Barbarians in pre-classical Greek literature: antithesis or mirror?

Wu, Tong

Title (and subtitle)

Barbarians in pre-classical Greek literature: antithesis or mirror?

Name and student number

Tong Wu, 3241882

E-mail address

S3241882@vuw.leidenuniv.nl

Name of supervisor(s)

Prosessor Maria Boletsi and Professor Casper de Jonge

Date

21st Jan. 2023

Master Thesis Classics and Ancient Civilizations

Faculty of Humanities, Leiden University

Catalogue

Introduction[1]

This thesis will discuss the representation of non-Greek people in pre-classical Greek literature, and the reception of such narration in modern literature, namely the novel (*That Time I Got Reincarnated as Iphigenia*) I wrote during the research of this work. There are three chapters for the thesis. In chapter 1, I will reassess the first two chapters of Edith Hall's *Inventing the Barbarian*, which focus on the comparison of image between the Greeks and non-Greeks in the *Iliad* and the *Persians*;[2] in the former, it shows faint evidence of non-Greek ethnicity in contrast of the Hellenic code of conduct, and the latter demonstrates a completed construction of representing the non-Greek (Persians) as the antithesis of the Greeks. Chapter 2 will investigate the use of the word βάρβαρος[3] in various of pre-classical texts, and I will assess the transformation of its meaning by different authors and different stages of time, and how these meaning nuance with each other. Chapter 3 will talk about classical reception, and how the narration of the non-Greek ethnicity in my novel was influenced by these pre-classical works.

Chapter 1 Reassessment of Pre-Classical Literature in *Inventing the Barbarian*

Inventing the Barbarian examines the image of the barbarian and displays the development of orientalism through literary evidence from Homer to classical theatre plays. Edith Hall regards the transformation of the image of the barbarians from the pre-classical to the classical period as a paradigm shift caused by the Greco-Persian Wars, as she states that 'the polarization of Hellene and barbarian was invented in specific historical circumstances during the early years of fifth century BCE.'[4] It is well known that in classical Greece the image of people with a non-Greek ethnicity bears stereotypical depiction and is generally treated as the antithesis of Greek values, but the perception and representation of non-Greeks before this paradigm shift that took shape in the classical era is more ambivalent and complex. The image of the non-Greeks in classical literature has been overall fixed to a general term of typical barbarians, namely as the antithesis of the Hellenes, but the work during the archaic and the transitional period provides more controversial views of the non-Greek people,

[1] All the Greek text translations are my own unless otherwise expressly stated.
[2] By Aeschylus.
[3] Superficially it means 'barbarous', please see the detailed research of this term in chapter 2 of my thesis.
[4] Hall 1989:1.

therefore in this chapter, I will lay out and assess Hall's seminal study, focusing particularly on her discussion of the *Iliad* and then Aechylus' *Persians*. I have chosen to analyse the first two chapters of the book which focus on the *Iliad* and the *Persians* because these two texts mark the transition of the representation of the barbarians between the archaic and classical period, which prepares the ground in a way for me to go back to the archaic period in chapter 2 and take a closer look at the context that forms the starting point in Hall's book.

Conceived in different periods, both texts narrate the confrontation of Greek and non-Greek forces: the former is the earliest case of Greek literature in which we can clearly trace representations of non-Greek ethnicity and in which the lexeme barbarian makes its first appearance (through the word *barbarophone*), and the latter lies in-between the Archaic and Classical period and could be regarded as marking the turning point in the image of non-Greeks in a new genre---theatrical plays. The reassessment of Hall's research on the *Iliad* will be a supplementary background of my research in chapter 2, which has interpretation of the term *barbarophone* in the *Iliad*. Another reassessment of Hall's analysis of the *Persians* (performed c.472BCE) echoes with my interpretation of Herodotus' *Histories* (written c.484-c.430 BCE, another crucial section in chapter 2).

Trojans and Achaeans in the *Iliad*

In the first chapter, titled 'Setting the stage', Edith Hall assesses the literature written before early fifth century BCE, including the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the Homeric hymns. Hall especially examines the narrations of Greek and non-Greek characters in epic poems, especially in the *Iliad*, through three aspects: language, behaviour and ethnography. For the language discrepancy between the Trojans and Achaeans, Hall argues that archaic literature does not pay much attention to such manner. She only mentions the term βαρβαρόφωνος which appears in the *Iliad* and is addressed to the Carians (an ally of the Trojans),[5] and two similar words in *Odyssey*: ἀγριοφώνους[6] which refers to people of Lemnos (*Odyssey* 8.294), and ἀλλοθρόους[7] which refers to the people of Temese (*Odyssey* 1.183). However, Hall does not pay attention to the

[5] The term βαρβαρόφωνος will be further assessed in Chapter 2.
[6] ἀγριοφώνους is pl. masc. acc. form of the adjective ἀγριόφωνος, which means 'with rough voice' according to the LSJ lexicon.
[7] ἀλλοθρόους is pl. masc. acc. form of the adjective ἀλλόθροος, which means 'speaking a strange tongue' according to the LSJ lexicon.

group of people who are addressed as speaking strangely, as suggested by the last two words. Indeed, the people of Lemnos are similar to the Carians (Caria is a coastal region of Asia Minor), since they dwell in the island close to Asia Minor, but Temese is a region on the shore of Tyrrhenian Sea, in Italy. Therefore, there might be a basis to argue that such comments on language do not only refer to the opponent or to the eastern side, but also to any neutral region where people speak another language.

Regarding the behaviour of the Trojans and the Achaeans in the *Iliad*, some scholars had argued that the Trojans are depicted as arrogant boasters, because all the epithets that refer to them generally suggest features of arrogance and pride.[8] Hall regards such views as suggesting a negative depiction of the Trojans as far too overstated. There are more neutral epithets applied to the Trojans and these show up more frequently than the potentially negative ones. Trojans are frequently addressed as ἱππόδαμος or 'horse-taming' (e.g. *Iliad* 24.804) which appears 23 times,[9] as well as μεγάθυμος or 'great-hearted' and φιλοπόλεμος or 'lover of war', which are commonly used for both the Trojan and Achaean sides. The word ὑβριστῆισι or 'insolent/arrogant men'[10] only appears once when Menelaus fights against Peisander (a Trojan warrior) and reproaches the Trojans with this word (*Iliad* 13.633).

Hall issues a critique on scholars' double standard when it comes to interpreting the negative or controversial behaviours of the Achaeans and the Trojans: 'In the case of the Achaeans, these forms of behaviours are excused as acceptable under the 'heroic code', but when the perpetrators are Trojan, they are adduced as tangible proof of the poem's chauvinism.'[11] Hall lists two cases of transgressive behaviour which only the Trojans had committed: the abduction of Helen which breaks the covenant of Zeus Xenios (god of hospitality), and the sneak attack of Pandarus[12] which breaks the covenant of Zeus Horkios (personification of oath).[13] I would say that Hall even exaggerates the guilt of Pandarus, since he would not break the truce until Athena

[8] Blegen 1963:17; Pinsent 1984:147-8; Page 1959:251-2.
[9] Hall 1989:24.
[10] Noun pl. masc. dat. form of ὑβριστής, according to the LSJ lexicon, it means 'violent, wanton, licentious, insolent man'.
[11] Hall 1989:25.
[12] In *Iliad* 4.68ff, Pandarus is a Trojan warrior who is tricked by Athena, and thus he breaks the truce and attacks Menelaus, then the war between Achaeans and Trojans is triggered again.
[13] Hall 1989:25.

entices him with ἔπεα πτερόεντα[14] to attack Menelaus. The ἔπεα πτερόεντα spoken by Athena – who in a similar way tricks Hector to fight with Achilles – must have some divine or magical power that affects or takes over a person's mind, thus I would suggest that no matter who the person is, if Athena's motivation is to trick him into attacking Menelaus, even a devout follower would be turned by her ἔπεα πτερόεντα. Hall believes that when it comes to other immoral or controversial forms of behaviour, they pertain to both Achaeans and Trojans (e.g., mutilation of the dead bodies, threatening their own soldiers).[15] Hall denies the possible argument that the wrath of Achilles shows Achilles' rejection of civilised Hellenic values and his regression to barbarism, because his inhumane forms of conduct – including humiliating the corpse of Hector and practicing human sacrifice – are never committed by the Trojans nor by any of their non-Greek allies, and nor by the Achaeans. It is Achilles himself who becomes alienated from humanity at large, not just from the Achaeans.[16]

In addition to Hall's conclusion regarding the conduct of both sides, when we consider the Achaeans' enslavement of the Trojans or of people who belong to the Trojan's allies (e.g., Chryseis, daughter of Chryses, and Briseis), it would be unfair to condemn only the Achaeans, because the Trojans are on the defending side and thus do not even have the chance to enslave their enemies. From another perspective, Paris' abduction of Helen could be considered to be comparable to the Achaeans' enslavement of the Trojans and Trojans' allies.

Regarding military skills, the overall narration of battles favours the Achaean side,[17] although there is praise for Hector's valour in fighting (and occasionally Aeneas). For other Trojan warriors, however, there are clearly fewer highlights than for the Achaeans. In general, there are 189 named Trojans and 53 named Achaeans killed on the battlefield.[18] But Hall gives the explanation that Homer put more narration of the Trojans in their domestic life which demonstrate their good moral values, for example, Hector's kindness to Helen; and for the Achaeans, since it is not possible to write about their domestic life when they are in Troy, the narration of them has to be focused on the

[14] ἔπεα πτερόεντα (pl. neut. acc. form) means 'winged words' in *Iliad* 4.92, the speeches of deities are frequently addressed with this phrase in Homeric epics.
[15] Hall 1989:25.
[16] Hall 1989:27.
[17] Hall 1989:29-30; For example, *Iliad* 5.705-10 gives a long list of the Achaeans soldiers slain by Hector.
[18] Hall 1989:30.

battlefield.

Hall argues that the piety of the Trojan side is clearly superior to that of the Achaeans from many perspectives.[19] Indeed, Zeus, king of the gods, favours the Trojans since they always dedicate luxurious offerings (*Iliad* 4.44-9); and even though the goddess Athena favours the Achaean side, Trojan women offer her a dress and pray to her (*Iliad* 6.269-312); and Hector is the most pious one to the Olympian gods (*Iliad* 24.425-8). On the contrary, the Achaeans are much less devoted to the gods. This characteristic is already shown in the beginning of Book 1, when Agamemnon is rude to Chryses (the Trojan priest of Apollo) who wanted his daughter back, and the only reason why he finally decides to return his daughter is the threat of Apollo, but not because he succumbs to the god's will.[20]

Hall also discusses the nuances in the depiction of the Trojans and the Achaeans. There are no signs of a clear distinction in terms of ethnicity, and she concludes concerning the physical depiction of characters' appearances that there is no significant physiological difference between the Achaeans and the Trojans.[21] The only discrepancy in physical appearance might be their hair colours:[22] some Achaeans are addressed with ξανθός ('yellow, fair') such as Achilles (*Iliad* 1.197, 23.141. etc.) and Menelaus (*Iliad* 10.241, 11.125. etc.); and Hector is addressed as having χαῖται κυάνεαι ('dark hair') after he is slain by Achilles and his body dragged behind the chariot.[23]

Regarding cultural differentiation, Hall analyses representations of weapons, religion, dresses etc, and concludes that there is no significant difference.[24] But the possible polygamy custom among the Trojans can be an issue.[25] Priam in the epic is said to have sons by μεγάροισι γυναῖκες ('women/wives in the palace/rooms'), but this reference is ambiguous, as it is not clear whether these women are Priam's wives or concubines: the word γυναῖκες can refer to either women or wives, or both. Some scholars simply

[19] Hall 1989:29.
[20] *Iliad* 1.22 ff.
[21] Hall 1989:40.
[22] Hall 1989:40.
[23] Although Hall suggests that it is possible that Hector's dark hair is caused by the dirt on the ground when he is dragged; thus, the only distinction of ethnography might not be existed.
[24] Hall 1989:40-7.
[25] See *Iliad* 24.495-7, Priam has 50 sons; except the 19 sons born by Hecuba, the rest of his sons are born by other women.

address Priam as a polygamous king,[26] but Hall suggests that polygamy could have been a tradition for the Trojan royal family before Homer – thus it is not Homer who made Priam a polygamist – but this concept remains vague.[27] Is there any Achaean in the epic who is said to have children by women other than his own wife? No, throughout the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, there is no Achaean described in such a way as to suggest that his children were borne by other women. Thus, a question that arises is: why did Homer specifically introduce Priams' familial composition by mentioning the multiple mothers of his children?

In the classical period, Euripides presented Hector's marriage as polygamous in form and his wife Andromache as submitting to such conduct; Hermione the Achaean in fact reproaches polygamy and incest as a barbaric custom.[28] Would this plot of Euripides have been influenced by the *Iliad*'s narration of Priam's family? Through Hermione's attitude and words, it is quite obvious that polygamy is held in negative light and deemed to be immoral conduct, and the Trojans are even branded as incestuous, which was never mentioned in earlier texts.[29] Another crucial point is that in Andromache's speech, she uses Phrygia to address her country instead of Troy or Ilion, 'ὡς ἡ Λάκαινα τῶν Φρυγῶν μείων πόλις…' ('that Laconia is a larger city than Phrygia…').[30] In fact, in the Homeric poems, Phrygia is not Troy, and Phrygians are not Trojans, but allies of the Trojans. In this case, under which circumstances are the Trojans classified as Phrygians?[31]

Apart from the Phrygians and the Trojans, Persian society and culture is also a popular topic in classical literature, and depictions of the Persians can be seen as a mirror for classical authors' attitude towards the Trojans. In Persian history, it is true that the royal Achaemenid family members often married their relatives (for example, Cambyses married two of his sisters,[32] and Darius II married his half-sister Parysatis[33]) and it was

[26] For example, see Dué, C., Lupack, S., & Lamberton, R. 2020: 329-30., and Monsacré 2018: II.1.
[27] Hall 1989:43.
[28] See Eur. *Andr*. 168-80 in which Hermione claims that polygamy is a barbarian custom and also accuses Trojans of incest; see also lines 222-7 for Andromache's self-description in which she mentions that she has even fed Hector's children who are not born of her.
[29] Indeed, in this play, Hermione's speech has a strong personal bias since she is angry with Andromache.
[30] Eur.*Andr*.194.
[31] See *Iliad* 3.184-90.
[32] Herodotus mentioned this marriage at 3.30-1.
[33] Ctesias F 15.47, see Nichols 2008:98-99.

a custom for the Persians to have many wives and concubines.[34] So these Persian customs may have been projected onto the Trojans too by classical authors. Scholars have developed different arguments about the Greek attitude towards polygamy. Lenfant argues that in the eyes of the Greeks – although Persian polygamy is indeed exotic – it is neither a striking nor a monstrous custom.[35] However, based on his research into Persian marriages, Brosius says the following about the Greek approach towards polygamy: 'Polygamy and certain kinds of incestuous marriages were unacceptable in Greek society. The Greeks noticed that the Persian royal family appeared to engage in both and described these practices to emphasize the monstrosity of the Persian king, his decadence, and his domination by women.'[36] I argue that, in fact, these two arguments do not contradict each other. The marriage custom that the Greeks see as monstrous is incestuous marriage but not polygamous marriage.

The Greek criticism towards polygamous and incestuous marriage resonates in the rhetorical speech of Hermione in Euripides' *Andromache*. She reproaches the Phrygians for the same 'sin': polygamy and incest. However, Hermione's husband Neoptolemus had borne children with Andromache. Hermione's perspective is thus biased due to her anger for the interrupted monogamous marriage: she certainly cannot judge fairly the culture and custom of Andromache's country, thus her criticism of these customs can be regarded as reflecting the exaggerated attitude of contemporary (classical) Athenians.

To conclude this review of Hall's chapter 'Setting the stage', the author focuses on the narrations of the Trojans and the Achaeans in the *Iliad*. There is indeed some faint evidence of a Greek sense of collective identity which accounts for some nuanced differences between these two groups. However, each character in the epic is judged mainly by their personal conduct (e.g., their moral behaviour, valour), and not by their ethnicity, but this way of presenting a character changes in the classical period.[37] Euripides' negative treatment of the Trojan marriage demonstrates the way the depiction of non-Greek people shifted in classical literature, and ideology of orientalism in Greece has formed in a mature stage. Andromache's line is a convincing example

[34] Hdt.1.135.
[35] See Lenfant 2019:28-30ff, Lenfant disagree with Hartog and Hall that Persian polygamy should be regarded as the antithesis of Greek monogamy, as the two customs are different indeed, but not a crucial impact of value for the Greek.
[36] Brosius 1998:35.
[37] Hall 1989:54.

from literature that suggests that, after the Greco-Persian Wars, the identity of non-Greeks (even when authors refer to characters from earlier periods) merges and becomes unified into a stereotypical image, namely that of the barbarians.

The Influence of the Greco-Persian Wars: the *Persians*

The Greco-Persian Wars (499-449BCE) marks the start of the Greek classical period. During this period, drama flourished, and the image of non-Greek characters was transferred to the stage. Hall sets the Greco-Persian Wars as the watershed for the presentation of non-Greek people as barbarians in literary sources. In the second chapter, 'Inventing Persia', Hall notices that after the outbreak of the war, the term βάρβαρος[38] finally became a general term referring to the non-Greek ethnicity.[39] Throughout the fifth century BCE, there is a gradual development in distinguishing the barbarians as the opposition to the Greeks, and Hall introduces the stages of this transition of the barbarian's image from Aeschylus to Euripides. In the second chapter, Hall focuses on Aeschylus' *Persians*, which as the name of the play shows, is comprised of a Greek narration of the non-Greek Persians.

The rise of Athens and Its influence on the Panhellenic world contributed to the flourishing of tragedy; before Solon (c.630-c.560BCE) and between Solon and Thespis (6th century BCE)[40] there are no other distinctive poets from Athens/Attica.[41] After the Greek victory over the Persians, the Athenians claimed their glory as the major power that defended the Panhellenic world against their enemy, Persia. As a result, the Athenians needed literature that reflected their own cultural features to increase their external influence, and they found that in Athenian tragedy. Tragedy is the indigenous Athenian literary genre. Although this genre mainly dealt with mythical stories about a heroic world, at times it also integrated historical events that happened not so long before the play was put to the stage. *The Sack of Miletus* by Phrynichus could be the earliest historical tragedy, and the *Persians* by Aeschylus is the most famous historical play.

Aeschylus' tragic play the *Persians* (first performed in 472BCE) is regarded by Hall as

[38] Superficially it means barbarous, please see the detailed research of this term in the next chapter of my thesis.
[39] Hall 1989:57.
[40] Thespis is recognized as the inventor of tragedy.
[41] Hall 1989:62-4.

the earliest testimony to the absolute polarization of Hellene and barbarian from the perspective of the Greeks. During this period when this tragedy was performed, the term βάρβαρος could refer to 'the whole non-Greek world',[42] and this is because the Greek hostility towards the Persian threat emerged in the same period.[43] The earlier play, the *Phoenissae* (*The Phoenician Women*) by Phrynichus, had already shown certain signs of what, strictly from a contemporary perspective, we could call orientalism.[44] The *Persians* tells of the Hellenic victory and the defeat of the Persians in the Battle of Salamis and condemns the *hubris* of Xerxes through the mouth of Darius' ghost. Thus, the religious and moral message of the tragedy is that gods will punish *hubris*.[45]

In addition to being a famous playwright, Aeschylus himself was an Athenian soldier and joined the fight against the Persians in the Battle of Marathon, the Battle of Plataea and the Battle of Salamis.[46] Thus, his depiction of the Persian infantry, clothing and customs stems from his first-hand experience of the Persian army.[47] Therefore, it may not be completely fair to argue that all descriptions of the non-Greeks in the *Persians* came from his stereotypical imagination. Nevertheless, Aeschylus' personal experience, colored by his ethnicity and affiliations as an Athenian, made the *Persians* a controversial literary source for depicting the Persians in history. Hall analyses the image of the Persians in Aeschylus' tragedy in a similar manner as she analyses the Trojans in the *Iliad*, and she discusses the features of the Persians in terms of language, behaviour, ethnography, religion and politics.

The discrepancy in language is starkly expressed in the play. While the Greeks and the Persians are confronting each other in the Battle of Salamis, the soldiers on the Greek side are motivated by an inspiring pean and battle-shout, but on the Persian side, the tongue of their battle-shout is said to be ῥόθος ('rushing noise').[48] Beyond simply branding their tongue as barbarous, Aeschylus creates aural effects to make the

[42] See Aes. *Per*. 434, in which Atossa says 'αἰαῖ, κακῶν δὴ πέλαγος ἔρρωγεν μέγα Πέρσαις τε καὶ πρόπαντι βαρβάρων γένει' ('Alas! The vast sea of misery had broken the Persians and the entire barbarian race!').
[43] Hall 1989:57.
[44] See Hall 1989:73, in which she suggests that in Phrynichus' *Phoenissae*, an eunuch starts the prologue, and that this 'realistic' touch would quickly remind the audience that they are under a eastern backgrounded stage.
[45] Hall 1989:70.
[46] Sommerstein 2009: x-xi.
[47] Hall 1989:74.
[48] See Aes. *Per*. 401-406; the word ῥόθος is in line 406, also in line 635 the Persian utterance is regarded as barbarian speech; Hall 1989: 77.

audience sense such exotic pronunciation, for example in line 958-61,[49] when the Persian messenger calls a long list with the names of the defeated Persian generals: ‘οἷος ἦν Φαρανδάκης, Σούσας, Πελάγων, καὶ Δοτάμας, ἠδ᾽ Ἀ- 960γδαβάτας, Ψάμμις, Σουσισκάνης τ᾽ Ἀγβάτανα λιπών;’ (‘Where have you left them, Pharandaces, Susas, Pelagon, Dotamas, Agdabatas, Psammis, and Susiscanes of Agbatana?’). These non-Greek names, when they come out of the messenger’s mouth in such a consecutive manner, will leave the audience with an exotic impression of the Persians.[50] Epic words sometimes appear in the lines spoken by Persians, such as ἱππιοχάρμης (‘one who fights from a chariot’ in line 29), βαθύζωνος (‘deep grided’ in line 155); Hall argues that these epic words create a certain foreign effect: first, the epic words can be regarded as obsolete diction which makes them a substitute of sorts for the foreign ethnicity; second, the epic words may help enhance the image of arrogant warriors who are filled with *hubris*.[51] Furthermore, the lines of the Persian Chorus, as Scott notices, contain many repetitions of words, as well as laments and wailing sounds Hall argues that Aeschylus intended to develop this way of speaking in the play in order to convey the barbarian diction.[52]

The Persians’ behaviour in this tragedy is harder to evaluate than that of the Trojans in the *Iliad*, because the Trojans can be compared with the Achaeans, but there is no Greek character in the *Persians* for us to compare with the Persians. Certainly, there are several significant examples from the conduct of the Persians in the play that demonstrate their negative behaviour, and Hall concludes.[53] Regarding the rulers, the highest sovereign ruler, Xerxes, is ruthless since he threatens to put to death all of his ship captains if they fail in their mission, and the Persian people treat the Queen Mother Atossa in an extremely submissive and fawning way.[54] When it comes to the battlefield, Persian soldiers are depicted as acting like cowards, as when they hear the Greek paean, they are seized by fear;[55] their chaotic flight casts them as the antithesis of the disciplined Greek army (lines 374 and 422). Their luxurious lifestyle and excessive wealth are also depicted in the play (e.g., line 842), and this demonstrates the exotic luxurious

[49] Also in 966-72 and 993-9, where a long list of Persians’ name has been called.
[50] Hall 1989: 77.
[51] Hall 1989: 79.
[52] Scott 1984:153-4; Hall 1989: 79.
[53] Hall 1989: 79-86.
[54] See Aes. *Per*. 371.
[55] See Aes. *Per*. 389ff.

atmosphere of an eastern court. The reversed position of mourners also strengthens the Persian antithesis, since their mourners are men and, in the Greek tradition, the job of lamenting is especially assigned to women.[56]

The difference in religion is not significant in this play but there is some evidence of foreign beliefs, namely Zoroastrianism, on the Persian side.[57] Hall argues that the ghost of Darius can be regarded as an element that speaks to the oriental treatment of the Persians by Aeschylus;[58] however, I doubt this interpretation, since the appearance of a ghost is not exclusive to Persia or non-Greek culture, but it is actually a common event in Greek literary sources. For example, the ghost of Patroclus manifests himself to Achilles in the *Iliad* and the two of them have a conversation about his (Patroclus') funeral.[59]

The political system of the Persian empire is cast by Aeschylus as foreign to the Greek. Hall points out the Persians' difference in the administration: the act of *proskynesis* to the royal family (lines 151-4), and other extravagant aspects of the protocol create an antithesis of the political ideology between the east and west.[60] Besides what Hall has noticed, as previously mentioned, Xerxes threatens to kill all of his sea captains, which shows that the Persian king has somehow the despotic power to decide on all matters, and this clearly conflicts with the Athenian democratic political system.

To conclude this discussion of Hall's evaluation of orientalism in the *Persians*, she presents evidence to suggest that the presentation of the Persians is built upon the image of barbarians as the antithesis of the Greeks; besides the significant contrasting features such as their language and political system, the insignificant eastern elements (their luxurious palaces, for example, and building decorations) are applied in the play to symbolise an exotic, oriental world. Although Aeschylus depicts the Persians as the antithesis of the Greek in many respects, his work – compared to later theatre plays in the classical period – is still subtle in its depiction of non-Greeks, although it certainly marks the start of the definition of barbarians on the basis of ethnicity.[61]

---

[56] See Pritchard 2014:191 for the role of Athenian women in funerary mourning.
[57] Hall 1989:88-9.
[58] Hall 1989:89.
[59] See *Iliad* 23.65ff, whereby the ghost of Patroclus talks to Achilles.
[60] Hall 1989:93-5.
[61] For example, Euripides' *Andromache*, as I have already discussed.

Conclusion

Throughout the book, Edith Hall has focused on the *Iliad* and classical theatre plays to evaluate the image of the non-Greeks in different period, thus the book has played an important role in scholarly discussions about the representation of barbarians in classical period. For the *Iliad*, the evidence of Hellenic identity is faint and we can only catch the nuance of such a sense; for the *Persians*, we can see the significant orientalism in the narration of the Persians as the antithesis of the Greeks, but on the other hand, the image of the non-Greek in this play has not fully reached the climax of being the antithesis, especially when compared to the later literature such as *Andromache* and *Medea*. Hall paid much less attention to historical prose (e.g., Herodotus) and archaic texts, but merely mentions them in a supplementary comment. The next chapter, therefore, will compensate for the gap by interpreting the use of the word βάρβαρος in archaic literature, including historical prose and poetry.

Chapter 2: the Use of the Word βάρβαρος in Pre-Classical Greek Texts

When the word βάρβαρος occurs in an ancient Greek text, the reader may expect the term to refer to brutal, primitive, or foolish people. Negative perceptions and representations of barbarians were greatly promoted by popular classical Athenian drama, as Edith Hall has shown;[62] while barbarians usually do not play the main role in Athenian drama – some exceptions (like Medea) notwithstanding – they are commonly represented as the antithesis of Greek characters. Edith Hall has argued that the stereotypical portrayal of non-Greeks as weak, slavish, decadent and effeminate emerged under the influence of the wars between Persia and Greece (499-449 BCE) in the beginning of the fifth century BCE, when the opposition between barbarians and Hellenes acquired clearer ethnic and political dimensions, and was mainly used to project Athenian democracy against Eastern despotism. In the context of these wars, the Greek-barbarian antithesis served to legitimize the Athenian leadership amongst the Greek allied states: as J. Hall argues, the barbarian was produced as the exact opposite not of Greeks in general, but primarily of the Athenians, who considered themselves to be the most free of all peoples, enjoying a democratic society.[63] But how do the texts that pre-date the classical period use the word βάρβαρος? How does the representation

[62] See Hall 1989:101-200 for her analysis of classical drama.
[63] Hall 1989:188-9.

of barbarians in Homer and in pre-classical sources compare with the dominant negative stereotypical views of barbarians that several scholars, and most notably Edith Hall, have traced in the classical era (for example, in Athenian tragedy and Isocrates' rhetoric)? That is the research question that this chapter will examine. Apart from a passage from Homer, I will examine passages from Anacreon, Pindar, and Herodotus (6^{th}-5^{th} centuries BCE). Even though an exhaustive study of pre-classical sources is beyond the scope of this thesis, the selection of passages that will be discussed in this chapter aims to offer a representative sample of uses of this word, through which I trace quite a different understanding of βάρβαρος than in the classical era. I will argue that in early Greek poetry and prose (except Herodotus' *Histories* which is a more complicated case) the word βάρβαρος has not yet related to the ethnicity of a group, but depends on the language and geography (namely the regions they dwell), or as a vague ideology.

I will focus on the ways in which the word βάρβαρος is used and the contexts in which it occurs. In classical texts Greeks and βάρβαροι are distinguished in different terms, including language, ethnicity, moral standard, political system, religions, etc. My thesis will not examine all the ways in which non-Greeks are represented in early Greek literature, but it will merely adopt a linguistic-semantic approach, as it will focus on the ways in which the terminology of βάρβαρος is used in these early texts, and the implications of these uses.

The Homeric Period

According to Edith Hall, in pre-classical sources the word βάρβαρος 'was never used in the plural as a noun to denote the entire non-Greek world', because between the eighth and fifth centuries BCE there was no shared sense of ethnicity among Greek and collective identities were mostly formed around city states.[64] As Hall and others have argued, the term 'barbarian' assumed clear negative connotations (political, ethnic and cultural) during and after the Persian Wars, when the term 'barbarian' received connotations of primitivism, inferiority, and irrationality (Hall 1989, 3–5; Munson 2005, 2; Boletsi 2013, 69-70). But even if these negative connotations only come to the foreground in the classical era, can we already find traces of them in pre-classical texts?

[64] Hall 1989: 9.

The earliest literary source which distinguishes Greek and non-Greek languages is the *Iliad*, in which the word βαρβαρόφωνος is used:

> Νάστης αὖ Καρῶν ἡγήσατο βαρβαροφώνων,
> οἳ Μίλητον ἔχον Φθιρῶν τ᾽ ὄρος ἀκριτόφυλλον
> Μαιάνδρου τε ῥοὰς Μυκάλης τ᾽ αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα.
>
> Nastes in his turn led the Carians – speakers of a barbarous language –
> who held Miletus and the mountain of Phthires, dense with leaves,
> and rivers of Maeander, and the lofty peaks of Mycale.
> Homer, *Iliad*, 2.867-70

This text from the *Iliad* has encouraged some scholars to argue that before the fifth century BCE, the definition of βάρβαρος was tied to language: the word βάρβαρος referred to people who spoke languages other than Greek and whose language thus sounded incomprehensible to Greeks.[65] The meaning of βαρβαρόφωνος in Homer has already been discussed by ancient scholars.[66] Strabo, the ancient geographer (63 BCE – 24 CE), left his important comments on Homer's use of βαρβαρόφωνος. Concerning the Carians in the *Iliad*, Strabo points out the difference between βαρβαρόφωνος and βάρβαρος, and motivates Homer's choice for the former word:

> Τοῦ ποιητοῦ δ᾽ εἰρηκότος οὑτωσί Μάσθλης αὖ Καρῶν ἡγήσατο βαρβαροφώνων, οὐκ ἔχει λόγον, πῶς τοσαῦτα εἰδὼς ἔθνη βάρβαρα μόνους εἴρηκε βαρβαροφώνους τοὺς Κᾶρας, βαρβάρους δ᾽ οὐδένας.
>
> When the poet (Homer) states 'Masthles[67] in his turn led the Carians, speakers of a barbarous language', there is no explanation why he, who knew so many non-Greek tribes, only mentioned the Carians as the speakers of a non-Greek language, while there are no people whom he calls barbarians.
> Strabo, *Geography* 14.2.28

Strabo wonders why Homer singles out the Carians as speakers of a non-Greek language (βαρβαρόφωνοι), and he is surprised that Homer does not even once use the word βάρβαρος ('non-Greek').[68] He proceeds to state that the word βάρβαρος is thus onomatopoeic, imitating the sounds of a foreign language ('bar bar bar') which is thick

[65] See Hall 1989: 9, Kirk 1993:260, Moggi 1991:36.
[66] See Hartog 2001:80.
[67] Strabo has a different name of the Carian leader, who in the *Iliad* is called Nastes instead of Masthles.
[68] Almagor 2000: 134-135.

and harsh from the perspective of the Greeks, while in fact the language of the Carians (according to Strabo) is not harsh and contains many Greek words:

> οὐδέ γε ὅτι τραχυτάτη ἡ γλῶττα τῶν Καρῶν· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλεῖστα Ἑλληνικὰ ὀνόματα ἔχει καταμεμιγμένα… οἶμαι δέ, τὸ βάρβαρον κατ᾽ ἀρχὰς ἐκπεφωνῆσθαι οὕτως κατ᾽ ὀνοματοποιίαν ἐπὶ τῶν δυσεκφόρως καὶ σκληρῶς καὶ τραχέως λαλούντων.
> It is not correct that the tongue of Carians is harsh, for it isn't, but it even has very many Greek words mixed up with it… I believe that the word *barbaros* from the beginning was uttered onomatopoetically in reference to those people who pronounced words with difficulty and talked harshly and roughly.
> Strabo, *Geography* 14.2.28

Strabo's comment on the Homeric word βαρβαρόφωνος, according to Almagor, is not entirely correct. As Almagor argues that 'while Strabo is ostensibly interpreting Homer in our passage, he is in fact alluding to the Hellenized nations of his own day, who adopted the Greek language and mode of life'.[69] Modern scholars have provided different interpretations of the word βαρβαρόφωνος in the *Iliad*.[70] What makes the case of Homer's use of βαρβαρόφωνος even more complicated is Edith Hall's suggestion that the Homeric lines on the βαρβαρόφωνοι Carians were added to the *Iliad* at a later stage. Georges is even more convinced that this *hapax* has entered the Homeric text in a much later period, even later than the time of Thucydides.[71] Werner notices the familiarity between the Greeks and Carians, and suggests that the word βαρβαρόφωνος does not denote those who speak a non-Greek language, but those who speak Greek badly.[72] Ross argues that although there is no language barrier between the Greeks and the Trojans, the ἐπίκουροι or allies of the Trojans have displayed their characteristic of being βαρβαρόφωνοι three times in the narrative.[73] Therefore, he argues that the term βαρβαρόφωνος does not refer to non-Greek or non-Achaian language; by referring to their strange tongue, Homer demonstrates the remoteness of the region where the Carians dwelled, making them distinctive to both Achaians and Trojans.[74] As for the contrast between the Trojans and Achaians, Ross argues that Homer presents the

[69] Almagor 2000:138.
[70] Please see Georges, Werner and Ross in the following.
[71] Hall 1989: 9-10; Georges 1994:15.
[72] Werner 1992:6.
[73] *Iliad* 2.802–6, 2.867, 4.433–38. In these three passage the allies of the Trojans are addressed as βαρβαρόφωνοι, first one is said by Iris, the third one describes the battle-shout of them as βαρβαρόφωνοι.
[74] Ross 2005:304-5.

language of the Achaians as aggressive, and their public political speech as often prone to blame; the Trojans in Homer, on the other hand, talk in a converse way: they are introspective, private, poetic, and prefer to praise rather than to blame.[75]

To conclude on the topic of βαρβαρόφωνος in Homeric time, we do not know exactly how Homer used the word βαρβαρόφωνος, but as what I analyse in chapter one that one thing is for sure that he does not present the non-Greeks as primitive. The various, divergent interpretations of Homer's use of βαρβαρόφωνος by ancient and modern commentators do not allow us to draw a straightforward conclusion regarding the connotations of this term's use. What these interpretations do allow us to speculate, however, is that in Homer's time a sense of shared ethnicity among Greeks and a Panhellenic identity had not yet been fully formed. The word βάρβαρος (as part of the word βαρβαρόφωνος) seems to have been used in relation to language, either to denote a language other than Greek or badly spoken language or – if we follow Ross – the remoteness of the Carian's region. It was in any case not used in a clear-cut distinction between Achaians and Trojans, and was not yet used as a generic term that encompassed all non-Greeks.

Anacreon (c.582-485 BCE)

In the archaic period, the word βάρβαρος first appears in some fragments of Alcman (7th century BCE) and Anacreon. Here is the relevant fragment from Anacreon, cited by the grammarian Herodian (2nd century CE):

> σολοίκους δὲ ἔλεγον οἱ παλαιοὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους· ὁ γὰρ Ἀνακρέων φησί·
> (a) κοίμισον δέ, Ζεῦ, σόλοικον φθόγγον,
> (b) μή πως βάρβαρα βάξῃς[76]
>
> People from the past called barbarians 'soloikoi'. For Anacreon once said: (a) 'But prevent, Zeus, the faulty (*soloikos*) tongue, (b) lest you speak barbarian things'.
> Herodian, *On Non-Greek Words and Solecisms* (*PMG* 423)

These short lines (a and b) are cited by the grammarian Herodian, who attributes them to Anacreon, a Greek poet living from the sixth to the fifth century BCE. The possible etymology of the word σόλοικος, according to Bernsdorff, derives from the corrupted

[75] Ross 2005:306.
[76] Greek text from Loeb edition.

Attic dialect used among the Athenian colonists of Σόλοι in Cilicia, if σολοικίζειν has the same construction as ἀττικίζειν ('to speak the Attic language').[77] Anacreon's text uses the structure of μή πως…βάξῃς: since βάξῃς is an aorist subjunctive, the construction is therefore either a prohibitive subjunctive ('do not speak') or a final subjunctive ('that you do not'). The connection between parts (a) and (b) is unclear: did b follow directly from a, or were they from different parts of one poem, or even from two poems?

However, this fragment, according to Bernsdorff's commentary, has other versions. The one above is an enlarged version found in a 15th century manuscript of the Bibliotheca Estense.[78] There is a shorter version where Ζεῦ, the vocative case of Zeus, does not show up and the word φθόγγον has moved from line two to line three:[79]

ὁ γὰρ Ἀνακρέων φησί·
< > κοίμισον δέ σόλοικον
φθόγγον < > μή πως βάρβαρα βάξῃς.[80]

Changing the placement of φθόγγον does not affect the meaning of the phrase, but the absence of Ζεῦ prompts an alternative interpretation of this text. If Ζεῦ does not belong to the clause, Anacreon would be accusing another person who speaks barbarian language. If Ζεῦ was indeed present in the original text, then it might suggest that Anacreon was accusing the Olympian god of speaking a barbarian language, which seems to be odd and illogical. Bernsdorff maintains that the corruption of the text suggests that Zeus is asked to silence someone else's use of the barbarian tongue.[81]

Even though the lack of the complete context of this statement does not allow us to safely reconstruct its meaning, we can make some assumptions based on the link that Anacreon here draws between the words βάρβαρος and σόλοικος. While βάρβαρος here still seems to refer to a type of language, it is not simply a signifier for foreign (non-Greek) languages: in the time of Herodian (2th century CE), this word seems to carry the connotations of σόλοικος, 'solecistic', a negative term describing the false application of grammar and syntax, this is the meaning of solecism in the second

[77] Bernsdorff 2010:734-5.
[78] Bernsdorff 2010:733.
[79] Bernsdorff 2020 :209, 733-5.
[80] Greek text from Bernsdorff 2020: 209. The brackets show where words are missing (and should be inserted).
[81] Bernsdorff 2010:734.

century AD (Herodian's time), but whether solecism already have this specific meaning in the time of Anacreon is very unsure, thus it is difficult to determine what σόλοικος means for Anacreon. There is tiny possibility that the connection Anacreon makes between σόλοικος and βάρβαρος suggests that βάρβαρος is treated as the antithesis of a 'correct', intellectual language – presumably the Greek language, even though the fragment does not make this clear – as opposed to the 'incorrect' barbarian tongue. A barbarian way of speaking, Anacreon's fragment suggests, is inferior and undesirable. Indeed, as scholars have noted, βάρβαρος denoted not only foreign speech but also difficulties in elocution or pronunciation, incorrect use of language, or speaking with inarticulate sounds, stuttering, or lisping.[82] Anacreon's passage reflects or prefigures this sets of connotations, which would be more fully developed in the classical era. In conclusion of Amacreon's passage, this interpretive assumption is grounded in the meaning that solecism had in the second century AD, i.e. Herodian's time: we cannot be sure whether the word had the same meaning in Anacreon's time. Its use alongside βάρβαρος in Anacreon suggests, however, that both words carried undesirable, negative connotations.

Pindar (c.518-438 BCE)

Pindar's *Isthmian ode* VI was written for Phylakidas, son of Lampon, who was the winner of the boy's *pancration* at the Isthmian Games c.458BCE. Phylakidas was from Aegina, where the mythical king Aeacus was said to have ruled; Aeacidae (*Aiakidai*), therefore, refers to the inhabitants of Aegina, the descendants of Aeacus. Peleus and Ajax are the sons of Aeacus and, in this text, they are mentioned as famous heroes. In the present poem Pindar also mentions the word βάρβαρος, alongside the term παλίγγλωσσος ('strange of tongue'):

> ὔμμε τ᾽, ὦ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαι,
> τέθμιόν μοι φαμὶ σαφέστατον ἔμμεν
> τάνδ᾽ ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαις.
> μυρίαι δ᾽ ἔργων καλῶν τέ-
> τμανθ᾽ ἑκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῷ κέλευθοι
> καὶ πέραν Νείλοιο παγᾶν καὶ δι᾽ Ὑπερβορέους·
> οὐδ᾽ ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος
> οὔτε παλίγγλωσσος πόλις,
> ἅτις οὐ Πηλέος ἀίει κλέος ἠ-

[82] Long 1986, 130–131; Hartog 2001, 80; Boletsi 2013, 69.

ρωος, εὐδαίμονος γαμβροῦ θεῶν,
΄οὐδ᾽ ἅτις Αἴαντος Τελαμωνιάδα
καὶ πατρός. …

And for you, O Aeacidae with your golden chariots,
I announce that I have the clearest settlement to sprinkle
you with praise when I come to this island.
Countless roads, a hundred feet wide,
have been cut by your glorious labours in successive order,
and extended beyond the stream of Nile and through
the land of the Hyperboreans.
There is no city so barbarian (βάρβαρος) or so strange of tongue (παλίγγλωσσος)
that it does not know the fame of the hero Peleus,
the blessed son in-law of gods,
nor of Ajax son of Telamon and his father …
Pindar, *Isthm.* 6.19-27

In this ode, παλίγγλωσσος and βάρβαρος are parallel terms, and thus scholars tend to tie these two words together and interpret their meanings as echoing each other. The exact meaning of παλίγγλωσσος and βάρβαρος in this context is, however, unclear. According to Hansen's commentary, παλίγγλωσσος is found only in Pindar before the Roman imperial period and it appears in other two places, [83] one in *Nemean* 1.58-9 (παλίγγλωσσον δέ οἱ ἀθάνατοι ἀγγέλων ῥῆσιν θέσαν, 'since the immortal gods reversed the messengers' report'), and another one in *Partheneia* 2.63 (ἐχθρὰν ἔριν οὐ παλίγγλωσσον, 'hateful and unrelenting strife'. [84] Slater in his *Lexicon to Pindar* defines the current use of παλίγγλωσσος as 'perverse in tongue', but can this interpretation be applied to the passage quoted from Isthmian VI? Moreover, is βάρβαρος here referring simply to foreign language, without negative connotation, or may it also be metonymically linked to παλίγγλωσσος as strange-sounding, 'reversed' (or even 'false') language?

I would argue that this word might not actually refer to language. If we relate these two words to the broader context of this ode, in which distant places like the Nile and the land of Hyperboreans are mentioned, it appears that the city which is βάρβαρος and παλίγγλωσσος carries the meaning of geographical remoteness. Therefore, Pindar used

[83] Hansen 2016: 124.
[84] Translation of this sentence: Race 1997:339.

these two words to convey that everyone in the world knows Peleus and Ajax, even non-Greek people who live far away or are culturally distinct from the Greeks.[85] The word παλίγγλωσσος can mean contradictory or false elsewhere, but here it appears to mean only 'strange' or 'foreign' (literally, 'with strange tongue'), and the term βάρβαρος apparently does not mean more than 'non-Greek' here.

In conclusion, Pindar might use the word βάρβαρος to describe the ignorance of the people dwelling in the βάρβαρος and παλίγγλωσσος city in an exaggerated way to praise the fame of ancient heroes or, since he was writing this from the perspective of Greek people, to whom the myth of the Greek heroes was of course common, and to those who live far away from the Greeks, were surely less familiar. Therefore, the word βάρβαρος in Pindar is tied to the geographical remoteness.

Ultimately, we can say that Pindar uses the word βάρβαρος to refer to far, non-Greek people: even these foreign people know the heroes Ajax and Peleus, who are famous beyond the Greek world.

Hecataeus (550-476BCE)

Hecataeus of Miletus in one of the surviving fragments of his work talks about the origin of the Greeks. He believes the ancestors of the Greeks to be βάρβαροι according to their names which do not belong to the Greek language:

> ῾Εκαταῖος μὲν οὖν ὁ Μιλήσιος περὶ τῆς Πελοποννήσου φησίν, διότι πρὸ τῶν ῾Ελλήνων ὤικησαν αὐτὴν βάρβαροι. σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ ἡ σύμπασα ῾Ελλὰς κατοικία βαρβάρων ὑπῆρξε τὸ παλαιόν, ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν λογιζομένοις τῶν μνημονευομένων· Πέλοπος μὲν ἐκ τῆς Φρυγίας ἐπαγομένου λαὸν εἰς τὴν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ κληθεῖσαν Πελοπόννησον, Δαναοῦ δὲ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, Δρυόπων τε καὶ Καυκώνων καὶ Πελασγῶν καὶ Λελέγων καὶ ἄλλων τοιούτων κατανειμαμένων τὰ ἐντὸς ᾽Ισθμοῦ καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς δέ·
> τὴν μὲν γὰρ ᾽Αττικὴν οἱ μετὰ Εὐμόλπου Θρᾶικες ἔσχον, τῆς δὲ Φωκίδος τὴν Δαυλίδα Τηρεύς, τὴν δὲ Καδμείαν οἱ μετὰ Κάδμου Φοίνικες, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Βοιωτίαν ῞Αονες καὶ Τέμμικες καὶ ῞Υαντες (ὡς δὲ Πίνδαρός φησιν [F 83] ῾ἦν ὅτε σύας Βοιώτιον ἔθνος ἔνεπον᾽). καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων δὲ ἐνίων τὸ βάρβαρον ἐμφαίνεται· Κέκροψ καὶ Κόδρος καὶ Αἶκλος καὶ Κόθος καὶ Δρύμας καὶ Κρίνακος. οἱ δὲ Θρᾶικες καὶ ᾽Ιλλυριοὶ καὶ ᾽Ηπειρῶται καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἐνπλευραῖς εἰσιν·

[85] Hansen 2016: 124.

ἔτι μέντοι μᾶλλον πρότερον ἢ νῦν, ὅπου γε καὶ τῆς ἐν τῶι παρόντι ᾽Ελλάδος ἀναντιλέκτως οὔσης [τὴν] πολλὴν οἱ βάρβαροι ἔχουσι Μακεδονίαν μὲν Θρᾷικες καί τινα μέρη τῆς Θετταλίας, ᾽Ακαρνανίας δε καὶ Αἰτωλίας ⟨τὰ⟩ ἄνω Θεσπρωτοὶ καὶ ⟨Κ⟩ασσωπαῖοι καὶ ᾽Αμφίλοχοι καὶ Μολοττοὶ καὶ ᾽Αθαμᾶνες, ᾽Ηπειρωτικὰ ἔθνη.

In fact, about the Peloponnese, Hekataeus of Miletus says that barbarians lived there before the time of the Greeks. Roughly speaking, the whole of Greece was the colony of barbarians in the old days, as people themselves may recall from the story: Peplos brought his people from Phrygia to the Peloponnese, which was named in this way because of him. Danaus was from Egypt, and the Dryopes, Caucones, Pelasgians, Leleges and other people like them took the land on the inner part of Isthmus, and also the outside.

The Thracians took the land of Attica when they came with Eumolpos; and Tereus took Daulis, a place in Phocis; the Phoenicians became the Cadmeia when they came with Cadmus; also the Aones, Temmikes and Hyantes (as Pindar says that they once called the Boeotian people wild swine). And from the names, their barbarian identity is displayed. Cecrops, Codros, Aiklos, Cothos, Drymas and Crinacos. The Thracians, Illyrians and Epeirotes – until today – are dwelling in the flank of Greece.

Even earlier than the present day, the barbarians took a large portion of the land which is now uncontestably the land of Greece. While the Thracians hold Macedonia and some parts of Thessaly, the Thesprotians, Kassopaians, Amphilocheans, Molossians, Athamanes and Epeirote tribes possess the upper part of Acarnania and Aitolia.

Strabo, *Geography* 7.7.1 (= Hecataeus fr. 119)

This extract (quoted by Strabo many centuries after Hecataeus) displays the idea that some barbarian people evolved to become Greek, but some remained barbarian depending on the regions in which they dwelt. In the text, we can see many familiar names such as Danaus, Cadmus and Pelasgus: these are famous Greek mythical heroes, but here they are said to be barbarians coming from non-Greek lands, who settled down in Greece. Their descendants are thus Greek. Indeed, Danaus was said to have come from Libya in literary texts like Aeschylus' *Suppliants*, and his brother Aegyptus from Egypt, but his ancestor Io was a princess of Argos who fled to Egypt in order to stay away from the anger of Hera (so Danaus would technically still relevant to the Greek ethnicity). The term 'Danaans' (*Danaoi*), already appears in Homer's *Iliad,* but the epic does not mention the origins of Danaus. Therefore, as Hecataeus seems to suggest, Greece had been inhabited by barbarians in the past and it seems that it was possible for barbarians and Greeks to belong to the same line of descent, with the former being the ancestors of the latter. Since (some) Greeks emerged from barbarian nations, we

may assume that Hellenicity was not dependent on blood. Moreover, as Hartog has argued, Hecateus may also suggest a temporal understanding of barbarism and Hellenicity: first there were barbarians, some of which then progressed to become Greeks.[86] The above point towards an understanding of the barbarian that we would today, at least partly, deem as anti-essentialist – an understanding that also makes its appearance in parts of the work of Herodotus.

Herodotus (c.430BCE)

Herodotus was active in the transitional period between the pre-classical and the classical ages. The Persian Wars, as Hall and others have argued, had changed the image of non-Greek people, and the term βάρβαρος was now adopting clear stereotypical connotations (effeminate, weak, decadent, slavish). In the *Histories* we can see the most complex and stringent Greek-barbarian opposition in Herodotus' representation of Persians. There are more than 180 occurrences of the word βάρβαρος in Herodotus' work, which cannot easily be reduced to one consistent meaning: although barbaroi are sometimes presented as the antithesis of the Greeks, the word βάρβαρος is sometimes used in a neutral sense, and sometimes more negatively. We could say that Herodotus has ambivalent or mixed attitudes towards non-Greek people, thus sometimes he is pressing the Greek and non-Greek boundaries to make it blurry,[87] which is reflected in his use of the term βάρβαρος.[88] Although Herodotus fully endorses the distinction between Greek and βάρβαρος in his ethnographic narrations, he focused on particular 'barbarian people', that 'he offers nuanced analyses of barbarian languages and refrains from generalizations particularly when referring to the discrepancy of languages'.[89]

When discussing the Pelasgi and the Greeks, Herodotus investigates the language discrepancy between Greeks and non-Greeks, and he examines how this difference in language relates to a difference in ethnos. He states the following:

> Ἥντινα δὲ γλῶσσαν ἵεσαν οἱ Πελασγοί, οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν. εἰ δὲ χρεόν ἐστι τεκμαιρόμενον λέγειν τοῖσι νῦν ἔτι ἐοῦσι Πελασγῶν τῶν ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν Κρηστῶνα πόλιν οἰκεόντων, οἳ ὅμουροι κοτὲ ἦσαν τοῖσι νῦν Δωριεῦσι καλεομένοισι (οἴκεον δὲ

[86] Hartog 2001, 80-81.
[87] Pelling 2007: 56.
[88] Hartog 2001.
[89] Boletsi 2013:70; Munson 2005:23.

τηνικαῦτα γῆν τὴν νῦν Θεσσαλιῶτιν καλεομένην),
καὶ τῶν Πλακίην τε καὶ Σκυλάκην Πελασγῶν οἰκησάντων ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ, οἳ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίοισι, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα Πελασγικὰ ἐόντα πολίσματα τὸ οὔνομα μετέβαλε· εἰ τούτοισι τεκμαιρόμενον δεῖ λέγειν, ἦσαν οἱ Πελασγοὶ βάρβαρον γλῶσσαν ἱέντες.
εἰ τοίνυν ἦν καὶ πᾶν τοιοῦτο τὸ Πελασγικόν, τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος ἐὸν Πελασγικὸν ἅμα τῇ μεταβολῇ τῇ ἐς Ἕλληνας καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν μετέμαθε.
…
Τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν γλώσσῃ μὲν ἐπείτε ἐγένετο αἰεί κοτε τῇ αὐτῇ διαχρᾶται, ὡς ἐμοὶ καταφαίνεται εἶναι·

For what language the Pelasgians used to speak, I cannot exactly tell. But if it is necessary for one to judge, from those now belonging to the Pelasgians and living in the city of Creston, above the Tyrrhenians, and who were the neighbors of the people now called the Dorians (but at that time, they used to live in the land which is now called Thessaly), and of the Pelasgians who lived in Placia and Scylace in the Hellespont, they came to live with the Athenians, and just like other towns, those who were once Pelasgians changed their names. If it is necessary for one to judge, the Pelasgians used to speak a barbarian language.
Then, if the Pelasgians were all like this (i.e., they used to speak non-Greek language), the Attic people who were once Pelasgians, when they changed to Greek ethnicity, they must have learnt a different language as well.
…
It seems clear to me that the Greeks always sticked to this tongue since they came into being.
Herodotus, *Histories*, 1.57-8

In *Histories* 1.56 Herodotus discusses the origins of the Ionian and Dorian people: while Dorians who speak Greek at the beginning were the ancestors of the current Lacedemonians, the Pelasgians being the ancestors of the Ionians/Athenians used to speak a barbarian language. Therefore, both the current Ionian/Athenian and the Dorian/Lacedemonian group are deemed Greek: Herodotus concludes that some Greeks spoke Greek from the very beginning, whereas other (current) Greeks used to speak barbarian languages in the past. Similar to Hecataeus, who implied that the distinction between Greeks and non-Greeks is not based on 'blood' but on region, Herodotus also states that being Greek is not related to 'blood': some Greeks used to be barbarians, so they have 'barbarian' ancestors. Thucydides in the classical period was also influenced by this understanding: he distinguishes the Amphilochians as either Greek or non-Greek according to whether they have changed their language from

barbarian to Greek.[90] Hartog therefore comments on these historians' attitude towards ethnicity: 'Greekness was thus something that could be acquired, following a period of apprenticeship, at least in those early periods when the divisions between peoples, spaces and customs were, so to speak, still in gestation.'[91]

Since in Herodotus the key for differentiating between Greek and barbarian is the history of the language that people speak, does this then imply that he bestows a superior status upon the Greek language, and an inferior one upon barbarian languages? Following the text above, Herodotus states that:

> πρόσθε δὲ ὧν ἔμοιγε δοκέει οὐδὲ τὸ Πελασγικὸν ἔθνος, ἐὸν βάρβαρον, οὐδαμὰ μεγάλως αὐξηθῆναι.
> Before that, as it seems to me, the Pelasgian people, as long as they were non-Greek, had never grown in great number.
> Herodotus, *Histories*, 1.58.

Therefore, in comparison to the Greek language, the barbarian language in this context is indeed less influential as it is used by a minor group; in this case, even though Herodotus does not explicitly state this, the suggestion may be that a people's barbarian status and language keeps them from growing in number. However, as ambivalent as the meaning of barbarian is in Herodotus, in the *Histories* there are many prosperous non-Greek cities or countries which do not speak Greek, thus the Greek language is not an absolutely necessary condition to make a state prosperous. The less influential barbarian language here, as it seems to me, is projected by Herodotus as the antithesis of the influential Greek language, but this suggestion only applies to this specific case case and does not hold when Herodotus talks about other non-Greek states which obtain neutral or positive narrations. Herodotus says that the Greek speaking people in Greece were in the end more successful, but he does not say that it was the Greek language that made them successful.

Undoubtedly, in Herodotus, there are countless cases in which the word βάρβαρος is used as the obvious antithesis of the Greeks. This antithesis usually showed up in his references to political systems, namely Greek/Athenian democracy versus barbarian

[90] Thucydides 2.68; cf. Boletsi 2013:99.
[91] Hartog 2001: 80.

tyranny (e.g. during the Battle of Marathon in Book 6, the Athenian army voted to decide the strategy, but the Persian army are subject to the one king), and to the battlefield (e.g. during the Battle of Thermopylae in Book 7, while the Greek fight fiercely, the Persians are described as 'ὅτι πολλοὶ μὲν ἄνθρωποι εἶεν, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἄνδρες/among so many peoples, few of them are real men' 7.210).

Herodotus points out that the Greek alphabet was adopted by the Phoenicians who came with Cadmus (*Histories* 5.58), and from Pelasgians who learnt from the Egyptians, and from whom the Greeks learnt the names of most of the gods. (*Histories* 2.50.1-3). Therefore, as Munson correctly states, 'the Pelasgians in Herodotus represent the collective embodiment of what links the Greek to the non-Greek world, they are especially responsible for fundamental contributions at the intersection of language and religion.'[92] Cross-cultural exchanges between the Greek and non-Greek language and religion do sometimes appear in Herodotus in a positive light, and thus the barbarians in Herodotus do not always show up as the negative antipode of the Greeks.

To summarise Herodotus' uses of βάρβαρος, there are positive, neutral, and negative applications of this word, generally depending on the context of the passage (though not always, there are negative barbarians in his history narrations in 1.1) and on whether Herodotus is recording the history of Greek and non-Greek communication or narrating the conflict between Greeks and barbarians. The passage above I took as reference can be regarded as the un-biased judgement of Herodotus about the non-Greeks. Because it is not related to war or conflict between the Greeks and non-Greeks, in this case Herodotus did not have to narrate it as the antithesis to make the scene a dramatic and vivid battlefield, thus this passage displays Herodotus' more complex and nuanced used of the term as opposed to his use of the terms in his narration of the Greco-Persian wars

Conclusion

Herodotus himself lived in a transitional period between the archaic and classical periods, after the Persian Wars, which deeply changed the Greek understanding of 'non-Greeks.' The ambivalent, at times contradictory uses of the word barbarian in his work therefore reflect precisely this transition. The other pre-classical literary sources that I

[92] Munson 2005: 10-11.

have discussed in this chapter (Anacreon, Pindar, Hecataeus) do not show an obvious trend towards a negative or neutral meaning of the term: the meaning of the word barbarian had not settled yet, and its divergent uses are symptomatic of a period in which identities were to a certain extent still in flux and organized around different axes (including language and region). What we see is that the word βάρβαρος comes to be used more often in the 6th and 5th centuries BCE, and that it seems to refer basically to non-Greek people. It is increasingly infused with more distinctly negative connotations as we move towards the classical era. This suggests that there was a growing attention among the Greeks to what it meant to be Greek or not, and a growing need to linguistically strengthen a sense of shared ethnicity in the context of the Persian wars, by defining the Greek world against its barbarian others.

Chapter 3

Barbarism Innovated: the Novel, *That Time I Got Reincarnated as Iphigenia*[93]

Before the Greco-Persian War, the image of non-Greek ethnicities in literary texts had not been fixed and the word 'barbarian' had a relatively neutral status, referring mainly to linguistic difference. In chapter 1, I reassessed Edith Hall's research of the non-Greek people in the *Iliad* and the *Persians* and, in chapter 2, I assessed the use of βάρβαρος in archaic Greek literature and Herodotus' *Histories* which lies in-between archaic and classical time. These texts are different to the classical texts, which include more stereotypical representations of non-Greek people. When compared to the fragmented archaic odes and proses, drama seems to be more influential in modern classical reception. The image of non-Greek characters in reception works depends partly on the primary source they are adapting but is of course often substantially modified and adapted to contemporary contexts and audiences.

In the movie *Troy* (2004),[94] the Trojan characters are sympathetic and characterised in a very positive way, even more positive than the way Homer had depicted them; but in

[93] The novel was originally written in Chinese, but the texts referenced in the chapter have been translated from Chinese to English by Wangzhi Xi.

[94] The movie *Troy*, directed by Wolfgang Petersen and written by David Benioff, was released in 2004. This movie is adapted from Homer's *Iliad*, and relates the war between the Greek and Trojans; it starts with Helen's escape (Helen goes with Paris voluntarily in this adaption) and ends with the fall of Troy.

the movie *300* (2006),[95] the image of the Persians is notoriously demonised with exotic imagination, and this movie became a source of researching the orientalism in film industry.[96] *Troy* made the Trojans kind and sympathetic, and the Greek side (especially the figures of Agamemnon and Menelaus) were wicked and cruel; *300* made the Spartans brave and valiant, but the Persian side were slaves to the king and were depicted a being subject to hellish conditions. In commercial films, what I found interesting is that they often echo what classical authors had written about Greeks and their 'others'. These movies create villains as the antithesis of the just (Greek) side; the dualism of good and evil might be the easiest way to write a script, but it is also the shallowest one.

Before reading those archaic literary sources which I have assessed in chapter 2, my impression of the Greek narration of the non-Greeks mostly relied on the more popular classical literature: Medea the wicked sorceress from distant Colchis (*Medea* by Euripides), the cruel Taurians who perform human sacrifice (*Iphigenia in Tauris* by Euripides), the polygamous marriages of the Trojans (*Andromache* by Euripides), and in the vicious Tereus king of Thrace (*Tereus* by Sophocles).

When I started to write the novel, *That Time I Got Reincarnated as Iphigenia*, which is situated in classical reception and in the *isekai* genre,[97] I realised that my work was influenced by the research on barbarism to some extent. The prologue of my novel portrays the reason behind the reincarnation of the protagonist:

> "Pathetic Agamemnon! The three stabs by Clytemnestra to kill him are really too kind."
>
> At 2:00 a.m., in the central library, I close Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*.
>
> I am a student majoring in Classics, trying to take the last overnight revision for the next day's exam in ancient Greek. I take another sip of coffee without a single drop

[95] The movie *300*, directed by Zack Snyder, is based on the comic series of the same name by Frank Miller and Lynn Varley. The movie depicts the Battle of Thermopylae, and is adapted from various ancient source including Herodotus' *Histories*.

[96] See Tahsily 2021.: 230–244.

[97] The name of my novel is inspired by a famous Japanese anime, called *That Time I Got Reincarnated as a Slime*; its genre is *isekai* (a normal person's accidental adventure to an 'otherworld'; in most cases, this person had been through some accident and, then, he or she has been reincarnated and transported to a fantasy world).

of milk, ready to go through the part where Clytemnestra accuses Agamemnon of sacrificing his own daughter Iphigenia. I really love this! *Iphigenia will greet him by the River of Acheron.* As dark as the underworld—this is so Aeschylus. To learn it is deadly-difficult—this is so Aeschylus, too.

This is my fourth cup of coffee. My spirits are high, except that… Damnit! Why is my heart beating too fast? Ah… Uh… My heart really hurts! Before I shout for help, I collapse unconsciously to the ground with my hands over my chest.

…

"Iphigenia! Wake up!"

"Please, open your eyes and look at your mother."

"My Iphigenia…"

"My poor daughter, how did you fall from the carriage?"

… Who is this voice?

Against the severe physical pain, my consciousness gradually wakes up, and the words in my ears is becoming clearer…

Iphigenia? What Iphigenia? What carriage?

I slowly open my eyes. A stunningly beautiful woman is holding my hand, with a worried look. She is… she is sobbing but with joy? Her dress is…wait, θυγατηρ… Is she speaking ancient Greek?

"Iphigenia! You're awake!"

What? She... What did she call me?

Iphigenia?

Does this mean… I'm inside Iphigenia's body?

I am totally astonished while this noblewoman, the mother of my current body—Clytemnestra, right, Clytemnestra—is excitedly saying, "Thank goodness! Hera bless! My girl, you just fell down. The doctor said you will recover soon. Good, the wedding of you and Achilles will be held as usual! It is not in vain that we have made such a long journey to Aulis!"

Wait, my brain is still struggling to process the information in her words… And I hear… what?! Achilles? Aulis?

Wait a minute…

Damn it! I'm screwed!

(prologue, *That Time I Got Reincarnated as Iphigenia*)

As the prologue shows, my novel is about the adventure of the protagonist in the

mythological world who has taken the body of Iphigenia. The prologue draws from Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*, a play that stages the sacrifice of Iphigenia before the Achaean army set out to Troy. When I started writing about the adventure of the protagonist, I did not mean to constrain her to the Greek world but expand her travels to several ancient worlds (including Egypt, Uruk, Scythia, Hittite, Troy, India, etc.) and combine the mythology of these civilizations. In a way, it was my attempt to bring together – in the same fictional work – the worlds of the Greeks and their 'barbarians,' in a manner that would be different from classic Athenian literary sources and their negative stereotypical depictions of barbarian characters and lands. Thus, my own work as a creative writer and my scholarly interest in archaic sources in this thesis are both motivated by my wish to find ways to transcend, complicate or twist the fixed image of Greeks and barbarians that we have inherited from classical antiquity. When I wrote about these non-Greek cultures and people, therefore, I was careful not to fall into a stereotypical narration while keeping in mind the discrepancies between different primary sources from different periods.

Non-Greek World as *Deus ex Machina*

In the novel, when Iphigenia told Clytemnestra about Agamemnon's plan of sacrificing her to Artemis, the queen Clytemnestra immediately concocted a plan for the two of them to escape to Egypt. Before the protagonist was reincarnated as Iphigenia, she was a classics student, thus her personal attitude towards Near-Eastern and other civilizations is determinedly positive, and she is curious and willing to explore these attractive places:

> It is tonight, and as soon as we board the ship laden with gold, we are free. With so much treasure and a loyal escort, we can go together to the wealthy lands of Egypt and have a luxurious mansion there. Clytemnestra told me that Pharaoh Ozymandias[98] will be happy to receive us as guests, as we will bring a large treasure with us, and her brothers, Castor and Pollux, get on quite well with the local nobles. Oh, I will have a chance to hear the ancient Egyptians speak. I want to record it as much as possible! Many of the vowels in hieroglyphics are still undeciphered. If I get them, when back in modern society, it will be effortless for me to publish a world-shattering book. Haha… And… and after arriving there, I will also definitely go to

[98] Ozymandias is the Hellenic name of Ramses II. Here I am inspired by the Ramses Series by Christian Jacq, in which the Trojan War and the reign of Ramses II are in the same time period.

Hittite and Babylon. I want to see with my own eyes the tribe of the Amazons if they actually exist!

I am waiting for the darkness in silence, while my thoughts have flown to places far away.

(part of chapter 6, *That Time I Got Reincarnated as Iphigenia*)

What Clytemnestra planned to do echoes with the myth of Io, who was also a princess of Argos, and her self-imposed exile to Egypt to escape from Hera's wrath. And later, in chapter 108 of my novel, the protagonist escorted Persephone to Abydos, Egypt to seek Isis' help, because Persephone was escaping from her enemy. Egypt is therefore a special place in both the Io myth and my novel: it functions as a sanctuary for those who are doomed in their homeland. The Greeks had, of course, absorbed and adapted Egyptian culture,[99] which was familiar to the Greeks from its figuration in myths, yet still exotic for its distance.

Besides Egypt's function as a sanctuary, in the novel, the magic and power of the deities from the non-Greek world is powerful and superior to the Greek ones, because I meant to set their strength according to the age of their history. When Iphigenia became a friend of Pasiphaë, the queen of Crete, who knows magic,[100] she asked Pasiphaë to teach her magic. But the protagonist had angered Hecate, and thus she did not dare learn the magic related to Hecate. Then Pasiphaë finds a new way for her to learn magic:

"Could you tell me from which mighty god your magic is guided?" The next night, after Pasiphaë cast a sleep spell on the crew, I (the protagonist) ask her the first question after long hesitation.

Hearing me ask such a question, her (Pasiphaë) eyes suddenly glow with adoration, "The torch in the hands of the goddess Hecate will always guide me. Ah, the beautiful waning moon..."

"Except the great Hecate, from which other gods have you received help?" Oh no, it is really Hecate. Stop, stop your fond and admiration! What if she is summoned here?

"Ah, except the great Hecate, Artemis and Hermes of the underworld will also help

[99] See what I have disccused in chapter 2 about the communication of Greek and non-Greek civilizations (e.g., *Histories* 2.50.1-3)

[100] Although Pasiphaë was later portrayed as lascivious, in the early records she also knows magic, and her sister was Circe. For example, in *Bibliotheca* 3.15.1, she used the 'love magic' on Minos.

me in casting curses, and they are always able to pin the *kynotos* on the soul of my enemy![101]

"Ah, yes, you are very powerful! But I fear these powerful deities. These curses are not something I should learn. Maybe I should learn something more practical. For example, the transformation spell you once cast on me?"

(After the protagonist has asked, Pasiphaë promised to teach her Egyptian magic)

"Well, you are right. Something practical is more suitable for you. I had learned the magic of invisibility from the high priest of the god Amun in Thebes (the Egyptian Thebes). Isis met me on her way to find her brother Osiris, and I lent her a hand, giving her the papyrus boat that I was using so she did not have to make a new boat, in exchange for her secret magic of transforming and healing. These kinds of magic are useful for a captain who often travels to different places to earn a living. When running into pirates, you can turn into a bird and fly away; when injured, you can quickly recover. I would like to teach you tomorrow when we arrive at Thera for a rest."[102]

These spells are irrelevant to Hecate. Then I am safe for now...

(part of chapter 44, *That Time I Got Reincarnated as Iphigenia*)

Furthermore, in chapter 91 of the novel, the protagonist allies herself with Asclepius who wanted to avenge his mother's death by destroying his father Apollo.[103] Since Apollo is immortal and cannot be killed under the Greek mythical rules, the protagonist goes to India and convinces Karna to lend his weapon *Vasavi Shakti* to destroy Apollo.[104] When the plan succeeds, Asclepius is tried for patricide, and the protagonist defends him for the reason of avenging his mother. Finally, Asclepius gets exonerated and the status of women and men in Greece is thus changed. This part of the novel is my adaptation of the trial of Orestes (in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*), in which Orestes – the son of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra – murdered his mother, in revenge for Clytemnestra killing Agamemnon to avenge her daughter Iphigenia, and Orestes was then hunted and tormented by the Erinyes (the personification of fury) because of his

[101] *Kynotos* is originally the worst throw of the dice in an ancient Greek gambling game, later extended to bad luck. The word was also used as a curse spell.

[102] There was a city-state Thebes in Greece and in Egypt, there was a city Thebes (named by the Greeks), which the ancient Egyptians called Waset (w³s.t).
I am inspired by the story in Plutarch's version of Isis and Osiris (a very imaginative Greek record of Egyptian mythology), where Isis was searching for Osiris, whose body was divided by Typhon (i.e., Seth), in a papyrus boat. Isis is the goddess of Egyptian mythology; Osiris is her brother and lover..

[103] In some versions of the myth (e.g., Pindar) Coronis the mother of Asclepius, had affairs with Apollo and another man. After Apollo found out about the other affair, he killed the man and Artemis killed the mother of Asclepius as a punishment for infidelity to the immortals. And, in the novel, I set the story so that it is Apollo who murdered Coronis.

[104] Karna is a hero in the Indian epic *Mahabharata*, who is granted by Indra with a weapon called *Vasavi Shakti,* which can demolish any enemy, but can only be used once.

matricide; Athena then held a trial for him at Areopagus, and twelve Athenian citizens were required to decide whether Orestes' matricide was jusifiable, for he murdered his mother in order to avenge his father. Their verdict is 6:6 and, finally, Athena votes for 'not guilty' which exonerates Orestes, and therefore this event can be interpreted as the allegorical symbol of the power of the father surpassing the power of the mother.

Back to the novel's plot, when the deicide mission of murdering Apollo is impossible (since Apollo is technically immortal), the non-Greek weapon then acts like a *deus ex machina*. While the Greek world has its own rules, what comes from the outside carries a transgressive force and acts as a rule-breaker that carries another form of justice – a justice that challenges the rigidity of Greek rules and confronts them with alternative conceptions of what is just and even alternative gender roles.

Two Sides of a Goddess: the Greek Artemis and the Anatolian Hecate

In the course of my novel, the most significant scene of confrontation between Greek and non-Greek is the ethnicity of Greek Artemis and Hecate from the East. There are several assumptions about the origin of Hecate,[105] including indigenous Greek origins, and Egypt origins. Burkert has also suggested the possibility of her Anatolian origin.[106] In order to create more suspense, I set Hecate as having Anatolian origins. The following passage is from a part of the novel where the protagonist finds out that Artemis is acting 'weirdly' – different from the quiet Artemis she knew – the goddess in front of the protagonist now suddenly becomes bloodthirsty:

> (The protagonist is terrified by Artemis' unusual behavior) Is this... is this schizophrenia? No, impossible! A second ago she was Artemis and now she is not herself, she must be switched into another personality, probably stimulated by my blood. *The new moon*, *suppressed*, *blood*… Could it be that… now she is…
>
> That happens. The cross-cultural influence of Mediterranean region and Asia Minor on the other side of the sea impacted ancient Greek religion and mythology, the gods and goddesses acquired more than one identity, who also evolved on their own, leading to the confusion of two or more deities. The identification of the Sun God, Helios and Apollo in later period, became unclear over the ages. Demeter, the God of Agriculture, was mixed up with the local deity Ceres by the Romans, Cybele by the Asian Minor, and later even Isis by the Egyptians. Ishtar was the Mesopotamian parallel to Aphrodite and Athena in the Greek world. I guess she... might be in a similar state now. If I boldly read out her true name, as Isis did to the Sun God Ra[107]

[105] See Mooney, Carol M. 1971.
[106] Burkert 1987:171.
[107] In Egyptian mythology, Isis gained the power of Ra by recognizing his true name. All the names of the Egyptian deities that we know are not their 'real names', because the real names of the deities are unknown to

in Egyptian mythology, is it possible to… subdue her? *I can't be terrified now. Think, think!* Who is she most likely to be? If I can't come up with the right answer, I'd better quit my master's program in Classics when I travel back to modern times!

Ah—

The pain of my blood vessel tearing open quickly brings me back to reality. This "Artemis" is holding my injured hand and sucking my blood… "Ah, the taste is so sweet; a small sip of blood is worth many mortals. The flavor of a descendant of Zeus is exactly my favorite ambrosia!" [108]

(after insignificant conversation, Hecate explains to the protagonist her relationship with Artemis)

"I am Artemis, and Artemis is me. We have long been one. The moon phase only determines the extent to which one dominates this body. She is watching every move I make right now. She is struggling, you know, but in this phase (here I mean the new moon) and in this place—Tauris, far, far away from Olympus—oh well, she has no domination at all. But I wonder, really, she has sat by and let me consume so many sacrifices (here I mean the human sacrifice). It's really interesting she is now resisting like this when it's your turn."

The moon phase determines the degree of domination over the body, which means the two spiritual powers exist at the same time. Then could it be that...

"That night... you were there?"

"It's just easy to talk to smart people. Yes, I was the one who left the spell on your body that night. How could *she* know such profound magic?"

That's her. But… profound magic? *Magic, the new moon, sacrifice and death, away from Olympus, more powerful in Asia Minor… another name for Apollo, another "sister" …*[109] I've read such an article… The answer is clear…

(after some insignificant conversation, the protagonist reveals the true identity of this "Artemis")

Right now! "In place of Artemis, you enjoy offerings as his sister in the Temple of Apollo in Miletus, far from Olympus! You master esoteric magic because you are the ancestor of magic! You are not a native Greek god. You are from a distant land, possessing Artemis and overpowering her when you are far from Olympus! Am I right?! Hecate, one of Triple Goddesses!"[110]

(part of chapter 19, *That Time I Got Reincarnated as Iphigenia*)

---

anyone, for example, *Horus* is not the real name of Horus, but only a reference. In ancient Greece, there was also a theory (inferred by some historians, not confirmed, and of course opposed by some scholars) that the deities could be driven by their true names, so they were called by many names in the prayers written by humans get the 'correct' name.

[108] Iphigenia was also a descendant of Zeus, whose paternal lineage was traced back to Tantalus (son of Zeus).

[109] There were numerous epithets for Apollo, one of which was Hecatos, direct evidence of their 'sister –brother' relationship.

[110] Artemis and Hecate were integrated more deeply in Asia Minor. There are many hypotheses for the origin of Hecate, either foreign or native Greek. In this novel, it is assumed that Hecate is a deity in Asia Minor, foreign to the Greeks.

Here, I give shape to the two personalities of Artemis/Hecate according to the regions that they dwell: her 'Artemis' side is dominant most of the time, and all the time when the goddess is in mainland Greece; Hecate is the latent personality of Artemis and her 'Hecate' side takes control of her body only when she is in Asia Minor during the new moon.

When I was writing the conversation above, I set Hecate as a chthonic goddess who is a master of magic, and somehow bloodthirsty, knowing that the chthonic feature is only one of her several characteristics.[111] Inspired by events in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, I made the priestesses of Tauris perform human sacrifice to Artemis-Hecate by capturing and killing the outsiders. The human sacrifice I plot is specifically dedicated to Hecate but not to Artemis, for Hecate has the need of blood as her source of power. I was not thinking about the Greek and non-Greek issue when it comes to human sacrifice, but I regard Hecate as the symbol of ancient primitive power[112] or the 'Mother-goddess', who at the same time protects her believers and the city Tauris where she is the patron goddess but needs blood sacrifice as reward.

But the sense of contrast is what I was aiming at because, during this stage (chapter 19), the protagonist and Artemis are starting to get closer and to know each other. The first impression the protagonist had of Artemis is majestic and reticent, and of Hecate on the contrary is bloodthirsty and passionate. The characteristics of both Artemis and Hecate have been through a major reversal afterwards: the majestic Artemis turns out to be a hypocrite and Hecate, who is sympathetic to the protagonist, releases her when was held captive by Artemis. In this novel, Hecate, although she needs human sacrifice, but the number of victims is much less than the population Artemis has destroyed. Artemis on the other hand despises mortals and take their lives as dirt, and she and Apollo cast down plague to Argos in order to punish the protagonist.

Therefore, even though my representation of the 'Anatolian' Hecate at first sight might evoke the stereotype of a 'barbarian' bloodthirsty female goddess, I end up showing that the seemingly more 'civilized' and rational Artemis (associated with the Greek

[111] Hecate's characteristic varies in different genre and condition. See Youtie 1937:45, she frequently appears as horrible doom in curse table. But she can be positive, for example, in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, she helped Demeter to find Persephone.
[112] The 'primitive' here I mean is the positive expression of the origin power.

world) in fact represents a more insidious and destructive form of power and violence. In this, way, I drew from existing classical stereotypes of Greek and barbarian characters in order to subvert them and expose the violent side of those who present themselves as civilized and rational.

Barbaric Scythian: Songs and Reality

I deliberately depict the Greeks as the ones who carry stereotypical impressions of the non-Greek ethnicities in order to echo what most classical literature had to say about the non-Greek people. For example, the following dialogue between the protagonist and a girl demonstrates the Greek aversion to the distant Scythians:

> "…do not worry about her, she is a fugitive of the wrath of the gods. She has exiled herself for twenty years, she is now with the Scythians, settled down, safe and sound." (The protagonist)
>
> …
>
> "Please wait…" she is hesitating, "I know that I am merely a girl living in a farm, and I am not gifted with the skill of prophecy, and I do not know the secret of the universe, but…" (a girl)
>
> "But?"
>
> "I heard from a song sang by a rhapsode, the story of the savage Scythians, is she really among the Scythians? What if…what if the Scythians do evil things to the innocents, what will she do?" She looks at me with her bright innocent eyes, but this sight is just like fire of judgement, burning my heart on the red-hot stake.
>
> (part of chapter 106, *That Time I Got Reincarnated as Iphigenia*

I staged such misunderstandings between normal Greek people and non-Greeks faraway from Greece, suggesting that the rhapsodes are the ones who spread such stereotypes of non-Greeks. When the protagonist herself travels to these cities and countries, she finds out that although they have different custom and living habits,[113] these local people are as normal as the Greek people, and totally different from what Greek people have imagined. Therefore, I created an ironic contrast between the protagonist's preconceptions about non-Greeks (which she carried in her imagination from her classical education) and the reality she encounters during her (imaginary)

[113] None of these customs are considered to be negative of course.

adventure, in order to underscore the biased lens through which Greeks views and depicted non-Greek people and offer imaged of those ‘others’ from the other side.

In conclusion, my fictional attempt to revisit, nuance and question these stereotypical representations of non-Greeks mirrors and parallels my attempt in this thesis to critically revisit the archaic period and the liminal period of the transition between archaic and classical times in order to take a closer looks at the uses of the ‘barbarian’ and references to non-Greeks from a pre-classical, transitional time: a time of intense movement, migrations and exchanges, during which identities were less fixed and Greeks and barbarians were not (necessarily) perceived as belonging to completely different and incompatible worlds. In my novel, I tried to bring these worlds closer together – while also stressing the power struggles among them - and have them interact and penetrate each other in less rigid terms than those dictated by the Greek-barbarian antithesis.

Final Conclusion

While Edith Hall provides the concept of paradigm shift before and after the Greco-Persian Wars, this analysis went through the image of the non-Greeks in more detailed interpretation of archaic literary texts. The meaning of βάρβαρος and the use of it on the non-Greek people had been through a big change. Discovering the representation of non-Greek identity in pre-classical literature is crucial to the study of Greek barbarism, though it is always more vague, complex and controversial than the texts from later period, where the stereotypes towards the non-Greeks has formed in a generally tag---the ‘barbarian’.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aeschylus. *Persians. Seven against Thebes. Suppliants. Prometheus Bound.* Edited and translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. Loeb Classical Library 145. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Aeschylus. *Persians. Seven against Thebes. Suppliants. Prometheus Bound.* Edited and translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. Loeb Classical Library 145. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Herodotus. *The Persian Wars, Volume I: Books 1-2.* Translated by A. D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library 117. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Homer. *Iliad*. Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by William F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library 170. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Homer. *Odyssey*. Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock. Loeb Classical Library 104. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Pindar. *Nemean Odes. Isthmian Odes. Fragments.* Edited and translated by William H. Race. Loeb Classical Library 485. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Strabo. *Geography, Volume I: Books 1-2.* Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Loeb Classical Library 49. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917.

Secondary Sources

Almagor, E. 2000. 'Strabo's Barbarophonoi (14.2.28 C 661-3): A Note' in *SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA*, vol. 19, 133-138.

Burkert, Walter.1987. *Greek Religion: Archaic and classical*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Bernsdorff, H., & Anacreon. 2020. *Anacreon of Teos: testimonia and fragments*, Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Blegen, C. W. 1963. *Troy and the Trojans*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Boletsi, M. 2013. *Barbarism and Its Discontents* (1st ed.). Stanford University Press.

Brosius, M. 1998. *Women in Ancient Persia, 559-331 BC. Oxford Classical Monographs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bühler, W. 1969. ‘Eine vollständigere Fassung von Anacr. fr. 122 G’, *MCr I*V, 9–14.

Burnett, A. P. 2005. *Pindar’s Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pelling, C. 2007. ‘East is east and west is west - or are they? : national stereotyping in Herodotus’, *Histos* 1, 51–66.

Dué, C., Lupack, S., & Lamberton, R. 2020. ‘Family and Marriage in Homer’, *The Cambridge Guide to Homer* (C. Pache, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 329-331.

Führer, R. 1972. ‘Zum neuen Anakreon’, *Museum helveticum*, 29(4), 278–279.

Georges, P. 1994. *Barbarian Asia and the Greek experience: from the archaic period to the age of Xenophon*. Baltimore.

Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hall, J. M. 2002. *Hellenicity: between ethnicity and culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hartog, F., & Lloyd, J. 2001. *Memories of Odysseus: frontier tales from ancient Greece*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hansen, H. J. 2016. *Pindar's Isthmian 6: A commentary and literary study*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Herington, C. J. 1985. *Poetry into drama : early tragedy and the Greek poetic tradition*. Berkeley, Calif. [etc.]: University of California press.

Isaac, B. 2014. ‘The Barbarian in Greek and Latin literature’ *Scripta Classica Israelica* 33. 117-137.

Ivantchik, A., 2006. ‘Scythian’ Archers on Archaic Attic Vases: Problems of Interpretation. *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia*, 12(3), pp.197-271.

Jacoby, Felix. 1912. ‘Hekataios von Milet.’ *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 7, no. 2: 2667–2750.

Kim, Hyun Jin 2021. ‘Ethnic Identity and the “Barbarian” in Classical Greece and Early China: Its Origins and Distinctive Features’ in *Rulers and Ruled in Ancient*

Greece, Rome, and China, first ed., edited by Beck, Hans, and Vankeerberghen, Griet, 420-442. Cambridge University Press.

Kirk, G. S. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, volume 1, Cambridge University Press.

Lenfant , Dominique. 2019. 'Polygamy in Greek views of Persians', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 59*(1). 15–37.

Dué, C., Lupack, S., & Lamberton, R. 2020. 'Family and Marriage in Homer', *The Cambridge Guide to Homer*, 329-30., and Monsacré 2018: II.1.

Moggi, M. 1991. 'Greci e barbari: uomini e no', in *De Finis*, ed., 31-46.

Monsacré, Hélène. 2018. *The Tears of Achilles*. Trans. Nicholas J. Snead. Introduction by Richard P. Martin. Hellenic Studies Series 75. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Mooney, Carol M. 1971. "Hekate: Her Role and Character in Greek Literature from before the Fifth Century B.C.".*Open Access Dissertations and Theses*.Paper 4651.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo. 2005. *Black Doves Speak: Herodotus and the Languages of Barbarians*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nichols, A. 2008. *The complete fragments of Ctesias of Cnidus*: Translation and commentary with an introduction. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Orrells, D. 2012. 'GREEK LOVE, ORIENTALISM AND RACE: INTERSECTIONS IN CLASSICAL RECEPTION', *The Cambridge Classical Journal*, 58, 194-230.

Page, D.L. 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley, CA. [etc.]: University of California Press.

Pinsent, J. 1984. 'The Trojans in the *Iliad*', in *The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context*, eds. L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies. Bristol: 141–62.

Pownall, Frances. 2013. 'Hekataios of Miletos (1)' In *Jacoby Online*. *Brill's New Jacoby, Part I*, edited by Ian Worthington. Brill: Leiden.

Pritchard, D. M. 2014. 'The position of attic women in democratic Athens', *Greece and Rome*, *61*(2), 174–193.

R.L. Fowler.2003, ‘Pelasgians’, in E. Csapo & M.C. Miller (eds.), *Poetry, Theory, Pr axis: The Social Life of Myth, Word and Image in Ancient Greece* , 2-18 and 9-10. Oxford.

Ross, S. (2005). ‘Barbarophonos: Language and panhellenism in the *Iliad*’ in *Classical Philology*, *100*(4), 299–316.

Said, E. W. 1985. *Orientalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Scott, W. C. 1984. *Musical Design in Aeschylean Theater*. Hanover: University Press of New England.

Slater, W. J. 1969. *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Tahsily, B. 2021. ‘Culture Industry and Orientalism in the Movie *300*’, *Journal of Asia-Pacific Pop Culture* 22. 6 (2): 230–244.

Werner, J.1992. 'Zur Fremdsprachenproblematik in der griechisch-römischen Antike’, in *Müller, Sier and Werner*, eds., 1-20.

Youtie, H. C., & Bonner, C. 1937. ‘Two Curse Tablets from Beisan’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, *68*, 43–128.