

The Strange Love of the Fish and the Goat: Regional Contexts and Rough Cilician Religion in Oppian's *Halieutica* 4.308–73*

EPHRAIM LYTLE

University of Toronto

SUMMARY: This paper examines one of the better-known episodes in Oppian's *Halieutica*, an unusual account that describes first the strange desire of a fish, the σαργός, for the goat, and then the bizarre way in which that desire is manipulated by humans to capture the fish (4.308–73). Although it has been dismissed by most previous scholars as the product of ignorance, misunderstood source material or poetic imagination, I argue that this account can be elucidated by evidence for social, economic and religious contexts in the poet's native Rough Cilicia.

OPPIAN'S *HALIEUTICA* REMAINS A LARGELY UNDISCOVERED POEM. THIS IS true despite the recent appearance of a first modern critical edition (Fajen 1999) and periodic claims that a poem that "should be meat and drink to post-modern literary critics" deserves more attention (Goldhill 2004). What consideration the *Halieutica* has received is generally restricted to narrow linguistic analysis or to brief discussions in much wider studies of the didactic genre or the Second Sophistic.¹ In this article I hope to suggest the usefulness

* For a number of valuable suggestions I would like to thank collectively the members of the audiences that heard parts of this paper in Toronto, Quebec and San Antonio, as well as Christopher Trinacty, Michael Dewar and Gil Renberg for their comments and corrections to an earlier draft. But I am especially indebted to the diligence, learning and insight of *TAPA*'s two anonymous reviewers, and to the editor, Katharina Volk.

¹ There are important exceptions, most recently Kneebone's article (2008). The *Halieutica* is also the subject of recent monographs that include Rebuffat 2001, Bartley 2003 and Benedetti 2005, but these are generally narrow in scope: the first treats techniques of composition, the second documents Oppian's (and pseudo-Oppian's) use of comparisons and digressions, and the third treats the source material for a number of passages in the first book of the poem. A fairly complete bibliography of work on the *Halieutica* is available in Cuypers 2010. For the text of the *Halieutica* I follow Fajen's edition (1999), except where indicated in the notes. All translations are my own.

of a rather different approach by examining one of the poem's better-known episodes, an extended passage that describes the strange desire, ξείνος ἔρως, of a fish, the σαργός, for the goat (4.308–73). Although casually dismissed by previous scholars as mere poetic invention or the hopeless confusion of material harvested from earlier sources, this episode can be illuminated by exploring its relationship to social, economic and religious contexts in the poet's native Rough Cilicia.

In the first section I introduce the passage in Oppian and note its reception among early modern naturalists. In the second I trace its more general reception, which tends to treat the tale in sexual and moral terms that are foreign to Oppian's account. In the third section I discuss a closely related account in Aelian, whose version differs from Oppian's chiefly in that it omits any account of goat bathing, a feature of Oppian's account that Keydell characterizes as an absurd fiction. To the contrary, I show in the fourth section that the forcible bathing of goats is alluded to in other ancient accounts, with comparative evidence suggesting that it is a feature of the Mediterranean *longue durée*. In the fifth section I argue that Oppian introduces this goat-bathing ritual into a narrative carefully structured to contrast not just mountain and sea but also the competing social and economic modes characteristic especially of the poet's native Rough Cilicia. In the sixth section I demonstrate that Oppian's description of the capture of the σαργοί is also unlikely to be an invention of the poet and that there are reasons to believe that it records a real fishing method. In the seventh section I suggest that the more bizarre features of that method can be explained with reference to an underlying ritual context that involves the butchering of a goat and its sacrifice to Pan. In the final section I argue that this pastoral ritual should perhaps in turn be linked to specific religious traditions that are otherwise attested at the Corycian Cave in the poet's homeland and specifically engaged with elsewhere in his poem.

I. THE SARGUE AND THE GOAT

Book 4 of the *Halieutica* opens with an invocation of Eros. In what follows, Oppian generally adheres to a simple pattern of first describing the behavior of a given species, illustrating the way in which it is slave to ἔρως, then describing the way in which fishermen take advantage of a particular species' desire in capturing it. In certain cases, this ἔρως is explicitly sexual (e.g., 4.111–71), but it is better described by much broader notions of desire, with Oppian also illustrating, for example, the special devotion of comrades or the familial care of kin (4.40–110, 242–63; Kneebone 2008: 43). Oppian introduces in the middle of this ichthyologic exploration of desire a series of narratives intended to illustrate the existence among fish (and, more gener-

ally, in nature) of ξείνοι ἔρωτες, strange or foreign passions.² This section is uniquely important insofar as it attempts to demonstrate that desire operates not only over a whole range of species, but also between individuals of different species, its causal force obtaining both on land and in the sea and even, in certain instances, across the two environments. This section opens with an account of the octopus's desire for the olive tree, a fascinating passage worthy of careful reexamination in its own right; however, we are chiefly concerned here with what follows at 4.308–73. These lines describe the desire of the σαργός, the white seabream or sargue (*Diplodus sargus sargus*), for the goat, and, consequently, the fish's capture.³ The account opens by describing the occasion for a physical encounter between fish and goats, when the latter are bathed in the sea (4.308–24):

σαργοὶ δ' αἰγείοισι πόθοις ἐπὶ θυμὸν ἔχουσιν,
αἰγῶν δ' ἰμείρουσιν, ὀρειαύλοις δὲ βοτοῖσιν
ἐκπάγλως χαίρουσι καὶ εἰνάλιοι περ ἐόντες. 310
ἧ σέβας οὐκ ἐπίελπον ὁμόφρονα φύλα τεκέσθαι
ἀλλήλοισι ὀρέων τε πάγους χαροπὴν τε θάλασσαν.
εὕτε γὰρ αἰγονομῆες ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνας ἄγωσι
μηκάδας ἐν δίνῃσι λοεσσομένας ἀλίσιν
ἐνδίοις, ὅτε θερμὸς Ὀλύμπιος ἵσταται ἀστήρ,
οἱ δὲ τότε βληχὴν τε παρακταίην αἰόντες 315
αὐδὴν τ' αἰπολίων βαρυηχέα πάντες ὁμαρτῇ
καὶ νωθεῖς περ ἐόντες ἐπειγόμενοι φορέονται
σαργοὶ καὶ θρώσκουσιν ἐπ' ἀνδῆροισι θαλάσσης,
γηθόσυνοι, κεραὸν δὲ περισσαίνουσιν ὅμιλον 320
ἀμφὶ τε λιχμάζουσι καὶ ἀθρόοι ἀμφιχέονται
πυκνὰ κατασκαίροντες· ἔχει δὲ τε θαῦμα νομῆας
πρωτοδαεῖς. αἶγες δὲ φίλον χορὸν οὐκ ἀέκουσαι
δέχυνται· τοὺς δ' οὔτις ἔχει κόρος εὐφροσυνάων.

² 4.264–67: ἄλλους δὲ ξεινός τε καὶ οὐκ ἐνδήμιος ἄλμης / εἶλεν ἔρωι χερσαῖον ἐπ' ἰχθύσιν οἷστρον ἐγείρων / ἔξαλον· ἄλλοδαπῆς φιλῆς βέλος οἶον ἰκάνει / πουλύποδας σαργῶν τε γένος πέτρῃσιν ἐταίρον (“Others are taken by strange desire not at home in the sea, stirring up a fierce and landward passion among the fishes. Such a dart of foreign love strikes the octopuses and the race of sargues at home among the rocks”).

³ The name σαργός most often refers, like the Latin *sargus*, to *Diplodus sargus sargus*, a species of the family *Sparidae* that is widely present in the Mediterranean and commonly called by names derived from the Ancient Greek and Latin (e.g., MG. σαργός; Fr. *sar commun*, *sargue*; It. *sarago*, *sargo*; etc.). On this and all subsequent species, see Froese and Pauly 2010. On the ancient sources, Thompson 1947: 227–28, s.v. σαργός.

Sargues' hearts are gripped by yearning for goats. Goats they desire, and though they themselves reside in the sea, they rejoice beyond measure in the mountain-sheltered herds. Indeed, it is an unexpected wonder that the blue-gray sea and the mountain ridges should give birth to flocks so like-minded to one another. For when the hot Olympian star stands in the sky, the goatherds lead their bleating tribe to the surf to be bathed at midday in the swirling waves, and the sargues, hearing the bleating along the shore and the deep-echoing song of the herds,⁴ they all rush together and, although usually somewhat sluggish, they are drawn eagerly in and leap along the edge of the sea, happy, and they fawn upon the horned herd and lick them and pouring around them in a dense school they dart here and there, such that astonishment grips those herdsmen experiencing it for the first time. For their part the goats welcome gladly their loving chorus, and for the fish their happiness is insatiable.

After a series of extended metaphors, Oppian remains loyal to his pattern and proceeds to describe the seemingly even more bizarre way in which the sargues' desire is exploited by man (4.345–73):

σαργὲ τάλαν· τάχα γάρ σε κακὸν πόθον αἰπολίοισι	345
φημὶ συνοίσεσθαι· τοῖος νόος ἀσπαλιήων	
εἰς ἀπάτην καὶ κῆρα τεοὺς ἔτρεψεν ἔρωτας.	
πέτρας μὲν κείνας τεκμαίρεται ἐγγύθι γαίης	
πρῶτον ἀνὴρ διδύμοισιν ἀνισταμένας κροτάφοισιν	
ἐγγύθεν, αἱ στεινωπὸν ἀλὸς διὰ χώρον ἔχουσιν,	350
αἰθέρος ἀκτίνεσσι διαυγέας· αἷς ἔνι σαργοὶ	
πολλοὶ ναιετάουσιν ὁμόκτιτον αὐλὶν ἔχοντες·	
ἔξοχα γὰρ πυρσοῖσιν ἐπ' ἡελίοιο γάνυνται.	

⁴For αὐδὴν τ' αἰπολίων βαρυηχέα Fajen prefers ὁδμήν τ' αἰπολίων βαρναέα ("the strong-smelling odor of the herds"), a reading that is certainly possible. While ὁδμήν is not found in any of the MSS, it is suggested by the wording of a late antique prose paraphrase (Gualandri 1968: 29). But the paraphrase may have been influenced by ὁδμή in line 358, and ὁδμήν is here governed awkwardly by αἰοντες; forms of the verb αἰώ most often indicate the sense of hearing. Adopting ὁδμήν requires that Fajen prefer βαρναέα for βαρυηχέα, both of which are attested in the MSS (1979: 12). The rarely attested adjective βαρναής seems to mean "hard-breathing" at Ps.-Oppian *Cyn.* 3.421 and could as easily agree with αὐδὴν. However, as Fajen notes, it occurs once in Nicander (*Ther.* 43) with the sense of "strong-smelling." Other considerations: αὐδὴν perhaps makes more elegant the figure of speech in lines 4.323–24 where the goats "gladly welcome their loving chorus" (αἶγες δὲ φίλον χορὸν οὐκ ἀέκουσαι / δέχυνται). The sargues, responding to the deep-echoing song of the herd, crowd around like the singer's chorus. Finally, "deep-echoing" (βαρυηχέα) could be taken as an allusion to the common association between the goat and the deepening of the male voice at puberty (see, e.g., LSJ s.v. τραγίζω; Arist. *Hist. an.* 581a; Brulé 2007: 267–68).

ἐνθάδ' ἀνὴρ μελέεσσιν ἐφεσσάμενος δέρος αἰγὸς
 δοιὰ κέρα κροτάφοισι πέρι σφετέροισιν ἀνάψας 355
 στέλλεται ὀρμαίνων νόμιον δόλον· ἐς δ' ἄλα βάλλει
 κρέαςιν αἰγείοισιν ὁμοῦ κνίσσῃ τε λιπῆνας
 ἄλφιτα· τοὺς δ' ὁδμή τε φίλῃ δολόεσσά τ' ἐσωπῇ
 φορβή τ' εὐδώρητος ἐφέλκεται, οὐδέ τιν' αἴτην
 ἐν φρεσὶν ὀρμαίνουσιν, ἀγαλλόμενοι δὲ μένουσιν 360
 αἰγὶ περισσάινοντες ἐοικότα δῆιον ἄνδρα·
 δύσμοροι, ὥς ὀλοοῖο τάχ' ἀντιώσιν ἐταίρου
 οὐ φρεσὶν αἰγείησιν ἀρηρότος· αὐτίκα γάρ σφι
 ῥάβδον τε κραναὴν ὀπλίζεται ἡδὲ λίνιοιο
 ὀρμὴν πολιοῖο, βάλεν δ' ὑπὲρ ἀγκίστροιο 365
 χηλῆς αἰγείης κρέας ἔμφυτον. οἱ μὲν ἐδωδὴν
 ἐσσυμένως ἥρπαξαν, ὃ δ' ἔσπασε χειρὶ παχείῃ
 αὐτῶν· εἰ γάρ τις οἴσσεται ἔργα δόλοιο,
 οὐκ ἂν ἔτ' ἐμπελάσειε καὶ εἰ λασιότριχας αὐτὰς
 αἶγας ἄγοι, φεύγουσι δ' ἀποστύξαντες ὁμαρτῇ 370
 καὶ μορφήν καὶ δαῖτα καὶ αὐτῆς ἔνδια πέτρης.
 εἰ δὲ λάθοι καὶ κραιπνὸν ἔχοι πόνον, οὐ κέ τις ἄγρης
 λειφθεῖη, πάντας δὲ δαμάσσεται αἰγὸς ὀπωπῇ.

Wretched sargue, how swiftly will your yearning for the herds prove a bane. The purpose of fishermen turns your love into a trap and destruction, a purpose such as this. First a man marks out those rocks arrayed close by the shore in twin ridges, forming a narrow space of sea between, the water open to the rays of the sun. And among these rocks many sargues dwell in a communal stading, rejoicing exceedingly in the heat of the sun. There the man eagerly fashions a pastoral ruse, putting on a goatskin and fastening around his temples dual horns. And he throws into the sea barley enriched with goat meat together with cooked fat. And the lovely odor and the deceptive appearance of the man and the rich feast attract the sargues, completely mindless of the ruse, who in reverence await the goat, fawning on its dreadful likeness, a man. Grim-fated sargues, how swiftly they go to meet a companion of a different mind than goats, for immediately he readies a rugged rod and a line of gray linen, and he throws out stuck fast to the hook the flesh of a goat hoof. The sargues dash to snatch the meal, and he yanks and drags in the line again with his strong hands. For if one of them should perceive these duplicitous deeds, it will not draw near even if the man should lead down the shaggy-haired goats themselves, but swiftly the sargues flee altogether the feast and the figure and even the grotto of the rock itself. But if he should adhere swiftly to his work, undetected, not one of the school will escape, but the appearance of the goat conquer them all.

It is not surprising that such an unusual account has attracted attention, or that, aside from one or two perhaps naively credulous commentators, nearly

every scholar on record has been quick to dismiss it as the product of ignorance, misunderstood source material or an overactive poetic imagination. Typical of these is the great naturalist Lacépède, who attributes “this ridiculous notion” to the Greek “fondness for the marvelous, where natural history was always mixed with mythology and the inventions of poets.” Here, he argues, Oppian has “maladroitly substituted by ignorance certain absurd stories for an original belief that was itself likely false.”⁵

This explanation is, as we shall see, insufficient. Like other classically trained naturalists who consult the *Halieutica*, Lacépède is interested only in the poet’s descriptions of specific behaviors of particular species. Accounts are examined piecemeal, with no attention to their place in the larger poetic project or their relationship to broader historical or socio-economic contexts. Likewise, more general discussions of the sargue and the goat often show little evidence of familiarity with Oppian’s text, and more often than not they reflect developments in the 16th and 17th centuries, when the ancient material was widely adapted as an overtly moralizing tale.

II. LOVERS OF PROSTITUTES

In the 16th century the classically trained legal scholar Alciato included among his collection of Latin epigrams an account of the sargue and the goat, titled *In amatores meretricum*, or “Against lovers of prostitutes” (*Emblem 75*)⁶:

Villosae indutus piscator tegmina caprae,
 Addidit ut capiti cornua bina suo;
 Fallit amatorem stans summo in littore sargum,
 In laqueos simi quem gregis ardor agit.
 Capra refert scortum: similis fit sargus amanti,
 Qui miser obscoeno captus amore perit.

⁵ 1799: 257: “On pourroit trouver l’origine de cette croyance ridicule dans quelques contes absurdes substitués mal-adroitement par l’ignorance à une opinion peut-être fausse, mais que l’on ne pourroit pas regarder au moins comme très-invraisemblable ... et dans un pays ami du merveilleux, et où l’histoire de la Nature étoit perpétuellement mêlée avec les créations de la mythologie et les inventions des poètes” For similarly dismissive statements, see, e.g., Cuvier and Valenciennes 1830: 12; Limes 1817: 329–30; Badham 1854: 174: “No finny creature has been the subject of more misrepresentations, or had greater liberties taken with his natural history, than the sargos.” Thompson merely notes it is a “curious story” (1947: 228, s.v. σαργός).

⁶ The first authorized edition appeared in 1534. An edition of the Latin texts, English translations and a convenient introduction to Alciato’s life and works are available online: <http://www.mun.ca/alciato/index.html>.

Wrapped in the hide of a hairy she-goat, the fisherman adds also to his head two horns; standing on the ledge of the seashore he deceives the desirous sargue, whom desire for the snub-nosed herd leads into the nets. The goat recalls the whore and the sargue is like to the lover, the wretch who perishes caught by an obscene desire.

Alciato's *Emblems* seem to have been immediately popular. They were quickly translated and often produced with commentaries explaining their classical allusions to a wider audience. Readers of such editions will have found reference to Oppian at *Emblem* 75, and many will no doubt have assumed that he included a similarly moralizing account.

Such impressions will have only been reinforced as popular traditions about the debauched sargue gained wide currency. By the 17th century, the fish's reputation is casually alluded to even in popular genres like the English broadside ballads.⁷ The wide dispersion of the tale is owed not just to Alciato but also to other popular literary accounts, whose authors were generally credited with classical learning. Such works include Edward Topsell's early 17th-century bestiary, *The Historie of Foure-Footed Beastes* (1607), but far more influential was Du Bartas's hexameral epic, *La Sepmaine; ou, Création du monde* (1578), a widely-read poem credited with having inspired Milton. Du Bartas's epic includes a brief account of the sargue and the goat (Holmes, Lyons, and Linker 1938: 343):

L'adultere sargon ne change seulement
De femme chaque jour sous l'ondeux element,
Ains, comme si le miel des voluptez des ondes
Ne pouvoit assouvir ses amours vagabondes,
Les chevres il courtise, et sur les bords herbus
Veut goustier les plaisirs qu'ont leurs maris barbus (185–90)

In the early 17th century, the popular Euphuist poet Joshua Sylvester translated into English much of Du Bartas's work, including this account (1605). To Du Bartas's already absurd premise that the fish court the goats along the grassy shore, Sylvester apparently could not resist adding the notion that, in

⁷ See, e.g., among the collection of Samuel Pepys, the ballad "Market for Young Men," which includes the stanza (*Pepys* 3.250): "Without Temple-bar, a beautiful Sar, / Sweet Madam Mosella, who came from a far, / With her white snowy Breast, most gallantly drest, / And she's to be sold now amongst all the rest / For Clip'd Money." This transcription is from the online English Broadside Ballad Archive (<http://ebba.english.ucsb.edu/ballad/21264/citation>). The "Sar," from σαργός/*sargus*, is here understood to mean a harlot or prostitute; see Williams 1994: 646–47, s.v. "harlot."

so doing, the sargues “horned,” or made cuckolds of, the billy goats (*The Fifth Day of the First Weeke* 206–11):

Th’ adulterous *Sargus* doth not onely change
Wives every day, in the deep streams; but (strange)
As if the honey of Sea-loves delights
Could not suffice his ranging appetites,
Courting the Shee-Goats on the grassie shore,
Would horn their Husbands that had horns before

While Dryden would later dismiss Sylvester’s imaginative translation as “abominable fustian,” his own testimony clearly suggests the work’s great popularity, which is evidenced also by its many early editions.⁸ After the Restoration, Sylvester soon went out of style, but the tale of the sargue and the goat persisted, as clearly reflected by the necessity of including entries for the fish in popular 18th- and 19th-century glossaries and encyclopedias.⁹ Indeed, Izaak Walton alleges to offer in his *The Compleat Angler* (1653) a translation of Du Bartas’s lines on the sargue, “because none can express it better.” What appears in Walton’s text is Sylvester’s translation, although, given the lasting popularity of *The Compleat Angler*, it is perhaps not surprising to discover that the lines are now sometimes credited to Walton himself (see, e.g., Radcliffe 1926: 242n1).

In every period, the appeal of these retellings relies in part on the notion of ancient authority. Walton, for example, claims that Du Bartas’s account is noteworthy not only for its verbal expression but also because it is ultimately owed to unnamed ancient authors who were “great and industrious searchers into the secrets of nature.” Nevertheless, the episode’s modern reception wanders far from its ancient stading. Oppian’s account includes no indications of sexual moralizing, and a careful reading of the passage suggests that the poet deliberately defuses potentially erotic elements.

Explicitly sexual details in Oppian’s account consist chiefly of the genders of sargues and goats. This dichotomy is obviously suggestive, but it exists primarily at the linguistic level. Σαργός is always a masculine name, while,

⁸In the dedication to Lord Haughton of his *The Spanish Fryar*, or *The Double Discovery*, Dryden admits having been much taken by the poem as a child (Scott 1808: 6.378–79).

⁹The authors of such works sometimes share Dryden’s impression of Du Bartas and Sylvester; see, e.g., Nares, Halliwell, and Wright 1859: 767: “How two such authors, as Du Bartas and his translator, could be so extravagantly admired, in both countries, is a problem not of very obvious solution. Which surpassed the other in bad taste, may be doubted, but I think the Englishman must have the prize.”

in fact, the school will have been comprised chiefly of females, as we will discover below. Likewise, the plurals of generic ancient Greek words for goat are almost always feminine.¹⁰ Potentially more suggestive is Oppian's description of how the sargues "fawn upon the horned herd and lick them and pouring around them in a dense school dart here and there" (κεραὸν δὲ περισσαίνουσιν ὄμιλον / ἀμφὶ τε λιχμάζουσι καὶ ἀθρόοι ἀμφιχέονται / πυκνὰ κατασκαίροντες, 4.320–22). This "fawning" and "licking" might be interpreted as decidedly erotic, but the sexual connotations are perhaps weaker in the Greek. The verb σαίνω refers most often to the dog's wagging of its tail and, by extension, its general fawning response to its master. It occurs compounded with περί only rarely, but notably twice in the *Odyssey*, at 10.215, when Odysseus's men are greeted by Circe's wolves and lions, which uncharacteristically fawn about them, wagging their long tails like domesticated dogs (10.215), and again when Eumaeus's dogs similarly greet the returned Telemachus (16.4). We might imagine a more specific Homeric intertext with Book 17 of the *Odyssey*, where the returning hero is recognized by his now aged hunting dog, whose fondness for his master is again signaled by σαίνω (οὐρῇ μὲν ῥ' ὃ γ' ἔσθνε, 17.302) and whose name Oppian perhaps alludes to with a clever wordplay: (s)Argos.¹¹

More importantly, the verb λιχμάζω is found on three additional occasions in the *Halieutica*. In each instance, it denotes "licking," but specifically in the context of procuring sustenance. We are told that small fry, or ἀφύη, subsist only by cleaning or licking the algae from one another's skin (κεῖναι δὲ δέμας περιλιχμάζουσιν / ἀλλήλων· τόδε δέ σφι βορὴ βίότοιο τέτυκται, 1.786–87). So, too, the gray mullet feed only on algae, mud and by cleaning one another (ἀλλήλων τε δέμας περιλιχμάζουσι, 2.650). Finally, the ability of bears to survive the winter without leaving their lairs is curiously credited to the meager nourishment they enjoy by licking their own feet (πόδα λιχμάζουσιν, 2.250). The logical conclusion is that Oppian intends the reader to imagine that the sargues are not merely affectionately licking but also feeding on the goats.

Oppian further distances the sargue's desire for the goat from sexual desire by means of the two extended similes that link his account of the bathing with his subsequent description of the fish's capture. In the first of these similes, the joy of the sargues is compared to that of kids when the nanny goats are

¹⁰On this point, see Brulé 2007: 262n19. Form and function will sometimes have agreed: in ancient herds male goats will often have been culled within their first year, frequently to be sold for sacrifice. Females will have been disproportionately retained for breeding and milk and cheese production (Jameson 1988: 100–2).

¹¹I owe this suggestion to Christopher Trinacty.

returned to their stading.¹² In the logic of the simile, the sargue's desire for the goat is desexualized, and the nanny goats are seen to be a source of sustenance for both kids and sargues alike. So, too, in the subsequent simile, the sargue's grief at the herd being driven away again is compared to the grief of a wife or mother, mourning the departure by sail of her husband or child.¹³ In the logic of neither simile are desire and its attendant emotions seen to be explicitly or primarily sexual, while in both cases the distinction between *ἔρως* and *ξείνος ἔρως* is deliberately obscured: desire is a universal force of nature, capable of operating across mere typological or taxonomic distinctions, and is ultimately the cause of joy and grief for fish, goats and humans alike.

III. AELIAN'S PARAPHRASE

The contrast between the treatment of desire in Oppian's account and in modern versions of the tale can be understood as a reflection not only of markedly changed times but also of the fact that, in the modern reception of the story, where an ancient source has actually been consulted, this source is more likely to have been not Oppian but rather Aelian. After first describing

¹² 4.325–30: οὐτόσον ἐν σταθμοῖσι κατηρεφέεσσι νομήων / μητέρας ἐκ βοτάνης ἔριφοι περικαρχαλόωντες / πολλῇ γηθοσύνῃ τε φιλοφροσύνῃ τε δέχονται, / ἥμος ἅπας περὶ χώρος ἀγαλλομένησιν ἰωῆς / νηπιάχων κέκληγε, νόος δ' ἐγέλασσε βοτήρων, / ὥς κείνοι κεραῖσι περισπέρχουσ' ἀγέλησιν ("Not in the cliffside steadings of the goatherds do the kids so revel, and welcome back their mothers with so much joy and kindness, while the whole space echoes with the reverent calls of the little goats, and the minds of the herdsmen are happy, as when the sargues circle the horned herds").

¹³ 4.431–44: εὐτ' ἂν δ' εἰναλίων ἄδην ἴσχωσι λοετρῶν, / ἃς δὲ πάλιν στεῖχουσιν ἐς αὐλία, δὴ τότε σαργοὶ / ἀχνύμενοι μάλα πάντες ἀολλέες ἐγγὺς ἔπονται, / κύματος ἀκροτάτοιο γέλως ὅθι χέρσον ἀμείβει. / ὥς δ' ὅτε τηλύγετον μήτηρ γόνον ἦ καὶ ἀκοίτην / εὐνέτις ἀλλοδαπὴν τηλέχθονα γαῖαν ἰόντα / ἀχνυμένη στέλλῃσι, νόος δέ οἱ ἔνδον ἀλύει, / ὅσση οἱ μεσσηγὺς ἀλὸς χύσις, ὅσσα δε κύκλα / μηνῶν ἀκροτάτοισι δ' ἐπεμβαίνουσα θαλάσσης / κύμασι δακρυόεσσαν ὑπὸ στόμα γῆρυν ἴησι / σπεύδειν λισσομένη, καὶ μιν πόδες οὐκέτ' ὀπίσσω / ἰεμένην φορέουσιν, ἔχει δ' ἐπὶ πόντον ὀπωπᾶς· / ὥς κείνους καὶ κέν τις ὑπ' ὄμμασι δάκρυα φαίη / στάζειν οἰωθέντας ἐλαιομένων πάλιν αἰγῶν ("But whenever the goats take their fill of the sea baths and march back again to their steadings, then the sargues grieve exceedingly and follow altogether in a school right to where the laughter of the cresting wave breaks on dry land. As when the grieving mother sends off her dearest child or a wife her husband setting out for some far-off foreign land, and her heart is frantic within her, at how great the flood of the sea between and how many the cycles of the moon, and standing at the edge of the breaking waves of the sea she calls out with her weeping voice, begging him to hurry, and no longer are her feet able to carry her eagerly home, but she holds her gaze on the sea. Just so one might imagine the sargues weep, abandoned, as the goats are driven away again").

the sargues' avidity for rocky, sunlit habitats, Aelian includes an account of the fish's attraction to goats and their subsequent capture that is clearly related to, but not identical with, Oppian's (NA 1.22[23])¹⁴:

φιλοῦσι δὲ τῶν ἀλόγων αἶγας ἰσχυρῶς· ἂν γοῦν πλησίον τῆς ῥόνης νεμομένων ἢ σκιὰ μιᾶς ἢ δευτέρας ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ φανῇ, οἱ δὲ ἀσμένως προσνέουσι καὶ ἀναπηδῶσιν, ὡς ἡδόμενοι, καὶ προσάψασθαι τῶν αἰγῶν ποθοῦσιν ἐξαλλόμενοι, καίτοι οὐ πάνυ τι ὄντες ἀλτικοὶ τηνάλλως· νηχόμενοι δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῖς κύμασιν ὁμῶς τῆς τῶν αἰγῶν ὁσμῆς ἔχουσιν αἴσθησιν, καὶ ὕφ' ἡδονῆς προσελθεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὰς σπεύδουσιν. ἐπεὶ τοίνυν εἰς τὰ προειρημένα δυσέρωτές εἰσιν, ἐξ ὧν ποθοῦσιν ἐκ τούτων ἀλίσκονται. ἀλιεὺς γὰρ ἀνὴρ αἰγὸς δορὰν ἑαυτὸν περιамπέχει, σὺν αὐτοῖς τοῖς κέρασι δαρείσης αὐτῆς· λαμβάνει δὲ ἄρα τὸν ἥλιον κατὰ νώτου ἐπιβουλεύων ὁ θηρατῆς τῇ ἄγρᾳ, εἴτα καταπάττει τῆς θαλάττης, ὕφ' ἣν οἰκοῦσιν οἱ προειρημένοι, ἄλφιτα αἰγείφ' ὥμῳ διαβραχέντα. ἐλκόμενοι δὲ οἱ σαργοὶ ὡς ὑπὸ τινος ἴγγος τῆς ὁσμῆς τῆς προειρημένης προσίασι, καὶ σιτοῦνται μὲν τῶν ἀλφίτων, κηλοῦνται δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς δορᾶς βλεπομένης ὡς αἰγός· αἰρεῖται δὲ αὐτῶν πολλοὺς ἀγκίστρῳ σκληρῷ καὶ ὀρμιᾷ λίνου λευκοῦ· ἐξήπται δὲ οὐχὶ καλάμου, ἀλλὰ ῥάβδου κρυνείας· δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐμπεσόντα ἀνασπάσαι ῥᾶστα, ἵνα μὴ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐκταράξῃ.

And the sargues love exceedingly goats of all animals. If the shadow of one or two of those grazing near to the shore should fall on the surface of the sea, the sargues rush out gladly, and they leap up as though rejoicing, and springing up they yearn even to touch the goats, although indeed in no way being good at leaping. And even those swimming below the swells detect the odor of the goats, and they hurry to them, driven by desire, and because they are so sick with desire in the respects described, it is on account of this yearning that they are captured. For the fisherman gathers about himself the skin of a goat, with the horns also of the flayed goat. Then the fisherman, putting the sun at his back, he sets himself to the task, scattering over the sea where the sargues dwell barley soaked in a goat broth, and the sargues, drawn by the described odor as if by a spell, press in, devouring the barley, charmed by the goatskin as if an actual goat. And he takes many of them with the barbed hook and the line of white linen, attached not to a reed pole, but a rod of cornel-wood. And it is necessary for him to swiftly snatch out the hooked fish, lest it disturb the others.

Moralizing sentiment is a general feature of what Richmond describes, perhaps uncharitably, as “the meretricious ornament of [Aelian’s] literary style” (1973: 3), and elements of the modern reception of the sarge and the goat should

¹⁴For the text of Aelian I have followed the recent Teubner of García Valdés, Llera Fueyo, and Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén 2009. Wherever their chapter numbering differs from the standard numbering of Hercher 1864, I have also given the latter in square brackets.

perhaps be traced back to Aelian's language of love-sickness (δυσέρωτες) and magic charms (ὡς ὑπό τινας ἰυγγοῦς and κηλοῦνται).¹⁵ That explanation would at least explain why a critic like Nares, who, while disdainful of Du Bartas and Sylvester's mishandling of the ancient source material, is, on the other hand, just as eager to praise Alciato's "emblem against debauchees," in part because even if the ancient sources have "ridiculously told of this fish," at least Alciato "relates the story correctly from Aelian" (1859: 767).

A more obvious difference between Aelian's and Oppian's accounts is that the former omits any mention of the goats being bathed in the sea. The desire of fish for goat is eroticized even though there is no actual occasion for a physical encounter. Some scholars nevertheless assume that Aelian's account is merely a paraphrase of Oppian (e.g., Greenhill 1849: 35; Mair 1928: 428na). In that case, we might imagine that Aelian has streamlined Oppian's account by simply omitting description of the bathing. This is not, however, the view of Keydell, perhaps the most insightful of the various 19th- and 20th-century philologists concerned with ancient zoological literature, *Quellenforschungen* and Oppian's *Halieutica*. Keydell argues that Oppian and Aelian here both rely on a single, shared source (1937). Keydell offers this argument in the context of a larger discussion intended to prove that Aelian knew Oppian's poem and borrowed directly from it, especially in the ninth book of his *De natura animalium*. The details of Keydell's larger arguments are too complicated to treat in any detail here, as are the arguments of a number of other scholars working in a similar vein.¹⁶ But in a recent discussion of the problem, Benedetti suggests an even more complex picture, with similar accounts in the two authors often relying on multiple sources, some shared and others not (2005). Nevertheless, Benedetti confirms that Aelian will in certain instances have borrowed directly from Oppian, although his study is unfortunately limited only to material in the first book of the *Halieutica*. For his part, Keydell admits that it is tempting to posit Aelian's direct borrowing also of sections of Books 3 and 4 of the *Halieutica*, including Oppian's description of the sargue and the goat. Ultimately, Keydell rejects that conclusion, leaning strongly on the argument that Aelian's account is less absurd than Oppian's and must therefore more accurately reflect the version given in their shared

¹⁵ This feature of Aelian's account is noted already by Borgeaud 1988: 115.

¹⁶ Keydell is responding in part to earlier discussions of, e.g., Wellmann 1891 and Baumann 1912. More recent bibliography, which includes Richmond 1973, can be found in Benedetti 2005. Other than Keydell, none includes substantive discussion of the two accounts of the sargue and the goat.

source (1937: 428). Here Keydell places considerable emphasis on only a few perceived incongruities in Oppian's account:

In Oppian the nanny goats bathe in the midday heat, a fact that is completely against the goat's nature and on rocky coastal cliffs scarcely possible, and the previously described caution of the fishermen is therefore not mentioned. Here it is clear that Oppian has arbitrarily changed an account that Aelian renders rather faithfully. Obviously Oppian did not want to believe that the fish can perceive the smell of the nanny goats climbing on the rocks as Aelian claims, following his source, and therefore had the nanny goats enter the water.¹⁷

The first necessary observation is that Oppian's account links two passages that are, in fact, distinct. The first offers a kind of *aition* for the second, in that it describes an occasion for a physical interaction that then explains the efficacy of what is otherwise a not only bizarre but also inexplicably effective method of fishing. Keydell wrongly assumes that the bathing and the fishing need have taken place in the same location at the same time. His remaining objection, that bathing in the sea is against the goat's nature, relies on a perfectly valid assumption, as goats are notoriously hydrophobic. But nowhere does Oppian's account suggest that the goats willingly enter the sea, and Keydell's objections conveniently encapsulate a fundamental problem: this passage in Oppian and the social and economic context in which it is embedded have been generally misunderstood.

IV. GOAT BATHING

Keydell, like most other commentators, is unfamiliar with what likely will have been in certain regions of the ancient Mediterranean a very real practice of herding goats to the shore and forcibly, if necessary, bathing them in the sea. In antiquity only Oppian describes this practice in any detail. His account is subsequently alluded to in the early third century C.E. by the author of the pseudo-Oppianic *Cynegetica* (2.433) and by Timotheus of Gaza in the late fifth or early sixth century C.E. (Haupt 1869, fr. 7). Nevertheless, the practice itself is referred to by earlier authors: at the conclusion of Theocritus's *Idyll* 5, the goatherd Comatas turns his attention back to his herd, saying "take courage my

¹⁷Keydell 1937: 428: "Bei Oppian nehmen die Ziegen in der Mittagshitze ein Bad, was ganz wider ihre Natur und an einer felsigen Steilküste auch kaum möglich ist, und von der erwähnten Vorsichtsmaßregel des Fischers ist demgemäß auch nicht die Rede. Hier ist es klar, daß Oppian eine Vorlage, die Aelian ziemlich getreu wiedergibt, eigenmächtig geändert hat. Offenbar hat er nicht glauben wollen, daß die Fische den Geruch der an den Felsen herumkletternden Ziegen wahrnehmen können, wie Aelian seiner Vorlage folgend behauptet, und hat darum die Ziegen ebenfalls ins Wasser gehen lassen."

horned goats, for tomorrow I will bathe you in the Sybaritic *limnē*” (αἶγες ἐμαὶ, θαρσεῖτε, κερούτιδες· αὔριον ὕμμε / πάσας ἐγὼ λουσῶ Συβαρίτιδος ἔνδοθι λίμνας, 145–46). Additional details suggest that the poet imagines this *limnē* as a saltwater lagoon near the mouth of the Sybaris, where it entered the Gulf of Tarentum.¹⁸ Mention of goat bathing subsequently appears in Virgil’s third *Eclogue*, but here the setting is not coastal, and the herd is to be bathed in a spring.¹⁹ An imperfect analogy is offered also by Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Tauris*, where Orestes and Pylades are captured by herders bringing their animals to the shore, again specifically in order to bathe them in the sea (βοῦς ἤλθομεν νίψοντες ἐναλῖαι δρόσωι, 255). These are herds of cattle rather than goats, but the scene suggests that the notion of herders bathing their livestock in the sea will have been intelligible to audiences already in Classical Athens.²⁰

Ancient evidence may be scarce, but in parts of the Mediterranean the practice of bathing goats in the sea can still be encountered and is best understood in the context of the *longue durée*. It can, for example, still be witnessed in late summer along the Mediterranean coast of Turkey, especially in the region of

¹⁸ The setting is a mixture of the real and imaginary. Comatas is depicted as herding his goats among the oaks in the hills near Sybaris and Thurii, where the Rivers Sybaris and Crathis flow into the sea. The Sybaris (It. *Coscile*) now joins the Crathis (It. *Crati*) in a rich alluvial plain before entering the sea. In antiquity, both rivers would already have crossed an alluvial plain, but apparently their courses did not join before entering the sea. That the contest takes place near the shore is suggested when Lacon swears by an image of Pan Actius, or Pan of the Headland (αὐτὸν τὸν Πᾶνα τὸν ἄκτιον, 14), whose shrine the scholia place by the seashore. Gow prefers not to see the term as a cult epithet, but nevertheless agrees that this coastal shrine, as well as a shrine of the nymphs mentioned in line 17, are imagined as within view of the contestants (1950: 97–98). More importantly, as Gow notes, the description of the nymphs as λιμνάδας (17) would seem to be a clear allusion to the same coastal lagoon in which the goats are to be bathed. On this Pan Actius and his relationship to fishermen, see below.

¹⁹ *Ecl.* 3.96–99: *Tityre, pascentis a flumine reice capellas: / ipse, ubi tempus erit, omnis in fonte lavabo* (“Tityrus, drive back the grazing goats from the stream: I myself, when the time is right, will wash them all in the spring”).

²⁰ Given the environmental constraints, it is not surprising that there is little ancient evidence for cattle herding in Attica. The Attic Stelai (*IGI*³ 421–30) frequently record flocks of sheep or goats, but typically only a pair of plow oxen. It is possible that here Euripides has simply altered for the purposes of his account a more commonplace practice of bathing goats: the Taurians’ name suggests an association with cattle-herding, while Orestes’ furious slaughter of the cows, their blood staining the waters of the sea bath, makes for a more dramatic and richly allusive image. This passage would seem to be a primary model for Ovid’s account of Peleus and the wolf (*Met.* 11.346–409). In Ovid’s account, cattle are similarly driven to the shore, although not explicitly to be bathed.

Antalya, and I have seen old photographs of herds of goats being washed in the sea on the Greek island of Symi. I can find no detailed ethnographic studies from the Eastern Mediterranean describing the practice in its social context. However, well-documented accounts from beyond the Straits of Gibraltar in the Canary Islands furnish a useful analogy. Here, herdsmen on the island of Tenerife carry on an annual ritual that seems to have originated among the island's native Guanche.²¹ In the town of Puerto de la Cruz, the ritual bathing of the goats, "El baño de las cabras," marks the summer solstice, when the island's goatherds, having brought their flocks to the coast, commence at dawn to drive the goats into the sea. The bathing continues until midday and popular accounts describe the nervous protest of the unwilling bathers (Montgomery 2006): "Goats and water are not compatible bedfellows so the air is soon filled with tortuous cries." Such details are already familiar from Oppian's account, which stresses that the sargues "hear the bleating along the shore and the deep-voiced song of the herds" (οἱ δὲ τότε βλήχην τε παρακταῖν ἀίοντες / αὐδὴν τ' αἰπολίων βαρυχέα, 4.316–17).²²

Modern accounts are apt to offer sterile scientific justifications for the practice; for example, bathing goats in the sea in the Philippine province of Southern Leyte is encouraged because of "the accaricidal (i.e. mite-killing) effect of salt water on goats."²³ Similar explanations are likely to have been recognized in antiquity, with the beneficial effects perhaps linked to the generally healthy influence of salt, the feeding of which to sheep and goats is described in our ancient sources and was apparently intended to fatten the herds for slaughter or breeding.²⁴ On the other hand, modern ethnographic accounts suggest also something of the matrix of beliefs in which such practices can exist.²⁵ In the Canary Islands the ritual goat bathing is now tied directly

²¹ The classic study of the Guanche and the Canary Islands' pastoral traditions remains Diego Cuscoy 1968.

²² See n4 above for the reading αὐδὴν.

²³ See the document "Low Cost Veterinary Treatments for Livestock," prepared by the Food & Fertilizer Technology Center for the Asian and Pacific Region, available at: <http://www.agnet.org/library/bc/50004/>.

²⁴ Aristotle, e.g., notes that in late summer herders feed their flocks salt every five days at the rate of one *medimnos* per hundred animals (*Hist. an.* 596a10–24). Howe suggests the practice is "probably to fatten for fall festivals" (2008: 56). Campbell describes the same practice among the Sarakatsani of Northern Greece and notes that the practice "is believed to strengthen them for successful mating" (1964: 29).

²⁵ We might note, e.g., widely held beliefs among the Sarakatsani about the purificatory or apotropaic effects of salt, and similarly the notion that goats are animals of the Devil and hence especially unclean (Campbell 1964: 31–32 and 333–34).

to the summer solstice and incorporated into Catholic belief and the annual Festivals of St. John. But ethnographic accounts suggest that originally it will have occurred in conjunction with fertility and harvest festivals in late summer, with goatherds continuing to link the bathing to its beneficial effects on the fertility of the herd (Montgomery 2006).

In antiquity, the bathing of goats is likely to have been embedded in a similarly dense social fabric. As for specific meanings associated with the bathing itself, the paucity of evidence only allows us to point at the occasional far-flung analogy linked more generally to beliefs about fertility and the purificatory effects of saltwater, such as the important ritual on the second morning of the Greater Eleusinia in mid-September, when the initiates went to the sea to bathe their sacrificial piglets.²⁶ But Oppian's account does suggest an annual ritual, with the bathing linked to a specific point in the astronomical cycle marked by the rising of the "hot Olympian star," or Sirius, in mid- to late summer (ὅτε θερμὸς Ὀλύμπιος ἵσταται ἀστήρ, 4.315).²⁷ That the ritual is performed year after year is also implied by Oppian's assertion that the herdsman seeing it for the first time are amazed (ἔχει δέ τε θαῦμα νομῆας / πρωτοδαεῖς, 4.322–23).

The bathing will perhaps have been most easily accomplished in the warm water temperatures of late summer, but the ritual will also likely have been tied to beliefs about the health and fertility of the herd, which will have been bred soon after.²⁸ Theocritus's goatherd similarly suggests that the bathing

²⁶ Parke 1977: 62–63. Robertson notes that the rituals on the opening days of the Eleusinia have distinctly pastoral overtones. The bathing on the second day will have involved sacrificial victims often likely numbering in the thousands. It is this fact that best explains the name given to the festival's opening day, the ἀγυρμός: rather than referring to an "assembly" of initiates, it will have referred, as its etymology suggests, to the "herding up" of victims (1998: 563–65).

²⁷ On the heliacal rising of the Dog Star, Sirius, which will have occurred around the 20th of July, see the astronomical tables in Neugebauer 1929: 58–62. Oppian imagines this ritual taking place during the intense heat of the subsequent "dog days." These often lasted until late September, by which time the star was visible in the sky for only half of the day; see West 1978: 262–63, on *Op.* 417. Euripides' account in the *IT* perhaps also suggests a shared ritual: Orestes and Pylades are not discovered by a solitary herder but by a host of herders apparently bringing their animals to the seashore in unison.

²⁸ Modern accounts, relying on Varro, *Rust.* 2.3.8, Columella, *Rust.* 7.6.6 and *Geoponica* 18.9.7, sometimes suggest that in Ancient Greece goats will have been bred in late autumn (see, e.g., West 1978: 307, on *Op.* 590). But for much of Greece a cycle of breeding in summer and birthing in late winter or early spring is more likely (Jameson 1988: 100). This is encouraged by the availability of pasturage and especially by climate, with milder winters allowing kidding earlier in the year. So, too, in the milder Mediterranean region of Turkey, the common Kıl breed of hair goat is traditionally bred in mid- to late summer or early fall; see Gürsoy 2006: 185 and table 4; Yalçın 1986: 15.

occurs in the context of the mating season. Immediately after informing his goats that they will be bathed the following day, Comatas warns his billy goat against attempting to mate with any of the goats before the proper time, which is to be marked by a sacrifice to the Nymphs (*Id.* 5.147–50). That the season is again mid- to late summer is indicated by Lacon's address to the cicadas in lines 110–11: "Look, Cicadas, at how I rile the goatherd, just as you rile the reapers" (τοὶ τέττιγες, ὀρήτε τὸν αἰπόλον ὡς ἐρεθίζω· / οὕτω κῦμμες θὴν ἐρεθίζετε τὼς καλαμεντάς). As notably discussed by Petropoulos in his exploration of the midsummer festival in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, the advent of the singing of the cicadas is frequently linked in both ancient and more recent Greek traditions to the end of the grain harvest, the ripening of the grapes and the rising of Sirius (1994: 47–68). Hesiod's account of the sacrificial feast, taking place as "the cicada ... pours down its clear-noted song" (τέττιξ / ... λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ' αἰοδὴν, 582–83) and "when Sirius dries out the head and knees" (ἐπεὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ γούνατα Σείριος ἄξει, 587), includes what is likely an oblique reference to the fertility of the goats, which are, he tells us, at this very juncture, "fattest" (τῆμος πιόταταί τ' αἰγες, 585) and in the process of ceasing to lactate (γάλα τ' αἰγῶν σβεννυμενάων, 590).²⁹ Finally, this connection between the hottest period of the summer and goat bathing is made also in Virgil's third *Eclogue*, where it is specified that the goat bathing will take place "when it is the proper time" (*ubi tempus erit*, 97), with mention in the following lines of extreme heat and the cessation of lactation suggesting again the dog days.³⁰ This fragmentary evidence does not allow us to recover with any certainty the underlying context for the goat bathing described by Oppian, but it does suggest some of the ways in which such rituals will have been incorporated into larger frameworks of belief related to the cyclical practices of Mediterranean pastoralists.³¹

²⁹ Petropoulos is concerned primarily with agricultural rather than pastoral traditions, but he does note comparative evidence from the Sarakatsani for the goat's gradual cessation of lactation beginning in mid-July (1994: 49n8).

³⁰ Menalcas responds to Damoetas's couplet with one of his own, noting that the heat is affecting his sheep's lactation, which, unlike the routine summer cessation among goats, is something the shepherds hope to avoid (98–99): *cogite ovis, pueri; si lac praeceperit aestus, / ut nuper, frustra pressabimus ubera palmis* ("Gather the sheep, boys; if the heat dries up their milk, as it has recently, in vain will we squeeze their udders with our hands").

³¹ Unfortunately, ancient sources have left us very little in the way of explicit evidence about pastoralists and their beliefs (Shaw 1982–83), although there are abundant traces in myth and cult; see, e.g., Robertson 1991: 5–10 on myth and ritual related specifically to transhumance and sheep and goat production.

V. AN UNHOPED-FOR WONDER: THE MEETING OF MOUNTAIN AND SEA

Oppian's account of goat bathing seems to describe a particular pastoral practice, but I would suggest that it also reflects a regional context. The poet includes at the outset of his narrative of the sargue and the goat an observation clearly intended to frame the description that follows (4.311–12): ἡ σέβας οὐκ ἐπίελπτον ὁμόφρονα φύλα τεκέσθαι / ἀλλήλοις ὀρέων τε πάγους χαροπὴν τε θάλασσαν (“It is an unexpected wonder that the mountain ridges and the gray-blue sea should give rise to flocks so like-minded to one another”). This physical meeting in the coastal shallows of the sargue and the goat evokes a larger contrast between mountain and sea.³² The dichotomy between sea and land, more generally, is already a familiar feature of ancient Greek thought and a common and flexible literary trope. In certain instances, as in the *Halieutica's* opening proem, the sea is wilderness, and the fisherman or sailor venturing upon it stands in stark contrast to the settled citizen of the *polis*. So, for example, a fisherman in one of Alciphron's letters is made to write: “We are as unlike the residents of cities and villages as the sea is foreign to the land” (ὅσον ἡ θάλαττα τῆς γῆς διαλλάτει, τοσοῦτον καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ταύτης ἐργάται τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἢ κώμας οἰκούντων διαφέρομεν, 1.4.1).

But this dichotomy can also be reversed, with the sea and its fluid access to a cosmopolitan world of interconnected *poleis* representing civilization, especially where it borders on the rugged wilderness of non-Greek lands. Here the dichotomy also frequently includes a contrast between economic modes, especially that of cosmopolitan seafarers and primitive pastoralists. This dynamic is at play, for example, in a work we have already mentioned, Euripides' *IT*, where Iphigenia's question to the cowherd frames the account that follows: “What business do herdsmen have with the sea?” (καὶ τίς θαλάσσης βουκόλοις κοινωνία; 254). The literal answer is, of course, usually nothing; it is merely a coincidence that these herders happened to be involved in a periodic ritual of bathing their cattle in the sea. But Iphigenia's question can also be interpreted as a veiled accusation: as Herodotus's account makes clear (4.103), the Taurians were best known for preying on shipping along their rugged coast, and Iphigenia's implication that these pastoralists were perhaps engaged in brigandage plays on a common association in ancient Greek thought between pastoralism and banditry (Arist. *Pol.* 1256b.1–6; Shaw 1982–83). The custom-

³² Borgeaud has already noted how the passage “brings into play a hopeless passion seeking to conjoin the two extremes of space, the sea and the mountain” (1988: 115).

ary Taurian practice of brutally sacrificing stranded seafarers is symbolic of the perceived tensions not just between Greek and barbarian but also, more generally, between competing economic modes. Orestes and Pylades comprise an arguably exceptional case, but the chorus makes clear the usual context for such interactions by assuming that these visitors also will have come to fill their ships with the wealth of barbarian cities, whether by trade or more ancient forms of plunder (408–21).

In Oppian, this unlikely meeting of mountain and sea might further be thought of as a kind of generic statement, wherein as the goatherds bring their herds to the sea the poet's hexametric account meets and mingles with familiar bucolic or pastoral genres. Generic interaction is a noted feature of didactic epic, while in the Second Sophistic we find similar interplay between halieutic and pastoral modes even in prose genres like the novel.³³ And such interaction is clearly at play elsewhere in the *Halieutica*.³⁴

These observations are not incompatible with what I would argue is a more compelling interpretation, specifically that Oppian's account includes pointed reference to social and economic realities in his native Rough Cilicia.³⁵

³³ See, e.g., a passage in *Daphnis and Chloe* wherein a chanted song echoes through the novel's bucolic setting as a fishing vessel passes close along the shore, the crew answering the song of the coxswain as they row in unison (2.21).

³⁴ Such concerns are evident already in the proem to Book 1, which, in comparing the fisherman to the hunter and fowler, participates in an ongoing discourse about genre; see esp. Paschalis 2000. Elsewhere, as noted by Kneebone, the poem deliberately engages with martial epic (2008: 34).

³⁵ The evidence for Oppian's biography is collected in Mair 1928: xiii–xxiii. Byzantine tradition is divided in making Oppian a native either of Corycus in Rough Cilicia or of Anazarbus. The *Suda* (s.v.) reports his birthplace as Corycus. One version of the ancient *vitae* (*Βίος β*, Westermann 1845: 65–66) opens by stating the poet is “from Corycus or Anazarbus in Cilicia” (ἀπὸ Κωρύκου ἢ ἀπ’ Ἀναζάρβου τῆς Κιλικίας), but the very next clause specifies that Corycus is a Cilician city, and the *vita* thereafter consistently speaks of the poet as being from Corycus. This life is heavily interpolated (Mair 1928: xv), and I suspect that the reference to Anazarbus is an intrusion owed to the tradition preserved in a second version of the *vitae*, which gives Anazarbus as the poet's birthplace (*Βίος α*, Westermann 1845: 63–65), but without offering any reliable evidence. Far better evidence is given in the poem itself, specifically two passages from Book 3. Together these clearly suggest the poet is from Corycus, as seen already by, e.g., Keydell 1939: 699 and Houwink ten Cate 1961: 207n2. Fajen's insistence, *contra* Keydell, that the evidence of 3.206–9 is uncertain (1999: viii) ignores the point already made succinctly by Feissel (Dagron and Feissel 1987: 45n5), that it is rather by means of the conjunction of elements in this passage and the proem to Book 3 that the poet identifies his birthplace as Corycus. These passages are discussed below.

In the late second century C.E., this region offered a unique social, economic and physical geography. Hellenized chiefly along a thin coastal strip virtually devoid of extensive plains, the region's Greek and Roman inhabitants were primarily residents of a handful of scattered *poleis* oriented strongly towards the sea. Looming above this narrow coastal strip, rough hills rose steeply to the high mountainous plateaus at the heart of the massive Taurus range, an imposing wall breached only by a handful of dauntingly deep gorges. Apart from its coastal settlements, this region of Rough Cilicia/Isauria remained, even in the late second century C.E., perhaps the one area of the Roman Empire that best symbolized the notion of the internal barbarian, its economy predicated less on settled agriculture than a timeless, often large-scale pastoralism, its population conceived of as lawless brigands by the Roman and Greek inhabitants of the immediate coast and of the rich agricultural plains of Cilicia Campestris to the east.³⁶ That operative dichotomy is thoroughly discussed by Brent Shaw in a seminal article (1990), and Hopwood has described the considerable resources required to try and maintain law and order in the region (1983 and 1989). Such research suggests the possibility of a rather more pointed interpretation of Oppian's description of a concord between such disparate tribes as sargues and goats that is literally "not to be hoped for," οὐκ ἐπιέλπτον.

It is likewise in the context of Rough Cilicia's pastoral economy that the described interaction between sargue and goat can be understood as something other than purely imaginative fiction. The entire Anatolian plateau was noted for the wealth of its pastoral economies. Sheep were reared in large numbers, and various regions produced prized wools frequently the object of long-distance trade (see, e.g., Strabo 12.6.1). But the forested southern flanks of the Taurus descending towards the Mediterranean offer an especially rich habitat for goats.³⁷ In antiquity the region was widely associated with its

³⁶ Recent archeological survey has found evidence for agricultural activity as well, suggesting that the usual portrait of the Rough Cilician economy as exclusively pastoral requires, at least for the Roman period, some modification (Rauh et al. 2006). So, too, a range of productive activities are attested epigraphically at Corycus once it becomes a prosperous center for regional trade in Late Antiquity (Hild and Hellenkemper 1990: 315–16). Nevertheless, the preponderance of evidence suggests that for most of Rough Cilicia herding will have remained of central importance.

³⁷ Historically, the raising of hair goats has been of greatest importance in the Mediterranean region of Turkey (see, e.g., Yalçın 1986: 21–22 and fig. 4.2), where hair goats continue to be raised in considerable numbers despite a steep decline owed in part to strict regulations protecting the region's forests from grazing; see Davran, Ocak, and Secer 2009: 1151, where the authors report that goat production nevertheless remains the primary income source in the Taurus's mountainous villages. Another likely factor

characteristic shaggy-haired goats, and Rough Cilicia lent its name directly to the goat hair textiles, or *kilikia*, which, after timber, seem to have been the region's primary export under the Roman Empire.³⁸ These textiles are still produced in traditional fashion in a few villages of the southwestern Taurus, a regional cottage industry and trade that seem to be a feature of the *longue durée*.³⁹ Ancient and modern comparative evidence suggests that seasonal transhumance will have played a key role. While villages and individuals in Rough Cilicia might have owned mixed flocks of goat and sheep, the herds would frequently have been segregated, especially during the summer, with the sheep requiring grassy pasture at higher, cooler elevations and goats herded at lower elevations. Here they could feed on abundant spring and summer growth in the wood- and scrubland where the region's hillsides descend steeply towards the sea.⁴⁰

is the drop in demand for secondary products like goat hair; while Turkey's overall goat population declined more than 50% between 1985 and 2007, from over 13 million to approximately 6.5 million (Ocak, Davran, and Güney 2010: 156–57 and table 1), the production of black goat hair, which amounted to 8,625 tons in 1983 (Yalçın 1986: 28, table 4.5), declined by more than 70% between 1980 and 2000 (Gürsoy 2006: 184).

³⁸ See, e.g., Ps.-Zonaras, s.v. Κιλίκιοι. δασεῖς. κιλίκιοι τράγοι. τοιοῦτοι γὰρ οἱ ἐν Κιλικίᾳ γίνονται τράγοι. ὅθεν τὰ ἐκ τριχῶν ἐκτιθέμενα κιλίκια λέγονται. These textiles had a range of useful applications and are frequently mentioned in Roman sources; see, e.g., Varro, *Rust.* 2.11.11–12 and the additional sources and discussion in Levick 2004: 194–95; Bresson 2008: 156 and 260n72.

³⁹ This cottage industry can still be found in a few mountain villages such as Başoluk in the region of Nazilli. Here, goat hair, collected widely from Turkish herdsmen, is cleaned, carded, spun and woven, especially into the tent cloth traditionally used by Turkish and Arab bedouin. This production is continuously attested for certain villages from at least the early Ottoman period, and the mountain villages of ancient Rough Cilicia will have likely engaged in a similar trade; see Erdoğan and Jirousek 2005: 209; Bresson 2008: 260n72. The latter notes ancient references to the goat-hair tents of the Arab Scenites and suggests that the modern trade is a remarkable example of “continuité historique.”

⁴⁰ More recently, deforestation and resulting environmental regulations have led to considerable changes in traditional grazing practices; see, e.g., Davran, Ocak, and Secer 2009. Ethnographic research in the region has tended to focus on the long-distance transhumance of Yoruk herdsmen (see, e.g., Bates 1973), but of more immediate relevance is the seasonal transhumance still common among the region's goat herders (Yalçın 1986: 11). This seasonal transhumance can take a wide variety of forms, and Xavier de Planhol's rich ethnographic study records some of the complicated patterns found in the Pamphylian Taurus just to the west of Rough Cilicia (1958). The evidence for long-distance transhumance in antiquity remains much debated, but seasonal transhumance is well documented; see esp. Georgoudi 1974 and the collection of epigraphic documents and commentary in Chandezon 2003; on ancient pastoral economies more generally, see Whittaker 1988 and Horden and Purcell 2000: 80–87, 197–200 and 550–51.

That Oppian's description is embedded in a physical and cultural dichotomy operative in his homeland is even more clearly signaled by the subsequent series of extended similes that I mentioned briefly above. Having described the sargues schooling around the goats as they are bathed in the sea, Oppian's first simile, ostensibly intended to illustrate the sargues' joy in the company of the herd, carries the reader away from the coast, back to a bucolic setting in the herd's seasonal, cliffside steadings (ἐν σταθμοῖσι κατηρέεσσι, 4.325). The second simile treats the despair of the sargues when the bathing is finished and the herd is led away to its stading. It takes its departure from precisely the same point where the waves break on the shoreline, but rather than tracing a journey back into the rugged hills it projects its viewpoint deliberately seaward, with the lamenting of the sargues compared to that of wife or mother, standing on the beach by the breaking surf, staring out at sea, grieving at the departure by sail of her husband or child. This simile obviously suggests the second pole in that dichotomy between pastoral and maritime cultural modes.

These distinct modes are further explored in the poem's two subsequent extended similes. The first occurs in a further discussion of the sargue's relationship to desire, wherein the poet describes how the male sargues violently compete for mates (4.374–403). The dominant male's habit of herding the females into the weel is compared to the shepherd carefully counting his livestock back into the stading. The second simile occurs in the new section that follows, which opens by describing the habits of the dolphinfish, a species that desires, we are told, a particular habitat, the shade found below masses of floating detritus, especially the scattered timbers of shipwrecks (4.404–18). This description clearly picks up from our earlier simile, furnishing an object to the gaze of the grieving mother or wife standing at the shore, peering out to sea. The subject of her grief is the object of the dolphinfish's desire: merchant vessels shepherding their cargo across the sea (4.416). Both pastoral and maritime modes are seen to have an explicitly economic dimension, wherein individual actors are all, whether herders or traders, understood to be motivated by desire.

Here ethnographic accounts of goat bathing can offer one final analogy: in the Canary Islands a familiar dichotomy evolved in the wake of European conquest between the remnants of the indigenous population, marginalized as primitive pastoralists, and the communities of "civilized" immigrants oriented towards the sea. Indeed, there are striking similarities between ancient depictions of the Cilicians, dressed in their shaggy goatskin tunics with customs to match, and Spanish accounts of the traditional dress and

customs of the Canary Islanders.⁴¹ Nevertheless, these representations and their attendant biases tend to obscure the degree to which pastoral and coastal economies are mutually dependent, and on Tenerife the yearly ritual of the bathing affords a focal point for interaction between the apparently distinct social and economic contexts of mountain and sea (Montgomery 2006). We might imagine a similar dynamic in Oppian's Rough Cilicia, where, despite the biases of ancient sources that are invariably hostile to and never represent the genuine viewpoints of pastoralists, the realities and necessities of trade nevertheless meant that the interests of mountain villages and the small Greek *poleis* on the coast were inextricably tied and periodically met on the seashore.

VI. MODERN AND ANCIENT ICHTHYOLOGIES

It seems fairly certain that Oppian's description of goat bathing reflects a real pastoral ritual, and I suspect it is one that will have been practiced along the coasts of his native Rough Cilicia. His subsequent account of the sargue's capture might fit equally well into a regional, pastoral context, but that interpretation alone cannot sufficiently explain bizarre details that include a fisherman dressing up in a goat skin and horns to scatter a chum composed of barley enriched with goat savor. Indeed, the tendency of scholars to dismiss it as an obviously absurd fiction is understandable. However, the rationalizing explanations that such skeptics offer for the origins of the tale are not particularly convincing. Powell, for instance, suggests that Oppian's account somehow derives from the practice of using goat hair as net floats, and Lacépède offers a complicated and flawed hypothesis whereby observations about the sargue's interactions with another species of fish were gradually confused and elaborated over time.⁴² Research on the relationships in antiquity

⁴¹ For a description of traditional Guanche dress and the characterizations of early visitors, see Mercer 1980: 112–15 and a more detailed discussion in Diego Cuscoy 1968. A good example of the usual characterization of Cilician otherness is found in Cornelius Nepos's biography of Datames, who managed to establish himself as a strong man controlling the mountainous regions of Rough Cilicia, most likely in the first half of the fourth century B.C.E. Originally sent as an agent of the Persian king to capture another rebellious strong man, Datames is himself transformed into a native wild man, an *agrestis* clothed in the customary Cilician goat hair tunic (*Dat.* 3.2: *hirtaque tunica*). On this account and its relationship to "a structural contrast between mountain and plain," see Shaw 1990: 210–11.

⁴² Powell 1996: 105. Although Lacépède's explanation has been lauded as ingenious (see, e.g., Limes 1817: 330), it is utterly unconvincing. He begins by suggesting that the ancient Greek fish name τράγος, or billy goat, designated a species closely related to the sargue, which, however, it did not (see Thompson 1947: 263, s.v. τράγος). He then further

between folk traditions and natural history can perhaps suggest more probable explanations. So, for example, while Polybius's account of tuna growing fat by eating the acorns of a kind of "sea oak" (βαλάνω δρυϊνή, *ap.* Strabo 3.2.7) has attracted a host of more or less natural explanations, Lelli has recently offered a more compelling suggestion. Noting the frequent associations between tuna and pigs in Mediterranean folk traditions, he suggests the story evolved in antiquity as an *aition* for an already common association between the two species (2004).⁴³ So, too, we might imagine the account of the sargue and the goat evolving as an explanation for some existing association.⁴⁴ One such possibility is perhaps suggested by Oppian himself, who concludes his account by observing that the sargues "are all overcome by the likeness of a goat" (πάντας δὲ δαμάσσειται αἰγὸς ὁπωπή, 4. 373). The likeness he refers to is, of course, the fishermen dressed in goat guise. But the line might be read more subtly: with their prominent ruminant-like teeth, other species of the family *Sparidae* are sometimes called by names that suggest a resemblance to caprids, such as sheepshead (*Archosargus probatocephalus*) and the goat's head porgy (*Calamus calamus*).⁴⁵ In other words, we might interpret Oppian as acknowledging that it is the fish's resemblance to the goat that is ultimately responsible for its undoing in folktale.

speculates that females of that same species may have been known as nanny goats and that an attraction of male sargues to the females will have subsequently given rise to the misconception that sargues were attracted to actual goats (1799: 258).

⁴³ Lelli appears to have overlooked a passage in Aelian that notes that the very largest tuna often travel alone "as pigs do" (NA 15.3: κατὰ τοὺς σὺς). Furthermore, the social and economic basis for this association has long been noted: already in the 18th century, Marchese di Villabianca described in vivid detail how Palermitan families would use one or two of these massive fish to provision their household for a year: "Just as the slaughter of a land pig fills a house with abundant meat, so the sea tuna fills it with salt flesh" (quoted from Consolo 2006a: 179). Marchese di Villabianca also suggests that the story of these tuna feeding on sea acorns remained a part of local oral tradition.

⁴⁴ Milliner 1975 follows Bonner 1907 in suggesting that an expression in Longus (2.15: νέμει τὰς αἰγὰς ὡς ναῦτης, "he tends his goats like a sailor") alludes to the fact that the word αἶγες could apparently describe not only "goats" but also "waves" (see Artem. 2.12; Hesychius s.v. αἶγες). He further argues that Oppian's account reflects a popular tradition playing on these themes. That explanation, however, cannot explain the passage's detail, including the presence specifically of the sargue.

⁴⁵ The German name for the white seabream, *Geißbrasse*, or "goat bream," might be interpreted in similar fashion, but I can find no evidence to suggest that the name is owed to the fish's appearance and rather suspect that it reflects the German reception of the accounts in Aelian and Oppian.

That interpretation, however, finds little direct support. We have no evidence that ancient fishermen commonly recognized a resemblance between the sargue and the goat. Furthermore, even had such an association existed, it would do little to explain the curious specificity of detail in Oppian's account. Finally, it is clear that the poet believes that sargues really can be captured in the fashion he describes, hence the need to rationalize its peculiar efficacy. Of course, that the poet believed sargues were captured in such a fashion is no argument for the account's ultimately having some basis in reality. Scholars are divided on the question of the general trustworthiness of Oppian's descriptions, with some stressing that Oppian, unlike less discriminating authors such as Aelian, "carefully avoid[s] the Recital of fabulous Reports" (Diaper and Jones 1722: 11). Others, even some willing to praise Oppian's "considerable zoological knowledge," nevertheless conclude that the poet sometimes includes "fables and absurdities ... as grave matter of fact" (Greenhill 1849: 35). Most recently, Bekker-Nielsen has argued that Oppian affords historians little reliable evidence. Bekker-Nielsen leans heavily on the argument that direct observation will have played little or no role in the poet's work, stating emphatically that certain of Oppian's descriptions of fishing methods are simply "too far-fetched to be based on autopsy" (2002: 36n8). He includes similar claims in a subsequent article, noting that "there is nothing to suggest that [Oppian] describes the fishing practice of his native region" (2005: 84). Here, however, it is curious that he fails to mention a brief passage that might suggest otherwise (3.205–9):

ἀνθιέων δὲ πρῶτα περίφρονα πεύθεο θήρηγ, 205
οἷην ἡμετέρης ἐρικυδέος ἐντύνονται
πάτρης ἐνναετῆρες ὑπὲρ Σαρπηδόνοσ ἀκτῆν
ὅσσοι θ' Ἑρμείω πόλιν, ναυσίκλυτον ἄστν
Κωρύκιον, ναίουσι καὶ ἀμφιρύτην Ἐλεοῦσαν.

First hear of the cunning capture of the anthias, the method employed by the inhabitants of my glorious homeland above Cape Sarpedon, those who reside in Corycus, the city of Hermes, famous for its ships, and in Elaeussa washed by the sea.

This is one of the two passages that together suggest that Oppian is a native of Corycus: here that settlement is described as the "city of Hermes" (Ἑρμείω πόλιν), while in the proem to the same book his claim to having been reared below the shrines of Hermes occasions the introduction of a myth that both internal and external evidence suggests is local to Corycus, as I will discuss below. The fact that Oppian here also mentions Elaeussa does not necessarily

weaken that claim, and I would argue that the poet deliberately ties together by means of their fishermen two closely neighboring communities that were sometimes uneasy rivals: an entry in the *Stadiasmus Maris Magni* (173 = GGM 1.482) indicates that in the third century C.E. the formal status of Corycus would be reduced to that of a village (κώμη), likely due to the efforts of Elaeussa (Hild and Hellenkemper 1990: 315). In any event, what follows in Oppian is a detailed account of a fishing method that the poet locates along the shores of his native region. Obviously, autopsy cannot be proven and should not be taken for granted, even if one assumes the passage is the result of original research: Aristotle's descriptions of the habits of fish often rely not on direct autopsy but on accounts gathered from fishermen. And, to a certain degree, the question of direct autopsy is a red herring. As Kneebone demonstrates, criticisms of Oppian on the grounds of lack of autopsy are at least as old as Wilamowitz and primarily illustrate "the cultural baggage with which (late) didactic poetry has long been encumbered" (2008: 32). Oppian's literary project will have always relied on a careful handling of a wide range of source material, and its goals are decidedly distinct from those of a practical manual or scientific treatise.

At the same time, the accuracy of the information that the poet does choose to impart is not irrelevant, and his authority depends in no small measure on his claims to knowledge. The ultimate veracity of many of Oppian's accounts is demonstrated by the abundance of confirmatory detail collected in the notes to Mair's Loeb edition (1928), and it is noteworthy that the only example Bekker-Nielsen cites of an obviously absurd account is Oppian's description of catching swordfish by harpoon in the Tyrrhenian Sea and along the coast of Gaul in the region of Marseilles (*Hal.* 3.542–66). Here Oppian likely borrows from some earlier account, but that source appears to have been generally accurate: authors as early as the 16th century describe fisheries conducted in the Straits of Messina in essentially the same fashion, while later accounts note the remarkable similarities between these traditional fisheries, the account given by Oppian and a similar account owed to Polybius (*ap.* Strabo 1.2.15–16).⁴⁶

While Oppian does include elements of myth, legend and folk tale, that material is generally introduced in the context of digressions, and none of the other fishing methods described in the *Halieutica* is certainly or even

⁴⁶ Consolo compares Strabo's account with that of a 16th-century historian from Messina, Francesco Maurolico (2006b: 194). For a detailed account of these fisheries in the 19th century, noting the similarities to the accounts in Oppian and Strabo, see, e.g., Goode 1883: 356–61.

probably literary invention.⁴⁷ Of more immediate relevance is that Oppian appears to have surprisingly good information specifically about the sargue. I have already briefly mentioned an account that follows directly upon Oppian's description of the fisherman donning goatskin and horns. It describes how the male sargues compete in the spring for mates (4.374–92):

ἄλλος δ' αὖ σαργοῖσι μέλει πόθος εἶαρος ὥρη
 ἀλλήλων, εὐνῆς δὲ γάμων πέρι δηριόωνται. 375
 πολλαῖς δ' εἰς ἀλόχοις πέρι μάρναται· ὃς δέ κεν ἀλκῇ
 νικήσῃ, πάσῃσιν ἐπάρκιος ἔπλετ' ἀκοίτης,
 πέτρας δ' εἰσελάει θῆλυν στόλον. ἔνθ' ἀλιῆες
 κύρτον ἐτεχνήσαντο βαθύν, περιηγέα πάντη·
 τὸν δὲ φυτῶν λάχνησι περὶ στόμα πάντα πύκασσαν, 380
 μύρτων ἢ δάφνης εὐώδεος ἡέ τευ ἄλλου
 πτόρθοισιν θαλεροῖσιν ἐπισταμένους σκιάσαντες.
 τοὺς δ' οἴστρος ποτὶ μῶλον ἐπώρορεν εὐνητῆρας
 μάρνασθαι, πολλῇ δὲ γαμήλιος ἴστατ' ἐννύ·
 ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἀριστεύσας τις ἔλη κράτος, αὐτίκα πέτρην 385
 παπταίνει γλαφυρὴν ἀλόχοις δόμον, ἐς δ' ἶδε κύρτον
 κείμενον, εὐφύλλοισιν ἐπηρεφέ' ἀκρεμόνεσσιν·
 ἔνθ' ἐλάει νυμφεῖον ἐὸν χορόν. αἱ μὲν ἔπειτα
 κύρτον ἔσω δύνουσιν, ὃ δ' ἔκτοθι πάντας ἐρύκει
 ἄρσενας οὐδέ τιν' ἄλλον ἔξ νύμφῃσι πελάσσαι. 390
 ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐμπλήσῃ πλεκτὸν δόλον, ὕστατος αὐτὸς
 ἐς θάλαμον προὔτυπεν, ἀνέκβατον αἶδος εὐνήν.

Again there is another yearning for one another that takes the sargues in the season of spring, when they contend about the wedding couch, and each sargue

⁴⁷ Oppian's account of the octopus and the olive tree is an interesting example. The reality of Oppian's description of the octopus wrapping itself in the branches of olive trees growing along the seashore is beside the point: the popular belief that octopuses regularly left the sea is well attested already in Aristotle (*Hist. an.* 622a31) and Theophrastus (fr. 171.3 and 173 Wimmer). Clearchus pays particular attention to their affection for the olive tree, noting that they are frequently discovered with their tentacles wrapped around its trunk (fr. 102 Wehrli). Oppian introduces it here as an *aition* for the subsequently described fishing method, whereby octopuses are attracted to leafy olive branches bundled around hooks embedded in lead. This fishing method is, Oppian assures us, well known to fishermen (ὡς ἐδάησαν / ἰχθυόβλοι, 4.300–1). We have little reason to doubt the claim: the method is alluded to already by Clearchus (fr. 102 Wehrli), and an “entirely analogous” method (Mair 1928: 426na) is described in the 19th century by Apostolides (1883: 48–49). Thompson suggests a different origin for the belief that octopuses leave the sea (1947: 207): “[Their] eggs look remarkably like ripe olives; hence the story.”

fighths for many brides, and whoever is victorious in the struggle is sole husband to them all, and drives a whole female flock among the rocks. There the fishermen devise a deep, round weel, its entire entrance covered about with foliage, the fishermen carefully shading it over with the blooming growth of myrtle or laurel or some other sweet-smelling plant. And when the gadfly stirring the toil of war rouses the husbands to fight, the battle for brides is fierce. But when one sargue, having proven the strongest, holds sway, immediately he scans the hollow rock for a home for his brides, and sees the weel available, overhung with leafy twigs, and there he drives his maiden chorus. And then the brides plunge within the weel, and he wards off all the males, and allows no other near his brides. But when the treacherous trap is full, he last of all rushes into the bride chamber, the wedding couch of death with no exit.

This behavior is described only in Oppian.⁴⁸ Early modern naturalists treat this account with the same skepticism as that describing the sargue and the goat, although they freely admit to having little reliable evidence of their own for the fish's habits (see, e.g., Cuvier and Valenciennes 1830: 13–14). In fact, Oppian's account finds direct support in recent research on our white seabream, *Diplodus sargus sargus*, and the closely related *Diplodus vulgaris*. In many parts of the Mediterranean these seabream have been found to spawn in the spring, just as Oppian claims, departing notably from the opinion of Aristotle.⁴⁹ More importantly, research additionally suggests that males aggressively compete to fertilize the females' eggs. It is hypothesized that this behavior is in turn responsible for an interesting sequential hermaphroditism: while growing to maturity these seabream can first develop as females and successfully produce eggs to be fertilized by dominant males; upon reaching a sufficient size they can undergo a sexual transformation and efficiently compete as dominant males (Mouine et al. 2007; Gonçalves and Erzini 2000; Buxton and Garratt 1990). As a result, in commercial catches females greatly predominate, a phenomenon implicit in Oppian's account of the weel capturing a single male with a whole steading of brides.

This discovery should give us pause before dismissing as fiction the immediately preceding account of the sargue and the goat. Here, too, modern ichthyology affords interesting discoveries. As we have seen, Oppian's rationalizing account includes the suggestion that the sargues are somehow feeding around the goats as they are bathed, a notion that would seem to contradict

⁴⁸ Aelian does allude to it (1.25[26]): καὶ ἔστιν ὁ ἀγὼν οὐχ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, ὡς τοῖς σαργοῖς (“The contest is not over multiple brides, as among the sargues”).

⁴⁹ Aristotle claims it breeds twice a year, in summer and fall (*Hist. an.* 543a7); Pliny that it breeds *circa aequinoctium* (*HN* 9.162).

the poet's own assertion that the sargue's usual habitat is the rocky coast rather than the sandy shore. In fact, more recent research suggests that *Diplodus sargus sargus* often leaves its rocky haunts, especially at dawn, to actively feed in the surf zone on small shellfish and other benthic invertebrates found in the sediment (Sala and Ballesteros 1997; Froese and Pauly 2010 s.v. *Diplodus sargus sargus*). Oppian's sargues may well have learned that the clouds of sediment kicked up by reluctant goats could furnish an easy feast. Along similar lines, in a brief footnote to Walton's description of the sargue and the goat, the editor of a 19th-century edition of *The Compleat Angler* suggests that "the notion was derived probably from the fish crowding around the goats to feed on the vermin, &c., which fell from them" (Bethune 1880: 39). That the sargues are "cleaning" or feeding on the goats is precisely the rationale for their behavior that Oppian himself proposes. Modern science offers a perhaps meaningless, but nevertheless curious, coincidence: based on the prevalence of ectoparasitic crustaceans in the stomach contents of specimens collected from Mediterranean coastal lagoons, cleaning behavior has been proposed for various *Sparidae* including *Diplodus sargus sargus* (Mariani 2001).

Finally, concerning Oppian's fishing method itself, we might note that nothing about it is impossible. In the 18th century, Duhamel du Monceau described a vaguely similar method of catching sargues employed by the fishermen of Toulon, who would attract the fish by scattering around their rocky coastal habitat a kind of paste made of cheese, crushed sardines and flour. The fishermen noted that this chum was required to draw the fish away from their usual meal of small crustaceans and to the surface where they could then be captured with a line and hook, but one baited with a sardine rather than goat flesh.⁵⁰ This analogy is striking, even if imperfect, and the difference between a paste made of flour, cheese and crushed sardines and one of barley and goat fat is perhaps less important than one might otherwise assume: neither sardines nor goats are a normal feature of the white seabream's diet, and traditionally it was not uncommon for Mediterranean fishermen to use as chum or bait the fat, meat or organs of a whole range of animals. Duhamel du Monceau suggests that such baits were made "of every kind of animal"

⁵⁰ See Duhamel du Monceau 1769–82: 5.480. Duhamel du Monceau's work is organized internally into parts and sections, but these were published in installments in six different volumes of the *Descriptions des arts et métiers* series of the Académie des Sciences, Paris. I have used scanned texts from Harvard's Kress Library and follow their numbering for citation purposes: <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/MOME?af=RN&ae=U104134369&srchtp=a&ste=14>. Duhamel du Monceau's *sar de Toulon* can be identified as *Diplodus sargus sargus* (Cuvier and Valenciennes 1830: 25–26).

(1769–82: 1.29). Goats are not singled out, but he otherwise mentions cows, horses, donkeys, pigs and dogs. Considered especially effective, he tells us, is the flesh of rabbits and cats (1769–82: 1.29–33).

But even if we accept that sargues could have been captured in the fashion that Oppian and Aelian describe, this remains at best a partial explanation and one that cannot sufficiently explain a number of curious details, chief among them the crucial fact of the fisherman dressing up in a goatskin and horns. Radcliffe suggests that goatherds, having observed the apparent attraction of the male fish to the female goat, will have consciously invented the fishing method.⁵¹ Mair offers an ethnographic analogy, comparing this method of capture to Captain Cook's description of the natives of Nootka Sound who don masks and animal skins to decoy their wild prey (1928: 428na). Neither of these explanations is particularly satisfying, in part because they accept Oppian's premise that the primary purpose of the fisherman donning goatskin and horns is to provide a necessary object of physical desire for the fish. This particular technique will have no more required that fishermen dress up as goats than the method of catching sargues at Toulon will have required fishermen to disguise themselves as sardines. The strange ritual seems to require an explanation more convincing than the rationalizing *aition* constructed by Oppian, and I would argue that if we reject altogether the poet's logic, it is possible to offer a far more compelling explanation for these underlying details.

VII. PASTORAL RUSE, PASTORAL RELIGION

My hypothesis is straightforward: Oppian constructs a rationalizing aetiology for a method of fishing that can be better understood as a religious ritual embedded in a network of pastoral social practices and religious beliefs. Oppian describes this fishing method specifically as a "pastoral ruse" (νόμιον δόλον), but there are less obvious clues that the social context is very different from that of those other methods he has depicted. His account seems to avoid an explicit assertion that this method is one practiced by fishermen more generally. That

⁵¹ 1926: 241: "'Once upon a time' one of them noticed that the *sargi* came round the goats in vast shoals. The reason for this—whether grasped in a moment by one great brain, or evolved by two or three generations of speculating herdsmen—was discovered to be the attraction of the male *sargus* by the smell of the female goat. So the reasoning goat-herd slays his nanny, puts himself inside her skin, and to perfect, I presume, the resemblance of the deception, 'adjusts on his brows the horns!' Then he gently slides into the shallow, 'scatters the food full shower' among the *sargi* hot on their amorous mission and, well! for the number that were slain by 'The Sturdy Rod his latent Hand extends' I refer you to the fourth book of the *Halieutica*!"

association is owed entirely to a prefatory remark that could be construed as intentionally periphrastic (4.345–47): the fishing method itself is ascribed to the *vóos* of fishermen, but nowhere in the description that follows does Oppian use a term that would explicitly mark his “fisherman” as a member of that distinct occupational class. He is twice denoted only as “a man” (ἄνθρωπος, 4.349; ἄνδρα, 4.361), while the whole tenor of the passage suggests that this fisherman is by trade a goatherd, a circumstance that is at least implied by the concluding observation that if the ruse is discovered the fish will no longer approach the rocks, “even if he should lead down the shaggy-haired goats themselves” (καὶ εἰ λασιότριχας αὐτὰς / αἰγας ἄγοι, 4.369–70). This conclusion is by no means novel. Borgeaud, for example, assumes that this man is by trade a goatherd, even if his “activity shades into that of the fisherman” (1988: 114). And the act of a goatherd wetting a line is not itself implausible, with comparative evidence suggesting that in antiquity Mediterranean herders or agriculturalists will sometimes have engaged in opportunistic fishing.⁵²

More importantly, previously overlooked details suggest that this peculiar fishing method is directly related to a pastoral religious practice centering on the sacrifice of a goat. Nearly all the key body parts are represented. The goatherd dons the skin and horns (4.354–55). Aelian’s account specifies that the horns belong to the same flayed goat as the skin (αἰγὸς δορὰν ἑαυτὸν περιαιμπέχει, σὺν αὐτοῖς τοῖς κέρασι δαρείσης αὐτῆς, NA 1.22[23]). Oppian’s account likewise notes that the goat flesh used to bait the hook is taken from the hooves (4.365–66). At a sacrificial feast centering primarily on the consumption of the victim’s κρέα, understood as the chief cuts, it is the peripheral parts, including skin, horns and hooves, that are routinely left over (Rosivach 1994: 85–88). Such a feast is implicit in Oppian’s account, which specifies that the sargues are lured out of their rocky haunts and to a parallel “feast” (δαῖτα, 4.371) of their own. This is achieved when the goatherd “throws into the sea barley enriched together with goat meat and the cooked fat” (ἐξ δ’ ἄλλα βάλλει / κρείασιν αἰγείοισιν ὁμοῦ κνίσση τε λιπήνας / ἄλφιτα, 4.356–58). Presumably, the choice meat, the κρέα itself, is not scattered on the water but will have been consumed by those sharing in the sacrifice. Aelian’s account explicitly notes that the chum consists of “barley soaked in a goat meat broth” (ἄλφιτα αἰγεῖω ζωμῷ διαβραχέντα), and it is the barley on which the sargues

⁵² See Gallant 1985, who, however, in arguing that ancient fishing will have usually amounted at most to a part-time subsistence strategy, attempts to apply comparative evidence too broadly. Our ancient evidence, including the *Halieutica*, clearly shows that marine fishing will more often have been carried out by professionals engaged in well-developed artisanal industries (Bresson 2007: 183–93).

feed (σιτοῦνται μὲν τῶν ἀλφίτων, NA 1.22[23]). Aelian's term, ζωμός, is, as Rosivach notes, the usual word used to describe the rich broth made by boiling those odd parts of the victim left over after the primary cuts are cooked and shared (1994: 86). Likewise, in Oppian's account the goatherd enriches or fattens (λιπήνας) the barley by somehow steeping it with goat flesh (κρέιασιν αἰγείοισιν) and the savor of the roasting meat (κνίσση).

The term κνῖσα is most often used in contexts related to sacrifice, whether to describe, following LSJ, the "*smell or savour of a burnt sacrifice*" or the source of that savor, the "*fat caul ... in which the flesh of the victim was wrapped and burnt.*" Ancient authors do occasionally employ the word in contexts that are not explicitly sacrificial, and the term sometimes even describes a savor used specifically as bait. So, for example, a passage of Aelian describes how dogs can be attracted by the lure of "cooked meat giving off its savor" (κρέα ... ὅπτα κνίσσης προσβάλλοντα, NA 14.27). Aristotle specifically notes that fishermen place in their weels roasted octopus "on account of no other reason than its savor" (οὐδενὸς ἄλλου χάριν ἢ τῆς κνίσσης, *Hist. an.* 534a26). Oppian includes a similar claim (3.344–46), but such examples in no way weaken the sacrificial implications in our passage, where the savor of the cooked goat meat is used as a very real chum to attract the sargues. Rather, the usual connection between κνῖσα and sacrifice is determined largely by cultural context: as Greek social and economic historians have frequently noted, the evidence suggests that virtually all of the fresh meat consumed by Greeks will have been the product of ritual sacrifice.⁵³ In our ancient sources, when a non-game herd animal is butchered and its flesh consumed, the context is inevitably sacrificial.⁵⁴

It is perhaps also curious that the primary ingredient of the chum itself, the unmilled barley, ἄλφιτα, is likewise perfectly at home in sacrificial contexts. Attested already in the Homeric epics, the act of throwing or scattering unmilled barley in association with sacrifice is so frequently recorded in a range of later literary and epigraphic sources that Burkert treats it as a normative feature of Greek sacrificial practice.⁵⁵ Oppian's strange account implies,

⁵³ Stengel 1920: 105–6; Jameson 1988: 87: "The Greeks derived virtually all their meat (aside from game) from the ritual of sacrifice"; Rosivach 1994: 2–3 and 84–85.

⁵⁴ See, e.g., Stengel 1920: 105–6; Rosivach 1994: 3n5. This fundamental religious act of slaughtering a bull, sheep or goat is not narrowly delimited in time or space: Horden and Purcell, e.g., observe that it can be thought of as a defining practice not only of Greek but of ancient Mediterranean religion more generally, and one that proved unusually long-lived (2000: 427).

⁵⁵ See LSJ s.v. ἄλφιτον, and especially *Od.* 14.429; LSJ s.v. οὐλαί; more generally Burkert 1985: 56–58 and 66–68. Here again, the fact that barley is attested in other contexts, and sometimes specifically to attract animals, can hardly render the conjunction of sacrificial elements in Oppian's account any less meaningful.

then, a religious ritual involving the sacrifice of a goat, with the remnants of sacrifice used to attract the sargues to a goatherd-turned-fisherman disguised in the skin and horns of the victim and wielding a hook baited with the scraps of flesh clinging to the victim's hooves (or perhaps with pieces of the hooves themselves, softened by boiling). In Greek religion, there is no more likely recipient for such a sacrifice in such a context than Pan, as in an epigram ascribed to Agathias Scholasticus: "A horned offering to the horned god, a hairy-skinned sacrifice to the hairy-legged."⁵⁶ This epigram specifically addresses Pan as Philoscopelus, or "lover of the rocky lookout," an epithet similarly attested in Nonnus (*Dion.* 6.275 and 43.332) and one that suggests the kind of rugged landscape where mountain and sea meet. As we have already seen, in Theocritus's *Idyll* 5, Lacon specifically addresses a Pan Actius (line 14), or Pan of the Headland, a fitting epithet for a deity thought to inhabit the rugged coasts populated primarily by lonely herders and their cliff-loving goats. But these same headlands will have been home also to the rock-loving sargues and occasionally the fishermen that came to set their weels.⁵⁷ As Borgeaud notes, the fact that fishermen frequented these remote headlands, conceived of as belonging to the *eschatai* or "margins" that were home especially to Pan, explains at least in part the relationship sometimes attested between fishermen and a god that otherwise has little to do with the sea.⁵⁸ Thus, in another poem ascribed to Agathias, a goat is offered to Pan specifically at his "lookout by the sea" (παράκτιον ἐς περιωπᾶν, *Anth. Pal.* 6.167), with a direct connection then made between this coastal Pan and seine fishermen working in adjacent waters.

⁵⁶ *Anth. Pal.* 6.32: δικραῖρῳ δικέρωτα, δασυκνάμῳ δασυχαίταν, / ἵξαλον εὐσκάρθμῳ, λόχμιον ὕλοβάτῳ, / Πανὶ φιλοσκοπέλῳ λάσιον παρὰ πρῶνῃ Χαρικλῆς / κνακὸν ὑπηγήταν τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε τράγον ("A horned offering to the horned god, a hairy-skinned sacrifice to the hairy-legged, a leaper to the swift-springing, a woodland-grazed victim to the god who haunts the forest, by the headland Charicles offered to Pan Philoscopelus this shaggy, tawny, bearded goat"). Pan is frequently honored with goat sacrifice, see, e.g., *Anth. Pal.* 6.99, 154, 158 and 167.

⁵⁷ The scholia to Theocritus note the belief that this Pan Actius will have been worshipped especially by fishermen (on 5.14–16: Πᾶνα <τὸν> ἄκτιον: ... τινὲς δὲ φασι τὸν ὑπὸ ἀλιέων [τὸν] ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκτῆς ἰδρυσμένον), and likewise suggest that a connection between fishermen and Pan is attested already in Pindar (φησὶ δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος τῶν ἀλιέων αὐτὸν φροντίζειν [= fr. 98 Snell³]). See also *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἄκτιος.

⁵⁸ 1988: 60, 65 and 214n154. This relationship between Pan and fishermen is the subject of a number of ancient epigrams, e.g., *Anth. Pal.* 6.11–16, 167, 179–87 and 196. These epigrams frequently attempt to explain this association, focusing, e.g., on the fact that fishing is a form of hunting, and that hunters, fowlers and fishermen all employ nets.

As it happens, the link between this strange fishing ritual and the worship of Pan has already been proposed by Borgeaud, but on different grounds (1988: 115):

Although the deceit of the maritime goatherd is not explicitly connected with Pan, it is surely integrally connected with a symbolic configuration centering on the goat-god. It works because in the dog days, which are the noontime of the year, it brings into play a hopeless passion ... The goatherd disguises himself as a sort of Pan and takes this chance to exercise an irresistible enchantment.

Borgeaud's discussion pays little attention to Oppian's text or regional context, and, curiously, it shares with Alciato or Du Bartas certain details not found in the *Halieutica*, such as the fisherman's catching the sargues with a net (1988: 114). However, his observations about the passage's "symbolic configuration" are worth pursuing, especially his claim that the goatherd is disguising himself as a kind of Pan, an interpretation that is entirely compatible with my argument that it is a sacrifice to this deity that furnishes both the means and the occasion for the fishing endeavor itself. If we wished to push this interpretation further, we might note that the goatherd, having assumed the identity of the god, takes into his possession those elements of the sacrifice that are explicitly set aside for the deity, especially the κνῖσα, the fatty savor often imagined as rising up with the smoke to the heavens (Burkert 1985: 56–58). Likewise, his tool is described in unusual terms as a "rough staff" (ῥάβδον τε κρاناήν, 4.364). The word ῥάβδος is used specifically to describe a fisherman's rod in a well-known simile in the *Odyssey* (12.251) but otherwise only rarely. Oppian nowhere else uses it as a term for a fishing pole.⁵⁹ It is never found with that meaning in Aristotle, and it occurs in Aelian only in three passages, all directly related to the capture of the sargue.⁶⁰ The adjective Oppian employs, κραναός, most often has the sense of "rugged," and although for its meaning here LSJ proposes "*hard*," that interpretation is revisited in

⁵⁹ It otherwise occurs only once in the poem, in the plural to describe staves used to anchor a plaited weel (3.343).

⁶⁰ In his account of the sargue and the goat, Aelian specifically notes that the line is attached *not to a reed pole*, but to a rod of cornel-wood (ἐξήπται δὲ οὐχὶ καλάμου, ἀλλὰ ῥάβδου κρανεῖας, NA 1.22[23]). In a later passage Aelian lists various implements needed for different kinds of fishing. One list includes a cornel-wood rod, but following immediately after it in the list are the horns and skin of a goat, with Aelian's subsequent comments suggesting these lists are merely culled from his earlier accounts (NA 12.40[43]). More curiously, Aelian shortly thereafter includes an account describing a different method of capturing sargues (NA 13.2), but again paying special attention to the fact that the implement used is not a reed pole (καλάμου μὲν οὐ δεῖται) but rather a ῥάβδος.

the *Revised Supplement*, which suggests instead that it is “applied to things having a rough appearance.” If we follow the latter interpretation, Oppian’s description works on multiple levels. This “fishing pole” can be thought of as the goatherd’s rugged staff, an attested meaning for ῥάβδος (see LSJ s.v.), now put to a different but equally practical use. And, symbolically, it might be conceived of as a λαγώβολον, the stout hunting stick or herding staff that is, together with the syrinx, the most common attribute of Pan (Borgeaud 1988: 210n66 and 215n192).

Given these indications that Oppian’s rationalizing account masks what is also a religious ritual, we might revisit the phrase νόμιον δόλον. Importantly, the phrase follows immediately upon the description of the goatherd donning goatskin and horns (4.354–56). I would suggest that this image prepares the audience for an allusion to Pan, with νόμιον δόλον echoing a description of Pan as the “pastoral god” in the Homeric hymn (19.5): Πᾶν’ ἀνακεκλόμεναι, νόμιον θεόν, ἀγλαέθειρον. Case, word order and quantity are the same, with Oppian’s νόμιον δόλον occurring in the same position in the hexameter. While ancient quotations of and allusions to the *Hymn to Pan* are rare, the phrase νόμιον θεόν is perhaps quoted by Sophocles’ scholiast and in a number of related entries in the lexicographers, where, in attempting to explain the curious epithet ἀλίπλαγκτε given to Pan in the *Ajax* (695), it is noted that “fishermen honor Pan as a νόμιον θεόν.”⁶¹

Even if it affords a better explanation for the curious details included in Oppian’s description than does the poet’s own rationalizing account, the underlying sacrificial ritual to Pan that I have proposed might strike some readers as still too strange to be believed. There are, however, analogies for various of its features. The closest comes from the coast of Lycia, where Hellenistic and Roman sources attest a bizarre oracular ritual in the sanctuary of Apollo at Sura about 20km SW of the city of Myra.⁶² Here there was a sacred grove close by a “whirlpool,” where a freshwater spring welled up in the sea. Visitors seeking prophecy would throw into the pool roasted meat on wooden spits, which (marine) fish would then rush to devour, with an oracle somehow given accordingly. The most detailed description is preserved by Athenaeus, who quotes a passage from the *Lyciaca* of the Hellenistic historian Polycharmus.⁶³

⁶¹ See schol. Soph. Aj. 695 (ἢ ὅτι οἱ ἀλιεῖς τιμῶσι τὸν Πᾶνα ὡς νόμιον θεόν); similarly *Suda* s.v. Ἀλίπλαγκτος; Ps.-Zonar. s.v. Ἀλιπλάγητος.

⁶² Polycharmus and Artemidorus of Ephesus *ap.* Ath. 8.333d–334a (= *FGrH* 770 F1); Varro, *Rust.* 3.17.4; Pliny *HN* 32.17; Plut. *Mor.* 976c (*De soll. an.* 23); Ael. *NA* 8.5 and 12.1; Steph. Byz. s.v. Σοῦρα.

⁶³ *FGrH* 770 F1 (Ath. 8.333d–f): οὐ κατασιωπήσομαι δὲ οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐν Λυκίᾳ ἰχθυομάνεις ἄνδρας, περὶ ὧν ἱστορεῖ Πολύχαρμος ἐν δευτέρῳ Λυκικῶν, γράφων οὕτως· ὅταν γὰρ

The late Hellenistic geographer Artemidorus offers additional details, specifying that the oracular ritual is preceded by a sacrifice and that the “bait” used to attract the fish is comprised of the “first fruits” of that sacrifice and includes also dedicatory barley cakes and bread.⁶⁴

The ritual described by Oppian is clearly not oracular. Nevertheless, the fishing is preceded by a sacrifice, the cooked remnants of which are, like the “first fruits” at Sura, then cast together with grains into the sea, with the object of attracting fish that are not themselves sacred. In both cases the strange ritual of tossing the products of sacrifice into the sea to attract fish will have been more closely tied to pastoral practices than the activities of fishermen

διέλθωσι πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, οὗ τὸ ἄλσος ἐστὶ πρὸς τῷ αἰγιαλῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δῖνα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάθου, παραγίνονται ἔχοντες οἱ μαντευόμενοι ὀβελίσκους δύο ξυλίνους, ἔχοντας ἐφ’ ἑκατέρῳ σάρκας ὀπτὰς ἀριθμῷ δέκα· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἱερεὺς κάθηται πρὸς τῷ ἄλσει σιωπῇ, ὁ δὲ μαντευόμενος ἐμβάλλει τοὺς ὀβελίσκους εἰς τὴν δῖναν, καὶ ἀποθεωρεῖ τὸ γινόμενον. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐμβολὴν τῶν ὀβελίσκων πληροῦται θαλάσσης ἡ δῖνα, καὶ παραγίνεται ἰχθύων πλῆθος τοσοῦτον καὶ τοιοῦτον, ὥστ’ ἐκπλήττεσθαι τὸ ἀόρατον τοῦ πράγματος, τῷ δὲ μεγέθει <τοιοῦτων> ὥστε καὶ εὐλαβηθῆναι. ὅταν δὲ ἀπαγγεῖλῃ τὰ εἶδη τῶν ἰχθύων ὁ προφήτης, οὕτως τὸν χρησμὸν λαμβάνει παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως ὁ μαντευόμενος περὶ ὧν ἠῤῥατο. φαίνονται δὲ ὄρφοι, γλαῦκοι, ἐνίοτε δὲ φάλλαιναί ἢ πρίστεις, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἀόρατοι ἰχθύς καὶ ξένοι τῇ ᾧψει (“I will not pass over in silence those Lycians who prophecy by means of fish, whom Polycharmus treats in the second book of his *Lyciaca*, writing as follows: ‘Whenever they arrive at the sea, at the grove of Apollo by the shore, where there is a whirling eddy over sand, here those seeking prophecy present themselves carrying two wooden spits, each holding ten pieces of roasted meat. The priest sits in silence by the grove, while the individual seeking prophecy throws the spits into the whirling eddy, paying close attention to what occurs: after the spits are thrown, the sea rushes in and a host of fish appear, so many and of such a sort as to cause astonishment at the strangeness of the sight, and so great in size as to cause fear. Then the prophet calls out the species of fish and the individual consulting the oracle receives accordingly from the priest an answer to his questions. Among the fish there appear dusky grouper, drum, sometimes even cetaceans or sawfish, and also many other strange and rarely seen fish.’”).

⁶⁴ *FGH* 770 F1 (Ath. 8.333f–834a): Ἀρτεμίδωρος δ’ ἐν τῷ δεκάτῳ τῶν Γεωγραφουμένων λέγεσθαι φησὶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων πηγὴν ἀναδίδοσθαι γλυκεὸς ὕδατος, ὅθεν συμβαίνειν δῖνας γίνεσθαι· γίνεσθαι δὲ καὶ ἰχθύας ἐν τῷ δινάζοντι τόπῳ μεγάλους. τοῦτοις δὲ οἱ θυσιάζοντες ἐμβάλλουσιν ἀπαρχὰς τῶν θυσιαζομένων ἐπὶ ξυλίνων ὀβελίσκων ἀναπείροντες κρέα ἐφθὰ καὶ ὀπτὰ καὶ μάζας καὶ ἄρτους. ὀνομάζεται δὲ ὁ λιμὴν καὶ ὁ τόπος οὗτος Δῖνος (“Artemidorus in the tenth book of his *Geographies* says that it is said by the locals that a spring of fresh water wells up and where it issues forth eddies form, and that where the water eddies there are large fish to which those offering sacrifice throw the first fruits of their sacrifices, fixing roasted and boiled meat on wooden spits and barley cakes and bread. And the harbor and the spot itself are called Whirlpool”).

as a distinct class: although we have no explicit evidence for the origin of the sacrificial ritual at Sura, this site, nestled at the foot of the Lycian Taurus, will have been as remote in antiquity as it is today. Interestingly, the ancient sources and the archaeological evidence agree in suggesting that Apollo's arrival at Sura is relatively late. Only in the Hellenistic period is a small Doric temple *in antis* constructed on the site, and the sanctuary previously seems to have consisted only of a sacred grove and pool (Bean 1978: 130–33; Parke 1985: 196–97). Dedications from the site suggest that these were originally sacred to an indigenous Anatolian deity Sozon. Scholars seem to agree that the strange oracular rituals attested at the site are vestiges of pre-Greek religious practices, and indeed *ichthuomancy* would seem to be a distinct feature of Lycian religion more generally (Flacelière 1972: 15; Bryce 1986: 193–202; Lebrun 1990: 192; Nolle 2006: 516).

In a setting such as at Sura it is hard to imagine any context other than pastoral for a ritual whose meaning is structured in part by an implied contrast between mountain and sea. Polycharmus imagines visitors to the site arriving at the sea, apparently from the interior (ὅταν γὰρ διέλθωσι πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν), and then watching with astonishment and even fear as an assortment of strange sea creatures devour their offerings in the clear water of the pool. The ritual itself, we are told, is silent, but for the prophet, whose role, at least according to Polycharmus, is simply “to announce the name of each species” (ἀπαγγεῖλη τὰ εἶδη τῶν ἰχθύων ὁ προφήτης). While modern readers might sometimes chafe at the seemingly dry catalogues of fish names that feature prominently in the first book of Oppian's *Haleutica*, the ritual at Sura suggests something of the vatic significance inherent in the act of naming that which is usually unseen and unknown.

Although Oppian's account of the sargue and the goat carefully joins two descriptions of distinct pastoral practices and associates both through language and simile with a regional context, I am not suggesting that the religious ritual he describes necessarily enjoys a shared Anatolian origin with the practice attested at Sura.⁶⁵ However, it is certainly worth noting that the connections between the indigenous populations of Lycia and Rough Cilicia are unusually close. This fact is not at first obvious: Lycia and Rough Cilicia are separated geographically by Pamphylia and there are marked differences in the social and political structures attested in the two regions in Classical

⁶⁵ An Anatolian origin for the account preserved in Oppian is possible even if we conclude with Keydell that Oppian and Aelian have relied on a single, shared source. Keydell would identify this source as Leonidas of Byzantium (1937), a suggestion that is perhaps more likely than Wellmann's Alexander of Myndus (1891).

and later antiquity. But their religions and languages seem to have shared common Luvian origins, with distinct Luvian population groups surviving in both regions well into the Classical and Hellenistic periods (Houwink ten Cate 1961). In Rough Cilicia, outside of a few coastal towns, the local populations will have included a strong Luvian component into the Roman period, with abundant evidence for the widespread adoption of Greek beginning to appear only in the Augustan period.⁶⁶ In fact, Oppian's text elsewhere more certainly engages with Rough Cilician religion and its ancient Luvian traditions, specifically those associated with the sanctuary at the Corycian Cave located just a few kilometers from what is likely Oppian's native town of Corycus. I propose that Oppian's account of the sargue and the goat can be connected to these same traditions.

VIII. MYTH, RITUAL AND LANDSCAPE AT CORYCUS

Oppian opens the third book of the *Halieutica* by again addressing Marcus Aurelius and noting how fortunate the emperor is to have a bard such as Oppian, reared "among the Cilicians in the shadow of Hermes' shrines" (3.1–8):

νῦν δ' ἄγε μοι, σκηπτοῦχε, παναίολα δῆνεα τέχνης
 ἰχθυόλου φράζοιο καὶ ἀγρευτῆρας ἀέθλους
 θεσμόν τ' εἰναλίων ζυμβάλλεο, τέρπεο δ' οἴμῃ
 ἡμετέρῃ· σοῖς μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ σκήπτροισι θάλασσα
 εἰλεῖται καὶ φῦλα Ποσειδάωνος ἐναύλων,
 ἔργα δέ τοι ζῦμπαντα μετ' ἀνδράσι πορσύνονται,
 σοὶ δ' ἐμὲ τερπωλὴν τε καὶ ὑμνητῆρ' ἀνέγκαν
 δαίμονες ἐν Κιλικεσσιν ὑφ' Ἑρμαίοις ἀδύτοισιν.

5

Come now, scepter-wielder, observe the manifold devices of the fisherman's art and their halieutic toils, learn the law of the sea, take pleasure in my song. For under your scepter the sea churns and the flocks of the shelters of Poseidon, and for you are accomplished all works among men, for you the gods have

⁶⁶ On the spread of Greek and Greek epigraphic habits in Rough Cilicia, see, e.g., Mitford 1990: 2135–36. Blanton notes that for the survey area of the project in coastal Western Rough Cilicia nearly 80% of the individuals epigraphically attested between 65 B.C.E. and 250 C.E. have names that are not Greek or Roman, but rather Luvian (2000: 19). The same survey agrees with our other evidence in suggesting that the coastal regions of Rough Cilicia remained sparsely inhabited until the Roman period: the project found within its survey region evidence for Hellenistic settlements at only four sites with a total estimated population of 1,400. The population of these settlements swells to an estimated 18,000 during the period 65 B.C.E. to 250 C.E. (Blanton 2000: 57).

reared me, your enjoyment and singer, among the Cilicians in the shadow of Hermes' shrines.

Cults of Hermes are widely attested in Cilicia, but, as we have seen, Oppian later in this same book specifically identifies Corycus as "the city of Hermes" (3.208).⁶⁷ Furthermore, after invoking Hermes as the inventor of the fisherman's τέχνη, it is the relationship between this god and specifically Corycian Pan that affords Oppian the opportunity to relate what appears to be a local account of the destruction of Typhon (3.9–25)⁶⁸:

Ἑρμεία, σὺ δέ μοι πατρώϊε, φέρτατε παίδων	
Αἰγίοχου, κέρδιστον ἐν ἀνθρώποισι νόημα,	10
φαῖνέ τε καὶ σήμαινε καὶ ἄρχειο νύσσαν ἀοιδῆς	
ἰθύνων· βουλὰς δὲ περισσόνων ἀλιήων	
αὐτός, ἄναξ, πρῶτιστος ἐμήσαο καὶ τέλος ἄγρης	
παντοίης ἀνέφηνας ἐπ' ἰχθύσι κῆρας ὑφαίνων.	
Πανὶ δὲ Κωρυκίῳ βυθίην παρακάτθεο τέχνην,	15
παιδί τεῶ, τόν φασι Διὸς ῥυτῆρα γενέσθαι,	
Ζηνὸς μὲν ῥυτῆρα, Τυφαόνιον δ' ὀλετῆρα.	
κεῖνος γὰρ δείπνοισιν ἐπ' ἰχθυβόλοισι δολώσας	
σμερδαλέον Τυφῶνα παρήπαφεν ἔκ τε βερέθρου	
δύμεναι εὐρωποῖο καὶ εἰς ἀλὸς ἐλθέμεν ἀκτῆν·	20
ἔνθα μιν ὀξεῖαι στεροπαὶ ῥίπται τε κεραυνῶν	
ζαφλεγέες πρήνιξαν· ὁ δ' αἰθόμενος πυρὸς ὄμβροις	
κρᾶθ' ἑκατὸν πέτρησι περιστυφελίζετο πάντη	
ξαινόμενος· ξανθαὶ δὲ παρ' ἡιόνεσσιν ἔτ' ὄχθαι	
λύθρῳ ἐρευθιώωσι Τυφαονίων ἀλαλητῶν.	25

You, Hermes, god of my homeland, best of the Aegis-bearer's children, most profitable in purpose for men, reveal, mark out and guide, holding straight the course of my song. You yourself, lord, first devised the schemes of the fishermen cunning beyond measure, and you brought to light the devising of every kind of capture, weaving destruction for fish. And you handed over the art of the deep to Corycian Pan, your child, who they say was the deliverer of Zeus, the deliverer of Zeus but the slayer of Typhon. For tricking him with a banquet of fish he induced the terrible Typhon to issue from his wide pit and

⁶⁷ For Hermes on the local coinages of Corycus and neighboring towns, see Houwink ten Cate 1961: 36n3. An epigram in the *Anthologia Palatina* ascribed to Archias addresses Hermes as the patron deity of the Corycians (9.91.1: Ἑρμῇ Κωρυκίων ναίων πόλιν).

⁶⁸ Fajen's text includes an emendation in 3.18, ὑπ' ἰχθυβόλοιο for ἐπ' ἰχθυβόλοισι, which finds no support in the MSS and is, in my view, unnecessary (it is defended in Fajen 1995: 259–60).

to come to the shore of the sea. There the flashing lightning and the fiery rush of thunderbolts dashed him down, and burning in the rain of fire he beat his hundred heads on the rocks, tearing himself to tatters. There the yellow shores are still stained red with the gore of Typhonian violence.

For those familiar with the myth chiefly through Hesiod and other Archaic and Classical sources, Oppian's version will likely seem strange, especially the important role played by Pan in luring the monster from his cave. In his recent monograph, Bartley suggests that Oppian has here recounted the myth because of Typhon's "association with Cilicia in earlier literature," and further suggests that the prominence of Pan is the product of intertext, either an allusion to "a source that is no longer extant" or else a "learned reference" to Hellenistic epigrams that mention Pan in the context of hunting, fishing and fowling (2003: 159). For Bartley, this proem is primarily a kind of academic exercise involving sifting through various literary traditions in search of the impressively obscure.

As seen by a few scholars, most notably the Luvian specialist Houwink ten Cate (1961: 206–15), Oppian's account is better understood in the context of local religious traditions, an interpretation that, while generally accepted by scholars interested in Rough Cilicia or Near Eastern traditions,⁶⁹ continues to be ignored by most classicists interested in the poem. Houwink ten Cate follows Hicks 1891: 241 in suggesting that Oppian's account draws directly on local oral traditions maintained especially in association with the Corycian Cave, home of the monster identified by the Greeks as Typhon. Houwink ten Cate further demonstrates that key features of this local version are extremely ancient, as shown by the close relationship between Oppian's account and one version of the Hittite Illuyankas myth recorded in the second millennium B.C.E.⁷⁰ In that account the monster is destroyed by the Storm God but only with the assistance of two figures, Inara and Hupasiya, and after the monster

⁶⁹ See, e.g., Dagron and Feissel 1987: 44–46; MacKay 1990: 2103–10; Lane Fox 2008: 308–12; Bremmer 2008: 319–20; and Rutherford 2009: 30–34.

⁷⁰ Houwink ten Cate 1961: 208–15. For a text and translation of the Illuyankas myths, as told by the priest Kellis and preserved in the Hattusas tablets, see Beckman 1982. Although it is beyond the scope of this argument, the evidence for the Greek Typhon myths and their relationship to Near Eastern traditions deserves a careful reappraisal. Despite Watkins's pioneering work on these myths and Indo-European poetics (1992 and 1995; likewise Katz 1998 and 2005), the discussions of classicists still frequently rely on Vian 1960 or Fontenrose 1959 and 1966. Observing that no one has "fully untangled Typhon before" (437), Lane Fox recently revisits the question (2008: 295–318 and 437–41). Much of his discussion is decidedly speculative, but he includes a number of important insights, notably in arguing that thanks especially to long-lived regional

is lured out of its cave to a banquet. While elements of the Greek Typhon myths will have been transmitted through various Near Eastern intermediaries already by the Early Archaic period, Houwink ten Cate argues persuasively that certain ancient traditions reflected in our Hittite sources will have been maintained and eventually transmitted separately into Greek at a much later date by way of Luvian population groups in Anatolia. The epigraphic record suggests a possible mechanism whereby those ancient Luvian oral traditions can have been preserved and eventually transmitted into Greek. The most important evidence comes from the site of the Corycian Cave itself.

Roughly 3.5km to the southwest of ancient Corycus there are two large depressions, collapsed limestone caverns, at the site known in Turkish as Cennet e Cehennem (Heaven and Hell). Cehennem's steep walls render it inaccessible. The north end of Cennet, however, gives access to the floor some 70m below, with a deep inner cave accessible at the depression's southern end. This spectacular location was known as the home of Typhon already to Aeschylus (*PV* 353–74) and Pindar (*Pyth.* 1.15–17; 8.16). It was later visited and described, most notably by Strabo (14.5.5) and Pomponius Mela (1.13), but these visitors were primarily interested in recording the depression's natural features, including the saffron crocuses that famously grew there, and they have virtually nothing to say about local cults associated with the cave.⁷¹

However, at the site of an ancient temple perched above the southern rim of the depression, inscriptions built into the wall of a later church record the names of priests at the sanctuary.⁷² The earliest list appears to cover a period of some 214 years, beginning probably around 239 B.C.E.⁷³ As scholars have noted of Greek and Luvian theophoric names alike, isolated examples cannot

traditions, all three of the Typhon accounts preserved in Oppian, Ps.-Apollodorus and Nonnus have “much more authority than the late date of their authors suggests” (302).

⁷¹ For additional ancient references to the cave, see MacKay 1990: 2104n237 and, on its saffron, Robert 1960: 334–35. Keil and Wilhelm describe an additional, much narrower cave a short distance to the west of Cennet that seems also to have been visited and described by Pomponius Mela and associated in antiquity with Typhon (1931: 214–15).

⁷² See Hicks 1891: 243–58, nos. 27–28; Heberdey and Wilhelm 1896: 71–79, nos. 155 A, B and C; and Hagel and Tomaschitz 1998, *KrA* 1. On the date and architecture of the church atop the depression, its relationship to the ancient *temenos* and temple that preceded it, and the small chapel to the Virgin Mary within the depression itself at the mouth of the inner cavern, see Feld and Weber 1967 and, more recently, Bayliss 2004: 79–86 and 200–11, figs. 106–26. The remains suggest a Hellenistic date for the temple. As of yet, there is no archaeological evidence for earlier cult, although the site remains entirely unexcavated.

⁷³ Houwink ten Cate 1961: 38 and 204–5. This list records the names of some 169 priests, with the letter β that accompanies many of the names likely indicating that these priests served an annual priesthood for a second term.

constitute evidence for cult, but in well-defined contexts they can be meaningful and constitute useful historical evidence.⁷⁴ In this regard, the onomastic patterns from the Corycian Cave are extremely interesting. Names appear with patronymics, allowing us to trace successive generations of priests within the same families, of which there appear to be at most a dozen (Houwink ten Cate 1961: 203). At the start of the list, the priests' names are primarily of Greek origin. An unusual number of the Greek names throughout the lists are theophorics related to Hermes. After a generation or so an interesting pattern develops, and names of Luvian origin begin to emerge, or reemerge, within the same families. Many of these names are also theophoric, reflecting the Luvian Stag God, Ru(nt), who Houwink ten Cate argues will have been assimilated by Greeks to Hermes.⁷⁵ Others of the Luvian names are related to Tarhunt, the Luvian manifestation of the Anatolian weather god, widely assimilated to Zeus. A few decades later, the Luvian names begin to fade away, to be replaced once again by Greek names. This pattern is best explained, as Houwink ten Cate suggests, by the loss and then eventual reestablishment of Seleucid control of the adjacent coast in the third and second centuries B.C.E., with the strong expression of Luvian identity mirroring the absence of Greek political authority. These priests, bearing alternately Greek and Luvian names, allow for the hypothesis that their families will have comprised, for a period at least, a potentially bilingual population.⁷⁶

Later lists from the same sanctuary indicate that cults carried on at the site into the Roman period, and additional epigraphic evidence suggests that local traditions continued to associate Zeus and Hermes with myths about the destruction of Typhon. Early third-century C.E. altars include dedications addressing Corycian Zeus and Corycian Hermes as Ἐπινεικίῳ, Τροπαιοῦχῳ, Ἐπικαρπίῳ, epithets that, as Feissel shows, would seem to be a clear reference

⁷⁴ On the value of theophoric names as evidence, see Parker 2000. Hutter cautions against interpreting Luvian onomastic evidence too liberally, arguing that theophoric names "can hardly offer information on cultic practices" (2003: 276n54). Houwink ten Cate's argument, however, assumes only that in a well-defined context, such as that afforded by the priest lists from the Corycian Cave, theophoric names offer good evidence for the identity of deities and their cults; see Watkins 1999: 16: "Cilician theophoric personal names from Hellenistic times ... clearly show the perseverance of these Anatolian divinities, the Storm God and the Stag God, and their cult."

⁷⁵ Houwink ten Cate 1961: 212–14. On the Anatolian Stag God, see more recently Watkins 1999: 12–20.

⁷⁶ Cult contexts and bilingual singers have similarly been suggested as the likeliest route of transmission for the Near Eastern material found in Hesiod, on which see, e.g., Rutherford 2009: 33.

to the important role played by both gods in defeating Typhon and restoring fertility to the land.⁷⁷ No less noteworthy, is an inscribed epigram roughly contemporary with Oppian and discovered at the mouth of the inner cave⁷⁸:

ἄγκεσι καὶ δρυμοῖς ἡδ' ἄλσεσι πρὶν μυχὸν εὐρὺν
 δύμεναι ἐν γαίης βένθεσιν εἰν Ἀρίμοις,
 ἡχῆεις ὅθ' Ἀῶος ἀφενγέσι ρεύμασι φεύγει,
 Πάνα καὶ Ἑρμείην Εὐπαφίς εἰλασάμην.

Among the branches and the scrub oak and sacred groves, before entering the wide inner cavern in the depths of the earth among the Arimoi, where the echoing Aous flows in unseen streams, I, Eupaphis, propitiated Pan and Hermes.

The poem's reference points seem to be partly literary: εἰν Ἀρίμοις furnishes the requisite allusion to Homer, specifically *Iliad* 2.783 (εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι φασὶ Τυφώος ἔμμεναι εὐνὰς). That allusion is unmistakable, even if we are persuaded by Lane Fox's argument that Eupaphis's εἰν Ἀρίμοις reflects local topographical realities.⁷⁹ It is possible that the dedicator also will have known the name Aous from some literary source, although it is just as likely that the river flowing audibly through the limestone passages below the inner cave

⁷⁷ See Feissel's discussion at Dagron and Feissel 1987: 44–46; more recently MacKay 1990: 2106–8. The Zeus altar belongs to the ruins of an ancient temple at Göztepe near the village of Hasanaliler approximately 3km north of the cave (Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert 1978: 377). Bent seems to have recorded at this site an additional dedication to Corycian Zeus (Hicks 1891: 258, no. 30; Hagel and Tomaschitz 1998, *KrA* 2 [c. 117 c.e.?]): Ζεῦ Κορύ[κιε] / Τ(ίτος) (?) / Τραϊανός (?). The altar is first published by Hicks 1891: 242, no. 26 and more recently by Dagron and Feissel 1987: 44, no. 16 = Hagel and Tomaschitz 1998, *KrA* 4: Διὶ Κωρυκίῳ / Ἐπινεικίῳ / Τροπαιούχῳ / Ἐπικαρπίῳ / ὑπὲρ εὐτεκνίας / καὶ [[φιλαδελφίας]] / τῶν / Σεβαστῶν. Other than the name of the god (Ἑρμεῖ Κωρυκίῳ), the inscription on the Hermes altar, now in the Silifke Museum, is virtually identical (Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert 1978: 377 and 416, no. 42; Dagron and Feissel 1987: 44, no. 17 = Hagel and Tomaschitz 1998, *inc.* 13). The findspot is unknown, but Dagron and Marcillet-Jaubert suggest it will have come from the same temple at Göztepe. Both altars will have been dedicated on behalf of Caracalla and Geta with the reference to φιλαδελφία erased after the latter's assassination in 212 c.e.

⁷⁸ First published by Hicks 1891: 240, no. 24, but revised shortly thereafter by Heberdey and Wilhelm 1896: 71, no. 154 and collected more recently as Hagel and Tomaschitz 1998, *KrA* 3. The inscription's lettering suggests a date in the latter half of the second century c.e.

⁷⁹ Lane Fox 2008: 308 suggests that we ought to credit Callisthenes' claim that the Arimoi did in fact live in the region of the cave, taking their name from the neighboring mountains (*FGH* 124 F33 [*ap.* Strabo 13.4.6]).

was known locally by that name.⁸⁰ But the poem's invocation of Hermes and Pan specifically in the context of the cave's mythical typography seems to be a clear reference to the decisive role played by that pair as accomplices to Zeus in the local version of the myth (Hicks 1891: 241; Houwink ten Cate 1961: 213; Dagron and Feissel 1987: 44–46; MacKay 1990: 2106–7).

For the details of that myth we must rely primarily on Oppian, whose language, Πανὶ δὲ Κωρυκίῳ, includes a regional epithet directly echoed in the local cults of Zeus and Hermes, as shown by the roughly contemporaneous alters to Διὶ Κωρυκίῳ and Ἑρμῇ Κωρυκίῳ.⁸¹ This suggests that the poet has in mind a local manifestation, and perhaps one that is notably distinct from those representations of the deity elsewhere attested in the Greek literary tradition. Various of Oppian's details certainly have literary antecedents. For example, while local traditions perhaps will have made Corycian Hermes the father of Corycian Pan, a father-son lineage is already attested for the two gods in the Homeric *Hymn to Pan* (19.1, 35–36).⁸² But there is no evidence in earlier Greek traditions for the primary feature of Oppian's account, the involvement of Pan in catching a banquet of fish to lure Typhon to the sea-shore. Bartley is forced to posit some lost literary source, which can hardly be convincing, and an appeal to poetic invention is constrained by Oppian's use of a specific cult epithet and also by the fact that the tale's underlying structure, the preparation of a banquet to lure out the monster, is owed to an ancient

⁸⁰ See Hesychius s.v. Ἄωτος; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἄφος (quoting a line of Parthenius that locates the Aous specifically in the region of Corycus [Κωρυκίων σεύμενος ἐξ ὀρέων]); and Hicks 1891: 241. The stream's flow has apparently diminished, but Bent describes hearing from within the cave "a tremendous roar of water in the bowels of the earth" (1891: 213).

⁸¹ The epithet strikes Oppian's scholiast as worthy of comment, although that commentary is not particularly illuminating: Κωρυκίῳ δὲ τῷ ἐν Κωρυκῷ, Κωρύκιον δὲ τόπος ἐν Ἰσαυρίᾳ.

⁸² Bartley suggests that Oppian chooses this lineage largely for its obscurity and as a show of learning (2003: 162). But a passage in Herodotus suggests that it was standard (2.145), and it is also given at Apollodorus 1.4.1; Dio Chrys. 6.20; *Anth. Pal.* 16.229; schol. Theocrit. 1.3 and 123; and Serv. *ad Aen.* 2.43. Borgeaud considers this lineage "prevalent throughout antiquity" (1988: 65). As we have seen, traditions will have already made Pan the patron deity of hunting, a concept that includes fishing, and individuals plying that trade along the Mediterranean's rugged coasts sometimes explicitly invoke the god. Oppian's narrative skillfully combines these traditions, with Pan taking not only his lineal descent but also his knowledge of fishing, "the art of the deep" (βοθίη τέχνη), directly from his father (3.15). This construct fits the pattern not infrequently observed by ancient and modern ethnographers alike: more so even than other trades, the fishing profession tends to be a family affair with the requisite skills invariably passed down from father to son(s).

Anatolian tradition.⁸³ It is more probable to assume, with Hicks, Houwink ten Cate and others, that Oppian here recounts key features of local myth told in association with cults in the region of the Corycian Cave. Those cults both afford an opportunity for the myth's eventual transmission from Luvian into Greek and also help explain its preservation: as anthropologists have shown, oral traditions are rarely long-lived except where they are maintained through formal mechanisms such as religious ritual.⁸⁴

Unfortunately, we cannot recover details concerning the rituals conducted at Corycian sanctuaries to Zeus and Hermes, even if the dedicatory evidence clearly suggests that the Typhon myth will have played a role. But oral traditions are also frequently preserved in part through reference to landscape (see, e.g., Vansina 1985: 45–46). Here the Corycian Typhon myth affords better evidence. Landscape is an obvious feature of the quatrain dedicated by Eupaphis at the mouth of the inner cave and also of Oppian's account of the myth, which concludes with Typhon's hundred heads being shredded on

⁸³ Pan, or Aegipan, features in other traditions related to Typhon. Many of these are late and involve aetiologies intended to explain the nature of Egyptian deities or the appearance of the constellation Capricorn; see, e.g., Ps.-Hyginus, *Poet. astr.* 2.28 and *Fab.* 196. Other traditions are perhaps earlier than these. In the elaborate account of the Typhon myth given in the first two books of Nonnus's *Dionysiaca*, Pan plays a prominent role in rescuing Zeus, as do Hermes and Aegipan in stealing back Zeus's sinews from Typhon's cave in Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 1.6.3). As Houwink ten Cate shows, these two accounts are otherwise markedly different from the account preserved in Oppian and share many of their essential details with a second Hittite Illuyankas tradition (1961: 208–9). Finally, the *Suda* s.v. Ἀλιπλάγκτος records that Pan “hunted Typhon with nets” (ἦ ὅτι τὸν Τυφῶνα δικτύοις ἤγγρευσεν).

⁸⁴ On the relationships between myth and ritual in Greek religion and competing theories about the same, see the concise discussion in Burkert 1983: 29–34, especially the conclusion that “it may be possible to conceive of a religion without myths, but not of a religion using myth without ritual practice” (34). More recently, see, e.g., Burkert 2002 and Bremmer 2005. That formal ritual is a primary mechanism for preserving oral traditions has been well demonstrated by anthropologists; see, e.g., Vansina 1985. Ritual contexts are explicitly attested for many of the Anatolian myths preserved in our Hittite sources, and the Illuyankas accounts are no exception, having been recounted in the context of the annual *purulli* festival; see, e.g., Beckman 1982: 24, stressing that the Illuyankas myths, “like all known examples of ... ‘Anatolian’ mythology, are contained within a ritual context.” In his discussion of the Kizzuwatna rituals, Miller includes a nuanced discussion of the complex relationships between oral and literate traditions attested already in the Hittite texts (2004: 469–532). There is little evidence, however, for Luvian literacy in Rough Cilicia in the first millennium B.C.E., and the survival of mythological traditions will likely have relied exclusively on oral transmission.

the rocks, literally “carded like wool,” ξαινόμενος, again a pastoral image, but also an *aition*: the monster’s blood explains, the poet suggests, a characteristic reddish mineral stain on the region’s yellow coasts. Strabo likewise draws attention not only to the impressive spring that emerged in the bottom of the cave before disappearing out of sight, but also to the fact that the river continued its course out of sight until discharging itself in the sea. At the coast nearest to the Corycian Cave, there is a picturesque cove now known as Narlıkuyu (“the pomegranate well”), but when Bent visited it was called Tatlı Su, or “sweet water,” and is so marked on 19th-century maps (Bent 1891: 213; Budde 1969–72: 1.97–98). Here, freshwater still wells up in the sea, and local traditions link these springs to the river that runs beneath the cave. In the late fourth century C.E., a certain Poimenios, apparently governor at some point of the Princes’ Islands, constructed at Narlıkuyu a bathhouse with a fine mosaic of the three Graces, recording in verse his bringing into the light “waters once hidden.”⁸⁵ This phenomenon of abundant freshwater emerging after running down unseen from the mountains is obviously a feature of the *longue durée*. Today, as in antiquity, it is here that one picks up the road leading inland approximately 2 km to the cave. The site where the Aous reemerged in the sea will have been visited by Strabo, whose account suggests that a specific link existed in local Typhon traditions between the disappearance of the Aous in the cave and its presumed reemergence at the coast.⁸⁶

Today, Narlıkuyu is more often frequented not by travelers interested in Zeus, Hermes and Typhon, but by diners attracted to the popular fish tavernas supplied by local fishermen. The cove is also occasionally visited by herdsman, who afford an unusual sight by driving their livestock into the sea to drink

⁸⁵ The mosaic is published in detail by Budde 1969–72: 1.95–98, figs. 166–68 and 2.101–4, figs. 91–102. The text of the inscription is also given with additional information in Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1974.612: εἰ ζητῖς, ὦ ξεῖνε, τίς εὔρετο καλὰ λοετρά, / ἐκφῆνας πηγὴν τὴν ποτε κρυπτομένην, / Ποιμένιον γίνωσκε φίλον βασιλεῦσι ἑτέρων (= ἑταίρων) / κὲ νήσων εἰρῶν ἀρξάμενον καθαρῶς (“If you should wonder, stranger, who devised these beautiful baths, having brought to light a spring once hidden, know that it was Poimenios, a dear companion to kings and a blameless governor of the sacred islands”).

⁸⁶ Curiously, Strabo suggests that the river, or perhaps the site where it reemerged, will have been called πικρὸν ὕδωρ, or ‘bitter water’ (14.5.5): ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄντρον αὐτόθι ἔχον πηγὴν μεγάλην ποταμὸν ἐξεῖσαν καθαροῦ τε καὶ διαφανοῦς ὕδατος, εὐθὺς καταπίπτοντα ὑπὸ γῆς· ἐνεχθεὶς δ’ ἀφανὴς ἔξεισιν εἰς τὴν θάλατταν· καλοῦσι δὲ Πικρὸν Ὑδωρ (“There is also a cave here that has within a great spring giving out a river of clean and translucent water that promptly disappears again beneath the earth, and carried along out of sight it empties into the sea. They call it Bitter Water”).

from the freshwater springs (Budde 1969–72: 1.97; Lane Fox 2008: 310). That convergence of elements, of traditional pastoral modes on the one hand and fish banquets on the other, might be thought to recall Typhon's final feast, and suggests a concluding bit of speculation along lines that will likely have already occurred to the reader.

In his brief but brilliant discussion, Philippe Borgeaud suggests not only a connection between Pan and Oppian's description of the goatherd fishing for sargues but also a further connection between that account and Pan's role in the Typhon myth recounted by the same poet. For Borgeaud, however, the relationship is not about a particular social context or sacrificial ritual but "a symbolic configuration." The goatherd disguises himself as Pan in order "to exercise an irresistible enchantment, homologous to the enchantment of Typhon in the myth" (1988: 115). In my view, the relationships between the two accounts are likely to be much more than merely symbolic and will include shared social and religious contexts. In light of the unique religious traditions and landscapes of the poet's native Corycus, the pastoral ritual of fishing for sargues, which begins with sacrifice and culminates with the goatherd capturing fish while in the guise of Pan, should be connected to the pivotal role played by that same god in capturing the banquet of fish that ultimately allows for the destruction of Typhon. While the evidence permits us to say little with certainty about either the origins of that sacrificial ritual or the precise role that the Typhon myth may have played in it, the sacrifice itself and the subsequent act of ritualized fishing, not confined to a sanctuary but carried out on the rocky headlands home to the νόμιος θεός, will have comprised a memorable feature of the Corycian sacred landscape.⁸⁷ The ritual will have recalled the god's role in the myth, and the myth, whenever and wherever it was told, will have taken as a point of reference the very real sight of local goatherds catching sargues in the guise of the god.

CONCLUSION

I hope to have shown that Oppian's account of the sargue and the goat cannot be casually dismissed as poetic fiction. I have argued that it preserves evidence for two distinct pastoral rituals, one involving goat bathing and the other sacrifice to Pan. The poet attempts to link them in a single rationalizing account that further constructs a dichotomy between mountain and sea and their contrasting social and economic modes. I have argued that this dichotomy is not merely symbolic but can be connected to regional contexts

⁸⁷ On local and regional traditions and the notion of a "sacred landscape," see, e.g., Alcock 1993: 172–214.

in the poet's native Rough Cilicia. Finally, the described method of catching sargues can likewise be connected to local religious traditions, more specifically to a myth of Typhon told in association with cults of Corycian Zeus and Hermes and anchored in the surrounding sacred landscape. More generally, I hope to have shown that a poem that is too often dismissed as merely a versified prose treatise or another product of the Second Sophistic penchant for the stale recycling of earlier material can repay the careful attention of scholars interested in untangling its densely packed and meticulously crafted meaning. I have concentrated chiefly on regional contexts, but there are no doubt a whole range of historical and literary questions and a wide array of scholarly perspectives and approaches capable of offering more profitable contributions to our understanding of a poem that remains too infrequently read and only poorly understood.

WORKS CITED

- Alciato, A. 1534. *Andreae Alciati emblematum libellus*. Paris: Wechelus.
- Alcock, S. E. 1993. *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Apostolides, N. C. 1883. *La Pêche en Grèce: ichthyologie, migrations, engins et manières de pêche, produits, statistique et législation*. Athens: Typographie de Perris frères.
- Badham, C. D. 1854. *Prose Halieutics; or, Ancient and Modern Fish Tattle*. London: J. W. Parker & Son.
- Bartley, A. N. 2003. *Stories from the Mountains, Stories from the Sea: The Digressions and Similes of Oppian's Halieutica and the Cynegetica*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bates, D. G. 1973. *Nomads and Farmers: A Study of the Yörük of Southeastern Turkey*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Baumann, W. 1912. *Quaestiones de animalium historia Aelianae et Oppianae. Pars 1: De animalium inter se inimiciis atque amicis vel societatibus*. Marburg: Koch.
- Bayliss, R. 2004. *Provincial Cilicia and the Archaeology of Temple Conversion*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Bean, G. E. 1978. *Lycian Turkey: An Archaeological Guide*. London: Benn.
- Beckman, G. 1982. "The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 14: 11–25.
- Bekker-Nielsen, T. 2002. "Fish in the Ancient Economy." In Ascani, K. et al. eds. *Ancient History Matters: Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydsgaard on His Seventieth Birthday*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider. 29–37.
- . 2005. "The Technology and Productivity of Ancient Sea Fishing." In *id.* ed. *Ancient Fishing and Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press. 83–95.
- Benedetti, F. 2005. *Studi su Oppiano*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Bent, J. T. 1891. "A Journey in Cilicia Tracheia." *JHS* 12: 206–24.
- Bethune, G. W. ed. 1880. *The Complete Angler, or the Contemplative Man's Recreation, By Izaak Walton, and Instructions How to Angle for a Trout or Grayling in a Clear Stream, by*

- Charles Cotton. *With Copious Notes, for the Most Part Original, a Bibliographical Preface and a Notice of Cotton and his Writings, by the American Editor. New Edition with some Additions and Corrections from the Editor's Own Copy.* Vol. 1. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Blanton, R. E. 2000. *Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Settlement Patterns of the Coast Lands of Western Rough Cilicia.* Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Bonner, C. 1907. "An Interpretation of Longus ii.15." *CP* 2: 338–40.
- Borgeaud, P. 1988. *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece.* Trans. by K. Atlass and J. Redfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourchard, N. and Lollini, M. eds. 2006. *Reading and Writing the Mediterranean: Essays by Vincenzo Consolo.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bremmer, J. N. 2005. "Myth and Ritual in Ancient Greece: Observations on a Difficult Relationship." In von Haehling, R. ed. *Griechische Mythologie und frühes Christentum.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 21–43.
- 2008. *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible, and the Ancient Near East.* Leiden: Brill.
- Bresson, A. 2007. *L'Économie de la Grèce des cités (fin VI^e-I^{er} siècle a.C.).* Vol. 1: *Les Structures et la production.* Paris: Colin.
- 2008. *L'Économie de la Grèce des cités (fin VI^e-I^{er} siècle a.C.).* Vol. 2: *Les Espaces de l'échange.* Paris: Colin.
- Brulé, P. 2007. *La Grèce d'à côté: réel et imaginaire en miroir en Grèce antique.* Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Bryce, T. R. 1986. *The Lycians: A Study of Lycian History and Civilisation to the Conquest of Alexander the Great.* Vol. 1: *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources.* Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.
- Budde, L. 1969–72. *Antike Mosaiken in Kilikien.* 2 vols. Recklinghausen: Bongers.
- Burkert, W. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth.* Trans. by P. Bing. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1985. *Greek Religion.* Trans. by J. Raffan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 2002. "Mythos und Ritual: im Wechselwind der Moderne." In Horstmanshoff, H. F. J. et al. eds. *Kykeon: Studies in Honour of H. S. Versnel.* Leiden: Brill. 1–22.
- Buxton, C. D. and Garratt, P. A. 1990. "Alternative Reproductive Styles in Seabreams (Pisces: Sparidae)." *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 28: 113–24.
- Campbell, J. K. 1964. *Honour, Family and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chandezon, C. 2003. *L'Élevage en Grèce (fin Ve-fin Ier s. a.C.): l'apport des sources épigraphiques.* Pessac: Ausonius.
- Consolo, V. 2006a. "Tuna Fishing." Trans. by M. Chu. In Bourchard and Lollini, eds. 159–187.
- 2006b. "Views of the Strait of Messina." Trans. by M. Chu. In Bourchard and Lollini, eds. 188–209.
- Cuvier, G. and Valenciennes, M. 1830. *Histoire naturelle des poissons.* Vol. 6. Paris: Levrault.
- Cuyppers, M. 2010. "Oppiani." *The Hellenistic Bibliography.* Version July 2010. [<http://sites.google.com/site/hellenisticbibliography/empire/oppiani>]
- Dagron, G. and Feissel, D. 1987. *Inscriptions de Cilicie.* Paris: De Boccard.
- Dagron, G. and Marcillet-Jaubert, J. 1978. "Inscriptions de Cilicie et d'Isaurie." *Belleten* 42: 373–420.

- Davran, M. K., Ocak, S., and Secer, A. 2009. "An Analysis of Socio-Economic and Environmental Sustainability of Goat Production in the Taurus Mountain Villages in the Eastern Mediterranean Region of Turkey, with Consideration of Gender Roles." *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 41: 1151–55.
- de Planhol, X. 1958. *De la Plaine pamphylienne aux lacs pisidiens: nomadisme et vie paysanne*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Diaper, W. and Jones, J. 1722. *Oppian's Halieuticks of the Nature of Fishes and Fishing of the Ancients in V. Books: Translated from the Greek, with an Account of Oppian's Life and Writings and a Catalogue of his Fishes*. Oxford: The Theatre.
- Diego Cuscoy, L. 1968. *Los Guanches: vida y cultura del primitivo habitante de Tenerife*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo Arqueológico de Tenerife.
- Du Bartas, G. de Salluste. 1578. *Le Sepmaine, ou Création du monde*. Paris: J. Feurier.
- Duhamel du Monceau, H. L. 1769–82. *Traité général des pêches, et histoire des poissons qu'elles fournissent, tant pour la subsistance des hommes; que pour plusieurs autres usages qui ont rapport aux arts et au commerce*. 6 vols. Paris: Saillant & Nyon.
- Erdoğan, Z. and Jirousek, C. A. 2005. "Ankara (Angora) Goat Hair: The Turkish Mohair Tradition." In Marchese, R. T. ed. *The Fabric of Life: Cultural Transformations in Turkish Society*. Binghampton, NY: Global Academic Publishing. 209–24.
- Fajen, F. 1979. *Handschriftliche Überlieferung und sogenannte Euteknios-Paraphrase der Halieutika des Oppian*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- 1995. *Noten zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Halieutika des Oppian*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- 1999. *Oppianus: Halieutica. Einführung, Text, Übersetzung in deutscher Sprache, ausführliche Kataloge der Meeresfauna*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Feld, O. and Weber, H. 1967. "Tempel und Kirche über der Korykischen Grotte (Cennet Cehennem) in Kilikien." *MDAI(I)* 17: 254–78.
- Flacelière, R. 1972. *Devins et oracles grecs*. 3rd ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Fontenrose, J. 1959. *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1966. "Typhon Among the Arimoi." In Wallach, L. ed. *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of H. Caplan*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 64–82.
- Froese, R. and Pauly, D. eds. 2010. *FishBase*. Version May 2010. [www.fishbase.org]
- Gallant, T. W. 1985. *A Fisherman's Tale: An Analysis of the Potential Productivity of Fishing in the Ancient World*. Ghent: Belgian Archaeological Mission in Greece.
- García Valdés, M., Llera Fueyo, L. A., and Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén, L. 2009. *Claudius Aelianus: De natura animalium*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Georgoudi, S. 1974. "Quelque Problèmes de la transhumance dans la Grèce ancienne." *REG* 87: 155–85.
- Goldhill, S. 2004. Review of Bartley 2003. *BMCR* 2004.02.05.
- Gonçalves, J. M. S. and Erzini, K. 2000. "The Reproductive Biology of the Two-Banded Sea Bream (*Diplodus vulgaris*) from the SW Coast of Portugal." *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* 16.3: 110–16.
- Goode, G. B. 1883. "XII. Materials for a History of the Sword-Fish." In *United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries Report of the Commissioner for 1880*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. 289–367.

- Gow, A. S. F. 1950. *Theocritus. Vol. II: Commentary, Appendix, Indexes, and Plates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenhill, W. A. 1849. "Oppianus." In Smith, W. ed. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*. Vol. 3: O-Z. Boston: Little & Brown. 34–37.
- Gualandri, I. 1968. *Incerti auctoris in Oppiani Halieutica paraphrasis*. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino.
- Gürsoy, O. 2006. "Economics and Profitability of Sheep and Goat Production in Turkey under New Support Regimes and Market Conditions." *Small Ruminant Research* 62: 181–91.
- Hagel, S. and Tomaschitz, K. 1998. *Repertorium der westkilikischen Inschriften nach den Scheden der Kleinasiatischen Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Haupt, M. 1869. "Excerpta ex Timothei Gazaei libris de animalibus." *Hermes* 3: 5–30.
- Heberdey, R. and Wilhelm, A. 1896. *Reisen in Kilikien ausgeführt 1891 und 1892*. Vienna: Gerold.
- Hercher, R. 1864. *Claudii Aeliani de natura animalium libri xvii, varia historia, epistolae, fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hicks, E. L. 1891. "Inscriptions from Western Cilicia." *JHS* 12: 225–73.
- Hild, F. and Hellenkemper, H. 1990. *Kilikien und Isaurien*. Vol. 1. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Holmes, U. T., Lyons, J. C., and Linker, R. W. 1938. *The Works of Guillaume de Salluste, Sieur Du Bartas: A Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary, and Variants*. Vol. 2. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hopwood, K. 1983. "Policing the Hinterland: Rough Cilicia and Isauria." In Mitchell, S. ed. *Armies and Frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia: Proceedings of a Colloquium held at University College, Swansea, in April 1981*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports. 173–87.
- 1989. "Consent and Control: How the Peace Was Kept in Rough Cilicia." In French, D. H. and Lightfoot, C. S. eds. *The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports. 191–201.
- Horden, P. and Purcell, N. 2000. *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Houwink ten Cate, P. H. J. 1961. *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*. Leiden: Brill.
- Howe, T. 2008. *Pastoral Politics: Animals, Agriculture and Society in Ancient Greece*. Claremont: Regina Books.
- Hutter, M. 2003. "Aspects of Luwian Religion." In Melchert, H. C. ed. *The Luwians*. Leiden: Brill. 211–80.
- Jameson, M. H. 1988. "Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece." In Whittaker, C. R. ed. 87–119.
- Katz, J. T. 1998. "How to be a Dragon in Indo-European: Hittite *illuyankaš* and its Linguistic and Cultural Congeners in Latin, Greek, and Germanic." In Jasanoff, J., Melchert, H. C., and Oliver, L. eds. *Mir Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. 317–34.

- Katz, J. T. 2005. "To Turn a Blind Eel." In Jones-Bley, K. et al. eds. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, November 5–6, 2004*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man. 259–296.
- Keil, J. and Wilhelm, A. 1931. *Denkmäler aus dem Rauhen Kilikien*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Keydell, R. 1937. "Oppians Gedicht von der Fischerei und Aelians Tiergeschichte." *Hermes* 72: 411–34.
- 1939. "Oppianos (1)." *Pauly-Wissowa* 18: 698–703.
- Kneebone, E. 2008. "The Poetics of Knowledge in Oppian's *Halieutica*." *Ramus* 37: 32–59.
- Lacépède, B. G. de. 1799. *Histoire naturelle des poissons*. Vol. 8. Paris: Plassan.
- Lane Fox, R. 2008. *Travelling Heroes: Greeks and their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer*. London: Allen Lane.
- Lebrun, R. 1990. "Quelques Aspects de la divination en Anatolie du Sud-Ouest." *Kernos* 3: 185–95.
- Lelli, E. 2004. "Il tonno 'Maiale del mare' da Polibio ad Ateneo." *QUCC* 78: 153–58.
- Levick, B. 2004. "The Roman Economy: Trade in Asia Minor and the Niche Market." *G&R* 51: 180–98.
- Limes, J. M. 1817. *Les Halieutiques, traduits du grec du poëme d'Oppien, où il traite de la pêche et des mœurs des habitants des eaux*. Paris: Lebègue.
- MacKay, T. S. 1990. "The Major Sanctuaries of Pamphylia and Cilicia." *ANRW* 2.18.3: 2045–129.
- Mair, A. W. 1928. *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus*. London: Heinemann.
- Mariani, S. 2001. "Cleaning Behaviour in *Diplodus* spp.: Chance or Choice? A Hint for Future Investigations." *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* 81: 715–16.
- Mercer, J. 1980. *The Canary Islands: Their Prehistory, Conquest, and Survival*. London: Collings.
- Miller, J. L. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Milliner, M. J. 1975. "Le Chevrier marin (Longus, *Daphnis* et *Chloé* II.15.3)." *REG* 88: 11 (abstract only).
- Mitford, T. B. 1990. "Roman Rough Cilicia." *ANRW* 2.18.3: 2131–60.
- Montgomery, J. 2006. "A Midsummer Night's Dream." *Living Tenerife* July 2006. [<http://www.realtenerifeislanddrives.com/Midsummer.html>]
- Mouine, N. et al. 2007. "The Reproductive Biology of *Diplodus sargus sargus* in the Gulf of Tunis (Central Mediterranean)." *Scientia Marina* 71: 461–69.
- Nares, R., Halliwell, J. O., and Wright, T. 1859. *A Glossary; or, Collection of words, phrases, names and allusions to customs, proverbs, etc., which have been thought to require illustration in the works of English authors, particularly of Shakespeare, and his contemporaries*. Vol. 2. London: Smith.
- Neugebauer, P. V. 1929. *Astronomische Chronologie*. Vol. 2: *Tafeln*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nolle, J. 2006. "Königliches Gefolge beim Fischorakel von Sura." In Dörtlück, K. et al. eds. *The IIIrd Symposium on Lycia, 07–10 November 2005, Antalya*. Vol. 2. Antalya: Suna & İnan Kıraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü. 515–22.

- Ocak, S., Davran, M. K., and Güney, O. 2010. "Small Ruminant Production in Turkey: Highlighting in Goat Production." *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 42: 155–59.
- Parke, H. W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 1985. *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. Dover, NH: Croom Helm.
- Parker, R. 2000. "Theophoric Names and the History of Greek Religion." In Hornblower, S. and Matthews, E. eds. *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 53–79.
- Paschalis, M. 2000. "Generic Affiliations in Roman and Greek Cynegética." In Sifakis, G. M. ed. *Κτερίσματα. Φιλολογικά μελετήματα αφιερωμένα στον Ιω. Σ. Καμπίτση (1938–1990)*. Heraklion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης (Crete University Press). 201–32.
- Petropoulos, J. C. B. 1994. *Heat and Lust: Hesiod's Midsummer Festival Scene Revisited*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Powell, J. 1996. *Fishing in the Prehistoric Aegean*. Jonsered: Åström.
- Radcliffe, W. 1926. *Fishing from the Earliest Times*. 2nd ed. London: John Murray.
- Rauh, N. K. et al. 2006. "Viticulture, Oleoculture, and Economic Development in Roman Rough Cilicia," *MBAH* 25: 49–98.
- Rebuffat, E. 2001. *ΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ ΕΠΕΩΝ: tecniche di composizione poetica negli Halieutica di Oppiano*. Florence: Olschki.
- Richmond, J. A. 1973. *Chapters on Greek Fish-Lore*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Robert, L. 1960. "Recherches épigraphiques VII.: décret de la confédération lycienne à Corinthe." *REA* 62: 324–42.
- Robertson, N. D. 1991. "Myth, Ritual, and Livelihood in Early Greece." In Silver, M. ed. *Ancient Economy in Mythology: East and West*. Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. 3–34.
- . 1998. "The Two Processions to Eleusis and the Program of the Mysteries." *AJP* 119: 547–75.
- Rosivach, V. J. 1994. *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Rutherford, I. 2009. "Hesiod and the Literary Traditions of the Near East." In Montanari, F., Rengakos, A., and Tsagalis, C. eds. *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*. Leiden: Brill. 9–35.
- Sala, E. and Ballesteros, E. 1997. "Partitioning of Space and Food Resources by Three Fish Genus *Diplodus* (Sparidae) in a Mediterranean Rocky Infralittoral Ecosystem." *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 152: 273–83.
- Scott, W. 1808. *The Works of John Dryden*. Vol. 6. London: Miller.
- Shaw, B. D. 1982–83. "'Eaters of Flesh, Drinkers of Milk': The Ancient Mediterranean Ideology of the Pastoral Nomad." *AncSoc* 13–14: 5–31.
- . 1990. "Bandit Highlands and Lowland Peace: The Mountains of Isauria-Cilicia." *JESHO* 33: 199–233 and 237–70.
- Stengel, P. 1920. *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*. 3rd ed. Munich: Beck.
- Sylvester, J. 1605. *Bartas: His Divine Weekes and Workes*. London: Lownes.
- Thompson, D. W. 1947. *Glossary of Greek Fishes*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Topsell, E. 1607. *The Historie of Foure-Footed Beastes*. London: Jaggard.
- Vansina, J. 1985. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Vian, F. 1960. "Le Mythe de Typhée et le problème de ses origines orientales." In Eissfeldt, O. ed. *Éléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne. Colloque de Strasbourg, 22–24 mai 1958*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 17–37.

- Walton, I. 1653. *The Compleat Angler or, The Contemplative Man's Recreation. Being a Discourse of Fish and Fishing, Not Unworthy the Perusal of Most Anglers*. London: Maxey.
- Watkins, C. 1992. "Le Dragon hittite Illuyankas et le géant grec Typhôeus." *CRAI*: 319–30.
- 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1999. "A Celtic Miscellany." In Jones-Bley, K. et al. eds. *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, May 21–23, 1998*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man. 3–25.
- Wellmann, M. 1891. "Alexander von Myndos." *Hermes* 26: 481–566.
- West, M. L. 1978. *Hesiod: Works & Days*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Westermann, A. 1845. *Βιόγραφοι: Vitarum scriptores Graeci minores*. Braunschweig: G. Westermann.
- Whittaker, C. R. ed. 1988. *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Williams, G. 1994. *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*. London: Athlone Press.
- Yalçin, B. C. 1986. *Sheep and Goats in Turkey*. Animal Production and Health, Paper No. 60. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.