 2003.

[20] Dougherty 2003.

[21] For a short critical history of the Other in Classics, see Gruen 2011.1-5, Skinner 2012.21-30.

argument of how tragedy both establishes and undermines the boundary between Greek and non-Greek.[22]

Works such as Hartog's or Edith Hall's tend to focus more on how the Other is a unilateral projection rather than a negotiation. For both, representation is not only relatively static, but somewhat removed from the world. The general tendency in works of this period is to conceptualize any sort of interaction in terms of resistance.[23] Moreover, the focus on ideological constructions and representations, and particularly the focus on Athens, tends to obscure the real-world interactions that subvert or defy the xenophobic and misogynistic language of the fifth century. 'Othering' is only one of several coexisting strategies of ethnic identification available to classical writers.[24] The current view by the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century, established by Jonathan Hall, has been that notions of Greek identity transform from aggregative to oppositional (self vs. Other) around the time of the Persian wars.[25] Scholars have become increasingly sensitive to both the instrumentality of identity—as Joseph Skinner argues, language of opposition appears within Greek cultures(s) instrumentally, and its deployment depends heavily on time, place, and intended target—and the capacity of Greeks to utilize different strategies of ethnic identification at the same time.[26] Even in the Athenian fifth century, Greekness might not have been so clear a concept. The Persian wars did not automatically transform the east into an adversary at every level of culture: if Euripides, for instance, surprises us by *not* depicting his Medea as a scary magic Persian snake woman, the question should be directed at *our* expectations rather than Euripides' characterization.[27] If 'Greek' identity was never a truly firm concept in

---

[22] E. Hall 1989.3-12. On Hartog, E. Hall and E. Said, see Vasunia 2003.89, also Bowditch 2011.91-95.

[23] i.e. Rabinowitz 1993.

[24] See Woolf 2011.13-17.

[25] J.M. Hall 2002; Skinner (2012.26-27) criticizes Hall for his reliance on synchrony.

[26] For review see Skinner 2012.19-30.

[27] i.e. D.L. Page's famously dismissive (and rather Senecan) characterization of Medea as 'a woman scorned' and '[what] fifth-century Athenians believed to be characteristic of Orientals' (in Mastronarde 2002.22-23). For Medea as Greek aristocrat, see Mueller 2001.

the archaic and classical periods, other types of identities must follow—which lines of gender, linguistic, and status identity do individuals like Miltiades (or Pausanias, Themistocles, Cimon, or Alcibiades—not to mention aristocratic culture in general) cross? And what about the non-elites who regularly crossed these lines? Increasingly, scholars are also discovering the presence of subaltern groups in Greek literature, particularly literature set—and often performed—on the margins of the Greek cultural sphere, such as Italy and Sicily, or among non-elite classes.[28]

Thus work of the cultural poetics circle has been aimed at matching texts with historical contexts to reach a vision of the social and political motives behind cultural production in archaic Greece. Scholars working in cultural poetics have a particular tendency of mining late or fragmentary sources for preserved information about literary culture or ritual in archaic and classical Greece to use as contexts, a tendency that is quite open to criticism.[29] Although archaeologists and ancient historians have been active participants in the cultural poetics school, the continuing metaphor for culture employed by those using cultural poetics as a methodology has been the text, and indeed its most successful applications have been by literary scholars. The term 'cultural poetics' is originally Greenblatt's, but aside from its origins in Renaissance studies, the cultural poetics school promotes a decidedly anthropological and structural angle of criticism, seeing individual communications as largely determined by underlying, fixed social factors. Clifford Geertz's influential anthropological work that seeks to provide 'thick description' of cultural practices—noting down every possible detail of cultural practice in order to make culturally informed readings—has the tendency to lead to the view of culture as a closed system, like a text.[30] Nevertheless, cultural poetics makes an attempt to read literary culture in archaic Greece as a manifestation of a system of cultural production that is more important than the texts themselves. In their comprehension of

---

[28] Here it is worth remembering Spivak's important assertion that the subaltern *cannot* speak by virtue of being the subaltern (Spivak 1985; see Gandhi 1994.65-66; Gopal 2004). Kurke and Dougherty's method is optimistic in this regard, since the subaltern is so often characterized by silence (cf. Nicholson 2005 on the missing charioteer, Kurke 2011 on the affiliations of prose writing).

[29] i.e. Malkin 1998.23-24 criticizing the tendency towards synchronic interpretations.

[30] Dougherty and Kurke 2003.7. Though Dougherty and Kurke note this tendency, it lives on in the essays of the 2003 volume as well as in subsequent work.

the ability of class and status politics to manifest themselves through cultural production, scholars of cultural poetics have recognized the ability of classical texts to operate as zones of contention between groups, rather than as finished objects. At the same time as modern scholars can appreciate that texts carry with them historically discrete contexts, we can also appreciate that texts at all points in their production and reception are necessarily 'in between' constituencies of readership.[31] As I will describe in the next chapter, for instance, a literary creation like Theocritus' Cyclops in *Idylls* 6 and 11 can serve as a type of canvas, onto which Theocritus applies anxieties about the exte;nt to which people that are not ethnically Greek can engage in Greek cultural practices. Likewise, Lucian's mock ethnographies in the *True histories* and *On the Syrian goddess* (chapter IV) engage in the standard tropes used in Herodotean-inspired Greek historiography to describe the peoples of the east, while at the same time raising the specter of there being a non-Greek author, and potentially even a non-Greek audience.

In this light I would like to return to the relevance of using postcolonial literary theory—and to a lesser extent, the history of nineteenth and twentieth century colonialism—as a comparative context for modern readers to read texts from the colonial world of the ancient Mediterranean.

Poscolonial Theory: Said And Bhabha

Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) has been widely held as the founding text of postcolonial literary critique.[32] Leela Gandhi has identified two stages of postcolonial thought: Said's brand of postcolonialism, which investigates the discursive and ideological underpinnings of colonial discourse and representation, and a later variety, identified with Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha, which tracks the ambivalent negotiations between the colonist and the colonized.[33] Borrowing heavily from Foucauldian discourse analysis, Said aims his critique of Orientalist thinking towards the political, noting that all individual thought is both bound by and implicated in its social,

---

[31] Cf. Martindale's "all meaning begins at the point of reception" (1993.2).

[32] Gandhi 1994.64-65, Vasunia 2003.89.

[33] Gandhi 1994.64-65.

economic, and political circumstances.[34] This is to say that there can be no thinking by westerners about the 'Orient' outside from the historical reality of colonialism. Said's work generated a fierce—and political—pushback almost immediately. Said's attack on the discourse of Orientalism drew, from its antagonists, almost immediate comparisons to a possible (and for them, unfathomable) attack against the discourse of classicism. In a notable misunderstanding of Said's work, Bernard Lewis, for instance, speculated the horror that would surely ensue if the study of ancient Greece was suddenly limited to modern Greeks.[35] Lewis raises this criticism because he finds the idea preposterous, but recent discussions by classicists on the history of western classicism have shown it to be synonymous with the ideology of nineteenth century colonialism and empire.[36] The powers of western Europe have a (possibly ongoing) history of colonial involvement in modern Greece, and for both modern western Europeans and modern Greeks appeals to antiquity (and comparisons with the present state of Greece) carry potent force.[37] Like the work of many postcolonial scholars, Said's thought reflects a level of disenchantment with the politics of resistance by early postcolonial thinkers, noting how writers like Kenya's James Ngugi (later Ngugi wa Thiong'o) ended up both isolated from the west and persecuted by his own government.[38] For Said, there is no escape from or alternative to the reality of colonialism in the modern world. Though *Orientalism* was often withering in its attacks on the western academy, Said's later work (such as his 1993 *Culture and Imperialism)* transitions towards a celebration of the ability of the exile—removed from the context of his or her home country—to fashion his or her own world between east and

---

[34] E. Said 1978.11.

[35] Quoted in Vasunia 2003.90-91.

[36] On the classical education of the imperial administrative class, see Vasunia 2003.93-96, Goff 2005; for the classical education of native elites and its consequences see Greenwood 2010.69-111; imperial ideology and the manufacture of the other Bowditch 2011.93.

[37] See Swain 1996.35-36 on the politics of language use in modern Greece.

[38] E. Said 1994.18. Ngugi—famous for abandoning the use of the English language in his literary works and for calling for the abolition of the literature faculty at the University of Nairobi—has been a powerful presence in postcolonial criticism for his call for the 'decolonization of the mind,' also the title of his 1986 book. This motif particularly set the tone for Cornel West's powerful talk on postcolonialism at the 2012 APA and promises to greatly expand the scope of postcolonial critique in Classics by decentering postcolonialism from the *historical* process of decolonization.

west. Rather than rejecting the structure of western knowledge, Said proposes a negotiation.[39]

The next generation of postcolonial scholarship made a much more concerted effort to reach out to the experiences of the colonized. Homi Bhabha's *Location of Culture* (1994) identifies two concepts in the relationship between colonizer and colonized that have become paradigmatic terms in postcolonial studies: *hybridity* and *ambivalence*.[40] According to Bhabha, *hybridity* is the area of compromise that appears between the competing identities of social actors. Hybridity is not just a phenomenon between culture groups, but one that manifests itself in the very structure of language.[41] *Ambivalence* as a term encapsulates the slippage between the ideology of empire—how native elites steeped themselves in British elite culture in order to position themselves within the often ecumenical and meritocratic language of colonial empire—and the usual experience of the colonized, which was exclusion from the imperial elite because of the open racism of the colonizer.[42] Indians, for instance, were willingly schooled in British elite culture (including Latin and Greek), but the relationship between British educators and Indian educated was always one of *ambivalence:* the British could teach Indians *how* to be British, but were never willing to allow Indians to *be* British.[43] There were always discourses of racism and ethnic exclusion operative in the language of nineteenth century colonialism that sought to exclude even the best educated native elites from finding a place in the metropolis. The ambivalence of education has been a popular topic in all areas of postcolonial scholarship, and has been a major topic of interest in discussions of postcolonialism in the Classics.[44] However, ambivalence, like hybridity, is a concept that

---

[39] *Orientalism* faced criticism from, amongst others, academic Marxists such as Aijaz Ahmad who attacked Said (as well as other postcolonial critics) for themselves participating in colonizing discourse from their positions in prestigious western universities. See Ahmad 1993; Bhabha's response (1994.19-39).

[40] See also Ghandi 1994.149-56.

[41] Bhabha 1994.24.

[42] Bhabha 1994.85-92; Anderson 2006.92-93.

[43] Bhabha 1994.87, Anderson 2006.83-111.

[44] Vasunia 2003, Goff 2005, Greenwood 2010.

can exist in noncolonial environments, as well, where one cultural group comes under the influence of another cultural group between which there is an imbalance of power, for instance Rome's reception of Greek culture (and vice versa).[45]

It is useful to return to Hartog in light of Bhabha's theorization of the colonial relationship. For Hartog, images of the Other are projections from the geographical center of the Herodotean text (Greece) into the margins of the world.[46] The text erects firm boundaries between self and Other and systematically penalizes those that dare to cross them. For Hartog, bilingualism presents a symbolic threat to the dichotomy of self/Other that Herodotus means to preclude. [47] Yet again, Herodotus *does* occasionally make fairly nuanced engagements with some of the cultures he writes about, such as, for instance, his deployment of metarhythmic translations of foreign names.[48] Is Herodotus' construction of the Other *only* a projection, or is his ethnography, rather than just functioning as a mirror, also a negotiation? Or, to rephrase the question, can the other write back? Emily Greenwood reads the fourth book of Herodotus quite differently from Hartog, seeing Scythia as a zone of engagement and negotiation with the Other, rather than of delineation and separation.[49] In her example of method, she reads Herodotus 4.99.4-5, where Herodotus attempts to describe the Crimean peninsula by inviting the reader to imagine "Attica projected rather further into the sea and inhabited by some race other than the Athenians."[50] Herodotus propels the Athenians from a central position in Herodotus' Greek world to the margins by describing Greek geography in terms familiar to a hypothetical Scythian sailor. Instead of Greeks discovering the countries of

---

[45] See Wallace-Hadrill 2008.219 on the use of Hellenism to define Romanitas; Barchiesi 2009 on the use of Greek rhetorical models by such famous Hellenophobes as Cato the Elder.

[46] Hartog 1988.12-14.

[47] Hartog 1988.64.

[48] Chamberlain 1999.49-50. Munson is more cautious on Herodotus' understanding of foreign language, but does observe that Herodotus depicts foreigners as capable of 'knowing' Greek culture as Greeks are capable of 'knowing' foreign cultures through metarhythmic translation (2005.69-70 on Hdt. 5.1.2-3).

[49] Greenwood 2009.

[50] Greenwood 2009.661. ὡς εἰ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἄλλο ἔθνος καὶ μὴ Ἀθηναῖοι νεμοίατο τὸν γουνὸν τὸν Σουνιακόν, μᾶλλον ἐς τὸν πόντον [τὴν ἄκρην] ἀνέχοντα.

foreigners, Attica itself becomes a virgin land in the eyes of the Scythian explorer—as marginal to Scythia as Scythia is marginal to Greece. Hence the other has a presence in its own representation: the act of representing the Other is never unilateral, but in fact a relationship, even if power might be weighted to one side.[51]

In this larger sense, there is nothing necessarily 'postcolonial' about postcolonial criticism: postcolonial critique is useful to conceptualize situations of contention between and within cultures, especially those where one group wields disproportionate power. It has become increasingly current even for critics who are not familiar or sympathetic with the current, poststructuralist, angle of postcolonial theory to make overtures to the field.[52] Though the term can sometimes be even more problematic than the theory, which has largely gone along with major critical trends over the last three decades,[53] what is more interesting is that there are questions of social and disciplinary identity in labeling something postcolonial or not. As Greenwood observes, there is a large body of classical scholarship that addresses postcolonial concerns—such as the relationship between Romans and Greeks, or consensus under the Roman empire—and reflects similar theoretical concerns, yet is not conceived of as such.[54]

Postcolonial Approaches in Classical Studies

Despite the interpretative kinship with approaches such as cultural poetics, classicists have been slow to apply postcolonial theory directly to Greek and Latin literary cultures. As I briefly discussed in the introduction, there has been great debate on the applicability of the term 'colonialism' in antiquity at all,[55] and uses of postcolonial theory by literary scholars have been rare until very recently. While understanding and appreciating the fundamental differences between the several varieties of ancient and modern colonialisms, it is also important to understand the commonalities of the

---

[51] See Bowditch's discussion (2011.93-95); cf. Bhabha 1994.44.

[52] e.g. Antonaccio 2003, Malkin 2004, Skinner 2012.29 n109.

[53] Greenwood 2009.655.

[54] Greenwood 2009.658.

[55] See Osborne 1998.265-69, Malkin 2004.363; see also de Angelis 2009.49-54 for a more recent summary of the debate on the term 'colonization.'

experiences of foreign control between nineteenth and twentieth century writers and those in antiquity. A key premise of this work, for instance, will be the experience of colonial ambivalence in both Theocritus in the Hellenistic period (particularly *Idylls* 3, 6, 10, 11, 15, and 16) and Lucian during the Second Sophistic. First, however, I would like to survey the current uses of postcolonialism by classicists. In the following section I will informally delineate two major approaches taken by Classicists influenced by postcolonial thought, and by Said in particular: classical reception and discourse analysis.

Reception:

Postcolonialism first entered into the awareness of classicists through the study of receptions of classical texts by writers from the formerly colonized world, including Wole Soyinka's translation of the *Bacchae,* Derek Walcott's *Homeros,* and the poetry of Aime Cesaire. Walcott especially leaped into the public consciousness with the awarding of his Nobel Prize in 1992, the citation for which specifically commended him for his use of classical models. Walcott's ascent to laurels came in the same period as classical reception studies emerged as a methodology first in the UK, and later in the US. Following the lead of Charles Martindale, whose maxim that "all meaning begins at the point of reception,"[56] proponents of classical reception seek to demonstrate how classical texts continue to be appropriated and used as cultural touchstones into the twenty-first century. Studying classical receptions by postcolonial writers (Soyinka, Walcott, Heaney, etc.) during this period becomes, for classicists, a means for opening up a notoriously exclusive discipline to new eyes.[57]

As a result, some of the earliest and most important use of postcolonial theory by classicists has been, in the example of Edward Said, to investigate how the institution of the classical education was used both to justify the empires of Britain and France as legitimate successors of Athens and Rome and to view ancient Greeks and Romans as proto-English or Frenchmen. In the eighteenth century, the expanding European colonial empires began to construct themselves in the model of ancient empires as they

---

[56] Martindale 1993.2. Italics removed.

[57] On the use of Classics as a tool of social differentiation and exclusion see Stray 2002.

established overseas dominions.[58] Likewise, as Britain and France expanded into Africa, India, Asia, and other regions of the world, the cultural elites of both empires deployed classical authors in education to promote their vision of empire, but also educated the children of colonized elites in Latin and Greek in order to incorporate them into the broader vision of imperial society, where colonized elites would make themselves into imitations of the English or French gentleman.[59] The European administrators sent to run the colonial possessions were deliberately schooled in Latin and Greek—often to the exclusion of more 'practical' subjects, such as agronomy, engineering, or medicine.[60] Classics as a discourse served both to legitimate empire and to promote a unifying vision of world history: if (alternately) the Greek *polis* or the Roman Empire marked the previous highlights of human history, then the colonial empires should be seen as elaborations upon them. The result in the formerly colonized world has largely been a rejection of classical studies, with exceptions.[61]

Much has been written on the fallacies of colonial education, such as the instruction of children in Caribbean classrooms in Latin and Greek instead of mathematics or biology. Indeed, many of the prominent postcolonial theorists of the 1980s and 1990s expressed a lingering bitterness at their own educations.[62] The influence of Walcott, and particularly his use of the classical tradition as a means of 'writing back,' has meant that Caribbean receptions of classical antiquity have drawn special attention.[63] Barbara Goff and Michael Simpson's work on the reception of Greek tragedy within the African diaspora has, following the early work of Fritz Fanon, adopted a psychoanalytic perspective on the dynamics of postcolonial reception. According to Goff and Simpson, the appeal of Sophocles' Theban tragedies to postcolonial African

---

[58] Webster 2001, Goff 2005.5-9.

[59] Vasunia 2003.93-96, Goff 2005.9-12, Greenwood 2010.69-111; cf. Bhabha 1994.

[60] Vasunia 2003.94-95.

[61] Goff 2005.10, Greenwood 2010.3-4 on Kamuzu Academy.

[62] See especially Bhabha 1994 on colonial mimicry, but also Chatterjee 1993, Gandhi 1994, Anderson 2006, Greenwood 2010.

[63] See Greenwood 2004, 2010.

audiences mirrors the inner condition of the postcolonial subject; the colonial subject sees in Oedipus, who murders his father and sleeps with his mother, an analogy to his or her own situation, with Europe being the father.[64] This operates as a larger dynamic of adversative, but deeply personal, intergenerational cultural transmission.[65] Building on the work of Paul Gilroy's concept of the 'black Atlantic,' Goff and Simpson fashion what they call the 'Black Aegean.'[66] Rather than being simply the tool of the colonial oppressor, Greek antiquity operates as a zone of contact between the ancient world and the modern: Britain becomes simply one more island along the shore of the black Aegean.[67] Concepts of the 'black Aegean' are indeed relevant on a level beyond postcolonial reception, since, as has been increasingly accepted by classicists, the Aegean itself in antiquity, rather than being a Greek sea, served as a zone of contact between a number of ancient cultures.[68]

Goff and Simpson's concept of the 'black Aegean' has wider relevance within the growing discourse of the postcolonial classics. Emily Greenwood has, for instance, used it as a framing device in her discussions of the Cuban revolutionary Jose Marti's call for a new, non-European model of the university, where texts of different cultures would come together to create a new notion of the 'classic.'[69] Given the near-incessant debate within the classical reception community about what constitutes the 'classic,' scholars working in postcolonial receptions of classical texts have created a new model for the 'classical tradition:' the zone of contact, between different constituencies rather than a canon.

---

[64] Goff and Simpson 2007.13.

[65] Goff and Simpson 2007.35.

[66] Gilroy 1993. The black Atlantic serves as one of a number of metaphors employed by postcolonial critics to describe zones of cultural negotiation; Richard White's concept of the 'middle ground' (1991) has been as or more popular with classicists and will be discussed below; see Woolf 2011, Skinner 2012. Both the 'black Atlantic' and 'middle ground' differ from Bhabha's concept of hybridity, which has its roots in such poststructuralist theorizations as *différence.*

[67] See also Greenwood 2010.20-38 on the history of comparisons between the colonized Caribbean and the Aegean in both European travel accounts and Caribbean writers.

[68] Goff and Simpson 2007.38-42. See Malkin 2011 on the metaphor of sea as network.

[69] Greenwood 2009.653, 2010.5.

Reception studies represent the major, and perhaps even the primary, strand of postcolonial studies in classics up to the present moment. Reception studies have clearly established their relevance within the broader Classics community, and the study of Latin and Greek authors outside the context of Europe carries the promise of (as it were) decolonizing the field. What this study means to do, however, is to demonstrate the functionality of using postcolonial theory to access colonized voices *within* antiquity.

Discourse analysis:

Following Said, postcolonial thought has largely developed within the framework of poststructuralism.[70] Discourse analysis, first developed by Michel Foucault in a series of works published in the early 1970s, is an approach of investigating how power is both shaped and limited by structures of knowledge built to surround it. Although works such as Said's *Orientalism* effectively used discourse analysis to explore a series of relatively strict binaries (east/west, self/Other), Foucault's own thought was far less dichotomously structured. As Bhabha explains, "*'Pouvoir/Savoir'* (knowledge/power) places subjects in a relation of power and recognition that is not symmetrical . . . subjects are always disproportionately placed in opposition or domination through the symbolic decentering of multiple power relations."[71]

Said's *Orientalism* was influential among classicists, and many early uses of Said in Classics used discourse analysis to build the dichotomy of the self/Other along the lines of power/knowledge. Approaches taken over the last decade have been more interested in using discourse analysis as a means of studying how discourse serves as a zone of contention for identity, rather than a means of imposition. Tim Whitmarsh (2001), Phiroze Vasunia (2001), Stephanie Stephens (2003), and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill (2008) have for instance utilized discourse analysis to understand how Greek-speaking writers, often living as minority populations in the non-Greek-speaking east, develop a sense of elite Greek identity through discourses of cultural practice and alterity. Vasunia, writing on Greek perceptions of Egypt, Whitmarsh, writing on elite identity in the Second Sophistic, and Stephens, writing on literary culture in Ptolemaic Egypt, all focus on how

---

[70] On the move away from materialism, see Gandhi 1994.64; on the strategic adoption of poststructual critical models by postcolonial theorists, see Gopal 2004.146.

[71] Bhabha 1994.72.

32

elite Greek-speakers living in the presence of non-Greeks (or non-Hellenizing non-Greeks) perform their identities as a means of cultural politics. Whitmarsh, for instance, notes how elite Greeks living under the rule of the Roman empire fashioned this discourse of *paideia*, a combination of literary knowledge, manners, and athletics, into a performance of Greek manhood that could operate as a functional equivalent of the political and military prowess that Greeks had lost to Rome.[72] Vasunia likewise argues that in a manner similar to nineteenth and twentieth century Orientalism, ancient Greek knowledge of Egypt becomes an authorization to 'own' the Egyptian Other,[73] while Stephens sees Ptolemaic court literature as deliberately making overtures to interpretation by Hellenizing Egyptian readers.[74] Wallace-Hadrill has similarly argued that the adoption of the discourse of Hellenism by Roman elites served as impetus for the development of the nativist discourse of the *mos maiorum*.[75]

The works of Whitmarsh, Vasunia, Stephens, and Wallace-Hadrill on discourses of Hellenism all display the familiar interplay of power and knowledge: cultural production becomes a zone for the articulation of power.[76] Unlike Hartog's study, Whitmarsh, Vasunia, and Stephens write about situations where for the most part Greek-speaking writers are in regular direct contact negotiation with non-Greek speakers. In that type of situation, rather than being empty projections, non-Greeks have a definite place in these discourses of Hellenicity. Jane Webster's work from around the same period explicitly makes use of postcolonial theory for proposing a new model of religious syncretism in the western Roman empire.[77] Webster notes how existing paradigms of Roman-Celtic cultural interaction in classical archaeology have been shaped by early twentieth century British imperial ideology, particularly in the ecumenical language often used to describe the adoption of Roman material culture by those describing the process

---

[72] Whitmarsh 2001.25.

[73] Vasunia 2001.11-20.

[74] Stephens 2003.13-14.

[75] Wallace-Hadrill 2008.218-59.

[76] Whitmarsh 2001.37.

[77] Webster 1996, 1997, 2001.

of acculturation. As Webster demonstrates, unidirectional Romanization (where non-Roman adoption of Roman gods functions simply as political accommodation) is an unsatisfying explanation of the phenomenon of syncretism, not the least because syncretic artifacts are often found at non-elite sites, where there would be fewer rewards for natives to Romanize.[78]

Instead, Webster proposes a model for Roman-Celtic cultural interaction taken from Caribbean studies and linguistics: creolization, where non-elites adopt facets from the culture of their overlords, but deploy them in different ways.[79] African slaves, for instance, adopted the material culture of their masters (not to mention other forms of cultural expression) but deployed it quite differently. Borrowing from Stuart Hall, Webster adopts a diachronic model of discourse analysis. Whereas artifacts in their preserved contexts represent a discourse, different archaeological discourses over time "[embody] certain similar institutions, practices, and inequalities [that] inevitably exhibit similar regimes of truth and knowledge (that is, similar forms of discourse). Where the forms of discourse are similar, the statements of which they are composed (whether these are written or artifactual, as in the case of iconography) may be compared."[80]

Hence Webster goes as far as to suggest that postcolonial theory can present a useful mode of historicized reading. If one of the major risks of comparative approaches is overconfidence in believing that one knows what he or she does not, a discourse-based approach offers a firmer basis for comparing experiences across history. Yet there is a line that must be drawn between contextual reading and the type of (inadvertent) positivism that assumes that a modern critic can access an ancient mind through a comparative approach.

Postcolonialism in the classics is still at an age where it tends to be justified by those that use it. Most of the writers I have discussed above (with the exception of Greenwood and Vasunia) do not tend to categorize their own work as postcolonial;

---

[78] Webster 2001.212.

[79] Webster 2001.218.

[80] Webster 1997.329.

Stephens, for instance, prefers the concept of 'copresence' to postcoloniality.[81] Other

fields have been somewhat less reluctant to adopt the language of postcolonial studies for

issues of marginality, ethnicity, and identity. The medievalist Jeffery Jerome Cohen, for

instance, has edited *The Postcolonial Middle Ages,* offering postcolonialism as a

theoretical framework for unthinking many of the critical mainstays of medieval studies,

such as monolithic ideas of Christendom, Islam, and Judaism at the expense of the hybrid

local religions that existed all across Europe.[82] As has already been noted, Emily

Greenwood has proposed using postcolonial approaches in a similar vein in Classics. For

Greenwood, postcolonial analysis not only decenters classical texts from their central

place in canons of knowledge, but also serves as a tool for discovering other cultural

voices inside texts.[83] In a close reading of Tibullus 1.7, for instance, Lowell Bowditch

has made the case that Tibullus seeks to embed the victor of the Roman triumph into the

matrix of a Hellenized Egyptian pantheon. Bowditch argues that Tibullus contrasts two

external perceptions of Egypt (as *barbara* and *docta*) as a means of turning his poem into

a piece interpretable by Romanizing Egyptian elites.[84] Likewise, Ian Henderson sees a

type of colonial mimicry at work in New Testament and patristic uses of sophistical

discourse.[85] Classicists are beginning to debate the theoretical underpinnings of

postcolonialism too: while Carla Antonaccio has made a use of Bhabha's framework of

hybridity to describe the archaeological context of archaic eastern Sicily, Irad Malkin

prefers Richard White's conception of the colonial 'middle ground' between disparate

(and unorganized) groups of colonizers and colonized.[86] A forthcoming volume on

---

[81] Stephens 2003.18.

[82] Cohen 2000.6-7.

[83] Greenwood 2009.660-62.

[84] Bowditch 2011.93.

[85] Henderson 2011.

[86] Antonaccio 2003, Malkin 2004; White 1991. Woolf 2011 and Skinner 2012 on ethnography borrow heavily from White's postcolonial model as well.

Apuleius, based on a conference in 2010 at Oberlin, further promises to interpret Apuleius and second century C.E. North Africa in light of postcolonial theory.[87]

As I have already noted, the essays in the second cultural poetics volume (Dougherty and Kurke 2003) make strides towards the postcolonial classics. The difference in a postcolonial approach—and the difference that perhaps marks the postcolonial—is the insistence that discourses of power and knowledge can be transposed over time, an insistence that openly recognizes why postcolonial analysis so matches the Zeitgeist of the twenty-first century and opens the door for the field of Classics to more openly take a place in modern critical debates.

By adopting a historicizing lens—the lens of cultural poetics—a postcolonial approach can avoid consigning itself simply to postcolonial classical reception by investigating how power shapes cultural knowledge in the context of what have increasingly been recognized as the divers (and diverse) societies of Greek and Roman antiquity. The increasing popularity of research on topics of ethnicity and race in antiquity—as well as the increased discomfort with assuming rigid dichotomies of gender, status, class, and citizenship even in so regulated a place as fifth century Athens—provides an ideal moment for classicists to deploy theoretical models developed in light of the increasing diversity of modern societies.[88]

Towards a New Poetics Of Culture? Some Objections

If metaphors of 'reading' culture (metaphors that were popular in the early state of cultural poetics) have proved overly simplistic, it is because two and a half decades of criticism have complicated many of the concepts Greenblatt uses so easily—'culture,' 'energy,' 'margin.' A large part of the pushback against the new historicism in both English and Classics has been the suggestion that it leads towards a new positivism—an optimism that modern critics, standing at a safe critical distance, can gain some sort of knowledge of not only the lives and careers of their subjects on the basis of reading texts, but also subjective experience.[89] Although working from a standpoint of historicism, this

---

[87] Lee, Finkelpearl, and Gravieri, eds. 2013 (forthcoming; *non vidi*).

[88] Skinner 2012.

[89] Vasunia 2005 on Dougherty and Kurke; Goff and Simpson 2007.36.

study takes an angle that highlights the necessity not only of historical contexts, but also comparative ones. Hence, for instance, this study is quite firm about the existence of ancient paradigms of ethnic exclusion and racial bias, and that the ambivalence felt by colonized peoples in the modern era existed also in antiquity, whether under the various Hellenistic regimes or the Romans.

As I have suggested in my discussion of Thomas Morton and Ma-re Mount in the last chapter, though the motives of colonialism might change, the discourse of the colonial experience is transferable over time. When Bradford and Morton shape their experiences in Massachusetts according to their readings of scripture (Bradford) or Vergil (Morton), they are repackaging their ambivalence about the legitimacy of their respective places in both the new landscape and in English society in light of their reading. In this case, reception of ancient texts by seventeenth century colonial writers serves to interpret their contemporary experience. Comparative contexts also work in the other direction. Our own contemporary experiences, for instance, such as the pain and disruption of decolonization, can serve as meaningful comparative contexts to analyze how discursive structures of power react under strain (this will be explored in chapter V, which discusses ethnic cleansing).[90] In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries there was an uneasy coexistence of both the meritocratic logic of colonial empires and the discourses of racism and prejudice that stymied the dreams of colonial elites. While remembering the substantial, historically contingent differences between ancient and modern colonialisms, we can identify similar discourses of exclusion at work in antiquity, and see them as a source of a phenomenon akin to what Bhabha identifies as colonial ambivalence. Hence this study will use the same theoretical basis to discuss both Theocritus and Lucian, though they are writers separated by as many as 300 years and writing under very different political structures. While not adopting a strict definition of what constitutes the 'colonial world' or the 'margins' in antiquity (are, after all, the lower Apennines in first century B.C.E. any more or less marginal than Syria in the second century C.E.?), we can identify how the negotiation of difference between individuals and groups away from the canonical cultural centers serves not just to undermine strict definitions of 'Greek' or 'Roman,' but demonstrate that those definitions are themselves anomalous.

---

[90] Cf. Webster 1997.

Thus we might be lead to ask questions about antiquity that are both liberating and troubling. To what extent is Lucian, whose ethnographic writing is shaped by his experience with Herodotus, able to envision cultural difference? What about the vexatious, but shadowy, persistence of ethnic strife in antiquity? To what extent does *paideia* engage and accommodate non-Greek cultural practice? To what extent does biological difference in antiquity inform cultural identity? And more close to home, how are modern critical perspectives on these topics shaped by the daily experiences and educations of critics (is it a coincidence that there is so much interest in ethnicity in antiquity now)? Can there really be such a thing (as Dougherty and Kurke provocatively suggest) as ancient multiculturalism?[91]

Finally, there will need to be a word on the most problematic concept of all: culture. This work offers no pretense at identifying what defines a culture: in this thesis, for instance in my chapter on ethnography in the *True histories* I will speak more of circulation of properties of cultural identity (language, customs, and physical characteristics) rather than culture as a unitary phenomenon by itself. Whitmarsh's Foucauldian reading of culture as a discourse within which different articulations of power by different constituencies can take place comes as close to a working definition as this study will use.[92] It must be observed withal that Greek has no word for culture as a phenomenon, though we have such terms as *nomos,* which can be broadly defined as cultural practice, or *paideia,* which Whitmarsh identifies as a discourse of elite cultural practice. Hence approaches—like mine—that identify politics as operative at the level of culture will need to be selective as to what vocabulary they use. For the purposes of this work, by culture I mean cultural practices; when I want to refer to larger identity groupings, I will use more accessible terms such as ethnic or linguistic group, although these terms are hardly neutral either.[93]

---

[91] Dougherty and Kurke 2003.2.

[92] Whitmarsh 2001.37.

[93] See J.M. Hall 2002.9-19.

CHAPTER III

IDENTITY AND HYBRIDITY IN THE HELLENISTIC MEDITERRANEAN: THE

CASE OF THEOCRITUS' CYCLOPS

At the start of *Idyll* 11, Theocritus promises his addressee, Nicias, a story about "the Cyclops, the one among us" (*ho Kuklôps ho par' hamin,* 11.7).[1] Long used as by-words for everything uncivilized—Odysseus characterizes the Cyclopes as hubristic (*hubristai*), savage (*agrioi)*, and unjust (*ou dikaioi*) (*Od.* 9.175-6)—the mold of the Cyclops becomes a paradigm in Greek historiography for describing the natives of the west,[2] and the specific vocabulary Odysseus uses to describe the Cyclopes serves as a model for characterizing the inhabitants of the world's margins.[3] This chapter argues that Theocritus' depiction of the lovelorn Cyclops in *Idylls* 6 and 11 emerges out of the context of ethnic and racial anxieties engendered by the Hellenistic colonization and recolonizations of Sicily and Egypt. By situating his Cyclops *par' hamin,* Theocritus invokes the fraught ethnic and colonial histories of Sicily: rather than functioning as the far-off Other, in Sicily the Cyclops is a local. Drawing on his physical descriptions of shepherds and female agricultural workers in the *Idylls,* I will argue that Theocritus frames his Cyclops in ethnographic and even racial terms, and that the use of this type of description reflects ambivalence on the part of the poet about the extent to which that language can functionally delineate Greek from non-Greek.[4] Rather than, as many commentators have claimed, circulating 'traditional' ideas of physical beauty, the conceptions of beauty voiced by both Theocritus' shepherds and the Cyclops are enunciated in terms of ethnographic discourse given charge by the colonial setting of his

---

[1] This is usually seen as evidence that Theocritus was a Siceliot ; see Dover 1971.xix, Hunter 1999.1-2.

[2] Cf. Thucydides' assertion (6.2) that the original inhabitants of the west were said to be Cyclopes and Laestrygones.

[3] Hartog 1988.194-95, Dougherty 2003.46, Skinner 2012.143-44.

[4] Discussions of race in antiquity are going through a period of rapid flux. On race in antiquity, see Snowden 1983, Isaac 2004, McCoskey 2012.

work.[5] To use another analogy currently in favor with classicists, then, Theocritus'
Cyclops operates as a figurative 'middle ground,' or a discursive space set between the
different audiences for Greek literary production in the Hellenistic period (Greek
migrants and settlers and Greek-speaking non-Greeks) as well as the presence of non-
Greek-speaking or non-literate sub-elite populations.[6]

As I discussed in the previous chapter, representation of the so-called Other as
uncivilized or monstrous is familiar to western audiences, and it is a topic that has been
thoroughly covered by classicists.[7] As the clean lines of the self/Other dichotomy have
increasingly fallen out of favor among classicists,[8] recently proposed models of cultural
contact in the ancient Mediterranean have taken into consideration the active presence of
non-Greek, non-Greek speaking, and non-elite populations in shaping their own
representations in Greek literary culture.[9] This evokes a specifically postcolonial
situation, and indeed postcolonial scholarship has been formative in shaping this view.[10]
In his celebrated chapter on colonial mimicry, for instance, Homi Bhabha notes that the
construction and representation of the cultural Other operates as a functional negotiation
with those represented.[11] Bhabha employs the concept of hybridity to identify the area of
compromise between the representative gaze of the colonizer and the experience of the

---

[5] Dover 1971 Theoc. *Id.* 10.27n , Hunter 1999 26-27n; cf. Clausen 1994 Verg. *Ec.* 2.16n. As Prof.
Bowditch has reminded, what Clausen and other commentators refer to as 'traditional' values are
themselves rather Athenocentric. See my discussion of Plat. Rep. 474d7-e4 on p. 58 below.

[6] Stephens 2003.11; see Bowditch 2011.93-95 on a similar situation in Roman Egypt. Malkin (1998,
2004, 2011) has used this model extensively; see also Antonaccio 2003, Woolf 2011.

[7] Hartog 1988, E. Hall 1989.

[8] See Gruen 2011, Woolf 2011, Skinner 2012.

[9] For this model generally see Malkin 2011; in regard to representation see Skinner 2012.

[10] See discussions in Antonaccio 2003.59-61, Malkin 2004.357-59.

[11] Bhabha 1994.86.

native elite.[12] Yet otherwise, there has been hesitation among classicists in using other important postcolonial concepts, such as the ambivalence of the colonial subject.[13]

One of the fundamental points of difference between ancient and modern colonialisms is that race and racism were central to experience and ideologies of nineteenth and twentieth century empires.[14] Any comparison between the two should raise the question of whether race is an applicable concept to think about in antiquity— and if it is, whether racial ideology shaped or legitimized power relations.[15] The answer to the former question should be yes: while still accepting the received wisdom that race, like all other identities, is a construct, we can recognize racial logic at work in Greek representation of non-Greek groups. Overseas regions in Greek literary culture signify a range of stereotypes, and assumptions (both good and bad) more powerful and consequential than firsthand observation or experience.[16] Prior 'knowledge' of a people or a place by one group shapes how it views and treats the other: in the case of nineteenth century colonial regimes, for instance, knowledge of the colonized that consisted of stereotypes or assumptions actively shaped colonial policy.[17] Yet as Bhabha notes, the logic of the racial stereotype is more ambivalent than necessarily malicious: racial 'knowledge' represents the use of unchanging, unverifiable claims (as he describes, the savagery of the African, the cleverness of the Asian) to evaluate and judge individuals in

---

[12] Bhabha 1994.27.

[13] Malkin 2004.363, de Angelis 2009.49-54. Ambivalence is another programmatic term in postcolonial studies, originally used by Said but theorized by Bhabha. For Bhabha (1994.85-92) ambivalence as a term encapsulates the slippage between ideology (the self-cultivation of native elites in British imperial culture) and reality (the ideologies of race and ethnicity that prevent them from becoming imperial elites). Hence for Bhabha, colonized natives are only able to wield the discourse of colonialism with ambivalence. Stereotypes operate as a major locus for colonial ambivalence (1994.66-84).

[14] See Bhabha 1994.66-84 on ambivalence and colonial racism; also Anderson 2006.92-93.

[15] The work of Frank Snowden (1970, 1983) has largely formed a consensus that racial identification in antiquity was of little importance. Snowden explicitly used a conception of race based on the experience of 'blacks' in antiquity, but racial thought is a broader phenomenon than color prejudice. See Isaac 2004; McCoskey 2012.

[16] Vasunia 2001.29-30, Woolf 2011.16-17.

[17] S. Said 1978.

real time.[18] In this light we can see race at work in antiquity. If race was not used *prima facie* to legitimize claims of political domination, as in modern times, it is operative in strategies of representation.

Hence representation must not be seen as a one-way phenomenon. The Cyclops in Theocritus *Idylls* will serve as a good example. Unlike the Egyptians, who had long been exoticized and racialized in Greek art, representations of the west either ignored the natives, made them hostile, or abstracted them into such monsters as the Cyclops.[19] Yet heroes, monsters, and symbols employed by Greeks to think about the margins do not function as exclusive cultural property. Both native peoples and Greek ethnographers engaged in a process of embedding local tales within larger traditions such as the Trojan war or the travels of Heracles or Odysseus.[20] The Cyclops, for instance, has a long history before Theocritus as a figure between cultures. Carol Dougherty and Irad Malkin have observed how images of the Cyclops function as objects of cultural negotiation or 'middle ground' between Greek settlers and Etruscan elites.[21] Dougherty's earlier work traces how Greek accounts of colonial foundations in the west tend to 'write out' the native peoples by turning them into adversaries or ignoring them altogether.[22] Representations of the Cyclops, such as in *Od.* 9 or on the Greek Geometric Aristonothos crater (which depicts on one side a Greek and non-Greek—possibly Etruscan—ship fighting, and on the other Odysseus against the Cyclops) serve to represent the adversarial western native into the Cyclopean monster.[23] Yet the image can be turned around: Odysseus, the proto-colonizer of the west, appears in Etruscan tomb art, and indeed the Aristonothos crater depicting the blinding of the Cyclops was found in an

---

[18] Bhabha 1994.66.

[19] Dougherty 2003.47, Woolf 2011.23.

[20] Woolf 2011.27.

[21] See Malkin 1998.160-75; Dougherty 2003; on 'middle ground' see Malkin 2004.356-69, Woolf 2011.17-24.

[22] Dougherty 1993, Woolf 2011.66 on the marginalization of western natives in fifth century historiography.

[23] Dougherty 2003.40-42.

Etruscan tomb.[24] Moreover, in the period of Greek colonization the Etruscans were expanding too; for both Greek and Etruscan, Odysseus and the Cyclops become a symbol of territorial expansion over 'Othered,' colonized peoples.

Rather than being the cultural property of Greek narratives of the west, the Cyclops becomes a hybrid discourse able to be wielded by several groups for different purposes.[25] By contextualizing knowledge of foreign cultures into familiar paradigms, ethnographic discourse, rather than only distancing or objectifying foreign peoples, serves as a site of negotiation between cultures. Regions and their inhabitants can be imagined in various ways at the same time: the west can be monstrous, uninhabited, or unproblematically culturally similar; the east, as the exotic Other, as culturally superior, or subhuman. Likewise, a Greek literary genre like pastoral, which developed in the context of third century B.C.E. colonialism, can serve as a site of engagement with non-elite and even non-Greek populations. By representing his Cyclops using ethnographic terms, Theocritus makes Polyphemus a generalized canvas onto which he projects conceptions of alterity. But rather than being the distant and scary Other, Theocritus' Polyphemus tries, and fails, to speak the language of pastoral love. The Cyclops' failure then becomes a site for Theocritus to reflect on the extent to which physical difference—the Otherness of the Cyclops—precludes cultural assimilation.

Dark Skin And Snub Noses

Before advancing towards Theocritus' framing of the Cyclops, I would like to briefly review the ethnic and racial politics of his bucolic poems. Theocritus is a colonial writer: although there is continuing debate about Theocritus' origins and the pattern of his career, evidence from his poems generally places him in Syracuse and later Alexandria.[26] Despite recent appeals by formalist critics to the 'fictionality' and 'irreducibility' of Theocritus' poetry[27]—or at least in the case of his bucolic poems,

---

[24] Dougherty 2003.40-42, Malkin 2004.356.

[25] Malkin 1998.168-70; Malkin 2004 more generally on myth as middle ground.

[26] Hunter 1999.1-2.

[27] i.e. "The irreducability of the bucolic world's origins once again enhances its ontological mystique" (Payne 2007.15).

which comprise about half of his work—Theocritus firmly situates the *Idylls* in the political landscape of the third century Mediterranean, specifically locating his bucolic poems in Sicily (1, 6, 11, 16), Southern Italy (4, 5), or Kos (7), and at one point fashioning the tyrant Hieron II of Syracuse as protector of the bucolic landscape from Carthaginian invaders (16.90-97). The fact that Theocritus locates many of the bucolic poems in these landscapes is no less important than that he specifically locates his urban mimes in Ptolemaic Alexandria (2, 15) or that several of his poems either directly praise Hellenistic monarchs (Hieron: 16; Ptolemy: 14, 15, 17) or engage with mythical narratives associated with them (22, 24, 26). As Susan Stephens has argued, Theocritus' use of certain myths and motifs in his court poetry, such as in his hymn praising baby Heracles' triumph over the snakes, builds off of Ptolemaic royal propaganda meant to appeal both to immigrant Greek and native Egyptian elite audiences.[28] Theocritus' poetry serves then as a negotiation between two literary cultures (imported Greek and native Egyptian), which both reflects its colonial context opens itself up to interpretations by Greek-speaking non-Greeks.

Theocritus' bucolic world similarly incorporates the presence of non-Greeks. Though there have been attempts to date his bucolic poems (perhaps to assign them to an 'early' period of his career, before he left Sicily, or perhaps when he was on Cos), it is not reasonable to conclude that Theocritus's career was divided into distinct bucolic, encomiastic, or epic phases.[29] Theocritus' apparent homeland, Sicily, had itself a long history of ethnic hybridity by the time of Theocritus' birth. With large-scale migration to the near east and Egypt during the third century, Greeks found themselves as masters, supervisors, or even equals to larger numbers of non-Greek speaking peoples, many of whom, such as Egyptians and Syrians, had been the subject of ethnographic speculation for centuries in Greece.[30] Theocritus' bucolic world is no more removed from a historical context than his court poetry requires it. Rather, by incorporating ethnographic language in his descriptions of certain characters in the bucolic poems, Theocritus

---

[28] Stephens 2003.132-36.

[29] Dover 1971.xix-xxii.

[30] Skinner 2012.95-106 (Egyptians and Ethiopians).

represents the presence of groups within Greek-speaking societies that, though perhaps having access to the Greek language, are in some way different.

Theocritus' herdsmen and peasant farmers deploy a distinctly ethnographic vocabulary of dark skin and snub noses in order to describe themselves or their companions, characterizing each other as variously *Sura* (10.26), *melas* (10.29), *melanochrôs* (3.35), *simos* (3.8), or otherwise snub nosed (11.30-32).[31] Though there is a long tradition within Greek poetics of associating value with appearance—most famously illustrated in the well-known Odysseus and Thersites episode of *Iliad* 2—Theocritus describes his distinctly lower-class characters using the language of physical description associated with portrayals of Egyptians and Ethiopians.[32] Theocritus negotiates the distance between ethnographic discourse—which displaces foreigners to the margins— and the reality of Greek presence in the third century B.C.E. in Egypt. Theocritus' bucolic world, rather than existing in a separate, aesthetic space, seeks to incorporate the new peoples brought under Greek rule into the circumscribed space of pastoral.[33]

Dark skin:

In 10.26-29, the agricultural laborer Boukaios pines over the lovely Bombuka. Prodded into song by his interlocutor, Milon, Boukaios sings to justify his infatuation:

> Μοῖσαι Πιερίδες, συναείσατε τὰν ῥαδινάν μοι
> παῖδ'· ὧν γάρ χ' ἅψησθε, θεαί, καλὰ πάντα ποεῖτε.
> Βομβύκα χαρίεσσα, Σύραν καλέοντί τυ πάντες,
> ἰσχνάν, ἁλιόκαυστον, ἐγὼ δὲ μόνος μελίχλωρον.
> καὶ τὸ ἴον μέλαν ἐστί, καὶ ἁ γραπτὰ ὑάκινθος·
> ἀλλ' ἔμπας ἐν τοῖς στεφάνοις τὰ πρᾶτα λέγονται.
> (Theoc. 10.24-29)

> Pierian Muses, sing with me about a slender girl; for those things you touch, goddesses, you make entirely lovely. Lovely Bombuka, everyone calls you Syrian (*Suran*), thin (*ischnan*), sunburnt (*haliokauston*), but I alone call you

---

[31] These terms appear frequently in contrast with characteristics associated with ethnographic descriptions of the north, such as red hair, large size, or blue or grey eyes. On the contrast of northern and southern ethnographic terminology, see Isaac 2004.157-58, Woolf 2011.51, Skinner 2012.83-86 (Thracians), 95-99 (Ethiopians).

[32] Skinner 2012.96-98, McCoskey 2012.139-43.

[33] On the circumscription of the pastoral world see Payne 2007.

honey-yellow (*melichlôron).* Indeed, the violet is dark (*melan),* and so is the marked (*grapta*) hyacinth; but at any rate they are chosen first in wreaths.

Singing that other people call her 'Syrian' as an insult (*Suran kaleonti tu pantes*), Boukaios restates their insults that she is thin (*ischnan)* and sunburnt (*haliokaston),* and in response proclaims that she is in fact a lighter shade of 'honey-yellow' (*melichlôron*). As both Dover and Gow note, her strange name (derived from *bombux,* a type of flute) and the fact that she plays the *auloi* (10.16, 34) associate her with a profession (flute-girl) that was heavily non-Greek and enslaved.[34] Bombuka's most prominent physical characteristic is her dark skin, which is likened to the skin of Syrians and which Boukaios feels the need to reinterpret positively. The association of Bombuka's skin color and the skin color of Syrians does not represent an unequivocal claim that she *is* actually Syrian, though. The primary association of skin color is class or status, and it is the predominant convention in Greek pictorial art to fashion women as light skinned. In the context of *Idyll* 10, then, as a song between field workers, the insult that Bombuka is *haliokauston* suggests that her dark skin is a function of low class or status that leads her to fail to meet normal expectations of female beauty.[35] Hence in 3.35, for instance, the speaker of the poem threatens the lovely (and indoor-dwelling) Amaryllis that he will transfer his affection to the dark-skinned slave-girl owned by Mermnon (*ha Mermnônos erithakis ha melanochrôs*).[36]

The association of dark skin with an ethnonym draws special attention to what would be an otherwise unproblematic passage. Concepts of beauty and moral character are situated on a scale of light/dark in Homeric speech.[37] Although the fact that she is being called a *Sura* is not necessarily even an indication that she is one,[38] the association

---

[34] Dover 1971.166-67. Gow 1950 *ad loc.* derives her name from a type of flute (*bombux).* Bombuka is also the name of a prominent Syrian city (Hunter 1999 Theoc. *Id.* 10.26-27n).

[35] Snowden (1982.63) reaches this conclusion to deny the existence color prejudice in antiquity.

[36] Richard Hunter (1999 *ad loc.*) has argued for reading the mention of skin color in this passage as carrying a possible—but ambiguous—ethnic charge.

[37] Vasunia 2001.25. It is worth recalling Odysseus' antagonists in the later books of the *Odyssey,* the suggestively named herdsman Melanthos and his sister Melantho.

[38] Though Gow (1950 10.26n) notes that ethnonyms like *Sura* are commonly nicknames for slaves.

of a physical characteristic with an ethnic group raises the specter of ethnographic discourse. The ethnic adjective *Suros, -ê, -on* is not well attested before Herodotus, and is extremely rare in poetic diction. Noting the increasingly common depiction of Memnon and Andromeda on pottery as Africans during the fifth century, Denise McCoskey sees the association of dark skin with non-Greek elites as an ongoing renegotiation between the traditional depictions of Homeric heroes—in which the women are light skinned, the men are dark, and features are largely indistinguishable between characters of the same gender—and ethnographic thought, which sees physical characteristics as products of ancestry and geography.[39] Similarly, the description of Bombuka's skin pits Helleno- or Athenocentric ideas of beauty against an ethnographic awareness that people from Syria have dark skin.

In this sense Bombuka's skin functions within discourse associating beauty with class (both Bombuka and the slave-girl of Mermon are dark because they are outside, while higher class women live indoors), gender norms, and perceived ethnicity. During the Hellenistic period, skin color can also serve as a type of legal assertion. In Egyptian legal papyri *melichrôs,* a synonym to *melichlôros,* appears as a term for 'light skinned,' and functions as one of many avenues for native Egyptians to fashion themselves as Greek, thus exposing themselves to a lower tax bracket and the Greek/Macedonian court system.[40] In the colonial world of the third century, interpretation of skin color can function as one of many means by which both Greeks and their new near eastern and Egyptian neighbors can judge social position, not only on the scale of class or status, but also ethnic affiliation. As I will discuss below and in the next chapter, early conceptions of determinism, race and physiognomics—what Benjamin Isaac calls "proto-racism"[41]—enter into ancient consciousness as means for certain Greek elites to exclude those who are *acting* Greek from those that really 'are.' Perhaps, then, we can interpret the mocking of Bombuka's skin color in that regard: when Boukaios further explains that he plans on sacrificing to Aphrodite and dressing in nice clothing (10.32-36), perhaps he is making a

---

[39] McCoskey 2012.14-43.

[40] Gow 1950 10.27n. On this system see Malkin 2004.355, McCoskey 2012.98-99.

[41] Isaac 2004.1-3.

deliberate show of his Hellenicity. Boukaios likens Bombuka to the hyacinth, a flower marked with its identity (*ha grapta huakinthos* 10.28); similarly in that respect Bombuka is marked with her own sort of identification.[42] Like the hyacinth marked with the letters of its own name, the dark skin of the female agricultural worker serves as a self-evident signifier of social place and even ethnic background.

Snub noses:

So, although skin color is not an unquestionable signifier of race in Theocritus, other physical characteristics point in that direction. The unnamed speaker of *Idyll* 3, pleading with Amaryllis, asks a rhetorical question:

> ἦ ῥά γέ τοι <u>σιμὸς</u> καταφαίνομαι ἐγγύθεν ἦμεν,
> νύμφα, καὶ προγένειος;
> (Theoc. 3.8-9)

Do I appear to be nearly snub-nosed (*simos*) to you, girl, and long-bearded (*progeneios)*?

The speaker's question whether he is a *simos* has long elicited interest. Dover notes that "the vase-painters give snub noses to satyrs and Egyptians,"[43] and the word itself has a strongly ethnographic context. Like *Suros, simos* is a rare word in non-ethnographic contexts, appearing most famously in Xenophanes' famous statement of relativist theology (that the *Aitheopes . . . simous melanas te* worship gods that look like themselves),[44] and in a number of Herodotus' ethnographic descriptions.[45] Theocritus' ancient readers understood *simos* as an ethnographic descriptor as well. In his second *Eclogue,* which is partially an extended paraphrase of *Idyll* 3, Vergil freely reinterprets *simos* as *niger* (2.16)*,* and in the following lines (2.17-18) moves into a free reception of *Idyll* 10.29:

---

[42] See Dover 1971 *ad loc.* The flower Theocritus is referring to is apparently one that was marked with the letters AI and is apparently not the modern hyacinth.

[43] Dover 1971 *ad loc.*; see also Hunter 1999 *ad loc.* "a characteristic regarded as ugly (so, most famously, Socrates) and ascribed to goats . . . satyrs, and non-Greeks."

[44] καί <κε> θεῶν ἰδέας ἔγραφον καὶ σώματ' ἐποίουν / τοιαῦθ', οἷόν περ καὐτοὶ δέμας εἶχον <ἕκαστοι>. / Αἰθίοπές τε <θεοὺς σφετέρους> <u>σιμοὺς μέλανάς τε</u> / Θρῆικές τε γλαυκοὺς καὶ πυρρούς <φασι πέλεσθαι>. (Xenophanes DK fr. 16)

[45] Hdt. 2.71, 4.23, 5.9.

nonne fuit satius tristis Amaryllidis iras
atque superba pati fastidia? nonne Menalcan,
quamuis ille niger, quamuis tu candidus esses?
o formose puer, nimium ne crede colori:
alba ligustra cadunt, uaccinia nigra leguntur.
(Verg. *Ec.* 2.14-18)

Was it not enough to endure the anger and the pompous aversion of sad
Amaryllis? Or Menaclas, although he is dark (*niger)*, and you are fair
(*candidus)*? Oh lovely boy, don't put excessive trust in color; the white privets
fall, and the dark hyacinths are plucked.

The juxtaposition of *niger* and *candidus* here are at the simplest level of
interpretation a reoccurring trope in Greek erotic discourse, comparing the lightness of
the young boy juxtaposed with the darkness of his previous lover. Following Vergil's
appeal not to put too much trust in color (*nimium ne crede colori*), where we see lightness
and darkness put in juxtaposition, we should not assume the inherent presence of an
allusion to race or ethnicity unless these terms are in the presence of other types of
ethnographic language, such as the language of physical description.[46] What is apparent
in Vergil's reading, however, is the clear association he makes between Theocritus' *simos*
and the color term *niger*, and that Vergil links through paraphrase two instances of skin
color description in Theocritus and unites them into one passage.

Descriptions of skin color in antiquity operate within a larger discourse of
ethnographic knowledge. Joseph Skinner has argued for broadening the conception of
ethnography in the archaic and classical periods from the prose treatises of Hecataeus and
Herodotus to all representations of difference, including those found in sympotic lyric,
sculpture, and vase painting.[47] Ethnography has the broader function of serving as a
medium for contextualizing foreignness, and from a very early point ethnographic
knowledge finds a home in the aristocratic symposium.[48] The related fourth century
phenomenon of physiognomy—the pseudo-science of using defined physical
characteristics to 'read' someone's personality, usually to define him or her as less

---

[46] Cf. Clausen 1994 2.16n.

[47] Skinner 2012.8-14.

[48] Cohen 2011.476, McCoskey 2012.141.

masculine or less authentically Greek—deploys ethnographic terms to create 'in' or 'out' groups within one's own society.[49] In the sympotic setting of Plato's *Republic,* for instance, when Socrates questions his interlocutors about relative perspective (*Rep.* 474d7-e4), he compares the physical characteristics of lovers using ethnographic language, opposing the people from the north with people from the south: one lover is snub-nosed (*simos),* some are dark-skinned (*melanas),* while others are hook-nosed (*grupos*) or pale (*leukous).*[50] If this is the conventional or traditional language used to describe lovers, it a language that is framed in terms of ethnographic knowledge: the physical characteristics of the beloved are those shared by peoples at the geographical margins.

  Simos is a technical word in Greek that comes into Latin as *simus,* and in both languages it is commonly used for either descriptions of Africans or animals.[51] Snub noses are also associated with satyrs and comic masks, and in that capacity Plato's Socrates repeatedly offers himself up for mockery because of the strange appearance of his face.[52] Plato's characterization of Socrates fashions Socrates as interpretable across lines of class and status, variously positioning him as pro- and anti-aristocratic, sacred, profane, and, in the end, menacing to the Athenians.[53] What ties together the snub-noses of Socrates, satyrs, and Egyptians is that their snub noses place them in the eyes of their peers as unusual and interpretable: Plato's descriptions of Socrates' strange physical appearance situates him within a discourse of status identification.[54] If Vergil is not

---

[49] Gleason 1995.33, Isaac 2004.156-58.

[50] Hunter 1999 on Theoc. *Id.* 10.26-27n. Cf. LSJ[9] s.v. *grupos* as opposite of *simos.* This is a situation of pederasty, in which case *leukos* is negative because it is effeminate.

[51] Cf. OLD s.v. *simus,* LSJ[9] s.v. *simos;* Theoc. *Id.* 7.80-81 (*simai . . . melissai).*

[52] Ἀλλ' ἐὰν δὴ μὴ μόνον τὸν ἔχοντα ῥῖνα καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς διανοηθῶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν σιμόν τε καὶ ἐξόφθαλμον (Pl. *Theat.* 209c1); also *Theat.* 143e9, 209c5, *Phaedr.* 253e2, *Prot.* 340a3, *Rep.* 474d8. See Cohen 2011.480-81.

[53] Compton 1993; on Plato's contextualization of Socrates within the "low" wisdom tradition, see Kurke 2011.251-64.

[54] Cohen 2011.481.

making an explicitly racial contrast between Corydon and Alexis, the language of ethnography is implicit in the use of the metaphor.

The assertions by Theocritus and Vergil's speakers characterizing certain individuals as *simos, progeneios*, *niger,* or *candidus,* take place within the framework of pastoral contests of song. Their debates over their own beauty or appearances mimic the discussions and negotiations of status that took place within the aristocratic symposium. Symposia were key sites of negotiation of concepts of status, gender, and ethnicity within aristocratic communities.[55] The unnamed speaker of *Idyll* 3, Boukaios in *Idyll* 10, Corydon in *Eclogue* 2, as well as the actually monstrous Polyphemus of *Idylls* 6 and 11, seek either to accuse others of having ethnographic features or to rebut assertions that they themselves do. Commentators of Theocritus and Vergil have often pointed to conventions of depictions of men as dark-skinned in Greek art, conventions of female beauty and satyrs as snub-nosed *(simos)* or bearded *(progeneios)*, to explain passages such as these.[56] While it is true that contemporary theatrical masks—or depictions of them on vases—display these features, and that Plato, both in his descriptions of Socrates and elsewhere uses *simos* as a conventionalized term for ugliness, *simos* is a very rare word for physical description in old comedy (though its characters are in fact wearing snub-nosed masks),[57] and *progeneios* first appears in Theocritus (and very few times thereafter). The so-called Janiform vases—drinking vessels molded into the shapes of juxtaposed human heads—that begin to appear in the fifth century typically oppose light-skinned women with a variety of 'Other' figures, including satyrs, black Africans, Heracles, but never Greek males.[58] Although there has been debate on whether Janiform vessels explicitly exhibit bias,[59] Janiform vessels do participate in a broader circulation of

---

[55] Cohen 2011.482.

[56] Clausen 1994 Verg. *Ec.* 2.16n*,* Dover 1971 Theoc. *Id.* 3.8n*.*

[57] In Ar. *Lyst.* 488, *Ecc.* 617, 709.

[58] Snowden 1983.14-16, Gruen 2011.211-20, Cohen 2011.477-80, McCoskey 2012.139-42, Skinner 2012.97-99 on Janiform vessels.

[59] Snowden 1983 and Gruen 2011 see the interest in the exotic on Janiform vases as curiosity without prejudice.

ideas of beauty and identity that is taking place in specifically ethnographic terms in the context of the symposium.

As we have seen in the case of Vergil, for Theocritus, pastoral song serves as a middle ground that negotiates identity through the ethnographically charged language of physical appearance. This itself becomes a trope in pastoral. In a passage deploying tropes very similar to Theocritus' circulation of ethnographic terms in *Idyll* 10.27-29, Longus has Daphnis respond to an attack by his rival Dorkon: "I am boyish (*ageneios)* but Dionysus is as well; dark (*melas)*, but so is the hyacinth; but Dionysus is better than the satyrs and the hyacinth is better than white lilies. He [Dorkon] is red-haired like the fox, bearded (*progeneios)* like the goat, and pale like the woman from the town" (1.16.3).[60] Longus redeploys the language of Theocritus using the terminology of ethnographic observation, echoing Xenophanes' contrast of the snub-nosed and dark (*simous melanas te*) Ethiopians with the grey-eyed and red-haired (*glaukous kai purrous)* Thracians.[61] Theocritus' pastoral debates, rather repeating preexisting comic depictions,[62] specifically locate the pastoral within the context of ethnographic discourse. Rather than reinterpreting Theocritus within the light of ethnography, the context of ethnographic description Vergil and Longus find in Theocritus existed all along.

Race, Ethnography, and Ancient Colonialism

Thus far I have argued that the fifth century notions of beauty that become the tropes of pastoral—notions relating to the pigmentation and morphology of the lover— are shaped by ethnographic discourse. The expression of ideas of beauty and desirability by his herdsmen and agricultural workers in the language of ethnography serves to locate the bucolic landscape of the *Idylls* within the context of the colonial worlds of the third century. The increasing copresence of Greek and non-Greek populations in the third century and afterward complicates the distancing logic of ethnography—rather than

---

[60] Ἀγένειός εἰμι, καὶ γὰρ ὁ Διόνυσος· μέλας, καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὑάκινθος· ἀλλὰ κρείττων καὶ ὁ Διόνυσος Σατύρων <καὶ> ὁ ὑάκινθος κρίνων. Οὗτος δὲ καὶ πυρρὸς ὡς ἀλώπηξ καὶ προγένειος ὡς τράγος καὶ λευκὸς ὡς ἐξ ἄστεος γυνή·

[61] On ethnographic depictions of Thracians see McCoskey 2012.43-44, Skinner 2012.83-86.

[62] See note 57 above.

existing as abstracted projections at the margins of the world, non-Greeks live in the same places as the Greek speakers—but it does not eliminate it. The tropes of ethnography retain a remarkable consistency from the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. to late antiquity, despite the constancy of extensive Greek interactions with non-Greeks over that period of time.[63] The uses of ethnographic discourse, on the other hand, are constantly changing, and Greek writers maintain no one common strategy of writing about foreigners, their languages, and their customs.[64] If, as Greg Woolf notes, Greek ethnography displays almost no interest in the familiar, it does not mean that Greek writers do not develop an interest in developing terms for difference that is familiar and near.[65] This is where scholars have increasingly shown interest in using race as a heuristic tool for interpreting ancient views on the ability of physical difference to determine behavior.[66]

As Irad Malkin, Jonathan M. Hall, and others have argued over the last decade, the ideological weight of ethnic identity in ancient Greece ebbed and surged in response to its instrumental value, with an 'oppositional' model (self vs. other) peaking in the aftermath of the Persian Wars although no one model ever comes to provide a normative definition.[67] Although often used as a synonym for race (and indeed physical markers can constitute an element of ethnicity) ethnicity is not usually considered a biological phenomenon.[68] Yet in the Classical period, as Denise McCoskey notes, Greeks developed a deep lexical and symbolic vocabulary for conceptualizing and theorizing

---

[63] Woolf 2011.37-38.

[64] Woolf 2011.35.

[65] Woolf 2011.23.

[66] See Isaac 2004, McCoskey 2012.

[67] Malkin 1998, 2001 (ed.), 2004, 2011, J.M. Hall 1997, 2002, Gruen 2011, Skinner 2012; see especially J.M. Hall 2002.9-19. For J.M. Hall, ethnicity functions as one of many facets of the broader concept of 'cultural identity.' This means that it is only one of several means Greeks have (i.e. gender, class, etc.) for conceptualizing difference. Malkin and others (including Gruen, Woolf, and Skinner) see notions of ethnicity and heroic genealogy in the archaic west as bridges between communities.

[68] J.M. Hall 2002.9; on race versus ethnicity in antiquity, see Isaac 2004.33-38.

physical difference.[69] The use and deployment of stereotypes in literary culture—ranging from the ambivalence about the Phoenicians in the *Odyssey* to Praxinoa and Gorgo's open prejudice in *Idyll* 15—constitute a deep level of engagement and knowledge about the stereotyped.[70] Stereotypes are ambivalent constructs, designed to simplify difference into terms usable within the discursive framework of those that deploy them.[71] Even though Greeks had not yet colonized Egypt or the near east in significant numbers, there was a fetishization of the features of the bodies of various groups identified as different and particularly African bodies. As Snowden observes, this does not constitute anything like the modern experience of racism, but this does not preclude the existence of *discourses* of racial difference in antiquity.[72] The bodies of non-ethnic Greeks can function as texts upon which various social tensions can be projected. More broadly, conceptualizations of western monstrosity fit into this variety of thought as well. Racial thinking uses physical difference as a *determinant* of some facet of identity, rather than just a marker.[73] Hence Benjamin Isaac offers a relatively broad definition of race for classicists: it is a discursive system that "attributes to . . . individuals and groups of peoples collective traits, physical, mental, and moral, which are constant and unalterable by human will."[74] Though race is no more of a trans-historical or permanent category than ethnicity (or more broadly, 'culture'), to accept that racial thinking existed in some

---

[69] McCoskey 2012.5-10.

[70] Skinner 2012.115-21.

[71] See Bhabha 1994.66-84. Bhabha notes that stereotypes seek to obviate the distance between ideas of the synchronic—unverifiable claims such as the unchanging barbarity of the African or cleverness of the Asian—and the diachronic reality of historical change. Their exercise within societies thus manifests itself in an ambivalence felt both sides of a personal exchange between what is 'known' about the Other and the experience of interacting with the Other.

[72] Snowden 1983.63-65; see also Gruen 2011.197-220, in agreement with Snowden.

[73] Isaac 2004.23, McCoskey 2012.23-27; Gruen 2011.205-9 notes expressions of racial tolerance in antiquity, but these are clearly operative in response to bias; see particularly McCoskey 2012.137-38 *contra* Gruen's argument for the absence of racial derision in the pseudo-Vergilian *Moretum* (2011.207).

[74] Isaac 2004.23.

capacity in antiquity will allow us to more fully address how identity was articulated in the ancient Mediterranean.

Still, race cannot be an 'answer' for the Greeks and Romans the same way it often, if erroneously, serves for us: physical difference and cultural performance (of class, status, or gender) must be interpreted in light of each other. Suzanne Said has seen this tendency operative in the Greek novel—a genre that explores how Greek elites fashioned themselves in the east during the early empire—and given that the ancient novel builds on the stock narratives of fourth and third century BCE forms (new comedy, mime), it is fair to see how this framework can be applied to Hellenistic literary culture.[75]

In this light we can think of the differences which existed in ancient representations of different parts of the colonial world. Theocritus, with his feet decidedly set in both Sicily and Egypt, marks these distinctions well. If the native inhabitants of the west were conceived of as culturally or linguistically different, it was often not in the ideologically marked terminology of the Other.[76] This is not so much the case for Egypt, which despite having not been substantially colonized by the Greeks until the third century, looms large in the Greek ethnographic imagination.[77] In light of the massive amount of surviving written evidence, it is clear that Hellenistic Egypt produced hybridizing cultures very early in its colonization by Greeks.[78] Though the papyri attest that there were legal differences between being 'Egyptian,' 'Greek,' or 'Macedonian' in Ptolemaic Egypt, these boundaries are highly flexible and often carry stronger markers of class and status than race or ethnicity.[79] Tax documents show members of the same families with different legal statuses (Egyptian or Greek), Egyptians who use both Greek

---

[75] McCoskey 2012.27; S. Said 1998.45.

[76] Antonaccio 2001.121, J.M. Hall 2002.97-103, Malkin 2004.349, Woolf 2011.66.

[77] See Hartog 1988; Vasunia 2001.4-10.

[78] Earlier generations of scholars tended to see differently, e.g. Lewis (1986.4): "Where people of two cultures, speaking different languages, live in close proximity, something of each is bound to rub off on the other. But what has now become clear, and becomes clearer with each new study, is that Hellenistic Egypt such mutual influences were minimal." Webster (2001.210-17) notes that this conceptual issue has been pervasive in nineteenth and twentieth century descriptions of empire. Concepts of 'acculturation' 'Romanization' and 'Hellenization' are particularly symptomatic of this.

[79] Malkin 2004.355, McCoskey 2012.98-99.

and Egyptian names, and the plausible suggestion that many of those with identifiably Greek names were not genetically so.[80] Tim Whitmarsh has offered a useful paradigm for describing situations like these: by appealing to models of *paideia* (Greek elite cultural practice), non-Greek local elites situated themselves within a political discourse of power where correct performance of cultural practice (including speaking the language properly) was a means for social advancement.[81] In that sense, Hellenicity becomes a zone of contact within which local elites can fashion themselves as 'Greeks' without having to abandon their 'native' names, languages, or dress, as long as they can present themselves as Greek in the proper situations (this is akin to the practice of code-switching).[82]

Whitmarsh's model specifically addresses a cultural dynamic of the eastern Roman empire during the Second Sophistic, but it is useful to consider how it operates in Hellenistic Egypt, or even earlier.[83] Despite the frequent lack of ethnographic representation of natives of the west in Greek literary culture before the first century B.C.E., ethnic politics in the west were just as complex as they were in the east, and raise many of the same issues.[84] Greek settlers 'colonized'[85] the coastal regions, and progressively the interior, of Sicily and southern Italy between the eighth and sixth centuries. It is clear that there was a high degree of linguistic and cultural accommodation, marked by the traffic of customs, goods, names, brides, and language between Sicels and Greeks.[86] On the other hand, it is also clear that, at times, there was strife specifically conceptualized as ethnic between Greek and non-Greek populations on the island. The latter assertion is rather fraught, because even though—just as in

---

[80] McCoskey 2012.103.

[81] Whitmarsh 2001.16.

[82] On code-switching in antiquity see Wallace-Hadrill 2008.63-64.

[83] See Malkin 2004.352-56 on Hellenistic *paideia.*

[84] Woolf 2011.19-24.

[85] For the debate on this term see Osborne 1998, de Angelis 2009.

[86] See Antonaccio 2001, 2003, J.M. Hall 2002.97-103, Nicholson 2011.98-112.

Hellenistic Egypt—there are recorded revolts that are specifically conceived of as ethnic by the historians that record them (the revolt of the *Kullurioi* in Hdt. 7.155, Ducetius' revolt in Diod. Sic. 11.91-92), neither fits into such modern paradigms of strife as ethnic cleansing, nationalist uprising, or rural insurgency.[87]

Yet though modern scholars typically envision the relationship between Greeks and non-Greeks on the margins (in colonial Sicily, in Hellenistic Egypt, or in the eastern Roman Empire) in such ecumenical terms as accommodation and negotiation, to some extent we are only scraping the surface.[88] When, for instance, in Theocritus *Idyll* 15, the Syracusan immigrant women Gorgo and Praxinoa complain about the *araios* and *kakoergos* Egyptian commoner who spends his time *parerpôn* (15.46-54), the abstracted presence of the singular *kakoergos* represents a moment of colonial ethnic or even racial anxiety.[89] Though, unlike in modern colonial empires, perceived ethnic or racial identities of colonial 'natives' did not prevent Gauls or Syrians from successfully claiming *paideia*, this does not mean that ideologies of racial or ethnic prejudice were not operative.[90] The ancient Greeks were capable of recognizing physical difference, and as for us, representations of physical difference by Greek writers map onto competing notions of class, status, and gender identities.

Monstrosity and Race

In *Idylls* 6 and 11, Theocritus turns the Cyclops into a character similar to his shepherds and agricultural workers. Like the speaker of *Idyll* 3, Theocritus' Polyphemus twice offers himself up to the audience to be imagined using the language of physical description. First, in *Idyll* 6:

> ἦ γὰρ πρᾶν ἐς πόντον ἐσέβλεπον, ἦς δὲ γαλάνα,
> καὶ καλὰ μὲν τὰ γένεια, καλὰ δέ μευ ἀ μία κώρα,
> ὡς παρ' ἐμὶν κέκριται, κατεφαίνετο, τῶν δέ τ' ὀδόντων

---

[87] Malkin 2011.117-18 on Ducetius.

[88] See Webster 2001.210-17 for a survey of twentieth century views on cultural exchange. Ando 2000 on consensus and the Roman empire follows a similar tone.

[89] See McCoskey 2012.134.

[90] See relevant conversations on Lucian, Polemon, and Favorinus in Gleason 1995 and Whitmarsh 2001; chapter IV below.

λευκοτέραν αὐγὰν Παρίας ὑπέφαινε λίθοιο.
(Theoc. 6.35-38)

Yesterday, when I was looking into the sea, since it was calm, my chin looked
handsome, and so was that single eye of mine (since it has been fated to me), and
the gleam of my teeth shines out from under (*hupephaine*) brighter than Parian
marble.

Looking at his reflection in the water, Polyphemus draws attention to the shape of

his chin (*geneia*), his monstrous single eye (*ha mia kôra*), and the shine of his teeth (*tôn .

. . odontôn . . . augan)*, which is whiter than Parian marble. Theocritus similarly

describes the body of the Cyclops in close detail in *Idyll* 11:

γινώσκω, χαρίεσσα κόρα, τίνος οὕνεκα φεύγεις·
οὕνεκά μοι λασία μὲν ὀφρὺς ἐπὶ παντὶ μετώπῳ
ἐξ ὠτὸς τέταται ποτὶ θώτερον ὣς μία μακρά,
εἷς δ' ὀφθαλμὸς ὕπεστι, πλατεῖα δὲ ῥὶς ἐπὶ χείλει.
(Theoc. 11.30-33)

I recognize, dear girl, why you are fleeing: because of the shaggy brow that
stretches across my whole face from one ear to the other as one big one, as well as
the one eye underneath, and the flat nose (*plateia . . . rhis)* upon my lip.

Unlike Odysseus' rather vague description of Polyphemus in *Odyssey* 9,

Theocritus' Cyclops carefully and methodically describes his anatomy to his audience,

explicitly self-identifying with his flat nose (*plateia . . . rhis)*, enormous unibrow (*lasia . .*

. ophrus), and single eye (*eis ophthalmos)*. Despite the rich detail with which Odysseus

describes his adventure in Polyphemus' cave, Odysseus does not actually offer much of

an account of the physical appearance of the Cyclops. The Cyclops of *Od.* 9 is clearly

very large—not like a man that eats bread, but the wooded peak of a tall mountain (*Od.*

9.190-91).[91] Odysseus characterizes the Cyclops and his fellows primarily in terms of

their social deficiencies: they are hubristic (*hubristai),* savage (*agrioi),* unjust, and hostile

(*oude dikaioi / êe philoxeinioi*) (*Od.* 9.175-76), and rather than eating bread, they subsist

on meat and dairy. Despite scattered reference to the fact that he has one eye (*Od.* 9.453,

---

[91] καὶ γὰρ θαῦμ' ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον, οὐδὲ ἐῴκει /ἀνδρί γε σιτοφάγῳ, ἀλλὰ ῥίῳ ὑλήεντι ὑψηλῶν
ὀρέων,

503), Odysseus' description of the Cyclopes dwells on their lack of *nomoi* rather than their physical difference.

On the other hand, physical detail is of singular importance in Theocritus' telling. Theocritus builds a robust physical characterization of his monstrous protagonist, drawing particular attention to his face. Theocritus characterizes the Cyclops in similar terms as he describes the unnamed narrator of *Idyll* 3. Polyphemus' flat nose maps onto the same variety of representation—as ugly, non-Greek, or non-human—as the speaker of *Idyll* 3.[92] Again, Theocritus describes the bearded chin of the lover, although *geneia* is a far more common word than *progeneios*. The description of Polyphemus' teeth in *Idyll* 6, however, is somewhat exemplary (*tôn . . . odontôn / leukoteran augan Parias hupephaine lithoio,* Theoc. *Id.* 6.37-38). Teeth are almost unheard of in Greek lyric, and depictions of teeth are extremely rare in Greek art. Where they do appear, they are most commonly found on vase depictions of black Africans, often emerging out from under lips of exaggerated size.[93] The Cyclops' juxtaposition of the physical characteristics that mark his body as difference—his chin, his eye, his teeth—with one of the prestige products of the ancient world, Parian marble, creates as it were a hybrid moment in the text: Polyphemus incorporates through metaphor the same rock that built the Parthenon into his monstrous body.[94] The body of the Cyclops then functions as a pastiche of specifically racialized characteristics (the teeth, the chin), merely ugly characteristics (his large eyebrow, his hairiness), monstrous characteristics (his single eye), and the odd mark of civilization (the claim that his teeth are brighter than Parian marble).[95] If many of the features of the Cyclops are hard to map onto any specific racial stereotype, though, monstrosity can more generally function as a signifier for colonial anxiety.[96] In a manner similar to how Praxinoa fashions the Egyptians into the singular *kakoergos* (*Id.* 15.47),

[92] Hunter 1999 *ad loc.* on the similarity of representations of the Cyclops to those of satyrs and non-Greeks; also 3.8-9n.

[93] Cohen 2011.480.

[94] I am indebted to Prof. Bowditch on this point.

[95] Certain of these characteristics, if never explicitly racial, still carry a range of signification across antiquity. For hairiness, for instance, see Gleason 1995.68-70, Malkin 2004.355.

[96] Dougherty 2003.47.

there is a long history of Greeks representing the natives of colonial west in terms of undifferentiated monstrosity.[97]

It is not likely that Theocritus was the first Greek writer to pay substantial attention to the precise anatomy of the Cyclops, nor is it likely that Theocritus was the originator of the Cyclops and Galateia myth.[98] It is, however, well to associate the appearance of the Cyclops and Galateia story in the late fifth or early fourth century with the wide appeal of strategies of Othering within fifth century ethnographic discourse, and particularly within the context of the symposium.[99] The Polyphemus/Galateia myth, by fashioning the Cyclops as a helpless lover, comically inverts the monstrosity and Otherness of the Cyclops by rendering him powerless to a nymph.[100] Theocritus frequently draws attention to the difference in representation of the Cyclops between his work and the *Odyssey* with verbal echoes of lines from the epic.[101] Yet this inversion, while allowing the Cyclops to speak in the refined discourse of pastoral love, serves to draw special attention to his physical characteristics. This domestication of the Cyclops changes the nature of his difference from a difference based on customs *(nomoi),* or lack thereof, to one based on nature *(phusis).*[102] By focusing his attention on the physical, rather than cultural, difference of the Cyclops, Theocritus creates a sense of ambivalence as to whether the Cyclops truly belongs within the pastoral landscape or not. While this ambivalence of representation is the source of the humor in *Idylls* 6 or 11, it also expresses the broader—and more socially consequential—use of ethnographic terminology and stereotypes to conceive of populations that by the third century coexist alongside Greek communities.

---

[97] Dougherty 2003.43-47.

[98] On the history of the motif see Dover 1971.140-41, Hunter 1999.217, 244. The motif of the romantic Cyclops first appears in the fragments of Philoxenus of Cythera at the end of the fifth century.

[99] Cohen 2011.476.

[100] On the comedic ambivalence of ethnographic representation on pottery, see Cohen 2011.469-77.

[101] In *Id.* 11.38 and 11.51 (see Dover 1971 *ad locs.).*

[102] See chapter IV below for further discussion of these terms.

The lexical and representational vocabulary with which Theocritus describes the body of the Cyclops are all current in ethnographic discourse by the fourth century, and are similar to those used by Theocritus to characterize—and make ethnically ambiguous—some of his herdsmen. By engaging in detailed descriptions of the Cyclops' anatomy, Theocritus reimagines the Cyclops in the terms of ethnographic description. Rather living somewhere at the edge of the world, as he does in the *Odyssey,* this Cyclops lives in a definite place—Sicily—and Theocritus frames the Cyclops using much of the same language that Theocritus' herdsmen and agricultural workers use to describe each other. Though Sicily was established as the home of the Cyclopes by the end of the fifth century (meaning that it would be quite strange for Theocritus to place him elsewhere), Theocritus' use of place actively thematizes the association of the west with monstrosity. By charactarizing the Cyclops' monstrosity with ethnographic and racial vocabulary, Theocritus raises the issue of the island's own, ethnically ambiguous status in the Greek world. In the various ethnic associations carried by the different parts of the Cyclops' anatomy, the pastiche nature of the Cyclops becomes a metaphor for ethnic uncertainty. Yet by using ethnographic and racializing language to describe the Cyclops, Theocritus threatens to destablilize the indistinctness of the Cyclops' monstrosity.

Aside from Thucydides' description of the original inhabitants of the west as '*Kuklôpes kai Laistrugones,*' (6.2), Pindar (*Pyth.* 1) praises the earlier Syracusian tyrant Hieron for subduing the Tyhrennians, likening the defeated natives to Typhon (*Pyth* 1.13-20).[103] Thucydides' Alcibiades famously justifies the invasion of Sicily in 417 by writing off the Siciliots as 'mixed up crowds' (*ochloi xummeitikoi)* compared with the long-rooted Athenians (Thuc. 6.17.2-3), characterizing their bodies politic as shifting and without distinct identity. As has been previously mentioned, Greek historiographical practice never developed a vocabulary specific beyond barbaric generalities (*agrios* etc.) for stereotyping the non-Greek natives of Italy and Sicily, unlike for Thracians, Persians, and Egyptians.[104] On the other hand, Carol Dougherty has argued that when western natives *do* appear in early accounts, they are represented in terms of being the early

---

[103] See Dougherty 1993.92-98.

[104] J.M. Hall 2002.121-24, 2004.43-46; Woolf 2011.19-24; see Skinner 2012.59-109 for a list of archaic and classical ethnic associations.

adversaries of colonial settlement: once they are defeated, they tend to disappear in most accounts of the archaic west.[105] Though recent work has tended towards recovering the agency of western natives, myths of colonial foundation like those found in Herodotus (as I will describe in chapter V below) serve a purpose for the Greek audiences they were intended for, conceptualizing the colonial landscape as empty (*eremos*), even if it was not.[106] To those audiences, monstrosity serves as a non-distinct means of conceptualizing the natives. Thus Odysseus' Cyclops, rather than having a culture of his own, is characterized in lacking culture as a general *phenomenon*. If Polyphemus has a special way of milking his ewes or pressing his cheese, all the *Odyssey* cares to inform about him is that he is *not* just and *not* a friend to guests (*oude dikaioi / êe philoxeinioi, Od.* 9.175-76). Though the *Odyssey's* characterization of Cyclops serves as a paradigm of Othering in Greek ethnography—Herodotus' Scythians have substantial similarities—they are in some sense 'pre-Other.'[107]

In this sense monstrosity is a more elastic means of representation than Othering. The indistinctness of monstrosity (and the lack of set stereotypes beyond negation) prevents the symbol of the monster from being used diachronically as a symbol for a distinct set of people. Western monsters signify a range of associations and value judgments that shift widely depending on context. In historical times, monstrosity was even used as a tool to demean *Greeks* living in the ethnically mixed west.[108] If Sicily was already a linguistically, ethnically and culturally hybrid island in the fifth century, the critical lexicon of Greek historiography and literary culture does not have the vocabulary or the interest to depict it.[109] Monstrosity can be a trope for the dangers of the natives, or

---

[105] Dougherty 1993.67

[106] J.M. Hall 2002.97-98; on western natives see Malkin 1998, 2004, 2011; Woolf 2011.31-58 Skinner 2012.52-58.

[107] See Hartog 1988.204-5 on the use of the description of the Cyclops to frame ethnographic descriptions of Scythian nomadism.

[108] Alcibiades' comment above.

[109] Sicily was repeatedly ravaged and depopulated between the early fifth and third centuries. See McKechnie 1989.39-42; more generally on the west in this period, 1989.35-49. On the hinterlands as hybrid zones see Antonaccio 2003.59-61, 65-72; Nicholson 2011 on ethnic politics on the island in the fifth century.

even of the dangers of intermarrying with them or moving into their settlements, but the trope itself does not constitute a true vocabulary for conceptualizing people that are different.[110] Where Greeks explicitly mention the presence of non-Greeks in the west (usually referring to Cathaginians or Etruscans), they fall back into the familiar dichotomy of Greek non-Greek. This occurs in Theocritus: in his hymn to Hieron II, *Idyll* 16, he depicts the 'spearman Hieron' (16.103) chasing the Carthaginian foe off the island and back to Africa whence it came (16.76-87). With the Carthaginians gone, the Sicilians, safe from the foreign menace, turn to herding, farming, and reclaiming their long-abandoned fields (16.90-100). The context of Hieron's expulsion of the long-standing Carthaginian presence from Sicily circumscribes Theocritus' description of the bucolic world: Theocritus uses the language of his explicitly bucolic poems to describe what Sicily is like now that it is safe.

For Theocritus in the third century (*Id.* 16), like Pindar in the fifth (*Pyth.* 1), any possible claims of self-identification of Greeks against non-Greeks in Sicily are squarely political: non-Greek enemies (the Carthaginians for Theocritus, and the Etruscans for Pindar) are conveniently not actually from the island.[111] The populations of Greek, native, and non-Greek in Sicily were substantially mixed, but *Idyll* 16 reduces the political situation of the island to the simple terms of Greek against non-Greek. This is a maneuver that at least is politically expedient for Theorcitus' patron. By the third century, it is increasingly difficult to identify difference in the material record (although material culture is not a sufficient indicator of identity).[112] The fact that the fields were long abandoned had much to do with the activities of several generations of Syracusian tyrants who exploited the politics of the island to strengthen their hands by continually deporting and resettling its inhabitants.[113] Sicily had been so successfully depopulated and resettled so many times that both populations were, if not inseparable, hard to

---

[110] Dougherty 2003.48.

[111] This was also the period when fifth century, essentializing visions of Greek ethnicity (the famous trifecta of *homoglosson, homotropa,* and *homaimon* in Hdt. 8.144) appear less and less, and the performance of cultural practice (*paideia*) comes to the foreground; see Said 2001.285.

[112] Webster 2001.

[113] Dover 1971.227; see McKechnie 1989.35-49, Nicholson 2011.

distinguish on a material basis. Hence Theocritus' *ho Kuklops ho par' hamin* (11.7) becomes a reality: you cannot characterize the native as the Cyclops when the native is you yourself.

Marrying the Cyclops

Theocritus' Cyclops crosses lines that are different from those tread by the bucolic herdsmen and the female agricultural workers. The Cyclops is male, and Theocritus does not characterize his skin color as variant in any way: on the other hand, where there is reference to dark skin color in Theocritus, it is an exclusively female characteristic. Yet his snub nose and single eye appear in connection with impossible sexual desire, the monster loving the girl, or the male colonial native loving the female colonist. Theocritus' Cyclops knows how to woo a nymph but can only do so awkwardly: he speaks human language and has a human-like shape, but between the close description he provides of his monstrosity (11.30-33) and his inability to correctly identify what a proper love token is (Galateia, understanding the trope in pastoral of what proper love tokens are, mockingly pelts him with apples, 6.5) and is not (bear cubs, 11.41) precludes the chance of successfully wooing Galateia. The impossibility of the Cyclops' success is of course what makes the poem comedic, but that impossibility is the product of a line that Theocritus draws in his depiction.[114] In a poetic world where Theocritus' other male narrators have access to no shortage of sexually available dark-skinned girls, the Cyclops alone has problems, pining over a fair-skinned one (*leuka* 11.19).

Polyphemus' desire for Galeteia crosses a structural line between male colonist and female colonized that exists in both colonial narrative—where males are newcomers to the feminized landscape—and apparently operative in Greek colonial history. Narratives of the marriage or rape of a native woman by a newcoming colonist or god are common in stories of colonial foundations, while Greek male intermarriage into non-Greek communities reaches the level of a literary trope during the Theocritus' lifetime.[115] A similar line exists in Theocritus' bucolic world, where dark-skinned female agricultural

---

[114] On Otherness and comedy, see Cohen 2011.479-80.

[115] Dougherty 1993.67-69, Stephens 2003.191-93.

workers are available to men (*Ids.* 3, 10, 11), but the opposite scenario is not true. This bears out in the history of the Hellenistic period: as fluid as identities could be in places like Ptolemaic Egypt, despite the huge amount of bureaucratic papyri that survive, there is not a single one listing a marriage between a Greek woman and an Egyptian man.[116] Though there are any number of reasons to explain this disparity besides race—for instance, it is likely that most Greek-speaking immigrants to Egypt in the third and second centuries were mercenaries[117]—it does reveal a structural paradigm behind the logic of ancient colonialism. Migration and settlement is a male activity, and from the archaic period well through the Hellenistic period Greek settlement in foreign lands was imagined through the prism of marriage of male newcomer with feminized landscape.[118] If the Cyclops in the *Odyssey's* telling functions as a stand-in for the hostile native population, Odysseus is the proto-colonist. As Dougherty notes, in a passage that is structurally parallel to Odysseus' landing on the isle of the Cyclopes, when Odysseus comes ashore on Scheria and is found by Nausicaa, he encounters the opposite situation: the land is friendly to him, and Alcinous offers Nausicaa to him in marriage.[119] Odysseus of course turns down his offer, but by supplicating and appearing bashful to Nausikaa from the start, he prevents even the thought from occurring of the single most common *aetion* for the founding of cities: the rape and/or subsequent marriage of a native girl.[120]

Polyphemus in a sense is playing the role of Nausicaa: vying to marry the newcomer from the sea, but disappointed in the end. Alternately presenting himself as aloof (*Id.* 6) or openly courting Galateia's attention (*Id.* 11), he invites her to come ashore and to take the bounty he offers. His construction as culturally passive—being pelted with apples in *Idyll* 6, and looking out at the sea from his cave in *Idyll* 11—even puts him in contrast with the speaker of *Idyll* 3, who is excluded from the cave of his beloved. But if the Cyclops' helplessness operates as a lampoon of the *Odyssey* (hence the various

---

[116] McCoskey 2012.105-109.

[117] McCoskey 2012.106.

[118] Dougherty 1993.67-69, Dougherty 2003.45, Stephens 2003.191-92.

[119] Dougherty 2003.44-46.

[120] Stephens 2003.191-92
.

quotations of it), it is also an ambivalent lampoon. We have already seen how in *Idyll* 15, Praxinoa fashions the colonized male into the malevolent *kakoergos* (15.47) who is up to no good.

In this sense I would like to return to the postcolonial theory of Homi Bhabha. In Bhabha's terminology, the uncomfortable distance between the ability of the colonized native to speak the language of the colonizer and the inability to be accepted by the colonizer because of factors such as race prejudice represents what he calls colonial mimicry.[121] Polyphemus' partially-mastered employment of the language of love only serves to separate him further from Galateia. If Polyphemus has some element of understanding of how to woo a lover in bucolic song (an understanding better developed in *Id.* 6 than in *Id.* 11), the description of his monstrous body only serves to make the difference between his speech and his appearance more jarring. As Bhabha theorizes ambivalence, you can be "almost the same, but not quite:"[122] here, Theocritus' racialization of monstrosity emphasizes the space between acting like a Greek and being Greek. Compared with the explicitly unfavorable encounter with the non-Greek Egyptian native in *Idyll* 15, Theocritus' imagining of the Cyclops is thoroughly ambivalent, partially sympathetic and partially at Polyphemus' expense.[123] Although we must recognize the inherent differences between ancient and modern colonialisms, as Jane Webster has argued, we will be continually drawn to see the discursive similarities between them in regard to the strategies of negotiation, exclusion, and assimilation between colonizer and colonized.[124] In a passive sense, then, Theocritus' Polyphemus operates as a microcosm of the bucolic world in full, as a middle ground between ethnographic representation, and engagement with the presence of the Other. Theocritus' hybrid Cyclops inhabits a space between the ethnographic discourse that turns the colonized into the Other and the logic of assimilation. But in an active sense, the body of

---

[121] Bhabha 1994.86.

[122] Bhabha 1994.86. Italics removed.

[123] As Prof. Bowditch has pointed out to me, there is also another difference: though the Cyclops lives at the margins of the world, he is a creation of a Greek poetic tradition, unlike the Egyptian commoner, who is undeniably foreign.

[124] Webster 1997.328-330.

the Cyclops serves as a locus for the deployment of evolving discourses of exclusion in the increasingly globalized Mediterranean world of the third century B.C.E.[125]

---

[125] Cf. Malkin 2011 on networks in the ancient world.

CHAPTER IV

ETHNOGRAPHY AND THE CRITIQUE OF HISTRIOGRAPHY IN LUCIAN'S

VERAE HISTORIAE

In this and the following chapter, I will investigate the reception of Herodotean ethnographic ideas in two works by the second century CE sophist Lucian of Samosata: the *True histories* (*Verae historiae*), about an imaginary journey to the west, and the *How to write history* (*Quomodo historia conscribenda sit*), Lucian's prescriptive treatise on historiography. In this chapter, I will discuss how Lucian uses ethnographic discourse as a means of framing a contemporary debate over whether Greek identity could be determined by performance of elite cultural practices (*paideia)* or descent (*genos).* In the subsequent chapter I will argue that Lucian parodies the passivity or absence of native peoples in the colonial foundation myths, such as those found in Herodotus, in order to critique the continued use of Herodotean models of history by his contemporaries. While recent critics have argued against the applicability of applying models such as the ambivalence of the postcolonial author as defined by Homi Bhabha to antiquity, I will argue that the discourses of ethnic exclusion that made such ambivalence possible in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries also existed to some extent in antiquity.[1] By parodying the discourse of ethnography, Lucian engages in a negotiation with the logic of ethnic identification—and ethnic exclusionism—inherent in second century intellectual culture.

Ethnographic knowledge was an intrinsic part of ancient historiography.[2] While it is true that there are histories that only rarely describe foreign customs or peoples (Thucydides) and there are ethnographic works that contain little history (Tacitus' *Germania*), ethnographic discourse was part in parcel with the ancient concept of *historiê*.[3] In the footsteps of Herodotus, ethnography becomes an expected part of ancient historiographical writing about the near east and Egypt.[4] Unlike the nineteenth

---

[1] e.g. Malkin 2004, de Angelis 2009.49-54. On racism and colonial education see chapter IV.

[2] 'Ethnographic knowledge:' Woolf 2011.17, Skinner 2012.5-8.

[3] Woolf 2011.16, Skinner 2012.16.

[4] Vasunia 2001.113-14; Skinner 2012.243-48 on Herodotus.

and twentieth century ethnographers who fanned out across Africa and Asia in the wake of colonization, Greek and Roman ethnographers typically relate stories that can be centuries old: the so-called *Indica* of Arrian (*Anabasis* 8.1-17)*,* for instance, is explicitly based off of other sources (Nearchus and Megasthenes) that were hundreds of years old by Arrian's time and written in literary Ionic specifically to resemble Herodotus.[5] The ethnographic presentation of the Indians—within a particular circumscribed section of the text, and using a special dialect—serves to make them comprehensible.[6] Phiroze Vasunia has provocatively argued that, to some extent, ancient ethnographic descriptions of Egypt legitimized its conquest.[7] This argument must be deployed carefully, however, because as others have shown, there was little or no coordination between ancient ethnographic writers and conquerors, and many of the regions that were frequently the topics of popular ethnography (such as India) remained far beyond Macedonian or Roman conquest.[8] Areas conquered by Rome and long colonized by Greeks still generated ethnographies well into late antiquity, as well.

So why does a second century historian continue to recycle tales of the barbarian? Arrian's employment of ethnographic discourse confirms the expectations an audience, nurtured on Herodotus, that has come to understand that one of the purposes of historiography is to depict, as Lucian describes in the *How to write history* (54)*,* "Greek triumphs and barbarian defeats."[9] Although the ethnography of the Indians in the *Indica* is somewhat unrelated to the narrative in the second half of the eighth book of the *Anabasis,* it serves to emphasize that Alexander is fighting a war of the west against the east. There are, of course, other types of history (no one could describe Thucydides as the canonical historian of Greek triumphs and barbarian defeats), but when it comes to depicting interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks, the audience of historiography in

---

[5] Cf. Lucian. *Hist conscr.* 16; see Hornblower 2006.309.

[6] Vasunia 2001.113-14.

[7] Vasunia 2001.248-88 following E. Said 1978.240-41.

[8] Woolf 2011.59-66.

[9] On the expectations of second century audiences see Kemezis 2010.

the second century expects that interaction will be adversarial.[10] Though in the *How to write history* Lucian tends to valorize Thucydides as a model for other historians, two of the three canonical historians he lists (Thucydides, Herodotus, and Xenophon) were famed for writing histories about battles against the Persians, and indeed the context of Lucian's composition of his treatise is Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus' war against the Parthians.[11]

Later Greek historiography seeks to represent a world quite different from the one which Herodotus described—not only one in which Greeks have settled across the non-Greek east and adopted foreign cultural practices, but also one under domination by the Romans. Tim Whitmarsh has offered a useful paradigm for describing the cultural dynamic of Greek cities in the east in the Second Sophistic: by appealing to models of *paideia* (Greek elite cultural practice), non-Greek local elites situated themselves within a political discourse of power where correct performance of cultural practice (including speaking the language properly) was a means for social advancement.[12] In that sense, Hellenicity becomes a contact zone where local elites can fashion themselves as 'Greeks' without having to abandon their 'native' names, languages, or dress, as long as they can present themselves as Greek in the proper situations (this is akin to the practice of 'code-switching').[13] Yet later Greek historiography about the east inherits its difficulty in describing cultural interaction in the face of cultural hybridity because it was a product of readers of Herodotus, who continued to perpetuate his narrative patterns—all of which appeal to models of cultural performance in archaic and classical Greek culture—as active historiographical biases. In the *True histories,* Lucian reads these Herodotean silences and develops a critique of them by pushing two of Herodotus' common types of

---

[10] "The familiar was edited out of ethnography because it failed to distinguish them." (Woolf 2011.23).

[11] Thucydides: Bartley 2003, Greenwood 2006. Cf. Lucian in *How to write history* 2 mocks contemporary historians for mimicking the canonical three historians too closely (οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐχ ἱστορίαν συγγράφει· μᾶλλον δὲ Θουκυδίδαι καὶ Ἡρόδοτοι καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν ἅπαντες,). On the context of the *How to write history,* see Kemezis 2010.

[12] Whitmarsh 2001.16.

[13] Cf. Wallace-Hadrill 2008.63-64.

narrative describing Greek/foreign interactions—ethnography and colonial narrative—to an extreme.

Ethnography East and West

Lucian's mock ethnography in the *True histories* takes on another gap in the narrative of Herodotus: the west. Although Herodotus is not, in fact, silent about the west, unlike even Thucydides (at the start of his sixth book), Herodotus never develops any sort of western ethnography as a counterpart to his famous stories of Egypt and the near east.[14] This did not mean that these did not exist: Poseidonius of Apamea wrote an influential ethnography of the Celts in the first century B.C.E. that was well known both to Greek writers, like Strabo, and Romans such as Sallust.[15] Lucian, if he was not aware of Poseidonius himself, was certainly aware of the genre of western ethnographic writing: his account of finding the footprint of Heracles at the start of the *True histories* (1.7) demonstrates an awareness of myths about Heracles as conqueror of the west.[16] Developing from Hartog's characterization of ethnography as a mirror—and that Herodotean ethnography aims towards delineating lines between self and Other— scholars have more recently reevaluated Herodotean ethnography as a series of engagements with foreign cultures that demonstrates some level of knowledge and interaction with the peoples described.[17] Ethnographic accounts of the peoples of the west are heavily intertwined with the experience of Greek colonialism, which I have already discussed to some extent in the preceding chapter: as Irad Malkin has investigated, a figure like Odysseus can serve as a location for cultural negotiations

---

[14] Munson 2006.

[15] References to the practices of western people appear as early as the fifth century, although no works specifically about them are known until much later; Woolf (2011.66) suggests that this lack is deliberate, possibly based on lack of frequent interaction. On the particularities of western ethnography compared to the east, see Woolf 2011.4-5.

[16] Myths of Heracles as world traveler appear at an early date, and he does not just go to the west; in Pind. *Ol.* 3, he travels beyond the Ister, while in Hdt. 4.82, the particular passage Lucian alludes to in *VH* 1.7, Heracles leaves footprints by the shore of the Maerotic lake. On Heracles and the west, see Woolf 2011.20 n53.

[17] Particularly Hartog 1988.62-83 on Anacharsis and Scyles. See Chamberlain 1999, Munson 2001, 2005, Thomas 2001, Greenwood 2009, Gruen 2011.21-52, Skinner 2012.243-47.

between Greek merchants and colonists and native inhabitants.[18] If ethnographies of the east displayed a proclivity towards 'Othering,' Greek ethnographies of the west could display a multitude of tendencies—from fashioning the colonial native as monstrous or savage[19] to conceptualizing the colonial native as familiar within heroic genealogy (as descendants of Heracles, for instance, or Trojan refugees).[20] Even if the prevailing scholarly opinion has overemphasized the extent to which Greek thought about the east is dominated by the lens of Othering, Lucian's statement—that history is about the defeat of the barbarian (*Hist. conscr.* 54)—still stands.[21] The legacy of Herodotus was strong enough that even writers of second century historiography had little interest in conceptualizing easterners as anything *but* the Other.

Being Ambivalent in the Second Sophistic

The ambiguity of Lucian's ethnic, cultural, or linguistic identities has typically served as a starting point in recent discussions of his work.[22] Despite the sheer number of statements by his protagonists that they are variously *Suroi* or *barbaroi*,[23] Lucian never provides a clear answer as to what his first language or 'true' ethnicity was, leading to the general scholarly consensus that, as Swain states, "a Greek cultural-cognitive identity is extremely important to him."[24] To some extent, it is indeed true that the question of ethnicity is a mirage: as we saw in the last chapter, ancient conceptions of ethnic identity allowed some degree of continued mobility between colonial Greek and colonized

---

[18] Malkin 1998.

[19] Dougherty 2003.

[20] Malkin 1998, Woolf 2011.19-24, 38-44; see Thuc. 6.2 on the Elmyians for an example. All of these tendencies exist in ethnographic discourse on Scythia, Persia, or Egypt as well, but in those cases the Herodotean model is strong enough to shape the broader conceptualization.

[21] Skinner 2012.22-23.

[22] See S. Said 1994, Swain 1996.298-329, Whitmarsh 2001.122-29, Elsner 2003, Lightfoot 2003.205-7, Henderson 2011, Isaac 2011.

[23] *Hist. conscri.* 24, *Scyth.* 9, *Adv. indoct.* 19, *Hal.* 19, *Bis acc.* 14, 25-34; see also Isaac 2004.342-45.

[24] Swain 1996.304.

Egyptian.[25] If Lucian was by modern understanding ethnically Syrian, there should be nothing preventing him from claiming a Greek cultural identity. If we accept Whitmarsh's framework of *paideia* as the predominant discursive paradigm, then elite cultural performances during the Second Sophistic have a distinctly ecumenical character: it does not matter whether an elite male comes from Syria, Egypt, or Gaul as long as he correctly engages in a series of cultural acts, such as speaking proper Attic. In that respect, engaging in the performance of elite culture serves as a type of severance from one's roots, voiding the question of whether Lucian's 'identity' matters.[26] If *paideia* makes *all* elites foreign, then the genealogical origins of the very embodiment of elite culture in the second century, the travelling scholar-orator*,* become meaningless: the *rhêtor* is always more cultured, more masculine, and indeed more Greek than those he frames himself against.[27]

As I argued in the preceding chapter on Theocritus, Sicily, and Egypt, while it is true that elite cultures in the ancient Mediterranean were somewhat inclusive, there were at the same time functional ideologies of racial and ethnic difference operative as tools of exclusion in antiquity, particularly for those low in the class and status hierarchy. Lucian likely never had to worry excessively about anything like systematic exclusion based on being from Syria, or even looking like a Syrian.[28] On the other hand, Lucian's overtures to his background do form part of a larger pattern. All of the major figures of the Second Sophistic that we know come from marginal areas of the Roman empire—Lucian, Apuleius, Favorinus, Fronto—are in the habit of making variously defensive references

---

[25] See chapter III above.

[26] ". . . the Hellenization enacted by *paideia,* even in the case of 'ethnic' Greeks, is never simply a consolidation of an anterior identity but the creation of a new, 'foreign' one." (Whitmarsh 2001.129).\

[27] Gleason 1995, Henderson 2011.

[28] Lucian never refers to physical difference by ethnicity, though profession carries physical associations: in *Somn.* 9-11 he depicts *Paideia* characterizing the sculptor (earlier described as one who stays at home, *tên patrida . . . katalipôn)* strong-armed, though mean and illiberal, while the *rhetor* gets to travel and gain stature in the eyes of those who are preeminent in descent (*hupo tôn genei . .. prouchontôn apoblepomenos*).

to that fact.[29] Even if the 'Asiatic' oratory that Second Sophistic *rhetores* are so accustomed to attack is largely a fictive creation, the fact that it is associated with an ethnonym draws attention to another facet of Second Sophistic elite culture: if *paideia* allows access to elite Greek culture to ethnic non-Greeks, there were tendencies latent in Greek intellectual culture that sought to keep them out.[30]

Undesirable traits or tendencies were routinely associated with non-Greeks. Philostratus, the author of the early third century *Lives of the sophists* (*Vitae sophistarum),* a collection of biographies of prominent sophists that starts in the fifth century B.C.E. but largely focused on sophists of the first and second century C.E., does not for the most part single out perceived ethnicity as a particular stumbling block to sophistic fame. On the other hand, at certain times in the *Lives of the sophists* some of the figures he writes about—most notoriously the sophist Polemon—will use the perceived ethnicity of their rivals as reasons to disregard their learning entirely.[31] It has increasingly become a scholarly commonplace to implicitly read the appeals to the accessibility of Greek cultural identity made by Lucian, Favorinus, Aristides, and other writers or orators of the Second Sophistic as prototypes for such modern conceptions as multiculturalism and diversity.[32] I do not want to single out these appeals *per se,* because as Frank Snowden observed long ago, the lines on which modern prejudices are drawn (particularly on skin color) would appear quite strange to ancient Greeks or Romans.[33] That said, when Favorinus, in a speech to the Corinthians, asserts his pride that as a Hellenized Gaul, he serves as an example for other Celts to Hellenize (Fav.=Dio Chrys. 37.26-27), the fact that he foregrounds his barbarian ancestry should not be automatically

---

[29] Isaac 2011.503-9. Compared to such writers as the Greek-speaking Gallic eunuch Favorinus and the apparently Numido-Maurdurian Apuleius, Lucian's gestures towards his alleged ancestry are comparatively unfraught.

[30] Romero 2002.31-32, Henderson 2011.27.

[31] Henderson 2011.27-29; for examples see particularly Polemon's remarks towards Marcus (*VS* 529); also Pausanias of Cappadocia's inability to move past his accent (*VS* 594). To some extent Philostratus regards accent as genetic.

[32] i.e. Whitmarsh 2001.25, 116-29, Wallace-Hadrill 2008.1-6.

[33] Snowden 1983.63-64.

taken as a sign of the ecumenicalism of second century intellectual culture.[34] The vast majority of the practicing sophists during Lucian's lifetime derive from the Aegean coast of Asia Minor, which was increasingly becoming the epicenter of Greek cultural production during the period.[35] Although the Greek cities of Asia Minor had long been sites of cultural hybridity between Greeks, Carians, Lydians, and others, during the second century C.E. the Aegean cities of Asia Minor became increasingly assertive in proving their untainted genetic Hellenicity. These claims often came at the expense of discounting claims made by inhabitants other Greek cities perceived to be less authentic Greek.[36] To the extent that the elite culture of the Second Sophistic is grounded in the rhetoric of *paideia, paideia* is only one strategy of defining cultural identity. At any rate, even using fluency in Attic as a measure of cultural identity is heavily grounded in the logic of ethnic exclusion.[37]

It is in this context that we can safely speak of there being a postcolonial Lucian. While Lucian's references to his ancestry tend to be elusive at best—what is *really* his first language?—in the lives of orators on the margins there are hints of the colonial mimicry so eloquently formulated by Homi Bhaba.[38] Although one of Lucian's contemporaries and the preeminent sophist of his day, Polemon of Laodicea, is most strongly associated with physiognomics—the ancient pseudoscience of reading personality through innate physical characteristics—physiognomic thought has broad

---

[34] Thus Wallace-Hadrill 2008.1-6. ἐπ' αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ἐδόκει ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν οἷον ἐξεπίτηδες κατεσκευάσθαι, Ἕλλησι μέν, ἵνα ἔχωσιν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι τῆς Ἑλλάδος παράδειγμα ὡς οὐδὲν τὸ παιδευθῆναι τοῦ φῦναι πρὸς τὸ δοκεῖν διαφέρει· Ῥωμαίοις δέ, ἵνα μηδ' οἱ τὸ ἴδιον ἀξίωμα περιβεβλημένοι τὸ παιδεύεσθαι πρὸς τὸ ἀξίωμα παρορῶσι· Κελτοῖς δέ, ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν βαρβάρων μηδεὶς ἀπογιγνώσκῃ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας, βλέπων εἰς τοῦτον.

[35] Romeo 2002.36; 29-31 on the mythical genealogies deployed by cities in Asia Minor to fashion themselves as the original colonizers of Greece through such figures as Pelops. This is a form of genealogical argument that appears quite early; see for instance Pind. *Ol.* 1.23-24 for Olympia as *apoikia* of Lydia. Whitmarsh (2011.23-25) sees these genealogical claims—many of which are quite contrived—as evidence of the flexibility of Greek cultural assertion in this period, which is surely true, but behind this logic there are serious attempts to fashion 'out-groups' delineated via *genos*. *Genos* is a discourse predicated on claims of physical superiority and exclusion by birth.

[36] Romeo 2002.36. See Philost. *VS* 518, 613 on non-Greeks in second century Smyrna.

[37] Cf. Swain 1996.35-36 on the 'language question' in modern Greece; 48-49 on Lucian.

[38] Bhabha 1994.86-87. On colonial mimicry in the Second Sophistic, see Henderson 2011.

75

appeal to many writers of the Second Sophistic and afterward.[39] Polemon was a leading

proponent of a restrictive meaning to Hellenicity—defining Greekness by descent, or

genos, alone—and indeed, when Hadrian establishes the Panhellenic League in the early

130s, he restricts membership to those cities with the strongest claims to Hellenicity

based solely on *genos.*[40] Some of Polemon's particular actions, such as his insistence on

the ethnic purity of his students and his refusal to even meet with certain foreign

dignitaries (*VS* 535)—bring to mind the type of George Wallace-style open racism that is

rarely associated with antiquity.[41] Indeed, certain passages in the *Physionomica* appear to

be deliberate attacks on Favorinus.[42] Although Philostratus depicts the successes of a

number of sophists from the margins, he at the same time reflects the tendency of

physiognomic thought to use anatomy to define the character of broad classes of people.

Physiognomic thought is much more widespread in the Second Sophistic than Polemon.

Philostratus pays particular attention to anatomy that prevents characters from speaking

good Attic: the *phusis* of eunuchs, for instance, causes Favorinus to have a shrill and

unpleasant voice,[43] while Lucian, too, in a possibly satirical attack on eunuchs (*Eun.* 6-7),

claims that eunuchs, rather than being humans, are "something composite, hybrid

---

[39] Gleason 1995, Isaac 2011. Physiognomy is related to theories of environmental determinism that are considerably older (e.g. Hippocrates, Vitruvius 6.1) and often exist in opposition to Herodotus' general ecumenicalism (Thomas 2001.216-18). Woolf (2011.44-47) sees these theories as used to explain why Greek or Roman conceptions of distant peoples were so similar; physiognomy is the application of these theories to people that are close by, and thus have the capacity of functioning as a proto-racism. See Isaac 2004.149-63.

[40] Romeo 2002.32-35, Isaac 2011.508. *Genos* is ultimately constructed subjectively through genealogical claims, but under Hadrian these take an increased interest in 'purity;' see J.M. Hall 2002.225.

[41] Polemon's students are not "undisciplined and promiscuous" but "selected and purely Greek." (οὐκ ἀκολάστου καὶ ξυγκλύδος, ἀλλ' ἐξειλεγμένης τε καὶ καθαρᾶς Ἑλλάδος *VS* 531). This would likely not suggest a concern for genealogical ancestry by itself, except that Polemon's contemporaries in Smyrna are far more open minded in whom they accept: Scopelian teaches Ionians, Lydians, Carians, Maeonians, Aeolians, as well as Greeks from Mysia and Phrygia (*VS* 518); a generation later Heracleides accepts Ionians, Lydians, Phrygians, and Carians (*VS* 613).

[42] On Favorinus in the *Physiognomica,* see Gleason 1995.46; Romeo 2002.34 on Philostr. *VS* 531-35.

[43] "For he was heard shrill and delicate and taut, just as nature grants eunuchs." ὀξυηχὲς γὰρ ἠκούετο καὶ λεπτὸν καὶ ἐπίτονον, ὥσπερ ἡ φύσις τοὺς εὐνούχους ἥρμοκεν. (*VS* 489).

(*mikton*) and monstrous, apart from human nature (*exô tês anthrôpeias phuseôs).*"[44]
Polemon envisions physiognomy as a means of reconciling the fact that peoples as
various as Thracians, Syrians, and Libyans are able to pass as Greeks with conceptions of
race, and his language in the *Physiognomica* is heavily ethnographic.[45] In discussions
about eunuchs (probably inspired by the strange case of Favorinus)[46] there is repeated
emphasis on the ability of *phusis* to inhibit the capacity of speech, but the association of
phusis and hindered *phonê* is not limited to eunuchs. Philostratus relates how even
Favorinus had great fun listening to their dark-skinned (*melas*) Indian slave fail to speak
good Attic because of the shape of his tongue.[47] While not discounting the ability of
paideia to function as a discursive system that elites from the eastern Roman Empire
were able to use to vie for cultural or political prestige, *paideia* is not the only paradigm
of Hellenicity operative in the Second Sophistic.[48] If the experience of nineteenth and
twentieth century elites from the formerly colonized world can serve as a functional
parallel, perhaps Lucian's deliberate ambiguity about specifying his origins can be taken
as colonial ambivalence: while he clearly *did* master *paideia,* there were countervailing
pressures that made the fact that he allegedly was a *Suros* meaningful.[49]

---

[44] καὶ πολὺς ἦν ὁ περὶ τούτου λόγος, οὔτε ἄνδρα οὔτε γυναῖκα εἶναι τὸν εὐνοῦχον λέγοντος, ἀλλά τι σύνθετον καὶ μικτὸν καὶ τερατῶδες, ἔξω τῆς ἀνθρωπείας φύσεως. (Lucian *Eun.* 6).

[45] Gleason 1995.33, 41.

[46] Gleason 1995.1-6 on the rarity of eunuchs even in the east. Lucian makes reference to Favorinus in *Eun.* 7.

[47] "There was this Indian, a sufficiently dark one, the plaything of Herodes and Favorinus, who diverted them when they were drinking together by mixing Attic with Indian and barbarizing it with his irregular tongue." ἦν δὲ οὗτος Ἰνδὸς μὲν καὶ ἱκανῶς μέλας, ἄθυρμα δὲ Ἡρώδου τε καὶ Φαβωρίνου, ξυμπίνοντας γὰρ αὐτοὺς διῆγεν ἐγκαταμιγνὺς Ἰνδικοῖς Ἀττικὰ καὶ πεπλανημένῃ τῇ γλώττῃ βαρβαρίζων. (*VS* 490).

[48] Romeo 2002.31.

[49] Cf. Whitmarsh 2001.124: "Yet [Lucian] never presents the transfigurations of *paideia* as absolute, entirely effacing his barbarian origins: his satirical stance makes a virtue of the culturally junctural position of its author."

Hence Lucian's ethnography is due for reevaluation.[50] Lucian wrote two major

works of ethnographic discourse: the *Verae historiae* and the *de dea Syria,* a work in

Ionic mimicking the style of Herodotus, formerly of disputed authorship but generally

accepted as Lucianic.[51] This paper will only have space to focus on ethnographic and

colonial discourse in the *VH,* but the stance taken by the narrator of the *de dea Syria*—an

ethnography of Syria purportedly written by a Syrian—is in many respects unique in

antiquity.[52] In his imaginary ethnographies of the moon people, the sun people, the lamp

people, and others in the *VH,* Lucian channels the voice of Herodotus, paying close

attention to specific devices used by the fifth-century historian in creating the

ethnographized people as the Other.[53] Herodotus' creation of the Other has been a

popular topic of research since Hartog's 1980 book, but it certainly is not the only means

of ethnography that Herodotus deploys: besides 'Othering,' Herodotus is able to imagine

genealogical ties with foreign peoples, to incorporate their legends into a Greek

framework, or, in the peculiar case of the colonized west in particular, to remove them

altogether.[54] Herodotus' ethnographic discourse is as much able to engage with the

Other—through analyzing foreign religious customs or vocabulary[55]—as to differentiate

from the other. Rather than there being one strategy of Greek ethnography, or even a

series that evolves over time, Greek ethnography tends to deploy several coexistent

strategies that both assimilate and differentiate foreign peoples from the customs and

practices of those that describe them.[56]

---

[50] Lucian's practice of ethnography has yet to be approached in light of cultural studies, new
historicism, or postcolonialism. Major discussions include S. Said 1994, Elsner 2001, and Lightfoot
2003, which is the authoritative work on the *de dea Syria.*

[51] See Swain 1996.304-8, Elsner 2001.125, Lightfoot 2003.184-208.

[52] See S. Said 1994.163, Elsner 2001.123-28.

[53] See S. Said 1994.156-63.

[54] On the colonial west, see chapter V below. On strategies of ethnography, see Woolf 2011.13-17.
On Lucian and Herodotus, see S. Said 1994.150-52, Elsner 2001.153.

[55] Chamberlain 1999, Munson 2005.

[56] Woolf 2011.13-31; see also Greenwood 2009.

What ethnography and physiognomy have in common is the tendency towards uniform judgment and prescriptive behaviors based on physical characteristic. Benjamin Isaac sees this even as a type of proto-racism, and indeed what is so off-putting about physiognomy is that it serves as a type of ethnography, aimed towards exclusion, of people who are close-by rather than far away.[57] Lucian's practice of ethnography—as he states in the first chapter of *de dea Syria,* "I write as an Assyrian" (*graphô de Assurios eôn*)—bridges the gap between nearby and distant peoples, and if ethnography is fundamentally the practice of 'Othering,' then Lucian is doing it to himself.[58] When Lucian is describing the strange peoples of the sun and moon, is Lucian engaging in a satire of those who either deploy ethnographic discourse unquestionably, or even alluding to those who see ethnic characteristics as intrinsic before culture? Rather than just subverting or jesting at the framework of self and Other,[59] Lucian puts different strategies of ethnographic discourse in opposition to each other that, though they might coexist in the same works, largely do not interact.[60] More broadly, Lucian identifies as inherently problematic the use of exoticizing language and ethnographic discourse in writing the history of the culturally hybrid and ethnically mixed second century east.

The Well and the Mirror

Before taking a look at Lucian's different strategies of ethnography, it is worth remembering how conceptually interwoven ethnographic observation is to methods of historiographic discourse.[61] As Emily Greenwood observes, the Lucianic critique of historiographical writing in the *True histories* and the *How to write history* both foregrounds the presence (or non-presence) of the historian and questions the identity of the historian.[62] While the *How to write history* tends to valorize Thucydidean history and

[57] Isaac 2004.149-63.

[58] S. Said 1994.163, Elsner 2001.126.

[59] i.e. S. Said 1994.163.

[60] Elsner 2001, Woolf 2011.13-19 on ethnographic strategies; see section below.

[61] Skinner 2012.244-45.

[62] Greenwood 2006.111-13.

the *True histories* focuses on Herodotus, both works depict the problem of relating the historian to the written work. The Thucydidean historian is not only neutral, but in his works he is "a foreigner . . . and without a city."[63] The *True histories* makes no pretense of neutrality, but Lucian does make a gesture. Near the end of his sojourn with the moon people, the narrator of Lucian's *True histories* describes one of the wonders (*thaumata*) in that land:

> καὶ μὴν καὶ ἄλλο θαῦμα ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἐθεασάμην κάτοπτρον μέγιστον κεῖται ὑπὲρ φρέατος οὐ πάνυ βαθέος. ἂν μὲν οὖν εἰς τὸ φρέαρ καταβῇ τις, ἀκούει πάντων τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ γῇ λεγομένων, ἐὰν δὲ εἰς τὸ κάτοπτρον ἀποβλέψῃ, πάσας μὲν πόλεις, πάντα δὲ ἔθνη ὁρᾷ ὥσπερ ἐφεστὼς ἑκάστοις· τότε καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους ἐγὼ ἐθεασάμην καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πατρίδα, εἰ δὲ κἀκεῖνοι ἐμὲ ἑώρων, οὐκέτι ἔχω τὸ ἀσφαλὲς εἰπεῖν. ὅστις δὲ ταῦτα μὴ πιστεύει οὕτως ἔχειν, ἄν ποτε καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκεῖσε ἀφίκηται, εἴσεται ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω. (*VH* 1.26)

> And moreover another wonder (*thauma)* I saw in the kingdom was a great mirror that is set above a well not very deep. If someone goes down into the well, he hears everything said among us on earth, and if he looks into the mirror he sees all the cities (*poleis),* all the tribes (*ethnê*) just like he were standing over each; then I saw my relatives and my entire homeland, although as to whether they saw me or not I am not able to safely say. Whoever does not believe these things are so, if he ever goes there he will know that I am telling the truth.

Lucian discovers a mirror at the bottom of a well through which he is given panoptic vision over the entire world: he can see all the cities (*poleis),* all the tribes (*ethnê),* as well as his family (*tous oikeous*) and his homeland (*tên patrida).* In the *How to write history* Lucian similarly identifies panopticism as *sine qua non* for history in the Thucydidean model (49), and, not much later, he brings up the image of the mirror again: Lucian states that the mind of the historian must be like a mirror, "clear, gleaming bright, accurately centered, displaying the shape of things as he receives them, free from distortion, false coloring, and misrepresentation."[64] Unlike the image of the mirror in the *How to write history*, though, in the *True histories,* Lucian's narrator is implicated in his miraculous ability to see. He sees his family and his country, but he is not sure whether

---

[63] ξένος ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις καὶ ἄπολις (*Hist. conscr.* 41).

[64] μάλιστα δὲ κατόπτρῳ ἐοικυῖαν παρασχέσθω τὴν γνώμην ἀθόλῳ καὶ στιλπνῷ καὶ ἀκριβεῖ τὸ κέντρον, καὶ ὁποίας ἂν δέξηται τὰς μορφὰς τῶν ἔργων, τοιαῦτα καὶ δεικνύτω αὐτά, διάστροφον δὲ ἢ παράχρουν ἢ ἑτερόσχημον μηδέν (*Hist. conscr.* 50).

they can see him or not: unlike the removed Thucydidean historian, the narrator's gift of sight in the *True histories* renders him naked to be in turn seen.

While the *True histories* engage in ethnographic thought almost from their start, Lucian's image of the mirror operates as something of a second proem, picking up carefully on the beginning of Herodotus' own work. Herodotus typically describes the *thômata* of the places he describes after relating some narrative of the country.[65] Lucian's description of the mirror in the well takes place after his narrative of the war between the moon-people and the sun-people, but before he begins his ethnography of the country. Both the prologues of Herodotus and Thucydides's so-called *Archaeology* (1.2-21) contain fairly well-developed ideas on the relationship between social organization and history. While Herodotus rather openly promises to portray both the large cities and the small (*homoiôs smikra kai megala astea anthrôpôn epexiôn* 1.5.3) so that great and marvelous deeds do not lack glory (*aklea genêtai* 1.1.1), Thucydides is far more restrictive. Thucydides offers two main categories of social organization in the *Archaeology*: there are people that live in *poleis* and those that live in decentralized *ethnê,* who possess a lower level of civilization.[66] Locrians and Aetolians, for instance, are developmentally stunted because they still carry weapons around in the style of barbarians and are apparently bandits for a living (Thuc. 1.5-6). The type of social organization matters: when writers begin to compare customs between the Greeks, or between the Greeks and non-Greeks, a variety of different social structures appear, and one thing Thucydides does to simplify his historical model is to limit the narrative of history—and really, the cultural identity of Greekness itself—to the *polis.*

As Edward Said, Phiroze Vasunia, and others have noted, as a general trend, histories written from a panoptic viewpoint (such as Thucydides), treat descriptions of the familiar as diachronic: things change, and events happen (the physical proximity of the

---

[65] Hartog 1988.230-31. *Thôma* have the capacity of granting extra-textual authority to Herodotus' statements (Munson 1986). On *thauma* and *theôria,* see Nightengale 2001. Herodotus lists telling *thôma* as one of the purposes of his work *(μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά . . . ἀκλέα γένηται* 1.1.1).

[66] Thucydides' *Archaeology* has until relatively recently dominated discussions of Greek state formation; see discussions in Morgan 2003, Vlassopoulos 2007.

writer no doubt shapes this).[67] Descriptions of those further out on the margins tend to be synchronic and ethnographic, depicting a world where things do not change, and the primary focus of knowledge is to describe cultural practices or material culture rather than historical change. This leads to the use of tropes (the antiquity of the Egyptians, the youth of the Scythians) or even stereotypes (the eating of raw meat) to conceive of the distant.[68] Partially because of limited knowledge (as perhaps is the case in Herodotus), and partially through the filtration of knowledge through preexisting representations or narratives (as is certainly the case in the second century), foreign cultures become 'knowable' based on a set number of aspects, such as the tendency of 'Orientals' to be slavish or child-like. Vasunia refers to this as the "ethnographic present" by which Greek ethnographic writing deprives many of the considerably more ancient civilizations of the east coeval historical existence, while rendering places like Egypt as merely storehouses of antiquities.[69]

Bhabha has rightly noted that the patterns of representation which appear so vividly in representations or in narrative are scarcely so clear in the actual experience of living in a colonized society.[70] The question of life in a colonial society is of course relevant to Lucian; what Lucian balances in his discussions of historiographical practice is the tension between what audiences expect in historiographical accounts of the east and what life in the east is actually like. Yet if we reapproach one of canonical statements of method in Greek historiography (Thucydides' *Archaeology)*, we can see that the tension between the synchronic and diachronic is already present there. As Thucydides moves further out from southern and central Greece, or further back in time, he begins to incorporate more and more ethnographic detail, such as customs or genealogies.[71] Yet even Thucydides' seemingly clear delineation in the *Archaeology* has its cracks: in

---

[67] See E. Said 1978.240-41 on 'synchronic fundamentalism' in ethnography; Hartog 1988.8-11 on the 'ethnographic mirror;' Vasunia 2001.27-28.

[68] Hartog 1988.

[69] Vasunia 2001.112-13.

[70] Bhabha 1994.72.

[71] i.e. Thuc. 2.15-17 on the history of Attica, 6.1-3 on the non-Greek Sicilians.

several places Thucydides *does* provide ethnographic detail about contemporary Greece,[72] and his famous description of the desecration of the Herms (6.27-28) operates as an ethnography in miniature, using a cultural practice to explain history (the recall of Alcibiades in particular, but the failure of the campaign against Syracuse more generally).[73] If, in the terms formulated by Hartog, ethnography is very much the writing of the self in relation to the Other, ethnography should also be conceptualized as the writing of the self in relation to one's own framework of cultural practice as well.[74] This is to say that ethnography is not a special type of historiography designed for looking at other cultures: ethnography is the consideration of *any* cultural practice, including one's own, as germane to history.[75]

The dichotomy of the self/Other as made familiar by Hartog and Edith Hall has increasingly fallen out of favor as scholars have identified the sheer variety of Greek ethnographic thought.[76] Rather than looking outwards from the center, Greek ethnography devotes a considerable amount of time to investigating diversity and difference within the Greeks themselves.[77] The conventional wisdom among classicists over the last decade has been that the Persian Wars mark a break between an aggregative period of Greek identity formation—where Greeks formulate a sense of common identity based off of conceived genealogical ties between heroic ancestors, similarity of practices, and not generally factors such as dialect or 'blood'—and an adversative phase, marked by the practice of Othering the foreigner.[78] Yet both strategies, rather than one displacing another, coexist, and indeed they can be deployed in different ways, in that aggregative approaches can be used for conceptualizing difference (as well as similarity) and

---

[72] e.g. Thuc. 1.24-25; 2.102; 3.104; 6.27.

[73] See Quinn 2007.

[74] Hartog 1988.8-11.

[75] Skinner 2012.245-47.

[76] See Gruen 2011.1-5, Skinner 2012.21-30.

[77] See particularly J.M. Hall's survey of ethnogenesis in early Archaic Greece (2002.56-89); Romeo 2002 on the practice in the Second Sophistic.

[78] J.M. Hall 2002.

Othering approaches can be used to create solidarity, rather than exclusion.[79] Although by the end of the fifth century the most ethnocentric and xenophobic conceptions of Greek identity become considerably less popular (for instance in the *Panegyricus* of Isocrates, in which Greek cultural identity becomes conceptually available for peoples of all backgrounds) they do not disappear.[80] As has been discussed above, while Whitmarsh's conception of *paideia* as paradigm for elite cultural practice in the Second Sophistic is by definition ecumenical, in the late first and second centuries C.E. there are counter-paradigms at work, such as physiognomics. Another comes from Herodotus himself.[81] On the eve of the battle of Salamis, responding to a request by Alexander of Macedon for them to Medize, Herodotus puts into the mouths of the Athenians a very essentializing definition of Greek ethnic identity:

> αὖτις δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ἐὸν ὅμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἤθεά τε ὁμότροπα, τῶν προδότας γενέσθαι Ἀθηναίους οὐκ ἂν εὖ ἔχοι. Ἐπίστασθέ τε οὕτω, εἰ μὴ καὶ πρότερον ἐτυγχάνετε ἐπιστάμενοι· ἔστ' ἂν καὶ εἷς περιῇ Ἀθηναίων, μηδαμὰ ὁμολογήσοντας ἡμέας Ξέρξῃ. (8.144.2)

> Again, this is the Greek thing (*to Hellênikon),* namely common blood (*homaion)* and common speech (*homoglôsson),* and common temples of the gods and, sacrifices, accustomed habits (*êthea),* and common practices (*homotropa).* It would not be well if the Athenians became betrayers of these. Thus know if you did not already: as long as a single Athenian remains, we shall never come to terms with Xerxes.

In response, the Athenians deny his advances before the Spartan ambassadors, making an appeal to *to Hellênikon,* 'the Greek thing,' which is defined in the following phrase as *homaimon te kai homoglôsson* (blood and language), and after that temples and ritual (8.144).   In this view, Greekness is an intrinsic quality that must be defended from foreign influence. This is not necessarily the opinion of Herodotus, however: it is the Athenian speaker appealing to shared cultural characteristics to demonstrate to the

---

[79] Skinner 2012.245.

[80] S. Said 2001, Romero 2002.31.

[81] See J.M. Hall (2002.225) on Second Sophistical conceptions of Greek identity in relation to Herodotus.

Spartans that the Athenians are serious about beating the Persians.[82] As happens so often in Herodotus, this definition is advanced but not embraced. Claims of ethnic identity are defined by their instrumentality. Nowhere else do these concepts appear so unified, although all of them appear elsewhere: blood, practices (ritual, architectural, and otherwise), and most importantly, language, but it is difficult to advance this definition as normative for the entire text.[83] Aside from 8.144, Herodotus never advances a cohesive definition of group identity.[84] According to another instance of Herodotean speculation, the Athenians are ethnically 'Pelasgsian,' the ubiquitous and semi-imaginary pre-Greek natives of Greece (1.57).[85] At some point—Herodotus does not know when—they learned Greek and somehow became Greek.[86] By changing their language, customs change as well—and suddenly a pre-Greek people becomes the most Greek of all, the Athenians. Greenwood sees this as a decentering of the text[87]—a transposition of Athens from the center to the periphery of Greek identity—but what might be a better conception is that rather than upsetting the framework of self/Other, this passage demonstrates that it was never really there in the first place, or at least it is not operative at all times.[88] Rosalind Thomas has observed that the decentering of Athens probably serves to mock the developing narrative of autochthony in the mid fifth century, and that Herodotus here

---

[82] Thomas 2001.215.

[83] Cf. E. Hall's longer discussion on Greek ethnic self-consciousness in the ancient world (1989.3-12). J.M. Hall (2002.111-17) substantially questions the ability of language to define culture in antiquity, noting that linguistic self-consciousness seems to be a late development;

[84] Munson 2005.23-27.

[85] "It is this indeterminacy that has led many scholars to suspect that the term 'Pelasgsian' was not used in any ethnographically precise way to identify a definable, self-conscious population but was rather a vague designation for any population that later Hellenes believed to be in some way 'aboriginal'" (J.M. Hall 2002.33-34). In Hdt. 1.57.1, for instance, the Pelasgians are also native to Italy.

[86] εἰ τοίνυν ἦν καὶ πᾶν τοιοῦτο τὸ Πελασγικόν, τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος ἐὸν Πελασγικὸν ἅμα τῇ μεταβολῇ τῇ ἐς Ἕλληνας καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν μετέμαθε. "If, indeed, it is, and 'Pelasgian thing' is entirely such, the Attic race, although being Pelasgian, with their change to the Greeks learned the language" (1.57.3).

[87] Greenwood 2009.661-62.

[88] Skinner 2012.245.

deploys Pelasgian origin instrumentally.[89] Herodotus, like his successors, deploys various types of ethnographic discourse, but never adheres to one overarching strategy.

On a broader level, ethnography needs to be understood as an instrument—a specific type of discourse for accomplishing narrative goals. By the second century C.E. it was a major and expected component of historiographical writing, and particularly about the east. When second century historiography wants to address interactions with non-Greek, eastern cultures, it presses relevant information into predetermined narratives that will fulfill the expectations of its audience.[90] For instance, in *How to write history* 24-5, Lucian takes particular issue with one historian writing a history of Lucius Verus' war against the Parthians who decided that Lucian's hometown, Samosota, was not exotic enough in its original location in Anatolia, so he relocates it to somewhere in Mesopotamia, on a crag between the Tigris and Euphrates.[91] Lucian responds that this historian is clearly wrong, since he is obviously not a *Mesopotamitês*—a comment that is deliberately unhelpful if we wish to ascertain what, exactly, Lucian thinks he *is,* since the ethnonym 'Mesopotamian' is the type of name—one geographically indicative from an external point of view—only applied by a cultural outsider.[92] On the other hand, Lucian does seem to be feeling a little Orientalized here by a writer who has deliberately changed the information of his story to make the east more exotic. The *How to write history* is littered with similar critiques of exoticizing contemporary histories.[93] Elswhere, barring his occasional self-effacements,[94] Lucian rarely takes direct aim at the Orientalizing tropes of historiography, although he seems to understand them well

---

[89] Thomas 2001.225.

[90] Vasunia 2001.258-61, Kemezis 2010.297-98.

[91] On Lucian and contemporary historiography, see Georgiadou and Lamour 1997.28-50, Kemezis 2010; Lucian and Herodotus, S. Said 1994.

[92] Hartog 1988.247-48.

[93] See *Hist. conscr.* 28-31 for a list of historians that Lucian lambastes for ignoring historical events for exotic descriptions of the east, particularly the historian in 31 who attempts to complete his history with an ethnography of India similar to Arrian's *Indica*; see Kemezis 2010.296-98.

[94] *Bis acc.* 27, where he claims to have been a 'barbarian in respect to speech and only wearing a kaftan in the Assyrian manner' before he was an orator, for instance.

enough. These historians are bad historians not because they exoticize—they are bad because they are exoticizing with such predictable ignorance and at the expense of actually narrating the tales of Greeks triumphing over barbarians. Lucian never questions the validity of these tropes, because they are at the heart of what the audiences for history in the second century—including Lucian—expect.[95] For second century writers, the display of ethnographic knowledge constitutes a type of performance of the literary canon that confirms the identity of the writer: by asserting knowledge of the genre, the writer demonstrates fluency in the discourse of *paideia,* and hence Greekness.[96] Rather than being truly 'a foreigner . . . without a city' (*Hist. conscr.* 41) the deployment of ethnography by the author confirms his *own* identity. Hence when Lucian questions whether he himself is exposed in his fantasy of panoptic vision in the account of the well and the mirror, he is making a more general observation about historiography and ethnography and their uses as assertions of identity in the broader politics of culture.

Ethnographic Knowledge in the Lucianic West

I will conclude this chapter with a brief look at Lucian's negotiations with ethnographic practice in the first book of the *True histories*. In both technique and use of sources—presentation of material culture as evidence, for instance, or distancing himself from what he claims to have not seen—the tropes of Lucian's ethnography, and the strategies he uses to interpret his accounts, are heavily indebted to Herodotus.[97] Elsewhere in his corpus, in his brief prologue the *Herodotus or Aëtion,* Lucian self-identifies with Herodotus as a travelling scholar from the margins of the Greek world,[98] and although the *True histories* are written in Attic (unlike the *de dea Syria)*, in the

---

[95] Kemezis 2010.297.

[96] Whitmarsh 2001.125-27 on Lucian as barbarian performing Hellenicity.

[97] S. Said 1994.156-63.

[98] S. Said 1994.150-51. Herodotus is an unavoidable figure in the history of ethnography, but elsewhere Lucian claims special kinship with him. In the *Herodotus or Aëtion,* Lucian describes Herodotus coming up with a clever plan to sneak into the Olympics to present his work to an audience, granting him eternal fame (1-3). Lucian particularly finds it notable that the work was written in his native Ionic (τὸ οἰκεῖον τῇ Ἰωνίᾳ καὶ προσφυὲς) and makes repeated mention of Herodotus' origin from the Greek periphery. On Herodotus and Caria see Thomas 2001.214.

Herodotus, Lucian notes how Ionic serves as a marker of authorial marginality similar to his self-presentation as a Syrian. Lucian takes advantage of Herodotus' lack of a coherent ethnographic strategy in order to cast light on the inability of Herodotean ethnography—and in particular the oppositional model of ethnography that Herodotus uses to describe Scythia and Egypt—to be used to still describe the second century east.

Precolonial landscapes: phonê:

When Lucian goes to the furthest reaches of the west, rather than finding it a virgin landscape, he discovers that it has already been marked by Greek-speakers. When the narrator and his crew reach the first island outside the pillars of Heracles, they come upon a bronze stele engraved with Greek letters (*Hellênikois grammasin katagegramenên* 1.7) that proclaims Heracles and Dionysus had been there prior, accompanied by their footprints set in the rock. The stele and the footprints function as a methodological gesture to Herodotean *historiê.* In his periplus of the Black Sea, Herodotus lists the existence of a giant footprint of Heracles as one of the *thômata* of the land (*to de apothômasai,* 4.82). In Herodotean historiography, the interpretation of a *thôma* functions very similarly to the interpretation of foreign inscriptions: in both cases, the successful interpretation of the cultural artifact can serve as a key for the successful understanding or appropriation of a foreign culture as well.[99] Heracles and Dionysus are both gods of colonial importance; while Dionysus typically has eastern associations, in colonial foundation myth, Heracles serves as the precolonial tamer of both the east and the west.[100] Elsewhere in Herodotus, figures such as Darius (3.88) use epigraphy to lay claim over landscapes, and the stele of Dionysus and Heracles serves a similar function in the *True histories.* As Irad Malkin has noted, heroes like Odysseus and Heracles are continually deployed and redeployed by Greeks, Etruscans, Phonecians, and Romans across the Mediterranean basin both as a symbol of legitimization of control over the landscape and as a genealogical tie between neighboring or allied groups.[101] Myths of

---

[99] On inscriptions, S. Said 1994.161; on use of material proof, Gray 2001.15-16; on foreign words Munson 2005.69-70.

[100] Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 3.25-6, Hdt. 4.8-10; also Livy 1.7 for Heracles in early Rome. On Heracles' western expedition (including his founding of the Celtic people), see Woolf 2011.19-24.

[101] Malkin 1998 (Odysseus), 2011.119-42 (Heracles).

shared heroic ancestry from Heracles and others served as a symbolic language for diplomacy throughout antiquity (including between Greeks themselves), and in early colonial encounters, heroic myths could either be applied to native peoples by Greek writers in order to explain peculiar behaviors or physical characteristics, or even appropriated by native groups in order to justify friendly relations or intermarriage.[102] The discovery of the stele of Dionysus and Heracles by Lucian's narrator serves as a pre-existent claim for his presence on the island, rendering the precolonial landscape familiar.

Herodotus is careful never to deploy epigraphy or other material evidence as self-evident proof for a claim.[103] Yet Lucian's narrator, starting with his reading of the epigraph from the stele that serves as evidence of prior contact, familiarizes the remarkable bounty of the landscape in terms he recognizes: when he comes across a river of wine, for instance, his comment is that it is just like Chian wine (1.7). A little further on, Lucian's narrator and his crew come upon a remarkable curiosity (*chrêma):* a group of half-tree, half-nymph beings (*VH* 1.8). Despite their strange bodies, the nymphs are able to engage them in multiple languages (*phonai)*, some speaking Lydian, some Indian, but the most Greek (*hai men Ludion, hai men Indikên, hai pleistai de tên Hellada phônên, VH* 1.8) thus downplaying everything that is otherwise monstrous about their bodies.[104] The island thus far is able to be conceptualized by the narrator both within the symbolic language of mythology, through the presence of heroes, and through functional language of speech (*phonê)*. Although there is a convention for identifying things—usually either remarkable or contrived—as *chrêmata,*[105] by far the most common use of the word is for money and convertible goods. As Leslie Kurke has argued, *chrêmata* function as tokens

---

[102] Woolf 2011.24-27 on ancestry myths in colonial encounters; J.M. Hall 2002.125-71 on heroic ancestry myths between Greek states; Romeo 2002.

[103] Cf. the appropriation of the dedications of Croesus to Delphi the Corinthians, Clazomenians, and Lacadaemonians (1.50-1) through false inscriptions; see Gray 2001.19-22.

[104] Strangely, multilingualism and translation are issues that only rarely appear in Herodotus between speakers of different cultures; see Munson 2005.71-72.

[105] LSJ[9] s.v. yields creature, monster, business, or thing, e.g. Plut. Ant. 31 where Octavia is a *chrêma thaumasion,* 'a remarkable thing.' Money in classical thought is inherently suspicious: it is mutable (can be exchanged for any other type of good) and has no inherent use of its own. Aristotle, for instance, repeatedly refers to money as *para phusin* (Ar. *Pol.* 1257c-1258b *passim*). See Kurke 1999.45-46.

of a larger ideological system within which archaic and classical Greek writers—
Herodotus among them—use coinage as a metaphor for the relative quality of human
bodies.[106] Lucian obviously writes several centuries later—and in a different political
context than the one within which archaic and classical anxieties about money are
operable—but the meaning of *chrêmata* to denote ambiguous marvels retains the
ideological connotations of the term.

Like money, the tree nymphs are mutable; their appearance is of Daphne mid-
transformation, and when they freely offer themselves up to the crew (*VH* 1.8) they are
able to transform people as well. When Lucian's comrades attempt to have sex with
them, they are turned into trees. As Dougherty has noted, colonial foundation myths
often memorialize the early contact of the colonizers and the colonial natives through use
of rape or marriage narratives, figuring the colonist as sexually active while the native—
and the native landscape—becomes passive.[107] The motif of marriage/rape in colonial
foundation myths fashions the landscape—often eliding the landscape with its original
inhabitants—as ready and willing to accept the colonist, and metaphorically describes the
appropriation of elements of native cultural practice into the ideological framework of the
Greek colony.[108] Rather than functioning as the cultural Other, the native tree nymphs
operate as a currency between cultures, mutable in shape and capable of exchanging
cultural values between linguistic groups without having to move. Lucian reduces the
inhabitants of the first island he makes landfall on to movable cultural property able to be
appropriated by whoever makes contact with them. Of course Lucian also allows the tree
nymphs to write back against the narrative: misled into believing that their presence on
the island has been legitimized, the sailors who attempt to have sex with the tree nymphs
are themselves turned into trees.[109] In their attempt, the male sailors are both
emasculated (their genitals are bound [*ek tôn aidoiôn ededento*] by the tree nymphs) and

---

[106] Kurke 1999. See also Bergson 1967 on the expression.

[107] Dougherty1993.61-80, 2003.44-45.

[108] Thus see Antonaccio 2003.59-61 on colonial hybridity.

[109] Fitting, since Lucian says they look "just like Daphne as she turns into a tree with Apollo still
trying to seize her, according to those writing among us" (τοιαύτην παρ' ἡμῖν τὴν Δάφνην γράφουσιν
ἄρτι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καταλαμβάνοντος ἀποδενδρουμένην

take root (*sunerrizounto)* in the landscape. In this sense, the female inhabitants of the precolonial landscape obliterate the male colonists (or pre-colonists).[110] While Lucian's crew is able to frame their landing on the island within the heroic travels of Dionysus and Heracles and is able to speak the language of the natives, neither property is unequivocally able to mark the island as friendly, colonized territory.

Differentiating the foreigner: phusis:

Despite the fact that the tree nymphs speak multiple languages, language is not enough to give them their own positive cultural identity. Appearing as *chrêmata* between cultures, the tree nymphs are able to reflect the linguistic identities of others but present none of their own. Lucian's concern with the language capabilities of the tree nymphs, however, draws attention to the functionality of language in delineating members of a culture. Herodotus is largely ambivalent about the ability of language to define membership in a cultural group: while we hear about foreign languages and even from time to time the presence of translators, foreign languages in Herodotus operate as another means of knowing aspects of foreign cultural practices.[111] Neither the Herodotean narrator nor his characters ever find language as an insurmountable barrier to cross.[112] Although it has long been conventional wisdom that being *barbarophonos*—speaking a foreign language—is the defining mark of Other even before the fifth century,[113] Greek conceptions of ethnicity tend to be highly instrumental and discursive in nature. We have seen how Lucian locates the island of the tree nymphs using both spoken (Greek, Lydian, and Indian) and symbolic language (heroic mythology).[114] Likewise, although Herodotus makes frequent mention of Egyptian or Scythian languages, and in the case of the Egyptians even is able to claim to have spoken with

---

[110] I am indebted to Prof. Bowditch for this observation.

[111] Munson 2005.71-77

[112] Munson 2005.65-66.

[113] J.M. Hall 2002.111-12. Strabo (14.2.28) is the first to onomatopoeically define *barbaros.*

[114] Note that spoken language in both our and Lucian's usage is associated with particular ethnonymns.

sources in the country, knowledge of spoken language alone is no guarantee of either cultural similarity or difference.[115]

Lucian's ethnography of the moon people (*VH* 1.21-27) has the ethnographic Other speak in the same language, yet have bodies that are remarkably variant and that largely determine the differences between their own cultural practices and Lucian's. The moon people are able to communicate with Lucian using recognizable terms, and when they make a gesture of friendship towards the narrator—the hand in marriage of a young boy—they expect the narrator will accept (1.21). The narrator, excluding himself from their symbolic language of ritual (their marriage customs), proceeds to turn to a new mode of ethnography: Othering. The Moon people embody a series of reversals from Greek norms (*nomoi)*, but as in the case of both Herodotus' Egypt (where the women urinate standing up but the men sitting down Hdt. 2.35) or Scythia (where the ocean freezes over and becomes a road for wagons Hdt. 4.28) the reversals from Greek norms are quite complex, and operate within their own system of polarities.[116] Like Herodotus, Lucian makes claims that strange Greek words actually are derived from the habits of the described people: the calf is called the *gastroknêmiê,* for instance, because the Moon people use their calves as wombs (*VH* 1.22).[117] The Moon people do not have women, but still marry men and practice pederasty using similar language to describe the practice as Greeks themselves do (1.21-22).[118] Certain members of the species are actually born from trees (*VH* 1.22); social class is marked by ownership of different quality prosthetic body parts, meaning that class has an unequivocal mark on the functionality and use of one's body (1.23-24). The depiction of the non-human foreigners as variously composed

---

[115] J.M. Hall 2002.10-13 on language and ethnicity generally; Munson 2005.66 on Herodotus.

[116] See Hartog 1988.256-7 for modes of describing the other. Hartog differentiates two Herodotean methods: one is taxonomical (describing even barbarous practices dispassionately, but with the author making clear his or her disproval with the use of negatives) and the other ambivalence, simply mentioning something and moving on.

[117] See Munson 2005.36-9 ('metalinguistic glosses'); see Hdt. 2.43, how the Greeks adopt the names of the Egyptian gods.

[118] Namely, and active and passive usage of the same word in the same sentence: μέχρι μὲν οὖν πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι ἐτῶν γαμεῖται ἕκαστος, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων γαμεῖ αὐτός (1.22).

of animal and plant parts multiplies the degree of cultural difference: they cannot be similar to people because they have a different *phusis*.

Lucian's description of the moon people has affinities to Herodotus' descriptions of Egypt and Scythia to the extent that it envisions them living in a circumscribed, ethnographic space.[119] The fact that Lucian stresses that their unique, non-human biology serves as a driver of their *nomoi*—rather than history or even climate—goes a step further in differentiating the moon people from Greeks than even Herodotus accomplishes in his ethnography. For the moon people, ethnography is more like taxonomy—their *nomoi* are defined by their *phusis*. The fact that they speak the same language earns no mention.

Assimilating foreignness: nomoi:

Despite the fact that Lucian treats the cultural practices of the moon peoples as simply a product of anatomy, elsewhere neither Lucian nor Herodotus tends to privilege inborn nature (*phusis)* or language (*phonê)* above cultural practices (*nomoi)* when determining membership of groups.[120] Lucian's encounter with the lamp people (1.29) offers a good illustration of this: although their bodies consist entirely of flame (a fact that is surely as unusual as the weird bodies of the moon people), their cultural practices are otherwise entirely familiar to the narrator's own. When Lucian's narrator enters Lamp City, the lamp people immediately offer *xenia* in the Homeric model before even asking their names. Lucian's narrator comprehends both their spoken language and the offering of *xenia,* although he rejects the offer out of initial fear of their appearance. Nevertheless, the similarities to Greek life are striking. The lamp people pass time in the agora and around the harbor (*luchnous de pollous peritheontas kai en têi agorai kai peri ton limena diatribontas),* have social classes and private homes, have names just like people do (*autoi onomata eichon, hôsper hoi anthrôpoi),* laws, court proceedings, and buildings (*VH* 1.29). In short, they are a human civilization—apart from the fact that they are made of fire. By fashioning the lamp people out of fire, however, Lucian sets them in opposition to the moon people, whom he characterizes in terms of their *phusis*. The only existences his lamp people have are their *nomoi*. If a lamp person violates the

---

[119] Vasunia 2001.112-14.

[120] Thomas 2001.217-18.

law, he is put on trial and sentenced to be snuffed out. If, for the moon people, bodily nature (*phusis*) determines cultural practice (*nomos*), it is the reverse for the lamp people. Their ephemeral bodies make it easy for them to be removed from society if they violate *nomos*.

Culture as Middle Ground

Lucian's imagined ethnography of the west operates as what Richard White calls a 'middle ground'—a space between competing definitions of culture and identity that has no firm allegiance to any particular model.[121] The different models of culture that Lucian builds—whether *nomos* is defined by *phusis*, or the appearance of the body is obviated by cultural practice—engage in an oblique dialog with second century debates over whether Hellenicity can be properly imagined as a performance, through *paideia*, or an intrinsic state acquired through descent (*genos*). By parodying the inability of contemporary historiography to properly conceptualize the east without resorting to misplaced exoticism or the use of ethnographic discourse, Lucian also implicates the practice of ethnography in the reality of ethnic determinism—and even ethnic prejudice—in the Second Sophistic. When Lucian's narrator eventually comes upon the isles of the blessed, he has a meeting with Homer and discovers that despite the number of Greek cities vying to be the birthplace of Homer, Homer is a Babylonian brought into Greece as a hostage (*VH* 2.20). By rendering the very touchstone of Greek cultural identity ethnically non-Greek, Lucian attempts to void the question over whether *genos* matters, turning Greek identity into something attainable by all. Yet this is no less a polemical move than when Favorinus creates himself as an exemplar of Hellenism for the Gauls (Fav.=Dio Chrys. 37.26-27). As ecumenical as Lucian's vision is, it is one that is framed by the logic of exclusion used by such contemporaries as Polemon. Lucian might well have been, as Swain suggests, "culturally and cognitively Greek," but the decision to speak or act Greek, like all identities, is not framed by the subject alone. Rather, the fact that, either in jest or in seriousness, Lucian can be potentially identified as a *Suros* is of urgent importance in interpreting his canon.

---

[121] White 1991; cf. Malkin 2004, Woolf 2011, Skinner 2012.

In this light Lucian—as well as many of the other luminaries of the Second Sophistic—needs to be considered in light of postcolonial ambivalence. The continued practice of archaizing ethnographies like Arrian's, Lucian's belletristic satire of them, and treatises like Polemon of Laodicea's all participate in a cultural dialog between different groups seeking to expand and restrict access to the cultural apparatus of Hellenism. The production of a Herodotean ethnography of the east by Arrian, a mock ethnography of fictional peoples by Lucian, and a paranoid screed about the perceived ethnic affiliations of oratorical style by Polemon all fit in one spectrum of ethnographic practice. In that sense, in the second century, ethnographic observation becomes a consequential field on which cultural politics are waged.

CHAPTER V

THE VOYAGE TO SICILY: COLONIAL FOUNDATION AND ETHNIC

CLEANSING IN HERODOTUS AND LUCIAN

In his *True histories,* Lucian of Samosata engages repeatedly in questions of the portrayal of non-Greeks in Greek historiography. Beginning with an invocation that he promises *not* to tell the truth—and therefore he can be trusted (1.4)—Lucian's protagonist travels beyond the pillars of Heracles and encounters a variety of diverse peoples, some of whom, as we have seen, Lucian writes imaginary ethnographies of, parodying the continued popularity of ethnographies in contemporary historiography. As Phiroze Vasunia has observed, following the footsteps of Herodotus, ethnography becomes a standard and even expected element of Greek historical writing about interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks.[1] In the last chapter, I discussed how Lucian parodies the logic of Othering in both Herodotus and, in the *How to write history,* some of his unidentified contemporaries. As we have seen, however, Othering is not the only means Herodotus has for conceptualizing difference. In some of his accounts of the western Mediterranean and the history of Greek colonization, for instance, Herodotus either ignores or removes the presence of non-Greek native peoples altogether.[2] Though there are mentions of western peoples as early as the fifth century, Herodotus only rarely takes into consideration ethnographic information about the west.[3] Rather than thinking about western natives in terms of the Other, Herodotus' accounts of the west are largely focused through the lens of colonial foundation narratives, a type of generalized symbolic narrative explaining the foundation of Greek cities in Sicily, Italy, and elsewhere promoted by the colonial cities and in circulation by the beginning of the fifth century.[4] As Carol Dougherty has discussed, colonial foundation narratives of western Greek

---

[1] Vasunia 2001.257-61; see also Kemezis 2010.297.

[2] See Munson 2006 on Herodotus and the west.

[3] Woolf 2011.66.

[4] On colonial foundation narratives, see Dougherty 1993. Malkin (1998.24-25) has criticized Dougherty's approach for being overtly synchronic in that she does not account for the evolution of these narratives, but by the early fifth century the substantial elements of these narratives (see section below) are in place. Colonial narratives in Herodotus include that of Cyrene (4.150-59) and the failed colonial expeditions of the Phocaeans (1.164-67) and Dorieus the Spartan (5.42-48); see section below.

colonial cities display a relatively standard pattern, depicting the foundation of the colony from the perspective of the struggles of the founder both to gather an expedition and to establish a new city in an often hostile landscape. If colonial natives are encountered, they are hostile and quickly overwhelmed.

In this chapter, I will examine how Lucian's parody of a colonial foundation narrative in *VH* 1.31-39 operates as an extended critique of Herodotean historiography. By reusing a structural type narrative from Herodotus that makes no room for native perspectives, Lucian draws attention to the inherently one-sided nature of historiographical practice. In the previous chapter, I explored how Lucian's parody of Othering bears immediate relevance to life in the colonial worlds of antiquity, and that representation of foreigners as the Other functions as a negotiation. In this chapter I will discuss how Lucian parodies another variety of representing difference that is present in Herodotus: the representational obliteration of the colonial native. While colonial cities in the west were loci of substantial hybridity and interaction between various Greek and non-Greek populations (as cities in the east such as Herodotus' Halicarnassus or Lucian's Samosata certainly were), colonial foundation narratives seek to establish the history of the colonial city as purely and unequivocally Greek.[5] As I will argue below, these narratives can too be sites of negotiation with colonized and native populations. If this is so, however, Lucian is likely not aware of the ability of colonial narratives to function as bridges between colonizing Greek and colonized non-Greek. Rather, Lucian parodies colonial foundation narratives by pushing their logic to the final extreme: the representational obliteration of the native people in colonial foundation narrative leads, in Lucian's account, to a somewhat horrific act of ethnic cleansing.

Lucian's parody of Herodotus in both his ethnographies and his colonial narrative in the first book of the *True histories* forms part of a broader critique of historiographical practice that Lucian carries on in the *How to write history*. By mimicking their classical predecessors, Second Sophistic belletristic historians fulfill the narrative expectations of their audiences, who had been schooled on the 'big three' of classical historiography,

---

[5] Osborne 1998.265-69, Malkin 2011.56-64.

Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon.[6] As I discussed earlier, the adoption of static

models of historiography is not without purpose: the genre of history-writing in the

Second Sophistic, like sophistical oratory, served as a site for discussions about the

integrity and unity of Greek ethnic identity over time. The popularity of histories about

wars between Greeks and Persians, such as Arrian's *Anabasis,* the accounts of campaigns

against the Persians or Parthians in a number of Plutarch's *Parallel lives,* and those

Lucian mocks in the *How to write history,* allow Greek audiences to continue to think

about their identities in terms of self and Other, even if it is in fact Roman armies that

were doing the actual fighting in many cases.[7] Historiographical practice that had

reduced history to narratives of "Greek victories and barbarian defeats" (*Hist. conscri.*

54) downplay or eliminate narratives of cultural hybridity or negotiation between

immigrant and native populations.[8] The valorization of the Persian Wars and the

conquests of Alexander as the central moments of history served among the readers and

writers of history to justify the superiority of Greek culture in a world where Rome was

the imperial power.[9]

Interpreting foreigners as Others has a clear functionality in the light of Greek

copresence in the east with non-Greek populations. Rearticulations of claims of the

purity of Greek ethnicity associated with the Persian wars could be expressed by writers,

such as Polemon, living in regions that had not only once been under Persian control, but

had long histories of negotiation and hybridity of their own.[10] In this light, Lucian's

method of historiography is shaped and engendered by the experience of life on the

---

[6] Lucian in *How to write history* 2 mocks contemporary historians for mimicking the canonical three historians too closely (οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐχ ἱστορίαν συγγράφει· μᾶλλον δὲ Θουκυδίδαι καὶ Ἡρόδοτοι καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν ἅπαντες,).

[7] Swain 1996.78-80.

[8] Swain 1996.66.

[9] Swain 1996.68.

[10] Particularly Hdt. 8.144; see chapter IV above. On Polemon and ethnic claims of ethnic purity in Asia Minor see Romeo 2002.36.

hybrid margins of empire. If Lucian's genetic or cultural origins remain an enigma, what is clear is that, for Lucian, the practice of representing difference is enduringly political.[11]

Native Peoples in Colonial Narrative

Near the end of the first book of the *True Histories*, Lucian's narrator and his crew are swallowed, ship and all, by a mighty whale. Inside, they discover a small Greek settlement, complete with tombs, temples, and inscriptions (1.32), founded by the survivors of another shipwreck. Joining with the settlers, the newcomers plan an assault on the natives of the whale, which consist of various races of human-fish hybrids (1.37). Destroying them to a man(-fish), the Greeks celebrate the future of their ethnically and linguistically pure new colony and its surrounding empty (*eremos)* landscape with hunting, athletic competition, and vine cultivation (1.39). This sequence of events is no coincidence: it follows the distinct path of what was by the second century a fairly remote symbolic narrative (colonial narrative) that could only have been available to Lucian through his readings of historiography. So the question is why does Lucian choose to lampoon colonial narratives? When the process of settlement and migration that colonial narrative depicts are so far removed in time, who does Lucian either think their representations are worthy of mockery or recognizable to his audience?

Before I proceed to the main part of my argument on Lucian's satirical reception of colonial narrative, I would like to pause for a moment to discuss colonial narratives in Herodotus and compare the depiction of natives in colonial narrative with Herodotus' own usual practice of ethnography. Modern accounts of Greek colonialism view the large-scale emigration from Greece that took place from eighth to the sixth centuries BCE as a unique and time-discrete historical phenomenon. Though this historical narrative has increasingly been critiqued by ancient historians, like many other discarded historical narratives (i.e. the Dorian invasion), standardized narratives of colonization were remembered as history by Greek sources long after they had allegedly taken place.[12] As Carol Dougherty has explained, colonial foundation tales follow a distinct pattern: a founder, the oikist/*oikistês,* is an exiled criminal or physically impaired individual who

---

[11] Whitmarsh 2001.26-29.

[12] For objections to this scholarly narrative, see Osborne 1998, de Angelis 2009.

goes to Delphi in order to purify or cure himself and is subsequently commanded to found a colony.[13] The foundation of a colony provides a ritual solution to a political crisis at home. Herodotus' Theran colonists, for instance (4.150-62), are exiled by lot as a means of solving a famine and led to their new country by the stuttering oikist Battus.[14] After a few failed attempts to settle different sites, the native Libyans make their first appearance in the narrative (4.158) to show the Therans where they should settle, the future site of Cyrene. As the population of Cyrene swells, the native Libyans, 'deprived of their land and insulted by the Cyreneans' (*tês te chôrês steriskomenoi kai periubrizomenoi hupo tôn Kurênaiôn)* put themselves under the protection of their neighbors, the Egyptians, who try (but fail) to drive the colonists out. Though there continue to be wars between the natives and the Greeks (4.160), native success in the wars is subordinated in the narrative to political crisis among the Greeks, and the natives slowly disappear from an important place in the narrative. This disappearance of the natives was for some time mirrored in the scholarly tradition: John Boardman, writing in the 1960s describes the native cultures "described so vividly in Herodotus" as "archaeologically unknown, or at least inaccessible" and having had "no material influence on the Greeks who settled amongst them."[15] The Herodotus story itself suggests that there clearly *was* influence: the Greeks at least know enough of the native language to use it to claim dominance over the native's land (Herodotus 1.55.4 observes that Battus means 'king' in Libyan), and Herodotus describes the neighboring Asbytae as having taken to riding around in Homeric-style chariots (4.170).[16]

---

[13] Dougherty 1993.31-44; see also J.M. Hall 2002.97.

[14] Battus allegedly goes to the oracle (4.155) seeking a cure for his stutter. The priestess recognizes that 'battus' means 'king' in the indigeonous language of the Libyans. Herodotus sees the coincidence of Battus' name as a political fabrication, believing that Battus adopts his name after going to Libya and becoming king of Cyrene and was not born with it. He does not actually shed doubt on the oracle itself: the oracle knows the Libyan language (*eiduian hôs basileus estai in Libuêi*) and addresses him using their word for king. Munson (2005.80-83) notes that plays on words shared between Greek and native languages are a common feature of colonial narratives.

[15] Boardman 1980.158.

[16] See Munson 2005.79-83 on translation and non-Greek words in the Cyrene narrative; Antonaccio 2001, 2003 on colonial hybridity in material culture.

The absence of the native outside of either a helpful or adversarial role early in the history of the colony is a narrative phenomenon that persists both across a variety of different types of colonial experiences and across time; Battus and his friends' experiences with the natives in some way recall William Bradford's with, at first, Squanto and Massasoit, and, later, with the hostile Narragansetts. But if Bradford shows at least some troubled recognition of the fact that the local natives are using the presence of the English at Plymouth as leverage to claim power over each other,[17] Herodotus casts the political maneuvers of the native Libyans in calling in the Egyptians in the most simplistic terms possible—that they came to expel the Greeks. Unlike Bradford, Herodotus is not witness to the colonial foundation. More consequentially, though, Herodotus is making no effort to think from the native perspective, precisely because the colonial narratives fashion native peoples as adversaries: if they do not resist, they do not appear.[18] The natives vanish in Cyrenean affairs after 4.160 in Herodotus' colonial narrative. But they are clearly still there, and the fact that Herodotus follows his Cyrenaean narrative with an ethnography of the Libyans says much about his historiographical approach to the thorny cultural interaction.[19] Herodotean ethnography typically engages in a sort of deliberate distancing from the present—and hence a denial of existence of the present—that has long been criticized in modern anthropological writing.[20] The Libyan tribes exist as they always have (as nomads without a material culture, in Boardman's calculation),[21] and their only entry into the world of historical time is in their adoption of an elite Greek custom. In his account of Libya in book four, there are, then, two types of narrative: the descriptive and ethnographic. The former

---

[17] For instance, Squanto, who "plaid his owne game, by putting the Indians in fear, and drawing gifts from them to enrich him selfe; making the beleeve he could stur up war against the whom he would & make peece for whom he would. Yea, he made them beleeve they kept the plague buried in the ground, and could send it amongs whom they would" (Bradford 1962.84).

[18] The silence of the colonized has long been thematic in postcolonial studies (see Greenwood 2009.658-60); on the perspective of natives in colonial narrative see Dougherty 1993.40-41.

[19] Herodotus sees African 'natives' as considerably more exotic than other natives: we have no ethnographies of the Sicels. On the other hand, Herodotus provides no ethnography until they have safety left the narrative.

[20] E. Said 1978.240-41, Dougherty and Kurke 1993. 3-4; Vasunia 2001.113.

[21] Boardman 1980.158.

relays what has existed from time immemorial, while the latter, using the lens of colonial narrative, describes the historical entry of the Greeks into this differentiated landscape. Colonial narrative bridges the gap between two conceptions of time (between the differentiated/ahistorical and the historical) and provides a symbolic matrix through which Herodotus can interpret how Greeks interact with foreigners.[22]

Colonial narratives, though they fashion the native as enemy, have an additional capacity to negotiate the presence of the native. Colonial narratives can cover up a variety of unfortunate circumstances (*stasis* in the metropolis or the rape or displacement of natives), but also serve as moral capital, allowing the colonial cities to claim the same mythical foundations as the cities of the mainland.[23] The strategy of colonial narrative develops in concert with mythic foundation narratives on the mainland during the late archaic and early classical periods,[24] and hence are neither necessarily representative of the broader Greek colonial experience or the mechanisms by which Greeks contextualized the presence of native peoples in the lands they settled.[25] This is to say that colonial narratives have intended audiences. When colonial cities celebrate their foundations—as they often do on coinage—symbols and tropes from these narratives can present to a domestic audience histories of accommodation, rather than opposition.[26] Irad Malkin's work has, as we have already seen, extensively surveyed the processes by which colonial myths are used by the inhabitants of the Mediterranean littoral to conceptualize their space within the broader framework of what he refers to as "the network of Greece," a figurative geography marked by the presence of wandering heroes such as Odysseus and Heracles, fictional genealogies, and extensive precolonial contact.[27] The representation of natives in colonial discourse, as both Malkin and

---

[22] Cf. Hartog 2000.388: epic a "generative matrix for history;" Dougherty and Kurke 1993.4, "mythical reality is continually reproduced and reinforced as it orders and structures new historical phenomena within a preexisting system."

[23] Dougherty 1993.41.

[24] Osborne 1998.265-69, Malkin 2011.56-64.

[25] de Angelis 2009.52.

[26] Cf. Dougherty's reading of Hieron's refounding of Catana (1993.83-102).

[27] Malkin 1998, 2004, 2011; see also Woolf 2011.19-24.

Dougherty have explored, can to some extent serve the integrative function of turning, say, native Sicilians into Trojan refugees (as in Thuc. 6.2), or explaining the origins of native customs through Greek gods.[28] Colonial narratives, then, function as a middle ground, serving, on the one hand, as an instrument that advertises the Greek identity of colonists to mainland audiences, while, on the other hand, integrating natives into the history of the colonial city. In that sense, when the natives cease to appear as enemies, it is because they cease to be conceptualized as different.

Malkin has criticized Dougherty's methodology—and more broadly cultural poetics—because of the emphasis in her work on the structural and the performative aspect of narrative and myth.[29] Yet what is so important about colonial narrative is not that it *correctly* depicts the collective Greek memory of colonial foundation (as we have already seen in the case of ethnography, Greek writers use a variety of strategies to contextualize contact with and the presence of non-Greeks), but that these narratives serve to determine in later narratives what is remembered about the process of colonization and what is not. Colonial narratives already preexist Herodotus by some amount of time, they continually reappear in writers ranging from philosophers (Plato) to geographers (Strabo)[30] to lexicographers (Stephanus of Byzantium)[31] to biography (the *Suda*)[32] well into the medieval period. What is clear is that these narratives—when read by audiences centuries removed from the colonial foundations—shape and reinforce the binary by means of which later Greek historians read Greek/non-Greek interactions. If the natives are no longer the enemy, there is no need to conceptualize them as foreigners, and thus their representation simply disappears. In the *True histories,* Lucian turns the representational disappearance of the native in colonial foundation narratives in Herodotus into actual obliteration. Pushing the logic of the colonial narrative to an

---

[28] Dougherty 1993.88-90, Malkin 2011.117-18, Woolf 2011.19-14.

[29] Malkin 1998.22-24.

[30] Dougherty 1993.

[31] *Etymologicum Magnum* s.v. Gela (in Munson 2005.83 n61).

[32] s.v. Herodotus. An earlier chapter of this work compares Lucian's *Herodotus or Aëtion*, *Suda* s.v. Herodotus, and exile *logoi* in the *Histories.*

extreme, Lucian satirically and ironically turns what was a vehicle for communal integration into legitimization for ethnic cleansing.

Lucian, Ethnography, and Colonial Narratives

Greek historiography in the Second Sophistic carried with it a geographic orientation: towards the east. In the *How to write history,* Lucian specifically marks struggles against the barbarians as the proper subject of historical writing (*Hist. conscr.* 54), and though the Romans might sometimes have been conceived of negatively, they never become *barbaroi:* in the Second Sophistic, the *barbaros* is in the east, and to writers like Arrian, so is history.[33] In the same way that writers of the Second Sophistic adopt fourth-century Attic as their language, they adopt a fourth-century perspective on world affairs as an act of communicating their *paideia*—their ease of reference to the classics—amongst themselves, to their Roman contemporaries, and to their sub-elite audiences.[34] For Lucian and his contemporaries, the topic of history is war, and by conceiving Roman imperial adventures in the east as akin to the Persian wars, Greek writers can themselves take credit for Roman victories as Greek accomplishments against the *barbaros*.[35]

If there is one unchanging characteristic of the east in Greek historiography, it is that the east is home to people marked distinctly as the Other, a distinction that is not typically applied by Greek writers to the Roman west.[36] Lucian's receptions of Herodotus both pick up on Herodotus' major interest in foreign cultures and his general lack of interest (or even apprehension) in depicting Greek communities that hybridize with non-Greeks.[37] But if, for second century audiences, the subject of history is the near

---

[33] Swain 1996.69-70, Kemezis 2010.297.

[34] Swain 1996.69, Whitmarsh 2001.17-20. On sub-elite audiences of sophistical rhetoric see Henderson 2011.

[35] On the centrality of Roman warfare against the distant east to second century historiography see Kamezis 2010.

[36] Swain 1996.70 on Romans as *tertium quid;* Greg Woolf (2011.66) sees the lack of interest in the west in classical period historiography due to the lack of involvement of western barbarians in Greek affairs. See however Munson 2006 on Herodotus' deliberate downplaying of the major fifth century wars between Greeks and Carthaginians.

[37] See for instance Hartog 1988.61-84 on Anacharsis.

east, why would Lucian use Herodotus' accounts of the far west to make a critique of the inability of Greek historians to describe cultural interaction? Lucian's access to the western Greek colonial experience as a distinct cultural phenomenon is only available through the historians. Lucian, from an ethnically mixed eastern city, has a compelling narrative of Greek settlement and cultural, ethnic, and linguistic mixing much closer to home than the archaic colonial west that he will parody in *VH* 1.31-39.[38] Yet, as we have already seen in the two previous chapters, in both Theocritus and Lucian the comparison of eastern ethnography and western monstrosity both reflects the long-standing language of Greek ethnographic observation—the type that Greek audiences expect—and serves as a vehicle for colonial ambivalence. Whether it is Theocritus and the Cyclops or Lucian and colonial narrative, the empty space of the west—compared to the 'Otherized' space of the east—presents an opportunity to project apprehensions about Greek ethnic identification and the accessibility of Greek culture to those conceptualized as non-Greek.

I would first like to explore Lucian's depth of engagement with the language of colonial narrative. There are two clusters of colonial diction in the first book of the *True histories:* first, in his description of the colonial war between the sun and the moon people (*VH* 1.12), and second in 1.31-39, where Lucian depicts the foundation and early struggles of a Greek colony inside the belly of a mighty whale. When Lucian's narrator acquaints himself with Endymion, king of the moon people, Endymion explains that he is preparing to go to war with the sun people because they had disrupted his process of colonizing the Morning Star:

> ἤρξατο δὲ ἐξ αἰτίας τοιαύτης. τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τῇ ἐμῇ ποτε τοὺς <u>ἀπορωτάτους</u> συναγαγὼν ἐβουλήθην <u>ἀποικίαν</u> ἐς τὸν Ἑωσφόρον στεῖλαι, ὄντα <u>ἔρημον καὶ ὑπὸ μηδενὸς κατοικούμενον</u>· ὁ τοίνυν Φαέθων φθονήσας ἐκώλυσε τὴν ἀποικίαν κατὰ μέσον τὸν πόρον ἀπαντήσας ἐπὶ τῶν Ἱππομυρμήκων. τότε μὲν οὖν νικηθέντες — οὐ γὰρ ἦμεν ἀντίπαλοι τῇ παρασκευῇ — - ἀνεχωρήσαμεν νῦν δὲ βούλομαι αὖθις ἐξενεγκεῖν τὸν πόλεμον καὶ <u>ἀποστεῖλαι τὴν ἀποικίαν</u>. (*VH* 1.12)

> It began from such a cause. Gathering together all of the poorest people in my kingdom, I wanted to send out a colony (*apoikia)* to the morning star, since it was lonely (*eremos)* and inhabited by none. But Phaethon, since he was jealous, hindered the colony by blocking the middle route at the head of the Horse-ants.

---

[38] See Swain 1996.298-302.

At that point, having been defeated—we were not equally equipped—we withdrew, but now I want to wage war again and establish the colony (*apoikia)*.

Endymion was preparing to found a colony (*apoikian*) in an empty and uninhabited place (*erêmon kau hupo mêdenos katoikoumenon)* consisting of his very poorest subjects (*aporôtatous)*. Endymion's language here distinctly mimics one type of colonial narrative: a city, because of political uprising, famine, or disease chooses to expel some people and directs them to establish a new city.[39] Lucian's story shows awareness of the pattern of colonial foundation identified by Dougherty in its use of specific terminology (*apoikos, eremos)* mirroring the thematic language of the type narrative.[40] The foundation of the colony here is a state effort, which recalls both certain colonial narratives in the historians and the rhetoric that accompanies them.[41] In the following battle, when the moon people lose to the sun people, their treaty (1.20) calls for them to synoikize their colony (*sunoikizomenôi* 1.28), which is a specific means of state formation that is common in foundation narratives both on mainland Greece and the colonies and, as a historical process, is quite remote in time from Lucian.[42]

Lucian's description of the battle between the sun and the moon people, while fanciful, contains the same level of bitter cynicism that Herodotus and Thucydides tend to reserve for events in the west.[43] What Endymion and Phaethon are battling over is for control of an uninhabited (*eremos*) and passive landscape, and the whole motion is predicated on Endymion ridding himself of the lowest members of his society.[44] The question of relative poverty amongst the moon people is especially important because

---

[39] Dougherty 1993.16-18; cf. the Cyrenean foundation narrative in Hdt. 4.150-62.

[40] Osborne cautions here that the language of colonial foundation is not necessarily a sure sign of a colonial narrative (i.e., *apoikia* does not necessarily mean 'colony') (1998.252). Cf. Malkin 1998.10-14; J.M. Hall 2002.91.

[41] The Therans in Hdt. 4.15-62; Thuc. 1.38 on claims of dominance of a colonial city by its metropolis.

[42] Megara, Gela, Zancle, Rhegion, and Camerina, for instance (Thuc. 6.3-5). For an example of *sunoikeô* in a colonial context see Thuc. 1.24.2. *Sunoikeô/sunoikizô* is a word associated with marriage as well (cf. Menelaus and Helen, 2.8). Colonial narratives use the same vocabulary employed for marriage; see Dougherty 1993.61-80.

[43] See Munson 2006. Herodotus in particular views the political situation in the west under the tyrants (Gelon and Theron) as mirrors to Persian tyranny in the east.

[44] See J.M. Hall 2002.97-98 on *eremos* landscapes.

among the moon people, social class is marked by physical difference: the rich have better prosthetic genitals (1.22) and more eyes (1.25) than the poor, while one subclass of moon people, the tree people (1.23), are born by sprouting from acorns, which makes them almost like a separate species. Lucian constructs the episode on the moon paratactically, meaning that the ethnography at the end is more or less pegged onto the earlier narrative of the episode. But, if the whole episode is to be taken as a whole, what becomes clear is that social difference in the episode of the moon people is exactly the same as physical difference. This is, in a way, carrying on the idealized tradition of social politics in aristocratic writings—Thersites and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 2 practically inhabit different worlds, as their respective outward appearances make clear—but the actual difference in physical body between social classes on the moon is striking.[45]

If Lucian's mapping of social difference onto physical difference amongst the moon people is extreme, it builds on a tension always present in Greek literary culture (Agamemnon vs. Thersites) but one that was becoming more marked in the second century C.E. One common characteristic of the ancient novel—a genre that Lucian's narrative is sometimes included within[46]—is that there is a marked differentiation between the barbarous countryside (populated by brigands and witches) and the city: "the difference," Suzanne Said notes, "is not only based on social class, but also on *race* and on *status:* townsmen are always *Greeks,* by culture if not by origin, and *free men,* whereas peasants are *Barbarians* and *slaves.*"[47] In the ancient novel, sub-elite populations are not just sub-elite, but also less or non-Greek. There is also the question of language: one of the motives behind the Attic purists of the Second Sophistic— amongst whom Lucian consorts—is an effort both to prove the superior Hellenicity of those who spoke (or at lease wrote in) Attic and to discount the Hellenictiy of those who do not. This obviously includes the entire rural population; if one of the consistent strains of the ancient novel is that it is a form of discourse meant to confirm the Hellenicity of

---

[45] See chapter III above.

[46] Swain 1996.102.

[47] S. Said 1998.95. See also the discussions of ethnic identity in the Greek novel in Swain (1996.101-31) and Whitmarsh (2011.1-21).

both the writer and the reader, there needs to be a group of people for that sense of identity to be proved against, and the rural population tends to serve this purpose.[48] Even if they are Greek speakers, their claims to Hellenicity tend to be discounted by the urban protagonists, readers, and writer himself. Not only are they less Greek linguistically and culturally, but if peasants are interpreted as *barbaroi,* we are not looking at simply a degree of difference between people of different class or status. Rather than looking at a degree of difference, in the Greek novel the peasant at home becomes the Other no less than the foreigner abroad.

In that light, I would like to return to a premise that I made in the previous two chapters: for writers that live in the colonial worlds of antiquity, the politics of ethnic identification—who is Greek, who is not, and what constitutes Greekness—are always present in discussions of physical difference. As becomes clear in the ethnography that follows Lucian's description of Endymion's expedition, when Endymion sends his poorest to the colonial frontier, he really is dispatching people whose bodies are of lesser quality than other members of the community (they after all have prosthetic body parts of inferior quality). The colonial space becomes a space for keeping those who are in some sense less moon-people than the other moon-people.

Later in his narrative, near the close of the first book (*VH* 1.31-39), Lucian turns towards a satire of the accounts of colonial histories manufactured by the colonists themselves. Lucian adopts Herodotus' cynical attitude towards the politics of the west, particularly (as I will discuss below) Herodotus' criticism of the habit of the tyrants of Syracuse to impose forced resettlement and migration for manifestly political ends. In colonial foundation narratives, Lucian finds a genre in which native peoples have been representationally wiped out in the interest of smoothing out the past of the colony. The reality of resettlement and mixing with native populations belies the non-representation of native peoples in colonial histories. By explicitly reading ethnicity and difference into these accounts, Lucian takes the representational annihilation of the native peoples to an extreme, turning the colonial narrative into a satirical justification for ethnic cleansing.

---

[48] Swain 1996.116-18; S. Said.1998.91-97.

Lucian's Voyage to Sicily: *VH* 1.31-39

When Lucian evokes colonial narrative in the *True histories*, he very much reads a broken Herodotean silence. Lucian had access to plenty of sources for colonial narratives, but in spirit, his account in the *True histories* specifically recalls Herodotus, namely his accounts of the successful foundation of Cyrene (4.150-59) and the failed colonial expeditions of the Phocaeans (1.164-67) and Dorieus the Spartan (5.42-48). It is about the identity of the settlers; the natives are menacing accessories. Dorieus, for instance, because he is blocked from the Spartan throne by his impaired brother Cleomenes, embarks on several failed adventures in Libya, Italy, and finally Sicily before he dies in battle (5.48). Herodotus quite literally blames this whole process on his failure to adhere to the standards of a proper colonial narrative (5.42).[49] The Phocaeans face a similar fate: when they go to the west to escape the Persians they become pirates and are slaughtered by the neighboring Etruscans and Carthaginians (1.166-67). Going into the west to found a new city can have drastic ramifications for individual identity if you do not do it right—Herodotus destroys those that do not conform to the proper narrative expectations.[50] The native role in Herodotus' colonial tales is not to be a historical actor, but rather to stand in to help define the experience of the colonizer.

Lucian's account of the battles between the Greeks and the various *ethnê* of fish people in the whale (*VH* 1.31-39) push the narrative expectations of the colonial narrative to an extreme uncomfortably close to a phenomenon we are unaccustomed to hearing about in antiquity: ethnic cleansing.[51] Though the fish people ostensibly face the ire of the Greeks because of their hostile behavior towards then, Lucian's primary means of describing the fish people is based on their physical differences. Lucian explains their behavior by their physical characteristics, and the link between the two—strange appearance leads to savagery—becomes justification for their annihilation. Lucian takes up the idea of an essentializing identity of *to Hellênikon ethnos*—an identity that is

---

[49] Dougherty 1993.17-19; Munson 2006.259-62.

[50] Munson 2006.260-61.

[51] See Isaac 2004.215-24 for discussion. Note that ethnic cleansing is distinct from the other types of mass killing that undoubtedly were common in antiquity.

exclusive based not only on language and customs, but also on physical characteristics—and pursues its implications to the furthest extent. If the first book of the *True Histories* is a movement from a definition of culture based primarily on physical characteristics (the moon people) to a definition based on language and custom (but not physical characteristics) that will culminate in his narrator's entry into the world of *paideia* on the Isles of the Blessed in book two,[52] the colonial narrative of the whale is his way of sealing the transition. Lucian's account of his narrator's adventures in the whale puts in order a stark contrast between the inhabitants of the whale and the natives.

Scintharus, a Cyprian merchant, was on his way to Italy and Sicily on a cargo ship when he was swallowed by the whale, killing the whole crew except him and his son (*VH* 1.34). Inside the whale, the two survivors build a miniature Greek city: Lucian's narrator finds a temple to Poseidon with a written epigram, steles, and marked graves (1.32).[53] The two survivors act in particularly civilized ways, burying their dead, farming, fishing from a raft, sleeping in beds, and bathing (1.34).[54] When Lucian's narrator arrives, Scintharus, following the Odyssean pattern, refuses to hear his story until he offers *xenia* (1.33).[55] The Lamp People also offer Lucian's crew *xenia* and display similar institutions (1.29), but Lucian uses the meeting of his narrator and Scintharus to different ends. The arrival in the whale marks a return of the crew to civilization, and once they return, characterizations of those who are not party to it change: whereas earlier, Lucian revels in the ethnographic (or at least physical) description of the strange human-animal hybrids he meets, in the whale he scarcely cares. Scintharus defines them in terms of his own hostile interactions with them:

> οἱ δὲ γείτονες ἡμῶν καὶ πάροικον σφόδρα χαλεποὶ καὶ βαρεῖς εἰσιν, <u>ἄμικτοί τε ὄντες καὶ ἄγριοι</u>. ἦ γάρ, ἔφην ἐγώ, καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς εἰσιν ἐν τῷ κήτει; πολλοὶ μὲν

---

[52] Kim 2010.168.

[53] οὔπω δὲ πέντε ὅλους διελθὼν σταδίους εὗρον <u>ἱερὸν Ποσειδῶνος</u>, ὡς ἐδήλου <u>ἡ ἐπιγραφή</u>, καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ καὶ <u>τάφους πολλοὺς καὶ στήλας ἐπ' αὐτῶν</u> πλησίον τε πηγὴν ὕδατος διαυγοῦς.

[54] θάψαντες δὲ τοὺς ἑταίρους καὶ ναὸν τῷ Ποσειδῶνι δειμάμενοι τουτονὶ τὸν βίον ζῶμεν, λάχανα μὲν κηπεύοντες, ἰχθῦς δὲ σιτούμενοι καὶ ἀκρόδρυα. πολλὴ δέ, ὡς ὁρᾶτε, ἡ ὕλη, καὶ μὴν καὶ ἀμπέλους ἔχει πολλάς, ἀφ' ὧν ἥδυτατος οἶνος γεννᾶται·

[55] ὁ δὲ οὐ πρότερον ἔφη ἐρεῖν οὐδὲ πεύσεσθαι παρ' ἡμῶν, πρὶν ξενίων τῶν παρόντων μεταδοῦναι, καὶ λαβὼν ἡμᾶς ἦγεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν

οὖν, ἔφη, καὶ ἄξενοι καὶ <u>τὰς μορφὰς ἀλλόκοτοι</u>: τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἑσπέρια τῆς ὕλης καὶ οὐραῖα Ταριχᾶνες οἰκοῦσιν, <u>ἔθνος</u> ἐγχελυωπὸν καὶ καραβοπρόσωπον, <u>μάχιμον καὶ θρασὺ καὶ ὠμοφάγον·</u> τὰ δὲ τῆς ἑτέρας πλευρᾶς κατὰ τὸν δεξιὸν τοῖχον Τριτωνομένδητες, τὰ μὲν ἄνω ἀνθρώποις ἐοικότες, τὰ δὲ κάτω τοῖς γαλεώταις, ἧττον <u>μέντοι ἄδικοί εἰσιν τῶν ἄλλων·</u> τὰ λαιὰ δὲ Καρκινόχειρες καὶ Θυννοκέφαλοι συμμαχίαν τε καὶ φιλίαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς πεποιημένοι· τὴν δὲ μεσόγαιαν νέμονται Παγουρίδαι καὶ Ψηττόποδες, <u>γένος μάχιμον καὶ δρομικώτατον·</u> τὰ ἐῷα δέ, τὰ πρὸς αὐτῷ τῷ στόματι, τὰ πολλὰ μὲν ἔρημά ἐστι, προσκλυζόμενα τῇ θαλάττῃ· ὅμως δὲ ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἔχω φόρον τοῖς Ψηττόποσιν ὑποτελῶν ἑκάστου ἔτους ὄστρεια πεντακόσια. (1.35)

"Our neighbors and the local residents are excessively difficult and stern, unsociable and savage." "Ah!" I said, "there are others in the whale?" "There are many, he replied, inhospitable and divers in form; the Tarichanes ('Salt-fishes') inhabit the western hills of the forest, an eel-eyed and crab-faced *ethnos,* warlike and bold and flesh-eating; those on the other side, by the right wall, are the Tritonomendetes ('Mer-goats'), whose upper parts look like men, but whose bottom parts are like catfish; they are less unjust than the others. On the left are the Carkinocheires ('Crab-claw-hands') and the Thunnocephaloi ('Tuna-heads'), who have made each other allies and friends; in the middle dwell the Pagouridae, and the Psettopodes ('Sole-feet'), a war-like and extremely fast race; the parts in the east, which are close to the mouth, are for the most part empty, washed over by the sea; nevertheless, I inhabit these parts, paying five hundred oysters a year in tribute to the Psettopodes.

Immediately after describing the facets of his own civilization, Scintharus characterizes the natives: not only are they all part fish, but they are unsociable (*amiktoi),* savage *(agrioi),* varying in respect to their bodily forms (*morphas allokotoi),* warlike (*machimon),* bold (*thrasu*), unjust (*adikoi),* and perhaps the most important part of all, flesh-eating (*ômophagon);*[56] a little while later they are described as living in dens (*phôleoi* 1.37). Scintharus' account of the locals, using vocabulary drawn from Odysseus' description of the Cyclopes (*Od.* 9.175-6), does not afford them even the possibility of having a culture.[57] Rather, he defines them in terms of what they are not— they are not sociable, not just, and they do not have a single human form. Perhaps more important here, though, is their social grouping—all the different fish people are *ethnoi,*

---

[56] Well known as an accusation used against a variety of cultural 'others' from antiquity on; see Isaac 2004.207-11. These range the frightening and mysterious Androphagoi (Hdt. 4.18) to Carthaginians (Livy 23.5.12), Christians, Jews, and the Caribs of the new world.

[57] On the description of the Cyclopes in the *Odyssey* see chapter III above.

while Scintharus and his son have taken the first steps of founding their own *polis,* a distinction that Thucydides at least takes quite seriously as a mark of civilized development.[58] But what is wrong with not having a human form?—Lucian does not seem to have minded the various semi-human creatures in the earlier adventures of his protagonists. The difference here is that the natives are being construed for different purposes than before. They are the enemy; they must be destroyed. So, gone is the ecumenical view of the well and the mirror (1.26);[59] the uncivilized natives of the whale who would have been subject to an ethnography earlier in the work become a challenge to civilization itself.

Lucian's narrator offers a concise response to Scintharus' complaints by proposing that the natives be eliminated (1.35). Setting up an ambush of the natives by refusing to pay tribute and slaughtering the enemy forces when they arrive to collect it, Lucian's narrator, Scintharus, and the crew massacre every single native in the whale (with the exception of the neutral Mer-goats, who escape into the open ocean) after rejecting their pleas to surrender. The newly dominant Greeks celebrate their victory over the *eremos* landscape with a performance of culture—planting trees, tending vines, hunting with dogs, and wrestling specifically in the nude (1.39)—activities, that, needless to say are related primarily because they are conceptualized as specifically Greek activities (few military activities in antiquity were celebrated with garden parties).[60] Lucian juxtaposes the Greek marks of civilization with the native marks of barbarity, but the most important part of the story is that by removing the natives altogether, the land becomes the ideal colonial landscape, *eremos.* Where the Other exists as a pure negation—and not an ethnographic mirror, nor a presence to be negotiated with—its intended role is to be overcome, not to be explained.

---

[58] Thuc. 1.7-8; see McInerney 2001.53-54.

[59] See chapter IV above.

[60] ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν χώραν ἐπελθόντες ἔρημον ἤδη οὖσαν τῶν πολεμίων τὸ λοιπὸν ἀδεῶς κατῳκοῦμεν, τὰ πολλὰ γυμνασίοις τε καὶ κυνηγεσίοις χρώμενοι καὶ ἀμπελουργοῦντες καὶ τὸν καρπὸν συγκομιζόμενοι τὸν ἐκ τῶν δένδρων καὶ ὅλως ἐῴκειμεν τοῖς ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἀφύκτῳ τρυφῶσι καὶ λελυμένοις.

In the whale narrative, rather than picking up on any Herodotean model of cultural interaction, Lucian picks up on the major, but punctuated Herodotean silence—and unease—about the natives of the west. Scintharus, like Lucian, is an easterner from Cyprus, a locus of Greek/foreign interaction from a very early point in history. Embarking on a voyage to Sicily, another long-colonized land, Scintharus is swallowed by the whale and ends up in an uncolonized country populated by savages. Some time after Scintharus founds his settlement, a fellow group of colonists arrive to help Scintharus annihilate the non-Greek native inhabitants, leading to the sunoikism of the two groups and the founding of an entirely Greek—and specifically *not* ethnically mixed—city.[61] Lucian's colonial vision entails the creation of a specific locale governed *only* by the logic of the ideal colonial narrative, where the Greeks are either unopposed by the savage natives or easily overcome them, and the only real function of the natives is to be defeated. This is something that very clearly happened in no Greek colony. But the response of mainland Greek writers who describe Syracuse or the other cities of the western middle ground is to almost completely ignore the native element, both serf populations, like the Syracusan Kullurioi (who are altogether absent from Thucydides, despite his two books on Syracuse) and the free, hybridized natives. Where the canonical Greek historians do recognize them, western natives are conceived of in the monstrous terms by which the *Odyssey* envisions the natives of the west, as Cyclopes and Lastrygones (Thuc. 6.2). And so, when Herodotus presents his brief, tantalizing account of a native uprising followed with massive population transfers by Gelon (Hdt. 7.153-56), the ethnic subtext just barely appears—but that it elicits a mention suggests that it does mean something. By sending Scintharus into the whale rather than to Sicily, Lucian parodies the inability of Greek historiography following Herodotus to effectively discuss cultural interaction in the west at the same time as it engages in substantial ethnographies of the east. The whale, then, serves as a type of generalized colonial landscape, without a fixed location, that Lucian uses to parody representations of colonial histories not just in particular cases, but as a practice overall.

---

[61] That Scintharus and (presumably) Lucian both come from hybridized regions of the Greek east (in language, culture, and ethnicity) is consequential here, too—at least in the logic of this narrative, are these two characters acting out a fantasy of Hellenicity?

Ethnic Cleansing in Classical Sicily? Hdt. 7.153-56

Lucian's work engages in the ethnic and cultural politics of the ancient novel, deploying narrative as a theatre for competing ideas of cultural and ethnic identities.[62] Indeed as we have already seen, Lucian's readings of Herodotus are sensitive to many of the cultural faultlines in Herodotus and Thucydides' narratives, particularly those that relate to cultural identification.[63] In the final section of this chapter I shall briefly diverge from my discussion of Lucian's reception of Herodotean type-narratives to address the ambivalent ethnic politics in Herodotus himself. As Rosaria Vignolo Munson has argued, both Herodotus and, to a lesser degree, Thucydides display a profound sense of ambivalence towards the Greek west: although two books of Thucydides take place on Sicily, and several of Herodotus' *logoi* unfold across the Ionian Sea, the west continually appears as marginal to the main narratives of history—or at worst, in Herodotus, as a landscape marked by constant migration, resettlement, and tyranny.[64] If Herodotus gives us no ethnography of the west, ethnicity and the politics of ethnic identity still manifest themselves in his narrative of the ascension of Gelon as tyrant of Sicily (7.153-56). Rather than there being Herodotean indifference or even ignorance about the natives of the west, Herodotus' ethnographic strategy is instead one of ambivalence as to whether claims that come out of the west can ever be verified.[65] If colonial foundation narratives appear in the classical period as a means to assert the 'authenticity' of claims to Hellenicity by western Greek cities,[66] Herodotus displays a remarkable ambivalence towards whether these can be believed. Lucian adopts Herodotus' ambivalent attitude towards the west in order to undermine assertions of Greek ethnic purity in the west while at the same time echoing the logic that engenders such claims. Although Lucian's reception of Herodotus functions towards the end of satire, Herodotus' ambivalence

---

[62] See chapter IV above.

[63] See discussion in Greenwood 2006.111-13.

[64] Munson 2006.262-65.

[65] Munson 2006.266.

[66] Malkin 2011.56-64.

about the veracity of ethnic claims has immediate relevance towards the question of Lucian's own ethnic identity.

One of the reoccurring patterns in histories of Greek cities in the west is that massive population transfers happened with some frequency whenever there were periods of turmoil.[67] When Alcibiades promotes an invasion of Sicily before the assembly at Athens noting that "the cities are filled with intermixed mobs (*ochloi xummeitikoi)* and they have constant exchange and rearrangement of their inhabitants" (6.17.2-3),[68] the backdrop he is referring to is the ascent and aftermath of the Deinomenid tyrants of Syracuse, who in the early fifth century had come to dominate—and forcibly resettle—most of the island. Herodotus' account of the rise of the first Deinomenid tyrant, Gelon (7.153-56), a narrative embedded in his account of Gelon's attempt to commandeer Athens' and Sparta's alliance against the Persians, is strikingly negative and dismissive of Gelon's accomplishments.[69] Gelon, serving under Hippocrates of Gela, had helped Hippocrates conquer many of the cities of Sicily before taking over the city as tyrant after his death. Having conquered Syracuse, he proceeds to raze the surrounding cities, sell the people into slavery, and bring the nobles and their property into Syracuse as the new ruling class (7.155-56). Having made heavy use of native Sicel and Arcadian mercenaries against the Greek populations of his cities, when the family dynasty collapsed in 461 *stasis* broke out in most of the cities of eastern Sicily (Diod. Sic. 11.76), driving the mercenaries into the hinterlands.[70]

Alcibiades' remarks that the Greek population of the island are *ochloi xummeiktoi* resonate with the biases of an Athenian audience couched in the language of autochthony: according to him, the *xummetikoi* Siciliotes' claims to their own island are less legitimate than Athens' claims to Sicily. Alcibiades' description of the Siciliotes as *xummetikoi* does not bear the necessary connotation of Greek intermixing with non-

---

[67] See McKechnie 1989.39-42 on displacement and resettlement in Sicily from the fifth to the third centuries.

[68] ὄχλοις τε γὰρ ξυμμείκτοις πολυανδροῦσιν αἱ πόλεις καὶ ῥᾳδίας ἔχουσι τῶν πολιτῶν τὰς μεταβολὰς καὶ ἐπιδοχάς.

[69] Osborne 1998.265-69.

[70] See Nicholson 2011.98-99, Malkin 2011.116-17.

Greeks. As we have already seen in Herodotus' parody of claims of autochthony by the Athenians (1.56-57),[71] the discourse of autochthony is one of ethnic superiority above other people specifically conceptualized as Greeks. In this regard having mixed origins is no better if you are from Achaea or Syracuse, since no one can be as Greek as Athenians are by *genos*. Other Greek cities, including Syracuse in the colonial west, had the capacity to manufacture counter-claims to diminutions of their Greekness.[72] Gelon, for instance, in his speech to the other Greek envoys, holds that the Carthaginians are an equal threat to Greece and Greek identity as the Persians (7.158), and Herodotus follows his account of the embassy to Syracuse with a narrative of how the Syracusans hold their subsequent victory over the Carthaginians at Himera as equal to the Athenian victory at Salamis (1.165-67). Herodotus doubts these claims (framing them with the dismissive "there is this story of the Carthaginians told by them" 7.167.1),[73] and indeed Herodotus' doubt is part of a larger proclivity in his accounts of the west to discount claims of equivalence between mainland and Siciliot Greeks.[74]

It is useful to return to Herodotus' account of Gelon's ascension in this light. Gelon, while still tyrant of Gela, intervenes in an episode of *stasis* in Syracuse when the helotized native population, the Kullurioi, rose up with the *dêmos* to force the aristocrats from power (7.155). When Gelon arrives at the gates of Syracuse with his army, the city surrenders. Herodotus does not elaborate on whether Gelon punished either the natives or the *dêmos* separately, and, at this point in the narrative, the Kullurioi—having been introduced and defined—disappear from the narrative. Gelon turns his attention from his previous empire to Syracuse, moving the aristocrats from his other conquests into Syracuse while selling the common people into slavery. The brief inclusion of ethnic politics is unexplained, and especially so in light of Herodotus' general lack of interest in the natives of the west. If we are looking to use the mention of ethnic politics to explain Gelon's policy of selling the common people of his former conquests into slavery,

---

[71] See chapter II above; Thomas 2001, Greenwood 2009.

[72] Antonaccio 2003.66.

[73] Ἔστι δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν Καρχηδονίων ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος

[74] Munson 2006.262.

Herodotus interprets through the prism of class, saying that Gelon wipes out or enslaves the commoners of the cities he conquers and sunoikizes the wealthy because he finds commoners disagreeable to live with (7.156.3).[75] The fact that the Kullurioi have been helotized offers little explanation, either: the institution of helotage manifests itself in a variety of ways across both the colonized (Byzantium, Syracuse) and old (Sparta, Crete) Greek worlds, and it is not clearly associated with ethnicity.[76] Yet the mention of the Kullurioi as a group implies the existence of the appellation as an identity that in some sense shares a consciousness with, or at least has had one imposed upon them—or imagined upon them—by, their masters.[77]

       If there *is* a subtext of ethnic cleansing in the account of the revolt in Syracuse, it would be a strange behavior for an actual Gelon, who, as Diodorus reminds, depends heavily on Sicel mercenaries. Herodotus tells a story in which ethnic identity has been construed by a source as an important element of a story. This story operates against an archaeological backdrop in which there is little major apparent difference between Greek and Sicel communities[78] and in which, when assertions of Sicel identities do take place (such as in the mid-fifth century uprising of Ducetius), manifest themselves in terms easily understandable to Greeks.[79] In an article on ethnic relations in Roman Alexandria, Koen Gourdiaan notes that discourses of ethnic identification often take place on quite unequal terms: different ethnic and social constituencies can map each other using characteristics and terminology that other groups might not recognize.[80] In this case, then, the appellation 'Kullurios' could very well be practically meaningless. Is this a case

---

[75] Ἐποίεε δὲ ταῦτα τούτους ἀμφοτέρους νομίσας δῆμον εἶναι συνοίκημα ἀχαριτώτατον. See Kurke 1999.30-31 on Herodotus' use of social class as lens for interpretation.

[76] OCD³ s.v. There is a discredited but still repeated theory of helotage as a Dorian cultural phenomenon that reflects the aftermath of the 'Dorian invasion.' For the ambiguities surrounding servile populations in ancient Greece see Austin and Vidal-Naquet 1977.65 (in a colonial context), 1977.86-87 (in general), J.M. Hall 2007.237-38.

[77] See J.M. Hall 2002.9-19 on ethnic identification.

[78] J.M. Hall 2002.45, Antonaccio 2004.60-61. See also Webster 2001 on creolization of the material record.

[79] Malkin 2011.117-18.

[80] Gourdiaan 1993.88.

of the colonial native being 'spoken for' by the colonist, or Herodotus' Syracusan (or non-Syracusan) source coming up with a false derivation for a social institution?[81]

Rather than being apparent in any way, ethnicity in the Gelon narrative becomes a text upon which different constituencies cast their apprehensions. Ethnicity functions in Bhabha's terminology as hybrid space in which identities and the terminology for them are under constant negotiation by those that define them.[82] Inasmuch as Herodotus displays a lack of interest in writing a western ethnography, his narrative inadvertently wanders into a broader discourse of ethnic identification that is not taking place in the familiar terms of the self and Other. Both ethnography and strategies of ethnic identification within and between communities fluctuate depending on their instrumentality.[83] We have already seen how ethnographic language is prevalent in discourses of physical description and in physiognomy. But where Othering is not operative as an ethnographic strategy, new strategies come to the fore.[84] Herodotus' account of how the ethnic identification of the Kullurioi functions explicitly as a pretext for political and military action is only scratching the surface, as it were: in situations of cultural accommodation, discourses of ethnicity and difference remain operative and only reappear in recognizable terms when the occasion demands.

Yet, given the tendency in colonial foundation narratives to eliminate native populations when they are no longer hostile, a tendency that Lucian parodies when his narrator engages in what certainly *is* ethnic cleansing in the whale, it is appropriate to speculate to what degree ethnicity *prima facie* operates as legitimation for killing or subjugation in antiquity.[85] Expressly ethnic violence is known to have occurred in cities across the Greek east, and the riots between the Jewish and Egyptian populations of Alexandria in 38 C.E. drew a range of responses from Jewish, Greek, and Roman

---

[81] Cf. Wallace-Hadrill 2008.49-51 on the Roman invention of the *pallium* as sign of Greek identity.

[82] Bhabha 1994.38.

[83] Gourdiaan 1993.76.

[84] Woolf 2011.23.

[85] See Isaac 2004.215-24. Isaac convincingly demonstrates that the language of ethnic cleansing exists in antiquity, although the case that this represents an actuality *per se* is far less clear. The vast majority of his accounts are of events taking place on the borders of the Roman Empire.

authors. Gourdiaan sees the riots as fueled by a combination of a series of unreciprocated conceptions of ethnic identity between the different constituencies in the city and the pressures brought upon inter-group relations by Roman attempts to reorder ethnic classifications in the city.[86] Ethnic cleansing becomes a product of outside interference upsetting the communal balance of the city.

In a way, Herodotus' Gelon narrative operates in similar terms. If ethnic violence in antiquity is the product of power being wielded in unfamiliar contexts, then perhaps we can return to interpret both Lucian's account of the colonization of the whale, and colonial type narratives more generally, in light of Herodotus' perceived ethnic violence in Syracuse and the actual ethnic violence in Alexandria. Herodotus, like the modern ethnographer, depicts what happens in an unfamiliar place by contextualizing them within familiar models.[87] Herodotus, for instance, understands colonial foundation narratives, and he understands narratives of class and status, such as Gelon's alleged dislike for the common man. What he is less comfortable with, and almost never depicts, is the presence of people he identifies as non-Greeks coexisting with Greek populations. Herodotus, preserving mention of the Kullurioi, otherwise removes the ethnic politics from his account of Gelon, instead interpreting the uprising at Syracuse through the light of class and status politics. Herodotus thus offers a new context to the story of the Syracusan rebellion quite different from what might have actually happened.

Lucian, by displacing his colonial narrative from the historical west into a giant, imaginary whale, removes his account from any historical context. Colonial narratives are strategies of ethnic identification employed by Greeks seeking to legitimize their cities as *solely* Greek, as newcomers, and as worthy to be compared with the mythologies of the more rooted states of the Greek mainland. But, at the same time, they are not legitimizing tools for subordination or massacre of other communities like blood libel or the *Dolchstoßlegende*. By not describing the native peoples beyond their initial capacities as adversaries, they actually *obviate* the continued threat of interpreting native peoples as enemies. Ceasing to classify natives as enemies, colonial foundation myths

---

[86] Gourdiaan 1993.90-95.

[87] Cf. Kurke 1999.30-31 on Herodotus' tendency to provide interpretation in the light of fifth century aristocratic/anti-aristocratic politics. He does so, however, inconsistently.

take their place within the much larger process of the creation of ritual and narrative middle grounds between immigrant Greeks and colonial natives. When Lucian removes colonial narrative from its context as a time-discrete strategy of ethnic identification, he transforms colonial foundation narratives from strategies of inclusion to tools for exclusion—and hence colonial myth becomes a vehicle for ethnic cleansing.

Hence let us return briefly to the question of Lucianic identity. The Greek settlement and colonization of the east employed as wide a variety of strategies as were employed in the west to legitimize the presence of the Greeks and to unify the elite cultures of Greeks and natives. Literary cultures are embedded in wider networks of social interaction, trade, and migration. The removal of literary artifacts from context is no less pernicious than to do the same to material culture. Herodotus' ethnography represents one step of removal between the cultures he depicts and his audience. By taking knowledge about foreigners and embedding it within a new context familiar to his audience, Herodotus renders the ethnographized people 'knowable' to the Greeks. Lucian's reception of Herodotean narrative patterns takes the process a step further by stripping the colonial narrative of the context that made it relatable to Herodotus' contemporary audiences. With clever use of colonial narrative, Lucian continues his parody of those he singles out in the *How to write history* for seeking to exoticize the mundane and to fit into the language of Herodotean description his hometown, Samosata (*Hist. conscr.* 24-5).[88] As we have already discussed, Lucian is no enemy of the tropes of the exotic or the strange in historiography, but he does call for their moderation. The alienation of text from context has the capacity to lead to unintended consequences. Lucian explores the distance that the tropes of Othering can be taken when historians attempt to portray the multi-ethnic regions of antiquity through his satire of colonial narrative. Doing so, he raises the dangerous logic of ethnic cleansing (to whatever extent it existed in antiquity) and the question of whether, when we think about foreigners in the terms of Othering, the *actual* presence of the Other nearby can ever truly be tolerated. The result is an effective satire, but the answer is chilling— because it is no.

---

[88] See chapter IV above.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

What does it mean to 'read' a culture? In this study I have approached texts as social documents that are interpretable within a series of 'frameworks'—race, ethnicity, status, language. Some of these are apparent in ancient texts: Lucian is unquestionably an Atticist, while Theocritus' Doric is at least thematically important to some of his characters, such as Gorgo and Praxinoa in *Idyll* 15. The works of Lucian and Theocritus are both certainly created by elites for elite audiences. Yet other labels of identity (race, ethnicity) are either understood in different terms than are in common use today. Can we call Polyphemus 'white?' To do so would be of course to miss the point. Can we really know Lucian's first language, or assign meaning to the answer? We can do neither. Rather, what this study does is to open the door to exploring how the negotiations of identity that take place between author, text, and audience in the process of literary production operate differently in the context of the colonial world. Perspective matters. If Herodotus interprets historical events through the lens of aristocratic/anti-aristocratic politics,[1] or Livy reads the class politics of the last century B.C.E. into early Rome, then for authors working in the colonial sphere, ethnic identity comes to the fore as a leading concern. For this reason the language of ethnography, assimilation, or Othering becomes useful for highlighting or downplaying one's difference from one's neighbors. There were concepts of race in the ancient world, no less than there were concepts of ethnic, gender, or status identities. In our own times we have struggled to define what it means to be 'black,' 'white,' 'male,' or 'middle class.' In antiquity, where the most important of social identities were measured by social obligation—client, patron, mother, citizen— those identities *not* envisioned in terms of obligations called less urgently for definition. Yet when Lucian talks about being a *Suros,* or the speaker of Theocritus third *Idyll* a *simos,* it is clear that these identities matter in some respect. There will always be a haziness or uncertainty in talking about identities ancient and modern. This should not serve to prevent discussions.

There is also a pressing need to explore how texts represent the dynamics of ancient societies. As Dougherty and Kurke have observed, perhaps only five or ten

---

[1] Kurke 1999.

percent of all ancient texts survive, and most of those that do are elite.[2] Is there a means of accessing the subordinated, or poorly represented voices of antiquity? Can the subaltern have a presence in elite texts? Both the cultural poetics of Dougherty and Kurke and the postcolonial theory of Bhabha offer means to study how representation of cultural difference serves to negotiate with cultural difference. Rather than representation being inherently hegemonic or one-sided, representation operates as a traffic in which both sides of the gaze negotiate each other's presence into terms that each can understand. Ethnography serves as an obvious locus to find this process at work, but this type of negotiation is hardly unique to colonial contexts. As Bhabha notes, hybridity is a phenomenon that takes place in *all* personal interactions, as different parties attempt to discover meaning.[3] In that light, even the most seemingly one-sided or prejudiced of interactions—such as where Praxinoa (Theoc. *Id.* 15.46-64) characterizes the Egyptians as useless malefactors, or where Polemon (Philost. *VS* 535) refuses to meet with non-Greeks—represent a kind of social negotiation between the presence of Greeks and non-Greeks in the same communities. Stereotyping the Other, or refusing to talk to him, is still an acknowledgement of and response to copresence. Even if these are isolated incidences, they are only comprehensible as tokens of a larger system of social judgments and attitudes that were clearly important to those that wielded them. So even if these are decidedly negative reactions to the presence of non-Greeks living with Greeks, they offer to the modern critic a position from which he or she might 'read' the cultural system. An interaction that goes wrong is still an interaction. At any rate, they can be read in light of the attitude of punctuated silence that ancient writers have in regards to other social ills that were clearly present in their societies: domestic abuse, rural violence, slave revolts. Perhaps the non-Greek cannot ever 'own' his or her presence in a Greek text. But his or her representation is a concession of sorts. The Other is never *just* the Other.

It would be foolish to give ancient texts unlimited agency in their ability to be truly *representative* of—and not just represent—the presence of foreigners. Yet by reading texts as constituents of cultural dialog, and representative of multiple actors in that dialog (rather than representing one position), classicists and literary scholars of

---

[2] Dougherty and Kurke 2003.9.

[3] Bhabha 1994.25.

antiquity can give themselves the liberty to do what ancient historians and archaeologists also do: talk about what it is like to live in a society. As Cornel West proclaimed to an audience of classicists in 2012, we have colonized antiquity. In some respects (and perhaps in many fewer respects than twenty years ago), the study of ancient languages and literatures is not considerably different from what the study of the 'Orient' was before Edward Said.[4] As Goff, Vasunia, Greenwood, and other scholars I surveyed in the second chapter have noted, the field of Classics as we have it today is a creation of the experience of European colonialism. But I will not recuse myself from West's charge, either. Interest in the diversity of ancient societies in 2013 derives from the same source as when twentieth century classicists envisioned ancient societies in terms of the monolithic nation state. We all find what we want to in antiquity. Yet rather than taking this pessimistically, we can look at the generational nature of scholarship as a saving grace. America in 2013 is a nation that has become both aware of its diversity and, increasingly, of the limits of what diversity is. Bhabha has criticized the term as a retreat of sorts from the basic hybridity of human interaction: diversity seems to be a term describing the interaction between members of different knowable, well-defined cultural units.[5] Within decades there will be no majorities in America: this will be a nation in-between. Never before in American history have labels been so fluid, and it is from this privileged position we can finally see that a similar fluidity existed in antiquity.

But perhaps there were other periods of similar fluidity in America. When Thomas Morton founded his plantation on the southern shores of Boston harbor, he could at least imagine a world without Indians and Englishmen: we are all Trojans here. As we have seen, his interest in native languages and Roman customs was quite possibly self-serving, and there is no reason to think his colony would have been so utopian had it lasted. Yet in his employment of antiquity between cultures—Wampanoag, English, Roman, Trojan—he followed the footsteps of his forebears in the precolonial western Mediterranean. When he saw the inhabitants of the colonial landscape, it was not their difference that struck him, but the extent to which they were the same.

---

[4] See Vasunia 2003.

[5] Bhabha 1994.34.

REFERENCES CITED

Abbreviations:

AJA: *American Journal of Archaeology*

AJP: *American Journal of Philology*

CP: *Classical Philology*

G&R: *Greece & Rome*

JHS: *Journal of Hellenic Studies*

MLQ: *Modern Language Quarterly*

Adams, Charles Frances, ed., 1882. *The New English Canaan of Thomas Morton.* Boston.

Ahmad, Aijaz, 1993. *In theory: classes, nations, literatures.* London.

Anderson, Benedict, 2006 (reprint 1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London.

Ando, Clifford, 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire.* Berkeley.

Antonaccio, Carla, 2001. "Ethnicity and Colonization" in Malkin 2001: 113-158.

———. 2003. "Hybridity and the Cultures within Greek Culture" in Dougherty and Kurke 2003: 57-75.

———. 2004. "Siculo-geometric and the Sikels: Ceramics and identity in eastern Sicily" in Lomas 2004: 55-81.

Austin, M.M, and P. Vidal-Naquet, 1977. *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: an Introduction.* Berkeley.

Barchiesi, Alessandro, 2009. "Roman Perspectives on the Greeks" in Boys-Stones, Graziosi, and Vasunia 2009: 98-113.

Bartley, Adam, 2003. "The Implications of the Reception of Thucydides within Lucian's 'Verae Historiae.'" *Hermes* 131: 222-234.

Bergson, Leif, 1967. "Zum periphrastischen χρῆμα." *Eranos* 65: 80-115.

Bhabha, Homi K., 1994. *The Location of Culture.* London.

Boardman, John, 1980 (reprint 1964). *The Greeks Overseas.* London.

Bowditch, P. Lowell, 2011. "Tibullus and Egypt: a Postcolonial Reading of Elegy 1.7." *Arethusa* 44.1: 89-122.

Boys-Stones, George, Barbara Graziosi and Phiroze Vasunia, eds., 2009. *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies.* Oxford.

Bradford, William, 1964 [~1647]. *Of Plymouth Plantation.* Ed. Harvey Wish. New York.

Burnham, Michelle, 2006. "Land, Labor, and Colonial Economics in Thomas Morton's 'New English Canaan.' *Early American Literature* 41.3: 406-28.

Chamberlain, David, 1999. "On Atomics Onomastic and Metarhythmic Translations in Herodotus." *Arethusa* 32.3: 263-312.

Chaterjee, Partha, 1993. *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories.* Princeton.

Clausen, Wendell, 1994. *Virgil: Eclogues.* Oxford.

Cohen, Ada, 2011. "The Self as Other: Performing Humor in Ancient Greek Art" in Gruen 2011b: 465-490.

Cohen, Jeffery Jerome, ed. 2000. *The Postcolonial Middle Ages.* New York.

Compton, Todd, 1990. "The Trial of the Satirist: Poetic *Vitae* (Aesop, Archilochus, Homer) as Background for Plato's *Apology." AJP* 111.2: 330-47.

Connors, Donald F., 1969. *Thomas Morton.* New York.

Cooper, Nicholas, and Jane Webster, eds., 1996. *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives.* Leicester.

de Angelis, Franco, 2009. "Colonies and Colonization" in Boys-Stones, Barbara and Vasunia 2009: 47-63.

Dewald, Carolyn and John Marincola, 2006. *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus.* Cambridge.

Dougherty, Carol, 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization: from City to Text in Archaic Greece.* Oxford.

    ---------. 2003. "The Aristonothos Krater: Competing Stories of Conflict and Collaboration" in Dougherty and Kurke 2003: 35-56.

Dougherty, Carol, and Leslie Kurke, eds., 1993. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Action.* Oxford.

---------. eds., 2003. *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture.* Cambridge.

Dover, Kenneth J., 1971. *Theocritus: Select Poems.* London.

Elsner, Jas, 2001. "Describing the Self in the language of the Other: Pseudo (?) Lucian at the temple of Hierapolis" in Goldhill 2001: 123-53.

Finley, Moses I., 1999 (reprint 1973). *The Ancient Economy.* Berkeley.

Gandhi, Leela, 1994. *Postcolonial Theory: a Critical Introduction.* New York.

Georgiadou, A., and D.H.J. Lamour, 1997. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel:* True Histories. Leiden.

Gilroy, Paul, 1993. *The Black Atlantic.* London.

Gleason, Maude, 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome.* Princeton.

Goff, Barbara, ed., 2005. *Classics and Colonization.* London.

Goff, Barbara, and Michael Simpson, 2007. *Crossroads in the Black Aegean: Oedipus, Antigone, and dramas of the African diaspora.* London.

Goldhill, Simon, ed., 2001. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire.* Cambridge.

Gopal, Priyamvada, 2004. "Reading subaltern history" in *The Cambridge companion to postcolonial literary studies,* ed. Neil Lazarus: 139-61. Cambridge.

Gourdriaan, Koen, 1992. "Ethnical strategies in Greco-Roman Egypt" in *Ethnicity in Roman Egypt* ed. Per Bilde: 74-99. Aarhus.

Gow, A.S.F., 1950. *Theocritus.* 2 vols. Cambridge.

Greenblatt, Stephen, 1988. *Shakespearean negotiations: the circulation of social energy in Renaissance England.* Berkeley.

Greenwood, Emily, 2006. *Thucydides and the Shaping of History.* London.

---------. 2009. "Postcolonialism" in Boys-Stones, Graziosi, and Vasunia 2009: 653-664.

---------. 2010. *Afro-Greeks: Dialogues between Anglophone Caribbean Literature and Classics in the Twentieth Century.* Oxford.

126

Gruen, Erich, 2011. *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity.* Princeton.

         ---------. ed., 2011b. *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean.* Los Angeles.

Issac, Benjamin, 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity.* Princeton.

         ---------. 2011. "Attitudes towards Provincial Intellectuals in the Roman Empire" in Gruen 2011b: 491-518.

Hall, Edith, 1989. *Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy.* Oxford.

Hall, Jonathan M., 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture.* Chicago.

Hartog, Francois, 1988 (trans. 1980). *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History.* Trans. Janet Lloyd. Berkeley.

         ---------. 2000. "The Invention of History: the Pre-History of a Concept from Homer to Herodotus." *History and Theory* 39.3: 384-395

Henderson, Ian, 2011. "The Second Sophistic and Non-Elite Speakers" in *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic in its times / Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque,* eds. Thomas Schmidt and Pascale Fleury: 23-35. Toronto.

Hornblower, Simon, 2006. "Herodotus' influence in antiquity" in Dewald and Marincola 2006: 306-318.

Hunter, Richard, 1999. *Theocritus: a Selection.* Cambridge.

Kemezis, Adam M., 2010. "Lucian, Fronto, and the Absence of Contemporary Historiography under the Antonines." *AJP* 131.2: 285-325.

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

Kurke, Leslie, 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: the Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece.* Princeton.

         ---------. 2007. "Greek Lyric Poetry" in *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece,* ed. H.A. Shapiro: _. Cambridge.

         ---------. 2011. *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose.* Princeton.

Lee, Benjamin Todd, Ellen Finkelpearl and Luca Graverini, eds., 2013 (forthcoming). *Apuleius and Africa.* London.

Lewis, Naphtali, 1986. *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt.* Oxford.

Lightfoot, Jane L., 2003. *Lucian: on the Syrian Goddess.* Oxford.

Lomas, Kathryn, ed., 2004. *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton.* Leiden.

Malkin, Irad, 1994. *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean.* Cambridge.

---------. 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity.* Berkeley.

---------. ed., 2001. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Identity.* Washington, D.C.

---------. 2004. "Postcolonial Concepts and Ancient Greek Colonization." *MLQ* 65.3: 341-64.

---------. 2011. *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean.* Oxford.

Mastronarde, Donald, ed., 2002. *Medea.* Cambridge.

McCoskey, Denise Eileen, 2012. *Race: Antiquity and its Legacy.* Oxford.

McInerney, Jeremy, 2001. "*Ethnos* and Ethnicity in Early Greece" in Malkin 2001.51-73.

McKechnie, Paul, 1989. *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century BC.* London.

Morgan, Catherine, 2003. *Early Greek States Beyond the Polis.* London.

Morris, Ian, 1996. "The Strong Principle of Equality and the Archaic Origins of Greek Democracy" in *Dêmokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern,* eds. Charles Hendrick and Josiah Ober: _. Princeton.

Morton, Thomas, 1972 [1637]. *New English Canaan, or New Canaan.* New York.

Mueller, Melissa, 2001. "The Language of Reciprocity in Euripides' *Medea.*" *AJP* 122.4: 471-504.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo, 1986. "The Celebratory Purpose of Herodotus: The Story of Arion in Histories 1.23-4." *Ramus* 15: 93-104.

---------. 2005. *Black Doves Speak: Herodotus and the Languages of Barbarians.* Washington, D.C.

---------. 2006. "An alternate world: Herodotus and Italy" in Dewald and
        Marincola: 257-273.

Nicholson, Nigel, 2011. "Pindar's Olympian 4: Psaumis and Camarina after the
        Deinomonids." *CP* 106.2: 93-114.

Nightingale, Andrea Wilson. 2001. "On Wandering and Wondering: *Theôria* in Greek
        Philosophy and Culture." *Arion* 3rd.s. 9.2: 23-58.

Osborne, Robin, 1998. "Early Greek Colonization? The nature of Greek settlement in
        the West" in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence* eds. Nick
        Fisher and Hans van Wees: 251-70. Swansea.

Quinn, Josephine Crawley, 2007. "Herms, *Kouroi,* and the Political Anatomy of
        Athens." *G&R* 54.1: 83-105.

Rabinowitz, Nancy Sorkin, 1993. *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women.*
        Ithaca.

Romeo, Ilaria, 2002. "The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece." *CP*
        97.1: 21-40.

Said, Edward, 1978. *Orientalism.* New York.

Said, Suzanne, 1994. "Lucien ethnographe" in *Lucien de Samosate; actes du colloque
        international de Lyon organisé au Centre d'études romaines et gallo-romaines,
        les 30 septembre-1er octobre 1994,* ed. Alain Billaut : 149-70. Paris.

        ---------. 1998 (trans. 1987). "Rural Society in the Greek Novel, or the Country
                Seen from the Town" in Swain 1998: 83-107.

        ---------.   2001. "The discourse of identity in Greek rhetoric from Isocrates to
                Aristides" in Malkin 2001: 275-300.

Skinner, Joseph, 2012. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: from Homer to Herodotus.*
        Oxford.

Snowden Jr., Frank, 1970. *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman
        Experience.* Cambridge, Mass.

        ---------. 1983. *Before Color Prejudice: the Ancient View of Blacks.* Cambridge,
                Mass.

Swain, Simon, 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the
        Greek World AD 50-250.* Oxford.

        ed., 1998. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel.* Oxford.

Thomas, Rosalind, 2001. "Ethnicity, Genealogy, and Hellenism in Herodotus" in Malkin 2001:213-233.

Vasunia, Phiroze, 2001. *The Gift of the Nile: Hellenizing Egypt from Aeschylus to Alexander.* Berkeley.

    ---------. 2003. "Hellenism and Empire: Reading Edward Said." *Parallax* 9.4: 88-97.

    ---------. 2005. "Review: C. Dougherty and L. Kurke; J. Siapkas." *JHS* 125: 178-200.

Vlassoupoulos, Kostas, 2007. *Unthinking the Greek polis: ancient Greek history beyond Eurocentrism.* Cambridge.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew, 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution.* Cambridge.

Webster, Jane, 1996. "Roman imperialism and the post imperial age" in Cooper and Webster 1996: 1-17.

    ---------. 1997. "Necessary comparisons: a post-colonial approach to religious syncretism in the Roman provinces." *World Archaeology* 28.3: 324-338.

    ---------. 2001. "Creolizing the Roman Provinces." *AJA* 105.2: 209-225.

White, Richard, 1991. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815.* Cambridge.

Whitmarsh, Tim, 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: the Politics of Imitation.* Oxford.

[Winslow, Edward], 1962 [1622]. *Mourt's Relation.* Ed. Dwight B. Heath. Bedford, Mass.

Woolf, Greg, 2011. *Tales of the Barbarians: Ethnography and the Roman Empire in the West.* London.