Fosterage, kinship and the circulation of children in ancient Greece

JAN N. BREMMER

In the second half of the second century AD Pausanias travelled around Greece in order to describe local myths and the monuments still present.[1] In the small city of Troezen, not far from Athens, he recorded certain stories about Theseus, the greatest Athenian hero: 'when Heracles visited Pittheus at Troezen he laid down the lion's skin at dinner, and there came in to him some Troezenian children, among whom was Theseus, then just seven years old. They say that when the rest of the children saw the skin they ran away, but that Theseus, not much afraid, slipped out, snatched an axe from the servants, and at once came on in earnest, thinking the skin was a lion.' According to Pausanias, 'this is the first story the Troezenians tell of him.' The second is this: 'Aegeus deposited boots and a sword under a rock as tokens of the boy's identity, and then sailed away to Athens; but when Theseus was sixteen years old, he pushed up the rock and carried off what Aegeus had deposited there. There is a statue on the Acropolis illustrative of this story: it is all of bronze except the rock.'[2]

In literature the story of Theseus' stay in Troezen is first attested in the Hellenistic poet Callimachus. However, the scene of Theseus lifting the rock already occurs on Athenian and Etruscan vases from the middle of the fifth century, which proves that the story easily predates the Hellenistic age.[3] Apparently, it had remained alive in Troezen because of the presence of a monument – a not uncommon prompt in antiquity for the collective memory.[4] But why was a son of the Athenian king living in Troezen? We find relevant 'information' in Plutarch's biography, which relates that Pittheus was the father-in-law of Aegeus.[5] In other words, Theseus was being raised by his maternal grandfather, which is a clear case of fosterage: that is, the education by foster parents instead of the biological parents.

The Greek verb used for 'raise' is *trephô*, which is the usual verb in such cases. Normally, we translate it 'feed', but the passage in Pausanias shows that such a translation overlooks the educational factor.[6] The connection between 'feeding' and 'educating' is not only found in ancient Greece. In the Latin texts of the Celts the foster-father is called *nutricius*; the Germanic root of fosterage, **fod-*, lies at the basis of English 'food'; and Latin *alumnus*, 'fosterchild', derives from the verb *alo*, 'feed'.[7] It seems clear that the Greek vocabulary for fosterage goes back to ancient times and is, perhaps, even of Indo-European origin.

Plutarch also mentions that Theseus had a private tutor in the shape of Connidas. The name of this Athenian mythological hero is derived from *konnos*, one of the various terms in Greece for the hairstyle of male adolescents.[8] The *paidagôgos* as such did not yet exist in archaic Greece and is an anachronism here,[9] but the name of the tutor underlines the educational aspect of Theseus' fosterage.

The education of a boy by his maternal grandfather is not uncommon in the literature of archaic Greece and is already mentioned in the *Iliad*.[10] The Trojan Iphidamas was raised (the Greek uses a form of the verb *trephô*) by Cisseus, his *mêtropatôr* (XI 221-4), and Neoptolemus was raised on the island of Scyrus, where his father Achilles had left him with his father-in-law Lycomedes (XIX 326-7). The motif is still used by Euripides in his tragedy *Cresphontes*, where after the murder of his father the homonymous protagonist is raised by his mother's father, the Arcadian king Cypselus. We know this from later sources, since a papyrus fragment of the *Cresphontes* breaks off virtually after the words 'his mother's father . . . '.[11]

The relation between fosterage and the mother's family is unique, and in our tradition we do not find any examples of a comparable role for the father's family. Studies of Greek kinship have always stressed the importance of the father's family (see below). None of them has paid any attention to the role of the mother's family in the education. This silence has led me to pose some questions about Greek kinship relations. First, are there more examples of this unexpected interest on the part of the mother's family? Secondly, if this is indeed the case, what is the best way of characterizing Greek kinship relations? Finally, what was the function of fosterage, and what does this educational practice tell us about the place of children in ancient society?[12]

These questions direct us to a theme that has often attracted the attention

of anthropologists, namely kinship relations, and within those relations the place of children. The theme could probably fill a book, and we have to limit ourselves. I shall concentrate on archaic Greece and Athens, the city about which we are best informed. However, as I shall also touch on the period before the rise of the polis, my results may well be of comparative interest for investigations into the kinship systems of the tribal Celts and Germanic peoples, as well as for students of the earlier Middle Ages.

The role of the maternal family

In archaic Greece, children could not only be raised by their maternal grandfather, they could even become his successor, since in Greek mythology there are various examples where a king lacks a son and is succeeded by his daughter's son.[13] Perseus left his son behind with his wife Andromeda's father Cepheus, who had no sons; Leucippus left the throne of Sicyon to his daughter's son, because he had no male heir; and Hippothous requested the kingdom of his maternal grandfather Cercyon as his rightful inheritance. In two other cases, a grandfather was succeeded by his daughter's sons, even though he did have sons of his own. As we do not have any 'historical' examples of such a succession, we cannot be absolutely certain that in this respect myth closely reflects reality. However, we may at least note that one of those cases, that of Bellerophon, took place in Anatolia, where in the time of the Hittites succession by a daughter's son had indeed been the rule.[14]

The potential candidacy of a daughter's son for the throne may well explain the attempt by a grandfather to kill his grandson. When, according to the mythographer 'Apollodorus' (his real name is unknown), 'Acrisius inquired of the oracle how he should get male children, the god said that his daughter would give birth to a son who would kill him. Fearing that, Acrisius built a brazen chamber underground and there guarded Danae . . . When Acrisius afterwards learned that she had got a child, Perseus, he would not believe that she had been seduced by Zeus, and putting his daughter with the child in a chest, he cast it into the sea'. When Perseus had reached adulthood, he returned home, accidentally killed his grandfather and so became king.[15]

How can we interpret this myth? It should be clear by now that scholarship must be extremely careful in using mythology in order to reconstruct ideas and practices in archaic Greece. Yet we have learned from mistakes in the past, and surely some progress has been made. One of the more fertile insights, which

has recently been developed, stresses that myths play a role in making explicit aspects of Greek civilization which remain hidden in daily life, such as collective fears.[16] A good illustration is the role of women in (male-produced) myth, where they are frequently pictured as aggressive and dominant in a way that cannot have been the reflection of daily experience. Many myths, therefore, tell us more about the unconscious *Angst* of the Greek male than about real-life relations. It seems that the myth of Perseus made manifest one of these fears, since some kings must have feared that their daughters' sons would not wait for their death or abdication.

The myth probably tells us something too, albeit in an indirect manner, about the relationship between a grandfather and his daughter's son, as may be apparent from a comparison with the relationship between fathers and sons.[17] The latter relationship was considered so important (though more along lines of loyalty, respect and obedience than affection) that the producers of myth could not imagine a premeditated parricide. If it ever came about that a son was the cause of his father's death, then he could not possibly have known that the victim was his father: witness Oedipus. Alternatively, he caused his father's death simply by mistake, as when Theseus forgot to change the sails after his victory over the Minotaur. All later sources stress the affectionate character of the relationship between a grandfather and his daughter's son. This is well illustrated by the words of Orestes about his maternal grandfather Tyndareus in Euripides' *Orestes* (462-5): 'Indeed, he raised me [again a form of the verb *trephô*] when I was still small and he fully accomplished the signs of friendship regarding me: he carried me, the son of Agamemnon, around, and also Leda [the grandmother: a very rare mention of the mother's mother] – honouring me no less than the Dioscuri [their own children].' The relationship will hardly have been different in archaic Greece. The myth of Perseus, then, is also an early witness to this affectionate relationship, since the myth could not possibly imagine a premeditated murder of the maternal grandfather.[18]

Besides a good relationship with the maternal grandfather, there are a number of testimonies to a good relationship with the maternal uncle, who was also the favourite uncle among the Romans, Germanic peoples and Celts, and remained so in the High Middle Ages: the Dutch word for 'uncle', *oom* (German *Oheim*, Old English *eam*) derives from the original Germanic word for maternal uncle, which from the twelfth century onwards, but only gradually,

began to acquire the meaning of paternal uncle.[19] However, in the Greek world the difference between maternal and paternal uncle was less marked than in the Roman world, where *patruus* became synonymous with 'very strict, severe'.[20]

The maternal uncle has an educational, even initiatory, function in the myths of Odysseus, Meleager and the expedition of Jason with his Argonauts. Even though the classical period no longer practised an initiation proper, the maternal uncle continued to play an inspirational role for his nephew, since several nephews choose the same profession as their maternal uncle, such as Plato's sister's son and Callimachus' homonymous sister's son.[21] The relationship with the maternal uncle will often have been better than that with the maternal grandfather, since differences in age were much smaller and in many cases the maternal grandfather must already have passed away. Evidently, the Greeks, like many other Indo-European peoples (I limit myself to those civilizations I have some acquaintance with), tackled the difficult combination of affection and discipline in the education of the young by dividing it between the father and the maternal uncle. The modern father – and I speak from experience – is not always so successful.

In classical Athens, only males had a public identity, and it was not customary to mention respectable women by name in public during their lifetime: the same woman could be called 'the wife of x', 'the daughter of y', or 'the mother of z'.[22] These circumstances mean that we are hardly able to say anything about the relationship between a woman and her maternal uncle. It is therefore interesting to note that in Aristophanes' *Clouds* the adolescent Phidippides is strongly under the influence of his mother's maternal uncle, whom he himself (vv. 46, 124) also calls 'uncle'. Evidently, despite the isolation to which Greek women were subjected, it was not uncommon for a woman to receive visits from her maternal uncle. It is clear, then, that the mother's family hardly played some negligible role in Greek life.[23] It even seems to have been the case that the role of the mother's family in the education was more important than that of the father. This preponderance may well be explained by the fact that Greek fathers left the education of the younger children mainly to the mother. It was only later in adolescence that they stepped in and took the education of the sons into their own hands.[24]

Are there any other spheres of life where the family of the one side was more important than that of the other? Unfortunately, we are not in the position

of the modern anthropologist who can settle in a Greek community and make a close study of local relationships.[25] Yet we are not totally deprived of possibilities, since there exist at least four situations in which we can reasonably analyse the functioning of both families: war, legal proceedings, adoption, and death.

We begin with war in archaic Greece. In the *Iliad*, Hector is regularly assisted by his family in the fight against the Greeks. Evidently, such help could be expected at critical moments. But from whose family did his help come, from that of his father Priam or that of his mother Hecuba? After Hector with his Trojan troops has advanced right into the camp of the Greeks, Ajax and his allies kill three full paternal cousins, namely Clytius (XV 421-2), Dolops (XV 543) and Melanippus (XV 576-8), and a paternal second cousin, Laodamas (XV 516-7), one after the other. And in the somewhat later pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 212a), Patroclus is not called the friend of Achilles, as we would have expected, but his paternal cousin. We may also note that, during his labours, Heracles is always accompanied by his brother's son Iolaus. On the other hand, one could also enter battle with one's maternal uncle: Apollo appeared to Hector in the shape of his mother's brother Asius in order to exhort him to challenge Patroclus; Achilles' sister's son Menesthius was second in command of his fleet; and during the famous campaign of the Seven against Thebes, Adrastus was accompanied by his sister's son Hippomedon.[26] The Greeks were not unique in this respect. In the early Germanic world and the medieval society of the *chansons de geste*, the maternal uncle is often assisted in battle by his nephew; here we may also recall that in ancient Israel, David's army was commanded by Joab, his sister's son.[27] In archaic Greece, anyhow, there does not seem to have been a significant difference between the assistance offered by the father's or the mother's family, at least not in our fictional sources.

Let us now move to historical Athens, where our second example concerns the presence of kin during court cases. From the many orations of the fourth century which have survived we are able to gain considerable insight into how far relatives were called up as positive witnesses and from which side, that of the father or that of the mother, one could expect the most support. From a detailed investigation, Sally Humphreys concludes that 'ties traced through women seem to have been rather more likely to produce support than those traced through males . . . and there is perhaps a slight tendency for matrikin to

appear as more supportive than patrikin, although the difference is certainly not statistically significant.'[28] This conclusion seems to me very important, since it is precisely in this area of court cases that we have much Athenian evidence at our disposal.

We are also not badly informed in our third area, adoption, even though most of the material derives from the same orations. In classical Athens, unlike archaic Greece, marriage was subjected to various legal rules, and parents had to give the bride a dowry.[29] An heiress without brothers, the *epiklêros*, was obliged to marry first her paternal uncle.[30] If he was unable or unwilling to fulfil his duty, he had to procure a dowry in order to enable the heiress to marry. However, the husband of the heiress did not become the owner of her possessions. On the contrary, only his sons became the new owners and thus in fact inherited from their mother's father. This practice too points to the importance of the mother's family. It was also possible for a father to keep the inheritance within the family by adopting the future husband of his daughter, in which case the genealogy of the daughter's son would lead back to the maternal family.[31] This custom, perhaps, is a continuation of the Homeric uxorilocal marriages discussed below.[32] From the nearly forty attested cases of adoption only a few concern those of a male agnate by the male line, and even those are mostly only posthumous; the case of the adoption by the father's father is even rather complicated because the adoptee himself was, through adoption, also the paternal uncle of his own mother! On the other hand, we have at least six cases of adopting the sister's son, one case of the grandson of a sister's son, and one of the brother of the wife. In this area the mother's family seems to have been by far the more favoured.[33]

Finally, death. Were Athenians customarily buried in a family grave and, if so, who was considered to be family? Unfortunately, our information is rather scanty, since the older graves in particular contain no epitaphs or only insufficient ones. In many later cases we find the nuclear family or parts thereof, for example a brother or a sister. If there are two generations, the grave usually also contains the children of brothers or sisters; there is even a burial together with a maternal uncle. Graves with three generations usually contain father, son and grandson with the respective wives and (unmarried?) daughters, and we have at least one grave with relatives on the mother's side.[34] The famous orator Isocrates, who occupied a very prominent grave, was

buried with his parents, his brother, his adopted son with his two sons, but also with his mother's sister and her son.[35]

The character of Greek kinship relations

Up to now analysts of Greek kinship relations have limited themselves to a study of the kinship terminology within a comparative Indo-European framework. Despite variations in detail, virtually all have reached the conclusion that the Indo-European kinship system was endogamous, patriarchal, patrilocal and patrilineal.[36] Certainly, their investigations have often enriched our understanding and knowledge, but without exception they also fail in two respects. First, they are still moving within the nineteenth-century tradition, which looked at the nuclear family from an evolutionistic point of view and was especially interested in the reconstruction of the primeval situation. This perspective has maintained itself almost up to the present day, but is increasingly open to criticism: the most recent research stresses the socio-cultural context of the kinship relations instead of the traditional reduction of these relations to a kind of higher algebra with numerous diagrams.[37] Secondly, earlier investigations virtually always involved a direct step from kinship terminology to kinship system. Consequently, they hardly took into consideration social variations or tensions within the system, relationships not covered by the terminology, or diachronous developments within individual Indo-European traditions.[38] In the light of these objections, we may ask to what extent we can still accept as valid the formulation 'endogamous, patriarchal, patrilocal and patrilineal'?

Let us start with the problem of endogamy, which has attracted the attention of Indo-Europeanists and classicists only more recently. According to Émile Benveniste (1902-69), the Greeks and other Indo-European peoples practised matrilateral cross-cousin marriage: that is, a marriage of *ego* with a daughter of the mother's brother. Benveniste did not produce any specific instances of this kind of marriage, but deduced its existence from the (near) identity of the words for mother's father and mother's brother, for example Greek *mêtrôs* or Latin *avus* and *avunculus*.[39] However, if *ego* did not marry his mother's brother's daughter as a rule,[40] in the archaic age he certainly seemed to have not infrequently married her sister, witness Diomedes (*Iliad* V 412), Iphidamas (*Iliad* XI 221-2), Aeetes (Hesiod, *Theogony* 352-6) and Pandion (Apollodorus 3.14.8); or at least he courted her, as Actaeon did (Acusilaus fr.

4). On the other hand, there were also marriages with the brother's daughter, as with Alcinous (*Odyssey* VII 63-6) or Cretheus and Amythaon (Apollodorus 1.9.11); in the case of Alcinous, Homer even explicitly mentions that he married an heiress, which seems to point already to the practice of the *epiklêros* in the classical period. It would appear that there is a certain preference for the mother's family in these cases.

The type of marriage with a member of the older generation hardly seems to have survived into classical Athens, but we do hear of a marriage with the brother's daughter (Lysias 32.4 and [Demosthenes] 43.73), and of an offer of such a marriage, even though it was declined (Demosthenes 44.10); the marriage of the orator Lysias with his sister's daughter was even more exceptional ([Demosthenes] 59.22). Lysias was a metic and his possibilities may thus have been rather limited: from the time of Pericles, Athenians could marry legally only with children of two Athenian parents. We have virtually no information about practice outside Athens, but the Spartan King Leonidas had married Gorgo, the daughter of his brother Cleomenes (Herodotus 7.239), and in his *Life of Dio* (6) Plutarch mentions that Dionysius I (*c.* 430-367), a tyrant of Syracuse, had married his daughter Arete to his brother and after his death to the brother of one of his two wives. Presumably, the tyrant did not want to enter into an alliance with any one of the prominent families of Syracuse in order to avoid a jealous reaction on the part of the others.

After the archaic period, if they wanted to marry a member of their family, the Athenians preferred a partner of their own generation, even if the husband was usually twice the age of his wife.[41] It is impossible to establish the frequency of endogamous marriage in classical Athens, since we need at least five names in order to be certain of the exact relationship. Yet though literary sources and inscriptions tend to be insufficiently informative – and in any case, as we have seen, the names of respectable women often went unmentioned – we can still give some indications. From the fifteen or so Athenian marriages of which we can establish the exact relationship, there are roughly as many matrilateral as patrilateral parallel-cousin instances – that is, marriages with the daughter of a mother's sister or the father's brother. In the second half of the fourth century, Menander even wrote one of his comedies around this theme. His play, the *Aspis*, ends with marriages of a boy with the daughter of his paternal uncle and of his sister with the stepson of her paternal uncle.[42]

In passing we may note that, in addition to class endogamy, the Athenians were familiar with a degree of local endogamy, since a number of marriages were clearly concluded within a specific deme. It was even the case that after a marriage with a partner of another deme, the children (so to speak) married back into the original deme. Once again, our prosopographical data are limited and not crystal-clear, because we do not know whether those epitaphs are local which do not indicate an origin from a certain deme. In any case, it was very normal to marry outside one's own deme: of the 131 marriages about which we have the necessary data, 89 concern marriages with a partner from a different deme.[43]

This kind of 'extra-demal' marriage is well illustrated by an inscription from the mid-fourth century, which concerns a dedication to the goddess Athena by a grandfather, his three sons and three grandsons. Whereas the sons all belong to the deme Phlya, the three grandsons come from three different demes. The variance in origin indicates that the youths were his daughter's sons, who accompanied their fathers during important religious activities. Such shared religious activities were not uncommon. When the plaintiffs, in a fourth-century oration by Isaeus, wish to demonstrate that they are the children of Ciron's daughter, they offer the following proof: 'for, as was natural, seeing that we were the sons of his own daughter, Ciron never offered a sacrifice without our presence.' We find a similar sacrifice in the Spartan version of the myth of Cresphontes, where the father of Cresphontes' wife invites his daughter's sons to sacrifice with him to Zeus Akraios: a further example of the close relationship between a grandfather and his daughter's sons.[44]

Endogamy, then, was an established, but certainly not the ruling, practice, in archaic and classical times: famous couples, such as Hector and Andromache, or Odysseus and Penelope, were no family at all and did not come from the same communities.[45]

We can be much briefer about patriarchy. Albeit less marked than in Rome, the strictly patriarchal nature of which has admittedly been qualified in recent investigations,[46] the position of the father was unassailable in Greece. In this respect there is little difference of opinion between recent Greek and Indo-European research.

On the other hand, the patrilocal aspect has become more problematic. Although in general we can still maintain that classical Greece was patrilocal, we do have to be careful. According to the mythological tradition, it was not

unusual in the world of archaic Greece that a king with only a daughter selected a macho son-in-law who subsequently came to live with him and, one may suppose, in due time would succeed him. There are various examples of these filiacentric marriages in Homer, such as those involving Tydeus (*Iliad* XIV 121), Bellerophon (who also received half of his father-in-law's kingdom: *Iliad* VI 191-3), and Odysseus (who was offered Nausicaa by her father, the Phaeacian king Alcinous: *Odyssey* VII 311-6). Elsewhere we hear of Heracles, who received Megara from Creon and was appointed to a kind of viceroyship over Thebes. The same type of marriage is still regularly mentioned in the tragedies of Euripides. Here, the occurrence is probably a case of mythological continuity rather than a reflection of living practice, although cases of uxorilocal marriages are actually attested in Athens.[47]

Although our main evidence is mythological and dates from the archaic age, the Athenian evidence strongly suggests that these cases were not just fiction but did reflect a historical reality. This type of marriage, then, clearly shows up one of the weaknesses of current analyses, since these do not differentiate between social groups or between ideology and practice.[48] Evidently, the social élite felt no difficulty in deviating from the norm of patrilocality. It is therefore not acceptable when one of the most influential post-war classicists, Jean-Pierre Vernant, states that these cases point to a *crise* in the marriage structure. Vernant is clearly influenced by Claude Lévi-Strauss' theories about marriage as primarily an alliance between two groups, but this view is hardly valid for ancient Greece.[49]

If the principle of patrilocality can only be accepted with some qualifications, what about patrilinearity? In this matter, modern anthropologists pay much more attention than their predecessors to the difference between representation and reality. Sir Edward Evans-Pritchard (1902-73), perhaps the greatest anthropologist of this century, could still, without batting an eyelid, write that only the underlying model was of importance: 'actualities are always changing and passing while the principle endures.' Modern anthropologists try to distinguish between the ruling ideology of a community and the actual feeling and behaviour of its members. As traditional investigations focused on terminology, they never got far enough to study behaviour and they were certainly not interested in possible ideological aspects of kinship structure.[50]

When we look at real behaviour by the Greeks, the Athenians in particular,

we do at once notice that the maternal family does not play a subordinate part at all. The maternal relatives were extremely important, perhaps even more important than the paternal, not only during the period of education but in everyday life more generally, as the counsels' pleas illustrate. The reason for this importance is probably to be found in the relationship between brother and sister, which was closer than that between brother and brother or sister and sister, as is also the case in modern Greece. The brother was the protector of the sister and the only man, except her husband and mother's brother, who could freely visit her. And even those visits were not always without their problems, since prominent politicians were regularly accused of incest.[51] For example, the flamboyant Alcibiades was reproached with visiting his sister 'not as her brother but as her husband' (Lysias 14.28). Moreover, the tie between a mother and her children was closer than that with the father. As a character in Euripides' *Erechtheus* (fr. 358) says: 'Nothing is more delightful to children than a mother.'[52]

Both sides of the family, then, played an important role in Greek kinship relations. It even seems to have been the case that this practice of bilaterality influenced terminology, since in the course of the fifth century the separate terms for father's brother and mother's brother were replaced by one new term, *theios*, just as the new term *kêdestai* replaced the various terms for the maternal and paternal relatives. It is not easy to gain an idea of changes in Greek kinship structures over a long period of time, but another example is the existence of an old terminology which seems to indicate the one-time domination of the extended family, although the nuclear family was the norm in historical Greece.[53]

Does the important role played by both sides of the family suggest that we should speak of 'ego-centered bilateral kindred'?[54] Such a view probably goes too far. Athenian citizenship was mainly determined by the membership of the *phratria* and the *phulê*, both of which recruited their members only along patrilineal lines.[55] Moreover, the ideal inheritance always went via the paternal line (albeit in the case of an only daughter the practice was different). In addition, a legitimate son always called himself after his father and traced his descent via the paternal line, whereas names derived from the mother (matronymics) were used for illegitimate children despite the fact that in archaic genealogical poetry, like the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, women still played a prominent role in the family tree.[56] The patrilineal ideology even verged on

the grotesque, as when philosophers like Anaxagoras and poets like Aeschylus and Euripides suggest that the mother, from a biological point of view, is not really a parent because she merely provides the place in which the male seed can develop.[57]

Given the importance of the paternal line in citizenship and inheritance and the clear patrilineal ideology, but also given the importance of the maternal line in everyday practice, the qualifications 'patrilineal' or 'bilateral' to characterize Greek kinship relations seem inappropriate. Rather, I would use the term 'asymmetrical bilateral', the characterization used of the Greek countryside in recent times by modern anthropology:[58] the importance of the paternal family seems to have been more prominent in public life, certainly at the ideological level.[59]

Fosterage and the circulation of children

Let us now return to the fosterage of Theseus. The custom of not educating one's own children, but leaving this task to others, was and is widespread.[60] But why do people take in children not their own? One reason may well be that these children carry out all kinds of useful duties. Our Greek material is not very helpful in this respect, but the Roman evidence shows that children, wherever we have information about them, had to contribute to survival by participation in economic life, be it as maid, farm hand, assistant to an entertainer, or servant of a smith – as is still the case in many parts of the world today.[61] It is also striking how often words meaning 'child' or 'youth' have developed into the meaning 'slave' or 'servant', such as Greek *pais*,[62] Latin *puer*, western-European *page*, French *garçon*, *valet* and *bachelier*,[63] Old English *cniht*, *cnapa* and *thegn* (related to Greek *teknon*, 'child'), and Dutch and German *knecht / Knecht*, *deerne / Dirne* and *dienstmaagd / Magd*. It used to be very normal in western Europe to employ youths as servants, and things were not that different in ancient Greece.[64]

Admittedly, the function of the fosterchild as helping hand does not explain the prominent role of the maternal family in fosterage and therefore hardly explains the origins of the phenomenon. There is no recent study of the matter, but in 1893 the Dutch ethnologist S.R. Steinmetz (1862-1940) published a detailed article on the subject, the scope of whose investigations remains unsurpassed.[65] Unlike most modern anthropologists, Steinmetz was strongly interested in contemporary ethnology and historical sources, a combination

which for a long time would be very hard to find among anthropologists and historians, with the notable exception of my famous compatriot Johan Huizinga.[66] A rapprochement between spokesmen for the two approaches would only gradually get under way again in the 1960s, with Evans-Pritchard in the vanguard.[67]

Steinmetz collected data from the whole world and was struck by the prominence of the maternal family. The quest he began is certainly not over, and, *inter alia*, his collection of evidence for fosterage by the maternal family among Germanic and Celtic peoples is far from complete.[68] Steinmetz even missed the occurrence of fosterage in Germanic mythology, where the Germanic supreme god Wodan was raised by Bolthorn, the father of his mother Bestla.[69]

In the spirit of his time, Steinmetz thought he could explain the prominence of the maternal family as a 'survival' of an earlier matriarchy, but this nineteenth-century construct no longer merits serious attention. Moreover, he failed to distinguish between primitive egalitarian communities and more developed and hierarchical societies. This made him overlook the fact that fosterage can symbolize submission, since in the world of the Nordic sagas it was usually an inferior who educated the child of a social superior. It was for this reason that the English king Aethelstan refused to foster the child of the Norse king Harald.[70]

The Germanic material in particular, but also the Caucasian evidence collected by Steinmetz, clearly shows that feudal societies used fosterage to bolster ties between the higher and lower strata of society. Some kings transformed the institution in such a way that they educated the sons of aristocrats at court, and thus killed two birds with one stone, not only by creating ties of loyalty between their own sons and those of the aristocracy, but also by checking possible competitors. This education of young aristocrats at court is well attested among the Macedonians, and it remained popular among their Hellenistic successors, who selected youths from the sons of the king's Friends, men of letters and military advisors. Callimachus and Eratosthenes were most likely raised at the court of Ptolemy, and the institution was still alive enough in the second-century Near East for the author of the Book of *Daniel* (1.3f) to picture the three youths of the fiery furnace as such pages.[71] The probably independent existence of this institution among the Franks, Normans, Anglo-Saxons and English suggests that fosterage provided

opportunities whose potential was variously realizable according to the period and royal aspirations.[72]

The element of alliance may well have been the most important function of fosterage with the maternal family in archaic Greece. Marriage had created a tie between two families which would be strengthened by the education of a sister's or daughter's son. This interpretation gains in force, in my opinion, from the fact that 'gift-exchange', in the widest meaning of the word, functioned as the 'basic organizing mechanism' of archaic society,[73] as Moses Finley (1912-86) first argued in his famous *The World of Odysseus* (1954).[74] The role of children as pawns in the game of creating alliances is not uncommon, but is rather different from modern Western ideals, as even children of royals are now relatively free to marry whoever they want.

We have seen that fosterage was not uncommon, and that it strengthened the ties between families and the position of kings. In addition, the practice illustrates the importance of the maternal family, whose role may now be seen to be much more important than is usually thought. It is precisely in relatively undifferentiated societies, like ancient Greece, that the analysis of a single phenomenon can throw light on society as a whole.[75]

NOTES

1 On Pausanias see now C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley 1985); K.W. Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers* (Cambridge 1996). Unfortunately, the Penguin translation by Peter Levi is less reliable than that by J.G. Frazer (1898).

2 Pausanias 1.27.7-8, tr. Frazer.

3 *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (= *LIMC*) VII.1 (Zurich 1994) s.v. Theseus, 17-29 (C. Weber-Lehman).

4 R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1989); J.N. Bremmer, *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1994) 33.

5 Plutarch, *Theseus* 3-6, cf. C. Calame, *Thésée et l'imaginaire Athénien* (Lausanne 1996^2) 70-1.

6 C. Moussy, *Recherches sur* trepho *et les verbes signifiant nourrir* (Paris 1969); P. Demont, 'Remarques sur le sens de *trepho*', *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 91 (1978) 358-84.

7 F. Kerlouegan, 'Essai sur la mise en nourriture et l'éducation dans les pays celtiques d'après le témoignage des textes hagiographiques latins', *Etudes Celtiques* 12 (1968-9) 101-46; J. Boswell, *The Kindness of Strangers* (Harmondsworth 1989) 356 (Germanic peoples); C. Moussy, 'Alo, alesco, adolesco', in *Etrennes de septantaine. Travaux...offerts à Michel Lejeune* (Paris 1978) 167-78.

8 J.N. Bremmer, 'Heroes, rituals and the Trojan War', *Studi Storico-Religiosi* 2 (1978) 5-38 at 26; add Com. Adesp. fr. 371 Kassel-Austin, cf. A. Sommerstein, *Classical Quarterly* 77 (1983) 489; B. Legras, 'Mallocouria et mallocourètes. Un rite de passage dans l'Egypte romain', *Cahiers du Centre G. Glotz* 4 (1993) 113-27.

9 For the *paidagôgos* see M. Golden, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Baltimore 1990) 147-9.

10 For an excellent exploration of the difficulties posed by the use of literature as a historical source, see K. Thomas, *History and Literature* (Swansea 1988).

11 A. Harder, *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos* (Leiden 1985) 7-12; C. Collard et al., *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays* I (Warminster 1995) 126.

12 These questions are insufficiently answered in the recent studies of the Greek and/or Athenian family by S. Pomeroy, *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece* (Oxford 1997); C.A. Cox, *Household Interests: Property, Marriage Strategies, and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens* (Princeton 1998); C.A. Patterson, *The Family in Greek History* (Cambridge Mass. 1998).

13 I derive all examples for which no source is given from J.N. Bremmer, 'The importance of the maternal uncle and grandfather in archaic and classical Greece and early Byzantium', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 50 (1983) 173-86.

14 Greeks: Bremmer, 'The importance', 174-6. Hittites: T.V. Gamkrelidze and V.V. Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans* I (Berlin 1995) 675.

15 Apollodorus 2.4.1, tr. J.G. Frazer. For texts and representations of this myth see *LIMC* VII.1 (1994), s.v. Perseus (L.J. Roccos); for the type of myth see J.N. Bremmer and N.M. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London 1987) 27-30.

16 For these recent insights see K. Dowden, *The Uses of Greek Mythology* (London 1992); F. Graf, *Greek Mythology* (Baltimore 1993); R. Buxton, *Imaginary Greece* (Cambridge, 1994) 129 (on 'making explicit').

17 Most of our evidence derives from the Athenian relationship between fathers and sons, see Golden, *Children and Childhood*, 82-114; B. Strauss, *Fathers and Sons in Athens* (London 1993); Cox, *Household Interests*, 78-88.

18 Parricide: J.N. Bremmer, 'Oedipus and the Greek Oedipus complex', in Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London 1990[3]) 41-59 at 52. Mother's father and daughter's son: Bremmer, 'The importance', 177; Golden, *Children and Childhood*, 136-40 (grandfathers and grandchildren).

19 Germanic peoples: R.H. Bremmer, 'The importance of kinship: uncle and nephew in *Beowulf*', *Amsterdammer Beiträge z. ält. Germanistik* 15 (1980) 21-38; W.J. Jones, *German Kinship Terms (750-1500)* (Berlin 1990) 149-52; I.M. Bajema, 'The mother's brother: an investigation into the meaning of Old English *Eam*', *Neophilologus* 78 (1994) 633-43. Celts: T. Ó Cathasaigh, 'The sister's son in early Irish literature', *Prudentia* 5 (1986) 128-60; K. McCone, 'OIr. *aub* "river" and *mnair* "maternal uncle",' *Münch. Stud. z. Sprachwiss.* 53 (1992 [1994]) 101-11. Middle Ages: U. Peters, 'Von der Sozialgeschichte zur Familienhistorie', *Beitr. z. Gesch. der deutschen Sprache und Lit.* 112 (1990) 404-36 at 413-14 (bibliography); D. Kullmann, *Verwandtschaft in epischer Dichtung* (Tübingen 1992).

20 J. Hallett, *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society* (Princeton 1984) 152-68; M. Bettini, *Anthropology and Roman Culture* (Baltimore 1991) 14-66.

21 Note also the case of the Athenian military instructors *c.* 200 BC as discussed by Pomeroy, *Families*, 158-9.

22 J.N. Bremmer, 'Plutarch and the naming of Greek women', *American Journal of Philology* 102 (1981) 425-6.

23 For the terminology of the family on the mother's side see J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften* I (Göttingen 1953) 477-82, overlooked by E. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* I (Paris 1969) 230-1.

24 For the education by the mothers see Bremmer, *Interpretations*, 54-5.

25 See, e.g., R. Just, 'The limits of kinship', in P. Loizos and E. Papataxiarchis (eds.), *Contested Identities: Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece* (Princeton 1991) 114-32.

26 Iolaus: *LIMC* V.1 (1990), s.v. Iolaus (M. Pipili); J.N. Bremmer, 'The importance', 178-82.

27 Germanic world: R.H. Bremmer, 'The importance', 33 n. 55. *Chansons*: R. Bezzola, 'Les neveux', in *Mélanges...Jean Frappier* I (Geneva 1970) 89-114 (with a useful list of all the cousins); Kullmann, *Verwandtschaft*, 88-92. Joab: 1 *Chronicles* 2.16; Paul, too, is assisted by his sister's son (*Acts* 23.16). These passages have been overlooked in an interesting comparison of Athenian and Israelite kinship relationships: R. Littman, *Kinship and politics in Athens 600-400 B.C.* (New York 1990) 225-46.

28 S.C. Humphreys, 'Kinship patterns in the Athenian courts', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 27 (1986) 57-91; note also D. Cohen, *Law, Violence and Community in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1995) 163-80.

29 For Athenian marriage see A.R.W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* I (Oxford 1968) 3-9; E.J. Bickerman, *Religions and Politics in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Como 1985) 559-88: J. Modrzejeweski, *Status personnel et liens de famille dans les droits de l'Antiquité* (London 1993), ch. 5 with addenda.

30 See the helpful diagram in Patterson, *Family in Greek History*, 98.

31 The close connection between adoption and the institution of the *epiklêros* was already noticed by Louis Gernet (1882-1962) in 1920, see now his *Droit et société dans la Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1955) 121-49 at 129-31.

32 *Epiklêros*: see most recently PCG V 27 Kassel-Austin (comedies entitled *Epiklêros*); G. Sissa, 'La famille dans la cité grecque (V-IVe siècle avant J.-C.)', in A. Burgière et al. (eds.), *Histoire de la famille* I (Paris 1986) 209-51; also, 'Epigamia. Se marier entre proches à Athènes', in J. Andreau and H. Bruhns (eds.), *Parenté et stratégies familiales dans l'antiquité romaine* (Rome 1990) 199-223; Goody, *The Oriental*, 386-96; C. Leduc, 'Comment la donner en mariage? La mariée en pays grec (IXe-IVe s. av. J.-C.)', in G. Duby and M. Perrot (eds.), *Histoire des femmes* I, ed. P. Schmitt Pantel (Paris 1991) 259-316; S. Todd, *The Shape of Athenian Law* (Oxford 1993) 226-31; Cox, *Household Interests*, 94-9; Patterson, *Family in Greek history*, 97-101.

33 See the survey in L. Rubinstein, *Adoption in IV. Century Athens* (Copenhagen 1993) 117-25; C.A. Cox, 'The names of adoptees: some prosopographical afterthoughts', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 107 (1995) 249-54, and Cox, *Household Interests*, 125-8, 148-51.

34 S.C. Humphreys, *The Family, Women and Death* (London 1983) 79-130; I. Morris, *Burial and Ancient Society* (Cambridge 1987) 52-4, 90-1; B. d'Agostino, *Gnomon* 65 (1993) 43; Cox, *Household Interests*, 38-9.

53 A. Scholl, *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 109 (1994) 240-52; Cox, *Household Interests*, 39.

36 See, in this century, A.M. Hocart, *Imagination and proof* (Tucson 1987) 61-84 (1928[1]); H. Galton, 'The Indo-European kinship terminology', *Zs. f. Ethnologie* 82 (1957) 121-38; G. Ghurye, *Family and Kin in Indo-European Culture* (2nd edn., Bombay 1962); Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire* I, 203-76; H.P. Gates, *The Kinship Terminology of Homeric Greek* (Baltimore 1971); O. Szemerényi, *Scripta Minora* III (Innsbruck 1987) 1455-75; Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans* I, 658-77.

37 A. Kuper, *The Invention of Primitive Society* (London 1988); M. Godelier, 'L'Occident, miroir brisé. Une évaluation partielle de l'anthropologie sociale assortie de quelques perspectives', *Annales* 48 (1993) 1183-1207; M.G. Peletz, 'Kinship studies in late twentieth-century anthropology', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (1995) 343-72; J. Faubion, 'Kinship is dead. Long live kinship', *Comparative Studies in Social History* 38 (1996) 67-91.

38 J. Goody, *The Oriental, the Ancient and the Primitive* (Cambridge 1990) 23, points out that these are frequent mistakes in the study of kinship relations.
39 Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire* I, 223-37; Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans* I, 671.
40 See also I. Morris, 'The Gortyn code and Greek society', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 31 (1990) 233-54. For an exception note Humphreys, *The Family*, 109; for modern exceptions, J. Pitt-Rivers, *The People of the Sierra* (2nd edn, Chicago 1971) 103-6. Note also a marriage with the mother's brother's daughter's daughter: Cox, *Household Interests*, 12.
41 R. Just, *Women in Athenian Law and Life* (London 1989) 151-2.
42 W.E. Thompson, 'The marriage of first cousins in Athenian society', *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 273-82; some additions, but no mention of Menander's *Aspis*, in id., 'Athenian marriage patterns: remarriage', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 5 (1972) 211-25 at 211 n. 2.
43 R. Osborne, *Demos* (Cambridge 1985) 127-53; C.A. Cox, 'Sisters, daughters and the deme of marriage', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108 (1988) 185-8; and Cox, *Household Interests*, index s.v. local endogamy; add the case of Menander's *Samia*.
44 *IG* II^2 4327; Isaeus 8.15; Nic. Damasc. *FGrH* 90 F 31 Jacoby; J.N. Bremmer, 'The family and other centres of religious learning in antiquity', in J.W. Drijvers and A.A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of Learning* (Leiden 1995) 29-38. Note also *I. Knidos* 627 with, probably, a grave epigram for Epitadeios by his daughter's sons.
45 Endogamy frequently occurred also among the ancient Roman élite: Y. Thomas, 'Mariages endogamiques à Rome', *Rev. Hist. Droit Franç. Étrang.* 58 (1980) 345-82.
46 R. Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge 1994) 102-32. Note that J. Goody, *Comparative Studies in Kinship* (Stanford 1969) 236, stresses that 'patriarchal authority' also occurs among 'matrilineal descent groups'.
47 Heracles: Diodorus Siculus 4.10.6. Euripides: Harder, *Euripides' Kresphontes*, 171; add Eur. *Hyp. Phoen.*, frr. 72, 558. Athens: Cox, *Household Interests*, 142 n. 56.
48 The exception is now Cox, *Household Interests*,
49 J.-P. Vernant, *Mythe et société en Grêce ancienne* (Paris 1974) 73-4. On Vernant see R. de Donato, *Per una antropologia storica del mondo antico* (Florence 1990) 209-23. For Homeric marriage see now E. Scheid-Tissinier, *Les usages du don chez Homère* (Nancy 1994) 83-114.
50 Kuper, *Invention*, 198 (quotation); Y. Kuiper, 'Genealogie, familiebesef en afstamming. Verkenningen van een cultureel antropoloog', *Jaarboek Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie* 49 (1995) 73-84.
51 J.N. Bremmer, 'Why did Medea kill her brother Apsyrtos?', in J. Clauss and S. Johnston (eds.), *Medea* (Princeton 1997) 83-100 at 93-9; Cox, *Household Interests*, 114-29.
52 See also Golden, *Children and Childhood*, 100; Cox, *Household Interests*, 99-104.
53 S.C. Humphreys, *Anthropology and the Greeks* (London 1978) 193-208 (part of an attractive sketch of Greek kinship relations).
54 Humphreys, *Anthropology*, 197-8.
55 See most recently N.F. Jones, 'The Athenian phylai as associations: disposition, function, and purpose', *Hesperia* 64 (1995) 503-42; R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford 1996) 104-8.
56 R. Janko, *The Iliad: a commentary* IV (Cambridge 1992) 202.
57 See the detailed discussion by A. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus: Eumenides* (Cambridge 1989) 206-8; N. Loraux, *The Children of Athena* (Princeton 1993) 111-43.
58 J.K. Campbell, 'The kindred in a Greek mountain community', in J. Pitt-Rivers (ed.), *Mediterranean Countrymen* (Paris 1963) 72-96 at 80.

59 Recent insights concerning the Roman family seem to be yielding comparable results: J.P. Hallett, '*Agnatio*, *affinitas* and *cognatio* in Classical Rome', in H.D. Jocelyn (ed.), *Tria Lustra* (Liverpool 1993) 215-28.

60 See, for example, more recently C. Fonseca, 'Valeur marchande, amour maternel et survie: aspects de la circulation des enfants dans un bidonville brésilien', *Annales ESC* 40 (1985) 991-1022; J. Carsten 'Children in between: fostering and the process of kinship on Pulan Langwahi, Malaysia', *Man* 26 (1991) 425-43; G. Gunnlaugsson, '"Everyone's been good to me, especially the dogs": foster-children and young paupers in nineteenth-century Southern Iceland', *Journal of Social History* 27 (1993-4) 341-58.

61 Golden, *Children and Childhood*, 32-7 (Greece); K. Bradley, *Discovering the Roman Family* (Oxford 1991) 103-24 (Rome); A.C. Zeller, *Man* 22 (1987) 541-8 (elsewhere).

62 Cf. M. Golden, '*Pais*, "child" and "slave",' *L'Antiquité Classique* 54 (1985) 91-104, who has somewhat neglected the comparative evidence.

63 H. Meier, 'Frz. *bachelier*', in H. Ölberg and G. Schmidt (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen. Festschrift für Johann Knobloch* (Innsbruck 1985) 255-8 (an interesting attempt at etymologically connecting these words) and 'Garçon, valet, vassal', in *Scritti in onore di Giuliano Bonfante* I (Brescia 1976) 473-87.

64 M. Mitterauer, 'Gesindedienst und Jugendphase im europäischen Vergleich', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 11 (1985) 177-204.

65 S.R. Steinmetz, *Gesammelte kleinere Schriften zur Ethnologie und Soziologie* I (Groningen 1928) 1-113. On Steinmetz see the not entirely satisfactory studies by P. Kloos, in F. Bovenkerk (ed.), *Toen en thans* (Baarn 1978) 98-103 and by A.F.J. Köbben, in J.C.H. Blom et al. (eds.), *Een brandpunt van geleerdheid in de hoofdstad. De Universiteit van Amsterdam rond 1900 in vijftien portretten* (Hilversum 1992) 313-40.

66 On Huizinga and anthropology see W. Krul, *Historicus tegen de tijd. Opstellen over leven en werk van J. Huizinga* (Groningen 1990) 201-2; add I. Bulhof, 'Johan Huizinga. Ethnographer of the Past', *Clio* 4 (1974-5) 201-24; W. Bergsma, *Johan Huizinga en de culturele antropologie* (Groningen 1981).

67 E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Anthropology and History* (Manchester 1961); one should note also the work of the Dutch anthropologist H.G. Schulte Nordholt, *Culturele antropologie en geschiedenis* (Amsterdam 1967). For an informative survey see Y. Kuiper, 'Antropologie en geschiedenis', in P. Vries *et al.*, *Geschiedenis buiten de perken* (Leiden 1989) 49-61.

68 Cf. Bremmer and Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 55; add Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Brittanniae* 2.4; *Hallfredssaga* 2; M. Ní Dhonnchadha, '*Inailt*, foster-sister, fosterling', *Celtica* 18 (1986) 185-91; G. Kreutzer, *Kindheit und Jugend in der altnordischen Literatur* I (Diss. Münster 1987) 221-34.

69 Bolthorn: *Havamal*, str. 140. Among the Germanic peoples, fosterage regularly takes place among giants, which reminds us of Achilles' education by the centaur Cheiron: H.R. Ellis, 'Fostering by giants in Old Norse saga literature', *Medium Aevum* 10 (1941) 70-85; R. Kroesen, 'Ambiguity in the relationship between heroes and giants', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 111 (1996) 57-71 at 67-9; L. Motz, 'Kingship and the giants', ibid. 73-88 at 80-1.

70 See also W.I. Miller, *Bloodmaking and Peacemaking: Feud, Law, and Society in Saga Iceland* (Chicago 1990) 122-3. Aethelstan: *Haralds saga* 21.

71 N. Hammond, 'Royal pages, personal pages and boys trained in the Macedonian manner during the period of the Temenid monarchy', *Historia* 39 (1990) 261-90; W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London 1992) 237-98; M. Hatzopoulos, *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine* (Athens 1994) 87-111; Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton 1995) 3-5.

72 Franks: P. Riché, *Les écoles et l'enseignement dans l'Occident chrétien de la fin du Ve siècle au milieu du XIe siècle* (Paris 1979) 287-313. Anglo-Saxons and English: D.A. Bullough, 'The educational tradition in England from Alfred to Aelfric: teaching *utriusque linguae*', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull' alto medievo* 19 (1972) 453-94 at 455-60; N. Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry* (London 1984) 44-80; Peters, 'Von der Sozialgeschichte', 427.

73 On gifts see most recently Scheid-Tissinier, *Les usages du don* and S. von Reden, *Exchange in Ancient Greece* (London 1995).

74 Finley had been inspired by Marcel Mauss's (1872-1950) classic *Essai sur le don* (1925) – a book he carefully avoided mentioning, as is pointed out in the fascinating study of Finley's oeuvre by H. Lirb and M. Wendel, 'Moses Finley en de sociale wetenschappen', *Tijdschrift voor Oudheidstudies* 1 (1989) 26-49 at 47. For Mauss see now the informative but very sloppy work by M. Fournier, *Marcel Mauss* (Paris 1994) 512-26.

75 I am most grateful for information to Wim Jongman, Robin Osborne, Robert Parker and Leo Tepper, and to Rolf Bremmer, Marjo Buitelaar, Goffe Jensma, André Lardinois and the anonymous referees of this journal for their observations on various stages of my text. The editors exemplarily corrected my English. An earlier Dutch version appeared in *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 109 (1996) 343-60.