

CRISTIANA FRANCO

GENDERING ANIMALS. FEMININE AND MASCULINE SPECIES IN *ARTEMIDORUS' INTERPRETATION OF DREAMS*. PART ONE

[G]ender always has a semantic core: there are no gender systems in which the genders are purely formal categories.

(CORBETT 1991, p. 307)

This is the first part of a two-part article. An early stage of this work was presented in November 2016 at the Sixth workshop "Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves" (Montpellier) organized by the research team "Groupe Artémidore", whose members are preparing a new edition, with French translation and notes, of the *Interpretation of Dreams*. I thank them for that invitation and for giving me access to the draft of their edition. For their comments, and for the remarks of the audience at that venue, I am greatly indebted. The text of the presentation in Montpellier, from which the present paper originates, will appear (in French) in D. Auger, C. Chandezon, J. du Bouchet et G. Weber (ed.), *Les rêves et leur interprétation. Le traité d'Artémidore de Daldis et sa postérité*, Les Belles Lettres. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers of this paper for drawing my attention to studies I had neglected and to aspects I had not considered.

1. INTRODUCTION: GRAMMATICAL AND CONCEPTUAL GENDER OF THE SPECIES

One of the interesting aspects of ancient zoologies – by "ancient zoologies" I mean all the ancient discourses on non-human animals – is the fact that we can distinguish in them a principle of organization of species, that articulates the animal classes by hierarchies and oppositions in some way comparable to those of human social classes. Zoologies thus record native and foreign species, «allied» and «enemy» species, «slave» and «free» species, «virile» and «effeminate» species¹. The present study will focus on the characterization of some

¹ On equine hierarchies see GRIFFITH 2006; GREGORY 2007; on the opposition between «free» and «enslaved» canids see FRANCO 2014. Intersectional studies about other animal species would be welcome, as they would provide more data and help in assessing the pervasiveness of this phenomenon.

animal species according to gender norms and stereotypes in light of Artemidorus' *Interpretation of Dreams* as a case study.

In Greek zoology there is indeed a tendency to represent certain animals as «masculine» and others as «feminine». This happens mainly according to two criteria:

- 1) the masculine/feminine cultural characterization of the species (i.e. its semantic or conceptual gender) is the same as the grammatical gender of the species name;
- 2) the semantic (or conceptual) gender is determined independently of the gender of the noun, by cultural norms.

In the first case, when a zoonym is either masculine or feminine, one may suppose that it is precisely the grammatical gender of the name that determines the characterization: for example, the eagle (ὁ ἀετός), a grammatically masculine noun, would elicit representations of the animal characterized by *virile* qualities such as dominance, courage, and proud independence². The individual prototype of the eagle species (unmarked term) would therefore be a male individual; in order to represent a «female eagle» a member of the ancient Greek culture would have had to force the ordinary image and fabricate a marked representation³. If it is true, as is most often believed, that the attribution of names to gender classes is arbitrary or follows purely linguistic logic⁴, the gendered characterization of the animal that results from this type of zoonym would be also arbitrary⁵.

The second case, on the other hand, concerns species whose name is of an undifferentiated gender (common gender nouns) and therefore does not have a specific

² Animal species names in the ancient Greek language mainly possess a masculine or feminine gender (neutral cases are extremely rare) and function as epicene nouns, i.e. they can indicate indifferently male or female referents and thus have a gender-neutral meaning. Nevertheless, they appear to elicit, as we shall see, symbolic interpretations which put them in relation with (human) genders, i.e. with (attributes of) men or women.

³ On markedness see JAKOBSON 1984, whose example in the domain of gender involves precisely a pair of animal nouns, namely the Russian word *oslica* 'she-ass' (marked feminine) as compared to *osel* 'donkey' (unmarked, containing no indication of the sex of the animal); BATTISTELLA 1996. On markedness and prototype theory see LAKOFF 1987, pp. 59-60; BATTISTELLA 1990, p. 26 ff.

⁴ Gender assignment seems to be semantically motivated in a small number of cases, e.g. when the noun refers to male or female human or sexed entity, or when it belongs to a class of lexical items (such as tree names, all feminine in ancient Greek and Latin); but for most nouns it is maintained that grammatical gender is semantically arbitrary (BASSETTI 2014). On the arbitrary assignment of epicene animal nouns to grammatical genders see BASSETTI 2011; SPATHAS - SUDO 2020, p. 17. For a history of the diverging lines of thinking about gender from the ancient Greek scholars to modern times see KILARSKI 2013.

⁵ In these cases, we would be dealing with semantic projections of grammatical gender, such as those studied, for the Latin context, by CORBEILL 2015. These projections, however, can end up being troublesome: see Varro's embarrassment over the Latin (feminine) *aquila* (CORBEILL 2015, 30). Whether grammatical gender (be it motivated or arbitrary) does *affect how people think* of the entity denoted by the respective noun, however, is a long-disputed issue: see KONISHI 1993; BASSETTI 2011; BELLER ET ALII 2015.

grammatical gender mark. For example, in Greek, nouns such as κύνων, ὄς, ἵππος, ὄνος, ἡμίονος, χῆν, βοῦς, ὄις, and αἴξ can be used interchangeably as masculine or feminine⁶. It would similarly be the case, in modern languages, for names like Italian «un/una collega». For this kind of substantives, the generic masculine is the norm in the plural, in ancient Greek as well as in Italian: the animals would be referred to as οἱ χῆνες (geese), οἱ κύνες (dogs), οἱ ὄνοι (asses) and so on, even if there are females in the group, as the Italian syntagm «i colleghi» can refer to a mixed group of men and women coworkers⁷.

In Greek, however, we find cases where these names are sometimes used, against the norm, in the generic (unmarked) feminine. Dogs and pigs for example – even when it is a question of a male individual or groups including males – take feminine articles and adjectives, both in the singular (ἡ κύνων, ἡ ὄς) and in the plural form (αἱ κύνες, αἱ ὄες). In these cases, the linguistic usage seems to reflect a femininity by default attributed to the species as a whole. The same happens, mostly in the plural, with βόες (cattle), ὄιες / οἰές (sheep), ἵπποι (horses), ἡμίονοι (mules), αἴγες (goats), and ἔλαφοι (deer)⁸.

With regard to the dog, the question has already been addressed in another study to which I refer for sources and argument⁹. It will suffice to cite here, by way of example, the constant use of κύνων in the feminine in the *Cynegeticus* of Xenophon¹⁰ and the following proverbs: ἐν ὕπνοις πᾶσα κύνων ἄρτον μαυτεύεται ("a sleeping dog always dreams of bread") and οὐδὲ γὰρ κύνων σκυτοτραγεῖν μαθοῦσα τῆς τέχνης ἐπιλήσεται («the dog who learned to gnaw

⁶ Since there is no universal agreement on terminology for gender categories, I will employ the fivefold system already used by some ancient grammarians (Dion. Thr. *Ars grammatica* 12 (14b), p. 24-5 Uhlig), and articulated as follows: masculine, feminine, neuter, epicene (grammatically gendered, but gender-neutral as far as the sex of the referent is concerned), and common gender (no grammatical gender, can take masculine or feminine agreement – never neutral – and refer both to a male and female referent). This last category is called "double-gender" by CORBETT 1991, pp. 181-2.

⁷ Nouns of common gender escape the norm enunciated by KONISHI (1993, p. 520) according to which «in languages with grammatical gender (...) all nouns are marked for gender».

⁸ I offer here some examples, taken from different literary genres and including some from Artemidorus's treatise, for cattle: Hom. *Il.* 11. 172-3, 15. 630-1, *Od.* 20. 212, 22. 299; Plat. *Ion* 540 c; for sheep and goats: Aristot. *HA* 596 a 15; 596 b 1-10; Artem. 2. 12. 2; 4. 55; for horses: Hdt. 8. 115 (cf. 7. 40); Ael. *NA* 12. 44; for mules: Hom. *Il.* 10. 352-3; Simon. fr. 515 PMG; for deer: Hom. *Il.* 21. 486; *Od.* 6. 104; Xen. *Cyn.* 9. 11; Artem. 2. 12. 16. As they possess no grammatical gender, these zoonyms differ from the feminine animal nouns with no gender inference, such as the «Feminine-default Animal Nouns» studied for modern Greek language by SPATHAS-SUDO 2020 p. 11, which would rather belong to the category of «epicenes».

⁹ FRANCO 2014.

¹⁰ Arrian aligns himself with the usage of Xenophon by treating κύνων / κύνες in the feminine; but Ps.-Oppian in his *Cynegetica* uses instead the masculine, proof of the fact that the use of the generic feminine was not stable for hunting dogs. In Aristotle's biological works the dog is sometimes treated in the masculine, other times in the generic feminine: e.g. Aristot. *HA* 506a35, 508a8 (male); *HA* 594a29; *PA* 675a27 (female).

leather will never forget how to do it»)¹¹. It is clear that in these proverbs the subject in question is a dog (in general) and not a bitch.

Also for pigs, many examples have been collected in previous studies¹². By way of example, it suffices here to recall that in Homer the herd of domestic swine in Ithaca is defined in the feminine plural, although this herd is made up of 600 females and 360 males¹³. The domestic pig is also treated in the generic feminine in Aristotle¹⁴ and in some popular proverbial expressions, among which the famous insult βοιωτία ὤς «a Boeotian pig» to mean «a stupid and pretentious person» or the formula ἄν πᾶσα ὤς γνοίη «even a pig would know it» to speak of an easy and obvious thing, which everyone knows¹⁵. In these cases, it is the cultural representation that seems to orient linguistic usage, causing the generic feminine noun to be used against the generic masculine norm.

To justify these uses Stella Georgoudi invoked, with regard to cattle¹⁶, a reason of a zootechnical nature, linked to breeding practices imposed by certain ethological characteristics. In some species, in fact, adult males show a marked resistance to sharing herd life with other rival males. For this reason, the breeders castrate or kill most of the males in the juvenile stage, before they reach sexual maturity; in this way the herds (of cattle, sheep and pigs) have a decided prevalence of castrates and females, whose productivity as breeders is guaranteed by the presence of a few males preserved purely for this purpose. Not surprisingly, for these species of zootechnical interest, the sexual difference was lexicalized: the few entire males left to grow with the function of reproducers were designated with a specific name, invariably of the masculine gender (ὁ ταῦρος, ὁ κριός, ὁ κᾶπρος, ὁ τράγος). Conversely, therefore, the herd/flock group of females and castrates would have been indicated with a generic unmarked feminine (αἱ βόες / βοῦς, αἱ σῦες / ὄες, αἱ αἴγες, αἱ ὄιες / οἴς)¹⁷.

¹¹ Theocr. 21. 44 -5; Alciph. 3. 11. 4.

¹² FRANCO 2006; FRANCO 2010, pp. 168-195.

¹³ Hom. *Od.* 13. 407; 14. 15-6.

¹⁴ *E.g.* Arist. *HA* 545 b 2.

¹⁵ *E.g.* Pind. *Ol.* 6. 90; Plat. *Lach.* 196 d.

¹⁶ GEORGOUDI 1990, pp. 233-4. But the same reflections apply to pigs, sheep and goats: Hes. *Op.* 785-6, 790-1 (οὐδὲ μὲν ἢ πρώτη ἔκτη κούρη γε γενέσθαι / ἄρμενος, ἀλλ' ἐρίφους τάμνειν καὶ πάρα μήλων; μηνὸς δόγδοάτη κᾶπρον καὶ βοῦν ἐρίμυκον / ταμνέμεν). It has already been said that the pigs that Eumaeus has in custody include 600 females compared to 360 males. Consistent with the need to have herds with a preponderance of females, in Homer the pigs sacrificed are often males (*e.g.* Hom. *Il.* 9. 208, 19. 197, 23. 32; *Od.* 24.215). For the castration of sheep see Aristot. *Pr.* 10. 36 (894 b 22).

¹⁷ Alternatively designated with gender-neutral collective nouns such as βοτά, πρόβατα, μῆλα. Aristotle informs us (*GA* 770 b 34 ff.) that the hermaphrodite goats were called τράγαιναί («he she-bucks»). The assimilation of

Although there is no lexicalization of the difference in sex among equines (the substantives ἵππος and ἡμίονος mean "horse mare" and «mule/she-mule» and there is no specific word for «stallion» or «mare»), the zootechnical reason could also in this case be at the origin of the use of these names in the unmarked feminine. While the castration of young male horses is very poorly documented, thus leaving us in doubt about its frequency, this practice is certain for mules, for which breeders had no reason to let the males grow to full reproductive maturity, being that the entire species is sterile¹⁸. However, no reason of this nature can be invoked for deer, which are also often treated in the feminine (αἱ ἔλαφοι), even in contexts which speak of their proverbial horns and, therefore, certainly of male individuals¹⁹.

The case of κύων is also difficult to trace back to causes related to farming practices. Although even adult male dogs, once they reach sexual maturity, can develop aggressive attitudes towards other males and therefore make it difficult to manage a group, to my knowledge there is no ancient evidence for castration of male dogs. In order to explain the use of κύων in the unmarked feminine some modern scholars have resorted to a passage in Aristotle's *History of Animals*, where Aristotle argues that the female – of any species – is *generally* more flexible and malleable, easier to train than the male; and adds, by way of a simple example, «the κύνες (feminine) of Laconia»²⁰. This was enough for some scholars to conclude that the use of the generic feminine for dogs in cynegetic contexts, as in the treatise

the castrated male to the female would find a theoretical conceptualization in Aristotle: ZUCKER 2005. In general, for animals that are socially and/or culturally very important for human speakers lexicalization is more frequent, given the importance of describing different subsets classified by sex, age, reproductive functions, zootechnical applications etc. (ZUBIN - KÖPKE 1986, p. 153 with note 7): see, *e.g.*, the series βοῦς, ταῦρος, πόρτις, μόσχος, δαμάλι for domestic bovine and ὄστρον, κάπρος, χοῖρος, σίαλος, δέλφαξ / δελφάκιον for domestic swine. See also CORBETT 2013a.

¹⁸ Hes. *Op.* 790-1 (μηνός δ' ὀγδοάτη κάπρον καὶ βοῦν ἐρίμυκον / ταμνέμεν, οὐρῆας δὲ δυδεκάτη ταλαεργούς). According to Aristotle female mules are more long-lived and bigger than their male counterparts (Arist. *HA* 538 a22). Generic uses of the feminine for the mule are to be found in Latin as well, as early as the I century AD. According to ADAMS 1993 this was due to the preference accorded to females over males for drawing carriages. For the castration of horses see GRIFFITH 2006 (Part Two), p. 327. The tendency of the species ἵππος to represent femininity is testified in the symbolic system of Artemidorus: 1. 56. 7 (p. 64 Pack) and 4 *Praef.* 8 (p. 240 Pack). See also FRANCO 2008a and FRANCO 2008b. The common gender zoonym ὄνος («donkey»), on the other hand, shows no tendency to be used in the generic feminine.

¹⁹ *E.g.* Aristot. *HA* 611a27 (ἀποβάλλουσι δὲ καὶ τὰ κέρατα ἐν τόποις χαλεποῖς καὶ δυσεξευρέτοις ὅθεν καὶ ἡ παροιμία γέγονεν “οὔ αἱ ἔλαφοι τὰ κέρατα ἀποβάλλουσι”). Artemidorus himself treats ἔλαφος in the generic feminine (Artem. 2. 12. 16, p. 125 Pack).

²⁰ Aristot. *HA* 608a.

of Xenophon, derives from the predilection of hunters for female dogs²¹. However, in a previous passage Aristotle himself had explicitly stated that the males of the Laconian hound work harder than the females, who live longer for this very reason²². Furthermore, the purported predilection of hunters for the female hounds is not confirmed by other sources: in the list of names that Xenophon proposes for hunting dogs, more than half are masculine, an indication that the packs were not only made up of females²³. Last but not least, the treatment of *κύων* as a default feminine was not limited to Laconian dogs, nor more generally to hunting dogs, because the phenomenon also occurs in reference to other breeds and in the most varied contexts, in which the prevalence of (and reference to) female individuals would make no sense. Finally, metaphors and allusions, together with the many other types of symbolic contacts between dogs and stereotypes of human femininity in literary texts show a fertility so high that it cannot be interpreted as due to a banal generalization of a linguistic use arisen in the cynegetic field²⁴. What is at stake here are oppositions like submissive/independent, cowardly/courageous, deceitful/loyal, which contrast the dog with the wolf. We will have to come back to this point at the end of this study. However, it should be noted beforehand that such phenomena of gendered polarization do not impose a rigid standard. Rather, they seem to function as possibilities, which the authors decide to exploit from time to time as the context requires, to produce allusive and connotative effects or to read the world in terms of gender oppositions with a freedom that, however, hardly ever proves arbitrary²⁵.

Therefore, it does not seem without interest to verify whether the oneiric hermeneutics of Artemidorus was susceptible to this type of gender polarization and how the interpreter

²¹ For a history of this invention by modern scholars see WILLIAMS 1999. A similar reason is invoked by ADAMS 1993 – on much sounder evidence – for the Roman mule, for which the generic feminine (*mula*) is to be found in Latin sources especially in Imperial times.

²² Arist. *HA* 575 a (ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν Λακωνικῶν διὰ τὸ πονεῖν τοὺς ἄρρενας μᾶλλον μακροβιότεραι αἱ θήλειαι τῶν ἀρρενῶν).

²³ Xen. *Cyn.* 7. This argument is of course based on the hypothesis that in principle the proper name of the puppy would be congruent with the sex of the animal, as it is usually the case whenever we have the opportunity to determine the matching (in literary and epigraphical sources). *Contra* STADTER 1976, p. 163 n. 15, who believes that Ὀρμὴ (Arrian's favourite dog) was a male individual with a feminine name: however, the reason he gives for this odd choice (the fact that Arrian judged male dogs more valid hunters than females) makes a weak argument.

²⁴ For a more detailed analysis of this phenomenon, see FRANCO 2014, pp. 142-153 (and notes). Artemidorus (2. 11) treats *κύων* in the masculine in a paragraph dedicated to hunting, and distinguishes three different types of animal (hunting, guard or companion dog) each with its own symbolic meanings.

²⁵ Some general observations on gender characterization of the species for rhetorical purposes are found in FRANCO 2008a and FRANCO 2008b.

decided to exploit it in different contexts. Dreams about animals represent 11% of cases treated in *Oneirocritica*²⁶. For some of them, we can determine with certainty whether a species has a gendered (masculine or feminine) characterization²⁷. This happens notably when the animal symbol refers to a human being of female (woman) or male (man) sex in the outcome of the dream. That is, when sexual difference is explicitly involved in the interpretation offered by Artemidorus, either because two animal species are opposed as predicting a man *vs.* a woman or because one animal species is related to a person (in the outcome) who presents some marked features in terms of sex, gender roles or sexual behavior²⁸. It is on *these* cases that the present study will focus, with the aim of describing different strategies of «genderization» of a species emerging from Artemidorus' text, whether based on a projection of grammatical gender onto cultural meanings or, on the contrary, of cultural meanings onto linguistic usage; whether created by means (and for the sake) of polarization or due to an idiosyncratic selection of a particular (morphological or ethological) trait of the animal likely to be connected with human femininity, masculinity or sexual ambiguity. I am not therefore presenting a systematic study of zoonyms in the *Oneirocritica* nor am I offering a complete survey of *all animal symbols* in the corpus with their respective meanings, although references to animals other than those associated with

²⁶ According to the calculations of MONBRUN 2015.

²⁷ The treatment of gender in the hermeneutics of Artemidorus has been the subject of many studies (see FOUCAULT 1984, pp. 13-50; WINKLER 1990, pp. 17-44; MACALISTER 1992; SHERWOOD 1996; THONEMANN 2020, pp. 71-85), but none has been specifically devoted to the gendered characterizations of the animal symbols.

²⁸ Oneiric interpretations in which an animal symbol is connected with a man or a woman in the outcome seem in fact to reveal a gendered characterization of the symbol with the lowest margin of error. Sometimes, however, it has been difficult to decide whether the person predicted by the animal symbol was to be considered marked by gender or not, as in the case of people described in the generic masculine. The rationale behind my choices is as follows: i. passages in which an animal symbol predicts the involvement of human beings referred to as ἄνθρωποι («people», with no gender mark) have not been considered; ii. given the overwhelming prevalence of male characters in the whole treatise (dreamers, interpreters, and also human types in the fulfilments are overwhelmingly male in Artemidorus' manual) also cases of people described in the generic (unmarked) masculine have been excluded, unless their activity or social role is culturally gendered as masculine. Therefore, instances such as the following have not been taken into account: «a bull, especially when threatening or charging, signifies an extraordinary danger, and a threat from one's superiors if the dreamer is a poor person or a slave» (Artem. 2.12.5, p. 121 Pack ταῦρος δὲ <κίνδυνον> οὐ τὸν τυχόντα σημαίνει, μάλιστα ἀπειλῶν ἢ διώκων, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὑπερεχόντων ἀπειλήν, ἐὰν ᾗ πένης ὁ ἰδὼν ἢ δοῦλος). On the other hand, seemingly similar cases are included on account of their involvement with the cultural masculinity of the social roles, as in the example of the ram, referring to “a master, a ruler and a king” (Artem. 2.12.1 p. 119 Pack πρὸς δεσπότην... καὶ πρὸς ἄρχοντα καὶ βασιλέα); iii. conversely, the very mention of a woman in the outcome has been considered as a clear marker of a gendered characterization, with the consequent analysis of all cases in which a woman is predicted through an animal symbol.

men or women in the outcome will be considered from time to time, in order to clarify some interpretations²⁹.

As far as I know, gender specifications of the ancient Greek zoonyms have received no extensive and in-depth linguistic analysis so far. Moreover, as Spathas and Sudo have recently pointed out, animal nouns have been largely neglected in the theoretical literature about gender, despite the apparent relevance of this class of nouns for the study of gender in language³⁰. Some of the assumptions and conclusions in the present study cannot therefore be generalized without further research by professional linguists on the topic. But at least I hope to make informative observations on the basis of a relevant and significant selection of cases and offer some speculative thoughts for future research, both on linguistic and conceptual aspects of the issue at stake.

In this first part of the essay, I will discuss the passages in which the gender of the animal that appears in a dream is congruent with the sex of the human being predicted to play a role in the outcome³¹; afterwards, I will address the case in which a male/female polarization occurs within the same animal symbol (lion/lioness). The forthcoming second part will move from a consideration of gender oppositions between different species and the particularly complex question of the gender of the goose (χίην) to some cases of discordance between the traditional gender characterization of the animal and the sex of the person predicted in the outcome. It will finally present a general conclusion.

²⁹ The sex of the dreamer is taken into account only when Artemidorus himself is shown to consider the distinction male vs. female dreamer relevant in his interpretation of the animal symbol.

³⁰ SPATHAS - SUDO 2020, p. 3; MICHARD 2002, pp. 126-132. Passing remarks are scattered throughout academic literature on the topic: see, e.g., CORBETT 2013a who observes that «languages with nominal gender systems may set the threshold for ‘sex differentiability’ at different points. Sex distinctions extend to insects and plants, but no language has been reported as including a reference to their biological sex within a grammatical system. Humans are most interested in the sex of other humans, and the threshold may well be set here. This is the case for Tamil, where both ‘bull’ and ‘cow’ are in the neuter gender. Similarly in Tidore (...) a rooster is treated as grammatically neuter, as is a pregnant goat (...). Other languages set the threshold lower. In Russian, sex-differentiability extends to creatures whose sex matters to humans (that is, primarily animals which humans breed), or where the difference is striking (as with lions); nouns which fall below the threshold may be in any gender (thus ‘shark’ is feminine and ‘dolphin’ is masculine)».

³¹ For the sake of clarity, I shall avoid calling “referent” the person in the outcome to whom the oneiric symbol refers (*i.e.* the person or thing foretold by a specific element in the oneiric vision), in order to keep it distinct from the “referent” of the noun (*i.e.* the linguistic referent). So, for instance, in a dream in which a κριός foretells a master of the house, a magistrate or a king, the referent of κριός is the animal (“ram”), whereas the master of the house, the magistrate and the king are the people that are predicted by the ram to play a role in the outcome.

2. GENDER OF THE SPECIES AND SEX OF THE PERSON IN THE OUTCOME: BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

In Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*, forty of the sixty-one animals that I have reviewed (almost two thirds) show perfect congruency between gender of the zoonym and sex of the person to whom the animal symbol is referred in the outcome. Among these, either a species has a masculine name which appears to be related to a man in the fulfillment of the dream and vice versa (a feminine name related to a woman), or it bears a name of common gender which, being undifferentiated, can be associated in the prediction to a person of either sex. Of the remaining cases, twelve show no sign of a relationship with either sex, and in only eight cases is the connection between the gender of the zoonym and the sex of the person in the fulfillment not straightforward³² or completely reversed³³. It seems worth noting that only one (σύαγρος) out of thirty-two masculine zonyms refers to a woman, whereas six (ύαινα, λέαινα, πάρδαλις, άλώπηξ, άσπίς, έχιδνα) of the eighteen feminine zonyms allow for the presence of men *besides* women in the outcome. This asymmetry needs to be assessed against the overwhelming prevalence of male actors (interpreters, dreamers, *and* people

³² Namely five epicenes (άσπίς, έχιδνα, ύαινα, λέαινα, πάρδαλις) and three common gender nouns (όνος, ίππος, έλαφος).

³³ It is the case of the wild boar (σύαγρος), that will be discussed in Part Two of the present article. Further details: out of the 33 animals with a masculine name, 26 (άλεκρουών, κριός, ταύρος, λέων, λύκος, έλέφας, πίθηκος, κυνοκέφαλος, δράκων, όφις, ύδρος, δρυίνας, παρείας, φύσαλος, βάτραχος, άετός, γύπες, ίέραξ, ίκτινος, κόραξ, ψάρ, κολιός, πελαργός, ίκνεύμων, κύκνος, πελεκάν) are related exclusively to men in the outcome, one (σφήξ "wasp") predicts vicious *people* (πονηροίς άνθρωποις και όμοίς), 5 show relation to neither sex (σήψ, χαμαιλέων, σκορπίος, κωβιός, κορακίνος), and only one (σύαγρος) refers to a woman. Out of 18 animals with a feminine name, more than a half (10) are related to women exclusively (άρκτος, γαλή, άρπη, κορώνη, φάσσα, περιστερρά, ίκτις, χειλιδών, άηδών) or almost exclusively (άλώπηξ), 2 predict women *and* men (άσπίς, έχιδνα), 2 refer to men and women with aberrant (social or sexual) behaviours (ύαινα, λέαινα), 1 can indifferently predict people of either sex (πάρδαλις), and 3 show relation to neither sex. Out of 11 animals with a name of common gender, 5 appear related to both men and women (κύων, χήν, ίππος, όνος, πέριδιξ), 1 (γέρανος) refers to an «onslaught of pirates and enemies», 4 show no relation with the sex of the people evoked in the fulfillment of the dream (αΐξ, ήμίονος, βοϋς, όρνυξ), and one (the deer) is related to coward people in the generic masculine despite being treated itself in the feminine (ή έλαφος). The only clearly reversed relation appears to be that of the σύαγρος (referring to one's wife): I will however consider as somehow discrepant also the case of the όνος, for reasons that will appear clear in the Part Two of the present article. As regards neuter names: όρνεα θαλάσσια as well as ποτάμια όρνεα can be related to both men and women in the outcome, but are not included in the calculation, as they are names which cover many species of birds with different zonyms. Πρόβατα refers to human beings in general. Φαλαγγιον is a species hard to identify, but the zoonym appears to be related to no specific sex in the outcome.

referred to in the outcomes) in the whole treatise, in which the human subject is a man by default and the generic masculine is used to refer to people in general³⁴.

Congruency between the grammatical gender and the sex of the person referred to in the outcome seems to be the norm also in the treatment of oneiric symbols other than animals³⁵. In many cases, therefore, the presence of men/women in the fulfilment can easily be explained as a semantic projection of the grammatical gender of the noun-symbol onto the person(s) involved in the scenario of the outcome. However, the evidence shows that the linguistic gender is not the only principle guiding Artemidorus' interpretations of symbols in dreams. Let us consider plants. Burning trees and bushes in a house refer to different kinds of people³⁶:

δένδρων δὲ τὰ μὲν πρὸ τῆς οἰκίας πεφυκότα δεσποτῶν, τὰ δὲ ἔνδον ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τὰ μὲν μεγάλα καιόμενα ὁμοίως δεσποτῶν, τὰ μὲν ἀρσενικὰ ἀνδρῶν, τὰ δὲ θηλυκὰ γυναικῶν, τὰ δὲ μικρὰ φίλων καὶ συγγενῶν, τὰ δὲ παντελῶς χθαμαλά, οἷον πύξοι καὶ μυρρίναι, οἰκετῶν.

If the trees growing in front of the house are burnt, that signifies the death of the masters. As for the trees growing inside the house, the large trees on fire signify likewise the death of the masters (the male trees the men, and the female trees the women), the small trees the death of friends and relatives, the very low-growing shrubs, like box or myrtle, the death of household servants.

In this interpretation, Artemidorus does not refer to the grammatical gender, but to the conceptual gender of the symbol. The noun δένδρα («trees»), in fact, is neuter. But, as Lin Foxhall has shown, in ancient Greece some plants were considered «male» and others «female» because of their «fertility/sterility» and other symbolic associations of this kind³⁷. This criterion seems to lurk behind a second passage³⁸:

ἐλαία γυναῖκα σημαίνει καὶ ἄθλησιν καὶ ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐλευθερίαν (...) δρῦς ἄνδρα σημαίνει πλούσιον διὰ τὸ τρόφιμον, ἢ πρεσβύτην διὰ τὸ πολυχρόνιον ἢ χρόνον διὰ ταῦτό. Δάφνη δὲ γυναῖκα σημαίνει εὐπορον διὰ τὸ ἀειθαλές καὶ εὐμορφον διὰ τὸ χάριεν (...)

³⁴ MACALISTER 1992.

³⁵ *E.g.* Artem. 1. 51, p. 58 Pack (σπέρματα δὲ καὶ φυτὰ οἱ παῖδες, πυροὶ μὲν υἱοί, κριθαὶ δὲ θυγατέρες); 2. 24, p. 142 Pack (πέλεκυς δὲ στάσεως ἔστι σημεῖον καὶ βλάβης καὶ μάχης, ἄξινη δὲ καὶ ἄμη γυναικός τε καὶ γυναικείας ἐργασίας καὶ γυναικείας μὲν ἐργασίας διὰ τὸ τῷ κρατοῦντι προσφέρειν καὶ προσέλκειν, γυναικός δὲ διὰ τὸ ὄνομα). In fact Artemidorus' hermeneutics is largely (but not exclusively) based on linguistic data: see Part Two.

³⁶ Artem. 2. 10, p. 116 Pack (transl. HAMMOND 2020, p. 81).

³⁷ FOXHALL 1998.

³⁸ Artem. 2. 25, pp. 143-4 Pack (transl. HAMMOND 2020, p. 97).

An olive-tree signifies a wife, athletics, public office, and freedom (...) An oak signifies a rich man because of its luxuriance, or an old man because it is long-lived, or time itself for the same reason. A laurel signifies a wife who is wealthy (because the laurel is evergreen) and also beautiful (because it is a lovely tree).

Compared to the olive tree and the laurel (which can both indicate a woman), the oak, although it also has a feminine name (ἡ δροῦς), indicates a man, because of its robustness or because it is the rich man who provides the means of subsistence, depending on the meaning we decide to assign to the substantivized adjective τροφίμων in the text³⁹.

Another significant case comes from the animal world, one dreaming of a hyena, found in the twelfth chapter of the second book: ὕαινα δὲ γυναῖκα σημαίνει ἀνδρογυνον ἢ φαρμακίδα καὶ ἄνδρα κίταιδον οὐκ εὐγνώμονα («A hyena signifies a woman who is a lesbian or a witch, and a man who is a promiscuous catamite»)⁴⁰. In the list of terrestrial animals to which the chapter is devoted, the hyena follows the fox and the monkey in the list of symbols: the ἀλώπηξ («fox», feminine substantive) indicates a woman, the πίθηκος («monkey», masculine substantive) a man, while the ὕαινα represents a woman *or* a man. Despite its female name, the hyena was in fact known in antiquity as a species where the distinction between the sexes appears enigmatic; some claimed that it was a hermaphroditic animal, others that each hyena changed sex periodically⁴¹. But this sexual ambiguity of the animal also determines the key to the dream symbol in another sense. This refers, in a coherent way, to people whose activity involves an exchange of roles: women who "act as the man", that is to say are sexually active (lesbians); or men "who act as the woman", that is to say are sexually passive. The ambiguity of the hyaena also prompts the reference to women «expert in *pharmaka*», inasmuch as *pharmaka* were *per se* equivocal preparations

³⁹ The adjective τροφίμων may have here the rare passive sense of "compact, robust" (cf. Hipp. *Aer.* 20. 1 τροφιμώτερα (σώματα) «(bodies) more compact» *qua* less humid), as suggested in a note to the French translation by the Groupe Artémidore. The alternative interpretation «due to his nutritiousness» (HARRIS-MCCOY 2012, p. 195) seems less pertinent given the "virile" character attributed to the person in the outcome the symbol refers to. Hammond's translation ("because of its luxuriance": HAMMOND 2020, p. 97) explains why the oak should refer to a *rich* person, but does not say much about the person's maleness. On plants in dreams see WEBER 2000, pp. 215-217.

⁴⁰ Artem. 2. 12, p. 125 Pack (transl. HAMMOND 2020, p. 86)

⁴¹ At the origin of the uncertainty is the fact that the female of the species has a very developed clitoris, which resembles a penis. On the sexual ambiguity of the hyena in ancient sources, see ZUCKER 1994; BRISSON 1997, pp. 130-45.

that tended to be thought of in terms of healing «medications» when in the hands of a man, but dangerous magic philtres in those of a woman⁴².

Now let's turn to the case of the bear (ἄρκτος / ἄρκος), the interpretation of which will take us to the issue of Artemidorus' relationship with his own cultural background. A bear indicates a woman, Artemidorus tells us, because in the myth the bear is represented by Callisto, the Arcadian maiden, a follower of Artemis, turned into a bear after being seduced by Zeus⁴³:

ἄρκτος δὲ γυναῖκα σημαίνει (φασὶ γὰρ ἐκ Καλλιστοῦς τῆς Ἀρκαδικῆς μεταβαλεῖν τὸ ζῷον οἱ περὶ μεταμορφώσεων μυθολογήσαντες), καὶ νόσον διὰ τὸ θηριῶδες καὶ κίνησιν καὶ ἀποδημίαν, ἐπειδὴ ὁμώνυμός ἐστι τῷ ἀεὶ κινουμένῳ ἄστρῳ.

A bear signifies a woman, because the mythographers who have written about metamorphoses say that Callisto the Arcadian was transformed into this animal. It also signifies disease because of its savage nature, and movement and travel abroad, because it shares its name (*arktos*) with the constellation which is in constant movement.

This reasoning is not isolated in the *Oneirocritica*: traditional myths do orient the interpretation⁴⁴. However, this does not happen without exceptions. In the case of the swallow, for example, Artemidorus appears to challenge the received view. Other interpreters of dreams, in fact, considered the bird as bringing mourning and premature death, in keeping with the myth of Procne and Philomela. Artemidorus disagrees with them: affirming the superior authority of his own experience (πεῖρα) over the traditional interpretation, he claims that, on the contrary, the swallow in a dream is a positive sign⁴⁵. Therefore, we should assume that also the role of the myth of Callisto in the interpretation of the bear could have been contradicted; should his experience have told him so, Artemidorus could have brought the animal symbol, against the mythical tradition, back to a male person⁴⁶.

⁴² On the gendered opposition between the physician (medicine) and the witch (magics) in the ancient imagination about *pharmaka* see FRANCO 2010, pp. 227-51.

⁴³ Artem. 2. 12, p. 122 Pack.

⁴⁴ FAVREAU-LINDER 2008.

⁴⁵ Artem. 2. 66, pp. 189-191 Pack (transl. HAMMOND 2020, p. 85).

⁴⁶ On the fact that myths are not always reliable as keys to the interpretation of dreams, see Artemidorus' reflections in 4. 47.

At any rate, in ancient Greece the bear exhibits a pronounced tendency to be aligned with the feminine side in very many contexts, even outside the mythological tradition. First of all, the zoonym ἄρκτος always takes feminine agreements: although classified by ancient grammarians among nouns of common gender, it tends to function as a feminine epicene⁴⁷. This appears even more significant if we consider that its inflectional class does not point towards femininity, as nouns of the second declension are very often masculine or neuter⁴⁸. The femininity of ἄρκτος, if not at the level of linguistic system, seems thus to be firmly established in the linguistic usage; at the same time, it appears constructed and confirmed by many narratives⁴⁹.

In Aristotle, for example, ἄρκτος shares with πάροδαλις a singular ethological peculiarity: these are the only two species in which the females are stronger and more courageous, literally *more virile* (ἀνδρειότερα) than the males⁵⁰:

Ἐν πᾶσι δ' ὅσοις ἐστὶ γένεσι τὸ θῆλυ καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν, σχεδὸν ἢ φύσις ὁμοίως διέστησε τὸ ἦθος τῶν θηλειῶν πρὸς τὸ τῶν ἀρρένων. Μάλιστα δὲ φανερόν ἐπὶ τε τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν μέγεθος ἐχόντων καὶ τῶν ζυφοτόκων τετραπόδων· μαλακώτερον γὰρ τὸ ἦθος ἐστὶ τῶν θηλειῶν, καὶ τιθασσεύεται θάπτον, καὶ προσίεται τὰς χεῖρας μᾶλλον, καὶ μαθητικώτερον, οἶον καὶ αἱ Λάκαιναι κύνες αἱ θήλειαι εὐφυέστεραι τῶν ἀρρένων εἰσίν. (...) Ἀθυμότερα δὲ τὰ θήλεια πάντα τῶν ἀρρένων πλὴν ἄρκτου καὶ παρδάλεως· τούτων δ' ἡ θήλεια δοκεῖ εἶναι ἀνδρειότερα. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις γένεσι τὰ θήλεια μαλακώτερα καὶ κακουργότερα καὶ ἥττον ἀπλᾶ καὶ προπετέστερα καὶ περὶ τῶν τέκνων τροφήν φροντιστικώτερα, τὰ δ' ἄρρενα ἐναντίως θυμωδέστερα καὶ ἀγριώτερα καὶ ἀπλούστερα καὶ ἥττον ἐπίβουλα.

⁴⁷ In his comment on Dionysius Thrax' *Ars grammatica*, Heliodorus holds that ἄρκτος and κάμηλος are common gender nouns which, however, hardly appear in the masculine (*Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem grammaticam*, p. 526 Hilgard δύο δ' ἐν τούτοις ἀπεισιωπήθησαν ἀρσενικὰ προσλαμβάνειν ἄρθρα, ἡ ἄρκτος καὶ ἡ κάμηλος, σπανίως τὰ γὰρ ἀπαξ λεχθέντα ἀρσενικῶς). According to LSJ the instances of the masculine are dubious «the fem[inine] being used even when both sexes are included» Arist. *Col.* 798 a24-26 (καὶ γὰρ λαγῶς ἤδη γέγονε λευκός, καὶ μέλας δὲ ποτε πέφηνε καὶ ἔλαφος καὶ ἄρκτος, ὁμοίως δὲ τούτοις καὶ ὄρνυξ καὶ πέριδιξ καὶ χελιδών) is inconclusive, insofar as the adjective μέλας primarily refers to (masc.) λαγῶς, and the pronoun τούτοις refers back to all of the three preceding zoonyms. To my knowledge, the only clear example of ἄρκτος in the masculine is Ant. Lib. *Metam.* 21 (see below, note 60). For κάμηλος in the generic feminine see Arist. *HA* 596 a10.

⁴⁸ In other words, the assignment of ἄρκτος to the feminine is not based on formal (morphological) reasons. On principles for gender assignment in languages see CORBETT 2013b; CORBETT 2014.

⁴⁹ On the myth of Callisto and its possible relationship with zoological notions concerning the bear, see now SCACCUTO [forthcoming]. In modern Greek the name for «bear» (αρκούδα) is a feminine-default noun (SPATHAS - SUDO 2020, p. 11), and predictably so, as the ancient root has been reused in a new nominal form in -a to make it sound more typically feminine (on this type of analogical change in the history of the Greek language see COKER 2009, pp. 50-1). However, the morphologically related masculine marked form αρκούδος has been created to refer specifically to a male bear.

⁵⁰ Aristot. *HA* 608 a (transl. BALME 1991). Artemidorus himself informs us that he read both Aristotle's works on animals and the epitome by Aristophanes of Byzantium: Artem. 2. 14.

In all kinds in which there are the female and the male, nature has established much the same difference in the character of the females as compared with that of the males. But it is most evident in the case of humans and of the animals that have some size and of the viviparous quadrupeds. For the character of the female is softer, and quicker to be tamed, and more receptive of handling, and readier to learn, for example the female Laconian hounds are in fact cleverer than the males. (...) All females are less spirited than the males, except the bear and leopard: in these the female is held to be braver. But in the other kinds the females are softer, more vicious, less simple, more impetuous, more attentive to the feeding of the young, while the males on the contrary are more spirited, wilder, simpler, less cunning.

This fact does not appear to be based on empirical observation. According to the scientific literature, it does not appear that female bears are more aggressive than males – evidence would rather prove otherwise⁵¹. And yet, the experience of the defensive aggressiveness of female bears to protect their young may have spread the prejudice of the ferocity of the female bear in general: the *ursina rabies* of the mother who defends her cubs was well known in Rome⁵². Even today, the media have presented the fact that males are much more dangerous than females as a recent "discovery" by ethologists, a sign that this prejudice, which has a long history, is still circulating.⁵³

As far as the Greek testimonies are concerned, everything suggests that the bear inherently possessed a pronounced "femininity" which guided the accounts concerning this animal by imposing on them a female subject as the protagonist of the narrative. In Aelian's treatise on animals, for example, the sections on the bear pay great attention to the female subject⁵⁴:

τεκεῖν βρέφος οὐκ οἶδεν ἄρκτος, οὐδὲ ὁμολογήσει τις ἐξ ὠδίνων ἰδῶν τὸ ἔκγονον ζυγογόνον εἶναι αὐτήν, ἀλλὰ ἢ μὲν ἐλοχεύθη, τὸ δὲ εἰκῆ κρέας καὶ ἄσημόν τε καὶ ἀτύπτον καὶ ἄμορφον. ἢ δὲ ἤδη φιλεῖ καὶ γνωρίζει τὸ τέκνον, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῖς μηροῖς θάλλει, καὶ λεαίνει τῇ γλώττῃ, καὶ ἐκτυποῖ ἐς ἄρθρα, καὶ μέντοι καὶ κατὰ μικρὰ ἐκμορφοῖ, καὶ ἰδῶν ἐρεῖς τοῦτο ἄρκτου σκυλάκιον.

⁵¹ HERRERO ET AL. 2011.

⁵² E.g. Plin. *HN*8. 130; Mart. 6. 64

⁵³ Here is an excerpt from an article published in the *Daily Mail* online edition: « For while forest rangers traditionally warn of attacks by mother bears protecting their cubs, it is actually the male of the species that is more dangerous, a study has revealed ». For more see: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1386828/Why-black-bear-kills-likely-male-mothers.html#ixzz5BoIOwZE9>

⁵⁴ Ael. *NA* 2.19, 6.3, 6.9 (transl. SCHOLFIELD 1958)

The bear is unable to produce a cub, nor would anyone allow, on seeing its offspring immediately after birth, that it had borne a living thing. Yet the bear has been in labour, though the lump of nondescript flesh has no distinguishing mark, no form, and no shape. But the mother loves it and recognises it as her child, keeps it warm beneath her thighs, smooths it with her tongue, fashions it into limbs, and little by little brings it into shape; and when you see it you would say that this is a bear's cub.

ἡ ἄρκτος ὅτι τίκει σάρκα ἄσημον εἶτα τῇ γλώττῃ διαρθροῖ αὐτήν καὶ οἶονεὶ διαπλάττει, ἄνω που λέλεκται. ὁ δὲ οὐκ εἶπον ἤδη, τοῦτο εἰρήσεται νῦν, καὶ μάλα ἐν καλῷ. χειμῶνος μὲν ἀποτίκει, καὶ φωλεύει τεκοῦσα, καὶ ὑφορωμένη τοὺς κρυμοὺς τὴν ἐπιδημίαν τοῦ ἥρος προσμένει, οὐδ' ἂν πρὶν ἢ πληρωθῆναι τρεῖς μῆνας ἐξαγάγοι ποτὲ τὰ βρέφη. ὅταν δὲ αἴσθηται ἑαυτῆς πεπλησμένης, ὑφορωμένη τοῦτο ὡς νόσον, ζητεῖ φωλεόν.

I have described in some earlier passage how the bear produces some shapeless flesh and then licks it into shape and, so to say, moulds it. But what I have not already mentioned I will mention now, and this is a suitable occasion. It gives birth in the winter time, and having done so, hibernates; and as it dreads the frosts it awaits the coming of spring, and would never bring its cubs out until three full months have passed. But when it perceives that it is pregnant it dreads this as though it were some sickness, and seeks for a lair.

ἐὰν διώκηται μετὰ τῶν αὐτῆς σκυλακίων, προωθεῖ αὐτὰ ἐς ὅσον δύναται. ὅταν δὲ συνίδη ὅτι ἀπεῖπε, τὸ μὲν κατὰ τοῦ νότου φέρει, τὸ δὲ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος, καὶ δένδρου λαβομένη ἀναπηδᾷ. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἔχεται τοῦ νότου τοῖς ὄνυξι, τὸ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὁδοῦσι φέρεται ἀναθεούσης αὐτῆς.

If it is pursued together with its cubs it pushes them along in front as far as it is able. But when it realises that they are exhausted, it carries one on its back and another in its mouth, then laying hold of a tree, climbs up. And one cub clings to its back with its claws, while the other is carried in the teeth of the bear as it mounts.

Even for other authors, to speak of a "bear" most of the time means to speak of the female bear, known to give birth to shapeless cubs⁵⁵ and to protect them with determination and

⁵⁵ This belief, widespread in Imperial times, came about due to a misunderstanding and confusion of two passages in Aristotle in which it is stated (i) that the bear cubs are born small in size, hairless, blind and with poorly articulated limbs (Arist. *HA* 579 a 24-5) and (ii) that the fox mother licks her pups (born even less articulated than the bear cubs) in order to warm them up, thus bringing their concoction to completion (Arist. *HA* 580 a5-10). According to HÜNEMÖRDER 2006 the notion may be based on inexact observation of consumption of the embryonic membrane and the afterbirth (cf. TRINQUIER 2009, p. 154 who refers back to *La Ménagerie du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle ou description des animaux qui y vivent ou qui y ont vécu*, Paris, Miger, 1804 for this hypothesis). The expression *more ursino* became in time proverbial to indicate something left unfinished or in the draft state (cf. Gell. 17. 10 on the Virgilian technique of noting sketched

ferocity⁵⁶. For the Greeks, in short, the prototypical individual in the species – that is, the unmarked individual, the one to whom the name ἄρκτος suggests «by default» – seems to have been the female⁵⁷. This may be the reason that Aristotle attributed to the female in this species even the eminently manly trait of aggressiveness and courage⁵⁸. Whether this prominence was actually due to any (morphological, ethological, interactional) affordance presented by the female of the species or, on the contrary, derived from the impact of the common treatment of ἄρκτος in the feminine on the conceptualization of the animal is hard to tell, and a comprehensive study on the Greek bear would be necessary to settle the issue⁵⁹.

Whichever the reason, the bear shows a marked feminine connotation throughout the ancient literature. Therefore, Artemidorus' reasoning can be actually reversed: it may be that it was precisely this intrinsic "femininity of the species" which allied the bear with the feminine side and which consequently produced stories like the myth of Callisto and rites like that of the *arktoi*-girls at Brauron, if not the feminine treatment of the zoonym ἄρκτος itself. This interpretation is also suggested by the existence of one more myth – one of the variants of the story of Cephalos the great-grandfather of Odysseus – which happens to be one of the very few Greek narratives in which a human line is traced back to an animal ancestor. In his lost *Constitution of the Ithacans*, Aristotle wrote that the paternal grandfather of Odysseus was Arkesios (an «ursine» hero), son of Cephalos and a she-bear: indeed, being unable to have a son, Cephalos had consulted the oracle, who had ordered him to copulate with the first feminine being he would meet when leaving the sanctuary. Meeting a bear, Cephalos mated with her and had a son, named Arkesios (or Arkeisios) from his animal mother⁶⁰. The story recalls some narratives in the folklore of Northern Europe, where a very widespread character is the «Son of the bear», the son of a (male) bear

verses which were carefully shaped afterwards: DEGL'INNOCENTI PIERINI 2006). See also TRINQUIER 2009, BRESCIA 2017.

⁵⁶ Aristot. *HA* 579 a; Plin. *HN* 8. 126; Plut. *Mor. (de amore proliis)* 494 C.

⁵⁷ On the "theory of affordance" borrowed from Gibson's ecological psychology and applied to the study of the cultural representations of animals see BETTINI 1998, p. 202 ff. [2013, pp. 125 ff.]; FRANCO 2014, pp. 160-165; FRANCO 2017. A thorough argument for the prototypicality of the male (κάπρος) as representative of the (wild) swine is made in FRANCO 2006.

⁵⁸ SAID 1983, p. 97.

⁵⁹ TRINQUIER 2009 would be a good starting point. One can only regret, with KITCHELL 2014, that Sostratus' monograph on bears is lost.

⁶⁰ *Et. M.* 144. 22-31 [Aristot. fr. 504 Rose]. The bear apparently changed into a woman after becoming pregnant: Ἀρκεΐσιος ὁ ἦρως, ὁ πάππος Ὀδυσσεύος [...] Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἰθακησίων πολιτείᾳ, τὸν Κέφαλον οἰκοῦντα ἐν ταῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κληθείσας Κεφαλληνίαις νήσοις, ἀπαῖδα ἐπιπολὺ ὄντα, ἐρόμενον τὸν θεὸν κελευσθῆναι ᾧ ἂν ἐπιτύχη θήλει συγγενέσθαι· παραγενόμενον δὲ εἰς τὴν πατρίδα καὶ δὴ ἐντυχόντα ἄρκτῳ κατὰ χρησμόν συγγενέσθαι, τὴν δὲ ἐγκύμονα γενομένην μεταβαλεῖν εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ τεκεῖν παῖδα, Ἀρκεΐσιον ἀπὸ ἄρκτου.

and of a woman⁶¹. The Hellenic variant of the story transmitted by Aristotle (or his school), on the contrary, seems to confirm the idea that for the Greeks the bear was mainly a feminine animal, to the point that a hybrid bear-human being was imagined as the son of a she-bear and a man⁶².

Let us now turn to somewhat more complex cases, in which the congruency between the conceptual gender of the species and that of the related person in the outcome occurs in a more articulate fashion.

3. MALE AND FEMALE OF THE SAME SPECIES

Unlike the bear, the lion in the Greek tradition is almost always seen as a masculine species. This is what happens without the slightest exception in the Archaic tradition where this animal, which functions as a perfect double of the valiant and generous warrior⁶³, is always mentioned in the masculine, including in scenes where it can be assumed that the subject of the action is in reality a female individual. In the following passage, for instance, Ajax defends the corpse of Patroclus as a lion defends its young against the threatening presence of the hunters⁶⁴:

Αἴας δ' ἀμφὶ Μενoitιάδῃ σάκος εὐρὸν καλύψας
 ἐστήκει ὡς τίς τε λέων περὶ οἷσι τέκεσσιν,
 ᾧ ῥά τε νήπι' ἄγοντι συναντήσονται ἐν ὕλῃ
 ἄνδρες ἐπακτῆρες: ὃ δέ τε σθένει βλεμεαίνει,
 πᾶν δέ τ' ἐπισκύνιον κάτω ἔλκεται ὅσσε καλύπτων:
 ὡς Αἴας περὶ Πατρόκλω ἥρωϊ βεβήκει.

But Aias covered the son of Menoetius round about with his broad shield, and stood like a lion over his whelps, one that huntsmen have encountered in the forest as he leads his young; and he exults in his might, and draws down his entire brow to cover his eyes; so did Aias stand over the warrior Patroclus.

⁶¹ CARPENTER 1946, p. 127 ss.; DUICHIN 2013, pp. 278-280.

⁶² This is not to say that a male bear was unimaginable as a «father» for heroes: in the (presumably) later narrative by Ant. Lib. *Met.* 21, apparently based on the Hellenistic *Ornithogonia* by Boios, Agrios and Oreios are said to be sons of a maiden (Polyphonte) and a bear. However, the two characters do not show any specifically ursine feature: only a generic «wild» and ferocious nature – in keeping with their names. The passage in Antoninus is a very rare instance of ἄρκτος in the masculine.

⁶³ On epic lions see SCHNAPP GOURBEILLON 1981, pp. 38-63; LONSDALE 1990, p. 49ff.

⁶⁴ Hom. *Il.* 17. 133-8 (transl. MURRAY 1925).

A similar situation occurs in another passage, where Achilles weeps with rage and despair over the corpse of Patroclus like a furious lion because the hunter has stolen its cubs out of the den⁶⁵:

τοῖσι δὲ Πηλεΐδης ἄδινοῦ ἐξῆρχε γόοιο
 χεῖρας ἐπ' ἀνδροφόνους θέμενος στήθεσσιν ἐταίρου
 πυκνὰ μάλα στενάχων ὥς τε λῖς ἠϋγένειος,
 ᾧ ῥά θ' ὑπὸ σκύμνους ἐλαφιβόλος ἀρπάσῃ ἀνήρ
 ὕλης ἐκ πυκινῆς· ὁ δέ τ' ἄχνυται ὕστερος ἐλθὼν,
 πολλὰ δέ τ' ἄγχε' ἐπῆλθε μετ' ἀνέρος ἴχνι' ἐρευνῶν
 εἴ ποθεν ἐξεύροι· μάλα γὰρ δορυς χόλος αἰρεῖ·
 ὧς ὁ βαρὺ στενάχων μετεφώνεε Μυρμιδόνεσσιν·

And among them the son of Peleus was leader in the vehement lamentation, laying his man-slaying hands on the breast of his comrade and uttering many a groan, like a bearded lion whose whelps some hunter of stags has snatched away out of the thick wood; and the lion coming back later grieves, and through many a glen he ranges on the track of the footsteps of the man, in the hope that he may find him somewhere; for anger exceeding bitter lays hold of him. So groaning heavily spoke Achilles among the Myrmidons.

This fact becomes even more significant if we consider the ethological data: father lions, like many felines, do not worry much about their young; instead they seek from time to time to kill them in order to make the female again available for mating⁶⁶.

From this perspective, what are called «reverse similes» are interesting. Among these, there are some where the lion is a *comparandum* used to refer to a human or divine being of the female gender, as in the following Homeric passages about Artemis and Penelope⁶⁷:

ἀλλὰ χολωσαμένη Διὸς αἰδοίῃ παράκοιτις
 νεῖκεσεν ἰοχέαιραν ὄνειδείοις ἐπέεσσι·
 πῶς δὲ σὺ νῦν μέμονας κύον ἀδεῆς ἀντί' ἐμεῖο
 στήσεσθαι· χαλεπή τοι ἐγὼ μένος ἀντιφέρεσθαι
 τοξοφόρῳ περ' εὐούση, ἐπεὶ σὲ λέοντα γυναιξί
 Ζεὺς θῆκεν, καὶ ἔδωκε κατακτάμεν ἦν κ' ἐθέλησθα.

But the revered wife of Zeus grew angered, and rebuked the archer queen with reviling words: “How comes it that now you are eager, bold and shameless one, to stand and oppose

⁶⁵ Hom. *Il.* 18. 317-24 (transl. MURRAY 1925).

⁶⁶ SCHAIK - JANSON 2000; PARMIGIANI - VOM SAAL 1994.

⁶⁷ Hom. *Il.* 21. 480-485 (transl. MURRAY 1925); *Od.* 4. 788-795 (transl. MURRAY 1919).

me? No easy foe, I tell you, am I for you to rival in might, though you are carrying the bow, since it was against women that Zeus made you a lion, and granted you to slay whomever of them you are minded to.

ἡ δ' ὑπερωίῳ αὔθι περιφρῶν Πηνελόπεια
 κείτ' ἄρ' ἄσιτος, ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτήτος,
 ὄρμαίνουσ' ἢ οἱ θάνατον φύγοι υἱὸς ἀμύμων,
 ἢ ὅ γ' ὑπὸ μνηστῆρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισι δαμείη.
 ὄσσα δὲ μερμήριξε λέων ἀνδρῶν ἐν ὀμίλῳ
 δείσας, ὁππότε μιν δόλιον περὶ κύκλον ἄγωσι,
 τόσσα μιν ὄρμαίνουσιν ἐπήλυθε νήδυμος ὕπνος:
 εὔδε δ' ἀνακλινθεῖσα, λύθεν δέ οἱ ἄψευα πάντα.

But she, the wise Penelope, lay there in her upper chamber, touching no food, tasting neither meat nor drink, pondering whether her flawless son would escape death, or be slain by the insolent suitors. And just as a lion is seized with fear and broods among a throng of men, when they draw their crafty ring about him, so was she pondering when sweet sleep came upon her. And she sank back and slept, and all her joints relaxed.

On Artemis' refusal to conform to feminine roles (marriage and motherhood) there is no need to insist here; furthermore, her assimilation to a deadly lion comes as no surprise, if one considers that she was a death-bringing goddess, held accountable for the premature passing of young maidens and women. Even Penelope, who later in the poem will be described by her son Telemachus with words emphasizing her particularly strong and implacable temper⁶⁸, would receive in the second passage quoted a masculine characterization by means of the comparison to a lion. Here is how H el ene P. Foley comments on this point: «Lion images are typically reserved for heroic men. In the disrupted Ithaca of the early books of the *Odyssey* Penelope, far from being the passive figure of most Homeric criticism, has come remarkably close to enacting the role of a besieged warrior»⁶⁹.

It is important to remember that the name of the lion in Homer is a masculine epicene (ὁ λέων, ὁ λῆς), and so it remains until the end of the Classical period. This means that in Archaic times the lion and the lioness were both referred to, indiscriminately, by a masculine name. Even in this respect, the general characterization of the species in those times was therefore «masculine». It is only from Herodotus and Aeschylus that we begin to meet the feminine ἡ λέαινα. This lion/lioness lexical differentiation was presumably

⁶⁸ Hom. *Od.* 23. 97-103, 166-172.

⁶⁹ FOLEY 1984, p. 62. On this simile see also MAGRATH 1982, pp. 206,7; PACHE 2016.

intended to complicate the stereotypical cultural image, as the prominent masculinity attributed to the species did not fit well with "feminine" roles. This is how in metaphorical uses, the "lioness" ends up representing a woman in the virile, «ferocious» mode, like Clytemnestra or Medea⁷⁰. Accordingly, in the zoological discourse, the lioness happens to exhibit a fierce «masculinity» which does not fit well with the principle of complementarity of the sexes, and shows a very problematic relationship with her cubs. The first occurrence of the term *λέαινα* speaks precisely of the womb of a mother torn by the claws of her baby⁷¹:

ἡ δὲ δὴ λέαινα ἐὼν ἰσχυρότατον καὶ θρασύτατον ἅπαξ ἐν τῷ βίῳ τίκει ἕν: τίκτουσα γὰρ συνεκβάλλει τῷ τέκνῳ τὰς μήτρας. τὸ δὲ αἴτιον τούτου τόδε ἐστί: ἐπεὰν ὁ σκύμνος ἐν τῇ μητρὶ ἐὼν ἄρχηται διακινεόμενος, ὁ δὲ ἔχων ὄνυχας θηρίων πολλὸν πάντων ὀξύτατους ἀμύσσει τὰς μήτρας, αὐξόμενος τε δὴ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐσικνέεται καταγράφων: πέλας τε δὴ ὁ τόκος ἐστί, καὶ τὸ παράπαν λείπεται αὐτέων ὑγιᾶς οὐδέν.

The lioness, a very strong and bold beast, bears offspring but once in her life, and then but one cub; for the uterus comes out with the cub in the act of birth. This is the reason of it: when the cub first begins to stir in the mother, its claws, much sharper than those of any other creature, tear the uterus, and as it grows, much more does it scratch and tear, so that when the hour of birth is near seldom is any of the uterus left whole.

This is why the lioness only gives birth to one baby: when giving birth, she also expels the uterus, damaged by the claws of the fetus, which, moving during gestation, hurts the womb. This belief will be refuted by Aristotle⁷², but must have been widespread. Even in the Aesopian tradition, the lioness appears to be characterized by this same restricted fertility: when one reproaches her, she responds by exalting the incomparable character of her only child: «just one, certainly: but it is a lion!»⁷³.

As for the complementarity of the sexes, on this point also lion and lioness were not perceived as fit to play the expected role. According to Aelian, who relies on the authority of the "elders", the lion and the lioness do not share meals, because neither of them needs the other for their livelihood. They are both strong enough to live with perfect autonomy⁷⁴:

⁷⁰ KONSTANTINOY 2012; PRINCE 2009, p. 163.

⁷¹ Hdt. 3. 108. 4 (transl. GODLY 1921).

⁷² Aristot. *HA* 579b.

⁷³ Aes. 167 Hausrath; 240 Halm; 240b Halm.

⁷⁴ Ael. *NA* 4. 3 (transl. SCHOLFIELD 1958).

Λύκω συννόμω καὶ ἵππῳ, λέοντέ γε μὴν οὐκέτι: λέαινα γὰρ καὶ λέων οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἴασιν οὔτε ἐπὶ θήραν οὔτε πιόμενοι. τὸ δὲ αἴτιον, τῇ τοῦ σώματος ῥώμῃ θαρροῦντε ἄμφω εἶτα οὐ δεῖται θατέρου ὁ ἕτερος, ὥς φασιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.

The Wolf and the she-Wolf feed together, likewise the Horse and the Mare; the Lion and the Lioness however do not, for the Lioness and the Lion do not follow the same track either hunting or when drinking. And the reason is that both derive confidence from their bodily strength, so that neither has need of the other, as older writers assert.

In a mythical tradition, lion and lioness even represent the paradoxical case of males and females of the same species *who cannot mate* and therefore must resort to males and females of another species of felines (the *πάρδαλις*) to reproduce. The mythical *aition* of this ethological singularity was the story of Atalanta and Melanion (or Hippomenes) preserved by Servius in his commentary to the *Aeneid*⁷⁵:

sed Hippomenes potitus victoria, cum gratiam Veneri vel oblitus esset, vel neglexisset referre, impulsu eius in luco matris deum amoris impatientia cum victa concubuit. unde irata dea in leones eos convertit et suo currui subiugavit et praecepit, ne secum umquam leones coirent. nam et Plinius in naturali historia dicit leonem cum pardalide libenter, et pardum cum leaena concumbere.

After his victory (scil. over Atalanta), however, Hippomenes either forgot or neglected to thank Venus; the goddess then inspired him with an urge to have intercourse with the defeated woman in the grove sacred to the Mother of the Gods. Hence the wrath of the goddess, who changed them both into lions, yoked them to her wagon, and ordered that lions never mate again one with another in the future. As a matter of fact, Pliny says (in his *Natural History*) that the male lion is happy to mate with a she-leopard, and the he-leopard with a lioness.

The passage from Pliny to which Servius refers says more precisely that the lioness has a very strong libido and mates with many males, and especially with the *pardus*, which provokes the anger of the betrayed lion⁷⁶. But in the mythical discourse the question takes a different turn: the anger of the Mother of the Gods explains why *λέων* and *λέαινα* cannot

⁷⁵ Serv. in *Aen.* 3. 113 (transl. mine)

⁷⁶ Plin. *HN* 8. 17. 42-43 (the lion «sniffs» when the lioness has committed adultery with a *pardus*). According to Isidore (*Etym.* 12. 2. 11) "the leopard is born from the adultery of the lioness with the *pardus*".

mate with each other – a belief probably based on the idea that they are both too «masculine» and must resort, in order to reproduce, to individuals of a species (the πάρδαλις)⁷⁷ which presents, unlike the lion, a «feminine» mark. The πάρδαλις was in fact associated with stereotypically feminine qualities such as ποικιλία (cunning) and the seduction of perfumes, as Marcel Detienne masterfully showed in his *Dionysos Slain*. Not surprisingly, the author of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomics* precisely opposes this animal to the lion on the axis of gender⁷⁸:

τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων φαίνεται τῶν ζῴων ἀπάντων λέων τελεώτατα μετεληφέναι τῆς τοῦ ἄρρενος ιδέας (...) ἡ δὲ πάρδαλις τῶν ἀνδρείων εἶναι δοκούντων θηλυμορφότερόν ἐστι (...) τὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν μικρὸν καὶ ἐπίκλοπον καὶ ὄλως εἰπεῖν δολερόν (...) τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐκπρεπέστερα μετεληφότερα ζῶα τῶν δοκούντων ἀνδρείων εἶναι τῆς τε τοῦ ἄρρενος ιδέας καὶ τῆς τοῦ θήλεος εἴρηται.

Given this state of affairs, the lion seems to be, among all animals, the species that embodies masculinity at the highest degree (...) Among animals thought to possess virile courage, the leopard is the one that looks most feminine (...) as regards its mind, it (scil. the leopard) is mean and sly, in short, deceptive (...) To conclude, among animals thought to possess virile courage these are the two species that partake respectively of the type «masculine» and «feminine» at the highest degree.

Artemidorus also insists on the varied, «dappled» malice of the *pardalis*, which can symbolize scoundrels⁷⁹:

πάρδαλις δὲ καὶ ἄνδρα καὶ γυναῖκα σημαίνει, πανούργους δὲ καὶ κακοτρόπους διὰ τὸ ποικίλον τοῦ χρώματος, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν ὄντας ἐν οἷς οἱ πλείστοι στίζονται. Καὶ νόσον καὶ [ἄλλον τινα] φόβον οὐ τὸν τυχόντα σημαίνει καὶ περὶ ὄμματα κίνδυνον.

A leopard, because of its spotted coat, signifies people of either sex who are devious and given to mischief, and often it also signifies people from those nations where the majority are tattooed. It can signify disease too, some other serious cause for fear, and danger for the eyes.

⁷⁷ In most cases the Greek term indicates the cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*), the only big cat that can be tamed and was in fact kept as a pet already in Classical times. But the zoonym could be loosely applied to other «spotted big cats» such as the leopard: see KITCHELL 2014, pp. 28-9, p. 147 (with further bibliography).

⁷⁸ Ps.Aristot. *Phgn* 809 b (transl. mine).

⁷⁹ Artem. 2. 12, p. 122 Pack (transl. HAMMOND 2020, p. 85).

However, Artemidorus does not exploit the possible opposition between the *pardalis* and the lion to distinguish a female/male person in the outcome of a dream. Instead he chooses to perform this operation «within the lion species». Indeed, in Artemidorus, the vision of the lion presents a peculiarity: it is not unique and undifferentiated (a generic «lion», as in the physiognomonic tradition), but is subdivided in «seeing a lion»/«seeing a lioness»⁸⁰:

Λέοντα ιδεῖν ἡμερον μὲν καὶ σαίνοντα καὶ προσιόντα ἀβλαβῶς ἀγαθὸν ἂν εἶη καὶ φέρον ὠφελείας στρατιότη μὲν ἀπὸ βασιλέως, ἀθλητῆ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ σώματος εὐεξίας, δημότη δὲ ἀπὸ ἄρχοντος καὶ δούλῳ ἀπὸ δεσπότη· τούτοις γὰρ τὸ ζῶον ἔοικε διὰ τὸ δυνατὸν καὶ ἰσχυρόν· ὅταν δὲ ἀπειλῆ ἢ ἀγριαίνηται τινὶ ὁ λέων φόβον τε ἐπάγει καὶ νόσον μαντεύεται (ἔοικε γὰρ ἡ νόσος θηρίῳ) καὶ τὰς ἀπὸ τοιούτων ἀνδρῶν ἀπειλὰς μαντεύεται ἢ τοὺς ἀπὸ πυρὸς κινδύνους. (...) λέαινα δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ λέοντι σημαίνει πλὴν ἥττω, καὶ τὰς ὠφελείας σαίνουσα καὶ τὰς βλάβας ἀπειλοῦσα καὶ δάκνουσα οὐκ ἀπὸ ἀνδρῶν ἀλλ' ἀπὸ γυναικῶν γενέσθαι μαντεύεται. ἐτήρησα δὲ πολλάκις καὶ ἄνδρας πλουσίους σημαίνουσιν διαβεβλημένους ἐπὶ κιναιδίᾳ.

To dream of a lion which is tame, fawning like a dog, and coming up to one harmlessly would be auspicious and beneficial, bringing benefits to the soldier from the emperor, to the athlete from his well-conditioned body, to the private citizen from a magistrate, and to the slave from his master – in its power and strength the animal is analogous to all these. But when the lion is threatening someone and turning aggressive, that brings about some fearful situation for the dreamer and portends disease, as disease is like a wild beast; and it also portends menace from people of leonine character, or else dangers arising from fire (...) A lioness signifies the same as a lion, but to a lesser extent, and the benefits presaged by a lioness fawning and the harm by a lioness menacing or biting will come not from men, but from women. And I have often observed that a dream of a lioness signifies rich men being vilified as catamites.

It must be noted that Artemidorus treats the other wild mammals (the leopard, the bear, the elephant, the onager, the wild boar, the wolf, the fox, the monkey, the deer) as a homogeneous symbolic class, without introducing differences in meaning between the female and the male of the species. In introducing an internal distinction to the leonine species, therefore, Artemidorus seems to recognize the extraordinary symbolic importance of the lion/lioness couple in the imagination of his time⁸¹. As we have already mentioned, in fact, in the Archaic period the lion (of no matter what sex) was called λέων/λίς and the

⁸⁰ Artem. *Ibid.* (HAMMOND 2020, p. 85).

⁸¹ The name *Λέαινα* began to be used as a proper name for women. Even the lion cub became in time an important symbolic figure, playing the role of the "son of the king", the "wild child" intended to bring mourning to the house which adopts him, and so on: see PRINCE 2009; KONSTANTINOU 2012.

individual-prototype was the male (under whose name the figure of the lioness was subsumed). In time poets, writers and commentators articulated «leoninity» in complex symbolic and metaphorical networks, through not only the declension of gender (λέαινα) but also the distinction of age classes. In the imperial times in which Artemidorus lived the lioness had already won a place of honor alongside the lion and the leonine cubs in the symbolic lexicon⁸².

An interesting aspect of this oneiric «key» in Artemidorus, however, is the fact that – despite being articulated in the male/female/youngster classes in a way similar to that otherwise applied to domestic species – the lion and the lioness do not have distinct meanings. This is in contrast to the ovines, for example, for which the ram refers to a very different class of people than that assigned to the sheep (neuter πρόβατα). In dreams the sheep represent human beings in a subordinate condition, while the ram refers to a leader, a king, a master (with a pareymology of κρείειν «to order» < κριός)⁸³. In the case of the lion, on the other hand, male and female convey «the same type of message», with the only difference that the lioness indicates that the fulfillment will take place with less intensity and that it will have for protagonists women, most likely powerful women such as queens, empresses, and higher-class ladies. The general "masculinity" of the species is therefore confirmed in that, although referring to a woman, the lioness symbolizes a female individual on a superior rung of the social scale and/or a person with a fierce nature⁸⁴. The symbolism of the couple lion/lioness can be thus compared to that of some god/goddess couples, regarding which Jane E. Sherwood speaks of a «graded similarity»⁸⁵: dreaming of Hera for women has the same meaning as dreaming of Zeus for men; while if she appears to a man, it means the same things «but to a lesser degree»⁸⁶; by the same token, the

⁸² Lion cubs have in fact a meaning of their own in Artemidorus (2. 12. 6): they are auspicious for all alike, and foretell offspring. The articulation of the species in three distinct cases (lion, lioness and lion cub) attests to the symbolic importance of the animal in the imagination; importance comparable to that of the dog, which also gives rise to the distinction of different typologies, each with a different "key" (Artem. 2. 11).

⁸³ Artem. 2. 12, p. 119 Pack. Sheep (πρόβατα) represent human beings "due to their obeying their shepherd and herding together" (*ibid.* and cf. 1. 70).

⁸⁴ In Artemidorus' world "the masculine affords a higher social status, no matter the sex of the person to whom it refers" (MACALISTER 1992, p. 149).

⁸⁵ SHERWOOD 1996, p. 35.

⁸⁶ Artem. 2. 35, p. 159.12 Pack. See also the comment by HARRIS-McCOY 2012, p. 475.

appearance of Selene indicates the same benefits as that of Helios and the same disadvantages too, «but to a lesser degree» because she is less hot than he⁸⁷.

From the perspective of the ancient Greeks, who were less familiar with the ethology of wild animals than that of domestic species, animals such as lions, bears, tigers and wolves did not show a clear distinction of masculine/feminine roles. Gender characterizations therefore tend to involve in those cases the entire species. And within a globally "virile" species like that of the lion, it can only be the male who manifests in the highest degree the peculiar masculine virtues (courage, aggression, leadership); the female lion will therefore certainly be *virile*, but inevitably a little less than the lion. On the other hand, as we have seen in the case of the bear and the leopard, in the «feminine» species it is the female who manifests the features of the specific *ethos*: the prototypical subjects are the she-bear and the she-*pardalis*, while the respective males (male bears and leopards) are hardly mentioned.

The conclusion of the passage is also interesting: a lioness can indicate that «rich men (ἄνδρας) will be accused of the crime of indecency (κίναιδία)». The interpretive strategy seems quite clear also in this case: since the lion in a dream represents a remarkable «man», rich and powerful, therefore a lioness can still indicate a powerful man, but a «feminine» one (or, at least, one accused of being so): in Greek terms, if the referent of the lioness in the outcome is a man, he must however be a κίναιδος, one who plays the passive role in sexual intercourse. To understand this passage correctly, in my view, there is no need to evoke Aristotle and his remark on the sex position called πυγῆδόν («rump to rump» cfr. Pliny *HN* 10.173) supposedly shared by lions, hares and lynxes: κίναιδία is a matter of sexual roles – not a question of sex positions⁸⁸. Given the masculinity of the entire species, the lioness

⁸⁷ Artem. 2. 36, p. 164.1-5 Pack. For another example of «graded similarity» see the swallow and the nightingale (feminine zoonyms): they both foretell that the dreamer's wife will be loyal and a good housekeeper, but the nightingale does it to a lesser degree as it does not share human spaces to the same extent (Artem. 2. 66).

⁸⁸ On the "lioness position", however, see the recent PRINCE 2009. According to Prince, the expression "lioness on the cheese grater" in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (231-2) describes the sexual position in which the woman is on top of the man. The expression would however be a comic invention: if so, it is hardly of any use to explain the passage of Artemidorus. If, on the other hand, it had been a common way of speaking, would Artemidorus be referring to men who sexually «ride» other men?

cannot but represent either a «masculine» woman or a man whose virility is somehow diminished, a lion in a lesser degree, hence a sodomite⁸⁹.

Cristiana Franco

Università per Stranieri di Siena

e-mail: franco@unistrasi.it

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

ADAMS 1993: J. N. Adams, *The Generic Use of 'mula' and the Status and Employment of Female Mules in the Roman World*, in «RhM» 136 (1993), pp. 35-61.

BALME 1991: D.M. Balme (ed.), Aristotle, *History of Animals. Books 7-10*, Edited and Translated by D.M. Balme, prepared for the publication by A. Goothelf, Loeb Classical Library, London 1991.

BASSETTI 2011: B. Bassetti, *The grammatical and conceptual gender of animals in second language users*, in V.J. Cook, B. Bassetti, B. (eds.) *Language and Bilingual Cognition*, Hove UK 2011, pp. 357-384.

BASSETTI 2014: B. Bassetti, *Is grammatical gender considered arbitrary or semantically motivated? Evidence from young adult monolinguals, second language learners, and early bilinguals*, in «British Journal of Psychology» 105. 2 (2014), pp. 273-294.

BATTISTELLA 1990: Edwin L. Battistella, *Markedness. The Evaluative Superstructure of Language*, New York 1990.

BATTISTELLA 1996: Edwin L. Battistella, *The Logic of Markedness*, New York and Oxford 1996.

BELLER ET ALII 2015: S. Beller, K.F. Brattebø, K.O. Lavik, R.D. Reigstad, and A. Bender, *Culture or language: what drives effects of grammatical gender?*, in «Cognitive linguistics» 26. 2 (2015), pp. 331-359.

BETTINI 1998: M. Bettini, *Nascere. Storie di donnole, donne ed eroi*, Torino 1998 [Engl. tr. *Women and Weasels*, Chicago 2013].

⁸⁹ Although he counts physiognomists among the ψευδομάνεις (2. 69), Artemidorus does not renounce the physiognomic principle of analogy between characters of animal species and human types, as is explicitly stated in 4. 56, p. 278 Pack (χαρή δέ σε τὰ ἦθη τῶν ζῴων ἀντιπαραβάλλειν τοῖς ἦθεσι τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις καὶ τὴν γνώμην καὶ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐκάστου κατὰ τὸ ὅμοιον σκοπεῖν). The obsessive desire to unmask sodomites was part of the physiognomonic control device well described by GLEASON 1995.

- BRESCIA 2017: G. Brescia, *Dare forma all'indefinito: il cucciolo dell'orsa tra sapere zoologico e metafora letteraria*, in «Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica» 15. 1 (2017), pp. 115-137.
- BRISSON 1997: L. Brisson, *Le sexe incertain. Androgynie et hermaphrodisme dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine*, Paris 1997.
- CARPENTER 1946: R. Carpenter, *Folk tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1946.
- COKER 2009: A. Coker, *Analogical change and grammatical gender in ancient Greek*, in «Journal of Greek Linguistics» 9 (2009), pp. 34-55.
- CORBEILL 2015: A. CORBEILL, *Sexing the World: Grammatical Gender and Biological Sex in Ancient Rome*, Princeton-Oxford 2015.
- CORBETT 1991: Greville G. Corbett, *Gender*, Cambridge 1991.
- CORBETT 2013a: Greville G. Corbett, *Sex-based and Non-sex-based Gender Systems*, in DRYER – HASPELMATH 2013, <http://wals.info/chapter/31> (Accessed on 2021-01-23).
- CORBETT 2013b: Greville G. Corbett, *Systems of Gender Assignment*, in DRYER – HASPELMATH 2013, <https://wals.info/chapter/32> (Accessed on 2021-01-23).
- CORBETT 2014: Greville G. Corbett, *Gender Typology*, in Id. (Ed.), *The Expression of Gender*, Berlin and Boston 2014, pp. 87-130.
- DEGL'INNOCENTI PIERINI 2006: R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, *Il parto dell'orsa ovvero divagazioni sulla 'maternità' letteraria fra Virgilio e Ovidio*, in «Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica» 4a s. 4. 2 (2006), pp. 210-228 [ora in R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, *Il parto dell'orsa. Studi su Virgilio, Ovidio e Seneca*, Bologna 2008, pp. 1-19].
- DRYER - HASPELMATH: M. S. Dryer, M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Leipzig 2013.
- DUICHIN 2013: M. Duichin, *Il lato oscuro di Odisseo: eroe greco o 'sciamano' nordico?*, in «Rivista Di Cultura Classica e Medioevale», 55. 2 (2013), pp. 267-297.
- FAVREAU-LINDER 2008: A.-M. Favreau-Linder, *Le référent mythique dans le discours physiognomonique et l'analyse onirocritique*, in «Pallas» 78 (2008), pp. 67-85.
- FOLEY 1984: H.P. Foley, *Reverse Similes and Sex Roles in the Odyssey*, in «Arethusa» 1978 [now in J. Peradotto and J.P. Sullivan (Eds.), *Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers*, 1984, pp. 59-78].
- FOUCAULT 1984: M. Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité: Le souci de soi*, Paris 1984.

- FOXHALL 1998: L. Foxhall, *Natural sex: the attribution of sex and gender to plants in ancient Greece*, in L. Foxhall, J. Salmon (Eds.), *Thinking men. Masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition*, London-New York 1998, pp. 57-70.
- FRANCO 2006: C. Franco, *Il verro e il cinghiale. Immagini di caccia e virilità nel mondo greco*, in «Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica» 4. 1 (2006), pp. 5-31.
- FRANCO 2008 a: C. Franco, *Questioni di genere e metafore animali nella letteratura greca*, in «Annali online dell'Università di Ferrara - Lettere» 3. 1 (2008), pp. 73-94.
- FRANCO 2008 b: C. Franco, *Riflessioni preliminari per uno studio su animali e costruzione di genere nel mondo antico*, in A. Alexandridis, M. Wild und L. Winkler-Horaček (Hrsgg.), *Mensch und Tier in der Antike*, Wiesbaden 2008, pp. 265- 284.
- FRANCO 2010: C. Franco, *Il mito di Circe*, in M. Bettini, C. Franco, *Il mito di Circe*, Torino 2010, pp. 25-380.
- FRANCO 2014: C. Franco, *Shameless. The Canine and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*, Oakland 2014 [updated and expanded English edition of *Senza ritegno. Il cane e la donna nell'immaginario della Grecia antica*, Bologna 2003].
- FRANCO 2017: C. Franco, *Vincoli ecologici all'arbitrarietà del segno. Breve nota di (zoo)antropologia teorica*, in A. Romaldo (a cura di), *A Maurizio Bettini. Pagine stravaganti per un filologo stravagante*, Milano 2017, pp. 157-160.
- GEORGOUDI 1990: S. Georgoudi, *Des chevaux et des boeufs dans le monde grec : Réalités et représentations animales à partir des livres XVI et XVII des Géoponiques*, Paris and Athens 1990.
- GREGORY 2007: J. Gregory, *Donkeys and the Equine Hierarchy in Archaic Greek Literature*, in «The Classical Journal» 102. 3 (2007), pp. 193-212.
- GRIFFITH 2006: M. Griffith, *Horsepower and donkeywork: equids in the ancient Greek imagination*, Part One in «Classical Philology» 101. 3 (2006), pp. 185-246, Part Two in «Classical Philology» 101. 4 (2006), pp. 307-58.
- GLEASON 1995: Maud W. Gleason, *Making Men. Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton, 1995.
- GODLEY 1921: A.D. Godley, (Ed.), *Herodotus. The Persian Wars, Volume II: Books 3-4*. Translated by A. D. Godley, Loeb Classical Library 118, Cambridge MA 1921.
- HAMMOND 2020: M. Hammond (Ed.), *Artemidorus, The Interpretation of Dreams*, Oxford 2020.
- HARRIS-MCCOY 2012: Daniel E. Harris-McCoy, *Artemidorus' Oneirocritica. Text, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford 2012.

HERRERO et alii 2011: S. Herrero, A. Higgins, James E. Cardozam, Laura I. Haajduk, and Tom S. Smith, *Fatal attacks by American black bear on people: 1900–2009*, in «Wildlife Management» 75. 3 (2011), pp. 596-603.

HÜNEMÖRDER 2006: Ch. Hünemörder, s.v. *Bear*, in *Brill's New Pauly Online*, 2006 [Accessed January 28, 2021].

JAKOBSON 1984: R. Jakobson, *Structure of the Russian verb*, in Linda R. Waugh & M. Halle (eds.), *Russian and Slavic Grammar Studies 1931-1981*, Berlin 1984, pp. 1–14.

KILARSKI 2013: M. Kilarski, *Nominal classification: A history of its study from the classical period to the present*, Amsterdam 2013.

KITCHELL 2014: Kenneth F. Kittell, *Animals in the Ancient World. From A to Z*, London and New York 2014.

KONISHI 1993: T. Konishi, *The Semantics of Grammatical Gender: A Cross-Cultural Study*, in «Journal of Psycholinguistic Research» 22. 5 (1993), pp. 519-534.

KONSTANTINOÛ 2012: A. Konstantinou, *The Lioness Imagery in Greek Tragedy*, in «Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica» 101. 2 (2012), pp. 125-141.

LAKOFF 1987: G. Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*, Chicago-London 1987.

LONSDALE 1990: Steven H. Lonsdale, *Creatures of Speech: Lion, Herding and Hunting Similes in the Iliad*, Stuttgart 1990.

MACALISTER 1992: S. MacAlister, *Gender as sign and symbolism in Artemidoros' Oneirokritika: social aspirations and anxieties*, in «Helios» 19 (1992), pp. 140-60.

MAGRATH 1982: W.T. Magrath, *Progression of the lion similes in the Odyssey*, in «The Classical Journal» 77. 3 (1982), pp. 205-212.

MONBRUN 2015: P. Monbrun, *Quand on rêve d'animaux: Place de l'animal et bestiaire du rêve dans les Oneirokritika d'Artémidore*, in G. Weber (Hrsg.) *Artemidor von Daldis und die Antike Traumdeutung. Texte, Kontexte, Lektüren*, Actes du colloque international d'Augsbourg organisé par l'UPV Montpellier et l'Université d'Augsbourg (21-23 mars 2013), *Colloquia Augustana* Band 33, Berlin-Boston 2015, pp. 127-160.

MURRAY 1919: A.T. Murray (Ed.), Homer. *Odyssey, Volume I: Books 1-12*. Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA, 1919.

MURRAY 1925: A.T. Murray (Ed.), Homer, *Iliad*, vol. II (Books 13-24), Translation by A.T. Murray, revised by William F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA, 1925.

PACHE 2016: C. Pache, *Mourning Lions and Penelope's Revenge*, in «Arethusa» 49.1 (2016), pp. 1-24.

- PARMIGIANI - VOM SAAL 1994: Stefano Parmigiani, Frederick S. vom Saal (eds.), *Infanticide and Parental Care*, London-New York 1994.
- PRINCE 2009: C.K. Prince, *The Lioness and the Cheese-grater* (Ar. Lys. 231-232), in «Studi italiani di filologia classica» 7. 2 (2009), pp. 149-175.
- SAID 1983: S. Said, *Féminin, femme et femelle dans les grands traités biologique d'Aristote*, in E. Edmond-Lévy (éd.), *La femme dans les sociétés antiques*, Strasbourg 1983, pp. 93-123.
- SCACCUTO [forthcoming]: A. Scaccuto, *Callisto et Arcas: mère chasseresse et fils, prédateur et proie, proie et chasseur*, in «Clio» [forthcoming].
- SCHAIK and JANSON 2000: Carel P. van Schaik, Charles H. Janson (Eds.), *Infanticide by Males and Its Implications*, Cambridge 2000.
- SCHNAPP-GOURBEILLON 1981: A. Schnapp-Gourbeillon, *Lions, héros, masques. Les représentations de l'animal chez Homère*, Paris 1981.
- SCHOLFIELD 1958: A.F. Scholfield, (Ed.), *Aelian. On Animals, Volume I: Books 1-5*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge MA 1958.
- SHERWOOD 1996: Jane E. Sherwood, *Perceptions of Gender and the Divine in Greek Texts of the Second and Third Century AD*, PhD Thesis, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1996.
- SPATHAS - SUDO 2020: G. Spathas, Y. Sudo, *Gender on Animal Nouns in Greek*, in «Catalan Journal of Linguistics» [online] 19 (2020), pp., 25-48.
- STADTER 1976: Philip A. Stadter, *Xenophon in Arrian's Cynegeticus*, in «Greek Roman & Byzantine Studies» 17 (1976), pp. 157-167.
- THONEMANN 2020: P. Thonemann, *An Ancient Dream Manual*, Oxford 2020.
- TRINQUIER 2009: J. Trinquier, *L'ours mal léché: la reproduction de l'ours dans les sources antiques*, in «Schedae» 20. 2 (2009), pp. 153-188.
- WEBER 2000: G. Weber, *Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, Stuttgart, 2000.
- WILLIAMS 1999: F. Williams, *Daphne's Hounds: Gender and Feminism in Parthenius 15*, in «Eikasmos» 10 (1999), pp. 137-142.
- WINKLER 1990: John J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire*, New York and London 1990.
- ZUBIN - KÖPCKE 1986: A.D. Zubin, K.-M. Köpcke, *Gender and folk taxonomy: The indexical relation between grammatical and lexical categorization*, in C. Craig (Ed.), *Noun classes and categorization*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1986, pp. 139-180.
- ZUCKER 1994: A. Zucker, *Raison fausse et fable vraie. Sur le sexe ambigu de la hyène*, in «Pallas» 41 (1994), pp. 27-40.

ZUCKER 2005: A. Zucker, *La castration chez Aristote*, in «Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne», 31. 2 (2005), pp. 57-63.