This book provides a revised edition and English translation of the author’s ‘Mythe et histoire dans l’ Antiquité grecque’, published in 1996, itself compounded out of two earlier publications on Pindar (1990) and Herodotus (1988), to which a substantial theoretical chapter and other connective tissue was added.

Calame’s overall mission is to challenge the common notion that the Greeks viewed μῦθος in the same way we do today, namely as a traditional and foundational story, fictive because of its supernatural elements. For C., the Greeks made no distinction between μῦθος and λόγος, or myth and history; instead they regarded both as a fluid set of narratives that might be articulated differently by different authors in different social contexts, but could share common ‘semionarrative’ patterns. He illustrates this type of confluence through a close study of the various foundation narratives of Cyrene.

C. begins with a substantial theoretical chapter titled ‘Illusions of Mythology’, in which he argues for an indigenous archaeology of the Greek concept of myth, unbiased by the universalizing impetus of modern anthropology. He proceeds by first investigating the actual usage of the word μῦθος in various genres: its basic meaning as a ‘narrative’ or ‘story’ is neutral. For the philosophers, μῦθος is not so much fictional as ‘fictionalizing’; it is objectionable only when it is without ethical or social utility, not because it relates falsehoods concerning the gods. Similarly, the historians make no consistent or categorical distinction between μῦθος and ‘the way it really was’. Indeed, one sometimes finds μῦθος as the privileged term for the most authoritative story, as in Hecataeus (I F1 FGrH) or Euripides (Phoen. 469–72). Amid such a semantic survey, it is surprising that C. makes no mention of the earliest use of μῦθος in epic poetry or of Richard Martin’s important thesis that μῦθος consistently designates the most authoritative speech acts in epic, as opposed to the less colored term ἔτος. C. works very much in the tradition of Marcel Detienne’s earlier scholarship on mythology and ancient constructions of truth, but enriches it with considerable original insight. This chapter should make any teacher or scholar of ‘mythology’ think twice about how they use that term with reference to the Greeks.

At the end of the first chapter, C. gives a rather murky and convoluted exposition of Greimas’ semionarrative method and terminology, which he will proceed to employ in the next chapter. The translator, Daniel Berman, one of C.’s students, does a far better job of laying this material out in his seven-page Introduction. However, C.’s reliance on this terminology sometimes provides more of
a straitjacket than help in elucidating the intertextual and intratextual continuities in which he is interested.

For example, in expounding Pindar’s *Pythian* 4, he attempts to argue that Poseidon, Apollo, and Zeus all three function as the ‘Sender’ who motivates the action, but Zeus at most appears in *P.*4.4 and 23 in the background role of one who assents to the more active commands of Apollo to Battus and Poseidon to Euphemus, not as a motivator in his own right. C. may also be overeager to give Zeus a central role in Pindar’s *Pythian* when he refers to the ‘foundation’ of the cult of Zeus Ammon, as if it were a compensatory offering of the colonists: *P.*4.16 and 36 could just as well be interpreted to imply a pre-existing indigenous cult, since the Greeks freely syncretized their gods with those of other populations. Indeed one might make a better case, in view of other aspects of the Jason myth, that Hera was the original ‘Sender’, since there would have been no Argonautic expedition and therefore no clod given to Euphemus without her initial impetus:

The heart of C.’s demonstration of his method lies in the second chapter, ‘The Foundation Narrative of Cyrene’. Students of Pindar, Herodotus, Apollonius, and Callimachus will all find much to reward them in C.’s subtle analysis of these authors’ Cyrenian texts. He begins with the most grandiose of narratives, Pindar’s *P.*4. After a long and not always clear theoretical discussion of the ‘time of enunciation’ or ‘Erzählzeit’ as opposed to ‘erzählte Zeit’, he skilfully explicates the complex opening sequence of *P.*4 in terms of continuing interference of the time of enunciation with the narrated time.

In particular, he distinguishes five temporal levels, each of which he labels with a symbol:

- **T1**: time of performance (Arcesilas IV, 8 generations after T2)
- **T2**: time of foundation (Battus, 17 generations after T4)
- **T3**: time of the unrealized program (the Danaans of *P.*4.43–49, 4 generations after T4)
- **T4**: time of prophecy (Medea)
- **T5**: time of manipulation (Euphemus)

I have long felt that the temporal structure of this part of *P.*4 was ripe for such narratological analysis. In some ways, the interplay between temporal levels is even more intricate than C.’s scheme reveals: we should probably add to it a T2a, the time of the Delphic prophecy that sends Battus on his mission of future foundation. That this is a distinct temporal level from the foundation itself is emphasized by its proleptic anticipation by Medea in *P.*4.53–56, a prophecy of a prophecy. Also unmentioned by C. is the fact that these temporal levels enclose each other in the narration like the skins of an onion, adhering to the familiar Greek technique of ring-composition:

- **T1 (vv. 1–3)**
  - analepsis to T2a (vv. 4–6) and prolepsis to T2 (vv. 6–8)
  - analepsis to T4 (vv. 9–13)
  - prolepsis to T2 (vv. 14–20)
  - analepsis to T5 (vv. 20–43)
  - prolepsis to T3 (vv. 43–49)
  - return to T5 (vv. 50–51)
  - return to T2 (vv. 51–53) and T2a (vv. 53–56)
  - return to T4 (vv. 57–58)
  - return to T2a (vv. 59–63) and T2 (vv. 61–62)
  - return to T1 (vv. 64–67)

Of course, even within this scheme, yet further temporal levels are to be distinguished: vv. 50–51 really describe a future event within Euphemus’ own life, and most of the rest of *P.*4 takes us back to what we might designate T6, the events that proceed even T5; the nar-
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This study includes many other acute observations about the Cyrenean narrative of *P.4*.

The talismanic clod undergoes an elevation in cultural status each time it is mentioned: first mere *γάμος* (v. 21), then plowed (i.e. civilized) *ἁμάρτωλος* (v. 34), then deified as a *βίολατρ* ἀναμονή in v. 37, and finally an ‘immortal seed’ (v. 43) giving birth to new creations.

Thera, from which Battus colonized Cyrene, is itself a colony of Sparta and hence occupies an intermediate position between Greece and Libya both in terms of geography and cultural development. The Cyrenian colonists’ uncertain roaming at sea is transformed into fixation on land abundant enough to provide them, in later generations, with mastery of horsemanship, another realm of Poseidon; the present chariot victory of Arcesilas is its appropriate culmination (vv. 66–67).

It is regrettable that C. virtually ignores the longer Argonautic narrative of *P.4.68–254*, since it serves to contextualize the Cyrenean *μῖθος* as one in a series of heroic acts bringing order and civilization to a disorderly and violent world.

The same emphasis on ‘isotopies’ of cultural development pervades C.’s analysis of other texts as well.

For example, in Callimachus’ ‘Hymn to Apollo’, the god is praised first as Nomios (vv. 47–54), the pastoral cultivator representing a primitive stage of civilization, then as Phoibos the founder of cities (vv. 55–64), then as Carneios (vv. 71–87), the founder of festivals, and finally as Paean (vv. 97–104), the Delphic vanquisher of autochthonous forces. In his involvement with Admetus in Thessaly, Apollo is a god of homophilic love (vv. 48–54); in association with Artemis on Delos, he is a god of fraternal love (vv. 60–64). In Cyrene he is the protector of a colonizer (vv. 65–96) and in Delphi the patron of an entire people (vv. 97–104). Each stage marks greater progress toward the establishment of human civilization and thus further elevates the god’s status.

In Pindar’s *Pythian 9*, an ode written for a private Cyrenean some twelve years earlier than *P.4.5*, we find another *μῖθος* of Cyrene’s foundation that is less monarchic and more romantic: the story of Apollo’s love for Cyrene, whom he transplants from the wilds of Thessaly, where she wrestles with lions to protect her father’s herds (wild vs. civilized), to Libya, where she eventually becomes the eponymous deity of a new city, itself a movement from a more primitive to a more advanced cultural level. The wise centaur Chiron functions in this narrative as Apollo’s own ‘Sender’ (a role usually occupied by Apollo himself in his oracular capacity). Both bestial and human, Chiron mediates nature and culture, even as Cyrene’s son Aristaeus does in the next generation. C. may go too far in trying to bring Heracles into this scheme as a third civilization; his role in this poem is subordinate and does not emphasize his familiar taming of monsters. Many critics have observed that a marital theme connects this narrative to that of Alexidemus winning Antaeus’ daughter in a footrace (*P.9.105–23*) and ultimately to the victor Telesicrates’ own eligibility (pointedly noted in *P.9.97–100*). What C. adds is the perception that in both *μῖθοι*, the marriage effects a symbiosis of outsiders and the indigenous Libyan population (Cyrene welcomed by the local nymph Libya; the Greek Alexidemus wedded to the daughter of an indigenous king).
Pindar’s other Cyrenean ode, *P.5*, receives briefer discussion. C. sees this poem, which celebrates the same royal victory as *P.4*, as an attempt to situate Cyrene’s epichoric μνήμη within the larger epic cycles of Troy (hence the Antenoridae as early settlers) and Thebes (hence the reference to the Aegidae, some of whom migrated from Thebes to Sparta to Thera and ultimately to Cyrene). The Aegidae tie Battus and his descendants even more closely to the monarchs of mainland Greece by giving them a Heraclid ancestry. The Antenoridae were famous as the Trojans who hosted the Greeks and favored reconciliation; although C. does not notice it, their status as hospitable non-Greeks again implies the merging of Greek and non-Greek populations in Cyrene. Here too we see the familiar ‘isotopy’ of colonizers as civilizers: by ridding Libya of lions through his loud cry (*P.5* 57–62), Battus gives it civilization and transforms himself from a pathetic stammerer into an eloquent king. Significantly, Cyrene’s civilizing capacity was also demonstrated by her wrestling with lions (*P.9* 26–28).

C. offers a sophisticated attempt to read Pindar’s three Cyrenean poems together as reflections of interconnected μνήμη of cultural origins. He also usefully reads Apollonius’ treatment of Euphemus against Pindar’s, and toward the end of the second chapter demonstrates the parallel structures of the differing Theran and Cyrenean versions of the colony’s foundation, as recorded in Herodotus 4.145–57. He shows that the Cyrenean version is formulated to reflect a stronger and more permanent break with the mother city.

I could go on at length with other examples of what I have learned from this subtle and provocative work. But in one major respect, C. delivers less than he promises. He repeatedly insists that we must read the symbolic codes of each text within the text’s historical, extra-discursive situation. However, we hear very little about Cyrene, or for that matter the rest of the Greek world, at the time of either Pindar or Callimachus. Almost in passing, he does make the illuminating observation that Pindar’s Cyrenean cosmogony serves to justify a monarchical model that was otherwise obsolete in mainland Greece. Much more could be said on this subject with reference to the Sicilian tyrants, who aspired to be, but were not hereditary monarchs. C. also does not broach the question of whether Pindar’s epinicia were ultimately designed for a pan-Hellenic audience, as I believe they must have been: if they were, the explicit integration of Cyrene into a Theban and Spartan pedigree in *P.5* raises intriguing questions. Nor do we hear anything about the internal politics of Cyrene, as reflected in the exile and rehabilitation of Damophilus, the aristocrat who commissioned *P.4* in praise of the king’s victory. It should also be noted that the involvement of the Aegidae and Antenoridae in *P.5* may be more to offer a genealogy of Cyrene’s aristocratic clans than of the king himself. Could it be that foundation by the Antenoridae was even a rival μνήμη that some in Cyrene maintained as an alternative to the monarchy’s Battid origins? Is it relevant that the non-royal *P.9* says nothing about Battus? While our knowledge of Cyrenean politics in this period may be limited, more engagement with these issues, even if by way of specula-

---

1 His is not the only recent treatment to do so: see also C. Dougherty, The Poetics of Colonization, Oxford 1993, 103–19 and 136–56, and L. Athanassaki, Transformations of Colonial Disruption into Narrative Continuity in Pindar’s Epinician Odes, HarvSt 101, 2003, 93–128.

tion, would have enriched Calame’s discussion. Without it, his ‘semino-narrative’ discourse analysis is not radically different from traditional narratological, semi-otic, and structuralist methods, although it does have the merit of fusing all three.

Despite its brevity, this book is not light reading. The author presupposes much in his audience. His citations of text are sometimes imprecise. However, for the scholar who is familiar with the texts under discussion and who has a serious interest in the theory of ‘myth’, this volume rewards the effort amply.
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