

The Shield of Achilles and Indo-European Tradition

Nicholas J. ALLEN

University of Oxford, Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology

ABSTRACT

How far do the scenes depicted on the shield of Achilles form a coherent structure reflecting early Indo-European patterns of thought? Dumézil thought this ideology had three main compartments ('functions'): F1, relating to wisdom and the sacred; F2, to physical force and war; F3, to fecundity and wealth; but many contexts demand that we also recognise at the bottom of the hierarchy an F4- and at the top F4+, respectively devalued and valued Otherness.

Achilles' shield is organised into boss, concentric bands, and rim. Yoshida in 1964 connected the bands to the classical functions (roughly, city at peace F1; city at war F2; agriculture F3). But the firmament at the centre and Ocean at the rim doubtless reflect F4+ and F4-.

The agricultural scenes show ploughing, grain harvest, grape harvest, cattle rearing and sheep, the two forms of livestock reflecting an IE distinction between larger and smaller domesticated animals. This distinction is situated by Watkins within an IE taxonomy of wealth which also includes 'grain and grape', and metals. So the F3 part of the shield largely corresponds to Watkins' taxonomy (metals being used in making the shield). But it can also be analysed functionally: ploughing F4+; grain harvest with sacrifice F1; grape harvest F2; paired livestock scenes F3; (non-living) metals F4-. If so, the pentadic ideology is reflected both in the shield as a whole and within one of its component parts.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Achilles, shield, Indo-European heritage, forms of wealth, pentadic ideology.

RESUMEN

¿En qué medida las escenas representadas en el escudo de Aquiles constituyen una estructura coherente que refleja antiguas pautas de pensamiento indoeuropeas? Dumézil creía que esa ideología tenía tres componentes principales («funciones»): F1, relacionada con la sabiduría y lo sagrado; F2, con la fuerza física y la guerra; F3, con la fecundidad y la riqueza; sin embargo, muchos contextos exigen que en la parte inferior de la jerarquía se reconozca una F4- y en la superior, una F4+, que serían, respectivamente, una «Otridad» devaluada y una valorada.

El escudo de Aquiles se organiza en umbo, bandas concéntricas y borde. En 1964 Yoshida puso en relación las bandas con las funciones clásicas (resumidamente, ciudad en paz F1; ciudad en guerra F2; agricultura F3). Pero el firmamento que se encuentra en el centro y el Océano en el borde sin duda reflejan F4+ y F4-.

Las escenas agrícolas muestran el arado de los campos, la cosecha del grano, la vendimia y la cría de vacas y ovejas, que son las dos formas de ganadería que reflejan la distinción indoeuropea entre ganado mayor y menor. Watkins sitúa esta diferenciación dentro de una taxonomía indoeuropea de la riqueza que también incluye el «grano y la uva» y los metales. Así pues, la parte F3 del escudo se corresponde ampliamente con la taxonomía de Watkins (pues los metales se usan para la elaboración del escudo). Ésta también se puede analizar funcionalmente: arado F4+; cosecha del grano con sacrificio F1; vendimia F2; las dos escenas de ganadería F3; metales (no seres vivos) F4-. Desde esta perspectiva la ideología pentádica se reflejaría tanto en el escudo en su conjunto como dentro de una de las partes que lo integran.

KEY WORDS

Aquiles, escudo, herencia indoeuropea, formas de riqueza, ideología pentádica.

When Patroclus borrows Achilles' arms and loses them to Hector, Achilles needs a new set, and his mother goes to Mount Olympus to get it made by Hephaestus. The decoration of the new shield is described by Homer at some length (126 lines), and falls into a number of discrete scenes, no doubt disposed in concentric circles around a hub or boss. The question addressed in this paper concerns the subject matter of the different scenes: to what extent do the subjects form a coherent structure, and to what extent does this structure reflect early Indo-European (IE) patterns of thought?

The shield as a whole

An IE background to the shield was first proposed by Atsuhiko Yoshida in a classic paper (1964), which we shall need to recall. But Yoshida's analysis draws on Dumézil's account of the three functions that provide the framework to IE ideology, and it may be useful to begin by recalling what is meant by a function in this context, and how each function is defined.

Some world-views, including that of the early IE speakers (but not, for instance, that or those of the modern west) are 'partitional': the partitions or compartments that they recognise crosscut contexts (contexts such as the components of social structure, the gods or heroes in a particular narrative, a list of priestly offices, the objectives of a particular ritual). In one context after another one finds that the entities recognized by the culture fall unambiguously into one or other of the compartments, which have become known as functions. The analyst needs to be able to label the compartments or functions, and the numerical labels –first, second, third– have come to be used for two reasons. Firstly, if one analyses the entities occurring in a given context, the compartments into which they fall tend to follow a standard order. Secondly, this same order tends to correlate with rank, the highest-ranking compartment coming first, the lowest last. We can now define the three functions. The first relates to the intellect, to the management of the sacred, and to

what is morally binding; the second to physical force and war; the third to fecundity, abundance, wealth and related ideas, such as sexuality and nourishment. For reasons that I have discussed elsewhere, my definition of the first function is deliberately narrower than that of Dumézil, for whom it also covers 'sovereignty'.

With this in mind, we can turn to the shield. The description starts in 18.483 at the boss, and progresses to the rim (18.609). The boss is occupied by cosmic entities – earth, heaven, sea, sun, full moon, constellations (four are listed); and the rim is occupied by the ocean.¹ Between boss and rim are scenes of human activity, and it is these that Yoshida analyses in terms of the three functions. The 'city at peace' shows cheerful wedding processions (6 lines), then a lawsuit in the assembly (12); law being divinely sanctioned, this city represents the first function. Next, the city at war (32 lines) straightforwardly represents the second function. Finally, agricultural productivity relates to wealth and nourishment, so the five scenes of rural life (49 lines), plus the round dance (16 or 17), represent the third function.

Yoshida's analysis has generally been endorsed by comparativists (e.g. Littleton 1980: 147, Sergent 1998: 62–8), but ignored or rejected by classicists (cf. Edwards 1991: 209). The classicists are not altogether unjustified. The round dance has youths and maidens in their best clothes in a lovely dance (*perhaps* a fertility dance), watched by cheerful spectators, and may be acceptable as third-functional under the rubrics of sexuality, beauty and (perhaps) fertility; but the arguments for treating the wedding processions as first-functional seem to me unpersuasive. The sequence litigation–war–agriculture is a straightforward trifunctional set in the standard or canonical order: if any text manifests the three functions, this one does. But as some Homerists have noted (e.g. Redfield 1975: 188), the weddings and dance have a lot in common – song, whirling young men (*edineon* 949, *edineuon* 606), music, onlookers – and the scenes may perhaps be seen as an instance of ring composition, framing the trifunctional pattern but originally independent of it.²

Whatever is made of the weddings and dance, the cosmic entities at the centre and rim, which come respectively first and last in the text, clearly form a frame that stands outside the human activities. We must now introduce an idea that Dumézil knew of but never seriously entertained – that of a fourth function in IE ideology. As I have argued elsewhere (e.g. 1999, 2000), the fourth function pertains to what is other, outside or

¹The last constellation, the Bear, is mentioned as not bathing in the ocean (18.489). The reference to the ocean in the first and last scene is an instance of ring-composition.

²Vanderlinden (1980: 1220) criticises specifically Yoshida's interpretation of the weddings and dance, but does not realise how strong the trifunctional interpretation becomes if these two elements are omitted. As quite often happens, the representatives of the first two functions are linked to each other (as the 'two cities' of line 490), and stand apart from the representatives of the third (the rural scenes). Note also the multiplicity ('abundance') of the third-functional scenes, which are not explicitly interlinked.

beyond, relative to the classical or 'core' functions, and it has two aspects. One aspect, the superior and/or transcendent one, precedes and outranks the first function, while the other, inferior and often in some sense excluded, follows and ranks lower than the third function. There are reasons, which I need not discuss here, for avoiding the obvious idea of a fifth function and preferring to recognize a split fourth function.

The cosmic entities fit reasonably well under the fourth function. The firmament, as transcendent as anything material can be, would represent the positively valued aspect of the fourth function. The outer ocean, which Odysseus has to cross to reach the dreaded Other World of Hades, would represent the devalued or negative aspect.³ If this interpretation is accepted, the five compartments of the ideology are manifested on the shield in their standard or canonical order.

Dumézil's rules for trifunctional analysis require the representatives of the functions to be homogeneous, and in four-functional analyses the additional entities have to be homogeneous with the others *to some degree*. Firmament and ocean are in fact not wholly unlike human beings. In some contexts the cosmic entities are animate beings, endowed with agency, beings whose names can be written with capital initials. From this point of view, Earth and Heaven can be seen as Gaia and Ouranos, the Hesiodic primal couple, and Ocean can be seen as the figure who ignores Zeus's summons in *Il.* 20.7 and is said by Homer to be the source or origin of all the gods (*Il.* 14.201, 246).⁴ Even in the present context, one constellation 'keeps his eye' on another – the Bear watches Orion (*dokeuei* 488). Thus the cosmic entities show just that combination of homogeneity and otherness that four-function theory looks for.

The weak point in the analysis is the interruption of the solidary sequence by the wedding procession and (perhaps) the dance, but such interruptions in functional sequences occur elsewhere, for instance in the Nuristani pantheon and (I think) in the Ynglingasaga king list.⁵ One possibility is that they were elaborations introduced into the oral tradition at a time when the old partitional ideology had ceased to dominate the creative imagination of the bards. In any case, the Homerist literature, from Lessing in 1766 onwards to Schadewaldt, Marg and Taplin a generation back, emphasizes that the shield constitutes a whole (*ein Ganzes*, a microcosm), and four-functional analysis reflects this holism better than trifunctionalism.

Another comparatist paper (Allen in press) argues that Achilles' shield is cognate with a well-known and frequently painted Buddhist image called the Wheel of Life. This

³ It seems to be a widespread cultural rule that centre contrasts with periphery as valued with devalued: kings belong in the centre of the ordered cosmos, barbarians outside it.

⁴ That Homer's Ocean and Hesiod's Ouranos are both primal figures relevant to the origin of the gods exemplifies one of the sorts of argument in favour of keeping the two aspects of the fourth function together, rather than positing a fifth function.

⁵ See Allen 1991 and 2005.

image may show the Buddha in the centre, and around the centre are disposed concentric rings showing vignettes of human activity, while the wheel as a whole is gripped by a demon representing death (*cf.* the Ocean on the shield). The comparison not only provides a measure of support for the four-functional analysis of the shield, but also suggests that it has a long prehistory. With this prehistory in mind, let us concentrate attention on the third-functional part of the shield.

The agricultural scenes: (A) taxonomy

The five agricultural scenes depict the following activities: ploughing, grain harvest, grape harvest, cattle rearing, sheep farming. The first four scenes each average around eleven lines in Homer, while the sheep receive only three. All that is really said is that Hephaestus depicted a pasture in a valley with sheep, pens and huts. Following the preceding and far more elaborate descriptions, these three lines have been judged rather feeble, and certain Homerists, including Heyne (1802), Leaf (1902) and Taplin (1980), have thought of dismissing them as interpolations.⁶ But from a comparative point of view, their presence makes excellent sense.

It is now clear that within the field of livestock rearing, the early Indo-European speakers made a distinction between larger and smaller domestic animals. For the Roman material one can start in 1962 with Dumézil's analysis (based on Varro, Vergil and Columella) of the two Roman goddesses called Pales, who protect respectively *le gros bétail* and *le petit bétail*, or *pecus maior* and *pecus minor*, *armenta* and *greges*, herds and flocks. Without referring to Dumézil, Benveniste (1969 I: 40) touches on the same distinction when examining Greek lexical material, while Watkins, following Benveniste, treats the topic systematically (1979, summary in 1995: 209-213). None of the three refer to the shield.

Watkins (1979) starts from the Hittite phrase NAM.RA GUD UDU,⁷ which means roughly 'deportees, cattle, sheep', i.e. mobile wealth taken on a raid; but the words for cattle and sheep, GUD and UDU, constitute a merism, by which he means 'a bipartite noun phrase serving to designate globally an immediately higher taxon'. Thus the two species, bovine and ovine, represent livestock in general, as distinct from the human deportees or slaves. Since English lacks convenient expressions, Watkins refers to the two livestock categories using the German words *Großvieh* and *Kleinvieh*, and he assembles further evidence for the distinction from Indo-Iranian. If we were right to

⁶ One of Taplin's reasons is that he links the first four scenes respectively with the four seasons, starting with spring, and has no season left for the sheep. Among other problems the link between herding and winter is not obvious; but Taplin is right to sense that the sequence of scenes has a rationale.

⁷ Written in capitals because the phrase consists of sumerograms. The individual letters do not represent Hittite phonemes and the Hittite reading of the phrase is debated.

recognise an IE background to the overall design of the shield, the chances are that the separation of cattle and sheep scenes also reflects the early Indo-European distinction.

Watkins then goes on to situate this particular distinction within a wider folk taxonomy of wealth, conceived in terms of binary semantic features such as \pm human, \pm large, \pm equine; but I summarize without using this device. The crucial point is that non-mobile organic wealth (i.e. vegetable wealth) is expressed by the merism 'grain and grape'. Apart from Hittite, Watkins draws into his analysis (1995: 197-206) an early Roman prayer to Mars reported by Cato (*De Agric.* 141.1 ff.), where the two units of the merism appear doubled: grains and corn, vineyards and brushwork or shrubwork (*fruges frumenta vineta virgultaque*), the brushwork serving as support for the vines. This line is followed by a reference to shepherds and cattle (*pastores pecuaque*), and its relevance for us is of course the parallel with the sequence of scenes on the shield – grain harvest and the grape harvest followed by the two livestock scenes.⁸

Watkins' fullest taxonomy derives from a list in the Old Hittite *Merchant Epic*, which spells out the components of 'plenty and abundance'. In this text the forms of wealth we have touched on so far are followed by a list of inorganic materials – precious metals and jewels, then iron, copper, tin (less precious). The Hittite list is compared by Watkins (1979: 285-6) with three lists of valuables that include metals or metal artifacts and that occur elsewhere in the *Iliad*.⁹ On the shield the taxonomy is not presented in full since the deportees or slaves are missing, but what about inorganic wealth?

Obviously metallic wealth does not receive a discrete section of the description, but it is not absent either. The reader or listener is constantly reminded that the shield is being made by Hephaestus, the divine metal-smith, and some of the reminders consist of references to the materials he is using. Moreover, such references are particularly frequent in the section of text relating to the third function: the forty-nine lines contain eight of them. The god uses gold for the ploughed field, for the vineyard and the herders; silver for the vine supports, blue enamel for its trench, tin for the fence, gold and tin together for the cattle. In the remaining 77 lines only one reference occurs that is certainly comparable: in the war scene Ares, Athena and their clothes are in gold. A few further cases are ambiguous in that we are not told whether the objects depicted by Hephaestus are made from the relevant metal (this applies to the gold talents, the gold daggers in the dance, and to the bronze-tipped spears). The god's craftsmanship is so wonderful that, although the ploughed field is crafted from gold, the viewer sees it as black; so we cannot be certain that the bronze spear-tips are made of bronze. If we take account only of the

⁸ Like Cato's prayer, the Iliadic grape-harvest scene mentions supports for the vines. The grain-grape merism covers food and drink in general, and might perhaps bring to mind the bread and wine of the Eucharist.

⁹ 23.259-261, 549-550; 7.467-475.

unambiguous passages, we can say that nearly all the references to inorganic wealth come in the third-function section of the shield.

If we are on the right tracks, the shield reflects an IE classification of wealth that includes inorganic wealth as well as grain and grapes, cattle and sheep. Admittedly, while metals are present in the account of the shield, it is not in the same sense as the organic forms of wealth: the latter are depicted, the metals are used to depict.¹⁰ We shall later suggest an interpretation of the difference.

Watkins' paper also prompts the question of how the ploughing scene would fit in a taxonomy of wealth. In his final sentence he refers to 'the complete absence of any reference to land tenure as a form of wealth despite its documented economic significance in Mycenaean Greek and Old Hittite times'; so might the gap be filled by the ploughing scene, with its reference to 'soft fallow-land, rich tilth and wide'? The idea seems too narrow, too exclusively economic – Homer does not present the ploughed field as anyone's property. We need a broader frame of reference.

The agricultural scenes: (B) functions

To make sense of the ploughing scene, we must leave Watkins with his lexical preoccupations and return to Dumézil with his interest in ideology: in anthropological parlance, we leave ethnoscience and return to classifications that cross-cut contexts. When Dumézil links the paired Roman goddesses Pales with the Großvieh/Kleinvieh distinction, he remarks that such pairing is typical of the IE theology of the third function; for instance, it recalls the twin gods called Nāsatyas or Ásvins, and their Mahābhārata incarnations, the Pāṇḍava twins Nakula and Sahadeva.¹¹ Dumézil's remark raises the question whether correlations exist between scenes and functions, and also suggests that to answer it one might look for the Roman deities who best fit the scenes.

For the grape harvest, the obvious Roman deity is Liber; for cereals Ceres; for the Earth itself Tellus (corresponding to Greek Gaia or Ge). Now the sequence Tellus, Ceres, Liber, Pales may sound familiar to students of Roman religion: it opens, indeed dominates, the section on the third function in one chapter of Dumézil's *Religion romaine archaïque* (1975: 375-394). He sums up this set of deities as 'defining the ordinary field of peasant activity...they are, roughly speaking, the articulated and solidary principles of the third function' (ibid: 389). This remarkable insight is not developed elsewhere; usually, for instance in *Les dieux souverains* (1977: 10), Dumézil presents the third function as 'by its nature recalcitrant to systematization'. He was certainly not thinking of Achilles' shield when he wrote about this sequence of gods, and the fit with Homer's scenes is all the more remarkable.

¹⁰ In referring to 'metals' I include the enamel.

¹¹ I hope to show elsewhere that an even better comparison is with the servants who help Odysseus on his return to Ithaca: Philoetius is a cowherd (Großvieh), Eumaeus is a swineherd (Kleinvieh).

We must now ask whether this 'articulated and solidary' sequence, correlating so neatly with the Homeric scenes, relates to the functions. We are of course operating *within* the third function, but one functional set can perfectly well be involuted within another. For instance, as *ksatriyas*, the *Pāṇḍavas* are all second-functional at one level of analysis (that is, in terms of the *varṇa* schema), but at another level, regarded as individual brothers or half-brothers, they form an involuted four-functional set.¹² In our present case a functional interpretation is attractive, though not totally compelling.

Following Dumézil's rules of method (1979: 77), we may note that the scenes of rural production constitute a set of units that are 'distinct, solidary, homogeneous and exhaustive' (the round dance, not being clearly related to rural production, need not be considered). But (the second rule) whether it is 'evident' that the units relate to the functions is more debatable.

First comes Earth and ploughing. Now the earth produces not only cereals and grapes, but also the pasturage needed for livestock, the *nomon* referred to in both livestock scenes (575, 587). The earth is thus the ultimate origin of the growing things, both vegetable and animal (not to mention the inorganic wealth it may contain), and in that sense it subsumes them. Representatives of the valued fourth function, such as kings, often somehow embody synthetically the totality which is then covered analytically by the other functions. Moreover, as we noted, Earth in the form of Gaia can be read as the Creatrix in the Hesiodic cosmogony,¹³ and the gap between creator and creation is one of the common modes of heterogeneity that separates representatives of the transcendent half-function from representatives of the rest of the ideology.

Now comes the harvest scene. Among the rural scenes this one contains the only clear reference to religion, namely the ox sacrifice of 18.559. This provides a link, albeit a slender one, with the first function.

As for the grape harvest, Indian evidence, mainly relating to the heads of the monster *Trīśiras*, links alcohol (*surā*) specifically with the warriors and the second function, in contrast to the sacred beverage *soma*, which is linked with the brahmins and hence the first function (Allen 2003: 166-8). The argument is again less direct than one would like, and the question of the place of intoxicants in IE ideology is complicated (Dumézil 1975: 87-107); compare also the reference to wine in the ploughing scene (18.545). However, it is worth noting Dumézil's proposal (1975: 126 n.3) that, at least in India, 'It may be that there were originally three drinks related [respectively] to the functions and classes: *soma*, *surā*, *madhu*' [mead].

¹² Dumézil analyses them as a three-functional set: brother I as F1, brother II and Arjuna (III) as F2, the twins (IV and V) as F3. But a better analysis (Allen 1999) associates Arjuna primarily with the F4+ slot and includes the quasi-outcaste *Karṇa*, Arjuna's elder half-brother and arch-enemy, in the F4- slot.

¹³ Moreover, the ploughed land on the shield is *eureia* 'broad' (18.542). The Vedic Earth, so often coupled with *Dyu* or *Dyaus* 'Sky', is called *Pṛthivī*, which means 'the broad one' – a locution that goes back to the proto-language (Dunkel 1988-90: 12).

The connection between the paired livestock scenes and the third function was our starting point for this section of the paper, but it raises the broader question of why pairing or twinning is such a salient feature of the third function. The usual answer has been that the pairing reflects the abstract notion of abundance, which is so prominent in definitions of that function. However, it may also express the more concrete notion that wealth in livestock is of two basic types.¹⁴

Three further observations are relevant at this point. Firstly, as regards the relative status of the two types of livestock, presumably the Kleinvieh rank lower than Großvieh, and this may go some way towards explaining the brevity of the sheep scene. Secondly, as regards the relative status of cultivation and livestock rearing, the proposed allocation to functions implies that cultivation was originally the higher-ranking, and this in turn raises questions that archaeology may be able to answer about the relative economic importance of the two forms of production in the proto-society. Thirdly, as Yoshida might have noted, in the sequence litigation–warfare–production, the duality within the last item (i.e. cultivation versus livestock) can be seen as a typical third-functional pairing. Again the element that comes earlier in the text and presumably ranks higher is treated in greater detail: (9+11+12=)32 lines for cultivation versus (14+3=)17 lines for livestock.

Having argued that the third-function scenes relate to four of the five slots in the ideology, we need at least to raise the question of the remaining slot. Of course, it does not *have* to be filled: no relevant scene appears on the shield and consequently no correlated Roman deity was suggested. But this is the point to recall the earlier discussion of the place of metals at the end of Watkins' taxonomy of wealth.

Being inanimate, metals are in a sense dead, and death and the Other World regularly fall under the negative aspect of the fourth function. Moreover, those who work with metal tend to belong to that devalued social class which in India is represented by Untouchables, who belong to the same category (Allen 2007). Another line of argument draws on the connections one often finds between representatives of the positive and negative aspects of the fourth function (compare the cosmic entities on boss and rim, as noted above). Whereas grain, grapes and livestock all grow on the surface of the earth, ploughing means penetrating that surface, as does mining. But ploughing is a respectable ritual activity quite often performed by kings, e.g. by Romulus when founding Rome (Plutarch *Rom.* 11.2), or by a modern-day 'ploughman king' in Rajasthan (Balzani 2003: 157–162), while mining, in contrast, is typically a task for slaves. If Homer had allocated a third-functional scene to metalwork, it would fit well under the devalued aspect of the fourth function.

Thus there are several reasons why metallic wealth would fit well within the fifth, apparently empty slot. If the other forms of wealth are represented by scenes of human

¹⁴ On this interpretation, grain and grape relate to different functions, while cattle and sheep relate to a single one; but I do not see this as problematic.

activity, while metalwork is represented only by the activity of Hephaestus, this heterogeneity may itself be a mark of the fourth function. Perhaps the absence of a scene devoted to this compartment of the ideology reflects not only its low rank in the hierarchy but also, more precisely, an associated inauspiciousness.

Concluding Remarks

The shield of Achilles is a delightful piece of poetry, providing welcome relief after the long battle scenes surrounding the death of Patroclus, but it has been treated here solely as a reflection of early IE patterns of thought. The argument has been based on the theory of a split fourth function bracketing the traditional three. The theory is already supported by much evidence assembled from several areas and many contexts in the IE-speaking world, and I have tried to add to this.

We have seen that the pentadic pattern relates to the shield at two different levels of analysis. It is expressed in Homer's account of the shield as a whole, even if the small amount of text devoted to the weddings and dance (18%) may be extrinsic to the pattern; and it is probably expressed again, though less clearly and completely, within the part of the shield devoted to the third function. Moreover, we have encountered one further expression. Watkins' work has here been used as a source of assistance in analysing the poetic artifact of the shield, but the perspective can be reversed. If the analysis of the third-function scenes on the shield is correct, then the Indo-European folk taxonomy of wealth that he reconstructs was itself partly patterned by the old ideology.

By way of overview, it may be worth presenting the argument as a table, despite the inevitable simplifications intrinsic in this format. For instance, the table does not show the different degrees of confidence attaching to different rows (the interpretation of the whole shield is more secure than that of its third-function part), and only in the last row does it show the tendency to pairing in the third-function column.

FUNCTIONS	F ₄₊	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	F ₄₋
their foci	valued otherness, transcendence	knowledge, incl. law/ritual	physical force	fertility, wealth...	devalued otherness, exclusion
whole shield	firmament	lawsuit	combat	production	ocean
its F ₃ part	ploughing	grain harvest	grape harvest	livestock	metals?
Watkins' taxonomy	—	grain	grape	livestock	metals
Dumézil's list	Tellus	Ceres	Liber	Pales I, II	—

Immense scope remains for further work to establish in just how many contexts traces of the ideology can be detected. It may turn out to have been surprisingly pervasive. On the other hand, we should remember that the old Indo-European partitional ideology was doomed to transform itself into, or give way to, the non-partitional ideologies of the modern world. Nowadays our world views no longer recognise compartments that systematically cross-cut domains such as social structure, pantheons, philosophy, narrative. So we need not be surprised if, even in sources as early as Homer, the fit between reconstructed ideology and text is less than perfect.¹⁵

REFERENCES

- ALLEN, Nicholas J. (1991), «Some gods of pre-Islamic Nuristan», *RHR* 208(2): 141-168.
 — (1999), «Arjuna and the second function: a Dumézilian crux», *J. Royal Asiatic Society, Series 3*, 9(3): 403-418.
 — (2000), *Categories and classifications: Maussian reflections on the social*. Oxford.
 — (2003), «The Indra-Tullus comparison», en B. Drinka & J. Salmons (eds), *Indo-European Language and Culture: Essays in Memory of Edgar C. Polomé, part I. General Linguistics* 40: 149-171.
 — (2005), «The articulation of time: some Indo-European comparisons», *Cosmos* 17(2) (for 2001): 163-178.
 — (2007), «The close and the distant: a long-term perspective», in G. Pfeffer (ed.), *Periphery and Centre: Studies in Orissan History, Religion and Anthropology*, pp. 273-290. Delhi, Manohar.
 — in press, «The Buddhist Wheel of Existence and two Greek comparisons», en *Anthropology of the Indo-European World and Material Culture: 5th International Colloquium of Anthropology of the Indo-European World and Comparative Mythology*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
 BALZANI, Marzia (2003), *Modern Indian kingship: tradition, legitimacy and power in Rajasthan*. Oxford.
 BENVENISTE, Emile (1966), *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* (2 vols). Paris.
 DUMÉZIL, Georges (1969), *Idées romaines*. Paris.
 — (1974²), *Religion romaine archaïque*. Paris.
 — (1975), *Fêtes romaines d'été et d'automne*. Paris.
 — (1977), *Les dieux souverains des Indo-européens*. Paris.
 — (1979), *Mariages indo-européens*. Paris.
 DUNKEL, George (1988-90), «Vater Himmels Gattin», *Sprache* 34: 1-26.
 EDWARDS, Mark W. (1991), *The Iliad: a commentary, vol. V: books 17-20*. Cambridge.
 HEYNE, C.G. (1802), *Homeri carmina cum brevi annotatione, vol. VII*. Leipzig.
 LEAF, Walter (ed.) (1900-02²), *The Iliad*. London.
 LESSING, G.E. (1990), *Laokoon: oder über die Grenzen der Malerei und Poesie* en W. Barner ed. *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, Werke 1766-1769*. Frankfurt am Main.
 LITTLETON, C. Scott (1980), «The problem that was Greece: some observations on the Greek tradition from the standpoint of the New Comparative Mythology», *Arethusa* 13: 141-159.

¹⁵ A version of this paper was presented in the Departamento de Filología Griega y Lingüística Indoeuropea, Complutense University, Madrid on 16 February 2006.

- MARC, Walter (1971²), *Homer über die Dichtung*. Münster.
- REDFIELD, James M. (1975), *Nature and culture in the Iliad: the tragedy of Hector*. Chicago.
- SCHADEWALDT, Wolfgang (1951²), «Der Schild des Achilleus», en *Von Homers Welt und Werk*. Stuttgart: 352-347.
- SERCENT, Bernard (1998), *Les trois fonctions indo-européennes en Grèce ancienne, I*. Paris.
- TAPLIN, Oliver (1980), «The shield of Achilles within the Iliad», *G&R* 27: 1-21.
- VANDERLINDEN, E. (1980), «Le bouclier d'Achille», *Les études classiques* 48: 97-126.
- WATKINS, Calvert (1979), «NAM.RA GUD UDU in Hittite: Indo-European poetic language and the folk taxonomy of wealth», en E. Neu & W. Meid (eds), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck: 269-287. (Reprinted in idem (1994), *Selected writings*, Innsbruck: 593-601.)
- (1995), *How to kill a dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics*. New York & Oxford.
- YOSHIDA, Atsuhiko (1964), «La structure de l'illustration du bouclier d'Achille», *RBPh* 42: 5-15.