

but it might be rather forced. As it is our evidence suggests just what the action of *Acharnians* and the character of Dicaeopolis would lead us to expect, that Eupolis criticised the conduct of the war and focused on some of its damaging or ridiculous concomitants and consequences.

It seems that in *Prospaltioi*, now established as his first play and so produced in 430/429 BC,⁹ he attacked Pericles' conduct of the war, a fact that would enhance an audience's appreciation of how Dicaeopolis presents Pericles' rôle in the outbreak of war (esp. 530 ff.). *Prospaltioi* was also, so far as we know, the only previous comedy with a chorus of demesmen. Its few fragments include a reference to the story of Bellerophon (*fr.* 259.126) to lameness (*fr.* 264, *cf.* for both *Ach.* 427) and to a Thracian lady (*fr.* 262, *cf.* *Ach.* 273). There is also a verbal parallel between *Prospaltioi fr.* 260.30 and *Ach.* 162.¹⁰ This may all be coincidence, but to me it suggests that in *Acharnians* Aristophanes had at least half an eye on *Prospaltioi*.

Taxiarchoi appears to have exploited the contrast between the effeminate and luxury-loving Dionysus and the martinet admiral Phormio. Although Phormio was mentioned in comedy as late as Aristophanes' *Peace* 348, there is much to be said for Wilamowitz's belief that his prominence in *Taxiarchoi* points to that play's production not long after his death in 428 BC.¹¹ Indeed I know of no reason why it should not actually belong to a festival prior to his death, the Dionysia of 429 BC or either festival in 428 BC. It must be conceded, however, that the date is unknown,¹² and hence that any inference is speculative. But if *Taxiarchoi* had been produced between 430/29 BC and 426/5 BC, then audience might see in Dicaeopolis some elements of Eupolis' Dionysus, and in Lamachus a version of Eupolis' Phormio. It is improbable that in Eupolis' play Phormio was not worsted by Dionysus and martial arts and ideals held up to ridicule.

Astrateutoi also dealt with contrasts between effeminacy and war (the *Suda* gives an alternative title *Androgynoi*) and has been placed early by some scholars. The leadership of a campaign involving Minoa in *fr.* 38 K-A should put the play no earlier than the summer of 427 BC (*cf.* *Thuc.* iii 51.1) and could (but need not) take it later than 424 BC (*cf.* *Thuc.* iv 66.3). The enigmatic reference to Peisander's *strateia* to Pactolus (*fr.* 35 K-A) could conceivably refer to the same abuse as the envoys' luxurious travel through the plains of the Cayster in *Ach.* 68–71, and Peisander was already a butt of Aristophanes in 427/6 BC (*Babylonians fr.* 84.) *Astrateutoi fr.* 41 K-A refers to the keeping of peacocks, a standard present from the Persian king to envoys which we know to have been in the air in 426/5 (*Ach.* 63). All this harmonises with, but cannot demonstrate, a date for *Astrateutoi* of 427/6 BC.

It is also necessary to suppose, if my explanation of 377 ff. is correct, that at the Dionysia of 427/6 BC Eupolis produced a play which seemed to attack the city's policies. The most economical hypothesis is that this was a play whose theme could be represented as attacking the city's prosecution of the Peloponnesian

war (like *Acharnians*, and in this respect different from *Babylonians*) and that it was indeed *Astrateutoi*.

If either or both *Taxiarchoi* and *Astrateutoi* do belong before *Acharnians*, (and there can be no doubt about *Prospaltioi*) then the audience in 426/5 BC will not simply have seen quickly that Dicaeopolis represents Eupolis, but will also have seen the appropriateness of ascribing to him a dislike of the war and a desire for a life of peace. His position will not have been confused with that of Aristophanes.

E. L. BOWIE

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

Sisters, Daughters and the Deme of Marriage: A Note*

With the publication recently of two valuable studies on Attic demes,¹ we are now more fully aware of what we know, and do not know, of the deme. With Osborne's work, we now have some idea of the tendency of Athenians to own and maintain property in the deme of origin, but the role of marriage in consolidating property in that deme is more difficult to assess.² In contrast to Osborne's focus on the ancestral deme, this brief study will concentrate on the deme into which the woman married; such a deme will be termed the deme of marriage or the marital deme. The study will focus particularly on the families who contracted more than one alliance for their kinswomen into the same outside deme and will emphasize the importance of siblings in securing and maintaining these alliances in the marital deme. In terms of siblings, the paper will then point out how the locally endogamous marriage contracted by Plato for his sister seems to have consolidated landed, neighbouring estates.

These repeated marriages into the same deme and the locally endogamous union consolidating landed estates exhaust the examples found in Davies' register.³ Our dependence on Davies' reconstructions will be evident, especially as regards the assumption, typical of the prosopographer, that similar names derived from a root

* I would like to thank Robin Osborne for many criticisms and helpful comments on bibliography. Any remaining errors are of course my own.

¹ R. Osborne, *Demos: the discovery of classical Attika* (Cambridge 1985) and D. Whitehead, *The demes of Attica 508/7—ca. 250 BC: a political and social study* (Princeton 1986).

² Osborne (n. 1) 52–63 for landholding in the deme of origin; 131–5 for marriages within the hereditary deme. To this add the remarriage of Socrates' mother to her first husband's demesman: J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Chicago 1981, reprint, hereafter *PA*) 11697. See W. E. Thompson, *De Hagniae hereditate: an Athenian inheritance case (Mnemosyne Supplement xlv, Leiden 1976)* esp. 11–13 for the remarriage of Hagnias II's mother to a demesman of herself and her first husband (also briefly described in *id.*, *CSCA* v [1972] 212). It is unknown whether the woman's second husband was also a kinsman: J. K. Davies, *Athenian propertied families 600–300 BC* (Oxford 1971, hereafter *Davies*) 83. In some inscriptions, kinship endogamy may be combined with marriage within the native deme, if the names of spouses and their patronymics, which derive from a similar roots, suggest a blood tie: for instance, *IG* ii² 5698 *Philomachus* of Araphen and his wife *Philostrate* daughter of *Callimachus*; also 6028; for *SEG* xxiii 161, see: S. Humphreys, *The family, women, and death* (London 1983) 109.

³ *Davies* 145–9 and 461–4 (Dicaeogenes' and Polyaratus' families); 232–3, 302–4 (Cimon's family); 332–4 (Plato and his sister); 437–8 (Deinas' family).

⁹ Kassel-Austin (n. 7) 442 ff. on *Prospaltioi*.

¹⁰ 260.30. μέγα στένοι μέντ' ἄν' ἄκ' *cf.* *Ach.* 162. ὑποστένοι μέντ' ἄν' ὁ θρανήτης λέως.

¹¹ Wilamowitz, *Philologische Untersuchungen* 1 (1880) 66.

¹² E. Handley has even proposed a date as late as 415 BC, *PCAJ* lxxix (1982) 24 ff.

word or homonymy may indicate a familial or marital link. For the marriages concerned here the sources are as disparate as the *Athenaion Politeia*, the orations and the biographical treatises written in the Roman era. The inaccuracies, prosopographical or otherwise, in the *Ath. Pol.* and the orations are well known, while the lateness of the biographical sources has made their dependability uneven.⁴ Nevertheless, if Davies' reconstructions approach any accuracy, the pattern of kinswoman following kinswoman into the marital deme finds its equivalent in other landed European societies.⁵ Outside of Davies' register, *IG ii² 5811* will be considered, though the interpretation of family relationships is necessarily conjectural. So too must the reasons for repeated marital alliances into the same deme be left to conjecture; our sources do not inform us as to how a family's influence in its deme encouraged its affines to contract a second marital alliance into that deme, nor can we easily assess the role of kinship endogamy in these marital alliances.

The first case, the chronologically earliest, concerns the marriages of Cimon's kinswomen. Following the political demise of Cimon's father Miltiades, the latter's trial in the early 480s, the large fifty-talent fine imposed upon him, and the payment of the fine by Cimon, Cimon's sister Elpinice married Callias II.⁶ Callias II was one of the wealthiest men in Athens, and a member of the Ceryces, the *genos* which dominated the *dadouchia* in the Eleusinian cult.⁷ Although Miltiades' fine probably did not impoverish Cimon, the alliance with Callias would have done Cimon no harm: the orations indicate clearly how an individual could benefit from his wealthy brother-in-law. Isaeus ii *passim* tells of the adoption of a woman's brother into the estate of her ex-husband. In Isaeus viii Diocles encroaches on Ciron's estate through the marriage of Diocles' half-sister to Ciron. Demosthenes xlviii *passim* relates how a woman's brother and husband conspire to share the estate left by a relative and to exclude all other kinsmen from the estate. Also, according to Demosthenes (xxx 1-9), Onetor, whose sister married Demosthenes' guardian Aphobus, was in collusion with Aphobus to take over Demosthenes' estate.

The alliance with Callias II may therefore have encouraged Cimon to contract a marriage in the 470s or 460s for either another sister or his daughter with Callias II's fellow demesman, Thucydides the son of Melesias.⁸

⁴ Osborne (n. 1) 128-30 for the sources on marriages and demes and the problems entailed.

⁵ D. Sabeau, 'Aspects of kinship behaviour and property in rural Western Europe before 1800', J. Goody, J. Thirsk and E. Thompson, eds., *Family and inheritance: rural society in Western Europe, 1200-1800* (Cambridge 1976) 101.

⁶ On Miltiades' fine for the Parian expedition: Hdt. vi 136.1-3; Davies 303 for the scepticism of scholars that the fine impoverished Cimon. For the marriage of Elpinice and Callias II's wealth: Davies 258-61, 303 and sources cited. Although C. Hignett (*A history of the Athenian constitution* [Oxford 1952]) 194 and Davies 259 infer from Elpinice's burial in the Cimonid family plot that Elpinice was divorced from Callias II, Humphreys (n. 2) 111-15 has shown that a married woman could choose burial with her family of origin rather than with her husband.

⁷ K. Clinton, *The sacred officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (TAPS lxiv 3 [1974]) 8.

⁸ *Ath. Pol.* xxviii 2; Plut. *Per.* xi 1; schol. Aristeides III 446 Dind.; Davies 232-3, 304; Thucydides as the *kedestes* or *gambros* of Cimon was either his brother-in-law or son-in-law.

Therefore, either sister followed sister into the deme of marriage or Cimon's daughter followed her paternal aunt. More conjecturally, scholars have argued that if Cimon's sister married Thucydides, a daughter from this marriage may then have married her first cousin Olorus of Halimous (matrilineal parallel), the son of a third sister of Cimon.⁹ If this reconstruction is correct, then both Cimon's third sister and their niece (ZD) married into the deme of Halimous; the marriage of Cimon's sister to Olorus' father was then reinforced by kinship endogamy in the next generation.

For the affines of Dicaeogenes II, sister may have followed sister into the marital deme. In the 420s Polyaratus of Cholargus married one of the sisters of Dicaeogenes II of Cydathenaeum, the grandson of Dicaeogenes I. A daughter of Polyaratus at the end of the century married Cleomedon of Cydathenaeum, the son of the famous statesman Cleon. It would be tempting to accept Davies' conjecture that, if Cleon had married the daughter of Dicaeogenes I c. 440, Polyaratus' daughter married her first cousin once-removed. Davies' stemma is admittedly conjectural, based on an inscription dated traditionally to the 370s, listing a group of councillors (demotic missing) among whom appears the name Cleon son of Menexenus. From these names Davies infers that the demotic was Cydathenaeum, that Menexenus (II) here was the son of Dicaeogenes I's daughter and named after her brother Menexenus I, and that the Cleon in our inscription was possibly named after Menexenus II's father, Cleon the statesman.¹⁰ Bourriot in his criticism of the stemma, however, argues that to judge from other names in the list the men are from Paeania, not Cydathenaeum, and that the Cleon there mentioned was a grandson of a sister of Dicaeogenes II, who had married Cephisophon of Paeania (Is. v 5). Bourriot points out that because of the popularity of the name Cleon, homonymy in this case does not necessarily mean a marital connection with the famous statesman.¹¹

⁹ W. E. Thompson, *Phoenix* xxi (1967) 276-7 and bibliography therein. Davies 235, following Lewis, conjectures that Olorus of Halimous was also from a prominent religious family which was closely associated with the cult of Demeter Thesmophorus.

¹⁰ For Polyaratus' marriage: Davies 149, 461; his daughter's: *ibid.*, 319, 462; Cleon's supposed marriage: *ibid.* 145, 320. Davies' reconstruction is based on B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora* xv (Princeton 1974) no. 10. Dicaeogenes II's estate was worth from 10 to 13 talents: Davies 146; L. Casson, *TAPA* cvi (1976) 33 n. 10, 52 n. 55. Cleon's estate, and consequently that of his son, estimated at fifty talents (Davies 319) was far greater than the fortune of Dicaeogenes II.

¹¹ F. Bourriot, *Historia* xxxi (1982) 404-35, and esp. 420-33. Although Isaeus does not mention the marriage of Cleon to Dicaeogenes I's daughter, Isaeus does not mention the marriage of one of Dicaeogenes' daughters to Proxenus of Aphidna either, despite Bourriot's statement to the contrary (420). The latter marital alliance is Reiske's inference based on homonymy and accepted generally by scholars (Davies 476-7). In his argument to downplay homonymy and to prove the popularity of the name Cleon, Bourriot refers to the Cleons from various demes listed in *PA* (8664-79), seemingly without his having consulted the revisions in *IG ii²*. With these revisions in mind, of the individuals certainly named Cleon, six date to the third century and later—the context of familial transmission of names is uncertain for one (8667+68) and non-existent for the others. More to Bourriot's point would be fourth-century individuals from, for example, Cothocidae (D.xviii 29, 55), Anaphlystus (*ibid.* 75) and Sunium (D.xxi 168), who are not listed in *PA*. Of the fourth-century

In any case, Polyaratus' daughter married back into her mother's deme of origin, Cydathenaeum, and another daughter of Polyaratus *c.* 395 married an Eryximachus, possibly to be identified as the son of Eryxias of Cydathenaeum.¹² If the above stemma is correct, Polyaratus' wife married out of her deme of origin, but her two daughters married back into it. The daughters' marriages into Cydathenaeum, significantly, were contemporaneous with the feud begun by Polyaratus, his wife and her sisters with Dicaeogenes III, the adopted son of Dicaeogenes II, over the inheritance rights of the women to their brother's estate.¹³

For both Cimon and Polyaratus, repeated alliances into the same deme reinforced ties with wealthy and/or politically powerful families. For a less well-known family, the combination of kinship endogamy with the tendency for kinswoman to follow kinswoman into the deme of marriage may be evidenced in one inscription. *IG ii² 5811* records the marriage of two sisters, Cleostrate and Sostrate, daughters of Deximenes of Acharnae, to two men of Daedalidae, Sostratus II son of Eratocles I and Eratocles II son of Sostratus I. To judge from the names of Sostratus II, Eratocles II and their fathers, the husbands may have been first cousins (patrilineal parallel). Furthermore, the feminized form Sostrate for the name of one of Deximenes' daughters and the similar Cleostrate for the other daughter may indicate that the girls were related by blood to their husbands, perhaps as their husband's patrilineal cross-cousins (FZD). If so, the girls' mother had married into Acharnae, but the girls married back into their mother's deme of origin, Daedalidae.

For the family of Deinias of Athmonon, the role of siblings and kinswomen took on a slight variation: a woman followed her aunt (father's sister) into the

latter's deme of marriage, and the alliances were secured by the endogamous marriage of the girl's brother to the girl's daughter. Both Deinias' sister and daughter married into Acharnae: Deinias' sister *c.* 395 married a Meneclis of Acharnae, while his daughter *c.* 365 married Apollodorus the son of the famous banker Pasio, who was enrolled in the deme of Acharnae.¹⁴ The marriage of Deinias' sister therefore appears to have been a means for Deinias to ally his family to the wealthy banker. Through these alliances, the son of Deinias' sister, Stephanus, became the agent of Pasio's manager, Phormio. Furthermore, *c.* 349 Theomnestus the son of Deinias, married Theomnestus' niece, the daughter of Theomnestus' sister by Apollodorus.¹⁵ The marriages of Deinias' sister and daughter into Acharnae were then balanced by kinship endogamy, a union which brought Deinias' granddaughter, Apollodorus' daughter, back into Deinias' native deme. These complex manoeuvres into the deme of marriage and the return of a kinswoman to the deme of origin, however, could not prevent relations among the members of the kin group from becoming strained: Apollodorus feuded with Stephanus and Deinias over the management of Pasio's estate (*D. xlv* and *xlvi passim*).

Unlike the complex transactions of Polyaratus and Deinias, which could not prevent feuds among kinsmen, the marriage contracted by Plato for his sister Potone, a single marriage, unified neighbouring estates for at least two generations. In this case the two families concerned owned estates in a deme to which neither family belonged.¹⁶ Around 410 Plato (of the deme Collytus) contracted a marriage between his sister Potone and Eurymedon of Myrrhinous.¹⁷ Plato's landed property consisted of estates in two city demes about ten kilometres apart and belonging to the same trittys of Acamantis. One plot lay at Iphistiadae, land which he seems to have inherited, and the other plot he purchased at Eiresidae (*D. L. iii 42*).¹⁸ Plato's property at Eiresidae was bounded, according to his will, on the north and east by the property of Eurymedon of Myrrhinous (*iii 42-3*). Davies conjectures that, given the date of Plato's death as *c.* 348/7, the Eurymedon referred to in the will may be a homonymous son or grandson of Potone's husband.¹⁹ If Eurymedon's property was inherited

Cleons listed in *PA*, Cleon son of Thudippus of Araphen (8669), the son of the fratricide in Isaeus ix, has been identified, based on homonymity, as the grandson of the statesman, Cleon's daughter having married Thudippus the proposer of the reassessment decree of 424. (Davies 228-9; more recently B. D. Meritt, 'Kleon's assessment of tribute to Athens', in G. S. Shrimpton and J. M. McCargar, eds., *Classical contributions: studies in honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor* [Locust Valley 1981] 92.) Criticizing this identification, Bourriot asserts (412-18) that Thudippus would have had to assault his brother Euthykrates in the field in Araphen before the Spartan invasion of Decelea in 413. If so, Euthykrates' son Astyphilus would have been five or six at his father's death. That would make him fifty-two, and therefore too old, for his military service in 366. The text (*ix 20*), however, states that Astyphilus was related the tale of his father's death when a child: he may therefore have been an infant at the time of the assault, and therefore below fifty in 366. See *Lysias xiii 42* for a similar situation.

¹² *IG ii² 3063*; Davies 462-4. Many of the marriages contracted by the members of Dicaeogenes II's *oikos* and their affines were with urban families. For examples of urban marriages: Davies 16, 19, 231-5, 263, 268-9. See also Osborne (n. 1) 246 n. 17 for families from rural demes who married into families whose demes were near the *astu*.

¹³ W. Wyse, *The speeches of Isaeus* (New York 1979, reprint) 402-3; Davies 461. The sisters and their husbands objected to the adoption from the outset. In an effort to compromise, the natural father of Dicaeogenes III, Proxenus II, may have agreed to his son's receiving only part of Dicaeogenes II's estate, a compromise subsequently rejected by Dicaeogenes III: Wyse 414; Davies 145-6. If Polyaratus died shortly after 399 (Davies 461), the marriage of his daughter to Eryximachus *c.* 395 was contracted by her brother Menexenus who assumed the feud for his father.

¹⁴ *D. xlv 46, 54-5*; [*D.*] *lix 2*; Davies 437-8 for Apollodorus' marriage and that of Deinias' sister. For Pasio's enrollment into Acharnae: *ibid.*, 430.

¹⁵ [*D.*] *lix 2-3*; Davies 437-8: the relationship allowed Stephanus to give his daughter a wealthy dowry of 1 talent 4,000 drachmae. The interest of aunt, niece and nephew in Acharnae should be compared with the interest demonstrated by the Goulandris stele of father, son and grandson from Oe in marrying women from Angele: Osborne (n. 1) 131-2. In the latter case, there is a strong likelihood that land attracted the men to Angele.

¹⁶ Whitehead (n. 1) 75 n. 37 for Plato's neighbours from disparate demes.

¹⁷ For the date of the marriage and the demes of the two men: Davies 331, 334.

¹⁸ Osborne ([n. 1] 49, 131) defines two demes in the same trittys as neighbouring. For the locations of the two demes: J. S. Traill, *The political organization of Attica* (*Hesperia Supplement* xiv, Princeton 1975) 47 and Map 1. The exact locations of Plato's estates in relation to the deme centres are, however, unknown. If the conjectured location of Eiresidae is accurate, its centre and that of Iphistiadae were ten kilometres apart, well within walking distance. M. H. Hansen, *GRBS* xxiv (1983) 233-7: 12 kilometres would be a two-hour walk.

¹⁹ Davies 334.

from his father or grandfather, Potone's husband, then Potone's marriage consolidated two contiguous tracts of land, that of her brother and of her husband, in Eiresidae. The terms of Plato's will, establishing Plato's affines and their descendants, particularly the younger Eurymedon (iii 43),²⁰ as his executors, suggest that the coalition begun by Potone's marriage remained intact for at least two generations.

In the marriages discussed above, the repeated alliances into the same deme and Potone's marriage which consolidated neighbouring estates, the role of siblings was paramount. The marriages contracted by Cimon, Polyaratus and Deinias reinforced alliances with powerful or wealthy affines, and underlying these alliances may be a tendency towards kinship endogamy, a tendency hinted at in the inscription on Deximenes' family. The evidence on repeated alliances into the same deme is not extensive: it cannot reveal in any detail how deme associations stimulated such a marital practice, nor can we see the role of property transactions. The evidence, however, can let us begin to appreciate the forethought behind a family's marital practices, whose planning at times affected several generations. In turn, we may direct our attention to the marital patterns of other families, patterns which may or may not involve the deme but which indicate a family's needs and motivations. Here as well the role of individual members of the *oikos* in the alliances should be examined as well as the success of any given pattern in reinforcing kinship ties. In the end, a study of intricate marital manoeuvres and the implicit interrelationship between the individual household and the kin group cannot ignore the fact that the interests of the *oikos* were all-important.

CHERYL ANNE COX

Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

²⁰ D. L. iii 42. PA 11855 and table; Davies 331–4 for the family tree.

Homeric Words and Speakers: An Addendum

This note is written in reaction to Jasper Griffin's article in *JHS* cvi (1986) 36–57. He argues two points: (1) that there is a significant difference in vocabulary between the narrated portions of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the speeches, the former containing almost no emotional, critical, or evaluative words; (2) that Achilles and Agamemnon each have their own characteristic vocabulary.

It is the first of these two points I am concerned with here, more in particular the exceptions to the rule, *viz.* emotional words which are found outside direct speech. It appears that many of these exceptions occur in passages in the narrated parts of the poems where the narrator represents the perceptions, thoughts, emotions, interpretations of characters. Indeed, 14 of the *ca.* 40 exceptions mentioned explicitly, *i.e.* with exact book and verse indication, by Mr Griffin—and I restrict myself to these—can be explained in connection with emotions or interpretations of characters.

I discuss the relevant exceptions in the order in which they appear in Mr Griffin's text:

(p. 37) μαχλοσύνην (*Il.* xxiv 30): this is the evaluation of those who lost the contest: Hera and Athena (mentioned in 25–6).¹

(p. 38) ἦπια (*Od.* xv 557): the narrator very succinctly describes Eumaeus' state of mind.

(p. 43) αἰδώς (*Il.* xv 657): the γάρ-clause describes why the Greeks did not scatter through the camp. They are afraid and also ashamed to do so.

(p. 45) ἦ (*Od.* xxii 31): the narrator describes what the suitors thought and the particle is expressive of their emotions at that moment. So much for this exception mentioned by Denniston. The exception *Od.* xxi 98 added by Mr Griffin himself—to which I, too, have one to add: *Il.* xvi 46!—cannot be explained in connection with the emotions of a character. In both these last two cases the particle occurs in an anticipation by the narrator marked by μέλλω.

(p. 46) οἶος (*Il.* xxiv 630): Priam is marvelling at Achilles' beauty and stature.

λίην (*Od.* xiv 461): here Mr Griffin himself remarks that we are dealing with 'Odysseus' unspoken thoughts'.

ὑπερφίαλος (*Od.* iv 790, i 134, xx 12)

ὑπέρβιον (*Od.* xvi 410 [N.B. not x 410]). In these four passages we are dealing with Penelope's view of the suitors, which, naturally, is negative and emotional.

(p. 47) ἀτασθαλίαι (*Od.* xxi 146): this one suitor, Leiodes, considers the deeds of his group 'reckless deeds' and as such they are hateful to him.

(p. 49): ἔχθιστος (*Il.* ii 220): this is Achilles' and Odysseus' opinion on Thersites.

νεώτατος, φίλτατος (*Il.* xx 409–10): the οὐνεκα-clause describes Priam's considerations as to why he would not let his son go to war. The superlatives reflect his emotions as a father.

What we observe here can be stated in more general terms: in analyzing the *Iliad*, or indeed any narrative text, it is useful to distinguish not only narrated parts (narrator-text) and speeches, but also a third category, *viz.* narrator-text in which the point of view of a character is represented. The germ of this idea lies with the French narratologist G. Genette, who wisely chose to avoid the term 'point of view' in order to forestall confusion with earlier narratological theories, and spoke of focalization.² I call this third category, of which examples have been discussed above, embedded focalization: the events or persons are focalized (*i.e.* seen, experienced, evaluated) by characters, but narrated by the narrator.³

¹ How are we to interpret ἀλεγεινήν? According to the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* it has lost here (and in *Il.* ix 491) its original meaning ('painful') and is used as an adjective of intensification ('schlimm'). I prefer the interpretation of Ameis-Hentze, *viz.* that Paris' randiness will cause himself and his people much pain or grief. Whichever interpretation one chooses, ἀλεγεινήν can be brought in connection with Athena's and Hera's feelings concerning the Judgement of Paris.

² I give more detailed discussions of Genette's theory and apply a revised version of it to the Iliadic text in *Arethusa* xviii (1985) 1–22; *Mnemosyne* xxxviii (1985) 257–80; and particularly in *Narrators and focalizers. The presentation of the story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987).

³ This definition is not wholly accurate, since the narrator is also a focalizer. The full definition is: embedded focalization means that a primary narrator-focalizer embeds the focalization of another, a character, who functions as secondary focalizer.