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Abstract

This thesis examines the characterization of Trojans in fifth-century Attic tragedy with a particular focus on their ability to shed light on the contemporary Athenian sense of identity. I argue against the notion that Trojans are displaced Persians, for they maintain a strong connection to their mythological heritage. The evidence I present draws on fifth-century Attic tragedies but also on the *Iliad*, iconography, and fragmentary tragedies. My discussion of passages from the *Iliad* creates a context for interpreting Trojan characters in fifth-century tragedy by establishing the tradition that tragedians could draw on as the background against which to set their Trojan characters. The iconographic evidence similarly adds depth to the project by stepping away from a textual focus to create a wider understanding of how Trojans were visually conceptualized. The fragmentary tragedies provide a tantalizing glimpse into the portrayal of Trojan men, who are otherwise almost entirely absent from tragedies. As a result, my discussion of tragedy focuses on Trojan women, and I suggest that they are representatives of an idealized culture designed to evoke an idealized sense of Athenian cultural identity.

I examine Euripides’ *Andromache* to compare the portrayal of Spartans, contemporary fifth-century Athenian enemies, with that of Trojans to demonstrate the differences between them. Following that, I address the gendered nature of the aftermath of the Trojan War by focusing on one particularly feminine theme in each of three plays: exchange in *Andromache*, nostalgia in *Trojan Women*, and mourning in *Hecuba*. Finally, I discuss the role played by class in considering Trojan characters. Only Euripides’ *Orestes* presents a (male) character who was a
slave in Troy before the fall, and this provides an excellent opportunity to contrast the treatment of that character with the treatment of the royal Trojan women.

The purpose of this examination of Trojan characters is to demonstrate that there was an intellectual curiosity about them and their role in contemporary society. I argue in favour of a sympathetic treatment of Trojan characters, or more specifically, against the notion of a “Phrygianization of Troy,” and restore to the Trojans their own unique identity.
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Chapter 1
A New Beginning for Troy

ἀμφί μοι Ἴλιον, ὦ
Μοῦσα, καινόν ὑμνών
ζον σὺν δακρύοις φθάν ἐπικήδειον.
sing, Muse, of Ilium;
sing with tears a song of death
in strange new strain (Trojan Women 511-513)¹

In the first stasimon of Euripides’ Trojan Women, the chorus invokes the muse and asks her to sing new songs for Troy. The women do not ask the muse to sing about a man, his deeds or war as the Homeric epics did. Instead, they ask for new songs, perhaps even new kinds of songs, about their city, its destruction, and about the women themselves. They are asking the muse to move beyond the tales already told by epic poems, which tell the stories of men in relationship to their heroic world, war and the after-effects of war. By asking for new songs, the chorus of Trojan women is marking a shift from the themes of epic to themes that highlight not war, but the aftermath of war; not the actions of men, but the sufferings of women. As they sing the choral ode that follows the invocation, in which they tell of the day they thought they were free from the Greeks, they are actively participating in the re-creation and re-calibration of the stories told about Troy. No longer is this the epic tale of men, their battles, defeats and triumphs, but it has become the tale of women and their experiences after the war is over. The characters and their stories are appropriated by tragedians and become vibrantly enacted for the audiences in the Theatre of Dionysus.

¹ Text and translation of Trojan Women are Barlow (1997).
This study examines Trojan characters in fifth-century Attic tragedy and how they and their stories are recast from their epic incarnation. It is inspired in large part by Edith Hall’s *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (published in 1989), which is an investigation into the construction of self-identity among the Greeks after the Persian Wars, the motivating force behind the Greek exploration of categories of identities. After such a prolonged and hostile exposure to a different ethnic group, Hall argues, the Greeks began to “construct an ideology of difference” with respect to the Persians, and to try to distil from that their own self identity.\(^2\) I will position this study within the context of Hall’s work on the literary impact of the Persian Wars\(^3\) and Margaret Miller’s archaeologically oriented work on the cultural transfer through the exchange of material goods between Greeks and Persians.\(^4\) Both discussions form an important background to my study and allow me to show how it will diverge significantly from previous conceptions of Greek dealings with the East.

Hall and Miller demonstrate that Persia was the foremost point of contrast for the Greeks during the fifth century as they began to evaluate their identity, and Hall in particular argues that Trojan characters were re-evaluated as the mythic predecessors of the Persians. In the ancient world, Herodotus makes the connection explicit, creating a direct ancestral link between the heroic-age Trojans and his contemporary Persians.\(^5\) Moreover, it is impossible to deny that a shift occurred after the Persian Wars in the iconographic depiction of Trojan characters, when they began to be differentiated from Greeks.\(^6\) I argue, however, that in tragedy Trojan characters are unique,

---


\(^3\) This work is present in both *Inventing the Barbarian* and her 2006 reprise *Recasting the Barbarian*, which is a chapter in a volume that explores many different aspects to the role of tragedy in Greek society from the role of women and foreign characters to the intersection of tragedy and the Athenian courts.

\(^4\) Hall (1989) and (2006); Miller (1997).

\(^5\) Herodotus gives an account of the background of both the Trojan and Persian Wars. At 1.3 he explains Paris’ rape of Helen as a response to a long history of rape without retribution between the east and the west. At 1.5 he reports that the Persians attribute the beginning of their hostilities with the Greeks to the fall of Troy at the hands of the Greeks.

\(^6\) McNiven (2000) states that, in the fifth century, Trojans “may also stand for Persians” (89), but Bérard (2000) notes that after the Persian Wars “painters do not seize the opportunity to affirm the wholesale supremacy of Greek values” (394). For more on the iconographic representation of Trojans, see chapter 2.
distinct from Persians. Instead of presenting them as mythological representations of Persians and thereby assigning them pejorative Eastern characteristics, the tragedians, according to our evidence, keep Trojan characters firmly rooted in their own mythological past. This study will not, therefore, focalize the Trojan characters through the lens of Persia, but will instead examine them as Trojans. Rather than seeing them as displaced Persians, that is as representatives of a newly created polarization between East and West, I suggest that in tragedy they participate in such dynamics by problematizing that polarization of ethnicities. I suggest that the tragedians are not using Trojan characters as a means of establishing dominance over an eastern culture.

On the one hand, as I will discuss below, there is no real Trojan culture over which the Athenians could dominate. It is entirely invented, which allows the tragedians to create sympathetic characters without the complication of an intimate and emotional connection as there was with Persian characters. On the other hand, the invention of a culture suggests an element of domination because the inventors, here the tragedians, can do with it what they please without even the notional possibility of a response from the invented culture. In a symbolic appropriation of Trojan characters for their dramatic purposes, the Athenian tragedians are both keeping them rooted in their epic, largely sympathetic past and infusing them with Athenian cultural qualities, thereby creating complex characters with an important role in the dramatic expression of Athenian culture.

The conception and limitations of the “Phrygianization of Troy.”

Inventing the Barbarian, first published in 1989, was groundbreaking at the time and continues to be a central work in the study of Persians in Greek society, specifically Greek tragedy, as well as the study of identity more broadly. Its impact on the study of ethnicity and culture in tragedy is reflected in its many reviews, all of which praise Hall’s thorough research and note the

7 It is important to note that there is an element of invention to every culture, including one’s own. I suggest that there is a difference, however, in the possible degree of invention between the Trojans, who exist only in the distant past of the heroic age, and the Persians, who are real contemporary figures.
The argument presented by Hall posits that non-Greek, barbarian, characters in tragedy helped to create a Hellenic identity by having those characters invested with the opposite qualities to those considered to be the Greek valued qualities: a penchant for hierarchy, immoderate luxuriousness and unrestrained emotionalism in particular. This creates a distinction that is political in nature, which Hall cites as the most important kind of distinction for Athens and its tragedians to enforce upon their audience members as Athens sets forth to distinguish herself as a leader among Greeks. She argues that these qualities became emblematic of Persia after the Persian Wars and after Aeschylus’ portrayal of the Persian royal family, and that they were then extended to other ethnically different characters.

Under the new ideological distinction between Greek self and barbarian other, according to Hall, even the Trojan War was “radically reinterpreted” and there occurred a “Phrygianization of Troy” after the Persian Wars. That is, once the Greeks began to be concerned with the differences between themselves and others, themselves and the East in particular, they re-evaluated even the mythical Trojans and began to imbue them with Eastern attributes. For Hall, all aspects of ethnic identity and the definition of self were polarized and emblematic of

8 See, for example, Juffras (1990-1991), Heath (1991), Buxton (1991), Jabouile (1992), Sancisi-Weerdenberg (1993). This is a mere sampling of the eleven reviews published, and even the reviewers who find gaps in the argument or express uncertainties regarding the conclusions (see Juffras (1990-1991) for perceived gaps and Heath (1991) for uncertainties) generally recognize the importance of such a monograph. Buxton (1991) notes the appropriate timing of a study on the other when in 1980s-Europe different notions of the other were beginning to be conceived, Muslim fundamentalism was rising, and the Eastern bloc disintegrating.

9 Hall (1989) 80. These are the three most prominent qualities that she identifies in Aeschylus’ Persians that distinguish the Persian characters from the Greek. See 1-5 for her introduction to her argument about the construction of the barbarian other and Greek self-identification.

10 Hall (1989) 2 for a general discussion of the need for political distinction, and 99 for its application in Persians.

11 She does acknowledge that Aeschylus’ representation may not be as innovative as it seems to a modern reader given the lost Phoenissae of Phrynichus (69).

12 For the “Phrygianization of Troy” see Hall (1989) 39, where she credits the fifth century, and possibly Aeschylus, for the conflation of Phrygia and Troy.

13 Hall (1989) 29-39. Erskine (2001) also stresses that the Persian Wars were “fundamental to the changed representation” (61).
the differentiation between Greek and Persian, and she interprets all ethnically other characters as part of the polarity. The presentation of Persian or Persianized characters on stage, according to Hall, helps to engage the audience in the discourse of defining self and other, which is paramount in creating the audience’s awareness of their own identity.

The starting point, and focal point, for Hall’s argument is Aeschylus’ *Persians*, since it is the only extant example of the Persians themselves represented in tragedy. She describes the play as “not ornamented by oriental colouring but suffused by it, indeed it represents the first unmistakable file in the archive of Orientalism…”, 14 by which she connects her work to Edward Said’s influential *Orientalism*. Central to Said’s argument is the authoritative stance taken by the Western author or scholar that reduces the East to the West’s representation of it and allows other Westerners to feel that they know or understand the East, though they may have no more contact with it than through a text. Said asserts, “it seems a common human failing to prefer the schematic authority of a text to the disorientations of direct encounters with the human.” 15 It is in part the reliance on textual authority that, according to Said, creates the distance required to define and thereby dehumanize the other. 16 The group that is defining the other places itself in a position of elevated power and authority: the power to study, to analyze, and to pass judgment. This elevated distance ensures that the group being defined can remain a specimen, a mere object of study, and does not risk becoming viewed as sympathetic and not-so-other. Said highlights this hierarchical construction and the unquestioning way that societies accept it and continue to perpetuate it. 17

Tragedy, because of its emphasis on performance (and later performance and text), is one of the means of ‘schematic authority’ that Said describes: its characters, no matter how realistically

15 Said (1978) 93.
16 With the exception of Aeschylus’ *Persians* Said’s *Orientalism* does not treat antiquity in particular, but many of his ideas about the Western evaluation of the East can be seen in ancient texts as well. Said describes a Western European and North American world view that cares little about “any such real thing as the Orient” and focuses instead on representations of it (20-2). Just so, most ancient authors drew their characterization of the Eastern other based on widely held beliefs about them, not based on careful research.
17 See for example Said (1978) 20-1, 65, 73, 85.
drawn they are, are always constructed entities. From Said’s perspective, the construction by Westerners of Easterners always maintains an aspect of dominance. Similarly, Hall’s analysis of Persians and other barbarians argues for Greek dominance over the representation of those people in tragedy. The East is co-opted for the Greeks’ own purposes. One thing that Hall does not take into account in her Orientalist analysis of Persia and its effect on all other barbarians in tragedy is the impact of the Greek mythological heritage, in particular with respect to the Trojans. While the Greeks do create the Trojans, and they do certainly dominate them because of this, it has very little to do with their ethnicity. Instead, it reflects the Trojans’ place in Greek traditional narrative. Their geographical provenance is significantly less important for Trojans than their literary tradition as doomed characters in their portrayal on the Greek stage and within the Greek cultural imaginary in general. In the following chapters I will argue that Trojan characters in tragedy are based on the Homeric model and, while they are recast in fifth-century tragedy, that model remains more important than a geographical association to contemporary Persians.

Hall’s statement that Aeschylus’ Persians is “suffused” by “oriental colouring” resonates with Said’s definition of Orientalism and also with Christopher Balme’s discussion of post-colonial theatre and the difference between the two poles of exoticism and theatrical syncretism. In his ground-breaking 1999 study of post-colonial performance practice (Decolonizing the Stage: Theatrical Syncretism and Post-Colonial Drama), Balme defines theatrical exoticism as a representation of one ethnic group by another that makes no effort to authenticate the dramatized culture, but appropriates elements of it that are “arbitrarily re-coded and semanticized in an entirely Western aesthetic and ideological frame.” In exoticized theatre, the represented culture is stylized and superficial, more of a reflection on the author and

---

18 Balme’s work is ground-breaking because it focuses on post-colonialism and performance, while most other post-colonial work concentrates on non-performance genres. Classicists working in this field, the best representation of whom are in Hardwick & Gillespie (eds) (2007) Classics in Post-Colonial Worlds, concentrate mostly on literary topics rather than performance. Post-colonialism may seem out of place here, since the Greeks did not colonize Troy. Balme’s work on the representation of others in post-colonial theatre, however, presents a helpful framework for this assessment of Trojans in Greek tragedy because it shows how different ethnicities or cultures can be represented on stage.

19 Balme (1999) 5 says that this is typical of nineteenth-century orientalism.
audience’s perceptions than of the culture itself. If a culturally other character were to appear in
exoticized theatre, he or she would be costumed in such a way as to represent the audience’s
preconceived expectations of how people of that culture dress, and would do nothing to
challenge those preconceptions.

For example, in his discussion of R.W. Tully’s play *The Bird of Paradise*, Balme describes how
it began as culturally sensitive, even employing Hawaiian musicians to perform.\(^{20}\) Yet it
inspired a number of imitators of the Hawaiian theme, which ended up being nothing more than
“a set of predictable elements” such as erotically-charged hula dancers and ukelele music.\(^{21}\) As
part of the “commodification” of the theme, cultural sensitivity ceased to be important and was
replaced by a representation of the American and British audience members’ *perceptions* of the
Hawaiian culture.\(^{22}\) Syncretic theatre, by contrast, is not “monocultural,” but reflects a
“conjunction of aesthetic and cultural codes.”\(^{23}\) It is a genuine attempt to respect the portrayed
culture, to be as authentic as possible, while allowing for a mingling of cultural influences on
the performance. For example, Balme cites David Coplan’s, an ethnomusicologist, study of
black South African music performance as a concrete model of syncretism. Coplan
demonstrates how the South Africans perform a new form of music by incorporating their own
traditional music performance and Western-influenced styles that they were exposed to through
“education, church, and the mass media.”\(^{24}\) The result is a new form of music performance that
is an honest integration of two cultures without denigrating either.

There is little evidence of syncretic theatre in the corpus of extant Greek tragedy. Aeschylus’
*Persians* should be classified as exotic, since it represents a stylized creation of the Persian court
and the reaction to Xerxes’ loss. Aeschylus portrays Xerxes and his mother in such a way as to
make them recognizable to the Greek concept of Persians, with no indication of attempts to
incorporate Persian performance elements. Although they are different from Aeschylus’

\(^{20}\) Balme (2005).
\(^{22}\) For the commodity theme, see Balme (2005) 16, 20.
\(^{23}\) Balme (1999) 5.
Persians, tragedies with Trojan characters cannot be understood as syncretic theatre because there is no Trojan performance culture with which the Greeks could interact, authentically or not. Trojans are exoticized in Greek tragedy, but – and this is the crucial difference - not with the same pejorative connotation. They are exoticized only because they have to be since they do not exist in reality, but are a literary construct that goes back as far as Homer at least. I will argue in the following chapter that Euripides maintains some facets of the Homeric characters while placing them in new situations, but this is done so that there is a familiar background against which the characters can be interpreted. Balme’s category of exoticism, therefore, does not necessarily suggest a negative representation of another culture in drama, but a representation that does not, or in the case of the Trojans cannot, truly engage with that culture.

Despite Hall’s strong focus on the Persians, Trojans are an important element to her discussion since she states that they provide the mythic background against which to project the contemporary enmity with the Persians. The Trojan War, she argues, became the mythic precedent of the Greeks overcoming an Eastern army.\(^{25}\) After the defeat of the Persians, she argues, the Trojans became orientalized, and under new patriotic ideals the war became a symbol of Greek victory.\(^ {26}\) She marks a difference between the archaic, Homeric Trojans and the classical, tragic Trojans, remarking on the lack of distinction between Greek and Trojan in Homer but the careful distinction between them in tragedy.\(^ {27}\)

Yet, her evidence to support the claim of orientalized Trojans in the fifth century is not convincing. For example, she states that Trojan wealth is explicitly emphasized at Hecuba 624 and Trojan Women 674, thus connecting the Trojan royal family with “tyrannical forms of government” and with “barbarian luxury.”\(^ {28}\) Hall attributes both of these lines to Hecuba, and the former is part of the queen’s lament in response to Talthybius’ report of Polyxena’s death.

---

\(^ {25}\) Hall (1989) 68-74. Hall states that this creation of mythic ancestry does two things: it validates the Persian war and sets it within the heroic realm with all the glory that accompanies it.

\(^ {26}\) Hall (1989) 102.

\(^ {27}\) On the Iliadic Trojans see 26-32; on the tragic Trojans see 127.

\(^ {28}\) Hall (1989) 127.
Hecuba does not speak of “the opulence of her palace” in any detail, but contrasts her current state of anguish with her past life when she lived with her family “πλουσίοις ἐν δῶμασιν” (“in rich halls”). The single use of the word πλουσίοις is not enough to suggest that Hecuba is characterized as a displaced luxurious Persian.

The latter example from Trojan Women, however, is not spoken by Hecuba, but by Andromache as part of her lament for her future life of slavery and marriage to Neoptolemus after her happy life with Hector. She does not refer to the “unsurpassed wealth of (her son) Hector,” but says: “σὲ δ’, ὦ φίλ.’ Ἐκτῶν, ἐῖχον ἀνδρ’. ἀρκοῦντὰ μοι / ξυνέσει γένει πλούτῳ τε κάνδρῳ μέγαν” (“In you, my dearest Hector, I had everything I wanted in a husband, for you were strong in understanding, rank, wealth and courage”). Once again, this is less like a woman luxuriating in her opulent lifestyle than eulogizing, perhaps even idealizing, her dead husband.

These two examples may serve as a caution for accepting Hall’s argument of the “Phrygianization of Troy” in tragedy because they demonstrate that she has merely taken two examples of the use of the semantic field ‘wealth’ (ploutos) without establishing the context in which they are spoken but instead uses them as proof that Trojans are luxurious and revel in their wealth. Moreover, the fact that she only cites these two single uses of one word should indicate that wealth is not a theme that peppers the depiction of the Trojan women.

Hall does allow for “noble barbarians,” using the characters of Trojan Women as an example, noting that most “noble barbarians” are Trojans, and that they are not automatically replaced by base barbarians in tragedy. She proposes that there are two possible explanations for the positive treatment of the Trojans in Trojan Women. One is that Euripides is concerned about the idea of Greek superiority and that he forces the audience to reconsider their assumption of the natural inferiority of barbarians. The other explanation is that Euripides is directing his

29 Hall (1989) 127.
30 Hall (1989)127.
31 Trojan Women 673-4.
32 Hall (1989) 212. And yet, she continues, the status of the Trojan royal family is ambiguous, since their barbarism is given more or less stress depending on the dramatic need (213).
animosity not towards barbarians but towards another Greek state, Sparta, which, during the Peloponnesian War, appeared to him to behave more like barbarians than “real” barbarians.\(^{33}\)

I find the use of the “noble barbarian” to explain the sympathetic depiction of Trojans to be problematic and contradictory of the rest of Hall’s argument because it does not support her notion of the all-encompassing vilification of the Trojans, the “Phrygianization of Troy” that she proposes. Moreover, if the “Phrygianization of Troy” was a pervasive phenomenon, we would likely have Trojan characters basking in their luxurious surroundings, or enslaved Trojans bewailing their lost luxury and lost power. But this is not at all the image of Troy that is left for us by either Aeschylus or Euripides (there are, unfortunately, no surviving Sophoclean tragedies with Trojan characters). Because of this, I will examine the characters as Trojans to demonstrate that they are unique figures characterized by a deeply nuanced relationship with Athens, which helps to demonstrate that the dichotomy between East and West on which Hall insists is not so polarized. After all, eastern characters, particularly those with a strong mythological heritage, were not trapped in the current events of the fifth century, but came with mythological baggage, which continued to be useful tools for character experimentation.

Throughout this study, I will argue that Trojan characters are indeed used as part of the creation and discussion of identity in fifth-century Athenian tragedy, but not in the way that Hall suggests. Rather, I propose that Trojan characters in tragedy remain distinct from the Persians and maintain sympathetic qualities that align them more with Athens than Persia. For example, Trojan characters are often the more rhetorically skilled speakers, displaying logic, reason, and sound methods of argumentation. They are also concerned with justice and seeking resolution of conflicts through appropriate channels. It is precisely their ethnic difference that underlines their cultural similarities to Athenians. This phenomenon problematizes the notion of a barbarian East and the notion of a panhellenic unity towards the East.

Hall’s 2006 reprise of *Inventing the Barbarian* is a remarkable expression of reminiscence of her earlier and foundational work as well as a response to critics and a review of scholarship in the field of ethnic studies. It is a careful re-evaluation of the field, both as it was when she

\(^{33}\) Hall (1989) 213-5. The Sparta issue is more relevant in the *Andromache* where Trojans and Spartans are more explicitly compared.
wrote *Inventing the Barbarian*, and how it has developed since then. She is candid in her discussion, drawing attention to authors and studies of which she was not aware when she was writing *Inventing the Barbarian*, and almost wistfully noting the scholars with whom she might have engaged had they published by 1989. Ultimately, however, the chapter is less of a ‘recasting’ of the barbarian, to deploy the term used by Hall in the chapter’s title, since ‘recasting’ suggests a fundamental re-orientation. The only change Hall remarks upon is the socio-historical shifts of perspectives that occurred since the late 1980s, while the barbarian of the fifth century she interprets in the same way as in *Inventing the Barbarian*.

She makes the important observation that *Inventing the Barbarian* is a product of its socio-historical surroundings, in particular the end of the Cold War, with its emphasis on and eventual deconstruction of polarities. The discussion of self and other presented in *Inventing the Barbarian* (as well as that presented in Hartog’s *Le Miroir d’Hérodote*, which Hall claims was written in a “more purist structuralism and pyrotechnical style of textual analysis” than her own work, though of the same period34) was “certainly inseparable from the experience of the two superpowers [the Soviet Union and the USA] defining themselves, and what they each felt to be their core values, against their enemy of several decades.”35 She concludes that *Inventing the Barbarian* would have been different were it written today, in particular because of the changed nature of the relationship between the East and the West, but she does little more than reaffirm her position in the earlier work and expand her bibliography. She does, however, add an important element to her argument by raising the possibility of the barbarian audience member and questions, “what did the barbarian who lived in Athens think – if anything – about the portrayal of ethnic issues on the public stage?”36 The question is impossible to answer, but by asking it Hall invites her reader to add yet another layer of complexity to the complex issue of ethnic identity in Athens.

---

34 Hall (2006) 224. This is in response to what she calls scholars’ pairing of *Inventing the Barbarian* with *Le Miroir d’Hérodote*.


The central point to Hall’s interpretation of the ethnic other on stage is that “it was the Persian Wars which engendered the polarization of Greek and barbarian.”\(^\text{37}\) On the other hand, the central point to my argument is that Trojan characters are not part of the Persia-Greek polarization and that they can, and should, be interpreted as individuals, not as mythological representatives of Persia. How, then, do the Trojans feature in the discourse of self and other in the fifth century, and what can they tell us about Athenian identity? To answer this question, it is essential to remember that one of the great roles of tragedy in the fifth century was not to provide solutions or even to create accurate reflections of its contemporary society, but instead to suggest problems without solutions.\(^\text{38}\) Tragedies often end with a sense of uncertainty, both for the characters and for the audience, and although the action of the play may be resolved, that resolution is often inorganic, artificially imposed and does not solve the source of the conflict.

A recent study by Elton Barker on the nature of dissent in epic, tragedy and historiography argues that in tragedy the *agon* “is as much about reproducing the crisis of interpretation among the audience as about displaying the contest between characters.”\(^\text{39}\) While Barker is speaking specifically about the *agon* and the nature of dissent in tragedy, I argue that this premise can be expanded to explicate the nature of tragedy itself as being more concerned with producing a ‘crisis of interpretation’ than with feeding the audience clear answers. This places the responsibility of interpretation on the audience and also creates freedom of interpretation: because tragedy does not provide solutions, it allows each spectator to find meaning for themselves. Tragedy can suggest interpretations by making characters more or less representative of the audience’s communal values. For example, in *Andromache* the audience is invited to sympathize more with Peleus and Andromache because they are being mistreated by the Spartan characters, Hermione and Menelaus, who are represented as luxurious and


\(^\text{38}\) Vernant (1979) asserts that, in tragedy, the hero is no longer a model for behaviour as he is in epic or lyric. Instead, “il est devenu problème,” in that he is not a reality that we can define, but a problem that has no answers (639).

\(^\text{39}\) Barker (2009) 15. He goes on to connect the staging of dissent in tragedy to the Athenian democracy, arguing that the democracy is not concerned with unanimity as much as the ability of the people to voice their dissent from authority. By consistently reproducing dissent on stage, he argues, tragedy reflects democratic procedure.
tyrannical. And because Trojan characters are more often represented with attributes that are similar to ideal Athenian attributes (the ability of clear, rational rhetorical skills, for example) or as being treated brutally by non-Athenian characters, they are co-opted as models of Athenian values. The audience is invited to work through the ‘crisis of interpretation’ and to try to make sense of the shift from the polarization between East and West to the polarization between two Greek poleis.

The Persian Reality: the cross-cultural exchange of material goods

Trojans are unique and should be viewed as distinct from Persians in their literary representation. Nevertheless, it is impossible to ignore the impact of the Athenian interaction with the Persians because it shaped the way the Athenians began to think about their identity and that of others. The relationship between Athens and Persia in the fifth century was complex because it involved a certain amount of cultural transfer from East to West that was actively sought by the Athenian West.40 Margaret Miller’s analysis of the two cultures’ interaction with each other in her 1997 monograph Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity focuses on the reality of the cross-cultural exchange of material goods. Miller demonstrates that there was not only enmity between them but a certain fascination as well, at least from the Greek perspective, that accounts for the appropriation of Persian items into Greek daily use.

As even Hall recognized, “hatred and fear can coexist beside envy and emulation.”41 Miller deconstructs the polarity to a greater degree by showing the closeness between the two cultures and the role social class plays in this complex relationship. Her analysis of what she calls Perserie highlights the way in which the élite “embraced Persian luxury and incorporated into

40 Hall (2002) 201 states that Athenian culture did not become Persianized through the appropriation of Persian products, but rather expanded to allow for their inclusion.

41 Hall (2006) 211. Rhodes (2007) 36 also addresses the ambivalent position towards the Persians: “So Persia had become the national enemy; but fifth-century Greek attitudes to Persia were complex. Was Persia dangerous or feeble?”
their own world some of its symbols and practices." Outward symbols of Persian culture thus formed the foundation for the new luxury culture, a new means by which the wealthy Athenians could distinguish themselves from the other members of society. Perserie was eventually disseminated among the masses with the result that by the end of the fifth century it ceased to be a marker of luxury and status for the elite, who instead adopted the opposite fashion polarity of Lakonism. The adoption of Persian items, therefore, was not permanent, but was part of the interplay between classes as the wealthy members of society strove to maintain a visible distance between themselves and their social inferiors.

Miller’s study begins with a historical overview of the relationship between Athens and Persia from the sixth to the late fifth century. She is interested in noting in particular the ‘spheres of contact’ between the two, and her discussion culminates in the fifth century with the ambassadors who were sent from Athens to the Persian court when Persia was looming again as a potential ally for Athens in the Peloponnesian War. In addition to the official interaction that arose with the ambassadors going back and forth, Miller highlights slaves as the “human factor” of the influx of Persian goods after the Greek victory. The increase in personal interaction created an atmosphere of close contact between the Greeks and the Persians that was entirely real and saw both people and goods being integrated into Athenian culture.

The conspicuous consumption of a wide variety of Persian goods, from pottery to items of clothing to animals, was part of a burgeoning luxury culture through which the wealthy elite

42 Miller (1997) 189.
43 Which, according to Miller, is the goal among the elite (253).
44 Miller (1997) 255.
45 Miller (1997) 15-28. The first-hand knowledge of a culture that (upper-class) ambassadors acquire helps to de-mystify it, particularly for members of the upper class, and so is a crucial part of the relationship between the two.
46 For the influx of slaves, see Miller (1997) 81-5.
47 For pottery see Miller (1997) 136-49 where she discusses how such items could be either imitated by Athenian potters or adapted by taking a Persian model of a handleless cup, for example, and adding handles, which were preferable to Athenian tastes. For clothing see 153-87, and for peacocks see 189-92. The parasol and parasol-bearer were also important means of expressing wealth and status. In Greece, according to Miller’s evidence (193-8), only women
could distinguish themselves from the masses. The peculiarity of the appropriation of Persian goods in the post-Persian War era becomes evident when Miller and Hall’s discussions are juxtaposed and the contrast between the Persian-inspired luxury culture and the theatrical barbarization of Persians is revealed. While wealthy Athenians were actively adopting items of Persian material culture as symbols of their distinction from the lower classes, the Persians were becoming the foil *par excellence* for the creation and dissemination of Greek cultural identity.

It is entirely legitimate to suppose that there were men in the audience of Aeschylus’ *Persians* who had themselves incorporated items of Persian attire, or whose wives were attended by parasol-bearing slaves. It may seem incongruous that the Athenians could both glory in the military victory over the Persians and adopt items from Persian culture for daily use. I suggest, however, that this creates an increased sense of victory over the Persians. The Greeks were successful militarily, and now they have also *symbolically* dominated the Persians through the appropriation of their material culture. It is particularly significant that much of the luxury culture is adopted by the wealthy élite women. While Miller cites evidence for men wearing imported items of Persian clothing, true luxury is embodied by the leisured wealthy woman with exotic slaves and items of clothing, whose lack of productivity in the *oikos* was a key marker of its abundant wealth. With the female display of *Perserie* acting as an “effective semiotic vehicle” for the “expression of social standing,” the “symbolic domination” of Persia is complete: its cultural symbols are proven effeminate through their use by Athenian women.

While the incorporation of goods as luxury items is a symbolic gesture of authority over Persia, it also indicates an attraction to the goods and the culture that produced them. This can be extended on the state level, as Miller demonstrates that Pericles’ Odeion was built to look Persian instead of being functional. The building can be associated with what Miller calls

---

48 For example, the *ependytes* (a short tunic; see 170-83).


50 She devotes an entire chapter to a detailed discussion of the Odeion: 218-42.
“symbolic domination” since it takes a structure that was originally Persian in design\textsuperscript{51} and recreates it in the distinctly Athenian setting of the south slope of the acropolis by the theatre of Dionysus and the sanctuary of Dionysus. Thus it ‘perverts’ the original use of the structure.\textsuperscript{52} And yet the placement of such a building in such a prominent location makes a strong statement regarding the attractiveness of the culture that inspired the architecture. Although the original use may be perverted, the style of the structure is celebrated.

\textit{Troy as an imagined community}

The material reality of the relationship with Persia that Miller so effectively reveals is the central reason for distinguishing Trojans from Persians with respect to Athenians’ concepts of them. Trojans are always only literary figures, with whom there is no real interaction or opportunity for cultural interchange. This literary mediation establishes the Trojans as an \textit{imagined community}. I borrow the term ‘imagined community’ from Benedict Anderson’s work on nations and nationality, but I am using it in a different manner than he uses it.\textsuperscript{53} Anderson attempts to define and analyze the terms nation, nationality, nationalism, and begins by offering a working definition of the nation as “an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.”\textsuperscript{54} The community is imagined because it is not possible for all members to know each other “yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.”\textsuperscript{55} It is the notion of connection that supports the nation, not an actual

\textsuperscript{51} At 235-8 Miller persuasively demonstrates that the Odeion was modeled after a Persian hypostyle hall rather than the tent of Xerxes (see especially 237).

\textsuperscript{52} Miller (1997) describes the ‘perversion’ of goods through ‘symbolic domination’ as something that “undercut the original” (250).

\textsuperscript{53} Anderson (1983). I use the phrase differently than Anderson does deliberately. I mean it to invoke the created aspect of the Trojans and the active role of the Greeks in creating them. A different term such as ‘imaginary community’ does not give the desired effect since it evokes more a sense of fantasy and fiction, whereas I wish to emphasize the pseudo-reality of the Trojans: while they have been created, they have an important place in the mythological history of the Greeks, and are treated not as fantastical creatures, but just the same as Greek characters.

\textsuperscript{54} Anderson (1983) 6.

\textsuperscript{55} Anderson (1983) 6.
fellowship between its members. Anderson continues that the nation is limited because each nation has boundaries, regardless of how vast it may be, and has neighbouring nations.\textsuperscript{56} Finally, it is sovereign because the concept of the nation arose at a time when the “hierarchical dynastic realm” was ceasing to exist and the legitimacy of rule was no longer considered to be divinely appointed.\textsuperscript{57}

The focus that Anderson places on the notional conceptualization of the national community, as opposed to a concretely identifiable community, can be recast to fit my proposed analysis of Trojan characters because the Trojans, like the unknown fellow-community members of Anderson’s definition, live in the minds of the Athenians as part of their mythical community and cultural imaginary, and can be as real as the Greek heroes against whom they fought. In this way, the Trojans and the community in which they live (or lived, in the case of most tragedies) are like the nation that Anderson proposes. They are imagined in that they live in the minds of the Athenians, they are limited because their story is finite, and they are sovereign because they hold a place in the literature of the Muse-inspired Homeric poet.\textsuperscript{58} The strong literary tradition of which they are a part solidifies their important place in the discourse of identity in the fifth century.

\textit{The New Simonides: other literary Persians}

I have argued that the Trojans exist only as mythologized, literary characters and for this reason are different from the Persians, who were very real in the memories and, as Miller demonstrates, daily lives of the fifth-century Athenians. One question we might ask, however, is whether or

\textsuperscript{56} Anderson (1983) 7. Here he contrasts nationalism with religion, stating that no nationalist aspires to have as many fellow-members as possible join their nation in the way that many religions attempt to draw more members.

\textsuperscript{57} Anderson (1983) 7. He places the creation of the nation at the end of the eighteenth century and calls nationality, nation-ness and nationalism “cultural artefacts of a particular kind” (4).

\textsuperscript{58} The finite and sovereign aspects of the Trojans are what distinguish them most from the Persians who, despite the efforts of Greek authors or artists or statesmen to depict them in one way or another, continue to live and act independently. Thus, their community is not completely in the hands of the authors, as the Trojans’ is.
not the *Persians* were ever mythologized, and if so, were the Trojans necessarily the mythological paradigm? The new Simonides fragments provide one example of the mythologizing of recent events, the battle of Plataea, and they explicitly link the Spartans at Plataea with the Argives who fought at Troy.\(^5\) The elegy appears to be addressed to Achilles and is certainly set during the Trojan War, which immediately transports the reader into the heroic past:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἡ μέγα πένθως λαὸν [ἐπέλλαβε· πολλὰ δ᾽ ἐτίμων,} \\
καὶ μετὰ Πατρόκλου σ᾽ ἄγγει κρύψαν ἐνὶ. \\
	ext{οὐ δὴ τὶς ἐδάμασσεν ἐφὶ ἡμέριος βροτὸς αὐτός,} \\
ἀλλ᾽ ὑπ᾽ Ἀπόλλωνος χειρὶ τυπεῖς ἐδάμης.
\end{align*}
\]

[A great grief seized] the war-host; [much they honoured you,]

[and with Patroclus’ [ashes mingled yours.]

[It was no ordinary mortal] laid you low,

[‘twas by Apollo’s [hand that you were struck.] (5-8)\(^6\)

Thus the mood is set for the reader to understand the following praise of the Spartan soldiers in a heroic manner.\(^6\) Simonides transitions between the past and the present by mentioning the

\(^5\) For a brief commentary and discussion of the fragments, including issues such as genre and performance context, see Rutherford (2002), esp. 40 ff. This is a chapter in Boedeker & Sider (2002), an excellent volume that approaches the text in a variety of ways and is commentary on both the text and Simonides’ social context.

\(^6\) The text and translation of Simonides is Sider (2002).

\(^6\) The extant fragments seem to indicate that Simonides’ subject was the Spartans in particular, although there is no way of being certain that the Athenians were excluded altogether.
immortal fame of the Greeks who fought at Troy and the poet’s role in conferring immortality. The transition is introduced by an invocation to the Muse, thereby completing the allusion to Homeric epic by drawing a connection between himself and Homer as poets who have the divinely inspired power to grant glory and fame through poetry.

Boedeker (2002), especially 153f, discusses the predominance of the Spartans in the fragments, and the heroizing effect of the proem of this elegy.
of those who held the line for Sparta and for Greece.  

[that none should see] the day of slavery.] (19-26)

In this way, Simonides establishes himself as an authoritative voice on the same level as Homer, lending weight to his description of the forces against Persia.

It is impossible to say for certain, since much of the elegy is lost, but based on what is extant and the tone of what is extant, I would like to suggest that this does not provide us with proof that Simonides was directly connecting Troy and Persia, but that he was instead praising the Spartan soldiers. It is possible that Simonides is “drawing connections between the defeat of Troy and the repulse of Xerxes,” but it is also possible that he is merely using the Trojan War as a means of elevating and mythologizing the battle of Plataea: that is, not drawing a direct parallel between Persians and Trojans but instead suggesting that the Greek soldiers who fought at Plataea are worth praising, and thereby immortalizing, through poetry the same way that Homer immortalized the heroes from the Trojan War.

It is possible that Simonides is both drawing a connection between Troy and Persia and mythologizing (and therefore elevating) the Spartan soldiers at Plataea. This brief discussion is meant to raise the possibility of something other than a direct and exclusive parallel between Troy and Persia and to show that the process of mythologizing is complex. It does not have to create an unequivocal rapport between two events, but can instead be used in a variety of ways.

In the case of Simonides’ Plataea elegy, as far as the fragmentary nature of the piece allows for interpretation, the narrow focus on the Greek side in no way implies a clear vilification of the Trojans, or indeed a clear alignment between Troy and Persia. Instead, the poem focuses on the valour of the Spartan soldiers. The Trojan War provides a useful mythological example of Greek heroism that can be transferred to Simonides’ contemporary era. In this elegy Paris is called wicked, which is parallel to the sentiment expressed in the Iliad, but this does not extend to the rest of the Trojans. The use of the Trojan War as a prelude demonstrates Simonides’

62 Boedeker (2002) 161-2 suggests that the contrast between Greek and barbarian is restrained in the Plataea elegy as it is in Homer and that Simonides focuses instead on the support that the Greeks have from the Olympian gods, making this feature the association with the Trojan War.

63 As Hall (2006) suggests at 196.
The Ancient Greeks were thoroughly “ethnocentric,” for they considered their culture superior to that of others and tended to look down upon and despise foreigners.\(^{64}\)

The opening sentence in Coleman’s discussion of Ancient Greek ethnocentrism underscores the challenges in discussing the topic, as he merges the concepts of ethnicity and culture and goes on to say that Greek “attitudes” toward ethnicity were based on “language, culture and geography.”\(^{65}\) I will discuss the notions of ethnic and cultural identity in this section to demonstrate the differences between them and to show that a careful distinction between the two

\(^{64}\) Coleman (1997) 175.

\(^{65}\) Coleman (1997) 177.
is helpful in determining the nature of Greek self-identity with relation to others. Jonathan Hall offers the most thorough and comprehensive discussion of the two forms of identity, and I draw on his definitions and classification.\textsuperscript{66}

According to Hall, both ethnic and cultural identities are socially constructed, but ethnicity is defined by collective agreement about a shared background.\textsuperscript{67} This may be articulated through a connection to a particular myth of origin or kinship, through a more concrete connection to a particular place, or through a “sense of shared history.”\textsuperscript{68} The Greeks and the Persians were, therefore, ethnically different: they did not see themselves as sharing any connection, be it to a place or to a mythic ancestor, and this was the most obvious division between them.

Cultural identity, on the other hand, is not based on the same sense of shared heritage, but on a more conscious decision to live in a particular manner. It is more concerned with shared values, beliefs and communal organization.\textsuperscript{69} The Athenian funeral oration is a particularly effective manner of constructing cultural identity, as, for example, Pericles’ funeral oration in Thucydides. It is an address to the community on the occasion of the deaths in war of men who belonged to that community, but it is really a “symbolic manifestation of the democratic polis.”\textsuperscript{70} Thus, it is less concerned with eulogizing the dead in a way that is meaningful to the memory of the individuals and more concerned with creating a civic pride.\textsuperscript{71} It can achieve this

\textsuperscript{66} Hall (1997) and especially (2002).

\textsuperscript{67} Hall (2002) 9-16; Hall (1997) 20 calls ethnicity the “result of a series of conscious and socially embedded choices.” In both studies, he is careful to emphasize the elements of choice and social conditioning in ethnicity and to remove biology or actual genetic relations from it. See also Konstan (2001a) 30, where he defines ethnicity as the “collective identity” that is stated by a group.

\textsuperscript{68} Hall (2002) 9. The “sense of shared kinship” shows how nebulous the avowed connections between people can be.

\textsuperscript{69} Hall (2002) 17.

\textsuperscript{70} Loraux (1986) 19. Konstan (2001a) 35 notes that the funeral oration “eschews topics of common lineage” and instead focuses on “common values and traits of character that distinguish the Athenians’ way of life from that of their Spartan enemy.”

\textsuperscript{71} Loraux (1986) 37; at 105, she states that each man is denied his name and therefore his unique and distinguishing qualities, while at the same time maintaining glory simply by being a member of the group being eulogized.
by speaking to the elements of culture, those chosen ideals that are upheld by the community and that can serve as a mark of inclusion or exclusion. Ethnicity and culture are not, in practice, as distinct as this outline makes them appear to be. In fact, cultural identity is often a significant part of ethnic identity. I have kept them clearly separated to make the point that cultural identity can be shared, even between people of different ethnicities.

I will argue in the following chapters that Trojan characters may be ethnically different from the Athenians, but that cultural identity is the more prominent identifier in the tragedies in which they are central characters. When Trojan characters share the stage with, for example, the Spartan characters in Euripides’ *Andromache*, it is the Spartan characters that are depicted as quick-tempered, luxurious, inept at skilful argument and persuasion. The Trojan Andromache, on the other hand, is invested with the Athenian virtues of propriety, modesty, and persuasive ability. Trojans are consistently endowed with qualities that are presented in a more positive way than those of other characters, in particular the other non-Athenian Greek characters with whom they interact. It is precisely their unique position of being well-known characters from an established tradition that consistently maintains their sympathetic nature that allows them to become a kind of representative for Athens in tragedy. There is an inherent safety in these characters because there is no contemporary reality associated with them, no possibility of them suddenly becoming enemies of Athens, and so it is convenient to explore such topics as the fate of the defeated through them. Their stories must always end in the same way, according to the tradition, and they are typically portrayed as innocent victims of war, having done nothing to deserve their fate, and so become the ultimate examples of ‘what if’ for the Athenians: what if we, innocent and culturally sophisticated Athenians, were to suffer the same fate?

One might, then, wonder how the tragedies with Trojan characters would appeal to a broader non-Athenian audience. Edith Hall states that barbarian characters in tragedy are “undoubtedly an imperial image” because they help to create a strong panhellenic community, which, she argues, is central to the development and maintenance of the Athenian empire.\(^72\) Barbarians on stage create a unified sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’, thus helping to promote the notion of unity among a diverse audience. But, if, as I suggest, Trojans are not ‘barbarians’ in the same way

---

that other characters may be, how do they then fit into the Athenian ideological framework? I propose that, while Trojans may not reinforce panhellenism, they do support Athenian cultural hegemony because they are sympathetic characters who act and speak in ways that are largely representative of Athenian ideals. In this way, the tragedies in which they appear become showcases for Athenian culture with the added benefit of having a vast and well-established literary tradition that lends weight to the characters.

This discussion of ethnicity vs. culture focuses on the characterization of Trojans and their contrast with other characters, and their visual representation is an important aspect of their characterization. It would be difficult to maintain that Trojans could be showcases for Athenian culture if they were consistently visually distinguished with Eastern clothing that emphasized their royalty and wealth. There are, to be sure, some instances in tragedy where a visual distinction between Greek and Trojan would be desirable and necessary. For example, in Euripides’ fragmentary *Philoctetes* a Trojan embassy arrives to persuade Philoctetes to side with them instead of the Greeks. The context suggests that these Trojans would look different from the Greeks so that they are immediately recognizable as different. In the complete extant tragedies, however, there is textual evidence to suggest that the Trojans are not depicted in luxurious easternized costumes.

In *Andromache*, Hermione, not Andromache, is specified as adorning herself with luxurious clothing and jewelry, and the contrast and conflict between the two women is central to the play. Furthermore, the play is set years after fall of Troy, since Andromache’s child by Neoptolemus is old enough to speak, and she has been living as a slave, so it seems reasonable to suggest that she would not be costumed as a Trojan princess. In *Trojan Women* the women of Troy are waiting outside the walls of their captured city to be taken to Greece by their new masters. There is no indication of luxury among them, but once again there is a reference to a Greek woman being adorned: Hecuba accuses Helen of coming to meet her husband having adorned

73 There is also visual evidence that suggests that there was a visual distinction between the two groups. See further below, page 30 and chapter 2, page 27 (n. 52).
herself, suggesting a contrast between her adornment and the other women’s clothing. At the end of *Trojan Women*, Hecuba readies the body of Astyanax for burial and commands the women with her to help with meager offerings:

φέρετε, κομίζετ ἀθλίῳ κόσμον νεκρῷ

ἐκ τῶν παρόντων· οὐ γὰρ ἐς κάλλος τύχας

δαίμων διδῶσιν· ὅν δ᾽ ἔχω, λήψῃ τάδε.

Come, bring adornment for the pitiful body, as much as our present condition allows. Fate does not grant us the chance for much display. But you shall get what I have. (1200-2)

Hecuba is not able to surround Astyanax in luxury because whatever luxurious items she may have once had have been taken by the Greeks. She and the other women would not be dressed in their most regal robes under such circumstances. Finally, in *Hecuba*, the chorus describe the night that Troy was taken by the Greeks and note that they were getting ready for bed when they heard the tumult in the city:

μολπᾶν δ᾽ ἀπο καὶ χοροποιῶν

θυσιὰν καταλύσας

πόσις ἐν θαλάμοις ἔκειτο,

το, ἔτος ἐπὶ πασσάλῳ,

...

74 “οὸν δέμας ... ἀσκήσασα” (“having adorned your body”)1022-3. Barlow (1997) translates the phrase as “all dressed up” and comments that “ἀσκέω sometimes has a pejorative connotation” (213).
My husband ended the sacrifice after the music and dancing and was lying in our chamber, his spear hanging on a peg … and I was binding my hair, arranging it in a head-band gazing into my golden mirror’s countless rays, so that I might lie down to rest … but having left my bed, wearing only a tunic, like a Dorian girl, I, wretched woman, was not able to station myself at the holy hearth of Artemis.

(916-36)75

They were taken captive wearing none of the finery they may have possessed, but in their nightclothes. It would be incongruous for Euripides to have the women sing about the nighttime confusion and their state when they were captured, but then have them appear lavishly clothed. Hecuba should also appear in a rather plain costume to visually emphasize her diminished

75 The text of Hecuba is Tierney (1946).
status, which is emphasized throughout the play. One of the consistent themes in the plays that dramatize the aftereffects of the fall of Troy is the loss of station. The women consistently note their once privileged life in contrast with their current life of slavery, and it seems likely that one of the markers of such a loss would be their loss of the outward signs of their previous life through their appearance in rags rather than luxurious robes. The context of each play therefore suggests that here the Trojan characters would not have been visually Persianized in addition to their non-Persianized characterization.

Away from Persia: restoring the Trojans to Troy

I have now established the context of this project, which is that Trojan characters in tragedy are unique objects of study. They are not displaced Persians, for they maintain a strong connection to their mythological heritage. In the next chapter, I address the importance of the Homeric Trojans and create a context for interpreting Trojan characters in fifth-century tragedy by establishing the depth and breadth of Homeric mediation. The purpose is to establish the tradition that tragedians used as the background against which to set their Trojan characters.

The focus of the chapter is on the Trojan women in the Iliad, since our extant corpus of tragedy provides examples of Trojan women, with the sole exception of the contentious Rhesus. I will argue that in the Iliad the women are characterized through the men in their lives, quite unlike tragedy, where the women are given their own voices. And yet, the men in their lives are still an important part of their tragic characters, and so they are not entirely unlike their epic predecessors. In addition to the Iliad, I examine the representation of Trojan women in Athenian iconography to create a broader understanding of how Trojan women might have been perceived by Athenian audiences of tragedy.

At the end of chapter 2, I turn my attention to the lost evidence, fragmentary remains of tragedy, to discuss how Trojan men might have been represented. Euripides’ Alexandros is the only fragmentary tragedy with Trojan characters of any real substance, thus receives the most attention. It is difficult to draw any certain conclusions from fragments, but the few lines that have survived suggest that the Trojan men were not ‘Phrygianized’ in this tragedy. The embassy of Trojans in Euripides’ Philoctetes adds an interesting dimension to this discussion, because the iconographic evidence suggests that those characters were represented as visually
distinct, but the textual evidence does little to confirm this. To complete the transition from my
discussion of epic and other media in which Trojans appeared, I conclude the chapter with a
discussion of *Rhesus*. It is the only complete extant tragedy in which Trojan royal men appear,
which makes it an important piece of evidence, but because it is the only one of its kind, it is
difficult to draw certain conclusions from it. I argue that it is a liminal tragedy because of its
closeness to book ten of the *Iliad*, and that Hector, the central character of *Rhesus*, is also
liminal because the character resonates with the Iliadic Hector but is nevertheless a tragic
caracter. The fragments and *Rhesus* are an essential part of this investigation because they
illuminate what we do not know about Trojan characters in the fifth century, which helps clarify
why the focus must be on women.

Euripides remains central to this project as I move from Trojan men to the examination of
Trojan women, because of the lack of Trojan characters in either Aeschylus or Sophocles’
extant tragedies. Cassandra in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* is the one exception, and I discuss her
caracter in chapter 5. Of course, it would be nice to be able to create a more complete image of
how Trojans were portrayed in tragedy by drawing on evidence from all three tragedians, but I
propose that Euripides will provide an attractive case study. Of the three tragedians, Euripides
is the more experimental, \(^{76}\) and thus more likely to portray Trojan characters in novel and
unique ways. Although we may not have *all* Trojan characters, it is possible that we have the
most innovative examples of the way audiences were invited to consider this unique group of
characters. Moreover, Euripides shows an affinity for exploring the many complexities of
female characters. It seems fitting, therefore, that it is Euripides who appears to have
championed the dramatic depiction of the aftermath of the Trojan war and the impact on its
female survivors.

Chapter 3 compares the portrayal of Spartans, contemporary fifth-century Athenian enemies,
with that of Trojans to demonstrate the differences between them. Euripides’ *Andromache*
provides a rich field for discussion because of its broad range of characters from the Spartans
Hermione and Menelaus to the Trojan Andromache to the Phthian Peleus. I demonstrate that

\(^{76}\) We need look no further than Aristophanes for evidence of Euripides’ reputation for
innovation. See, for example, *Frogs* 905-78 where ‘Euripides’ describes some of his
improvements to tragedy, such as his slimming down of Aeschylus’ weighty language.
the Spartans have taken over the position of contrast with the Athenians from the Persians insofar as they are given the characteristics that most contrast with the Athenians’ view of themselves. Furthermore, Andromache stands in sharp contrast with the Spartan characters and shares a close allegiance with Peleus. This tragedy highlights the change in the perception of the other in fifth-century Athens to include a more cultural than ethnic emphasis. With the Peloponnesian War the definition of enemy and other had to be redefined to reflect the enmity between Athens and Sparta. Far from suffering from this, Trojan characters benefited, and became more complex and broadly conceptualized.

In chapter 4, I address the *gendered* nature of the aftermath of the Trojan War, which is impossible to ignore, particularly since the vast majority of the tragedies with Trojan characters that have remained treat the period after the fall, and therefore, the female characters. In the context of the East-West dichotomy the female other holds a curious position because one of the attributes commonly associated with the Eastern *man* among the Greeks is effeminacy, softness, so that the domination of such men by the strong, manly Greeks becomes naturalized and expected. The Trojan women in tragedy are in a weakened state, having lost their city and their men, and yet they are portrayed as maintaining strength of spirit, strength that allows them to stand up to the Greeks. Because the women are the final representatives of Troy and are given such strong voices by the tragedians, the city itself does become feminized, but these women are not destructive forces (even, I argue in chapter 4, Hecuba in *Hecuba*). Instead, they offer an opportunity for discussion of some of the themes that have been raised in recent scholarship pertaining to women and tragedy. In chapter 4, I explore what their Trojan identity adds to their femininity by discussing the role of the women in three plays, focusing on one particularly feminine theme in each play: exchange in *Andromache*, nostalgia in *Trojan Women*, and mourning in *Hecuba*.

The final chapter examines the role played by *class* in considering Trojan characters. The majority of them in tragedy, lyric poetry, and visual art are from the royal family. Only Euripides’ *Orestes* presents a character who was a slave in Troy before the fall, and this provides an excellent opportunity to contrast the treatment of that character with the treatment of the royal Trojan women that is examined in chapters 3 and 4. In a way that links this chapter back to chapter 2, I argue that the characters established in the oral and literary tradition maintain their sympathetic nature and the dignity that their previous royal status, reflected in the
Iliad, afforded them. The Phrygian slave in Orestes, however, has no literary background and therefore no tradition to uphold, which facilitates this denigration. This, particularly in contrast with Cassandra from Aeschylus’ Agamemnon, suggests the importance of the tradition in which the tragedians were operating.

The two characters’ roles are similar insofar as both are eye-witness narrators, Cassandra of the more distant past and future and the Phrygian of the more recent past. Both share important information with the other characters and the audience, though Cassandra’s prophecy is not believed, and the Phrygian’s lyric monody, which makes the information he is sharing almost cryptic at first, is reminiscent of Cassandra’s mantic utterances, which are difficult for the chorus to understand. Cassandra’s character is powerfully used to create a vivid image of the past horrors associated with the house of Atreus and the connection that has to the present situation and her impending death along with Agamemnon. Similarly, the Phrygian slave’s lyric description of the near-death of Helen is used to create dramatic tension. Their ethnic background is the same, yet their social status in Troy was vastly different and the Phrygian slave has no traditional heritage on which his character can be based. Once a tragedian moves beyond the traditional material and characters, represented entirely by the royal family, there is nothing to enforce the traditional characterization of the Trojans.

The purpose of this examination of Trojan characters in fifth-century Athenian tragedy is to demonstrate that there was an intellectual curiosity about them and their role in contemporary society. They were recognized as useful characters to act as foils for many aspects of life. They had the literary pedigree necessary to be so utilized and to be highly recognizable. The following chapters mostly argue in favour of a sympathetic treatment of Trojan characters, or more specifically, against the notion of a “Phrygianization of Troy,” and restore to the Trojans their own unique identity.

An argument for the sympathetic treatment presupposes an audience whose members could be moved to sympathy. The issue of audience composition has been thoroughly debated, particularly on the point of the presence or absence of women in the Theatre of Dionysus during the fifth century. Arguments both for and against usually raise the same three ancient sources as part of their evidence, namely Aristophanes’ Peace 962-7 and Thesmophoriazusae 390-7, as well as Plato’s Gorgias 502d and Laws 658c-d, but scholars interpret those same passages
differently. Each passage contains a brief, off-hand reference to women being in the audience, but as part of a comedy or a philosophical dialogue they can also be explained as merely a joke or a means for a rhetorical point. The basic division between scholars’ opinions on these passages is whether they identify tragedy as primarily civic/political or festive/religious. For example, Henderson insists on the festive nature of the theatre and is therefore more inclined to consider the ancient sources as confirmation of female attendance. For Goldhill, on the other hand, the theatre at the Great Dionysia is ultimately a political event at which the audience “represents the body politic” and should exclude women.

The presence of foreigners is a less contentious matter. Despite Wilson’s assertion that “we can safely rule out the presence of non-Greeks in the theatre audience,” there is evidence from comedy that indicates the presence of non-Greeks at the Great Dionysia. At 501-8 of Aristophanes’ Acharnians, for example, Dicaeopolis says that he can speak freely against Cleon since it is the Lenaea and the foreigners (ξένοι) have not yet arrived. The Lenaea took place in late January at a time when winter weather made travel difficult, but by the time of the Great Dionysia in late March, “good weather and the beginning of the sailing season permitted
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77 Examples of those for the presence of women: Podlecki (1990 – though he is the least assertive voice, going only so far as to say (at 43) that there is “not conclusive evidence that they were excluded”), Henderson (1991), Csapo & Slater (1995), Sourvinou-Inwood (2003). Those against the presence of women include Goldhill (1994 & 1997) and Sommerstein (1997).
78 Henderson (1991) does not deny the “official” nature of the theatre in addition to the festive nature. He argues for a combination of the two elements (147).
79 Goldhill (1997) 66. Sommerstein (1997) agrees that skepticism regarding the presence of women at the theatre is wise, but disagrees with Goldhill’s emphasis on the civic nature of the event. He argues that the theatre audience is not a representation of the citizen body since citizens were not required to participate, but is a representation of those who wanted to be there and who could afford the entrance fee (66-7).
80 Wilson (2000) 124. His justification is that “the Athenian remains the proper recipient of the dramatic message,” but it is possible for the notional audience to be Athenian even with non-Athenians present, just as the notional audience may still be male if women are present.
81 Even Goldhill (1997), who believes that women were not present because the audience represented the “civic gaze” (57), is certain that foreigners were audience members (60).
national and international participation." It seems likely that foreigners were, or at least could be, in the audience at the Great Dionysia.

The case of slaves is difficult because in spite of their omnipresence in Athens, their daily lives are rarely spoken of in extant texts with the result that they seem to have been almost invisible. Scholars agree, however, that it is likely that slaves accompanied their masters to the theatre. Throughout this discussion, I assume that women, foreigners and slaves were present at the Great Dionysia, since there is no evidence to suggest conclusively that they were excluded. The question, though regrettably unanswerable in the end, has implications for the interpretation of tragedy. Although the notional audience may have been the male citizens, the presence of women and foreigners as part of the actual audience would have allowed some of the tension between male and female characters or between Greek and non-Greek characters created on stage to infiltrate the audience. If tragedy’s role is provocative in nature, challenging rather than resolving, a diverse audience in which different reactions would arise would help to make it more thoroughly stimulating.

The highly varied nature of the audience means that audience reaction and response could not be uniform. Indeed, even if it were only Athenian citizen men in the theatre, uniformity of response would be highly unlikely. Individual reactions, however, do not preclude a collective reaction. Lada-Richards suggests that group identity is created and strengthened in the Athenian theatre because it is part of the polis’ “most lavish pageantry.” That is, the context of the
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84 Hall (2006) 198ff argues that the largest groups of foreigners in Athens were metics and slaves or former slaves. Regarding the metics, she suggests that they “are not known to have been excluded from at least watching plays at the Dionysia” (198).
85 This is certainly the case in tragedy, where slaves appear frequently as characters but their status is rarely, if ever, discussed explicitly. Griffith (2005) argues that satyrs in the satyr plays that accompanied tragic trilogies are used to explore “problems and anxieties” between the ruling class and slaves (184). Hall (2006) notes the difficulty for us to remember “the ubiquity of slaves in classical Athens, and what must have been the theatregoer’s almost daily experience of dealing with individuals who were both not Greeks and almost completely powerless” (202).
88 Lada-Richards (1996a) 106.
theatrical performances in Athens created a sense of community among the spectators that created the probability of a collective response on some level at least. My argument for audience sympathy towards Trojan characters is only one possible response, and is more likely the response of attentive, engaged audience members. But if, as Revermann argues, there was a “considerable degree of theatrical competence, shared by a significant portion of the audience members at any competition” due to their experience performing as chorus members themselves and frequent exposure to tragedy as a (overall) formally conservative art form, there is a high proportion of audience members who would have been attentive and engaged. These are precisely the spectators whom I suggest would have felt sympathy towards Trojan characters.

There is always the potential trap of transposing modern emotions and reactions onto an ancient audience, and suggesting that Athenian audiences might have felt sympathy for Trojan characters may seem dangerous. Indeed, according to Aristotle, tragedy was supposed to produce feelings of pity, not sympathy. The difference between pity and sympathy is significant, with sympathy consisting of “putting oneself in the position of another so as to feel what the other person feels.” Pity, on the other hand, does “not mean identifying with the experience of another; rather, it was just insofar as one did not share another’s misfortune that one was in a position to pity it.” The ability to identify with the experience or suffering of another is the key to sympathy. I argue in the following chapters that Athenian audiences were able to identify with Trojan characters because of the cultural similarities that are created in those characters. The complication of the dividing line between East and West in the formation of Greek identity that I suggest Trojan characters create demonstrates the fluidity of the markers of identity and invites more careful consideration of the characterization of the other. Trojans, as characters that hover above the line that distinguishes ‘us’ from ‘them,’ lend themselves to
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89 Revermann (2006b) 112.

90 Aristotle’s Poetics does not specifically mention the distinction between the two, but mentions only pity (ἐλέος) at 1449b 27, for example.


emotional attachment and are the perfect vehicle for exploring the complexity of creating and maintaining identity.
Trojan characters are not the creative inventions of tragedians in the fifth century. Rather, they are inherited largely from the epic tradition and recast in the newer genre of tragedy, in which the women in particular acquire a new scope and dimension. But it is necessary to look back to epic first before entering fully into the discussion of tragedy to understand what concept of the Trojans the tragedians inherited and to be able to demonstrate the development of the characters. My discussion in this chapter will be wide in scope and include iconography in addition to epic. Vase painters and their commissioners seem to have been drawn to the emotionally charged sack of Troy and other episodes that fall outside of the *Iliad*, as were tragedians, but I argue that elements of the characterization from the *Iliad* loom in the background. Homer was not the inspiration for plots, but the characters of the *Iliad* had a lasting impact.

After examining the depiction of the Trojans in epic and iconography, I discuss the fragmentary tragedies that portray Trojan *characters*, especially men, not Trojan *themes*. The evidence from fully extant tragedy is largely concerned with Trojan *women* portrayed by Euripides. Because of this, our perception of Trojans in tragedy is necessarily skewed and incomplete. In addition to the fragmentary tragedies, the significant exception to this is the controversial *Rhesus*, in which Hector, Aeneas, Paris, and Dolon appear as characters along with a chorus of Trojan soldiers. The authorship and authenticity of the play are problematic, and its closeness to *Iliad* Book 10 makes it an oddity within the corpus of extant tragedy, but the treatment of Trojan characters is valuable to this discussion precisely because of its uniqueness. In a discussion at the end of this chapter, I outline the unique features of *Rhesus* and present an argument for reading it as a generically liminal play, a tragedy that retains a close link to its epic model.

Euripides’ treatment of the Trojan women after the fall of Troy is also a departure from the most significant extant predecessor of the representation of Trojans in literature, the *Iliad*, which shows primarily Trojan men during the war. Nevertheless, in this chapter, I will discuss the depiction of the Trojan women in the *Iliad*, with a particular focus on Hecuba and Andromache.
since they are the two most prominent characters in the tragedies discussed in the following chapters. I will argue that Euripides develops his female Trojan characters in a manner that is suggestive of their characterization in the *Iliad*. The situations in which Euripides places the female characters are entirely different from the *Iliad* and, because the men in relation to whom they are characterized in the *Iliad* are dead in the extant Euripidean tragedies, the women are given a voice of their own. Instead of reacting to the joys and sorrows of the men in their lives, in tragedy they are shown to come into direct contact with the Greeks, and they mourn for their own suffering and loss. They become the focus instead of the periphery, proactive instead of reactive, and this allows their characters to be developed in new ways. The Homeric model is still present, however, and acts as a backdrop against which to view the new incarnation of the Trojan women. As different as the characters’ situations may become in tragedy, there is still an important root of the Homeric characters that remains.

The question of Homeric influence on tragedy is a thorny issue, but crucial to understanding the full complexity of Trojan characters in tragedy. Studies have already argued for a Homeric influence on some specific tragedies and on tragedy in general. My purpose here is not to demonstrate a one-to-one correlation between the female Trojan characters in the *Iliad* and in their appearance in tragedy, but to establish a background against which the tragic characters can be interpreted. I suggest not a direct reliance on a Homeric model, but a more pervasive Homeric influence that informs the characterization of the women. Euripides breaks from the Homeric representation of the women, but their characters are effective in large part because of their epic past. Although specifics regarding any text’s influence, Homeric or otherwise, are entirely lacking, it is not unreasonable to suggest a strong Homeric tradition that helped to shape the conception of these characters.

After examining the women in the *Iliad*, I will discuss the way these female characters are represented on Attic vases. While Euripides may diverge from the Homeric tradition by

---

93 See Davidson (1995), for example, for a discussion of Odyssean influence on Sophocles’ *Philoctetes*. Davidson argues that, even though *Philoctetes* may be more closely related to the material of the lost Epic Cycle and the other *Philoctetes* plays by Aeschylus and Euripides (on which see below, p. 24ff), the absence of such evidence does not make his intertextual analysis irrelevant (25). Alaux (2007) argues more generally that Athenian tragedies were “nourris d’Homère” (58).
focusing on the women after the fall, the iconographic evidence indicates a strong connection among vase painters to the fall itself, and a preference for detailed depictions of the suffering of the Trojans and the violence of the Greeks. I will offer examples of women on vases to demonstrate how they were used by artists to help create deep pathos by adding an emotional element to otherwise martial scenes. In the final section, I will turn to the tantalizing evidence of fragmentary plays for the characterization of Trojan men in tragedy. The breadth of interest in Trojan themes indicated by the titles of the lost plays is remarkable, yet the examination of the fragments, many of which consist of mere words, yields very few conclusions. And so we are left to lament the loss of so many plays while observing that Trojan characters held a significant place in the Athenian theatre.

In *Inventing Homer: the Early Reception of Epic*, Barbara Graziosi discusses in great detail the ancient perceptions of Homer: who he was, where he was from, when he lived, whether or not he was blind, and how he measured against other poets. The evidence that she presents covers a wide range of genres and time periods, and shows how various authors continued to write about Homer and his poetry, which suggests the importance of the Homeric tradition to all forms of literature throughout the ancient world. In the classical period, poets and prose authors use Homer as a source of authoritative references and as an important source that can be corrected based on a new kind of history. Both of these uses of Homer indicate his primacy in the mind of the intellectual community, but also imply a familiarity with him and his poems among the wider population since such references would be useless unless they were comprehensible to the authors’ audiences. The ancient concept of ‘Homer’ appears to have

94 From Xenophanes in the sixth century BC to Aelian in the second century AD, for example.

95 For a more detailed discussion of this see Barker and Christensen (2006), who argue that Archilochus establishes his poetry as an anti-epic by making pointed reference to Homeric poetry, thus creating an antithesis between the two.

96 Burkert (1987: 2001) suggests that Pindar’s use of Homeric references demonstrates that Homer was “suited for ready quotation” (200), whereas Thomas (2000) proposes that Herodotus carefully establishes his work within the context of a Homeric precedent, as one that builds on and improves the Homeric interpretation of history (268).
allowed for a much broader range of heroic poetry than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but those two poems, or versions of them, were included in that grouping.  

Homer held a position of central importance in Athens, despite the Athenians’ near absence from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Graziosi outlines the evidence for the preeminence of Homeric poems at the Panathenaea to the exclusion of works by other poets in the rhapsodic competitions. Burkert cites a further indication of the Athenians’ preference for Homer in the inscription of a herm from the Stoa of Herms in Athens which refers to the Iliadic praise for Menestheus, the only Athenian mentioned in the *Iliad*. This attempt on the part of the Athenians to publish a reminder of their connection to Homer indicates an assumed familiarity among the public with the *Iliad*. Furthermore, at lines 1034-6 of Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, Aeschylus refers to “θεῖος Ὅμηρος” (“divine Homer”) and lists what he is known for teaching his audience – military matters, in particular. This, according to Burkert, suggests audience familiarity with Homeric poetry. Ford’s discussion of Homeric quotation adds a cautionary element to this discussion, however, by demonstrating that other authors quoted Homer for a variety of reasons, from providing a witty analysis of a line or passage to promoting their cultural learning. The purpose of his discussion is to argue against a notion that the Greeks conceived of the Homeric epics as wholes the way modern readers do, suggesting that such an assumption about the ancient reception of Homer “may be to project a literate mode of aesthetic
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97 Graziosi and Haubold (2005) state that there were many poems attributed to Homer in the archaic period (24 ff). They suggest this as part of their argument for the ‘resonance’ of Homeric poetry within the tradition of oral epic. For them, resonance is ‘the ability to evoke a wider epic tradition and place(s) itself in relation to that tradition” (12). By attributing many poems to ‘Homer’, “audiences and performers [of heroic epic poetry] actively postulated a connection between a specific text and its wider context” (27). That is, they participated in the process of creating a resonance within the traditional genre.

98 Graziosi (2002) 195 ff. She also notes that the evidence does not mention which poems were to be recited, leaving modern scholars once again unsure regarding which poems were considered to be Homeric (see especially 197).


101 Ford (1997). For the witty analysis of lines, which Ford describes as the ability to produce “a line for discussion and then have the wit to discern in it something not generally appreciated” see 95. For highlighting one’s cultural learning, see 98.
reception onto the archaic period."

I suggest that this does not necessarily diminish an audience’s capacity to perceive and appreciate references or allusions to Homeric epics by tragedians. The reference in Aristophanes noted above suggests the dramatists’ explicit awareness of their epic heritage, perhaps on a more complete and sophisticated level than the rest of the population. It is for this reason that it is important to discuss the female Trojan characters in the *Iliad* before turning to their representation in tragedy in the following chapters.

Throughout the *Iliad* there is a fine but important distinction that scholars have noted between the Greek and Trojan men. For example, Van der Valk has twice argued that the *Iliad* is intrinsically nationalistic. He argues that the Trojans are not vilified explicitly, but that they are not allowed by the poet to achieve any significant victory, while even their minor accomplishments are assisted in some way by the gods. In the same way, Traill maintains that the poet of the *Iliad* is concerned with preserving the status of the Greeks. Such arguments, however, focus too narrowly on the poet’s alleged intention and detract from a more detailed analysis of the characters and their interactions with each other. Moreover, an epic composed for a local Greek audience should, reasonably, have an increased focus on the Greeks, some of whom were the ancestors of the various local audiences.

Another method of analyzing character distinctions in the *Iliad* is based on the speech patterns of characters’ speech. According to Mackie, a socio-linguistic approach also reveals a bias in favour of the Greeks. Mackie demonstrates how the Greek force is repeatedly shown to be
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102 Ford (1997) 85. He also demonstrates that poets such as Pindar, for example, misquote Homer as the text has survived for us and accounts for such errors by suggesting that Pindar either misread Homer or intentionally altered the Homeric material, not expecting to be challenged on his use of the material; see 96-8.

103 He first argued this in 1953, and then in 1985 revisited the issue and provided even more examples to help support his perspective.

104 Van der Valk (1953) 12-5 especially.

105 Traill (1990) 299.
efficient in their communication that leads, according to her interpretation, to cohesion within the group and greater efficiency in battle.\textsuperscript{106} The Trojans, by contrast are hampered in some ways by their lack of linguistic unity. She argues that this is evident not in an explicit statement by the poet, but through the subtle use of similes, particularly in direct contrast with the unified Greeks as in the opening lines of book 3 when the two armies march towards each other for the first time in the \textit{Iliad}. The Greeks’ silence indicates their unity, whereas the Trojans’ comparison to shrieking birds draws attention to their disunity.\textsuperscript{107} Although the Trojans and their allies as a whole may be disjointed in comparison to the Greeks because of their language, individuals are still able to be effective speakers.\textsuperscript{108} This contrast between disorganization and ineffectiveness on the large scale and effectiveness on an individual level within the issue of language indicates the complex nature of the presentation of Trojan characters.

The Trojan women are left out of these scholarly comparisons between the two camps because there are no Greek women in the \textit{Iliad} who create a sense of domesticity among the Greeks.\textsuperscript{109} The Trojan women are the only representatives of the family life of the warriors, and as such they help to create a sense of normality that makes them and their sufferings recognizable. Segal describes Andromache in this way:

\begin{quote}
With her maternal and conjugal tenderness, her rich feminine emotionality, her intelligence and sharpsighted realism quickened by intense involvement, she is the bearer of the suffering of all the
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{107} Mackie (1996) 15; Gera (2003) notes that a lack of linguistic unity among the Trojans indicates more than a lack of cohesion, but a lack of discipline.

\textsuperscript{108} Martin (1989) 130 highlights Hector and Achilles as the two most sympathetic characters in the \textit{Iliad} in part because of their use of language. It is also noteworthy that the characters can all understand each other. See further Gera (2003) 3.

\textsuperscript{109} Helen is, of course, the notable exception to this, but she spends the entire \textit{Iliad} with the Trojans in Troy, and is part of their domesticity. While it is undeniable that there are women in the Greek camp, they are all captive women such as Chryseis and Briseis, for example, and there is no indication that the Greeks enjoy a normal home life in the same way as the Trojans do.
women in the war, and perhaps of all women in all war.\footnote{Segal (1971) 55.} Thus, according to Segal, Andromache’s characterization is crucial not only for creating the domestic atmosphere of Troy, but also for creating the atmosphere of suffering that is common among women in war. While I do not agree that Andromache, or any Trojan woman, represents \textit{all} women in \textit{all} war, I agree that the domestic normality represented by the Trojan women collapses the distance between the Greeks and the Trojans. I will offer as case studies the portrayal of the Trojan women in books 6, 22, and 24, with a particular focus on the women who appear in Euripides’ tragedies: Hecuba and Andromache.\footnote{Despite her presence in Troy in the \textit{Iliad}, Helen is not Trojan and will therefore not be discussed here. Even in the \textit{Iliad} she is isolated from the other women, and in tragedy her character varies from the innocent wife in Euripides’ \textit{Helen} to the woman returned from Troy with Trojan spoils in Euripides’ \textit{Orestes}. Cassandra, who does appear in tragedy, receives very little characterization in the \textit{Iliad}. For more on Cassandra, see chapter 5.} The observations I make, therefore, will not be referring to Trojans in general but only those characters in particular. I will argue that their roles as markers of domesticity, family, and powerless victims of male conflict establish them as highly sympathetic characters.\footnote{Farron (1979) 15 suggests that their inability to exert control over their lives is the primary cause of their sympathetic nature.}

The suffering of the women helps to create what Rutherford has called the “community of suffering” between the Greeks and the Trojans.\footnote{Rutherford (1982) 158 uses the phrase to describe the “realization [i.e. between Achilles and Priam in \textit{Iliad} Book twenty four] of their kinship, not by blood or nationality, but as two human beings, the victims of the common fate of man, grief and death”.} Even though the women are not directly compared to each other, in the way that Achilles and Priam are in book 24, the mere fact that they appear as characters who are occupied in tasks that a Greek woman might also do, creates a sense of familiarity and questions the differentiation of Greek and Trojan. This sense of familiarity is what prevents them from necessarily becoming vilified barbarians later in literary tradition.
Despite their significant contribution to the emotional tone of the poem, the women in the *Iliad* are marginal characters because of the nature of the epic in which they are found. The *Iliad* is a war narrative, and its main purpose is to describe the battles between heroes; its stated concern is *klea andron*. The women of the poem exist only through their relationships with the men, and they never leave the city of Troy. And yet, they are crucial in creating the domestic aspect of Troy that helps bring the human element into focus. Their involvement in the scenes that are set in Troy helps to complete the image of Troy as a normal functioning city and the Trojan men as characters who are more familiar than foreign. They are not an army of men without domestic context, but the royal household, at least, is depicted as having important relationships with their women. Furthermore, the women together are shown to have relationships with each other through the performance of duties such as the pilgrimage to the temple of Athena, for example, with the hope of helping their men and their city as a whole. Thus the city is shown to be a thriving network of social relations.

Because I am excluding Helen from this discussion, it is book 6 when the Trojan women first appear, thanks to Hector’s re-entrance into the city. Hector first meets Hecuba, accompanied by her daughter Laodike, and her first word to him emphasizes Hecuba’s most dominant characteristic, that of motherhood: “τέκνον, τίπτε λιπὼν πόλεμον θρασύν ειλήλουθας;” (“child, why have you come, leaving behind harsh war?” 6. 254). She is walking with one child, identifies Hector primarily as her child, and so is distinguished as a mother, and the Trojan royal family is described as a family. Hecuba is not described as attended by a retinue of attendants, which might accompany a queen, but by one daughter. The focus on family, with a mother and one child greeting another child, helps to establish the queen in a personal way. After Hecuba greets her son, she suggests that he drink wine and pour a libation to the gods, and her reason for him doing so has a tone of maternal care: “ἀνδρὶ δὲ κεκμήστι μένος μέγα οἶνος ἀξέξει, ὡς τήν κέχμησας ὁμύλων σοῖσιν ἔτησι” (“when a man’s exhausted, wine will build his strength – battle-weary as you are, fighting for your people,” 6. 261-2). Hector is the

---

114 Pantelia (1993) 493 specifies the women’s domestic work, spinning and weaving in particular, as creating a sense of normal life in the city.

leader of the Trojan forces, but the interaction is intimate and familial as Hecuba attempts to offer personal comfort to her son.

Hector is dismissive of his mother’s attempts, and is not swayed from his initial purpose of returning into the city, which was to send Hecuba and other women to offer prayers to Athena. Hecuba does not protest her son’s disinterest in her suggestion and obeys his request immediately and without another word to him: “Ὤς ἐφαθ’, ἣ δὲ μολοῦσα ποτὶ μέγαρ’ ἀμφιπολοιοι. ἀκέλετο· ταὶ δ’ ὁφ’ ἀόλλοσαν κατὰ ἄστυ γερμαις” (“But his mother simply turned away to the palace. She gave her servants orders and out they strode to gather the older women through the city.” 6.286-7). Only once her attempts at maternal comfort have been rejected, Hecuba resumes her role as queen of Troy, and instead of being surrounded by her children she has her attendants and she is giving orders.

Hector’s interaction with Andromache is entirely different from that with Hecuba, though it ends with the same result of the woman being unable to persuade him to do as she asks. The motivation for their meeting is different than that with Hecuba. There is no expressed reason for him going to his house in search of his wife, and the conversation that ensues does not indicate any purpose other than his desire to see her before returning to battle. Whereas Hecuba was met in her home and with her child, Andromache is pointedly not at home, but has gone towards the walls ἐπειγομένη (hurrying, 6.388) and μαινομένη ἐικυῖα (like a madwoman, 6.389). Andromache highlights the familial cost of this war in an intensely personal way. In describing all that she has lost with the death of her natal family members and will lose with the death of Hector and the fall of Troy, she makes it so that this is no longer merely the tale of a battle among men on the battlefield, but one that also highlights the damage that battle inflicts upon the families of those involved:

"Εκτορ, ἀτὰρ σὺ μοί ἐσσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ

---

116 He does so at Helenus’ suggestion at 6.86ff.
117 She is also a woman obeying orders from a man. Her authority among the women is resumed only once Hector leaves.
118 Farron (1979) identifies this as the ultimate character trait among the women in the Iliad, and that the powerlessness that it creates makes the women tragic characters.
说实名，你是我父亲，我尊敬的母亲，
一个哥哥，你也在我心，年轻温暖有力。

哀求我，求你！站在我壁垒这里，
在你孤儿你的儿子之前，让你的妻子为寡妇。
（6.429-32）

她的努力让赫克托留在城内全是个人的。她想让他安全，因为她已经失去了她的整个家族在希腊人手中，并且她不希望也经历这个。最终，正如海克柏，安德洛玛克的请求没有被满足，正如安德洛玛克的情绪状态更为夸张一样，她也是。海克柏建议他喝酒和向诸神祭献，表示这将帮助他回归战场。安德洛玛克，然而，建议赫克托改变他的战斗策略，采用一种更守势的策略（6.433ff）。

法隆认为赫克托对安德洛玛克的请求是突然的，他愿意听她的更感性的话语，但一旦她转向军事建议，他就不回应。

但仔细考虑赫克托的回应，他不是一个更不冷漠，甚至她的战略建议，而不是海克柏。虽然与海克柏，赫克托告诉她不要尝试阻止他，与安德洛玛克他专门回应她。

法隆（1979）24。法隆进一步认为安德洛玛克的军事建议是合乎逻辑的，虽然她的感情状态。
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her request not merely refusing to fulfill it, but even providing reasons, so that in this encounter, the audience sees not only Andromache’s innermost fears and desires, but Hector’s, too:

内分泌 καὶ ἐμοὶ τάδε πάντα μέλει, γύναι· ἀλλὰ μάλι’ αἰνῶς

αἰδέομαι Τρώας καὶ Τρώαδας ἐλκευτέπλους,

αἱ κε κακὸς ὃς νόσφιν ἀλυσκάξω πολέμου·

οὐδὲ μὲ θυμὸς ἄνωγεν, ἐπεὶ μάθον ἐμμεναι ἐσθλὸς

αἰεὶ καὶ πρῶτοι μετὰ Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι,

ἀρνύμενος πατρός τε μέγα κλέος ἢδ’ ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ.

All this weighs on my mind too, dear woman.

But I would die of shame to face the men of Troy

and the Trojan women trailing their long robes

if I would shrink from battle now, a coward.

Nor does the spirit urge me on that way.

I’ve learned it all too well. To stand up bravely,

always fighting in the front ranks of the Trojan soldiers,

winning my father great glory, glory for myself. (6.441-6)

Here, Hector speaks frankly to his wife in a way that he does not to his mother, creating a strong bond between them. The remarkable aspect to Andromache’s plea to her husband is that it is in
no way manipulative. She does not beguile him, or try to trick him in any way, but instead is shown to be emotionally honest and straightforward. This is an important aspect of her character to remember when it comes to discussing her appearance in tragedy.

Andromache is, however, in the end urged back to her domesticity. The next time the audience sees her, she is quietly working in her home surrounded by her women:

…ἄλοχος δ᾽ οὗ πώ τι πέπυστο

´Εκτορος· οὐ γάρ οἱ τις ἐπήτυμος ἀγγελος ἐλθὼν

ἡγεῖλ᾽ ὅτι όι πόσις ἐκτοθι μίμε πυλάων,

アルバム ἕτον ὑφαίνε μνηφό δόμον ὑψηλοῖο

dιπλαξα πορφυρότην, ἐν δὲ ἥρωνα ποικιλ᾽ ἐξασσε.

…but the wife of Hector

had not heard a thing. No messenger brought the truth

of how her husband made his stand outside the gates.

She was weaving at her loom, deep in the high halls,

---

120 According to Farron (1979) 31 the lack of sexual manipulation among the women of Troy in favour of heightened emotionality emphasizes their passivity. Compare Helen’s more aggressive sexual manipulation in book 3, for example, when she tells Paris how much stronger Menelaus is (3. 433-6). It may be argued that Andromache is deliberately manipulative in telling Hector that he must take care not to die in battle because he is her entire family. The difference between Helen and Andromache, however, is that Helen seems to speak out of spite and for no apparent advantage to herself, whereas Andromache is simply speaking the truth.

121 That is, she is where Hector expected her to be in book 6 when he was looking for her, and she is occupied with a typically feminine task. Pantelia (1993) 495 notes that weaving can symbolize familial order. See also Farron (1979) 25 for a discussion on the emphasis on Andromache’s obedient seclusion. This scene of domestic obedience can be contrasted with Helen’s weaving, which contains images of the war that she created. Instead of an image of domestic harmony, Helen’s weaving is a highly personal project that seems to aim more at expressing the consciousness of her guilt than at preserving domestic order.
working flowered braiding into a dark red folding robe. (22.437-41)

At the moment that her worst fears are about to be realized, when Hector is about to be killed by Achilles, she is unaware of what has happened and is doing precisely what Hector asked of her in book 6. This seclusion, even from the other women of the Trojan royal family who have gathered on the walls, emphasizes her sense of obedience to her husband.

Hecuba, by contrast, is not shown in the domestic context in the same way. In book 22, she has left her home, where she was in book 6, and gone to the walls of the city to plead with Hector to return to the protection of the city walls. It is an emotional plea, and she uses her maternal position to attempt to sway him, but it is brief and not face to face. But, once again, Hecuba is portrayed as a mother primarily:

μήτηρ δ’ αὖθ’ ἐτέρωθεν ὁδύρετο δάκρυ χέουσα,
κόλπον ἀνιεμένη, ἐτέρηφι δὲ μαζὸν ἀνέσχε.
καὶ μν δάκρυ χέουσ’ ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσήυδα·
Ἅκτορ, τέκνον ἐμόν, τάδε τ’ αἴδεο καὶ μ’ ἐλέησον
αὐτήν, εἰ ποτὲ τοι λαθικηδέα μαζὸν ἐπέσχον·

And his mother wailed now, standing beside Priam,
weeping freely, loosing her robes with one hand
and holding out her bare breast with the other,
her words pouring forth in a flight of grief and tears:

“Hector, my child! Look – have some respect for this!

Pity your mother too, if I ever gave you the breast
to soothe your troubles.” (22. 79-83)

Her concerns are specifically for her son and for her role in his death, not explicitly for the safety of Troy. Even at his death she mourns not only for the warrior, protector of the city, but also for the son she has lost:

τέκνον, ἐγὼ δειλή· τί νυ βείομαι αἰνὰ παθοῦσα,
σεῦ ἀποτεθνηῶτος; ὃ μοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἧμαρ
ἐύχωλῃ κατὰ ἀστυ πελέσαντο, πᾶσι τ´ ὄνειαρ
Τρωσί τε καὶ Τρῳῆσι κατὰ πτόλιν, οἵ σε θεὸν ὡς
dειδέχατ᾽· ἢ γὰρ καὶ ωφι μάλα μέγα κῦδος ἐνθα
ξώς ἐῶν· νῦν αὖ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα ἁχάνει.

O my child – my desolation! How can I go on living?

What agonies must I suffer now, now you are dead and gone?

You were my pride throughout the city night and day –

a blessing to us all, the men and women of Troy:

throughout the city they saluted you like a god.

You, you were their greatest glory while you lived –

now death and fate have seized you, dragged you down! (22.431-6)
Having heard these cries from Hecuba, Andromache rushes towards the wall, fearing the worst, once again as in book 6 described as μαινάδι ἱση (like a madwoman, 22.460). With the mention of Eetion at line 472, the audience is reminded yet again of her previous familial loss at the moment of her losing her present family, which may also serve as a reminder that she will go on to inhabit yet another. 122 This is continued through her words as she traces her life from her father’s home to her new reality as widow:

"Έκτορ, ἓγω δύστηνος· ἵη ἄρα γεγνόμεθ’ αῖση
ἀμφότεροι, σὺ μὲν ἐν Τῳῇ Πριάμου κατὰ δῶμα,
αὐτὰρ ἓγω Θήβῃσιν ὑπὸ Πλάκω ὑλήσσῃ
ἐν δόμῳ Ἡτίωνος, ὃ μ’ ἔτρεψε τυτθόν ἔοὺσαν,
δύσμορος αἰνόμορον· ὡς μή ὀψελλε τεκέσθαι.

νῦν δὲ σὺ μὲν Λίδαο δόμους ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαῖς
ἔρχεσαι, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερῷ ἑνὶ πένθει λείπεις
χήρην ἐν μεγάροισι·

O Hector I am destroyed! Both born to the same fate after all!

You, you at Troy in the halls of King Priam –

I at Thebes, under the timberline of Placos,

---

122 Segal (1971) 50 suggests that it is the tearing of the veil, a gift from Aphrodite, from her head that might provide the association of Andromache’s future ‘marriage’, but I would add that the mention of her departure from her paternal home further emphasizes her continued mobility, as Farron (1979) 25 notes. The continued references to Andromache’s mobility help to shape her as the mobile woman, which is an important aspect of her character to be discussed in the following chapter. On women as objects of exchange in tragedy see particularly Wohl (1998).
Eetion’s house… He raised me as a child,

that man of doom, his daughter just as doomed –

would to god he’d never fathered me! Now you go down
to the House of Death, the dark depths of the earth,

and leave me here to waste away in grief, a widow

lost in the royal halls; (22.477-84)

Andromache is given the last words of grief for Hector as he is taken back to the Greek ships, emphasizing the importance he had in defining her life, and once again allowing for the personal to take precedent over the public, Andromache’s grief over the loss of the city.

Cassandra makes her only appearance in the *Iliad* as the announcer of Priam’s return to Troy with Hector’s body in book 24. It is significant for her later role in tragedy that she is apart from her family, and is not specifically mentioned as one of the female mourners around the body of Hector because in the tragic depiction of the events after the fall of Troy she is consistently set apart from the other women. Euripides has her appear on stage only in a mantic state in *Trojan Women*, and because of this she appears to the other women to be more disengaged from the suffering around them, although the audience knows her engagement is deeper because of her prophetic abilities.

Once the body of Hector is brought through the crowds and back to his home, Andromache is the first to sing a lament over him. Here, Andromache imagines her enslaved future:

... ἥ γὰρ ὀλῶλας ἐπίσχοπος, ὃς τέ μν αύτην

ὑόσευ, ἔχεις δ’ ἀλόχους κεδνᾶς καὶ νήπια τέκνα,

αἱ δὴ τοι τάχα νησίον ὀχήσονται γλαφυρῆι,

καὶ μὲν ἐγὼ μετὰ τήν...
τῷ καὶ μν ὀλοὶ μὲν ὀδύρονται κατὰ ἄστυ,

ἀρητὸν δὲ τοκεύοι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔθημας,

Ἅκτορ· ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα λελείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρά.

οὐ γὰρ μοι θυήσαν λεγέων ἐκ χείρας ὀρεξας,

οὐδὲ τί μοι εἴπες πυκνον ἔπος, οὐ τὲ κεν αἰεὶ

μεμνήμην νύκτας τε καὶ ἠματα δάκρυν κεύνω.

…Because you are dead,

her great guardian, you who always defended Troy,

who kept her loyal wives and helpless children safe,

all who will soon be carried off in the hollow ships

and I with them…

the whole city of Troy mourns you now, my Hector –

you’ve brought your parents accursed tears and grief

but to me most of all you’ve left the horror, the heartbreak!

For you never died in bed and stretched your arms to me

or said some last word from the heart I can remember,

always, weeping for you through all my nights and days!

(24.729-32; 740-5)

She does not praise his heroic life or his glories in battle, but stresses how his military career has

made life more difficult for their son, who will now be despised by the Greeks particularly
because of his father’s exploits, and for herself. She ends her lament in a deeply personal way, bitterly expressing how she has been cheated out of the comfort of having him die in bed. In all the laments for Hector, the public praise of the warrior and protector of the city is combined with deeply personal reflection, which shows Hector’s double role of public figure and private man.

Throughout the *Iliad*, Hecuba and Andromache are used to demonstrate two different aspects to the domesticity of the Trojans. Hecuba is the mother and queen, both surrounded by her children and leading the other Trojan women in performing the religious duties. As such, she can convincingly become the matriarchal representative of all of the losses of Troy in Euripides. As I have demonstrated above, her character in the *Iliad* is obedient to the men around her. Euripides, by contrast, has her become a strong leader and advocate of the lost and remaining Trojans in his play in the absence of male Trojans, but I will argue in chapter 4 that she still acts based on her maternal instinct. Andromache, on the other hand, is the more emotional representation of the female martial experience, and is defined entirely through her role as a wife, and as a mobile unit of exchange. She is the embodiment of acute sorrow in the *Iliad* and this intense focus on her individual suffering is also translated to Euripidean tragedy.

In the *Iliad*, these women are closely associated with the men in their lives and do not exist fully on their own. The audience hears of them only in interaction with men, or in reaction to the fortunes and misfortunes of men. When we meet them in the extant Euripidean tragedies, the physical connection between the Trojan women and men has been severed and the women are forced to cope in their new post-war lives alone. As I will argue in the following chapters, however, the memories of their former husbands and sons remain an important aspect of their characterization in Euripides. In this way, they retain a connection to Troy, and specifically to the men of Troy, that fundamentally shapes their tragic characters. Furthermore, I have demonstrated that, despite their attempts and their often emotionally stirring words, the women are not able to effect change among the men. This is another quality that will be part of their Euripidean representation, where the women’s situation has changed but their inability to take charge of it has not. Iliadic women are consistently depicted as powerless victims of their surrounding circumstances.
Iconography

The iconographic tradition of the Trojan War is much more interested in the male characters, and the Greeks in particular. There are some examples of Trojan women, but they are not typically the central figures of the visual scenes. Where they do appear, they are typically in postures of grief, thus contributing to the atmosphere of loss and desolation. After some preliminary comments regarding the nature of Trojans in iconography in general, I will turn to the evidence for the visual representations of Andromache and Hecuba. I will then look closely at one example of the Ilioupersis theme in art to demonstrate how female characters are used.

There is no doubt that the artistic representations of Trojans changed at some point after the Persian Wars.\(^{123}\) It is then that Trojans begin to appear with Phrygian caps, for example, as markers of their difference from Greeks. But it is also significant that while the Trojans’ clothing may change and become a means of identification and differentiation, they are never made physically different. It is interesting to compare, for example, the depiction of the Egyptians in the Pan Painter’s rendition of Heracles fighting Busiris’ servants (fig. 1).\(^{124}\)

---

\(^{123}\) Miller (2000) 420 notes that before the Persian Wars, Greeks and Trojans are only distinguishable in vase paintings by inscriptions.

\(^{124}\) On a pelike from Athens, National Museum, 9683, *ARV* 554, 82.
On this pelike, the three Egyptians’ appearance is in sharp contrast with Heracles’. They are bald and clean-shaven with rounded chins and snub noses, and they are circumcised. All four men’s genitals are visible, making the circumcision of the Egyptians unmistakable.\textsuperscript{125} The physical markings of alterity combined with Heracles’ clear command of the situation (he is holding one Egyptian by the ankles upside down behind his back and appears to be about to

\textsuperscript{125} According to Foley (2000) 298 circumcision is an indicator of barbarity. In her discussion of this image, Miller (2000) 430 argues that the display of the Egyptians’ genitals is a parody of Egyptian “concepts of decency.”
throw him overhead, while another cowers beside the altar and the third wields a mallet) create a marked difference and suggest a hierarchy.\textsuperscript{126} Heracles, looking like a standard Greek hero, overpowers the visibly different and inferior Egyptians. There is, by contrast, no such ridicule or distinction with Trojans. They may appear in more eastern-style clothing, but this simply makes them more recognizable as non-Greek, indicating a growing awareness of such distinctions and, as Bérard suggests, an interest in the other.\textsuperscript{127} The Trojans become assimilated into the iconographic markers of eastern figures, but this does not necessarily imply an all-out assimilation of Trojans into Persians.\textsuperscript{128}

Andromache and Hecuba along with other unidentified women do not appear to have been given eastern attributes, although their appearance on vases is not extensive. Hecuba in particular was not a popular subject, nor is she always easily identifiable when she does appear.\textsuperscript{129} There are more images of Andromache, though she too was not a particularly popular subject for the vase painters.\textsuperscript{130} Touchefeu-Meynier goes so far as to describe her as a merely secondary character (“de toute evidence, A. n’est qu’un personage très secondaire”), and to say that the expression of grief is her only purpose in the images: “elle n’existe, en effet que pour pleurer.”\textsuperscript{131} In the extant images, as in the \textit{Iliad}, Andromache is always shown in association with Hector, either with him while he lives or grieving for him after his death.

\textsuperscript{126} The appearance of the Egyptians is also suggestive of comedy and its exaggeration of the body. See further Foley (2000).

\textsuperscript{127} Bérard (2000) 395 stresses that this interest is not only because the other is considered inferior. On the other hand, Miller (2000) 441-2 suggests that Busiris and his attendants are deliberately Persianized, and that in the fifth century ethnic markers of non-Persians were “distorted” to be more Persian. This, she continues, marks the dominance of the Persians as the “perfect foil” against which the Greeks identified themselves.

\textsuperscript{128} The assimilation is rarely complete, according to Anderson (1997) 106, and it is unusual to find a “one-to-one correlation” in the depiction of Trojans and Persians, even though Trojans “sometimes fell on the other side of the racial divide.”

\textsuperscript{129} “H. n’est jamais la figure principale,” according to Laurens (1988) 480, and she is often used by herself or with other women to indicate grief and loss.

\textsuperscript{130} Touchefeu-Meynier (1981) 773 points out that this is in spite of her being identified in art from the sixth century BCE to the sixth century CE.

\textsuperscript{131} Touchefeu-Meynier (1981) 773.
One image that is highly resonant with the Homeric depiction of Andromache is from a sixth-century black-figure krater by the Inscription Painter (fig. 2).\(^{132}\) Hector and Andromache are the central figures, flanked on the right by an unnamed man identified by Woodford as Hector’s squire on horseback and on the left by Paris and Helen.\(^{133}\) The difference in mood between the two couples is palpable. Helen turns away from Paris as he approaches her and is covering herself with her cloak in an unreceptive posture. Andromache, on the other hand, stands facing Hector, with one hand reaching towards him and her cloak open in a comfortable, familiar posture that reflects the same kind of open relationship they are depicted as having in book six of the *Iliad*.\(^{134}\) While the image is not necessarily Iliadic, the similarity of theme and characterization is clear.

---

\(^{132}\) Woodford (1993) figure 64, Chalcidian black-figure krater, ca. 540-530 BCE, Inscription Painter, Würtzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum.

\(^{133}\) Woodford (1993) 71.

\(^{134}\) As Woodford (1993) 71 says, “sometimes pictures can be elegant all on their own, but at other times we have to know what their creator had in mind before we can appreciate their full impact.” It is, of course, impossible to state that the artist of this particular krater had *Iliad* Book six in mind when painting this scene. It does suggest, however, that the marital affection between Hector and Andromache expressed in Homer was a theme known to others. As Hedreen (2001) suggests, artists were most likely to have been influenced, if they were influenced by literature in any way, not by one poem or one version of a poem but by a memory of an oral recitation (see 3-21).
In the extant evidence of red and black figure vases the Ilioupersis is a popular theme.\textsuperscript{135} In the images of the fall of Troy, the painters frequently show the barbarity of the Greeks to a degree that they do not show in depictions of ‘others’\textsuperscript{136} Female figures, whether identified or not, have an important role in these images as markers of grief. The Vivenzio hydria, attributed to

\textsuperscript{135} Vases with Trojan themes were produced “repeatedly and continually from the mid-sixth to mid-fifth century,” according to Anderson (1997) 179.

\textsuperscript{136} Bérard (2000) 407. According to Bérard, even after the defeat of the Persians, Attic painters do not show the “wholesale supremacy of Greek values” (394).
the Kleophrades painter (fig. 3 a&b),\textsuperscript{137} is a good example of this because it is one of the more comprehensive images of the sack of the city. It includes major elements of the sack of Troy, such as the slaughter of Priam by Neoptolemus (fig. 3a) the dead Astyanax (fig. 3a), the rape of Cassandra (fig. 3b), and Aeneas escaping with Anchises and Ascanius (fig. 3b, far left). There are seven women in this image including the statue of Athena, which raises shield and spear in a protective gesture over Cassandra. Another woman is identified as Aithra being rescued by her grandsons (not shown),\textsuperscript{138} and behind the grandsons sits an unidentified woman holding her head in one hand.\textsuperscript{139}

Cassandra is shown holding onto Athena’s statue with one hand as Ajax is about to drag her from it by the hair while holding a drawn sword in his other hand. Cassandra’s outstretched hand indicates supplication and creates a sense of helplessness on her part and emphasizes the frightful power that Ajax has over her. Her nudity draws attention to both the sexual nature of Ajax’ attack against her and physical vulnerability. The scene is given even greater pathos by the two women on the other side of Athena’s statue, one sitting on the statue base and the other under a weeping palm (fig. 3a, far left; fig. 3b, far right).\textsuperscript{140} Both women sit in a posture of grief, head in hands. The juxtaposition of the violent rape of Cassandra with the scene of the two defeated and grieving women heightens the sense of Trojan loss and Greek violence by showing the helplessness and despair of the Trojans.

\textsuperscript{137} Naples, Museo Nazionale, 2422: Beazley ARV\textsuperscript{2} 189, 74.
\textsuperscript{138} Boardman (1976) 8.
\textsuperscript{139} Ferrari (2000) 123 notes that the rescue of Aithra on the far right of the hydria and the departure of Aeneas and family on the far left frame “the central scene of murder and mayhem.”
\textsuperscript{140} Woodford (1993) 116 states that the palm “bows in sympathy with the sufferings of the city.”
The final woman on this vase is sometimes identified as Andromache, even though there is nothing to concretely identify her thus (fig. 3a, far right). This woman is in a markedly different posture than the other women, for instead of sitting weeping or resisting attack she is wielding a
staff of some sort against a Greek.\textsuperscript{141} It is a bold move, perhaps suggesting the desperation that has descended upon the Trojans. It is significant that it is a woman who is shown as the only Trojan aggressor in this image since, with the departure of Aeneas and his family and the impending death of Priam, women are all that remain in the city. This woman, whoever she is, performs one final act of resistance in defense of herself and her city, even though she is surrounded by the evidence of the futility of her attempt.

The spirit of resistance embodied by the woman on the vase colours the Euripidean portrayal of Trojan women, manifested in different ways. Andromache resists the attempts of Hermione and Menelaus to kill her and her son in \textit{Andromache}; Hecuba rebels against the continued loss of her children in \textit{Hecuba}; and Hecuba continues to challenge the Greeks through rhetoric in \textit{Trojan Women}. The Kleophrades painter captured both the grief at the loss of the city and freedom of the women and the feisty resilience that makes the women interesting and complex tragic characters.

\textit{The lost evidence: Trojan men}

The men of Troy dominate the epic and historiographic record, but are virtually absent from the extant tragedies.\textsuperscript{142} Titles of lost or fragmentary tragedies seem to suggest that Trojan men were not completely absent from tragedy, and in this section I will discuss the evidence we do have. The nature of the fragmentary evidence demonstrates that the characterization of the Trojans was much more complete and nuanced than the non-fragmentary evidence suggests. Most importantly, it indicates that the fifth-century interest was not exclusively the enslaved Trojan women or the aftermath of the fall of Troy, but that the entire story of the ill-fated city and its royal family held an important place in the literary repertoire of the Athenians. Despite the

\textsuperscript{141} See Touchefeu-Meynier (1981) 773. Based on all other evidence for Andromache’s character, literary and iconographic, it seems as though this woman cannot be her, since we have seen her as an emblem of marital obedience and grief. If this is her, it is a departure from her traditional characterization. A woman performing a similar action on an early fifth-century cup by the Brygos Painter, however, is identified as Andromache according to Boardman (1976) 8.

\textsuperscript{142} The exceptional Phrygian slave in Euripides’ \textit{Orestes} is the subject of chapter 5.
frustration inherent in having no more than titles and minuscule fragments, the lost evidence indicates one crucially important fact: the Athenian playwrights devoted a great deal of attention to Troy. This confirms that the study of Trojan characters, as narrow as the evidence forces it to be, is an important aspect of the study of tragedy.

In his *Poetics*, Aristotle lists ten titles of tragedies that could be written from the material in the *Little Iliad*, from which six may have Trojan characters, but there is no guarantee that this is true.\(^{143}\) This example demonstrates the difficulty of determining how many tragedies from the fifth century treated in any significant way Trojan characters, and serves as a reminder that the Trojan War in general was a popular theme but that the Greek characters were just as, if not more, interesting to tragedians and their audiences than Trojans. A glance through the volumes of fragmentary tragedies shows precisely how popular Trojan War themed tragedies were, and some titles make it easy to assume that Trojan characters were indeed the central focus. Aeschylus’ and Sophocles’ *Alexandros*, for example, must surely have had the Trojan prince as a main character, though the fragments in each case are so few that both the plot and *dramatis personae* are impossible to determine. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that the interest in the war and in Trojans was more widespread in tragedy than our extant evidence indicates. Moreover, if the fragmentary evidence were more complete and gave a better idea of the nature of the plots, it would perhaps provide us with a different concept of Trojans in fifth-century thought.

Euripides’ *Alexandros* is the most extensive fragmentary play with Trojan characters, and a fairly extensive hypothesis (T iii Kannicht) tells that Paris, who had been exposed as a baby, returns to Troy twenty years later and is not recognized. He is allowed to compete in the games that are held in his memory where he angers Deiphobos by his victory and is about to be killed by Hecuba when she somehow recognizes him as her child. Most of the extant fragments are book fragments, primarily from Stobaeus, and are therefore gnomic in sentiment. The fragments are particularly concerned with slavery and the difference between being a slave by nature and by position (e.g. 57 Kannicht). The papyrus fragments are less well preserved in

\(^{143}\) *Poetics* 1459b 4-7. From the *Little Iliad*: *Judgment of Arms, Philoctetes, Neoptolemus, Eurypylus, Vagabonds, Laconian Women, Sack of Troy, Embarkation, Sinon, Trojan Women.*
general than the book fragments, and difficult to interpret. For example, the fragments from the Strasbourg papyrus include the discussion between Deiphobos and Hector (62a Kannicht) in which the two clearly disagree about how to react to the outcome of the games, but it is difficult to say anything more with certainty. Even with the comparatively large amount of text it is difficult to make any determinations about characterization. We see the most of Deiphobos and Hector, and there seems to be a distinction between them, with Hector appearing to be the less hostile and aggressive brother. Hector seems to demonstrate a sense of comfort in his own status so that he does not feel threatened by the unknown competitor. He is a prince, the eldest son of Priam, and seems to be comfortable in allowing others to excel (62a&b Kannicht). The play must end with the return of Paris into the family, despite the warnings of Cassandra, and would therefore have been heavily ironic as the audience could contrast the happy reunion on stage with the knowledge of the eventual destruction of the city.

Euripides’ fragmentary *Philoctetes* is also of interest to this discussion. Much of what we are able to reconstruct regarding the plot and characters of this incarnation of the play comes from Dio 52, in which Dio compares the three tragedians’ versions of *Philoctetes*. The interesting element of Euripides’ play for this discussion is that it contains a Trojan embassy and at least one speaking Trojan character. This character appears to be nameless, which places him in a unique category of having the authority to conduct such a mission (not a nameless slave such as we shall see in chapter 5), yet not a known Trojan character from the royal family or their direct associates (as in *Alexandros* and *Rhesus*). Amidst the fragments is one short selection from the Trojan’s speech (794 Kannicht), which seems to be part of the opening remarks of his rhesis in what appears to be an agon with Odysseus. The Trojan speaker urges Philoctetes not to shrink from profit, indicating that he has offered Philoctetes some sort of reward for going to Troy with his bow.144 Odysseus must counter this plea for help from the Trojan with an entreaty to patriotism and the Trojan embassy must be rejected by Philoctetes and return to Troy. Regrettably, Dio tells us nothing regarding how this happened or regarding the characterization of the Trojans. One question to which we have no answer is whether the Trojan’s attempt to persuade Philoctetes portrayed in a better or worse manner than Odysseus’ deceitful

144 This is confirmed by Dio 52.13.
manipulation of Philoctetes through disguise?\textsuperscript{145} That is, would it have been considered more deceitful to openly offer wealth in return for a favour or to attempt persuasion by means of deceit? It is easy to assert that Euripides presented a caricature of the Eastern Trojans by emphasizing their wealth, but there is nothing to confirm that it is not Odysseus’ deception that was shown to be more contemptible.\textsuperscript{146} More importantly, moreover, is that Trojans are present at all in Euripides’ version at all, indicating an interest in these characters.

\textsuperscript{145} Dio 52.5 tells us that Odysseus was disguised in the Euripidean version of the play.

\textsuperscript{146} There is iconographic evidence that appears to be closely linked to this play, but it is from the second century, and so not necessarily evidence of how the play might have looked in the fifth century. There are three similar Etruscan urns (\textit{LIMC} Alexandros 102 [fig. 4a]; Odysseus/Uthuze 34 [fig. 4b], 36 [fig. 4c]) that depict Philoctetes in the middle flanked by two men on each side. On the least damaged urns (figures 4a & 4c), the men closest to Philoctetes on either side are wearing Phrygian caps, marking them as members of the Trojan embassy. Because these examples are so late, however, we cannot use them as evidence that Euripides’ original Trojans wore such costumes.

\textit{Fig. 4a. Philoctetes and Trojan embassy?}
Judging from the titles of lost plays, Sophocles and Aeschylus were equally interested in the events surrounding the Trojan War. Unfortunately, the fragments of their Trojan-themed plays
are even more difficult to interpret than Euripides’ *Alexandros*, and many do not appear to have many Trojan characters. Still, Aeschylus wrote an *Alexandros* and a play entitled *Phrygians*, about which we know virtually nothing. The one thing we do know about *Phrygians* comes from Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, where we learn that Achilles sat on stage in silence with his head veiled for a long time. Once again, there is nothing about the characterization of the Trojans. We have more titles for Sophocles that must have had Trojan characters (*Alexandros*, *Andromache*, *Hermione*, *Laocoon*, *Polyxena*, *Priamos*, *Sinon*, and *Troilus*), but with no indication as to how the characters were portrayed. Although no conclusions can be drawn from these titles, and though it is next to impossible to determine how Trojan men were treated in fifth-century tragedy, it is nevertheless important to note that they did in fact appear in fifth-century tragedy. The extant evidence for Trojan characters, which will be discussed in the following chapters, does not, therefore, provide a complete sense of these characters, but only one aspect of them.

Before leaving the fragmentary material and moving on to discuss the single appearance of a Trojan royal man in tragedy, there is one further point worthy of note. Euripides’ *Telephus* treats the Trojan theme indirectly and does not contain any Trojan characters, but it provides an interesting contrast for Trojan characters. Telephus occupies an in-between ethnic position as the son of Heracles and Auge, the daughter of the king of Tegea, but ends up in Mysia in Asia Minor. Telephus himself draws attention to the liminality of his position in the prologue:

147 Aeschylus’ *Judgment of Arms, Palamedes, Philoctetes*, for example. It is more difficult to determine whether or not Trojan characters appeared in the plays of Sophocles. In his *Hermione*, for example, it seems likely that Andromache would be a character, but impossible to tell, and in his *Eurypylus* Priam is mentioned but may or may not be a character.

148 911ff.

149 Clearly Paris was a popular character, and his story a popular one to tell, since all three playwrights devoted an entire play to him.

150 Trojans continued to be characters in fourth-century tragedy as, for example, in Astydamas’ *Hector*. See Taplin (2009) and Hall (2007).

151 How Telephus comes to Mysia is uncertain. He either went with his mother when she was sent away by her father, or he went later by himself. In Euripides’ version, Telephus says in the prologue that he reached Mysia, found his mother there and stayed (“ἠλθόν δὲ Μυσῶν πεδίον, ἐνθ’ ἐ<ν> ρῶν ἐμὴν/μητέρα κατοικῶ…” 9-10). The lack of detail about his journey there
“Ἑλλην δὲ βαρβαροίων ἡρχον” (“although a Greek I led barbarians” 14). This establishes the question of identity from the beginning and suggests that it will be an important theme throughout.

And yet, instead of being a tale of conflict between East and West, Telephus tells of ethnic unity and reconciliation. Telephus was wounded by Achilles when the Greeks mistakenly attacked Mysia, thinking it was Troy. According to the Delphic oracle, he can only be healed by Achilles, and he is also destined to be the Greeks’ guide to Troy, which creates a complex relationship between Telephus and the Greeks that comprises past enmity and future collaboration with the complication presented by Euripides of Telephus, having disguised himself as a beggar, seizing the baby Orestes and holding him hostage at sword-point until his wound is healed. The two sides must put aside hostilities and Telephus must both be accepted by the Greeks and learn to be Greek again. Because of this fated end, Telephus is an important contrast with the Trojans since his Greek ethnicity and the Delphic oracle citing his importance in the war against Troy are the only things that connect him to the Greeks. There is a history of animosity between them based solely on Telephus’ life in Mysia and the events that transpired there. He fought the Greeks because they attacked Mysia.

The resolution of events in Telephus come about only because of the need on both sides for help from the other, suggests that the destination and what occurred thereafter is more important than the events that led up to it.

Collard, Cropp and Lee (1995) 24-5 discuss whether the threat to Orestes occurred on or off-stage. They conclude that Aristophanes’ parodies of the scene “make it overwhelmingly likely” that it was included in the on-stage action (24).

An interesting comparison is the new Archilochus fragment, in which the battle at Mysia and Telephus’ routing of the Greeks is described. The fragment does not appear to indicate interest in Telephus’ ethnicity, but seems to use the episode of the Greek flight as a mythological exemplum of flight in battle. If there is any concern about his background, it is in his semi-divine parentage since Heracles is mentioned towards the end of the fragment as being present and helping his son (line 21). For the fragment’s editio princeps see Obbink (2005). It also appears in Obbink (2006) and (with some emendations) West (2006). Both Obbink (2006) and West (2006) note the likelihood of the fragment being a mythological exemplum of flight in battle. This new fragment seems to indicate that, in Archilochus’ time at least, it was possible to exclude any mention of Telephus’ ethnicity while in fifth-century tragedy, ethnicity had become an important point of characterization.
and so it is a good example, with the apparent focus on ethnicity as the unifying factor, of the fluid nature of ethnicity and culture in the formulation of identity. When, as in Telephus, it is convenient to emphasize ethnicity it can be done with great effect and not diminish the effect of the portrayal of sympathetic ethnic others, such as the Trojans. It also demonstrates an interest in liminal characters since Telephus stands astride the line between Greek and barbarian, having lived at least part of his adult life as a non-Greek and as a military opponent to the Greeks. Turning now to the Trojan characters in tragedy, I suggest that there is a similar liminality inherent in them, but one that focuses on their culture instead of their ethnicity.

Rhesus: towards an interpretation

Rhesus stands alone in the corpus of extant tragedy. Its authorship and authenticity are hotly debated, and it is criticized for being nothing more than an adaptation of an episode of book ten of the Iliad. The scholarship on the play has focused primarily on its peculiarities and has allowed it to be largely ignored as a worthwhile object of study, with the result that its content and characters and anything they may tell us about cultural biases are left unexamined. There are two closely related important aspects of Rhesus for the purposes of this discussion. The first is that it is the only extant tragedy featuring Trojan men. As such, it is important to digress momentarily from the more central question of the portrayal of Trojan women in tragedy to

154 Ritchie (1964) states that the playwright simply “expands” some lines of the Iliad to make Rhesus. There is an ongoing concerning the authenticity of the Rhesus and its date. Ritchie (1964), in what remains the most thorough discussion on the topic, does not take a definite position but concludes that there is no way of determining absolutely whether it is Euripidean or not even though “external sources yield no evidence against the authenticity of Rhesus” (346). He does, however, argue that if it is Euripidean, “it is an early work” (344), and even “the earliest of Euripides’ extant works” (361). For a lively discussion of the tragedy, see also Burnett (1985), who places the Rhesus in the mid-fifth century as the earliest of Euripides’ extant plays and Euripides as author. This conclusion is drawn from her reading of the tragedy as a parody (“a young man’s art”) both of war and of tragedy (50-1). Grube (1941) describes the language as “thoroughly Euripidean” (439), and Goosens (1932) cites political references in the text as his reason for insisting on a fifth-century date. Lesky (1965) argues for a fourth-century date and altogether “post-classical” in nature (201). Ferguson (1972) declares that the Rhesus is probably the work of a “fourth-century imitator” (488), and Bond (1996) states that it is “so inferior that it could not possibly be from the hand of Euripides” (255). For tragedy in the fourth century more generally see Easterling (1993), Hall (2007), West (2007).
examine the portrayal of Hector in *Rhesus*. I will focus on Hector’s character because, as we have seen, he is the character through whom the women in the *Iliad* are most strongly characterized. The second important aspect of *Rhesus* is its seemingly unique position as a tragedy based closely on part of the *Iliad*.\(^{155}\) The connection between these two aspects is the fact that we do not know whether the Trojan men in *Rhesus* have not become Persianized because of the closeness of the text to the *Iliad* or not. Moreover, if the characters are as closely based on the Homeric characters as the plot is, how representative of Trojan men in tragedy is the *Rhesus*? Our dearth of evidence for Trojan men in tragedy makes this an impossible question to answer, but the evidence presented in the *Rhesus* makes it a necessary question to pose. In this section, I will make no excuses for the oddities of the tragedy, nor judge its merits or attempt to settle the debate on whether or not it is in fact a tragedy by Euripides or by an unknown author.\(^{156}\) Instead, my goal is to illuminate its unique qualities as a generically liminal tragedy with an ethnically liminal central character, Hector, as a way of examining the way that Trojan men could be presented in tragedy.

*Rhesus*, through an engagement and discussion with the epic world by evoking resonances of book ten of the *Iliad*, presents a new kind of Trojan, one that has left the more egalitarian context of Homeric epic, but who has not been transformed into a contemporary Persian. The evocation of the epic representation of this event helps to highlight the ways that the tragedy is different from other extant tragedies and how it presents a re-evaluation of Troy and the Trojans and allies who fought there. The opening of *Rhesus* is highly evocative of the opening of *Iliad*

\(^{155}\) It seems to be unique only because we do not have enough tragedies to say conclusively that there are no other fifth-century examples (if it is a fifth-century tragedy) of such a closeness to Homeric material with the exception of the * Cyclops*, a satyr play. See Taplin (2009) for a discussion of Astydamas’ fourth-century *Hector*, which Taplin argues “set itself up in simultaneous affinity and contrast with both Homer and the great tragedians of the fifth century” (263). In the fifth-century, even Sophocles who was considered to be the most Homeric of the tragedians diverges from epic models. Easterling (1984) 8 states that Sophocles’ “highly individual response to Homer” helped to shape his work (she refers specifically to his *Ajax*).

\(^{156}\) The focus on the peculiarities generally aims at proving or disproving the Euripidean authorship of the play. Bond’s claim for the inferiority of the play is based on the opinion that it is “structurally awkward” and “dramatically unsatisfying” (1996, 255). There are, however, scholars who ignore the authorship debate altogether. Rosivach (1978), for example, writes without any mention of an author while attempting to prove the unity of the play created by Hector’s character.
Rhesus begins with the chorus of Trojan soldiers on night watch rushing to wake Hector to tell him of the activity they have observed in the Greek camp. After several lines of confusion, they finally say:

πῦρ’ αἴθει στρατὸς Ἀργόλας,

Έκτορ, πᾶσαι ἀν’ ὄρφαν,

dieipetή ἐν ναῶν πυροίσις σταθμά.

πᾶς δ’ Ἀγαμεμνονίαν προσέβα στρατὸς

ἐννύχιος θορύβῳ σκηνάν,

νέαν τιν’ ἐφιέμενοι

βάξιν.

The Greek army is burning watch fires, Hector, all through the night, and the ships’ mooring places are bright with torch gleam. The whole army by night comes in tumult to Agamemnon’s tent, desiring to hear some new report. (41-7)

Their observation of the fires burning is a reminder of Agamemnon’s observation of the fires in the Trojan camp:

ἡτοὶ οτ’ ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τροικὸν ἀθρήσει

θαύμαζεν πυρὰ πολλὰ, τὰ καίετο Ἕλλθι πρό,

---

157 Fenik (1964) remains the only extensive study of the connection between the Iliad and Rhesus. He examines the different versions of the Rhesus myth to try to determine whether the play is closer to the Iliadic version or to another version and concludes that it is closer to non-Iliadic versions in which Dolon does not feature. He argues that Dolon is necessary in the Iliad because book ten downsizes the role of Athena, the central divine figure of the myth.

158 Text and translation are Kovacs (2003).
In fact when he gazed toward the Trojan plain, he marveled at the many fires that burned before Ilium, and at the sound of the flutes and pipes, and the din of men.
(10.11-3)

The mention of the army gathered at Agamemnon’s tent is a direct allusion to the meeting of leaders that takes place at that same location in *Iliad* Book ten. This also evokes the *Iliad* because it quickly becomes apparent that the Trojans are camped on the plain as they are in *Iliad* Book ten. The Trojans camped outside and the chorus observing the Greek meeting from the *Iliad* establishes the scene for the audience: the play begins after the Trojan victories that have given Hector the confidence to keep the troops out from behind the walls. The *Rhesus* playwright, however, ensures that he removes this Iliadic scene from epic and places it unmistakably in tragedy by having the chorus report the Greek fire in their parodos. From the beginning, therefore, the audience is presented with a tragedy that is firmly centered in the epic tradition.

Just as the play is generically liminal, straddling, as it were, the line between epic and tragedy, Hector, the central character, is also in a position of ethnic liminality. As a Trojan, I argue, he is neither Greek nor truly barbarian, and this allows the playwright to present a complex and unresolved image of leadership and ethnic identity that is not possible to achieve with characters of other ethnicities. The best way of discussing Hector’s ethnic characterization and to determine whether or not he is vilified is to examine the scene in which Hector and Rhesus meet, upon Rhesus’ arrival.

Hector and Rhesus, both non-Greek characters, engage in a dialogue that establishes the difficulty of Hector’s position of having to lead effectively over different kings from different

---

159 According to Fantuzzi (2005), however, *Rhesus* alludes more to *Iliad* Book eight, drawing particular attention to Hector’s speeches at *Rhesus* 56-8 and *Iliad* Book eight. 498-501.
countries, which is alluded to in the *Iliad* when Glaucus criticizes his leadership. He must unite the many different groups to fight together, but he is also dealing with independent kings whom he must be careful not to offend or risk losing their support. In his dialogue with Rhesus, Hector is demonstrated to be willing to put aside his personal inclinations for what is perceived to be the benefit of his people. Earlier in the play, Aeneas is able to persuade him against an assault against the Greeks, but Hector’s yielding to Rhesus is different. Whereas Aeneas presents his arguments with no personal attachment and argues merely for the sake of the good of the Trojan prospects, Rhesus, on the other hand, is entirely personal. But before examining the conversation between the two men, Rhesus’ introduction is worth considering.

Rhesus is barbarized in this tragedy, starting with the messenger who introduces him. At 264 the shepherd messenger enters and addresses Hector: “ἄναξ, τοιούτων δεσπότων ἄγγελος / εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν οἷς οἱ φέρω μαθεῖν” (“My lord, I wish that I may always bring such news to my masters as I am now bringing for you to hear!”). A peculiar exchange follows in which Hector is dismissive of the shepherd, not understanding that he has come with news of something other than his livestock (266-74). When he is finally able to deliver his news, Hector, the chorus, and the audience learn of the arrival of Rhesus and his Thracian army, a most magnificent sight to behold:

… ὁρῶ δὲ Ἡρόον ὡστε δαίμονα

ἐστῶτ’ ἐν ἵπποις Θηριῶις τ’ ὁχήμαιοι.

χρυσῆ δὲ πλάστιξ αὐχένα ζυγφόρον

πῶλον ἐκλημε χίόνος ἕξαυγεστέρων.

πέλτη δ’ ἐπ’ ὄμων χρυσοκολλότωις πύποις

ἐ’ Γοργών δ’ ὡς ἐπ’ αἰγίδος θεᾶς

---

160 *Iliad* 16.538-47. This is not unique to Hector. Agamemnon, too, has difficulties with the varying kings fighting under his authority. Indeed, without the conflict of kingly egos the *Iliad* would not exist.
χαλκῆ μετώποις ἱπποίῳ πρόοδεος
πολλοῖς σὺν κώδωσιν ἔκτυπει φόβον.

And then I saw Rhesus mounted like a god behind his horses in his Thracian chariot. A yoke of gold restrained the necks of his steeds, which gleamed brighter than snow. The light shield on his shoulder flashed with a boss of beaten gold. A Gorgon of bronze, like that on Athena’s aegis, glared from its place on the horses’ cheekpieces and with its many bells struck a note of fear.

(301-8)

In the *Iliad*, Troy is by all accounts a rich city, and in *Rhesus*, too, Hector speaks of its riches in his exchange with Dolon,\(^{161}\) but nowhere in *Rhesus* is abundant wealth put on display as much as with the description of Rhesus. The description of his appearance is ostentatious, especially in comparison to the drab and dirty Trojans who have been fighting all day and are now camped on the field. More importantly, however, is that the first thing the audience learns about the newly arrived king is his splendid appearance. He does also arrive with countless troops, but his own person, “ὡς δαιμόνα” (“like a god,” 301), is the image with which we are first presented. This image is presented to Hector, who has been fighting all day and is now camped for the night far from the comforts of home. The visual comparison between the clean, shining Rhesus and the grimy Trojans would be striking. Furthermore, even though Hector, too, is rich it would establish Rhesus as the opulent barbarian other, strutting into battle in his finest gear.

The chorus immediately recognize this new arrival as a benefit to their situation (317-8), but Hector becomes defensive instead. His words reveal, however, that it is not that he does not want Rhesus’ help, but that he resents his late arrival. He rebels against the implication that the forces which have been there from the beginning are not strong enough to maintain pressure against the Greeks. This is one of the ways in which Hector’s character is shown to be unable to read the situation. His focus is on himself primarily: his concerns, his plans, his ego. It is left to

\(^{161}\) line 169.
the other characters to guide him towards an understanding of how best to handle the situation. Even before Rhesus arrives on stage, the chorus and the messenger have to convince Hector to receive him as an ally, which he finally does at 339-41. Rosivach identifies this as a pattern of behaviour in Hector’s character in which “he initially chooses one course of action in an unthinking fashion and for what we might call ‘wrong’ or ‘base’ motives, but is then persuaded by others to put aside his ‘base’ motives and rationally to adopt an alternate course based on ‘higher’ motives.”\textsuperscript{162} However, it is more helpful to interpret his actions as selfish rather than ‘wrong’ or ‘base’. This may seem to be an insignificant difference, but by emphasizing Hector’s isolating selfish attitude instead of placing a value judgment on his motives, we are able to interpret his character as resonating with his Homeric predecessor. Rosivach also describes this individualistic attitude of Hector’s as entirely separate from the \textit{Iliad}, and created specifically for this tragedy. As we have seen above, however, this is an important echo of the Homeric Hector. Moreover, it is crucial for the re-casting of his character in tragedy that he is shown to be willing to be guided by the advice of others: he is still a prince of Troy, but he listens not only to the advice of other princes, but to the people represented by the chorus and the messenger. These may not be the best advisors, but they act as representatives of the common people. That he will listen to them is also an evocation of the Homeric Hector in that, there, too, he is concerned with protecting his people.

The arrogance attributed to Rhesus makes Hector’s willingness to yield to the advice of his men stand out more. Hector appears to be struggling to operate both within the epic system, in which princes and kings deal primarily with each other, and the tragic system, in which princes and kings are shown to be flawed and often in need of a democratic platform to clean up the mess made by their oligarchic, aristocratic tendencies. This struggle between epic and tragedy highlights the differences between the genres, and it demonstrates the importance of Trojan characters – only with them is it possible to present the full extent of ethnic ambiguities. They are non-Greek, but, as the comparison between Hector and Rhesus shows, they are not utterly

\textsuperscript{162} Rosivach (1978) 55 further argues that Hector is ‘tested’ in these situations to determine whether or not he will accept the logic that is presented to him or reject it outright and continue to act based on his ‘base’ motives.
depraved. As such, they are useful instruments in exploring themes surrounding not only identity but also governance.

The meeting between the two men is one of two barbarians only insofar as they are both non-Greek. Hector is able to call himself a barbarian along with Rhesus (404), but over the course of the conversation, it becomes clear that each has distinct characteristics and that only Rhesus is a barbarian in the pejorative sense. Both men are non-Greeks but the Trojan Hector still comes out looking better than Rhesus. Hector is able to deflect the potential impasse created by two stubborn characters, even though it is Rhesus who has his way in the end. Each man begins his speech to the other with a disclaimer, as Hector says “…φιλῶ λέγειν / τάληθες αἰεὶ κοῦ διπλοὺς πέφυκ’ ἄνήρ” (“…it is my custom always to speak the truth: I am not double-tongued” 394-5), and Rhesus responds “τοιοῦτός εἰμι καὐτός, εὐθείαν λόγων / τέμνων κέλευθον, κοῦ διπλοὺς πέφυκ’ ἄνήρ” (“I too am the sort of man who cuts a straight path in his speech: I am not double-tongued” 422-3). These are two men who claim to be straight talking and stepping away from the rhetorical skill. Indeed, their speeches are short (twenty-eight lines for Hector and thirty-one for Rhesus), but each is direct and pointed. Hector expresses his dissatisfaction with Rhesus for not having come sooner after having been sent for and having been placed on his throne by Hector (“καίτοι σε μικρὰς ἐκ τυραννίδος μέγαν / Θρῆκων ἀνακτὰ τῇ δ’ ἐθῆρ’ ἐγὼ χερί…” “And yet with this hand I made you the great king of Thrace instead of a petty chieftain…” 406-7). Rhesus in turn replies that he has been too busy protecting his own land from Scythian attacks to come sooner, but now that he has arrived he will singlehandedly end the war that the Trojans and other allies have struggled with for so many years. We might expect Hector to put up more of an argument against Rhesus’ arrogant and demeaning reply, particularly given how resistant he was to Rhesus’ arrival when it was narrated to him by the shepherd messenger, but he does not. He merely cautions Rhesus against assuming that the Greeks are easily conquered (477-8). His goal is now not to be right, but to protect his people and his city as he himself admits:

 ei τοῦ παρόντος τοῦδ’ ἀπαλλαχθεὶς κακοῦ
πόλιν νεμοίμην ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ποτ’ ἀσφαλῆ,
ἡ κάρτα πολλὴν θεοῖς ἄν εἰδείην χάριν.
If I can escape our present misfortune and rule the city securely, as I did before, I will be extremely grateful to the gods. (474-6)

For the sake of the safety of his people, Hector does not pursue an argument with Rhesus. Moreover, while he rebukes Rhesus for arriving so late, he himself is not boastful. Rhesus, on the other hand, does nothing but boast of his abilities. Not only will he conquer the Greeks, but he will take on their best warrior. He will not simply kill Odysseus, but he will impale him and leave him for the vultures to pick at. Everything about Rhesus is exaggerated, but instead of quarreling with him and escalating the hostilities between them, Hector remains disengaged. This creates a great distinction in their characters, presenting Rhesus as the arrogant, overbearing tyrant against Hector who, very much like his epic predecessor, is portrayed as wanting nothing more than to be the protector his people expect him to be.

Even though Hector is not transformed into a vilified barbarian prince, he is still not a Greek. He belongs to a third category, and as I turn to examine Trojan women in tragedy, I will argue that they too occupy a distinct ethnic category. The troubling point about Hector in Rhesus is that we do not know how representative his characterization is of Trojan men in tragedy. The meager evidence from the fragmentary Alexandros seems to indicate that the Trojan men in that play were not vilified, but too little remains to be certain. Because of the scarcity of evidence for Trojan men in tragedy, Trojan women will be the focus of the rest of this discussion.

In this chapter, I have demonstrated that in the Iliad, Trojan women, Hecuba and Andromache in particular, are characterized largely in relation to Hector in particular. Their portrayal in domestic contexts makes the Trojans familiar, recognizable characters, which collapses the distance between the Greeks and Trojans. The iconographers seem to have been less interested in depicting the women and more interested in the Ilioupersis. As we turn now to their appearances in tragedy, we move one step further to the experiences of the women after the Ilioupersis. Close attention must be paid to the women because, as my discussion of the fragments and Rhesus has indicated, there is only enough evidence for speculation regarding the depiction of Trojan men in tragedy. It will become clear that Euripides borrowed from the
Homeric depiction of the Trojan women, while adding depth to their characters by showing them in various difficult situations involving violence, death, and grief. The women were once defined by their relationships with the men in their lives. Euripides, while making many direct references to the dead men, shows them coping on their own and navigating their new servile status and their new relationships with their Greek captors. These new relationships provide ample opportunity for Euripides to expand the characters and to give them an independent voice.
Chapter 3
The Barbarian Within

This chapter examines the changing nature of the concept of barbarian and questions its exclusive association with the east, and Persia in particular. I will contrast Spartan and Trojan characters to demonstrate how the depiction of Trojans remains consistent, while the concept of barbarian changes during the Peloponnesian War. Euripides’ Andromache\textsuperscript{163} provides an excellent opportunity for examining this problem since it has Spartan characters, Menelaus and Hermione, alongside a Trojan, Andromache, and a non-Spartan Greek, Peleus. Through the interactions between the characters in this tragedy, the complex relationship between Athenians and others, both internal and external, begins to emerge. By comparing the portrayal of the Spartans Menelaus and Hermione with the Trojan Andromache I will demonstrate how the play constructs a direct contrast between them by drawing on perceptions of Spartans that were created in part by contemporary historians. After outlining how Spartans are constructed in ancient historical sources, I will further argue that acquired cultural behaviour and not ethnicity determines the positive or negative attributes of the characters in Andromache.

The idea of ‘Spartan’ that I will be employing is taken primarily from the writings of Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon, since those are good representations of the ideas about the Spartans that were circulating in Athens in the fifth century. It is not possible within the confines of this project to outline and discuss comprehensively the depictions of the Spartans in ancient sources, the problems surrounding the accuracy of the depictions, and to propose solutions to the problems. It suffices for the purpose of this discussion to select some key points that are relevant to the interpretation of Andromache that I will propose, and to acknowledge that this is

\textsuperscript{163} The date for the tragedy is commonly accepted as c. 425 for metrical reasons (see Lloyd (1994) 12; Stevens (1971) 18-9) and based on the scholion of line 445 that places it at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (Lloyd 11; Stevens 15-8).
not fully reflective of the great complexity and nuance in a comprehensive analysis of Spartans. This will allow me to ground my discussion of *Andromache* in the context of the contemporary discourse regarding Spartans while maintaining my focus on tragedy.

*The ‘Historical’ Spartans*

The different presentations of Sparta and Spartans in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon\textsuperscript{164} have helped to form what has become known as “the Spartan mirage” after the work of François Ollier.\textsuperscript{165} This mirage has caused serious problems in historiography and in modern perceptions of Spartans because most evidence about the Spartan world comes from the “wrong” side of the mirage, from beyond its borders.\textsuperscript{166} A distortion of facts relating to most aspects of Spartan life is almost guaranteed, given the distance at which even our ancient sources observed it. The mirage and the history reported from within it are useful, however, in promoting “Sparta as a political model, or paradigm, an imaginative or imaginary representation…”,\textsuperscript{167} or promoting Sparta as a creation, a myth. The ancient authors do not provide a definitive authoritative account of Spartanness, but different models of cultural stereotypes, which vary depending on the ideology of the author. This mirage is precisely what creates the complexity concerning Spartans. My purpose is not to detail the nuances of the representation of Spartans in historical works from the fifth century, but to establish a background against which *Andromache* can be read. I will therefore propose a set of assumptions about Spartans that will be helpful in reading

\textsuperscript{164} Plutarch is intentionally absent from this list even though his *Life of Lycurgus*, for example, is often considered to be an important source in Spartan historiography. My intention here is to understand how fifth-century authors thought about Spartans not how later authors interpreted those same sources.

\textsuperscript{165} What Ollier (1973) calls “le mirage Spartiate” is the idealization of Sparta that does not accurately reflect Spartan civilization. Instead, it is a creation in part by external observers, and in part by internal propaganda and self-imposed exclusion from pan-Hellenic activities beginning in the sixth century (16). There is some evidence from within Sparta, however. Osborne (1996) 177 proposes that the poet Tyrtaeus gives a “reasonably trustworthy picture of Sparta’s history.”

\textsuperscript{166} Cartledge (1999) 312.

\textsuperscript{167} Cartledge (1999) 313.
Andromache, focusing on three themes that are particularly relevant to it: tyranny, violence, and austerity.

The Spartans’ practice of oligarchy is perhaps the point at which they differ most dramatically from Athens, since so much of what we identify with fifth-century Athens stems from her democracy. Their own oligarchic tendencies are reflected in Herodotus and Thucydides’ accounts of Spartan desire to impose tyrannies or oligarchies on those whom they perceive to be a threat:

Τότε δὲ ὡς ἀνέλαβον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοὺς χρησμοὺς καὶ τοὺς Αθηναίους ὀφέλους σφιγμένους καὶ σφιγμός ἔτοιμους ἐντας πείθεσθαι οἰδίσσα, νῦν λαβόντες ὡς ἔλευθερον μὲν ἐδ' ὅ το γένος τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἵδρος ὑπὸ ἔως τοὺς ἄνθρωποι ἃν γίνοιτο, κατεχόμενον δὲ ὑπὸ τυραννίδος ἁσθενεῖς καὶ πειθαρχέοντο ἐτοίμον ...

And when the Spartans got hold of the oracles, and saw at the same time that the Athenians were increasing in power and that they were in no way ready to submit to their authority, they realized that a free Attica would be equally matched to them, and the only way of weakening them and making them ready to obey was through tyranny. (Herodotus 5.91.1)

καὶ οἱ μὲν Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐχ ὑποτελεῖς ἔχοντες φόρου τοὺς ἐνμάχους ἦγοντο, κατ' ὀλιγαρχίαν δὲ ὀφίσσαν αὐτοῖς μόνον ἐπιτηδείως ὡς πολιτεύσοντοι θεραπεύοντες ...

The Lacedaemonians ruled without keeping their allies tributary to them, but took care that these should be governed by an oligarchy advantageously to the Lacedaemonians alone. (Thucydides 1.19)\textsuperscript{168}

\textsuperscript{168} The text of Herodotus is Hude (1972); Thucydides is Jones (1900:1942).
Herodotus’ account is specifically associated with Athens and shows the Spartan reaction to a threat against its own position of authority, whereas Thucydides’ indicates that during the time in which he was writing, such behaviour was considered to be common. This practice indicates a desire among Spartans to impose their preferred means of governance on enemies and on states whose position seems to pose a threat to them, such as Athens during the Persian Wars.

The worry about maintaining their position of authority is closely related to the second Spartan character trait, harsh reaction to opposition. For states, it seems to have sufficed to impose a system of government that they could influence, at least in theory. For individuals, and for their massive population of helots in particular, strong physical punishment was the preferred method of discipline. Though it reached its most extreme form with the helots, Spartan violence was not restricted to them alone. At 8.84 Thucydides provides an account of free Syracusan and Thurian men reacting angrily to a threat of violence – a raised bakteria - against them by the Spartan commander Astyochus. Hornblower proposes that the bakteria is symbolic of the Spartan commander’s power and dominance over the underclasses and that among Spartans it was the norm for threats of violence to be issued by those in positions of authority. That this is a convention only used by the Spartans is made clear by the Syracusan and Thurian men’s reaction to it. Free non-Spartan men react angrily because they are not accustomed to being treated in such a manner.

The third theme of interest in this discussion is that of Spartan austerity, something in which, by all accounts, the Spartans took great pride. One of the points on which Xenophon places the most emphasis in his delineation of the Spartan way of life is on the lack of excess, which manifests itself in many different ways. Two such manifestations are in the areas of clothing and food, both showing how the Spartans were historically considered to prefer modesty and restraint over excess. With respect to clothing, Xenophon claims that “there is not even any need of money to spend on clothing: for they adorn themselves not for the extravagance of their clothes, but for the excellent condition of their bodies” (ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἵματιῶν γε ἔνεκα

———

169 See, eg. Thucydides 4.41, 4.80, 5.14 for Spartans fearing Helots and Helot revolts – esp. 4.80 for extreme measures to quell potential revolts.

170 Hornblower (2000) 70 calls the bakteria a visual reminder of potential violence that was meant to maintain discipline and obedience.
For food, a careful balance had to be achieved so that the Spartans could maximize their strength and productivity, whether they were men on the battlefield or women giving birth. This meant ensuring that everyone had just enough ("they were allotted food so that they were not over-full or lacking"); χρηματιστέον: οὐ γὰρ ἐσθήτος πολυτελείᾳ, ἀλλὰ σώματος εὐεξίᾳ κοσμοῦνται, Lak. Pol. 7.3). For food, a careful balance had to be achieved so that the Spartans could maximize their strength and productivity, whether they were men on the battlefield or women giving birth. This meant ensuring that everyone had just enough ("they were allotted food so that they were not over-full or lacking"); καὶ οὐτὸν γε ἔταξαν αὐτοῖς ως μήτε ὑπερτληθοῦσθαι μήτε ἔνδεεῖς γάγνεσθαι, Lak. Pol. 5.3), and is one of the ways that Sparta stands in direct opposition to Persia, as Herodotus reports at 9.82. After the battle of Plataea, Pausanias is said to have gone into Mardonius’ tent. Upon seeing the luxurious furnishings in the tent Pausanias asked the Persian cooks to prepare a typical meal, which he compared to a typical Spartan meal for a joke:

...when both meals were ready, Pausanias laughed and sent for the Greek commanding officers. When they arrived, pointing out the arrangement of the two tables, Pausanias said, “Men of Greece, I asked you here because I wanted to show you the folly of the Persian leader, who, living in this style came to Greece to rob us of our poverty.”

In this way, the Spartans are depicted as recognizing their different way of life and judging it to be superior. It is significant that this is the point at which Euripides seems to have his Spartan characters in Andromache diverge with the historical representation of Spartans and invest them with the luxurious style of living that was mocked by Pausanias in the passage from Herodotus.

171 Xenophon’s text is Marchant (1920).
Cultural Identity and Euripides’ Andromache

The above comments demonstrate the kinds of perceptions that an Athenian playwright or theatre audience member might have had about the Spartans, and are useful to have in mind in the discussion of Euripides’ *Andromache*. Along with the assumptions about Spartans I will also be making use of the distinction between ethnicity and culture as it is fully discussed in chapter 1. The key points to remember are how Hall defines and distinguishes the two categories. He calls an ethnic group a “self-ascribing and self-nominating social collectivity that constitutes itself in opposition to other groups of a similar order,”¹⁷² and a group that looks to “notions of kinship” whereas the “genetic reality of kinship is unimportant and often fictitious.”¹⁷³ ‘Trojan’ or ‘Hellen’ are ethnic markers denoting all those who consider themselves to be from the same place historically. They believe that the myths of Dardanus or Deucalion and Pyrrha, for example, speak to their shared history and provide proof of a connection based entirely on that shared history.

Cultural identity is different. According to Hall it is a “conscious reification of ideas, beliefs, values, attitudes, practices.”¹⁷⁴ In other words, it is to live according to a particular collective ideology, regardless of descent. This means that culture can be borrowed,¹⁷⁵ and it can also be learned. For the Athenians, cultural identity is what Pericles talks about in the funeral oration in book 2 of Thucydides: the system of values by which, ideally at least, the people in the community live, regardless of where they are from. It is the shared values and the act of living according to them that draws people together and gives them a sense of commonality. Nobody can learn to be Athenian ethnically, but, according to Pericles in Thucydides, Athens can still be the teacher of all of Greece.¹⁷⁶ It is culture that Athens teaches: how to think, how to govern,

¹⁷² Hall (2002) 9. Furthermore, this group is not necessarily static, but it and the categories by which its members define themselves can change over time.
¹⁷⁴ Hall (2002) 17. He gives the example of *romanitas* for cultural identity, since it is based not on the place of birth or of any shared history but on “the cultural communication of a legal-juridical status that lacked any concept of a common ethnic core” (23).
¹⁷⁶ Thucydides 2. 41.
how to wage war. And it is culture that becomes more significant than ethnicity in the self-identification of the Greeks in the fifth century.\textsuperscript{177}

Using these definitions, I will demonstrate here how the characteristics that were once associated with the East, and Persia in particular, cease to be applied exclusively on the grounds of ethnicity. Nevertheless, ethnicity remained a useful part of identity discourse because the construction of identity is a malleable and continual process with no fixed end. Therefore, the identity of a single group can be defined on different occasions using different qualifiers: language, religion, ethnicity, or culture. The qualifier used depends on what will best suit the author’s purpose, so while ethnicity may have fallen slightly out of fashion as the prime marker of identity in the fifth century, it could still be employed if an author deemed it necessary. With the rise of Athenian cultural hegemony, however, and with the Peloponnesian War creating enemies out of ethnically similar people, it became convenient to highlight culture as the defining factor in identity. With all this in mind, let us at last turn to \textit{Andromache}, a tragedy that perfectly exemplifies this trend towards the activation of cultural identity.

In \textit{Andromache}, the eponymous heroine is in an awkward position. After the fall of Troy, she finds herself in Phthia as a slave to Neoptolemus, son of Achilles, killer of Hector. She has borne her master a son but his wife Hermione is barren and suspects that Andromache is to blame. As the tragedy opens, Andromache has taken refuge in the shrine of Thetis under the threat of death from Hermione in Neoptolemus’ absence. Andromache’s appeals to Peleus for help have so far been unanswered and she fears for her life and the life of her son by Neoptolemus. Menelaus and Hermione use Andromache’s ethnicity as an excuse for their mistreatment of her. Hermione claims that Andromache’s ethnicity and the depravity that goes along with it, such as the use of witchcraft and magic, is what has led Andromache to use charms and spells to make her barren. It is actually Menelaus and Hermione, however, who have been barbarized in this tragedy, as they repeatedly demonstrate the baseness of their

\textsuperscript{177} Hall (2002) 198 argues that a rather complex thing begins to occur in fifth-century authors. \textit{Physis} is preferred over \textit{nomos}, not in terms of “vague concepts of ‘genetic’ heredity transmitted via descent groups but rather of environmental and climatic determinants; the promotion of ‘nature’ is not a return to ethnic definitions of identity.” He further argues that culture replaces ethnicity in the construction of self-identity in large part due to Athens, its actions as “the new self-appointed arbiter of cultural authenticity” (202; see also 198-220).
cultural identity. Starting with Menelaus, I will treat each character individually to show how they are consistently negatively characterized in contrast with Andromache.

Menelaus in *Andromache* might at first glance appear to share none of the qualities of the Spartans as constructed by historiographers. He involves himself in female squabbling, he intervenes in his married daughter’s affairs, but is ultimately ineffective and leaves when confronted by Peleus. He has also lavished his daughter with the luxurious clothes she flaunts at lines 147-52. So much for Spartan austerity. This, however, is precisely how Euripides makes the characters in this tragedy more closely resemble the Persians. But, upon closer inspection, Menelaus is found to have the other two typically Spartan qualities outlined above. He is tyrannical and fond of imposing his own tyrannical rule on others, and he is cruel and violent in his reaction to opposition.

Menelaus is militaristic and focused on winning at any cost, even employing deceit to lure Andromache from her suppliant position:

\[
\text{ἵν᾽ ἁγνὸν βωμὸν ἐκλίποις θεᾷς,}
\]
\[
\text{προὔτεινα παιδὸς θάνατον, ὦι ὦ ὑπήγαγον}
\]
\[
\text{ἐξ χεῖρας ἐλθεῖν τὰς ἐμὰς ἐπὶ σφαγήν.}
\]

I held out your son’s death so that you would leave the holy altar of the goddess, and used it to induce you to come into my hands for slaughter. (427-9)\(^{178}\)

He is also concerned about the advancement of his own ideals and running his son-in-law’s household as he would run his own, which he does not see as tyranny: “Are not my possessions his, and his mine?” (οὗκουν ἐκείνου τὰμὰ τὰκείνου τ᾽ ἐμά; 585), but Peleus does: “How so? Will you come here and take over my house? Is it not enough for you to rule those in Sparta?”

\(^{178}\) The text and translation of *Andromache* are Lloyd (1994).
Menelaus’ departure from the tragedy is also an indicator of his penchant for tyranny. There is an un-named city near Sparta (ου πρόσω/Σπάρτης πόλις τις) that is in revolt and he must put an end to it (733-6). This need not be seen as a weak-willed escape from Peleus nor as a desertion of Hermione, as scholars tend to interpret the scene.\(^{179}\) Menelaus’ words are explicit, even though he gives few details about the nature of the problem. He simply states that he does not have the time to argue endlessly with Peleus, and he will return once his problem has been solved to speak directly with Neoptolemus (737-9).\(^{180}\) There is nothing here that would necessarily cause an audience member to doubt Menelaus’ commitment to resolving this problem.\(^{181}\) His reason for leaving is vague because the audience does not need to know the specifics. It is sufficient to know that Menelaus is leaving to quell an uprising: Hermione and her problems with Andromache are not the only things occupying him and his yearning for control extends far.\(^{182}\) Based on his actions in *Andromache*, it should come as no surprise to an audience member that he intends to use force in order to establish control over the city in revolt, saying “I intend to lead an army against this city and subdue it” (τῇ δ’ ἐπέξελθεῖν θέλω/στρατηλατήσας χύποχείριον λαβεῖν, 735-6).

---

\(^{179}\) Allan (2000) 104; Lloyd (1994) 141 calls it “a feeble, *ad hoc* excuse”; Stevens (1971) 183 says that these lines are “unconvincing in matter,” and that Menelaus in this scene is “improvising and unsure of himself.”

\(^{180}\) Moreover, Hornblower (2000) 73-4 stresses that Spartans were harsh but highly disciplined. Perhaps the escalating argument with the elderly Peleus was no longer appropriate so Menelaus removes himself accordingly.

\(^{181}\) For the opposing view see Allan (2000) 104. Allan generally interprets Menelaus as a weak character who can only involve himself in female issues and who must flee even an aged hero like Peleus due to his cowardice. Kovacs (1980) disagrees, preferring to interpret Menelaus as momentarily defeated, and not a real match as a warrior for Peleus, but not a coward, either, stating that “there is nothing in the text to justify the common assumption that Menelaus has no intention of coming back” (70). Kovacs’ analysis is preferable because it allows for greater subtlety in Menelaus’ characterization, whereas Allan’s sees him as a mere caricature. Even though the Spartans in this tragedy may be depicted as culturally inferior, their characterization may still be complex.

\(^{182}\) Spartans were known for being fearful of helot uprisings, more than any other Greek city feared slave uprisings (Hornblower (2000) 69). Keeping this fearful nature of the Spartans in mind is helpful in analyzing Menelaus’ character: he is constantly looking over his shoulder to see who is rebelling, and constantly imposing his force so that he can minimize the revolts.
Menelaus’ cruelty and violence in *Andromache* are first displayed towards Andromache herself as he indicates the arrogance of his character in terms of intelligence, “you were found to be less clever than me, Menelaus,” (ἀλλ᾽ ἐφημερέθης/ὁσσον φρονούσα τοῦδε Μενέλεω, γύναι. 312-3) and in terms of ethnic superiority, “you, Peleus, ... say things shameful to yourself and insulting to me because of this barbarian woman...” (...οὐ Πηλεὺς ... αἷσθο ἀν ςαυτῶι λέγεις/ημίν δ᾽ ὀνείδη διὰ γυναῖκα βάρβαρον /τήνδ’ ... 647-50). He also displays a great deal of force towards her as he binds her wrists so that they bleed. Peleus is the first to remark upon this behaviour, indicating the unnecessary level of force used to contain Andromache:

| ὅδ’, ὦ κάκιστε, τῆσδ’ ἐλυμήνῳ χέρας; |
| βοῦν ἢ λέοντ’ ἠλπίζεις ἐντείνειν βρόχοις; |
| ἢ μὴ ἡλέφος λαβοῦσ’ ἀμυνάθοιτό σε |
| ἐδεισάς; |

So badly, scoundrel, have you mutilated her wrists? Did you think that it was an ox or a lion that you were knotting tight? Or were you afraid that she would take a sword and drive you off? (719-22)

Menelaus continues his harsh outbursts when opposed by Peleus in this way, demonstrating the aspect of the Spartan character that is overly concerned about gaining and maintaining control, authority, and power (589). Although this may have been considered standard Spartan behaviour, Euripides displays it in a most unflattering light, because the tyranny and the violence by which Menelaus is characterized is not used to crush a militaristic rebellion against his city or his leadership, but a supposed rebellion of one woman against his daughter and the intervention of his daughter’s grandfather-in-law. He is also overextending himself by having his hand in many different areas: Hermione’s problems, the uprising, the governance of his own city. Euripides has created a character who is tyrannical, violent, and lacking in any kind of austerity, so that he has all of the negative traits associated with Spartans and the luxury and
ornamentation associated with Persians. This amalgamation that Euripides presents as Spartan culture is Menelaus’ adopted culture, for he is not Spartan by birth but by marriage, yet he has learned Spartan ways.

Menelaus’ daughter Hermione behaves similarly to her father, demonstrating that learned culture crosses gender barriers. Like him, Hermione fits into the typical characterization portrait of Spartans while adding Persian features. First, she is, as much as a woman can be, tyrannically-minded as she publicly asserts control of the oikos in her husband’s absence by speaking her mind and defending her right to do so. Spartan women were more liberally educated and raised than most other Greek women, therefore a character portrayal of a woman who believes that she has the right to speak out against her husband is not entirely inappropriate. With her first words she firmly associates herself with her father, not with her husband, and with the display of her father’s wealth she claims the right to speak her mind against Andromache (147-53). Instead of assimilating to her new cultural milieu, she clings to her upbringing, reveling in her luxury and power. This attitude is strongly contrasted with Andromache’s ability to adapt to each new role she has been forced to assume in her life.

One of the ways that Hermione supports her claim of witchcraft against Andromache is by insisting on Andromache’s barbarian nature. She claims that such things are typical of women from the east (159-60) who are also, moreover, incestuous, murderous, and generally overly connected to their birth families at the expense of their marital families (174-6). Andromache fits this category not by participating in incest or murder but by sleeping with the son of the man who killed her husband, and thereby “undervaluing the marriage bond.”

Not to mention their reputation for beauty and impropriety, which they could trace as far back as Helen (Cartledge (2002) 12). This becomes a negative quality in the eyes of other Greek states, as they interpret this to mean that Spartan girls are of loose morals. See, for example, Peleus’ description of Spartan girls at Andromache 597-600. Furthermore, Euripides does not allow us to forget that Hermione is Helen’s daughter, at 229 and 248, for example.

Kovacs (1980) 57-8 interprets this as meaning that Hermione is championing the “human traits that are rational and acquired.” That is, she is claiming that Greece is ordered by customs such as marriage, whereas the barbarian countries act on unbridled impulses.
counters this claim by criticizing Hermione’s own behaviour in her marriage,\(^{185}\) and by contrasting it with the relationship she had with Hector:

ō φίλταθ’ Ἐκτορ, ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τὴν σὴν χάριν
σοί καὶ ξυνήρων, εἰ τί σε σφάλλοι Κύπρις,
καὶ μαστόν ἥδη πολλὰς νόθοιοι σοίς
ἐπέσχον, ἵνα σοι μηδὲν ἐνδοίην πικρόν.
καὶ ταῦτα δρῶσα τῇ ἀρετῇ προσηγόμην
πόσιν: σὺ δ’ οὐδὲ ὑανίδ’ ψαυθοίοις δρόσου
τῶν σοι προσίζειν ἀνδρὶ δεμαίνουσ’ ἐάις.

My dearest Hector, I even helped you in your love-affairs, to please you, if ever
Aphrodite tripped you up; and often offered my breast to your bastards, so as to cause
you no offence. By doing this, I drew my husband to me by my virtue; but you, in your
terror, do not even let a drop of the dew of heaven settle on your husband. (222-8)

Encouraging affairs and nursing Hector’s bastard children to keep him happy may seem
extreme, but it refutes Hermione’s attempt to show that Andromache does not value the
institution of marriage.

The things of which she accuses Andromache are in fact qualities that Hermione herself
possesses, creating a transference of values between the two women as Hermione displaces her
own family problems onto Andromache. That Hermione pejoratively calls Andromache a

\(^{185}\) 205-20, but note especially 205-6: “Your husband loathes you not because of any drugs of
mine, but because you are not a pleasant person to live with” (οὐκ ἐξ ἐμῶν σε φαρμάκων
στυγεῖ πόσις/ἀλλ’ εἰ ἔσθε ἵνα μὴ πιτηδεία νυφεῖς).
barbarian does not mean that Euripides is portraying her as such.\textsuperscript{186} It simply means that Hermione’s character in this tragedy views Andromache as inferior based solely on her ethnicity. Her words draw attention to ethnicity and barbarity (meaning not just non-Greek, but morally inferior), but her actions aid in her own characterization as a (morally inferior) barbarian. It is Hermione who is overvaluing her birth family at the expense of her marriage, and even when she later fears her husband’s reaction to her behaviour she continues to undervalue her marriage by leaving it as soon as she is given the opportunity with the appearance of Orestes (881). In all of her accusations and actions, she is vilifying herself, not Andromache. Andromache helps to make this evident as she rebuts each of Hermione’s sweeping statements regarding the impact of her ethnicity by pointing to the degeneracy of Hermione’s culture (236-60).

Hermione longs for control and is prone to violence like her father, two of the least appealing qualities attributed to the Spartans by historians. Also like her father, she is associated with a very Persian sense of luxury. It is possible, though in no way verifiable, that Hermione is easternized in an even more specific way if part of her finery is actually Trojan plunder.\textsuperscript{187} The wealth and luxury of her father’s home, which she speaks of as giving her the power to speak her mind (147-53), is not native Spartan wealth but Spartan wealth that has been increased by Trojan goods. Since language is not a marker of alterity in tragedy it is possible that costume was, particularly because Hermione draws explicit attention to her clothing as being golden, luxurious, and embroidered (κόσμον μὲν ἄμφι κρατὶ χρυσέας χλιδῆς/στολμὸν τε χρωτὸς τόνδε ποικιλῶν πέπλων... 147-8). She does not, however, explicitly indicate that it is Trojan finery that she wears, which makes this a difficult point to champion. In Athenian society after the Persian Wars there was a high probability for the appropriation of Persian goods. Margaret Erskine (2001) erroneously uses Hermione’s use of the word ‘barbarian’ at 261 as an example of how Trojans are routinely portrayed as barbarians in tragedy (73). He later notes that Andromache’s “noble stance” contradicts Hermione’s “denunciation” of her (75), but maintains his position that Trojans became barbarians in the fifth century.

\textsuperscript{186} Erskine (2001) erroneously uses Hermione’s use of the word ‘barbarian’ at 261 as an example of how Trojans are routinely portrayed as barbarians in tragedy (73). He later notes that Andromache’s “noble stance” contradicts Hermione’s “denunciation” of her (75), but maintains his position that Trojans became barbarians in the fifth century.

\textsuperscript{187} Saïd (2002) 66 argues that in tragedies that deal with the aftermath of the Trojan War, eastern, Trojan wealth is depicted visually as Greek plunder. “Thus Greece, which has become a haven of wealth, is no longer distinguishable from the Barbarian universe.” Although there is no way to determine how Hermione was costumed, this is an interesting point of speculation that demonstrates how multi-faceted the question of alterity could be.
Miller provides a nuanced analysis of the ambivalent relationship between Athens and Persia and she examines a variety of evidence from visual arts to demonstrate the integration of Persian objects and clothing into Athenian day-to-day life.\(^{188}\) She demonstrates that the Greeks appropriated some aspects of Persian culture, including clothing. This appropriation either decreases the foreignness of Persian culture and therefore the apparent differences between the two cultures or increases the sense of superiority of those doing the appropriating.\(^{189}\) Eastern dress on a Greek woman, therefore, is not unusual in itself after a victory in war and it is not entirely impossible that Hermione is wearing Trojan plunder. With this adoption of luxury items for her own use, in addition to her actions, Hermione would demonstrate that a Phrygianization of Sparta, not of Troy, has quite literally occurred.

What are the implications of all of this for Andromache? Is she more than just an exemplum of model behaviour and dignity opposite the harsh and cruel Spartans? Does her ethnicity have any bearing on her portrayal? Mythologically, the Trojans and the Spartans have a long history of enmity, and throughout the play Andromache’s ethnicity is stressed by both Hermione and Menelaus as frequently as is her servile status (for example, 170-6; 243; 261; 652). Just as the audience is continually reminded of Andromache’s ethnicity, they are continually confronted with examples of Spartans acting in cruel, vicious ways. Furthermore, Hermione’s luxurious clothing would create a remarkable visual contrast between the slave and the princess. This is not a comment on the degeneracy created by luxury items designed to emphasize the fact that Andromache is now humble because she is humbled in status and removed from such luxury. On the contrary, throughout the tragedy Andromache makes reference to her virtuous behaviour in her former life. She once wore the same kinds of clothing that Hermione now wears and had the same kind of power that Hermione has, but it did nothing to damage her demeanor. This is not, however, simply a contrast between model behaviour on the one hand and depravity on the other. It does demonstrate that ethnicity and clothing, the most immediate outward marker of ethnicity, do not necessarily make the woman.

---

\(^{188}\) For a complete discussion of Miller (1997) see chapter 1, 15-9.

\(^{189}\) According to Miller (1997) there are two methods of appropriation, which lead to subtly different outcomes. One is ‘domestication,’ whereby the reduction of alien goods to a level of familiarity reduces their power (249). The other is ‘symbolic domination,’ which “enhances the society’s own power over the alien” (248).
If we read this tragedy primarily focusing on the issue of ethnic identity, it becomes clear that it is not ethnic distinctions that are significant but cultural distinctions. 190 Menelaus and Hermione emphasize Andromache’s ethnicity, but the tragedy emphasizes culture, since Peleus and Andromache, with no shared descent, can live in a way that is respectful and supportive of one another. The Spartans are separated from other Greeks and from Trojans in their unstable, tyrannical, violent, and luxurious ways, all of which, according to Andromache, lead to the breakdown of the oikos and the breakdown of ties between the larger family unit. It is, in short, an unsustainable and unprofitable way of living. Nevertheless, this tragedy is not a warning about the possible collapse of society, as represented by the behaviour of the Spartans, 191 because the focus at the end is on regeneration, a new race of men, not collapse and decay.

The end of Andromache does not, as one might expect, focus on Hermione’s escape with Orestes but it does implicitly suggest that her manner of behaviour is not appropriate because it does not ensure the survival of her bloodline. She escapes her immediate predicament of dealing with an angry Neoptolemus when he returns, a predicament which is solved more concretely by the murder of Neoptolemus, but her future is of no real consequence in the end and there is no mention of any descendants from Hermione and Orestes. It is Molossus, son of Neoptolemus and Andromache, who survives and it is their bloodline that descends. It is fitting, therefore, that historically the Molossians, who claim descent from Molossus, change their allegiance from Sparta to Athens during the Peloponnesian War. 192 If this were part of the motivation for this tragedy, it would be important to stress the nobility of the eponymous founder’s mother and paternal grandfather. Even Neoptolemus’ questionable behaviour at Troy is silenced in Andromache, and instead he is depicted as a pious, repentant man who is violently

190 As Allan (2000) says at 104, the connection between Peleus and Andromache, despite their different ethnic backgrounds, “discredits” the ethnic distinction that Menelaus and Hermione have been trying to make throughout the tragedy.

191 Allan (2000) 138 suggests otherwise, stating that the Spartans’ manner of behaviour displays the fragility of “civilized order”. I prefer to interpret it in a more hopeful manner. Even though civilized order is fragile, the founding of a new people focuses the audience’s attention away from that fragility towards a new generation.

192 Thucydides 2; Allan (2000) 151-5.
ambushed and killed at Delphi. Here the argument becomes complicated because in the case of the Molossians it appears that ethnicity is being stressed since their connection to this tragedy is through descent, even though I have been arguing throughout for the importance of culture in creating identity. The solution to this problem is to remember that ethnicity did not cease to be employed in the discourse surrounding identity, and in this instance the Molossians can look to both their ethnicity and their culture. They are ethnically linked to the gentle, non-violent characters from the tragedy and they have made the decision to support Athens in the Peloponnesian War, thereby demonstrating that they have learned to recognize the cultural differences between Athens and Sparta and have aligned themselves with the culturally superior (from an Athenian perspective) Athens.

But was the play written with an Athenian audience in mind, and would an original performance outside of Athens alter the reading I suggest? The scholion on line 445 states that Andromache was not produced in Athens, but does not say where it actually was produced.¹⁹³ There is no record of an Andromache by Euripides play on the didaskalia but, as Allan points out, “we cannot verify this as the relevant dramatic records are lost.”¹⁹⁴ If it were performed outside of Athens, Allan identifies Molossia or Thessaly as possible alternatives. Molossia is attractive because of the prophecy of its foundation at the end of Andromache and the alliance between Molossia and Athens during the Peloponnesian War.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, having an Athenian tragedian produce a tragedy there would fit with the “Hellenization of north-western tribes” that “is said to have begun with Tharyps,” the Molossian king from ca. 423-390.¹⁹⁶ Thessaly is an attractive possible location for production because of its alliance with Athens dating from 462 in spite of its link to Sparta through its “Dorian language and Heraclid descent.”¹⁹⁷

¹⁹³ Allan (2000) 150. Stevens (1971) 19-20 is skeptical about the accuracy of this information, noting that the scholiast does not provide a source.
¹⁹⁶ Allan (2000) 153. See also 154-5 for further discussion on the process of Hellenization of Molossia.
¹⁹⁷ Allan (2000) 156.
Thessalian connection to Athens and aversion to Sparta is echoed in *Andromache*, in which Peleus rules over Thessalian Pharsalus and repels “unwarranted Spartan aggression.”\(^\text{198}\)

It remains possible, however, that *Andromache* was in fact first produced in Athens and perhaps re-produced outside of Athens in Molossia or Thessaly or both. The play could certainly have appealed both to Athenian and non-Athenian audiences, with different aspects becoming more or less prominent in different performance locations. For example, an Athenian audience might enjoy the degradation of the Spartan Hermione in contrast with Andromache, while a Molossian audience might respond most to Thetis’ prophecy about their founding ancestor at the end, and a Thessalian audience might laud the aged Peleus’ spunk. *Andromache* could plausibly have been originally produced in any one of the three locations, but there is inadequate evidence to support any one definitively.

The conclusion of *Andromache* supports the suggestion that cultural features were used to establish identity in fifth-century Athens, since the characters who are held in opposition to the Spartans are those whose lineage will continue, even though Andromache is of a different ethnicity. Pericles’ funeral oration in Thucydides demonstrates how, at that time in Athens, acquired behavioral traits were key in distinguishing between Athenians and others, thereby widening the scope of cultural inclusion to anyone who lives according to the Athenian cultural norms. In such an environment, Trojans are not immediately relegated to barbarian status in tragedy. Instead, their status can be decided for each individual context, depending on each author’s preferences. Our evidence indicates that they are part of a much larger discourse regarding Athenian self-identity in which it was at times convenient to highlight their ethnicity, and at other times to highlight their culture. Whichever aspect was employed, Trojans remained a useful tool with which Athenian tragedians could continue to re-evaluate their own identity and that of those around them.

\(^{198}\) Allan (2000) 156.
Chapter 4
The Women of Troy: Exchange, Nostalgia, and Mourning

The aftermath of the Trojan War is gendered. It is concerned with women because they are the survivors and they survive only because of their gender. By necessity, therefore, tragedies dealing with the fallout of the war are concerned with gendered issues. The women survivors are useful tools for tragedians because they are in a unique position: they are the sole representatives of a destroyed city that holds a significant place in the mythological past. Because of this, Trojan women are different from most other tragic women. If female characters in tragedy “in the end, are the tools of the male poets in reasserting masculine identity and supremacy,” Trojan women are utilised in a different manner than others. They appear in tragedy only as slaves in Greece (Andromache), or in the liminal period after the fall of Troy but before their arrival in Greece (Trojan Women and Hecuba). Their position is consistently presented sympathetically, because the women are consistently presented as victims of fate and

199 With the exception of Aeneas and Helenus, only the women survive. Aeneas, the figure so important for the Romans, is ignored as a survivor of the fall of Troy in extant Greek tragedies (he does appear in Rhesus as an important advisor to Hector), and Helenus receives only passing mention as the future husband of Andromache (as part of Thetis’ prophecy at Andromache 1245). It is the Trojan women who received the greatest amount of attention from the tragedians.

200 Rabinowitz (1993) 111 states that the only reason Trojan women, or in fact any women, survive war is because of their gender.

201 Many scholars agree that women provide an important marker of the Athenian male anxiety concerning the role of women in society and the possible dangers that occur when they transgress the societally approved boundaries of that role. See Hall (1997) 110. Roselli (2003) 39 suggests that women in Greek art are part of an “androcentric worldview,” a statement that stresses the creative role that men played in shaping the way that women were presented and therefore perceived. Rabinowitz (1993) 12 also reminds her readers that female characters in tragedy are ideological constructions, and Pomeroy (1975) has as a central thesis to her work that any images or myths of women in antiquity were created by men. As a cautionary note, Easterling (1987) warns against interpreting female characters as “immediately transgressive” or in any way “real” women (esp. 16-7).

202 Mossman (2005) 363 (n. 1).
of Greek cruelty. These characters always have Troy and their fall to slavery in the background. The victimization and complete loss sets them apart from other female characters in tragedy, and yet they are still women. As such they occupy the often ambiguous position of women in tragedy.\textsuperscript{203}

One important aspect to their difference from other female characters is the destruction of their city and their way of life. Unlike other mythical women, therefore, they can represent a type of woman and a type of society that no longer exists. This creates a safety and distance in their representations, which allows them to be portrayed as something other than a cause for male concern about their identity. They are separated from their fellow cast-mates in each tragedy not only by their gender, but also by their city of origin, which is an important link between the women discussed here.

The Trojan women have a history of sympathetic treatment that dates back to Homer at least, where we are presented with the women in domestic scenes, which lends them an air of familiarity, and where we are presented with them grieving for their dead sons, brothers, and husbands.\textsuperscript{204} Instead of being strange foreign women, in Homer they are presented as ordinary women, occupied with typical female tasks.\textsuperscript{205} This portrayal is part of the tradition that informs their portrayal in tragedy, which helps to create the Trojan women’s unique position: they are both the female other, a canvas onto which male authors can project male concerns, and

\textsuperscript{203} The feminist critical assessment of women in tragedy has a long history, going as far back as Pomeroy (1975) who includes a discussion of the female characters of tragedy in her broader examination of the women in classical antiquity. More recent discussions of women in tragedy include: Gould (1980); Foley (1982 & 2001); Loraux (1985 & 1998); Zeitlin (1988 & 1996); Rabinowitz (1993); Hall (1997) 103-10; Wohl (1998); McClure (1999); Mendelsohn (2002). Easterling (1987) 15 states that women in tragedy were both useful, attractive characters and dangerous because of the perceived power of their sexuality.

\textsuperscript{204} See above in chapter 2 for a complete discussion of the Homeric characterization of Trojan women. Mossman (1995) 21 argues that Homer’s influence seems to have been pervasive enough to still be relevant in the fifth century.

\textsuperscript{205} We see, for example, \textit{even Helen} weaving (3.125ff) and guiding her women in their weaving (6. 323-4); Hecuba making an offering to Athena (6. 287ff); Andromache weaving and running a bath for Hector (22. 440ff); and all three of these women lamenting over the corpse of Hector (24. 723ff). See also chapter 2, 52ff.
they are a particularly, and uniquely, sympathetic type of female because of their epic heritage and their distance from the world of the audience members.

This chapter will enter into the long and multi-faceted debate concerning women in tragedy to elucidate the complex relationship between Athens and Troy by looking at the themes of exchange, nostalgia, and mourning through the characters of Trojan women. I argue that Trojan women further complicate those themes because of their own complex and unique natures. While all three themes are present in varying degrees in all three of the tragedies under consideration in this chapter, I will be presenting one theme per tragedy: exchange in *Andromache*, nostalgia in *Trojan Women*, and extreme mourning that leads to revenge in *Hecuba*. The variety encompassed in these themes will allow me to present a more complete account of the ways that Trojan women were used by Euripides and, although the themes themselves may seem to be unconnected, how the city of Troy, and its destruction in particular, joins them together in an important way. Troy is in the background in all three plays discussed here and informs everything that the female characters do and say. Troy is not merely a sacked city, it is the sacked city. Having come from it changes the way that the women are presented. Through these themes, I will show that Trojan women stand in a unique position in Greek tragedy and further challenge the notion of the “Phrygianization of Troy”. The Trojan women have many ambiguous traits and perform some questionable actions (such as Hecuba’s revenge against Polymestor), and yet they remain sympathetic characters who are treated respectfully by other Greek characters in their tragedies. Even though Troy ought to become the pinnacle of alterity since it is both foreign and characterized by women, it and its female survivors consistently avoid reaching such heights.

*Andromache: a dangerous exchange.*

In the previous chapter, we saw the tension between Andromache and Hermione that was created by Hermione and Menelaus’ insistence on Andromache’s ethnic inferiority. Throughout *Andromache* the title character is consistently given the upper hand with respect to female virtue: she was a better wife to Hector because she did not interfere in his extra-marital life, and even encouraged it; she is better in her reproductive capacity, having born Astyanax to Hector and Molossus to Neoptolemus; and she is better at respecting the boundaries imposed upon her
as a woman and in her new capacity as a slave because she respects the authority of the household, and has only left its walls in order to protect herself and her child from Hermione’s wrath; and she has taken no direct action but instead she has sought help from Peleus. Hermione, on the other hand, is jealous of the relationship that she suspects between Neoptolemus and Andromache; she has born no children; and she acts without being under the guidance of her husband.

Through her memories of Hector and the way she used to live, Andromache keeps the memory of Troy alive and held in opposition to the depravity that she finds in Sparta, where the institution of marriage is entirely undervalued by Menelaus and Hermione. As we have seen in the previous chapter, much of Andromache’s positive characterization, in contrast with Hermione in particular, is designed to highlight the moral depravity among the Spartans. It is also possible, however, to understand her character as presenting a problematization of the exchange and mobility of women. As a Trojan woman who clings to her past life and offers it as a model of good female behaviour, Andromache provides a perfect example of how the exchange of women can go terribly wrong, even when the woman herself has the best of intentions. After having moved from Eetion to Troy, from Troy to Phthia, this will be her third move, her third kurios, and she has willingly submitted to each of them in turn.206 Truly, Andromache is an example of the benefit of having a woman under the rule of a kurios and how one can even flourish under such circumstances.207

Exchange is what most fully exemplifies Andromache’s life, and she herself focuses on the necessity of it and the way that she has participated to make each of her transitions as positive as

206 This is not to suggest that Andromache is happy about her situation, but that she understands her role as a subordinate, mobile unit.

207 Hall (1997) 109 discusses the dangers that are highlighted in many tragedies of women who are unsupervised by the appropriate male authority. Hermione, for example, is not under the control of her husband and therefore acts in inappropriate ways. She is an example of how tragic women can reinforce the need to keep women under firm control. Andromache, on the other hand, because she follows the rules of ideal female conduct, is an example of confirmation to the male audience that social checks and boundaries on women work and can be appreciated by men and women.
possible. The play opens with Andromache outlining the series of exchanges that have brought her to Phthia:

Ἀσιάτιδος γῆς σχῆμα, Θηβαία πόλις,

ódhen poth’ édnon súv poluχrúsoi χλιδήι

Πριάμου τύραννον ἐστιαν ἀφικόμην

dámaρ δοθεία παιδοποιός Ἀκτορι (…)

αὐτῇ δὲ δούλη τῶν ἐλευθερωτάτων

οἰκὼν νομοθείοι Ἑλλάδ’ εἰσαφικόμην

tóí νησιώτηι Νεοπτολέμωι δορὸς γέρας

dοθεία λείας Τρωικῆς ἐξαίρετον.

Asian homeland, city of Thebe, whence I came with luxurious golden dowry long ago to the royal hearth of Priam, given to Hector as childbearing wife (…) and I myself, from a family esteemed as the most free of all, came to Greece a slave, given to the islander Neoptolemus as a choice spear-prize from the plunder of Troy. (1-4; 12-5)

After explaining that she has borne her latest move better than could be expected, she is confronted by Hermione who accuses her of trying to disrupt her marriage, which Andromache

208 The exchange of women has been shown to be one important aspect of Greek society that is also important in tragedy. Carson (1990) 136 underlines the importance of the woman as a mobile unit, and Foley (2001) 11 argues that while female exchange was designed to solidify social bonds between men, in tragedy these bonds are destroyed instead. Wohl (1998) also demonstrates the ways in which the commerce of women is often portrayed in tragedy with disastrous effect.
denies. She then lectures Hermione on a woman’s duty towards her husband, outlining her own values and making clear to the audience the contrast between the two women.

οὐ τὸ κάλλος, ὦ γυναι,

ἀλλ’ ἀρεταὶ τέρσουσι τοὺς ἐνυμέντας (…)

χρή γὰρ γυναῖκα, κἂν παρὼν πόσει δοθήμι,

στέργειν ἀμμάλλαιν τ’ οὖς ἔχειν φρονήματος (…)

ὁ φιλταθ’ Ἐκτορ, ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τὴν σὴν χάριν

οἰ καὶ ἔμνήσον, εἰ τι σε σφάλλοι Κύπρης,

καὶ μαστὸν ἔμη πολλάκις νόθοισι σοίς

ἐπέσχον, ἵνα σοι μηδὲν ἐνδοίην πικρόν.

καὶ ταῦτα δρώσα τῇ ἀρετῇ προσηγόμην

πόσιν.

It is virtue, Hermione, not beauty that delights a husband (…) Even if a woman is married to a bad husband, she should cherish him, and not engage in a contest of pride (…) My dearest Hector, I even helped you in your love-affairs, to please you, if ever Aphrodite tripped you up; and often offered my breast to your bastards, so as to cause you no offence. By doing this, I drew my husband to me by my virtue. (207-8; 213-4; 222-7)

Through her frank and generally positive commentary on the position of the woman in a male transaction, Andromache affirms the practice and confirms to a male audience that a large part
of Hermione’s problem is in fact the absence of her husband and her adherence to her father when her allegiance ought to have been transferred fully to her husband. On the other hand, far from being merely an example of a relatively happy subordinate woman, Andromache’s unique position as a Trojan woman with a sympathetic literary tradition allows her subtly to highlight a problem with the portability of women because none of the transactions in which she was an object is ultimately successful. Her marriage to Hector is not productive since Astyanax is killed by the Greeks. Her concubinage to Neoptolemus, though productive because of Molossus, causes the final collapse of the house of Peleus. To be sure, Orestes is responsible for killing Neoptolemus and Hermione is responsible for leaving her marriage, but in Andromache Andromache’s presence is the impetus for Hermione’s jealousy and the problems in the household.

Andromache’s final transference to Helenus is presumed to be successful, but the chaos surrounding her life in the house of Neoptolemus raises concerns regarding the constant displacement of women from both the female and the male perspective, and it is precisely her complicity in the matter that allows the concerns to be raised. If she resisted her mobility, she would merely be another transgressive, problematic woman. Her agreement makes the matter more troubling because it implies a fundamental flaw in the system, not a problem in controlling one particular woman. Trojan women are the ultimate tokens of female subjectivity and mobility because they are all claimed by a male master and they all leave Troy. Yet, they are all examples of exchange and mobility not functioning properly because not one of them goes on to live in a positive way with her Greek master. Even the exchange of the willing Andromache ends in disaster. Athenian society was built on the mobility of women, but the Trojan women provide examples of the dangers of such mobility.

---

209 According to Thetis’ prophecy at 1243-9.

210 In many ways, a war-captive like Andromache is no different from a woman taken in marriage. In both situations the woman is subject to a male authority figure after being taken from her home. Furthermore, Andromache plays the wife’s role in this play, insofar as she has provided Neoptolemus with the child that his wife has not. This example demonstrates how closely integrated into the household a slave could be.
Andromache’s preservation of her former standards of behaviour and idealization of her relationship with Hector creates a kind of longing for the past. Even though she has moved on and adjusted to her new life as much as was in her power to do so (based on her description in the prologue things were fine in Phthia until Hermione began to cause trouble), her former life at Troy continues to inform the way she conducts herself in Phthia. This indicates nostalgia for the past, despite her acceptance of the present. Much more acute nostalgia is expressed in Trojan Women, more acute, perhaps, due to the proximity of the loss.

*Trojan Women: Mournful Nostalgia.*

*Trojan Women* is a tragedy of nostalgia that is created by the idealization of the past as the grief of the Trojan characters is elevated through dignified and respectful treatment. For the purpose of this discussion, I am using the definition of nostalgia proposed by Santesco, who argues that nostalgia in literature is an expression of stylized longing for the past that did not become an identifiable poetic motif until the eighteenth century. I suggest that his particular definition is useful in looking at *Trojan Women*, specifically his focus on nostalgia as a stylized and communal idealization of the past instead of a more personal longing for the past. Santesco further argues that a character’s nostalgia can inspire a personal nostalgic response in the reader and, I would add, the audience, but not one that exclusively revives reminiscence of the past. Rather, it causes the audience to reflect upon their present circumstances and either feel nostalgic for a past in which they were happier, or to feel an anticipatory nostalgia for what they fear they might lose. For example, a fifth-century Athenian theatre audience might, when presented with the Trojan women’s highly stylized longing for their recently lost city and freedom, anticipate what they themselves stand to lose.

---

Santesco (2006) provides an interesting discussion about nostalgia and its use in poetry. He focuses on eighteenth-century poetry, but his comments provide a useful template for the discussion of nostalgia in Greek tragedy as well. He argues that nostalgia expressed in poetry is a highly stylized literary mode that is not concerned with personal suffering but is instead an impersonal idealization of the past. The idealized concentration on the past, Santesco argues, reflects dissatisfaction with the present (see 12-21 especially).
This may not be immediately evident since the Trojans lost the war against the Greeks. Why would fifth-century Athenians, who were so arrogant about their own superiority in the post-Persian War era, feel any connection with Trojans, who lost the war against the Greeks and whose loss is expressed solely by women? I wish to answer this question in two closely related steps. First, I will demonstrate that the city of Troy itself is a model of an innocent and law-abiding city that suffered destruction not because of the dysfunctionality of its citizens but because of external forces. As such, it can be used as an example of what Athens might experience in times of war. Once this is established, I will examine the mourning expressed in Trojan Women to determine how it could create a longing among Athenian spectators because the women are depicted as mourning specifically for the city of Troy. The continued emphasis on Troy helps to keep the focus less on the specifics of individual loss and more on the sense of communal loss.

I do not intend to argue that it is a nostalgic longing for the lost heroic age, but for something less tangible, a proleptic nostalgia for the losses as yet inexperienced by the Athenians. That is, by placing a sacked city and mourning women against whom no blame for their current situation can be directed on stage, Athenians could reflect on the present state of their city and the potential for its destruction. It is difficult to deny a correlation between the Trojan War and the Peloponnesian War as extended, drawn-out wars (in 415 the Peloponnesian War was already longer than the Trojan War). Athenians could have identified with the besieged Trojans, virtually trapped within the city walls. It is possible, therefore, that in Trojan Women Euripides is making a statement regarding the futility of war. I do not wish to suggest that such a reading is not one of many layers to this tragedy. Rather, I wish to illuminate the nostalgic element in the tragedy and to demonstrate how it suggests more than simply anti-war rhetoric.

The city of Troy is not a typical tragic city. It does not act as a mere non-Athenian backdrop to the events on stage, but plays a more dominant role. When compared to cities such as Argos or Thebes, Troy stands out as the example of the potential mortality of cities themselves.212 Thebes is a city in which many problems regarding the polis, the family, and the self can be examined at a safe distance from Athens. It is diametrically opposed to the way in which

---

Athens thought of itself in the fifth century. Thebes is used by tragedians as an anti-Athens, and a city that needs Athens’ help to resolve problems. The distance from Athens, however, creates a sense of distance from modern politics and therefore from any dangers of repercussions against a tragedian for staging potentially threatening politically charged material. Because it represents an important contrast with Athens, it is essential that the physical city of Thebes remains relatively undamaged so that Athenians could continue to set plays there, and to show how it is a city that is dysfunctional and that breeds a self-destructive ruling class. It is this paradox of constancy and internal self-destruction that is crucial for the characterization of Thebes as anti-Athens, and it is precisely this paradox that Troy, by contrast, does not have.

Troy is not an anti-Athens in the same way that Thebes is since its fall is not caused by internal problems, nor is it the city in which ‘what not to do’ is staged. Nevertheless, it stands in stark contrast to Athens: it is the city that always falls, that must fall. It is not a city that is faced with and overcomes inner conflict time and again as Thebes does, nor do its institutions provide refuge for troubled heroes and their descendants as Athens does. Rather, its citizens are always killed or captured and its walls and buildings are always destroyed. The people of Troy cannot prevent the destruction of the city, nor can any other city offer it relief. Even though the events at Troy occurred in a different time and place, as do the events in any Theban tragedy, the circumstances at Troy could more plausibly occur in Athens. Troy represents more of an ‘everycity’ with which Athens can identify and hope never to become.

---

213 See Zeitlin (1990) for a thorough discussion of this issue. For her treatment of Argos, see p. 145 ff.
215 Zeitlin (1990) 148 goes on to state that the conflicts enacted in Thebes can never be resolved.
216 Scodel (1980): “At the height of her ambitions, (Athens) embodied all the madness of the Greeks of the tragic trilogy, all the blindness of the Trojans in the Alexander, and all that potential disaster which is realized in the Troades” (142).
217 Dué (2006) 109 remarks upon the vulnerability of potential slavery that is shared between the Greeks and the Trojans.
Perhaps, therefore, after seeing the parade of victims after the sack of Troy in *Trojan Women*, Athenian audience members could feel nostalgia towards an idealized, pre-war past of their own city, even though it has not been destroyed on the same scale as Troy. Moreover, some inhabitants may have begun considering what might be lost in the event of defeat, and seeing the destruction of Troy and the innocence of its victims could have helped to create nostalgia for what had not yet been destroyed. That is, the destruction of Troy and the nostalgia expressed by the Trojan women could have accentuated for the Athenians the possibility of suffering the same.

Nostalgia is created in a particularly feminine way through mourning in *Trojan Women* which helps to enliven the sense of the women’s loss and also their affection for their recently lost way of life. The extended lament over the whole tragedy can be interpreted as what helps to create and sustain momentum in an episodic tragedy in which it is difficult to sustain momentum.

After the prologue spoken by Poseidon and Athena, Hecuba begins her lament:

> ἄνα, δύσδαιμον. πεδόθεν κεφαλῆν  
> ἐπάειρε δέρην <τ’>. οὐκέτι Τροία  
> τάδε καὶ βασίλης ἐσμεν Τροίας.

Up, you poor one. Lift your head and neck from the ground. This is no longer Troy nor we the queen of Troy. (98-100)

These are the first words spoken by the former queen of Troy, and with her last words, she is still lamenting:

> ἵω <ἱω>, τρομερὰ τρομερὰ  
> μέλεα, φέρετ’ ἐμὸν ἵχνος. ἵτ’ ἐπ’

---

218 Indeed, with the parade of war-orphans in the pre-performance ceremony would invite audience members to reflect on the men who had already been killed in war. For the pre-performance ceremonies see Goldhill (1987 & 2000).

219 The structure of *Trojan Women* as an extended lament itself is outlined by Suter (2003).
δούλειον ἁμέραν βίου.

Io, io, make your way, my shaking, trembling limbs. Forward into the day of slavery. (1328-30)

Hecuba’s lament invites a primarily emotional response from the audience not a political response, which makes the Trojan women’s situation universally sympathetic. The lament is extensive, and in terms of action there is no real progression from beginning to end. The women’s longing for the past, however, invites the audience to reflect on its present circumstances. The depth of their lamentation ensures that the focus remains steadfastly on it.

According to Gary Meltzer, nostalgia can be expressed in different ways, three of which apply to the characters in Trojan Women, of which all are expressed through lament. The first is a reference to a prior context in contrast with present circumstances. Hecuba’s first words provide the first example of this: “οὐκέτι Τροία…” (“this is no longer Troy…” 199), and later in her lament shared with Andromache, Hecuba sings once again that “βέβακε Τροία” (“Troy is lost,” 582). The second possible expression of nostalgia is through a reference to loss of position, of which there are many examples in Trojan Women since all of the Trojan characters in the play have recently become captives of the Greeks. Hecuba declares that she is “οὐκέτι… βασιλῆς ἐσμεν Τροίας” (“we are no longer the queen of Troy,” 99-100), and later wonders

220 See chapter 1, page 37-8 where I define sympathy as that which requires the audience’s ability to identify with another. The emotional response towards the Trojan women that I propose here also depends on the audience’s identification with them.

221 Duet (2006) 112 suggests that in Trojan Women the women’s lament is Greek in form and theme and therefore overrides any difference between the women and the audience. While I agree that the lamentation itself may help to soften the lines of identity, I do not agree that the Greek form aids in this in any way. Greek tragedy is a Greek genre written by Greek authors. It is only natural that the form of any lament is Greek. On the extent of the women’s lament and the sympathetic connection it might create with the audience, see Dunn (1993) 34-5.

222 All three expressions of nostalgia are at Meltzer (2006) 19. His fourth possible form of nostalgia is the expression of utopian wishes and is omitted here only because it is not directly relevant to the Trojan women.
whether she must really become a slave to the Greeks, “ὁ Τροίας ἄρχαγον ἔχων τιμᾶς,” (“I, who once held a ruler’s honour in Troy?” 195-6), to guard their doors or make their bread (492-4). The chorus also indicate the loss of position suffered even by the average women: “διὰ στέρνων φόβος ἀίσσει Τρωιάσιν, αἱ τῶν δ’ οἴκων εἰσώ δουλείαν αἰάζουσιν” (“fear stabs the hearts of the Trojan women mourning their slavery inside,” 156-8). Meltzer’s third manner of expressing nostalgia is a yearning for home, whether or not it may be fulfilled. The Trojan women yearn for their home in a particularly poignant manner, since they are standing before the desolate shell of their former home that has been stripped of plunder and is about to be burned. Their yearning cannot be fulfilled, as the chorus know as they sing:

οὔν Ἰδαίως ἱστοῖς κερκίδα
diveύουσ᾿ ἐξαλλάξω.

νέατον τοχέων δώματα λεύσσω,

νέατον.

No longer shall I move the whirling shuttle back and forth at Trojan looms. This is the last time I shall look on the home of my parents, the very last time. (199-201)

Throughout these examples that demonstrate some of the different ways nostalgia is expressed by these characters, the women mourn for themselves and for their lost men, but the city of Troy is the prime focus for their lament (Hecuba mourns: ὦ πατρίς, ὦ μελέα, 601) and that helps to generalize their loss and make it more accessible to the audience.
Nicole Loraux argues that tragedy is an antipolitical (not an apolitical or neutral)\(^{223}\) genre, and as such it actually confronts and rebels against the political climate of its time. She also argues for the reinsertion of the human element into tragedy,\(^{224}\) which comes as a reaction against the trend in scholarship to read tragedy as a genre that reflects, through affirmation or questioning, of civic ideology.\(^{225}\) She argues that tragedy somehow straddles the line between civic and emotional, but that the emotional or human side should be considered important in creating the antipolitical stance that tragedy takes. Similarly, I propose that the civic element in tragedy should not be ignored, but that, in the case of *Trojan Women*, the emotional element in the Trojan women’s display of mourning is precisely what creates the opportunity for the audience’s reflection on their city and what it means to them.\(^{226}\) That is, the women’s expressed nostalgia for the burning Troy creates the opportunity for the audience’s nostalgic reflections on the present state of Athens and what they would lose should they find themselves in the Trojan women’s position. It is the intrinsically sympathetic nature of the Trojan women that allows for the emotional connection to be made. The characters’ continued emphasis on the city, as opposed to an exclusive lament for the individuals, helps to bring the emotional and the civic elements together, which in turn reduces the distance between Athens and Troy.

---

\(^{223}\) Loraux (2002) 26 defines ‘antipolitical’ as “any behaviour that diverts, rejects, or threatens, consciously or not, the obligations and prohibitions constituting the ideology of the city-state.”

\(^{224}\) Loraux (2002) 19-20, 26-41 for the antipolitical nature of tragedy; 85ff for the human element of the audience reaction. Dué (2006) agrees with the human or emotional aspect of tragedy (164).

\(^{225}\) Goldhill (1987 & 2000); Arnott (1989); Rhodes (2003); Cartledge (1997); Hall (1996b & 1997); Griffith (1995); Boedeker and Raaflaub (2005) to name only a few who have entered into this wide-ranging debate. Loraux, by contrast, states that her aim in her 2002 volume is to “make the tragic voice of mourning audible, a voice not usually heard when tragedy is defined as a political genre” (81).

\(^{226}\) Far from ignoring tragedy’s civic element in this argument, following Lada-Richards the recognition of its importance is crucial since, as she maintains, emotional responses are social in nature and are culturally dependent (1996a) 89. That is, the combined civic and social aspects to the theatre are precisely what create the possibility of an emotional response.
Hecuba: *Frightful mourning.*

If *Trojan Women* nostalgically reflects on what can be lost, *Hecuba* seems to reflect upon what is repressed in times of war, in particular the place of female mourning in a predominantly male setting. The focus of much of the scholarship on *Hecuba* is on her act of revenge against Polymestor. I will focus instead on how she reaches the point of revenge and how the Greeks, Agamemnon in particular, react to it. As in the previous two sections of this chapter, it is important that the central character is a Trojan woman because the sympathetic nature of her traditional character allows for her actions, however distasteful they may be, to be treated with a greater degree of ambiguity than most other tragic women. The first half of *Hecuba* emphasizes her recent losses and so from the beginning it reminds the audience of her background. In this way, Euripides establishes her not as a monstrous woman intent on revenge but as a woman deprived of both her home and her freedom. For the sake of comparison, for example, any sympathy one might feel for Aeschylus’ Clytemnestra for having lost her daughter is eroded due to her subsequent actions of taking a lover in her husband’s absence, taking control of the household, and plotting the murder of her husband for years. Hecuba, on the other hand, does not plot against her husband or *kurios*, she does not take on any male position of authority, and her actions are in the context of the acute loss of her last two children in addition to the loss of her entire male family, her city, and her freedom.

Instead of acquiring ‘male’ attributes and becoming political, like Clytemnestra, I will demonstrate how Hecuba uses her femininity to manipulate Agamemnon. There is no violence in her background that might cause an audience to regard her character with suspicion and, since she has already lost everything, she has nothing to gain from her act of revenge. This makes her different from a character like Euripides’ Medea, for example, who has the violent history surrounding her flight from Colchis and stands to lose everything that she gained by leaving Colchis the way she did. Hecuba’s particular situation and the spatial and temporal liminality of

---

227 Burnett (1998) 143-4 describes how a woman who seeks revenge is unnatural and not a woman at all, for she steps beyond the boundaries of appropriate behaviour and “undermines the very household that she sought to defend” (144). Since, however, this applies exclusively to women for whom there were still “male defenders of the household to which she belonged” (144), Hecuba, who takes revenge only when the last living male member of her family is discovered dead, cannot be counted as acting inappropriately.
the setting allow for consideration of the place of a grieving mother in a post-war environment, and how it leads her to revenge. Most interesting, and key to this reading, is Agamemnon’s acceptance of her actions. His implicit compliance demonstrates the ambiguous position of Hecuba’s revenge as he allows it but then goes on virtually to ignore it as he dismisses Polymestor and returns to his ships. Thus female mourning and the revenge it inspires in this case are allowed their place but also left unacknowledged.

Hecuba’s character is carefully constructed in the first half of the tragedy to remind the audience of her severe loss and to instill sympathy for her, beginning even in the prologue spoken by the ghost of her son Polydorus. The murdered boy establishes in his words the context of Hecuba’s current grief and the grief that will be unfolded in the tragedy itself while providing the basis for the dramatic irony of Hecuba’s presence on stage before Polydorus’ corpse is discovered.

δυοῖν δὲ παῖδοιν δύο νεκρῶς κατόψεται
μήτηρ…

ὦ μήτερ, ἥτις ἐξ τυραννικῶν δόμων
δούλειον ἡμῶρ εἶδες, ὡς πράσσεις κακῶς…

Two children, two corpses my mother will have to see…O mother, in having to see the day of slavery after the house of kings, what misery is yours! (45-6, 55-6)

---

228 The setting is liminal in space because it is between Greece and Troy, and therefore home neither to the Greek captors nor the Trojan captives, and liminal in time because it is after the war, but before the homecoming. Thus, it is a difficult time for the Greek army since they are no longer under strict military order, and yet they have not yet resumed their civic lives. It is equally difficult for the Trojan women who are no longer free, but who have not yet truly begun their lives as slaves. See Burnett (1998) 157. On the other hand, Barker (2009) 594 suggests that, in spite of the Greeks’ as yet unfulfilled nostos, there is nevertheless at this point a “carefully constructed post-war order” among the Greeks established in particular by Agamemnon.
From these words, the audience knows that while Hecuba grieves for her current situation, there is yet more for her to endure. Hecuba is characterized almost entirely as a mother, which builds on the foil of the Homeric Hecuba and allows for a greater potential for audience sympathy. At the beginning of the tragedy she is not a demonic force who is scheming against men who are trying to maintain the status quo of their social relations, but she is a grieving mother trying to come to terms with her new position as a widow and a slave who has outlived almost all of her children.

Only forty lines after the prologue, she learns from the chorus the news of Polyxena’s impending sacrifice. All of Hecuba’s attention is focused on her daughter at this point, which is most keenly demonstrated in her failed attempt to persuade Odysseus to spare Polyxena:

```
μή μου τὸ τέκνον ἐκ χειρῶν ἀποσπάσῃς,
μηδὲ κτάνιτε. τῶν τεθνηκότων ἁλιζ.
ταύτῃ γέγηθα κἀπιλήθομαι κακῶν.
ἡδ᾽ ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἐστί μοι παραψυχή,
πόλις, τιθήνη, βάκτρον, ἤγεμὼν ὀδοῦ…
εἰ δὲ δεῖ τῷ Πηλέως
χάριν γενέσθαι παιδὶ καὶ ψόγον φυγεῖν
ήμας, Ὑδυσσεὺ, τήνδε μὲν μὴ κτείνετε,
ημᾶς δ᾽ ἄγοντες πρὸς πυρὰν Αχιλλέως
κεντεῖτε, μὴ φείδεσθ᾽.
```

Do not pull my child from my arms, and do not kill her: there are enough dead. In her I have my joy and forget my misery; she is my consolation in place of
many things. She is my city, nurse, staff, guide upon my way… Odysseus, if Peleus’ son must have his favour and you Greeks escape censure, do not kill this girl, but take me instead to Achilles’ pyre and stab me, without mercy. (277-81; 383-8)

Later, the exchange between mother and daughter as Polyxena tries to comfort Hecuba creates a strong sense of sympathy and empathy between them and indicates the strong level of humanity that still exists among the Trojan women, and places them in contrast with the sole representative of the Greeks at this point, Odysseus. In this way, the Trojan women are established as a model of the social behaviour that is lacking among the Greeks. Polyxena’s sacrifice and the subsequent discovery of Polydorus’ body mark the transition from Hecuba as a model of good social behaviour as she and Polyxena exhibited the positive forces of social bonds, to a model of the violent forces of revenge. Polyxena’s sacrifice begins the sequence of events that culminate in the murder of Polymestor’s children.

After she has learned of the noble way in which Polyxena has died, which is narrated by Talthybius at 523ff, Hecuba’s fortitude and stamina are tested once again as she is presented with the corpse of Polydorus, whom she presumed to be safe in the home of Polymestor:

οἴμοι. βλέπω δὴ παῖδ᾽ ἐμὸν τεθνηκότα,
Πολύδωρον ὃν μοι Ὁρῆξ ἔσῳζ᾽ οἴκοις ἀνήρ.
ἀπωλόμην δύστηνος, οὐκέτ᾽ εἰμὶ δὴ.
ὦ τέκνον τέκνον…

230 See Rabinowitz (1993) for a different view on this. She argues that Polyxena and her death are presented in a sexualized way, as they are presented as the object of male gaze and Polyxena’s nudity is particularly marked (59-62). Thus, according to Rabinowitz, Polyxena’s death is fetishized through the male gaze of the Greeks and Talthybius’ narration. Segal (1990) 111-2 agrees, calling the sacrifice “highly eroticized.”
O-oh me! My son! I see him dead! Polydorus, whom the Thracian man was keeping safe for me in his house. My fate has destroyed me. Indeed, I no longer live! O my child, my child! (681-4)

It is with this new turn of events that Hecuba’s grief turns destructive\textsuperscript{231} as she demands that Agamemnon, as leader of the Greek army and pseudo son-in-law through the concubinage of Cassandra, take action against Polymestor.\textsuperscript{232} While she does not achieve her initial goal of having Agamemnon take action against Polymestor, she gains from Agamemnon allowance to do as she pleases, as he agrees to leave and not interrupt or allow others to interrupt her meeting with Polymestor.\textsuperscript{233}

The prelude to Hecuba’s revenge is long, but the revenge itself is quick: Hecuba asks Polymestor to come to her by way of a slave (890-4), and once he has arrived, she invites him and his sons into the women’s tent where she and her women kill his two sons and blind him. The killing of Polymestor’s children is often interpreted as the most horrific thing that Hecuba could have done, because it is precisely the area in which a man is most vulnerable to a woman: the production and sustenance of children, especially sons.\textsuperscript{234} It is also where her actions seem the most excessive because in retaliation for the death of one of her children at Polymestor’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{231} Zeitlin (1996) 211 notes that there is no ceremony or formal mourning over Polydorus. This is in part because of her lack of community.
\item \textsuperscript{232} Segal (1990) 124-5 sees this appeal to Agamemnon’s sexual interest in contrast with Hecuba’s appeal to legal matters in her appeal to Odysseus for Polyxena’s life as a display of the “moral bankruptcy” in the world of the tragedy. I prefer to interpret this as Hecuba’s awareness of Agamemnon’s values and interests. She is able to target precisely what will secure a reaction from him. Mossman (1995) 113 identifies Hecuba’s great rhetorical skill and her ability to use what she knows about Agamemnon in her attempt to persuade him.
\item \textsuperscript{233} Furthermore, her dialogue with Agamemnon encourages a sympathetic reading of her character because by asking for his assistance and permission in this matter Hecuba is doing what a good woman should (Foley (2001) 284).
\item \textsuperscript{234} See Segal (1990) 122; Zeitlin (1996) 176 calls the killing of children by mothers to be man’s “deepest fear.”
\end{itemize}
hands, she kills both of his and maims him. Her revenge should act as a means of further
distancing Hecuba from her captors. She is Trojan, female, and now a murderer who killed the
sons of one man by manipulating her femininity.\footnote{Rabinowitz (1993) 122 says that Hecuba and her women exaggerate their femininity to
deceive Polymestor with a false sense of security upon entering the tent.} Surprisingly, however, it draws no real
censure or fear from the Greeks, and it does nothing to affect her relationship with Agamemnon.

It is peculiar that Hecuba insists on revenge for the death of her son when she does not seem to
have considered it against the Greeks for the death of her husband and the rest of her sons and
some of her daughters. In a time full of loss and grief, there is still room for distinction between
death in war and murder, and just as her world has been destroyed, Hecuba is still able to insist
upon the proper observances of the social custom of xenia.\footnote{According to Zeitlin (1996) the combination of murder and violation of xenia provides
Hecuba with legitimate grounds for her appeal to Agamemnon for help (192).} This may be a simple
acknowledgment of the importance of following customs and rules even in times in which rules
seem no longer to apply, or indeed an emphasis of the importance of such customs especially in
times in which all other sense of stability no longer exists.

Hecuba frames her act of revenge in logical terms: Polymestor killed for profit, he killed a
custom-protected guest, and therefore he must suffer consequences (1188ff).\footnote{Segal (1990) points to the theme of loyalty throughout the tragedy and notes its importance
since the betrayal of loyalty has the effect of turning xenia into hatred (111).} Nevertheless, within the context of fifth-century Athens, her actions are no longer appropriate because the
vendetta-style justice that she employs is supposed to be obsolete. It is remarkable, therefore,
that Agamemnon acquits her in his judgment of the scene.\footnote{Agamemnon pretends to be shocked and horrified at Hecuba’s actions when he is first
communicating with Polymestor, but if he is at all shocked it is probably because Hecuba
actually went through with her revenge. Mossman (1995) argues that his ‘shock’ is probably
more a reflection of how he ‘should’ respond and not an accurate assessment of his true feelings
(132).} One interpretation of his reaction
is that he is allowing Polymestor to be the scapegoat for the Greeks.\footnote{Rabinowitz (1993) suggests that Hecuba makes Polymestor a scapegoat for all that she has
suffered (121).} He allows punishment
against a man who has killed one of Hecuba’s children when Agamemnon’s forces have killed
all the others, and so he condones Hecuba’s outburst because it is a release of her anger and frustration that will not be unleashed against the Greeks. This interpretation implicitly accepts that Agamemnon recognizes that he and his forces have wronged Hecuba, and that he even feels some guilt in that regard. While it is tempting to accept a guilt-laden Agamemnon encouraging the use of a scapegoat to cleanse his conscience, I suggest that there is more to be added.

Polymestor’s blinding and loss of sons may assuage the Greeks’ conscience, but it still remains that the means by which it occurs, that is, vendetta, should not be acceptable in an era of institutionalized justice and public funeral orations that discourage the personalization of grief. The Greek acceptance of Hecuba and her actions suggests the questioning of the place of such ‘wild justice’. Furthermore, the judicial-like environment implies that revenge can be a sanctioned form of justice, and that it can function within an institutionalized system of justice. Burnett suggests that Hecuba’s actions are part of an important civic re-integration process for the Greeks through which they re-learn proper social bonds. She argues that the community of Trojan women teach the Greek men, who have been living as soldiers in a foreign land for many years, how to function once again as part of a civic community rather than a military community.\(^{240}\) If this is the case, the problem of how to deal with the desire for revenge is suggested as an important aspect of society.

The revenge that Hecuba takes is not merely an expression by Euripides of an out-of-control barbarian woman, from whom we should expect no less. This is in part because of her characterization in the first half of the play, which is developed in such a way that highlights her sympathetic qualities of grief and loss to the audience. But she also, significantly, first tries to take her vengeance through a sanctioned channel. She asks Agamemnon to intervene, and it is only when he refuses that she takes control:

\[\begin{align*}
& \text{ἐπεί δὲ ταρβεῖς τῷ τ’ ὄχλῳ πλέον νέμεις,} \\
& \text{ἐγώ σε θήσω τοῦδ’ ἐλεύθερον φόβου.} \\
& \text{σύνισθι μὲν γάρ, ἦν τι βουλεύσω κακόν}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{240}\) Burnett (1998) 158-9; 176.
Since you are afraid, then, and cede the mob the upper hand, I shall free you of this fear myself. Give me your complicity if I plan some harm against this man’s killer, but do not share the deed; and if there is any uproar or assistance from the Achaeans, when that Thracian man suffers the kind of thing he shall suffer, prevent them without seeming to do it for my sake. As for the rest – take heart: I myself will see that everything is well. (868-75)

She gains from him the freedom to do as she pleases, for he agrees to leave and not interrupt or allow others to interrupt her meeting with Polymestor. She acts of her own accord, but she has his permission to do so. Edith Hall has argued that women in tragedy are a source of trouble when they are out of the control of their male authority figure, their kurios. That is, women typically act out when they are left alone, when their husbands are gone (for example, Medea, Clytemnestra, and Phaedra are ‘unsupervised’). Hecuba has been deprived of one kurios, her husband, but she is already under the control of another man, Agamemnon, and goes to him first. More importantly, Agamemnon later acquits Hecuba of any wrongdoing. In her speech of self-defense, Hecuba frames her defense in logical terms: Polymestor killed for profit, he killed a custom-protected guest, and therefore he must suffer the consequences. Agamemnon agrees and tells Polymestor:

241 Hall (1997).
ἐμοὶ δ’, ἵν’ εἰδῆς, οὐτ’ ἐμὴν δοξείς χάριν

οὐτ’ οὖν Ἄχαιῶν ἄνδρ’ ἀποκτεῖναι ξένον,

ἀλλ’ ὡς ἔχης τὸν χρυσὸν ἐν δόμοις σοῖς.

λέγεις δὲ σαυτῷ πρόσφορ’ ἐν κακοίσιν ὄν.

τάχ’ οὖν παρ’ ὑμῖν ἄνδρ’ ἄν δοκεῖς χάριν,

ἀλλ’ ὡς ἔχῃς τὸν χρυσὸν ἐν δόμοις σοῖς.

λέγεις δὲ σαυτῷ πρόσφορ’ ἐν κακοίσιν ὄν.

ἡμῖν δὲ γ’ αἰσχρὸν τοῖσιν Ἑλληνοῖς τόδε.

πῶς οὖν σε κρίνας μὴ ἄδικεῖν φύγω ψόγον;

οὖχ ἂν δυναῖμην. ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ τὰ μὴ καλὰ

πράσσειν ἐτόλμας, τλῆθι καὶ τὰ μὴ φίλα.

To my mind, so you may know it, you seem to have killed a man who was your guest neither for my sake, nor yet for the Achaeans’, but in order to keep that gold in your house. You are saying what suits you in your disaster. Then, perhaps it is a light matter among your people to kill guests, but to us at least, the Greeks, it is disgusting. So how am I to escape censure if I judge that you do no wrong? I could not escape it. Since you could bring yourself to do what was dishonourable, you must also endure what is disagreeable. (1243-51)

It is significant that Agamemnon had already agreed to side with Hecuba, so this is not entirely a fair judgment, but what is of particular interest is his professed reason for doing so, which is that Polymestor transgressed the custom of xenia. By citing this betrayal of customary behaviour, and the language he uses to do so (“it is a light matter among your people… but to us at least, the Greeks”) he establishes distance between the Greeks and Thracians, and suggests a closer relationship, at least with respect to social custom, between Greeks and Trojans, thus creating a
triangulation of ethnicities: Greek, Trojan, Thracian, with the Trojans being neither Greek nor fully vilified barbarians.

Collard argues that *Hecuba* is unsettling for the audience because it shows what the war and cruelty at the hands of a trusted friend provoke in Hecuba, and that it is in no way reassuring with respect to Hecuba’s nobility and resilience in the midst of loss and grief. I agree that there is nothing reassuring about the tragedy, but I suggest that the discomfort comes not from Hecuba’s actions but from Agamemnon’s complicity in them. His approval of her behaviour implies that there is something both acceptable about it and something that nevertheless ought to be repressed. It is one of the unspoken effects of war and mourning and the much-suffering Trojan queen is the ideal character through which this can be explored because she brings with her not the background of a destructive monster, but of a mourning wife and mother. Agamemnon and Hecuba are closely linked, and her story continues through his as Agamemnon will become another Polymestor when he returns home. In consenting to Polymestor’s death, he is consenting to his own and just as Orestes becomes part of a new system of institutionalized justice in the *Oresteia*, Agamemnon is part of a reflection on revenge and the intense grief that leads to it. He validates the female role in vendetta while acknowledging that it is best left repressed.

The three tragedies examined in this chapter highlight the Trojan women’s distinct position of eliciting a great deal of sympathy while being both ethnically other and female. As such, they allow for the dramatization the themes of exchange, nostalgia, and revenge in a unique manner. Instead of being confined to female characters who are exclusively transgressive and dangerous, with the Trojan women Euripides was able to introduce complexity and nuance to those themes. In *Andromache*, the focus on Andromache herself illustrates how the exchange of women is not always a positive thing, even when the woman being exchanged is a willing participant. Andromache’s eagerness to be a compliant object of male transactions draws attention to the flaws that may arise in such a system. *Trojan Women* creates nostalgia for an idealized past among the characters and for the present among the audience members, while *Hecuba* places the

---

243 Segal (1990) 128.
revenge instituted by the women within the justice system, thereby exploring its function within that system. Only Trojan women can experience such breadth in tragedy because unique position of being both representatives of alterity, since they are never equated with Greek women, and of a sympathetic tradition. This chapter demonstrates that in spite of their gender and ethnicity, Trojan women consistently received a thoughtful and multi-layered characterization that shows them to hold a distinctive role in the imaginations of the fifth-century Athenians.
Chapter 5

The Trojan Slave

In the previous chapters I have shown examples of the problematic nature of Trojan characters in tragedy within the discourse of Greek self-identity. They are not Greek, they are not free, and they are almost exclusively women (with the exception of the characters in *Rhesus* and the fragmentary *Alexandros*244). They are not, however, treated as the barbarian other. The preceding chapters contain several examples of how Trojan characters are consistently not characterized in a way that promotes their consideration as the eastern other, even when they are called barbarians by other characters. I would like to add the issue of class as one final element for consideration in this matter, and suggest that the treatment of Trojan characters in Attic tragedy depends in part on their class before they were enslaved and not on ethnicity alone. The Phrygian slave in *Orestes* provides an excellent opening into a discussion of the nature of slavery because he is the only extant example of a Trojan man in tragedy not belonging to the royal family.

The first section of this chapter deals with ancient ideas regarding slavery, but it is not intended to be an exhaustive delineation of the large and complex role slavery played in Athenian society. Instead, I will pay particular attention to the discussion in ancient sources concerning the slave by nature. This discussion will touch upon the works of Aristotle, Hippocrates, and the Sophists before moving on, in the second section, to the character of the Phrygian slave. To help understand the importance of social status *before* his arrival in Greece, I discuss two comparable characters. Cassandra in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* has a similar messenger-type role as the Phrygian slave, yet because of her recognized social position in Troy she does not become a disparaged eastern caricature. The Phrygian soldier in Timotheus’ *Persians*, on the other hand, confirms that nameless, unknown characters of lower social status are more likely to be given uncomplimentary eastern attributes.

244 See chapter 2 for a discussion of these two plays.
In an article that challenges the notion of tragedy as an entirely democratic genre in which democratic values are re-asserted, Mark Griffith explores the class hierarchies and argues that the upper class of ‘brilliant dynasts’ is dominant and necessary for the proper functioning of the democracy.\textsuperscript{245} This is an important contribution for two distinct reasons. First, the article is devoted to the presentation of class in tragedy, which prior to Griffith had received very little focused attention among scholars. Secondly, the article is important because its focus on the ruling class is contrary to the more common discussion of the servile class in tragedy.\textsuperscript{246} Thus, Griffith is able to approach the issue of class distinction in tragedy in a different way than is often done and to present it as a reflection, not a distortion, of reality.

An example of the view that class in tragedy is a distortion of the reality of class distinction is found in Edith Hall’s statement that “some of the most thrilling moments in Athenian tragedy are created when women and slaves are permitted, however briefly, to challenge the hegemonic value-system, and tell us how it felt.”\textsuperscript{247} Griffith, on the other hand, suggests that the ‘hegemonic value-system’ is often left unchallenged and that one of tragedy’s functions is to “negotiate between conflicting class interests and ideologies within the polis.”\textsuperscript{248} That is, instead of approaching the matter of class from the point of view of the servile class, Griffith shifts the frame to demonstrate the continued importance on the ruling class in spite of the democratic institutions that are being celebrated on stage.\textsuperscript{249} Furthermore, Griffith’s argument highlights the reality of class distinction in tragedy and demonstrates that it is more than a tool to be manipulated and inverted.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{245} Griffith (1995).
\item\textsuperscript{246} See, for example, Hall (1997).
\item\textsuperscript{247} Hall (1997) 118.
\item\textsuperscript{248} Griffith (1995) 109-10.
\item\textsuperscript{249} Griffith (1995). He makes his argument through a detailed analysis of the Oresteia, but concludes in more general terms, calling tragedy a ‘dynamic’ genre that investigates the differences between the classes (110).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Another distinct perspective on class in tragedy is presented by David Roselli, who suggests that gender acts as a “disguise” for class. For Roselli, women are the ideal displacements for class concerns because they can represent the entire range of classes and can therefore best represent the “competing social ideologies” that tragedy stages. According to this argument, class is not dealt with openly but is more subtly reflected through the various female roles. In the previous chapter we saw that with the Trojan women class and gender are indeed in some way intertwined: their survival and subsequent reduction in status is exclusively due to their gender. The Trojan women are not, however, acting as a “disguise” for broader issues relating to class.

As I move now to discuss the Phrygian slave in Orestes, class stands alone without the disguise of gender and without an inversion of social roles. The slave is male, and he does not exhibit traits of the clever slave character type who, despite his or her status, has great knowledge or insight. The information that he conveys to the audience and chorus is not private, nor does he offer philosophical musings on the current state of events. He is merely a slave and even though he is a Trojan, he can be a mere slave because he falls outside of the imagined community of Trojans created in the Iliad. The Trojan literary tradition creates a class hierarchy among the Trojans who are enslaved after the fall of Troy. The imagined community of Troy in the Iliad permeates the portrayal of Trojan characters in tragedy and lends the women their elevated sense of sympathy despite their new servility. That imagined community, however, does not encompass all Trojans, but is limited to the royal family. Euripides’ treatment of the Phrygian slave demonstrates that characters who are not part of the traditional conception of Trojans are not necessarily conceived of in the same way. The Phrygian slave is viewed differently by two different commentators of Orestes. Willink lauds him as among Euripides’ “most brilliant and original contributions” to tragedy, while West is slightly more reserved.

---

250 Roselli (2007) 82. That is, instead of dealing with class explicitly, tragedians use women to explore these issues.

251 Roselli (2007) 82.

252 Hall (1997) focuses much of her discussion of slaves on the power that they often have in tragedy because of their access to private household information.

253 Willink (1986) 305.
noting the originality of the character but associating it with what he identifies as Euripides’ penchant for ‘exoticism’ in the later stages of his career. The novelty of the character is not what is of prime significance to this study. Instead, I am interested in how he is different from the Trojan characters I have discussed in the previous chapters.

First, he is more closely associated with Helen than he is with his Trojan background. Because of this, he is partly characterized within the context of Helen’s luxurious, easternized sense of wealth and therefore helps to characterize Helen. Secondly, he appears not as a central character who is experiencing acute suffering because of the destruction of Troy, but as an incidental character who may have been displaced from his homeland but has not experienced a change in status. He survived the seizure of Troy because of his servile status, in particular because of his service to Helen, and so he is removed from the Trojan women through his gender, his class, and his attachment to Helen. In both of these ways, his character is functioning differently from the characters of the Trojan women that I have presented in the previous chapters. Their characters are central to each play in which they appear, and they are presented in the context of suffering and loss, not luxurious wealth. This contrast is acute and curious, given my argument that the Trojans are not given the attributes of eastern excess and luxury but are treated with nuance and subtlety. The significant difference between the Phrygian slave and the other Trojan characters discussed in the previous chapters is their class in Troy. The only characters included in the imagined community of Troy are the members of the royal family. Since the Phrygian slave was not part of that imagined environment, Euripides is not bound by tradition to present a recognizable Trojan character.

Concepts of Slavery in Athens

There was a widespread, though not comprehensive, belief in antiquity up until Aristotle’s time at least that barbarians were slaves by nature. As I have demonstrated elsewhere, the belief is thought to have originated after the Greek victory of the wars with Persia. The victory over a

254 West (1987) 277. He cites Phoenician Women and Bacchae as further examples of exoticism. See chapter 1 for a discussion of the difference between exoticism and theatrical syncretism and the application of those terms to Greek tragedy.
much larger force confirmed for the Greeks that their way of life was superior and this superior way of life is what created the impulse to fight and defeat such a large force. Belief in Greek superiority extended so far as to claim that barbarians were better off as slaves, since it was in their nature to subject themselves to mastery. I hope to show, through the example of the Phrygian slave (particularly in contrast to the characterization of the women from the Trojan royal family that I have outlined in the previous chapters), that Trojan characters in tragedy are not all depicted as being slaves by nature. Instead, their class before the Greek conquest is a more significant aspect to their characterization than their ethnicity alone. There are three aspects to my argument dealing with the Phrygian slave: how the character behaves on stage, how he is treated by other characters, and his use of language.

There is no single work of Aristotle or Plato that is entirely devoted to the issue of the natural slavery of barbarians, yet both have strong positions on the topic. Both Aristotle and Plato are late sources for a discussion about tragedy, yet their opinions on natural slavery are generally regarded as a solidification of fifth-century views. Aristotle in particular makes a peculiarly reasoned argument for the natural superiority of Greeks over barbarians in book 1 of the *Politics*. His stated purpose is to discover whether or not anyone is a slave by nature, whether it is just for anyone to be a slave, or whether all slavery is against nature (1254a 17-20). He concludes that indeed it is just and necessary for relationships of authority and subordination to occur (1254b 20-4), and just as the soul ought to rule the body and male ought to rule female, those not in possession of reason ought to be, and even benefit from being, ruled by another who is in possession of reason (1254b 6-20). This reasoning is straightforward; where it becomes

\[\text{255} \quad \text{Fisher (1993) argues that this is the ultimate conclusion reached by Herodotus in his contrasts between the Greeks and the non-Greeks that he encounters (87-9).}\]

\[\text{256} \quad \text{de Ste. Croix (1981, 416-8) thoroughly reviews the examples in the works of Plato and Aristotle that discuss the natural slave and states simply that the beliefs expressed by Plato were shared by “the vast majority of his contemporaries” (416). While this statement comes without any documented evidence, it seems safe to suggest that the natural superiority of the Greeks over barbarians was widely believed precisely because Plato does not present a carefully articulated treatise on the matter. Instead, it is a pervasive element to his thinking (Vlastos, 1941). On the wide belief of natural slavery, see also Garnsey (1996, 9-15); Garlan (1982, 119-26); Schlaifer (1936); Vlastos (1941).}\]
interesting is when Aristotle discusses slavery imposed by law and in particular the war-slave, which is of central interest in the discussion of Trojan slaves.

Aristotle claims that when Greeks are taken prisoner in war they are not slaves because it is not in their nature, but when barbarians are taken prisoner in war they are slaves (1255a 28-9). Furthermore, Greek nobles maintain their nobility no matter where they are in the world, but barbarian nobles are only noble in their own country. Thus, according to Aristotle, there exist two kinds of nobility and two kinds of freedom: one is absolute and belongs only to the Greeks and the other is relative and belongs to barbarians. According to this, most Trojans in Attic tragedy (with the exception of those who appear in tragedies set on Trojan soil: Trojan Women, Rhesus, Alexandros) should have their nobility revoked since they are no longer in their own land. Furthermore, de Ste. Croix proposes an ideology of hegemony that is enforced by the captors in which they must attempt to justify to the captives their natural subordination. In both Agamemnon and Orestes such an ideology of hegemony will be seen to be at work among the captors in the manner that they treat the captive characters, Cassandra and the Phrygian slave, but to different degrees. Clytemnestra asserts her authority over Cassandra, but does not address her in a way that indicates a natural and inherent inferiority. Moreover, Cassandra is not characterized in such a way as to indicate that she believes in her inferiority to Clytemnestra. The Phrygian slave, on the other hand, is treated by Orestes and the chorus as naturally inferior, and he is characterized so as to indicate his belief in his inferiority.

The evidence for the supposed superiority of the Greeks goes beyond the philosophers to include the historical works of Herodotus and even medical writings from the Hippocratic corpus. The Hippocratic treatise On Airs Waters Places does not resemble a medical work, but is more akin to an ethnography, as it uses geography and climate to predict the kinds of illnesses from which people will suffer and their physical appearance. The author goes systematically through the three areas of discussion (airs, waters, and places) and discusses how the different kinds of each can affect people’s health. The first half of the treatise deals with the natural

---

257 de Ste. Croix (1981) 411. By convincing the captives of the validity of their subordination the class of captors is able to “propagate and perpetuate its ideology” (411).

258 “Medical climatology” is the term used by Sarton (1952) to describe the use of climate to explain various health problems and character traits.
environment and is scientific since it makes its thesis from what the author believes to be empirical research and its findings relate almost entirely to health and physical strengths or ailments. In chapters 12-24 however, the entire second half of the treatise, the author extends his findings to the less tangible realm of courage and spirit. He tries to argue that from the medical perspective, Greeks are superior to barbarians because of the climate in which they live.

The consistency of the barbarians’ climate causes them to be weaker in spirit and more willing to subjugate themselves than the Greeks for whom the changes in climate create a fiercer, independent spirit. This position is explained as follows: in the temperate parts of Asia, everything grows beautifully, where the climate is steady year round and gets neither too hot nor too cold. Because of this, the author claims, there is no courage to be found in the men of such lands and pleasure reigns supreme. The uniformity of the seasons does not foster the development of courage, but where there are drastic changes in climate from season to season the men’s spirit and courage are roused. Sharp and frequent seasonal change occurs more in Europe and explains why Europeans\(^{259}\) are by nature more courageous than their Asian counterparts.

Beyond making observations regarding the impact of climate on health and constitution, the author of this treatise makes claims regarding the lack of courage among Asians based on their rule by king. It is at this point that it becomes clear that the discussion is concerned not only with the way health is influenced by climate but also with promoting cultural stereotypes, since at no point does the author claim that rule by king is in any way determined by climate or geography. Arguments such as these indicate how extensive and pervasive the sense of Greek ethnic superiority was, and help to explain why the idea of slavery by nature was so prevalent.

The debate concerning slavery reaches a new level of complexity in the works of the Sophists. The Sophists were by no means a unified group and do not present a unified front on any topic. It is customary to refer to them as a group, but the Sophists shared little more than a name,

\(^{259}\) The author of this work does not specify Greeks as those who live in the ideal climate for producing courage, but it seems safe to assume that he is making precisely that comparison.
which does not appear to have been self-imposed,260 and a new approach to philosophy and philosophical teachings.261 Nevertheless, there are some unifying trends among the disjointed group, even though their actual beliefs and views may have greatly differed. First, they all worked in the second half of the fifth century in and around Athens and are commonly described as teachers of rhetoric.262 Insofar as their teaching focused on preparing young men for a career in public speaking,263 the focus on their rhetorical teaching is justified, but it is also the object of their most critical treatment and the focus on it, particularly by such an influence to later years as Plato, overshadows their other achievements.264 Their intellectual activity focused on humanity rather than transcendental religion and metaphysics; and they practiced empirical research.265 In many ways, therefore, despite the lack of cohesion with respect to their specific interests and conclusions, they can be characterized as practical rather than theoretical, concrete rather than abstract. Furthermore, they helped to create a new way of thinking about life and the way men lived, and it is this curiosity about human life that inspired Euripides to create intellectually curious characters.266

The origin of the eclectic group of thinkers is often overlooked due to the greater interest in their works and legacy. Wallace argues that the Sophists did not arise out of nothing, but represent a shift in the mode of thinking and communication as poets such as Pindar, Simonides, and Bacchylides, all of whom traveled and received payment for their work, were replaced by those

260 Of the Sophists, only Protagoras called himself by that name, and there is no evidence that they considered themselves to be a group at all. See further Wallace (1998) 203; Conacher (1998) 7; Kerferd (1981) 111; Gagarin (2002) 23.

261 Wallace (1998). Wallace suggests that Plato is largely responsible for grouping the Sophists together and for associating them with the pejorative connotation that they have (205ff).

262 Wallace (1998) 203; Conacher (1998) 9. It is difficult to be entirely precise with the dates of the sophistic movement because it encompasses many different thinkers.


265 Wallace (1998) 207. This is based on Wallace’s research into Plato’s construction of the Sophists. See also Conacher (1998) 9.

called the Sophists. Thus he is able to argue that the Sophistic movement was not revolutionary, but built upon ideas that existed earlier and were being disseminated in a different format. Nevertheless, the Sophists were pioneers in helping to shape the intellectual environment in which they lived and in the novelty of their approach to philosophy.

One of the issues that was of great interest to the Sophists is the distinction between nomos – custom and physis – nature. Conacher suggests that the Sophists in general may have been sympathetic to the egalitarian approach to humanity, and therefore against the superiority of any people based solely on physis because many of them were foreign. Naturally, therefore, they would object to the concept of innate slavery that they may have seen propounded by Athenians. The debate spread into every aspect of life and touched upon religion, politics, justice, for example, as the Sophists grappled with the question: are these institutions created by the customs of society, or did they arise out of some natural need? This can be extended to the whole of the community’s social structure, by asking whether the divisions between people exist because of natural racial division or because of human custom. The issue is complex and requires more time than can be devoted to it here in order to fully expound it. I will, therefore, focus on the implications of the nomos/physis antithesis to the question of slavery and enslaved Trojans in particular.

---

267 Wallace (1998) 210-1. One major difference between the poets and the Sophists is that the poets received money from wealthy patrons who have earned a particular achievement in order to create an epic-style glory for them, whereas the Sophists received money from anyone who could pay their fees in order to teach them how to promote and further their political lives. Such students were potentially anyone without a noble pedigree whom the sophists would train to place them in the same position of advantage as those from noble families.


270 According to Kerferd (1981) this is always a prescriptive not a descriptive term which can have the meaning of law (“a legally prescribed norm” 112) or custom (“a norm prescribed by convention” 112).

271 Conacher (1998) 67. This is a weak argument for explaining an entire shift in philosophical thinking, if an interesting attempt to draw the reader’s attention towards the human factors that may be responsible for such shifts.

272 See further Kerferd (1981) who devotes a chapter of his monograph to the nomos/physis antithesis within the Sophistic movement, especially pp. 111-29.
I have already discussed the later manifestation of this debate in which Aristotle argues for natural slavery particularly applied to barbarians. It is the Sophists who brought this debate to a mass audience, and Antiphon is the Sophist of greatest interest and relevance here, for some of his extant writings deal directly with the question of slavery, and whether or not there are those who are slaves by nature.\footnote{There is great scholarly debate regarding the identity of Antiphon and whether there was one or two such figures because of a dramatic difference in the tone of the writings attributed to him/them. One writes with what is considered to be a strong ‘democratic’ tone, praising common humanity, while the other is more staunchly oligarchic. See Pendrick (2002) 1-26. Wallace, however, argues convincingly that the sophistic movement experienced a shift from democratic to antidemocratic tendencies sometime after 430 (1998, 216). He takes this argument so far as to suggest that the Sophists helped to destroy the Athenian democracy (222). Such a shift would explain the radical change in Antiphon’s writings. For further support of the unitarian view, see Gagarin (2002) 41-52.}
The work of immediate interest are the fragmentary remains of \textit{On Truth},\footnote{Pendrick (2002) provides the most recent and extensive edition with a full introduction and commentary.} in which Antiphon questions societal norms by arguing that what is desirable is what is advantageous to each individual man. He goes on to make what has been interpreted as an egalitarian comment on humanity, that Greeks and barbarians are by nature the same. This has more recently been complicated as more of the papyrus has been found and scholars have attempted to interpret a more nuanced position.\footnote{See Pendrick (2002) 351-6 and Hall (1989) 218-20 for a summary of past and more recent scholars’ interpretations of the nature of Antiphon’s position.} My interpretation pieces together Antiphon’s argument with the goal of determining his view of slavery. It reveals a circular argument that is difficult to comprehend fully.

Fragment 44b states that “we”, that is, all of humanity, according to Pendrick,\footnote{(358-9). He argues specifically that this first person plural is all-inclusive and not merely referring to Greeks.} have become barbarians in each other’s eyes because we are not familiar with each other’s laws or customs:

\begin{verbatim}
...οιον ἐπιστήμων...
θά τε καὶ σέβουμεν.
\end{verbatim}
τοὺς δὲ [τῶν τη- 
λού οἰχ[οῦν] τῶν 
οὔτε ἐπ[οτ]άμε 
θὰ οὔτε σέβομεν.

… [the laws of those near by] we know and observe, the laws of those who live far off we neither know nor observe. (2.1-6)277

Furthermore, by birth “we” are all the same:

ἐν τ[ο]ύτω οὖν
πρὸς ἀλλήλους
βεβαβαβαβώμε-
θα· ἐπεὶ φόσει γε
πάντα πάντες
ὁμοίως πεφύξ[α-
μεν καὶ βαβα-
ροι καὶ Ἐλλην[ες
eῖνα.

277 All line numbers are following Pendrick (2002).
Now in this we have become barbarians in one another’s eyes; for by birth, at least, we are all naturally adapted in every aspect to be either Greeks or barbarians. (2.7-15)

This statement, followed by the remarks about how “we” all breathe, feel, laugh, cry (2.27-3.12), encourages reading this fragment as promoting egalitarianism, but it does not say that “we” are all equally good or moral creatures. Rather, it argues for sameness at the most basic level while leaving open the question of cultural development. If we return to Antiphon’s previous statements regarding justice, however, he argues against man-made laws because many of them inhibit human nature (fr. 44a 2.26-3.18), and he claims that one ought to follow one’s nature. This is where the argument becomes circular because, according to Antiphon, only laws or customs distinguish Greeks from barbarians, and yet those very customs are flawed because they inhibit nature. Since there appears to be a great emphasis on nature and on the natural similarities between all people, and since it is custom that induces change, it must follow that there cannot be slaves by nature. Moreover, since laws or customs are inhibitors of nature and therefore negative, and it is law or custom that creates slavery, and since all are born equal, the institution of slavery itself can be questioned with this argument.

And yet, it is crucial to note that Antiphon does not reject the notion of separation based on class. The argument focuses on whether or not those born outside of Greece are naturally inferior, not whether or not it is acceptable for one to keep slaves. The institution of slavery is never explicitly questioned, only the notion of judgment based on ethnic difference. This is an intriguing distinction for this chapter, which discusses a character who is both a ‘barbarian’ and a slave and demonstrates how Euripides in particular engaged with the same kind of intellectual activity as the Sophists. It is difficult to determine the level of direct influence that the

---

Sophists had an impact on Euripides, if any, but it is clear that Euripides contributed to the intellectual climate that he shared with the sophists.\textsuperscript{280}

Antiphon’s *On Truth* shows us how closely connected nature and culture are and how culture can influence nature, or perhaps how nature can influence culture, creating such a fine distinction that it becomes difficult to discern between them. This provides an explanation for the great debate on this topic and for the range in interpretations. If the distinction between nature and culture can be made so slight, arguments can easily be made for the importance of each. With respect to the Trojan characters in tragedy I suggest that their class before Greek captivity is key to determining the kind of slave they are. I have already argued that the Trojan royal family’s nobility is maintained in their removal from Troy, a point which will become more pronounced by comparison with the Phrygian slave in this chapter. The consistency of their characterization suggests that Euripides considered the royal characters to be slaves by law but not by nature. Their class ensures that any negative ethnic qualities that might be associated with them are not made part of their character. Our single example of a slave who was also a slave in Troy, the Phrygian slave in *Orestes*, creates a rather different kind of Trojan because he is portrayed as a slave by nature, and for this reason he has negative ethnic qualities emphasized in his characterization. This suggests that class was central to the way that the Greeks conceived of the Trojans.

\textit{Orestes’ Phrygian Slave: the hierarchy of slavery.}

Euripides has much creative freedom with all aspects of *Orestes* since it treats an intermediary episode of the Orestes myth (between the killing of Clytemnestra and the departure of Orestes for Delphi) that is not seen elsewhere. Over the course of the first thousand lines of the play, Orestes is tormented by Furies that are invisible to the audience (255-79), insulted by Tyndareus (478-541; 607-33), abandoned by Menelaus (682-715), and judged by the Argive assembly (866-956). The assembly’s judgment is for the immediate death of Orestes and Electra by

\textsuperscript{280} As Allan (1999-2000) puts it: “The details of who borrowed what from whom are less important than a larger fact; namely, that both Euripides and the sophists testify to a period of extreme intellectual curiosity in all directions” (147).
suicide, but this is put off by Pylades’ plan to murder Helen (1105). Helen’s daughter Hermione interrupts Helen’s murder (1323) and it is not until the end of the play that the audience learns of her fate (1653–4). The Phrygian slave enters amidst the confusion of Hermione’s seizure and Helen’s supposed murder and provides information that is crucial to the audience and chorus’ understanding of the events that have just taken place inside the house. His escape from the house also provides the opportunity for Orestes’ entrance as he comes to retrieve the escaped slave. This, in turn, allows the audience and the chorus to learn of Orestes’ intended course of action. The slave acts as an important guide for the audience’s understanding of events until this point and anticipation of upcoming events.

The slave’s ethnicity is brought to the audience’s attention before he enters in Orestes and Pylades’ planning of their murder of Helen:

Πυ. τίνας; Φρυγῶν γὰρ οὐδέν’ ἄν τρέσαιμ. ἐγώ.
Ορ. οἶους ἐνόπτρων καὶ μύρων ἐπιστάτας.
Πυ. τρυφὰς γὰρ ἥκει δεῦρ’ ἔχουσα Τρωικάς;

Pylades: What are they? I wouldn’t be scared of any Phrygian.
Orestes: Such as any superintendants of mirrors and perfumes.
Pylades: You mean she’s come here with the comforts of Troy?

(1111-3)  

The mention of perfume and mirrors in line (1112) evokes the image of a perfumed, effeminate barbarian but this is quickly dismissed with Pylades’ next line: “οὐδὲν τὸ δοῦλον πρὸς τὸ μὴ δοῦλον γένος” (“the slave breed is nothing as against the free”; 1115). The slaves’ ethnicity is

281 Text and translation of Orestes are West (1987).
nothing compared to their class, and it is not a Trojan that is nothing to Pylades, but a slave is nothing in comparison to a man born free. Their ethnicity cannot even be named as the sole reason for their presence in Argos because, while it is true that the Greek victory over the Trojans created the situation of Trojans in Greece, only their position as slaves under Helen’s control saved them. Almost every other Trojan man was killed, and even young Astyanax was killed because of the potential future threat he posed to the Greeks.\footnote{So we are told is Odysseus’ reason for calling for his death in \textit{Trojan Women}, line 723.} Despite the shared ethnic background of the Phrygian slave and the Trojan women who are taken captive by the Greeks, the culture that each has acquired is vastly different. Here I am once again using Jonathan Hall’s distinction between ethnicity and culture with culture being, as he says, the “reification” of learned ideas, values, attitudes, and ethnicity being what comes from the belief in a shared kinship and descent, whether it is real or fictive.\footnote{See Hall (2002), especially 9-17.} The difference between the culture of the slave and the Trojan royal women allows for the difference in their treatment and further demonstrates the respect granted to the traditionally kind reception of the Trojan royal family.

There is no doubt as to the nature of the Phrygian slave’s slavery, either in his actual role or in his perception of the role. He describes himself as a domestic slave in Helen’s service, and as such he is incorporated as part of the household. He has fully accepted his yoke of slavery because he was a slave also in Troy.\footnote{Pylades and Orestes tell us that Helen is surrounded by slaves brought from Troy, and the Phrygian himself says that Helen is surrounded exclusively by Phrygian, Trojan, slaves who fan her, for example, in a typical Phrygian fashion (1448-77).} When he mourns for Troy (1381-92) he does not mourn his past life or mention the fall of Troy bringing any change in status to him, but he bewails only the loss of his homeland. His daily life, however, shows no indication of change. This marks a significant distinction from the way the Trojan royal women mourn in other plays when they mourn for the loss of their city and families, but also for their former status and way of life.\footnote{For example, see \textit{Andromache}; \textit{Hecuba}; \textit{Trojan Women}.} Moreover, his quick change in allegiance from Helen to Orestes when faced with Orestes’ threats highlights his servility for he will flatter and serve whomever he identifies as the more
powerful master. This, too, can be compared with the behaviour of other Trojan slaves of war, all of whom submit to their fate but maintain a level of defiance towards their new masters.

Cassandra in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* is a useful contrast for the Phrygian slave, since their situations are similar. Both have brief, yet crucial roles as conveyors of information. The Phrygian slave has information about the present that is essential for the audience and chorus’ understanding of the off-stage action. Cassandra has information about the past and the future of the house of Atreus that helps to build dramatic irony as the chorus continues to misunderstand her prophecies. In contrast with the Phrygian slave, Cassandra remains in control of herself and her actions. Although she is ultimately killed by Clytemnestra, she is still able to undermine Clytemnestra’s attempt at mastery over her by ignoring her instructions to enter the palace (from 1035-1068). This is interpreted by Clytemnestra and the chorus as either an act of defiance or a sign that Cassandra does not understand Greek. Neither considers that she may be silent because she is becoming consumed by her own thoughts and prophetic visions.

Throughout her presence on stage, Cassandra speaks when she is moved by the god to do so, or in a reciprocal conversation with the chorus, not when she is moved by the necessity of human servitude. Furthermore, when she does enter the palace it is not because she has accepted the yoke of slavery, but because she has accepted her role in the death of Agamemnon and the fate of the House of Atreus (1279-89). She is not focused on the reduction of her status, but sees rather her position as part of something greater. Cassandra does not behave like a slave because she maintains power over her captors through the self-control that stems from the knowledge that her prophecies grant her. She is frightened and agitated, which is marked in the text by frequent exclamations of distress (1072, 1089, 1100, 1107, for example). Despite this, however,

---

286 Denniston and Page (1957) 163 argue for Clytemnestra’s impatience and motivation for thinking that “even a benighted barbarian could surely understand that she is being urged to enter the palace, and could surely say Yes or No by a gesture.” Thomson (1966), however, suggests an alternate interpretation of Clytemnestra’s lines (87-8), in which she addresses line 1061 to the chorus and not to Cassandra. He consequently translates lines 1060-1 as follows: “if you (Cassandra) do not understand, then you (chorus) address her not with your voice, but with a barbarian hand (i.e.: drag her from the chariot).” The problem with this suggestion is that the chorus does not respond to such an order in any way.
she does not cower, but confronts the visions she sees and faces her own fate (1313-4). She thus embodies calmness once she has overcome her fear instead of throwing herself at her new masters’ feet in an attempt to reverse the impending fate she has seen. In this way, she maintains her self-control and the dignity of her former station.

In Euripides, Cassandra is also accepting of her fate and proud of her role in the destruction of the house of Atreus without ever bowing to her new masters (Trojan Women 357-67, for example). Elsewhere in Trojan Women, Hecuba advocates an acceptance of fate to Andromache (686-700), while maintaining the dignity of her status. In Hecuba, Hecuba maintains her status to such an extent that she attempts to place herself on the same social level as Agamemnon. Andromache, though a frightened suppliant, is able to stand firmly against Hermione and Menelaus until threatened with the death of her son in Andromache. As I have demonstrated in the two previous chapters, in all of these cases the women maintain the nobility of their birth class as much as they are able to in their new positions under Greek masters. Through their fear and grief they are presented to the audience as strong, proud women.

The Phrygian slave, by contrast, is presented entirely differently, as his speech indicates a nervous, agitated and confused character. His difference from the other characters is marked by the lyric metres of his song as it is unlike any other character’s in the play. This is certainly a marker of his difference in terms of ethnicity, but I also suggest that it marks him as distinctly lower class. The Phrygian’s song, through its varied meter and distinction from other characters’ speech, contributes to the sense of confusion in the Phrygian’s presence.

Winnington-Ingram suggests a neat solution to the oddity of the slave’s song. He points to the rarity of two messenger speeches, and the rarity of two lengthy messenger speeches in particular. Since Orestes’ trial was reported in a more traditional messenger speech, the slave’s song presents the solution to the necessity of having the interior activities described. Thus Euripides creates a new kind of messenger as well as a new use for monody in tragedy.287

287 Winnington-Ingram (2003) 58-9. Arnott (1973) 57 explains that in this scene Euripides substitutes the expected messenger speech for “an eccentric monody by a Phrygian slave” thus creating a sense of the “unexpected” throughout the scene.
The Phrygian’s entrance is hurried and frantic as he escapes from the chaotic scene inside the palace and he is not greeted with any sympathy by the chorus, who treat him simply as an eye-witness narrator. It shows no concern for him, no pity for his situation, it only needs him to provide them with information. Compare this, for example, with the chorus’ sympathetic and gentle treatment of Cassandra at *Agamemnon* 1069ff as it tries to encourage her to leave the chariot. That chorus treats Cassandra, also a Trojan slave by this point, with respect for the position that she held previously. The Phrygian slave, in contrast, is greeted by an impatient chorus, and after he has reported on the indoor action a sword-wielding Orestes enters in pursuit of the escapee. As soon as Orestes enters, the Phrygian throws himself at Orestes’ mercy and tries to negotiate some control over his situation (1519-23) but is unsuccessful. The nameless, unknown Phrygian slave is portrayed as weak, scared, and willing to debase himself in order to save his life. Yet, what emerges is not a defense for the so-called “Phrygianization of Troy” because of this one character who exhibits the classic Eastern symptoms of slavishness and effeminacy. Rather, this is one character whose slavish class, not ethnicity, is fully exploited.

*Language and the New Music*

The contrast with Cassandra shows that class determines how Trojan characters are presented and how the other characters in each tragedy behave towards them. The most significant aspect of difference between the Phrygian slave and the other characters in *Orestes* is speech, and his manner of speaking has garnered the most attention for him. As Porter has said, most critics tend to focus on the “formal peculiarities” of the speech – such as its odd form and metre and the confused way in which he conveys the information that he brings. Porter goes on to show how many of these observations are not entirely accurate – the metre, for example, he demonstrates to be deliberate and careful rather than chaotic, and in his discussion of this character Porter moves away from the focus on the formal aspects, making clear the importance of the Phrygian as a messenger, and therefore the importance of having his words fully understood by both the audience and the chorus: that is, what has often been considered to be

---

babbling, baffling almost incomprehensible Greek is in fact necessarily orderly and fully comprehensible.\textsuperscript{289} This is essential because Euripides has, as far as we know, stepped away from the traditional telling of the aftermath of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus’ murder and has invented all of the events of \textit{Orestes}. In so doing, he creates a bold but potentially confusing narrative.

By the time the Phrygian enters the stage, the audience and the chorus have already heard Helen’s death cries from inside the palace. It is the Phrygian’s role to assure the audience that Helen has not actually been killed, but has merely vanished. His words must be clearly understood. Nevertheless, his language and syntax are different from that of the other characters and the form of his monody sets him entirely apart. He is agitated, he throws in a non-Greek interjection and draws attention to the fact that he is speaking in a non-Greek way: “αἵλινον

\textsuperscript{289} Willink (1986) takes particular exception with Arrowsmith’s 1958 translation in the Grene and Lattimore series, which he calls a “travesty of a translation into pidgin English” (305). For example, the Greek of lines 1376-9 is:

\begin{verbatim}
πᾷ φύγω, ξέναι, 
πολιον αίθερ' ἀμ-
πτάμενος ἥ πόντον, Ὄκεανὸς ὃν
ταυρόκρανας ἄγκαλαις
ἐλίσσων κυκλοῖ χθόνα;
\end{verbatim}

which Arrowsmith translates as:

Where can run, where go?
Mebbe foreign ladies know?
Up, up, soar in air, him shimmer nothing?
Swim in sea – mebbe? mebbe? –
where godbull ocean cradles world
flowing water with?

and West (1987), by contrast, translates rather differently as:

Which way may I escape, ladies:
by flying up unto the white heaven,
or to the sea that Ocean the bull-headed
winds in his arms as he rounds the earth?
αἴλινον ἀρχὰν θανάτου βάρβαροι λέγουσιν, αἰαί…” (“Ailinon aيلinions barbarians say to inaugurate death, ah woe!” 1395-6). His frantic behaviour, most evident in verbal repetition (for example, 1373: “φροῦδα φροῦδα, γά γά”) and his incomplete mastery of the Greek language prevent him from being seen as anything other than a foreign slave.

The Phrygian soldier in Timotheus’ Persians is an interesting parallel to Euripides’ Phrygian. Although he only speaks twelve lines in a citharodic nome and not a tragedy, he is a similar character type. Both are nameless characters, previously unknown in myth or history, both are cowardly, and both are linguistically distinguished from the mythically or historically known characters in their respective poems. Timotheus introduces the soldier’s speech in general terms. It is what any Celaenaean would say when being dragged off by the hair by a conquering Greek. Just as the Phrygian slave in Orestes is a non-specific slave, merely one from the many who arrived with Helen, this soldier is merely one of the many taken by the victorious Greeks. His speech is confused and reflects “imperfect linguistic knowledge:”

†έγω μοι σοι† κώς καὶ τί πράγμα;
αὕτις οὐδάμ’ ἐλθω’
καὶ νῦν ἐμὸς δεσπότης
δεῦρο μ’ ἐνθάδ’ ήξειν:
tὰ λοιπὰ δ’ οὐχέτι, πάτερ,
οὐχέτι μαχέσ’ αὕτις ἐνθ<ά>δ’ ἐφχω

290 ά λινον ά λινον also appears at Ajax 627, uttered by the Salaminian chorus, and so it cannot be considered to be an unequivocally Eastern or barbarian exclamation. The key here is that the slave specifies that it is what the βάρβαροι say.
293 Hordern (2002) 205. Hordern suggests that Timotheus is drawing on the use of “non-Attic dialects and non-Greek gibberish” common in Old Comedy.
ἀλλὰ κάθω.

ἐγὼ σοι μὴ δεῦρ᾽, ἐγὼ
κεῖσε παρὰ Σάρδι, παρὰ Σοῦο′,
Ἄγβάτανα ναῖων·
Ἄρτιμις ἐμὸς μέγας θεός
παρ᾽ Ἐφεσον φυλάξει.

†I with you† how and what thing? Me no come back. This time my master
brung me here to this place; but for the rest no more, sir, no more I come here
again to fight. But I stay. I here not to you, I there by Sardis, by Sousa, dwelling
Agbatana. Artimis, my great god, will guard me in Ephesus. (150-61)²⁹⁴

The confused syntax and errors in the Greek are distinct markers of alterity and are perhaps
intended to be humorous, as Hall argues,²⁹⁵ and are more prominent when compared to the
proper Greek that Xerxes’s character speaks:²⁹⁶

ιὼ κατασκαφαὶ δόμων
σεῖμαι τε νάες Ἑλλανίδες, αἬ

²⁹⁴ Text and translation of Timotheus are Hordern (2002).
²⁹⁶ Hall (1993:2006) 64:280 identifies Xexes’ speech with “high tragic style” and Hordern
(2002) 214 observes “several phrases are borrowed directly from Aeschylus.” For example,
Hordern suggests that “πολύανδρον” (181, “many”) is found at Persians 73 and 533; “βαρε ἀ
συμφορά” (187, “heavy fate”) is “imitating” Persians 1044; “βαρε ἀ γ ὀ δε συμφορά”
(“indeed this fate is heavy”). He further notes that it is “uncertain” whether an audience would
notice the intertextuality, but suggests “they would no doubt have been able to identify the
change in style from the preceding section and to recognize the tragic influences.”
κατὰ μὲν ἥλικ’ ὀλέσαθ’ ἤ-

βαν νέων πολύανδρον·

νάες δ’ οὐκ{1} ὀποσσόπορευ-

τόν <νυν> ἄξουσιμ, πυρὸς

δ’ αἰθαλόεμ μένος ἄγιω

ὀσματι φλέξει{5}, ὀστονόεντα δ’ ἄλγη

ἔσται Περσίδι χώραι·

<Ϊ> ῥ βαρεία συμφορά,

ἄ μ’ ἐς Ἑλλάδ’ ἣγαγες·

ἀλλ’ ἵτε, μηκέτι μέλλετε,

ζεύγνυτε μὲν τετρά<ορ>ον ἵπ-

πων ὀχμ’, οἱ δ’ ἀνάριθμον ὀλ-

βον φορεῖτ᾿ ἐπὶ ἀπίνας·

πάμπρατε δὲ σκηνάς,

μηδὲ τις ἣμετέρου γένοιτ᾿

ὄνησις αὐτοῖσι πλοῦτου.

O ruin of my house and burning Greek ships that destroyed the multitudinous youth of young men! The ships will not carry them away, backward-travelling, but the blazing strength of the fire will burn them with its savage body, and lamentable suffering shall befall the Persian land. O you heavy fate that brought me to Greece! But go, delay no more; yoke my four-horsed chariot, and you
others carry my countless wealth to the wagons; burn the tents, and let them have no benefit from our wealth. (178-95)

Xerxes, the only named and historically recognizable character in the nome, speaks in correct Greek. Class, not ethnicity, determines linguistic register, which nicely parallels the different registers of language and syntax of the characters in *Orestes*. There is nothing remarkable about the way the known, royal characters (or the friends of the royals, such as Pylades) speak. The otherwise unknown slave, however, can easily become an ethnic caricature, one who does not (perhaps even cannot) share in the Greeks’ cultural identity because there is no mythical or literary background with which to identify him.

The Phrygian slave’s monody deserves some attention, primarily because it creates such a distinction between him and the other characters. Furthermore, it is part of a scene that is full of both confusion and strong emotions through the lyrics and, presumably, the music that accompanied them. The metrical composition is a combination of various lyric metres to intensify the slave’s frantic words:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἀμφιπορφύρων πέπλων (lekythion)}^{297} & \\
\text{ὑπὸ σκότου ξίφη σπάσαντες ἐν χεροῖν (three iambbs)} & \\
\text{ἄλλοσ᾽ ἄλλοθεν (hypodochmius)} & \\
\text{δίνησαν ὄμμα, μή τις (iamb, bacchic)} & \\
\text{παρὼν τύχοι (iamb)} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

(1457-9)

---

297 Willink (1986) provides a metrical analysis of the Phrygian’s song.
The changing metre also helps to convey the slave’s fear for himself and his mistress based on what has just occurred inside the palace, and it ensures that the sense of urgency and anticipation is maintained for the audience. The polymetric nature of the song is what allows the slave’s monody to be classified as part of the New Music.

‘New Music’ is a term used only by modern scholars to describe the innovations in music that occurred in the later half of the fifth century and included many different kinds of musically accompanied performances, but the dithyramb and drama in particular. The innovations received harsh criticism by many scholars in antiquity for their more sensual appeal of varied musical modulations, ornate vocabulary, use of imagery, and a flowing sentence structure that “was susceptible to grammatical derailment.” In short, these new musical stylings made popular by Timotheus and Euripides, among others, were nothing like good, old-fashioned music, and critics used the popular innovations to create a political difference out of a musical difference. Such critics were mostly conservative aristocrats who were opposed to change and took the opportunity presented by the musical innovations to present them as undermining traditional music in a dangerous way. For example, the varying metre and the highly figurative language was considered to be a liability and evocative of eastern, effeminate sounds. There is nothing to suggest that New Music was itself an anti-establishment political statement issued by rebellious poets, though it is possible that once the antithesis between old


300 Csapo (1999-2000) 401 cites Phrynis, Melanippides, Kinesias, Timotheus, Euripides, Agathon, Philoxenus, and Telestes as the authors generally cited by modern scholars in their treatment of New Music. He argues, however, that discussions of individuals result in “the misrecognition of the social and economic factors which make innovation acceptable, desirable, or consistent enough to be reckoned coherent movements” (401).

301 Csapo & Wilson (2009).

and new was politicized poets responded to the accusations against their music. It is better understood to be reflective of a dynamic social and artistic environment.

Social and artistic dynamism and innovation often involves a return to a conservative element or a re-working of a traditional element. What is called the New Music is seen by Csapo as a conservative movement and a return to the inclusion of Dionysiac elements into drama. Instead of being an innovative new direction for drama that takes it even further into the realm of popular entertainment that is pandering to the tastes of the masses, it is a return to the religious, cultic aspect of tragedy. The problem with such an interpretation, I suggest, is that, in this case study of the Phrygian slave in Orestes, the New Music is placed in the mouth of a marginalized, entirely invented character. That is, the character who sings the monody is an oddity among the traditional characters that are conventional in Greek tragedy. Because of this, there is an undeniable innovative element that is being added to the re-introduction of Dionysian music. Csapo argues that the prominence of female or Eastern choruses in Euripides helps make the New Musical trends more palatable to the Athenian audience members since those are the groups more likely to become emotional. The characterization might fail to create a sense of identification between audience and chorus, “but this gap is arguably there precisely to allow the audience to receive emotional outpourings which it would have found unseemly in a chorus of citizen males”. This explains the prominence of, and the need for, so many female and Eastern choruses and monodists, but it does not fully account for the case of the Phrygian slave.

If we consider only Trojan characters, the slave still holds a unique position. The other captive Trojans have a distinct reason for outpourings of grief: the loss of land, family, status. From them, emotional songs are acceptable not only because they are Eastern women but also because

---


304 Csapo (1999-2000) 425 states “the New Musicians imagined their project as the (re-) creation of an authentically Dionysian music.” He further argues that the New Music gained its negative reputation in part through Dionysus’ association with sensuality, femininity, and the East, none of which fit with the fifth-century Athenian ideological view.


306 Csapo (1999-2000) 425. He also notes that this is also the case for most monodists in Euripides.
they have a legitimate, well-known reason for grief. What makes the Phrygian unique is that his highly emotional monody stems not from the destruction of his country or the loss of family but the near-death of his mistress which, should it have happened would have been distressing, but would not dramatically have altered his life. Moreover, it is not a coherent expression of emotion, but a rather confused outburst (though, as Porter argues, carefully controlled by Euripides) from which the chorus and the audience learns frustratingly little.

By stepping outside of the tradition, Euripides is able to experiment with a class of Trojans other than the royal family. By showing us this other side of Troy – the otherwise nameless, faceless lower class – Euripides toys with audience expectation and raises questions regarding the portrayal of all other Trojan characters. If the Phrygian slave fits so nicely into the category of “them” – non-Greek, slave, arguably with effeminate qualities – if such a portrayal is possible, then why do we not see it with the other Trojan characters? I have suggested that class was an important consideration in forming ethnically other characters in tragedy, and that it is a component that should not be overlooked when considering the construction of Greek self-identity. If all of the above discussion is taken into account, the complexity of the notion of slavery becomes clear, in particular when it is related to the notion of being a slave by nature. I suggest that the class into which one is born is the greatest distinction among Trojans, and that Trojan slaves by birth are characterized with the easternizing qualities, while the war-captured royals escape these mechanisms.

Tragedy respected the Trojan social hierarchy for reasons that are difficult to understand. The care taken to preserve the nobility of the captured royal family in the Trojans’ depiction in tragedy is most evident when contrasted with the only extant example of a real Trojan slave, one who belonged to that rank before captivity, the Phrygian slave of Orestes. This demonstrates a social hierarchy among captured Trojans, not only in the value of the prize but also in the perception of social status and consequent proximity or distance from Greek social norms. As has been the case in many examples throughout the previous chapters, the cultural identity of the character is emphasized as the crucial element, not their ethnic identity. This chapter has further demonstrated that neither ethnicity nor captivity is sufficient to reduce royal Trojans to cowardly slaves. As Troy is re-cast in tragedy, its “brilliant dynasts” maintain their privileged position while its one nameless slave can easily become an object of derision.
Epilogue

Troy Beyond Athens: from Destruction to Empire

In chapter 2, I began with a discussion of the traditional background of Trojan characters as presented in the *Iliad.* Much of my argument in the chapters that followed depends upon the importance of the traditional background of Troy and the Trojans and how they are appropriated by tragedians. I have argued that Trojan women in particular, having been removed from epic and given their own voice in tragedy, are useful models with which tragedians could explore the complex issue of identity. Because of the sympathetic nature of their epic characters, they can take on aspects of Athenian culture and become representatives of Athens, even though they are ethnically different. They are thus in a unique position in tragedy of being ethnically other but culturally similar at a time when distinctions between the Athenian self and the external other were being considered in tragedy. The Trojan women’s expression of grief or loss in tragedy allows for an emotional connection to be made with the ever-doomed city that could have provoked a powerful emotional response from the audience. If, as I have argued in chapter 4, Troy can function as a representative ‘everycity’ and could remind Athenian audience members of the potential mortality of their own city, then an emotional response to the Trojan women could have inspired reflection and feelings of proleptic nostalgia towards Athens.

In Athenian tragedy the emotional connection inspired by Trojans is one of despair or hopelessness. There is no salvation for Troy and its inhabitants, for even those who survive do so either briefly, such as Cassandra and Hecuba, or live first in miserable slavery like Andromache does in the house of Neoptolemus only to be transferred to yet another husband in yet another foreign city. Their behaviour in face of adversity may be admirable, but their lives are not enviable. Euripidean tragedy focuses on the unenviable lot of the women in a way that creates political distance and encourages instead an emotional association. The interest in appropriating Trojans for new stories does not end with fifth-century Athenian tragedy, and if we leap forward several centuries to Vergil’s *Aeneid,* we can see that they continue to be unique
due to their liminal position of being both similar and different. That they can hold this position in both fifth-century BC Greece and first-century CE Rome is a testament to their unique characteristics and the power of the tradition that maintained them as vibrant characters throughout the centuries.

I have argued that in tragedy Trojan characters are used to invite an emotional response from the audience through their ever-doomed city and destroyed inhabitants. In the *Aeneid*, the opposite perspective is shown, since it is the story of the survivors who, led by Aeneas, escape the destruction of the city and captivity at the hands of the Greeks. For Vergil, the Trojan Aeneas is destined to prevail, and so the Greek concept of the Trojans is entirely altered. In this further recasting of Troy, instead of death, sadness, and destruction, the Trojans must embody a new sense of resilience and they must learn to leave Troy in the past and look to a new future in a new land. This is a difficult lesson for the Trojans to learn, and their initial instinct upon fleeing their burning city is to attempt to recreate Troy elsewhere.

I will not present a complete analysis of the place and function of Troy in the *Aeneid*, but will offer a brief discussion of the meeting of Aeneas and Andromache in the Buthrotum episode from book 3 by way of comparison and contrast with the portrayal of Trojans in tragedy to demonstrate the continued interest in the Trojan characters and their subsequent evolution. Whereas in tragedy Troy was idealized and the life it provided was held in contrast with the current life of the individual characters, in the *Aeneid* Troy becomes an empty shell of the past from which Aeneas must distance himself if he is to progress. His meeting with Andromache is narrated by Aeneas himself to Dido as part of his description of the sequence of events that

307 *The Aeneid* is by no means the only example of Roman literature to include Trojan characters. I have selected it as an example because the treatment of the Trojans is a marked contrast with that of Athenian tragedy.

308 As Williams (1962) notes, the re-establishment of the Trojan gods is indeed Aeneas’ duty. Bettini (1997) states that Aeneas wants to rebuild Troy, but that fate will make it impossible for him to do so.

309 In fact, more than distancing himself from Troy, Aeneas and his fellow Trojans must abandon much of their Trojan identity, including their language, custom and even the name ‘Trojan.’ In order to settle in Italy, only the Trojan penates can remain from their past. See Bettini (1997) 30.
led him to Carthage. The events of book 3 show the slow progress made by the Trojan wanderers. Instead, they have a series of failed settlements that repeatedly force them to start over again. They appear to be caught in a regressive cycle in which they attempt to build or find hollow replicas of Troy instead of moving on. It is the Trojans’ nostalgic attempts to repeat or relive their past that constitutes their wanderings, steering them off-course and away from their goal, and the epic’s goal, of Italy.

The past haunts them when they should be looking to the future. This is perhaps most keenly felt during the episode of Buthrotum at 3. 294-505, in which Vergil depicts the imitation of Troy with Helenus and Andromache clinging to their remembered past as a kind of underworld, inhabited by the living and the ghost-like memories of the dead. The episode comes after the Trojans have tried and failed to establish a new Troy in Crete and they have been encountering difficulties along their entire course. Their attempted settlement on Crete demonstrates that the Trojans desire a new Troy, a fresh beginning where they can recreate the glory of their former city. The encounter with Andromache, however, indicates to the reader that Troy and its former inhabitants are nothing more than ghosts best left in the past.

If we turn back to Euripides’ *Andromache*, the contrast between the portrayals of Troy becomes apparent. In *Andromache*, Andromache recalls her relationship with Hector and uses it to contrast her appropriate uxorial behaviour with the inappropriate behaviour she sees in Hermione. She idealizes her past, but is nevertheless living in the present. She speaks of her current condition as one of necessity, over which she has no control but with which she must endure. Her idealized past is a reminder of how happy she once was, and provides her with the strength to tolerate her current life.

Vergil’s Andromache is rather different. The strength that Euripides’ character received from the memory of her past is gone and replaced instead by endless longing and tears. Aeneas

---

310 According to Williams (1962) 18 the “gradual progress towards the desired goal” is the theme of book 3.

311 Bettini (1997) 20 argues that the exact replica of Troy created by Helenus and Andromache is “marked by inadequacy,” and has a “melancholy lack that prevents it from fully replacing the original.” That is, the new city tries to replicate Troy but it is nothing more than an imitation of the city’s former glory.
encounters her after the events in *Andromache* have concluded and she has been sent to live as Helenus’ wife in Buthrotum. After having put into the shore, when Aeneas hears that Helenus is living there, ruling over Greek cities with Andromache as his wife (“Priamiden Helenum Graias regnare per urbis/coniugio Aeacidae Pyrrhi sceptrisque potitum,/et patrio Andromachen iterum cessisse marito” 3. 295-7) he quickly goes in search of his countrymen. Andromache is the first person he sees, making offerings to Hector’s ‘tomb’, really an empty mound at which she mourns her first husband:

\[
\ldots\text{sollemnis cum forte dapes et tristia dona}
\]
\[
\text{ante urbem in luco falsi Simoentis ad undam}
\]
\[
\text{libbat cineri Andromache manisque vocabat}
\]
\[
\text{Hectoreum ad tumulum, uiridi quem caespite inanem}
\]
\[
\text{et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacrauerat aras.}
\]

By chance Andromache, with a ceremonial feast and mournful gifts in a grove before the city near the flow of the false Simois, was making a libation to the ashes, and was calling the shades at Hector’s tomb, an empty mound with lush turf and twin altars that she consecrated for her tears.

(3.301-305)

---

312 The text is Mynors (1969).
When she sees Aeneas, she marvels at the occasion and immediately asks whether Hector accompanies him (“Hec\textipa{t}o ubi \textipa{e}st?” 3.312), whereupon she falls to such a state of weeping that only with some difficulty does Aeneas get her to stop and explain to him her situation.\textsuperscript{313} Curiously, after she tells Aeneas how she came to be in Buthrotum, she asks about Ascanius, Aeneas’ son.\textsuperscript{314} The curiosity is not that she asks about a young nephew, but that she asks not how he is, but whether he remembers his mother and whether his father and \textit{the dead} Hector continue to remind him of manliness (“\textit{antiquam uirtutem animosque uirilis}” 3.342). Even regarding a young man who has his entire life ahead of himself, she is more concerned about his preservation of the \textit{past}.\textsuperscript{315}

Hector’s empty tomb is representative of how Andromache is stuck in a past that offers no possibility of forward movement.\textsuperscript{316} Remaining dedicated to a dead husband and a destroyed city in the extreme way that Andromache does presents no comfort but allows her to dwell on her grief, to live for grief alone. She has remarried, but her new marriage is a mere reproduction of the former.\textsuperscript{317} Aeneas recognizing this is key to the foundation of Rome, for he must move forward, he must set aside his grief, and he must accept that a model of Troy is not what his new city should be. In Vergil’s adaptation of the destruction and aftermath of Troy as a theme, the focus is not, as it is in Euripides, the sorrow of loss and uneasy sense of the possibility of the same happening to anyone. The Roman author instead highlights the need to refocus on the future, to move past setbacks and forge ahead. Troy may have been glorious, but the true glory is yet to come for Aeneas and his men.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{313} The emotional impact of this scene is great because Andromache is a “tragic individual in a world of oracles and destiny and powerful people,” according to Williams (1962) 16.
\textsuperscript{314} Bettini (1997) reminds us that when she asks this, she does not even know whether or not Ascanius is alive (15).
\textsuperscript{315} Bettini’s statement that “there is no one among the living who does not remind Andromache of the dead,” nicely summarizes Andromache’s attachment to the past at the expense of the present (16).
\textsuperscript{316} Bettini (1997) 13 remarks that it is as if Andromache were before a theatrical backdrop, which further emphasizes how she is not living in a dynamic manner.
\textsuperscript{317} Bettini (1997) calls Helenus no more than a ‘stand-in’ for Hector (11).
\end{flushright}
It is remarkable that Trojan characters maintain their appeal over the centuries, and that they are able to be used differently by authors for different purposes. They can be both representatives of mournful despair and hopeful resilience, and they can be represented as slaves or princes after the fall of Troy. Their use and movement through the centuries and across countries and cultures shows how they continue to hold a unique position in the cultural imaginary of authors and audiences. Far more than displaced Persians or culturally other characters, they remain Trojans: fixed yet malleable, for as much as the outcome of the Trojan War can never change, the recasting of its characters has near limitless possibilities.
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