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) ἤπια (*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 οὕνεκα-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.

This third category takes up about 5 per cent of the Iliadic text, whereas 50 per cent is focalized and narrated by the narrator and 45 per cent by speaking characters (direct speech). Thus, the fact that 14 of Mr Griffin's *ca.* 40 exceptions appear in embedded focalization, which is ten times less frequent than 'simple' narrator-text (5 per cent against 50 per cent), points to a significant pattern.

My interpretation of the exceptions as embedded focalization only strengthens Mr Griffin's thesis that the emotional and evaluative elements in Homer are largely restricted to the characters. Does this mean that I agree with him that the Homeric style (in the narrated parts of the poems) is 'objective' (p. 36), 'impersonal' (40), 'uniform and dispassionate' (46)? If one takes 'style' in a restricted sense, *viz.* as pertaining to vocabulary only, I might agree, but not heartily (why is the war so frequently called πολύδακρυς, αἱματόεις etc. and only seldom κυδιάνειρα and then mostly by characters: does this not imply a personal interpretation by the narrator?). But if one understands 'style' more broadly in the sense of 'mode of presentation' (as Mr Griffin himself does on p. 46), I disagree. To argue this pont more substantially lies beyond the scope of this note and I refer to my book mentioned in note 2.

<div align="right">I. J. F. DE JONG</div>

University of Amsterdam

Battle Narrative and Politics in Aeschylus' Persae

In *JHS* cvii (1987), I argued that the Festival of the Great Dionysia needed to be seen in the context of fifth-century Athenian culture and that the plays which make up a major part of this festival could be seen as offering a profoundly questioning attitude towards what might be called fifth-century Athenian democratic *polis* ideology. One play which seems to fit uneasily into that description of Athenian tragedy—as indeed it fits uneasily into many general arguments about Athenian theatre—is Aeschylus' *Persae*. In this brief paper I want to suggest some ways in which the social and political context I outlined in my earlier paper may help us to understand certain elements of the *Persae* which have worried critics.

Although the *Persae* is, of course, the only extant tragedy whose plot is concerned with contemporary events,[1] there are elements that make 'history play' a misleading term to apply.[2] It is, like most other tragedies, set in and largely concerned with a place that is not Athens, and it involves characters who are other than Athenian citizens—females, barbarians, kings etc.[3] The narrative, moreover, as various critics have pointed out, is specifically 'theological', that is, the events of the recent past are seen in terms of divine causation, a divine punishment.[4] The Persians provide for the Athenian audience an *exemplum*, so critics have argued, of the need to avoid *hubris*. As often in Athenian culture, the East constitutes a privileged locus of what is different from Athenian society,[5] which is used to articulate concerns and positive values about the Athenians' own selves—the logic of the negative *exemplum*. The extensive *kommos* for such a defeated enemy is less easy to fit into such a description of the play, however, and critics have been led to describe it as 'satire' or even *Schadenfreude*.[6] The sympathy—not to mention 'pity' and 'fear'— that one would normally associate with mourning might be seen rather as part of Aeschylus' turning the narrative away from a simple extolling of Athens' victory over the Persians towards the wider concerns of the theological or moral drama. It is not so much the fact of triumph as the factors that have led to triumph that interest Aeschylus.

One of these factors that has been too rarely discussed is the theme of power and its correct use particularly in a political context—a typically Aeschylean concern. The *Oresteia* leads from the question of δίκη in the house of Atreus to its conclusion in the δίκη of the πόλις—the 'just city' of Plato's search. The *Septem* dramatizes the leader of the city, a man who fights for the city, being ruined in part by the curse of his *oikos*. The *Suppliants* not only focuses on the tensions and ambiguities of the terms κράτος and κύριος, but also has one of the most explicit and most discussed exchanges on political system and power (*Supp.* 365 ff.). The *Prometheus Bound*, if perhaps not by Aeschylus, is Aeschylean at

---

Classical Studies in Honor of W. A. Oldfather (Urbana 1943) 82–93; H. Lloyd-Jones, *The justice of Zeus*[2] (Berkeley 1983) 88–9. For attempts to tie the play closely to a specific political situation, see F. Stoessel, 'Aeschylus as a political thinker', *AJP* lxxiii (1952) 113–39; A. Podlecki, *The political background of Aeschylean tragedy* (Michigan 1966) who both see the play as written expressly to support Themistocles. For more general attempts to relate the play to a political background, see V. di Benedetto, *L'Ideologia del potere e la tragedia Greca* (Turin 1978) 3–43; G. Paduano, *Sui Persiani de Eschilo problemi di focalizzazione dramatica* (Rome 1978) *passim*, especially 1–27, 71–84.

[3] For discussion and bibliography on Athenian self-definition and its importance in tragedy, see S. Goldhill, *Reading Greek tragedy* (Cambridge 1986), especially 57–78, and now F. Zeitlin, 'Playing the Other: theater, theatricality and the feminine in Greek drama', *Representations* xi (1985) 63–94.

[4] See, for example, Winnington-Ingram (n. 2) 1–15; H. Kitto, *Greek tragedy*[2] (London 1961) 33–45; Paduano (n. 2) 71–84; Benedetto (n. 2) 3–43; Gagarin (n. 2) 46–50; Conacher (n. 2) 163–8; E. Holtsmark, 'Ring composition and the *Persae* of Aeschylus', *SO* xlv (1970) 23; M. Anderson, 'The imagery of the *Persians*', *GR* xix (1972) 166–74.

[5] See in particular F. Hartog, *Le miroir d'Hérodote* (Paris 1980); S. Pembroke, 'Women in charge: the function of alternatives in early Greek tradition and the ancient idea of matriarchy', *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* xxx (1967) 1–35.

[6] So, for example, Blomfield, quoted by Broadhead (n. 2) xv; A. Sidgwick, *Aeschylus' Persae* (Oxford 1903) ad 847; A. Prickard, *The Persae of Aeschylus* (London 1928) xxviii. For a more balanced view, see Gagarin (n. 2) 84–6.

---

[1] We know little of Phrynichus' *Sack of Miletus*, or of his *Phoenissae*, on which the *Persae* is said to be based (by the Hypothesis). Other 'historical tragedies' (e.g. Moschion's *Themistocles*, Philicus' *Themistocles*) are fourth century or later.

[2] Much criticism has focused on the nature of this 'historical writing'. In general, see e.g R. Winnington-Ingram, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1983) 1–15; H. Kitto, *Greek tragedy*[2] (London 1961) 33–45, 'Political thought in Aeschylus', *Dioniso* xliii (1969) 160–5 and, in particular, *Poiesis* (Berkeley 1966) 74–115; M. Gagarin, *Aeschylean drama* (Berkeley 1976) 46–50; H. Broadhead, *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1960) xv ff.; D. Conacher, 'Aeschylus' *Persae*: a literary commentary', in *Serta Turyniana* (Urbana, Chicago, London 1974) 143–68; R. Lattimore, 'Aeschylus on the defeat of Xerxes', in