

Myth and Thought among the Greeks

Jean Pierre Vernant



Routledge & Kegan Paul
London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley

5 Hestia-Hermes: The Religious Expression of Space and Movement in Ancient Greece

On the base of the great statue of Zeus at Olympia, Phidias carved the twelve gods. Between the Sun (Helios) and the Moon (Selene), the twelve deities, in pairs, were disposed in the orderly arrangement of a god and goddess in each couple, while in the centre of the frieze, in addition, appeared Aphrodite and Eros (2) - the two deities (feminine and masculine) who preside over unions. In this series of eight divine couples there is one pair which poses a problem: Hermes and Hestia. Why are they matched? Neither their genealogies nor their legends can explain this association. They are not husband and wife like Zeus-Hera, Poseidon-Amphitrite, Hephaestus-Charis; nor brother and sister like Apollo-Artemis and Helios-Selene; nor mother and son like Aphrodite-Eros; nor even protector and protege like Athena-Heracles.

What is the link that, in Phidias's mind, unites a god and goddess who appear to be without connection? It can hardly be ascribed to the sculptor's personal fancy. The artist of classical times was bound to conform to certain models when creating any sacred work of art: his creativity could be expressed only within the forms laid down by tradition. Hestia - the name of a goddess but also the noun designating the hearth - was less suited to anthropomorphic representation than the other Greek gods and goddesses. She is seldom depicted and when she is it is often, as sculpted by Phidias, in the shape of Hermes's partner. (3) In the plastic arts, as a rule, therefore, the Hermes-Hestia association is invested with real religious significance. It is there to express a definite structure in the Greek pantheon.

Meagrely represented in the arts, Hestia is even more poorly served in the mythical tales: a remark concerning her birth in Hesiod and in Pindar, an allusion to her virginal status in the 'Hymn to Aphrodite'. We would know

practically nothing about her which could explain her relations with Hermes were it not for a few lines in a Homeric 'Hymn to Hestia' that have come down to us. In this text the two deities are associated in the closest possible way. The hymn opens with six lines invoking Hestia, followed immediately with six lines of invocation to Hermes, whose protection is sought 'in agreement with the worshipful goddess who is dear (φίλη) to him'; and it closes with two lines addressed to the god and goddess jointly. On two occasions the poet stresses the feeling of friendship which Hermes and Hestia nurture for each other. This mutual *philia* explains why Phidias could place them, together with the other couples, under the patronage of Aphrodite and Eros. Nevertheless this reciprocal affection is based neither on blood ties nor on ties of marriage nor on personal interdependence. It is the result of an affinity of function, for the two powers are present in the same places and carry out their complementary activities side by side. Neither relations nor spouses nor lovers nor vassals - one could say that Hermes and Hestia are 'neighbours'. Each is related to the terrestrial sphere, the habitat of a settled people. The 'hymn' sings that the two gods 'in friendship together dwell in the glorious houses of men who live on the earth's surface (ἐπιχθόνιοι).' (4)

That Hestia should reside in the house goes without saying: in the middle of the quadrangular *megaron* the rounded Mycenaean hearth marks the centre of the human dwelling. According to the 'Hymn to Aphrodite': 'Zeus the Father gave her (Hestia) a high honour instead of marriage and she has her place in the midst of the house (μέσῳ οἴκῳ).' (5) But Hestia represents not only the centre of the domestic sphere. Sealed in the ground, the circular hearth denotes the navel which ties the house to the earth. It is the symbol and pledge of fixity, immutability, and permanence. In the 'Phaedrus' Plato evokes the cosmic procession of the twelve gods. (6) Ten deities proceed in the wake of Zeus who leads them across the heavens. Only Hestia remains at home and never leaves her abode. For the poets and philosophers, Hestia, the node and starting point of the orientation and arrangement of human space, could be identified with the earth, immobile at the centre of the cosmos. According to Euripides, 'the Sages call the Earth-Mother Hestia because she remains motionless at the centre of the Ether.' (7)

Hermes too, though in a different way, is associated with man's habitat, and, more generally, with the terrestrial sphere. In contrast to the distant gods who dwell in an outer region, Hermes is a familiar god who frequents

this world. [Living among mortals on terms of intimacy, he introduces the divine presence into the very heart of the world of mankind.] As Zeus says to him in the 'Iliad': 'Hermes, seeing thou lovest above all other to companion a man (ἐταίρισσαι)....' (8) And Aristophanes salutes him, of all the gods, as the most 'friendly to man'. (9) But if he thus manifests himself on earth, if, with Hestia, he inhabits the dwellings of mortals, Hermes does so in the form of the messenger (Hermes ἄγγελος, - it is by this name that he is specifically invoked in the 'Hymn to Hestia'), as a traveller from afar and one who is already preparing to depart. Nothing about him is settled, stable, permanent, restricted, or definite. He represents, in space and in the human world, movement and flow, mutation and transition, contact between foreign elements. In the house, his place is at the door, protecting the threshold, repelling thieves because he is himself the thief (Hermes ληϊστήρ, the robber, πηλοδόκος, the watcher at the gates, νυκτιδὸς ὁπωπητήρ, the watcher by night), (10) for whom no lock, no barricade, no frontier exists. He is the wall-piercer who is pictured in the 'Hymn to Hermes' as 'gliding edgeways through the keyhole of the hall like the autumn breeze, even as mist'. (11) Present at the front doors of houses (Hermes πυλαῖος, θυραῖος, στροφαῖος), he also stands at the gateways of towns, on state boundaries, at crossroads (Hermes τρικέφαλος, τετρακέφαλος), (12) as a landmark along paths and tracks (Hermes ὁδῖος, ἐνόδιος), and on tombs - those gateways to the underworld (Hermes χθόνιος, νύχιος). In all places where men, departing from their private dwellings, gather together and enter into contact for the purpose of exchange (whether for the exchange of ideas or for trade), as in the *agora*, or for competition as in the stadium, Hermes is present (Hermes ἀγοραῖος, Hermes ἀγώνιος). He is the witness to agreements, truces, and oaths between opponents; he is the herald, messenger, and ambassador abroad (Hermes ἄγγελος, διάκτορος, κηρύκειος). A wandering god, the patron of the roads both on and leading to the earth, he is the travellers' guide in this life, and, in the other, escorts souls to Hades - and sometimes brings them back (Hermes πομπαῖος, καταιβάτης, Ψυχοπομπός). He leads the dance of the *Charites*, brings in the four seasons in their turn, attends the change from waking to sleep and sleep to waking, from life to death, from one world to another. He is the link, the mediator between mortals and the gods, both those of the world above and those of the underworld.] The Albani villa bust of him (13) bears the inscription: 'coeli terraeque meator'; and Electra addresses him in these words:

'Herald (κῆρυξ) supreme between the world above and the world below, Oh nether Hermes, come to my aid and summon me the spirits beneath the earth to attend my prayers.'

(14) But though he may mingle with humanity, Hermes remains both elusive and ubiquitous. He makes an abrupt appearance where least expected, only to disappear again immediately. When there was a sudden pause in the conversation and silence reigned, the Greeks used to say: 'Hermes is passing.' (15) He wears the helmet of Hades which grants the wearer invisibility, and winged sandals that abolish distance. He carries a magic wand that transforms all he touches. He is the unpredictable, the uncontrollable. He is also chance, good or bad luck, the unexpected meeting. In Greek a godsend is τὸ ἔρμαιον.

Through this profusion of epithets, this variety of attributes, Hermes appears as an extraordinarily complex figure. He has been thought so baffling that it has been suggested that in the beginning there must have been several different Hermes gods which later merged into one.

(16) The various characteristics that are combined in the general makeup of the god seem, however, to fall into order more easily if he is considered in the light of his relations with Hestia. If they form a couple, in the religious beliefs of the Greeks, it is because the two deities belong to the same plane, their action applies to the same field of reality, and their functions are inter-related. Now, as regards Hestia, no doubt is possible: her significance is obvious, her role is strictly defined. Because her fate is to reign, forever immobile, at the centre of the domestic sphere, Hestia implies, as her complement and her contrast, the swift-footed god who rules the realms of the traveller. To Hestia belongs the world of the interior, the enclosed, the stable, the retreat of the human group within itself; to Hermes, the outside world, opportunity, movement, interchange with others. It could be said that, by virtue of their polarity, the Hermes-Hestia couple represents the tension which is so marked in the archaic conception of space: space requires a centre, a nodal point, with a special value, from which all directions, all different qualitatively, may be channelled and defined; yet at the same time space appears as the medium of movement implying the possibility of transition and passage from any point to another.

Obviously, by interpreting the Hermes-Hestia relationship in terms of these concepts, we distort them. The Greeks who worshipped these deities never saw them as symbols of space and movement. The construction/structuring of a pantheon was ruled by a logic which is not in accordance with our criteria. Religious thought obeys

its own rules of classification. It defines and classifies phenomena by distinguishing between different types of agent, by comparing and contrasting various kinds of activity. In this system space and movement are not yet interpreted in the form of abstract ideas. They remain implicit in that they are incorporated in more material and more dynamic aspects of reality. If Hestia is apparently capable of 'centring' space while Hermes can 'mobilize' it, it is because as divine powers they are the patrons of a series of activities undoubtedly dealing with the organization of earth and space, and even constituting, in terms of praxis, the framework within which, for the Ancient Greeks, the experience of space took place - but which nevertheless covers a very much wider field than that implied when we talk of space and movement.

The relationship of the Greek Hestia to the Roman Vesta has given rise to many a controversy. (17) In Greece there was no persona or function comparable to the Vestal virgins. It is, however, difficult not to believe that, in the beginning, the tending and care of the Mycenaean hearth, and in particular the royal hearth, was a sacred office performed by women and that this duty fell on the daughter of the house prior to her marriage. (18) Louis Deroy has even argued that the word *parthenos* (virgin) is a functional designation denoting she who tends the fire. (19) Whether that is true or not, if fire as such (the sacrificial fire as much as that of the forge or the cooking fire) is related to Hephaestus, a male god, the round altar of the domestic hearth is, on the contrary, associated with a female deity and a virginal one. The usual explanation in terms of the purity of fire is not satisfactory. For one thing, Hestia is not fire but the altar-hearth; and for another, Hephaestus, who is precisely the incarnation of this power of fire, is anything but 'pure'. (20) In order to interpret these facts, therefore, it would be better to go back to the Homeric 'Hymn to Aphrodite' and the short passage concerning Hestia which is moreover sufficiently explicit. (21) The hymn exalts Aphrodite's supremacy: nothing can withstand her, neither beasts nor men nor gods. But the goddess's prerogative is not the brutal domination, the physical coercion appropriate to the warrior deities. Her weapons, even more successful, are those of tenderness and charm. No creature, in the heavens, on earth, or in the sea, can escape the magic powers of the forces she mobilizes in her service: Πειθῶ, persuasion, Ἀνάτη, alluring charm, Φιλότης, the bonds of love. In all the universe there are only three goddesses able to withstand her magic arts:

Athena, Artemis, and Hestia. Unshakeable in their determination to remain virgins, they oppose Cytherea with hearts so staunch and such high resolution that neither the wiles of Πειθώ nor the fascinations of Ἀνάτη succeed in changing their sentiments or altering their status. This fixity of purpose, this obstinacy in refusing to change, is particularly emphasized in the hymn with regard to Hestia. Wooed by Poseidon and Apollo, who both desire her, Hestia firmly (στερεῶς) rejects their suit, and to make this refusal irrevocable she takes the grand oath of the gods - 'that which can never be retracted' - and vows to remain an eternal virgin. There can be no doubt that Hestia's function as goddess of the hearth is related to the permanency of her virginal status: the text specifies that Zeus gives her the right to take up her residence at the centre of the house in compensation for the nuptials she has renounced forever (ἀντι γάμοιο). For Hestia, the wedded state would be the negation of the values that she represents at the heart of the house (house, οἶκος, signifying both the dwelling place and the human group inhabiting it): values of fixity, permanence, seclusion. Does not marriage, after all, imply a twofold transformation of the young girl - of herself as a person and of her social status? On the one hand it is a form of initiation by which she accedes to a new status, to a different world of human and religious realities, (22) and on the other it uproots her from the domestic milieu to which she belonged. Once she is established at her husband's hearth she becomes part of another house. (23) More generally speaking, the union of the sexes is a contract and of all contracts the one that involves the two greatest natural opposites - the male and the female. In this connection, one of the essential aspects of Greek *charis* should be emphasized: *charis* is the divine power that is manifest in all aspects of gift-giving and reciprocity (the round of generous liberality, the cordial exchange of gifts), which, in spite of all divisions, spins a web of reciprocal obligations, (24) and one of the oldest of all of the functions of *charis* is the giving of herself by a woman to a man. (25) Thus it is not surprising that Hermes, who is closely linked with the *charites* (Hermes χαριδότης) should also play a part in the union of the sexes and should appear side-by-side with Aphrodite as the true patron of Πειθώ, of the persuasive arts capable of shaking the most fixed resolves, of changing the most confirmed opinions. (26)

But the analysis can go deeper. [In Greek the domestic sphere, the enclosed space that is roofed over (protected), has a feminine connotation; the exterior, the open air, a

masculine one. The woman's domain is the house. That is her place and as a rule she should not leave it. (27) In contrast, in the *oikos*, the man represents the centrifugal element. It is for him to leave the reassuring enclosure of the home, to confront the fatigues and dangers of the outside world, to brave the unknown; for him to establish contacts with the outside, to enter into negotiations with strangers. Whether engaged in work, war, trade, social contacts, or public life, be he in the country or in the *agora*, on sea or on land, man's activities carry him into the great outside.] Xenophon is merely expressing the common belief when, after contrasting mankind with the beasts as needing a roof over their heads instead of living in the open - ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ - he adds that the gods have endowed men and women with opposite characters. Body and soul, man is made for the ἔργα ὑπαίθρια, τὰ ἔξω ἔργα, the open-air life and outside activities, the woman, for the indoor life, τὰ ἐνδον. And so 'to the woman it is more honourable to stay indoors than to go out into the fields, but to the man it is unseemly to stay indoors rather than to attend to the work outside.' (28)

There is, nevertheless, one instance when this orientation of the man towards the exterior and the woman towards the interior is reversed. In marriage, in contrast to all other social activities, it is the woman who is the mobile social element, whose movement creates the link among different family groups, whereas the man remains tied to his own hearth and home. The ambiguity of the female status lies thus in the fact that the daughter of the house (more closely linked to the domestic sphere by virtue of her femininity than is a son) can nevertheless not fulfil herself as a woman in marriage without renouncing the hearth of which she is in charge. The contradiction is reconciled in the sphere of religious representation by the image of a deity who personifies those aspects of feminine nature that are permanent, while remaining, through her virginal status, a stranger to the element of mobility. [This 'permanence' of Hestia's is not only of a spatial kind. As she bestows on the house the centre that sets it in space, so Hestia ensures to the domestic group its continued existence in time. It is through Hestia that the family line is perpetuated and remains constant, as though in each new generation the legitimate offspring of the household were born directly from 'the hearth'.] Through the goddess of the hearth, the function of fertility, dissociated from sexual relations (which, in an exogamous system, postulate relations between different families), can appear as an indefinite

prolongation of the paternal line through the daughter, without a 'foreign' woman being necessary for procreation.

This dream of a purely paternal heredity never ceased to haunt the Greek imagination. It is openly expressed in the tragedy, 'The Eumenides', when Apollo proclaims that maternal blood can never run in the veins of the son, seeing that 'the mother of what is called her child is not its begetter; the begetter is the man, he who plants the seed, whereas she (ἔκτω ἔκνη) doth but preserve the sprout as a stranger would tend a stranger.' (29) It is this dream that doctors and philosophers disguise as scientific theory when they uphold, as Aristotle did for instance, that in procreation the female emits no seed, that her role is entirely passive, that the active regenerating function is exclusively male. (30) It is the same dream which is discernible in the royal myths in which the newborn child is compared to an ember from the paternal hearth. The stories of Meleager, of Demophoon, (31) recall the Latin legends - mostly Greek in origin - in which the king's son is born from a brand or spark leaping from the fire into the lap of the virgin tending the hearth. (32) The ritual appellation of the hearth-child (which, in the historic age, designated the city's representative to the deities of Eleusis) has very much the meaning and significance accorded it by Gernet when he specifically emphasized the close relationship which in Greece links the hearth and the child: the ἡαῖς ἄφ' ἐστίας represents, in its true sense, the child 'issue of the hearth'. (33) And, as we shall see, it is in this context that the ritual of the *mphidromia* should be understood, whereby the newborn child, seven days after birth, is attached to its father's hearth.

Hestia thus incarnates, pushed to its limits, the tendency of the *oikos* towards self-isolation, withdrawal, as though the ideal for the family should be complete self-sufficiency: total self-sufficiency economically, (34) strict endogamy in marriage. This ideal does not conform with Greek reality. But it is nevertheless present in family institutions and the forms they take to ensure their continued existence - it is one of the axes round which the domestic life of ancient Greece was organized.

In Sophocles's 'Electra' there is an example which allows us to judge the magnitude and the limits of this tendency of the *oikos* towards introversion. This is the dream which reveals to Clytemnestra the imminent return of Orestes, the son she has attempted to dispose of after the murder of her husband Agamemnon, killed with the help of her lover Aegisthus. Once the lawful king is dead, Aegisthus shares the throne with his wife the queen. (35)

He receives from his wife the sceptre which Agamemnon inherited from his forefathers, and the libations that the new king pours out for Hestia in the palace hall are in fact to honour an alien hearth. (36) In relation to the royal hearth of Mycenae, therefore, Aegisthus is in the same position as the woman normally is in the *oikos* of her husband. And this inversion of the social status of the spouses corresponds, in the tragedy, to a similar inversion of their relations and their psychological characteristics. In the Aegisthus-Clytemnestra couple Clytemnestra is the man, and Aegisthus, the woman. (37) All the great tragic writers agree in depicting Aegisthus as effeminate, cowardly, a voluptuary, and a womanizer, succeeding through women, and whose prowess is confined solely to that field of battle ruled by Aphrodite. (38) Clytemnestra, on the other hand, lays claim to the qualities and dangers of an entirely masculine nature. (39) Deliberate, authoritative, bold, born to command, she rejects with disdain all the frailties of her sex. It is made very clear that she reverts to womanhood only when in bed. In her decision to murder Agamemnon the legitimate grievances she could invoke against her husband weighed less than her refusal to accept masculine domination, her determination to take the place of the man in the home. (40) And this is the dream the queen has:

She beheld Agamemnon in bodily presence standing by her side, revisiting the light of day. He took the sceptre of Aegisthus, once his own, and at the household altar planted it, and from it sprang and spread a fruitful bough till it o'ershadowed all Mycenae's land. (41)

The sexual symbolism (Agamemnon planting the seed of the young shoot in Hestia's bosom where it will sprout) is inseparable, in this instance, from the social symbolism. The σκῆπτρον is a kind of mobile representation of sovereignty. Zeus transmitted it, through Hermes, to the Atrides. The king himself entrusts it to his herald and his ambassadors. In the assembly of the elders the sceptre passes from hand to hand, conferring on each orator in turn the authority and respect he requires in order to speak. The sceptre's royal quality could not be maintained intact through such delegations and transfers if at the same time it did not appear to be firmly rooted in the hearth. Corresponding with the staff (the ῥάβδος, the κηρύκειον) which Hermes brandishes or waves is the symbol which in all representations is placed in Hestia's hand as her ritual attribute, the σκῆπτρον in its true meaning. (42) But Aegisthus did not receive the sceptre, ἄφ' ἐστίας. It was transmitted to him obliquely

through a woman, herself a stranger to the house of the Atrides, and moreover in a feminine way - in and by way of the bed. By re-establishing it in the hearth Agamemnon wrenches it from the usurpers and returns it to his own descendants, who alone are truly implanted in Mycenaean soil. Analogous to the burning brand of the Latin legends, the staff set in the hearth symbolizes that royal seed, σπέρμα, placed earlier by Agamemnon in Clytemnestra's womb where it grows. (43) It is Orestes, the child become man, hated and feared by his mother because in him the father finds his avenger and his perpetuation. The dream could not denote more clearly that, beyond the person of Clytemnestra, Agamemnon in fact begot Orestes in his own hearth, the hearth which itself roots the royal house to the soil of Mycenae. In the same way as in her wifely role she should always have effaced herself before her husband, (44) so, as a mother, Clytemnestra should have effaced herself before Hestia, her own role being confined to cherishing, as a stranger would, the human seedling entrusted to her safekeeping by her husband. On the contrary, by asserting her masculine determination, the queen aspires to displace the male in all spheres. She lays claim to the active function in the government of the state, in marriage, in procreation, in all her relationships, just as she assumes it, sword in hand, in the carrying out of a crime in which she leaves to her confederate the female role of instigation, complicity, and cunning. (45) Clytemnestra has mounted the throne in Agamemnon's place. (46) She has taken over the sceptre and the power. She has summoned to the house of the Atrides, which henceforth she proclaims her own, (47) the bedfellow (48) she has decided to make a husband. She asserts that, in begetting, the woman's role prevails over that of the man. (49) She denies those children she has had by Agamemnon and who belong to the paternal line. As for those she has had by Aegisthus, that οἰκουρός, (50) that 'domesticated man' who preferred to stay with the women at home rather than set off with the men to war, Clytemnestra wants them; she makes them so completely hers that they take their name from their mother instead of from their father. In Euripides's tragedy, Electra, confronting the corpse of Aegisthus, denounces the 'inverted' relationship of Agamemnon's murderers in these words: 'And through all Argos the people called the man by the woman's name, and not the wife by her husband's name. Yet shame is this when foremost in the home is wife, not husband. I hold in horror the sons whom the city calls not by their father's name, but by their mother's.' (51)

It is Hestia who expresses herself through Electra.

Agamemnon's daughter represents the paternal household from which she, like her brother, has been cast out and which she wishes to restore with him, by expelling the intruders who have established themselves there. But, in her relations with Orestes, Electra is not only the sister so closely linked to the brother that their two lives merge in a single soul; (52) she is also the mother - in truth the only mother of Orestes. As a child she cherished, protected, and safeguarded him: 'For thou wast ne'er thy mother's babe, but mine, thou hadst no nurse in all the house but me. It was I, your sister, who fed you, and 'it was always me you called for.' (53) As he grows up, she urges him to take vengeance, she supports and guides him in carrying out the double murder which makes them the 'saviours of the father's hearth'. (54) At the side of her young brother, taking the place of the mother whose dominating and vigorous character she has inherited, (55) Electra is a double to Clytemnestra and at the same time stands in opposition to her. As a virgin (Ἥλέκτρα can be associated with ἄλεκτρα, without wedlock, (56) and Euripides's Electra remains chaste even in marriage), she wishes to be all the more pure in contrast to the sensuality and licentiousness she imagines in her mother. (57) She loves her father as forcefully as Clytemnestra hates her husband. (58) Of these two equally manly women, one of them has embraced the formula of Athena, a goddess who, like Hestia, is dedicated to virginity: 'With all my soul I am for the male, in all things, save wedlock.' (59) The other, in contrast, the 'polyandrous woman', (60) the 'female killer of men', (61) is against man in all his aspects; she wants him only as a bedfellow. Both, for inverse reasons, are outside the domain of marriage: one does not enter its orbit, the other goes beyond it. If the first, Electra, unreservedly takes the part of the father, it is in accordance with the fact that, being attached to the home, she refuses the conjugal relationship, and recognizes no progeniture of her own; it is her brother in whom the paternal line is perpetuated, and who takes the place, for her, simultaneously of son, father, and husband. If the second of these two women, Clytemnestra, declares herself unreservedly on the side of the mother, it is in so far as she rejects the wifely status. She disowns the children who remind her of the home of the spouse and the subjection of the woman to the husband. Like the Erinyes, who defend her cause at the level of the divine powers, she scorns marital ties. (62) In the blood-ties that she upholds against them and that she prefers to them, she wishes to retain only those which connect the child with

the womb that bore it, the breast that nourished it. For her, the man of the couple is restricted to the role of sexual partner. He is no longer the husband who leads his wife to his domestic altar nor the progenitor of her children. He enacts, for his wife, the role which is normally assumed by the concubine in regard to a man - that of a bedfellow. (63)

It is rather a platitude these days to point out that, in the Greek theatre, the story of Orestes expresses in the form of tragedy the conflicts that disrupt family life, particularly those which set man and woman against each other within the home: the conflicts between man and wife, son and mother, the paternal and the maternal lines. But in insisting so strongly on the antagonism between Electra and Clytemnestra, who are alike in so many ways, the tragedies also emphasize the contradictions which divide a woman against herself and the oppositions within her social and psychological status. Being deities, Hestia, Aphrodite, and Hera can personify a single facet of feminine reality to the exclusion of all others. But this 'purity' is impossible for human beings. Every woman who is mortal has to take on the totality of the female state with all its tensions, ambiguities, and conflicts. In wishing to be fully associated with Hestia or completely against her, Electra and Clytemnestra present a split picture of woman, deformed and contradictory. They destroy their femininity and emerge, both of them, as equally manly. By associating herself with the home in which she was born, Electra ends by identifying herself with the men of her paternal lineage. By the seizure of her husband's home in order to found her own maternal line, Clytemnestra makes herself a man. As against Electra, she is right in accepting the sexual union (woman and man being complementary), in forsaking the house of her father, and adopting that of her husband (the function of mobility of the woman). On the other hand, Electra is right in focusing the whole life of the couple around the husband's hearth (the 'patrilocal' nature of marriage, the submission of the spouse to the husband, the domestic vocation of the woman). Electra is not wrong when she associates the child with the paternal line (the precedence of the masculine line); Clytemnestra is telling the truth when she proclaims that the child is of the blood of the mother (the rules prohibiting incest, stricter on the maternal side). (64) They both make the mistake of disavowing one aspect of consanguinity (the bilateral nature of affiliation among the Greeks).

In a masculine society such as that of Greece the woman

is normally regarded from the man's point of view. And from this standpoint she fulfils, through marriage, two major social functions between which there is a divergence if not complete polarity. In its oldest form (and among the nobility to whose circles epic poetry introduces us), marriage is a formalized transaction between family groups and the woman is one element of the exchange. Her role is to seal the alliance between opposing groups. Like a ransom, she may be the means of bringing a vendetta to an end. (65) Among the gifts exchanged as a normal accompaniment to the marriage and which set the seal on the new agreement there is one of particular value because it is explicitly given in exchange for the woman, and is in fact the price paid for her. This is the *ἐδνα*, a very valuable commodity of a very definite type: prize animals from the flocks and herds, especially male cattle, of great prestige value, and for which exaggerated claims of size and number are made. By this marriage practice of purchase the woman becomes one of the commodities of the exchange. Being mobile in the same way as other commodities, she is similarly the medium for gifts, exchanges, and abduction. (66) In contrast, the man who welcomes the spouse to his house (it is *συνοικεῖν*, cohabiting with the husband, which defines the state of marriage for the wife) represents the landed property of the *oikos*, the *πατρῷα*, generally inalienable, which through the rise and fall of succeeding generations maintains the bonds between the family line and its native soil. This idea of a symbiosis, or, even better, of a communion between a plot of earth and the human group that cultivates it, exists not only in religious thought (witness the myths of autochthony: men asserting they are the 'sons of the soil' they inhabit) and in the rites of sacred ploughing (which we shall have occasion to consider later on). It is also evident, with remarkable persistency, in the city institutions. As the term *oikos* has both a family and a territorial meaning, it is easy to understand the undercurrents that, in a fully mercantile economy, hamper transactions of purchase and sale in the case of family landed property (*κληρος*). Equally comprehensible is the refusal to grant strangers the right to own land belonging to 'the city' because this is the privilege and right of the 'native' citizen.

Marriage, however, does not consist solely in this form of commerce between families. It also allows men of a particular lineage to found a family and so ensure the continued survival of their house. From this further standpoint the Greeks viewed marriage as a form of ploughing the soil (*ἄροτος*), the woman symbolizing the furrow

(ἄρουρα), and the man the ploughman (ἀροτήρ). This imagery, almost obligatory for the tragic poets, (67) but employed also by the prose writers, (68) is something much more than a mere literary device. It is in line with the declaration of the plighting of troths in the stereotypical style made familiar by the comedies. The father, or in his absence the κύριος who is authorized to arrange the daughter's marriage, pronounces as the pledge of betrothal (ἐγγύη): 'I bestow this girl in order that ploughing should bring forth legitimate children.' (69) Plutarch, referring to the existence in Athens of three ceremonies of sacred ploughing (ἱεροὶ ἄροτοι), remarks: 'But most sacred of all sowings is the marital sowing and ploughing (γαμήλιος ἄροτος) for the procreation of children.' (70)

The woman, who at one moment figures as an element of commerce, equivalent as movable property to the wealth of flocks, is now identified, in her procreative function, with a field. Paradoxically, however, she personifies not her native soil but that of her husband. This must be, for otherwise the sons, issue of the ploughed furrow, would not have the religious qualifications to take over the paternal property and work the land productively. Through Clytemnestra, but also in opposition to Clytemnestra, the 'stranger', it is the land of Mycenae which fosters the germination and growth of the tree that casts its shadow over all the land of the house of the Atrides, marking its boundaries in the process. This shadow (σκιά) projected by the royal scion, born of the hearth, rooted at the centre of the domain, possesses beneficent properties. It protects the land of Mycenae. It transforms it into a domestic enclosure, a place of security where each feels at home, protected from want, in a climate of family friendship. (71) Handed down from father to son, the *sacra*, privilege of royal houses or of certain noble *gene*, ensure simultaneously the defence of the land against dangers from outside, internal peace with justice, and the fertility of the soil and flocks. Should a prince be unworthy or illegitimate, the land, the flocks, and the women will be barren, and war and dissension will be rife. But if the rightful king acts according to the rules and upholds justice, then his people will flourish in boundless prosperity: 'The earth bears them victual in plenty, and the oak bears acorns upon the top and bees in the midst; his woolly sheep are laden with fleeces; his women bear children like their father.' (72) It seems legitimate to believe that the practice of sacred ploughing which was still the custom right up to historical times, and which, in the city, was carried out by such priestly families as the Bouzygai, was an extension of

ancient royal rites designed not only to introduce and regulate the agricultural calendar but also to promote, through the act of tilling, the marriage of the king to his land, as in earlier times Jason was joined to Demeter on thrice-ploughed fallow land. (73)

The need for the husband to summon a 'strange wife to his home', there to personify the family land where his children will grow seems less paradoxical if a further aspect of Hestia is considered. In the words of the Homeric hymn: 'For without you (Hestia), mortals hold no banquet + where one does not duly pour sweet wine in offering to Hestia both first and last.' (74) It is therefore Hestia's prerogative (τιμή) to preside over repasts which, beginning and closing with an invocation to the goddess, form a cycle enclosed within time as the *oikos* forms an enclosed circle in space. Having been cooked on the altar of the domestic hearth, the food engenders a religious fellowship among the table companions. It creates a kind of common identity among them. From Aristotle we know the epithet used by Epimenides of Crete for members of the *oikos*. He called them *δύοκαμοι*, (75) that is, those who eat at the same table, or, according to another reading, those who inhale the same smoke, *δύοκαμνοι*. By virtue of the hearth the table companions become 'brothers' as if of the same blood. Thus the expression 'to sacrifice to Hestia' has the same meaning as our proverb that charity begins at home. We are told that when the ancients sacrificed to Hestia no portion of the offering was given to anyone. The household shared their collective repast in privacy and no stranger was allowed to participate. (76) Under the sign of the goddess the family circle shuts itself in, the domestic group strengthens its ties and asserts its unity in consuming food forbidden to the stranger.

But there is a counterpart to this. [The verb *ἐστιάω* - in both of its generally accepted meanings: receiving in the home and accepting at the table - is usually applied to the guest who is being feasted in the house. The hearth, the meal, the food, also have the property of opening the domestic circle to those who are not members of the family, of enrolling them in the family community. The suppliant, hounded from his home and wandering abroad, crouches at the hearth when he seeks to enter a new group in order to recover the social and religious roots he has lost. (77) And the stranger must be led to the hearth, received, and feasted there, for there can be neither contact nor exchange with those who have not first been integrated within the domestic space.] Pindar wrote that at the ever-spread tables of sanctuaries where Hestia was the

patron goddess, the justice of Zeus *Xenios* was respected. (78) Relations with strangers, ξένος, are thus the province of Hestia as much when receiving a guest in the home as when returning to one's own house after a journey or an embassy abroad. [In both cases contact with the hearth assumes the value of deconsecration and reintegration within the family space. (79) The centre symbolized by Hestia defines, therefore, not only a closed and isolated world: it presupposes, as a corollary, other analogous centres.] By exchange of goods, movement of people - women, heralds, ambassadors, guests, and table companions - a network of 'alliances' is built up among domestic groups. Thus, without being part of the family line of descent, an outside element can become, in more or less permanent fashion, joined to and integrated within a household other than its own. This is the way in which the 'stranger' wife enters her husband's *oikos* through the ritual of the *καταχύσματα* and becomes part of his home. And for as long as she dwells in her husband's house, she can by virtue of her procreative powers assume that attribute of permanency, continuity, and attachment to the soil which is personified by Hestia. (80)

Each stage of this analysis has shown the polarity which exists between the static and the mobile, the open and the enclosed, the interior and the exterior: a polarity which is evident not only in the interplay of domestic institutions (division of labour, marriage, consanguinity, meals) but is present even in the nature of man and woman. It is also present among the heavenly powers in the structure of the pantheon. For neither Hermes nor Hestia can, in fact, be viewed in isolation. They fulfil their functions as a couple: the existence of the one implies that of the other. Each is a necessary counterpart to the other. Furthermore, this very complementarity which is an attribute of the two deities implies that there is a contradiction or internal tension in each of them that gives their characters as gods a basic ambiguity.

As has been shown, Hestia, in her chastity, remains outside those sexual relations which are the sphere of the wife or concubine, within the household. But, in order to fulfil her function of permanence in time, the virgin goddess must also be seen as a mother. It will be remembered, in this connection, that Euripides in associating Gaia and Hestia, uses the expression: Γαῖα-Μῆτηρ, earth-mother. (81) Hestia thus finds herself represented in the paternal line of descent both as woman in her role as virgin daughter and also as woman in her procreative capacity, as the potential giver of life. Porphyry stresses

this polarity, pointing to the existence of not one but two images of Hestia. On the one hand there is the model virgin (παρθενικόν), but on the other, in that Hestia is the power of fertility (γόνιμος), there is also the model of the matron with protuberant breasts (γυναικὸς προβάσπου). (82) There is only one institution where these two aspects, normally separated in human practice, find themselves in harmony and that is in the *epikleros*. At first sight this custom of *epikleros* in the Greek family system seems a complete anomaly. It is, in fact, an exceptional case and particularly valuable in that, momentarily upsetting the usual balance, it reveals, in its purest state, one of the trends of domestic organization: the very one we have detected in the figure of the goddess of the hearth.

The best way to define the institution of the *epikleros* is by reference to the definition in the laws of the Manu concerning the equivalent Indian practice. (83)

He who is without a son may instruct his daughter to provide him with one by marrying her in such a way and according to a convention such that the child she gives birth to will become his own and perform the funeral ceremony for him. The day the girl married in this way gives birth to a son, the maternal grandfather becomes the father of the child. (84)

In Greece, as in India, it means in practice that the daughter of a man without male descendants gives her father the son he lacks and who alone has the right qualifications to inherit the paternal *kleros*. The daughter is termed '*epikleros*' in that she belongs to her father's *kleros* and is joined to him (in Sparta and Crete she is called *patrouchos*, πατροῦχος). On the death of her father, and, in accordance with a carefully regulated preferential order of marriage, the *epikleros* must be married to that male member of her family who, being closest in kinship to the deceased father, is designated to represent him: first, the father's own brothers (the girl's paternal uncles), then their sons (the girl's first cousins), then the brothers of the girl's paternal grandfather (her paternal great-uncles), or one of their children (her first cousins once removed); failing these, the sons of the father's sisters, or, in the last resort, the sons of the paternal grandfather's sisters. (85) The successional aspect of the practice, very strongly marked in the classical period, should not deceive us. The custom of *epikleros* establishes clearly, in the absence of any direct male heir, which kinsman should inherit, with the daughter, the estate associated with her. But it is far less a matter of transmitting property to a collateral

than of preserving through the daughter the continuing existence of a 'hearth'. From this point of view the marriage of a blood-relation with the *epikleros* appears not as a priority right to an inheritance but as a family obligation which imposes on the person concerned a real renunciation, in that the son born of this marriage will perpetuate the line not of his father but of his maternal grandfather. The term used to describe this child is θυγατρίδου: 'son of the daughter' or again 'grandson'. Immediately upon gaining his majority, the θυγατρίδου has the right to take full possession of the κλῆρος of his maternal grandfather. Neither his father nor even his mother was really its owner. They were simply intermediaries with the duty to ensure that it was handed down from the grandfather to the grandson.

Brief though they are, these indications are enough to situate the place and role of the various protagonists of the institution of the *epikleros*. Contrary to the usual rules, the daughter remains, after marriage, attached to the paternal hearth. It could even be said she is identified with it. It is literally 'in her' that her father's line is continued by a new male. The man chosen to beget a child in this home is he who in his close kinship is most intimately associated with the father and who becomes, in performing his marital duties, the father's substitute. The child born of a marriage which joins him directly to his maternal forefather becomes as much the brother as the son of she who gave him birth. (86) In the institution of the *epikleros* the whole system of matrimonial relations is recast according to an inverted pattern. It is now the woman who represents the stable factor and the man who is the element of mobility. The wife is no longer the stranger who is brought into the home of the husband so that, eclipsing herself for the benefit of the domestic Hestia and assuming her attributes, she will, without disturbing the continuity of the line, give birth to sons who truly 'resemble the father'. In this instance the wife, as the daughter of the house, is the paternal home. And so, this time, it is the husband who must integrate himself within the *oikos* of his wife. It is for him to stand aside in favour of the father he represents and in this way the daughter can beget a child resembling its real father - that is, its maternal grandfather. Instead of the line of descent continuing as it usually does from father to son, *per viros*, through the medium of a stranger who by her cohabitation, her συνοίκησις, is attached to the home, the line is perpetuated *per feminas*, from mother to son, through the medium of the closest male relative whose blood affinity, his συγγενίς, joins him to the father.

The *epikleros* is not, therefore, an anomaly. It does not exist on the fringe of the matrimonial system. On the contrary, it is coupled with ordinary marriage and forms with it a whole which contains two opposite and symmetrical solutions to the same problem. It is always a question of ensuring the continuity of a line of descent, the survival of a home which must, through the ages, remain true to itself. And this is achieved in a marriage that, by joining a man and a woman, also unites one household with another while at the same time preserving their two very separate hearths. In the case of the *epikleros*, the daughter of the house personifies, even in marriage, the paternal hearth. And thus, in the person of the *epikleros*, the two aspects of Hestia that are normally dissociated among mortals are brought together: the virgin daughter of the father, and the woman as potential giver of life. But it should be noted at once that the *epikleros* is the outcome of quite exceptional circumstances which justify the reversal of the ordinary rules of marriage. It requires that both father and son, who in the normal run of things constitute the continuity of the family line, should be absent. It is due to the lack of males - the links in the chain of descent - that the daughter acquires the procreative capacity to give birth to a child capable of carrying on the paternal line. And even then, in order for her to be able to continue her father's line, a kinsman of the father must be joined to her in a marriage which effects in a lawful, because symbolic, form the forbidden union of father and daughter which ideally seems the best way to safeguard the purity of the domestic hearth from generation to generation. But the price paid for the gain in consistency, from the point of view of Hestia's relations with the young woman, her representative, is a further and fundamental contradiction. In order to give a son to a man without one - that is, to conform to the principle of descent *per viros* - the inverse principle of female consanguinity has to be exceptionally invoked and the son of the *epikleros*, the θυγατρίδου, is attached not to his father but to his mother.

And thus in Greek social thought, confronting the image of the male as the sole agent in the act of procreation, the no less powerful image of the woman takes shape as the true source of life nourishing the fruitfulness of the 'house'. Depending on the circumstances, the hearth goddess is able to justify either one of these two contradictory images. It would seem that Hestia's particular function is to set the seal on the 'incommunicability' of different hearths. Rooted as they are in a specific

spot, they can never mix but remain 'pure' even in the union of the sexes and in family alliances. In ordinary marriages the purity of the hearth is ensured by the integration of the wife in the household of her husband.

(Hestia being a virgin, the woman personifies her own hearth only while she remains a virgin. In marriage and procreation she no longer represents it. One might say she is 'neutralized'. She plays no definite part and is purely passive. The man alone is active.) In the *epikleros*, in contrast, the purity of the hearth as symbolized by the daughter seems even better protected in that the husband is less concerned in the act of procreation. Taking it to extremes, the daughter could be considered the only true generating force and the child treated as though it belonged solely to the mother. (87)

[This 'maternal' aspect of Hestia strengthens the analogy, already referred to, between the circular hearth and the *omphalos*, that other symbolic object also circular in shape and centrally situated. In some cases Hestia is pictured seated not on a domestic hearth but on an *omphalos* (88) and we know that the *omphalos* of Delphi was supposed to be Hestia's seat. (89) In historic times the altar of the communal hearth of Hestia *koine*, set in the centre of the town, was called the *omphalos* of the city. (90)]

[The *omphalos* is a protuberance in the ground or an ovoid stone which is associated with the earth and is occasionally styled *ge*, and it represents at one and the same time a central point, a tomb, and a storehouse of souls and of life.] Marie Delcourt has particularly studied the latter aspect. (91) She notes that the word 'umbilicus' and the protuberant form of the *omphalos* evoke the two cases in which the navel, instead of being in a hollow, protrudes: that is, the umbilicus of a woman in the later stages of her pregnancy and that of the newborn child, which recedes only after several days. Furthermore, the *omphalos* denotes, besides the navel, the umbilical cord which joins the child to its mother as the stem connects the plant to the earth which has nourished it. It is easy to see why the Greek physicians saw the *omphalos* as a root, the root of the abdomen, and why Philolaos, the fifth-century Pythagorean, made it the basis of his theory of the rootedness (*ρίζωσις*) (92) of man: each generation rooted in the previous one and the human descendants rooted in the soil of the paternal house. As Artemidorus writes in his 'Interpretations of Dreams':

The *omphalos* symbolizes the parents for as long as they live, or the mother country in which each was born as

he was born of the umbilicus. To dream of a mishap to the navel means one will be deprived of one's parents or country, and for he who is on foreign soil, ἐπὶ ξένῃς, that he will never return home. (93)

As a corollary, the circular altar of the hearth, the symbol of the enclosed space of the house, can evoke the female abdomen, the source of life and children. Artemidorus writes: 'The hearth signifies life and the wife of he who dreams,' (94) and later: 'To light a fire which burns brightly in the hearth or in the oven signifies the begetting of children, for the hearth and oven are like a woman ... and fire in them foretells that the woman will become pregnant.' (95) [The religious significance of certain geometrical forms should be noted in this connection. Like the *omphalos*, and in contrast to the quadrangular Hermes (Hermes τετραγώνος), (96) Hestia's hearth is round. There is every reason to believe that, in Greece, the circle was characteristic of powers both chthonic and feminine associated with the image of the earth-mother containing within her bosom the dead, the successive generations of mankind and plant life. (97) During the city period and the establishment of the communal hearth in the prytaneum, Hestia was associated with a building in the shape of a *rotunda*, the *tholos*, the sole example of the circular form in Greek religious architecture, and recalling the *aedes vestae* and the *mundus* of the Romans. (98)] For a long time it was believed that the communal Hestia was situated in the *tholos*, but it is now known that this was not always so. The prytaneum and the *tholos* could be distinct from each other. But, as Gernet points out, one should not exaggerate the significance of this point. (99) At Delphi the communal hearth was situated within the *tholos* of Marmaria. At Mantinea, according to Pausanias, the Hestia *koine* was to be found in a *rotunda* which also contained the tomb of a heroine. (100) At Olympia, at Sicyon, the prytaneum was composed of several buildings and those sheltering Hestia may well have been circular. Furthermore it would seem that the very name of the *tholos* at Athens, as at Sparta, emphasizes the affinity between this type of circular edifice and the religious symbolism of Hestia herself. In both these cities the *tholos* is called the *skias*, a term which sometimes evokes the σκιάδες (huts built of branches and leaves in the form of a tent, erected by the Spartans on the occasion of the *carneia*), and at other times the σκίπον, the large parasol (σκιάδειον) which the Athenians carried at the feast of the *skiophories*. In any case, the epithet binds the *tholos* to that sphere of shadow and obscurity which, in contrast to outside space,

characterizes the various forms of the protected enclosure, the interior: the underground world, the domestic space, the female abdomen.

It has been seen how the child that Agamemnon implanted in his hearth at the centre of the kingdom overshadowed, as it grew, all the land of Mycenae, or, in other words, extended to the farthest limits of the territory the protective shadow which makes the house a covered shelter, an intimate realm where women can feel at home. (101) In contrast to the open air, dazzling with sun and light during the day and filled with dread in the dark of night, the hearth space, shaded and feminine, implies, in the semidarkness of the fireplace, security, tranquillity, and even a certain easy softness incompatible with a state of virility. Xenophon was later to say that artisans were moral cowards and physically soft because their trade obliged them to remain indoors and live in the shade, σκιατραφεῖσθαι, next to the fire, like women. (102) In the *Phaedrus*, Plato contrasts the strong and vigorous boys brought up ἐν ἡλίῳ καθαροῦ, out in the sunlight in the stadium and palestra (connected with Hermes), with those tender shoots lacking strength whose flesh is as white as that of women because they have been nourished, ὑπὸ συμμιγεῖ σκιᾷ, in the shelter of the twilight shadows. (103)

On this point the 'Homeric Hymn to Demeter' gives us more exact detail. (104) Demeter, wandering in the countryside after fleeing from her Olympian dwelling place, has stopped not far from a well. Seated in the shade, ἐν σκιῇ, under an olive shrub, she resembles an old woman such as a king's nurse or even a housekeeper (ταμίαι) in the depths of her home. The daughters of Keleos, ruler of Eleusis, see her. They are surprised to find her there, out-of-doors and they question her: 'Why have you left the city instead of drawing near to the houses? For there, in the *shady halls* are women of just such age as you and others younger.' (105) The μέγαρον σκιάοντα evoke the expression used by Apollo, in the 'Eumenides', to define the family status of Athena: he declares that this goddess never had a mother; she was not nursed on a shaded lap (ἐν σκότοισι νηδύος). (106) Does this comparison allow us to imagine that in the interplay of mythical themes, there is an association between the image of the shadowy house symbolized by Hestia and that of the shelter of a woman's lap? A study of the semantic values of a word like θάλαμος, itself related to θόλος, would seem to indicate that there is such an association. The word denotes the quarters reserved for the women in the farthest, most secret depths of the house. (107) Strictly

forbidden to the stranger (it is an interior space) and closed by a bolted door so that even the male slaves cannot have access (it is also a female space), (108) this heart of the human dwelling place, often described as μυχός, (109) carries a chthonic implication: the θάλαμος occasionally expresses the specific idea of an underground hiding place: Danae's prison, (110) Trophonius's cavern, (111) a tomb, (112) could all be termed θάλαμος. But at the same time θάλαμος is related to marriage. It denotes sometimes the young girl's room before her wedding, (113) and sometimes the nuptial chamber, or, more explicitly, the nuptial couch, (114) and the verb θαλαμεύω signifies to lead to the bridal bed, to marry. (115) Finally, a further meaning of the word θάλαμος is that of the hiding place in the secret fastnesses of the dwelling, (116) where a woman stows her reserve stores, those domestic riches over which she, as mistress of the house, rules. Sometimes it is the wife and sometimes the daughter who is described as the keeper of the keys to this secret 'treasure'. (117) Because she is dedicated to the interior, the woman's role is to store the goods that the man, directed towards the exterior, brings home to the house. From the point of view of economic activity, the woman personifies the act of storing and the man that of acquiring. The woman arranges, stores, and distributes within the *oikos* the riches the man has won through his labours outside. The sense of this polarity between the functions of the two sexes is so strong that it is expressed by both the adulators and detractors of women and always in the same type of comparison. In Xenophon, (118) the model wife is compared to the queen bee who dwells in the hive watching over the honey collected outside and seeing that it accumulates in abundance in the cells of the honeycombs (those circular alveoli which also bear the name of θάλαμος or θαλάμη). (119) In Hesiod, in contrast to the man laboriously toiling outside to increase the earth's riches and bring the necessities of life flowing to the house, the woman is represented in the heart of the hive, as a drone who stores the riches acquired by the bee-husband not in the θάλαμος of their mutual dwelling place but directly in the depths of her own stomach: 'she remains indoors, within the shelter of the covered hives and stores in her own belly the fruits of the toil of others.' (120)

If, as in Plato's own formula, the woman 'imitates' the earth by receiving the seed which the male implants in her, the house, like earth and woman, receives and keeps in its heart the wealth the man has brought to it. The enclosure of the dwelling place is intended not only to

shelter the family group. Domestic goods are also kept there where they can be gathered together, stored, and preserved. It is thus not surprising to see the goddess, who symbolizes the interior, the centre, and fixity, directly associated with this function of the dwelling place, which inclines the life of the *oikos* in two directions. First, and in contrast to the circulation of riches under Hermes's patronage (exchange, profits, and expenditure), there is a trend towards accumulation (a tendency which in ancient times took the form of collecting food supplies in jars in the storeroom and accumulating precious objects such as ἀγάλματα locked up in the coffer of the θάλαμος; when a monetary economy was established this became capitalization). Second - and in contrast with the communal forms of social life - there is the tendency towards appropriation. Within the framework of a distributive economy, (121) each house appears to be bound up with a plot of ground. Each household is separate and differentiated and wants to have full control of the κλῆρος on which it subsists and which distinguishes it from other domestic groups.

Under the title of Hestia Tamia, the hearth-goddess assumes this joint role of the concentration of wealth and the delimitation of the family patrimonies. In the palaces of the Homeric kings, the ταμία was the thrifty housekeeper who organized the household work and watched over the provisions. (122) In city times the word ταμίης was used to describe the treasurer administering the state funds or the sacred treasures, the property of the gods. There are two confirmations of Hestia as the patron of the gathering in of riches even in a later period. The first is in Artemidorus who states that when Hestia or images of her are seen in a dream by one who is a citizen, this symbolizes 'the public revenue funds'. (123) The second, connected with a ritual of Cos alluded to in a third-century inscription, includes a significant detail. It concerns a sacrifice to Zeus Polieus with whom Hestia is closely associated in the feast. Among the cattle presented by the groups of different tribes the animal to be sacrificed is selected after a long procedure probably similar to that employed at Athens at the *dipolies*. The victim, having thus been selected, is led to the *agora*. Its price, valued in terms of money, is publicly declared by the herald (κῆρυξ). Its owner then declares that his fellow citizens should pay this amount, not to him, but to Hestia. As Gernet remarks, the value of the bullock in a monetary economy is 'capitalized' by Hestia, who is guarantian and guarantor of the wealth of the city. (124)

On the other hand, we should also stress Hestia's rela-

tionship with what this same writer calls a discretionary economy, dominated by the *suum cuique*. At Tegea the communal hearth of the Arcadians was associated with a Zeus Klerios, the apportioner (cf. κλῆρος, portion, patrimony) - an epithet which recalls the first allocation of Arcadian land divided by drawing lots between the three sons of Arcas. (125) In Athens, the first act of the archon (the magistrate who, we are told by Aristotle, (126) derives his office from the communal hearth, and who, from the earliest days, always resided in the prytaneum), (127) once he is installed, is to have proclaimed by the herald that 'all men shall hold, until the end of his office, those possessions and powers that they held before his entry into office.' (128)

Such testimony is concerned with the communal hearth, the Hestia of the city, become the centre of the state and symbol of the unity of the citizens. The better to appreciate it, we should place it in its historical perspective and relate it to what can be ascertained of a more ancient past, before the city-state, when Hestia was not yet the communal hearth but the family altar, and symbolized most specifically the superior virtues of the royal house. (129)

But there are two aspects to the wealth of the king - one could even say two opposite poles. On the one hand there are the goods that can be collected and stored in the palace: food supplies, of course, but also various types of ἀγάλματα - cloth; precious metals; *sacra* invested with power, used as symbols of authority; coats of arms; instruments of investiture. Penelope, in Odysseus's palace, goes down with her women into the depths of the θάλαμος where the master has locked up his treasures (130) of cloth placed in coffer, bronze, gold, and wrought iron, and lastly the bow which Odysseus alone can bend and which appears later in the poem as the instrument of his vengeance, the symbol and restorer of the lawful sovereignty. The word *κειμήλια* is applied to all these objects emphasizing that they are goods which are immobilized, intended to stay in place (cf. the verb *καίμαι* - to be laid, immobile). (131) The other aspect of royal wealth is represented by flocks and herds. (132) On the level of economic values these form a contrast to the treasure, as does the interior to the exterior, the static to the mobile, the domestic enclosure to the open space of the ἀγρός. In contrast to the world of town, house, and even cultivated fields, what the Greeks call ἀγρός is actually the pastoral sphere, land for pasturage, open country to which the animals are led or where wild animals are hunted - the wild and distant country filled with

herds. (133) When Xenophon contrasts men with beasts it is precisely because men need a roof over their heads, while herds live ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ. (134) Moreover the word denoting grazing stock, πρόβατον, is vivid enough: in its true meaning it signifies that which moves, that which goes forward. The phrase κειμήλιον καὶ πρόβασις (which, through the antinomy of κεῖμαι, to be lying down, and προβαίνω, to go forward, expresses the twofold aspect of wealth taken as a whole), (135) emphasizes clearly the contrast between riches that 'lie' in the house and those that 'run' in the country. Across the sweep of the ἄγρος the herdsman Hermes (136) (Hermes Ἀγοστήρ, Hermes Νόμιος) drives the flocks, controlling them with his magic staff. As god of the shepherds (137) he has power over them, just as Hestia, the domestic goddess, is patron of the goods within the house. (138) In the closing words of the 'Homeric Hymn to Hermes', Zeus commands 'that Hermes should be lord (ἀνάσσειν) over the cows in the fields, the horses and mules, the lions, the boars and the dogs, and over the sheep that the wide earth nourishes and over every four-legged animal (πᾶσι δ' ἐπὶ προβάτοισι).'

But it is not only in their wanderings that the herds exemplify the aspect of movement in wealth. They also constitute the first form of riches, which, instead of remaining constant, has the capacity to increase or diminish. First, because with the complicity of Hermes, the cattle thief, neighbours' lands can be raided and the booty added to one's own herds. And also because if Hermes ἐπιμήλιος, Hermes πολύμηλος (139) (of abundant herds) favours you the stock will multiply and your riches beget riches. Ownership and the preservation of goods are the domain of Hestia. But the movement of riches which can either increase or decrease, and acquisition and loss, depend, as does exchange, on the god, who, like Hecate, so Hesiod tells us, knows how to 'increase (ἄξειν) the livestock in their sheds - the herds of cattle, the flocks of goats, the long columns of sheep heavy with wool: he makes the few the many and the many the few.' (140) Later on, in a fully mercantile economy the Greeks had no difficulty in recognizing the ancient god of the shepherds beneath the features of their god of trade. In the movement of money, which, through the action of interest, is self-increasing, they could still discern the increase of livestock multiplying at regular intervals. They used the same word, τόκο, for interest on capital and for the newly born animals brought forth at the turn of the year. (141)

The opposition between the hearth-space, enclosed and

stable, and the space of the countryside, open and variable, gives us a better understanding and a greater appreciation of a family feast such as the *amphidromia*. This ceremony was celebrated, according to circumstances, on the fifth, seventh, or tenth day after birth, and sometimes coincided with the naming of the infant. (142) But its true function was to consecrate the official recognition of the newborn child by its father. The ritual is obviously aimed at enrolling the child in the space of the *oikos*, attaching it to the hearth of which it is the issue. According to the evidence at our disposal, the ritual consisted of two parts between which a distinction should be made: on the one hand, the ring run round the hearth by one or more people, who would be naked, (143) holding the baby in their arms; on the other, the laying of the child at a given moment (probably before the running) directly on the ground. (144) In this rite of the *amphidromia* the two elements reinforce each other. Direct contact with the floor of the house completes the integration within the domestic space which is also brought about by the motion of the child describing a closed circle around the fixed hearth. Nevertheless, in certain legends in which these two rituals are closely associated, there is a strongly marked opposition between them in contrast with their various similarities. The tales concerning immortality stress the difference between two procedures followed for the newborn child: holding the infant over the hearth amid the flames, and putting it on the ground next to the hearth. The first procedure recalls the rite of immortality in the flames of the hearth, while the second, in contrast, demonstrates the failure of the attempts at immortality and the return to normal practice. If the child could have been completely purified by the fire, it would have become immortal. But when placed on the ground and included in the household space, it shares the ordinary condition of mankind. Thus, in the palace of Keleus, Demeter, nurse to Demophoon, starts by 'hiding' (κρύπτειν) the baby in the blazing fire as though it too were that spark (δαλός), which, as already mentioned, is identified in some myths with the royal scion. The goddess would thus have made Demophoon immortal had not the mother, witnessing the scene, uttered a cry of terror and called down reproaches on the stranger concealing her son in the flames. Incensed, Demeter snatches the child from the fire and puts him on the ground. 'I would have made your son deathless and unaging all his days,' she says to Metaneira, 'but now he can in no way escape death and the fates.' (145) The same strongly contrasted structure is found in the story

told by Apollonius Rhodius about Thetis's attempt to immortalize her son Achilles. (146) During the night the goddess puts the child into the heart of the fire to consume his mortal body. When Peleus sees Achilles in the flames he cannot prevent himself from crying out. Angri-ly, Thetis casts the infant down on the ground and Achilles's fate is sealed. Child of man that he is, he is doomed to die. But there is one common feature which brings the two opposing procedures closer together, sometimes even makes them coincide, and that is that they are both ordeals imposed on the baby. No doubt the ordeal by fire appears infinitely greater and therefore relatively of greater import than simply being put down on the ground. But let there be no mistake: direct contact with the earth and the powers that dwell there, especially those chthonic deities associated with the realms of the dead, is also not without great peril. Legend informs us that placing the child upon the ground sometimes causes its death and sometimes ensures its immortality. It should also be remembered that the rite of immortality by fire in which the child is 'hidden' has an analogy in the parallel practice of Medea 'hiding' her children in the earth to make them immortal (κατακρυπτεία). (147) It is obvious that the two rites of immortality correspond and are in contrast with each other in the same way as are the two forms of funeral rites practised by the Greeks. The dead are sometimes 'hidden in fire' (incineration), sometimes 'hidden in the ground' (internment). In both cases their disappearance from the visible world is the condition and sign of their return to the other world. (148)

There are, furthermore, two symmetrical legends that illustrate at one and the same time the dangers and the virtues of contact with the ground. The first is the story of Hypsipyle. (149) She is nurse to Opheltes, and makes the mistake of laying on the ground for a moment the royal infant entrusted to her by the parents. The child is bitten by a snake, the incarnation of the chthonic powers, and dies instantly. Had not an oracle advised that he should never be placed on the ground before he was able to walk? (150) The other story takes us in the opposite direction. The Elians are defending their territory against the Arcadians who have invaded it. Before the battle a woman with a baby at her breast suddenly appears. Claiming to be inspired by a dream, she offers her child to the Elians, to fight with them. The military leaders accept the child from her, carry it out in front of the army and lay it naked on the ground. At once the newborn child turns into a snake. At the sight of the serpent the enemy camp is thrown into confusion and

routed. At the exact spot where the child disappeared into the ground the Elians erect a sanctuary dedicated to the child-god Sosipolis, the native daemon (δαίμων ἐπιχώριος) that their land, in the name of the goddess-mother, Eileithyia, made to appear in the midst of men in order to help them. (151)

Naturally, the significance of being put down on the ground differs according to whether the newborn child is placed in contact with the humanized ground within the house or the untamed ground of the great outside. In the context of the *amphidromia*, placing the infant on the ground close to the hearth, within the circle traced by the ritual ring run round Hestia, (152) has the value of a trial resulting in legitimation. When the ceremony is over, the newborn babe, joined to the domestic hearth, is accepted, 'recognized', by its father. The *amphidromia*, the rite of integration within the family space and the paternal line of descent, has its counterpart in the practices connected with the rejection of a child and its exclusion from the enclosed space of the *oikos*. This is the point of the rites of exposure in Greece. In exposure, as in the *amphidromia*, the infant is placed on the ground. (This action of placing is expressed by the verb τίθηναι). But the locality chosen is the opposite of the household enclosure or the cultivated land in the neighbourhood, and is instead the wild and distant countryside. (153) In some cases it can be the sea or a river, in that these can be symbols of the other world. But above all it is the uncultivated land where the flocks and herds live, far from houses, gardens, and fields - the alien and hostile space of the *agros*. In the heroic myths everything combines to depict the setting of a pastoral landscape around the exposed child. The parents, who reject their offspring from the world of the living, entrust the infant to a shepherd to carry it away and abandon it on the heaths or the hills, on the wastelands where he leads his flocks to pasture. Another shepherd discovers the child and gives it a home. It grows up among the herds and flocks. Sometimes wild animals suc-cour it.

The antinomy present in the feast of the *amphidromia* and the rites of exposure, with their alternative implications (154) is stressed in the famous 'Theaetetus' passage in which Socrates compares himself, in assisting the birth of minds, to his mother, the midwife. (155) Like the *maia* who helps deliver women in labour, Socrates helps young men bring forth the truths they contain within themselves and are unable to express. But his art goes further than that of the ordinary midwife. It is also

his duty to put the child that is born to the test (βαρυνίζειν) in order to detect whether it is a deceitful sham (εἰδωλον καὶ ψεῦδος) or a product of genuine and sound stock (γόνιμόν τε καὶ ἀληθές). (156)

And what is this test? And what is the outcome if the child appears incapable of passing it successfully? Socrates explains with great clarity. When young Theatetus has succeeded, at the cost of violent effort and with the help of the philosopher, in giving birth to the product of his mind, Socrates addresses him in these words:

Well, we have at last managed to bring this forth, whatever it turns out to be; and now that it is born, we must in very truth perform the rite (*amphidromia*) of running round with it in a circle - the circle of our argument - and see whether it may not turn out to be, after all, not worth rearing, but only a wind-egg, an impostor. But perhaps you think that any offspring of yours ought to be cared for and not put away (τρέφειν καὶ μὴ ἀποτιθέναι)? Or will you bear to see it examined and not get angry if it is taken away from you, though it is your first-born? (157)

This Platonic text should be compared with the information given us by Plutarch, on related Lacedaemonian customs. The community spirit that is a characteristic of the city of Sparta leaves no room for the *amphidromia* in their traditional form. As it is no longer a question of uniting the newborn child either to its father's hearth or the family κλῆρος, but of including it in the civic community of the equals, the progenitor is deprived of his authority in deciding the fate of his offspring. But the dilemma has still to be resolved: should the child be nurtured (τρέφειν), that is, integrated in the group space, or should it be exposed (ἀποτιθέναι), that is, ejected from the mortal world?

Offspring was not reared at the will of the father, but was taken and carried by him to a place called the *leschè*, where the elders of the tribes officially examined the infant, and if it was well-built and sturdy, they ordered the father to rear it, and assigned it one of the nine thousand lots of land as a κλῆρος; but if it was ill-born or deformed they sent it to the so-called *apothetai* (ἀποθέται). (158)

Plutarch's comment following this passage emphasizes the aspect of ordeal on which Plato too insists. Plutarch points out that, for reasons he has already stated, the women of Sparta bathe the newborn children, not with water, but with wine, 'thus making a sort of test (βάσανον) of their constitutions.'

As we have seen, the feast of the *amphidromia* focused on the hearth implies, in terms of the space with which it is concerned, that same polarity expressed for the Greeks, in the arrangement of their pantheon, by the Hermes-Hestia couple. And we have, therefore, to extend our investigations to further rituals concerning the hearth-goddess, in order to discover what form of spatial representation they may involve.

Two examples, in this respect, seem particularly illuminating. Knowledge of the first comes from a text of Plutarch's, who is a first-hand witness as it is about a ritual in Chaeronia, the birthplace of the author. (159) The rite of expulsion of hunger (βουλήμου ἐξέλασις), in the Beotian city, took place on two levels: each individual conducted the rites for his own family within the home, and at the same time the *archon* followed the ritual on behalf of the group, at the communal hearth of the city. The ceremony was identical in the two cases. A slave was beaten with a willow rod (ῥάβδος), (160) and pushed outside across the threshold, while the exclamation: 'Hunger out, Riches and Health within' (161) was pronounced. The rite is based on the opposition between an enclosed and fixed interior where the wealth is kept (Hestia), and the exterior to which the injurious forces of hunger are expelled with the very staff of Hermes.

In Athens the same opposition characterizes the organization of the space where the Πρυτανεῖον, the seat of Hestia Koine, is situated. In its immediate vicinity was a piece of land dedicated to Βούλιμος, Hunger. (162) This was evidently a field which was always left to lie fallow, and which, lying in the heart of the humanized space of the city, represented the wild land which man must not lay hands on for this would be a sacrilege for which the punishment was famine. (163) In relation to the Πρυτανεῖον, the Βούλιμος field is, therefore, the counterpart of the Βουζύγιον, the field at the very foot of the Acropolis which was annually subjected to a ritual ploughing by the Βουζύγης, (164) in the name of the city. One further point should be made: while conducting the ploughing ceremony which periodically renewed the union between the original Athenian peoples and their native soil, and deconsecrated the Attic earth for them to use and cultivate freely, the Βουζύγης uttered curses which fell on the newly turned soil and ensured its productivity. The priest anathematized on the one hand 'Those who refuse to share water and fire' (referring to the space of hospitality - Hestia), and, on the other, 'Those who do not point the way for wanderers, πλανωμένοις' (referring to the space of the traveller - Hermes). (165)

The second example is from the Achaean city of Phares, near Patrai. (166) It concerns a divinitory ritual of a rather special kind which associates Hestia and Hermes very closely. A stone statue of Hermes, bearded and foursquare, stands in the middle of a vast *agora*, surrounded by a *perobolus*. Oracles are uttered by the god who is called ἄγοραῖος. Facing this statue of Hermes is a hearth (Hestia). It includes, besides the altar, a number of bronze lamps bound with lead. The procedure for the delivery of oracles was as follows. At dusk, the person consulting the oracle enters the *agora*. First he goes to the hearth where he burns incense, fills the lamps with oil, and lights them. Then he puts on the altar of Hestia a coin of the country, no doubt sacred, and termed a 'bronze'. Then only does he turn to Hermes and whisper in the god's ear the question he wants answered. Having done this, he puts his hands over his ears and walks off to get out of the *agora*. As soon as he has left the *perobolus* and got outside (ἐς τὸ ἐκτός), he removes his hands from his ears, and the first voice he hears, as he goes on his way, will provide him with the god's answer.

In this instance the *agora* is a circumscribed place round a specific centre, under the twofold patronage of Hermes ἄγοραῖος and Hestia. It is in front of Hestia, in the centre, that the person coming from outside to consult the oracle first stops. By contact with the hearth in the actions of incense burning and lamplighting all round the goddess, the stranger is infused with the religious qualities necessary to be able to consult the local oracle. And he pays his consultation fee to Hestia because it is she, in the divine couple, who represents the force of permanency and storage. In contrast, the way in which the oracle is consulted emphasizes the volatile aspect of Hermes. The god's answer is revealed firstly through the very movement of the questioner who must start walking before he can learn it; second, at the moment he leaves the enclosed space of the *agora*, when he enters exterior space; third, in catching the sound of a voice - an elusive, faint, imperceptible φωνή, the voice of the firstcomer who happens to cross his path; last, in the distance which is imposed between the question asked in the centre of the *agora* (in the same way as the consultation fee is paid in the centre, there to remain forever), and the answer supplied by the outside, in a space other than that in which his statue is erected.

This study took as its point of departure the presence in the Greek pantheon of a particular and well-attested

structure - the Hestia-Hermes couple. From analyses of texts which stress the bonds uniting the god and goddess has emerged the relationship each has with specific and contrary aspects of space. This has led us to abandon the domain of purely religious representation and to direct our study no longer exclusively to the ideas of the Greeks regarding their gods, but towards the social systems of which these ideas seem a part. The various institutions discussed refer specifically, in the very way they function, to the hearth and the religious values it represents. This body of institutional practices, gravitating round the hearth established as a fixed centre, expresses one aspect of the archaic experience of space in ancient Greece. To the extent that these practices constitute a well-regulated and orderly system of conduct they imply a mental organization of space.

Whether concerned with facts affecting marriage, family relationships, lines of descent, the heritage of the family κληρος, the domestic status of husbands and wives, the social and psychological contrasts between men and women, their activities within the house and outside, the double aspect of wealth and of land improvement - our aim has always been to throw light on the structures of thought pertaining to space, as testified in the interplay of symbolic representations and structures of behaviour. It seems that the spatial values associated with a centre, immobile and withdrawn, had their regular counterpart in the opposite values of an open space, unstable, a place of distance, contacts, and change.

Nevertheless, the analysis has been one-sided. We have consistently approached it from the point of view of Hestia and the centre. So Hermes has been seen only as Hestia's complement, the god appearing as the antithesis of the goddess. In order, therefore, to complete the study of the relationship of these two deities, the approach should be changed and the investigation carried out from the converse point of view, this time from the standpoint of Hermes, through the study of the groups of images evoked by the god in the Greek conscience and the activities and institutions of which he is the patron. But before abandoning the subject of Hestia it should also be pointed out that the polarity that is so marked a characteristic of all the goddess's relations with Hermes is such a basic feature of archaic thought that it appears as an integral attribute of the hearth-goddess, as though part of Hestia already belonged to Hermes.

In order to fulfil her function as the power conferring on domestic space its centre, its permanence, and its confines, Hestia, as has been said, must root the human

dwelling place in the ground. This is the significance of the Mycenaean hearth, that *fixed* altar-hearth. This in fact gives a chthonic aspect to the 'epichthonic' goddess dwelling on the earth's surface. Through her the house and the household enter into contact with the underworld. In a fragment of the 'Phaethon', (167) Euripides identifies Hestia with Demeter's daughter, Kore, who, sometimes reigning at Hades's side and sometimes living in the world of men, is responsible for establishing communication and passage between two worlds separated by an insurmountable barrier.

Furthermore, in the Mycenaean *megaron* the circular hearth welded to the ground is in the centre of a rectangular space bounded by four columns. These reach to the roof of the house where they enclose an open lantern through which the smoke escapes. When incense is burned, or meat is cooked on the hearth, or when, during a meal, the portion of food dedicated to the gods is consumed by the flames of the fire lit on her domestic altar, Hestia sends the family offerings up to the dwelling place of the Olympian gods. Contact between earth and the heavens is established through her in the same way as she acts as a passageway to the infernal regions.

The centre, of which Hestia is the patron, represents for the domestic group that spot of earth which enables terrestrial space to be stabilized, demarcated, and determined. But it also, conjointly, represents the passageway *par excellence*, the channel of communication between normally separate and isolated cosmic levels. For members of the *oikos* the hearth, the centre of the house, also marks the path of exchange with the gods beneath and the gods above, the axis through which all parts of the universe are joined together. Another image evoked by the hearth is that of the mast of a ship firmly stepped in the deck and raised straight up towards the sky.

Should we believe, like Louis Derooy, that there is an early link between the hearth and the mast or colonnade, postulated by the lexicographical analogy, which, even in Homer's language, changed the old word ἑστῖν, hearth, into ἱστῖν, which means a colonnade, the confusion of the two terms being explained by the fact that the Mycenaean hearth was surrounded by wooden pillars, ἱστοί, supporting the roof-lantern (μέλαθρον)? (168) Hesychius, we know, comments that ἱστία = the altar of the hearth (ἑσχάρα) and the mast of a ship; and again that ἱστία = the woman who weaves, because ἱστός also denotes, apart from column and mast, a loom (always upright among the Greeks) which seems firmly fixed in the ground while reaching upwards.

It should be noted, in any case, that in Plato, who is

so faithful to the teachings of the sacred writings and the suggestions of the ancient myths, the figure of Hestia, alone of all the gods to remain immobile at home, (169) is merged, in the final myth of the 'Republic', (170) with the great goddess Anagke, the Spinner, enthroned at the centre of the universe. On her knees Anagke holds the spindle whose movement controls the rotation of all the celestial spheres. It is itself fixed to the great shaft of light in the centre of which Anagke is seated, and which, rising straight as a mast or a column, stretches from top to bottom right through the sky and the earth, uniting the entire cosmos in the same way as the various parts of a boat are linked together from prow to poop.

Immobile, but mistress of the movements around her, central in the same way as a main shaft traversing a machine throughout and holding its component parts together: this is the image of Hestia that Plato appears to have inherited from the oldest of the Greek religious traditions. That is why when he claims, in the linguistic game of the 'Cratylus', (171) to reveal the secrets of the divine names, Plato, the academy philosopher, suggests a double etymology for the word Hestia. Of his two contrary explanations Plato certainly gives his preference to one rather than the other. But it is very significant that he should present them, in spite of their antinomy, as two equally possible interpretations of the same divine name. For some Hestia corresponds with οὐσία, which, in Greek, is sometimes also called ἑσσία, that is, the immutable and permanent essence. But for others essence is termed ὤσια because, like Heraclitus, they think that all that exists is mobile and that nothing remains static. According to these latter everything is caused by and based on the impetus of movement (τὸ ὄθον) which they term ὤσια.

Hestia as the principle of permanence, Hestia as the principle of impetus and movement - in this twofold and contradictory interpretation of the name of the hearth-goddess we recognize the very foundations of the relationship which opposes and unites, in a single contrasted couple joined in unbreakable 'friendship', the goddess who immobilizes space around a fixed centre and the god who renders it completely and everlastingly mobile.

NOTES

- 1 'Revue française d'anthropologie' (1963), 3, 12-50.
- 2 Pausanias 5. 11, 8.

- 3 On the Sosibios vase, Hermes follows Hestia (cf. P. Raingeard, 'Hermès psychagogue: essai sur les origines du culte d'Hermès' (Paris, 1934), 500); bicephalic columns with masculine and feminine heads of Hermes and Hestia (cf. W. Frohner, 'Sculptures du Louvre', 1; 220, notes 198 and 199); on Hermes, habitually associated with Hestia as a couple among the twelve gods (cf. A.B. Cook, 'Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion', 3: 2, 1057 ff.).
- 4 'Homeric Hymn to Hestia' l. 11 ff.; cf. also lines 1-2: 'in high dwellings of all who walk on earth (χαυαί). In his 'Interpretation of Dreams', Artemidorus classes Hestia and Hermes among the epichthonian deities in contrast to the celestial and subterranean gods.
- 5 'Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite' 29-30.
- 6 'Phaedrus' 247a.
- 7 Euripides frg. 983N²; cf. Macrobius 1, 23: 'If Hestia remains alone in the house of the gods, it means that the earth remains motionless at the centre of the universe.' Cf. also the saying of Philolaos: 'That One who remains in the middle of the sphere is named Hestia' (H. Diels and W. Kranz, 'Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker' (7th edn, Berlin 1956), 1: 410, 12). Note also the expression in the 'Homeric Hymn' (line 3): 'Hestia's status in the home is immutable' (ἔσθον ἀίδιον).
- 8 Homer 'Iliad' 24. 334-5.
- 9 Aristophanes 'Peace' 392.
- 10 'Homeric Hymn to Hermes' 14-15.
- 11 Ibid. 146-7.
- 12 The triple or quadruple representation of the face of the god was precisely what enabled him to control simultaneously all directions in space.
- 13 L.R. Farnell, 'The Cults of the Greek States' (Oxford, 1896), 5: 62, note 2.
- 14 Aeschylus 'Choephoroi' 124 ff.
- 15 Plutarch 'De Garrulitate' 502F.
- 16 Cf. also J. Orgogozo's recent interesting study, L'Hermès des Achéens, 'Revue de l'histoire des religions' (1949), 10-30; and (1950), 139 ff.
- 17 See references in L. Deroy's Le culte du foyer dans la Grèce mycénienne, 'Revue de l'histoire des religions' (1950), 32, note 1.
- 18 Cf. Louis Gernet, Sur le symbolisme politique en Grèce ancienne: le foyer commun, 'Cahiers internationaux de sociologie', 11 (1951), 29. In his 'Life of Numa' 9-11, Plutarch remarks that the tradition was maintained in Greece of a female priesthood

- to tend the sacred fires. The responsibility fell not upon virgins, as in Rome, but on women abstaining from all sexual relations. During the city period, the ministry of the communal hearth became essentially a political function and was for this reason reserved for men. It should be noted that, already in Homer, the cult of Hestia was relegated to the background.
- 19 Deroy, Le culte, 26-43.
- 20 On the 'generating' fire, see Plutarch 'Life of Camillus' 20. 4; 'Quaest. Conviv.' 7. 4, 3.
- 21 'Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite' 20-30.
- 22 Concerning the rites which, on the eve of marriage, mark the renunciation of the previous state, cf. Euripides 'Iphigenia in Tauris' 372-5, and the remarks of L. Séchan, La légende d'Hippolyte dans l'antiquité, 'Revue des études grecques' (1911), 115 ff. On the rite of hair shearing, for marriage as for mourning a relative, cf. 'Palatine Anthology' 6. 276, 277, 280, 281. In Sparta the young bride's head was shaved all over, Plutarch 'Life of Lycugus' 15. 5.
- 23 On the καταχύσματα, the rites concerning the integration of the wife in the household of her husband, cf. E. Samter, 'Familienfeste der Griechen und Römer' (Berlin, 1901), 159. The bride was led to the hearth, perhaps even seated beside it (in the crouching attitude of the suppliant), and her head was covered with sweetmeats, τραγήματα, particularly dried fruit, dates, nuts, figs. The same ritual was followed with a new slave on his first entering the house to which he was to belong. In that case it was the mistress of the house (δέσποινα) who officiated as the representative of the hearth.
- 24 On Charis, presiding over free exchange and gift giving, cf. Aristotle 'Nicomachean Ethics' 1133a 2; R.A. Gauthier and J.Y. Jolif, in their commentary on this work ((Louvain-Paris, 1959), 2: 375) do not seem to have appreciated the significance of this passage.
- 25 Plutarch 'Eroticos' 751d.
- 26 Hermes, associated with Aphrodite in her role as Παιθώ: inscription of Mytilene to Aphrodite Παιθώ, and, among others, Hermes, 'I.G.' 12. 2, 73; Plutarch 'Conjug. Praec.' 138c. Associated with Aphrodite in her role as the 'schemer' (Μαχανίτις), Pausanias 8. 31, 6; when she is Ψίθυρος of the 'seductive murmurings', cf. Harpocration s.v. Ψίθυρισμός: the Athenians worshipped Hermes under this name in association with Aphrodite and Eros.

- On Hermes *Παισίου*, at Cnidos, cf. Farnell, 'Cults', 70, note 43.
- 27 'A virtuous woman should stay at home; only light women appear on the streets,' Menander frg. 546, Edmonds.
- 28 Xenophon 'Oeconomicus' 7. 30; cf. Hierocles in 'Stobaeus' 4. 1, 502H. 'Man's job is in the fields, in the *agora*, the affairs of the city; women's work is spinning wool, baking bread, keeping house.' In the 'Against Neaera' 122, Demosthenes, defining the married state (*τὸ συνοικεῖν*), gives special emphasis to the domestic vocation of the spouse as the guardian of her husband's hearth in contrast to the functions of courtesans and concubines: 'Mistresses we keep for the sake of pleasure, concubines for the daily care of our persons, but wives to bear us legitimate children and to be faithful guardians of our households, *τῶν ἔνδον φύλακα πιστήν*.'
- 29 Aeschylus 'Eumenides' 658-61; cf. also Euripides 'Orestes' 552-5, and 'Hippolytus' 616 ff.
- 30 Aristotle 'Generation of Animals' 1. 20, 729a. 'A theory of this type, deprived of all contact with the object is pure myth,' remarks Marie Delcourt in 'Oreste et Alcmeon: Étude sur la projection légendaire du matricide en Grèce' (Paris, 1959), 85.
- 31 On Meleager, cf. Apollodorus 1. 8, 2; Aeschylus 'Choephoroi' 607 ff. The brand (*δαλός*) in the hearth is a kind of 'double' or the outsoul of Meleager. The child will die when the brand, placed in a casket (*λάβραξ*) by his mother, is consumed by fire. This was decided by the *moirai* seven days after his birth - a date which corresponds, as we shall see, with the celebration of the *amphidromia*, the rites which integrate the newborn child into the home of its father. On Demaphoon, cf. 'Homeric Hymn to Demeter' 239 ff. The goddess, nurse to the royal baby, hides it in the fire like a brand (*δαλός*).
- 32 Legends of Caelculus and Servius Tullus. The comparison is made by Gernet, *Sur le symbolisme*, 27.
- 33 Ibid., 27.
- 34 Cf. A. Aymard, *L'idée de travail dans la Grèce archaïque*, 'Journal de Psychologie' (1948), 29-50.
- 35 Cf. Euripides's 'Electra' 1088 ff.: Clytemnestra brought the palace of Agamemnon to Aegisthus as the price of her new marriage.
- 36 Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 1587 and 1435.
- 37 In this connection, I should like to refer the reader to the very perceptive and careful study by R.P. Winnington-Ingram, *Clytemnestra and the vote of Athena*, 'Journal of Hellenic Studies' (1948), 130-47.

- 38 A few references, as a guide, to the three tragic poets who handled the same theme: Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 1224, 1259, 1625 ff., 1635, 1665, 1671; 'Choephoroi' 304; Sophocles 'Electra' 299-302; Euripides 'Electra' 917, 930, 950.
- 39 Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 10-11, 258, 1251, 1258, 1377 ff.; cf. also the irony of 483 and 592 ff.; 'Chorophoroi' 664 ff.; Sophocles 'Electra' 650 ff., 1243; Euripides 'Electra' 930 ff.
- 40 Winnington-Ingram, *Clytemnestra*.
- 41 Sophocles 'Electra' 416 ff.
- 42 On the similarities and differences between the *ῥάβδος*, Hermes's magic wand, and the *σκῆπτρον* with which eventually the former was merged, cf. Jane Harrison, 'Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion' (Cambridge, 1903), reprinted New York, 1957, 44 ff. The *ῥάβδος* is a stick held in the air, used to hit with ('Odyssey' 10. 236); it is waved (ibid. 24. 1-9); it is never held still (Pindar 'Olympics' odes 9. 33). In contrast one supports oneself generally on the *σκῆπτρον* which is like a walking stick (*βάκτρον*) held upright with one end placed on the ground. Thus, to throw the *σκῆπτρον* down during a meeting of the assembly, as did Achilles ('Iliad' 1. 245), takes the meaning of a rejection of the royal authority and a break in the solidarity of the group.
- 43 Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 966-70; 'Choephoroi' 204, 236, 503; Orestes is the root, *ρίζα*, the seed, *σπέρμα*, of the house of the Atridae; the same image is found in Sophocles 'Electra' 764-5.
- 44 Euripides 'Electra' 1052-4.
- 45 Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 1251-2, 1604-10, 1633, 1643; Sophocles 'Electra' 561. In Greece, as among the German tribes, the woman, because of her sex, could not herself exact a bloody vengeance: *σιδηροφορεῖν* was an exclusively masculine prerogative; cf. G. Glotz, 'La Solidarité de la famille dans le droit criminelle en Grèce' (Paris, 1904), 82.
- 46 Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 1379, 1672-3; Sophocles 'Electra' 651.
- 47 Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 1435.
- 48 Sophocles 'Electra' 97 and 587; Euripides 'Electra' 1035 ff.
- 49 Sophocles 'Electra' 533.
- 50 Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 1225.
- 51 Euripides 'Electra' 930 ff.; Sophocles 'Electra' 365.
- 52 Euripides 'Orestes' 1045-1148.
- 53 Sophocles 'Electra' 1145-8.

- 54 Aeschylus 'Choephoroi' 264.
- 55 Masterful nature of Electra: Sophocles 'Electra' 351, 397, 401, 983, 997, and 1019-20, in which the similarity with Clytemnestra is stressed; Euripides 'Electra' 982; 'Orestes' 1204. Electra, authoritative and passionate like her mother: Sophocles 'Electra' 605 ff., 621.
- 56 Sophocles 'Electra' 962.
- 57 Electra 'virgin': Aeschylus 'Choephoroi' 140, 486; Sophocles 'Electra' 1183; Euripides 'Electra' 23, 42, 98, 255, 270, 311, 945; 'Orestes' 26, 72, 206, 251.
- 58 Sophocles 'Electra' 341 ff., 365; Euripides 'Electra' 1102-4.
- 59 Aeschylus 'Eumenides' 736 ff.
- 60 Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 62.
- 61 Ibid. 1231.
- 62 Aeschylus 'Eumenides' 213 ff.
- 63 Sophocles 'Electra' 97; Euripides 'Electra' 1035: in taking Aegisthus as her lover, Clytemnestra is only following the example of Agamemnon bringing Cassandra back as concubine.
- 64 The marriage of brother and sister born of the same father is not completely forbidden; that of the brother and sister born of the same mother is strictly prohibited. It should be remembered that the term ἀδελφός, brother, is related to female consanguinity: it originally denoted issue from the same womb.
- 65 On the woman offered in wedlock as ποινή of the vendetta, cf. Glotz, 'Solidarité', 130.
- 66 The ritual bears witness to the persistency of this aspect of abduction in marriage; Plutarch 'Life of Lycurgus' 15, 5; 'Roman Questions' 271d 29.
- 67 Aeschylus 'Seven against Thebes' 754; Sophocles 'Oedipus Rex' 1257, 'Antigone' 569; Euripides 'Orestes' 553; 'Medea' 1281; 'Ion' 1095. Cf. Dieterich, 'Mutter Erde' (1905), 47.
- 68 Plato 'Cratylus' 406b; 'Laws' 839a.
- 69 Menander 'Perikeiromene' 435-6, frg. 720, Edmonds: ταυτην γυναικῶν παίδων ἐπ' ἀρότῳ σοι δίδωμι. Cf. E. Benveniste, *Liber et liberi*, 'Rev. études latines', 14 (1936), 51-8.
- 70 Plutarch 'Conjug. Praecepta' 144b.
- 71 Sophocles 'Electra' 421-3; Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 966.
- 72 Hesiod 'Works and Days' 232 ff.
- 73 Hesiod 'Theogony' 969-71.
- 74 'Homeric Hymn to Hestia' 1. 5 ff.; cf. Cicero 'De Natura Deorum': 'in ea dea, omnis et precatio et

- sacrificatio extrema est.' Cornutus c. 28: Hestia is at once πρώτη and ἑσχάτη; she is the beginning and the end.
- 75 Aristotle 'Politics' 1252b 15.
- 76 Zenobius 4. 44; Diogenianus 2. 40.
- 77 As did Ulysses in the palace of Alcinous 'Odyssey' 7. 153-4.
- 78 'Nemean Odes' 11. 1 ff.
- 79 Cf. Gernet, *Sur le symbolisme*.
- 80 On the καταχύσματα rites, see above, p. 92. The bonds between the man and his wife are the same as those which unite two antagonistic groups who have become guests and allies after an exchange of oaths has substituted a peace agreement between them for a state of war. It is the same word, φιλότης, which denotes intimate relations between spouses and the contract that establishes a fictitious relationship between recent antagonists with a view to binding them by reciprocal obligations. Cf. Glotz, 'Solidarité', 22. In the love story of Aphrodite and Ares there is no doubt some phrase-spinning, but basically what we see here are institutional realities with all the behaviour patterns and psychological attitudes that they govern. On the ties uniting the wife to the home of her husband, cf. Euripides 'Alcestitis' 162 ff. Before dying, Alcestitis invokes Hestia, the domestic goddess of the conjugal hearth. She addresses her as δέσποινα, mistress, and entrusts her children to her.
- 81 Euripides frg. 928N²; cf. also Menander, περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν, in 'Rhet. Graec.' 3. 275, Spengel: 'The young husband about to have sexual relations should be urged to pray to Eros, to Hestia, and the deities of procreation.'
- 82 Porphyry in Eusebius 'Praeparatio Evangelica' 3. 11, 7.
- 83 Cf. L. Beauchet, 'Histoire du droit privé de la République Athénienne' (Paris, 1897), 1: 399 ff.
- 84 'Laws of Manu' 9, 127 ff.
- 85 Plato 'Laws' 924e ff. The same regulations for degrees of affinity in inheritance: Isaeus 'The Succession of Hagnias' 1-2 and 11; Demosthenes 'Against Macartatos' 51.
- 86 The question even arises whether the son of the epikleros may have assumed the functions of the κύριος of his mother, thus taking the legal role of the brother. A practice such as that of the epikleros could, it seems, throw some light on the psychological relations, in the tragedy, between

Electra and Orestes. We have seen that Electra, in relation to Orestes, is as much a mother as a sister. The *epikleros*, in relation to her son, is as much a sister as a mother.

- 87 It is now the husband's turn to be 'neutralized', in that he represents a home which is not that of his father. His kinship with the father of his wife is at once the sign and instrument of this neutralization. In fact, in the case of a man, the mere *συνοίκησις* would not suffice seeing that the man, unlike the woman, has no domestic vocation, and cannot assume the attributes of the home. It is by blood, by race, that the man is bound to the house, or, if that be lacking, by an act of adoption which also establishes a direct link between father and son, an agnatic relationship; cf. Beauchet, 'Histoire', 2: 7.
- 88 Cf. P. Roussel, 'L'Hestia à l'Omphalos', 'Revue Archéologique', 2 (1911), 86-91.
- 89 Cf. Aeschylus 'Eumenides' 165 and 168; and J. Audiat's study, 'L'hymne d'Aristonos à Hestia', 'Bulletin de correspondance hellénique'.
- 90 Cf. Gernet, 'Sur le symbolisme', 22.
- 91 M. Delcourt, 'L'oracle de Delphes' (Paris, 1955), 144-9.
- 92 The *omphalos* is 'the principle for the rootedness and growth of the embryo (*ῥιζώσιος καὶ ἀναφύσιος τοῦ πρώτου*)', Philolaos, ap. Diels 'FVS' 7, 1; 413, 6-7.
- 93 Artemidorus 1. 43 (quoted by Delcourt, 'L'oracle', 145). As regards the expression *ἐπὶ ζένης*, the parallelism with Hestia should be noted, in 4. 34 and 5. 27.
- 94 Artemidorus 1. 74.
- 95 Ibid. 2. 10. On the relationship between the oven and the female abdomen, cf. Herodotus 5. 92, 5 ff.: to put bread in a cold oven meant to be joined with a woman when she was dead.
- 96 Hermes *tetragonos*, cf. Heraclitus 'Quaest. Homer' 72, 6.
- 97 The expression of Hippocrates in 'Regimen' 4. 92 comes to mind: 'For from the dead comes nourishment, growth and seed.'
- 98 Cf. F. Robert, 'Thymélé: Recherches sur la signification et la destination des monuments circulaires dans l'architecture religieuse de la Grèce (Paris, 1939).
- 99 Gernet, 'Sur le symbolisme', 24.
- 100 Pausanias 8. 9, 5; cf. also J. Charbonneaux, 'Tholos et Prytanée', 'Bulletin de correspondance hellénique' (1925), 158-78.

- 101 Sophocles 'Electra' 416 ff. This text should be compared with the 'Agamemnon' of Aeschylus 965 ff. In both cases the man is the root (*ῥίζα*) implanted in the earth, which, developing into a tree protecting the house, confers on the hearth (*ἑστία*) its 'shadowed' character. Aeschylus makes Clytemnestra say, when she is pretending to welcome Agamemnon joyously on his return: 'For if the root still lives, leafage comes again to the house and spreads its over-reaching shade against the scorching dog-star; so, now that thou hast come to hearth and home, thou showest that warmth hath come in winter-time; aye, and when Zeus maketh wine from the bitter grape, then forthwith there is coolness (*ψύχος*).'
- 102 Xenophon 'Oeconomicus' 4. 2.
- 103 'Phaedrus' 239c - Agesilaus, wishing to persuade his soldiers that in their Asiatic adversaries they would be fighting against women rather than men, had the prisoners he had captured stripped naked. Their bodies, soft and white from a lifetime spent in the shade of the house, never removing their clothes for physical exercise in the palaestra, aroused the contempt and derision of the Spartans; Xenophon 'Hellenica' 3. 4, 19; Plutarch 'Life of Agesilaus' 600e; 'Apophtegma. Lac.' 209c; 'Roman Questions' 28. In vase paintings female figures were conventionally pictured as white-skinned in contrast to brown-skinned men.
- 104 'Homeric Hymn to Demeter' 98 ff.
- 105 Ibid. 113-17.
- 106 Aeschylus 'Eumenides' 665; cf. the expression used by Aristophanes 'The Birds' 694: in the bottomless matrix of obscurity, *ἑρέβους δ' ἐν ἀπειροσι κόλποις*.
- 107 Cf. 'Odyssey' 23. 41 ff.: while the slaughter of the suitors is taking place in the *megaron*, all the women of the palace hide themselves in the depths of their chambers (*μυχῶ θαλάμων*), with their heavy walls and bolted doors.
- 108 Cf. Xenophon 'Oeconomicus' 9. 3.
- 109 On the relationship between *μυχός* (cavern, pit above the level of the ground) and *θαλάμος*, cf. A.J. Festugière, 'Les mystères de Dionysos', 'Revue biblique', 44 (April-July 1935), 382; L.R. Palmer, 'The Homeric and the Indo-European House', 'Transactions of the Philological Society' (1947), 92-120. The term *μυχός* can also denote the low altar-hearth (*eschara*). Cf. Euripides 'Medea' 397: *μυχός ἑστίας*, the depths of the hearth.
- 110 Sophocles 'Antigone' 947.

- 111 Euripides 'Ion' 394.
 112 Euripides 'The Suppliants' 980.
 113 Homer 'Odyssey' 7. 7.
 114 Homer 'Iliad' 18. 492; Pindar 'Pythian Odes' 2. 60. Pollux defines the *θάλαμος* as the place of conjugal union (*τόπος τοῦ γάμου*).
 115 Heliodorus 4. 6.
 116 Homer 'Odyssey' 21. 8-9. The expression *θάλαμον ἔσχατον* should be remembered and compared with Aesychius's glossary: Hestia: *ἔσχατη* (the ultimate, at the end). We know that, according to Cornutus 'Theol.' 28, Hestia is both *πρώτη* and *ἔσχατη*, the first and the last.
 117 The woman, mistress of the keys to the treasure: Aeschylus 'Agamemnon' 609-10; the virgin daughter holding the same privilege: Aeschylus 'Eumenides' 827-8.
 118 Xenophon 'Oeconomicus' 7. 20-1, 25, 35-6; in 39, the wife says to her husband, 'For my care of the goods indoors (*ἐνδόν*) and my management would look rather ridiculous, I fancy, if you did not see that something is gathered in from outside (*ἔξωθεν τι εἰσφέροιτο*).' To which the husband replies: 'And my ingathering would look ridiculous if there were not someone to keep what is gathered in.' Note that safeguarding and distribution (*φυλακή* and *διανομή*) are specifically the functions of Hestia Tamia.
 119 Xenophon 'Oeconomicus' 7. 33.
 120 Hesiod 'Theogony' 598-9: in this anti-feminine attack which identifies the domestic *θάλαμος* with the feminine *γαστήρ*, the two complementary activities - acquisition (man, Hermes) and gathering in (woman, Hestia) - are transformed into a conflict of two oppositions: labour (masculine) and expenditure (feminine). Further, for Hesiod, the woman is not content with 'squeezing her husband dry' through her appetite for food and the way she devours the fruits of his toil ('Works and Days' 705), she also squeezes him dry with her sexual appetite which the midsummer heat only serves to increase ('Works and Days' 586-7).
 121 On the contrast between totalitarian and distributive economies, cf. G. Dumézil, 'Mitra-Varuna' (Paris, 1940), 155 ff.
 122 A full study has yet to be made of the figure and functions of the Homeric *ταμία*, and her relations with Hestia. One or two points should be stressed: in Odysseus's palace Eurycleia is the attendant, the nurse, and the one who tends the fires. In his youth Laertes had obtained her, in exchange for

- twenty bullocks, from her father, Ops (the Eye), son of Pisenor. The heralds in Ithaca were recruited from this family ('Odyssey' 2. 38). In the palace Laertes had honoured Eurycleia on an equal footing with his wife but had refrained from any intimate relations with her ('Odyssey' 1. 431). She had suckled Odysseus, whom she calls her child. It is on her suggestion that Autolycos, the boy's maternal grandfather, is asked to choose a name for the newborn child ('Odyssey' 9. 403). Her role is to watch unceasingly over all the goods of the house. Her vigilance, care, and foresight are much praised. She is an accomplished *φύλαξ*. These are the qualities that Xenophon insists should belong to the *ταμία* ('Oeconomicus' 9. 11). She should have no weaknesses, whether for food, drink, sleep, or men; she must have a perfect memory. But the true *ταμία*, the best *φύλαξ* of the house should be the wife herself (9. 14-15).
 123 Artemidorus 2. 37; cf. Gernet, *Sur le symbolisme*, 38.
 124 On the Cos ritual, cf. V. Prott, 'Fasti Sacri', 8; Farnell, 'Cults', 349 ff.; Nilsson, 'Griechische Feste', 17 ff.; Cook, 'Zeus', 1; 564; Gernet, *Sur le symbolisme*, 33.
 125 Pausanias 8. 53, 9.
 126 'Politics' 1322b ff.
 127 Aristotle 'Constitution of Athens' 3. 5.
 128 Ibid. 56. 2.
 129 On the historical relations between the royal Mycenaean hearth and the city communal hearth, cf. Farnell, 'Cults', 350 ff.
 130 'Odyssey' 21. 8 ff.
 131 Note the expression, *κειμήλια κείται* ('Iliad' 6. 47; and 'Odyssey' 11. 9). In the first book of the 'Odyssey' Telemachus offers his guest a gift, saying: 'Thou mayest go to thy ship glad in spirit and bearing a gift costly and very beautiful, which shall be to thee a *κειμήλιον*, even such a gift as dear friends give to friends.' Again, in the twenty-third book of the 'Iliad' (618), Achilles gives Nestor a cup: 'Take this now, old sire, and let it be a *κειμήλιον* for thee, a memorial of Patroclus' burying'; cf. also Plato 'Laws' 913a.
 132 The presence among the herds of Atreus of a lamb with a gold or purple fleece is the sign that Pelops's son is born to be king. Occasionally Hermes is presented as having himself engendered the golden lamb, the symbol of royal investiture (Euripides 'Orestes' 995).

In any case it is he who intervenes to reestablish the legitimate sovereignty when Thyestes, in his contest with Atreus, fraudulently presents the royal beast which belongs to his brother's flocks. The relations of Hermes with the ram, the symbol of royalty, are the same as those which associate him with the σκῆπτρον, the mobile symbol of sovereignty that the god of exchange transmits from Zeus to the house of the Atridai, in the same way as he brings them the golden ram. In Orgogozo's study, already mentioned, there are some interesting remarks on Hermes's place in the myths of the golden fleece and his associations with the function of royalty.

- 133 On the significance of the ἄγρός, cf. P. Chantaine, 'Études sur le vocabulaire grec' (Paris, 1956), 34-5.
- 134 Xenophon 'Oeconomicus' 7. 19.
- 135 On the significance of πρόβατον and the opposition κειμήλια-πρόβασις, cf. E. Benveniste, Noms d'animaux en Indo-européen, 'Bulletin de la société de Linguistique', 45 (1949), 91-100. The double aspect of wealth could also be expressed in a formula such as Hesiod's ('Works and Days' 308): 'Through work men grow rich in flocks and substance, πολύμηλοι τ'ἀφνειοί τε.' Ἀφνειός is in fact related to a different type of riches from herds. It is wealth that is stored in houses or cities. In the 'Odyssey' 1. 392, the term refers to a house; in the 'Iliad' 2. 570, to a town - Corinth. On Corinth ἀφνειός cf. Thucydides 1. 13, 5. See also 'Odyssey' 1. 165, where the contrast is emphasized between 'light-footed' men (ἐλαφρότεροι πόδας) and men weighed down with possessions of the kind of riches constituted by gold and precious cloths (ἀφνειότεροι).
- 136 Hermes ἄγροτήρ, cf. Euripides 'Electra' 463; Hermes νόμιος, cf. Aristophanes 'Thesmophorusiae' 977.
- 137 Cf. Simonides of Amorgos, frg. 18 Diehl³: Hermes, patron of shepherds. We are reminded of the importance, in the religious plastic arts, of the figure of Hermes Criophorus bearing a ram on his shoulders.
- 138 Cf. Scholia to Aristophanes 'Ploutos' 395.
- 139 Hermes ἐπιμήλιος, cf. Pausanias 9. 34. 3; Hermes πολύμηλος, cf. 'Iliad' 14. 490.
- 140 Hesiod 'Theogony' 444 ff.
- 141 Cf. Aristotle 'Politics' 1258b.
- 142 In Athens the two feasts were separate. The naming of the child took place on the tenth day after birth (δεκάτη).
- 143 Scholia to Plato 'Theatetus' 160e; Hesychius s.v. Δρομιάμφιον ἥμαρ.

- 144 Scholia to Aristophanes 'Lysistrata' 758.
- 145 'Homeric Hymn to Demeter' 231-63.
- 146 'Argonautica' 4. 869 ff.
- 147 Pausanias, 2. 3, 11; on the κατακρυπτεία, cf. C. Picard, L'héraion de Perachora et les enfants de Médée, 'Revue archéologique' (1932), 218 ff.; Will, 'Korinthiaca: recherches sur l'histoire et la civilisation de Corinthe des origines aux guerres médiques' (Paris, 1955), 88 ff.
- 148 The word 'return' is used with intent. Born of the hearth as he is also born of the earth, man always returns, in death, to the world from which he issued.
- 149 Apollodorus 3. 6, 3.
- 150 Walking on the ground is quite a different matter from lying on the ground. The upright position does not carry the same risks as the prone position which delivers us into the hands of the chthonic powers. So the newborn child, even when exposed, was never put in direct contact with the soil. The tales of exposure always mention a casket, λάρναξ, a winnowing basket, λίκνον, or a pot, χύτρα.
- 151 Pausanias 6. 20, 3-6.
- 152 The 'Souda', in the περιστίαρχος and καθάρσιον article, informs us of the significance which this ring traced round the hearth can assume in an entirely different context. The pigs, which in Athens were used to purify the assembly, were first driven round the hearth; cf. Farnell, 'Cults', 363.
- 153 The ἀπό and ἐκ of ἀπόθεσις, ἐκθεσις both indicate the gap, the distance. These two terms do not appear to have the exactly opposite meaning that has sometimes been attributed to them with regard to the procedure of exposure (cf. M. Delcourt, 'Stérilités mystérieuses et naissances maléfiques dans l'antiquité classique' (Liège, 1938), 37 ff.; and, contra, P. Roussel, 'Revue des études anciennes' (1943), 5-17). To be convinced that the ἐκθεσις is not depositing the child in a frequented area in the hope that it will survive - an exposure decided by the father for social reasons, the ἀπόθεσις being, on the contrary, its abandonment for truly religious requirements, in a deserted place to make sure it will die - one need only consult the text of Euripides's 'Ion' and the 'Pastorals' of Longus, in which the specific term ἐκθεσις is used. The newborn Ion has been left in a deserted cave (ἄντρον ἔρημον, 1494) where Hermes will come to fetch him; he has been exposed to wild animals (θηρσὶν ἐκτεθείς, 951), as the prey of birds (504-5), exposed to death (ὡς θανούμενον, 18 and 27),

dedicated to hades (εἰς Αἰδαν ἐκβάλλη, 1496). As regards Longus's 'Pastorals' it could be said that the whole work is built round the opposition between the ἀγρός and the world of the city (πόλις and ἄστυ). Exposed ἐν ἀγρῷ (1. 2, 1; 4, 1; 5, 1; and 4. 21, 3), far from the town where their parents dwell, in areas frequented solely by shepherds searching for their lost animals, the two children, having grown up and found their family, always remain pure 'rustics' (4. 39, 1). On the opposition ἀγρός-ἄστυ cf. 4. 11, 1 and 2; 15, 4; 17, 1; 19, 1; 38, 3, 4.

154 'When a child is born, the question the father has to answer is whether it shall be brought up or exposed. Exposure of the child resulted from failure to celebrate the *amphidromia*, or, in other words, from the disavowal of paternity in consequence of this, Beauchet, 'Histoire du droit', 2: 87. Cf. also Glotz, 'Solidarité', 41; 'Études sociales et juridiques sur l'antiquité grecque' (Paris, 1906), 192.

155 Plato 'Theatetus' 150bc.

156 This could also be translated - and Glotz seems to have read the text in this way - 'of good constitution and legitimate birth'. Γόνιμος and ἀληθής could have both meanings. On γόνιμος, opposed to νόθος, bastard, in the sense of the legitimate son, cf. 'Palatine Anthology' 9. 277.

157 Plato 'Theatetus' 160c-1a.

158 Plutarch 'Life of Lycurgus' 16. 1-4.

159 Plutarch 'Quaest. Conviv.' 693F.

160 It is hardly necessary to recall that the ῥάβδος is an attribute of Hermes which confers on this god the patronage of certain 'expulsion' rituals, especially those that Eustathius ('Odyssey' 22. 481) calls πομπαῖα (cf. Hermes πομπαῖος, Aeschylus 'Eumenides' 91; Sophocles 'Ajax' 832): 'When the πομπαῖα are celebrated and the sullied are expelled to the cross-roads, a πομπός is held in the hands, which is said to be nothing else but the κηρύκειον, the wand of Hermes (σέβας Ἑρμοῦ): from this πομπός and the word δῖος comes the word τὸ διοπομπεῖν, sacred expulsion.

161 "Ἐξω βούλιμον, ἔσω δὲ πλοῦτον καὶ ὑγίειαν!"

162 'Anecd. Graec.', Bekker, 1. 278, 4; G. Verrall and Jane Harrison, 'Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens' (London, 1890), 168.

163 On the relations between this type of sacrilege and 'devouring hunger', cf. the story of Erysichthon, Callimachus 'Hymn to Demeter' 30 ff.

164 Plutarch 'Conjug. Praecepta' 144a-b.

165 'Paroemiogr. Graec.', Gaisford, 25; βουζύγης; cf.

Farnell, 'Cults', 3; 315, note 17. On the domestic symbolism of fire and water, cf. Plutarch 'Roman Questions' 1: in Rome, the new bride has to 'touch fire and water'. It was doubtless a rite of integration in her husband's home as were the καταχύσματα in Greece.

166 Pausanias 7. 22, 1 ff.

167 Euripides frg. 781, 55 N². Porphyrius, in Eusebius 'Praeparatio Evangelica' 3. 11 also associates Hestia with the subterranean deities.

168 Deroy, Le culte du foyer, 32 and 43.

169 Plato 'Phaedrus' 247a.

170 'Republic' 616 ff.; cf. P.-M. Schuhl, Le joug du bien, les liens de la nécessité et la fonction d'Hestia, 'Mélanges Charles Picard' (Paris, 1949), 2: 965 ff.

171 Plato 'Cratylus' 401c-e.