THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN CHALDEA, EGYPT, INDIA, JUDEA, AND GREECE TO THE TIME OF CHRIST

III

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN CHALDEA, EGYPT, INDIA, JUDEA, AND GREECE TO THE TIME OF CHRIST

[1909]

IN general, the status of women has been controlled, in all civilization up to the highest, by their power to help in the work of life. Where women have had important functions they have been valued; where they have needed protection and support, and have not been able to contribute much, they have been treated with contempt. If the economic situation is strong, so that each man can pay a good price for a wife, girls are valuable; in the contrary case female infanticide arises. If the women's contribution to the food supply is essential, women are well treated; while if the men are warlike meat-eaters, they treat women as drudges, tempering the treatment with respect for them as necessary mothers of warriors. Among nomads the status of women is low, and women, children, and the aged are regarded as burdens. The two former are necessary, but all are treated capriciously. Under agriculture women win a position of independent cooperation. When towns are built women incur dangers on the streets and complications arise; their position in rural life is then far more free than in towns. Public security in the latter once more changes the case. When women are valued for grace and beauty and are objects of affection, not means of gain, they win, as compared with earlier stages. An Arabic Jew of the

tenth century, Ibrahim Ibn Jakub, says of Poland at that time that grain was cheap and the bride-price for wives high. Therefore, if a man had many daughters, he was rich; if he had many sons he was poor.[1] The interplay of interests under the forms of material gain, sex-passion, and vanity is here most complicated and fierce; but the interference of philosophy and religion is noticeably slight. The phases are many, and there is not a feeling of the human heart which does not bear upon the sex-relation in one way or another. Masculine love of rule and domination, and masculine generosity to an object of affection, have modified every status. Fuegians prefer boys, who when they grow up will be a means of strength and protection to their parents.[2] The Amarr-Bambala celebrate the birth of a boy with a banquet; boys will become the strength of the country as hunters and warriors.[3] The Ossetes celebrate the birth of boys only.[4] Such is the usual sentiment, but in frequent cases girls are preferred. The Basutos find it a financial calamity if a woman bears all boys, for girls are salable and constitute a capital.[5] In Kamerun a girl is preferred because she will soon bring a bride-price.[6] Amongst Hindus, "when a son is born there is great rejoicing in the family and friends come with their congratulations, but on the birth of a daughter there are no sounds indicative of gladness in the house."[7] When a boy is born the conch shell is blown to call all the neighbors to rejoice; when a girl is born the conch shell is

[1] Geschichtschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit, XXXIII, 141.

[2] A Voice from South America, XIII, 201.

[3] Vannutelli, L., e Citerni, C.: L'Omo, 195. This tribe is located about 38° E., 5½° N.

[4] Haxthausen, A. F. von: Transkaukasia, II, 54.

[5] Archivio per la Antrop., XXXI, 459. [6] Globus, LXXXVI, 393.

[7] Wilkins, W. J.: Modern Hinduism, 389.

silent and neighbors offer condolences.[1] "It is believed by an average Hindu that a male child is the fruit of the propitiation of ancestors." [2] The Aryans thought daughters a sorrow, sons the father's pride and glory.[3]

The status of women is therefore a symptom of the mores because all the interests and feelings of man converge in it. It furnishes one of the most prominent illustrations of the traditional persistence of the mores through ages, even in spite of changes in interests, and of the ultimate triumph of interests in the mores. The phenomena are intricate and perplexing, but it is certain that we can never understand them unless we follow those indications in them which show us the mores as their ultimate explanation.

The remotest stage of civilized society which is known to us is that represented in the laws of Hammurabi as existing in the Euphrates valley 2500 years before Christ. In those laws men and women appear to be on an equality of personal rights. Three classes, wives, concubines, and slaves, are recognized.[4] The laws of Hammurabi and the laws of Moses point back to a common law of the Semitic peoples of Western Asia (Müller traces this out), and the society is evidently an old one, with well-established folkways, which are codified in these laws. Winckler[5] is able to show, from the position of the vernal equinox in the signs of the zodiac, that Chaldean culture must date back to the fifth millennium B.C., and Barton fixes dates as far back as 6000 B.C. The code of Hammurabi is elaborate and systematic,

[1] Wilkins, W. J.: Modern Hinduism, 10.

[2] Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay, V, 72.

[3] Zimmer, H.: Altindisches Leben, 318.

[4] The story of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar conforms exactly to the law of Hammurabi (Müller, D. H.: Die Gesetze des Hammurabis, 140).

[5] Die Babylonische Kultur, etc., 30.

and so it can hardly have been the first one. Back of it there must have been a long period of usage and custom. It is assumed in the laws of Hammurabi that a man will have but one wife, but as to concubines and slaves he arranges his affairs as he judges expedient for his own welfare. The laws define the rights of the parties in certain contingencies, and thus make wedlock a legal status, not a contract. The status, however, is plainly the product of mores which have been matured through a long period. The marriage gifts also show that long usage had produced elaborate customs. The bridegroom pays a bride-price (a survival of primitive purchase), but he also gets a dowry with his wife; furthermore the bride's father gives her a gift which is a *peculium* of hers — pin money — and the groom also gives her a present. Men can repudiate their wives at will, but they must provide for the wives if the latter are not guilty. If the woman is childless, the relation has failed of its primary purpose and is dissolved as a matter of course. A woman who has borne a child to a man, even if she is only a slave, has a claim on him and security by his side. Women can also leave their husbands, if the latter fail of the duties of a husband. There were consecrated women under religious vows, but not vowed to virginity, and public women. Müller[1] thinks that perhaps these two classes are priests who dress in woman's dress and women who dress in man's dress — two classes of hierodules. The former were provided for under a system which was equivalent to life-annuity.[2] Among the Tel-el-Amarna tablets[3] (1500 B.C.) there is a story of a god and his wife. He abuses her,

[1] Gesetze des Hammurabis, 144.

[2] Winckler, H.: Die Gesetze Hammurabis, Königs von Babylon um 2250 v. Chr., 22.

[3] No. LXXXVI.

but when she remonstrates they make up the quarrel and "whatsoever she wished to have done was done from that time forth forever more."

The laws of Hammurabi show that the problems of matrimony were the same 2500 years before Christ that they are now, and have been ever since. It is asserted that the excavations of Telloh show that the mother-family existed in Chaldea in the third millennium B.C.; that the wife was "goddess of the home," and that she could expel her husband from it.[1] Later, perhaps through Semitic influence, the man got control and the institutions of the father-family were fully developed; *e.g.*, *patria potestas*, sacrifices by the father to ancestors. A son could take only a concubine, not a wife, without the father's consent. A slave woman would resent it if her master took no notice of her; the popular poetry represented her case, and there was reason to fear her arts and magic.[2]

In the old Babylonian kingdom the husband could dismiss his wife at will by giving her a bill of divorcement, and frequent injunctions not to do it show that it often occurred; consequently the woman was powerless and rightless against her husband, although her dignity and authority in the house and over her children were great. If repudiated she could marry again.[3] Repudiated wives, however, were the "strange women" of antiquity; wandering adventuresses, without husbands or status where they were met with, and living by vice.[4] As wealth and social activity increased in the Euphrates valley, polygamy became commoner, women were se-

[1] Harper's Magazine, No. 524, 201.
[2] Maspero, G.: Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient, I, 735.
[3] Meissner, B.: Beiträge zum Altbabylonischen Privatrecht, 14.
[4] Erman, A.: Ægypten und Ægyptisches Leben im Alterthum, I, 223.

cluded more and more, and they lost their primitive independence of status. In Chaldea all women of the higher classes were cloistered in the harem and never appeared by the side of husbands and brothers as they did in Egypt.[1] The harem system, at least for Western Asia and Europe, originated here. The contracts of the period of Babylonian and Assyrian glory show that wives were then rarely bought; one such contract only from that period is known, but the terms in it are more crassly commercial than in the contracts of the old Babylonian period.[2] A wife brought a dowry to her husband, or there were no gifts, or each father stated in the contract what he would give to the young people; if there was a dowry the ownership remained in the wife, but the husband had the use; if a man refused his approval to the marriage of his son, the woman whom the son took became a slave. Married women could do business and make contracts without the intervention of their husbands in any way.[3] A very important device, which helped to produce monogamy, was the stipulation in the contract that, if the man took a second wife, he should pay a specified amercement. Many contracts have been found in which slave concubinage and prostitution are provided for in the most matter-of-fact, commercial terms.[4] The Assyrians were fierce and cruel; the Babylonians were more poetical, industrial, and artistic.[5] The former represent on their monuments very rarely any domestic scenes; a queen is once shown feasting with the king,[6] but the only other women on the monuments are

[1] Maspero: *l.c.*, I, 707. [2] Marx, V.: Die Stellung der Frauen in Babylonien gemäss den Kontrakten aus der Zeit von Nebukadnezar bis Darius, in Beiträge zur Assyriologie, IV, 6. [3] *Ibid.*, 11, 30, 49.

[4] Kohler, J., und Peiser, F. E., Aus dem babylonischen Rechtsleben, I, 7, 8; IV, 28 ff.

[5] Rogers, R. W.: A History of Babylonia and Assyria, II, 316.

[6] Rawlinson, G.: Five Great Monarchies, I, 492.

captives. Female charms are rarely noticed. We must, however, note that the monuments are all from public buildings.[1] In Babylonia every woman must, once in her life, submit to a stranger, in the temple of Melitta (Venus), for money, which was put in the temple treasury.[2]

Wherever women are treated with tyranny and cruelty, and are denied rights, that is, redress, they kill their husbands. In the laws of Hammurabi a woman who killed her husband was to be either hanged or impaled, the meaning of the word being uncertain.[3] With increasing wealth and the distinction of classes, the mores for rich and poor diverged, for women who had property could defend their interests. They held and administered property, made contracts, etc. In the poem of Gilgamesh, the hero, addressing the ghost of his friend and enumerating the miseries of the dead, says: "Thou canst no longer embrace the wife whom thou lovest, nor beat the wife whom thou hatest."[4] We must take this to represent the mores of the highest classes. Women of the lower classes in Chaldea, whether legitimate wives or not, went about the streets freely unveiled, while those of the upper classes lived in seclusion, or, if they went out, were surrounded by attendants.[5] In all societies women of the poorer classes have to encounter annoyances and have to protect themselves, while seclusion becomes, for the richer, a badge of superiority and a gratification of vanity. Usages which were devised to cherish and pet women become restraints on their liberty and independence, for when they are treated as unequal to the risks and tasks of life by men who take care of them, the next stage is that the men treat them as in-

[1] Tiele, C. P.: Babylonische-Assyrische Geschichte, 596.
[2] Herodotus, I, 199.
[3] Müller: Gesetze des Hammurabis, 128.
[4] Maspero: *l.c.*, I, 588.
[5] *Ibid.*, 739.

ferior and contemptible, and will not grant them dignity and respect. When they escape responsibility they lose liberty. Nevertheless, the customs, if introduced by the higher classes, spread downward by imitation; so it must have been with clositering and veiling. Men got security without care, women got the sense of refinement and elegance and of aristocratic usage; the interest of men and the vanity of women thus cooperated to establish the folkways which lowered the status of the latter.

In the early Aryan society the status of a wife depended on whether she was childless, bore daughters, or bore sons. In the first case she was blamed, being considered guilty, and was treated accordingly; in the last case she enjoyed honor.[1]

In that form of the religion of India which appears in the laws of Manu, and in the Mahabharata (about the beginning of the Christian era), fathers chose husbands for their daughters and proposed the marriage, but women also proposed to men who pleased them. Manu allows them to choose, but disapproves of it because the motive would be sexual desire, and for the same reason he classes love marriages as a bad form of marriage.[2]

"Husband-selections" were public ceremonies at which the suitors of princesses entered into competition for them, although the woman could, to some extent at least, set aside the result.[3] Devayani was given as a wife by her father to Yayati; he also gave her maid with her, telling Yayati to honor her, but not to make her his wife. Yayati begot two sons by his wife and three by the maid, and therefore Devayani went home to her father, saying: "Yayati has learned what duty is [from the Veda] and yet he has committed sin."[4] In the Nal episode the

[1] Ihering, R.: The Evolution of the Aryan, 343.
[2] III, 39.
[3] Holtzmann, A.: Indische Sagen, I, 254.
[4] *Ibid.*, II, 108.

hero, charmed by the consent of the heroine, promises her life-long fidelity.[1] "The best medicine of the physicians is not so good for a man, in any ill, as a faithful and beloved wife." [2] There are, in the poem, very striking love stories, especially about the fidelity and sacrifice of lovers, but one woman says that a wife turns away from a husband who has cherished her as soon as he gets into trouble. A little trouble, it is said, outweighs in the minds of women long happiness; they have fickle hearts, and no great virtues can win them to fidelity.[3] The law of India is full of hostile expressions against the female sex; it not only puts them in a position of inferiority to men, but even refuses them the position of persons endowed with independent rights. Manu[4] says: "It is the nature of woman to seduce man in this world"; "women are able to lead astray in this world, not only a fool, but even a learned man, and to make him a slave of desire and anger." A woman is to be always under tutelage; she can have no property, give no testimony, maintain no suit, make no contracts, and conduct no affairs. The books, however, contain also expressions of praise of women, and these fundamental principles are traversed to some extent by more humane ideas. "Where women are honored there the gods are pleased, but where they are not honored no sacred rite yields reward"; "in that family where the husband is pleased with his wife and the wife with her husband, happiness will assuredly be lasting." [5] In the early philosophical period women were freely admitted to hear and share in the discussion of theological and philosophical questions.[6]

The law-givers conceive of woman as a necessary evil.

[1] Holtzmann, A.: Indische Sagen, II, 18.
[2] *Ibid.*, II, 27.
[3] *Ibid.*, II, 266.
[4] Manu, II, 213.
[5] *Ibid.*, III, 56, 60.
[6] Hopkins, E. W.: The Religions of India, 382–384.

She is the soil which man requires to produce the desired offspring of marriage. This is one of the many cases in which the status of woman has been influenced by the accepted notions about the respective shares of the sexes in procreation. Marriage is the only sacrament in India in which woman has a share. The essentials of the wedding are the ceremonial of joining hands and taking seven steps together around the sacred fire with recital of formulas of blessing. The ceremony was entirely domestic and the parties married themselves. Marriage by purchase is one of the honorable forms, but Manu says[1]: "No man who knows the law must take even the smallest gratuity for his daughter; for a man who, through avarice, takes a gratuity is a seller of his offspring." The bride-price is to be construed otherwise. Other texts recognize this form of marriage with less reserve. Jolly says that the apparent revulsion against purchase was not in the mores, but was a symptom of a more friendly tone of mind of the lawgiver toward women. In southern India purchase is at the present time almost the only form of marriage. In the Vedic hymns the relation of husband and wife is represented as one of intimate affection, confidence, and cooperation. The place of the wife was especially marked by the fact that she participated with her husband in the household sacrifices, and in the house she was in authority over all the inmates. Only one could occupy this position. Manu's[2] precepts for a wife are that, although the husband is destitute of virtue, or seeks pleasure elsewhere, she is to regard him as a god, and is to make no vow or sacrifices apart from him. Manu also expresses the "one flesh" idea: "Learned Brahmins propound this maxim likewise: 'The husband is declared to be one with the wife.'"[3]

[1] III, 51. [2] *Ibid.*, V, 154. [3] *Ibid.*, IX, 45.

The jurists expressed this mystical unity in the provisions that man and wife could not go surety for each other, bear witness, contract debts, maintain suits, or divide property with each other. These are necessary corollaries of the "one flesh" doctrine. In respect to joint property there has been an important development toward the independence of women.[1] In the wedding ceremony the groom led the bride around the domestic fire-altar three times, saying: "I am male; thou art female. Come, let us marry. Let us possess offspring. United in affection, illustrious, well-disposed toward each other, let us live for a hundred years."[2] Although this formula was here directed only to procreation, it is an interesting historical parallel to the Roman formula and to a German formula, which latter ones had relation to rights.

"We shall not err if we understand that women in Iranian antiquity had substantially the same status as in Vedic India, or amongst the ancient Germans, or in the Homeric age of Greece. In all these cases we meet with the same conditions"[3]; that is to say, that in the ultimate forms of civilized society the status of women which we find is the same.

In the Zendavesta the sexes appear equal in rights and honor, but they never were so in fact in historical times. Zoroaster, according to the tradition, had three wives.[4] Each man had concubines and slaves according to his means and his own judgment of his personal welfare, as was the case throughout the whole ancient world. The most remarkable feature of the Iranian social system

[1] Jolly, J.: Ueber die rechtliche Stellung der Frauen bei den alten Indern, etc., 421–439; Zimmer, H.: Altindisches Leben, 315–318.

[2] Monier-Williams, M.: Brahmanism and Hinduism, 363.

[3] Geiger, W.: Ostiranische Kultur, etc., 243.

[4] Jackson, A. V. W.: Zoroaster, 20.

was the injunction to practice the closest incestuous marriages as the most meritorious.[1] This is a very interesting case of the survival of primitive mores into a later religion, and the reason for it was intense desire to maintain the blood-purity of a caste, a desire which had become a predominant motive.[2] For this reason, although courtesans existed, intercourse with them was strongly disapproved, and the mores imposed strict rules on women of the nation.[3] A man was praised for giving his daughter in marriage and ordered to do so as penance for his own sins; thus the interests of the daughter might be subordinated to those of the father. The wedding ceremony was a union of hands with prayers and formulas of words, in which, and in the ceremonies of transfer to her husband's house, the bride is spoken of as the comrade and equal of her husband and as his companion in the household.[4] On the one hand, these rules imposed on a man a status-wife, and on the other hand, as in all such cases, they caused love unions with foreigners and defeated their own purpose. Marriage was encouraged and premiums were given for large families, which seems to show that the premiums were necessary.[5] There are historical cases in which Persians showed very great attachment to their wives.[6]

The status of women in the Old Testament is that which has been described as prevailing in Western Asia in the earlier form. Very little is said about women; they play no rôle, and have no function in religion. Ruth is a heroine because when she, as a widow, had a right

[1] Darmestetter, J.: The Zendavesta, 126.

[2] Tiele-Gerich: Geschichte der Religion im Altertum, etc., II, 1, 165.

[3] Geiger, W.: Ostiranische Kultur, 337.

[4] *Ibid.*, 241.

[5] Spiegel, F.: Eranische Alterthumskunde, III, 679; Darmestetter, J.: Zendavesta, I, 46.

[6] Herodotus, 9, 111; Plutarch: Artaxerxes.

to return to her home and people, she chose to remain with her husband's family and nation and to adhere to his religion. Esther is a political heroine, while Athaliah and Jezebel seize power, as women did upon occasion in other states. In the Proverbs we hear what a good thing a good woman is; what a bad thing a bad woman or wife is. This might all be equally well said of husbands, but it is not said, because it was not in the mores to think of men in the same light. The model woman[1] is an industrious housewife. Woman is a coadjutor to man, though, according to the story in Genesis, she brought woe upon him. "The status of woman is characterized by the fact that she was always the property of some man"; she was the property of her father, who sold her to her husband. Her duty was to bear children and do household work. The man was not bound to exclusive fidelity; the woman was, under penalty of death. A priest might not mourn for his wife,[2] for she was not as near to him as his family kin, including his unmarried sister. This excluded his married sister, as if she went into the kin of her husband, which is inconsistent. A widow did not inherit from her husband, but the heir must care for her. A woman's vow required the confirmation of her father or husband.[3]

A man could have concubines and slaves; it was, however, a very important effect of the later strict endogamy of the Jews that these could be only Jews, and were, therefore, in a protected status, and were nationally equal to the wife; but the case of a war-captive, necessarily a foreigner, at the mercy of the captor, is allowed for.[4] Polygamy was the current usage[5]; divorce was easy at

[1] Prov. 31. [2] Lev. 21 : 1; Ezek. 44 : 25.
[3] Num. 30 : 4; *cf.* Buhl, D. F.: Die socialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten, 30.
[4] Deut. 21 : 10. [5] Deut. 21 : 15.

the will of the man; motherhood was the chief function of women. Throughout the canon of the Old Testament violation of the sex-taboo is earnestly condemned and made a subject of warning and of prohibition in the name of Yahveh. Sex-vice, including abortion, exposure of infants, and child sacrifice, are set forth as the distinguishing traits of the heathen, and an abomination to Yahveh. The prophets were constantly fighting the mores of the Jews, which coincided with those of the other people of Western Asia.[1] The Jews who returned to Judea were a selection of those who had the strongest national feeling and who thought that the captivity had been a chastisement of Yahveh. In the rabbinical period, with intenser national feeling, the antagonism to heathenism and sex-vice was even more strongly emphasized, and they often hold the first place in ethical exhortation and discussion. The importance attached, in the New Testament, to eating things offered to idols might not seem comprehensible, but it is conjoined with denunciation of sex-vice, and sex-vice and heathenism went together, and were the antipodes of Christianity. These sentiments entered deeply into the Jewish mores of the rabbinical period, while the standard of marital life, the conception of matrimony, and the status of women remained about on the level of the surrounding nations. Women were held to be inferior, as agents of seduction and evil; a father or husband had a hard task to keep daughter or wife from evil.

In Esdras[2] is an interesting argument to prove that woman is the most powerful thing amongst men; she is alluring and may be wicked, and is classed with wine as a cause of ruin to men.[3] All the wisdom of all the ages

[1] Ezek. 8 : 6–11; 22 : 9–11.

[2] I, 3 : 13.

[3] Eccles., chaps. 9, 19, 25, and 26.

and nations reiterates the same few propositions. The woman was held to strict fidelity in marriage, but not the man. The rule of divorce in Deut. 24: 1 was greatly enlarged, although sects differed about it. Hardly anywhere in the rabbinical writings do we find any high conception of wedlock[1]; in the rabbinical period there was a tendency to depreciate all sex-relations, as a consequence of the strong antagonism to heathenism; there is even some glorification of virginity and of long widowhood,[2] and a legend that Rachel withdrew from conjugal life and chose continency.[3] The Essenes, beginning in the second century B.C., rejected marriage and depended on new adherents to continue their sect. The Therapeuts did not reject marriage, but they honored celibacy.[4] The Talmudists said that a man might marry as many wives as he could support, but he was exhorted to take not more than four; it appears doubtful if many men in that period (early centuries of the Christian era) took more than one.[5] Polygamy was put under definite taboo in 1020 A.D.; women were also given more and more definite right of divorce, and divorce by the man from caprice or malice was restrained. Still dicta are quoted which allow wide freedom of divorce to both.[6]

The biblical scholars[7] now tell us that the story of the creation of woman in the second chapter of Genesis dates from about 775 B.C. It is very primitive myth-making. The processes and machinery are all described. So the woman is made out of a rib of man, and the man

[1] *Cf.* I Cor. 11: 9–15. [2] Luke 2: 36.

[3] Bousset, D. W.: Die Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 401–404.

[4] *Ibid.*, 443, 445.

[5] Bergel, J.: Die Eheverhältnisse der alten Juden, etc., 10.

[6] Klügmann, N.: Die Frau im Talmud, 37–46.

[7] Smith, H. P.: Old Testament History.

perceives that he and she were "one flesh." Then follows the enigmatical utterance that the man shall leave father and mother and go to his wife. In what social horizon could that rule arise? Nobody in the father-family ever did it, except heiress-husbands.[1] However, but for this rule there would be no establishment of pair-marriage in this text. If the husband goes to the wife he will have but one, unless it be exceptionally or by some confusion of usages. The first chapter of Genesis is held to have been written not before 500 B.C. It is very simple and direct, and is written as history, not myth; the human race is created in two sexes, and nothing states or implies pair-marriage. It cannot be supposed that the man was said to go to the woman, in opposition to almost universal usage, in order to suggest pair-marriage. Then modern men have read their own mores into these texts, and established such a tradition that we do not perceive that the text does not contain the institution. How could the Jews practice polygamy through their whole history if on the first page of the law stood an injunction of pair-marriage? They did not see it there because it is not there.

The position of women amongst the Jews at the time of Christ was what it was generally in the Greco-Roman world; their place was domestic and their chief function was to bear children. The New Testament Gospels contain very little about women, but later Christian hagiology created myths about the two Marys and Martha to satisfy the demand. The Epistles contain doctrines of marriage which are not fully consistent. One view is that marriage is a *pis aller* for sin.[2] The most important question is that of the effect on a pre-

[1] As in Num. 36.

[2] I Cor. 7; the same doctrine appears in Rev. 14 : 4.

existing marriage of conversion of husband or wife to Christianity. The rabbis held the current contemptuous opinion of women; Hillel is quoted as saying, "More women, more witchcrafts." [1] Woman, according to the current belief, was not saved through the Law, but through child-bearing.[2] Philo gives as the reason why the Essenes did not marry that "a wife is a selfish creature, immoderately smitten with jealousy, terrible at shaking to their foundations the natural habits of a man, and bringing him under power by continual beguilements. For as she practices fair false speeches and other kinds of hypocrisy, as it were upon the stage, when she has succeeded in alluring eyes and ears, like cheated servants, she brings cajolery to bear upon the sovereign mind. Moreover, if there are children she begins to be puffed up with pride and license of tongue, and all the things which before she speciously offered in a disguised manner in irony, she now summons forth with a more daring confidence, and shamelessly forces her way into actions, every one of which is hostile to communion. For the man who is bound under spells of wife or children, being made anxious by the bond of nature, is no longer the same person toward others, but is entirely changed, having become, without being aware of it, a slave instead of a free man." [3]

The status of women in Egypt was so free that the Greeks ridiculed the Egyptians as woman-ridden; Herodotus [4] says that the women went to market and the men wove at home. Descent was through women and was marked by the mother's name, which the child bore, while the tie of father and child was slight.[5] In the tombs of the old kingdom (before 2000 B.C.) the wife and

[1] Cook, K.: The Fathers of Jesus, II, 127. [2] I Tim. 2 : 15.
[3] Philo: Apology of the Jews, frag. *apud* Eusebius; Cook: *l.c.*, II, 7.
[4] II, 35. [5] Maspero: *l.c.*, I, 51.

mother of the deceased are represented; hardly ever the father. A very peculiar arrangement was that a man's next heir was his grandson by his eldest daughter, and that a boy's next friend and protector was his maternal grandfather. This arrangement was very ancient and was deeply rooted in the mores.[1] The women of the harem of Thothmes III got up a conspiracy against him (about 1600 B.C.) and were able to organize a large force of men and officers in it.[2] From about 740 B.C. a college of priestesses at Thebes became the political authority in that city, the chief priestess concentrating the political power in herself.[3] Some of these features of society seem to be survivals of the mother-family, but Herodotus saw 341 statues of successive priests in descent from father to son, which covered, as the Egyptians said, 11,340 years,[4] and would indicate father descent for that period. Herodotus[5] reports that each man had but one wife, "like the Greeks," but Diodorus[6] says that only priests were restricted to one. Kings certainly had more than one and probably great men also, and there were besides concubines and slaves. Prostitution was in effect organized in the service of religion.[7]

In the *Precepts of Ptah-hotep*, which date from about 2600 B.C., it is said: "If thou wouldst be wise, rule thy house and love thy wife wholly and constantly. Fill her stomach and clothe her body, for these are her personal necessities. Love her tenderly and fulfill all her desires as long as thou hast thy life, for she is an estate which conferreth great reward upon her lord. Be not harsh to her, for she will be more easily moved by persuasion than by force. Take thou heed to that which

[1] Erman, A.: Ægypten, etc., 224.
[2] *Ibid.*, 87.
[3] Maspero: *l.c.*, III, 172.
[4] Herodotus: II, 142.
[5] *Ibid.*, I, 80.
[6] II, 92.
[7] Maspero: *l.c.*, II, 536.

she wisheth and to that to which her desire runneth, and to that upon which she fixeth her mind [and obtain it for her], for thereby shalt thou make her to stay in thy house. If thou resistest her will, it is ruin to thee. Speak to her heart and show her thy love." [1] The extremest "friend of woman" in any age might admit that these precepts are excessive; if they ever were approximately in the mores, the derision of the Greeks did not lack justification. A later writer of unspecified date warns against the "strange woman" like the writer of Proverbs [2]: "Beware of a strange woman who is not known where she is. Do not look at her when she comes and do not know her. She is like a current of deep water, the whirling force of which one does not know. The woman whose husband is absent writes to thee every day. If there is no witness near her, she rises and spreads her net! O crime worthy of death when one hears of it." Have nothing to do with her and take a wife in thy youth, because "the best thing is one's own house," and because "a wife will give thee a son like thyself." [3]

In Egypt in the class of nobles every woman "brought some land to her husband as dower, but daughters took it away again, so that the fortunes of a family depended on the proportion of females born in it." [4] Each wife had her own house, given to her by her parents or her husband; thus there was no conjugal domicile and the man was not "head of the family," but a guest in his wife's house. The wife administered her own property and received a stipend from her husband; if she contributed to the expenses, she did so voluntarily. In a marriage contract of the time of Ptolemy III (247–221 B.C.) the man promises not to claim the authority of a husband,

[1] Budge, E. A. W.: A History of Egypt, etc., II, 150. [2] 6 : 24.
[3] Erman, A.: Ægypten, etc., 223. [4] Maspero: *l.c.*, I, 300.

to give to the woman slaves who are named, and to let her dispose of them without interference from him; he recognizes as hers all debts due to her and makes them collectible by her agent; if the husband collects any of them, he promises to pay the proceeds to her and to pay her a penalty besides. In a corresponding document, by a woman, she acknowledges the receipt of the marriage gift and of her share of the goods, and promises to return the same if she is unfaithful.[1] This last stipulation is an exact inversion of the case where the man, by custom or contract, receives a dower which he must repay if he repudiates the woman. Erman[2] thinks that conjugal relations were happy and affectionate. A widower, who had been told by a magician that his second wife had caused an illness from which he suffered, wrote and put in her tomb a letter of remonstrance, in which he rehearsed his attentions and devotion to her.

The Egyptian mores must be accounted for by the extreme traditionalism of that people which caused survivals of old customs to persist by the side of new ones. Contact with Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, and Greeks produced change but very slowly, although Egyptian men must have been instigated to borrow foreign customs by all motives of selfish interest and vanity. Paturet[3] thinks that he can discern a change in the marriage system after about 500 B.C.; from a free and equal relation it became more servile on the part of the woman and the Semitic notion that there could be no full marriage without a property pledge was accepted in Egypt. Later the woman, without selling herself entirely, made a contract of limited duty. She was lower

[1] Paturet, G.: La Condition juridique de la femme dans ancienne Égypte, 42, 50, 54, 72.

[2] Ægypten, etc., I, 217. [3] 14 to 20.

than if she had sold herself permanently or given herself away. "Nothing in his home experience had prepared a Greek to see a respectable woman come and go in liberty, without veil and without escort, carrying a burden on her shoulder instead of on her head, like a man, running about the market, keeping shop, while her husband or father was shut up at home, weaving fabrics, mixing potter's clay, and turning the potter's wheel or working at his trade. It was an easy inference that the man was a slave and the wife mistress of the family." [1] Accordingly, as soon as a Greek dynasty was seated on the throne, we find that Ptolemy IV (221–205 B.C.) made an ordinance which restrained Egyptian married women by Greek law; gifts and contracts between man and wife ceased, and the wife needed the authorization of her husband for her acts.[2] Under Mohammedanism in Egypt we find the mores completely reversed. The Roman conquest and christianization acted to remold Egyptian mores as to the status of women, a change which may have been brought about before Mohammedanism came in. All the conquerors were antagonistic to the Egyptian mores in regard to this matter, and they favored the change, which was in the interest of men.

In Homer the relations of young unmarried persons is free and unconventional, although there is a code of propriety. Wives were bought and the bargain is very purely commercial in motive; fathers were also moved by political and dynastic motives. The purchase contract and the formal ceremony distinguished the status-wife from the concubine; and there were also slaves and captives who were at their lords' mercy. The concubine or slave, who had no status, was chosen for love. "When the chief wife was also the loved wife, affection was very

[1] Maspero; *l.c.*, III, 797. [2] Paturet; *l.c.*, 42.

strong and true"; the best example is that of Hector and Andromache. Wives were held to fidelity: Penelope was a heroine; Clytemnestra "led to bitter words against all women." The fidelity of women is a duty on account of the rights which their masters have acquired in them by capture or purchase; if they violate it the paramour must pay a fine. No divorce occurs in Homer. The gods and goddesses present a picture of another community marked throughout by disreputable conduct as compared with the human community.[1] The quarrels of Zeus and Hera give us a picture of conjugal life which is more distasteful than any presented as of men. The pair are vain, frivolous, and jealous, and give cause for jealousy; their love-making is not dignified; they live like a couple in a French novel, who have decided to get on by not demanding too much of each other. It is a mistake to think that the custom of "purchase" degraded women; we find that, in barbarism, purchase is explained as a remuneration to the father for the expense of rearing the girl — she is not "bought" like a slave. Purchase also runs down through all grades of ceremony and survival. Then, too, the woman's father gave her a dowry-like gift, a transaction which shows that the purchase idea no longer characterizes the relation of the parties, but is a survival by the side of a new conception of marriage. From a pecuniary point of view the two gifts were incongruous, but as regards the sentiments which determined their meaning, they could well continue together.[2] The wooing in Homer is simple and natural, open and straightforward, though the language is often naïve and to our usage unrefined. The mores are not clearly defined because of the military and heroic plane on which the poems move.

[1] Keller, A. G.: Homeric Society, chap. V. [2] Od. I, 277; II, 53.

The women attend the heroes in the bath, a custom which to us seems inconsistent with the other sex mores but it illustrates well the power of the mores to extend approval, for the sake of an interest, to an incongruous usage. The gods give wives, so that marriages are made in heaven; they bless the marriage of a man who pleases them,[1] and they give children.[2] "Nothing is stronger and nobler than when man and wife, united in harmony of mind, rule their house in wisdom." [3] Achilles says: "Every brave and sensible man loves his consort." [4] Cases occur in which a man renounces a slave woman out of respect to his wife,[5] but there are others in which he declares that he prefers the slave woman.[6] The case of Penelope was complicated: it was not sure that her husband was dead; her son was a boy, but he grew to manhood and became her guardian as she had been his. She was clever and wise and managed well a difficult situation the phases of which changed as time went on, but always presented new difficulties. Telemachus declared to her with rude plainness that he was master [7]; he told her to go to the women's quarters and attend to the housework and to leave deliberation to men. Thus he defined her "sphere." Hesiod, as quoted in the *Anthology* of Stobæus,[8] says: "If a man has had the luck to get a wife who suits him, that is the acme of good fortune; if he has a bad one it is the worst disaster." Menander is also quoted: "If we rightly judge the matter, marriage is indeed an evil, but necessity imposes this evil on us."

Augustine [9] has preserved from Varro a myth of early

[1] Od., XV, 26; IV, 208.
[2] *Ibid.*, IV, 12; XVI, 117.
[3] *Ibid.*, VI, 182–184; Il., VI, 407.
[4] Il., IX, 341–342; Friedreich, J. B.: Die Realien in der Iliade und Odyssee, 197–200; especially 199 on the sex mores.
[5] Od., I, 431; Il., IX, 132; XIX, 261.
[6] Il., I, 112.
[7] Od., I, 356.
[8] 69.
[9] De Civitate Dei, XVIII, 9.

Attica. In the time of Cecrops an olive tree suddenly appeared at one place and water burst forth at another. The oracle explained the portent to mean that the people must choose between Minerva (the olive tree) and Neptune (the spring) as patron of their new city, Athens. Cecrops summoned all the people, male and female, for women then voted, to make their choice. The men voted for Neptune and the women for Minerva, and the latter triumphed by a majority of one; at this Neptune was angry and inundated Attica. The Athenians punished the women by taking from them the right to vote, by abolishing the usage that children took their names from the mother, and by depriving them of the name of Athenian women. This story seems to be a myth embodying a tradition of the mother-family and accounting for the change from it to the father-family, with a decline in the societal position of women. There are two obscure but very interesting Greek myths in which women rebel against marriage. The daughters of Prœtus treated with contempt the temple of Hera, patroness of marriage. Aphrodite punished them with madness, but after wandering about they were cured in the temple of Artemis. Their example led Argive women to forsake their husbands and slay their children; similarly the women on Lemnos despised Aphrodite and slew their husbands.[1] The myths suggest that the marriage institution was such that women revolted against it.

In the seventh and sixth centuries a series of lyric poets (Sappho, Anacreon) developed a strong erotic conception of love which was passionate and, according to later standards, vicious.[2] Such a sentiment the Greeks always understood by "love." They felt a great joy in

[1] Farnell, L. R.: The Cults of the Greek States, II, 448.

[2] Beloch, J.: Griechische Geschichte, I, 258.

living, were gay and light-hearted, but heartless and superficial. "The systematic repression of a natural appetite was totally foreign to Greek modes of thought"; "the Greek conception of excellence was the full and perfect development of humanity in all its organs and functions." [1] To such a scheme of life women were essential, but it offered them little honor. Simonides of Amorgos (seventh century B.C.) classified women, saying that God made of earth the lazy ones, of the sea the fickle ones. Other classes Simonides distinguished by the animals whom they resembled in character; for instance, the bee class was those who were industrious, thrifty, faithful — healthy mothers with grace and high virtues.[2] Aristotle says that in former times all Greeks bought each other's wives.[3] Lykurgus in Sparta and Solon in Athens [4] adopted very low and different policies about the discipline and relations of the sexes; their standpoint was that of man or the state, and woman was used for purposes assumed to be good, and in ways assumed to be expedient and practicable. Whether any good resulted to the male sex or the state under either plan is very doubtful, but the women were degraded in each case. At Athens, in order to have children of full civil standing, it was necessary that a man should marry the daughter of a citizen, but the women of this class were so secluded in the women's apartments, and lived such a remote life, that young men could not know young women. Therefore the wife of full rank was a status-wife. In the fifth century very many Athenians married foreign wives, in spite of the disabilities which their children would incur; it seems evident that they became acquainted

[1] Lecky, W. E. H.: History of European Morals, etc., II, 291; Mahaffy, J. P.: Social Life in Greece, etc., 104, 117.

[2] Bergk, T.: Griechische Literaturgeschichte, II, 197.

[3] Politics, II, 5, 11.

[4] Athenæus: Deipnos, 25.

with these women and formed attachments, which it was impossible to do with Athenian women. By the side of the legitimate order there came into existence a class of courtesans, who exercised, by education, beauty, wit, grace, and coquetry, the influence over man which belonged to woman, and to which Greeks were especially susceptible. If Athenæus may be believed, this class was very numerous. He gives a collection of the *bons mots* attributed to them and specifies the ones who were in more or less enduring relations with all the well-known men of Athens. While the status-wives were shut up at home, keeping house and nursing children, these love-wives enjoyed the society of the men and influenced the state; and some of them became famous in more ways than one. Aspasia made a trade of educating courtesans; Socrates refers to her a man whom he sought to indoctrinate with higher doctrines of conjugal duty.[1] Cicero[2] tells a story in which she appears as the instructress of Xenophon and his wife, showing them by the Socratic method that every man wants the best wife and every woman the best husband possibly to be had; therefore, to satisfy each other, each should strive to be as good as possible. She was, it appears, the competent teacher of the art of matrimony, and is credited with a share in the great movement to emancipate women. Aristophanes[3] attributes the Peloponnesian war to the anger of Pericles, on her account, against Megareans who had stolen two of her courtesans. Socrates[4] says that she was skilled in rhetoric and had taught many orators, including Pericles. Such were the mores by the end of the fifth century; wives at home like servants, intellectual recrea-

[1] Xenophon: Economicus, 3, 14.
[2] De Inventione Rhetorica, I, 31 (51).
[3] Acharnians, 524.
[4] Menexenos, 236.

tion sought in conversation, sexual passion gratified in dissipation with courtesans. This ran through the society according to wealth. In an oration against Neæra it is said: "We have courtesans for pleasure, concubines for daily companions, wives for mothers of legitimate children and for housekeepers." [1] This expressed exactly the mores of that time. In discussing the reasons for the headlong descent of the Greeks in the third and second centuries, it is to be remembered that they were breeding out their nationality by begetting children with foreigners and slaves, and by family and social mores which selected against the women of full blood.

The Greeks thought that a wise man would never confide entirely in his wife; therefore he never had complete community of interest with her. The reason was the same which would keep him from community of interest with children. He looked to women for the joy of life in all its higher and lower forms.

In the tragedies of the fifth century general statements about women often occur. They are almost always disparaging. In Æschylus's *Suppliants* the king says: "A woman's fears are ever uncontrolled," and the female chorus answers: "A woman by herself is nothing worth." In the *Agamemnon* Ægisthus says: "Guile is the woman's function." Women have no judgment, but are persuaded before the facts are known. In the *Seven against Thebes* Eteocles declares women to be a nuisance in trouble and prosperity. They are arrogant when they have power, while in war-time they get frightened and flutter about doing no good, but helping the enemy. Let them be kept out of affairs. "Oh, Zeus, what a tribe thou gavest us in women!" In the *Ajax* Tecmessa, a captive, says to her lord: "Since the hour that made me thine I live

[1] Quoted by Athenæus, XIII, 31.

for thee." In the *Eumenides* Apollo asserts that woman does not beget; she is only nurse; the mother only cherishes the germ. He uses Pallas as a proof that one could be born without a mother, but not without a father. In Sophocles's *Trachinian Maidens* Deianeira, the heroine, "the most real woman's soul that the Athenian dramatists ever put upon the stage,"[1] says that love is invincible; she feels it herself, and so it would be madness for her to blame her husband and his new love, if they too have fallen under it — "No shame to them and it does not harm me." Antigone says: "We must remember that we are only women and cannot strive with men. We are under authority."

In the Periclean age Athens had become a great city, and it was hard for women to move about in it freely, for they were in need of escort and protection. Hence they became secluded, especially in the higher classes; in the country they had more important functions, contributed more, and therefore were more free.[2] Thucydides[3] attributes to Pericles the saying that women are best when men never mention them, either to praise or blame. Pericles himself, in his relation to Aspasia, "lightly broke the barriers of the conventional morals of the time"; "according to the spirit of that age, the natural right of love must prevail over the right of marriage which human ordinances had created. Deliverance from every constraint was the effort of that age, and it was most nearly realized at Athens."[4] The current view was that marriage was a necessary evil, a business arrangement, part of the arrangement of an establishment, an arrangement as unsentimental as a contract to buy or hire a house. Property interests might make a marriage

[1] Rohde, E.: Psyche, II, 237.
[2] Mahaffy, 133.
[3] II, 45.
[4] Beloch, J.: *l.c.*, I, 474.

between near relatives advantageous, and half-brother and sister by the same father (not mother) might marry. Marriages of persons brought together by affection occurred, but were very rare. Women were married young and their will or choice did not enter into the matter. There was no purchase after the sixth century, but the woman received a dowry from her family, sometimes with a promise to double it if she bore children. If such a dowry was not given, the union was regarded as hardly more than concubinage, because the man could so easily divorce the wife if he had no dowry to restore; hence the dowry was a security for the woman against his caprice.[1] The change from the custom that the suitor pays the father to the custom that the father pays the suitor is undoubtedly due to the fact that suitors became rarer than marriageable girls; for the variations in customs about marriage gifts are always significant of the conjuncture of the interests of the parties. Women who disposed of themselves were those who had no dowry, when the custom was to bring a dowry in marriage. The marriage in Greece was preceded by a formal betrothal. The wedding consisted in the delivery of the bride to the bridegroom by her *kurios*, the man who had authority over her. No officer of church or state had any function, for the proceeding was entirely domestic and belonged to the family; religious sacrifices were made some days before the wedding, but were incidental, and were made for good fortune.[2]

The distresses of the Peloponnesian war compelled the Athenians to admit to citizenship the *nothoi*, or children of Athenian men by non-Athenian mothers. There is

[1] Blümner, H.: Griechische Privatalterthümer, 260–264.

[2] Müller, O.: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des attischen Bürger- und Eherechts, 746.

some evidence that they allowed men to take two wives each (*e.g.*, Socrates and Euripides).[1] Possibly the public necessities also forced them to think of emancipating women,[2] for secluded wives could hardly take the initiative in such a movement. Very strangely the initiative has been ascribed to the courtesans. That there was such a movement is best proved by the ridicule which Aristophanes poured out on it in his *Lysistrata;* either somebody went so far as to propose community of women or Aristophanes meant to affirm that emancipation would lead to that. In his *Woman's Parliament* he developed the farcical element in such a plan; evidently he regarded everything as mere suggestion for his fun-making. In his *Thesmophoria-festival* he took up the defense of women against utterances in Euripides's *Hippolytus.* Hippolytus is a woman-hater and celibate, but Hera, enraged at such rebellion against love, inspires a passion for him in his stepmother, Phædra. The chorus develops the idea that love is a mighty catastrophe for joy or ill, and that Hera allows no contempt for it; love maddens the hearts and deludes the senses of all whom it attacks. The conception is that of an erotic passion. The relationship of the two does not enter into the tragedy at all, but only that a wife may fall into such a passion and be torn between it and fidelity to her husband. The result is torment for Hippolytus, and he vents his rage on women. Why did Zeus ever create them to man's sorrow on earth? They are a curse. If more men were wanted they should have been bought. The father gives his daughter a dowry to get rid of her, and then she costs her husband heavily for dress, etc. He puts up with her

[1] Müller, O.: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des attischen Bürger- und Eherechts, 795–797.

[2] Bruns, I: Frauenemancipation in Athen, 19 ff.

if he gains anything by marriage; if not, he makes the best of it. If she is a simpleton, that is best. "Deliver me from a clever one!" They plot wickedness with servants. He hates them all. Let some one prove them chaste.

In the tragedies of Euripides the characters often discuss women — evidently the woman question had been rising through the century. In the *Hekuba* Agamemnon remarks: "I have a contemptuous opinion of the female sex." Iphigenia says, in *Iphigenia amongst the Taurians:* "A man is a great loss to his family, but a woman is not of much account." Women sympathize with each other and keep each other's secrets loyally. Orestes says that women are clever at inventing tricks, and again, that they have the gift of winning sympathy. In *Iphigenia at Aulis* the heroine declares that the life of one man is worth that of ten thousand women. In the *Hippolytus* Phædra says: "I found out thoroughly that I was only a woman, a thing which the world dislikes." In the *Andromache* Andromache speaks to her maid: "Thou art a woman. Thou canst invent a hundred ways," and again, "No cure has been found for a woman's venom, worse than that of reptiles. We are a curse to man." "Men of sense should never let gossiping women visit their wives, for they work mischief." In the *Phœnician Maidens* one passage states: "It is the nature of women to love scandal and gossip." In the *Medea* Medea in soliloquy says to herself: "Thou hast cunning. Women, though by nature little fit for deeds of valor, are expert in mischief," and she exhorts Jason, who is a scoundrel, "Thou shouldst not sink to the level of us poor women, nor meet us with our own childishness." He says that women are weak and given to tears, and that it is natural for a woman to rave against her husband when he is

planning another marriage (as he is); that she could bear his second marriage if she had self-control. He says that women think all is well if married life is smooth, but that men should have been able to get children some other way without the existence of any women. Medea appeals to Jason's oaths and promises to her which he pledged with his right hand; she would not complain if she were childless, but they have children. The sneak answers that he is going to marry the king's daughter for the good of the family. Medea says: "He who was all the world to me — my own husband — has turned out a villain. Women are unfortunate. They buy a husband at the high price and get a tyrant. It is always a great question whether they make a good choice. Divorce is discreditable to women. If we are clever enough to manage a husband, it is well; otherwise we may better die. The husband can go out, if vexed; the wife must stay at home. Better go through battle three times than through childbirth once." She is led to discuss the status of woman: "The dawn of respect to women is breaking. They shall be basely slandered no more. The ancient poets wrote much about their faithlessness. This shall cease. If Apollo had given us the gift of versifying I would have answered them. History shows up their sex as much as ours." In the *Bacchantes* the question is raised whether chastity is native to women; if it is, they will not fall when assailed in the mysteries of Dionysus. In the *Andromache* the heroine says that a wife must learn the ways of her husband's country and his own, and not try to impose the ways in which she was brought up. Her lord also has taken a wife who maltreats Andromache, the bond-maid. The wife says to her: "Do not bring amongst us barbaric customs which we think crimes. It is a shame here for a man to have

two wives. All men who care to live honorable lives are content to devote themselves to one lawful love." Andromache says that for Hector she would have borne a rival, if Hera had charmed him with another woman, and that she often nursed his illegitimate children to spare him annoyance. The chorus affirms that a husband should be content with one wife and not give her rights to another. In the *Electra* Clytemnæstra says that she killed her husband because he brought home a captive concubine. Women are fools, but if a man humiliates his wife, let her retaliate; she is then blamed and not he. Electra answers that if a woman has sense, she will always submit to her husband; it is not befitting for her to insist on rights. In the *Trojan Women* Hekuba tells how she behaved in wedlock in order to describe an ideal wife. She stayed at home and did not gossip. Going abroad gives a bad reputation. She was modest and silent before her husband, and knew when to rule him and when to yield to him.

Athenæus quotes a great many writers, of whom we otherwise know nothing, in regard to love, marriage, and women. They are nearly all contemptuous, sarcastic, or hostile, except where they speak of women as a means of pleasure. In no case is conjugal affection described; there is no evidence of knowledge or appreciation of it.

Aristophanes devoted three comedies to the woman question. In the *Lysistrata* the women determine to bring peace, and at the end Lysistrata, having brought together representatives of Athens and Sparta, reconciles them by arguments which any modern historian would say covered the common sense of the situation and do credit to the statesmanship of Aristophanes. If it was conceivable that women could see and urge such a solution of the case, great honor was done them, and it was

most unfortunate for Greece that they were excluded from diplomacy. In the *Thesmophoria-festival* the female chorus leader asks why, if women are a curse, men woo them, pursue, guard, and watch them, and follow them when they go away. She tells the men that they rob the public treasury and that some of them threw away their arms in battle and ran. Bruns[1] takes the comedies of Aristophanes as proof that there had been earlier a discussion of woman's right and status which is not in the literature, and that in this discussion it had been proposed to admit them to political functions and military service.

Thus it appears that at the end of the fifth century there was some agitation of the question of woman's status and function in society. The philosophers of the fourth century took part in the discussion. The first document is the dialogue in Xenophon's *Economicus*. Ischomachus, supposed to be Xenophon, gives a rhetorical and artificial statement. It is, however, very remarkable that, even in the way of fiction, any man of that time could imagine a man making such an attempt to get upon a basis of affectionate confidence and cooperation with his wife, for the story stands entirely by itself in the literature. The other participants in the dialogue hear with astonishment his story of his method with his wife, and what he tells of the response of the young woman shows that she had had no education to enable her to understand it; that is to say, it was entirely outside of the mores of the society. Plato thought that the question was real, because one-half of the state was losing its effective force and happiness; he wanted women educated better, but he thought of Spartan ways with favor, even those which seemed devised to eradicate feminine

[1] Frauenemancipation in Athen, 21.

modesty and sex propriety. In this way his discussion became a Utopian speculation which had no value.[1] In the *Republic* he advances to a more sweeping theory,[2] denying that any fundamental difference of capacities or capabilities goes with the sex difference. He lays stress on the difference of muscular strength only. From these dogmatic assumptions he argues that women should have the same education as men and share all social and political functions with them.

Aristotle also thought that women should be better educated, though he regarded them as, by nature, inferior to men, and therefore created to obey. In the *Problemata* he asks why it is considered more direful to kill a woman than a man, although any male is better than any female.[3] In the *History of Animals* he says that a woman is more compassionate, tearful, envious, complaining, fond of slander, quarrelsome, despondent, imprudent, unveracious, confiding, vindictive, watchful, less active, and requires less food. In this time the bankruptcy of the Spartan system was known to all the world; the Spartan women were useless and in the way in war, and the population had fallen off so that the state was ruined by a single lost battle. Women held the property,[4] and were free, bold, intemperate, and luxurious.[5] Aristotle ended by putting women back just where they were according to the existing mores. Their powers were limited; they had a sphere which was suitable for them; let them do their duty in it.[6]

If we may judge of the views of Menander by the fragments,[7] he held very adverse judgments about women and marriage. Jerome, in his first tract against

[1] Laws, 781, 805, 806.
[2] Fifth and following books.
[3] Prob., XXIX, 11.
[4] Politics, II, 9, 2.
[5] *Ibid.*, IV, 8, 23; 15, 13.
[6] *Ibid.*, I, 5, 7; I, 13, 3 and 9; III, 4, 7.
[7] In Stobæus LXX.

Jovinianus, quotes Theophrastus,[1] where the question is: "Ought a wise man to marry?" The preliminary answer is: "Yes, if the woman is pretty, of good morals and breeding, and of honest parents, and if the man is in good health and rich. These conditions are rarely all fulfilled. Hence the wise man will not marry." The author proceeds to justify this opinion by very derogatory assertions about women: "Whatever defect she has, you do not know it until after the marriage. Nothing else do you buy without a trial. A wife is not shown until she is given to you, lest she may not suit you." "Women are frivolous, vicious, intriguing, exacting, and selfish. None of the reasons given for marriage will bear examination." None of these philosophers had any influence to make the sex mores better; they had no criticism of the existing mores, no conception of the evils, no plan of reform. At most the contrast with Sparta suggested some reflections.

We may gather together the features of these mores into a distinct picture as follows. Women were valued to procreate children for their husbands and the state; also to serve the pleasure of men. They were "by nature" inferior. They had no schools and their education depended on chances at home, while they lacked the stimulus of social intercourse with men. Wives and courtesans were both injured by their juxtaposition and competition and by pæderasty, which was not recognized as a vice.[2] Beloch says that it is an unfounded prejudice that Greek women, in the classical period, had an unworthy position, or that their status had fallen since the Homeric period; but he lays too much stress on purchase in Homer.[3] He further argues that the *hetæræ* gave back to Greek women

[1] Friedländer, L.: Sittengeschichte Roms, I, 276, refers this tract to Seneca, and it is given amongst the fragments (*de nuptiis*) at the end of Seneca's works, ed. Haase.

[2] Beloch, J.: *l.c.*, I, 232. [3] *Ibid.*, 471.

in the Hellenistic period equality with men, and with that their rôle was played out.[1] The lot of wives was endurance, submission, and sacrifice to the egoism of men, although there were some noble exceptions, due to the personal character either of the man or the woman. Culture bore on only one-half of the nation. The "virtues" of a woman were in the main the same as those of a slave; the parallel in our time would be found in servants. Although there was no harem, the women's apartments were retired and secluded. The women and the men would meet in the house more or less, and the men might be satisfied with the women and like them. The latter were supposed to be where they belonged, performing the functions which were incumbent on them. They could go out only rarely and for especial reasons. Religious festivals gave them their only important opportunity to go abroad and see public activity. The purchase of supplies and visiting were also recognized occasions, and one or two passages are cited which recognize walking exercise as a reason for going out. The laws of Solon helped to establish the tendency of the mores in this direction.[2] No woman could go out unless she had passed her youth. The turtle was the symbol of woman; seclusion and silence. It is still an open question whether Athenian status-wives went to the theatre to see the tragedies, but it is believed that they never were present at the comedies. In this matter also the *hetæræ* were free. In the *Woman's Parliament* of Aristophanes[3] there is reference to a law requiring that men and women sit separately. It must be taken as a very significant symptom of the mores of a community if some comedies of Aristophanes ever could have been presented before a public audience even of men only; much more if any

[1] Beloch, J.: *l.c.*, 473. [2] Plutarch: Solon. [3] Line 21.

women were present; and if the latter were *hetæræ* the case might be worse. We miss the evidence of the refined taste and æsthetic sense of limits with which the Greeks have been credited. Every woman had a "lord" and was under tutelage. No respectable woman would appear at table with men, even with her husband's guests in his own home, and it was a great breach of propriety for a man to enter another man's house when the women were there and the man away. There were strict rules of propriety of conduct and language in the presence of women, but the motive was respect for the men to whom they belonged, not for themselves. In spite of all this, adultery of wives is spoken of as a familiar fact; also women often ruled. In Sparta they were said to do so commonly; but this was in part because the system concentrated land and other property in their hands.[1] In the fourth century there were some women who were distinguished for the kind of learning which was current in the period. One woman of good birth at Athens, about 320 B.C., married a cynic for love and followed him into his "beggar-life"; her parents disapproved but did not forbid. There were also some women in that period who wrote poetry.[2] After the conquest of Alexander there is nothing more to be said about the sex mores of Greece, for in the general relaxation of all mores, all social energy, and all national traditions, the family fell into the general form which prevailed throughout the Hellenistic world. The facts which we have found show that the Greek family would easily undergo modification toward the Oriental form.

[1] Plutarch: Agis and Lykurgus; Becker-Hermann: Charikles, last chapter.
[2] Beloch, J.: *l.c.*, II, 442.