

Studies held in Amman, Jordan (September 2000), vol. 1, Oxford: 293–300

Wiesehöfer, J. 2002c, "Gebete für die 'Urahnen' oder: Wann und wie verschwanden Kyros und Dareios aus der Tradition Irans?", in Dabrowa, E. (ed.), *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient World* (Electrum, 6), Kraków: 111–117

Wiesehöfer, J. (in press), "Narseh, Diokletian, Manichäer und Christen", in Tubach, J. (ed.), *Christen im Sasanidenreich*, Halle

Wiesehöfer, J./Huyse, Ph. (in press) (eds.), *Ērān ud Anērān. Beiträge zu den Beziehungen zwischen Ost und West in sasanidischer Zeit* (OrOcc), Stuttgart

Yarshater, E. 1983, "Iranian National History", *The Cambridge History of Iran* III/1, Cambridge: 359–477

Unity and Identity: Shaping the Past in the Greek Mediterranean

ANDREW ERSKINE

On the southern edge of Latium was the small town of Circeii. Visitors here would often have been regaled with stories of the town's celebrated past, how this was where the sorceress Circe lived and cast her spells, how Odysseus had arrived and had a year-long affair with her, and how his companion Elpenor had died falling from a roof. The visitors would have been taken to see the temple of Circe. No doubt it was here that they would have been shown a bowl that had once belonged to Odysseus, carefully stored with other relics and temple possessions. But the tour of ancient Circeii would not have ended yet. Another site to pay respects to would have been the tomb of Elpenor and perhaps the visitors would have paused to admire the myrtle growing there.¹ Circeii offers a small but striking example of a phenomenon seen throughout the Mediterranean world. A non-Greek community incorporates into its own local history material that originated in stories told by Greeks about themselves and others.

Why was it that some peoples incorporated the 'historical' traditions of outsiders into their own past while others such as the Greeks themselves appear not to have done so? This question may seem to oversimplify the diverse and complex network of cultural interactions that took place throughout the Mediterranean world, not least by positing a sharper division between the various peoples than may have existed in practice. Nonetheless, it offers a useful starting point. One purpose was surely to bring about an accommodation with others, for instance the establishment of common ground between native populations and Greek traders or colonists, but the transmission of tradition would appear to be in one direction – from Greek to non-Greek.²

This paper begins with an examination of the ways in which non-Greeks from the periphery of the Greek world adopted Greek interpretations of themselves and their past. Section two focuses on Greeks and argues that the scattered nature of the Greek community played an important part in shaping the Greek sense of their own identity. The final section draws attention to an odd feature of Greek representation of their own past: they may not incorporate the traditions of others but they are prepared to include in their own genealogies mythical peoples of questionable Greekness, such as Trojans and Amazons.

¹ Strabo, 5.3.6, Theophr. *Hist. Pl.* 5.8.3, Pliny, *HN* 15.119, Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.48; for the death and burial of Elpenor, Hom. *Od.* 11.52–83, 12.8–15; Ampolo 1994, Braund 1994: 19–20, Wiseman 1995: 45–50.

² On gateway communities in central Italy, Glinister 2003.

1. Borrowing from Greeks

Circeii in central Italy opened this paper, a native Italian community which adopted a story told by Greeks about the aftermath of the Trojan War. What we see here is in many ways typical: a non-Greek people, a Greek myth, a story told, a hero, a tomb, a relic – it can be repeated in various forms throughout the Italian peninsula and elsewhere. In the south-east of Italy the Daunians introduced Diomedes into their local history; further north the Romans found a place for the Trojans; in Asia Minor cities of Cilicia traced their origins back to Argive heroes, and further afield on the Black Sea the Armenians, mindful of Jason's Colchian excursion, set up sanctuaries to honour him.³ In spite of the enormous cultural differences among these various peoples they all appear to have been borrowing from Greek traditions. This is a phenomenon, therefore, that deserves further investigation. In this section I will consider first the Italian peninsula and the problems of interpretation there before turning my attention to southern Asia Minor.

The Italian peninsula had long been a meeting place of native Italians and Greeks, especially on its southern and western coasts. Already by the late eighth century BC Greek colonies, such as Taras and Cumae, had been established in these regions and it would not be so long before the Cumaeans themselves founded Neapolis. The Adriatic coast had less contact with Greeks, at least at this early date; there is little evidence for Greek colonial activity along its shores and it took longer for Greek artefacts to make an impact there.

Homeric heroes and stories of the Trojan War, introduced by incoming Greeks, flourished in this westerly setting. Numerous cities and communities told of Greek heroes returning from Troy whose faulty navigation had somehow led them to Italy instead of Greece. Not only Odysseus but also Menelaos, Philoktetes, Epeios and Diomedes are reported to have come this way, along with Trojan refugees such as Aeneas. Nor were these merely stories. The wandering heroes had founded cities, there were cults of them, local landmarks were associated with them, they had left precious objects in local temples. The very landscape thus confirmed and affirmed their presence.⁴ It is the Greek settlement of Pithekoussai in the Bay of Naples that produces our earliest evidence for Homer's *Iliad*, an eighth-century BC cup that appears to allude to the one used by Nestor in the *Iliad*.⁵ Such a cup would have been part of a world in which the Homeric past was a living, tangible past. These stories would have begun as part of the local history of the Greek communities of South Italy but they came to be adopted by their native Italian neighbours.

In the region of Apulia known to the Greeks as Daunia various figures from Greek myth seem to have become part of local native tradition, the most prominent of whom is Diomedes. This Greek hero from the Trojan War had had a

³ For Daunia, Rome and Cilicia, see this section below; for Armenia, Strabo 1.2.39, cf. 1.3.2.

⁴ For a fuller account, Erskine 2001: 135–43.

⁵ Ridgway 1996, *Hom. Il.* 9.628–43.

relatively untroubled return passage to Argos but on finding that his marriage had suffered during his absence, he sought refuge in Italy at the kingdom of Daunus. There are a number of versions of his adventures, but what is of interest here is the way they seem to have become incorporated into local Daunian tradition. Several cities, including Arpi and Canusium, named Diomedes as their founder. There were also said to be relics from the age of heroes in the area; the temple of Athena at Luceria not only had votive offerings dedicated by Diomedes, it also had the Palladion stolen by Diomedes from Troy; it was possibly this temple that was reputed to possess weapons dedicated by Diomedes and his companions.⁶ Daunia's heroic past was not limited to Diomedes and his crew; it also boasted sanctuaries of the celebrated seer Kalchas and of Podaleiros, the son of Asklepios, in both cases accompanied by graves.⁷ This picture of the heroic past of Daunia amalgamates material from a number of sources, differing in style and date, notably Lycophron, Strabo and the Ps. Aristotelian *De mirabilibus auscultationibus*. Such traditions will have changed over time in ways that are now hard to detect. For instance, the story that it was here that the Trojan women burnt their boats may reflect the rise of Rome and the appearance of a Roman colony at Luceria in the late fourth century.⁸ Nonetheless, from the point of view of this paper what is important is the presence of stories of this type in Apulia.

These stories may have been present, but it is a further and rather more difficult problem to say how firmly entrenched they were in the native imagination. For not only are the myths Greek but the whole conceptualisation is Greek. The sources cited above, Lycophron's enigmatic poem, Strabo's *Geography*, and so on, are all Greek, interpreting the world of South Italy within a Greek cultural framework. We need to be able to supplement this outsider's perspective with some internal evidence and this is where difficulties arise. There are no Daunian literary texts – and even the choice of the term 'Daunian' reflects Greek categories, perhaps gathering together peoples who would see themselves as distinct.⁹ On the other hand, the reports of temples, tombs, and relics give a certain solidity to these Greek observations of the native population but we cannot ignore the fact that the claims are being made by outsiders, not by natives; they are *etic* rather than *emic*.

Material culture might offer some compensation; it at least demonstrates that there was increasing familiarity with Greek practices and commodities. Greek vases are to be found in the region from the late sixth century, including some Attic red-figure jugs in a form unique to Daunia, a circumstance which suggests that Athenians were producing these especially for the Daunian market. The

⁶ Founder: Lycophr. 592–632 with scholia, Strabo 6.3.9; relics: Strabo 6.1.14, 6.3.9, [Arist.], *Mir. Ausc.* 109; Bérard 1957: 368–76, Giannelli 1963: 53–9, Gantz 1993: 642–6, 699–700, Malkin 1998: 234–57, *RE* 5 sv Diomedes 820–3.

⁷ Strabo 6.3.9, Lycophr. 1047–66; Bérard 1957: 376–8.

⁸ [Arist.], *Mir. Ausc.* 109; stories of the Trojan women's arsonist activities were widespread, cf. Strabo 6.1.12, 6.1.14, bk. 7 frag. 25, Servius on *Aen.* 10.179. For Trojan traditions and Luceria, Torelli 1999: 95–7.

⁹ Strabo 6.3.1; Whitehouse and Wilkins 1985: 101–4, Herring 2000, Lomas 2000: 80–2.

presence of decorated Greek vases, and occasionally local imitations, could be used to argue an awareness of Greek myth.¹⁰ Greek influence can also be seen, for instance, in Daunian coinage and from the fourth century in its architecture.¹¹ Nonetheless, it should not be forgotten that the Daunians were culturally very distinct, as the strange limestone slabs known as Daunian stelae indicate.¹²

Scholars seeking to balance Greek accounts of Daunian mythology with indigenous ones are thus frustrated by the lack of internal evidence. This is a problem that affects not only Apulia; the example of Circeii is similar. Odysseus' arrival in central Italy is attested early on and the connection with Circeii is evident from the fourth century, but again it is Greek sources that we must rely upon.¹³ Here some comparative assistance may be gained from the most celebrated instance of an Italian state or people adopting a Greek interpretation of the past, the Romans.

Rome is often seen as special, simply because it is Rome, but it would be better to treat it as a particularly well-documented example, thus offering a case study in how such a myth might have been used. An important aspect of the Roman example is that there survives an outsider's and an insider's perspective, the etic and emic viewpoint so to speak. Rome could count among its ancestors the Trojan Aeneas who, after escaping the sack of his city, had fled west and finally reached Italy where his descendants would one day found Rome. This story is recorded in both Latin and Greek, by both Romans and Greeks. This allows the opportunity to explore the myth from both sides and see the role that the Trojan past played within Rome; this may enable us to gain a greater insight into the Daunian and Circeian examples where only the external viewpoint remains. Such is the voluminous modern scholarship on Rome's Trojan past that a certain ruthlessness is necessary if it is not to distort my whole essay.¹⁴

Scholars have often assumed that Trojan ancestry was an essential feature of Roman self-identity during the Republic. It was what Elias Bickerman has described as 'an article of the Roman national creed'.¹⁵ This conclusion, however, has been reached by merging the internal and external evidence. If these two are kept separate, it becomes apparent that it is only with the rise to power of the Iulii, a family claiming descent from Aeneas himself, that Troy becomes central to the Roman state. What is striking is the neglect of Rome's Trojan past in the

¹⁰ Jugs: Pugliese Carratelli 1996: 696 (no. 143); note in particular the work on Greek influence at Arpi, de Juliis 1992 and Mazzei 1995.

¹¹ Lomas 2000: 83, Head 1911: 43–4.

¹² Herring 2003.

¹³ The tradition that Odysseus' stay with Circe took place in central Italy dates to at least the 6th c. BC, cf. Hes. *Theog.* 1011–16; for date of lines, West 1966: 435–6; for 4th c. Athenian knowledge of Elpenor's tomb, Theophr. *Hist. Pl.* 5.8.3. On Odysseus in Italy, Phillips 1953, Malkin 1998: 178–209.

¹⁴ The argument of the next page or so draws heavily on Erskine 2001: 15–43.

¹⁵ Bickerman 1952: 67, cf. Alföldi 1965: 278–87, Momigliano 1984: 448, Gruen 1992: 31, Cornell 1995: 68, and most recently Torelli 1999: 167 on 6th c. Latium: 'This process of myth formation shows how deeply the Trojan legend was rooted in the collective psychology of Latium'.

surviving Latin literature of the Republic and the contrasting high profile of Romulus as founder.¹⁶ This is not to say that it was absent. There was a tradition for Vergil to build on in his *Aeneid*, there were noble families who at some point did claim Troy for themselves, and the Romans did have their own Trojan relic, the Palladium, protected in the temple of Vesta.¹⁷

Yet, in all the writings of Cicero, which covered so many genres, there is only one explicit reference to Rome's Trojan past and that is in a speech against Verres; the Segestans of Sicily, he said, felt a particular affinity with the Romans because of shared Trojan ancestry. This is revealing and can be observed elsewhere in our evidence, though more usually our Greek evidence. Troy features where there is interaction between Rome and an outsider. Consequently it features in diplomatic exchanges between Romans and Greeks. When the people of Lampsakos in the Troad approach the Romans in the early second century BC, they invoke shared ancestry, as the inscription honouring their ambassador testifies.¹⁸ At about the same time, the Roman commander T. Quinctius Flamininus makes a dedication of some shields and a gold wreath at Delphi, to which two verse inscriptions in Greek are added. One of these read: 'it is fitting, son of Leto, that this golden crown, which is given by the great commander of the descendants of Aeneas, should sit on your ambrosial locks. Apollo grant to the divine Titus the glory due to his prowess'.¹⁹ What role Flamininus had in creating this verse is unknown, but it is clear that Troy had a place in the context of exchange between Greeks and Romans, one that both sides were willing to acknowledge.

Rome's Trojan ancestry, then, is not so much a Roman myth as a shared myth. In the pre-Augustan period it is in the Roman interaction with Greeks and things Greek that the story of Aeneas and Rome mostly occurs. It was in this context that it was meaningful, because it provided the Romans and the Greeks with a common past that offered a basis for their relationship in the present. The process by which the Romans came to adopt the myth has been the subject of many hypotheses.²⁰ Did the story emerge out of the first contacts between Greeks and Romans? Or was it acquired indirectly by the Romans through their Etruscan or Latin neighbours? Whatever explanation is preferred, its development appears to have been a collaborative enterprise between Greeks and Romans.

This has important consequences for our understanding of the place of Greek myths in other local histories in Italy. When the Daunians or the people of Circeii take on a Greek mythological past they are doing so in conjunction with the Greeks; it allows both parties to talk to each other and to accept each other in a setting in which the Greek as coloniser was originally an intruder. But the Roman example suggests limits. Diomedes is important for the Daunians because he is

¹⁶ For Romulus, Erskine 2001: 33–6.

¹⁷ Heroic genealogies: Wiseman 1974, Erskine 2001: 21–2; Palladium: Cic. *Scaur.* 48, *Phil.* 11.24, Livy 26.27.14, Austin 1964: 83–5, Dubourdieu 1989: 460–7.

¹⁸ *I. Lamp.* 4 (*SIG*³ 591).

¹⁹ Plut. *Flam.* 12.

²⁰ The possibilities are nicely reviewed by Poucet 1983; for more recent work Cornell 1995: 60–8.

the intermediary between their world and the Greeks. He thus becomes part of the interaction but how much of a separate existence he has in Daunia itself without that Greek context must be questionable. Just as the dogs at the temple where Diomedes and his companions dedicated their arms are reported to have been dogs friendly to Greeks so Daunian Diomedes represents a Greek-friendly myth.²¹ Similarly, the tour of Circeii with its Odyssean landmarks would have been especially meaningful to the Greek visitor.

The appropriation of Greek mythology was not limited to Italy. Another region of the Mediterranean, southern Asia Minor, home of the Lycians, Pamphylians and Cilicians, offers a useful comparison. Here a fuller acceptance of a Greek mythical past can be observed but one which coincides with the erosion of features of local ethnic identity, the most significant of which is language.

The Lycians, like their Pamphylian and Cilician neighbours, were not a Greek people; they had their own language, funeral practices, and religious customs. Unlike their neighbours, however, the Lycians had long been an important component of the Greek mythological past. The Lycian heroes Sarpedon and Glaukos had fought on the Trojan side in the *Iliad*, while Bellerophon married the daughter of the Lycian king Iobates.²² How much of all this, if any, was accepted by the Lycians at the time of the *Iliad* is unknown, although it most likely reflects a Greek outside perspective. At some point, however, cults of all three heroes do develop in Lycia. It may coincide with increasing Greek contacts and absorption of Greek culture. By the fifth century, as the French excavations at the Letoon of Xanthos have demonstrated, the indigenous Mother God had come to be identified with Leto, mother of Apollo, an identification which would have allowed the Lycians to borrow more extensively from Greek myth. By the fourth century Greek was beginning to take over from the Lycian language in public documents. Lycia was now presenting a Greek face to the world, whatever language they were speaking in private.²³ I have no wish here to review the complex issue of Lycian-Greek relations; rather I want to look at the way in which the Greek mythical past gives the Lycians a place within the community of Greeks. To do this I will focus on one particular document.

In the late third century BC an embassy from the Greek mainland arrived in the Lycian city of Xanthos. It was from the small *polis* of Kytinion in Doris, a region that had some claim to greatness as the reputed *metropolis* of the Dorians.

²¹ For the dogs, [Arist.], *Mir. Ausc.* 109; the Diomedes story can also reflect the vicissitudes of Greek-Daunian relations, as in the version in which a treacherous Daunus kills Diomedes, Malkin 1998: 237–8, Gantz 1993: 699.

²² Sarpedon and Glaukos: Hom. *Il.* 2.876–7, 6.120–236, 16.431–8, 16.673; Bellerophon: Hom. *Il.* 6.152–306, Gantz 1993: 313–16. Bryce 1986: 12 notes that the Lycians were the most prominent of Troy's allies. In the 1st c. AD a papyrus letter of Sarpedon, preserved in a Lycian temple, is recorded by highly sceptical Pliny, *NH* 13.88.

²³ French excavations are published in *Fouilles de Xanthos*. Note especially Metzger 1979 (vol. 6) and Balland 1981 (vol. 7). On language, Bryce 1986: 42–54 with 214–15 more generally on the survival of Lycian culture, cf. also S. Hornblower's remarks in *OCD*³ sv 'Hellenism, Hellenization'. For the complex 'Greekness' of the peoples of Asia Minor, see Spawforth 2001 on the Lydians. For a fuller examination of Lycia and its heroes, Gehrke, this volume.

The embassy was travelling to a number of cities, appealing for financial aid to restore the damaged walls of its own city. Nothing would be known of this embassy were it not for an inscription discovered in 1965 during the excavations of the Letoon of Xanthos, the federal sanctuary of the Lycians. This inscription consists of four documents, a decree of the Xanthians reporting the appeal of the ambassadors and giving the city's response, a decree of the Aitolians, who were sponsoring the embassy, a letter from the Aitolian magistrates, and a letter from the Kytinians themselves.²⁴ These are two cities with little in common, and on opposite sides of the Aegean Sea. Yet, when the ambassadors from Kytinion address the Xanthians, they seek out common ground and there is common ground available to them: the two peoples are kin, bound by ties of *syngeneia* that stretch back to the mythical past. The Kytinians have researched their mission thoroughly and lay before the Xanthian assembly a series of gods and heroes with interweaving genealogies, most of which are reported in the Xanthian decree.²⁵ As with all Lycian public documents of the period the whole exchange takes place in Greek. By this point Lycians might appear to us almost indistinguishable from Greeks. But their decision to record the embassy's arguments and to inscribe the whole dossier suggests that the Lycians still seek confirmation of their membership of the Greek community. Significantly, in all the many inscriptions that refer to *syngeneia* this is the only one that gives the genealogical arguments of the ambassadors in any detail.²⁶ Furthermore, the Xanthians may have seen no conflict between being Lycian, speaking Greek and being accepted as part of the wider Greek world. For them being Greek is something cultural. Here in Xanthos the Greek mythical past acts as a mediator between two peoples, bringing them together, though not bringing them so close that the Xanthians are willing to make a substantial donation to the Kytinians' rebuilding fund.

Further east, the Pamphylians and Cilicians did not have the same mythical reserves to draw upon, though they had not been ignored by the Greeks. They are found associated with various seers, Mopsos, Kalchas again, and most importantly the Argive Amphilochos, whose death in Cilician Soloi is already reported in a fragment of Hesiod. In Herodotus, Amphilochos, Kalchas and their followers appear as the ancestors of the Pamphylians, and Amphilochos goes on to be the founder of the city of Poseideion on the eastern boundary of Cilicia.²⁷ Nothing is known about the Pamphylian and Cilician response to these stories until the arrival of Alexander the Great, another descendant of Argos. A flurry of civic competition ensues. Alexander sacrifices to Amphilochos at Mallos and gives the city tax-breaks; the Solians, who indignantly think they have a better right to Amphilochos but had made the mistake of supporting the Persians, send an embassy to Argos to get confirmation of their claim to Amphilochos and Argive descent. Aspendos in Pamphylia too seems to have made a bid; an Argive decree of the late fourth century BC gives citizen rights to the people of Aspendos, while

²⁴ Text, with French translation and commentary, is to be found in Bousquet 1988.

²⁵ For *syngeneia* in diplomacy, Erskine 2002.

²⁶ For a collection of such texts, Curty 1995.

²⁷ Hesiod fr. 279 M-W; Proclus in Davies 1988: 67, Hdt. 3.91, 7.91, cf. Strabo 14.4.3.

also noting that similar rights had already been granted to the people of Soloi on grounds of kinship.²⁸ In the new Hellenistic world that followed Alexander cities such as these would come to be increasingly Greek in culture and appearance and the tales of Greek myth would take on a more central role in their civic life.

In Asia Minor then the stories of Greek myth again play their part in the interaction between two peoples, one of them Greek, just as they had in Italy, but a difference can be observed. The higher degree of Greek cultural influence in the area seems to lead to a greater willingness to adopt as their own the stories told about them by Greek outsiders. Acceptance of Greek interpretation becomes less a means of interacting with Greeks than a means of joining them.

2. Community and Identity among Greeks

Non-Greeks, then, are in some sense willing to adopt a Greek past as their own, yet this is not something that works in reverse. Greeks do not borrow their past from their neighbours. Peoples, such as Daunians or Cilicians, are to be found acknowledging or even embracing an ancestry which has its roots in Greek myth, but Greeks themselves, however much they may wish to establish some form of common ground with others, will not go so far as to admit descent from non-Greek peoples or their heroes. No Greek, for instance, claims descent from Romulus.

What other peoples may have said about the Greeks is not easy to know but they were not silent. The Jews at least are known to have had something to say. They drew up an elaborate genealogical account to explain the origins of the peoples of the world. The Table of Nations first appears in *Genesis* 10 and then with variations throughout later Jewish literature. In this Judeocentric version of world history the Greeks descended from Javan, son of Japheth, son of Noah.²⁹ By the time that Josephus is writing Jewish history in Greek the identification of the descendants of Javan with the Greeks is unambiguous.³⁰ Yet, with the exception of Christian literature, there is no indication that Greeks paid any attention to this at all, even though the story of the descendants of Noah does appear to have been known to others outside the Jewish community.³¹ Jewish literature does preserve the controversial claim in a letter, attributed to the Spartans, that the Spartans were somehow kin to the Jews through Abraham, but this story, unknown in Greek literature, occurs only in Jewish sources. Whether authentic or not, it would be a fair reflection of Greek diplomatic practice.³² Whatever the

²⁸ On Argive ancestry in Pamphylia and Cilicia, Scheer 2003: 226–31, for the decree, Stroud 1984, discussed in Scheer 1993: 220–2.

²⁹ For the Table of Nations, *Genesis* 10, *Jubilees* 8–9, Joseph. *AJ* 1.120–47; in rabbinic literature, Krauss 1895; on the development of tradition from *Genesis*, Scott 2002; on Greeks as descendants of Javan, Momigliano 1975: 78–9, Bickerman 1988: 20.

³⁰ Joseph. *AJ* 1.124.

³¹ At least to judge by Josephus' citation of Berossus, *Ap.* 1.130–31, Scott 2002: 42–3, 77; in the same text Josephus complains of Greek ignorance of Jewish history, *Ap.* 1.3, 1.217.

³² Joseph. *AJ* 12.225–7, 13.167, I Macc. 12, II Macc. 5.6–10; both I Macc. 12 and Joseph. *AJ*

Jews may have said about the Greeks there is little evidence that Greeks took any notice of it.³³

The readiness of some peoples to adopt the Greek view of their past and the contrasting reluctance of Greeks to reciprocate requires some explanation. One approach would be to argue that it is an illusion, the consequence of the Greek character of the evidence and of our own rather pro-Greek outlook. In other words the movement of myth and tradition does work in both directions but we are unable to see it. It would be preferable, however, to accept what the evidence tells us unless there is good reason to believe otherwise. This section will suggest that the phenomenon, although at first sight odd, makes sense. It will also be argued that there is no need to invoke Greek cultural and scientific superiority by way of explanation, as was done for instance by Elias Bickerman in his influential 'Origines Gentium' paper of 1952. Here Bickerman contended that the vigorously Hellenocentric Greeks were the only people to create a pre-history of mankind and as a result it was their image of national origins that predominated. Positions of this kind place emphasis on a very widespread conception of the Greeks as a people who considered themselves to be superior to others.³⁴ While there may be truth in this, it can easily be overstated and when too frequently used begins to lack explanatory force.

There undoubtedly is a Hellenocentric mentality. It is evident not only in the practice of attributing Greek origins to other peoples but also in the tendency to turn other peoples' gods and heroes into their own. Thus faced with the Great Mother in Lycia they see Leto; Ammon in Egypt becomes Zeus; Melqart in Tyre transforms into Herakles.³⁵ But there are also limits. It is possible, for instance, to carry out a careful examination of Herodotus, highlighting the way his interpretation reflects his Greek background, but the broader picture should not be ignored – he did write at great length about Persians, Egyptians, Scythians, and their respective histories. Furthermore Greek historians may give Aeneas precedence over Romulus and no Greek city may number Romulus among its ancestors, but pro-Roman Greek communities could choose to celebrate Romulus and Remus as a way of showing their good faith to Rome. Thus the twins have some part in a festival on Chios and are found decorating a temple in honour of an Attalid mother in Asia Minor.³⁶

12 quote the letter of the Spartan king Arius in different forms. I Macc. 12 seems to treat Abraham as a common ancestor, whereas the fuller text of Josephus refers to *oikeiotes* with Abraham, something rather looser, Gruen 1998: 264, Jones 1999: 75–6. The bibliography is extensive, see in particular, Gruen 1996, Cardauns 1967.

³³ Although there would have been contact, Jews make almost no impact on pre-Hellenistic Greek literature, Momigliano 1975: 75–96, who charts the relationship.

³⁴ Bickerman 1952, cf. Malkin 1998: 170–73. For further discussion of Bickerman's thesis, J. Hall, this volume. The idea of non-Greeks eagerly awaiting what superior Greeks had to offer is criticized by J. Hall 2002: 104–111.

³⁵ Lycian Great Mother: see p. 126 above; Ammon: Lloyd 1976: 195–8; Melqart: Malkin, this volume; in general, Rudhardt 1992.

³⁶ Chios: Derow and Forrest 1982: 85–6 on lines 25–8; temple: *Anth. Pal.* 3.1–19, Kuttner 1995: 168.

Culturally chauvinistic as the Greeks may appear, they were not immune to the attractions of other cultures.³⁷ Martin West's extraordinary book, *The East Face of Helicon*, has recently detailed numerous ways in which the East influenced Greek poetry but that influence is over form and narrative. The characters that inhabit it are Greek. Gilgamesh himself, for instance, does not become a part of the *Iliad*, but aspects of his story are there in Achilles, for example the interceding divine mother and the close friend who dies.³⁸ In a different context Margaret Miller has shown that for all its anti-barbarian, anti-Persian rhetoric fifth-century Athens was a city surprisingly receptive to Persian culture. Indeed many Athenians would have had 'some personal experience of the peoples of the Persian empire'.³⁹ Foreign influence there undoubtedly was, but in the area of historical and mythical traditions there is very little sign that the Greek view of the past took account of what their non-Greek neighbours thought and said.⁴⁰ This is not to say that Greeks might not re-import variations of their own myths from native peoples.

Bickerman's analysis in 'Origines Gentium' focused on historiography: the numerous Greek writers, historians, and mythographers who explored the origins of nations, Greek and non-Greek. These created a world in which the Greeks were at the centre; and as that world expanded, so more and more peoples became attached. I want to look beyond historiography and see the phenomenon as having its roots in the very character of Greek interaction with other Greeks, and then by extension with non-Greeks. Historiography is produced and read by intellectuals, but these intellectuals are drawing on a intricate web of myth and local tradition.⁴¹ Their version is an attempt to bring order to thousands of separate but interconnected stories. Just as the stories interconnect, so too do the cities that tell those stories.

Greek cities possessed an elaborate mythological past, stories of the birth of gods, of cities such as Argos and Troy, of heroes such as Herakles, Theseus, and Menelaos. There are two aspects of Greek myth and its stories that need to be stressed here, first that they are as much part of the present as the past, and secondly that they have the capacity to connect cities with each other. It is through these two aspects that the intricate web mentioned above can develop.

First, there was a continuum between past and present, myth and history. The world of myth did not have some separate existence. The gods were the same ones who were the objects of cult throughout the Greek world and the stories took place in identifiable locations. Each city had its own local version which tended to highlight its own place in the wider panorama of Greek myth. It would remember the part played by heroes in its past, perhaps as founders, perhaps as visitors. Local people would point out a tomb or some other landmark associated with the hero, or a temple in which the hero had made a dedication. What we

consider to be the mythical past flowed into historical times. The Lindos Chronicle, inscribed in 99 BC, records dedications in the temple of Athena at Lindos on Rhodes. Of the forty-two dedications, the first fourteen are by mythical figures: Kadmos, Minos, Herakles, Menelaos, Teukros and so on.⁴² A similar sense of continuity is apparent on the Parian Marble, a stone stele inscribed with a lengthy list of dated events beginning in 1581 BC with the legendary Kekrops, king of Athens, and ending in the mid-third century BC.⁴³ The heroes of myth, therefore, are a very real part of a city's past and present.

Secondly, as all Greek cities shared in this broad expanse of Greek mythological stories, so they were able to locate themselves in a common Greek past. Local and Greek identity overlap. When Thurian guides showed a visitor from the Greek mainland their city's valued possession, the arrows of Philoktetes, the visitor may not have known the local stories attached to these arrows or Philoktetes' importance in the area, but he will have known who Philoktetes was.⁴⁴ Spartans could show the grave of Orestes and tell how the bones had been retrieved from Tegea; the Orestes relics in Sikyon, on the other hand, were limited to the pebble Athena cast in his favour, but they would no doubt display the prize pebble to a visiting Spartan embassy.⁴⁵ Myth could assert a city's distinctiveness while at the same time linking it to other Greek cities.

These stories, then, are not quaint folktales but an essential element of the cities that tell them; they are part of what it is to be Greek. The importance of this mythical past for the Greeks is, to some extent, a consequence of their disparate, scattered nature. As a colonising people they are found settled throughout the Mediterranean. Cities may tend to prioritise local civic identity but a crucial element of that identity is their membership of the wider Greek community, even if they rarely speak of their Greekness. Since the Greeks are scattered and not concentrated in a single region, they will approach the past in a different way from a people whose identity can be defined within a fairly limited geographical area. For them the past is a way of uniting as Greeks, whether through the assurance which shared knowledge of that past brings or more directly because of ties of kinship (*syngeneia*), ties that could be real or based on heroic genealogies. A people settled within a particular region, on the other hand, has more sources of group identity and less reason to assert it.⁴⁶

The geographically dispersed nature of Greek communities thus makes the mythical past a fundamental element of Greek identity, and one that should not be underestimated. Consequently, when it comes to the explicit importation of the historical or mythical traditions of other peoples into their local history, Greeks

³⁷ For cultural chauvinism, Cartledge 1993, esp. 36–62 and E. Hall 1989.

³⁸ West 1997.

³⁹ Miller 1997 with quotation from p. 3.

⁴⁰ Cf. Dench 1995: 44 on Herakles and the naming of Italia.

⁴¹ Cf. Erskine 2001: 148–51.

⁴² *FGrH* 532, Higbie 2003.

⁴³ Jacoby 1904.

⁴⁴ Just. *Epit.* 20.1.16.

⁴⁵ Bones: Hdt. 1.67–8, Paus. 3.3.6; pebble: Ampelius, *Liber memorialis* 8.5, Scheer 1996.

⁴⁶ Reasons for asserting group identity are many and various; important are contact and competition with others, both elements that will affect the scattered Greeks, cf. Hodder 1979 on African anthropology; for varying views on the development of the idea of Greekness, note in particular E. Hall 1989: 1–13, the essays in Malkin 2001, and J. Hall 2002.

will hold back. To do otherwise would be to give up something of what it is to be Greek, whereas to attribute descent from figures of Greek myth to non-Greek peoples does nothing to undermine the mythological core. Moreover, because in their interaction with each other Greeks look for common ground and they look for it in the past, such attributions could be viewed as an extension of what Greeks do among themselves. This would help to explain why a similar dynamic worked at different, and often distant, parts of the Greek periphery. Their non-Greek neighbours, whether they are Daunians, Cilicians, or Armenians, can adopt this Greek perception of themselves not because they lack a past or because they feel culturally inferior but because to do so does not threaten their sense of identity.

3. Trojans and Amazons

Greeks may have been reluctant to borrow their past from their neighbours but their own traditions, indeed sometimes their own genealogies, did include mythical, 'alien' peoples, such as Trojans and Amazons. I say 'alien' because there is a certain ethnic flexibility to them. At various times, especially in fifth-century Athens, Trojans and Amazons become the archetypal barbarians, proto-Persians, but mostly they are figures of the heroic past, and as such they were simply part of a shared Greek cultural heritage.

There were other heroes too who, while firmly tied into the familiar genealogies of Greek myth, were reputed to have travelled to Greece from other lands, notably Kadmos, who came out of Phoenicia, and Pelops, who was said by some to have come from Phrygia. Kadmos brought the alphabet and founded Thebes, while Pelops gave his name to the Peloponnese.⁴⁷ Just as happened in the case of the Trojans and Amazons, Kadmos and Pelops could find themselves orientalised in the art and literature of fifth century Athens.⁴⁸ Nonetheless, rather than being borrowed from their non-Greek neighbours, figures such as these reflect the extension of Greek myth to neighbouring lands in the Greek imagination, if not in reality.

A fair number of Greek cities laid claim to some element of a Trojan past, with a natural concentration in the Troad. Here Ilion made the most of its name, but other cities such as nearby Skepsis were in vigorous competition – and all this was before the Romans had taken any interest in the region.⁴⁹ But even elsewhere one could find the tombs of famous Trojans: Anchises and Aeneas were the

⁴⁷ Kadmos: Hdt. 5.57–61, Strabo 7.7.1; Pelops: Thuc. 1.9, Strabo 7.7.1, Paus. 2.22.3. Strabo 7.7.1 appears under Hekataios of Miletos in Jacoby (*FrGH* 1 F119), but it must be questionable whether anything but the first sentence is from Hekataios. For full genealogical data on Kadmos and Pelops, Gantz 1993: 467–73 with table 8 and 531–56 with table 17.

⁴⁸ Artistic representations are fully discussed by Miller, this volume, literary images by E. Hall 1992; both also examine the comparable case of the 'Egyptian' Danaos. For the self-satisfaction of the autochthonous Athenians, see Plato *Menex.* 245c–d.

⁴⁹ Erskine 2001: 98–112.

subject of multiple burial, and Hector was to be found both in the Troad and at Thebes.⁵⁰ The people of Tenea in the Peloponnese believed that they were descended from Trojan prisoners of war brought back by Agamemnon.⁵¹ At Aineia in the northern Aegean Aeneas was the eponymous hero and founder, celebrated with a festival, a revered position he had held since at least the sixth century BC.⁵² There were even Greeks with Trojan names: Aineias, Anchises, Antenor, and Polydamas are all attested in fifth century Athens.⁵³ All this made the Trojan past part of the Greek present. Rather than identifying with one side in the Trojan War and rejecting the other as alien, Greek cities can be found looking to both sides. It was one of the great wars of the heroic age, and many saw it not as a war between Greeks and barbarians but between heroes. Greek preference may usually have been for the Achaeans rather than the Trojans, but the heroic past and heroic ancestry were always to be valued.

More surprising perhaps is the treatment of the Amazons, those women who were everything a Greek woman should not be. These were celebrated especially in Asia Minor, where several cities numbered them among their founders, cities such as Ephesos, Priene, and Smyrna, and off the coast of Asia Minor, Mytilene on Lesbos.⁵⁴ Ephesos in particular had a large body of Amazonian traditions. Pindar is reported to have attributed the foundation of the sanctuary of Artemis there to the Amazons. They were also said to have instituted here an annual dance performed each year by young girls wielding weapons and shields.⁵⁵ On the mainland there were tombs of Amazons to be found from Megara to as far north as Thessaly; these were often linked to their failed invasion of Attica, but there were other mythical conflicts with Amazons which may have been adduced by way of explanation. At Athens there were sacrifices to the Amazons in the prelude to the Thesea, which honoured Theseus, the heroic saviour of Athens against the invading Amazon forces.⁵⁶ The mainland myths with their stress on conflict are rather more ambivalent than the positive tone of the Asiatic foundation stories, but both reflect the incorporation of the Amazon women into the local mythological narrative. The essentially heroic character of the Amazons is apparent in one of the few encounters between the Amazons and a historical figure. The meeting between Alexander and the Amazon queen becomes part of the elevation of Alexander to heroic mythologised status.⁵⁷

⁵⁰ Aeneas: D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 1.54, Pfister 1909: 137–46; Anchises: Pfister 1909: 158 n. 582, 1912: 629; Hector: Lycophr. 1189–213 with scholia on 1194, 1204, 1208, Paus. 9.18.5, Strabo 13.1.29, Erskine 2001: 109, 124–5.

⁵¹ Paus. 2.5.4, Strabo 8.6.22, Erskine 2001: 118–19.

⁵² D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 1.49.4, Livy 40.4, Erskine 2001: 93–7; for representations of Aeneas on 6th c. BC coins, Head 1911: 214, Fuchs 1973: 617–18.

⁵³ Erskine 2001: 77–9.

⁵⁴ Strabo 11.5.4, Diod. 3.55.6.

⁵⁵ Paus. 7.2.7 cites but does not agree with Pindar (F174 Snell-Maehler); Call. *Hymn* 3.238–47 for dance.

⁵⁶ Paus. 1.2.1, 1.41.7, Plut. *Thes.* 27, Pfister 1909: 127, Boardman 2002: 64–5.

⁵⁷ Curt. 6.5.24–32, Diod. 17.77.1–3, Just. *Epit.* 12.3.5–7 (cf. 2.4.33, 42.3.7); for scepticism, Plut. *Alex.* 46, Arr. *Anab.* 7.13; all reviewed in Baynham 2001.

Trojans and Amazons thus play a part in the local traditions of the Greek world and this adds an interesting dimension to the question that began this paper: why was it that some peoples incorporated the 'historical' traditions of outsiders into their own past while others such as the Greeks themselves do not seem to have done so? Here we find that where Greeks do celebrate or trace their origins back to those whose ethnicity might appear ambiguous, they are people who are found only in Greek myth; they are not borrowed from anyone, so they are as Greek as they are not Greek. In this way they only serve to highlight the absence of figures borrowed from other cultures. Whether they are Amazons and Trojans or Kadmos and Pelops, they are safe because they are already part of the common mythology. They can even be used to establish common ground between Greeks and others as the Trojans are in Sicily and Latium.

Greeks are often considered to be a very exclusive people – they divided mankind up into Greeks and barbarians, for instance – but this is to adopt too narrow a perspective. Their attitude to myth suggests something rather different. Far from excluding, they used myth to include others. They were willing to share their own heritage and to bring cities like Lycian Xanthos within the community of Greeks. What they were not willing to do, however, was to embrace the past of other peoples, because that would run counter to the very idea of what it was to be Greek.⁵⁸

Bibliography

- Alföldi, A. 1965. *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor.
- Ampolo, C. 1994. 'La ricezione dei miti greci nel Lazio: l'esempio di Elpenore e Ulisse al Circeo', *Parola del Passato* 49: 268–79.
- Austin, R. G. 1964. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*. Oxford.
- Balland, A. 1981. *Fouilles de Xanthos*, vol 7: *Inscriptions d'époque impériale du Létôon*. Paris.
- Baynham, E. 2001. 'Alexander and the Amazons', *CQ* 51: 115–26.
- Bérard, J. 1957. *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité. L'histoire et la légende*. 2nd ed. Paris.
- Bickerman, E. J. 1952. 'Origines Gentium', *CP* 47: 65–81.
- Bickerman, E. J. 1988. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Boardman, J. 2002. *The Archaeology of Nostalgia: How Greeks re-created their mythical past*. London.
- Bousquet, J. 1988. 'La stèle des Kyténiens au Létôon de Xanthos', *REG* 101: 12–53.
- Braund, D. 1994. *Georgia in Antiquity: a History of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia 550 BC–AD 562*. Oxford.
- Bryce, T. 1986. *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*. Vol. 1 of *The Lycians*. Copenhagen.
- Cardauns, B. 1967. 'Juden und Spartaner', *Hermes* 95: 317–24.
- Cartledge, P. 1993. *The Greeks: a Portrait of Self and Others*. Oxford.
- Cornell, T. J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000–264 BC)*. London.

⁵⁸ This paper benefited greatly from the discussions at Schloss Elmau but I also owe particular thanks to my colleague Edward Herring for his help on the South Italian material.

- Curty, O. 1995. *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques*. Geneva.
- Davies, M. 1988. *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen.
- De Juliis, E. M. 1992. *La tomba del vaso dei Niobidi di Arpi*. 1992.
- Dench, E. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples from the Central Apennines*. Oxford.
- Derow, P. S. and Forrest, W. G. 1982. 'An Inscription from Chios', *BSA* 77: 79–92.
- Dubourdieu, A. 1989. *Les origines et le développement du culte des Pénates à Rome*. Rome.
- Erskine, A. 2001. *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford.
- Erskine, A. 2002. 'O Brother where art thou? Tales of kinship and diplomacy', in D. Ogden, *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives*. London. 97–115.
- Fuchs, W. 1973. 'Die Bildgeschichte der Flucht des Aeneas', *ANRW* I.4: 615–32.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: a Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore.
- Giannelli, G. 1963. *Culti e Miti della Magna Grecia*. Florence.
- Glinister, F. 2003. 'Gifts of the Gods: Sanctuary and Society in Archaic Tyrrhenian Italy', in E. Herring and J. B. Wilkins (eds), *Inhabiting Symbols: symbol and image in the ancient Mediterranean*. London. 137–47.
- Gruen, E. S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca.
- Gruen, E. S. 1996. 'The Purported Jewish-Spartan Affiliation', in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris (eds), *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C., in honor of E. Badian*. Norman, Oklahoma. 254–69.
- Gruen, E. S. 1998. *Heritage and Hellenism: the reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley.
- Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Hall, E. 1992. 'When is a Myth Not a Myth? Bernal's "Ancient Model"', *Arethusa* 25: 181–201, reprinted in M. Lefkowitz and G.M. Rogers, *Black Athena Revisited* (Chapel Hill 1996), 333–48, and Harrison 2002: 133–52.
- Hall, J. 2002. *Hellenicity: between ethnicity and culture*. Chicago.
- Harrison, T. (ed.), 2002. *Greeks and Barbarians*. Edinburgh.
- Head, B. 1911. *Historia Numorum*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Herring, E. 2000. "'To see Ourselves as others see us!': the construction of native identities in southern Italy", in E. Herring and K. Lomas (eds), *The Emergences of State Identities in Italy in the first millennium BC*. London. 45–77.
- Herring, E. 2003. 'Body art and the Daunian stelae', in E. Herring and J. B. Wilkins (eds), *Inhabiting Symbols: symbol and image in the ancient Mediterranean*. London. 121–36.
- Higbie, C. 2003. *The Lindian chronicle and the Greek creation of their past*. Oxford.
- Hodder, I. 1979. 'Economic and Social Stress and Material Cultural Patterning', *American Antiquity* 44: 446–54.
- Jacoby, F. 1904. *Das Marmor Parium*. Berlin.
- Jones, C. P. 1999. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Krauss, S. 1895. 'Die biblische Völkertafel im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum', *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 39: 1–11, 49–63.
- Kuttner, A. 1995. 'Republican Rome takes a look at Pergamon', *HSCP* 97: 157–78.
- Lloyd, A. B. 1976. *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 1–98*. Leiden.
- Lomas, K. 2000. 'Cities, states and ethnic identity in southeast Italy', in E. Herring and K. Lomas (eds), *The Emergences of State Identities in Italy in the first millennium BC*. London. 79–90.
- Malkin, I. 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley.
- Malkin, I. (ed.). 2001. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Mazzei, M. 1995. *Arpi: L'ipogeo della Medusa e la necropoli*. Bari.
- Metzger, H. et al. 1979. *Fouilles de Xanthos*, vol 6: *La Stèle trilingue du Létôon*. Paris.
- Miller, M. C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the fifth century BC: a study in cultural receptivity*. Cambridge.

- Momigliano, A. 1975. *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge.
- Momigliano, A. 1984. 'How to reconcile Greeks and Trojans.' In *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Rome. 437–62.
- Pfister, F. 1909 (vol. 1), 1912 (vol. 2). *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*. Gießen.
- Phillips, E. D. 1953. 'Odysseus in Italy.' *JHS* 73: 53–67.
- Poucet, J. 1983. 'Énée et Lavinium.' *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 61: 144–59.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1996. *The Western Greeks: Classical Civilization in the Western Mediterranean*. London.
- Ridgway, D. 1996. 'Nestor's Cup and the Etruscans.' *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 15: 325–44.
- Rudhardt, J. 1992. 'Les attitudes des Grecs à l'égard des religions étrangères', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 209: 219–338 (English translation in Harrison 2002: 172–85).
- Scheer, T. S. 1993. *Mythische Vorväter zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte*. Munich.
- Scheer, T. S. 1996. 'Ein Museum griechischer "Frühgeschichte" im Apollontempel von Sikyon.' *Klio* 78: 353–73.
- Scheer, T. S. 2003. 'The Past in a Hellenistic Present: Myth and Local Tradition', in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford. 216–31.
- Scott, J. M. 2002. *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: the Book of Jubilees*. Cambridge.
- Spawforth, A. 2001. 'Shades of Greekness: A Lydian Case Study', in I. Malkin, *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Washington, D.C. 375–400.
- Stroud, R. S. 1984. 'An Argive Decree from Nemea concerning Aspendos', *Hesperia* 53: 193–216.
- Torelli, M. 1999. *Tota Italia: Essays in the Cultural Formation of Roman Italy*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.
- Whitehouse, R. and Wilkins, J. 1985. 'Magna Graecia before the Greeks: towards a reconciliation of the evidence.' In C. Malone and S. Stoddart (eds), *Papers in Italian Archaeology IV Part iii: Patterns in Protohistory*, BAR International series 245. Oxford. 89–109.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1974. 'Legendary Genealogies in Late Republican Rome.' *Greece and Rome* 21: 153–64.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1995. *Remus: a Roman Myth*. Cambridge.

“Do you look like you belong here?”: Asianism at Pergamon and the Makedonian Diaspora¹

ANN KUTTNER

Art history observes that Pergamon's "Great Altar" was a quintessential achievement of Hellenistic Greek art, while it also resembled dynastic heroa of non-Greek Anatolia, like the Mausoleion of Karian Halikarnassos, and the Nereid Monument at Lykian Xanthos. Why this "Asianism" by a famously Hellenizing dynasty?² That query engendered this prolegomenon to the study of how Attalid environments nourished Asianizing topophilia³. Scholars admirably map how the Attalids and Seleukids incorporated indigenous fiscal, judicial, military and administrative institutions into their resilient diaspora empires. But art is also socio-politics. Working across verbal language barriers, visual language matters especially to a multi-lingual, multi-ethnic world, like Hellenistic Anatolia. This essay takes the shapes of stone as seriously for Attalid ideology as Ma (2000) did

¹ I would like to thank all my fellow speakers at Schloss Elmau, for encouraging this project in cross-cultural analysis and gently critiquing it on mountain paths, at dinner tables, and in seminar rooms. Especially, my thanks go to Meg Miller, Dan Selden, and Josef Wiesehofer, for their example and friendship. As in so many other enterprises, my affectionate gratitude is owed to Erich Gruen, and to Brian Rose, for their warm support and bracing criticisms. I dedicate this essay to Carl Nylander, who first taught me to love archaeological scholarship, in the study of the Achaemenid world.

² The imitative sequence is Xanthos > Mausoleion; both > Alexander's Pyre for Hephaistion, and the Tomb of Lysimachos at Belevi (Ephesos); and Xanthos, Halikarnassos, Belevi > Great Altar. The political statement made by the Attalid Altar's resemblance to the tomb of Lysimachos, who put the first dynast in power and was then betrayed by him, needs thought. For Hellenistic tombs in Asia Minor and their precedents, Fedak 1990. Bibliography on the Altar, see n. 83. This essay is selectively annotated. I do not mean to slight contributions that are masked by the capstone bibliographic citations, nor seem overly to criticize those made to stand in here for general trends because of their deservedly powerful impact on the field. On anything to do with Pergamon, Hansen 1947 (repr. 1971) has yet to be replaced; she should be understood as authoritative source for almost all data in this essay. I hope to build on it in a forthcoming book about Rome and Attalid Pergamon, for University of California Press.

³ Tuan 1974, 1–4, defines his terms: topophilia is "the affective bond between people and place or setting" (4), operating by perception, the sensory response to external stimuli which selects and erases according to values, "providing certain satisfactions that are rooted in culture", that is, in attitudes. Attitudes are defined as a cultural stance within a world view that is always a partly personal, largely social, system of belief. I stress Tuan's theorem, "Attitude .. has greater stability than perception and is formed of a long series of perceptions, that is, of experience. .. Attitudes imply experience and a certain firmness of interest and value." Looking at the social domain of perception, my subject is acculturation, the means by which the designed environment inculcates attitudes and ways of seeing; in those who perforce experience it, sophisticated memory is not necessary in order to be imprinted.

ORIENS ET OCCIDENS

Studien zu antiken Kulturkontakten
und ihrem Nachleben

Herausgegeben von
Josef Wiesehöfer

in Zusammenarbeit mit Pierre Briant,
Amélie Kuhrt, Fergus Millar und
Robert Rollinger

Band 8



Erich S. Gruen (ed.)

Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity



Franz Steiner Verlag 2005

Carpen
DE
2.5
C85
2005

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek
Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte
bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über
<<http://dnb.ddb.de>> abrufbar.

ISBN 3-515-08735-4



ISO 9706

Jede Verwertung des Werkes außerhalb der Grenzen
des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist unzulässig und strafbar.
Dies gilt insbesondere für Übersetzung, Nachdruck,
Mikroverfilmung oder vergleichbare Verfahren sowie
für die Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen.
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigen Papier.
© 2005 by Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Stuttgart.
Druck: Printservice Decker & Bokor, München.
Printed in Germany

Contents

ERICH S. GRUEN	
Introduction	7
STEPHANIE DALLEY	
Semiramis in History and Legend: a Case Study in Interpretation of an Assyrian Historical Tradition, with Observations on Archetypes in Ancient Historiography, on Euhemerism before Euhemerus, and on the So-called Greek Ethnographic Style	11
RONALD HENDEL	
Genesis 1-11 and its Mesopotamian Problem	23
JAN ASSMANN	
<i>Periergia</i> : Egyptian Reactions to Greek Curiosity	37
HANS-JOACHIM GEHRKE	
Heroen als Grenzgänger zwischen Griechen und Barbaren	50
M. C. MILLER	
Barbarian Lineage in Classical Greek Mythology and Art: Pelops, Danaos and Kadmos	68
ERICH S. GRUEN	
Persia Through the Jewish Looking-Glass	90
JOSEF WIESEHÖFER	
Rom as Enemy of Iran	105
ANDREW ERSKINE	
Unity and Identity: Shaping the Past in the Greek Mediterranean	121
ANN KUTTNER	
"Do you look like you belong here?": Asianism at Pergamon and the Makedonian Diaspora	137
GIDEON BOHAK	
Ethnic Portraits in Greco-Roman Literature	207