Karl Kerényi, *Mytologie Řeků I: Příběhy bohů a lidí*, př. J. Binder, Praha: Oikúmené, 1996, s. 113–115 (zkráceno)

(K Artemidinu zrození srov. texty o jejím bratru Apollónovi.)

Vyprávění o Artemidě

Vzpomínáte si snad, že maloasijská Velká matka bohů, která při své mateřskosti byla zároveň mužatka, se nazývala také Velká Artemis. Naši Artemidu nenazývají nikdy „matkou“, přestože měla ke své matce Létě stejně důvěrný vztah jako k bratru Apollónovi. Nám připadala panenská, ale ve své přísnosti a drsnosti také chlapecká a právě takový je i onen dívčí věk, nad nímž bděla. Vyprávělo se, že si od otce vyprosila samé devítileté družky. V tomto věku dívky zpravidla odcházely od matky a vstupovaly k Artemidě do služby, dříve asi všechny, později jen některé, zvlášť k tomu určené. Zůstávaly v službách bohyně, dokud nedosáhly věku na vdávání. Artemidiny malé služebnice nazývali v Athénách *arktoi*, „medvědice“. Artemis sama byla nepochybně kdysi v minulost považována za medvědici nebo – což odpovídalo starší, jižnější zvířeně v Řecku – za lvici.

Mnoho se vyprávělo o té panenské bohyni a o panenských družkách v jejím průvodu. Běda muži, který je spatřil, jak se koupají v dravých bystřinách a v tichých rybnících! Kréťan Siproités by proměněn v ženu, protože spatřil koupající se Artemidu. Proslulý je příběh Aktaióna, syna Aristaia a Autonoé, jejíž sestrou byla Semelé, Dionýsova matka. Tento příběh utrpení vyprávěli nejrozmanitějším způsobem. Podle nejznámější verze Aktaión, z něhož Cheirón vychoval lovce, překvapil Artemidu při koupeli. Za trest ho bohyně proměnila v jelena, jinak své oblíbené zvíře, tentokrát svou oběť. Padesát Aktaiónových psů rozsápalo svého proměněného pána a Autonoé měla bolestnou povinnost shledat synovy tělesné pozůstatky. Starší bylo patrně vyprávění, v němž Aktaión přestrojený v jelení kůži se přiblížil k Artemidě. Později je vyprávěli tak, že nezkrotný lovec chtěl Artemidu znásilnit nebo že toužil po Semelé, kterou miloval Zeus, a že to Artemis mu hodila přes ramena kůži jelena. Rozsápán byl však ve všech verzích.

V jiné události z Artemidina okruhu byla těžce zkrušenou hrdinkou jedna z jejích družek jménem Kallistó. Tak zní jakožto vlastní jméno slovo Kallisté, „Nejkrásnější“, jak se nazývala sama Artemis. Vyprávělo se, že Kallistó byla nymfa z Artemidiny družiny, lovkyně, která nosila stejný šat jako bohyně. Přísahala, že zůstane pannou. Různí vypravěči jí přisuzují různé otce: soudí, že jím mohl být Nykteus, „Muž noci“, Kéteus, „Nestvůrník“ nebo Lykáón, „Vlčí muž“. Podle některých básníků ji Zeus svedl v podobě Artemidy samé. Ve starých příbězích měla Artemis ještě podobu medvědice, a Zeus se zřejmě spojil s Kallistó jako medvěd. Původně to byl patrně zvířecí sňatek. Tak je také líčen: ve zvířecí podobě vstoupila Kallistó na Diovo lože. Podle pozdějších verzí objevila Artemis při koupání družčino těhotenství a ze zlosti ji proměnila v medvědici. Bohyně prý také hříšnici zabila. Když však Kallistó porodila Diovi syna, který se stal později praotcem obyvatelů Arkadie, dostala se přece jen nakonec na nebe jakožto „Velká medvědice“. Synovo jméno Arkas souvisí s medvědem, *arktos.* Také prý přivedla Kallistó na svět dvojčata: Arkanta a Pána, kozonohého boha téže krajiny, k jejíž drsnosti a starosvětskému rázu jejích obyvatel se takovíto bozi a takovíto předkové hodili.

Obr.: Artemis zabíjí Aktaióna (480–470 př. n. l.)

Příběh Britomartidin

Příběh o Britomartidě je rovněž vyprávěním o Artemidě. Tímto jménem nazývali Kréťané ve svém jazyce božskou dívku, kterou Artemis obzvláště milovala. Britomartis znamená v krétštině „Líbezná panna“. V jiných končinách velikého ostrova se jmenovala Diktynna, „Bohyně z pohoří Dikté“. Podobně zní náš výraz pro „síť“, *diktyon,* a v příběhu o bohyni Britomartidě hraje síť skutečně roli.

Vyprávělo se, že Britomartis byla na Krétě jedna z Diových dcer, nymfa a lovkyně. Mínós, Diův syn, se do ní zamiloval. Pronásledoval nezkrotnou dívčinu krétskými horami. Nymfa se skrývala brzy v dubinách, brzy v dolinách. Po celých devět měsíců jí byl Mínós na stopě. Na jednom srázném skalisku pohoří Dikté ji takřka uchvátil. Šat se jí zachytil na myrtové větvi, ale ona z té výšky skočila do moře, dopadla do sítí rybářů a ti ji zachránili Artemis ji povýšila mezi bohyně.

Podle vyprávění obyvatelů ostrova Aigíny tam Britomartis při plula v rybářském člunu. Rybář jménem Andromédés ji chtěl znásilnit, ale bohyně zmizela v lese, kterým byla již tehdy porostlá hora, na níž dnes stojí její svatyně. Jen se na Aigíně nejmenoval Britomartis, nýbrž Afaia, protože byla najednou neviditelná *(afanés)*. Toto vysvětlení není určitě správné, poněvadž ta dvě slova nejsou příbuzná. Ale Afajin chrám na jižním předhůří Aigíny můžeme stále ještě navštěvovat.

Karl Kerényi, *Mytologie Řeků II: Příběhy hérôů*, př. J. Binder, Praha: Oikúmené, 1998, s. 242–244

Ífigeneia

Když Agamemnón táhl na shromáždění spolčených králů do Aulidy, aby vedl vojsko Řeků proti Tróji, zanechal ve svém paláci s Klytaimnéstrou, svou neblahou chotí, tři dcery a nadějného syna, malého Oresta. Dcery se podle Homéra jmenovaly Chrýsothemis, Láodiké a Ífianassa. Obě, jimž bylo souzeno proslavit se zejména díky tragickým básníkům, známe pod odlišnými jmény: Láodiké je pro nás Élektra a Ífianassa Ífigeneia. Ífianassa znamená „Mocně vládnoucí“, Ífigeneia patrně „Silně vládnoucí nad porody“; Ífigeneia bylo přízvisko Artemidino. S její osobou se objevuje v těsné spojitosti s Átreovým rodem vedle Heleny jiná, mnohem přísnější jevová forma různotvárné měsíční bohyně, podobná Artemidě, a nikoli Afrodítě.

Ífigeneia byla prvorozená, nejkrásnější dcera Agamemnona a Klytaimnéstry. Zatímco se vojsko a loďstvo, které je mělo přepravit, shromažďovalo v Aulidě, veliký král a vojevůdce Řeků se prohřešil proti Artemidě. Velký záliv, v němž lodi čekaly, ležel patrně mezi Hyrií a Aulidou – obě tyto obce uvádí Homér na prvním místě – naproti Euboii, v Boiótii, v krajině, kde dnes již neuvidíme žádné lesy, v níž však tenkrát měla kromě svého chrámu také posvátný háj bohyně Artemis. Tam se Agamemnón dopustil hříchu a tam za něj také musel pykat.

Příběh Agamemnonova prohřešení není snadné vyložit, poněvadž pozdní vypravěči jej velice zkrátili a zjednodušili, a básníci tragédií se o něm zmiňují jen v narážkách. Patrně bylo tehdy nutné čekat neobyčejně dlouho na počasí příznivé pro vyplutí. Tu slíbil Agamemnón, že obětuje bohyni to nejkrásnější, co přinese rok. Zřejmě s tím Artemis souhlasila. Avšak stalo se, že král náhodou vyplašil v Artemidině háji kolouška s vyrážejícími parůžky a skvrnitou kůží. Přála si bohyně, aby jí toto krásné stvoření obětovali? Králi vyklouzlo neobezřetně z úst: „Ani sama Artemis...!“. Patrně chtěl říci: „Ani sama Artemis, i kdyby chtěla, by už to zvíře nemohla zachránit!“ Vzápětí totiž přesně zacílil a kolouška v posvátném háji složil. Jen kdyby byl býval ve své přílišné sebedůvěře nepochyboval o moci bohyně!

Příznivé počasí opět ustalo, ať už vypukla bouře, anebo ať úplně utichly větry. Obrátili se o radu na Kalchanta, věštce vojska, a ten vyjevil, že k utišení hněvu uražené bohyně by musela být obětována prvorozená Agamemnonova dcera: za pochybenou oběť by to byla jediná protihodnota. Museli pro ni poslat, aby ji od matky přivedli. Ale jak vydá Klytaimnéstra svou dceru k obětování? Odysseus prý si vymyslel lež: Ífigeneia má přijít do Aulidy, aby se provdala za Achillea. Svatba a smrt, jako v proslulém žalozpěvu Oidipovy dcery, byly vždy sdružené představy od té doby, co Hádés unesl Persefonu. Ke Klytaimnéstře bylo vysláno poselstvo. Odysseus byl jeho mluvčí. A ona sama doprovázela dceru jako na svatbu.

Ífigeneiu však nemuseli k obětování přivléct za plavé vlasy. Jedna pompejská freska nám ukazuje, jak ji Odysseus a Diomédés nesou v náručí k oltáři. Šafránově žluté roucho, jaké nosily dívky sloužící Artemidě v Braurónu, z ní spadlo, hruď byla vystavena napospas noži. Agamemnón se odvrátil a zakryl si tvář. Ífigeneia rozpřáhla náruč bohyni vstříc. Kalchás, obětní kněz, však již viděl, co se chystá. Artemis nad celým výjevem bděla a ukázala, že má ve své moci, o níž Agamemnón pochyboval, také

záchranu. V okamžiku usmrcení vyměnila dívku za laň a Ífigeneiu odnesla povětřím na Taurský poloostrov – dnešní Krym –, aby jí sloužila mezi barbary jako kněžka. Byly jí tam přinášeny lidské oběti: zejména řečtí trosečníci. Kněžka je měla převzít a odevzdat je bohyni, která pod jménem Parthenos, „Panna“, nebo dokonce Ífigeneia přijímala takový nelidský kult. Přesto měla Ífigeneia jako heroina v Artemidiných službách a její *alter ego* znovu najít v Braurónu na attické půdě svou řeckou vlast.

Řekové se domnívali, že Ífigeneiu obětovali, a jen Klytaimnéstra možná věděla, jak to vlastně bylo, ale kdo ví. Její mateřská pýcha byla tím podvodem a ztrátou dcery uražena, její divoká povaha nanejvýš rozlícená proti manželovi. Tak došlo v Agamemnonově domě po králově návratu z války ke krvavým činům, o nichž se měla nejstarší dcera dovědět teprve mnohem později. Podle vyprávění Odysseie byl Agamemnón skolen jako býk na porážce nikoli ve svém vlastním paláci, nýbrž u Aigistha, jímž byl po svém příjezdu přivítán. Netušil, že jeho choť s tímto mstitelem a svůdcem už dávno odešla do jeho domu. Jediný, kdo ho mohl varovat, Kassandra, byla první obětí: Klytaimnéstra nejdříve sprovodila ze světa manželovu souložnici. Nelítostná žena zběsile prováděla dávno plánovanou pomstu – a k té podle Aischyla došlo v paláci Agamemnonově. Dvakrát, ba třikrát udeřila muže sekyrou, když vystoupil z lázně a – zavinutý do osušky – se nemohl bránit. Tak to líčí vražednice sama v tragédii, která nese v názvu jméno „Agamemnón“. A k dovršení pomsty by se bylo slušelo zavraždit také budoucího mstitele, Klytaimnéstřina vlastního syna Oresta.

Oresta uchránila a z dosahu Aigisthovy moci dostala do bezpečí Élektra, sestra se jménem veliké bohyně, kterou známe z příběhu o Kadmovi, takřka druhá Pallas Athéna. Orestes byl zřejmě v době, kdy vyrůstal ve Fókidě, a později, když po zavraždění matky bloudil pronásledován Erinyemi, hoden svého jména, „Muž hor“. Fókis zahrnuje hornatou krajinu v okolí Delf. Chlapce se zde, na úpatí Parnássu, patrně v městě Kríse, ujal starý Strofios, otcův hostinný přítel a příbuzný, a v jeho synovi Pyladovi získal mladík věrného přítele, který ho bude doprovázet na jeho putování. Vyrůstali společně, dva jinoši určitě milí Apollónovi a pod ochranou tohoto boha věštírny, v jejímž okrsku žili. Když se Orestes věštírny dotazoval, zda má vraždu svého otce pomstít, příslušelo mu to ještě více než dotazy jiných hérôů, určené bohu v Delfách. Byl by se zřejmě vydal jakožto dospělý syn svého otce pomstít z vlastního popudu. Smí se však syn za zavraždění otce pomstít vlastní matce? Kdo byl ochoten převzít za to odpovědnost? Podle jednoho starého vyprávění daroval Apollón jinochovi luk, aby se mohl bránit před Erínyemi, matčinými mstícími duchy. Pokyn boha neponechával místo pochybnostem.

Sedm let vládl Aigisthos argejské a mykénské říši. V osmém roce se Orestés z Fókidy vrátil přes Athény domů. Přišel, jak se zdá, pod ochranou Pallady Athény, věrné dcery svého otce, která jako by byla v Agamemnonově rodu zastoupena Élektrou, do královského sídla svých předků. Homér se tu vystříhal jakýchkoli podrobností a vyhýbá se líčení synovy pomsty vůči matce a jejímu milovníku. Budeme se řídit spíš jeho příkladem a nevezmeme si za vzor velké tragické básníky, u nichž se vražedné scény odehrávají pokaždé jiným způsobem: u Aischyla v *Choéforoi*, „Obětujících ženách“, u Sofoklea a Eurípida v tragédiích, které se obě jmenují „Élektra“. Právě tito básníci mohou posloužit za průvodce po tomto krvavém poli. V den, kdy Orestés uspořádal za svou hrůznou matku a zbabělého Aigistha pohřební hostinu, dorazili po své bludné plavbě z trójské války do Argu také Menelaos s Helenou a po souši pokračovali dál v cestě do Sparty. Orestés byl ještě vzdálen tomu, aby došel klidu v hérojském hrobě v Arkadii.

Dva z velkých básníků tragédií nám líčí jeho pronásledování Erínyemi: Aischylos v „Eumenidách“ – „Usmířených bohyních“ – a Eurípidés ve svém „Orestovi“. Luk, jejž mu Apollón daroval, ba ani šípy, jimiž bůh sám ve svém delfském chrámu hrozil prastarým bohyním, mstitelkám matkovraždy, pronásledovanému mnoho neprospěly. Vzhledem k nerozhodnému výsledku hlasování ani nejvyšší soud Athéňanů – ačkoli Apollón vzal odpovědnost na sebe a Athéna vhodila při hlasování svůj kamínek pro Oresta – matkovraha podle tradice neosvobodil. Orestovu bloudění neměl být ještě konec. Ne všechny Erínye ho zprostily viny, mnohé ho pronásledovaly dál. Tu se vrhl před oltářem delfského boha na zem a prosil o poslední radu: jinak nemůže dále žít.

Tak získal Orestes pokyn, aby ze země Taurů přinesl Artemidinu sochu, která spadla z nebe. Před touto kultovní sochou sloužila Ífigeneia. K ní poslal bůh – aniž to řekl – Oresta s Pyladem. Když přišli, měla oba řecké jinochy zasvětit k oběti. Následovalo vzájemné poznání a zachránění všech: únos sochy a dovedení kněžky domů.

Chapter 11

THE FIGURE AND FUNCTIONS OF ARTEMIS IN MYTH AND CULT

WHY ARTEMIS? Certainly she is a seductive figure whose youthfulness combines many charms with many dangers. But the interest she has inspired in me and the questions I have asked myself about her have their origin in a much more extensive inquiry conducted over the last few years on various ways of configuring the divine.[1] How did the Greeks represent their gods, and what are the symbolic links, the relations that, in the eyes of a worshipper, associate a divinity with some type of idol whose task it is to evoke, to "make present" that god before him? It was in this context that I encountered the problem of Greek gods with masks—that is, those who are represented by a simple mask or whose cults contain masks, either votive offerings or objects carried by the celebrants. Essentially, three Powers of the world beyond are involved: Gorgo (the Gorgon Medusa), Dionysos, and Artemis. What traits do these Powers share, despite their differences, that might relate them to that zone of the supernatural expressed by the function of the mask? The hypothesis is that, according to the modalities appropriate to each, all have a connection with what, for want of better terms, I will call "alterity" or "otherness." These Powers are all involved in the experience the Greeks constructed of the Other, in the forms they gave it.

Alterity is too vague a concept and too broad but, given the fact that the Greeks knew and used it, I do not think the term is at all anachronistic. Plato opposes the category of the Same to that of the Other in general, *to heteron*.[2] Of course, it will not do to speak of alterity as such without each time distinguishing and defining the precise types of alterity involved: that which is other

The French text originally appeared as the first section of *La mort dans les yeux: Figures de l'Autre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1985), and its translation is published here with the kind permission of Hachette. Because, strictly speaking, the title referred to Gorgo and because a number of other pieces on Artemis are included in this present volume, it seemed practical to separate the two parts, retaining the original title for Gorgo, and putting this general discussion of Artemis as the preliminary introduction to the essays that follow, which take up various aspects of Artemis in greater detail. Translated by Froma I. Zeitlin with supplementary notes added from the relevant reports in the *Annuaire du Collège de France: Résumé des cours et travaux* that are published each year.

[1] Cf. *Annuaire du Collège de France* (1975–76 through 1983–84).

[2] *Tim.* 35a3ff.; *Theaet.* 185c9; *Soph.* 254e3; 255b3; 256d12–e1. In the *Parmenides*, the Other is opposed to the One, as to Being: 143c2ff.

in relation to the living creature, the human being (*anthrōpos*), the civilized person, the male adult (*anēr*), the Greek, and the citizen.

From this point of view one might say that the monstrous mask of Gorgo conveys an extreme alterity, the terrifying horror of that which is absolutely other, unspeakable, unthinkable—pure chaos. For a human being, this is the confrontation with death—the death that the eye of Gorgo imposes on those who meet her gaze, transforming every single thing that lives, moves, and sees the light of the sun into a fixed stone, frozen, blind, and shrouded in darkness. With Dionysos, the music changes. At the heart itself of life on this earth, alterity is a sudden intrusion of that which alienates us from daily existence, from the normal course of things, from ourselves: disguise, masquerade, drunkenness, play, theater, and finally, trance and ecstatic delirium. Dionysos teaches or compels us to become other than what we ordinarily are, to experience in this life here below the sensation of escape toward a disconcerting strangeness.

And Artemis? Let us look at her: not the whole of Artemis in the details of her sanctuaries and her various forms,[3] but in her essentials—in what gives this divine Power her specificity and suggests a unity and coherence in her multiple functions.

Artemis, or the Frontiers of the Other

Daughter of Zeus and Leto, sister of Apollo, holder like him of the bow and the lyre,[4] Artemis has two sides. She is the Huntress, the one who runs in the woods, the Wild One, the Archer, who shoots wild animals with her weapons and whose arrows, when used among humans, sometimes strike women unexpectedly to bring them sudden death.[5] She is also the Maiden, the pure Parthenos, dedicated to eternal virginity, the one who leads, in joyous dance, music, and beautiful song, that gracious chorus of adolescent girls she makes her companions—the Nymphs and Graces.

Where does Artemis come from? This question has been much discussed. For some her name is purely Greek. Others see in her a stranger whose origin is sometimes Nordic, or sometimes, on the contrary, Eastern—either Lydian or Aegean. In many respects her imagery in the archaic period recalls the figure of that great Asiatic or Cretan goddess who has been named "Mistress

[3] Cf. Lily Kahil, "Artemis," *LIMC*, where one will find all the necessary details.

[4] Cf. Georges Dumézil, *Apollon sonore et autres essais* (Paris, 1982), 13–108. In the case of the goddess, the epithet that designates her as *chrusēlakatos*, with the golden arrow, contains an ambiguity that evokes the double aspect of a Power—both huntress (murderous) and virginal (feminine). *Chrusēlakatos* also means "with golden shuttle." Cf. *Il.* 20.70 and *Od.* 4.122 for each of these meanings.

[5] Because she strikes abruptly, without anyone expecting her, and because she kills with one blow, Artemis is endowed with a "sweet arrow," and the death she sends is a "tender death." Cf. *Od.* 5.123; 11.172–73; 18.202; 20.60 and 80.

of the Animals" or "Lady of the Beasts," *Potnia therōn*, precisely the title one passage of the *Iliad* attributes to her (*Il.* 21.470). In any case, one thing apppears almost certain: the name of Artemis seems to be included on the Linear B tablets of Achaean Pylos. This means she would have been present in the Greek pantheon from the twelfth century B.C.E. on, and if she is sometimes described as *xenē*, stranger, by the ancients themselves, this term does not refer to any non-Greek origin, but rather, as in the case of Dionysos, to the "strangeness" of the goddess, her distance from the other gods by reason of that alterity or otherness she bears.[6] If the question of origins still remains insoluble today, one can, however, trace those characteristics that, beginning with the eighth century, give Artemis her own physiognomy and make her an original divine personage, who is typically Greek in that she occupies a place in the pantheon and fulfills roles and functions that belong only to her.

How has Artemis traditionally been viewed? With two sets of traits. First, she is the goddess of the untamed world on all levels: wild beasts, noncultivated plants and lands, and the young insofar as they are not yet integrated into society, not yet civilized. Second, she is considered a goddess of fertility, who makes everything grow—plants, animals, and humans.

What should we make of this standard opinion? Let us look first at her place and at those sites that are hers, and then at her role and functions.

Her Place

"Let all the mountains be mine," declares Artemis in Callimachus's hymn to her (18), and she makes it clear that only rarely does she descend into the city, only if there is some specific need of her. But in addition to the mountains and woods, she haunts all the other places the Greeks call *agros*, noncultivated lands that mark the boundaries of the territory, those *eschatiai* that lie beyond the fields. She is *agrotera* (rustic), but she is also *limnatis*, associated with swamps and lagoons. She has her place on the shores of the sea, in the coastal zone where the lines between earth and water are not clearly defined. She also can be found in the interior regions where an overflowing river or stagnant waters create a space that is neither entirely dry nor yet altogether aquatic and where all culture seems precarious and perilous. What is the common denominator among these different places that belong to the goddess and where her temples are built? We should not think of a totally wild space representing a radical alterity with respect to the town and the humanized terrain of the city. What really counts is the presence of boundaries, border zones, and frontiers where the Other is manifested in the regular contacts that are made with it,

[6] Cf. Vernant, *Annuaire du Collège de France* (1982–83): 443–57, translated in this volume as "Artemis and Rites of Sacrifice, Initiation, and Marriage," below, chap. 12.

where the wild and the cultivated exist side by side—in opposition, of course, but where they may also interpenetrate one with another.

Her Functions

First of all, the hunt.

On the frontier of two worlds, marking their limits and guaranteeing their proper articulation by her presence, Artemis presides over the hunt. In pursuing wild animals to kill them, the hunter enters the domain of the wild. He enters there but he must not go in too far. Many myths relate quite precisely what threatens the hunter if he crosses certain limits: danger of turning wild or bestial. Nevertheless, for the young man, the hunt constitutes an essential element of his education, of the *paideia* that integrates him into the city.[7] On the edge of the wild and of the civilized, Artemis introduces the adolescent into the world of ferocious wild beasts. But the hunt is conducted in a group and with discipline; it is a controlled art, regulated with strict imperatives, obligations, and taboos. It is only if these social and religious norms are transgressed that the hunter, falling outside the human domain, becomes savage like the animals he confronts. In jealously making sure that these norms are respected, Artemis sacralizes the intangibility of a frontier whose extreme fragility is emphasized by the hunt to the extent that it may challenge that frontier at any moment.

Artemis, then, is not wildness. She sees to it that the boundaries between the wild and the civilized are permeable in some way, since the hunt allows passage from one state to the other. At the same time, however, these boundaries remain perfectly distinct, for if they were not, men would become savage, as once happened, for example, as Polybius tells us, in the case of the Arcadians of Cynaetha in the third century. As a result of having neglected the rites and usages supervised by the goddess, they regressed to a precivilized stage. Abandoning their towns and cities to live on their own, they displayed the same kind of ferocity in massacring one another that impels wild animals to devour each other (4.20–22).

REARING OF THE YOUNG

Artemis is the Kourotrophos par excellence. She takes all the little ones in charge, both animal and human, whether male or female. Her function is to nurture them, to make them grow and mature until they become fully adult. With human offspring, she leads them to the threshold of adolescence. Abandoning to her their lives as children, they must, with her consent and assistance, cross this threshold in order to accede to a fully socialized status through rituals of initiation over which she presides—the young girl entering

[7] Cf. Xen., *Cyn.* 1.18.

into the state of wife and mother, the ephebe into that of citizen-soldier. Matron, hoplite: these are the states that constitute the model of what a woman and a man must become in order to arrive, along with the others, at a social identity. During the time when they are growing up, before they have taken that step, the young, like the goddess, occupy a liminal position that is uncertain and equivocal, where the boundaries separating boys from girls, the young from the adults, and beasts from men are not yet clearly fixed. They fluctuate and slide from one state to another; the girls take on the roles and behavior of boys; the young play the role of adults, claiming that status as if they were already mature and full-grown; and human creatures are assimilated to wild animals.

One single example: Atalanta, the most Artemisian of all *parthenoi*, the virgin who wants to remain in the sphere of Artemis all her life without ever crossing to the other side of that boundary, which makes the girl into what she is supposed to become, a wife and matron like all the other women.[8] After her birth, Atalanta is nourished in the woods by a she-bear who nurses her with milk from her teats and licks her just as she does her own cubs so as to "shape her in the ways of a bear."[9] The little girl grows so quickly that in a few years she has the size, strength, and speed of an adult. Not only is her beauty boyish, as is all of her behavior, but she is so masculine that she terrifies all who meet her.[10] Having become *teleia* or *hōraia*, that is, having reached the age when a woman is mature and is supposed to prove fertile, she refuses the *telos* of marriage, the fulfillment of her femininity. This is the goal toward which Artemis must lead the girl to abandon her there; the girl in turn escapes from the goddess at the appointed time and becomes a woman. In dedicating herself completely to Artemis, in wishing, like Artemis, to be a young virgin forever, Atalanta reduces the whole of femininity to its preliminary stage. She refuses to recognize and cross the boundary that separates the alterity of the young from adult identity. This is why everything with Atalanta gets so confused. The child, the *pais*, is no longer distinguished from the mature woman. The girl, instead of being separated from the boy, tends toward hypermasculinity. The human creature turns into a bear. When marriage is finally imposed on Atalanta, it is transformed at first into a race, a savage pursuit in which the girl, who is to be betrothed, tracks and kills her suitor as in the hunt. Then

[8] On Atalanta, Theog. 1287–94; ps. Apollod. 3.9.2; Ael., *Var. hist.* 13; Ov., *Met.* 10.560–680, 8.318–445. For the interpretation of this figure and her legend, cf. Marcel Detienne, *Dionysos mis à mort* (Paris, 1977), 80–88; trans. M. and L. Muellner, under the title *Dionysus Slain* (Baltimore, 1979), 26–34.

[9] Lycoph., *Alex.* 137 and the scholia ad loc.

[10] "Atalanta, when still a young child, was of a greater height than is usual for women . . . she had a male physiognomy, a terrible look. . . . She had nothing of her sex. . . . She combined two qualities, equally astonishing: an incomparable beauty and an air that inspired terror. . . . One would not ever meet her without feeling a chill of terror" (Ael., *Var. hist.* 13.1.1).

when Aphrodite intervenes to madden the girl with love, marriage is transformed into a bestial union where the husband and wife are eventually changed into lions.[11]

But this is precisely the point. The world of Artemis is not that of Atalanta. It is not closed in on itself, shut up in its own alterity. It opens out onto adulthood. The role of Artemis is to enable the young to leave her when the moment comes. While accompanying them to the other side, into the territory of the Same, she institutes the rites by which she dismisses them.

At Brauron in Attica, on the banks of the river, the little girls of Athens, as a preparation for marriage, had to be secluded in the sanctuary of Artemis at some time between their fifth and tenth years in order to become little bears, "to imitate the bear." What kind of bear is this? A wild bear but one that has left the woods to become progressively tamed in the sanctuary of the goddess, to get used to being around human beings and to become familiar with them. Unlike Atalanta, the little girls who, under Artemis's rule, undergo the course of the bear are not made wild. Like the bear, they too are domesticated little by little so that at the end of this ordeal that keeps them far from their homes, they in turn may be able "to cohabit in marriage with a man."[12]

In accompanying the young all along their route from embryo to maturity, in instituting the rites of passage that consecrate their leaving the margins and entering into civic space, Artemis is not the incarnation of a total wildness; the Kourotrophos acts rather to establish a definite line of demarcation between boys and girls, young and adults, beasts and men. As a result, it becomes

[11] [Atalanta is also closely related to two other *parthenoi* whose myths of animal metamorphosis link up with her story to form a set. "Each adventure only takes on its full meaning when confronted with those of the two others that are both similar and different. . . . At the age when Kallisto ought still to remain a *parthenos*, she is joined to Zeus against her will. Artemis, discovering Kallisto is pregnant, punishes her by changing her into a bear (in certain versions the metamorphosis takes place at the moment of giving birth). In her animal form, the girl still retains human feelings until Zeus makes her into the constellation of the Bear in the heavens. Through the story of her misfortunes, all the categories of human, bestial, and divine are called into question. In the Arcadian legends, Kallisto contributes to the fixing of these boundaries as a result of the son she had borne from Zeus, but insofar as she herself crossed these limits, she attests to their precariousness. Polyphonte, as *parthenos*, does not only have ursine feelings like Atalanta; she really joins in sexual union with a bear. She becomes a bear sexually both because she did not keep herself pure and because she did not renounce a wildness that was external to marriage. She gives birth to twins, Savage and Mountain Man, giants and eaters of human flesh, who scorn gods as much as they do men. She is metamorphosed into a bird of ill omen, a kind of owl, the Stux, in whom is expressed a complete reversal of values. In these three cases and in different forms, limits are posed and transgressed—those that separate the young from the adult, the *parthenos* from the matron, the girl from the boy, the wild from the tamed, the animal from the human, and the human from the divine. But none of these myths implies any identification of Artemis with the bear or with any other animal." *Annuaire du Collège de France* (1980–81): 398–99.]

[12] Suda, s.v. *arktos ē Braurōniois*. For the ensemble of texts relating to the *arkteia* at Brauron, cf. William Sale, "The Temple Legends of the Arkteia," *RhM* 118 (1975): 265ff., and Claudia Montepaone, "L'*arkteia* à Brauron," *Studi storico-religiosi* 3 (1979): 343ff.

possible to articulate both the chastity required of the young girl and the marriage that completes the woman in her adult state, the impulses of sexuality and the social order, the savage life and the civilized life.[13]

From the margins over which she rules, Artemis takes charge of the education of the young and thus assures their integration into the civic community. Making them pass from the "other" to the "same," she presides over this change of state, this leap, by which the young cease being young in order to become adults, but this time without entailing any confusion in status between youth and adulthood or any effacement of the boundaries between them.[14]

[13] ["This complex interplay in which rupture and continuity are associated finds its expression in the vocabulary. The *numphai*, the *parthenoi*, are those virgins who accompany the goddess, who attend her in the hunt as well as in the choruses, and who, as a result—boyish hunt, feminine chorus—straddle both sides, as though, at this age, the frontier between the sexes still remained somewhat fluid. But *numphē* is also the young married woman, the wife; and the term *parthenos* is sometimes used to define the young spouse who is not yet the mother of a family. Thus, when sexual initiation takes place by the regular routes of social integration, in and through marriage, there is not only a break, a change of status for the girl, but also continuity, regular progression, a process of taming conducted by Artemis in wild surroundings that in some way finds its fulfillment and its end in the context of the family and the city." *Annuaire du Collège de France* (1980–81): 401–2.]

[14] ["What then is the relation between chaste Artemis, the rude enemy of marriage, and sexuality? She prepares the little girls by making them ripen, rendering them nubile. She leads them to the threshold of marriage where sexual union is accomplished in its most 'cultivated' form. Nevertheless, even in this case, as we have seen in Callimachus, the girls' souls are 'terrified' by the song of Hymenaios, as by a bogey (*tēn kourēn mormussetai*, *Hym. Art.* 70; *ēthea kouraōn mormussetai*, *Hym. Del.* 296–97). For the *parthenos*, the first day of marriage can constitute what the *Palatine Anthology* calls the 'common terror of virgins' (9.245). In this respect, the sexual act is represented, even in marriage, as violence and brutality that takes place during a struggle that is reminiscent of the hunt and war, as a wound that will cause blood to flow. Like a bogey that puts fear into the virginal heart, it inscribes a form of savagery within the conjugal institution itself. This savagery, however, has nothing to do with Artemis; she refuses it by her rejection of marriage.

"We speak of sexuality in marriage. But when sexuality is not tamed, when it is not civilized by marriage, then its quality of masculine violence, of a hunt in which the companions of Artemis become prey, and its aspects of abduction and rape, all serve to accentuate this savage quality.

"On the horizon of the *parthenoi* dedicated to Artemis, we perceive in both myths and in rites, the specter or at least the threat of rape and seizure: that is, of a conduct that, instead of integrating femininity into culture by a ceremony that clearly fixes the boundaries between the Artemisian girl and the married woman, makes it the occasion of an ensavagement of the two sexes. The *numphē* loses her virginity but does not succeed in crossing the line that makes her a woman in the full social sense of the term.

"Until now we have envisaged a sexuality that the girl undergoes, which is imposed on her by the male. In the state of the *numphē* and *parthenos*, however, there is also a sexuality that is experienced from within. This is the kind that seizes the daughters of Proitos and makes them run, indecently clad, through the mountains, like fillies maddened by desire. Artemis Hemerasia must calm them by retaming them so they can be wed in the proper way.

"One of the functions of Artemis is to permit and prepare the integration of sexuality into

CHILDBIRTH

As a virgin goddess who rejects every erotic contact, Artemis nevertheless, under the title of Lochia, is the mistress of childbirth. This is because giving birth constitutes both the end of the girls' gradual maturation for which the goddess is responsible and the beginning, for the newborn, of the career in life that also belongs to her. Another reason is that childbirth introduces an animal element into the social institution of marriage. First, while the union of the conjugal couple relies on a social contract, the act of procreation produces an offspring similar to a little animal, a creature still alien to every rule of culture. Second, the bond that joins the child to the mother is viewed as "natural" and not, like the one that connects it to the father, social. Finally, giving birth—the production of human offspring the way beasts produce their own—displays to Greek eyes, with its screams, its agony, and its delirium, the wild and animal side of femaleness precisely at the moment when, by giving the city a future citizen, the wife is reproducing the city itself and therefore seems most integrated into the world of culture.[15]

culture. There are different forms of sexuality that can be more or less assimilated into the civilized, as the case may be. As *hagnē parthenos*, Artemis's function is to deny sexuality in such a way that it can only emerge in the conjugal context. But, by its very radicalism, this temporary rejection also runs the risk of giving sexuality over to all forms of deviance.

"By default, at first: the *parthenoi*, having arrived at maturity, refuse the fulfillment of marriage. They become hunters, boys, and perpetually young. Next, by excess: whether passively, subjected to abduction and rape, or actively, when they are possessed by sexual frenzy. The Nymphs of Artemis sometimes refuse all contact with men, sometimes unite furtively with shepherds, satyrs, and Pan; they attract mortals by seducing them and then make them vanish.

"But too much or too little, whether sexuality is a terror or an unbridled desire, whether one persists in a definitive refusal or offers oneself to all comers, whether as prey or as hunter, Artemis does not intervene to personify a complete wildness but—in a situation where sexuality is not yet in place, where it is located in an empty space or in an overflow—her function is to allow for an exact demarcation between boys and girls, young and adults, and to see to it that chastity and marriage, sexuality and the social order, savage life and civilized life are correctly articulated." *Annuaire du Collège de France* (1980–81): 402–3.]

[15] ["It is not so much marriage that integrates the *parthenos* into the cultivated life, that domesticates her by putting the wild filly under the yoke, but rather childbirth. As long as she does not have a child, the young wife has not entirely broken with the status of *parthenos*. What definitively cuts the links to the girl's virginal world is less perhaps the penetration of the feminine body in the first sexual contact than, inversely, the issuing forth of the offspring, as it makes its way out of the maternal womb. Although this tearing of the entrails attests to the savage and animal side of femininity through the cries, pains, and frenzy that accompany it, it brings the woman to a full and entire socialization. In a certain way, as Nicole Loraux has shown, this violent and brutal combat, this form of cruel struggle that the woman undergoes in giving birth, not only brings the woman to a socialized state but raises her to the same level as a man. If she dies when giving a future combatant to the city in the child she leaves behind, she is masculinized to the point of becoming equal to a warrior fallen on the battlefield for his country. But if in the case of the *parthenos*, the boundary between the sexes was not yet decisive, the *gunē gametē* who emerges from childbirth, even though she acquires a kind of male dignity, is still fixed in a sexual

WAR

Artemis plays her part finally in the conduct of war, although she is not a warrior goddess.[16] Her interventions in this domain are not of a bellicose kind. Artemis is not a combatant; she is there to guide and to save, both Hegemone and Soteira. She is invoked as a savior in critical situations, when a conflict threatens the city's continued existence, at a time when it is threatened with total destruction. Artemis is mobilized when too much violence is used during a military engagement, when warfare abandons the civilized codes through which the rules of martial struggle are maintained and moves brutally into the realm of savagery.[17]

In these extreme cases, the goddess does not have recourse to either physical or military force in order to bring deliverance. Rather, she acts by means of a supernatural manifestation that muddles the normal arena of combat in order to destroy the aggressors and give the advantage to those under her protection. The former she blinds, leading them astray on the roads or troubling their minds with confusion and panic. To the others she offers a kind of hyperlucidity by guiding them miraculously through the dark or by illuminating their minds with a sudden inspiration. In the first case, she effaces and confuses the boundaries, whether in nature or in the mind, while in the second, just when the boundaries are obscured, she allows her favorites to discern their outlines.

BATTLE

Before unleashing an attack, it is customary, as a preliminary of battle, to sacrifice a goat to the goddess on the front lines of the army where the enemy is in view. Here again it is the savagery lurking in the background of war that the presence of Artemis, on the threshold of battle, both recalls and aims to avoid. The goat one sacrifices to her shares the ambiguous status of the goddess in her pivotal position, for it is the least tame of all domestic animals. The sacrifice of the goat evokes in advance the blood that must necessarily be shed in the brutality of combat, but at the same time, it turns the threat back on the enemy. Once the army is drawn up in battle order, the sacrifice averts the danger of a fall into confused panic or into the horror of a murderous frenzy. At the point where the camps intersect and at the time when the critical moment has arrived—in this liminal situation—the *sphagē*, the bloody sacrifice of the animal, involves more than the boundary that separates life from death, peace from warrior combat. It tests the limits established between the

role that does not interfere at all with that of a man. See Nicole Loraux, 'Le lit, la guerre,' *L'Homme* 21 (1981): 36–67." *Annuaire du Collège de France* (1980–81), 404.]

[16] See "Artemis and Preliminary Sacrifice in Combat," below, chap. 14.

[17] Cf. Pierre Ellinger, "Le gypse et la boue: I. Sur les mythes de la guerre d'anéantissement," *QUCC* 29 (1978): 7–55; "Les ruses de guerre d'Artémis," in *Recherches sur les cultes grecs et l'Occident* 2, Cahiers du centre Jean Bérard, 9 (Naples, 1984), 51–67.

civilized order, where each combatant has his place and is expected to play the role he has been taught in the gymnasium from childhood on, and a domain of chaos, given over to the kind of pure violence found among the wild beasts who know neither rule nor justice (Hes., *WD* 276–80).

The hunt, the care of the young, childbirth, war, and battle—Artemis always operates as a divinity of the margins with the twofold power of managing the necessary passages between savagery and civilization and of strictly maintaining the boundaries at the very moment they have been crossed.

On the Margins of the Monstrous

Artemis is, with Dionysos, one of the Greek divinities whom the Greeks in their imaginings situate far from Greece, as a god come from outside, from foreign lands. Such is the case of Taurian Artemis whose idol Athens and Sparta both claimed to possess after it was brought back by Orestes from the land of the Scythians. Foreign, barbarian, savage, and bloody, Taurian Artemis belongs to a people located at the antipodes of Greece. The Taurians of Scythia do not know the laws of hospitality. They incarnate the *axenon*, the *amikton*, the inhospitable, and the refusal to mingle with others.[18] But what role does this barbarian Artemis play, the one who thirsts for human blood—for Greek blood—when she is welcomed by the Greeks and integrated into their cult? Then she becomes goddess of civilized humanity, of those who, unlike the barbarian and the savage, can find a place for someone who is not one of their own, for a *xenos*. From the moment foreign Artemis becomes Greek, her alterity shifts to the other side and her function is reversed. She no longer embodies, as in Scythia, the impossibility, attributed to the savage, of being neighbors with the civilized. On the contrary, she demonstrates the capacity implied by "culture" of integrating what is foreign to itself, of assimilating the other without, however, becoming savage.

The Other as a component of the Same, as the condition of one's own identity: this is the reason why the Mistress of the Margins also appears as a civic goddess and city founder in the sanctuaries where she has the young cross the boundary to adulthood, where she leads them from the limits to the center, from difference to similitude. For all those who were different at the beginning, those who were opponents or even enemies, she institutes a common life in the framework of a unified group of now identical beings. The examples of this function are numerous and clear—from Artemis of Tyndaris to the Triklaria of Patras and the Orthia of Sparta.[19]

[18] Cf. Eur., *Iph. Taur.* 402 and 1388.

[19] On Artemis of Tyndaris, cf. Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux, "Artémis bucolique," *RHR* 198 (1981): 46ff., and "L'homme, le cerf, et le berger: Chemins grecs de la civilité," *Le temps de la réflexion* 4 (1983): 58ff.; on Artemis Triklaria at Patras, cf. "Artemis and Rites of Sacrifice, Initiations, and Marriage," below, chap. 12. On Artemis Orthia, see "Between Shame and Glory: The Initiation of the Young Warrior at Sparta," below, chap. 13.

One word on this last case. For the Greeks Orthia represented the barbarian, the Scythian Artemis. She took charge of the entire process of initiation of young boys from start to finish. What does the legend of the foundation of her sanctuary tell us about her role? (Paus. 3.16.9–11). Her altar was the focus, around which were grouped the different components of archaic Sparta—the four *ōbai*, the tribes implanted each on its own terrain, in its own village, all of whom at the beginning were strangers to one another. Their purpose is to proceed together to the first sacrifice. The affair starts off badly; in the course of the sacrificial ceremony, the groups begin to quarrel. They kill one another and it is the blood of future citizens, not yet assembled into a single community, that drenches the altar of the goddess, as later the blood of the young will do when, in the ordeal of the whip, they submit to rituals of initiation. The institution of a cult with its regular procedures not only allows for the integration each year of a new class of young to be assimilated to adults. By the same action, it also realizes the harmonious integration of diverse, even hostile, elements, the fusion into a unified and homogeneous ensemble of all the participants, who will henceforth define themselves as the ones in comparison with the others, as the *Isoi*, the *Homoioi*, the Equals, the Similar Ones. Through the intermediary of this foreign Artemis, the bearer of alterity, the Greek city, by adopting her as its own, starts from and with the Other so as to constitute what it perceives as its Same.

At the end of this survey, which has ranged far and wide over Greece, let us pose the question: why study Artemis? For the pleasure it gives, of course, if not to understand her fully, then at least to attempt to understand her: to try to understand those others who are the ancient Greeks and also ourselves. Not that the Greeks are our model or that their way of doing and seeing things can be transposed to ours, however tempting this may be, considering how timely this problem of the Other is for us and how many facets it contains. Rather, because the distance makes us see more clearly that if every human group, every society, every culture thinks and lives what it imagines to be *the* civilization whose identity must be maintained and permanence assured in the face of irruptions from the outside and pressures from within, each group is also confronted with the problem of alterity in the variety of its forms. From death, the absolute Other, to those changes that, in the flux of generations, are continually produced in the social body, the community also makes a place for the necessary contacts and exchanges with the "stranger," which no Greek city can do without. The Greeks in their religion expressed this problem by granting it all its dimensions, including the philosophical one that Plato will later develop: the Same is not conceived as and cannot be defined except in relation to the Other, to the multiplicity of others. If the Same remains en-

closed on itself, thought is not possible—and let us add, neither is civilization. In making the goddess of the margins into a power of integration and assimilation, as when they take Dionysos, who incarnates the figure of the Other in the Greek pantheon, and install him at the center of the social system, right out front in the theater,[20] the Greeks pass on an important lesson. They invite us not to become polytheists, to believe in Artemis and Dionysos, but to construe the idea of civilization as giving each his or her place. They invite us to an attitude of mind that not only has moral and political value, but that is properly intellectual and is called tolerance.

[20] Cf. J.-P. Vernant, "Le Dionysos masqué des Bacchantes d'Euripides," *L'Homme* 93 (1985): 31–58, now in J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1986), 237–70, trans. Janet Lloyd under the title "The Masked Dionysus of Euripides' *Bacchae*," in *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*, (New York, 1988), 381–412.

Chapter 12

ARTEMIS AND RITES OF SACRIFICE, INITIATION, AND MARRIAGE

1. Xoanon and Strangeness

At Brauron and at the Limnaion of Sparta, as in other places that claimed the same privilege, the idol of Artemis was reputed to be the ancient *xoanon* that, according to legend, Orestes, when afflicted with wandering and madness, was supposed to have taken away from the Taurid where this fetish had fallen from heaven, in order to bring it back to Greece along with his sister Iphigenia. In Euripides (*Iph. Taur.* 85–91, 1448–61), it is at Halai Araphenides that Orestes set up this effigy of Artemis Tauropolos, while Iphigenia remained at Brauron as the goddess's temple guardian, to be buried there after her death. But Pausanias (1.23.7; 1.33.1), discussing the Athenians' claim to possess this relic, notes that the ancient *xoanon* was preserved at Brauron. Plutarch follows the same tradition: the Pelasgians, who had "abducted" the women from Brauron while they were celebrating Artemis, had, along with their captives, carried off the *xoanon* of Taurian Artemis. This triple infraction of the rules—of war, gender relations, and religious obligations—unleashed the long series of disturbances that from then on the abductors would suffer: in their contacts with strangers when they tried to settle among them, in their internal relations with their own wives and children, and in their relations with the gods. Condemned to marginal status and wandering from one place of exile to another, achieving neither full integration with others nor a real unity among themselves, they still carried the old *xoanon* with them. This they never abandoned in the course of their journeys, although the panic it caused made them lose their way, until the day when the idol became the object of a fixed cult and presided over the definitive emplacement of the human group through the founding of a united city.

According to Pausanias (3.16.9–17), the authenticity of the barbarian *xoanon* is probably in favor of Spartan Orthia. Among other indications, the one he finds most reliable for supporting his opinion refers to the very conditions that prompted the founding of the cult. First, as soon as the two "find-

This text was published in the *Annuaire du Collège de France*, representing the year's work in 1982–83, and is translated by Froma I. Zeitlin, with the omission of the last paragraph pertaining to Artemis Orthia and the Spartan *agōgē* that was later treated fully in the essay "Entre la honte et la gloire: L'identité du jeune Spartiate." See "Between Shame and Glory: The Identity of the Young Spartan Warrior," below, chap. 13.