

35. ra-wi-ja-ja, PY, nom. pl.: *lāwīaia* (?). Tritsch's "plant-cultivators" (cf. Greek *lēion* from \**lāwion* "standing crop," "cornfield"), rather than Chadwick's "captives."  
ra-wi-ja-ja-o, PY, gen. pl.: *lāwīaiāōn* (?).
36. re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo, PY, nom. & gen. pl.: *lewotrokhwoi*, -ōn, "bath attendants" (cf. Homeric *leotrokhōos* with inversion).
37. ri-ne-ja, PY, nom. pl.: *lineiai* "flax-workers" or "linen-weavers."  
ri-ne-ja-o, PY, gen. pl. *lineiāōn*.
38. si-to-ko-wo, PY, nom. pl.: *sītokhowoi* "grain-pourers," "baking women."
39. te-o-jo do-e-ra, PY, nom. sing.: *theoio dohelā* "do-e-ra of the god(dess)," an important type of female religious functionary.
40. te-pe-ja, KN TH, nom. pl. & dat. sing. (?): makers of te-pa (a type of cloth)" te-pe-ja-o, PY, gen. pl.: trade designation of women.
42. to-te-ja, KN, nom. pl.: members of a women's trade.
43. we-we-si-je-ja, PY, nom. pl.: *werwesieiai* "wool-workers."  
we-wi-si-je-ja-o, gen. pl.

Note: KN = Knossos, TH = Thebes, PY = Pylos, MY = Mycenae. Craftspeople of uncertain sex, such as the *kuwanoworgoi* "kyanos-workers" of Mycenae, are not listed, though they may well be women. Certain doubtful or fragmentary craft titles are also omitted.

## The divided world of *Iliad* VI

MARYLIN B. ARTHUR

*Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.*

THE ANCIENT GREEKS of the classical period inhabited what anthropologists call "a divided world,"<sup>1</sup> and the principle of division was the opposition between masculine and feminine. As in many contemporary traditional societies, male and female space, male and female attributes, roles, modes of behavior, and the like, are both conceived and acted out as opposites and as complements of each other.<sup>2</sup> Although Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* is the earliest explicit articulation of this system of dual classification, its force pervades many texts of the classical period<sup>3</sup> and informs the structure of Greek mythological thought.<sup>4</sup>

In the Homeric poems, by contrast, the dichotomization of roles, attributes, and spheres of activity is far less rigid,<sup>5</sup> and the opposition between "public" and "private"<sup>6</sup> domains is arguably non-existent. Instead, we find in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* a certain plasticity in the conception of male and female sex roles which is manifested, for example, in the "reverse similes" of the *Odyssey* studied recently by Helene Foley.<sup>7</sup> A similar spirit pervades the *Iliad*, and the *homilia* ("meeting and conversation") between Hector and Andromache in *Iliad* VI represents the climax of a thematic movement in the first five books which explores the contrast between male and female modes of being. *Iliad* VI, in turn, establishes the focal point from which the enmity between Hector and Achilles is developed in the ensuing narrative.<sup>8</sup>

The *homilia* takes place at the Scaean gates through which Hector enters the city of Troy in the middle of Book VI, and through which he exits at the beginning of VII to rejoin the battle.

The Scaean gates separate two radically different worlds, and they are the dividing line between city and battlefield. Book VI is structured<sup>9</sup> so as to emphasize and highlight this opposition, but also so as to suggest a merging or meeting of the two worlds. In Book VI the contrast is suggested primarily by the opposing figures of Hector and Andromache, and so it is formulated as a contrast between the male and female spheres. But, just as Hector and Andromache meet, embrace, and exchange discourses, so the thematic movement of the book suggests an interpenetration of these two spheres, and a dialectical rather than strictly polarized relationship between them. Earlier scenes in the first five books of the *Iliad* have prepared us to read this encounter as a resolution of the opposition between male and female, battlefield and city, in the form of a new heroic code. For in the first part of the *Iliad* the male and female characters are developed as polar opposites within the larger opposition between male and female spheres of activity.

Diomedes and Paris appear in the *Iliad* in a way that complements and anticipates the opposition between the worlds of the city and battlefield. Each is characterized in terms of his relationship to Aphrodite, the symbol of female sexuality and the polar opposite to her fellow god Ares.

Diomedes calls her an "unwarlike goddess" (V.331) and contrasts her in this respect with Athena in the same passage, whom he characterizes as, like Enyo, one of the goddesses "who lead men into battle" (V.332). When Aphrodite returns wounded to Olympus, Zeus reminds her that her province is not the works of war but the antipathetic sphere:

No, my child, not for you are the works of warfare. Rather  
concern yourself only with the lovely secrets of marriage,  
while all this [warfare] shall be left to Athene and sudden Ares.<sup>10</sup>  
V.428-430

Diomedes, up to and through the first third of Book VI, and especially in the section immediately preceding the *homilia*, is the most important and fully drawn of the Greek heroes. As V opens, Athena in her function as war-goddess gives him a strength and daring which will distinguish his excellence among the Greeks

(V.1-8). Her support of Diomedes is renewed at several points in the course of his *aristeia* ("account of heroic deeds"): in V.124-132 she speaks to him directly and encourages him, and in V.826 she addresses him as "the one in whom my heart delights" and goes on to urge him to confront Ares, the god of war.<sup>11</sup>

Athena's sponsorship of Diomedes' *aristeia* is one of the ways in which this hero's excellence is pointed up. In addition, when Hector enters the city, he remarks that Diomedes, "the savage spear-fighter," as Helenus describes him, had become the strongest of the Greeks:

that wild spear-fighter, the strong one who drives men to thoughts of  
terror,  
who I say now is become the strongest of all the Achaians.  
VI.97-98

He is more fearsome even than Achilles himself (VI.99-100), and he is irresistible: "This man has gone clean / berserk, so that no one can match his warcraft against him" (VI.101).

The similes applied to Diomedes anticipate those which figure when Achilles re-enters the battle and fights with such savage fury: the comparison to the dog-star is particularly remarkable, since it occurs just as the point when Diomedes rises into prominence in the narrative (V.4-8). When the same simile is applied to Achilles (in XXII.26ff.) its place in the narrative gives it special prominence among all the other occurrences in the later books of the *Iliad* where Achilles' destructive battle-fury is likened to the ravages of fire (e.g. XIX.365ff., 375ff., XX.371f., 490ff.).<sup>12</sup>

But Diomedes, terrible fighter though he is, is above all the typical warrior-hero. He adheres unflinchingly to the warrior's code which enjoins upon him the duty to fight in the forefront and not to yield before the onslaught of the enemy. He will not withdraw before the challenge of Aeneas and Pandarus, though Sthenelus urges him to:

Argue me not toward flight, since I have no thought of obeying you.  
No, for it would be ignoble for me to shrink back in the fighting  
or to lurk aside, since my fighting strength stays forever.

V.252-4

In V.96ff. he fights on though he is wounded, and when he finally does yield on the battlefield, it is only because he is confronted with overwhelming odds (V.589ff.: Hector and Ares). One of the signs that Diomedes is a typical hero is that does not challenge the gods or overstep his limits as a mortal.<sup>13</sup> Achilles, by contrast, arrogantly challenges the divine river Scamandrios in XXI.223, and asserts that he would willingly fight with Apollo if only he had the strength (*dynamis*: XXII.15ff.).

Diomedes not only observes the conventional limits which separate men and gods, but acts similarly in the human sphere. In contrast to Achilles (and even to Odysseus: see IV. 350ff.). Diomedes does not question Agamemnon's right to insult him and accuse him, however unjustly, of cowardice. Diomedes himself does not reply ("So he spoke, and strong Diomedes gave no answer / in awe before the majesty of the king's rebuking." IV.401-2), and restrains Sthenelus when he objects (IV.411ff.).

A very significant feature of Diomedes' characterization is his encounter on the battlefield with, first, Aphrodite, and then, Ares. Diomedes encounters Aphrodite as the enemy, the other, the hostile one whom he easily subdues. As Diomedes at this point in the narrative is the primary warrior, and the symbol of war's raging force, so Aphrodite is his natural opposite. When he wounds her, he invites her to draw the lesson that war is not her sphere:

Give way, daughter of Zeus, from the fighting and the terror. It is not then enough that you lead astray women without warcraft?  
Yet, if still you must haunt the fighting, I think that now you will shiver even when you hear some other talking of battles.  
V.348-351

Diomedes overpowers Ares as well, also under Athena's guidance and at her instigation (V.792-863). But by this episode Diomedes' excellence as a warrior, his abilities in the works of war, his superiority to even Ares, the god of war, is shown.

Diomedes, then, at the point in the narrative where Hector enters Troy, has been established as the typical Greek warrior, the symbol of the masculine sphere. An essential feature of this definition of his character is the exclusion of the *himeronta erga*, the

works of Aphrodite, from his sphere of activity — not only directly and explicitly, in the form of a hostile encounter with the goddess, but implicitly, in the irrelevance of his wife and children to his martial activity. They exist, because Dione mentions them when she comforts Aphrodite (V.460ff.).<sup>14</sup> And they are not absent from consideration just because Diomedes is fighting far from his homeland; for Sarpedon, in the same section of the poem, twice remarks to Hector that he misses his dear wife, baby son, and many possessions which he last left behind in Lykia:

Lykia lies far away, by the whirling waters of Xanthos;  
there I left behind my own wife and my baby son, there  
I left my many possessions which the needy man eyes longingly.<sup>15</sup>  
V.479-81

But for Diomedes, his wife and child are simply irrelevant.

Paris, in VI, is the only man in a world of women. This is consonant with his characterization when he first appears in the narrative. There, Hector calls him "evil Paris, beautiful, woman-crazy, cajoling" (III.39). Paris acknowledges the insult, but warns Hector not to begrudge him his special sphere, the gifts of golden Aphrodite (III.64). Book III is Paris' *aristeia*, just as V celebrates the excellence of Diomedes. In the course of the book the original quarrel between Menelaus and Paris is re-enacted in reverse, so that the warriors first compete over "Helen and all her possessions," and then Paris is literally carried away by Aphrodite. Helen yields to the goddess' enticements less readily, with a reticence and concern for social propriety which is hardly appropriate after nine years, but which is clearly a revival of her original ambivalence:

Not I. I am not going to him. It would be too shameful.  
I will not serve his bed, since the Trojan women hereafter  
would laugh at me, all, and my heart even now is confused with  
sorrows.

III.410-412

In order to seduce her away to Paris' bedroom Aphrodite assumes the guise of an old woman, a wool-dresser who was especially dear to Helen "when she was living in Lakedaimon" (III.387). Although

we are clearly meant to assume that this woman had accompanied Helen to Troy, both this detail and Paris' reminiscence at the end of Book III of the first time that passion overwhelmed him (III.442) and he and Helen first made love together on the island of Cranae (III.445), invite us to picture to ourselves the emotions and circumstances of the first seduction. Then, the old woman must have acted as confidante and go-between in much the same way as Eurycleia serves Penelope in the *Odyssey*.<sup>16</sup> And, finally, Paris' confession of love to Helen, with which he overcomes her resistance, is a fitting conclusion to a book which has shown Paris' particular area of excellence.

Paris can also, to be sure, perform on the battlefield as a good warrior. In both III and VI, when Hector recalls him to his martial duties, he joins in the fray wholeheartedly and bravely. But Paris' primary identification is with the world of Aphrodite, the anti-pathetic sphere to the battlefield, and he must be either rebuked (as above, in Book III) or cajoled by Hector (as in Book VI) before he can re-focus his energies on the specifically masculine field of endeavor.<sup>17</sup>

The women of the first five books of the *Iliad* present a contrast that is analogous to that between Diomedes and Paris. Briseis and Helen, the principal female characters up to Book VI, are characterized in terms of their relationship to the male world of war.

Briseis is the symbol of the dehumanizing effects of war, the living example of the way in which women, considered only from the perspective of the battlefield, become objectified as possessions and war-booty. The term which describes Briseis throughout almost all of Book I is *geras* ("prize"), a neuter noun. She is the symbol of Achilles' honor and the reward for his labor ("whom, after much hard work he had taken away from Lyrnessos / after he had sacked Lyrnessos and the walls of Thebe" [II.690-691]). In the competitive world of masculine values women exist only as chattel — whether the activity is war or funeral games. In wartime the prizes are, as Thersites lists them, bronze, women, and gold (II. 225ff.); in the funeral games for Patroclus, Achilles offers as prizes cauldrons, tripods, horses, mules, cattle, women and iron (XXIII.259ff.).

Achilles' attitude toward Briseis in I contrasts markedly with his later display of affectionate regard for her:

Since any who is a good man, and careful,  
loves her who is his own and cares for her, even as I now  
loved this one from my heart, though it was my spear that won her.  
IX.341-343

This is a statement which Achilles makes as part of a larger refusal to take part in the war, and as part of a rejection of the world of Ares. When, at a later point in the *Iliad*, Patroclus has been killed and Achilles re-enters the battle, one of the ways in which he asserts his recovered sense of community with the Greek warriors is through the expression of a wish that Briseis had been killed:

Son of Atreus, was this after all the better way for  
both, for you and me, that we, for all our hearts' sorrow,  
quarrelled together for the sake of a girl in soul-perishing hatred?  
I wish Artemis had killed her beside the ships with an arrow  
on that day when I destroyed Lyrnessos and took her . . .  
XIX.56-60

In the first books of the *Iliad* as here, Briseis is a *geras* only, a pawn in the men's disputes.

Briseis' unlucky fate is also an ominous foreshadowing of the doom that awaits the women of Troy. As we shall see, this feature of war figures importantly in the dialogue between Hector and Andromache in Book VI, and several passages in the first books of the *Iliad* draw attention to it. The Greek leader's incitement of their men to war in Book II includes the vision of revenge to be exacted from the Trojans' wives:

Therefore let no man be urgent to take the way homeward  
until after he has lain in bed with the wife of a Trojan  
to avenge Helen's longing to escape and her lamentations.  
II.354-356

Agamemnon, in his prayer for victory to Zeus in III, includes the wish that they might rape the Trojan's wives (III.301).<sup>18</sup> Such passages, with their vision of the violence and abuse to which the

women of the defeated warriors will be subjected, crystallize the vicious, dehumanizing aspects of war, and associate them with the fate of women. After Book VI there are no examples of such exhortations as those of Nestor in II or Agamemnon in II, IV, and VI. This is largely because the tragic effects of war, after VI, encompass the men of the poem (Patroclus and Hector especially) as well as the women. But, fittingly, the last exhortation to brutalize the women of Troy is the most savage:

No, let not one of them [the Trojans] go free of sudden death and our hands; not the young man child that the mother carries still in her body, not even he . . .

VI.57-59

Up to Book VI, then, one of the two kinds of women who appear in the poem is the woman as victim of war, the pawn in men's disputes and the innocent sufferer of all the degrading effects of war.

The other type of woman is Helen. She is the woman who subjugates warriors instead of being subject to them; instead of being the pawn in the men's disputes she plays a more active role — inciting them to hostility against each other on her behalf. When we first see her in III she is commemorating her powers in a woven robe depicting the struggles of the Greeks and Trojans which they underwent "for her sake" (128). She is shortly to venture forth to the Scaean gates to witness the duel between Paris and Menelaus — to see once more how the effects of her beauty and appeal are to set men at variance with one another. And in the end of III Paris confesses that he is "overwhelmed" by desire for Helen.<sup>19</sup>

Helen enters the world of war, then, as a disruptive force, in a fashion that is analogous to the warrior's destruction of the female world through conquest. Briseis and Helen, the two opposite types of women, are related to opposite ways to the male sphere of the battlefield. Similarly, Diomedes and Paris, the two opposite types of warriors, are related in opposite ways to the exclusively female sphere, the world of Aphrodite.

The development of this dual polarity conditions our response to Book VI, when Hector enters the city of Troy and meets

Andromache. [Book VI is the first point in the *Iliad* which shows an affectionate rather than hostile relationship between male and female, the first point in the narrative where there is presented an encounter which is free from the domination of one sphere of interests by the other.<sup>20</sup>] But Hector encounters Andromache only at the end of his visit within the walls, and only after he has first met the women of Troy, his mother, and Helen and Paris. Thus, he makes his way through the city in stages, each of which is represented by a single encounter, and which, taken together, make up a representation of what J.T. Kakridis has called "the ascending scale of affections."<sup>21</sup> This is a typical motif found in epic and tragedy and derived from folk-tale; its outstanding feature is the elevation of conjugal love over the love of friends and relatives. The order in which the persons appear is typical, and there are two principal patterns:

- 1) a) friends (compatriots)
- b) parents
- c) husband / wife
- 2) a) friends (compatriots)
- b) mother
- c) father
- d) brothers and sisters
- e) husband / wife

In Book VI the second pattern, with modifications, predominates. Hector encounters the Trojan women (VI.238; 2.a), his mother (VI.251; 2.b), his brother Paris and sister-in-law Helen (VI.313; 2.d), and at last Andromache, his wife (VI.394; 2.e). The encounter with the father (2.c) is omitted, since Troy in Book VI is a world inhabited by women alone (with the exception of Paris, a figure whose masculinity is always under scrutiny, as we have seen). The presence of this pattern is underscored by the use of formulaic parallels in the three principal encounters.<sup>22</sup>

As Hector proceeds through these encounters he becomes increasingly immersed in a world which, as the narrative presents it, is a direct contrast to that of the battlefield. The lengthy initial description of Priam's house, called *perikallea* (VI.242; "very

lovely"), and the product of a long and careful labor ("wonderfully built" [242]; "fashioned with smooth-stone cloister walks" [243]; "sleeping chambers of smoothed stone" [244]; "close smooth-stone sleeping chambers" [248]), suggests that form of work which occupies men during peacetime. A little later in the narrative, when Hector reaches Paris' dwelling, the poet tells us that it was a lovely (*kala*) one, which Paris himself had constructed, together "with the men who at that time / were the best men (*aristoi*) for craftsmanship in the generous Troad" (VI.314-315) — men distinguished by virtue of their abilities as builders rather than warriors.

Troy is not only a world of women, but of beautiful women. Laodice, the most beautiful of Priam's daughters (VI.252), accompanies her mother when Hector meets them, and he is soon to encounter Helen, the woman whose beauty the elders on the wall in III had likened to that of the goddesses (III.158).

Troy is a world of rest and relaxation. Hecuba offers Hector wine to help relieve his exhaustion (VI.261f.), and in the description of Priam's palace (see above) the poet focuses on the bedrooms (*thalamoi*) where men and women sleep together (VI.245-246, 249-250).

Troy is a world of the works of women: the storage room holds the *erga gynaikōn*, the elaborate *peploi* ("woven cloths or robes") which Paris had brought back to Troy together with Helen (VI.289ff.). When Hector comes upon Helen she is overseeing the work of her serving-women (VI.323f.), and this is the task to which Hector directs Andromache at the end of the *homilia* (VI.490ff.). Supervision of the spinning and weaving is the work with which Andromache is in fact occupied when, in Book XXII, the sound of lamentation calls her forth once more to the walls: "but she was weaving a web in the inner room of the high house, / a red folding robe, and inworking elaborate figures" (XXII.440-441). The ritual which the women of the city perform also traditionally belongs to their sphere of activity; prayers to the gods for salvation are the office of the women of the city in time of war.<sup>23</sup>

When Hector reaches the home, and enters the bedroom (*thalamos*, VI.321) of Helen and Paris, there is once more an offer

of rest. Helen invites Hector to sit down on the chair beside her and relax:

But come now, come in and rest on this chair, my brother,  
since it is on your heart beyond all that the hard work has fallen.

VI.354-355

The invitation clearly has sexual overtones, although they are presented with delicacy. When Helen earlier refused Aphrodite's suggestion that she return to the bedroom where Paris was awaiting her "in the bed with its circled pattern" (III.391), Helen's initial refusal included the outrageous proposal, "go yourself and sit beside him" (III.406). And when Helen does enter the bedroom, she first sits down with Paris on an "armchair" (*diphros* [III.424-6]), a type of chair which ordinarily seats two,<sup>24</sup> and which is the chair which Helen invites Hector to share with her in our passage (VI.354). In addition, Helen's description of the "perfect" husband, which she addresses to Hector in the context of a disparagement of Paris (III.350ff.), fits Hector precisely. He is above all the man "who [knows] modesty and all things of shame that men say" (III.351). This is indicated especially by the famous line "I would feel deep shame / before the Trojans, and the Trojan women with trailing garments" (VI.441), in which he explains to Andromache his reasons for fighting in the forefront of the Trojan ranks, and which he repeats at the significant point when he makes the decision to remain outside the walls and face Achilles (XXII.105).

In the first two principal encounters with women in VI, then, Hector meets them as representatives of the domain with which they are traditionally associated — the activities of nurturing, of the sustenance of life as both a daily activity and as the act of generation. Between them, Hecuba and Helen offer Hector gratification of his primary needs: Hecuba, as mother, wants to satisfy his thirst, and Helen's offer has overtones of a sexual enticement.<sup>25</sup> In addition, the descriptions in VI remind us of the cultural activities of peacetime — the building of homes by the men and the weaving of clothes by the women.

Hector is out of place in this world. He rejects Hecuba's cup of wine out of worry that it might take away his fighting strength: "My honoured mother, lift not to me the kindly sweet wine, / for fear you stagger my strength and make me forget my courage" (VI.264-265). He is covered with blood and muck and so cannot engage in ritual activity (VI.266ff.). When he enters the bed-chamber of Paris and Helen, a description of two lines' length (VI.319-320) highlights the long spear which he brings; Paris, by contrast, is not dressed in his armor but is holding it, turning it over and admiring it, but not using it (VI.321-322). And when Hector refuses Helen's offer of relaxation and rest, he counterposes to her desire for him his troops' longing (*pothē* [VI.362]) for him.

Andromache is also temporarily dislocated in this book. She is absent from her home: "[he] failed to find in the house Andromache of the white arms" (VI.371); she is not with her sisters-in-law: "she is not / with any of the sisters of her lord or the wives of his brothers" (VI.382-383); nor has she gone to share in the ritual sacrifice in which all of the other highborn women of the city take part: "nor has she gone to the house of Athene, where all the other / lovely-haired women of Troy propitiate the grim goddess" (VI.384-385). These are the places where Hector expects to find Andromache when he discovers her absence from his home, and these are the proper and traditional places and activities for her. Instead, she has run forth to the walls "like a woman gone mad" (VI.389).

Women, when they were possessed by Dionysus, acted like maenads (of whose existence Homer knew: see XXII.460<sup>26</sup>), rushing to the mountains and abandoning their traditional activities. This is the thrust of Pentheus' complaints and the cause of his outrage against Dionysus and the women in Euripides' *Bacchae*.<sup>27</sup> If, as seems likely, *μαιωμένῃ εἰκνῖα* is a metrical variant for *μαιώδισσῃ*,<sup>28</sup> then the force of the simile here is to underscore Andromache's dislocation. She is not only in a condition of heightened emotionality, but she is experiencing a transport that delivers her out of the world with which she is normally associated.

Hector and Andromache move toward one another, then, by a

process in which each dissociates himself from the world to which he or she normally belongs, and assimilates himself to the sphere of the other. At the same time, a tension is developed as the narrative focuses on the abnormality of this process: Hector enters the world of Troy but does not really belong there; Andromache's ability to function in this world, which is her proper sphere, is temporarily suspended.

The climax comes at the wall, when Hector removes his helmet in order to embrace his son. Since one of his principal epithets is *korythaiolos* ("of the shining helmet"), and since it is used of him frequently in VI,<sup>29</sup> the act takes on symbolic importance, and marks the moment of Hector's furthest distance from the world of the battlefield. Andromache, for her part, gives Hector advice about the conduct of the war — a move so inappropriate as to have led Aristarchus to athetize the passage on the grounds that it was unfitting for Andromache "to compete with Hector's generalship" (*antistratēgein*).

The speeches at the wall, and especially that of Hector, treat a dichotomy which has been building, not only throughout the entire first section of the *Iliad*, but in the course of VI, where the opposition between the city and the battlefield, between the feminine and masculine worlds, is developed. The *homilia* takes place at a point in time and space where both Hector and Andromache have been dissociated from their proper spheres and have each partially entered the world of the other. For this reason the Scaean gates, the dividing line between the two worlds, is an appropriate meeting place. The speeches which, like Hector's passage through Troy, make use of the ascending scale of affections, present a correlate; for in them the poet attempts a resolution of the polarity which affirms the possibility of their compatibility and, indeed, asserts the basic continuity between the two worlds.

Andromache's use of the ascending scale of affections constitutes something of a departure from the pattern which usually presents the husband loving his wife above all others or the wife loving her husband *more than others do*<sup>30</sup> (i.e. not more than she loves all others). Thus the pattern as it is applied to the wife is not normally analogous, but correlative. However, Homer has

Andromache employ the scale of affections in exactly the form in which Hector used it — only she does it in reverse.

Andromache begins by rebuking Hector for his battle-thirst and for endangering his life. For, she goes on, if he is killed, life would be worthless for her: “for there is no other consolation for me after you have gone to your destiny — / only grief” (VI.411-412). The word that Andromache uses, *thalpōrē* (“consolation”), covers the whole range of human affections and the warmth and pleasure to be derived from them. It is used by Telemachus to signify his longing for his absent father (1.167), and by Odysseus (X.223) when he explains to Nestor his need for a companion on the expedition into the Trojan camp. It is a good word to express the range of meaning of Andromache’s love for her husband: he is the source of comfort, companionship, and protection for her.

As the progression continues, Andromache explains that she lost both her father, Eetion (2.c), and mother (2.b), when Achilles sacked her town, Thebe (2.a). The poet then resumes the use of the pattern to explain that Eetion (2.c) and Andromache’s seven brothers (2.d) were killed, but that her mother (2.b) was ransomed but perished shortly thereafter. Hector is therefore father, mother, brother, and tender husband to Andromache (2.b, c, d, e):

Hektor, thus you are father to me, and my honoured mother,  
you are my brother, and you it is who are my young husband.  
VI.429-430

In the space of twenty lines Homer has used the scale of affections three times, and this repetition effectively conveys Andromache’s extraordinarily strong love for Hector.

In the remaining lines of her speech (VI.431-439) Andromache gives to Hector the advice on military strategy which Aristarchus condemned. If we look carefully at these lines, it will be clear that Andromache does not, as she has often been thought to do, ask Hector to refrain from going out to battle. Although she does say, “stay here on the rampart” (VI.431), the lines that follow constitute an explanation that what she wants is for Hector to adopt

a more defensive strategy. This wish accords with her reproach in the opening lines of her speech, where she had said, “your own great strength will be your death” (VI.407), and with her dire premonition in Book XXII where she fears for him because “[Hector] would never stay back where the men were in numbers / but break far out in front, and give way in his fury to no man” (XXII.458-459).

Andromache, then, does not ask that Hector play the coward, but that he give up his quest for *kleos* (“glory”<sup>31</sup>) — that he not fight in the forefront where, as Sarpedon explains it to Glaucus in XX.322ff., men win glory and fame. Andromache’s speech, therefore, is not only an expression of sincerely felt emotion; it is also a suggestion for a course of action by which Hector can honor his commitment to her and his responsibility as the defender of Troy.

Hector, in his response, also makes use of the ascending scale of affections (2.a.b.c.d.e):

But my concern is not so much for the sufferings of the Trojans  
nor [of my mother and father and brothers],  
but for your suffering [on the day when some Achaean  
leads you away as his slave].

VI.450-455 (abridged)

But Hector precedes his confession of love for Andromache with a firm rejection of her appeal. Both his regard for the Trojans (his public standing) and his own heart (*thymos*-VI.444) enjoin upon him the necessity of fighting in the front ranks and seeking glory:

and the spirit [*thymos*] will not let me, since I have learned to be  
valiant  
and to fight always among the foremost ranks of the Trojans;  
winning for my own self great glory [*kleos*], and for my father.

VI.444-446

Hector’s use of the scale of affections, like Andromache’s, is tailored to the particular message which he wants to convey. Whereas Andromache had asserted simply that life for her had no joy without Hector, Hector paints a dismal picture in which he combines the two aspects of his dread: his anguish over her suffering and his sorrow at his own loss of honor (VI.454-461). He concludes:

But may I be dead and the piled earth hide me under before I  
hear you crying and know by this that they drag you captive.  
VI.464-465

For both Hector and Andromache their exchange has emerged as a statement of the doom that awaits them both,<sup>32</sup> and the mood at the end of Hector's speech is one of profound despair. The exchange with his son which follows is the turning point of mood in the episode and the occasion for Hector to formulate a resolution between the conflicting demands of *eleos* ("pity") and *kleos*, the demands of the female and male spheres (cf. Andromache's appeal in VI.431: "Please take pity upon me."). This Hector does in the form of an address to his son which, since it takes the form of a prayer just preceding his re-entrance into battle, is the structural parallel to the hero's traditional prayer for strength and courage (e.g. V.115ff.).

In a brief six lines Hector counteracts the mood of despair by constructing a fantasy which both Andromache ("your own great strength will be your death" [VI.407]) and Hector himself ("For I know this thing well in my heart, and my mind knows it: / there will come a day when sacred Ilion shall perish" [VI.447-448]) realize will never be brought to fulfillment. Under the guise of a prayer he projects a picture of joyous harmony, delineated in terms which have specific reference to the family: his son fights bravely (and presumably beside his father), bringing fame to his father and joy to his mother:

Zeus, and you other immortals, grant that this boy who is my son,  
may be as I am, pre-eminent among the Trojans,  
great in strength, as am I, and rule strongly over Ilion;  
and some day let them say of him: "He is better by far than his  
father,"  
as he comes in from the fighting; and let him kill his enemy  
and bring home the blooded spoils, and delight the heart of his  
mother.

VI.476-481

It is a portrait of mutual cooperation, in which the traditional competition between father and son (cf. Sthenelus' boast on

behalf of Diomedes and himself in IV.405: "We two claim we are better men by far than our fathers."<sup>33</sup>) does not function. In addition, it is a situation in which the wife/mother is not only reconciled to her son's (and presumably husband's) martial activity — she too derives pleasure and satisfaction from it. This is a utopian vision of the nuclear family as the ideal reconciliation between opposing interests; it is a unity in which war is not a threat for women and children, and where women are a support in this venture for their husbands. The worlds of men and women do not exclude, but include each other; there is not opposition, but fusion and cooperation between the two spheres. It is an ideal which finds its fullest expression in the *Odyssey*, which culminates in a battle that fulfills every aspect of the fantasy which Hector projects in the *Iliad* — father and son fight alongside one another and bring joy to the heart of Penelope.<sup>34</sup> And at the very end of the *homilia*, when Hector returns the child to Andromache, directs Andromache to her loom and her woman's world, and himself returns to battle, the formulaic lines which delineate the separate spheres dissolve the contradictions and confusions of the halfway world of the wall:

Go therefore back to our house, and take up your own work,  
the loom and the distaff, and see to it that your handmaidens  
ply their work also; but the men must see to the fighting,  
all men who are the people of Ilion, but I beyond others.

VI.490-493

As the climax to the *homilia*, the lines must be understood in context, and must be seen as a resolution of competing interests.

But in the *Iliad*, this vision is a false resolution. In XXII, when Hector is killed and Andromache is called forth to the walls by the sound of lamenting, there are formulaic and other parallels with VI. Segal has discussed these fully in an article which argues that the scene which he characterizes as "Andromache's *Anagnorisis*" (XXII.437-476) describes Andromache "in terms of the stricken warrior . . . [and thus] equates her sufferings with the more 'public' sufferings of the heroes themselves."<sup>35</sup> In this episode of the *Iliad*, as in VI, Segal finds that one of the characterizing

features is "the confrontation between war and peace, battles and domesticity,"<sup>36</sup> which provide the background against which the action takes place.

In addition to this aspect of the scene, there is another important dimension. After Andromache returns to consciousness in XXII.475-476, she constructs a picture which constitutes a counter-fantasy to that of Hector in his prayer for his son. Andromache first laments Hector's death and then turns to contemplation of the fate that awaits her and their child. Instead of imagining their enslavement (the likely outcome, as they had both recognized earlier), she passes over this possibility in one brief line (XXII.487) and instead pictures to herself life as the widowed mother of an orphaned child.

The child is reduced to the status of a little beggar, tugging pitifully at the fine cloaks of his father's former companions in order to procure a few scraps from the table. This picture is the analogue to the one that Hector had imagined in VI, where Andromache is forced into the slavish tasks of working at the looms and fetching water. And in Andromache's vision there is an analogue to the abuse to which Hector imagined her subjected. The more fortunate child (the *amphithalēs*, "child with both parents living" [XXII.496]) chases Hector's son from the halls in disgrace, and the child cries (Andromache wept in VI.459) and seeks the consolation of his mother's embrace. A reminiscence of Astyanax's former position of carefree comfort and luxury (XXII.504) closes the passage.

This picture is a highly improbable one. It is scarcely thinkable that, given Hector's forty-nine brothers and twelve brothers-in-law, one at least (and most probably Deiphobus, who according to tradition survives the deaths of both Hector and Paris — see *Odyssey* 4.276 and 8.518 — and in the *Iliad* is close to Hector) would not have taken this favored child under his protection. Although there is no model for this in the Homeric poems themselves, it is appropriate to invoke the example of Eurysaces in the *Ajax* of Sophocles, since the dramatist was consciously imitating the circumstances and the action of the drama involving Hector, Andromache, and Astyanax.<sup>37</sup> In that play the dying Ajax entrusts

his son to his half-brother Teucer's care (558ff.; esp. 560-561), and thus avoids the reproach which Andromache is able to level against Hector: "Now, with his dear father gone, he [Astyanax] has much to suffer" (XXII.505).

Andromache's failure to take this possibility into account is not only a product of psychologically realistic despair, but a revelation that the resolution of Book VI was a false one. Hector's heroic ideal — his insistence on his pursuit of *kleos* and simultaneous use of the scale of affections — was a false resolution because it was achieved not by truly merging the two spheres into one, but by subordinating one to the other. His affective ties, and his duties as a father and husband, he had asserted, were subsumed under his pursuit of *kleos*. Homer's use of parallels with Book VI in his depiction of Andromache's reaction to Hector's death serves to remind us of the claims made there and of the vision of harmony between opposing interests. Andromache's bleak and despairing vision in XXII, which is coupled with an acknowledgement that Hector has indeed achieved the *kleos* among the Trojans and the Trojan women (XXII.514) for which he had longed earlier (VI.442), reaffirms the essential incompatibility of the masculine and feminine spheres, and returns us to the world of the first five books of the *Iliad*. There, as in XXII, the warrior strives for glory at any cost, including that of his own life and the bereavement of his wife and child. Hector in his pride, and especially under the exhilarating influence of his *aristeia* in VIII and his triumph over Patroclus in XVI, gradually dissociates himself from the community of Troy which had earlier formed the basis for his heroic enterprise. In XXII, when he refuses the appeal of his parents to re-enter the walls of the city, he closes his deliberative speech with a line in which he affirms the priority of the quest for glory:

Better to bring on the fight with him [Achilles] as soon as it may be.  
We shall see to which one the Olympian grants the glory.

XXII.129-130<sup>38</sup>

The woman, for her part, either suffers helplessly or seduces her husband away from the battlefield to the bedroom.

A true resolution of the competing claims of *kleos* on the one hand, and *philia* ("love") and *eleos* on the other, is only achieved when the drama is played out entirely in the male domain, as it is after Book VI. Thus, Achilles' love for Patroclus<sup>39</sup> brings him back to the battlefield, and ensures victory for the Greeks, even though Achilles fights for purely personal reasons and refuses to enter wholeheartedly into the community of the Greeks by sharing a meal with them (in XIX). And Achilles' pity for Priam, who reminds him of his own father, induces him to accept Priam's supplication and so to acknowledge the common bond of humanity which unites all men.<sup>40</sup>

In Book VIII of the *Ethics* Aristotle explores the nature of *philia* ("friendship," "love"<sup>41</sup>) and its relationship to *koinōnia* ("community"<sup>42</sup>). As in many other areas, so in this one Aristotle has codified principles which are inherent in Greek thinking from the earliest period. Here Aristotle explains that the *philia* which binds husband and wife, and parent and child, is implanted in us by nature,<sup>43</sup> but that the highest and most perfect form of friendship is that between equals:<sup>44</sup>

*Philia* is present to the extent that men share something in common, for that is also the extent to which they share a view of what is just. And the proverb 'friends hold in common what they have' is correct, for friendship consists in community. Brothers and bosom companions (*hetairoi*) hold everything in common, while all others only hold certain definite things in common . . .<sup>45</sup>

Although it was not his intention so to do, Aristotle's formulations in *Ethics* VIII might be understood as a statement of the ethical rules which underlie the themes of the *Iliad* which explore the dynamic between male and female, hero and community, and the city and the battlefield.

#### Notes

A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association (Chicago, Ill.) in December, 1974.

1. This is described most fully by Pierre Bourdieu, in *Outline of a Theory*

of *Practice* [1972], transl. Richard Nice (Cambridge, 1977), esp. Ch. 2, "Structures and the Habitus," and Ch. 3, "Generative Schemes and Practical Logic: Invention Within Limits." See also Bourdieu's statement, "It is not hard to imagine the weight that must be brought to bear on the construction of self-image and world-image by the opposition between masculinity and femininity when it constitutes the fundamental principle of division of the social and symbolic world" (93). Other major works in anthropology which describe the dual classification system are A.M. Hocart, *Kings and Councillors* [1936], ed. and intro. Rodney Needham (Chicago and London, 1970), esp. Ch. 20, "Heaven and Earth," and Rodney Needham, ed., *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification* (Chicago and London, 1973).

2. Such societies are studied by anthropologists who work in the modern Mediterranean, including modern Greece, e.g. J.K. Campbell, *Honour, Family, and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community* (New York and Oxford, 1964), Julian Pitt-Rivers, ed., *Mediterranean Countrymen: Essays in the Social Anthropology of the Mediterranean* (Paris and La Haye, 1963), and J.G. Peristiany, ed., *Mediterranean Family Structures* (Cambridge, 1976).
3. See, *inter alia*, my "Origins of the Western Attitude Toward Women," *Arethusa* VI (1973) 7-58, and esp. 47-48 on the "[assimilation] . . . of the social roles of male and female to the polarities whose opposition defined the world order." For tragedy, the reader should consult Froma Zeitlin, "The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the *Oresteia*," *Arethusa* XI (1978) 149-184, and esp. 171-172 where Zeitlin sets out a tabulation of a "series of antitheses [which] form about the polarization of male and female roles." For comedy, see Helene Foley, "The Female Intruder Reconsidered: Women in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazusae*," *Classical Philology* (forthcoming). And on history, consult Michèle Rosellini and Suzanne Saïd, "Usages de Femmes et Autres Nomoi chez les 'Sauvages' d'Hérodote: Essai de Lecture Structurale," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* VIII (1978) 949-1005.
4. Jean-Pierre Vernant, "Hestia-Hermès: sur l'expression religieuse de l'espace et du mouvement chez les Grecs," in *Mythe et Pensée chez les Grecs* I (Paris, 1971) 124-170.
5. See my "Origins" (*op. cit.*, note 3) 10-19, and Helene Foley, "'Reverse Similes' and Sex Roles in the Odyssey," *Arethusa* XI (1978) 7-26. And although I shall have occasion to cite passages from C.R. Beye, "Male and Female in the Homeric Poems," *Ramus* 3 (1974) 87-101, it will be evident throughout that I do not agree with the idea that "the conception of women [which appears] in the *Iliad*" is "the notion of woman as an object and possession" (87).
6. See S.C. Humphreys, "Public and Private Interests in Classical Athens," *The Classical Journal* 73 (1977/78) 97-104, and the same author's "Introduction" to *La Donna Antica*, ed. Lanza and Vegetti (Turin, forthcoming).

7. Foley (*op. cit.*, note 5), esp. 24-25, note 19.
8. This aspect of the *Iliad* will not be the subject of sustained discussion in this paper. For a full treatment, see G.K. Whitfield, "The Restored Relation": A Study of Supplication in the *Iliad*," (diss., Columbia University, 1967) and James Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago, 1975).
9. Critical attention has not been focused on this book since the time when "Hektors Abschied" and the whole scene in Troy was a favorite target of the analysts. Wilamowitz, in *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1916; 302-316); Bethe, *Homer I* (Leipzig, 1914; 245f.); and E. Schwartz, *Zur Entstehung der Ilias* (Schr. d. Strassb. wiss. Ges. 34, 1918; 17ff.) treated the section as an *Einzellied* which had simply been inserted into the poem. These scholars paid particular attention to the theme of Paris' anger (VI.326), and suggested that it may have occupied the central position in a short epic. Robert, *Studien zur Ilias* (Berlin, 1901; 194ff.) proposed that a council of the elders of Troy (cf. VI.86ff.) was the primary theme, and that it followed Hector's meeting with Paris. The most recent work in the "Separatist" tradition is G. Jachmann, *Homerische Einzellieder* (Cologne, 1949), who returns to the "lays" theory of Karl Lachmann and details the outlines of an original lay which had the story of the hero Hector at its center. According to Jachmann, the "Schöpfer" ("der nicht Homer hiess") originally designed a tale which united the events which in our *Iliad* are separated into Books VI and XXII, and which climaxed in the tragic death of Hector. One of the last major works on Book VI, that of W. Schadewaldt, "Hektor und Andromache," [1935] in *Von Homers Welt und Werk* (Stuttgart, 1965, 207ff.), takes up a very different line of inquiry. Schadewaldt defends the unity of the *Iliad* and the structural integrity of VI within the poem as a whole; his essay also analyses the structure of the book as an "Akt," which he calls "Hektor in Troja," and divides into three major sections, corresponding to the three principal stages of the "ascending scale of affections" as defined by Kakridis (see below, note 21). My debt to Schadewaldt's essay will be evident throughout, although it will also be clear that I am not content to allow Homer's delineation of "die grosse Grundpolarität" to stand as the central meaning of the book. My analysis also has certain points in common with Alfred Schmitz, "La Polarité des Contraires dans la Rencontre d'Hector et Andromaque: *Iliade* VI, 369-502," *Les Etudes Classiques* XXI (1963), 129-158, although I do not treat the scene, as he does, from the point of view of Hector's "psychology," which is determined by an overriding opposition between the "Je social" and the "Je personnel" (154ff.).
10. Quotations from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are cited in the translations of Richmond Lattimore; citations from the *Iliad* employ Roman numerals for book numbers; those from the *Odyssey* use Arabic numerals to designate books.
11. Her departure from the battlefield at the end of Book V marks the termination of the period during which Diomedes is under her special

- protection. See J.H. Gaisser, "The Glaucus-Diomedes Episode," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 166-167.
12. See Carroll Moulton, "Similes in the *Iliad*," *Hermes* 102 (1974) 381-397, and esp. 392-393, where he treats the simile under discussion.
  13. This is, as J.H. Gaisser (*op. cit.*, note 11) points out, the "message" behind the opposition of two "Weltanschauungen" in the exchange of speeches between Diomedes and Glaucus in VI: "In the sorty of Lycurgus [Diomedes] makes the point that the gods punish mortals who dare to oppose them; by implication, the man who does not oppose the gods will be safe from their wrath . . . On the other hand . . . the story of Bellerophon, as [Glaucus] tells it, shows mortals as the victims of the gods" (175).
  14. "Then, though he be very strong indeed, let the son of Tydeus  
[Diomedes]  
take care lest someone even better than he might fight with him,  
lest for a long time Aigialeia, wise child of Adrastos,  
mourning wake out of sleep her household's beloved companions,  
longing for the best of the Achaians, her lord by marriage,  
she, the strong wife of Diomedes, breaker of horses."  
15. "Son of Priam, do not leave me lying for the Danaans  
to prey upon, but protect me, since otherwise in your city  
my life must come to an end, since I could return no longer  
back to my own house and the land of my fathers, bringing  
joy to my own beloved wife and my son, still a baby."  
V.684-688
  16. The nurse (or servant-girl, as in *Lysias* I) figures in this way often in tragedy (e.g., *Medea*, *Hippolytus*) and, although Eurynome seems to be Penelope's special servant in the *Odyssey*, in 23 Eurycleia takes over this function. On her special status, see E.A.S. Butterworth, *Some Traces of the Pre-Olympian World in Greek Literature and Myth* (Berlin, 1966) 106ff.
  17. On the possible sexual overtones to the horse-simile applied to Paris at the end of VI (VI.506-511), see C.R. Beye, *The Iliad, the Odyssey and the Epic Tradition* (Garden City, New Jersey, 1966), 27.
  18. Leaf's comment (*ad loc.*) that the variant *dameien* for *migein* "looks like the prudery of a more fastidious age" is apropos. On *dameien*, see below, notes 19 and 20.
  19. Note that when Hera is finally able to subdue Zeus and work her own will in the war, she resorts to the charms of Aphrodite and Zeus admits that she has "conquered" him:  
"For never before has love for any goddess or woman  
so melted about the heart inside me, broken it to submission  
[*edamassen*]."

XIV.315-316

$\Delta\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  and the related  $\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\mu\iota$  are the terms regularly used to mean subjection of two kinds: (a) that of a woman to a man in marriage (XVIII.432; III.301) and (b) that of one man to another in battle (III.432; VIII.244; XV.376).

20. Note that in Book III, when Helen and Paris go up into the "bed of love," a spat precedes their lovemaking, in which Helen goes so far as to wish that Paris had been killed in the duel: "Oh, how I wish you had died there / beaten down [*dameis*] by the stronger man, who was once my husband" (III.428-429).
21. *Homeric Researches* (Lund, 1949), esp. "Meleagrea" and p. 20.
22. As Kakridis (above) points out, each of the women makes a suggestion (258, 354, 431); in all three cases Hector refuses their appeal (264, 360, 441 — this last request he rejects more gently); and to each woman he gives an order and explains his own intentions. The passages are cited and discussed in the chapter "Hektorea," 50-52. See also the discussion in Schmitz (*op. cit.*, note 9) 147.
23. Margaret Alexiou, in *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, 1974), discusses women's role as mourners when a city is destroyed. She distinguishes between "the *thrēnos* of the professional mourners . . . and the *goos* of the kinswomen" (12), and devotes a chapter (5) to "The historical lament for the fall or destruction of cities."
24. The word also means "chariot", which ordinarily carries the hero and his henchman or companion (e.g. III.261-262). Although Cunliffe (*A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* [1924] [Norman, Oklahoma, 1963] s.v.) says that, when the word means "seat", "the notion of 'two' [is] apparently lost," neither the Iliadic usage (as discussed here) nor that of the *Odyssey* (e.g. the fact that *diphros* is the kind of seat that is drawn up for Odysseus in Book 19, when the interview with Penelope takes place) suggests that the etymology of the word (from *di* = two and *pherō* = carry) was in every case irrelevant.
25. Long before Freud, these were recognized as the two primary instinctual urges. See, for example, Plato's discussion of the irrational part of the soul in *Republic* 439d, where it is described as that part "with which it [the soul] loves, hungers, thirsts, and feels the flutter and titillation of other desires, the irrational and appetitive — companion of various repletions and pleasures" (transl. Shorey).
26. It is disputed whether *mainadi* in XXII.460 means "maenad" or just "mad woman." See the discussion of this question by C.P. Segal, in "Andromache's *Anagnorisis*," *HSCP* 75 (1971) 47, n. 31.
27. Pentheus, in Euripides' *Bacchae*, complains about Dionysus' influence as follows:  
 "I happened to be away, out of the city,  
 but reports reached me of some strange mischief here,  
 stories of our women leaving home to frisk  
 in mock ecstasies among the thickets on the mountain . . ."  
 215-218 (transl. Arrowsmith)
28. *Mainomai* can mean "martial rage" (e.g. VI.101) and hence any condition of heightened emotionality, but as the participle *mainomenoio* is used of Dionysus in VI.138, it may have had a specialized meaning as well.
29. Lines 116, 263, 342, 359, 369, 440, 520. The epithet is more frequent

- in this book than any other, although Hector appears more often in other books of the *Iliad*. On this question see William Whallon, "The Homeric Epithets," *YCS* XVII (1961) 95-142, esp. "A Group of Epithets for Hector," 110-114.
30. The "type" is Alcestis; see Kakridis (*op. cit.*, note 21) 20.
31. On Hector's pursuit of *kleos*, see Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore and London, 1979) 28-29, 148-149, and compare Andromache's reference, in XXII.457, to Hector's "bitter pride of courage."
32. Schadewaldt (*op. cit.*, note 9) is particularly eloquent in this point: "Man sieht von selber, wie beide Reden in Gedanke wie Form durch Entsprechung und Gegensatz bis ins einzelne hinein aneinander gebunden sind. Jede der beiden Gestalten hängt in schmerzlicher Sorge am Schicksal des andern. Aber verbunden in ihrem Schmerz und ihrer Liebe, sind sie in ihrem Sein doch tief voneinander geschieden — wie eben Glück and Grösse sich nicht aufeinander reimen" (221).
33. A.W. Gouldner, *The Hellenic World* (New York, 1969) is one of the few scholars who have systematically studied this feature of Greek society. See especially his chapter, "The Greek Contest System: Patterns of Culture."
34. "Still, I [Penelope] will go to see my son, so that I can look on these men who courted me lying dead, and the man who killed them."  
 23.83-84
35. Segal (*op. cit.*, note 26) 55.
36. Segal (*op. cit.*, note 26) 43.
37. On this point see K. Reinhardt, *Sophokles* (Frankfurt, 1935) 31.
38. The word which is here translated "glory" is not *kleos*, but *euchos* ("boast"). On the relationship between the two concepts see Nagy (*op. cit.*, note 31) 44-45. It will be evident that I do not entirely agree with Redfield's interpretation of this scene, when he argues that "Hector's isolation here is . . . not a lack of relation to his community but a negative relation with it; he is sure that his community . . . rejects him" (*op. cit.*, note 8) 158. Although here and elsewhere (esp. 113-127) Redfield successfully highlights the role of *aidōs* ("shame") in Hector's sense of self, he does not altogether take into account the relationship between honor and shame, which in the *Iliad* and in "shame cultures" in general, form a natural pair. See Pierre Bourdieu, "The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society," in J.G. Peristiany, ed., *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (Chicago and London, 1966) 191-241.
39. On this subject see Nagy (*op. cit.*, note 31) 105ff., and Beye (*op. cit.*, note 5): "The erotic nature of their [Achilles' and Patroclus'] relationship is unclear and unimportant. What the poet shows is a non-competitive relationship, something unusual in the competitive society of Homer. It is something secure, something valuable; perhaps it seems so much like the male-female tie because the poet had only the model of the male-female relationship for something empathetic and accepting between men" (89).

40. See Redfield's (*op. cit.*, note 8) revealing discussion of "The Ransoming of Hector" (210-218) and his statement that "the final purification of the *Iliad* [is] achieved not by the reconstruction of the human community but by the separation of the hero from the community" (210-211).
41. On the meaning of this term in the *Ethics*, see Martin Ostwald, ed., transl., comm., *Aristotle, Nichomachean Ethics* (Indianapolis and New York, 1962) 214.
42. On the meaning of this term in the *Ethics*, see Ostwald (above) 231.
43. "It seems that nature implants friendship in a parent for its offspring and in offspring for its parent, not only among men, but also among birds and most animals" (transl. Ostwald [*op. cit.*, note 41] 215 [1155a 17-18]; all subsequent citations from Aristotle's *Ethics* are from this translation). "The friendship between man and wife seems to be inherent in us by nature. For man is by nature more inclined to live in couples than to live as a social and political being . . ." (239 [1162a 17-19]).
44. "The perfect form of friendship is that between good men who are alike in excellence or virtue" (219 [1156b 6-7]). "The highest form of friendship, then, is that between good men, as we have stated repeatedly" (223-224 [1157b 25-26]). Also cf. Aristotle on "friendship between unequals": "There exists another kind of friendship, which involves the superiority of one of the partners over the other, as in the friendship between father and son, and in general, between an older and a younger person, between husband and wife, and between any kind of ruler and his subject . . . In all friendships which involve the superiority of one of the partners, the affection, too, must be proportionate: the better and more useful partner should receive more affection than he gives, and similarly for the superior partner in each case" (227 [1158b 11-13; 1158b 24-27]).
45. P. 231 (1159b 30-34).

## Sappho's private world

EVA STEHLE STIGERS

*Wheaton College, Norton, MA.*

OF ALL THE LYRIC POETS writing love poetry in Greek between about 700 and 500 BC, Sappho is the most intense, the most immediate. "The isles of Greece, the isles of Greece! Where burning Sappho loved and sung," wrote Byron.<sup>1</sup> Other readers, less passionate themselves perhaps, have emphasized rather the atmosphere of magic and incantation in her poems, or the exotic settings, the Lydian head-dress and slippers, soft robes, flowers, everything rich, delicate, and lovely.<sup>2</sup> All these elements flow together to form the unique quality of Sappho's poetry, which I shall call her romanticism.<sup>3</sup> To suggest the source and nature of that romanticism is the purpose of this paper.

Sappho wrote within a tradition of love poetry in archaic Greece. Her poetry had roots; it was surely in its craft and themes a familiar form of expression. Hymns, poems of praise and blame, re-tellings of myth with culturally normative motives, and love poems are all traditional types found in Sappho's work. Yet the theme of love itself forced on Sappho a different structure of narrative from that of any other extant lyric poetry. The difference might be defined in two stages. The formal problem facing Sappho was to find a way of presenting the female persona as an erotic subject. Culturally acceptable models presumably did not include woman's pursuing man. Sappho's solution, to direct the erotic impulse toward other women, was perhaps a traditional one. On the social plane quite possibly girls before marriage were encouraged to cultivate female poetry, friendships, liaisons, and among them Sappho may have found her audience.<sup>4</sup>