Victims or Objects? The Representation of Sexual Violence in Greek Tragedy

CORINNA MARIA BRUNINI-CRONIN

Corinna Brunini-Cronin

Victims or Objects? The Representation of Sexual Violence in Greek Tragedy

Abstract:

This thesis concentrates on the representation of sexual violence committed against women of differing statuses in Greek tragedy in order to discern what designated sexual violence as negative in the opinion of the Athenian audience; how they regarded the issue of women's consent; and how they viewed the victims of sexual violence.

In order to get a comprehensive picture of sexual violence in tragedy, this study contains close readings of the extant plays and relevant fragments. I look at the descriptions of sexual violence and how it is represented throughout the plays. I also examine discussions of the imminent threat of sexual violence which feature in a number of plays. I take into account a number of factors: the status, motivation and subsequent actions of the aggressor; the locations and context of the assault; the status of the victim; how the victim is represented throughout the play; the reactions of other characters to the victim and any accounts of sexual violence and possible reasons for this.

In this thesis I demonstrate that although not all instances of sexual violence would have been regarded as requiring punishment in ancient Athens that does not mean the Athenians had no appreciation for the issue of women's consent to sexual intercourse. I show that in tragedy, regardless of the circumstances, the victims of sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships are regarded sympathetically. I also demonstrate that the tragedians use actual or potential sexual victimisation to make formerly unsympathetic mythic heroines more sympathetic.

Victims or Objects? The Representation of Sexual Violence in Greek Tragedy

Corinna Maria Brunini-Cronin

This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics and Ancient History

University of Durham

2015

Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the staff, academic and administrative, past and present, in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Durham. I would like to give special thanks to Justine Wolfenden for the support and encouragement she provided whilst teaching me Greek. This thesis would not exist without her skill and patience as a teacher.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Edward Harris, for furthering my knowledge of Greek, as well his support and guidance throughout the course of this thesis.

The love and support of my friends and family have been invaluable. I would especially like to thank Lauren Kniften, Louise Dickson, Kathryn Eddie and Zara Chadha.

Finally, I would like to thank my mother. Without her constant love, support and encouragement I would not be where I am today.

Introduction

In modern Western society women have full rights in legal, political, and economic spheres. As a result, they have the right to make all decisions about their bodies and sexual partners. Any violation of these rights is subject to punishment by legal authorities. This situation was not the case in ancient Greece and especially in Athens, where the majority of evidence comes from. Male-authored texts, usually written by men from the highest social class for a predominantly, if not entirely, male audience,[1] if they mention women's lives at all, do so briefly and from a male viewpoint. Their representation of women's sexuality is from the male author's point of view, and is moulded to fit the current social ideology for the status and behaviour of women. Any details which these texts do relate are likely to be more prescriptive than descriptive, designed to maintain the existing social order and *status quo*. We need to be mindful of these issues when studying ancient opinions of, and reactions to, sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships.

Women were perpetual legal, political, and economic minors, under the control of a *kyrios* (a legal guardian, usually an unmarried woman's father or brother, or a married/widowed woman's husband or son).[2] Women were not even referred to by their names in public contexts, but by their relationship to male kin.[3] The sexuality of women in ancient Athens was bound up in their relationship with their male relatives. Women were not able to contract their own marriages, or even the terms which they were given as a sexual partner to another man (women could be given in legitimate marriage with an *engye* which would mean her children were legitimate (*gnesioi*), or as a *pallake* in a form of concubinage, in which case her children would be considered illegitimate (*nothoi*)), and her consent to the union was not necessary. The arrangements were made by the woman's *kyrios* and her prospective sexual partner, who would become her new *kyrios* when she went to live with him. A dowry was provided for the woman, though she had no control over it, and it would be managed by her *kyrios*.

[1] Pomeroy 1975: xv; Gould 1980: 38; Versnel 1987: 64.
[2] For a comprehensive study of Greek marriage see Vérilhac & Vial 1998. For the economic rights of women see Schaps 1979; Harris 2006e. For women exercising freedom and agency through religious practice see Goff 2004. For the most recent survey of women in classical Athens (though with slightly more pessimistic conclusions than I would accept in regards to female seclusion) see Pritchard 2014.
[3] Schaps 1977; Hunter 1990.

Until the late twentieth century scholarship tended to gloss over references to sexual violence in ancient texts. Translations were often inaccurate or euphemistic, and passages featuring sexual violation omitted from discussion in studies or referred to so euphemistically that the sexual and/or violent component is not obvious.[4] However, over the past thirty years there has been an increased interest in the study of sexual violence and female consent to sexual relations in ancient Athens. Much of this work, though valuable, has concentrated on using oratorical texts to reconstruct the laws governing sexual offences, which include both consensual and non-consensual (in terms of the woman's consent) acts.[5] Although there is some debate to the exact content and nature of laws applicable to sexual violence, it is generally agreed that sexual assaults could be prosecuted by a *dike biaion* (private suit for violence) or *graphe hybreos* (public prosecution for outrage).[6] Under the law concerning lawful homicide a man who caught another man 'on top of,' 'with,' or 'in intercourse with'[7] his wife, mother, sister, daughter, or *pallake* kept to bear free children (basically any woman under a man's guardianship), could kill him with impunity, whether he had used force against the woman or not.[8] The *graphe moicheias* (seduction) also regulated illicit sexual encounters. It has been referred to as the law on adultery,[9] but the scope of this law is generally agreed to be a lot wider than the modern conception of adultery, and probably included

[4] For an excellent survey on the issue of the translation of terms used to describe instances of sexual violence and forced sex in Latin New Comedy translations and secondary literature see Packman 1993. Packman notes scholarship's tendency for misrepresentation and bowdlerisation leading to scenes of sexual violence to be portrayed as seduction and/or giving the victim a more active role in events. I do, however, find her desire to translate all these scenes using 'rape' and its cognates as going too far in the other direction. For secondary literature referring to sexual violence euphemistically or downgrading it to seduction see Chapter One and Appendix.
A good example of the theme of sexual violence being omitted from discussion in commentaries comes from Hutchinson's (1985) commentary on *Seven against Thebes*. As I shall demonstrate in Chapter Three, sexual imagery and the stress upon the sexual vulnerability of the Chorus abounds in the First Stasimon (288-368); Hutchinson does not even allude to possibility of a sexual component to the women's imagined sufferings until his comment on line 367. Pierrepont Houghton 1962: 70, summarising Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*, refers to Nessus' attempted sexual assault on Deianeira as an attempted 'insult,' giving no indication of the sexual or violent aspects of the assault.

[5] Cole 1984; Harris 2006c (first published in 1990); Cohen 1991; Carey 1995; Scafuro 1997; Omitowoju 2002.

[6] The *dike biaion* was a private suit initiated by the victim's *kyrios* and carried a monetary penalty. The *graphe hybreos* could be brought by any citizen. It was an *agon timetos*, and as such could carry any penalty proposed by the prosecutor (if accepted by the judges), including death; cf. Harris 2006c: 288; Din. 1.23.

[7] Harris 2006d: 316.

[8] Dem. 23.53: ἐπὶ δάμαρτι ἢ ἐπὶ μητρὶ ἢ ἐπ᾽ ἀδελφῇ ἢ ἐπὶ θυγατρί ἢ ἐπὶ παλλακῇ ἣν ἂν ἐπ᾽ ἐλευθέροις παισὶν ἔχῃ. Demosthenes texts are of Dilts' 2002-2009 OCTs, with the exception of Dem. 19, for which I used MacDowell 2000. All other non-tragic texts are from the most recent Loeb editions. All abbreviations are in accordance with the *Oxford Classic Dictionary*[3] 2003.

[9] Cohen 1991: 98-132 argues that the term *moicheia* refers to only to adultery, i.e. consensual sexual relations between a married women and a man other than her husband. This definition is widely rejected; cf. MacDowell 1992: 345-347; Carey 1995: 407-408; Ogden 1997: 27; Kapparis 1999: 297-298; Omitowoju 2002: 73-78; Harris 2006d: 316.

illicit sexual relations with any woman under the guardianship of another man. It is better regarded as a law on seduction.[10]

It has been argued that under these laws it was not the woman's consent that mattered, but that of her *kyrios*.[11] This is true to a certain extent: As women did not have legal autonomy in ancient Athens, their *kyrios* would have to initiate and prosecute the suit of *dike biaion*. As the other two forms of redress were *graphai* (*graphe hybreos* and *graphe mocheias*) they could be brought by any citizen, though due to the usually private nature of the offences it would effectively be responsibility of the woman's *kyrios* to bring these also. Therefore, for a prosecution to be brought the woman's *kyrios* would have had to not consented to the sexual relationship, and believe that it had occurred against the woman's will. Omitowoju (2002) argues that a victim needs to be 'respectable' for a *graphe hybreos* to be brought.[12] She claims that '[t]he ability of the allegation of *hubris* and the *graphe hubreos* to criminalise any specific sexual activity was limited in two crucial ways: firstly, in respect of heterosexual relations, it required the validation of a woman's *kurios* to present an action as hubristic in any convincing way; secondly, the focus on status implicit in any discussion of *hubris* demonstrated that the use of the *graphe hubreos* was always mediated by civic concerns, and that in practice it was only available to those whose positions within the democratic community were secure.'[13] These two statements show not only a fundamental misunderstanding of how a *graphe* was initiated (it could be brought by any citizen), but also a basic lack of knowledge of the form of the *graphe hybreos* itself, which applied to free men, women, and children, and slaves.[14]

A *dike biaion* by its nature involves violence; therefore, it is safe to say that the female victim would have not given her consent to the intercourse.[15] The requirements of female consent under the other two laws are less clear. A woman caught with a man charged with *moicheia* was

[10] It is thought by Harrison 1968: 36; Carey 1995; Kapparis 1999: 297; Harris 2006c; and Harris 2006d, to encompass the same categories of women who a man is entitled to protect under the law of lawful homicide given in Dem. 23.53.
[11] Omitowoju 2002.
[12] Omitowoju 2002: 41-50.
[13] Omitowoju 2002: 49-50.
[14] Aeschin. 1.15; Dem. 21.47-50. Omitowoju seems to supress (or not realise the significance of) contradictory evidence: In Din. 1.23, there is a reference to a *graphe hybreos*, thought to relate to an instance of sexual violence, being brought against Themistius of Aphidna who had outraged a Rhodian lyre-player. Omitowoju is well aware of this evidence as she refers to it herself on page 132. For a criticism of these errors in an earlier work (Omitowoju 1997), see Harris 1998. Harris 2006c: 294-295 points out that the issues raised were not corrected in the 2002 monograph.
[15] *Contra* Omitowoju 2002: 65-66.

liable to sanctions, this suggests that she was (or at least believed to be) complicit in her seduction and had consented to sexual activity.[16] Their punishment was presumably due to the fact that the women had effectively usurped the right of their *kyrios* to control their sexuality, whereas those who were the unwilling victims of sexual violence would not have undermined the control of their *kyrios*. Therefore, as long as their unwillingness was believed I do not think the sanctions would have applied to victims of sexual violence.[17] Although no text deals with this explicitly in relation to Athens, supporting evidence may be found in Xenophon (an Athenian by birth), in the context of discussing how *moichoi* are punished in many *poleis*, states that 'when a woman has had sexual intercourse because of some misfortune, their husbands honour them no less on account of that.'[18] This passage surely refers to non-consensual intercourse on the part of the woman. It demonstrates that the Greeks did recognise women's consent to sexual intercourse as an issue, and that they would treat those they believed did not consent to illicit sexual activity sympathetically.[19]

A major topic of debate in regards to sexual violence in ancient Athens has been whether the Athenians regard seduction as a worse crime than rape.[20] The conclusions of those who contribute to this debate are often drawn from the consequences for the perpetrators. A number of scholars follow the assertion of Lysias 1, that seduction is a more serious crime than rape, as a *moichos* can be killed with impunity but a rapist merely pays a fine. This view has been

---

[16] [Dem.] 59.6-86 and Aeschin. 1.183. The husband of a woman caught with a *moichos* was obliged to divorce her and she was not allowed to enter public temples. The ban effectively removed her from public life. Though others have noted that she would be unlikely to be eligible or desirable for remarriage (e.g. Scafuro 1997) they do not note that it is probably the ban on her entering public temples that advertised this fact. Divorce was not uncommon or shaming for Athenian women, and so the fact a husband divorced his wife would not raise suspicion of her fidelity. Her disappearance from religious life would. It is disputed whether those who were unwillingly violated, or were not married at the time of their seduction, suffered similar fates. Those who believe they did include Harrison 1968: 36 n.1; Carey 1995; Ogden 1997: 30-31; Lape 2001: 96-99. Harris 2006d: 315, does not believe those who were accepted as being victims of sexual violence would be punished for it. Sommerstein 2006: 234-237, points out that the 'Potiphar's wife' scenario, of a woman who has attempted to seduce a young man accuses him of attempted or actual sexual assault, could only be comprehended if victims of sexual violence did not face any punishment.

[17] *Contra* Cole 1984.

[18] Xen. *Hier*. 3.4: ὅταν γε ἀφροδισιασθῇ κατὰ συμφοράν τινα γυνή, οὐδὲν ἧττον τούτου ἕνεκεν τιμῶσιν αὐτὰς οἱ ἄνδρες.

[19] Although this passage refers to non-consensual sex in close relation to *moichoi* it does not necessarily follow that the *graphe mocheias* was used to prosecute sexual violence. Xen. *Hier*. 3.3 talks of *moichoi* alienating a wife's affection, implying that consent was a key factor in the offence.

[20] Accepting the argument of Lysias 1 many scholars have believed that the Athenians did regard seduction as worse than rape, including Harrison 1968: 34; MacDowell 1978: 124-125; Cole 1984. In a 1990 article (republished as Harris 2006c) Harris successfully challenged the validity of accepting the arguments of Lysias 1 and some of the claims which the text makes at face value. Harris' thesis has been widely accepted; see Harris 2006c: 291. Brown 1991 points out that Menander's *Dyskolos* 289-293 characterises 'rape' as more serious than seduction. Carey 1995 continued to argue for seduction having harsher penalties. For Harris' refutation of these arguments see Harris 2006c: 293-294.

successfully refuted by Harris (2006c), who highlights the misleading nature of the arguments given in Lysias 1, and that perpetrators of sexual violence were also liable to the death penalty when prosecuted under the *graphe hybreos*, or could be killed if caught in the act on the same terms as seducers (the statute on lawful homicide not differentiating between those who have seduced a woman and those who have used force). It appears that at least in terms of severity of the punishment for the male offender, that consensual and non-consensual offences were considered to be equally as serious.[21]

The largest and most recent study on sexual violence and consent is that of Omitowoju (2002). Her monograph examines oratory and New Comedy. Its basic premise, however, is fundamentally flawed. Omitowoju states that 'female consent is not part of the standard Athenian definition of rape.'[22] But if, as she later admits, the Athenians had no word 'which corresponds to our modern use of the word "rape,"'[23] how are they meant to have a standard definition of it? Just because the prosecution of sexual violence came under laws dealing with a wider range of offences does not mean that the Athenians had no regard for the issue of women's consent. The existence of the law on *moicheia* (seduction), which seems to have been applied when women were thought to be willing participants in illicit sexual activity, shows that women's consent could be taken into account when dealing with sexual offences. The evidence (legal oratory and New Comedy) which Omitowoju has chosen to use, does not overtly prioritise the issue of women's consent, but that does not mean that it was not an issue that the Athenians did not recognise, acknowledge, or take into consideration.[24]

In an article first published in 2004, Edward Harris challenged the conventional question of 'What was the attitude to rape in Classical Athens?'[25] He proposed that when studying sexual violence it is important to discern why some examples of sexual violence appear to be treated more seriously than others.[26] To do so he looks at a wider variety of evidence than is usually considered, including tragedy, history, New Comedy, myth, and oratory. Harris concluded that it was the intention of the aggressor which determined how the Athenians perceived sexual violence and

[21] Harris 2006c.
[22] Omitowoju 2002: 5.
[23] Omitowoju 2002: 26.
[24] No legal speech primarily concerned with a charge relating to sexual offences survives.
[25] Harris 2006d: 299.
[26] Harris 2006d: 306.

whether they deemed it as deserving of punishment. If the aggressor was negatively motivated and had acted deliberately with the intention of causing shame and dishonour to his victim and her family (in particular her *kyrios*) through his treatment of her, it would have been regarded as *hybris* and deserving of punishment. If, however, the aggressor did not intend to humiliate his victim or cause offence to her family, and he proves this by making recompense for his actions (taking responsibility for the act, acknowledging any child born from the union or possibly marrying the girl), there would be no need to take further action.[27]

Studies on sexual violence in New Comedy, which often features the scenario of the sexual violation and impregnation of a young unmarried girl, resolved by her marriage to the sexual aggressor, tend to stress the apparent inadequacy of marriage (to our modern sensibilities) as a 'punishment.'[28] Those most critical of the practice, however, fail to recognise that it is not some legally imposed sanction upon the aggressor, but is an offer which often comes from him, apparently without prompting.[29] Generally, any delay in the aggressor fulfilling his promise to marry the girl is caused by the absence of his father or his reluctance to tell his father of what he has done.[30] Only in situations where the young man has appeared to renege on his promise is any judicial action threatened.[31] It fundamentally misrepresents the act of marriage to see it as a 'punishment.' I do not believe that the Athenians would have regarded it as such, rather the aggressor's offer to marry the victim is proof that his actions were not intentionally meant to cause offence to his victim or her family through her. By aligning himself publicly to the woman's family through his marriage to her he is demonstrating this. There is no indication that the father was compelled to accept the aggressor's offer, and seems to only have done so when he judged the offer and apology as sincere. There is one comparable situation to this in tragedy. It is the account of the marriage of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra found in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis,* which will be discussed in Chapter Four.

---

[27] Harris 2006d: 306-331.
[28] Cole 1984: 105; Sommerstein 2006: 244; Ogden 1997: 30, believes aggressors were 'compelled to marry their victims.'
[29] Menander's *Samia*, *Kitharistes*, and possibly *Heros.* In *Epitrepontes* it is believed Habrotonon may induce Charisios to buy her freedom by posing as the mother of his baby.
[30] Menander *Samia*.
[31] Terence's *Adelphoe* (believed to be based on a Menandrian play) features an aggressor who promises to marry his victim soon after the attack, but delays because of his father. The girl's mother, Sostrata, becomes concerned when the marriage has not taken place by the time of the child's birth and considers legal action (344-350).

My biggest qualm with many modern works on sexual violence is the insistence of the suitability of using the modern term 'rape' (Vergewaltigung) as applicable to the incidents of sexual violence we see in Greek literature and art.[32] A corollary to this is referring to the aggressors as a 'rapist' (Vergewaltiger). I find the continued use of these terms anachronistic and misleading.[33] For the modern reader these terms are loaded with negative connotations, especially moral and legal ones which simply did not exist in classical Athens. The British legal definition of rape under the Sexual Offences Act 2003, section 1 is:

(1) A person (A) commits an offence if –
  (a) He intentionally penetrates the vagina, anus or mouth of another person (B) with his penis,
  (b) B does not consent to the penetration, and
  (c) A does not reasonably believe that B consents.[34]

No matter the circumstances, rape is prosecutable under the law, and all those proven to be rapists are criminals. However, Harris has demonstrated that this was not the case in classical Athens. He argues convincingly that as they did not have a word which corresponds exactly to our term 'rape' that we cannot assume 'they had one single attitude toward all acts of sexual violence.'[35] He argues that:

> Therefore, when one uses the word 'rape' when analyzing the ancient sources, one may be imposing an anachronistic concept on the evidence, a concept that may prove to be an obstacle to our understanding of ancient attitudes.[36]

Indeed, the use of the terms 'rape,' 'rapist,' and 'rape victim' have even been challenged for their applicability to contemporary offences in popular media recently, by both Feminists and those concerned with legal definitions. Following the infamous Delhi gang rape in December 2012, Feminist writer and journalist, Caitlin Moran, argued that the terms 'rape' and 'sexual assault' be

---

[32] A number of scholars note that there is no Greek word that corresponds directly to the modern term 'rape' (e.g. Cole 1984: 98; Rosivach 1998: 13) without acknowledging any issues with applying the term to the Greek evidence. Some however recognise the issue with it but continue to use it anyway:
Lape 2001: 84-85: '"rape" is a historically variable and culturally constructed offense. . . even to speak of rape in the Athenian context is. . . importing an ideology and locus of legal and moral problematization.'
Omitowoju 2002: 26: 'for the sake of clarity I am going to use the word in its modern sense, that is to indicate non-consensual, often but not necessarily violent, intercourse.'
Rabinowitz 2011: 6-7 recognises that 'it might seem anachronistic to use our concept of rape as sex without consent,' citing Harris 2006d, but continues to use the term without any justification for doing so.
Kaffarnik 2013: 77-78 regards 'vergewaltigung' an acceptable term to use, despite the moral connotations not present in the Greek terms for sexual violence. I disagree.

[33] Noted by Harris 2006d: 299.

[34] http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/42/section/1. Retrieved 19/05/2014. Force is not a necessary condition for a rape charge, but may help to prove lack of consent.

[35] Harris 2006d: 298.

[36] Harris 2006d: 299.

divested of sexual connotations and simply called 'internal assault.'[37] More recently it has been proposed that ceasing to use the words 'rape' and 'rapist' in the UK criminal-justice system would make the crime less emotive, and perhaps increase the rate of conviction.[38] The author of the piece advocates the use of the term 'non-consensual sex.' Both strategies aim to divest the crime of rape of preconceived ideas about the identity of 'rapists' and 'rape victims,' and its moral connotations and condemnations (for both victims and perpetrators), so it can be seen for what it is, a crime. Though sexual violence was not recognised as a specific crime in ancient Athens, I believe the Athenians were aware of the issue of women's consent to sexual intercourse and instances of forcible sex, through coercion, compulsion, or violence. In tragedy there are examples of all these types of non-consensual sexual intercourse, which we would characterise as 'rape.' I, however, prefer to use the terms 'sexual assault' or 'sexual violence' to refer to one-off or specific incidents of non-consensual sexual relations in tragedy. The term 'sexual violence' is particularly appropriate as it employs the Greek conceptions of *ta aphorodisia* ('sex') and *bia* ('violence'). I shall generally use 'enforced sexual relations' to refer to the instances of women who are compelled to be sexually acquiescent through marriage or because they are slaves.

I am reluctant to call the men involved in incidents of sexual violence 'rapists' or 'offenders.' I feel the application of these terms would be anachronistic, as it implies that they have intentionally committed an act they recognised as an offence, and that the ancient audience would regard them as having both committed a crime and as guilty. This predisposes the modern reader to make a moral judgement about the man that may not have been made by the original audience. The term I prefer to use for those who instigate non-consensual and/or forced sexual encounters is 'aggressor.' I believe this term clearly denotes the force or compulsion exerted by the men in these texts, as well as their subjective and active nature, while being more morally ambiguous, so as not to prejudice the modern reader. If we are to gain an accurate picture of Athenian attitudes to sexual violence we must approach the evidence as neutrally as possible.

As regards to the women, I will use the term 'victim' to refer to them on occasion. In all the examples I have found the women are the weaker party. They are generally referred to as the object of the aggressor's actions and generally suffer some kind of hardship as the result of those

[37] The Times Magazine, 19/1/2013.
[38] Oliver Wright, *The Independent*, 7/5/2014.

actions (whether the aggressor is the direct cause or not). They are treated as having suffered or being unfortunate by those characters who believe their accounts.

I began this study with the intention of conducting a broader investigation into the representation of sexual violence in Greek literature in general.[39] With a view to this I began to compile a catalogue of all the references to sexual violence in Greek literature, and was astounded by the number of instances I found across all genres. Many texts show little concern with the motivations for, and after effects of, sexual violence. They are incidental occurrences which happen in wars or occur in order to account for the conception of a hero, or a natural phenomenon. This is not to say that the authors did not regard them as serious or traumatic occurrences, just that stressing this does not meet the rhetorical or generic needs of their work. The three genres which give the most detail about the assaults, their circumstances, victim, aggressor, motivations, and consequences are tragedy, New Comedy, and the ancient novel.

Across these genres there appeared to be a pattern discernible in the scenarios of sexual assaults or socially sanctioned instances of forced sexual relationships in which there were no negative consequences for the aggressor. These are: the higher status of the aggressor; a spatial context of isolation of the victim; problems arise not from the assault but the subsequent pregnancy; the discovery of a pregnancy or birth of a child generally leads to conflict with the victim's *kyrios*;[40] the motivation for the assaults is generally presented (or implied) as sexual desire caused by the desirability of the victim; and as long as the aggressor is seen to be treating the victim or their offspring well (acknowledging what they have done, legitimising the child(ren) by acceptance of paternity (if divine) or marriage to the mother (if mortal)) then there is no condemnation of the original assault, and no further action is taken against the aggressor. Where the motivation of the aggressor appears to be negative, often signalled by him or it being referred to with the language of *hybris*, or the aggressor being presented as hubristic, there can be negative consequences for the aggressor.[41]

[39] As recommended in Harris 2006d.
[40] Pierce 1997: 166, in reference to New Comedy, observes that it is the birth of an illegitimate child that causes (or is foreseen as causing) 'problems and distress.'
[41] This fits the pattern of the two categories of sexual violence and the reactions to them noted in Harris 2006d.

The female victims fall into a number of distinct categories: citizen girls who are of marriageable age but are unmarried, become the objects of one-off attacks by gods, heroes, or young men; slaves and war-captives who are forced to have sexual relations(hips) with their masters/captors; and women who are at risk of, or actually forced to marry against their will and (usually) that of their legitimate *kyrios*.

I had intended to examine these patterns throughout the three genres. As the most detailed example of one particular incident of sexual violence and its consequences I began with Euripides' *Ion*. However, it soon became clear that the sheer quantity and wealth of detail of the accounts of sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships in tragedy was so large that to do it justice in the confines of a thesis I would have to concentrate solely on that genre.

This thesis offers close readings of the instances of actual and threatened sexual violence and enforced sexual relations in extant Greek tragedy and a number of fragmentary works.[42] I aim to consider a number of criteria: the way in which the sexual encounters are described by the women and other characters; the way in which the victim and her account is received and treated by other characters, and possible reasons for this; the location of the encounter and its context; and the motivation of the aggressor and their subsequent actions and behaviour towards the victim and any offspring.

Little work has been done exclusively on sexual violence in tragedy. Zeitlin (1986) and Lefkowitz (1993) include tragedy in the broader category of Greek myth. Zeitlin recognises the issue of women's consent as central to the plot of Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy.[43] Lefkowitz reads the encounters of women and gods in tragedy as examples of seduction rather than instances of sexual violence, and firmly believes that in all the examples she gives the women actually consent to sexual intercourse,[44] and the gods make their sexual experiences 'pleasant.'[45] I hope to demonstrate

[42] I have decided not to include Euripides' *Hippolytus* as my main aim here is to reconstruct not how those accused of sexual violence are treated and punished, but the sexual aggressor's motivation, the experience of the female victims of sexual violence and how others respond to them. As Hippolytus is not a sexual aggressor, and everyone on the stage and in the audience except Theseus knows that Phaedra is not the victim of sexual violence, I do not see this play as relevant to my study. I have also omitted Sophocles' fragmentary *Tereus*. I do not feel confident enough to make any assertions based on this play due to its fragmentary nature, as unlike the fragmentary 'girl's tragedy' plays the plot structure of *Tereus* appears to be unique.
[43] Zeitlin 1986: 137-143.
[44] Lefkowitz 1993: 37.
[45] Lefkowitz 1993: 17. She adduces this from the gods appearing to the girls in forms they imagine as pleasing to them, and the encounters occur in secluded and idyllic settings.

in my close readings of the *Ion* and various 'girl's tragedy' plays that neither of these assertions is supported by the tragic texts.[46]

Scafuro (1990) includes a number of tragic sources in her investigation into discourses of sexual violence in the 'girl's tragedy.' She argues that 'most male authors were not interested in women's view of unions;' that 'ambivalence is likewise implicit in a number of Attic laws that regulate sexual conduct and offenses;' and 'non-differentiation of language both in the myths and in the laws is a reflection of cultural anxiety that centers on the introduction of bastards into citizen stock,' and is 'rooted in shame.'[47] She regards the exception to this as being Euripides, who she asserts was 'unique in crossing the boundaries of shame and creating a "female" discourse about rape.'[48] Scafuro concludes that there was no differentiation between women who were seduced and victims of sexual violence, although she does somewhat confusingly admit that 'victimization invites sympathy, and hence compensation is offered.'[49] I hope to demonstrate that Euripides was not the only tragedian to dramatise the negative effects of sexual violence upon women; that there was interest in women's views of such unions; that although there may be some ambivalence in the descriptions and language used of these unions they are portrayed as non-consensual acts of sexual aggression; and, when accepted as such would result in sympathetic treatment of the victim, beyond simply a grant of compensation, and would not result in them being judged to be 'as impure as the seduced partners.'[50]

In general, the theme of sexual violence in tragedy is largely neglected and underestimated. Dunn (1990) recognises that in Euripides' *Ion* 'Creusa's story is told bluntly, frequently and with psychological insight challenges the audience not only to acknowledge the violence of rape, but also to feel for the victim.'[51] However, he sees this as anomalous in Greek tragedy. He regards, '[t]he emphasis upon Creusa's rape as an act of violence' as 'unprecedented.'[52] Dunn also asserts that '[s]ympathy for the victim is equally rare.'[53] In support of these claims he not only neglects

[46] A term coined by Burkert to apply to a category of myths in which young girls are impregnated by a god (1979: 7); see Chapter Two.
[47] Scafuro 1990: 127.
[48] Scafuro 1990: 127.
[49] Scafuro 1990: 136.
[50] Scafuro 1990: 136.
[51] Dunn 1990: 132.
[52] Dunn 1990: 132.
[53] Dunn 1990: 132.

evidence but also misrepresents it. He asserts that 'our initial sympathy for the Danaïds is reversed when they kill their husbands.'[54] But the murders do not occur in the action of Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* and we do not know how Aeschylus presented them in the two lost plays of his trilogy, therefore, I am not sure how Dunn can make this assertion.[55] He also claims in regards to *Helen* that 'Euripides repairs her reputation not by making her an innocent victim of sexual violence, but by substituting a phantom.'[56] However, I shall demonstrate in Chapter Four that Euripides makes her character more sympathetic through his portrayal of her as a potential victim of the sexual violence of Theoclymenus. In my examination of the tragedies I have found sympathy for the victims of sexual violence to be prevalent. Indeed, I believe one of the reasons victims of sexual violence are considered appropriate characters for tragedy is that the violence which they suffer adds to the *pathos* of the play.

Foley (2001) discusses the 'girl's tragedy' motif and Euripides' *Ion* briefly, and does not examine the sexual victimisation of the women in detail.[57] Her discussion on 'Tragic Concubines' concentrates on the women's status, appropriation of characteristics of the 'ideal wife,' and the conflicts caused by their presence within the aggressor's *oikos*, rather than their sexual victimisation.[58]

Sommerstein (2006) uses tragedy to demonstrate that for the Athenians the issue whether a woman had consented to illicit sexual intercourse was important and that it would affect how she was subsequently treated. He does, however, predominantly concentrate on just two types of sexual violence, the 'girl's tragedy' and the 'Potiphar's wife' scenario, before briefly looking at Sophocles' *Tereus* and Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy, as examples of tragedies in which the aggressors are punished because of their (attempted) sexual misdeeds.[59] Sommerstein concludes that tragedy does demonstrate that Athenian men were aware of the issue of female consent and did take it into consideration when dealing with those who had been involved in illicit sexual relations, but when the fact of non-consent was difficult or impossible to prove they may treat an unwilling woman as

[54] Dunn 1990: 132.
[55] For my analysis of Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* see Chapter Four.
[56] Dunn 1990: 132.
[57] Foley 2001: 85-87.
[58] Foley 2001: 87-105.
[59] Sommerstein 2006: 243-244.

though she had been seduced, and subject her to punishment.[60] By focusing on how consent in tragedy was represented, and how the (dis)belief of the woman's *kyrios* and other characters effected the subsequent treatment of her and the (alleged) aggressor, Sommerstein neglects the sympathetic portrayal of the victims of sexual violence and the tragedians' acknowledgement of the trauma and pain of sexual violence and its after-effects.

Rabinowitz (2011) begins with a good discussion of the way the issue of rape has been approached by Feminists since the 1970s. She does identify sexual violence as an important theme in the plays dealing with the Trojan War and its aftermath. However, I feel she wrongly concludes that 'the prominence of rape in the heroic corpus may have the effect of normalizing rape. . . it may construct what I have called a "rape culture".'[61] The main problem with this conclusion is that it gives one overarching explanation for the attitude to sexual violence in ancient Greece, which, with the sympathy for the victims of sexual violence discernible in tragedy, I do not feel is justified or accurate. The majority of incidents of sexual violence in tragedy are not portrayed as a demonstration of men's power over women (or other men), but are often characterised as being motivated by desire.[62] Instances which do appear to be demonstrations of superior power by mortals are generally characterised as *hybris*, which is regarded as negative and 'aberrant behaviour.'[63]

More recently *Sexuelle Gewalt gegen Frauen im antiken Athen* has been published.[64] Unfortunately it came to my attention too late to incorporate Kaffarnik's observations and conclusions into the body of my work, but I would like to give it some consideration here. Her approach in this book is comprehensive. She looks at a number of sources, both literary and artistic, and a variety of genres, namely myth, tragedy, and New Comedy. She gives a broad overview of

---

[60] Sommerstein 2006: 244.

[61] Rabinowitz 2011: 16. She earlier defines 'rape culture' as when rape is 'seen not as the aberrant behaviour of a few men, but as the way in which men in general wielded power' (2).

[62] The female victims even appear to be entitled to *charis* from the aggressor, indicating a degree of reciprocity (even when the woman is unwilling; cf. Eur. *Ion*), see Chapter Three, 'Euripides' *Hecuba*' section.

[63] There are a number of translations for *hybris* and related words. I will generally use 'outrage' or 'offence.' Fisher 1992 is a comprehensive study of the word and its appearance in literature. He defines *hybris* as 'the serious assault on the honour of another, which is likely to cause shame' (1992: 1). This definition has been challenged by Cairns, who does 'not believe the act is prior to the disposition. . . nor that *hybris* must be defined in terms of an intention to insult a specific victim' (1996: 1-2). This builds upon MacDowell's definition of *hybris* as 'having energy or power and misusing it self-indulgently' (1976: 30). The latter two definitions best fit the tragedies I examine, as the sexual aggressors in Chapter Four are presented as hubristic by nature and not just in relation to their (attempted) sexual victimisation of others.

[64] Kaffarnik 2013.

the characteristics of the victims (79-88) and aggressors (109-117), the location of the assaults (91-101), the motivation of the aggressors (118-125), and the consequences of sexual violence (133-173). She does not, however, give a detailed reading of a particular incident of sexual violence from any of her sources. She presents a (very) brief overview of what she sees as the characteristics of each genre, without any exploration of potential authorial and generic reasons for their representation of sexual violence. In the summaries of her sections she attempts to combine the evidence from various sources to build a general picture of how the Athenians portrayed sexual violence against women. However, a better way of discerning why certain sources portray sexual violence in the way they do would be to compare and contrast the information given in each genre.

In Kaffarnik's discussion of tragedy she identifies two categories of sexual violence, that which has already been committed prior to the play and is reported onstage by the victim, and that which is anticipated. In the first category she includes Euripides' *Ion* and *Andromache*, while in the second she specifically mentions Euripides' *Trojan Women*, *Hecuba*, and *Helen*, and Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*. The plays remaining from the list she gives of tragedies featuring the theme of sexual violence, Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* and *Prometheus Bound*, would presumably be in the second category. Although Iole does not give an account of her sexual violation herself presumably we are meant to connect Sophocles' *Women of Trachis* to the first category. Euripides' *Hippolytus*, however, fits into neither category.[65] Kaffarnik gives little consideration to the fragmentary plays. Her discussions of Euripides' *Andromache* and Sophocles' *Women of Trachis* (145-161) say more about the relationships between the aggressors and their legitimate wives than they do sexual violence.

Kaffarnik argues that the term *hybris* refers to the circumstances in which a sexual offence occurred and does not refer to the sexual act specifically,[66] and is used to refer to crimes which are particularly abhorrent.[67] This assertion is backed up by my own investigation into tragedy, in which *hybris* and related terms are used rarely in tragedy to refer to acts of sexual violence. The texts in

[65] Kaffarnik 2013: 40. Kaffarnik has also failed to discern the threat of sexual violence present in Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Children of Heracles*. Nor does she mention Cassandra's account of her sexual victimisation by Apollo in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, nor her (enforced) sexual relationship with Agamemnon referred to by Clytemnestra in the same play. She also omits to investigate the fragmentary 'girl's tragedy' plays.
[66] Kaffarnik 2013: 72 regards *hybris* as an act committed with the intention of causing humiliation to the victim and benefit for the perpetrator.
[67] Kaffarnik 2013: 76.

which *hybris* and its cognates do appear are those in which the aggressor(s) are presented as acting negatively in regards to their sexual behaviour towards the (potential) victim(s).[68]

One reason for the neglect of analysing references to sexual violence in tragedy may be the delicate or euphemistic language and vocabulary used in tragedy to describe sexual assaults, and indeed sexual relationships in general.[69] Therefore, rather than examining individual references, I shall look at the text as a whole, building up a comprehensive picture of the scenario and the representation of the characters involved, as well as how the characters and instances of sexual assaults or forced sexual relationships are received and interpreted by other characters.

Through close readings of the texts I will show that the classical Athenian audience did have an appreciation of the issue of women's consent, and that those they believed to be the victims of sexual violence were not punished because of their victimisation.[70] The treatment of the victim by individual characters, however, depends upon whether they accept her victimisation, and in the absence of proof a *kyrios* may punish the girl, but in tragedy this appears only to occur when he mistrusts her account.

A number of factors need to be taken into consideration when using fifth-century tragedy as a source for contemporary Athenian attitudes to sexual violence. These are tragedy as a genre, its style, purpose, aims, and use of mythological characters and tales; the composition of the audience; and the identity and function of the tragic chorus.

It is vital to remember that the authors of the surviving tragedies did not conceive their works primarily as written texts to be read silently and studied in solitude, but as play scripts for performance at large festivals amid a strong religious and patriotic atmosphere, for the purpose of winning prestigious prizes and entertaining the audience. It was not just the performance itself which needed to appeal to the allotted judges; the basic plots needed to be attractive in order to be

---

[68] See Chapter Four.

[69] Taplin 1986: 172; Scodel 2005: 190. The euphemistic language that tragedy employs can result in incidents of sexual violence seeming ambiguous. The language used is often that relating to marriage or ordinary sexual intercourse, therefore, it is necessary to look at the presentation of the incident as a whole. Inconsistency in translating terms can also be a problem. In his in translation of Euripides' *Ion* Waterfield 2001 translates lines 10-11 (ἔζευξεν γάμοις/ βίᾳ: 'yoke marriage by force') as 'took. . . against her will to be his lover,' while a similar phrase in line 437 (βίᾳ γαμῶν: 'marrying by force') he translates simply as 'raping.' In Burnett's (1970) translation of the same lines she gives 'lay in love with. . . he took her by force,' and 'take. . . by force.' Burnett also translates line 17 (ηὐνάσθη: 'she had been bedded') as 'known,' while Waterfield translates it as 'had lain together.' Both of these translations give Creusa too active a part in the incident, when she is actually the passive subject of the verb.

[70] This supports the thesis of Sommerstein 2006.

permitted to be performed.[71] The plots and characterisations must, therefore, have reflected contemporary sensibilities and values.

It is undeniable that tragedy was primarily a form of entertainment,[72] which seems to have mostly been derived from tragedy's ability to trigger an emotional response in the audience.[73] However, the pedagogical nature of the genre has been long recognised.[74] So too, has its reflection and aims of promoting contemporary socio-political ideologies, values and morals.[75] The apparent function of some plays as pieces of propaganda has been noted by scholars.[76] Conversely, it has been suggested that tragedy was able to criticise contemporary Athenian policy and practices, as well as subvert and challenge social, political and religious ideology.[77] Tragedy truly was the ultimate multi-tasker.

The performance of tragedies at major religious festivals is suggestive of a religious and ritual component, which is supported by a number of the plays providing aetiologies for ritual practices and the foundation of cities and dynasties.[78] Some story-patterns reflect ritual paradigms, such as the 'foundling's return' pattern which mirrors the separation-liminality-reintegration process common in *rites de passage*.[79] This pattern is also discernable within the 'girl's tragedy'

---

[71] The poets had to apply to the eponymous archon in order to be awarded a chorus. Pl. *Leg.* 7.817d indicates that the process involved an extract of the production being read; see Pickard-Cambridge [1968] 1988: 84. The judges were citizen males selected by lot; see Pickard-Cambridge [1968] 1988: 195-197.

[72] Pl. *Ion* 535b-e; *Grg*. 501e-502b; *Resp*. 392a-b, 539b, 604e-605d, 606b, 607a; *Leg*. 655c-d, 660e, 667b, 700e, 802c-d, 817a-d.

[73] The emotional aspect of tragedy was criticised by Plato, see esp. *Resp*. 10.605-608b. Aristotle believed that it was the aim of tragedy to arouse pity and fear within the audience, in order to achieve *catharsis* (*Poet*. 6.1449b24-28). For the various interpretations of Aristotle's meaning of *catharsis* here see Halliwell 1986: 350-356.

[74] Ar. *Ran.* 1006-1072; Vickers 1973: 261: myths 'create a sociology of morals with more coherence than has yet been granted them. As a whole they constitute an ethic which is perhaps the best guide to the social reality of Greek morals that we possess. As an entity, a system of morality, they create a feeling of security since violations of law (and especially crimes against the family) are seen to be obnoxious and are punished accordingly.' Cf. Gregory 1991: 1-17; Croally 1994: 17-47; Hesk 2007: 83-84.

[75] A number of scholars regard Athenian tragedy as being democratic in nature, and consider the genre to be bound up with the ideologies and aims of a democratic *polis*; cf. Goldhill 1987; Hesk 2007. I, however, prefer to follow Rhodes 2003 in reading tragedy as reflecting *polis* ideology, not an exclusively democratic *polis* ideology. Carter 2007: 67 defines political as '*a concern with human beings as part of the community of the polis*' (emphasis author's own); cf. MacLeod 1982: 132, whose definition Carter refines. Griffith 2011: 180 argues that tragedy reflects pan-Hellenic politico-social issues, though I am sceptical as to the degree to which tragedy reflected '"real life". . . dilemmas, pressures, decisions, and resolutions (or catastrophes) as were faced by elite families throughout the Greek world.' Roselli 2011: 8 is also sceptical about the democratic nature of Athenian drama.

[76] Bremmer 1997; Zacharia 2003.

[77] Vickers 1973: 101, 269; Goldhill 1987; Friedrich 1996.

[78] Longo 1990: 16 sees the tragic performance as one ritual aspect of the Great Dionysia, and that the festival was 'aimed at maintaining social identity and reinforcing the cohesion' of the *polis*; cf. Seaford 1996; Calame 2007; Graf 2007.

[79] Burian 1997: 166-167.

plays, affecting not just the heroic offspring, whose own stories often fit the 'foundling's return' pattern, but also their mothers, who are generally victims of sexual violence. The women in the forced marriage plays can be seen as fitting this pattern too. Despite these features it has been argued that 'the plays are not primarily cultic, [though] the religious framework of procession and sacrifice and the civic setting of the festivals for Dionysos are important.'[80] This setting allowed the tragedies to be 'a discourse of religious exploration.'[81]

The vast majority of fifth-century tragedies are based on Greek mythical tales or characters.[82] This is probably due to a number of factors. No doubt the religious and ritual performance context of the plays contributed to use of tales about gods and heroes. However, evidence for plays about recent historical events show that the tragedians were not restricted to religious and mythical tales and characters,[83] but plays with sufficient 'distance' from contemporary events seem to have been preferred.[84] This distance appears not only to apply to time but also location and comparability. To judge by the small number of tragedies located in Athens or concerning Athenian ruling families, as compared with the greater number set in Thebes, Argos, and Troy, a physical and to some extent ethnic distance was preferable.[85] The use of mythical plots set in the time when gods and heroes interacted with one another has been termed 'heroic vagueness.'[86] The world and values are identifiable to the contemporary audience, reproducing the characters and myths from the epic and lyric tradition, although the tragedians were free to modify and manipulate the material.[87] The development of tragedy's unique idiom demonstrates that 'getting the heroic ambiance right was a serious matter.'[88] By achieving this, the tragedians were

[80] Price 1999: 44.
[81] Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 1; cf. Price 1999: 44.
[82] On tragedy's use of mythic plots see especially Burian 1997; Easterling 1997c; Mastronarde 1999-2000; Buxton 2007. In the extant corpus of the tragedies the one exception is Aeschylus' *Persians*. Aristotle's *Poetics* (9.1451b) records the fifth-century tragedian Agathon composing a play called *Antheus* which was completely original. Herodotus (6.21) records that the *Capture of Miletus*, written by Phrynichus, was performed shortly after the city's fall, and resulted in the audience bursting into tears. The poet was subsequently fined one thousand drachmas and the play banned from being staged again.
[83] Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 41.
[84] Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 16; Easterling 1997c.
[85] When Athens does feature, the plays usually appear to be pieces of nationalistic propaganda aimed at promoting democratic and imperial ideology, glorifying the city and its history.
[86] Easterling 1997c.
[87] Vickers 1973: 295; Easterling 1997c: 22.
[88] Easterling 1997c: 23.

able to address 'problematic questions. . . without overt divisiveness and thus to be open from the start to different interpretations.'[89]

The use of mythical plots, which mainly feature the domestic conflicts of ruling elite families, and usually have implications for the entire *polis*, allows for the merging of *polis* and *oikos*.[90] They show that the health of one depends on the health of the other. Tragedy prioritises the role of the *oikos* within the *polis*, which may account for the high visibility of women in tragedy, despite their exclusion from active political power in the Athenian democracy.

Tragedy may use or invent myths in order to promote specific ideological ideals and as such could be used as propaganda.[91] The adaptation and invention of aetiological myths could be used in such a manner to suit the needs of the *polis*, while the heroic and historic setting of the myths and the performance context at major religious festivals would add further authority to the tragic accounts.

Another reason for the poets' use of mythical tales may have been the audience's familiarity with those tales. Therefore, if the tragedians changed the focus of the story from the character the audience might expect to another figure, or altered the details of the traditional myth, this would have made a larger impact upon the audience, and promoted the playwrights' message or agenda more successfully than if a completely original tale had been presented.[92] The audience would recognise the novelty and question its purpose.

An important consideration for the tragedians must have been their expected audience: class, gender, and ethnicity of the audience will have affected how they received the plays and their messages. The presence of women in the theatre could have resulted in the poets portraying female characters more sensitively, so as to gain the support of the female spectators. Although the decision about who would win the tragic prize lay firmly with the male judges, it was believed popular support from the audience could have an influence upon their decision.[93] However, the

[89] Easterling 1997c: 25. Cf. Dowden & Livingstone 2014b: 10, '[m]yth helps drama to tackle the extremes of emotion, the horrors of war, the pain of familial conflict and bereavement, the deepest personal dilemmas, while also retaining a measure of reflective distance. Through using myth, the plays can confront darkest the most terrifying aspects of human experience while also providing the audience with enjoyment and – according to prevailing ancient Athenian assumptions, at any rate – edification from the experience.'
[90] Humphreys 1993: 73.
[91] Bremmer 1997; Zacharia 2003.
[92] Burian 1997: 179-180.
[93] Pl. *Leg.* 2.659a, cf.3.700c-701b; Pickard-Cambridge [1968] 1988: 97-98.

presence of women at the theatre is by no means securely attested. Various pieces of evidence have been used by scholars to demonstrate the presence or absence of women in the theatre. I do not intend to re-evaluate all the evidence here as it has been collected and assessed in a number of articles and essays over the years, with largely inconclusive or divergent results.[94] I would, however, like to concentrate on a few of those pieces of evidence dating from the fourth and fifth centuries BC, which seem to suggest women were present, and evaluate a few general arguments regarding women's presence in the theatre.

Aristophanes' *Peace* 959-67:

[T] φέρε δή, τὸ δαλίον τόδ᾽ ἐμβάψω λαβών.
σείου σὺ ταχέως· σὺ δὲ πρότεινε τῶν ὀλῶν,
καὐτός γε χερνίπτου παραδοὺς ταύτην ἐμοί,
καὶ τοῖς θεαταῖς ῥῖπτε τῶν κριθῶν.
[O] ἰδού.
[T] ἔδωκας ἤδη;
[O] νὴ τὸν Ἑρμῆν, ὥστε γε
τούτων ὅσοιπέρ εἰσι τῶν θεωμένων
οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐ κριθὴν ἔχει.
[T] οὐχ αἱ γυναῖκές γ᾽ ἔλαβον.
[O] ἀλλ᾽ εἰς ἑσπέραν
δώσουσιν αὐταῖς ἄνδρες.

Trygaios orders a slave to throw barley to the spectators, when asked if he has completed the task, the slave replies that all the male spectators have barley. Trygaios then says that the women didn't get any. In a discussion about spectators, it would be unusual to suddenly mention the women if they were known not to be present in the theatre.[95] This scenario adds not only a bawdy joke on the pun of 'barley' (κριθή) and 'penis,'[96] but also the comedy scenario of an idle but wily slave, too lazy to distribute it to the entire audience. On this reading the passage is used as evidence that women were present but seated far away from the stage.[97] Goldhill (1994) points out that the passage has been used as evidence for both the absence and presence of women in the theatre

[94] Pickard-Cambridge [1968] 1988: 263-265; Podlecki 1990; Henderson 1991; Goldhill 1994, 1997; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 177-184; Roselli 2011: 158-194.
[95] Podlecki 1990: 33; Henderson 1991: 141 argues that 'the sudden reference to the populace at large sounds awkwardly abrupt;' Csapo & Slater 1994: 291; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 184 states 'the joke would be meaningless' if women were not part of the audience.
[96] Henderson [1975] 1990: 119-120.
[97] Pickard-Cambridge [1968] 1988: 264; Henderson 1991: 141; Roselli 2011: 179-180.

audience.[98] He regards the arguments put forward by both sides as inconclusive and conjecture, but does not come to an independent conclusion regarding the passage.[99]

Plato mentions women as watching and enjoying tragedy, leading a number of scholars to use various passages from his works in support of women's attendance at dramatic performances.[100] The four most positive passages regarding women's presence are *Laws* 2.658d, which states that tragedy is the form of entertainment preferred by educated women, young men, and the general public;[101] *Laws* 7.817c mentions tragedy being performed in front of women, children, and the whole populace;[102] *Gorgias* 502d states that the theatre audience is composed of children, women, and men, slave and free.[103] The final passage, *Republic* 6.492b, discusses the education of men and women, slave and free. A number of places where this type of audience may be gathered are listed, which includes the assemblies, law courts, theatres, military camps, and other public meeting places.[104] As the assembly, law courts, and military camps were only occupied by free citizen males it would be unusual if only one of the categories of meeting place (the other public meeting places) in this list would be expected to accommodate women and slaves. Therefore, it seems likely that Plato regards the theatre as a place which would contain female (and slave) spectators.[105] Henderson (1991) argues that the fourth-century Platonic evidence reflects 'the inclusive festive audience,' and that the situation was unchanged from the fifth century.[106] Plato, who was critical of tragedy and its effects on the *demos* would surely have mentioned it if practices had changed, especially as Plato uses women's spectatorship and enjoyment of tragedy to criticise the theatre and its influence.[107] Goldhill (1994 and 1997) has argued that none of the Platonic passages refer specifically to a performance context as part of the Great Dionysia.[108] However, Podlecki (1990) had already countered this as a possible objection by pointing out that 'it would be

[98] For the passage as evidence of women's absence see Wilson 1982: 158, who believes the woman got no barley because they were not present.
[99] Goldhill 1994: 248-249.
[100] Pickard-Cambridge [1968] 1988: 265; Podlecki 1990: 36-37; Gregory 1991: 14 n. 13; Henderson 1991: 138; Csapo & Slater 1994: 286, 291; Roselli 2011: 186-193.
[101] τραγῳδίαν δὲ αἵ τε πεπαιδευμέναι τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τὰ νέα μειράκια καὶ σχεδὸν ἴσως τὸ πλῆθος πάντων.
[102] παῖδάς τε καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τὸν πάντα ὄχλον.
[103] πρὸς δῆμον τοιοῦτον οἷον παίδων τε ὁμοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ ἀνδρῶν, καὶ δούλων καὶ ἐλευθέρων.
[104] Ὅταν, εἶπον, συγκαθεζόμενοι ἀθρόοι πολλοὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίας ἢ εἰς δικαστήρια ἢ θέατρα ἢ στρατόπεκα ἤ τινα ἄλλον κοινὸν πλήθους.
[105] Podlecki 1990: 37.
[106] Henderson 1991: 138.
[107] Roselli 2011: 186-193.
[108] Goldhill 1994: 349-351, 1997: 61-62.

strange if these strictures were uttered against a background in which both philosopher and his audience knew that women never in fact attended performances at the theater of Dionysus.'[109]

The Platonic evidence demonstrates that being a spectator at the Great Dionysia was the not only way to gain exposure to tragedy.[110] The performance of tragedy was not restricted to a single festival, and the opportunity to see it re-performed in some fashion was high. Herodotus specifically mentioning that the re-performance of Phrynichus' *Capture of Miletus* was banned, suggests that from an early date tragedies were expected to be reperformed at other locations and in other contexts.[111] The opportunity for reperformance increases the likelihood that the tragedians composed their plays with secondary audiences in mind, and may have even written them to be appealing to a female audience for this reason.

The Rural Dionysia, which took place in the various demes, included dramatic performances (both comedies and tragedies) in a number of locations.[112] Some demes even had their own theatres, suggesting dramatic performances were regular and popular occurrences.[113] Although there is no direct evidence for women's attendance at the deme theatres there is evidence of women taking part in the ritual aspects of the worship of Dionysus in rural locations. At Erchia women were given a prominent role in the sacrifice to Dionysus, receiving the sacrificial meat.[114] In Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, the presence and participation of Dicaeopolis' wife and daughter at his own celebrations of the Rural Dionysia seems to confirm that woman had a role in the ritual aspects of the festival, increasing the possibility that they attended the dramatic performances as well.[115]

The absence of any specific prohibition on women's attendance of the Great Dionysia and theatrical performances is mentioned by a number of those in favour of women's attendance.[116] The festive and religious context of dramatic performances is used as evidence in supporting the argument for women's presence due to their important and high profile role in religious and cultic

---

[109] Podlecki 1990: 37.
[110] Pl. *Leg*. 7.817c foresees travelling performers setting up in the market-place in the new city.
[111] Meier 1993: 61; Hdt. 6.21.
[112] Aeschin. 1.157; Dem. 18.180, 21.10; Pl. *Resp*. 475d. On the Rural Dionysia see Pickard-Cambridge [1968] 1988: 42-56; Habash 1995: 560-561.
[113] Jones 2004: 87, 140-141.
[114] Henrichs 1990: 263-264; *SEG* 21.541, A 44-51, Δ 33-40.
[115] Ar. *Ach*. 195-279; Roselli 2011: 174-176.
[116] Podlecki 1990: 27; Gregory 1991: 14 n. 13; Henderson 1991: 137; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 178; Roselli 2011: 164.

matters.[117] Goldhill (1994), however, has argued that there was no ritual role for women at the Great Dionysia.[118]

Women's absence from dramatic performances has been adduced by the lack of direct addresses to female spectators, as compared to those made to male spectators in comedy.[119] A number of explanations for this have been offered: it may reflect that 'the notional audience was composed of citizens,'[120] and is a result of the poets trying to gain the favour of 'those in the audience who were more likely able to influence the judgement.'[121] Women not being included in addresses to the audience in the surviving plays and fragments is 'evidence only of the conceptual invisibility of women in the theater audience, not their actual exclusion.'[122] I would interpret this as a symptom of Athenian unwillingness to name or draw attention to citizen women in public.[123]

On the whole, the evidence for the presence of female spectators in the theatre is compelling. The relative silence of ancient sources could be explained by their wish to promote the ideology of female seclusion.[124] Even if women were not permitted to enter the theatre during the Great Dionysia they may have still watched the tragedies from spaces outside the theatre itself.[125] Although the plays were primarily written for performance, copies would have circulated afterwards, and would be accessible to women within their homes. There is also, I believe, a high probability that spectators would retell the tragic versions of the myths they had seen portrayed on stage. In the ancient world oral story telling was a popular form of entertainment and it is likely that the plots of the tragedies would be retold in the homes of the spectators, in front of their wives and female family members.[126] After all, the goings on in the assembly and law courts, which

[117] Podlecki 1990: 30; Henderson 1991: 136; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 178-182; Roselli 2011: 164.
[118] Goldhill 1994: 360-364.
[119] Podlecki 1990: 31-32; Henderson 1991: 133-134; Csapo & Slater 1994: 286-287; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 183-184; Roselli 2011: 177.
[120] Henderson 1991: 134; Csapo & Slater 1994: 286.
[121] Csapo & Slater 1994: 287.
[122] Csapo & Slater 1994: 287.
[123] Schaps 1977; Hunter 1990; Henderson 1991: 146.
[124] I believe seclusion to be an ideological ideal and something only practicable for those with enough money to support such a system. Even in these instances I do not believe in the segregation of women within the house itself. Rather, I believe women only left the house with a legitimate reason, but this could be as trivial as visiting a friend. I would also like to posit that the ideal of seclusion was aimed primarily at women of child-bearing age, as a further guarantee of their chastity and the legitimacy of their offspring. Older women and widows are unlikely to have been held to the same standards, and could have enjoyed greater freedom.
[125] Roselli 2011: 174.
[126] On the oral dissemination of tragedy see Csapo & Slater 1994: 2-4.

women did not attend, are imagined as being reported to family members in a number of texts.[127] The role of women in the (re)telling of myths is attested in the ancient sources,[128] which suggests that even if they were unable to attend in person women would have taken interest in plots and may have gone on to disemminate the tales themselves, to their children, relatives, and friends.[129] The (re)production of plays at smaller festivals in Attica and abroad increases the likelihood of there being female spectators.[130] Indeed, it seems that from the late 430s tragedies were staged at the Lenaea, in a dramatic competition, and Sophocles may have staged at least one of his *Tyro* plays there in 419/8 BC.[131] The many allusions to tragedy in New Comedy, which to be effective must have been recognised by a large proportion of the audience (e.g. the echo of the arbitration scene from Euripides' *Alope* in Menander's *Epitrepontes*) is evidence for frequent retelling and re-performance of the tragic texts, which enabled the audience to make the connection over one hundred years after the first performance. Therefore, even if they were not permitted to watch the original performance at the Great Dionysia,[132] or did not make up a significant proportion of the audience, it does not mean that women were never able to watch any tragic performance, or learn the content of tragedies. The tragedians may have been aware of women as a significant secondary audience, and may have shaped their plays accordingly.

If the poets envisaged women as part of the potential audience this could have altered their representation of the effects of sexual violence upon the female characters. It could be that their presence was responsible for the apparent sympathetic treatment of victims of sexual violence within the tragic texts, and may skew the picture given by tragedy as compared with other genres. On the other hand I do not believe the numbers of female audience members would have been so large as to make the tragedies into some sort of proto-feminist texts. The attitudes and views towards sexual violence which are stressed in the plays must have been shared by a significant number of the male spectators.

---

[127] [Dem.] 59.110-111; Lyc. *Leocr*. 141; Isae. 12.5; Ar. *Lys*. 510-515.
[128] Price 1999: 12, Pl. *Resp*. 377a; Ar. *Vesp*. 1174.
[129] The women in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* certainly seem to be well versed in the plots of Euripides' plays.
[130] Csapo & Slater 1994: 3; Sommerstein 1997: 63-64.
[131] Sommerstein 2012: 193; *IG* II² 2319.77-82.
[132] Most studies concentrate on this festival and not dramatic performances in general, e.g. Goldhill 1994, 1997.

It is generally accepted that the notional audience which the playwrights composed their works for were males of Athenian citizen class.[133] However, Pelling (1997b & 2000) encourages us not to think of the ideal audience as one monolithic group, and stresses that the poets would not have expected a singular response from the audience, but would have had to compose their works in such a way as to be compatible with a multiplicity of audience responses.[134] To gain a positive response from the audience the poet had to reflect popular contemporary morality; the presentation of female sexual victimisation must not have directly challenged the audience's sensibilities. It has been noted by others that the representations of women in general seem to become more sympathetic as the fifth century progresses.[135] This appears to be borne out by two thirds of the eighteen plays with actual or estimated dates being produced after the mid-420s. The high profile of the women featured in these and other plays no doubt encouraged men in the audience have sympathy for them.[136]

The multitude of female characters in tragedy and their visibility in terms of stage presence, portrayal of their actions, and voicing of their circumstances, feelings, and opinions cannot exclusively be explained as a way for the Athenian male to imagine 'a fuller model for the masculine self.'[137] If we recognise the large role women played within the *oikos*, and the increasing importance for Athenian citizen women in conferring citizenship after Periclean reforms, their presence in tragedy need not exclusively revolve around masculine concerns, solely for the benefit of male citizens. Rather, it reflects the composition of the *oikos*, which was an important component of a successful *polis*.[138]

As one of my main avenues for investigation is the reaction of other characters to accounts and threats of sexual violence and forced marriage related in tragedy, I believe it would be useful to examine the characteristics of the tragic choruses. In a number of plays they are the most

[133] Csapo & Slater 1994: 286-290; Sommerstein 1997: 65. I include both boys and men in my conception of the notional audience. The actual audience is recognised to have also included *metics*, foreigners, and slaves; see Pickard-Cambridge [1968] 1988: 57-58, 263; Roselli 2011: 118-157. It appears that Euripides' *Ion* was aimed at least in part at those in the audience who were Ionian foreigners; see Bremmer 1997; Zacharia 2003.
[134] Pelling 1997b: 220; Pelling 2000: 198, 247.
[135] Henderson 1991: 145.
[136] Pelling 2000: 208.
[137] Zeitlin 1990: 85; cf. Foley 2001.
[138] For the importance of women in the life of the *polis*, despite their political disabilities; see Patterson 1986; Goff 2004; Roselli 2011.

sympathetic to the (potential) victims and are also identified as victims of sexual violence and forced marriage themselves.

It is important to consider how the chorus and their opinions would be perceived by the audience. Are the audience meant to identify with the chorus? Do the chorus' sentiments match contemporary ideologies? What effects do the chorus' words and actions have upon the audience? The continuous presence of the chorus throughout most of the play made 'palpable the communal and public nature of tragic drama.'[139] The chorus often acts as in internal spectator and commentator within the play itself and, therefore, can be seen as comparable to the audience.

An important factor in our understanding of the audience's relationship and identification with the tragic chorus, and their understanding of the sentiments which the chorus express, is the audience's familiarity with choral performances in general. It has been argued that taking part in a chorus 'was a ubiquitous, and culturally highly prolific, social practice.'[140] Choruses were seen as 'a representation of "community" and closely related to questions of group identity.'[141] They were recognisable and important as a religious, social, and/or political device/medium through which values were reaffirmed.[142] Tragedy appears to utilise different types of choral genre in order to promote specific associations and responses within the audience.[143] The authority of the tragic chorus will have been perceived as high by the spectators due to their association with education.[144]

Easterling (1997) has stated that the choruses in tragedy 'offer possible models for the onlookers' emotional responses.'[145] The emotions of the chorus will not always correspond to those felt by all sections of the audience,[146] especially in the instances where the audience have privileged knowledge the chorus does not possess (as in the case of Euripides' *Ion*), in which case the chorus' mistaken conclusions are used to increase the dramatic irony in the play. However, there could be occasions when the emotions of the chorus and audience would correspond, and the audience's response could be influenced by the chorus' treatment of the other characters. Indeed, it appears

[139] Burian 1997: 199.
[140] Kowalzig 2007: 5; cf. Swift 2010: 36.
[141] Kowalzig 2007: 5.
[142] Swift 2010: 36.
[143] Swift 2010: 376 regards the 'generic interaction as a kind of "metachorality": a technique which draws attention to the fact that the tragic chorus still represents a chorus.'
[144] Swift 2010: 38; Pl. *Leg.* 2.654a.
[145] Easterling 1997b: 163.
[146] Vickers 1973: 11.

that the tragedians characterised their choruses in different ways, depending on the effect they wanted, as Stanford (1983) asserts:

> In the Greek theatre the presence of a chorus complicated the emotional nexus. And in emotional terms there were two sorts of chorus, the fully involved chorus who shared the *páthē* of the actors (like the Trojan women in Euripides' two plays about the aftermath of the fall of Troy), and the more detached chorus who are spectators rather than partners in the *páthē*. . . Sometimes, then, the audience would see the chorus as the object of their emotional reaction, sometimes as sharers with themselves in their reactions to the sufferings of the characters in the play. In the second case the chorus acted almost as an instructor, telling the audience how and when to feel various emotions.[147]

Sometimes then the chorus seems to be directly equated to the audience. This is the model which Vernant (1990) proposes, describing the chorus as 'an anonymous and collective being whose role is to express, through its fears, hopes, and judgements, the feelings of the spectators who make up the civic community.'[148]

Gould (1996), however, has argued for the chorus' 'social marginality,' which he believes 'deprives the chorus of tragic authority.'[149] His thesis, however, has met with criticism. Goldhill (1996) points out that although Gould is correct in his assertion that choruses often express views from the 'experience of the excluded, the oppressed and the vulnerable,'[150] that what the 'choruses often sing of is an imagined world of (lost) civic harmony, integration, and fulfilment (as in *Trojan Women*) or a prayer for such political blessings (as in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*).'[151] The chorus, therefore, stress their previous status as members of a *polis* or desire to be included in a *polis*. In this way they are relatable to the citizen spectators, and their experiences and desires match those held by the audience.

Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) criticises Gould's labelling of all women, both slave and free, as 'other.' She argues that this 'does not correspond to the ancient perceptions, in which citizen women were significantly different from noncitizen women in a variety of ways.'[152] She argues that choruses of Greek citizen women would not be regarded as radically 'other', and would in all

---

[147] Stanford 1983: 46-47.
[148] Vernant 1990: 24; cf. Easterling 1997c: 25 the chorus 'seem to function as the perfect analogue for the audience.'
[149] Gould 1996: 221.
[150] Gould 1996: 224.
[151] Goldhill 1996: 252.
[152] Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 277.

likelihood be equated with Athenian citizen women by the spectators. As citizen women they could also be perceived as legitimately involved in the *polis* discourse developed by the tragedians.[153]

Foley (2003) argues that 'choral identity does not define choral role in the action and thought of Greek tragedy as much as one might expect.'[154] She notes that 'there are many features common to all choruses that tend to equalize their role regardless of their specific identity.'[155] These include their use of traditional wisdom, 'authoritative cultural memory,' and verbal and performative allusions to religion and ritual.[156] Even choruses characterised as being of a low social status could 'occupy a higher plane due to their language, themes, song, and dance.'[157] The audience, therefore, are likely to be able to identify with the chorus, regardless of their purported identity.

In the plays studied here the identities of the choruses are disparate. They are made up of Athenian household slaves, Greek citizen women, old citizen men, foreign female suppliants, enslaved Greek women, Trojan captive-women, and the semi-divine Oceanids. Of the twenty one plays considered in this thesis the identity of the chorus is unknown in five of the fragmentary plays;[158] one play has a chorus of each sex, both of citizen-class;[159] four have male choruses, all Greek citizens;[160] eleven have female choruses, four of whom are slave/war-captive choruses,[161] half of which express their own (potential) sexual victimisation.[162] Three of the four female slave/war-captive choruses are formerly free citizen women, two Trojan and one Greek.[163] Five of the female choruses are Greek women of citizen status,[164] one of whom expresses their own potential sexual victimisation.[165] The two remaining female choruses, the Danaids and the Oceanids, both express their potential sexual victimisation.[166] The Oceanids, though divine, are

[153] Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 279-280.
[154] Foley 2003: 24.
[155] Foley 2003: 20.
[156] Foley 2003: 21.
[157] Foley 2003: 21.
[158] Euripides' *Auge*, *Melanippe Wise*, and *Melanippe Captive*; Sophocles' *Tyro A* and *Tyro B*.
[159] Euripides' *Antiope* has choruses of Farmers and Maenads.
[160] Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*; Euripides' *Alcestis*, *Alope*, and *Children of Heracles*.
[161] Euripides' *Hecuba*, *Helen*, *Ion*, and *Trojan Women*.
[162] Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Trojan Women*.
[163] Euripides' *Hecuba*, *Helen*, and *Trojan Women*.
[164] Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*; Euripides' *Andromache*, *Electra*, and *Iphigenia in Aulis*; Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*.
[165] In Euripides' *Electra* the female protagonist seems to fear the sexual vulnerability of both herself and the Chorus at the appearance of the two armed strangers near her home (215-219).
[166] Aeschlyus' *Suppliant Women* and *Prometheus Bound*.

very much represented as typical young girls of Greek citizen status, while the Danaids stress their Greek descent, their worship of the Greek gods, and their free-status. Out of the seventeen identifiable choruses in the plays studied eleven are free Greeks of citizen status residing in their native *polis*, while two more are characterised as such. Of the four slave/war-captive choruses their previous free citizen status is stressed by three of them, while Creusa's female slaves in *Ion* closely associate themselves with Athens, and are extremely loyal to the autochthonous Athenian, Creusa. Therefore, I would suggest that in all the plays studied with identifiable choruses, the audience would be encouraged to identify with the chorus and be influenced by their sentiments and attitudes towards (potential) sexual violence and forced marriage.

It is difficult to determine if the choruses of the fragmentary plays express sympathy for the (potential) sexual victimisation of the female characters. In a number of other plays the choruses make no comment on accounts of sexual victimisation expressed by the characters.[167] However, in the majority of the plays examined the chorus is strongly identified with the (potential) victim(s) of sexual violence or forced marriage and are generally, but not always, the same sex, ethnicity, and social status as those victimised and can be (potential) victims themselves. These choruses not only stress their own victimization but also express sympathy for other (potential) victims of sexual violence.[168] The echo of the identity of the victim in the chorus must serve some purpose. However, that the identities of the chorus and victim of sexual violence can also be diametrically opposed (as in the case the Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*) demonstrates that the sympathy expressed by the chorus would not be perceived by the audience as purely due to a solidarity of status, but would be seen as understandable and legitimate to other portions of society.

The majority of these choruses, I would argue, are meant to be identified by the spectators as sharing the same value system as them, being of citizen class and concerned with the *polis* and its wellbeing. If I am correct, the choruses' sympathetic attitude towards the victims of sexual violence and forced marriage, and their representation of these as negative would therefore correspond with the views of the spectators.

---

[167] Euripides' *Alcestis*, *Children of Heracles*, *Electra*, and *Iphigenia in Aulis*. In Sophocles' *Women of Trachis* the Chorus do not comment on Iole's plight, though this may be due to the fact that much is made of it by other characters, especially Deianeira. They are, however, sensitive to the experience of the young Deianeira (498-530).

[168] By ethnicity I mean Greek or non-Greek.

My original contribution will be to firmly demonstrate that the Athenians had sympathy for the victims of sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships. This is not often noted by those looking at the legal texts or New Comedy.[169] It is true that it is not such a noticeable feature in those texts. I would argue that this is not due to any lack of sympathy innate in the audience, or lack of appreciation for the trauma and consequences of victims of sexual violence, but that in those texts inspiring sympathy and pity for victims of sexual violence does not meet the generic or rhetorical requirements. However, it is still possible to discern other characters expressing sympathy for the victims of sexual violence, and a sympathetic treatment of the act itself, on the odd occasion. Sympathy for the victims of sexual violence and the use of historic or potential sexual violation by the author to inspire pity and sympathy for the female characters is a significant feature of tragedy.[170] I propose that this indicates an appreciation for the issue of female consent, especially in scenarios of enforced sexual relations.

I intend to show that the tragedians generally construct the scenarios of actual or potential sexual violation in such a way as to negate any risk of the aggressor being perceived as having intentionally caused offence to the victim. Therefore, the audience would not perceive him as being prosecutable under the laws governing sexual violence. Where they do portray sexual violence as negatively motivated they use the language of *hybris* to describe the aggressor and his actions. In these cases the aggressor is usually thwarted and/or punished.[171] I will demonstrate that in tragedy sexual violence without the intention to humiliate the victim is portrayed not only in sexual relations with free women, but also with war-captives when the aggressors are well known mythical heroes. I believe this indicates that even in the socially acceptable area of warfare, sexual violence for the wrong reasons would be perceived as negative.

Existing studies have tended to focus on accounts of sexual violence against free *parthenoi*. However, my thesis also deals with the victimisation of war-captives and slaves, and the risk and

---

[169] Pierce 1997: 170, asserts that Menander's 'descriptions are realistic and evoke sympathy for the girl.' She identifies that concentrating on the woman's experience 'would have ruined the mood and the atmosphere of the play' (178), but then, rather confusingly concludes that as the assaults are just catalysts for the plots 'does seem to indicate a lack of understanding and sympathy towards the female victim' (179). Sommerstein 1998: 101, recognises Habrotonon's sympathy for Pamphile, but notes that the author does not dwell on it, and that there is no criticism of Charisios.

[170] *Contra* Dunn 1990.

[171] Supporting the thesis of Harris 2006d.

fear of victimisation under these circumstances, to give a holistic picture of attitudes towards different types of sexual violence in ancient Athens.

I have organised the thesis by the type of victim and context of their sexual victimisation. The first two chapters concentrate on young unmarried women who are assaulted by gods or heroes, and become pregnant. Chapter One offers a close reading of Euripides' *Ion*. This play provides one of the most unambiguous instances of sexual violence in the genre. The assault itself is retold a number of times, and discussed with various characters. As a text it is useful as a majority of the *pathos* in the play is derived from Creusa's trauma over the assault and its aftermath (her exposure of the child, her conviction that he has perished, and her subsequent childlessness).

Chapter Two deals with fragmentary plays belonging to the 'girl's tragedy' category of myths. These plays fall into two categories. The first deals with the familial conflict when the *kyrios* of a girl who has been sexually assaulted by a god or hero discovers the girl's pregnancy or child. The *kyrios* usually punishes the girl, apparently disbelieving her account of the child's paternity and manner of conception. This usually causes separation between mother and child. The second category deals with the mothers being reunited with their adult children. The paternity of the child(ren) and the mother's account of conception is vindicated, leading to her and her offspring's status being restored. Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* is slightly different as the play is set before Io's pregnancy, and she will not have conventional sexual intercourse with Zeus. It is included in this chapter as it comes from Burkert's original classification of a 'girl's tragedy' and Zeus' sexual desire for Io, and her reluctance to submit to the desire of Zeus, is an issue for her and her *kyrios*, and results in her sufferings portrayed within the play.

Chapter Three looks at the representation of enforced sexual relationships (both established and anticipated) between war-captives and slaves and their captors/masters. I examine how the actual and potential violent and coerced sexual relationships are used to inspire *pathos* within the play and sympathy for the victims, while at the same time not condemning the practice of the aggressors taking advantage of the sexual availability of war-captives and slaves.[172]

Chapter Four examines the texts concerning forced marriage. These plays deal with the issue of women's consent to marriage and sexual relationships. It is interesting to note that the

[172] The exception is Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*.

female protagonists in these situations are women who are generally regarded as unsympathetic in other sources. In these plays they are made to appear more sympathetic through emphasis being placed on their sexual victimisation.

Through my close readings of the tragedies I intend to demonstrate that although not all instances of sexual violence were regarded as prosecutable crimes in ancient Athens this does not mean that Athenian men had no conception of the issue of women's consent to sexual intercourse and that women's consent did matter in regards to how they were perceived and treated subsequently. The evidence I will elucidate from tragedy will also challenge the popular view that sexual violence was mainly regarded as an affront to male honour, specifically the woman's *kyrios* and male kin.[173] When female victims mention their male relatives or their fathers it is not to emphasise the affront to their family's honour, but to stress their own status and honour which they feel that they personally deserve. When victims of sexual violence are punished by their *kyrioi* in tragedy, this does not prove that Athenian men had no sympathy for victims of sexual violence and cared more about their own honour, as in these instances those who punish the girls seem to believe that they have been willingly seduced and intentionally deceived them. If the girls had been willingly seduced this would have been an affront to the personal honour of their *kyrios*, and as such he would be entitled to punish her. The apparently mistaken punishment of victims of sexual violence in tragedies would have added greatly to the *pathos*, but only if they were generally treated with leniency.

I shall demonstrate that sexual violence was regarded primarily as an offence against women. It is true that unless a woman's *kyrios* believed her unwillingness, and had also not consented to the union, her consent was not a criterion for a legal case to be brought against the sexual aggressor (unless a third party sought to initiate a suit for *hybris*), but other people may recognise her as a victim and she may have been treated sympathetically by friends and family members.[174] I believe the sympathy for the victims of sexual violence evident in these texts further supports this theory.

[173] Halperin 1990: 185 n. 70; Lefkowitz 1993: 18; Lape 2001: 88, 96; Cantarella 2005: 241-242; Harris 2006d: 314.
[174] *Contra* Omitowoju 2002.

Chapter One: Creusa

In Euripides' *Ion* we have one of the most explicit and clear-cut cases of sexual violence related in extant Greek literature. The number of references to the act of sexual violence and the numerous comments made by several characters makes *Ion* an excellent starting point for this study. The play reveals much about the motivations of the perpetrator; the effects on the victim; their reactions to the assault; and the reactions of other characters. Creusa's experience of sexual violation by Apollo and its consequences dominate much of the play's action and dialogue.[175]

The entire plot is based on Apollo's sexual violation of the Athenian princess, Creusa, daughter of Erechtheus, and its aftermath – the secret birth of a baby which Creusa exposes, and whom Apollo orders Hermes to take to Delphi, where he is raised as a foundling by the Pythia, and becomes a servant at Apollo's temple (16-56). Creusa remains ignorant of her child's fate. Married to Xuthus for a considerable time, she remains childless, which brings the royal couple to Delphi where they hope to receive a favourable oracle regarding their fertility. Creusa, who has continued to keep the birth of her first child secret, arrives at Delphi ahead of her husband, and hopes to receive an oracle herself concerning the fate of the child (57-75). Here Creusa meets her now teenage son, completely unbeknownst to each other (236ff.). After Ion reveals his suspicion that he was abandoned because he was the offspring of some 'wronged woman' (325), Creusa reveals her story to him, claiming that it happened to a friend, and asks him to seek an oracle on her behalf (330-368). Ion refuses out of fear of the god (369-380). Xuthus arrives and receives an oracle saying that the first person he sees on leaving the temple will be his son, it is of course Creusa's son he sees first and names Ion (517-562). Afraid of a step-mother's wrath, Ion persuades Xuthus to keep his identity a secret from Creusa (607-667). Creusa, however, is immediately told of these events by her slaves, who mistakenly inform her that she will remain childless (760-807). Creusa rages against the god and her husband as men who have betrayed her, revealing her experience for the first time to her slaves (859-964). Afraid to take revenge on the god, and reluctant to kill her husband, she is persuaded to kill Ion, sending a slave to poison him (972-1047). The plot is

[175] In tragedy the sex of the chorus, when there is only one, usually matches that of the eponymous character. In this play, however, the Chorus is not only made up of women, but Creusa's own slaves. Euripides could have easily made use of a secondary male chorus of Ion's supporters or contemporaries, as in the *Hippolytus*, but he does not. It seems that Euripides fully intended the audience to perceive Creusa as an extremely important character in this play, one whose opinions and feelings matter.

uncovered and Creusa is apparently sentenced to death for attempted murder (1106-1251). She seeks sanctuary at Apollo's altar as a suppliant (1252-1260). Ion intends to drag Creusa from the altar and kill her but at the last minute the Pythia reveals Ion's birth tokens, which Creusa recognises and the pair are reunited (1261-1545). Ion, still doubtful of his paternity, goes to seek an oracle. Athena intervenes, declaring that he is the son of Apollo and Creusa, and that Apollo has acted in order to keep them both safe and to secure the throne of Athens for Ion. She reveals to Ion his illustrious future and to Creusa the futures of the sons she will go on to have with Xuthus (1546-1605). After this Creusa praises Apollo (1609-1613).

In the prologue Hermes tells the audience that years before 'Phoebus yoked in marriage by force Creusa, the daughter of Erechtheus' (10-11: οὗ παῖδ᾽ Ἐρεχθέως Φοῖβος ἔζευξεν γάμοις/ βίᾳ Κρέουσαν).[176] The incident is referred to and recounted repeatedly throughout the play, most importantly by the victim herself on a number of occasions. It is discussed by and with other characters. It is mentioned again twice by Hermes (17 and 72), when he refers to Creusa having 'been bedded by the god' (17: ηὐνάσθη θεῷ), and lastly when he refers to 'the marriage of Loxias' (72: γάμοι τε Λοξίου). In the prologue it is clear that Apollo is the sexual aggressor and that his union with Creusa is an example of sexual violence. Apollo is very much the sexual subject, Creusa the passive object. Those scholars who pay attention to Hermes' prologue regard the sexual assault as a straightforward act of sexual violence, thus interpreting it and the god negatively.[177] However, it is presented in fairly neutral terms at this point, with no apparent moral condemnation. This is in contrast to how the assault is perceived by the human characters who are informed of it.

Those who see the encounter between Apollo and Creusa as 'rape,' especially those who use it as evidence that the portrayal of Apollo in this play is negative (and negative to the extent that this would have been perceived by the original audience), largely base their argument on Hermes' assertion that Creusa was 'yoked in marriage by force' (10-11: ἔζευξεν γάμοις βίᾳ).[178] They seem to read the *bia* in this passage as 'violent force,' however, *bia* can also be translated,

[176] All the translations are my own, though the following editions were consulted: Owen 1939; Kovacs 1999. The text is Diggle's 1981 OCT.
[177] Verrall 1895; Norwood 1920; Wolff 1965; Vickers 1973.
[178] Verrall 1895; Norwood 1920; Vickers 1973.

according to the LSJ as 'against one's will,'[179] something which one is compelled to do, but does not necessarily imply the use of extreme physical violence. Although Hermes clearly states that Apollo has non-consensual sex with Creusa, and the incident is referred to so many times in the course of the play, and its effects dominate the entire play and interactions between its characters, modern scholarship has been reluctant to call a spade a spade, or indeed a sexual assault a sexual assault.[180] It is barely even mentioned by some scholars.[181] One reason for this may lie in the reluctance of scholars in the late nineteenth, and even up to the late twentieth century, to address issues concerning sex, sexuality, and sexual violence. These matters are mentioned when they need to be, but are not elaborated on or examined. The reluctance of earlier scholarship to translate Greek references to sexual matters literally, and to refer to the sexual assault in explicit terms has affected the way later scholarship has interpreted the incident.

Another problem with readings of *Ion*, which persists up to the modern day, and may account for scholars' reluctance to identify the incident as sexual violence, could be their inability to conceive of a 'blameless rapist,' and is no doubt influenced by the Judeo-Christian view of deities: Apollo is a god, therefore, cannot be guilty of such a heinous crime.[182] There are those who assume that Apollo's actions are a sign of Euripides' anti-Apolline views, and that the portrayal of Apollo in this play is wholly negative.[183] This has led scholars who try to redeem and rehabilitate Apollo (or put a positive spin in his actions) to go too far in the opposite direction by ignoring Hermes' assertion, making Creusa a devious and manipulative figure. They marginalise Creusa's own accounts of her experience, despite the fact they take up a considerable portion of the play.[184] Although more measured readings of *Ion* have been expressed in recent years none is concerned solely with the representation of sexual violence in the play, therefore a detailed reading of the play is both desirable and necessary.[185]

---

[179] This translation is adopted by Lee 1997.
[180] Walsh 1978: 39, 'her adventure with Apollo'; Lefkowitz 1993. For a detailed survey of the terms modern scholars have used to refer to the incident see Appendix.
[181] Grube 1941; Conacher 1959; Willetts 1973; Giannopoulou 1999-2000.
[182] One of my rationales for not using the vocabuilary of rape is to avoid such preconceptions.
[183] Verrall 1895; Norwood 1920; Vickers 1973.
[184] Burnett 1962, 1970, 1971; Forehand 1979; Sinos 1982; Lefkowitz 1993; Rabinowitz 1993.
[185] Troiano 1985; Lloyd 1986a; Scafuro 1990; Lee 1997; Sommerstein 2006. For a detailed review of previous scholarship on Euripides' *Ion* see Appendix.

If Hermes' assertion was not understood by the original audience to be negative, Apollo is not demonised from the beginning. However, this need not necessarily mean that Creusa's understanding and version of the events are undermined by this; it is her perception, and that of those who hear her version of events, that matter (even if they are wrong or misunderstood due to limited knowledge). The play relies very much on the dramatic irony of both Creusa's and Ion's ignorance of each other's true identities, as well as Creusa's pain, to create the tragic effect. The audience were very much aware of Creusa's ignorance and will have seen her interpretation of the original assault as entirely valid and just. In reading *Ion* we are left with a sense that the victim's perception of an attack is important.

The first time human characters discuss the incident is when Creusa relates to Ion the story of her 'friend.' She tells him that 'she had intercourse with Apollo' (338: Φοίβῳ μιγῆναι), to which he in shock replies, 'a woman has been with Apollo?' (339: Φοίβῳ γυνὴ γεγῶσα;). The language here is bland and euphemistic, and gives no hint of the incident being non-consensual. However, when you take into consideration that what has preceded Creusa's revelation that 'some other woman has suffered as your mother' (330: πέπονθέ τις σῇ μητρὶ ταὔτ᾽ ἄλλη γυνή), is Ion's account of his own history and supposition that his exposure was possibly due to the fact that he 'was born of a wronged woman' (325: ἀδίκημά του γυναικὸς ἐγενόμην ἴσως), it does seem that the women could both be understood by the original audience as passive victims of sexual violence. It is important to remember that in the opening to this dialogue Creusa is brought to tears by the sight of Apollo's temple. When questioned by the boy, she says that upon seeing it she 'replayed a memory to myself, something that happened long ago' (250: μνήμην παλαιὰν ἀνεμετρησάμην τινά), before making the outburst (252-254):

> ὦ τλήμονες γυναῖκες· ὦ τολμήματα
> θεῶν. τί δῆτα; ποῖ δίκην ἀνοίσομεν,
> εἰ τῶν κρατούντων ἀδικίαις ὀλούμεθα;

This statement is later followed by her revelation, when Ion mentions the Long Rocks, that 'I know about a shameful deed in the caves' (288: ξύνοιδ᾽ ἄντροισιν αἰσχύνην τινά). The language of shame is associated with the act and the aggressor, there is no hint of seduction in these passages. The stress on the injustice of superiors indicates, if not violence, at least compulsion. Creusa is not

referring to an encounter with an equal. The language of destruction is associated with illicit sexual encounters, both consensual and non-consensual.[186] While discussing her family's lineage with Ion, she states 'my family was no benefit to me' (268: τὸ δὲ γένος μ᾽ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ). Because the rest of her life has been unmarred by suffering or hardship, she is obviously referring here to the assault, which strongly suggests that her family could not protect her. She was therefore the unwilling victim of sexual violence.

Ion's reaction to the story of Creusa's 'friend,' is one of initial disbelief that Apollo could have acted so, and he suggests that the blame lies with a mortal aggressor, 'it is not so: she is ashamed at the wrong-doing of a man' (341: οὐκ ἔστιν· ἀνδρὸς ἀδικίαν αἰσχύνεται). He accepts Creusa's belief in her 'friend's' account, though does not understand why a woman who 'had been yoked together with the god' would suffer (343: τί χρῆμα δράσασ᾽, εἰ θεῷ συνεζύγη;). Creusa explains that the child was exposed, and there has been no sign of him since. This prompts Ion to declare, 'the god wronged her; and the mother is miserable' (355: ἀδικεῖ νιν ὁ θεός, ἡ τεκοῦσα δ᾽ ἀθλία).[187] Some scholars who believe that the incident with Apollo is seduction rather than sexual assault use this passage, along with others (especially 384-387 and 859-922), to show that it is the presumed neglect and subsequent death of the baby which is the 'wrong' committed by the god, and the cause of Creusa's suffering and misery.[188] However, I believe that in this passage, at least, it is to the original assault which Ion is referring. The perceived neglect of the child by the god is proof that the woman has been wronged, as it appears to prove that the god's motivations for the assault were negative. This idea is repeatedly stressed by Creusa and other characters.[189]

When Ion mentions the possibility that Apollo could be secretly raising the child Creusa replies that 'by rejoicing alone in something that is joint he does something unjust' (358: τὰ κοινὰ χαίρων οὐ δίκαια δρᾷ μόνος). She considers the victim's perception over the fate of the child as important. It is how the motivation of original assault is interpreted by the victim that matters. Ion does not disagree with her.

---

[186] Scafuro 1990.
[187] I have retained the reading of L here, also accepted by Owen 1939; *contra* Page who reads νυν, accepted by Diggle 1981 and Kovacs 1999.
[188] Wassermann 1940; Burnett 1962, 1971; Sinos 1982; Hartigan 1991.
[189] See below.

Creusa does not differentiate between the seriousness of the original assault and the neglect of the child. For her everything is interlinked and the combination of these factors has culminated in her pitiful state. She assumes Ion will perceive this also (363-364):

[Ἴ]: οἶσθ᾽ οὖν ὃ κάμνει τοῦ λόγου μάλιστά σοι;

[K]: τί δ᾽ οὐκ ἐκείνη τῇ ταλαιπώρῳ νοσεῖ;

It continues to be ambiguous whether Ion is referring to the assault or the god's perceived neglect of the child in the following lines (365-8):

[Ἴ]: πῶς ὁ θεὸς ὃ λαθεῖν βούλεται μαντεύσεται;

[K]: εἴπερ καθίζει τρίποδα κοινὸν Ἑλλάδος.

[Ἴ]: αἰσχύνεται τὸ πρᾶγμα· μὴ ’ξέλεγχέ νιν.

[K]: ἀλγύνεται δέ γ᾽ ἡ παθοῦσα τῇ τύχῃ.

Creusa, in her response, seems to understand that Ion perceives the god as being ashamed at is the assault. The thing she 'suffered' must be the assault as the participle is in the aorist, hence it was a single event, whereas her 'grief' or 'suffering' is in the present, it is continuous. The word order in the Greek links her suffering more closely to the act of the god and could even be rendered: 'But she, who suffered because of his act, grieves.' Apollo had no active part in the exposure of the baby; 'the act' is the assault rather than the perceived neglect, which by definition is the god's lack of action. The perceived neglect of the child merely reinforces to Creusa that the assault was negatively motivated, and this adds to her grief.

A few lines later Creusa declares that Apollo is 'unjust' (384: οὐ δίκαιος) towards his victim, both in Athens and at Delphi. Surely this refers not only to the perceived neglect of the child, and reluctance to give an oracle, which Creusa goes on to list in the subsequent lines, but also to the assault, which was the precursor to all of these events, and is repeatedly referred to in connection to its geographical location in Athens. Many scholars, especially those who interpret it as seduction, have taken Creusa not specifically listing the sexual assault among these complaints as an indicator that it is not the cause of Creusa's suffering at all.[190] It even leads those that do see the original assault as 'rape' to conclude that it is not her original encounter that causes the suffering and grief that Creusa expresses, but the abandonment of the child.[191] What they fail to

[190] Burnett 1962, 1971; Sinos 1982.
[191] Whitman 1974; Troiano 1985; Saxonhouse 1986.

recognise is, for Creusa, the original assault, her exposure of the baby, and her torment afterwards are completely inseparable. If it was not for the original assault, and the illicit and unjust nature of it, she would not have had to conceal the birth and expose the baby. For her, the attack is the catalyst for all her troubles, and all her misfortunes originate with that event. The apparent neglect of the baby is, in the mind of Creusa and those who hear her version of the events, further proof that Apollo's original assault was negatively motivated. Creusa considers Apollo responsible for more than just the apparent abandonment of the baby she refers to 'his former errors,' plural, (426: τὰς πρὶν . . . ἁμαρτίας) in her final piece of dialogue before leaving the stage. At the very least she sees his neglect of the child *and* the sexual assault as the wrongs committed by the god.

While Ion puts what he assumes to be the god's point of view across, he is by no means an uncritical advocate. He accepts Creusa's version of events: the god has shamed the girl, merely to gratify his lust, without any thought of the consequences. He imagines that the god now feels shame at his act, and thinks that he is right to do so (367). He will no longer enquire of an oracle on Creusa's behalf as he fears divine retribution 'if Phoebus appears evil in his own temple' (370-371: ἐν τοῖς γὰρ αὑτοῦ δώμασιν κακὸς φανεὶς/ Φοῖβος).

When Creusa has left the stage, it appears that Ion has understood the god's 'former errors' (426: τὰς πρὶν . . . ἁμαρτίας), to which she has just referred to include not only the assault and neglect of the child, but also the sexual assault and the abandonment of the female victim to deal the consequences of the situation unaided (436-449):

νουθετητέος δέ μοι
Φοῖβος, τί πάσχει· παρθένους βίᾳ γαμῶν
προδίδωσι; παῖδας ἐκτεκνούμενος λάθρᾳ
θνήσκοντας ἀμελεῖ; μὴ σύ γ᾽· ἀλλ᾽, ἐπεὶ κρατεῖς,
ἀρετὰς δίωκε. καὶ γὰρ ὅστις ἂν βροτῶν
κακὸς πεφύκῃ, ζημιοῦσιν οἱ θεοί.
πῶς οὖν δίκαιον τοὺς νόμους ὑμᾶς βροτοῖς
γράψαντας αὐτοὺς ἀνομίαν ὀφλισκάνειν;
εἰ δ᾽ (οὐ γὰρ ἔσται, τῷ λόγῳ δὲ χρήσομαι)
δίκας βιαίων δώσετ᾽ ἀνθρώποις γάμων
σὺ καὶ Ποσειδῶν Ζεύς θ᾽ ὃς οὐρανοῦ κρατεῖ,
ναοὺς τίνοντες ἀδικίας κενώσετε.

τὰς ἡδονὰς γὰρ τῆς προμηθίας πέρα
σπεύδοντες ἀδικεῖτ᾽. οὐκέτ᾽ ἀνθρώπους κακοὺς
λέγειν δίκαιον, εἰ τὰ τῶν θεῶν καλὰ
μιμούμεθ᾽, ἀλλὰ τοὺς διδάσκοντας τάδε.

It is clear from this speech that Ion has understood Creusa's account as referring to an instance of sexual violence. Though Creusa has never mentioned the use of force Ion has obviously implied that it was a factor. Ion twice mentions the 'forcible marriages.' The first instance precedes the accusation of allowing the children to die, indicating that he sees this as an equally, if not more, serious charge than neglect. It is interesting to note that it is not for the neglecting their children that he attributes as the lawlessness of not just Apollo, but Zeus and Poseidon, but rather the instances of 'forcible marriages' which they commit. The monetary penalty for the sexual offences is an allusion to the *dike biaion* being used to prosecute instances of sexual violence.[192] Ion does not perceive the motivating factor behind these liaisons as providing the world with heroes, and cities with notable founders and kings, but characterizes the motivating factor solely as lust (448-449).

When left alone on the stage, the Chorus dwell on the story they have heard. They have nothing but sympathy for the victim, and believe that the gods do not properly provide for the well-being of the offspring from their encounters with mortals (503-509):

ἵνα τεκοῦσά τις
παρθένος μελέα βρέφος
Φοίβῳ πτανοῖς ἐξόρισεν
θοίναν θηρσί τε φοινίαν
δαῖτα, πικρῶν γάμων ὕβριν.
οὔτ᾽ ἐπὶ κερκίσιν οὔτε λόγων φάτιν
ἄιον εὐτυχίας μετέχειν θεόθεν τέκνα θνατοῖς.

Though largely more concerned with the fate of the child they do refer to the assault as 'bitter marriage' (506: πικρῶν γάμων). The epithet is applicable something that 'yields pain instead of expected pleasure.'[193] This emphasises that something which should have brought the girl joy (a marriage), has actually caused her pain and suffering. It highlights that they, having only heard

[192] Harris 2006d: 321.
[193] LSJ, πικρός, A.III.1.

Creusa's version, interpret the actions of the god as dishonourable. They regard the child as the ultimate symbol of that dishonour, and use *hybris*, 'outrage' (507) to describe him.[194] He is the proof of the god's violence against the girl, and his apparent neglect by the god is a symbol that the assault was negatively motivated.

In lines 510-675 we have the false recognition scene between Xuthus and Ion, in which Xuthus tells Ion that the oracle has proclaimed the first person he will see upon leaving the temple is his son. Ion, puzzled to know how he can be Xuthus' heir, questions him about the circumstances surrounding his birth and subsequent exposure. Xuthus reveals that on a trip to Delphi, before his marriage to Creusa, 'in the folly of youth' (545: μωρίᾳ γε τοῦ νέου), he had had illicit intercourse, while drunk, with a Bacchic maenad, who he assumes later exposed the baby.[195] Ion, so ready to chastise the gods earlier, finds no fault with Xuthus upon learning his account of the events of his supposed conception. The circumstance he wishes to assertain is whether Xuthus was drunk at the time of the incident: ἔμφρον᾽ ἢ κάτοινον ὄντα; (553). There is no hint at censure of Xuthus' former actions. Ion accepts that, like so many figures characterized later in New Comedy, Xuthus acted out of drunkenness and youthful exuberance when he had intercourse with Ion's mother.[196] He does not even question whether she was a willing party to the union. The consent of the woman is not the issue; it is the motivation of the man, or the perceived motivation, that leads to a sexual act being labelled as 'wrong.' It is enough for him that Xuthus' behaviour was largely out of character, he had not intended to cause the girl offence or shame, and that now he is willing to face up to his responsibilities and acknowledge Ion as his son, legitimating the boy.[197]

---

[194] Lee 1997: 214, regards *hybris* as here referring to the exposure of the child rather than the child itself.

[195] Ion literally asks him in line 545, 'did you go to some illegitimate bed?' (ἦλθες ἐς νόθον τι λέκτρον;).

[196] Men. *Epit*. 407, 472; Plaut. *Aul*. 689, 745, 794-795, *Cist*. 156-159; Ter. *Ad*. 470-471, *Hec*. 822-828, *Phorm*. 1017-1018. Drunkenness is offered as an excuse in Plautus' *Truculentus* (826-828). It is rejected by the girl's father (829-833), who is, however, an unfavourable character and subsequently agrees to marry his daughter to the aggressor anyway.

[197] Harris 2006d: 301-303, has demonstrated that the Athenians did not regard drunkenness as exculpating a person from wrongdoing or that it prevented them from receiving some form of punishment; cf. especially Arist. *Pol*. 2.9.1274b which mentions a law of Pittacus that instituted a larger fines for those who committed assaults while drunk. Regular and excessive (or inappropriate) drunkenness could be used in law-court speeches to portray opponents negatively, as these were hubristic traits; cf. Dem. 54 and Lys. 3, both cited by Harris. However, this scene, along with the Euripidean fragment *adesp*. F570, indicates that if the perpetrator was prepared to admit and make amends for their drunken actions, intoxication could be used as a mitigating factor in explaining the cause of the actions. It could be used to argue that the actions were out of character and were not premeditated or intended to cause offence, negating a charge of *hybris*. This was likely to have been effective when there was no previous enmity between the parties involved and the offence did not appear to be premeditated. Ctesicles' defence (Dem. 21.180) seems to have been that he had only assaulted someone because he was drunk, but his previous enmity with the victim and that he had taken the lash with

After establishing the supposed circumstances of Ion's conception, Xuthus insists that Ion return with him to Athens, as his rightful heir. Ion is dubious, fearing the jealousy and wrath of Creusa, whom he assumes will remain childless (607-620). Xuthus agrees to keep Ion's new identity from Creusa until he can attain her consent to make Ion his heir. The Chorus witnesses this entire scene, and despite being sworn to secrecy, they reveal everything to their mistress. However, they incorrectly relate Ion's assumption that she will remain childless as part of the oracle (761-762), and inform her that Apollo has given a child to Xuthus alone (774-775). The Old Man, backed by the Chorus, complicates the situation further by suggesting to Creusa that Ion has been born to Xuthus by a slave, was sent to Delphi to be raised, and that her husband has intentionally manipulated this visit to trick Creusa into allowing him to be made his heir, bringing to an end the house of Erechtheus. He urges her to retaliate against this 'plot' with violence (808-858).

The revelations of her slaves bring Creusa into a state of emotional turmoil. Her world has been turned upside down. She has lost everything she held dear. Even the hope that Apollo would make up for the wrongs she perceives he has committed against her, by giving a favourable oracle, has now been dashed. Instead, she thinks he has insulted and punished her further, giving a son to her husband while leaving her in a life-long state of childlessness, alienating her from her husband and condemning her blood-line and household to extinction. She has nothing left to lose and is now prepared to bring to light the extent to which the god has wronged her. She is no longer bound by her sense of shame, lost with the perceived loss of her social standing, and the assumption that she will never fulfil the role assigned to Athenian women, that of mother.[198] Creusa has kept Apollo's secret for many years, in the hope that she would be able to fulfil the role she was forced to reject due to the illegitimate nature of her first child's conception.[199] Now, having been further insulted by the god and her husband, she no longer has any reason to maintain her silence (859-880):

ὦ ψυχά, πῶς σιγάσω;
πῶς δὲ σκοτίας ἀναφήνω
εὐνάς, αἰδοῦς δ᾽ ἀπολειφθῶ;

---

him to the festival led the Assembly to believe he had acted out of *hybris* and not drunkenness (ἐδόκει γὰρ ὕβρει καὶ οὐκ οἴνῳ τύπτειν). He was condemned to death.

[198] Scafuro 1990: 144-145. Zacharia 2003: 79 also acknowledges that Creusa's apparent sterility 'means she has no place in society.'

[199] In the 'girl's tragedy' plays, upon the pregnancy, birth or child being discovered the girl is punished, killed, ostracized, or her social position degraded, as her *kyrios* never believes that the girl was assaulted by a god/hero, and/or that she was unwilling.

τί γὰρ ἐμπόδιον κώλυμ᾽ ἔτι μοι;
πρὸς τίν᾽ ἀγῶνας τιθέμεσθ᾽ ἀρετῆς;
οὐ πόσις ἡμῶν προδότης γέγονεν;
στέρομαι δ᾽ οἴκων, στέρομαι παίδων,
φροῦδαι δ᾽ ἐλπίδες, ἃς διαθέσθαι
χρήζουσα καλῶς οὐκ ἐδυνήθην,
σιγῶσα γάμους,
σιγῶσα τόκους πολυκλαύτους.
ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τὸ Διὸς πολύαστρον ἕδος
καὶ τὴν ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῖς σκοπέλοισι θεὰν
λίμνης τ᾽ ἐνύδρου Τριτωνιάδος
πότνιαν ἀκτήν,
οὐκέτι κρύψω λέχος, ὅ στέρνων
ἀπονησαμένη ῥᾴων ἔσομαι.
στάζουσι κόραι δακρύοισιν ἐμαί,
ψυχὴ δ᾽ ἀλγεῖ κακοβουλευθεῖσ᾽
ἔκ τ᾽ ἀνθρώπων ἔκ τ᾽ ἀθανάτων,
οὓς ἀποδείξω
λέκτρων προδότας ἀχαρίστους.[200]

We learn from this speech that the secret she has kept has weighed heavy on her heart, and obviously caused her emotional turmoil. Again, it is primarily the original assault that has caused Creusa's pain, not the exposure of the baby. It is her 'secret union' which she wishes to 'bring to light' (860-861: σκοτίας ἀναφήνω/ εὐνάς). She does not even mention the exposure of the child in this passage, just her 'much lamented labour' (869: τόκους πολυκλαύτους), and this only as the direct result of her 'secret marriage' (868: σιγῶσα γάμους). However, it is interesting to note it is not the nature or longevity of the sexual bond that causes Creusa pain, but the subsequent treatment of her by the sexual partner. This is how she can classify her husband (of approximately 14 years) and her one time attacker together as 'ungrateful betrayers of my bed.' She perceives that neither of her sexual partners have shown any regard or respect for her status, and the nobility of her line, but have separately engineered the extinction of her household by deceit and for their own ends.

Next comes Creusa's account of her assault by Apollo (885-896):

[200] I have retained the L's reading of line 877, see Owen 1939: 128.

σοὶ μομφάν, ὦ Λατοῦς παῖ,
πρὸς τάνδ᾽ αὐγὰν αὐδάσω.
ἦλθές μοι χρυσῷ χαίταν
μαρμαίρων, εὖτ᾽ ἐς κόλπους
κρόκεα πέταλα φάρεσιν ἔδρεπον
†ἀνθίζειν† χρυσανταυγῆ·
λευκοῖς δ᾽ ἐμφὺς καρποῖσιν
χειρῶν εἰς ἄντρου κοίτας
κραυγὰν Ὦ μᾶτέρ μ᾽ αὐδῶσαν
θεὸς ὁμευνέτας
ἄγες ἀναιδείᾳ
Κύπριδι χάριν πράσσων.

Apollo is portrayed as the aggressor from the beginning. It is his blame that Creusa intends to proclaim. Apollo is the subject of all the verbs (ἦλθές, ἐμφὺς, ἄγες), with the exception of Creusa's description of her picking the flowers (889: ἔδρεπον). Even when Creusa utters her cry to her mother, this is not related as a main verb but appears in the participle, her futile resistance as the object of Apollo's action.

Flower-picking is a common theme in the Greek poetic tradition, and is often associated with scenes of abduction and sexual intercourse with pubescent females.[201] Euripides' use of this theme is probably accounted for by his audience's familiarity with this aspect of it. This motif signals to the audience (who know from the prologue that Apollo has intercourse with Creusa against her will) that this is the occasion when the incident occurred. However, several other associations that the audience would have made with the activity of a young girl picking flowers are also relevant to this passage. The act of picking and gathering flowers to use as adornments (either loose or garlanded) appears to have had a long tradition in Greek religious practices and rituals.[202] In this way it can be seen as foreshadowing Creusa's encounter with the divine, and intended to remind that audience that this is no common assault but the epiphany of the god. Flowers are associated with divine or heroic weddings and sacred marriages, many of which are located in

[201] For the theme flower-picking and the setting in a meadow as prefiguring divine abductions and sexual unions see Motte 1973, especially page 42; Bremer 1975: 268-274; Cairns 1997: 60-65; Deacy 2013.
[202] Motte 1973: 38-41.

meadows.[203] They symbolise the importance of this event for Athenian and Ionian history. Flowers represent the beauty and potential fertility of girls themselves.[204] These associations may contribute to why the motif of flower-picking is an apt prelude to divine abduction/intercourse.

Deacy (2013) has pointed out that the location of Creusa's flower-picking, unlike the site of many divine abductions, is not a meadow but the Athenian Acropolis. She believes that by including this deviation from the normal locale Euripides is trying to signal that Creusa was 'inviting the sexual attentions of Apollo.'[205] I believe Euripides locates the assault on the Acropolis in order to stress Ion's connection with the city of Athens by portraying him as being conceived and born at its heart. The Acropolis is the scene of most of the major events in Athenian history which are mentioned in the play which is set in Delphi but constantly refers to the city of Athens. Locating the assault on the Acropolis may have led the audience to associate it with Hephaistos' attempted sexual assault upon Athena. The god's failed attempt resulted in his semen impregnating Earth and engendering Erichthonius. The site of his conception and birth may have been the Acropolis, as Loraux (1993) believes.[206] Creusa and Ion are descended from him and Athena's rearing of Erichthonius is directly referred to in the prologue and used to explain the cradle and birth tokens Creusa leaves with the baby (20-26; cf. 1427-1429), providing a further comparison between Ion and Erichthonius. In locating the assault on the Acropolis, Euripides stresses Ion's divine heritage and his connections to Athens in order to boost the city's claim to be the origin of the founder of the Ionian race.

An alternative translation of ἔδρεπον is 'gain possession or enjoyment of,' which prefigures Apollo's own 'plucking' of Creusa.[207] She is as powerless to resist and escape the god's advances as the flowers are to escape her. A further parallel between Creusa and the flowers is that they are both objects of desire because of their beauty, but apart from that are inconsequential to

[203] Motte 1973: 41-48.
[204] Motte 1973: 44.
[205] Deacy 2013: 399, n.17.
[206] Loraux 1993: 42, cites two vases paintings: the Palermo krater (*ARV*² 1339.3) and the Adolphsek krater (*ARV*² 1346.1). However, there is no extant literary evidence to support her assertion. Erichthonius was intrinsically linked with the Acropolis, having been raised by Athena in her temple there and instituting the Panathenaia while he was king of Athens; cf. Apollod. *Bibl*. 3.14.6.
[207] Deacy 2013: 399 notes that the pun 'works as well in Greek as in English.' Cf. Seaford 1987: 111-112; and Carson 1990: 145-148.

their aggressor. Creusa effectively destroys the flowers, as Apollo destroys her innocence, and once picked they are permanently ruined.[208]

Scholars who want to classify Creusa's encounter with Apollo as 'seduction,' at least the ones who acknowledge this passage,[209] attempt to play it down.[210] Burnett has gone so far as to claim that:

> When the god took her white wrists, his seizing of her was no more violent than is the clasping of hands (ἐμφύς, 891). The only harsh note is her own cry (893), for Creusa can find no uglier phrase for the rape than ἀναιδείᾳ /Κύπριδι χάριν πράσσων (895-896).[211]

However, from the LSJ definition of ἐμφύς (cling) it is apparent that the verb is usually used to denote a certain degree of force ('clung fast,' 'clasped tight,' and with reference to teeth 'biting hard'). The next few lines also make it obvious that the god takes hold of her wrists in order to lead her by her arms, whether she wants to go or not, into the cave. Indeed, Zacharia (2003) sees this as a verbal allusion to the 'hand-on-wrist' (χεῖρ᾽ ἐπὶ καρπῷ) motif, which is often seen in Greek vase paintings portraying marriage ceremonies.[212] It is believed that this iconography represents an aspect of abduction ritual in the marriage ceremony.[213] Zacharia argues that the gesture is 'indicative of the control one person exerts over another,' and that Burnett's comments are 'misleading,' as they imply a degree of equality between the god and Creusa which simply is

---

[208] Sappho F105c for the simile of a bride as a trampled flower; cf. Carson 1990: 148.
[209] Willetts 1973: 209 glosses over Creusa's monody in his summary of the play.
[210] Wassermann 1940 mentions Creusa's monody numerous times, but never goes into detail.
LaRue 1963: 131-132, refers to Apollo as a 'seducer,' and though acknowledging Creusa's cry to her mother, makes no mention of the god seizing her wrists.
Sinos 1982: 130-131: 'Creusa steps momentarily and perhaps unwillingly into the hedonistic world of Apollo. '*Kupridi charin prassōn*'; this is hardly a description of rape. . . Creusa has been seduced rather than raped. . . she fumes at the personal affront of having been abandoned by her lover.' He however neglects to include the *anaideia* 'shamelessly' that precedes the 'achieving what gratifies Cypris.'
Hartigan 1991: 80: '[w]e expect her words to name Apollo's rape for what it is, but as she tells of her encounter with the god, she makes no mention of violence. . . The god, taking her by the wrists (891) led her to the cave. Kreusa claims she cried out for her mother, but she describes their union in the most gentle terms (894-896). . . Only *anaideia* casts a shadow on their couch, and it is ambiguous as to whether it refers to his or her shamelessness.' I don't think it is ambiguous whether *anaideia* refers to Apollo or Creusa. Throughout the whole passage Apollo is presented as the active aggressor, and the preceding word is an active verb in which Apollo is the subject, Creusa very much the object.
Zacharia 2003: 94 n.159, states that she disagrees with Hartigan's claim, but offers no explanation other than that, 'the poet presents Kreusa clearly accusing Apollo of trampling the flower of her virginity selfishly, without bothering to obtain her consent.'
[211] Burnett 1962: 95-96.
[212] See Oakley & Sinos 1993: figs. 82 (Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum 929.22.3 = *ARV*² 1031.51), 86 (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 13.186 = *ARV*² 458.1), 87 (Athens, National Museum 1388 = *ARV*² 1317.1).
[213] Jenkins 1983: 139-142; Oakley & Sinos 1993: 32; Dougherty 1993: 64, and 1996: 259.

not there.[214] As Oakley & Sinos (1993) note, on vases the motif appears 'in contexts where a strong grip is needed' and 'as a forceful gesture in scenes of abduction.'[215] Indeed, a number of portrayals of divine abductions, both heterosexual and homosexual, utilise this iconography to denote the use of force.[216] Though this may not indicate instances of extreme physical violence it is strongly suggestive of compulsion on the part of the divinity, and the reluctance of mortal victims.

Deacey (2013) sees Creusa's solitude at the point of her assault as problematic for the audience's belief in her non-compliance, but the solitude of the victim seems to have been a necessary requirement for assaults in tragedy as there cannot be any witnesses to support the girl's account, thus allowing for her conflict with her natal family who believe she was willingly seduced. Generally those abducted from choruses are permanently removed from their locale, and their families have no doubt about their reluctance.

Creusa's assertion that she cried out to her mother is surely enough proof that even presented with the god's beauty and brilliance, she is not seduced but a frightened and unwilling young girl. Indeed, in ancient Greece the cry for help was important for gaining assistance and showing unwillingness in sexual assaults.[217] It echoes the cries of Persephone when she was abducted by Hades while she is picking flowers.[218] The allusion is further stressed by Apollo taking Creusa to a cave as Hades took Persephone below the earth.[219]

The echoes of Persephone's abduction, as it is represented in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, not only provide the audience with a recognisable tableau of abduction and sexual assault of a young *parthenos* by a powerful divinity but would also, I believe, invite the audience to perceive Creusa's plight sympathetically by stressing the painful and traumatic aspects of the assault, as well as its aftermath, just as Persephone's experience and her mother's emotional anguish are expressed in the *Homeric Hymn*. Creusa is not only comparable to Persephone as an

---

[214] Zacharia 2003: 93; Jenkins 1983: 139-142.
[215] Oakley & Sinos 1993: 32.
[216] Lefkowitz 2002, figs. 4 (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 95.28 = *ARV*² 482.32), 5 (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 28.167 = *ARV*² 890.75), 7 (Ferrara, Museo archeologico nazionale 9351 = *ARV*² 880.12).
[217] Lee 1997: 261; cf. Richardson 1974: 6.
[218] *Hom. Hymn Dem*. 20-21, 432.
[219] *Hom. Hymn Dem*. 431. Motte 1973: 213, points out that meadows as erotic locations are imagined as bordering on caves. Cf. *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 1-7, 27, Hermes was born in the cave where he had been conceived which borders onto grassland.

abducted and traumatised *parthenos*, but she is also a grieving mother separated from her child, and as such can be equated to Demeter. Like Demeter, Creusa's child is taken without her knowledge, and she does not know his location, which adds to her grief. Creusa is also searching for her child, and her presumption that he is dead, coupled with the betrayal she feels she has been subjected to by male figures causes her to react violently. The evocation of the *Hymn* is apt as at the end mother and child will be reunited, to the delight of both.

The word the poet chooses to use to denote the 'marriage bed' in reference to the cave (892) is interesting: Despite having used λέχος and εὐνάς previously in Creusa's monody (861, 874 and 880), and using them each once again later (898 and 900), at this point Euripides uses κοίτας, which can mean 'lair.' This is especially notable when used in conjunction with ἄντρου ('cave'), and makes Apollo seem more brutal, even animalistic. It prepares the way for her attribution of the assault to Apollo's lust (894-896), which Zacharia points out is 'a motive shared with uncivilised creatures.'[220] Creusa has created an impression of Apollo as an uncivilised god, which places further emphasis on his attack as an insult to the delicate noble girl and her position. A god (acting outside of what is socially acceptable) takes advantage of a young girl without thinking of the consequences. We are immediately informed of these consequences in the very next line (897-906):

> τίκτω δ᾽ ἁ δύστανός σοι
> κοῦρον, τὸν φρίκᾳ ματρὸς
> βάλλω τὰν σὰν εἰς εὐνάν,
> ἵνα μ᾽ ἐν λέχεσιν μελέαν μελέοις
> ἐζεύξω τὰν δύστανον.
> οἴμοι μοι· καὶ νῦν ἔρρει
> πτανοῖς ἁρπασθεὶς θοίνα
> παῖς μοι καὶ σοί.
> τλᾶμον, σὺ δὲ <καὶ> κιθάρᾳ κλάζεις
> παιᾶνας μέλπων.

The adjectives Creusa uses to describe herself and their encounter in these lines certainly do not suggest that she was willingly seduced by the god. She refers to herself as 'unfortunate' (897: ἁ δύστανός) twice, and her and their marriage-bed as 'miserable' (900: μέλεοις). It is important

[220] Zacharia 2003: 89.

here to remember that in myth divine couplings are never without issue,[221] and in Creusa's mind the assault is not just a sexual act but automatically an act of impregnation. She is not unfortunate because she had become pregnant; she is unfortunate in her sexual encounter with Apollo. If the inevitability of pregnancy from a divine coupling was not commonly assumed surely one of the characters who hear the tale would have tried to claim that god was ignorant of the child's existence. Not even Ion, when trying to account for Apollo's behaviour towards Creusa's 'friend,' proffers this explanation. When the Old Man later enquires of Creusa 'then how did you conceal your marriage by Apollo?' (946: κᾆτ᾽ ἐξέκλεψας πῶς Ἀπόλλωνος γάμους;), it is clear that he is referring to the resulting pregnancy as Creusa answers by informing him that she gave birth alone, in the cave (946-949).

When she refers to the encounter again, Apollo is presented as the aggressor. She addresses Apollo directly as 'wretched one' (905: τλᾶμον), and she makes it clear that it is Apollo's bed in which she leaves the child, not hers or theirs; she was not an active or equal participant in their union. She further stresses this was a site of misfortune for her. The use of εὐνάν (899) is interesting: not only does it mean 'bed,' and like κοίτας 'lair,' but can refer to a 'grave,'[222] which Creusa, in her ignorance, assumes it doubled as for her baby. Apollo put Creusa in a terrible position, one in which she is even frightened of her own mother if the pregnancy or child is discovered.[223] This passage highlights the god's supposed brutality and callousness towards Creusa and their child. It also stresses how Creusa has merged the site of her original attack and exposure of the baby in her own mind as the seat of all her troubles, further conflating the effects of these traumatic events into one inseparable horror.

Next we hear of Creusa's perception that Apollo has added further insult, literally, to the injuries he has already inflicted upon her (912-918):

Ἰὼ <ἰὼ> κακὸς εὐνάτωρ,

[221] Hom. *Od*. 11.249-250. Also noted by Rutherford 2012: 265.
[222] Cf. Aesch. *Cho*. 318; Soph. *El*. 436.
[223] From what we can gather from the fragments of the 'girl's tragedy' plays it is usually discovery of illegitimate pregnancies by the girl's *kyrios* which leads her and the child(ren) to be put into peril. However, due to the fragmentary nature of the tragedies it is not clear whether the girls' mothers may have had a role in the revelation to the *kyrios* or her punishment. It may be another device used by Euripides to arouse sympathy for Creusa, once so close to the mother, who by virtue of still being a babe in her arms she was spared the fate of being sacrificed with her sisters (279-280), and to whom she calls out when seized by Apollo (894). It stresses the emotional and social isolation of Creusa, an isolation which has only just been broken with the revelations she is now making to her slaves.

ὃς τῷ μὲν ἐμῷ νυμφεύτᾳ
χάριν οὐ προλαβὼν
παῖδ᾽ εἰς οἴκους οἰκίζεις·
ὁ δ᾽ ἐμὸς γενέτας καὶ σὸς †ἀμαθὴς†
οἰωνοῖς ἔρρει συλαθείς,
σπάργανα ματέρος ἐξαλλάξας.

Creusa is aggrieved and much distressed by the apparent neglect of the child, not only as its mother, but because this neglect signals to her that Apollo's motivation for the assault was nothing more than to satisfy his lust, mindless of the consequences. She again addresses him negatively as a 'wicked bed-fellow' (912: κακὸς εὐνάτωρ). In Creusa's mind he continues to live a carefree life, singing and playing his lyre. Meanwhile Creusa is wracked with guilt and shame, unable to fulfil her role in life, namely to provide an heir for the Erechtheid throne. Informed of the Chorus' mistaken account of the oracle she now believes that Apollo has no regard for her at all; she has been used and discarded. The perceived death of her child is further proof of this. She interprets the original assault as an insult, not only against her but her family. She stresses that it is to Xuthus' house that Apollo gives a child, though he has taken no 'favour' (914: χάριν) from Xuthus as he did Creusa. This is the final proof that the god has behaved unjustly towards Creusa, something that will be confirmed by the Old Man's analysis of the situation when he subsequently questions Creusa about the details of her assault and its aftermath.

Wassermann (1940) asserts that 'Creusa's grievances, much more because of the supposed death of the child than because of the outrage inflicted upon her, find their expression in that masterpiece of passionate indignation, the monody of 859[-922].'[224] However, I believe my discussion has effectively countered this stance. Indeed, Creusa does not mention the exposure of the child until line 898, over halfway through her monody, and does not mention the baby's supposed death until line 902, referring to his death for only the second time in lines 916-918. Each time she mentions the child, it is in connection with her encounter with Apollo. Each time she stresses that he was her son by the god, as if trying, by herself, to legitimate the child she believes the god has refused to acknowledge or provide for. This further emphasises the god's culpability

[224] Wassermann 1940: 590-591. On page 588 of the same article Wassermann states that '[t]he charges against Apollo, vehement as they are, are made, not so much because of his act of violence, as because he is thought responsible for the supposed neglect of the child and for Creusa's permanent childlessness (437f., 859f.).'

and the untenable position into which his actions have placed her. Each time Creusa speaks of the child the attack, birth, and exposure are conflated, inseparable in her mind, indistinguishable in their location and traumatic effects, these accumulate to prove, in her mind, that the god has acted dishonourably towards her and her family out of malice.

Upon hearing Creusa's outburst, the Chorus and Old Man are shocked at her revelations, though they have nothing but sympathy for the plight of their mistress, and recognise her suffering. The Old Man wishes to know more about the details of her encounter with Apollo and the child (931-933):

> τί φῄς; τίνα λόγον Λοξίου κατηγορεῖς;
> ποῖον τεκεῖν φῂς παῖδα; ποῦ ἀκθεῖναι πόλεως
> θηρσὶν φίλον τύμβευμ᾽; ἄνελθέ μοι πάλιν.

His reference to Creusa bringing a charge against Apollo certainly suggests that the Old Man has interpreted the god's motivation as negative from Creusa's account.

In her monody Creusa was very much absorbed in her own pain and sorrow. The monody takes the form of self-address, a device used as a 'justification for the dramatic conventions of making her thoughts public.'[225] Scafuro argues that it is Creusa's loss of shame and general hopelessness that leads to her revelations that she was indeed the victim of the sexual assault.[226] On the other hand, it is more likely that the isolation she has felt in a moment of deep despair which has triggered a temporary loss of shame. Faced with the Old Man's questions, Creusa's sense of shame returns once again, though now she has finally revealed her secret she is willing to answer his questions 'I feel shame before you, old man, but I will speak, nevertheless' (934: αἰσχύνομαι μέν σ᾽, ὦ γέρον, λέξω δ᾽ ὅμως).

Creusa makes it clear that she was not seduced by the god, but sexually assaulted (939-941):

> **[Κ]:** ἐνταῦθ᾽ ἀγῶνα δεινὸν ἠγωνίσμεθα.
> **[Π]:** τίν᾽; ὡς ἀπαντᾷ δάκρυά μοι τοῖς σοῖς λόγοις.
> **[Κ]:** Φοίβῳ ξυνῆψ᾽ ἄκουσα δύστηνον γάμον.

[225] Zacharia 2003: 79.
[226] Scafuro 1990: 144-145.

The language here portrays her encounter with Apollo as a violent attack which Creusa did not consent to and actually resisted.[227] As for Creusa's ambiguous description of the sexual act and the absence of an explicit charge of sexual violence in any of her accounts, Scafuro argues that 'the absence of graphically violent language is in accord with Creusa's delicate character.'[228] I would add to this argument that the generic constraints and conventions of tragedy in which a certain level of decorum had to be maintained, meant sexual acts could not be staged or explicitly described.[229] Indeed, all references to sex and sexual violence in tragedy, even those imagined and hypothesised by choruses under threat of capture by invading armies, are fairly euphemistic and rarely sexually graphic or vulgar.[230] Explicit charges (accusations of *bia* and *hybris*) of sexual violence made by the victims themselves are also extremely rare. Only Clytemnestra in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*, levels such an accusation against Agamemnon.[231]

The Old Man does not question the god's use of violence and is very much distressed to hear of Creusa's plight. When he enquires of the baby's fate, and is told by Creusa that the child has been exposed to the beasts of prey, he asks, 'did wretched Apollo not ward them off?' (952: Ἀπόλλων δ᾽ ὁ κακὸς οὐδὲν ἤρκεσεν;). Creusa asserts again that the child is dead, and confesses to the Old Man that it was she who exposed him. However, the Old Man still attributes the greater blame to Apollo (960: τλήμων σὺ τόλμης, ὁ δὲ θεὸς μᾶλλον σέθεν). When he then questions Creusa as to why she exposed the child, she reveals that she thought the god would save him.[232]

The Old Man is much distressed at Creusa's revelations; he is not only upset at the traumas Creusa has gone through, but also the effects on her household. Apollo's sexual violence and perceived neglect of his child are not just insults and offences against Creusa and the child (if indeed it was considered an offence against the child at all, the baby is not mentioned again), but against her father also (966-968):

[Π]: οἴμοι, δόμων σῶν ὄλβος ὡς χειμάζεται.

---

[227] For wrestling and athletic contests being used as metaphors for sexual intercourse see Henderson [1975] 1990: 169-170. Cf. Aesch. *Ag*. 1206 for the description of Apollo as a wrestler (παλαιστὴς) in his encounter with Cassandra.
[228] Scafuro 1990: 145.
[229] Taplin 1986: 172; Scodel 2005: 190.
[230] Scodel 2005: 190, notes the tendency of tragedy to utilise 'grand language' to describe anything sexually explicit, giving the example of *Women of Trachis* 539-540.
[231] Eur. *IA*. 1148-1149. See Chapter Four for a detailed discussion of this passage. In tragedy *hybris* is used in association with forced marriage, but is only applied to those who are presented negatively, see Chapter Four.
[232] 964-965.

[K]: τί κρᾶτα κρύψας, ὦ γέρον, δακρυρροεῖς;

[Π]: σὲ καὶ πατέρα σὸν δυστυχοῦντας εἰσορῶν.

This suggests that negatively motivated sexual violence was considered not only as an offence against the victim, but their *kyrios* and entire household.[233] The Old Man, however, does not neglect its effects on Creusa herself, and even mentions Creusa first. Sexual violence was primarily regarded as an offence against the victim.

The house of Erechtheus will remain childless due to the actions of Apollo. Yet the Old Man still perceives the 'wrong' as something done to Creusa: 'first, punish the god who has wronged you' (972: τὸν πρῶτον ἀδικήσαντά σ᾽ ἀποτίνου θεόν). Here he makes no mention of the child, and we must assume that he is referring to the original assault on Creusa.The neglect of the child proves the assault was negatively motivated by the god's lust and that he acted without any regard to Creusa's status. Creusa however is uncertain about how to act: 'being mortal, how can I prevail against stronger powers?' (973: καὶ πῶς τὰ κρείσσω θνητὸς οὖσ᾽ ὑπερδράμω;). Her description of Apollo in this way brings up a common theme in tragedy and in a variety of genres, namely that the aggressor is nearly always a higher status male. In the few exceptions to this rule the aggressor, generally talked of in these accounts as having committed *hybris*, is usually punished and the victim compensated in some way. Perhaps the reason that the *kyrios* is so unwilling to believe the victim in other incidents of the girl's tragedy is, as they are usually kings, and therefore of the highest status, they cannot conceive of anyone daring, or having the power, to violate their daughters. As a result, they conclude that the girls must have been seduced and are lying about it. This can perhaps be inferred from Creusa's remark to Ion at the beginning of the play that her kin was of no benefit to her (268: τὸ δὲ γένος μ᾽ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ). The status of her family should have meant that she was inviolable, but the gods are of even higher status.

Creusa rejects the Old Man's suggestion that she burn down Apollo's temple, and his next suggestion of killing Xuthus. She does agree to the murder of Ion and gives the Old Man some poison to administer. The plot fails because Ion pours the poisoned wine on the ground as libations for Apollo, which a dove then drinks and subsequently dies. Ion guesses the plot, the Old Man confesses everything, and Creusa is sentenced to death (1190-1228). Creusa has no choice but to sit

[233] Harris 2006d: 319-320.

at Apollo's altar as a supplicant when Ion comes to seize her (1258-1285). Ion is outraged that she would try to escape the death penalty by supplicating on the altar and asks her what pleasure she gets from dying among the wreaths of the god (1310: τίς ἡδονή σοι θεοῦ θανεῖν ἐν στέμμασιν;), to which Creusa replies, 'I shall cause distress to one who has distressed me' (1311: λυπήσομέν τιν᾽ ὧν λελυπήμεσθ᾽ ὕπο).[234] The one who has caused Creusa's distress could be understood to mean Ion. I think, however, that it is most likely to be Apollo, whose sexual assault and subsequent neglect of their child (as Creusa believes) have now made her childless. This has caused her husband not only to betray and deceive her but also to introduce a bastard into her household as his heir, which Creusa objects to. She does not want to be ruled over by this boy, who she sees as her enemy as he would take over her patrimony by force (1295: βίᾳ), and destroy the house of Erechtheus (1293: κἀπίμπρης γ᾽ Ἐρεχθέως δόμους). Creusa, who was powerless to defend herself against the god, has now done all she can to defend her household from Ion. When wronged by an inferior male, Creusa has no trouble as describing his actions as βία.

The conflict is interrupted by the arrival of the priestess of Apollo, who prevents Ion from committing sacrilege in the temple. She carries with her the basket and tokens that Creusa left with the baby when she exposed him in the cave. Creusa recognizes the basket, and challenged to do so by Ion, describes its contents. This completes the recognition and reconciles mother and son, both of whom are overjoyed at their discovery (1320-1442). Creusa not only rejoices in the recovery of the son she thought was dead, but also at regaining her place in society. She can now fulfil her role as mother, and supply the house of Erechtheus with a rightful heir (1463-1467):

> ἄπαιδες οὐκέτ᾽ ἐσμὲν οὐδ᾽ ἄτεκνοι·
> δῶμ᾽ ἑστιοῦται, γᾶ δ᾽ ἔχει τυράννους,
> ἀνηβᾷ δ᾽ Ἐρεχθεύς·
> ὅ τε γηγενέτας δόμος οὐκέτι νύκτα δέρκεται,
> ἀελίου δ᾽ ἀναβλέπει λαμπάσιν.

Creusa does not mention Apollo in this exchange, although the priestess repeatedly stated that it was the god's will that she raise Ion and retain the birth tokens until this point.[235] When the truth is revealed, Ion declares that their reunion has been brought about by the god (1456: θεῖον τόδ᾽).

[234] On Creusa's supplication see Naiden 2006: 202-204.
[235] Eur. *Ion* 1343, 1347, 1353, 1357-1360.

After Creusa's dramatic monody, and revelations she made to the Old Man, the poet goes to great lengths to remind the audience of Apollo's original intentions, as they were revealed by Hermes in the prologue. Hermes emphasised that it is by Apollo's machinations that mother and son will be reunited, and a noble heir provided for the house of Erechtheus. Nor does the poet need to go to great lengths to arouse the audience's sympathy for Creusa any longer. Creusa has heard the priestess say that Ion's rescue, upbringing, and now recognition are all due to the god. Creusa is already starting to see Apollo's assault in a different light because of this.[236] From this point on her recollection of the encounter softens, at least when she describes it to others. She reinterprets what she once saw as a callous violation and insult. She now realises that the assault has given her the child she sees before her. With the discovery of this child she is reinstated to her position in society as wife and mother; the house of her father will no longer die out; the throne of Athens will not be usurped by foreigners; and Creusa herself is saved from death.

When Ion, still presuming that the oracle was correct, says they should find Xuthus so that he can share their joy she is forced to reveal to him her encounter with Apollo: ὦ τέκνον,/ τί φῄς; οἷον οἷον ἀνελέγχομαι (1470-1471). The use of ἀνελέγχω (convict utterly) may suggest that to some that Creusa did in fact have some culpability in her liaison, and was not, as her earlier accounts imply, an innocent victim of the god's desire. But in tragedy, especially when the incident has not been witnessed by others and has been hidden by the victim, the tendency is for citizen male characters to assume that the girl has indeed been seduced by a mortal and is lying about being attacked by a god.[237] Hence, it is due to these circumstances, not any culpability on the girl's part, that they tend to suppress any evidence of the encounter.

Creusa's revelation to Ion of his true paternity is slow and faltering, presumably to build up the dramatic tension between them (1472-1488):

[K]: ἄλλοθεν γέγονας, ἄλλοθεν.
[Ἰ]: ὤμοι· νόθον με παρθένευμ᾽ ἔτικτε σόν;
[K]: οὐχ ὑπὸ λαμπάδων οὐδὲ χορευμάτων
ὑμέναιος ἐμός,
τέκνον, ἔτικτε σὸν κάρα.

[236] Harris 2006d: 322.
[237] See below and Chapter Two.

[Ἰ]: αἰαῖ· πέφυκα δυσγενής, μῆτερ; πόθεν;

[Κ]: ἴστω Γοργοφόνα

[Ἰ]: τί τοῦτ᾽ ἔλεξας;

[Κ]: ἃ σκοπέλοις ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῖς

τὸν ἐλαιοφυῆ πάγον

θάσσει

[Ἰ]: λέγεις μοι σκολιὰ κοὐ σαφῆ τάδε.

[Κ]: παρ᾽ ἀηδόνιον πέτραν

Φοίβῳ

[Ἰ]: τί Φοῖβον αὐδᾷς;

[Κ]: κρυπτόμενον λέχος ηὐνάσθην

[Ἰ]: λέγ᾽· ὡς ἐρεῖς τι κεδνὸν εὐτυχές τέ μοι.

[Κ]: δεκάτῳ δέ σε μηνὸς ἐν

κύκλῳ κρύφιον ὠδῖν᾽ ἔτεκον Φοίβῳ.

[Ἰ]: ὦ φίλτατ᾽ εἰποῦσ᾽, εἰ λέγεις ἐτήτυμα.

We need to remember that this is the first time that Creusa has revealed her secret to someone other than a faithful slave.[238] Given the generic tendency for the girl's *kyrios* and other free males to disbelieve the accounts of women claiming to be victims of sexual violence, Creusa may be concerned that making her secret truly public could affect her position in society and her household.[239] Upon Xuthus' approach towards the end of her first encounter with Ion, Creusa begged Ion not to reveal her account of her 'friend's' tale to her husband, lest she receive censure for even being associated with such a woman, and shame (395: αἰσχύνην) at carrying out her request to attempt to gain an oracle concerning the fate of her illegitimate child from Delphi.[240]

[238] When she told Ion of her 'friend's' story he was also a slave. This is the first time she has recounted any version of the encounter with Apollo to a free individual.

[239] This is a common theme in the 'girl's tragedy' plays, see Chapter Two. It is unclear if the men's scepticism is due to their disbelief in the girl's alleged unwillingness, or because of their claim that the aggressor was divine. As Vickers 1973: 329 notes, disbelief in women's claims to have been impregnated by a deity is a 'stock response of the men in Greek myth.' Lloyd 1986a: 35, notes that 'in Euripides generally there is a good deal of scepticism about divine births.' He cites the *HF* 353f., *Hel.* 17-21, *Bacch.* 26-29, and *IA* 793-800.

[240] Cairns 1993: 308, posits that Athenian men would 'consider a woman who had been raped as "bad" (*kakē*)'. However, Xen. *Hier*. 3.4 demonstrates that a distinction was made between women who had consented to illicit sexual intercourse and those who had not. If a woman was believed to have been unwilling she would not suffer any reparations. I would like to propose that Creusa's concern reflects the general tendency of male figures in tragedy to presume that a woman who has concealed a sexual assault and pregnancy had actually been willingly seduced. This theme recurs regularly in the 'girl's tragedy' plays.

Those who classify the encounter as 'rape,' criticise the passage for ignoring 'the pain of rape.'[241] This reaction, I feel, suggests the author is blurring the distinction between the dramatic and the actual. We do not have, in *Ion*, a first-hand account of the physical and psychological toll a sexual assault has had on the victim. What we do have is a socially acceptable, sanitised, and dramatised account of what a male poet perceives should be the attitude of the victim towards a sexual assault. Nevertheless, in the earlier accounts of the assault Euripides has not completely ignored the violence of it, nor the pain and suffering Creusa endured afterwards. However, as we move towards the play's resolution it is no longer dramatically necessary for him to stress her former traumas.

Some critics who interpret the encounter with Apollo as seduction play upon the fact that this passage merely describes the assault as 'secret,' and mentions nothing of Creusa's unwillingness. Burnett states that 'the Apolline villain has entirely disappeared. . . [now that Creusa] has escaped from her own torturing fictions and has recovered the past as it was.'[242] I believe what we see in this account is further evidence of the softening of Creusa's recollection of her encounter with Apollo, which comes from her reinterpretation of the god's motivation and subsequent actions. Yet, Creusa makes it plain to Ion that his conception was from an illegitimate union (1474-1475), and the appellation 'secret' stresses this. The language Creusa uses here is no different to the language which has been used to describe the union before, in all instances when it has been clearly presented as a sexual assault. Hermes uses εὐνάζω to refer to Creusa's union with Apollo in the prologue (17), just lines after telling the audience that the god used force (βίᾳ). In her monody Creusa says she will 'no longer keep secret this bed' (874: οὐκέτι κρύψω λέχος). The Old Man refers to Creusa's 'hidden anguish' (944: νόσον κρυφαίαν) after learning of Creusa's assault. The next few lines though do throw a darker shadow upon the union (1489-1509):

[K]: παρθένια δ᾽ †ἐμᾶς ματέρος†
σπάργαν᾽ ἀμφίβολά σοι τάδ᾽ ἀνῆψα κερ-
κίδος ἐμᾶς πλάνους.

[241] Saxonhouse 1986: 264.
[242] Burnett 1971: 125. Burnett seems to interpret Creusa as always knowing that Apollo had not acted out of malice, and would 'do the right thing' but has, after long years of waiting and dealing with the guilt of exposing the child, constructed an image of Apollo that was wholly negative. I believe this reading incorrect, or at least not one that intended by the author, as it weakens the sympathy the audience would have for the character, and diminishes the effect the dramatic irony her misunderstanding brings.

γάλακτι δ᾽ οὐκ ἐπέσχον οὐδὲ μαστῷ
τροφεῖα ματρὸς οὐδὲ λουτρὰ χειροῖν,
ἀνὰ δ᾽ ἄντρον ἔρημον οἰωνῶν
γαμφηλαῖς φόνευμα θοίναμά τ᾽ εἰς
Ἅιδαν ἐκβάλλη.

[Ἴ]: ὦ δεινὰ τλᾶσα μῆτερ.

[K]: ἐν φόβῳ, τέκνον,
καταδεθεῖσα σὰν ἀπέβαλον ψυχάν.
ἔκτεινά σ᾽ ἄκουσ᾽.

[Ἴ]: †ἐξ ἐμοῦ τ᾽ οὐχ ὅσι᾽ ἔθνησκες.†

[K]: ἰώ <ἰώ>· δειναὶ μὲν <αἱ> τότε τύχαι,
δεινὰ δὲ καὶ τάδ᾽· ἐλισσόμεσθ᾽ ἐκεῖθεν
ἐνθάδε δυστυχίαισιν εὐτυχίαις τε πάλιν,
μεθίσταται δὲ πνεύματα.
μενέτω· τὰ πάροιθεν ἅλις κακά· νῦν
δὲ γένοιτό τις οὖρος ἐκ κακῶν, ὦ παῖ.

Creusa had something to fear if the child was discovered, even from her own mother. As we have seen in reference to the 'girl's tragedy' plays, fear of the discovery of an illegitimate does not mean the girl has consented to the sexual act which engendered the child. Creusa's remark that her 'fortunes then were terrible,' may also refer to the original assault, as well as her having to conceal her pregnancy and expose the baby out of fear, after all, throughout the rest of the play the assault has been seen very much as the catalyst to her misfortunes.

If Creusa was concerned about being disbelieved by Ion, it appears as she was right to be so (1520-1527):

τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα πρὸς σὲ βούλομαι μόνην φράσαι.
δεῦρ᾽ ἔλθ᾽: ἐς οὓς γὰρ τοὺς λόγους εἰπεῖν θέλω
καὶ περικαλύψαι τοῖσι πράγμασι σκότον.
ὅρα σύ, μῆτερ, μὴ σφαλεῖσ᾽ ἃ παρθένοις
ἐγγίγνεται νοσήματ᾽ ἐς κρυπτοὺς γάμους
ἔπειτα τῷ θεῷ προστίθης τὴν αἰτίαν
καὶ τοὐμὸν αἰσχρὸν ἀποφυγεῖν πειρωμένη
Φοίβῳ τεκεῖν με φῄς, τεκοῦσ᾽ οὐκ ἐκ θεοῦ;

The son disbelieving the mother about his divine paternity features in fragments we have from 'girl's tragedy' plays, indicating this could have been a common theme in the sub-genre.[243] It emphasises the general theme of scepticism among free males about stories of divine sexual encounters. Indeed, though Creusa swears by Athena that she is telling the truth, Ion's scepticism continues (1528-1545):

[K]: μὰ τὴν παρασπίζουσαν ἅρμασίν ποτε
Νίκην Ἀθάναν Ζηνὶ γηγενεῖς ἔπι,
οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδείς σοι πατὴρ θνητῶν, τέκνον,
ἀλλ᾽ ὅσπερ ἐξέθρεψε Λοξίας ἄναξ.
[Ἴ]: πῶς οὖν τὸν αὑτοῦ παῖδ᾽ ἔδωκ᾽ ἄλλῳ πατρὶ
Ξούθου τέ φησι παῖδά μ᾽ ἐκπεφυκέναι;
[K]: πεφυκέναι μὲν οὐχί, δωρεῖται δέ σε
αὑτοῦ γεγῶτα· καὶ γὰρ ἂν φίλος φίλῳ
δοίη τὸν αὑτοῦ παῖδα δεσπότην δόμων.
[Ἴ]: ὁ θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἢ μάτην μαντεύεται;
ἐμοῦ ταράσσει, μῆτερ, εἰκότως φρένα.
[K]: ἄκουε δή νυν ἅμ᾽ ἐσῆλθεν, ὦ τέκνον·
εὐεργετῶν σε Λοξίας ἐς εὐγενῆ
δόμον καθίζει· τοῦ θεοῦ δὲ λεγόμενος
οὐκ ἔσχες ἄν ποτ᾽ οὔτε παγκλήρους δόμους
οὔτ᾽ ὄνομα πατρός. πῶς γάρ, οὗ γ᾽ ἐγὼ γάμους
ἔκρυπτον αὐτὴ καί σ᾽ ἀπέκτεινον λάθρᾳ;
ὁ δ᾽ ὠφελῶν σε προστίθησ᾽ ἄλλῳ πατρί.

Partly Ion's doubt seems to come from his belief in the Delphic oracle, which proclaimed him the son of Xuthus. We see from Creusa's response that she has now reinterpreted the original assault and her opinion of Apollo is transformed. He is a benevolent god that shows kindness (1540: εὐεργετῶν) to his son, providing him with noble patrimony. She seems to understand that the course of action Apollo took was a necessary one to secure a noble position for their son.

Ion, still doubting his mother, intends to seek an oracle from the temple when Athena appears before them (1553-1575):

μὴ φεύγετ᾽· οὐ γὰρ πολεμίαν με φεύγετε
ἀλλ᾽ ἔν τ᾽ Ἀθήναις κἀνθάδ᾽ οὖσαν εὐμενῆ.

[243] Euripides, *Antiope* test. iiic, F223.2-3; Euripides F498, referring to Melanippe.

ἐπώνυμος δὲ σῆς ἀφικόμην χθονὸς
Παλλάς, δρόμῳ σπεύσασ᾽ Ἀπόλλωνος πάρα,
ὃς ἐς μὲν ὄψιν σφῷν μολεῖν οὐκ ἠξίου,
μὴ τῶν πάροιθε μέμψις ἐς μέσον μόλῃ,
ἡμᾶς δὲ πέμπει τοὺς λόγους ὑμῖν φράσαι·
ὡς ἥδε τίκτει σ᾽ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος πατρός,
δίδωσι δ᾽ οἷς ἔδωκεν, οὐ φύσασί σε,
ἀλλ᾽ ὡς κομίζῃ᾽ς οἶκον εὐγενέστατον.
ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ἀνεῴχθη πρᾶγμα μηνυθὲν τόδε,
θανεῖν σε δείσας μητρὸς ἐκ βουλευμάτων
καὶ τήνδε πρὸς σοῦ, μηχαναῖς ἐρρύσατο.
ἔμελλε δ᾽ αὐτὰ διασιωπήσας ἄναξ
ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις γνωριεῖν ταύτην τε σοὶ
σέ θ᾽ ὡς πέφυκας τῆσδε καὶ Φοίβου πατρός.
ἀλλ᾽ ὡς περαίνω πρᾶγμα καὶ χρησμοὺς θεοῦ,
ἐφ᾽ οἷσιν ἔζευξ᾽ ἅρματ᾽, εἰσακούσατον.
λαβοῦσα τόνδε παῖδα Κεκροπίαν χθόνα
χώρει, Κρέουσα, κἀς θρόνους τυραννικοὺς
ἵδρυσον. ἐκ γὰρ τῶν Ἐρεχθέως γεγὼς
δίκαιος ἄρχειν τῆς ἐμῆς ὅδε χθονός,
ἔσται δ᾽ ἀν᾽ Ἑλλάδ᾽ εὐκλεής.

In this passage the goddess confirms to Ion that Creusa is telling the truth about his paternity, twice asserting that Creusa is Ion's mother and Apollo his father. She also informs them of Apollo's original plan, of which the audience was made aware in the prologue. Creusa is now rid of the ignorance that caused her so much pain and suffering up to this point, and her view of the god is completely transformed because of it. Creusa's position in her household will be completely safe. She is reassured that the throne of her ancestors will not be usurped by a foreign illegitimate child of her husband. Upon learning this she perceives that Apollo had always intended to ensure the welfare of her child, herself, and the continuation of her line. The god's continuing (though unknown and distant) concern for Creusa and their child's well-being has led him to intervene when they put each other in mortal peril and reveal everything before he had intended. She is now reassured that the assault on her was not negatively motivated, and that the god has therefore done nothing wrong.

Athena's explanation for Apollo's absence (1557-1559), and scholarship's interpretation of it (or lack thereof) is extremely interesting. For those who see Apollo's union with Creusa as rape, and negative, the end of the play, Athena's defence of the god's actions, and Creusa's praise for the god are troubling, so the majority brush over it.[244] Hoffer (1996) does mention this passage, and interprets it as evidence that Apollo feels shame at his actions.[245] Those who read Apollo's encounter with Creusa as seduction emphasise Athena's speech and Creusa's praise of the god as evidence as for the union being consensual. However, they often omit a discussion of this passage as it seems to suggest that the god did have something to be reproached for over the sexual assault and afterwards in regards to his treatment of Creusa and keeping her ignorant about the child's welfare.[246] Those who do discuss it frame their comments in such a way as to imply that the benevolent god does not appear in order to protect Creusa and her, mistakenly, negative attitude towards him. Wassermann (1940), for instance, believes that Apollo does not appear for the sake of Creusa, 'whose joy would be troubled by the recollection of τὰ πάροιθε which include her sufferings as well as her insults against Apollo and the attempt on the life of his and her son.'[247] Burnett (1971) also interprets this passage as referring to Apollo's reluctance to appear in front of Creusa 'for fear she might with further blasphemy put herself beyond even his mercy.'[248] Burnett does note that Creusa's 'rebellion by this time is at an end,'[249] but misses the point that surely the god knows this now that the truth has been revealed to her, after all she has apparently grasped his intentions perfectly in lines 1540-1545. Indeed, I believe these remarks of Athena are not addressed to Creusa, or at least not her alone. It is because of Ion's doubt in Creusa's story and the god's motivation for proclaiming him as Xuthus' son that Ion himself was heading to the temple to inquire of an oracle from Apollo which has caused Athena to be sent by him. It is Ion whom she

[244] Troiano 1985; Dunn 1990; and Scafuro 1990, all ignore the end of the play. Wolff 1965, does not mention this passage. Zacharia 2003 quotes it three times (99, 106, and 141) but does not discuss this remark in detail. Perhaps the most telling omission is that by Verrall 1895: 140 of 1609-1613. Although he discuss Athena's speech he completely ignores Creusa's praise of the god, possibly because it contradicts his assertion that, 'the supposed behaviour of Apollo to Creusa is that of a cowardly, selfish ruffian, and that nothing which he now can do, no future happiness which he can give her (even if there were the least reason to expect that she will get it) will affect the brutality of his original outrage and the cruelty of his fifteen years' silence about the fate of her child – all this is pointed out again and again in the plainest and most biting terms that the author can find.' A notable exception is Harris 2006d, who recognises the incident as sexual assault and also analyses the end of the play in his discussion.
[245] Hoffer 1996: 307. A view that Zacharia 2003: 94 seems to share.
[246] Willetts 1973; Conacher 1959 mentions the passage twice (23 and 33) but does not discuss it in detail.
[247] Wassermann 1940: 603.
[248] Burnett 1971: 122.
[249] Burnett 1971: 122.

directly addresses after 1557-1559, to confirm his paternity. Indeed she does not specifically address Creusa until 1571. If the god is protecting anyone it is Ion, and his questioning of the god giving false oracles.

Later, addressing Creusa, Athena declares (1595-1605):

> καλῶς δ᾽ Ἀπόλλων πάντ᾽ ἔπραξε· πρῶτα μὲν
> ἄνοσον λοχεύει σ᾽, ὥστε μὴ γνῶναι φίλους·
> ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ἔτικτες τόνδε παῖδα κἀπέθου
> ἐν σπαργάνοισιν, ἁρπάσαντ᾽ ἐς ἀγκάλας
> Ἑρμῆν κελεύει δεῦρο πορθμεῦσαι βρέφος,
> ἔθρεψέ τ᾽ οὐδ᾽ εἴασεν ἐκπνεῦσαι βίον.
> νῦν οὖν σιώπα παῖς ὅδ᾽ ὡς πέφυκε σός,
> ἵν᾽ ἡ δόκησις Ξοῦθον ἡδέως ἔχῃ
> σύ τ᾽ αὖ τὰ σαυτῆς ἀγάθ᾽ ἔχουσ᾽ ἴῃς, γύναι.
> καὶ χαίρετ᾽· ἐκ γὰρ τῆσδ᾽ ἀναψυχῆς πόνων
> εὐδαίμον᾽ ὑμῖν πότμον ἐξαγγέλλομαι.

Some scholars see this passage as referring to Apollo having done nothing wrong in regards to the sexual assault. I believe this interpretation is largely influenced by Verrall's representation of the remark as addressed to Creusa and referring to the assault.[250] Grube believes that Athena's assertion does not refer to the original assault, but the aftermath:

> The defence of Apollo is neither ironical nor ineffective. Apart from the original rape the god has behaved well; the violent accusations made against him by Creusa were not justified. The rape itself was necessary to provide Athens and her empire with divine ancestry. Could any Athenian deny that it was worth the price? Not even Creusa herself who now freely approves of Apollo's conduct (1609). By this I do not mean that the fifth-century audience believed in the literal truth of the legend, only that in the presentation of it there is little in the conduct of the god that would outrage their moral sense.[251]

However, he still interprets the original assault as 'rape' and therefore essentially wrong in the eyes of the characters and the audience. This sentiment is also shared by Zacharia who, though

[250] Verrall 1895: 156.
[251] Grube 1941: 277.

acknowledging Creusa's re-interpretation of the assault, dubs it 'a necessary sacrifice for the benefit of the autochthonous Athenian line.'[252]

Athena, in stating that 'everything has been done well by Apollo,' does not differentiate between the assault and its aftermath. The appearance of the goddess completely exonerates Apollo in the eyes of Creusa and Ion, and reminds the audience what they have known to be true from Hermes' prologue. Apollo had always intended to reunite mother and son and secure for Ion his place as heir to the Athenian throne. With the truth revealed none of the characters attribute any blame to the god or censure his actions in any way. This supports Harris' thesis that in ancient Athens the motivation of a sexual assault is what led to it being interpreted negatively.[253] What Athena lists as Apollo's achievements are keeping the mother and baby safe, and the secret concealed from her *kyrios*. This is something not usually achieved in the accounts of the 'girl's tragedy' plays, in which the mother and child(ren) usually go through much hardship and suffering before being reunited and regaining their proper place in society.[254]

The designation the sexual assault by Apollo as non-transgressive does not in any way undermine Creusa's previous accounts of her experience throughout the rest of the play. She is still the victim of sexual assault, but she can now accept her past and move on with her future, as her praise for Apollo demonstrates (1609-1613):

> τἀμὰ νῦν ἄκουσον· αἰνῶ Φοῖβον οὐκ αἰνοῦσα πρίν,
> οὕνεχ᾽ οὗ ποτ᾽ ἠμέλησε παιδὸς ἀποδίδωσί μοι.
> αἵδε δ᾽ εὐωποὶ πύλαι μοι καὶ θεοῦ χρηστήρια,
> δυσμενῆ πάροιθεν ὄντα. νῦν δὲ καὶ ῥόπτρων χέρας
> ἡδέως ἐκκριμνάμεσθα καὶ προσεννέπω πύλας.[255]

While Creusa was suffering and unable to fulfil her role of providing an heir to her household, and ignorant about the fate of her baby, she saw Apollo's assault upon her as negatively motivated,

---

[252] Zacharia 2003: 98.
[253] Harris 2006d.
[254] Perhaps the major problem of interpretations and attribution of genre to *Ion* is that it has been read in isolation due to fragmentary nature of the other plays.
[255] Line 1610 ἠμέλησε is given by L and followed by Owen 1939 and Diggle 1981. This is amended to ἠμέλησα by Heath which Kovacs 1999 follows. I have kept the manuscript reading because Creusa has believed up to this point that Apollo had neglected the child and, therefore, her phraseology reflects her previous viewpoint, which she now realises was wrong. If we regard Creusa herself as the subject of the verb it is still not entirely problematic, as Creusa has admitted on a number of occasions that she did neglect Ion. This has, however, always been contextualised as a direct result of her treatment by Apollo and would not affect Creusa's overall representation.

intending to cause her shame and dishonour, or at best merely showing no regard at all for her status or family. Once the truth has been revealed to her, she sees Apollo in a new light.[256] He has provided her with adequate compensation and proved that he had not intended to dishonour her and her household. After making this discovery Creusa once again holds the god in high regard. Reuniting her with Ion; securing his position in Creusa's household; enabling her to maintain her status, unaffected by any possible shame or condemnation that the discovery that she had given birth to and concealed an illegitimate child could bring; and ensuring that she would be able to fulfil her role as a mother openly with the birth of more children to her husband,[257] demonstrates that the assault was not an act of *hybris* intended to insult and shame her and her household, and consequently Apollo has committed no wrong.[258]

Burnett claims that by the end of the play it has been shown that Apollo 'was moved by serious purposes and not by lust.'[259] There is actually no hint in the prologue or epilogue that the god was just satisfying his lust; this is something inferred by the mortal characters before the revelation of Ion's survival, identity, and future destiny is made known.[260] Perhaps Athena's revelation of Apollo's intentions does satisfy the mortal characters that the god did not act out of lust and had not intended to cause any dishonour to Creusa. But is it really Apollo's primary intention and motivation for the assault on Creusa to supply Athens and the Ionians with a glorious ancestor as some have stated?[261] There is no mention made by Hermes of this as the god's intention until line 67 of the prologue, and this is only after we are told that Xuthus and Creusa have come to consult the oracle about their childlessness. We are told: Λοξίας δὲ τὴν τύχην/ ἐς τοῦτ᾽ ἐλαύνει, κοὐ λέληθεν, ὡς δοκεῖ (67-68), but there is no hint that this plan was the motivation for the original assault.

Even in the epilogue the things Athena states that Apollo has 'done well' are keeping Creusa's labour free from sickness, enabling the birth to be concealed from her family, sending

---

[256] Lee 1997: 319.
[257] Eur. *Ion* 1589-1594 Athena reveals to Creusa that she will have at least two sons by Xuthus, Doris and Achaeus, who will have illustrious futures.
[258] Harris 2006d: 321.
[259] Burnett 1971: 128.
[260] This is also noted by Lloyd 1986a: 37, who argued that '[t]here is no evidence that his motives were ever other than personal: originally lust, then the desire to benefit his son.' Vickers 1973: 342 n.18, criticises Burnett's comment and sees 'the basic motivation of sexual desire. . .[as] implicit in all myths of divine seduction.'
[261] Wassermann 1940; Grube 1941; Saxonhouse 1986.

Hermes to retrieve the baby, and raising him (1595-1600), at no point does she mention the original assault directly. Perhaps it does not matter whether his original motivation was lust, rather than some elaborate plan to secure a prestigious ancestor for the Ionian race (Xuthus, a grandson of Zeus and successful warrior is hardly some low class foreigner), but Apollo's behaviour towards the child, securing a legitimate place for him in society, and acknowledging paternity to those figures who 'matter' (Ion, Creusa, and Athena), is what shows that he did not mean to shame the girl and her family, and exonerates him from any wrong-doing in the eyes of the ancient Athenian audience. It does not, however, minimise Creusa's experience or reduce the audience's sympathy for her.

The closing scene of *Ion* does not appear to give credence to the popular view that the offence implicit in an instance of sexual violence was actually against the victim's *kyrios* and male kin. When the truth is revealed the only mention made of Creusa's father is when Creusa rejoices that his line will not die out (1465-1467). The offence, or lack of it once Apollo's plan has been revealed, is only mentioned in terms of its effects upon Creusa and Ion.

In recent years, the similarities and contrasts between Euripides' presentation of Creusa's sexual encounter with Apollo, and that of the god's relationship with Cyrene in Pindar's *Ninth Pythian Ode* have been recognised.[262] Kearns (2013) has noted the echoes of language and motifs of Pind. *Pyth*. 9.5-13 and 36, in Creusa's account of her sexual assault in the monody (887-896). These echoes have prompted Kearns to argue that Euripides' is alluding to Pindar's account.[263]

Euripides use of similar motifs highlights the contrasts between the nature and effects of the two women's unions with Apollo: In Pindar's ode, though the 'seizing' (6: ἅρπασ) of Cyrene may hint at the traditional violence of gods' sexual encounters, but the poet then goes to great lengths to stress that persuasion, mutual consent, and sexual desire was important to successful and fertile

[262] See Dougherty 1996: 258-259; Zacharia 2003: 94-95 notes the contrast between Apollo opting to use persuasion rather than force, and the αἰδώς he exhibits in Pind. *Pyth*. 9, in contrast to his lack of both in *Ion*; Kearns 2013.

[263] Kearns 2013: 60-65. Kearns does not think the allusions would have been spotted by the entire audience, Pindar's ode predating *Ion* by around sixty years (65-66). However, learned spectators could have recognised the allusions, and certainly those who read the plays later may have been more alert to Euripides' literary allusions.

marriages.[264] The legitimacy of Apollo's relationship with Cyrene is stressed by Pindar with frequent references and allusions to aspects of the marriage ceremony and wedding imagery.[265] The joining together of the couple by Aphrodite adds to the legitimacy of the union.[266] Coyness (αἰδώς in 12 and 40) in regards to sexual matters is a theme in the ode,[267] and Chiron councels Apollo that Persuasion holds the key to successful sexual encounter (39-39a). Apollo makes Cyrene mistress (7: δέσποιναν) of her own land, just as a new bride would become mistress of her husband's house. The pair have an immortal child, who is taken by Hermes and raised by the Horai and Gaia.[268] Cyrene is in no doubt about the esteem the god holds her in and suffers no negative consequences because of her relationship with him.

All this is in strong contrast to Creusa's encounter with the god, the illicit nature of which is stressed when Creusa refers to its lack of ceremony (1474-1475). In her monody it is Apollo alone who achieves that which gratifies Cypris (896: Κύπριδι χάριν πράσσων). There is no mutuality in Creusa's relations with the god. Rather than the coyness evident in his relations with Cyrene, Apollo behaves shamelessly (895: ἀναιδείᾳ) towards Creusa, and there is no hint of persuasion. Creusa receives no immediate benefit from her encounter with Apollo; she remains in the house of her father, and after abandoning her son by Apollo has no clue to his fate, assuming that the god has allowed him to perish, and is punishing her further with childlessness. It is years until Creusa is reunited with her child and told of his glorious destiny and that her marriage with Xuthus will be blessed with children. Until Ion is revealed as her son, Creusa has no evidence to interpret Apollo's treatment of her as anything but negative.

A further comparison between the two sexual encounters may be that both hint at Apollo's role as 'the patron deity of colonization.'[269] Dougherty (1996) argues that in both sources the

[264] Winnington-Ingram 1969; *contra* Woodbury 1972: 565: 'there is nothing in Apollo's language that proposes or implies the use of violence. . . ἅρπασ᾽. . . forcible abduction. . . has nothing to say about sexual assault.' However, Dougherty 1993 repeatedly refers to Cyrene's experience as 'rape.'
[265] See Carson 1982 for a detailed examination of Pindar's references to wedding rituals and their purpose within the poem; cf. Dougherty 1993: 137-138.
[266] Pind. *Pyth*. 9.12-13.
[267] See Woodbury 1972: 568-569; Cairns 1993: 176.
[268] Pind. *Pyth*. 9. 59-60. Kearns 2013: 63 alerts us to this being another link between the two works; it is Hermes who takes Ion to Delphi (28-49).
[269] Dougherty 1996: 258.

violent aspect of marriage and sexual violation is included in both sources as a metaphor for colonization, and to signal that both sexual encounters double as founding acts.[270]

A valuable observation made by Kearns (2013) is that Euripides allows Creusa to 'voice her own story; Cyrene is seen only through the omniscient narrator and the male gaze.'[271] Though this is due to the generic and authorial differences in the texts,[272] it could reflect a growing concern and recognition of the consent of women and their experiences of marriage and sexual relations over the sixty years between the composition of the two works. Pindar's work already seems to be concerned with the ideal of mutual consent and sexual desire in regards to marriage and sexual relations, implying a recognition and appreciation of women's consent to marriage in the early fifth century.

In *Ion*, Euripides pays much attention to the pain and trauma of sexual violence upon the victim, and represents her situation sensitively and sympathetically. At the end of the play we are left with a sense that the experience of sexual violence and its consequences were recognised as traumatic and potentially shaming for a woman on a personal level. However, we are also presented with a situation in which the disposition of the sexual aggressor and his treatment of the victim afterwards (if positive) were not only important in judging whether a prosecutable offence had been committed,[273] but were imagined to be vital in the victim coming to terms with the event and its consequences.

[270] Dougherty 1996: 258-259; cf. Dougherty 1993: 140-150 for a more detailed examination of this theme in Pind. *Pyth*. 9.
[271] Kearns 2013: 62.
[272] Kearns 2013: 62-63.
[273] Harris 2006d.

Chapter Two: 'The Girl's Tragedy'

In his 1979 monograph, Walter Burkert coined the term the 'girl's tragedy.' He noted that a number of myths relating to the mothers of heroes share the same structure – a 'fixed sequence of departure, seclusion, rape, tribulation, and rescue as a prelude to the emergence of the hero.'[274] The seven girls he lists feature prominently in at least one Greek tragedy:[275] Aeschylus wrote a play entitled *Callisto*;[276] Antiope, Auge,[277] and Danae[278] are all eponymous characters in works by Euripides; Melanippe's story was related twice by Euripides in *Melanippe Captive* and *Melanippe Wise*; while Io's tale is related in detail in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*; and there are two plays entitled *Tyro* attested to Sophocles. Scafuro (1990) added to the list Alope, whose story was dramatised in the eponymous play by Euripides.[279] It looks like this myth departs from Burkert's structure slightly as Alope probably perished rather than being rescued. The only play dealing with the 'girl's tragedy' which is extant is Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*. The remaining plays survive in a fragmentary state, but with testimonia and hypotheses fairly reliable reconstructions are possible, with the exception of Aeschylus' *Callisto*. For a number of the plays we are even able to discern the way in which the sexual encounter, victim, and motivation of the aggressor are

[274] Burkert 1979: 7.
[275] Burkert lists Antiope, Auge, Callisto, Danae, Io, Melanippe, and Tyro.
[276] We are not able to reconstruct its plot as we only have one two-word fragment. However, Callisto is compared to the protagonist in Euripides' *Helen* (375-380), as a woman who has suffered because of her beauty. In this play Helen is threatened with forced marriage by Theoclymenus. We may suppose then that Callisto is meant to be perceived as unwilling in her sexual relationship with Zeus. For a more in depth discussion of this passage see Chapter Four.
[277] Auge's tale is also mentioned in Euripides' *Telephus*. Sophocles is thought to have composed a trilogy about events in the life of Telephus, though it is unclear from the remaining fragments which version of the tale about his conception and birth, if any, was related in those plays.
[278] As well as the *Danae* the heroine also features in Euripides' *Dictys*, but its fragmentary nature means we do not know if the original story is related again, though it is likely that it was mentioned in the prologue. In *Dictys* she is an object of sexual desire, at risk of a forced marriage by Polydectes. Euripides' *Danae* and *Dictys* lack fragments which directly relate to the issue of sexual violence and will be omitted from this study. Plays entitled *Danae* and *Acrisius* are also attested for Sophocles, although it is thought they may have been alternate titles for the same play; cf. Lloyd-Jones 1996: 29. Karamanou 2006: 10, however, is inclined to believe they are two separate plays; cf. Pearson 1917 I: 38. The surviving fragments make it difficult to establish the content or even context of the plays, which may deal solely with the oracle and imprisonment of Danae rather than her impregnation by Zeus and its consequences. Due to the uncertain nature of the plots for these plays, and the difficulty in identifying the context of the fragments which we do possess, I shall not be considering the Sophoclean plays in this study.
[279] Scafuro 1990: 126. Sommerstein 2006, adds Deidameia's assault by Achilles, dramatized in Euripides' *Skyrioi*, as well as identifying a sub-category of plays in which the girl is not assaulted by a god or hero but incestuously by a father or brother. This occurs in Euripides' *Aeolus* and one of Sophocles' *Thyestes* plays (the victims are Canace and Pelopeia, respectively). These plays will not be considered in this thesis as no fragments remain concerning the context or circumstances of the assault, *pace* Sommerstein 2006: 241, whose contextualisation for Euripides F30 and F31 is conjecture; and Sophocles F247 could refer to the incestuous nature of the relationship rather than the sexual violence.

represented, as well as the attitudes of the other characters towards the victim. This makes them valuable sources for a study of attitudes towards sexual violence in ancient Athens.

Over the past twenty years, the similarity of the themes of the 'girl's tragedy' plays with those in Euripides' *Ion* has been increasingly noticed. Scafuro (1990) utilises Creusa's discourse of sexual violence to illuminate her discussion of the fragmentary texts.[280] Huys (1995) lists *Ion* among the first category of plays in his study of hero-exposure in Euripidean tragedy.[281] Sommerstein (2006) classifies *Ion* as a 'girl's tragedy.'[282] *Ion*, though similar in some respects to the recognition-play type of 'girl's tragedy' differs in that Creusa's assault is never discovered by her *kyrios*, consequently she does not suffer any reduction in status.

Rather than looking at the fragments or passages in later myths which refer to the sexual act in order to determine whether the encounter was consensual based on the language used or the implication, as has been done in previous studies,[283] I intend to reconstruct the plots of these plays from the testimonia and fragments with a view to looking at a number of aspects: Firstly, I shall attempt to determine whether these incidents were portrayed as sexual violence. Secondly, I shall examine how these encounters were represented: the motivation of the aggressor; the context of the incident; and the aggressor's subsequent actions. Finally I shall look at how the encounters were received: the reaction of the girl, her *kyrios* and other characters to the consequences of the incident; and the girl's account of it. This will give a better understanding of the representation of sexual violence in this type of tragedy and contribute to a better understanding of Athenian attitudes towards sexual violence, its perpetrators, and victims.[284]

---

[280] Scafuro 1990.

[281] Huys 1995: 57. The first category deals with the recognition plays, including *Antiope*, *Ion*, *Melanippe Captive*, and *Tyro B*. Even though recognition is the main focus of the plot, the previous experiences of the mother are still an important theme, utilised to incite sympathy for the mother, making them pertinent to this study. The second category consists of plays in which the discovery of the sexual encounter leads to conflict with the girl's *kyrios* and includes *Alope*, *Auge*, *Danae*, *Melanippe Wise*, and *Tyro A (Keiromene)*. The account of Io also falls into this category, although in *Prometheus Bound* it is the intention of Zeus to seduce her, not the effects of the seduction, that causes her physical alienation from her father and exile. Cf. Borecky 1955.

[282] Sommerstein 2006: 237. Karamanou 2003: 5-6, 2006: 24, divides the plays into two categories but does not use the term 'girl's tragedy.'

[283] Scafuro 1990; Sommerstein 2006.

[284] Unless otherwise stated, the texts translations of the Euripidean fragments are taken from the Loeb editions by Collard & Cropp 2008. The Sophoclean fragments texts and translations are from the Loeb edition by Lloyd-Jones 1996, with exceptions noted. The translation of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* is my own, having consulted editions by Griffith 1983 and Podlecki 2005; the text is from West's ([1990] 1998) Teubner.

Euripides' *Alope*

It is widely accepted that Hyginus *Fabulae* 187 (testimonia iib) recounts the story of Alope as it was represented in Euripides' play of that title:

> Alope Cercyonis filia formosissima cum esset, Neptunus eam compressit, qua ex compressione peperit infantem, quem inscio patre nutrici dedit exponendum. Qui cum expositus esset, equa uenit et ei lac praestabat. Quidam pastor equam persecutus uidit infantem atque eum sustulit, qui ueste regia indutum cum in casam tulisset, alter compastor rogauit ut sibi eum infantem donaret. Ille ei donauit sine ueste; cum autem inter eos iurgium esset, quod qui puerum acceperat insignia ingenuitatis reposceret, ille autem non daret, contendentes ad regem Cercyonem uenerunt et contendere coeperunt. Ille autem qui infantem donatum acceperat, repetere insignia coepit; quae cum allata essent, et agnosceret Cercyon ea esse ex ueste scissa filiae suae, Alopes nutrix timens regi indicium fecit infantem eum Alopes esse, qui filiam iussit ad necem includi, infantem autem proici. Quem iterum equa nutriebat, pastores iterum inuentum sustulerunt, sentientes eum deorum numine educari, atque nutrierunt, nomenque ei imposuerunt Hippothoum. Theseus cum ea iter faceret a Troezene Cercyonem interfecit. Hippothous autem ad Theseum uenit regnaque auita rogauit; cui Theseus libens dedit, cum sciret eum Neptuni filium esse, unde ipse genus ducebat. Alopes autem corpus Neptunus in fontem commutauit, qui ex nomine Alopes est cognominatus.

Hyginus' account suggests the play fits the pattern that we saw in *Ion*, and which I have proposed is present in all the 'girl's tragedy' plays. Poseidon, a higher status god, assaults Alope apparently because of her physical beauty, suggesting that desire was presented as the motivating factor.[285] We cannot detect from Hyginus' account whether this motivation was portrayed negatively. In F107,[286] Alope is referred to as Poseidon's 'beloved' (φίλοις), the object of the god's affection, rather than being presented as having mutual desire for the god. I would like tentatively to suggest that this fragment indicates that the sexual encounter was not presented negatively, even though Alope was not willing.

There is no evidence for the context of the assault in the surviving fragments, but Cercyon's ignorance of it certainly implies it fits the pattern of isolation. Alope concealed her

[285] The assault will have been related in the prologue, as the action of the play occurs after the child is born. It is uncertain who will have spoken the prologue, it could have been the Nurse, Alope, or a deity.
[286] F107: πλήσας δέ νηδὺν οὐδ᾽ ὄναρ κατ᾽ εὐφρόνην φίλοις ἔδειξεν αὐτόν.

assault and pregnancy from her father. She has the baby exposed with the help of her nurse, who is apparently sympathetic to her plight. Fragment 108 could reflect the nurse's complicity in this plan,[287] spoken either by her or Alope discussing the exposure, or by either character when challenged by Cercyon. Although we are not sure of her precise reasons for exposing the child, the fact that she wraps him in apparently expensive and distinctive clothing suggests that she did not intend for the child to die, but was merely attempting to conceal his birth from her father.[288]

The plan to conceal the child from Cercyon fails when the herdsmen bring the child into Cercyon's purview after they ask him to arbitrate their disagreement over the child's possessions. Although we have no corroboratory evidence for this scene in the remaining fragments it is likely that the arbitration scene in Menander's *Epitrepontes* (218-375) was based on it.[289] In that scene a shepherd, Daos, who has discovered the child of Pamphile (who we know was the unwilling victim of a sexual assault) asks her father, Smikrines, to arbitrate the dispute between him and Syros, a charcoal burner to whom he had given the child. Smikrines, unlike Cercyon, does not recognise the child as his own daughter's, which must add to the comic effect of the scene. The *Epitrepontes* also appears to be loosely based on Euripides' *Auge*, a play in which the female protagonist is almost certainly the reluctant victim of sexual violence.[290] The connection between *Alope*, *Auge*, and *Epitrepontes* strongly suggests that Alope was presented as the unwilling victim of the god.

Cercyon recognises the clothing as his daughter's, and the nurse (presumably under the fear or threat of torture) confirms his suspicions that the baby is Alope's. It is obvious from the remaining fragments that there is a confrontational *agon* scene between Alope and her father. It is clear he believes Alope has behaved wrongly (F109-111), and implies he does not believe her to be an unwilling participant in the sexual encounter:

F109: οὐ μὴν σύ γ᾽ ἡμᾶς τοὺς τεκόντας ἠδέσω.

F110: ἐγὼ δ᾽, ὃ μὲν μέγιστον, ἄρξομαι λέγειν
ἐκ τοῦδε πρῶτον· πατρὶ πείθεσθαι χρεὼν
παῖδας νομίζειν τ᾽ αὐτὸ τοῦτ᾽ εἶναι δίκην.

[287] F108: γυνὴ γυναικὶ σύμμαχος πέφυκέ πως.
[288] Huys 1995: 260, interprets Alope's main motivation for the exposure as fear of Cercyon's anger towards her, but accepts that she was concerned with the welfare of the child (261), and proposes that she may have wrapped it in her expensive clothing as an inducement for someone discovering the child to rear him (231).
[289] Collard & Cropp 2008 I: 117.
[290] See *Auge* section below.

F111: τί δῆτα μοχθεῖν δεῖ γυναικεῖον γάμον
φρουροῦντας; αἱ γὰρ εὖ τεθραμμέναι πλέον
σφάλλουσιν οἴκους τῶν παρημελημένων.

It is unclear whether his anger was due to his belief that the girl has been seduced, or because she has concealed her pregnancy from him, or both. He feels betrayed by his daughter, considers her to have acted intentionally (either being complicit in the illicit sexual union and/or hiding the child from him), and believes she has undermined his authority over her.[291] This interpretation of her actions results in his interring his daughter alive.[292] Alope's imprisonment is described by Seaford as a method by which a girl's family (I would argue her *kyrios* in particular) reasserts 'control over her,' upon the discovery of a supposed sexual transgression, a feature he perceives in all the other 'girl's tragedy' plays.[293] If this is the purpose of their punishment it suggests that their *kyrioi* do not believe their accounts and are trying to restrict the freedom they think the girls have been exercising.

As with the other 'girl's tragedy' plays the child is not raised in the maternal *oikos* but re-exposed to be once again suckled by the mare and raised by the herdsmen. Unlike a number of the other hero-children, Hippothoon does actually remain in the locale and is eventually restored to his rightful patrimony by Theseus.

Despite the paucity of fragments available for the reconstruction of this play it is still clear from those we do have that it exhibits the features which I think should be identified as a common pattern for all the Euripidean 'girl's tragedy' plays. This evidence, combined with the arbitration scene in the *Epitrepontes* (apparently inspired by this play), means we can confidently say that the sexual encounter between Alope and Poseidon was portrayed as non-consensual. Alope's supreme innocence makes her final fate all the more tragic, if she was treated as a sympathetic figure and the unwilling victim of sexual violence. It does not appear that Poseidon was viewed negatively for effectively causing her death, as the play portrays the mortal characters as responsible for the punishment. It is likely that Cercyon was portrayed as a savage tyrant, and that Alope is simply another of his innocent victims. It appears that Poseidon was helpless in preventing her fate but

[291] As Collard & Cropp 2008 I: 123 n.1, point out in F109 the plural may have been used in place of the singular, and still could just refer to Alope's father.
[292] Pausanias 1.39.3; Karamanou 2003: 5.
[293] Seaford 1990a: 81. He does not include *Ion* (Creusa), *Prometheus Bound* (Io), *Skyrioi* (Deidameia), or the 'incest plays,' *Aeolus* (Canace) or *Thyestes* (Pelopeia) in his list.

later immortalised her as a stream. The god is certainly represented as ensuring the survival of her child though: it is a horse, an animal closely associated with Poseidon,[294] who nurses the child, and another of Poseidon's heroic sons, Theseus, who eventually kills the tyrannical Cercyon and grants Hippothoon the kingdom. We are told that Theseus knows of Hippothoon's paternity, so either Poseidon has publicly acknowledged him somehow (or is imagined to have had), or Alope's story was accepted as the truth and treated sympathetically by all but her father.

Euripides' *Antiope*

Despite possessing a substantial number of fragments for this play, including over one hundred lines from the final scene (F223), only a handful of fragments are pertinent to this study. The fragments we do have seem to support the conclusion that Hyginus *Fabula* 8 is based on the Euripidean play.[295] Combining the surviving fragments with Hyginus' account it is possible to identify the common patterns I have observed through the 'girl's tragedy' story type being employed in this play to gain sympathy for Antiope, making the final recognition and restoration of her social position all the more dramatic.

From Hyginus *Fabulae* 8 (test. iiia.1-3) we learn of the background to the Euripidean play, presumably related in the prologue:[296] Zeus, again a higher status male, was attracted by Antiope's physical beauty, suggesting he was motivated by desire. It is not made clear in this source if he uses force or seduction. Her father, Nycteus, discovers the sexual encounter has occurred, presumably by finding out she was pregnant. It is unclear if he knows or is even told of the father's identity or the circumstances surrounding the conception (though from the end of the play it would seem he and his brother Lycus had either not been told or had not believed the explanation). Antiope runs away to escape punishment. Epaphus of Sicyon takes Antiope for his wife while she is pregnant. It is not stated whether he was aware of her situation or had sympathy for her predicament. This is

[294] Poseidon had the cult title of Hippios, and was referred to by the epithet Δαμαῖος (Pind. *Ol.* 13.69). Cf. Cook 1894: 144-145; Burkert 1985: 138; and below.
[295] Huys 1996: 171; Graf 1884: 30-34; Kambitsis 1972: 139-140; Luppe 1984: 41-59.
[296] EADEM (i.e. ANTIOPA) EURIPIDIS. Nyctei regis in Boeotia fuit filia Antiopa; eius formae bonitate Iuppiter adductus grauidam fecit. Quam pater cum punire uellet propter stuprum, minitans periculum Antiopa effugit. Casu in eodem loco quo illa peruenerat Epopeus Sicyonius stabat; is mulierem aduectam domo matrimonio suo iunxit. Id Nycteus aegre ferens cum moreretur Lyco fratri suo per obtestationem mandat, cui tum regnum relinquebat, ne impune Antiopa ferret. Huius post mortem Lycus Sicyonem uenit; interfecto Epopeo Antiopam uinctam adduxit. In Cithaerone parit geminos et reliquit, quos pastor educauit, Zetum et Amphionem nominauit.

possible; in other plays the girl and her child are taken in and adopted by another man.[297] Antiope's apparent sexual autonomy in conducting the marriage with Epaphus, for its own sake or because her father interprets it as proof that she must have been willing and complicit in the sexual encounter which engendered her pregnancy, seems to enrage Nycteus further. On his death bed, he charges his brother Lycus to recover the girl and punish her. Lycus kills Epaphus and brings Antiope back to Thebes as a captive. The children were born on her return journey (cf. F207) and Antiope abandoned them on Mount Cithaeron, either because she was forced to, or in order to try and protect them from her uncle and now *kyrios*.

We can tell from the fragments that the action of the play is set some fifteen to twenty years later, like *Ion*, and belongs to the category of recognition play. Its plot seems to be recounted in the second half of Hyginus' *Fabulae* 8 (test. iiia.4-6):[298] Antiope was given to Dirce, Lycus' wife, to torture and apparently remained in captivity for the entire time, until she seized an opportunity to escape and seek out her sons. The twins at first doubt her story (cf. F210), but their adoptive father, a herdsman who apparently witnessed the abandonment and rescued the twins (cf. F181-182), confirms that she is their mother. They pursue Dirce, who has recaptured Antiope, rescue their mother and kill Dirce in revenge for her mistreatment of Antiope. They are prevented from killing Lycus by the appearance of Hermes, who orders Lycus to give his kingdom to Amphion and Zethus (cf. F223).

Fragments 181 and 182 come quite early in the play. They are spoken by the herdsman and tell us what he has named the children and why.[299] He is explaining to the audience that he has discovered and raised the children (cf. Hyg. *Fab*. 8.3, which also tells us the herdsman named the twins). It is uncertain whether this forms part of the prologue,[300] or if there has been a previous

[297] Euripides' *Auge* and *Dictys*.

[298] Antiopa Dirce uxori Lyci data erat in cruciatum; ea occasione nacta fugae se mandauit; deuenit ad filios suos, ex quibus Zetus existimans fugitiuam non recepit. In eundem locum Dirce per bacchationem Liberi ilico delata est; ibi Antiopam repertam ad mortem extrahebat. Sed ab educatore pastore adulescentes certiores facti eam esse matrem suam, celeriter consecuti matrem eripuerunt, Dircen ad taurum crinibus religatam necant. Lycum cum occidere uellent, uetuit eos Mercurius, et simul iussit Lycum concedere regnum Amphioni.

[299] F181-182:
τὸν μὲν κικλήσκω Ζῆθον· ἐζήτησε γὰρ
τόκοισιν εὐμάρειαν ἡ τεκοῦσά νιν . . .
(τὸν δὲ . . . Ἀμφίονα) . . . παρὰ τὸ ἀμφ᾽ ὀδὸν . . .
γεννηθῆναι.

[300] Huys 1995: 313; Graf 1884: 72; Von Arnim 1913: 11; Wecklein 1923: 55-56; Séchan 1926: 294; Kambitsis 1972: IX- XII, all believe that the prologue was spoken by the herdsman.

speech by a deity, who has related the events preceding the exposure. The herdsman could serve a similar function to the nurse in other plays, but it is debated whether he would be able to provide enough background.[301] How would he know all of Antiope's history? If a god did not appear, the only other solution is that Antiope herself relates the past events. Fragment 207,[302] in which she reveals she gave birth on the return journey (cf. Hyg. *Fab*. 8.3), could have been part of such a speech. But if F182a-202, the debate between Amphion and Zethus, came early in the play (possibly straight after the herdsman's speech), surely Antiope's version of events would have come too late. I would like to suggest that, as Creusa does in *Ion*, Antiope relates her own experience of the events that have already been revealed in the prologue by a god. The god in question could be Dionysus, who is possibly responsible for the miraculous escape of Antiope,[303] and is certainly responsible for bringing Dirce to the cave where Antiope has rediscovered her sons (Hyg. *Fab*. 8.4; cf. F175).[304]

Antiope seems to have been portrayed in a manner aimed at securing the audience's sympathy. In F205 she talks of her suffering and misery, and in F208 she reveals the gods' neglect of her and her children:

F205: φρονῶ δ᾽ ἃ πάσχω, καὶ τόδ᾽ οὐ σμικρὸν κακόν·
τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι γὰρ ἡδονὴν ἔχει τινὰ
νοσοῦντα, κέρδος δ᾽ ἐν κακοῖς ἀγνωσία.

F208: εἰ δ᾽ ἠμελήθην ἐκ θεῶν καὶ παῖδ᾽ ἐμώ,
ἔχει λόγον καὶ τοῦτο· τῶν πολλῶν βροτῶν
δεῖ τοὺς μὲν εἶναι δυστυχεῖς, τοὺς δ᾽ εὐτυχεῖς.

---

[301] This is admitted by Huys 1995: 313, to be a problem with the attribution of the prologue to the herdsman.

[302] F207:
ἡνίκ᾽ ἠγόμην πάλιν,
κύουσα τίκτω.
Melanippe speaks the prologue in *Melanippe Wise*.

[303] Kambitsis 1972: XV; Van Looy 1998: 232; Collard 2004: 262; Collard & Cropp 2008 I: 173; cf. Eur. *Bacch*. 447, in which the chains of the Bacchae also miraculously fall away. Apollodorus' account of Antiope's story differs slightly from the Euripidean version, but in this source (3.5.5) we find the detail that her bonds are loosened miraculously. Hyg. *Fab*. 7 gives the detail of Antiope being restrained in her captivity. In Hyg. *Fab*. 7 we are told that she escapes her chains by the will of Jove (Zeus), this could imply he causes her to escape, but could easily indicate him charging another deity with the task of releasing her, possibly Dionysus, as Apollo tasks Hermes with rescuing Ion and taking him to Delphi. In F223.75-76 Hermes links Antiope's release to the action of Zeus.

[304] F175 portrays a maenad figure being 'threatened with forcible removal from the shrine,' and the female character apparently accepting death, which Collard & Cropp 2008 I: 203, attribute to Dirce being impure due to her torture of Antiope.

Huys (1995) describes her attitude in F208 as 'resignation,' and believes that in contrast to Creusa, Antiope 'did not have to conceal for many years her traumatic adventure to save her honour and keep up her social position . . . she was publicly dishonoured by the discovery of her pregnancy, and the continuous physical and psychic humiliations she had suffered ever since made her quite fatalistic, without any illusion but also without vengeful resentment.'[305] If fragments 205, 206, and 208 are rightly attributed to Antiope, she does not seem to share the self-pity and emotional torment that Creusa suffered due to her ignorance of the child's fate, but perhaps the contrast between the characterization of Antiope and Creusa is due to their different experiences. As I have shown above, more is made of Creusa's emotional and psychological torment precisely because she has retained her status and not suffered the social humiliation, physical hardship, and imprisonment as the protagonists in the 'girl's tragedy' plays do. The characterization of Antiope would more closely match that of Auge and Melanippe, as girls who are wrongly perceived by others as having transgressed sexual norms but will, in the end, be exonerated when the truth is revealed.

Fragment 206 alludes to Antiope's own conviction of her innocence and good nature. She was a victim of circumstance and neither in regard to the sexual assault nor the exposure was she able to act independently, but was forced to react to the situations in which she found herself. Antiope differs from Creusa because she has retained her faith and hope, but also her innocence, whereas Creusa is tormented by thoughts that her actions are responsible for her child's death. F206:

> ὦ παῖ, γένοιντ᾽ ἂν εὖ λελεγμένοι λόγοι
> ψευδεῖς, ἐπῶν δὲ κάλλεσιν νικῷεν ἂν
> τἀληθές· ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τοῦτο τἀκριβέστατον,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἡ φύσις καὶ τοὐρθόν· ὃς δ᾽ εὐγλωσσίᾳ
> νικᾷ, σοφὸς μὲν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ τὰ πράγματα
> κρείσσω νομίζω τῶν λόγων ἀεί ποτε.

These can hardly be the words of someone who the audience knows has lied about the conception of her children and was caught out. Antiope is obviously meant to be a sympathetic and sincere character. If she was disingenuous, this would prejudice the audience against her, which cannot have been the poet's intention. Nature in general seems to be an important theme within these

[305] Huys 1995: 105-106.

plays, especially the recognition plays, in which the superior nature of the heroic offspring, in contrast to their apparent low social position, is a common theme.[306] I would argue that the good natures of the girls were also important for their characterisation in order to gain and retain the sympathy of the audience, and to contrast them with the often tyrannical characterisation of the *kyrios*-figure. This would make their punishments all the more tragic.

Fragment 210 seems to suggest that Antiope claims her encounter with Zeus occurred while he was disguised as a satyr. This version of the myth is attested in the scholia to Apollonius Rhodius 4. 1090 (test. iiic), and John Malalas, *Chronicles* 2.16 Thurn = 2.35 Jeffreys-Scott (test. ivc), who directly attributes it to Euripides, though there is no way of knowing if this was a Euripidean innovation. F210:

οὐδὲ γὰρ λάθρᾳ δοκῶ
θηρὸς κακούργου σχήματ᾽ ἐκμιμούμενον
σοὶ Ζῆν᾽ ἐς εὐνὴν ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπον μολεῖν.

The metamorphosis of Zeus into a satyr points to Antiope's encounter with the god being characterized as an incident of sexual violence motivated by desire.[307] The association of satyrs with Dionysus and his cult may suggest that the assault had taken place during some Dionysiac religious rite, which could have been nocturnal. These circumstances imply a remote location for the assault, as well as a context of isolation and a situation of liminality, in which social *mores* are suspended. These features are not only seen in the other 'girl's tragedy' plays, but occur too in New Comedy.[308] I would propose that the characterization of Zeus metamorphosed into a satyr hints at the unwillingness of Antiope and the violence of the sexual assault, in order to gain further sympathy for the victim, without being so graphic as to transgress the generic conventions and decorum of tragedy.[309]

It is possible that the attack took place in the cave where Antiope later abandoned the twins. Huys (1995) has argued that a vase dating from the second century BC (Athens, National Museum

[306] Eur. *Ion* 247, 308, Ion strikes Creusa as educated, and she does not realise his servile status until he informs her of it; Eur. *Melanippe Captive* F495.40-43, speaks of the nobility of the twins, despite their apparent servile birth, being demonstrated in their fight with the Queen's brothers.
[307] Huys 1995: 105. Sommerstein 2006: 239, notes that 'satyrs, though eternally desireful, are notoriously bad at finding willing partners.'
[308] The sexual assaults in Menander often occur at religious festivals and at night; cf. *Kitharistes*, *Epitrepontes*, *Samia*, and possibly *Heros.*
[309] Taplin 1986: 172; Scodel 2005: 190.

11798[310]), which appears to portray the assault of naked girl by Zeus disguised as a satyr in cave, depicts this scene.[311] If this is the case, it provides a further similarity with *Ion* and *Tyro*: the abandonment of the offspring in the place where the assault took place, perhaps as some sort of appeal to the father to take responsibility for his actions. Rhesus' river-god father takes responsibility for him after his abandonment at the site of the assault which engendered him, as we are told by his mother, the Muse in epilogue of the pseudo-Euripidean *Rhesus*. This offers some insight into the imagined psychology of abandonment from the mother's perspective.[312]

Zeus' metamorphosis in order to commit the assault on Antiope is comparable to his metamorphosis into gold to impregnate Danae, and Poseidon disguising himself as the river god Enipeus in his encounter with Tyro. As in the other cases the god must have revealed his true identity to the girl at some point after the assault. In all three cases the metamorphosis seems to be essential in some way to gain access to the girl, and not to keep his identity secret from her. The need for such a ruse should perhaps point to the sexual encounter as being a non-consensual one, and shows that these girls are not presented as being lascivious by nature; they cannot be persuaded but must be caught unawares, as Creusa is shown to be in *Ion*. The stress on this factor is a further indicator that it was important to the Athenian audience whether a girl was a willing participant in the sexual act, and would affect the way she was perceived by them.

Huys argues that Antiope's apparent openness about her experience in this play is in strong contrast to Creusa's discourse with Ion upon their original encounter. He attributes this to Antiope's lack of shame.[313] However, the contexts of these two meetings are completely different. Firstly, it is probable that Antiope is already aware that the twins are her sons,[314] because she has returned to the place where she left them to find two youths of about the same age. Creusa, on the other hand, having abandoned her baby in Athens did not even suspect that the young temple slave she met in Delphi was indeed her offspring, despite acknowledging the child would be the same age as him

[310] *LIMC* I.2 Pl.680, Antiope I2.
[311] Huys 1995: 178-179; Hausmann 1958; Simon 1981: 855-857. The satyr-figure is identified as Zeus due to him holding a lightning bolt.
[312] Eur. *Rhes.* 926-928:
κἀπεὶ σὲ τίκτω, συγγόνους αἰδουμένη
καὶ παρθενείαν, ἦκ᾽ ἐς εὐύδρου πατρὸς
δίνας·
[313] Huys 1995: 105.
[314] Snell 1964: 75, thinks that she did not recognise them immediately.

(Eur. *Ion* 354), and identifying with the story Ion attributes to the supposed circumstances of his birth and exposure (Eur. *Ion* 330).[315] When Creusa realizes that Ion is her son she has no qualms about revealing his paternity and the illegitimate nature of his conception (Eur. *Ion* 1439-1496). Secondly, Scafuro (1990) has argued that in Greek tragedy the female protagonists who have (or perceive that they have) lost their social status are not bound by the constraints of shame; as someone who has been publicly discovered to have had an illicit pregnancy, and been imprisoned for years, Antiope is one such as this.[316]

Amphion rejects Antiope's account of her impregnation, and as we see in F223.2-16, also doubts that identity of his father:

> εἴπερ γὰρ ἡ]μᾶς Ζεὺς ἐγέννησεν πατήρ,
> σώσ]ει μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν τ᾽ ἐχθρὸν ἄνδρα τείσεται.
> ἵ]κται δὲ πάντως εἰς τοσόνδε συμφορᾶς
> ὥσ]τ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἐκφύγοιμεν εἰ βουλοίμεθα
> Δί]ρκης νεῶρες αἷμα μὴ δοῦναι δίκην.
> μένου]σι δ᾽ ἡμῖν εἰς τόδ᾽ ἔρχεται τύχη
> ὥστ᾽ ἢ] θανεῖν δεῖ τῷδ᾽ ἐν ἡμέρας φάει
> ἢ καὶ] τροπαῖα πολεμίων στῆσαι χερί.
> . . . . . (.) μ]ὲν οὕτω, μῆτερ, ἐξαυδῶ τάδε·
> σοὶ δ᾽ ὃς τ]ὸ λαμπρόν αἰθέρος ναίεις πέδον,
> λέγω τ]οσοῦτον μὴ γαμεῖν μὲν ἡδέως,
> γήμαν]τα δ᾽ εἶναι σοῖς τέκνοις ἀνωφελῆ·
> οὐ γὰρ κ]αλὸν τόδ᾽, ἀλλὰ συμμαχεῖν φίλοις.
> . . . . .] πρὸς ἄγραν τ᾽ εὐτυχῶς εἴη μολεῖν,
> ὅπως ἕλωμεν ἄνδρα δυσσεβέστατον.

Amphion is still not totally convinced that Zeus is his father but appeals to him to help them. He reproaches the god if he has actually had intercourse with Antiope, fathering the twins, and does not come to their aid. This strongly echoes the reproach by Ion to gods who do not take responsibility for their illicit children. It suggests that Zeus' failure to protect Antiope and his children would imply that the motivation for his original assault on her was negative, and morally

[315] A device employed to heighten the dramatic irony in *Ion*.
[316] Scafuro 1990. Huys 1995: 104, touches upon this but does not seem to see the full impact of it when he excludes shame as a motivation for Antiope's exposure of the twins due to her pregnancy having already been detected. However, though her shame is not a motivation for her, the shame she has brought upon her family (who assume she is responsible for the sexual transgression) is a factor in the exposure.

condemnable, but if he should protect them then he would not be perceived as having behaved negatively. We have further evidence to suggest that the motivation for Zeus' assault on Antiope was presented, or at least perceived by the human characters, as desire when Amphion says Zeus lay with Antiope 'for pleasure' (12: ἡδέως). In this passage desire is not seen as a negative motivation for sexual assault, as long as the aggressor is afterwards prepared to take responsibility for the consequences of his actions, namely the care of the woman and any offspring she might produce from the union.

Amphion's scepticism regarding his mother's account of his conception and paternity is in keeping with the pattern noted in *Ion*. All citizen males in tragedy, not just the victim's *kyrios*, disbelieve an accusation of assault by a divinity. Indeed, it is directly comparable to Ion's repeated refusal to believe Creusa until the truth is confirmed by Athena. Amphion is represented as still being sceptical until Hermes, acting as Zeus' messenger, confirms that Zeus is the father to him and Zethus in F223.67-77:

c. 13-14 letters]ιον ἐξορμωμένους
5-6 letters ἄνα]ξ Ἀμφίον· ἐντολὰς δὲ σοὶ
Ἑρμῆς ὁ] Μαίας τ[c. 11-12 letters] . ενος
.....] Διὸς κήρυγ[μ c. 8 letters]ν φέρων.
καὶ πρῶτα μὲν σφ[ῷν μητ]ρὸ[ς] ἐξερῶ πέρι,
ὡς Ζεὺς ἐμίχθη κ[οὐκ ἀ]παρνεῖται τάδε.
τί δητανε[a few letters legible at line-end
Ζηνὸς μολοῦσα λέ[κτρα a few letters legible
ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ὁρίζει καί δι [c. 8 letters] κακά,
ἀυτή τε δεινῆς [συμφορᾶς ἀπη]λλάγη
παῖδας τε τούσδ᾽ [ἀνηῦρε]ν ὄντας ἐκ Διός.

Hermes' statement however that 'she had come to Zeus' (bed)' (74) is puzzling, especially as it seems to contradict the earlier account (F210) of Zeus assaulting Antiope in the guise of a satyr. Perhaps Antiope had a dream instructing her to go to a specific place, as Io tells us she experienced but resisted in *Prometheus Bound*. As I have argued above, the assault had occurred during some sort of Dionysiac festival, when Antiope had free range to wander the field and mountains, and she may have come across the cave herself. However, the line is incomplete so it is not even certain that Zeus' 'bed' (74: λέ[κτρα) is the object in the sentence, as only the first two letters of the word survive. It is important to note that the word is sometimes

used to denote a sexual relationship.[317] This remark should not be taken as proof that Antiope was an active and willing participant in the sexual encounter. Nothing is made of Creusa's unwillingness in the epilogue of *Ion*; it is possible, therefore, that the divine intervention at the end of these plays is seen as overriding any negative aspects of the original assault.

At the end of the play Antiope has been completely vindicated, with Lycus admitting he has behaved wrongly in his dealings with Antiope and her sons. F223.104-108 and 116:

> ὦ πόλλ᾽ ἄελπτα Ζεῦ τιθεὶς καθ᾽ ἡμέραν,
> ἔδειξας [5-6 letters] τάσδ᾽ ἀβουλίας ἐμὰς
> ἐσσφ[7 letters] δοκοῦντας οὐκ εἶναι Διός.
> πάρεστε καὶ ζῆθ᾽· ηὗρε μηνυτὴς χρόνος
> ψευδεῖς μὲν ἡμᾶς, σφῷν δὲ μητέρ᾽ εὐτυχῆ. . .
> λύω δὲ νείκη καὶ τὰ πρὶν πεπραγμένα.

Lycus accepts that she had been telling the truth all along and acknowledges that her honour is now restored. He cedes the throne to the twins as Hermes has commanded.

This outcome is apparently heralded by an earlier fragment of the play, though it is unclear who the speaker is and the context in which it is said. F222:

> τήν τοι Δίκην λέγουσι παῖδ᾽ εἶναι Χρόνου,
> δείκνυσι δ᾽ ἡμῶν ὅστις ἐστὶ μὴ κακός.

This passage seems to reflect another theme in the 'girl's tragedy' plays, namely that time will reveal that the persecuted girl has not acted dishonestly, and is innocent of any accusations made against her. It is unclear however whether this innocence is proved by the discovery that she was telling the truth as to the identity of her sexual partner, or because she is now believed to be the victim of sexual violence, or both.

Antiope is presented as an innocent and sympathetic figure throughout the play, wrongly persecuted by Dirce, whom no one seems to feel has suffered harshly or that her death was undeserved. Lycus too, seems to have persecuted Antiope under the impression that she had been complicit in the liaison which engendered her twins, and falsely attributed it to Zeus. Once he has learnt the identity of the twins' father he may have no longer doubted Antiope's unwillingness. Zeus seems not to be regarded negatively as long as he protects his offspring, as this demonstrates that his intent was not to shame the girl.

---

[317] Eur. *Andr*. 123, 465, 487, 497-500, 909, *Hel*. 1634.

Euripides' *Auge*

The play in which we perhaps have the most evidence to establish that the girl was the unwilling victim of sexual violence is Euripides' *Auge*. There are a number of testimonia which allow us reconstruct the plot of this play, including a fragmentary hypothesis,[318] which closely matches the first part of an account of the Auge myth given by Moses of Chorene (*Progymnasmata* 3.3 = test. iib):

> Dum in Arcadiae quadam urbe festum Mineruae celebraretur, cum eiusdem sacerdote Augea Alei filia choreas in nocturnis sacris agitante rem Hercules habuit, qui et huius furti testem relinquens ei anulum porro migrauit. Illa ex eo grauida Telephum peperit, quod nomen ex euentu adhaesit. Iam Augeae pater stupro cognito excandescens Telephum quidem deserto loco abici, ubi is cerua nutritus est, Augeam autem abysso submergi mandauit. Interim Hercules ad eam regionem delatus deque re gesta sua ex anulo admonitus et puerum ex se genitum sibi imposuit et parentem ipsam ab instante mortis discrimine expediuit. Tum rursus pronuntiant Teuthrantem ex oraculo Apollinis Augeam deinde uxorem duxisse Telephumque in filii loco habuisse.

In accepting the account of Moses as useful in the reconstruction of this play,[319] and by combining it with the other testimonia and fragments we can establish an outline of a plot that in my view is entirely credible. Auge, the very beautiful daughter of Aleus and priestess of Athena Alea, was assaulted by a drunken Heracles (F570) during a nocturnal festival (test. iia, test. iib). Labelling Heracles' actions as *furta* implies that Auge should be seen as unwilling.[320] Auge became pregnant,

---

[318] Test. iia:

Αὔγη,] ἧς ἡ ἀρχή·
Ἀλέας Ἀθά]νας ὅδε πολ[ύχρυσος δόμος
ἡ δ᾽ ὑπό]θεσις·
Ἄλεος ὁ τῆ]ς Ἀρκαδίας δ[υνάστης ἔχων θυγατέ-
ρα Αὔγην π]άσας κάλλει[τε καὶ σωφροσύνῃ ὑ-
περέχουσ]αν τῆς Ἀλέα[ς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱέρειαν αὐτὴν
ἐποίησεν.] ἡ δὲ τῆς πα[ννυχίδος
]στάσης χορ[
]ς ὤλισθεν [
ἐσθ]ῆτα πλυν[ούσ-
πλ]ησίον κρή[νη
]δὲ κατὰ τὴ[ν
] οἰνωμένο[ς

remains of one more line.

[319] Anderson 1982, argues against the acceptance of this source for the reconstruction of Euripides' *Auge*. His arguments have been refuted by Huys 1990.

[320] As Adams 1982: 167 notes, *furtum* ('theft') is used to describe 'illicit sexual intercourse,' generally in an adulterous context; cf. *OLD* 2.b., 'secret love, stolen pleasures.' However, it is not always certain that the encounter is consensual, and the alternative meaning of 'abduction' (*OLD* 1.b.) could indicate its use in a

apparently giving birth in the temple of Athena (test. iii),[321] and possibly concealing the baby there too. This pollutes the temple, triggering the goddess's enmity (F266), and causing a famine.[322] In searching for the cause of this famine it seems that Aleus discovers Auge's baby (F267), apparently not believing she has been assaulted he orders the baby to be exposed and Auge to be drowned. Telephus is suckled by a doe, before being discovered and recognised by Heracles (F272, 272a), possibly by means of the ring mentioned in Moses' account (test. iib). Heracles then intervenes with Aleus on Auge's behalf and reassures him of the circumstances of the child's conception and Auge's innocence (F269, *adesp*. F402, *adesp*. F570). Heracles was apparently successful in saving Auge from death, though the play seems to have ended with mother and child both being cast adrift in a chest. This punishment could have been at the instigation of Aleus, still resentful of the child's birth and his daughter's deception,[323] or commanded by Athena due to the pollution of her temple.[324] They eventually reach Mysia, where Auge marries Teuthras and Telephus is adopted by him (test. iib and test. iv).

We can see from this summary that *Auge* fits the pattern I have discerned: The girl is attacked by a higher-status aggressor, the semi-divine hero Heracles. The context is one of isolation for the girl, and a situation of liminality, during a nocturnal religious festival. Desire is presented as a motivating factor for the assault, both by the context in which the author relates the attack (Auge's beauty and Heracles' drunken state are both stressed) and possibly by the words he puts in to the mouth of the aggressor if *adesp*. F570 is rightly attributed to this play:

> Οἶνός μ᾽ ἔπεισε δαιμόνων ὑπέρτατος.

There is another passage attributed to this play that stresses Heracles' drunken state at the time of the attack, F272b:

> νῦν δ᾽ οἶνος ἐξέστησέ μ᾽· ὁμολογῶ δέ σε

---

context of non-consensual encounters. Cf. Cat. 68.140, could refer to the adulterous nature of Jove's relations with other women, but may also be an allusion to the fact that many of these were achieved by deceit and abduction of the women involved; Sen. *Oed*. 716, *furta* is used to refer to the abduction of Europa. The adverb *furtim*/*furtimque* is used by Ovid to describe the way Priapus sneaks up upon a sleeping nymph (*Fast*. 1.425) and Vesta (*Fast*. 6.337) in order to commit a non-consensual sexual assault.

[321] Test. iii: Αὔγη, ἡ Ἀλέου θυγατήρ, ἱέρεια δ᾽ Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ γεννᾷ Τήλεφον. This passage is mentioned to account for the statement in Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1080 that Euripides portrayed women giving birth in sanctuaries.

[322] Parker 1983: 33, '[b]irth or death within a temple is sacrilege.' Cf. *IG* II² 1035.10: πάτριον ἔστιν ἐν μηδενὶ τῶν τεμενῶν μήτ᾽ ἐντίκτειν μήτ᾽ ἐναποθνήσκειν.

[323] Webster 1967: 240.

[324] Huys 1990: 171-172; Zielinski 1927: 48.

ἀδικεῖν, τὸ δ᾽ ἀδίκημ᾽ ἐγένετ᾽ οὐχ ἑκούσιον.[325]

Here we are presented with a figure who, by his own admission, was so drunk that he lost control of his faculties to such an extent that he committed an act which he now identifies as wrong. But why was it necessary for the author to stress this? Presumably he did not want the character's actions to be interpreted negatively by the audience. The drunkenness of Heracles apparently reduces his culpability, as it demonstrates that the assault was not pre-meditated or intended to cause offence to Aleus.[326] It is an indicator to the audience that Heracles should be imagined as having been in no state to persuade the girl, and so stresses that Auge was not willing.

In another fragment desire is stressed as a mitigating factor in the assault to indicate that Heracles did not mean to cause offence to the girl, and his actions should not be viewed negatively by the audience, or by Aleus, to whom these words are possibly addressed. As Auge's father, Aleus would have the legal right to prosecute Heracles if he felt an offence had been committed against the girl, and indirectly through her to himself. F269:

῞Ερωτα δ᾽ ὅστις μὴ θεὸν κρίνει μέγαν
{καὶ τῶν ἁπάντων δαιμόνων ὑπέρτατον}
ἢ σκαιός ἐστιν ἢ καλῶν ἄπειρος ὢν
οὐκ οἶδε τὸν μέγιστον ἀνθρώποις θεόν.

These passages suggest that it is the intention of the aggressor which designates a sexual assault as a prosecutable offence, and morally condemnable; and that in ancient Athens there were certain circumstances which could mean sexual assaults were not perceived as wholly negative. If the act was not premeditated and negatively motivated, the aggressor is not punishable.[327] By accepting he may have done something to offend the girl he has attacked and her *kyrios*, publicly acknowledging his responsibility for his actions, and presumably being prepared to take care of the consequences of those actions, he is absolved of any wrong-doing.

---

[325] As Huys 1995: 116, has remarked this apology could be equally valid addressed to Auge, Aleus, or Athena but in all cases it would refer to the sexual assault.

[326] Harris 2006d: 301-303, has demonstrated that drunkenness would not exculpate a person from wrongdoing in the eyes of the Athenian audience, and could actually result in a higher fine if someone was convicted of an assault while drunk; cf. Arist. *Pol*. 2.9.1274b. However, as argued above, this fragment and Eur. *Ion* 553 seem to indicate that in certain circumstances drunkenness could have been regarded as a mitigating factor used to demonstrate that the perpetrator's actions were out of character and not premeditated or intended to cause offence to the victim. If these circumstances were accepted it could negate an accusation of *hybris*. See Chapter One.

[327] Harris 2006d.

Auge and Heracles may have been unaware of each other's identity at the time of the attack in Euripides' tale, as in the versions related by Apollodorus.[328] This ignorance of the identity of the victim or aggressor is not just a useful dramatic device, making the plot more interesting and increasing the possibility for dramatic irony, but is a useful technique for the characterization of the aggressor. Not having knowledge of the victim's identity or social status means that the aggressor can more easily and plausibly claim that the attack was not negatively motivated.[329] It shows the attack was not pre-meditated or intended to insult and cause offence to the girl or her family. In this way the author is still able to maintain the audience's sympathy for the aggressor, and mitigate any negative connotations committing the sexual assault may cause. The stress placed on the aggressor's drunken state and ignorance of the girl's social status, and the recurrence of this theme in tragedy and New Comedy surely indicates that for the Athenians sexual assaults were perceived as negative acts and morally condemnable only under certain circumstances, and only when committed against certain groups of people, namely free citizens. When they discover the assaulted girl is a citizen, the aggressor is always repentant and willing to 'take responsibility' publicly for his actions. This provides further proof that the assault was not negatively motivated and rehabilitates the aggressor in the eyes of the audience.

As usual in these plays it is not the attack on the girl which is the catalyst for the conflict with her *kyrios*, but the subsequent pregnancy, birth, and eventual discovery of the child. Firstly, the child's birth in the sanctuary causes the enmity of Athena, F266:

> σκῦλα μὲν βροτοφθόρα
> χαίρεις ὁρῶσα καὶ νεκρῶν ἐρείπια,
> κοὐ μιαρά σοι ταῦτ᾽ ἐστίν· εἰ δ᾽ ἐγὼ ᾽τεκον,
> δεινὸν τόδ᾽ ἡγῇ;

This passage attributes the pollution solely to the birth itself; the goddess apparently has no issue over the manner of the child's conception, which we might expect if her virgin priestess had been willingly seduced. Indeed, we get the impression from this passage that Auge feels she has done nothing to offend Athena. The conviction of her own innocence would surely be out of place in any

[328] Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.7.4, 3.9.1; Huys 1990: 178.
[329] In a number of sources the aggressor is unaware that the girl is not of slave status. Cf. Men. *Epit.*: Charisios thinks it plausible that his victim was the slave courtesan; Eur. *Ion*: Xuthus cannot reassure Ion that his mother was not in fact of slave status.

scenario except one in which she was impregnated during a non-consensual sexual assault, especially if she is to remain a sympathetic figure.

It appears to be the discovery of the child which Auge fears in another fragment addressed to her nurse, either before they hide the baby in the temple originally or more probably later when they fear the temple will be searched. F271b:

ποῖ; πῶς δὲ λήσει; τίς δὲ νῷν πιστὸς φίλος;

This passage hints at the isolation the victim feels which has been noted in a number of the other girl's tragedies, and tends to be most obvious in the recognition plays. It highlights the desperate situation in which she has found herself, ensuring the audience feels sympathy for her plight.

Fragment 267 appears to relate to the plague which has affected the city and caused the temple to be searched. It could be spoken either by Auge or her Nurse fearing that the temple will be searched, though I think it is better attributed to Aleus, who would see the concealment of the child in the temple as a 'wrong,' and could be addressed to Auge:[330]

δεινὴ πόλις νοσοῦσ᾽ ἀνευρίσκειν κακά.

If this is spoken by Aleus, it is another example of a *kyrios* who considers the concealment of an illegitimate pregnancy and child as a wrong committed against him by his daughter. If Auge was an unwilling victim the dramatic irony of this scene would be all the more effective.

There are a number of other fragments which could be attributed to Auge or her Nurse and if so indicate that Auge was presented sympathetically, an innocent victim of circumstance, which would be unlikely if she had been willingly seduced by Heracles:

F273: πᾶσιν γὰρ ἀνθρώποισιν, οὐχ ἡμῖν μόνον,
ἢ καὶ παραυτίκ᾽ ἢ χρόνῳ δαίμων βίον
ἔσφηλε, κοὐδεὶς διὰ τέλους εὐδαιμονεῖ.

F274: . . . τὸ δ᾽ ἐπιεικὲς ὠφελεῖ τὰς ξυμφοράς.

If it did not matter to the Athenian audience whether a girl had been willingly seduced or sexually assaulted, passages on this theme would not exist. If there was no sympathy given to victims of sexual assaults, their tribulations would not make good material for the plots of tragedies. That the 'girl's tragedy' existed at all is proof of Athenian sympathy for the victims of sexual assaults.

[330] Though Huys 1995: 135, takes another tack altogether, attributing it to Auge 'protesting that her infant is being persecuted merely to satisfy some barbarous superstition.'

Another fragment which suggests the Athenians had sympathy for victims of sexual violence, and that Auge was presented as such in this play is F272c:

οὐ τῶν κακούργων οἶκτος ἀλλὰ τῆς δίκης.

This line could be spoken by Heracles or Auge herself asking Aleus to have pity for her predicament, or could be Aleus' sceptical response to an appeal to pity Auge by either of those characters, if he still believed that Auge was seduced. Whoever the speaker the object of the sentence must be Auge rather than Heracles, who admits that he has behaved wrongly. It is unlikely that he would ask for pity on the basis that he is in the right, and the statement must be part of a discussion when Heracles, or Auge, is appealing for her, and possibly the child's, life. An appeal for pity being made on the grounds that Auge was the victim of a sexual assault (a seduced girl could hardly be said to be 'in the right') demonstrates that the Athenians had an appreciation for the issue of female consent, could feel sympathy for victims of sexual violence, and treated the victims of sexual violence differently from those who had been seduced.

The discovery of the child by the girl's father provokes his anger, causing him to have the child exposed and to sentence Auge to death. Presumably the girl's concealment of the child, which has apparently triggered the plague, has led him to assume that she was willingly seduced. If *adesp*. F402 is rightly ascribed to a later scene in this play between Heracles and Aleus by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff,[331] it demonstrates that for Aleus it was relevant to his treatment of Auge and her child whether she had given her consent or not. It also proves that Aleus had not believed his daughter's own account, because otherwise he would not have needed to ask the question:

adesp. F402: βίᾳ δ᾽ ἔπραξας χάριτας ἢ πείσας κόρην;

Sommerstein (2006) argues that even if this does not belong to *Auge*, the passage still demonstrates that women's consent was an issue for consideration in this kind of situation,[332] and that it does indeed 'matter' to others if she has been the victim of a sexual assault.[333] Simply because in tragedy the victims of sexual assaults are (actually or threatened to be) punished or ill-treated, we should not assume that the Athenians had no sympathy for the victims of such assaults. In these cases, those who punish or threaten to punish the girls do not believe their accounts when they are

[331] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1935c: 201. It is placed among its fragments, also without argument, by Jouan and van Looy 1998: 327.
[332] Sommerstein 2006: 238.
[333] Sommerstein 2006: 244.

persecuting them. Once the circumstances of the assault (or the identity of the aggressor) are proven the girls' honour and position are restored and the persecution ceases. Even if we believe that it was Aleus and not Athena who caused Auge and her baby to be cast adrift in the sea, after discovering the truth of her unwillingness, Heracles' admission that he had assaulted the girl against her will still altered the original punishments handed to Auge and her child from ones which guaranteed certain death to one with hope of rescue.

There is another fragment from *Auge* which suggests that the heroine was portrayed as the unwilling victim of sexual violence in the Euripidean play.[334] F265a:

> ἡ φύσις ἐβούλεθ᾽, ἣ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει·
> γυνὴ δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ τῷδ᾽ ἔφυ. . .

This fragment is taken from Menander's *Epitrepontes* (1123-1124) where it is directly attributed to *Auge*. It is used in an attempt to explain to a bemused Smikrines that his daughter was sexually assaulted by her now-husband at a nocturnal religious festival before they were married, and has had a baby from that union. In *Epitrepontes*, Pamphile is portrayed as an unwilling victim of a sexual violence on a number of occasions (453, 486-490). In keeping with the apparent plot of *Auge*, Charisios is presented as having been drunk at the time of the attack (472) in which he also lost a ring, used by his victim as a recognition token for her baby.

A Menandrian fragment apparently from the *Heros* also appears to quote *Auge*. A reference is made to Athena Alea with the goddess' name spelt in the Doric form used in tragedy,[335] and is probably used in connection to a discussion of a sexual assault.[336] As in *Auge*, Menander often contextualised the sexual assaults of his heroines as having taken place at religious festivals or celebrations.[337] Although it is not entirely certain that this passage is from the *Heros*, it could have been an account of Laches' assault against Myrrhine, which, like the assault of Heracles seems to have been, was so anonymous that the couple were later married completely unrecognised by one another.

The slight exception in *Auge* to the pattern seen in the other 'girl's tragedy' plays is the recognition and public acknowledgement of paternity occurring soon after the child's birth. I would

[334] Sommerstein 2006: 238.
[335] Fr. θη recto 110.
[336] Arnott 1996: 37.
[337] This occurs in *Kitharistes*, *Epitrepontes*, *Samia*, and possibly *Heros*.

argue that this is due to the mortal status of the aggressor, which requires paternity to be established more quickly than in cases of divine assaults. It is comparable to the situation found in *Aeolus*, and *Skyrioi*, in which the mortal attackers admit their responsibility soon after the child's birth, a situation common in New Comedy.

Euripides' *Melanippe Wise & Captive*

There are two Euripidean plays which deal with the story of Melanippe and her twins fathered by Poseidon. *Melanippe Wise* centres upon the discovery of the children and conflict between the girl and her *kyrios*. *Melanippe Captive* is a recognition-play, set in southern Italy when the children are fully grown.

Before looking at these plays in detail some assumptions about the character of Melanippe need to be examined and addressed. Though we have quite a bit of information for the plot-structure of *Melanippe Wise* it is uncertain whether Melanippe is presented in this play as having been unwilling in her sexual encounter with Poseidon and treated as a sympathetic character in the play due to the ambiguous nature to which the sexual act is referred to in the testimonia and fragments.[338] Sommerstein's conclusion that Melanippe was indeed seduced seems to be based solely on Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* claiming Melanippe belongs to the group of wicked women, along with Phaedra, and contrasted with Penelope who is lauded as the example of female virtue (*sophron*).[339] In this context *sophron* is usually interpreted as representing goodness or chastity, but in reference to women it actually has a much broader interpretation of embodying ideal feminine characteristics, including self-control and moderation, though not just in a sexual

---

[338] The prologue spoken by Melanippe, recorded by Ioannes Logothetes, merely summarizes her account of the sexual encounter and the birth of the children in ambiguous language, F481.23:
εἶτα λέγει καὶ ὅτι Ποσειδῶνι μιγεῖσα τέτοκε τοὺς διδύμους παῖδας.
Although it does not follow that this was the terminology used by Euripides, even if it was the presentation of the encounter as a sexual assault is not ruled out as the same term is used by Creusa in her first encounter with Ion, which he apparently understands as non-consensual.
Scafuro 1990: 131-132, 138; Sommerstein 2006: 240, who concludes that Melanippe 'was *not* the god's innocent victim' (emphasis author's own); Collard & Cropp 2008 I: 569.

[339] Sommerstein 2006: 240; Ar. *Thesm*. 544-548:
οὐ γάρ σε δεῖ δοῦναι δίκην; ἥτις μόνη τέτληκας
ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς ἀντειπεῖν, ὃς ἡμᾶς πολλὰ κακὰ δέδρακεν
ἐπίτηδες εὑρίσκων λόγους, ὅπου γυνὴ πονηρὰ
ἐγένετο, Μελανίππας ποιῶν Φαίδρας τε· Πηνελόπην δὲ
οὐπώποτ᾽ ἐποίησ᾽, ὅτι γυνὴ σώφρων ἔδοξεν εἶναι.

context. Melanippe is represented in this play as having unfeminine knowledge and eloquence, F482:

ἐγὼ γυνὴ μέν εἰμι, νοῦς δ᾽ ἔνεστί μοι.

Melanippe's unfeminine intelligence and eloquence causes her portrayal to be criticised by Aristotle in his *Poetics* 15.1454a22-31. Aristotle believes that female characters should not be presented as courageous or clever, and deems Melanippe's speech in defence of the twins makes her character unsuitable and inappropriate.[340] This demonstrates that her character was interpreted at the time as not displaying the ideal feminine characteristics due to her excessive knowledge.[341] Her use of this knowledge to deceive her *kyrios* could easily account for her inclusion as a wicked woman without her having been complicit in the sexual encounter with Poseidon.[342]

From the very beginning of the play Melanippe is represented as an atypical female character, closely associated with her mother's centaur heritage and wisdom,[343] giving her an 'unfeminine eloquence' which may have triggered 'an ambivalent response in Euripides' audience.'[344] If Melanippe was not perceived as an entirely sympathetic character through the poet's characterisation of her this could have affected how the story has been transmitted in other texts. The ambiguity found in the testimonia and fragments relating to *Melanippe Wise* is similar to those found in fragments and references to the sexual encounters of other plays. As the features of this play match the patterns we have seen in the other 'girl's tragedies,' the encounter represented in *Melanippe Wise* is a non-consensual sexual assault.

I believe there are several reasons for the ambiguity about the nature of the sexual encounters portrayed in these plays. First, the general issue of the decorum maintained in tragedy prevents explicit language being used of sexual assaults. Second, the fragmentary nature of these texts limits our understanding. Third, the ambiguity of other authors in their references to these encounters may be because the precise status of the sexual encounter is not relevant or appropriate

[340] Mayhew 1999: 93 n. 11.
[341] This is not to say that the poet intended the speech to reflect negatively on Melanippe's character, but that it could have been interpreted as such by some, especially for comic effect. As Mayhew 1999: 94, argues Aristotle 'is speaking of cleverness as a virtue or positive characteristic. The speech of Melanippe must be an example of a cleverness that aims at a fine or noble end, but which is employed or possessed by Melanippe in a way or to a degree that is in some sense improper for a woman.'
[342] In Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* the women are angry that Euripides portrays them not only as adulterous, but also as generally deceptive.
[343] In F481, the prologue spoken by Melanippe, she relates her heritage and that her mother has been transformed into a horse by Zeus as punishment for revealing oracles and cures to mankind.
[344] Collard 1995: 246.

to mention. Fourth, other accounts may have been influenced by accounts of the myth in other genres, such as epic, in which the consent of the girl is not mentioned.

There are two more reasons, specific to this play, why the encounter may appear to be related ambiguously in the fragments and external sources. Firstly, it was possibly made clear from the beginning of this play that the assault was not negatively motivated, therefore, unlike in some of the other 'girl's tragedy' plays, the girl's ignorance of the aggressor's motivation is not a device used to emphasise her predicament and incite sympathy for her. Two facts may support this theory: Melanippe herself delivers the prologue, and we are told Poseidon instructed her on what to do after the birth of the children.

Secondly, the main conflict between Melanippe and her father represented in this play is not, as in the other 'girl's tragedy' plays, caused by his discovery that the children are her illegitimate offspring. When she gives her defence of the children, it is her sophistic and scientific view of the world which clashes with her father's and grandfather's more superstitious and primitive views. Melanippe being the mother of the children adds dramatic irony for the audience alone, but does not add to the conflict with her father until near the end of the play as he is ignorant of the children's maternity. Therefore, for the majority of the play little needs to be made of the fact that the girl was unwilling, as it is not the nature of the children's illicit conception that is the issue, but their apparent monstrous birth.

For *Melanippe Wise* we have a fairly detailed hypothesis, though it does not relate any of the plot beyond Melanippe's defence of the children, testimonia i.4-25:

> Ἕλληνος τοῦ Διὸς Αἴολος τεκνωθεὶς
> ἐκ μὲν Εὐρυδίκης ἐγέννησε Κρηθέα καὶ
> Σαλμωνέα καὶ Σίσυφον, ἐκ δὲ τῆς Χείρω-
> νος θυγατρὸς Ἵππης κάλλει διαφέρου-
> σαν Μελανίππην. αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν φόνον
> ποιήσας ἐπ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν ἀπῆλθε φυγάς,
> τὴν δὲ Μελανίππην Ποσειδῶν διδύμων
> παίδων ἔγκυον ἐποίησεν. ἡ δὲ διὰ τὴν προσ-
> δοκίαν τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς παρουσίας τοὺς γεν-
> νηθέντας εἰς τὴν βούστασιν ἔδωκε τῇ
> τροφῷ θεῖναι κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ κα-

> τασπείραντος. ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν κάθοδον τοῦ
> δυνάστου τὰ βρέφη τινὲς τῶν βουκόλων
> φυλαττόμενα μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ταύρου, θη-
> λαζόμενα δὲ ὑπὸ μιᾶς τῶν βοῶν ἰδόντες,
> ὡς βουγενῆ τέρατα τῷ βασιλεῖ προσή-
> νεγκαν. ὁ δὲ τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς Ἕλληνος γνώ-
> μῃ πεισθεὶς ὁλοκαυτοῦν τὰ βρέφη κρί-
> νας Μελανίππῃ τῇ θυγατρὶ προσέταξεν
> ἐνταφίοις αὐτὰ κοσμῆσαι. ἡ δὲ καὶ τὸν
> κόσμον αὐτοῖς ἐπέθηκε καὶ λόγον εἰς
> παραίτησιν ἐξέθηκε φιλότιμον.

In this hypothesis Melanippe is mentioned as exceedingly beautiful, therefore desire was probably portrayed as the motivation of the assault by Poseidon. We get a sense of a context of isolation and lack of protection as her father is in exile when she becomes pregnant. It is the discovery of the twins that causes the problems, as their being found in the cowshed leads Hellen and Aeolus to think they are the unnatural offspring of a cow. Melanippe is probably uncovered as their mother while trying to save them.

It is uncertain what happens after this. Presumably Aeolus plans to, or actually, punishes Melanippe and her infants in some way, believing her to have been seduced and angry at her blatant deception, F497:

> τείσασθε τήνδε· καὶ γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν νοσεῖ
> τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν οἱ μὲν ἢ παίδων πέρι
> ἢ συγγενείας οὕνεκ᾽ οὐκ ἀπώλεσαν
> κακὴν λαβόντες· εἶτα τοῦτο τἄδικον
> πολλαῖς ὑπερρύηκε καὶ χωρεῖ πρόσω,
> ὥστ᾽ ἐξίτηλος ἀρετὴ καθίσταται.

This fragment has not been securely assigned to *Melanippe Wise*, but could easily have been spoken by Hellen to Aeolus, urging him to carry out drastic action against his daughter, as he did in regard to burning the twins. It is clear that the speaker believes the woman has committed a wrong, and presumably been complicit in her seduction. If the woman concerned was the victim of a sexual assault, it would add to the dramatic irony of the scene.

It is likely that Hippo, Melanippe's mother appeared at the end of this play to deliver the epilogue,[345] and inform Aeolus of the facts surrounding the children's conception and paternity. She may have appeared to prevent Aeolus punishing Melanippe and the children,[346] or as Collard has suggested, not until after the punishment to expose Aeolus' actions as mistaken, which 'would give a tragic twist to the ending and exhibit the suppression of Melanippe's (as of Hippo's) excessive knowledge.'[347] This vindication of Melanippe would match those seen in the other 'girl's tragedy' plays, and would be most effective if she had been the unwilling victim of sexual violence.

The attribution to Poseidon of the instructions for Melanippe to place the children in the ox-stable could have been a device used by the author to negate any negative connotations the sexual assault may have had in the eyes of the audience. It proves that Poseidon intended to secure the well-being of the children, and that the assault was not negatively motivated. The bull and cow, animals associated with Poseidon, showing care for the children would have been further evidence of this.[348] It is the conclusions that the mortal cow-herds, who are ignorant of the twins' actual parentage, draw from the special attention the animals give to the children that leads their lives to be put at risk, not any negligence on Poseidon's part.

Melanippe being portrayed as following the god's instructions may be an indication that she was not characterised negatively in this play, and her situation may have been treated with some sympathy by the author. She is not a lascivious woman trying to hide the evidence of her guilt, but a young girl following the instructions she has been given by the god. Indeed, she does not act independently until the children's lives are at risk.

In Testimonia iia, Dionysius of Halicarnassus relates a shorter version of the play which matches the hypothesis. He tells us that Melanippe was impregnated by Poseidon (ἡ δὲ Μελανίππη ἐπεράνθη μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος), and she gives the speech in defence of the children, explaining that:

---

[345] Test. va, Pollux 4.141 on special masks refers to 'Hippe transformed into a horse in Euripides' (ἢ Ἵππη ἡ Χείρωνος ὑπαλλαττομένη εἰς ἵππον παρ᾽ Εὐριπίδῃ). Her appearance would be more likely to come at the end of *Melanippe Wise*, rather than *Captive*, due to the themes in this play. Hippo and her fate is mentioned in the prologue, and it is more appropriate for her to address Aeolus and Hellen, just as Thetis addresses Peleus in *Andromache* (cf. Webster 1967: 149), rather than Metapontus and her grandchildren.

[346] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1935d: 452-453; Van Looy 1964: 238; Webster 1967: 149.

[347] Collard 1995: 241, which would be comparable to the endings of the *Hippolytus* and *Electra*.

[348] Poseidon had the cult title of *Taureos* and received sacrifices of bulls. The tauriform appearance of water-deities is common in Greek religion. In Eur. *Hipp*. Poseidon sends a bull from the water in order to fulfil the wish of his son Theseus. Cf. Cook 1894: 126, 129-132; Burkert 1985: 138; Hes. *Sc*. 104.

> οὕτω τὸ δρᾶμα ὅλον ἐσχημάτισται· καὶ ἅμα διδάσκει ἡμᾶς Εὐριπίδης, ὅτι τὸν σχηματίζοντα ἐγγυτάτω δεῖ εἶναι τοῦ λῦσαι τὸ σχῆμα μετὰ τῆς ἀσφαλείας τοῦ σχήματος. περιερχομένη γὰρ πάσας αἰτίας τοῦ σῶσαι τὰ παιδία λέγει, 'εἰ δὲ παρθένος φθαρεῖσα ἐξέθηκε τὰ παιδία . . . σὺ φόνον δράσεις;' (= F485)· ὥστε καὶ τὸ αὑτῆς πρᾶγμα λέγει ἐν σχήματι συμβουλῆς.

Melanippe disguising her experience as that of another in order to protect herself, is comparable to the first meeting between Ion and Creusa. The ambiguous language used by Melanippe should not rule out that she was portrayed as a victim of sexual violence earlier in the play, nor that Aeolus did not perceive the hypothetical girl as a victim, as Creusa's language in *Ion* is just as ambiguous. The inclusion of this argument seems to be an attempt to arouse sympathy in Aeolus for the girl and the children. This would be unlikely to be successful if Aeolus is meant to view the girl as having been complicit in her seduction, and would be pointless if the Athenians had no sympathy for the victims of sexual assaults.

We have fewer sources for the plot of *Melanippe Captive* than the other plays. The account given by Hyginus, though different in some crucial details,[349] seems to provide an outline close to that the of Euripidean play. It is likely that Metapontus has adopted Melanippe's sons as his heirs (F491),[350] after they and their mother have presumably been exiled from her natal home. The exact circumstances of their arrival in his kingdom are unknown, but the twins have at least been in Metapontus' kingdom from being babies, and may have no idea that they are adopted.[351] It is usually supposed that Melanippe arrived in Metapontus' palace at the same time and has been a

---

[349] Hyg. *Fab*. 186, tells us that Melanippe's father is Desmontes, apparently derived from some confusion with the *Desmotis* of the title (cf. Collard 1995: 242), which is argued by Webster 1967: 150, to show that Hyginus had some familiarity with the plot of the Euripidean play, either first-hand or through another source. In this version Metapontus' childless wife secretly substitutes Melanippe's twins, but after having her own children regrets this and incites her own sons to kill them. The Euripidean version shows no sign of Siris having natural children, and we know from the messenger speech (F495) that it is the Queen's brothers who attempt to kill the twins. Hyginus also relates that the twins rescued Melanippe from her father after discovering their true identity, but this cannot have happened in the staged action of the play, nor could it be explained as being foretold in the epilogue as Melanippe has a speaking part in the play and must, therefore, be in the same location as the twins.

[350] F491:

ἴστω δ᾽ ἄφρων ὢν ὅστις ἄτεκνος ὢν τὸ πρὶν
παῖδας θυραίους εἰς δόμους ἐκτήσατο,
τὴν μοῖραν εἰς τὸ μὴ χρεὼν παραστρέφων·
ᾧ γὰρ θεοὶ διδῶσι μὴ φῦναι τέκνα,
οὐ χρὴ μάχεσθαι πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐᾶν.

This fragment is compared by Vysoký 1964, with Diod. Sic. 4.67, in which the twins were knowingly adopted by Metapontus as babies; see Collard 1995: 243.

[351] F498; F495.7, 15.

slave, and possibly imprisoned throughout the intervening time. I would like to suggest that it is entirely possible, and generically probable, that Melanippe is a recent arrival in Metapontus' household. It is a recognition-play, and as such is grouped with *Antiope*, *Ion*, and *Tyro B*. In these plays it appears that the mother and child(ren) do not live in the same locale, let alone the same household. The physical separation and ignorance of her child(ren)'s fate adds further *pathos* to the mother's physical suffering, examples of this in *Melanippe Captive* may be reflected in F505 and F507:[352]

F505: τὰ προσπεσόντα δ᾽ ὅστις εὖ φέρει βροτῶν,
ἄριστος εἶναι σωφρονεῖν τ᾽ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ.

F507: τί τοὺς θανόντας οὐκ ἐᾷς τεθνηκέναι
καὶ τἀκχυθέντα συλλέγεις ἀλγήματα;

If these passages do indeed relate to Melanippe's suffering at the separation from her children to arouse the sympathy of the audience, it would follow that she is obviously meant to be perceived as a sympathetic character, and was probably unwilling in her sexual encounter with Poseidon. There are, however, no fragments in this play which refer to her encounter with the god.[353]

In *Antiope* and *Ion*, the mothers both come across their children in new homes, so it is possible that Melanippe has recently been brought into the palace as a slave,[354] and that the Queen has discovered her to be the children's biological mother. She may possibly conclude, as Creusa did in *Ion*, that her husband has deliberately deceived her into introducing his own bastard off-spring into her home, prompting her violent reaction. It could be that Metapontus (as Xuthus has in *Ion*) has married into the Queen's family, and that his adoption of the twins, and possibly the discovery or their apparently servile birth, has caused resentment among the Queen and her family. Fragments 502 and 503 would certainly support the situation of Metapontus marrying into a higher rank:[355]

F502: ὅσοι γαμοῦσι δ᾽ ἢ γένει κρείσσους γάμους
ἢ πολλὰ χρήματ᾽, οὐκ ἐπίστανται γαμεῖν·

[352] Collard 1995: 247.
[353] There are no references to Poseidon at all in the fragments of this play, so it is impossible to tell if the god was portrayed negatively.
[354] It is generally assumed that Metapontus is absent from the palace for much of the play; cf. Webster 1967: 155; Collard 1995: 243. He could be on campaign somewhere and sent Melanippe ahead with part of his retinue, as Heracles did Iole, leading the Queen to fear for her own position in the household.
[355] Van Looy 1964; Collard 1995: 247; Collard & Cropp 2008 I: 587-588.

τὰ τῆς γυναικὸς γὰρ κρατοῦντ᾽ ἐν δώμασιν
δουλοῖ τὸν ἄνδρα, κοὐκέτ᾽ ἔστ᾽ ἐλεύθερος.
πλοῦτος δ᾽ ἐπακτὸς ἐκ γυναικείων γάμων
ἀνόνητος· αἱ γὰρ διαλύσεις <οὐ> ῥᾴδιαι.

F503: μετρίων λέκτρων, μετρίων δὲ γάμων
μετὰ σωφροσύνης
κῦρσαι θνητοῖσιν ἄριστον.

This theme would be appropriate in a play as a counter foil for the situation in which Melanippe has found herself due to her union, however unwilling, with a sexual partner above her station. The dangers of mortal girls having sexual relations with immortal gods are voiced in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* (894-907) and Euripides' *Ion* (507-509).

Although we do not know how the circumstances of the twins' conception were related in this play there are a number of fragments which suggest Melanippe was presented positively, indicating she was probably a sympathetic figure and therefore presented as the guiltless victim of sexual violence, F493:

ἄλγιστόν ἐστι θῆλυ μισηθὲν γένος·
αἱ γὰρ σφαλεῖσαι ταῖσιν οὐκ ἐσφαλμέναις
αἶσχος γυναιξί, καὶ κεκοίνωνται ψόγον
ταῖς οὐ κακαῖσιν αἱ κακαί· τὰ δ᾽ εἰς γάμους
οὐδὲν δοκοῦσιν ὑγιὲς ἀνδράσιν φρονεῖν.

This passage would be very poignant if spoken by a victim of a sexual assault who was wrongly considered by her *kyrios* to have been seduced and punished for it, especially if the Athenians did, as I believe, have sympathy for victims of sexual violence, as opposed to those who were willingly seduced.

Fragment 494 deals with women's superiority in which several points are made about women's virtues, including their trustworthiness, skill at household management, and the religious obligations they fulfil. It ends with an appeal for all women not to be tarred with the same brush if one is found to be bad. This would suggest that Melanippe is characterised as a good woman in this play, and echoes F493. As Sommerstein (2006) has pointed out, it would be impossible for the poet to retain the audience's sympathy for the character if the woman who spoke these words was represented as someone who had been willingly seduced, abandoned her children, and attempted to

deceive her *kyrios*. In this play Melanippe must have been presented as a 'good woman,' and as such have been represented as a victim of sexual violence.[356]

Fragments 493 and 494 could have been spoken in response to F498:

πλὴν τῆς τεκούσης θῆλυ πᾶν μισῶ γένος.

If this was spoken by one of the twins it would mirror the enmity of Zethus toward Antiope.[357] Hence, a scene could have existed in which Melanippe and the twins meet unbeknownst to each other, providing dramatic irony. This device is a feature of many of the 'girl's tragedy' recognition plays in which we know the mother to have been the victim of a sexual assault, and could add further weight to the argument that Melanippe was unwilling in her relations with Poseidon.

Melanippe Wise presents us with a picture of a sexual aggressor of superior status, who satiates his desire with a girl who is unprotected by her *kyrios* due to his absence. Poseidon does, however, appear to protect the children engendered by the union, and therefore would not have been perceived by the audience as having behaved negatively in regards to his obligations. In both *Wise* and *Captive*, Melanippe appears to be represented as a 'good woman' whose circumstances lead people to assume the worst of her. As a wrongly persecuted 'good woman' who was not the willing sexual partner of the god her situation is all the more pitiable and would have greatly contributed to the *pathos* of the play.

Sophocles' *Tyro A* & *B*

It is debated whether these are two distinct plays or if *Tyro B* is merely a revision of *A*.[358] It is difficult to reconstruct the plots of the *Tyro* plays from our existing fragments and testimonia.

---

[356] Sommerstein 2006: 240-241.

[357] Collard & Cropp 2008 II: 588-589.

[358] Those who believe that *B* is a revision of *A* are Welcker 1839; Dindorf 1870; Page 1942; Kiso 1984; and Lloyd-Jones 1996. Hartung 1851b; Engelmann 1890; and Martino 1996, think Hyg. *Fab*. 60, in which Tyro murders her sons by Sisyphus to prevent them from killing her father Salmoneus, was inspired by the plot of *Tyro B*, but I see absolutely no grounds for this myth relying on Sophocles' account. Robert 1916: 300-302, argues that *Tyro A* dealt with the twins' exposure, while *Tyro B* the rescue of their mother, as in the *Melanippe* plays. Huys 1995: 68-69, acknowledges the uncertainty over the content of each play but prefers to accept them as two different plays following Robert's classification. Pearson 1917 II: 274, proffers the possibility that *Tyro B* could have related the seduction and concealment of the children, F653 reflecting the instructions of Poseidon given in Homer to keep the paternity of her children secret, but in general concurs with Nauck [1856] 1889: 272, that it is not possible to try to distinguish the plots of these plays. Radt 1977, differentiates between the two plays but does not propose plot structures for both. Sutton 1984: 153, thinks that they are reflected in Apollodorus' account, one relating Tyro's encounter with Poseidon, its discovery and punishment, and the other Tyro's recognition and rescue by her sons. This dichotomy is followed by Clark 2003, who convincingly argues that they are two separate plays on the basis of existing fragments, one set shortly after her encounter with Poseidon, to which F659 belongs (80), and a recognition play set when

Most of the fragments cannot even be securely attested to one play.[359] I am convinced by the arguments put forward for there being two distinct plays, one focusing on Tyro's impregnation and conflict with her natal family, to which F659 must belong (though it is uncertain whether like the Euripidean examples this occurs after the birth, it may be set shortly after the encounter with Poseidon and the abandonment of the twins foretold in the epilogue), and a play of the recognition type, to which F649 fr. f., which is spoken by one of Tyro's fully grown sons, must belong:

. . .] . ας ἀρωγὸν πατέρα λίσσομα[ι μολεῖν
ἄν]ακτα πόντου μητρί.

There are only a few characters to whom we can guarantee speaking parts, Tyro, Sidero, and one of the twins, and it is unclear whether the action of either play takes place in the house of her father Salmoneus, or his brother, Cretheus.[360] We know from Aristotle *Poetics* 16.1454b25, that the twins were recognised by means of the *skaphe*, in which they were abandoned, but Apollodorus tells us the twins were abandoned on the ground. It could be supposed that there was a different method of exposure in each play. However, it is clear that Tyro's encounter with Poseidon is closely associated with the *skaphe*, which would suggest that Sophocles consistently used this method of exposure over both the plays and that Apollodorus' account is derived from, or at the very least has been influenced by, some other source.[361]

Many scholars assume that Sophocles followed the Homeric version of the myth (*Od*. 11.251-252) in which Tyro, enamoured with the river god Enipeus, was seduced by Poseidon who had taken his form. However, just because the girl could have been technically seduced, it may not necessarily mean she was portrayed as an unsympathetic character in the Sophoclean play. Nor is the god's metamorphosis into the object of the girl's desire proof that force was not used and that

---

the twins are fully-grown, to which fragments 653 and 656 are attributed, both *thrênos* speeches which she believes should be attributed to Tyro as laments for her supposedly dead sons (85). If one is set after the conception but before the birth, it would be unique among the 'girl's tragedy' plays. If this is the case more emphasis could have been placed on Tyro's assault than the abandonment of the children. Moodie 2003: 120-121, cannot see any evidence for the supposition that *Tyro B* was a revision, pointing to the frequent neglect of subsequent authors to using the numbering system to make a distinction between plays with the same name, even when they have different plots.

[359] Only fragments 650, 651, 652, and perhaps 668 are attributed to *Tyro A*. Fragments 653, 654, and 656 are more securely attributed to *Tyro B*, but that still leaves fifteen fragments unaccounted for.

[360] In Diod. Sic. 4.68, Sidero is Salmoneus' second wife who mistreats Tyro, but her impregnation in this source occurs only after Salmoneus was killed. In Apollod. *Bibl*. 1.9.8 Tyro is brought up by Cretheus after her father's death and Sidero appears to be his wife, though as Cretheus would be her *kyrios* in this situation Sidero would effectively be Tyro's stepmother; cf. Clark 2003: 83-84; Dräger 1993: 70-86.

[361] There were later tragic versions of this myth written by Carcinus II and Astydamas II from the fourth century, see Snell 1981: 213 fr.4, 206 fr.5c; Clark 2003: 86; Moodie 2003: 119.

she willingly had intercourse with him. Although her willingness is implied in the Homeric version Sophocles could have stressed some reluctance on the girl's part to make her more sympathetic to the audience. Certainly in the Euripidean plays disguises seem to be employed to gain access to the girl, not to make her sexually compliant.

It is possible that Sophocles made Tyro a sympathetic character by stressing the deception of Poseidon, the secrecy we are told she was sworn to in the Homeric myth, and her mistreatment by Sidero, the jealous stepmother who punished the girl to an obscene degree. If this is the case, it could mean that to the Athenians it not only mattered if a girl had consented or not to a sexual encounter, but that she had consented with full knowledge of her seducer and under no duress.

Tyro certainly seems to be a presented as a pathetic and misused figure in F659:

> κόμης δὲ πένθος λαγχάνω πώλου δίκην,
> ἥτις συναρπασθεῖσα βουκόλων ὕπο
> μάνδραις ἐν ἱππείαισιν ἀγρίᾳ χερὶ
> θέρος θερισθῇ ξανθὸν αὐχένων ἄπο,
> πλαθεῖσα δ᾽ ἐν λειμῶνι ποταμίων ποτῶν
> ἴδῃ σκιᾶς εἴδωλον αὐγασθεῖσά που
> κουραῖς ἀτίμως διατετιλμένης φόβην.
> φεῦ, κἂν ἀνοικτίρμων τις οἰκτίρειέ νιν
> πτήσσουσαν αἰσχύνῃσιν οἷα μαίνεται
> πενθοῦσα καὶ κλαίουσα τὴν πάρος χλιδήν.

This passage comes after Tyro has had her hair shorn off, probably by Sidero. According to Aelian, Sophocles alludes to the taming of desire in young mares by cropping their manes in his *Tyro*.[362] He could be referring to this passage, or perhaps Sidero has threatened Tyro with this punishment in an earlier passage, to which F652 (καπρομανής· εἰς κόρον ἐξυβρίζουσα, 'boar-mad: excessively abandoned to hybris') may belong. Presumably Tyro's pregnancy has been discovered at this point, prompting her stepmother to take violent and shaming action against the girl as punishment. It may be that Tyro is to be seen as losing any status she had within the house and become, effectively, a slave,[363] and that the lament over the loss of her beauty should apply to her status as well. It is interesting to note that in Menander's *Perikeiromenē*, the heroine Glycera, has

[362] Clark 2003: 91; Ael. *NA* 11.18.
[363] Clark 2003: 93.

her hair shorn off by a jealous lover, who mistakenly believes that she is having an affair with the young man next door. This could be an allusion to the unjustified punishment of Tyro. If this is the case then this Tyro must have been as much of a sympathetic figure as Glycera.

This passage may echo Tyro's assault by Poseidon,[364] which would increase the *pathos* of the scene. The imagery employed here could just as easily apply to a forcible sexual encounter. The filly in Greek literature is used to represent a sexually mature virgin in conjunction with the language of riding, yoking, and taming as metaphors for sexual intercourse.[365] The herdsman's rough grip could reflect the violence of the god, who was closely associated with horses, having the title Poseidon Hippios and being renowned as a tamer of horses.[366] The imagery of the meadow indicates a location of liminality and an appropriate site for erotic encounters.[367] The mention of the river brings to mind the assault, Poseidon possibly having taken the guise of Enipeus. The girl's image reflected in the river is associated with her situation of shame and dishonour. For the audience this may serve as a specific allusion to the attack by the god which may have been mentioned previously. Hence, the passage connects the actions of the god to Tyro's now much reduced status.

There is a passage among the fragments which suggests at least the recognition play shared a theme we have seen in the Euripidean recognition plays, that of time revealing the girl's innocence and the divine nature of her offspring, F664:

γῆρας διδάσκει πάντα καὶ χρόνου τριβή

It is possibly to be imagined as being spoken by Cretheus or Salmoneus (whichever was portrayed as Sidero's husband and Tyro's *kyrios*). It echoes F222 from *Antiope* and is highly suggestive that the girl will be shown to be vindicated of any wrongdoing.

Fragment 665 could be a defence of Tyro's *kyrios* for allowing Sidero's persecution of her, either spoken by himself, or the deity that delivers the epilogue:

---

[364] Clark 2003: 102.

[365] Alcman's *Partheneion* 45-59 compares the most beautiful and presumably sexually mature girls in the chorus to horses; Anacreon *PMG* 417 and 346; Henderson [1975] 1990: 165; Calame 1997: 106-107, 238-244; Calame 1999: 156, 165; Hutchinson 2001: 282-283; Clark 2003: 89; Rosenmeyer 2004: 170-177; Griffith 2006: 324-326; Topper 2010 especially 112 and 116.

[366] *Hom. Hymn* 22.5; Pind. *Ol*. 13.69, *Pyth*. 4.45, *Isthm*. 1.54; Cook 1894: 144-145; Burkert 1985: 138. Poseidon even engendered equine offspring: Arion, Pegasos, and Scyphius, see Pease 1943: 82.

[367] Motte 1973, especially 207-216; Bremer 1975: 268-274; Cairns 1997: 60-65; Rosenmeyer 2004: 176; Deacy 2013. Meadows with water sources such as streams or rivers, as imagined in this passage, seem to have been especially appropriate for erotic encounters as illustrations of fertility and fecundity; see Motte 1973, especially 47-48, 149, 214-215.

ἄκων δ᾽ ἁμαρτὼν οὔτις ἀνθρώπων κακός

If spoken by her *kyrios*, whether Salmoneus or Crethus this would mirror Lycus' reaction upon discovering the truth in *Antiope* (F223.104-117).[368] It is also possible that it was spoken of or to Tyro, perhaps referring to her exposure of the twins,[369] in which case it would also suggest that she was not meant to be perceived as a negative figure in the Sophoclean play.

It is true that Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* apparently makes references to a Sophoclean version of *Tyro* in association with lasciviousness.[370] It is equally possible that like Phaedra in the *Hippolytus*, and possibly Pasiphae in *Cretans*,[371] Tyro was portrayed as having an excessive passion for the river god due to the machinations of Aphrodite or Eros, and that she was not naturally lascivious. Eros is characterised as an irresistible force in Sophocles' *Women of Trachis* (see below). The purity of Tyro's beauty and nature, as suggested by her name (F648: λευκὸν <γὰρ> αὐτὴν ὦδ᾽ ἐπαίδευσεν γάλα) may have inspired the poet to name her stepmother, Sidero (F658: αὕτη δὲ μάχιμός ἐστιν ὡς κεκλημένη/ σαφῶς Σιδηρώ, καὶ φρονοῦσα τοὔνομα/ οὐκ οἴεται δύσκλειαν ἐκ τούτου φέρειν) in order to emphasise to the audience the contrast in their natures. This would make it clear that the girl was to be viewed sympathetically and was unjustly punished by a hard and unbending persecutor. It is certain that in at least one of the plays Tyro appears to have been beaten severely. Pollux informs us that a special mask was used to show 'Tyro, cheeks bruised in Sophocles; [and this she has received from being beaten by her stepmother Sidero.]'[372] As Kiso (1986) points out, the contrast of these bruises against her milk-white skin 'must have helped to win the audience's sympathy for Tyro,'[373] which would not be effective unless she was presented as a sympathetic figure.

The Sophoclean version of the play may be referred to in Menander's *Epitrepontes* (325-336). In this passage an account is given of how Neleus and Pelias were rescued by a goatherd, who, when they were grown realised their innate nobility and gave them a pouch with recognition tokens in, with which they were able to prove their lineage. This tale is told as one of the arguments

[368] Séchan 1926: 223, who believes Salmoneus featured in this play.
[369] Welcker 1839: 315. Kiso 1986: 166 puts forward the conclusions of Séchan and Welcker as both being plausible.
[370] Sommerstein 2006: 239.
[371] Webster 1967: 89-90; F472e.
[372] Pollux 4.141: Τυρὼ πελιδνὴ τὰς παρειὰς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ. . . τοῦτο δ᾽ ὑπὸ τῆς μητρυιᾶς Σιδηροῦς πληγαῖς πέπονθεν. Text Pearson 1917. Trans. adapted from Clark 2003: 100.
[373] Kiso 1986: 162.

used by Syros in the arbitration scene in which he is trying to ensure that the recognition tokens found with Pamphile's baby are kept by him. We know that Pamphile's child was the result of a sexual assault, therefore, there may be a direct comparison being made about the circumstances of conception in both these plays, indicating Tyro was presented as unwilling, at least in the play which featured the recognition.[374]

When attempting to reconstruct the portrayal of the sexual encounter in the Sophoclean *Tyro* plays we need to remember that the Homeric version of the myth and Tyro's love for the river god, and Poseidon's assumption of his form indicating that Tyro was seduced, was already well established. Sophocles, therefore, may have had less freedom with his presentation of the encounter than Euripides did with many of the myths he used, in which the girl's part had already been portrayed more ambiguously. If Sophocles did portray Tyro as reluctant in the sexual encounter or the god as using force as well as deception, this may have had less impact on the already established tradition, and could account for our lack of evidence concerning her unwillingness.

Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*

Io and her story occupy a considerable portion of this play.[375] The maddened Io arrives at line 561, pursued by a gad-fly and partly transformed into a cow. By the time she leaves the stage at 886 we have learnt her history and her future. Even after her exit the Chorus reflect on her ordeal in the Third Stasimon (887-906). Although Io's tale is classed among the original list of 'girl's tragedy' plays devised by Burkert (1979), the account of Io's story in *Prometheus Bound* has received little attention from those looking at sexual violence and the fragmentary 'girl's tragedy'

[374] As I have noted above there were other dramatic versions of the Tyro myth so this version cannot securely be attested to Sophocles. The absence of the *skaphe* among the recognition tokens mentioned in this passage does not necessarily rule out that this was based on the Sophoclean version. As Moodie 2003: 124 has noted there are multiple recognition tokens used in *Ion*, including the cradle that the baby was abandoned in, which was only the catalyst for the recognition, as it is Creusa's identification of its contents which proves Ion is her child. It could be that the *skaphe* was the means by which Tyro recognised her twins, and the other items used to prove that they were her children.

[375] The attribution of this play to Aeschylus is debated. Griffith 1977 and West 1990 reject it as an original work of Aeschylus based on differences in style, tone, and proportion of choral lyrics as compared to the rest of the Aeschylean corpus. Lloyd-Jones 2003 and Podlecki 2005 are more optimistic but still uncertain. Podlecki suggests that Aeschylus may have written it but died before he was able to complete the final revision (200). Saïd 1985 supports Aeschylean authorship of the play. She believes statistical analysis to the unreliable due to the small proportion of surviving Aeschylean texts. She argues that the plays themes and vocabulary of knowledge and power are used in an 'archaic' style comparable to Aeschylus' other works. Her analysis has, however, met with criticism for its failure to properly address the arguments of Griffith 1977; cf. Lloyd 1988.

plays.[376] It is true that when the play is set there has been no sexual relationship between Zeus and Io, nor does it seem there will ever be one in the conventional sense: Zeus will impregnate Io with a touch of his hand (848-849). Nevertheless, as noted by Harris (2015a), Io's consent is a major theme in relation to her experiences with Zeus, and other characters show her sympathy for the hardships she suffers as the object of Zeus' desire.[377]

Prometheus, knowing Io's situation, identifies it as lamentable and encourages her to share her story with the Chorus (637-639):

> ὡς τἀποκλαῦσαι κἀποδύρασθαι τύχας
> ἐνταῦθ᾽, ὅπου μέλλοι τις οἴσεσθαι δάκρυ
> πρὸς τῶν κλυόντων, ἀξίαν τριβὴν ἔχει.

Prometheus perceives that her story will win sympathy from others and literally bring them to tears (638: δάκρυ). His assumption that a tale in which Io's sexual vulnerability to Zeus is a major factor and instigates all her troubles will gain sympathy for her suggests that the Athenians did have sympathy for those who were the victims of unwanted sexual advances and sexual violence. After relating her tale, Io expects pity (684: μ᾽ οἰκτίσας) from those who have heard it, which implies this would be the usual reaction.

Io laments to speak of the god's desire for her as she tells her tale (642: λέγουσ᾽ ὀδύρομαι). It is clear that Zeus' advances have cause her much pain and distress. Rather than being too ashamed to speak, Io tells her story but needs to emphasise her unwillingness in her relationship with Zeus in order to prove her general innocence and good character.[378] There is a context of isolation associated with the sexual advances of the god. Visions in Io's dreams, sent by Zeus, try to persuade her (645-654). The dreams order her to the isolated, and sexually dangerous,

[376] Scafuro 1990 acknowledges Io's role in the play but does not discuss it in detail. She does not account for this, though it may be due to the fact it contradicts her arguments that 'male authors were not interested in a woman's view of union' (127); women's sense of shame prevented them from discussing such matters; and 'Euripides is unique in crossing the boundaries of shame and creating a "female" discourse about rape' (127). Sommerstein 2006, does not mention this play or his reasons for omitting it from his study on rape and consent in tragedy.
The Io scene has received little interest from scholarship in general, as noted by White 2001: 116.
[377] Harris 2015a: 301-302.
[378] *Pace* Scafuro 1990: 127.

meadow and cattle-pens of her father.[379] Io's tormented wanderings also isolate her from her family and society.

We are told on a number of occasions that Zeus feels desire for Io, and that is why he pursues a sexual relationship with her:

590-591: **[Π]**: ἢ Διὸς θάλπει κέαρ
ἔρωτι.

649-650: **[Ἰ]**: Ζεὺς γὰρ ἱμέρου βέλει
πρὸς σοῦ τέθαλπται.

737-738: **[Π]**: τῆδε γὰρ θνητῇ θεὸς
χρήζων μιγῆναι τάσδ᾽ ἐπέρρεψεν πλάνας.

As I have demonstrated in the previous sections (and will become clearer over the next chapters), sexual desire (as opposed to the intention to shame) is generally regarded as a positive motivation, and would not lead the audience to interpret Zeus' actions as wrongful. This may be due to the fact that genuine desire demonstrates that the sexual aggressor is not behaving with the intention of shaming and insulting the girl, or her family through her. The compulsion Zeus suffers due to his desire takes some of the responsibility away from him.

It is true that Zeus is represented and referred to as a tyrant on a number of occasions,[380] and his lack of sexual restraint towards Io could be interpreted as that typical in a hubristic tyrant.[381] Indeed, Prometheus seems to make that accusation at lines 735-740:

ἆρ᾽ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ
ὁ τῶν θεῶν τύραννος εἰς τὰ πάνθ᾽ ὁμῶς
βίαιος εἶναι; τῆδε γὰρ θνητῇ θεὸς
χρήζων μιγῆναι τάσδ᾽ ἐπέρρεψεν πλάνας.
πικροῦ δ᾽ ἔκυρσας ὦ κόρη τῶν σῶν γάμων
μνηστῆρος·

[379] Griffith 1983: 207. βουστάσεις (653) is used to refer to the place where Poseidon told Melanippe to abandon their children in the hypothesis to Euripides' *Melanippe Wise* (test. i.13). It seems that despite the isolated setting of the assaults the tragedians like to portray the gods as carrying out their sexual relationships in private, concealed places. This is in contrast to the assaults by mortals in New Comedy (and possibly by Heracles in Euripides' *Auge*), which seem to have occurred where the girls were seized, in the open. This detail may have to do with the need to present the assaults by mortals as spur of the moment acts, with no pre-meditation, in order to reduce any possible negative connotations on the part of the aggressor. The gods of tragedy, however, can commit pre-meditated assaults. In this context the privacy afforded to the liaisons may be intended to show they are not trying to insult the victim, and that they are not negatively motivated. For meadows as locations of sexual congress see Motte 1973; Bremer 1975: 268-274; Cairns 1997: 60-65; Deacy 2013.
[380] Cf. Aesch. *PV* 10, 222, 224, 305, 310, 357, 756, 761, 909, 942, 957, 996.
[381] Thomson 1929: 5; Griffith 1983: 220.

However, we need to remember that personal enmity already exists between Zeus and Prometheus. It suits Prometheus' purpose to represent Zeus' behaviour towards Io as another example of his tyrannical and hubristic rule. We should, perhaps, refrain from making judgements about Zeus' character, and Aeschylus' representation of it, when there is only one play surviving from a possible trilogy.[382]

Though Zeus is ultimately responsible for Io's condition because of his desire for her, he is not the direct cause of her sufferings, which are nearly always explicitly attributed to Hera:

592: **[Π]** Ἥρᾳ στυγητὸς πρὸς βίαν γυμνάζεται.

600-601: **[Ἰ]**: <Ἥρας>[383]
ἐπικότοισι μήδεσι δαμεῖσα.

703-704: **[Π]**: τὰ λοιπὰ νῦν ἀκούσαθ᾽, οἷα χρὴ πάθη
τλῆναι πρὸς Ἥρας τήνδε τὴν νεάνιδα.

900: **[Χ]**: δυσπλάνοις Ἥρας ἀλατείαις πόνων.

The audience may not have interpreted Zeus in a negative light due to the sufferings of Io, as it is repeatedly stressed that they being inflicted upon her by Hera.

Io does say once that it is Zeus who is treating her badly (759), but this may simply be a reference to him allowing her to suffer. However, Io does consider Zeus' desire to be ultimately responsible for her suffering (578-579):

τί ποτέ μ᾽, ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ, τί ποτε ταῖσδ᾽
ἐνέζευξας εὑρὼν ἁμαρτοῦσαν ἐν πημοναῖσιν.

The use of ἐνέζευξας (579) is ironic. Verbs of yoking are used in order to connote sexual relationships and marriage, which was Zeus' intention.[384] However, the side-effect to his desire, his wife's jealousy, has caused Io to be united with suffering instead. Zeus is treating Io badly because his sexual desire has caused Io to suffer through no fault of her own and because he is doing

[382] See Griffith 1983: 281-305; Podlecki 2005: 27-34 on the possibility of a Prometheus trilogy and its content.
[383] Supplied by Monk 1811: 223, who argues that its insertion 'seems almost as necessary to the sense as to the verse.' It was also conjectured by Hermann (recorded in Seidler 1811-1812: 164).
[384] Words related to yoking and taming were popular ways to describe sexual relationships and the marital status of women; cf. Eur. *Alc*. 314, *Ion* 10-11, *Med*. 673. They symbolise the domestication and acculturation through marriage and sexual relationships of the nature and wildness women are often thought to embody. Cf. Henderson [1975] 1990: 166; Seaford 1987: 106, 111; Calame 1997: 238-244; Griffith 2006: 324-326.

nothing to remedy that.[385] This could lead others to interpret his motivation towards Io as negative. However, if Zeus brings an end to her sufferings, there will be no more complaints to be made of him, and the audience learns this will indeed be the case.[386]

Unlike the girls in the other tragedies, Io arousing the desire of Zeus does not lead to a rift between her and her father, Inachus. I believe this is due to the fact that Io never deceives her father with regard to her relationship with Zeus and tells her father of the dreams (655-657). Sommerstein (2006) has argued that in the other tragedies the girls are disbelieved due to the fact they are found to be pregnant, unlike the women of the 'Potiphar's wife' scenario, who are not.[387] However, the fact of pregnancy cannot be the issue, as those who punish the young men could not know whether they have impregnated their wives. It is the timing of the allegations, and the fact that no deception has taken place, which secures for Io the trust and sympathy of her father.

Inachus takes his daughter's distress and reluctance seriously. He consulted oracles in regards to her dreams and was told to expel her from his house (669-672):

> τοιοῖσδε πεισθεὶς Λοξίου μαντεύμασιν
> ἐξήλασέν με κἀπέκλησε δωμάτων,
> ἄκουσαν ἄκων, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπηνάγκαζέ νιν
> Διὸς χαλινὸς πρὸς βίαν πράσσειν τάδε.

Zeus' oracles compel Inachus to expel Io from his house and send her out, presumably to be united with Zeus. It is interesting to note that Aeschylus stresses not only the father's unwillingness here, but also the daughter's.[388]

Io is treated sympathetically by Prometheus and the Chorus, not just because of her metamorphosis and her wanderings (687-695), but because of her sexual vulnerability to the god (894-907):

> μήποτε μήποτέ ἔμ᾽, ὦ
> Μοῖραι <∪ – – –> λεχέων Διὸς εὐ-

[385] Although Zeus sending Hermes to kill Argos may be alluded to at lines 681-682. As the audience were already familiar with Io's tale it is likely that they would have made the connection here; cf. White 2001: 120.
[386] White 2001: 116, sees a progression in the representation of Zeus in this scene from an apparently negative figure to a beneficent god.
[387] Sommerstein 2006: 242.
[388] This is a feature of Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* 227, in which Danaus regards his daughters' consent as equal to his own. However, the status of the aggressors in this scenario is completely different.

νάτειραν ἴδοισθε πέλουσαν,
μηδὲ πλαθείην γαμέτᾳ τινὶ τῶν ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ·
ταρβῶ γὰρ ἀστεργάνορα παρθενίαν
εἰσορῶσ᾽ Ἰοῦς ἀμαλαπτομέναν
δυσπλάνοις Ἥρας ἀλατείαις πόνων.

ἐμοὶ δ᾽, ὁπόθι μὲν ὁμαλὸς ὁ γάμος ἄφοβος, οὐ-
<δὲ> δέδια· μη δὲ κρεισσόνων {θεῶν ἔρως}
ἄφυκτον ὄμμα προσδράκοι {με}.[389]
ἀπόλεμος ὅδε γ᾽ ὁ πόλεμος, ἄπορα πόριμος· οὐδ᾽
ἔχω τίς ἂν γενοίμαν·
τὰν Διὸς γὰρ οὐχ ὁρῶ μῆτιν ὅπᾳ φύγοιμ᾽ ἄν.

The Chorus stress the sexual vulnerability of Io and themselves. They emphasise the inability to resist the sexual advances of those who are of a higher status. However, there is no condemnation of the sexual aggressors, who are imagined to be motivated by desire. They also draw attention to the fact that it is Hera who is causing Io's suffering. This indicates that they do not perceive Zeus to be acting unjustly, but does not detract from their sympathy for the victim, or their appreciation of Io's unwillingness.

Prometheus tells of Io's eventual meeting with Zeus, from which will engender a great child (848-849):

ἐνταῦθα δή σε Ζεὺς τίθησιν ἔμφρονα
ἐπαφῶν ἀταρβεῖ χειρὶ καὶ θιγὼν μόνον·

This passage may imply that Io's unwillingness to have a sexual relationship with Zeus came from a fear of sex and violence. Her eventual 'union' with Zeus will be non-violent, non-penetrative, and will relieve her sufferings, which demonstrate that the god's motivation was not negative.

Io will be known as 'the famous wife of Zeus' (834: προσηγορεύθης ἡ Διὸς κλεινὴ δάμαρ). This, of course, is not meant to imply legitimate marriage, but is an indicator of the high status Io will enjoy when her wanderings are over. It demonstrates that Zeus is not negatively motivated and does not intend to insult or dishonour Io. Therefore, Zeus would not be seen as having done anything unlawful by the audience.

[389] On the issues regarding the text of 901-903 see West 1990: 311-312. In 901 West amends M's ὅτι to ὁπόθι, and believes θεῶν ἔρως should be deleted.

In some versions of the myth Io may have been the willing sexual partner of Zeus and has intercourse with him before her transformation.[390] It is interesting that in this version Aeschylus portrays Io as reluctant to enter a sexual relationship with Zeus, and sexually pure. The intention of this must have been to emphasise the *pathos* of her situation and Hera's persecution of her to make her as sympathetic as possible in the eyes of the audience. For this device to have been effective the Athenian audience must have been fully aware of the concept of women's consent to sexual relationships and taken it into account in illicit sexual matters. It naturally follows that those who were accepted as the unwilling victims of sexual violence would be regarded sympathetically.[391]

Many of the patterns I have discerned in the other 'girl's tragedy' plays are present in *Prometheus Bound*: the sexual aggressor is of a higher status, the 'tyrant' of the gods, Zeus; his motivation is attributed to desire, and although some see Zeus as represented negatively in this play I do not believe this is true (at least not in regard to his treatment of Io);[392] once again the theme of the girl's isolation is present; and Io is represented sympathetically and is treated as such by the other characters. The only way Io's account differs from the stories in the previous plays is that Zeus' desire for Io does not cause personal conflict between the girl and her *kyrios*. I believe this is due to the fact that Io does not deceive her father, but actually reveals her knowledge about Zeus' desire for her before there is a sexual relationship. Her claims are quickly substantiated by oracles, unlike the other plays involving the 'girl's tragedy,' in which there is no confirmation of the god's involvement until after the girl has undergone some degree of suffering and persecution. This suggests that it is the uncertainty of the girl's *kyrios* regarding her consent to the union which leads him to punish her, preferring to believe she was seduced.

Conclusions

The fragmentary state of most of the texts makes it difficult to establish the precise nature of the sexual encounters portrayed, and whether they were consensual or not, but all the plays studied in this chapter share definite features and themes noted in *Ion*: The male aggressor is of higher status than the girl; desire is presented as an acceptable motive for the assault and is not

[390] Conacher 1980: 17; Aesch. *Supp*. 295-302; Apollod. *Bibl*. 2.1.3; Hyg. *Fab*. 145.3.
[391] Providing that the victim's unwillingness could be proved or was believed.
[392] Thomson 1929.

portrayed negatively; there is a spatial context of isolation of the girl from her *kyrios* and society; it is generally the discovery of the girl's pregnancy/baby which causes, or is envisaged as causing, problems between the girl and her *kyrios*, not the illicit sexual encounter which is apparently never discovered or revealed prior to this; the *kyrios* (and/or the girl's son(s) in the recognition plays) and his wife, if she is mentioned (though never the girl's mother), disbelieves her unwillingness and/or the divine nature of the aggressor until it is corroborated by another divine or authoritative source; the girl is portrayed sympathetically and is treated sympathetically by other characters in the play; the child is never raised in the maternal *oikos* and is generally exposed or exiled; and the girl is vindicated at the end of the play and her status restored.

The plays generally post-date the sexual encounters by at least enough time for the pregnancy to be fairly advanced. This seems to indicate that the turmoil in these situations is not caused by the sexual encounter itself but the resulting pregnancy. It is not the direct effects that sexual violence has on the body and the psyche of the victim that primarily made sexual violence an employable back-story for the tragic stage, but the indirect effects, triggered by the discovery of pregnancy,[393] which the incident of sexual violence has on the social status of the girl within her *oikos* and society at large, and the (general) ensuing separation between mother and child. This is not to say that the Athenians had no sympathy for the violence, pain, and trauma of sexual assaults, but for the male authors, at least for this category of play, the worst effects of the sexual violence was the illicit pregnancy and resultant loss of social status that this entailed when discovered by the girl's *kyrios*, with no man coming forward to 'take responsibility' for the pregnancy. This could account for the vagueness and ambiguity in references to whether these sexual encounters were consensual, because when the aggressor was a god it did not affect the outcome. The nature of the sexual encounter is almost incidental, for the girl has no way of proving her willingness either way, and there is no possibility of a deity being brought before her *kyrios* to back up her account, or 'take responsibility' for his actions.

In all the fragmentary plays the gods do not publicly acknowledge responsibility for their progeny until they reach adulthood. They do appear to be represented by the authors as ensuring their children's survival by miraculous means, which I believe mitigates any negative connotations

[393] A feature noted in New Comedy by Pierce 1997: 166.

that the assaults could have had. The public vindication of the girl in the epilogue speeches demonstrates to the audience that the god should not be perceived as having intentionally caused the girl's loss of status and suffering. These factors appear to be consistent features in the 'girl's tragedy' plays, implying that the behaviour of the male aggressor influenced how the Athenian audience would interpret the sexual violence.[394]

Although it is impossible to be certain given the fragmentary nature of our texts, the epilogue speeches never mention the use of force. This may be another reason for the ambiguity we see in sources which retell these myths. The girl's honour and social position are restored by the confirmation that her offspring is semi-divine. Does this mean that in literature it was acceptable for the gods to act outside the existing moral and social norms? Or that in acknowledging his child(ren) the god proves the attack was not negatively motivated, and not morally condemnable, so that the use of force is no longer relevant? Or is it expected that the characters will accept that as the girl had been telling the truth about the identity of the aggressor she was also telling the truth when she claimed to have been unwilling? Interestingly, the heroic mortal characters Heracles and Achilles acknowledge their responsibility for their children, and culpability for the sexual assault, while the children are still infants.

It is generally supposed that the girl's pregnancy and perceived sexual transgression causes the conflict between the girl and her *kyrios* in these plays.[395] I would like to propose a further cause of the animosity between *kyrios* and girl which has not been considered in previous scholarship, namely that it is the deception of the daughter in hiding her assault, pregnancy, and child (in some cases lying outright to her *kyrios*) which angers him and causes the rift. Sommerstein (2006) has noted the differentiation in likelihood of the woman's *kyrios* to believe the accusations of actual and attempted sexual assault or seduction by the female protagonists in what he terms the 'Potiphar's wife' tragedies, with the consistent disbelief of girl's unwillingness by the *kyrios* in the 'girl's tragedy.'[396] He attributes it to 'the relationship between accusation and pregnancy.'[397] The

[394] Cf. Harris 2006d.
[395] Karamanou 2003, 2006; Sommerstein 2006.
[396] In this tale-pattern a ruler's wife or mistress makes an allegation (often false) of attempted or actual forced sexual violation/seduction against the ruler's son or a young man or *xenos*. It occurs in both Euripides' *Hippolytus* plays, as well as his *Stheneboia*, *Phoenix*, *Peleus*, and *Tennes*, and Sophocles' *Phaedra*.
[397] Sommerstein 2006: 242.

'wife'[398] will be believed because she is not pregnant and has 'no obvious sinister motive for accusing the other man of rape.'[399] However, I believe it is the timing of the accusation that is central to whether her *kyrios* believes it. In all the 'Potiphar's wife' tragedies the accusation is presented as coming soon after the actual or supposed sexual assault/attempted seduction, and there would be no way of knowing if she was pregnant. In the 'girl's tragedy' plays the victims make no such report to their *kyrios* but conceal the matter until confronted by the *kyrios'* knowledge of their illicit pregnancy or baby, and are usually found to have conspired to conceal the matter and hide the child from the *kyrios*. This deceit seems to me to be a likely reason for the girl's punishment, as it leads her *kyrios* to assume that the girl has been seduced willingly. It is not that it does not matter to the *kyrios* whether the girl had consented, but that her deception was tantamount to proof that she was willing.

But why do the girls conceal their actual assaults when wives and *pallakai* have no qualms about making (false) accusations? Surely it cannot be solely because as 'wicked women' they are arch manipulators of the situation.[400] I believe the main difference lies in the status of the male aggressor. The scenario of a king's grown-up son or young heroic visitor attempting to seduce or assault the king's young wife or *pallake* is far more plausible than a princess being attacked by a god. There are a number of other reasons for the girl not immediately telling her *kyrios* of what has happened: fear that she will not be believed; shame; the girl is usually isolated from her *kyrios* when the assault takes place; there are no witnesses; and the girl is sometimes sworn to secrecy by the god, or given specific instructions by him on what to do with their offspring. In the fragments it appears as though the girls' *kyrioi* are represented as controlling and tyrannical figures, a characterisation which might have been utilised by the author as an explanation of the girl's secrecy over the assault. The Nurse, a character who features in a number of these plays, may have been portrayed as persuading the girl to keep the matter from her father, possibly from fear of any blame she herself might incur for negligence.

Even in the plays where we can fairly securely say that force was used against an unwilling girl, external sources, and some modern readings, still interpret and present the encounter

[398] In the case of Phoenix the supposed 'victim' is his father's *pallake*.
[399] Sommerstein 2006: 242.
[400] Sommerstein 2006: 242.

ambiguously.[401] One reason for this may be that in epic, unions between gods and mortals are not portrayed as having negative effects upon the women involved. However, it is not clear if the girl was entirely willing, as the accounts of sexual encounters tend to be fairly ambiguous. There does not appear to be the negative reaction to the girl's pregnancy by the mother's family, and the divine paternity of her offspring is always accepted. Her child is often brought up in her natal family, her father sometimes being without a male heir, and the girl subsequently married to a respectable husband, as Lefkowitz (1993) points out.[402] Lefkowitz believes that the encounters should always be categorised as seduction, and that the gods in these scenarios are keen to establish the girl's consent.[403] Although she admits that in Hesiod, which also applies to Homer, 'the poet does not describe how the women involved in these liaisons felt about their experiences.'[404] I think she is wrong in failing to make a distinction between the representation of the sexual encounters between gods and mortals and their consequences in epic and tragedy, and by using tragedy to attempt to elucidate how the women later interpreted their encounters with the gods to conclude that 'they do not complain that they were persuaded by the gods to have intercourse, but rather lament the consequences of that intercourse, a child born in disgrace or abandoned, and separation from their families.'[405] Rather, I agree with Seaford (1990b) who points out the conflict that the girl's impregnation causes with her natal family is not present in epic but is the main focus in tragedies based on these myths. I do not entirely agree with his first explanation that this is due to 'the tendency of tragedy to focus on family conflict, which Homer tends to avoid.'[406] I do, however, find his second explanation, that the appearance of this theme is due to 'the changed nature of marriage in the city-state. . . [and] the legitimacy required to produce children who will be full members of *oikos* and *polis*,'[407] more plausible in explaining the tragedians' pre-occupation with the conflict. This would explain why tragedy apparently needs to stress the unwillingness of the girl, whereas in epic the context of the sexual encounter remains ambiguous.

---

[401] Euripides, *Auge* and *Ion*. See Appendix for modern interpretations of *Ion* and their suppression of the sexual violence within that play.
[402] Lefkowitz 1993: 22-24. Polymele, Hom. *Il*. 16.180-192; Tyro, Hom. *Od*. 11.236-254; and Mestra, Hes. *Cat.* 43a55-57.
[403] Lefkowitz 1993: 34-35, 37, which she deduces from just two stories, that of Caenis and Cassandra.
[404] Lefkowitz 1993: 25.
[405] Lefkowitz 1993: 27-29, 37.
[406] Seaford 1990b: 159.
[407] Seaford 1990b: 159-160.

The mythic characters utilised in tragedy were familiar to the fifth-century audience from their roles in previous epic accounts as the sexual partners of gods and heroes and mothers of their heroic offspring. These accounts show little consideration with the issue of female consent, or the exact circumstances of the sexual encounters, and even in later times they seem to have been consulted as a genealogical and aetiological source, and not as an emotive piece intended to elucidate the feelings of the characters involved.[408] Tragedy on the other hand, especially those texts written in the latter half of the fifth century could use these irregular couplings as a way of problematizing issues of consent and legitimacy. After the Periclean changes to the citizenship laws in the mid-fifth century, the role of women in Athens was drastically changed. The status of a man's mother now became vital criteria in his claim to citizenship: she must have been of Athenian decent and properly married to a citizen Athenian. This would have raised the status of Athenian women, as the only type of wife and mother who could confer citizenship upon children. Female chastity, though always an important issue, became vital with the heightened role women now played in conferring citizenship, leading to an increased concern with women's sexuality and sexual availability in the literary record.[409] Their chastity not only guaranteed their production of legitimate heirs for their *oikos*, but legitimate citizens for the *polis*. In this way the perceived promiscuity of women was not just a threat to individual households but could undermine the whole *polis*. In the earlier epic texts a father could forgive a daughter's possible sexual transgression with a high status male (usually characterised as a god), whether or not it was consensual, as it was a private matter within his own *oikos*. However, by the late fifth century perceived female promiscuity not only affects individual *oikoi* but the entire *polis*.

The illegitimate status (at least by fifth-century Athenian standards of legitimacy) of many mythical heroes provided the tragedians with material with which to examine familial conflict caused by apparent female promiscuity. However, in these mythic versions the non-consent and general innocence of the women would be generically preferable. The woman's sexual victimisation would ensure she was still seen as a positive role-model and a suitable mother for important Greek heroes. The disbelief of her *kyrios* and his subsequent punishment of the mother and child(ren) may not have made him an overtly negative figure in the eyes of the audience, if he

[408] Lefkowitz 1986: 34 in reference to the *Catalogue of Women*.
[409] Ormand 1999: 4.

was portrayed as disbelieving the girl's victimisation; while their knowledge of his error would add to the tragic *pathos* of the play.

It seems likely that in all cases the poets utilised existing literary motifs in their construction of the gods' sexual encounters with mortal girls. All the girls are sexually mature but unmarried; they appear to encounter the gods while alone, in contexts where the girls are not out of place given their age and status – fertile rural locations seem to be favoured, and in at least one case the girl seems to have been overseeing a chorus when she catches the attention of her sexual aggressor. These are common motifs in scenes of sexual encounters and sites of abduction in earlier literature, notably epic and lyric. In this way the poets present a scene familiar to the audience. Where they diverge from the traditional model is in stressing the reluctance and negative effects of these encounters on the women involved. I believe their representation of the girls being reluctant in their encounters with the gods and heroes is a generic necessity. By problematising mortal-divine sexual encounters the material becomes more 'tragic' but, perhaps, reflects the social concerns of the fifth-century audience. For these women to be sympathetic characters and suitable 'role models' they needed to be represented as chaste, and, therefore, the unwilling victims of sexual violence. This point is similar to one made by Rabinowitz (1993) in relation to the representation of Creusa in Euripides' *Ion*, although the second component to her argument, that it was important for Apollo's sexual reputation that she desired him, would not have been a factor for the original audience,[410] as I have demonstrated. The superior power of the gods makes mortal consent redundant.[411] This acceptance of mortal vulnerability to divine will and desire may account for the ambiguous representation of mortal-divine relations in other genres. In many genres dealing with these couplings it is not important or generically beneficial to stress whether or not the girl consented or desired the god. However, in tragedy it is generically beneficial to stress that she did not. This in no way provokes moral condemnation of the gods' actions, as superior beings they would not be regarded as having committed an offence. It does, however, show that when a woman was accepted to be a non-consenting victim of sexual violence, her victimisation would be recognised and she would be treated sympathetically.

[410] Rabinowitz 1993: 197.
[411] Lefkowitz 2002.

Chapter Three: Sexual Violence against War-Captives and Slaves, and the Fear of Enslavement and its Sexual Consequences

Greek tragedy relates not only the one-off instances of sexual assaults by gods and heroes against free young virgins, but also deals with enforced sexual relations between captured and enslaved women and their captors or masters. The extant corpus of tragedy portrays women recently captured (Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*; Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Trojan Women*;[412] and Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*); those who have lived as slaves or war-captives for a number of years (Euripides' *Alcestis*[413] and *Andromache*; and Sophocles' *Ajax*[414]); and those who are at risk of being captured imminently as the result of war (Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*; and Euripides' *Children of Heracles*). None of these texts questions the legality of such sexual assaults and enforced relationships, though this is hardly surprising in a slave-owning society in which warfare was frequent and affected entire communities.[415]

---

[412] *Trojan Women*, produced in 415, has often been thought of as an Euripidean anti-war polemic, in reaction to the Athenian siege upon Melos (winter 416 BC), and the subsequent execution of all Melian men, and enslavement of all women and children; cf. e.g. Blaiklock 1952: 80; Vellacott 1975: 163-166. *Contra* e.g. Koniaris 1973: 102-103. It is now regarded as unlikely that Euripides composed the play as a direct comment on the events of Melos: van Erp Taalman Kip 1987, demonstrates that Euripides would have had the time. Carter 2007: 132-133, points out that Melos is not mentioned or alluded to in the play, and that 'there are few points of comparison between Troy and Melos' (133). However, it is generally concluded that we will never know Euripides motivation in writing the play, van Erp Taalman Kip 1987: 417; Carter 2007: 133. It is important to remember that Melos was not the only *polis* to be treated in this way, e.g. Scione (Thuc. 5.32.1 in 421 BC).
I do not think Euripides composed *Trojan Women* as a direct response to Melos. What was shocking regarding the fate of the Melians is that they were Greek state who were attempting to remain neutral in the Peloponnesian War; the practice of killing all men and enslaving women and children going back to the *Iliad* itself. However, Euripides does seem to have had the intention of reminding his audience of the horrors of war during a period when Athens herself was involved in the Peloponnesian War. There was also nothing stopping the audience from making the association with Melos themselves; cf. van Erp Taalman Kip 1987: 414; Croally 1994: 232 n.170, 234; Carter 2007: 133. However, Sidwell 2001 is extremely sceptical about the idea of the original audience perceiving the plight of the Trojan women as evoking the fate of Melos.

[413] The revived Alcestis is presented by Heracles as a prize slave won in an athletic contest.

[414] Sophocles' *Ajax* is an interesting text regarding the status of war-captives and their children. I shall not be considering it in detail in this study as although Tecmessa was undoubtedly compelled to have a sexual relationship with Ajax there is no mention of any current or former unwillingness on Tecmessa's part in the play. However, see 'Euripides' *Hecuba* – Cassandra' section for a discussion of her appeal to Ajax made on the basis of his obligation to her due to their sexual relationship.

[415] For the principle of war-captives as property of captors and slaves, from the Homeric era to the fourth century BC see Harris 2006b: 262-263, citing Hom. *Il*. 21.34-41, 76-79; 22.l45; 24.751-753; Pl. *Resp*. 5.468a-b; Arist. *Pol*. 1.6.1255a6-7; Xen. *Cyr*. 7.5.73. However, as war-captives (αἰχμάλωτοι) are not slaves from birth, their enslavement need not necessarily be permanent, and there is evidence throughout this period

What is surprising, perhaps, is the degree of sympathy for the female victims that the authors of these texts attempt to incite in the audience. This sympathy is obvious from the general presentation of these women, their circumstances, and experiences. Their plight incites the pity of other characters. However, what is even more shocking to the modern reader is that the aggressors in these scenarios are never criticized or described as behaving negatively in regards to their sexual actions towards these women, even by the victim.[416] A number of the enforced relationships will have been familiar to the audience from earlier literature, especially the epic tradition, which may have led the audience to question the propriety of the aggressor's actions less. I will attempt to demonstrate that the scenarios of sexual assaults in this category fit the pattern I noted in the previous chapters;[417] and what designated a sexual assault as a negative act (and one that would be thought of as deserving punishment) in the eyes of the audience was the assault being negatively motivated,[418] but that this did not diminish the sympathy the audience could have for the victims of these assaults,[419] nor their appreciation of the violence and trauma of enforced sexual relationships.

This chapter will first look at the plays set in the immediate aftermath of the Trojan War (Euripides' *Trojan Women* and *Hecuba*), before moving onto plays dealing with those under the immediate threat of capture (Sophocles' *Seven Against Thebes* and Euripides' *Children of Heracles*), and finally looking that those living as captive-women and slaves (Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*; Euripides' *Andromache*; Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*; and Euripides' *Alcestis*).

---

for the release and ransom of captives, apparently with no long term effects upon their social status. See 'Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*' section and the 'Conclusions' to this chapter.

[416] This has not, as far as I am aware, been picked up on in previous scholarship. Allan 2000: 25-26 and Anderson 1997: 138, have recognised that Neoptolemus' character in *Andromache* is to some extent rehabilitated from the epic model, though this is seen as a general observation, not one which applies solely to his sexual deeds. Agamemnon and Heracles have been interpreted as having negative and harsh traits by some modern scholars, but in the texts these are never explicitly associated with their sexual actions.

[417] Higher status aggressor; a context of isolation of the victim (in this scenario caused by their status as slaves and/or the destruction of their *oikos* and/or *polis*); and desire as a motivation of the aggressor (when it is stressed as the motivation) is not perceived or portrayed negatively.

[418] Harris 2006d.

[419] All the translations in this chapter are my own, though the following editions have been consulted: Lloyd-Jones 1994; Easterling 1982; Davies 1991; Kovacs 1995, 1999; Barlow 1986; Collard 1991; Denniston & Page 1957; Fraenkel 1950; Sommerstein 2008 I and II, 2009; Wilkins 1993; Stevens 1971; Hutchinson 1985; Lee 1976.

The texts cited in this chapter are taken from Diggle's 1981 and 1984 OCT editions of Euripides; Lloyd-Jones & Wilson's 1990a Sophocles OCT; and West's [1990] 1998 Teubner edition of Aeschylus. Any emendations are noted.

Euripides' *Trojan Women*

In this play we hear the fears and predictions about their sexual fate from a number of recently captured Trojan women (the Chorus of formerly respectable Trojan wives, Cassandra, and Andromache), as they learn to which commander they are being assigned, as well as the reaction of the former queen, Hecuba, to her daughter's, daughter-in-law's, and former citizens' enslavement.[420] Though no instances of sexual violence have taken place prior to the start of the play with any certainty,[421] for a number of characters the commencement of forced relationships perceived as imminent.

The distressing scene of the aftermath of the Trojan defeat by the Greeks is set in the prologue. Poseidon describes the devastation, and foretells the immediate fates of the captive women. Lines 28-29 and 41-44 are particularly relevant to this study:

28-29: πολλοῖς δὲ κωκυτοῖσιν αἰχμαλωτίδων
βοᾷ Σκάμανδρος δεσπότας κληρουμένων.

41-44: ἣν δὲ παρθένον
μεθῆκ᾽ Ἀπόλλων δρομάδα Κασσάνδραν ἄναξ,
τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τε παραλιπὼν τό τ᾽ εὐσεβὲς
γαμεῖ βιαίως σκότιον Ἀγαμέμνων λέχος.

It is clear from the very start that this play will revolve around the fates of the female characters, and *pathos* will be drawn from their enslavement, suffering, and future sexual exploitation. This theme would hardly be deemed worthy for a tragedy if the audience would not feel sympathy for victims of enforced sexual relations. As the play focuses on the separate sexual fates of two characters (Cassandra and Andromache) and one group of characters (the Chorus of Trojan women) this section will be subdivided accordingly.

Cassandra

Cassandra is mentioned by three characters before her first appearance. As we have seen, Poseidon reveals that Agamemnon will force Cassandra to have a sexual relationship with him (41-44). Agamemnon's actions do seem to be regarded as negative by Poseidon, though this is

[420] Craik 1990: 1, remarks that '[t]here is much overt allusion to the sexual aspect of the women's plight,' and argues 'that this explicit theme is implicitly reinforced by a strong underlying figurative content. . . [as well as] elements of innuendo and double entendre. . . and by some visual symbolism.' Scodel 1998: 145, asserts that 'rape is an important theme from the beginning.' Cf. Rabinowitz 2011.

[421] See the sub-section on Cassandra regarding the attack on her by Ajax mentioned in lines 69-70.

apparently due to the hero going against the will of Apollo (whom we are told has left Cassandra a virgin) rather than the nature of the sexual relationship itself being perceived as negative.[422] None of the human characters criticise him for his actions, although they express pity at Cassandra being forced to conduct an illicit sexual relationship with Agamemnon.

Cassandra is later mentioned in the conversation between Athena and Poseidon (69-70):

[Ἀ]: οὐκ οἶσθ᾽ ὑβρισθεῖσάν με καὶ ναοὺς ἐμούς;

[Π]: οἶδ᾽· ἡνίκ᾽ Αἴας εἷλκε Κασσάνδραν βίᾳ.

Some believe this refers to the sexual violation of Cassandra by Ajax.[423] It is clear, however, that this assault may only refer to her being dragged from her position as suppliant, as Cassandra is still considered to be a virgin at the time of the play.[424]

---

[422] Eur. *Tro*. 41-42. Apollo leaving Cassandra as a virgin is presumably a reference to Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, in which Cassandra rejected Apollo's sexual advances (Aesch. *Ag*. 1202-1212). This passage will be discussed in more detail in the section on that play. Poseidon does not regard Agamemnon's forced sexual with Cassandra in itself as negative, but because it is contrary to the will of Apollo has also been noted by Fisher 1992: 439: 'it seems to be the direct insult to the god. . . that interests Poseidon more than the general cruelty and ruthlessness of the Greeks.' Meridor 1989: 27 points out that *Trojan Women* is the only tragic version of the myth in which Agamemnon's relationship with Cassandra is 'considered a wrong against the god,' the sacrilegious aspect not being mentioned in either Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* or Euripides' *Hecuba*.

[423] It is identified as 'rape' by O'Neill 1941: 289; Lee 1976: xv; Barlow 1986: 161. Rabinowitz 2011: 14, thinks it is 'rape,' though her basis for this seems to come from misunderstanding that the *hybris* has been committed against Cassandra; the object of the verb is actually Athena, it is her who has been 'outraged.' Scodel 1998: 145, refers to the incident as a 'sexual assault.' I assume by this she means 'attempted rape,' as in her earlier work (Scodel 1980: 67 n.11) she states that 'Euripides does not make it an actual rape.' Croally 1994: 72 does not mention a sexual aspect to the assault when discussing it, but later (99) he states that she had been 'violated by Ajax.' For a discussion on the development of the myth of Cassandra's 'rape' by Ajax see Mason 1959: 81-82. However, Mason's assertion that the myth is probably an Alexandrian invention because 'it seems unlikely that Kassandra would have been offered as a prize to Agamemnon if she had already lost her virginity to Ajax,' is antithetical to other evidence we have regarding the sexual status of war-captives, even those given as prizes, many of whom we are told were previously married. Agamemnon had no qualms about seizing Briseis from Achilles in the Homeric account, even though she had been married, and Achilles had conducted a sexual relationship with her. When Agamemnon stresses that he has not had a sexual relationship with Briseis upon giving her back to Achilles (Hom. *Il*. 19.261-263), it is to show that he had not insulted Achilles via the girl, and has more to do with the relationship between the two men than the sexual integrity of Briseis. Virginity and chastity are only desirable features in potential wives, as a reassurance towards the legitimacy of her future children, not slaves, whose children become legitimate heirs in the heroic world only in extreme circumstances.

[424] Cassandra is still regarded as a *parthenos* in lines 41 and 252. Sissa (1990a and 1990b) has shown that for the Greeks the term *parthenos* did not guarantee biological virginity, and could be used to refer to young women who had given birth to a child before marriage. It designates a woman as pubescent but unmarried. It is, however, closely linked with the term *parthenia*, which seems to equate to 'virginity.' The true *parthenos* was someone whose *parthenia* was intact, although for the Greeks this was not something which could be proved without evidence to the contrary (a public marriage ceremony or the discovery of pregnancy); see Sissa 1990a: 73-123, especially 76-79 and 88-93, 1990b, especially 339-340, 342-343 and 347-348. Although the designation of Cassandra as *parthenos* is not on its own sufficient to imply her virginal status in line 453 she speaks of her 'undefiled body' (ἁγνὴ χρόα). Only after she has been taken away by Talthybius does Hecuba speak of Cassandra losing her chastity (ἄγνευμα) in line 501. Although Ajax's seizure may have been sexually motivated it was apparently not a completed act.

The offence Ajax commits and Cassandra's status are discussed by Naiden 2006: 152-153. However, he is not just considering the Euripidean version. With reference to *Trojan Women* he does believe Ajax rapes

As some have suggested, it is possible that it was an attempted sexual assault.[425] The comparison made between her original seizure by Ajax, and her assignment to Agamemnon, which we know to be sexually motivated, grants further credence to this assertion (616-619):

[Ε]: τὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης δεινόν· ἄρτι κἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ
βέβηκ᾽ ἀποσπασθεῖσα Κασσάνδρα βίᾳ.
[Α]: φεῦ φεῦ·
ἄλλος τις Αἴας, ὡς ἔοικε, δεύτερος
παιδὸς πέφηνε σῆς.

What is portrayed as reprehensible to the gods regarding Ajax's attack is not the sexual aspect of the assault, but the location of it. Athena is angry that her temple was outraged, and that the Greeks have not punished Ajax for that outrage, not any outrage he attempted to commit against Cassandra.[426]

Much is made of Cassandra's sexual vulnerability before she even appears. Hecuba is anxious that Cassandra remain inside the tent so as not to be shamed (αἰσχύναν) by the Greeks (168-172):

μή νύν μοι τὰν
ἐκβακχεύουσαν Κασσάνδραν,
αἰσχύναν Ἀργείοισιν, [171]
πέμψητ᾽ ἔξω, [170]
μαινάδ᾽, ἐπ᾽ ἄλγεσι δ᾽ ἀλγυνθῶ.

Whether this is in reference to some sexual degradation Cassandra may suffer or merely expected mockery of her frenzied state is unclear. Mason (1959) follows Parmentier's (1942) reading of this phrase, believing that Cassandra's madness being seen by the Greeks would bring shame upon her

---

Cassandra. As we are actually presented with a virginal Cassandra in this play, I would like to posit the suggestion that Ajax commits a wrong as he is not a legitimate *supplicandus*, and has no authority to remove Cassandra, hence his use of force is hubristic. In Euripides' *Hecuba* we are told the Chorus have been 'led away' (Eur. *Hec*. 936: ἄγομαι) from the temple of Artemis with no negative consequences, presumably because the action was taken legitimately after rejecting their supplication.

[425] Mason 1959: 89, citing line 453 as evidence Cassandra 'escaped actual rape;' followed by Fisher 1992: 459; Scodel 1980: 67. Cf. Craik 1990: 6 (discussed below) and n. 15.

[426] Cf. Fisher 1992: 439, and Conacher 1967: 135-136, who does not even mention Cassandra's part in the incident. *Contra* Craik 1990: 6, 'Athena has identified with this virgin victim of sexual persecution, viewing her own person as ὑβρισθεῖσαν, using a term which in Attic law meant technically 'rape' (LSJ s.v. II.3); the verb used of Ajax's assault on Kassandra, εἵλκε, is similarly specific to sexual attack (LSJ s.v.II.3).' These verbs have more than just sexual connotations, and although their use may signal to the audience a sexual aspect in Ajax's attack against Cassandra, Athena certainly does not identify with the priestess, whom she does not even mention.

and her family, and that because she is Agamemnon's 'fiancée' she would not be at risk of attack by the Greeks.[427] Mason does think it could possibly be a reference to her seizure by Ajax.[428] I agree that it may allude to Cassandra's sexual vulnerability, especially as at this point Hecuba has no idea that Cassandra has already been awarded to Agamemnon.[429] The advantage of this reading in regard to the tragic tone of the play is Euripides would be inciting as much sympathy for Cassandra's sexual fate as possible, perhaps to heighten the contrast with her ecstatic and celebrant pose when she does finally appear.

Lines 247-255 see Hecuba and Talthybius discuss Cassandra's allotment:

[Ἑ]: τοὐμὸν τίς ἆρ᾽
ἔλαχε τέκος, ἔνεπε, τλάμονα Κασσάνδραν;
[Τ]: ἐξαίρετόν νιν ἔλαβεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ.
[Ἑ]: ἦ τᾷ Λακεδαιμονίᾳ νύμφᾳ
δούλαν; ὤμοί μοι.
[Τ]: οὔκ, ἀλλὰ λέκτρων σκότια νυμφευτήρια.
[Ἑ]: ἦ τὰν τοῦ Φοίβου παρθένον, ᾇ γέρας ὁ
χρυσοκόμας ἔδωκ᾽ ἄλεκτρον ζόαν;
[Τ]: ἔρως ἐτόξευσ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐνθέου κόρης.

Here we see a character expressing shock that Agamemnon intends to conduct a sexual relationship with Cassandra, on account of Apollo's grant of perpetual virginity. The Greek messenger, however, does not perceive Agamemnon's actions as negative, and even attempts to justify them as motivated by desire (ἔρως). This seems to suggest Agamemnon's actions are not to be perceived as negatively motivated by the audience. He does not mean to dishonour the priestess of Apollo out of malice or a wish to insult her or the god. Although his actions are received as such by some of the other characters in the play, when this is the case there is no indication that his actions will result in punishment. This is an indicator that it was the motivation of the aggressor in instances of forcible sexual relationships, not the acts themselves, which designated the perpetrator subject to punishment.[430] Certainly Talthybius does not think Agamemnon's desire for Cassandra should be lamented, 'is it not a great thing for her to obtain a king's bed?' (259: οὐ γὰρ μέγ᾽ αὐτῇ

[427] Parmentier 1942: 35 n. 1.
[428] Mason 1959: 89.
[429] Also noted by Lee 1976: 95.
[430] Cf. Harris 2006d.

βασιλικῶν λέκτρων τυχεῖν;). This line reminds us that if she had not been specially chosen by Agamemnon, as a slave, Cassandra would have been vulnerable to the sexual advances of anyone else. The fact that the sexual aggressor in this case is a king, and one of the leading generals, fits the pattern of sexual aggressors being of a higher status than their victim.

Talthybius relates for a second time that Agamemnon has conceived a desire (ἔρωτ᾽) for Cassandra, and specifically chosen her as his prize for this reason (413-416):

> ὁ γὰρ μέγιστος τῶν Πανελλήνων ἄναξ,
> Ἀτρέως φίλος παῖς, τῆσδ᾽ ἔρωτ᾽ ἐξαίρετον
> μαινάδος ὑπέστη· καὶ πένης μέν εἰμ᾽ ἐγώ,
> ἀτὰρ λέχος γε τῆσδ᾽ ἂν οὐκ ἠτησάμην.

Cassandra's manic state would deter Talthybius, and presumably many other Greeks, from having her as a sexual partner. This gives the impression that Agamemnon's desire for Cassandra is indeed great, and that his motivation of desire should be seen as positive and beneficial to her future prosperity. I do not believe his sexual behaviour towards her would have been interpreted as negative by the audience.

When we first see Cassandra, she is in an ecstatic state as she sings a monody in celebration of her 'marriage' to Agamemnon (308-340). This, of course, brings out the irony of her current situation as it has already been made clear that she will never be a legitimate wife to Agamemnon (44, 252). As a virgin priestess, her gleeful assumption of the role of bride seems perverse to the other characters. Hecuba is perturbed by Cassandra's attitude. She stresses that Cassandra's present fate is drastically different from what she would have foreseen for her daughter, and asks the Chorus to lament for her, increasing the *pathos* of the situation (343-352):

> Ὤφαιστε, δᾳδουχεῖς μὲν ἐν γάμοις βροτῶν,
> ἀτὰρ λυγράν γε τήνδ᾽ ἀναιθύσσεις φλόγα
> ἔξω τε μεγάλων ἐλπίδων. οἴμοι, τέκνον,
> ὡς οὐχ ὑπ᾽ αἰχμῆς <σ᾽> οὐδ᾽ ὑπ᾽ Ἀργείου δορὸς
> γάμους γαμεῖσθαι τούσδ᾽ ἐδόξαζόν ποτε.
> παράδος ἐμοὶ φῶς· οὐ γὰρ ὀρθὰ πυρφορεῖς
> μαινὰς θοάζουσ᾽, οὐδέ σαῖς τύχαις, τέκνον,
> σεσωφρόνηκας ἀλλ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἐν ταὐτῷ μένεις.

ἐσφέρετε πεύκας δάκρυά τ᾽ ἀνταλλάσσατε
τοῖς τῆσδε μέλεσι, Τρῳάδες, γαμηλίοις.

Her language, particularly γάμους γαμεῖσθαι, emphasises the ironic nature of the union further. This phrase, as Croally (1994) notes, would generally mean 'to contract a marriage.'[431] However, in this passage it highlights the perverse nature of Cassandra's marital celebrations, for it is she who is contracting the marriage, something which for a legitimate marriage would have been done by the bride's *kyrios*. The circumstances of Cassandra's 'marriage' are anomalous: it is not being contracted between social equals (i.e. two citizen males), but under the threat of violence after defeat and enslavement in war. This inequality stresses the violence to which Cassandra is at risk, and the compulsion which she will be under in her relations with Agamemnon. Euripides is evidently trying to keep the audience's sympathy for Cassandra's plight fresh in their minds.

The ironic development of the marriage theme is pushed almost to breaking point in lines 353-356:

μῆτερ, πύκαζε κρᾶτ᾽ ἐμὸν νικηφόρον
καὶ χαῖρε τοῖς ἐμοῖσι βασιλικοῖς γάμοις·
καὶ πέμπε, κἂν μὴ τἀμά σοι πρόθυμά γ᾽ ἦ
ὤθει βιαίως·

Once again Cassandra evokes the imagery of the legitimate marriage ceremony by characterizing herself as a reluctant bride. The assumption of this role was a normal and desirable state for the young brides in ancient Greece, whose (sometimes mock, sometimes actual) reluctance was seen as a demonstration of their virginity and chaste nature. Under these circumstances the brides would be encouraged by female relatives.[432] Her use of the word βιαίως, however, reminds the audience that this is not a normal legitimate marriage, but she is being seized as a slave and is under compulsion and at risk of physical violence.

In lines 356-364 Cassandra predicts the fate of Agamemnon, which she explicitly attributes to his relationship with her. This explains her present attitude towards her allotment to Agamemnon. She is not overjoyed at the prospect of the sexual union, but at the repercussions her 'marriage' and Agamemnon's desire for her will have upon him when he gets home and is

[431] Croally 1994: 88. Although the phrase can simply mean 'get married,' see LSJ γαμέω A.II.1.
[432] Alexiou [1974] 2002: 120-122; Redfield 1982: 191; Seaford 1987: 112.

murdered by his jealous wife. Cassandra sees her sexual acquiescence as a means of securing Agamemnon's death and a Trojan victory. Thus Euripides suggests that if this was not the case, her reaction to the union would be very different.

The last thing we see of Cassandra is her removing the marks of her religious office, leaving them on the ground at Troy. This is a visual representation of her demeaned position, and the imminent loss of her sexual purity, which was one of her honours as a priestess of Apollo. The gesture is bound to arouse the sympathy of the audience for her plight and fall from her privileged position as royal virgin priestess to slave mistress of Agamemnon. It is reminiscent of the scene in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* in which Cassandra tosses them to the ground before going to her death inside Agamemnon's palace.[433]

After the departure of Cassandra, Hecuba laments her troubles, including the unrealised destinies of her virgin daughters, who should have had great and legitimate marriages but are now the possessions of others (484-486):

ἃς δ᾽ ἔθρεψα παρθένους
ἐς ἀξίωμα νυμφίων ἐξαίρετον,
ἄλλοισι θρέψασ᾽ ἐκ χερῶν ἀφῃρέθην·

This passage refers to their sexual fate by the close association of their virgin status, the reference to marriage, and the benefit they will now bring to others. Their sexual availability and risk of sexual assault is strongly implied. Though this fate in itself is lamentable, it seems to be accepted as the consequence of war. There is no condemnation of those who will take her daughters; indeed they are not even named or characterised in any way.

Andromache

As with Cassandra, we are told that Andromache has been chosen as a special prize (ἐξαίρετον), this time by Neoptolemus (274). It can surely not be a coincidence that the two would-be sexual aggressors against the Trojan princesses are both said to have specifically chosen these captives with the intention of having them as their sexual partners. Euripides is presenting these women as desired for their personal qualities by the aggressors, hinting that these

[433] Aesch. *Ag*. 1264-1269.

relationships are based on positive motivating factors, not just a desire to shame the women themselves, or merely because as their new masters they have sexual rights over the women.

Later Andromache enumerates the qualities and behaviour that made her an excellent wife, and she attributes the Greeks' knowledge of these things as the reason why Neoptolemus wants to take her as his 'wife' (643-660). Neoptolemus' reason for claiming Andromache being her good reputation seems to indicate his sexual actions arise from a positive motivation, a genuine desire to have a sexual partner who possesses excellent qualities. Not even Andromache herself criticises his desire to obtain her and treat her as his wife.[434] Indeed, the only person she foresees as being criticised for their sexual relationship is herself, should she forget Hector. Euripides uses Andromache's enslavement and the sexual compulsion she will be under to stress the *pathos* of her situation, making it clear that she will be a slave under the control of masters (664: δεσπόταις). It is implied in this speech that sexual consent was seen as preferable to the ancient Greeks (663-664: τόνδε δ᾽ αὖ/ στυγοῦσ᾽ ἐμαυτῆς δεσπόταις μισήσομαι).[435] If Andromache shows her hostility to Neoptolemus, she will gain his enmity and make her situation worse.

Interestingly, in Hecuba's response to Andromache's dilemma we have further evidence that the consent of sexual partners was indeed preferable (697-705):

> ἀλλ᾽, ὦ φίλη παῖ, τὰς μὲν Ἕκτορος τύχας
> ἔασον· οὐ μὴ δάκρυά νιν σώσῃ τὰ σά.
> τίμα δὲ τὸν παρόντα δεσπότην σέθεν,
> φίλον διδοῦσα δέλεαρ ἀνδρὶ σῶν τρόπων.
> κἂν δρᾷς τάδ᾽, ἐς τὸ κοινὸν εὐφρανεῖς φίλους
> καὶ παῖδα τόνδε παιδὸς ἐκθρέψειας ἂν
> Τροίᾳ μέγιστον ὠφέλημ᾽, ἵν᾽ οἵ ποτε
> ἐκ σοῦ γενόμενοι παῖδες Ἴλιον πάλιν
> κατοικίσειαν καὶ πόλις γένοιτ᾽ ἔτι.

[434] Andromache uses the word *damar*, which is commonly used to refer to a legitimate wife. Croally 1994: 87 attributes this to the 'confusion about the types of available relationships between men and women' in this play. Seaford 1987: 130, sees it as a device used to stress the 'perverted' nature of Neoptolemus' relationship with Andromache. I am inclined to agree with Barlow 1986: 192, that the use of this word by Andromache, '"the perfect wife". . . may be deliberate in order to create irony, pathos, and a convincing trait of character.' Andromache has made it her life's mission to be the ideal wife and simply cannot imagine herself in any other role, even in her enslaved state. As a captive slave she could never be a legitimate wife, but as Neoptolemus is young and unmarried she will presumably be his primary sexual partner for the foreseeable future.

[435] On consent to sexual intercourse as preferable in ancient Greece see Harris 2015a.

If Andromache submits to her present position and acts lovingly towards her new master, she can expect to enjoy a prosperous position within his house, and thereby secure the survival of not just herself but her child too.[436]

Although Neoptolemus' motivations and actions are not portrayed negatively, Euripides still manages to arouse great sympathy for Andromache and her future sexual fate, by contrasting it to her previous sexual purity and marital fidelity to Hector (675-679):

> ἀκήρατον δέ μ᾽ ἐκ πατρὸς λαβὼν δόμων
> πρῶτος τὸ παρθένειον ἐζεύξω λέχος.
> καὶ νῦν ὄλωλας μὲν σύ, ναυσθλοῦμαι δ᾽ ἐγὼ
> πρὸς Ἑλλάδ᾽ αἰχμάλωτος ἐς δοῦλον ζυγόν.

The stress on her virginal status before her only marriage and on the journey from her father's house recalls the legitimacy of her first union, while contrasting it with this second journey that marks the start of a new illegitimate sexual union. The emphasis on her status as spear-captive hints at the violence to which she is vulnerable, and the compulsion she will face within this union. It highlights her inferior status, neither being her husband's social equal, nor having the security of her natal family to fall back on, as she did when she was given in marriage to Hector. The reference to the yoke alludes to marriage imagery.[437] Andromache under the yoke of slavery is vulnerable to the sexual advances of her master.

Andromache is a reluctant partner in her future sexual union with Neoptolemus and sees her future life as worse than death. The fact that Andromache regards Polyxena, who has been sacrificed on the tomb of Achilles, as more fortunate than herself is explicitly stated on two occasions:

> 630-631: ὄλωλεν ὡς ὄλωλεν· ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως ἐμοῦ
> ζώσης γ᾽ ὄλωλεν εὐτυχεστέρῳ πότμῳ.
> 679-680: ἆρ᾽ οὐκ ἐλάσσω τῶν ἐμῶν ἔχει κακῶν
> Πολυξένης ὄλεθρος, ἣν καταστένεις;

These passages signal to the audience Andromache's horror at her situation and increase the audience's sympathy for her plight. Talthybius' assumption earlier in the play that suicide would be

[436] Sexual acquiescence on the part of war-captives as a strategy for survival is the subject of Scodel's 1998 article. Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 162-163, for the idea that non-consensual sex is less satisfying for a man; Harris 2015a.
[437] Seaford 1987: 111 and n. 58.

preferable to the captive women than a life of slavery strongly suggests that the audience would have understood Andromache's conception of death as preferable to sexual violation.[438] The only thing that eclipses Andromache's horror at her sexual fate is learning that her son has been sentenced to death by the Greeks (720: οἴμοι, γάμων τόδ᾽ ὡς κλύω μεῖζον κακόν).

The last we hear of Andromache paints her in a pitiable light, a figure lamenting her fate and her dead husband, about to enter a sexual relationship with her newly acquired master. Even Talthybius, who relates this scene, tells the audience that he wept to see her (1130-1139):

> πολλῶν ἐμοὶ
> δακρύων ἀγωγός, ἡνίκ᾽ ἐξώρμα χθονός,
> πάτραν τ᾽ ἀναστένουσα καὶ τὸν Ἕκτορος
> τύμβον προσεννέπουσα. καί σφ᾽ ἠτήσατο
> θάψαι νεκρὸν τόνδ᾽, ὃς πεσὼν ἐκ τειχέων
> ψυχὴν ἀφῆκεν Ἕκτορος τοῦ σοῦ γόνος·
> φόβον τ᾽ Ἀχαιῶν, χαλκόνωτον ἀσπίδα
> τήνδ᾽, ἣν πατὴρ τοῦδ᾽ ἀμφὶ πλεύρ᾽ ἐβάλλετο,
> μή νιν πορεῦσαι Πηλέως ἐφ᾽ ἑστίαν
> μηδ᾽ ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν θάλαμον, οὗ νυμφεύσεται.

At the same time as we are presented with this pathetic picture of a sympathetic Andromache, Neoptolemus seems to be portrayed in a positive light. As a dutiful grandson, he is rushing off to the aid of Peleus (1126-1130), which means he cannot allow Andromache to bury the child herself, but arranges for Talthybius to take his body to Hecuba in response to Andromache's pleas, and is entreated to send with him Hector's shield. Though the future sexual relationship, which we know Andromache does not want, is mentioned in this passage, there is no degree of censure addressed towards Neoptolemus. Indeed, he seems to be considerate towards Andromache's feelings, allowing the great shield of Hector (his valuable and prestigious war prize) to be buried along with her child, so she does not have a visual reminder of her first husband in Neoptolemus' house. This strongly indicates that he does not intend to carry on a sexual relationship with Andromache in order to shame her or her dead husband, further evidence that the audience was meant to perceive Neoptolemus' sexual motivations as positive, and that it would not be regarded as condemnable instances of sexual violence.

[438] Eur. *Tro*. 298-305, see below for discussion of this passage.

Chorus of Trojan Women

The captured citizen women of Troy represented by the Chorus envisage the prospect of enforced sexual relationships as part of a life of slavery (197-206):

> αἰαῖ αἰαῖ, ποίοις δ᾽ οἴκτοις
> τὰνδ᾽ ἂν λύμαν ἐξαιάζοις;
> οὐκ Ἰδαίοις ἱστοῖς κερκίδα
> δινεύουσ᾽ ἐξαλλάξω.
> νέατον τοκέων δώματα λεύσσω,
> νέατον· μόχθους <δ᾽> ἕξω κρείσσους,
> ἢ λέκτροις πλαθεῖσ᾽ Ἑλλάνων
> (ἔρροι νὺξ αὕτα καὶ δαίμων)
> ἢ Πειρήνας ὑδρευομένα
> πρόσπολος οἰκτρὰ σεμνῶν ὑδάτων.

Euripides builds upon the sympathy the audience feels for the Chorus before the mention of their prospective sexual fate by preceding it with their intention to lament. Popular topics for laments are mentioned over the next four lines: their previous lives working at the looms in their homes; and the houses of their families which are to be imagined as the backdrop of the play. These factors clearly mark out that the Chorus is made up of women of high status. The mention of familial homes is perhaps intended to invoke the imagery of a bride leaving her natal home upon her marriage. Next, one would expect mention of the woman's husband, but the lament suddenly switches the focus to their imagined future fate in Greece, the primary concern of which is being the unwilling sexual partner to a Greek. This highlights their change of fortune: women we should imagine as brides for Trojan husbands are envisioned as unwilling sexual partners of Greek masters. This image was obviously intended to arouse pity in the audience, which in turn implies that the Greeks had sympathy for the victims of sexual violence, and would differentiate between consensual and non-consensual sexual relations. However, that there is no condemnation for the aggressors in this scenario indicates that in certain circumstances those perpetrating sexual assaults were not automatically understood to be acting negatively. As these women are looking ahead to their lives as slaves, there is no moral condemnation for how they will be treated by their masters, who have full powers over them; but as they were once free, and should never have been liable to this sort of treatment and sexual availability, the situation is pitiable.

The author arouses sympathy for these nameless Trojan women by having them directly compare themselves with Andromache in lines 684-685, just after the speech in which she contrasts her previous high status and good fortune to her future as a slave and sexual object to her new master:

> ἐς ταὐτὸν ἥκεις συμφορᾶς· θρηνοῦσα δὲ
> τὸ σὸν διδάσκεις μ᾽ ἔνθα πημάτων κυρῶ.

This implies they will meet a similar fate of unwanted sexual advances from their new masters in Greece, while still being devoted, as Andromache is, to their previous husbands.

The Greek herald, Talthybius, certainly feels sympathy for the Trojan women and their terrible plight (298-305):

> ἔα· τί πεύκης ἔνδον αἴθεται σέλας;
> πιμπρᾶσιν, ἢ τί δρῶσι, Τρῳάδες μυχούς,
> ὡς ἐξάγεσθαι τῆσδε μέλλουσαι χθονὸς
> πρὸς Ἄργος, αὑτῶν τ᾽ ἐκπυροῦσι σώματα
> θανεῖν θέλουσαι; κάρτα τοι τοὐλεύθερον
> ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις δυσλόφως φέρει κακά.
> ἄνοιγ᾽ ἄνοιγε, μὴ τὸ ταῖσδε πρόσφορον
> ἐχθρὸν δ᾽ Ἀχαιοῖς εἰς ἔμ᾽ αἰτίαν βάλῃ.

Talthybius assumes the women are attempting to commit suicide and regards their behaviour as appropriate to their situation. This demonstrates his pity for them and recognition of their dire circumstances. There is, however, no condemnation of the Greeks' responsibility for this as he sees them for what they are now, possessions, and that if the women die valuable commodities will be lost.

The Chorus, on recalling their experience of Troy's fall speak of the pitiable sights they saw, and what the future holds for them (562-567):

> σφαγαὶ δ᾽ ἀμφιβώμιοι
> Φρυγῶν ἔν τε δεμνίοις
> καράτομος ἐρημία
> νεανίδων στέφανον ἔφερεν
> Ἑλλάδι κουροτρόφον,
> Φρυγῶν δὲ πατρίδι πένθος.

The connection between the fall of the city and the slaughter of husbands to the fate of the young women, whose sexual violation by the Greeks would produce children as the final demonstration of the Greek victory over the Trojans, is a powerful image. The image evokes sympathy for their plight but no condemnation of the Greeks' actions. These are presented as lamentable but the realities of ancient warfare.[439]

Euripides' *Trojan Women* presents a number of women, who were formerly free and protected against sexual violation, coming to terms with the destruction of their city and families, and their own enslavement. This enslavement is closely linked with their sexual vulnerability. Euripides' stress on this aspect of their future lives provides much of the play's *pathos*. It suggests that victims of sexual violence under such circumstances would be pitied and treated sympathetically. On the other hand the actions of the Greeks, their envisioned future sexual aggressors, are not represented negatively. Tellingly, where a motivation for the future sexual relations is expressed, it is attributed to positive reasons, including desire. The compulsion the women would be under as slaves to sexually acquiesce to their masters shows that although consent was not always possible to withhold it was appreciated as an issue in sexual relationships.

Euripides' *Hecuba*

Hecuba is set in the aftermath of the Trojan War, in the Greek camp on the Thracian coast shortly before the departure of the Greek ships on their homeward journey. This play does not revolve around the sexual fate of the captive women in the same way as *Trojan Women*, as the main focus is the utter desolation of Hecuba at the deaths of her two youngest children: Polydorus has been killed by the Thracian king he was sent to for safe-keeping; and Polyxena, the only daughter who had remained with Hecuba at the start of the play, is sacrificed on the tomb of Achilles. The sexual aspects of the captive women's lives are, however, mentioned on a number of occasions throughout the play. Polyxena, willingly giving herself over to be sacrificed, judges death as preferable to the future sexual fate that she foresees for herself. There has been much discussion on the erotic and voyeuristic nature of Talthybius' account of her sacrifice and its use of

[439] Thuc. 3.68, 5.32, 5.116. Cf. Kern 1999: 154-162; Vikman 2005: 24-26; Gaca 2010.

imagery seemingly reminiscent of the loss of virginity, which could symbolise marriage.[440] If we take into account the violent nature of her death and her status as slave, we could read Polyxena's sacrifice as a metaphor for sexual assault. Although we do not see Cassandra, we hear about her position as Agamemnon's sexual partner. The Chorus is made up of the captured Trojan women, and we hear their personal experience of Troy's fall, the language of which cannot fail to evoke their susceptibility to sexual violence. These accounts do much to add to the *pathos* of the play and arouse the sympathy of the audience for the women's plight. Although there is no condemnation of the acts or their perpetrators, the inclusion of these accounts shows that the Athenians did have some sympathy for the victims of sexual assaults and enforced sexual relations. Again, it is easiest to sub-divide this section by the characters: Polyxena, Cassandra, and the Chorus.

It has been proposed, by Gellie (1980) that *Hecuba* does not possess 'full tragic status,' and 'that Euripides has gone out of his way to direct our minds away from tragedy and to have us grappling with pain in a less painful way.'[441] Some of the devices which Gellie proposes Euripides uses to demonstrate this are the representation of Polyxena and her sacrifice;[442] the sexual innuendo in the play;[443] and the language and themes of the choral odes.[444] I would like to demonstrate in my reading of this play that rather than being untragic elements these devices were used by Euripides to heighten the *pathos* of the play by highlighting for the audience the suffering and experiences of these characters.

Polyxena

Just as we saw in *Trojan Women*, in *Hecuba* death is seen as preferable to a life of slavery and sexual violation. Polyxena accepts the prospect of her sacrifice on the tomb of Achilles willingly, and presents the audience with a pitiable alternative (365-368):

> λέχη δὲ τἀμὰ δοῦλος ὠνητός ποθεν
> χρανεῖ, τυράννων πρόσθεν ἠξιωμένα.
> οὐ δῆτ᾽· ἀφίημ᾽ ὀμμάτων ἐλευθέρων
> φέγγος τόδ᾽, Ἅιδῃ προστιθεῖσ᾽ ἐμὸν δέμας.

[440] See below.
[441] Gellie 1980: 31.
[442] Gellie 1980: 32-34.
[443] Gellie 1980: 34-35, though he only considers Polyxena's reported nudity, the risk of necrophilia assumed by Hecuba, and Hecuba's reference to Cassandra's sexual relationship with Agamemnon.
[444] Gellie 1980: 42-44.

As Segal (1993) has noted, the use of the verb χραίνω ('defile'), 'evokes sexual violation.'[445] Euripides makes this hypothetical scenario more shocking due to the servile nature of the sexual aggressor, a lowly slave, and has Polyxena herself show the perversity of this scenario by stressing that she has been raised to be the legitimate wife of a king, a point which has been mentioned previously (351-356).[446] The audience will have had sympathy for her plight and her decision to die rather than meet this fate. Her death is not envisaged without a degree of possible sexual connotations, as Michelini points out, the wording could imply a marriage to Hades: *prostithêmi* is sometimes used to designate a marital relationship.[447] Euripides thus prepares the way for the erotic connotations in Talthybius' account of her sacrifice.[448]

The eroticised nature of Talthybius' speech is frequently commented on by scholars, as is the imagery and actual risk of sexual violation.[449] I shall now offer a reading of lines 543-570:

> εἶτ᾽ ἀμφίχρυσον φάσγανον κώπης λαβὼν
> ἐξεῖλκε κολεοῦ, λογάσι δ᾽ Ἀργείων στρατοῦ
> νεανίαις ἔνευσε παρθένον λαβεῖν.

---

[445] Segal 1993: 177.

[446] Scodel 1998: 144 finds the scenario of Polyxena having a slave as a sexual partner as 'peculiar,' pointing out that 'a Trojan princess would normally be allotted to one of the leaders for concubineage.' She does not believe that Polyxena has been allotted already, although I think we are meant to perceive her as being allotted to Agamemnon along with Hecuba and Cassandra. As Agamemnon already has Cassandra for his mistress Polyxena may fear that she could be sold to another (359-360). As her new owner would have had every right to use her sexually, and would presumably be of high status, that scenario would not have been as shocking for the audience, or aroused as much sympathy, as the slave one which Euripides has Polyxena present. I believe we are meant to see her as just on the cusp of sexual maturity, as are all the other virgins sacrificed in tragedy (cf. Eur. *Her*., *IA*; Aesch. *Ag*.), which is possibly why she had not been allotted individually to another commander. Her youth makes her situation all the more pathetic, and her resolve all the more courageous.

[447] Michelini 1987: 159 and n. 109. The theme of death equating to a form of marriage for a *parthenos* is explored in detail by Loraux 1987.

[448] Segal 1993: 177.

[449] Michelini 1987: 165; de Jong 1991: 89; Gregory 1991: 97; Marsh 1992: 271; Rabinowitz 1993: 61; Segal 1993: esp. 166, 'the sacrificial (and implicitly sexual) violence,' 170, 172; Croally 1994: 61; Dué 2006: 125-126. *Contra* Mossman 1995: 144, who refuses to believe 'that Greeks found virgin sacrifices sexually appealing' and the fact that 'sacrifices are often surrounded by marriage imagery and animal imagery which is also closely associated with erotic contexts and marriage. . . has another, more obvious and acknowledged function. . . the creation of pathos. I would want to insist that any appeal to sexuality was unconscious on the part of author and audience.' This stance, however, seems to be completely undermined by Hecuba's later fears over the violation of her daughter's corpse (604-608), and her assertion of her newly ambiguous sexual status (612), which I will discuss below, as well as the author's inclusion of the detail of Polyxena's semi-nudity. Indeed, I would argue that to a great extent the *pathos* is derived precisely from the appeal to sexuality, by comparing her current fate of death to the fate of sexual violation that she would have been liable to as a slave, while contrasting it to the fate of legitimate marriage which she should have enjoyed. This comparison and contrast is clearly visible in lines 365-368, in which Polyxena sees death as preferable to the sexual violation she may suffer, in contrast to the legitimate marriage she had expected. See Loraux 1987: 36, who argues that animal metaphors are included for the human victims of sacrifice to show that they are suitable precisely because 'they are candidates for marriage' and 'will substitute sacrifice for marriage,' but also stresses the girl's lack of agency through masculine control of her body and sexuality, just as in marriage when a girl would be transferred from the control of one man to another.

ἡ δ᾽, ὡς ἐφράσθη, τόνδ᾽ ἐσήμηνεν λόγον·
Ὦ τὴν ἐμὴν πέρσαντες Ἀργεῖοι πόλιν,
ἑκοῦσα θνήσκω· μή τις ἅψηται χροὸς
τοὐμοῦ· παρέξω γὰρ δέρην εὐκαρδίως.
ἐλευθέραν δέ μ᾽, ὡς ἐλευθέρα θάνω,
πρὸς θεῶν, μεθέντες κτείνατ᾽· ἐν νεκροῖσι γὰρ
δούλη κεκλῆσθαι βασιλὶς οὖσ᾽ αἰσχύνομαι.
λαοὶ δ᾽ ἐπερρόθησαν Ἀγαμέμνων τ᾽ ἄναξ
εἶπεν μεθεῖναι παρθένον νεανίαις.
[οἱ δ᾽, ὡς τάχιστ᾽ ἤκουσαν ὑστάτην ὅπα,
μεθῆκαν, οὔπερ καὶ μέγιστον ἦν κράτος.]
κἀπεὶ τόδ᾽ εἰσήκουσε δεσποτῶν ἔπος,
λαβοῦσα πέπλους ἐξ ἄκρας ἐπωμίδος
ἔρρηξε λαγόνας ἐς μέσας παρ᾽ ὀμφαλόν
μαστούς τ᾽ ἔδειξε στέρνα θ᾽ ὡς ἀγάλματος
κάλλιστα, καὶ καθεῖσα πρὸς γαῖαν γόνυ
ἔλεξε πάντων τλημονέστατον λόγον·
Ἰδού, τόδ᾽, εἰ μὲν στέρνον, ὦ νεανία,
παίειν προθυμῇ, παῖσον, εἰ δ᾽ ὑπ᾽ αὐχένα
χρῄζεις πάρεστι λαιμὸς εὐτρεπὴς ὅδε.
ὁ δ᾽ οὐ θέλων τε καὶ θέλων οἴκτῳ κόρης
τέμνει σιδήρῳ πνεύματος διαρροάς·
κρουνοὶ δ᾽ ἐχώρουν. ἡ δὲ καὶ θνήσκουσ᾽ ὅμως
πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν εὐσχήμων πεσεῖν,
κρύπτουσ᾽ ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμματ᾽ ἀρσένων χρεών.

Throughout the passage Polyxena is frequently referred to as *parthenos*. Although this can mean simply maiden, it is frequently used to denote that a girl is unmarried, and is therefore a virgin, but of marriageable age, which brings Polyxena's sexual status to the foreground. Polyxena's request not to be touched by the young men who would be her guards and were meant to hold her down for the sacrifice can be interpreted as her desire to reject not only her slave status, but also her liability to the touch of any man, something she would have not have experienced during her life as a royal *parthenos*.

Polyxena's semi-nudity is generally agreed to be a gesture of heroic bravery to signify her free nature.[450] It is, however, received erotically by the soldiers due the beauty and presumably sexual desirability of the girl.[451] Polyxena, as the object of erotic gaze, is a reminder to the audience of her now reduced status, and her concurrent position of sexual vulnerability. The stress put on her decorous and intentionally modest fall to the ground also emphasises her reluctance to be an object of erotic gaze and sexual desire. This phrase has been interpreted by some as referring to the concealment of her genitals, largely because the entire Greek army has already seen her breasts.[452] However, I believe that as Polyxena intended her breast-baring gesture as a heroic one (and not a sexual one) she would wish to control the gaze of the audience after her death.[453] Indeed some interpret her actions as designed not to allow herself to become a sexual object after her death, pre-empting the fears of necrophilia apparently uttered by Hecuba later.[454] Polyxena agreed to her sacrificial death in order to avoid sexual violation. It is ironic that her heroic and noble actions result in her becoming an object of sexual attention. This, and the male observer's emphasis on the metaphorical sexual violation Polyxena was exposed to through the act of sacrifice, increases the *pathos* of the scene. This device would only have the optimum effect if the Athenian audience had sympathy for victims of sexual violence.

The manner of Polyxena's death is reminiscent of sexual violation, or equally, marriage.[455] The phallic and masculine sword,[456] held by Neoptolemus, cuts into her neck (*auchēn*, which can

[450] In relation to male nudity in Greek art Hurwit 2007: 46-47 writes 'nudity is thought to be heroic because it reveals the ideal, youthful, powerful hard body as the source of beauty and arete, which heroes possess. And it is heroic because to enter competition or combat fully exposed and thus completely vulnerable. . . is to display a special kind of energy and transcendent fearlessness.' However, nudity in art can also be 'pathetic,' emphasising the vulnerability of the nude individual (49), especially when they are in mortal peril. In regards to female nudity Cohen 1997: 72, has shown that until the late fifth century 'the major context for divesting the female breast of clothes in Greek art was also a negative one – marking female victims of violence.' Euripides then, uses the detail of Polyxena's nudity not only to enhance his heroic characterisation of the girl, but also to stress the *pathos* of the situation and her vulnerability to sexual violence.

[451] Loraux 1987: 60; de Jong 1991: 89, 145; Gregory 1991: 116 n. 23; Rabinowitz 1993: 58-60; Segal 1993: 269 n. 10.

[452] Collard 1991: 161; Rabinowitz 1993: 60.

[453] Cf. de Jong 1991: 28: 'the motive which Talthybius attributes to her (modesty) seems to be based on *his* preoccupations rather than hers. She had just bared her breasts and her concern was not to die as a modest maiden, but as a free woman.'

[454] Gregory 1991: 97; see below.

[455] Dué 2006: 126, pointing to the occasions in the play when her sacrifice is 'referred to as a wedding in death, or else a substitute for a wedding.' See Loraux 1987: 39, 80 n. 27; Eur. *Hec*. 352-353, 368, 414-416, 611-612. For the conflation marital and funerary rituals in Greek tragedy see Rehm 1994.

[456] Rabinowitz 1993: 54, notes that the sword represents a phallus.

also refer to the cervix)[457] and causes the blood to flow from her body. As Segal notes, 'blood is also closely associated with the biological changes that define a girl's passage from *parthenos* to *gunê*.'[458] Through the spilling of her blood from her neck, and her death through the connivance, and at the hands of men, Polyxena loses an aspect of her *partheneia*, just as she would if she had actually been sexually violated.[459] Polyxena takes an active part in her sacrifice, agreeing to it willingly, and adopts masculine heroic standards at the point of her death. However, the passive nature of her death at the hands of men, and the sexual overtones in the description of it, reaffirms her femininity, and the patriarchal order.[460]

Gellie (1980) has argued that Polyxena's nobility and attitude towards her death mean that '[o]ur pity is lost in admiration. . . [t]he high courage and positive will of the girl forbid us to look on her as a victim.'[461] However, she is a victim. Euripides describes her sacrifice in detail, the sword slicing through her trachea, and her blood pouring forth. Euripides' intention for the audience to view Polyxena with pity is further confirmed with the attribution of that emotion to Neoptolemus, the man who kills her, at the moment of the sacrifice (566). Nor do I agree with Gellie's sentiment that the sexual innuendo in the play is employed solely to maintain the attention of the audience.[462] I believe it is to keep at the forefront of the audience's mind the greatly reduced circumstances the captive-women.

When Hecuba addresses her former slave regarding the funerary rights for her daughter, we get a hint of the sexually anomalous status that has been conferred upon Polyxena by her sacrificial death: νύμφην τ᾽ ἄνυμφον παρθένον τ᾽ ἀπάρθενον (612). Hecuba recognizes that Polyxena has gone through a ceremony very much like a marriage. She has been taken from her natal family and given away for the good of another, she will now reside with Hades,[463] who took his own wife through violent means without the knowledge or consent of her mother (though with the full

[457] Loraux 1987: 89 n.48; cf. Hippocrates, *Diseases of Women* III.230. Sissa 1990a: 53, Hippocratic medical terminology demonstrates that in Greek medical thought 'the upper and lower portions of the female body are shown to be symmetrical through the use of identical terms to describe the parts of both.'
[458] Segal 1993: 177 n. 29; King 1983: 111 lists these as 'menarche, defloration, marriage and the first parturition.'
[459] Loraux 1987: 40-41. King 1983: 119 for the ideal death of a *parthenos* being a bloodless one (hanging or strangulation) and the idea that a 'real *parthenos* does not bleed.'
[460] Wißmann 1997: 319-323, 332-336.
[461] Gellie 1980: 32.
[462] Gellie 1980: 35.
[463] Loraux 1987: 36-39.

consent of her father, Zeus). Her blood has been spilt, and she is no longer a true *parthenos*.[464] Though she presented herself as a willing victim her lack of a viable alternative highlights the constraint she was under. Polyxena substitutes one violent loss of her *partheneia* for another. In this way her sacrificial death, with its eroticised description, emphasises the sexual vulnerability of all war-captives. The positive portrayal of her noble character arouses the sympathy of the audience, not just for Polyxena as a sacrificial victim, but for all war-captives as victims of sexual violence.[465]

After Polyxena's death Talthybius tells her mother that the soldiers began to adorn her body, and build a pyre (571-580). Rabinowitz reads this as a display of their lust, arguing that Hecuba is presented as interpreting their actions 'as a displacement of their desire,'[466] and that in death Polyxena's body is just as liable to sexual violation as it was in life (604-608):

> σὺ δ᾽ ἐλθὲ καὶ σήμηνον Ἀργείοις τάδε,
> μὴ θιγγάνειν μοι μηδέν᾽ ἀλλ᾽ εἴργειν ὄχλον,
> τῆς παιδός. ἔν τοι μυρίῳ στρατεύματι
> ἀκόλαστος ὄχλος ναυτική τ᾽ ἀναρχία
> κρείσσων πυρός, κακὸς δ᾽ ὁ μή τι δρῶν κακόν.

Hecuba fears that although Polyxena died in order to remain sexually inviolable and so that her body would not be treated as that of a slave, she is still without protection and her body is vulnerable to the desire and lust which she has inspired among the mob.[467] It is notable that it is an unruly mob that is envisioned as behaving in a way that would be perceived as negative; whenever sexual desire is attributed to one person in tragedy it is generally from a positive motivation. It is not even certain, however, that the army's reaction after Polyxena's death would have been regarded by the audience as being taken to the extreme, or if, as Michelini has proposed, Hecuba 'simply grasps the erotic element in the Greeks' admiration of Polyxene and inverts it, so that what at first seemed noble and high-minded becomes vile and crude.'[468] Hecuba's interpretation of their actions may be a device employed by Euripides to remind the audience of the sexual plight Polyxena had been in, and arouse further sympathy for her fate and Hecuba's recent experiences.

---

[464] Nor is she *gynē* as she has not been given to a husband, see Sissa 1990a: 78.
[465] Segal 1993: 172, argues that Polyxena's death 'is a strong enactment of the violence and violation that war brings to women.'
[466] Rabinowitz 1993: 59.
[467] Michelini 1987: 167; Gregory 1991: 97.
[468] Michelini 1987: 167.

Euripides does much to contrast Polyxena's previous and innate freedom and nobility with her reduced and sexually vulnerable status as a slave in order to produce the maximum pathetic effect. Even the man who sacrifices her feels pity for her plight. If we read the scenario as a metaphorical sexual assault, it fits the pattern we have seen in other accounts of actual sexual assaults in which the aggressor is not portrayed as acting negatively, or committing the act out of malice. It is also a scene which only works to the fullest extent if the Athenians had sympathy for those who were the recipients of unwanted sexual advances.

Cassandra

It seems that within *Hecuba* we are meant to read Agamemnon's relationship with Cassandra as being motivated by strong desire on his part, which would suggest to the audience that his relationship with her was not negatively motivated. This is demonstrated repeatedly by his apparent concern for Cassandra's interests, and those of her family. When the Chorus relate to Hecuba the debate concerning the sacrifice of Polyxena we are told that Agamemnon spoke against the human sacrifice, with no other reason attributed to his behaviour than his apparent devotion to Cassandra (120-123):

> ἦν δὲ τὸ μὲν σὸν σπεύδων ἀγαθὸν
> τῆς μαντιπόλου Βάκχης ἀνέχων
> λέκτρ᾽ Ἀγαμέμνων·

The reason was also perceived by those listening, with the sons of Theseus criticizing his sole motivation (127-129):

> τὰ δὲ Κασσάνδρας λέκτρ᾽ οὐκ ἐφάτην
> τῆς Ἀχιλείας
> πρόσθεν θήσειν ποτὲ λόγχης.

Those listening to the debate think Agamemnon would put the interests of his slave mistress above those of the army. This demonstrates that relationships between captors and captives were not automatically assumed to be negatively motivated. The intention was not necessarily to shame and humiliate the captives, but could be due to genuine desire, and bonds of affection could be expected to form. It is, however, slightly ironic that the man who sacrificed his own daughter to make the expedition to Troy, and thereby aroused the enmity of his wife, is portrayed as speaking against human sacrifice so as not to upset his slave mistress. Although Agamemnon's behaviour towards

Cassandra is not portrayed as negative, it does not necessarily make him a noble character in the minds of the audience.

Hecuba's appeal to Agamemnon to help her to take revenge on Polymestor suggests that Agamemnon's affection for Cassandra and concern for her interests were to be expected (824-835):

> καὶ μήν (ἴσως μὲν τοῦ λόγου ξένον τόδε,
> Κύπριν προβάλλειν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως εἰρήσεται)
> πρὸς σοῖσι πλευροῖς παῖς ἐμὴ κοιμίζεται
> ἡ φοιβάς, ἣν καλοῦσι Κασσάνδραν Φρύγες.
> ποῦ τὰς φίλας δῆτ᾽ εὐφρόνας λέξεις, ἄναξ;
> ἢ τῶν ἐν εὐνῇ φιλτάτων ἀσπασμάτων
> χάριν τίν᾽ ἕξει παῖς ἐμή, κείνης δ᾽ ἐγώ;
> [ἐκ τοῦ σκότου τε τῶν τε νυκτερησίων
> φίλτρων μεγίστη γίγνεται βροτοῖς χάρις.]
> ἄκουε δή νυν. τὸν θανόντα τόνδ᾽ ὁρᾷς;
> τοῦτον καλῶς δρῶν ὄντα κηδεστὴν σέθεν
> δράσεις.

The propriety of Hecuba discussing her daughter's sex-life does not concern me;[469] what does concern me is what she says about it. The picture she paints is not one Cassandra's enforced sex with the enemy, but of a reciprocal sexual relationship in which Cassandra is even shown as having a more active role (she is the subject of two verbs) than would be expected from a newly enslaved war-captive who was formerly a celibate priestess. It is unclear whether this is an accurate portrayal of their relationship, or Hecuba is presenting Cassandra as having a mutual affection and desire for Agamemnon in order to persuade Agamemnon to assist her in punishing Polymestor.

The reference to her appeal being 'foreign to the argument' is not that Cassandra would have a right to expect *charis* from Agamemnon, but that Hecuba can also claim it in order to avenge her son. Hecuba is certainly stretching the legitimacy of the relationship by appealing to

[469] Scholarship prior to 1990 tended to see this passage of Hecuba's as 'a final degradation' (Luschnig 1976: 232); 'demeaning' (Buxton 1982: 79); 'terribly indecent' (Reckford 1985: 121); and 'vulgar' and tantamount to pimping (Michelini 1987: 151). However, since the 1990s Hecuba's topic has been recognised as not wholly inappropriate for a parent to broach in tragedy; cf. Gregory 1991: 106; and appropriate to the construction of the relationship between Agamemnon and Cassandra within this text, cf. Rabinowitz 1993: 120. MacLachlan 1993: 158 believes that 'Hecuba has the right to claim *charis* in Cassandra's stead.' *Contra* Adkins 1966: 201-203, who argues that Agamemnon refuses to perform a *charis* for Hecuba as his *philia* with Cassandra does not extend to her mother (856-860).

him on the grounds that Polydorus is his in-law.[470] How far this represents the bonds of obligation that actually existed in ancient Athens to relatives of those in unofficial relationships is uncertain. It may have seemed perfectly natural to the audience that Agamemnon would have been concerned with the well-being of his mistress' family, or as completely perverse that he would pursue the interests of enslaved enemies. Agamemnon certainly thinks that the army would interpret any hint of hostility, on Agamemnon's part, towards Polymestor as a *charis* for Cassandra (855).[471]

It does appear that unofficial sexual relationships could incur bonds of obligation. In Sophocles' *Ajax*, Tecmessa's plea to the hero not to end his own life (485-524) stresses his responsibility to her because of their sexual relationship.[472] Tecmessa begins by emphasising to Ajax that she has been enslaved by him (489-90), has shared his bed (491: τὸ σὸν λέχος ξυνῆλθον), and is well-disposed to his interests (491: εὖ φρονῶ τἀ σά), therefore, he has obligations to her.[473] She supplicates him 'by both Zeus of the hearth and your bed in which you have intercourse with me' (492-493: καί σ᾽ ἀντιάζω πρός τ᾽ ἐφεστίου Διὸς/ εὐνῆς τε τῆς σῆς, ἣ συνηλλάχθης ἐμοί). Tecmessa's mention of Zeus who protects family and household in the same breath as her appeal to their bed and sexual relationship demonstrates the power she believes the sexual relationship should have over him.

Tecmessa stresses that Ajax is her only protection, and as such she would be endangered by his death, and at risk of humiliation from his enemies, which would bring shame on Ajax and his family. It is her former status as Ajax's 'bed-mate' (501: ὁμευνέτιν), not as the mother of his child, that will provide her new masters with ammunition to mock her, if Ajax kills himself. His failure to protect his sexual partner would undermine his honour and the heroic code by which he

---

[470] On the criteria of legitimate marriage and the status of other forms of sexual unions see Vernant 1980: 45-70, especially p. 54, '[t]he status of women. . . depended to a large extent upon the *time* or honour to which they were held by the head of the family.'

[471] Segal 1981: 136 offers a good definition of *charis* as a 'word, which denotes the bond of affection between men, spans both the closest human relations and remoter social obligations.'

[472] Tecmessa is a war-captive, who has occupied that status for a number of years and has an infant child by Ajax. It does seem as though a bond of affection has grown between the pair and Tecmessa is never portrayed as having been unwilling or reluctant in her relationship with Ajax. This speech is part of a larger scene between Tecmessa and Ajax (430-595) which has been recognised since the time of the scholiasts to have drawn heavily on the farewell scene between Andromache and Hector in Homer's *Iliad* (6.390-502). Tecmessa's speech draws heavily on that of Andromache (407-439) and Hector (441-465), as well as picking up on themes used in Priam's and Hecuba's appeal to Hector in Hom. *Il*. 22.31-92. See Easterling 1984; Garner 1990: 51-52, 58-59; Farmer 1998: 25-33.

[473] Easterling 1984: 3.

lives, bringing shame upon him and his family (505: σοὶ δ᾽ αἰσχρὰ τἄπη ταῦτα καὶ τῷ σῷ γένει), something which we have learnt from his preceding speech Ajax is eager to avoid (470-474).

After considering the effect of his death on his parents and son (506-513), Tecmessa once again returns to her own plight. She recapitulates the arguments with which she opened her speech: that he is her only protection, and she has given him pleasure (514-521). This leads onto her claim that '*charis* always begets *charis*' (522: χάρις χάριν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τίκτουσ᾽ ἀεί). Tecmessa is here referring to erotic *charis*, as it comes immediately after her claim to have given Ajax pleasure, and she uses the 'metaphor of "begetting."'[474] In the final part of Tecmessa's speech she challenges Ajax's concept of *eugeneia*,[475] arguing that a man can only be noble if he remembers the benefits he has received. This sentiment following on so closely from her statement about *charis* strongly suggests that in appreciating these benefits a man is obliged to repay them, in this case by providing Tecmessa and his family with security and protection.[476]

Tecmessa's emphasis is always on the sexual relationship itself, not as we may expect, in regards to her status as the mother of Ajax's child. Although she mentions his son on a number of occasions nowhere does she stress her maternity of Eurysaces. She does, however, make the connection implicit when she links his fate to her own in lines 499 and 513, adding more force to her claims.[477] It is the sexual relationship itself, therefore, and not any issue resulting from the relationship, that incurs the obligation.

As Easterling (1984) has stated, Tecmessa's speech is 'a carefully-designed reply to Ajax's.'[478] The strength in Tecmessa's argument is demonstrated by her utilisation of the heroic code so important to Ajax himself. She appeals to his *timē* and *aidōs*, manipulating her arguments to stress 'his co-operative obligations to his dependents' over Ajax's concern with the competitive aspects of heroic honour.[479] Tecmessa's speech indicates that Cassandra's consent and Hecuba's representation of her as an active partner in the relationship may make Agamemnon more likely to view her interests favourably.

---

[474] Segal 1981: 136.
[475] Easterling 1984: 4; Blundell 1989: 75; Zanker 1992: 23; Cairns 1993: 233-234.
[476] Cairns 1993: 233.
[477] Winnington-Ingram 1980: 29.
[478] Easterling 1984: 2, 8 n. 9, citing Stanford 1963; Kirkwood 1965; Winnington-Ingram 1980: 29-32.
[479] Cairns 1993: 232; Gill 1996: 208-209.

Another reference to *charis* is made under completely different circumstances: Creusa thinks Apollo owes her *charis* in Euripides' *Ion* (913-914) after a single instance of sexual violence. Creusa's claim to *charis* demonstrates that whether Cassandra was a willing sexual partner or not, her acquiescence is not a pre-requisite for claiming *charis*.[480]

Chorus of Trojan Women

In this play the Chorus is made up of recently enslaved Trojan women. From their first speech we get a hint of their plight, and the violence they have experienced and still threatens them (98-103):

> Ἑκάβη, σπουδῇ πρός σ᾽ ἐλιάσθην
> τὰς δεσποσύνους σκηνὰς προλιποῦσ᾽,
> ἵν᾽ ἐκληρώθην καὶ προσετάχθην
> δούλη, πόλεως ἀπελαυνομένη
> τῆς Ἰλιάδος, λόγχης αἰχμῇ
> δοριθήρατος πρὸς Ἀχαιῶν.

The stress laid on their new condition in this passage is great, and obviously designed to gain the sympathy of the audience, as well as stressing the new slave and commodified status of these women. There are no fewer than three words or phrases that designate the women as slaves, as well as three references to being captured by the spear. Particularly interesting is δοριθήρατος ('hunted and taken by the spear'), which appears to have been coined specifically for this play.[481] The language and repetition emphasises their powerlessness, as well as the violent nature of their seizure and the threat of violence to which they are vulnerable as slaves. Though there is no direct reference to sexual violence in this passage I believe it would have been implicitly perceived by the audience.

The First Stasimon (444-483) also stresses their new status as slaves and property (448-449), to be transported to wherever the Greeks choose. The risk of sexual violence is not mentioned

---

[480] *Pace* Scodel 1998: 144: 'the man's willingness to treat the sexual relationship as imposing obligations on him depends on the woman's willingness to acquiesce.' The woman's acquiescence and full transfer of loyalty would add further weight to her claim to *charis*, note that Tecmessa's assertion that she was well-disposed to Ajax's interests (Soph. *Aj*. 490-493) precedes her claim to *charis* by thirty lines, and there is no hint of mutuality in the erotic relationship just prior to the appeal to *charis*; *contra* Synodinou 1987: 104. For the reciprocal notion of erotic *charis* operating between unequal partners in earlier poetry see MacLachlan 1993: 56-72.

[481] Mossman 1995: 71 and n. 8. It is only used again in *Tro*. 574.

directly, but I believe Euripides manipulates the contents of the passage in order to keep their new sexual status firmly in the minds of the audience. Euripides has the Chorus imagine themselves in their future servile lives taking part in the worship of the virgin-goddesses Athena and Artemis, particularly in aspects of their worship normally associated with young unmarried (i.e. virgin) citizen girls.[482] Rosivach (1975) argues that by making this association Euripides 'leaves the impression of sexual abstinence as part of their servitude in Greece.'[483] However, their hopes for a chaste future in Greece are in vain, and they can no more achieve this than actually take part in the cult celebrations reserved for the free and virginal citizen girls. The impossibility of their assumption of virginal roles is firmly realised in the last part of the ode where we learn the Chorus are already mothers (475). The ode ends with the word *thalamos* which can mean, and is later used to denote, 'bedroom.' The full phrase Ἅιδα θαλάμους not only refers to the city of Troy itself, where the women's husbands, who shared their bedrooms, lie dead among its ruins, but also to their only alternative to enslavement, namely death and marriage to Hades.[484] I believe this stasimon prefigures the more obvious sexual imagery we see in the Third Stasimon. It hints at the captive women's former marital sexuality, and a sexuality that for them is now inescapable, even in death, to which Polyxena has gone in order to avoid the humiliation of a sexual union with a slave. Far from being a 'happy travelogue'[485] this ode allows the Chorus to begin to come to terms with the realities of their future social and sexual status, while eliciting the sympathy of the audience by placing themselves in roles carried out by their young daughters.

The Third Stasimon indicates more clearly the vulnerability of the Chorus to sexual violence during the sack of Troy and is an 'eroticization of the violence of war.'[486] I shall offer a detailed reading of lines 905-942:

> σὺ μέν, ὦ πατρὶς Ἰλιάς,
> τῶν ἀπορθήτων πόλις οὐκέτι λέξῃ·
> τοῖον Ἑλλάνων νέφος ἀμφί σε κρύπτει
> δορὶ δὴ δορὶ πέρσαν.
> ἀπὸ δὲ στεφάναν κέκαρ-

[482] For the evidence concerning these religious rites being practised by free girls see Rosivach 1975: 354-358.
[483] Rosivach 1975: 354.
[484] Rosivach 1975: 358.
[485] Gellie 1980: 42.
[486] Segal 1993: 173.

σαι πύργων, κατὰ δ᾽ αἰθάλου
κηλῖδ᾽ οἰκτροτάταν κέχρωσαι.
τάλαιν᾽, οὐκέτι σ᾽ ἐμβατεύσω.

μεσονύκτιος ὠλλύμαν,
ἦμος ἐκ δείπνων ὕπνος ἡδὺς ἐπ᾽ ὄσσοις
σκίδναται, μολπᾶν δ᾽ ἄπο καὶ χοροποιὸν
θυσιᾶν καταπαύσας
πόσις ἐν θαλάμοις ἔκει-
το, ξυστὸν δ᾽ ἐπὶ πασσάλῳ,
ναύταν οὐκέθ᾽ ὁρῶν ὅμιλον
Τροίαν Ἰλιάδ᾽ ἐμβεβῶτα.

ἐγὼ δὲ πλόκαμον ἀναδέτοις
μίτραισιν ἐρρυθμιζόμαν
χρυσέων ἐνόπτρων λεύσσουσ᾽ ἀτέρμονας εἰς αὐγάς,
ἐπιδέμνιος ὡς πέσοιμ᾽ ἐς εὐνάν.
ἀνὰ δὲ κέλαδος ἔμολε πόλιν·
κέλευσμα δ᾽ ἦν κατ᾽ ἄστυ Τροίας τόδ᾽· Ὦ
παῖδες Ἑλλάνων, πότε δὴ πότε τὰν
Ἰλιάδα σκοπιὰν
πέρσαντες ἥξετ᾽ οἴκους;

λέχη δὲ φίλια μονόπεπλος
λιποῦσα, Δωρὶς ὡς κόρα,
σεμνὰν προσίζουσ᾽ οὐκ ἤνυσ᾽ Ἄρτεμιν ἁ τλάμων·
ἄγομαι δὲ θανόντ᾽ ἰδοῦσ᾽ ἀκοίταν
τὸν ἐμὸν ἅλιον ἐπὶ πέλαγος·
πόλιν τ᾽ ἀποσκοποῦσ᾽, ἐπεὶ νόστιμον
ναῦς ἐκίνησεν πόδα καί μ᾽ ἀπὸ γᾶς
ὥρισεν Ἰλιάδος,
τάλαιν᾽ ἀπεῖπον ἄλγει.

As Segal (1993) has shown, by beginning with the sack of the city and the imagery of its torn ‘veil’ of towers Euripides ‘immediately establishes the analogy between the (figurative) rape of the city

and the actual violation of its women.'[487] The 'cropping' is reminiscent of the Greek tradition of those in mourning cutting their hair, emphasising that these women are in mourning for their husbands and families.[488] It is also a physical sign of the women's enslavement and their reduced status.

From this distressing scene of a city in ruins we switch to a picture of the women's previous idyllic life, and the peace and security they felt just before the sack of Troy. Fooled by the Greeks' ruse into thinking they were victorious, the Trojans were caught completely off-guard after their victory celebrations. Husbands who had previously spent many nights on watch were lounging in their bedrooms, their weapons put aside, waiting for their wives to join them in the marital bed. The women meanwhile were preparing for bed, arranging their neatly braided hair in front of gold mirrors. This scene not only highlights the luxurious lifestyle which these now enslaved women previously led,[489] but the stress on the arrangement of the hair I believe is in order to prefigure the sack of the city and their risk of sexual violation during this process. It alludes to the physically violent aspect of enslavement, when women are often imagined as being dragged by their hair, their veils and head-dresses, symbols of their status and fidelity, cast aside.

The many references to the marital bed and bedroom,[490] especially the phrase λέχη δὲ φίλια (933) suggests a loving and mutual sexual bond within the legitimate marriage. The phrase serves to emphasise the sexual violation and violence which the women of the Chorus are at risk of during the sack of the city, and in their lives as slaves. It contrasts previously amicable and mutual sexual relationships with the hostile beds and enforced sexual relations the captive-women will endure in the future.[491] We hear of the women going through the streets of the city, barely clothed 'like a Dorian girl' (934), which is surely meant to emphasise their sexual vulnerability and incite pity and sympathy for their plight among the audience. They tell of supplicating the goddess

[487] Segal 1993: 173: 'Euripides here draws on the Homeric analogy between breaking the *krêdemnon* (veil) of the city's towers and the tearing the *krêdemnon* that protects a matron's chastity.' Cf. Hom. *Il*. 22.469-472; Nagler 1974: 44-60. Archilochus F23 uses the metaphor of his body as a captured city to describe the power the woman he desires has over him. The references to his city/body as having never been sacked by a man, and the woman having captured it with her spear (cf. 'Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes'* section), increase the sexual aspect of this metaphor.
[488] Mossman 1995: 89.
[489] Mossman 1995: 89.
[490] Eur. *Hec*. 919, 927, 933.
[491] Mossman 1995: 89-90 reads the references to the marital bed and the head-dress as representing wealth and 'honourable and loving security... [which] contrasts bitterly with the insecurity of slavery.' However, I firmly believe the contrast is made between the circumstances of the sexual relations of the women in their married and enslaved states.

Artemis, recalling the First Stasimon in which they hoped to be dedicated to her service upon reaching Greece. Here the protection of virginity and chastity are merged yet again, but in this passage we learn of the futility of their optimism, they are led away, their husbands having died. There is no one left to protect them from the servitude and sexual violation they now face.[492]

The imagery in this ode is surely employed to increase the *pathos* of the Chorus' situation and heighten the sympathy the audience feels for them. For this imagery to have its full effect it must follow that the Athenians saw loving and mutually consensual sexual relationships as preferable, and at the same time could feel sympathy for those in enforced sexual relationships.

Hecuba dramatizes the effects a city's fall has upon its women. The women are enslaved, and liable to death and sexual violation. The violence of these processes is evident in the songs of the Chorus and account of Polyxena's death. Throughout the play the former idyllic lives and high statuses as respectable wives and daughters of citizens are stressed to emphasise the *pathos* of their current situation.

In the case of Cassandra we see what may be in store for favoured captive-women. Although she is clearly socially (if not physically) compelled to carry on a sexual relationship with Agamemnon he is presented as being concerned with her interests and treating her well, which may in the eyes of the audience remove any negative connotations his relationship with her would have, and mean it would not be regarded as wrong.

Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*

Seven against Thebes is set in the prelude to the assault on the city of Thebes. The Chorus is made of up Theban women, frightened by the preparations for the siege and the thought that the city will fall and they will be enslaved (253). In the First Stasimon (288-368) the Chorus vividly imagine the consequences for the city and its inhabitants if it should fall:[493] the slaughter of the men

[492] Segal 1993: 173-174.

[493] Thalmann 1978: 102, recognises that the Chorus represents the city as a whole. *Contra* Cameron 1971: 84, who thinks that for the Chorus 'the threat is directed not so much against Thebes as a state but rather against themselves personally,' although he does acknowledge that 'the threat. . . is a real one' (33). Valakas 1993: 68 points out that these events are meant to be perceived as imminent and direct threats to the Chorus themselves from the use of the verbs προταρβῶ (332) and προλέγω (336). I am inclined to follow Thalmann: the Chorus is not oblivious to the fate of the men and children in the First Stasimon or the city itself. As I shall demonstrate, Aeschylus represents the city and its women as analogous. I completely disagree with Byrne's (1997) reading of this play, which interprets the Chorus as 'politically subversive'

and children, the burning of the city and ruination of the food supplies, and their own enslavement and sexual violation. This imagery considerably develops the *pathos* of the play, and no doubt secures the audience's sympathy and pity for the women.

As we saw in *Trojan Women* and *Hecuba*, the sack and destruction of the city, and the enslavement and sexual violation of its women, are analogous. The city is described in terms that also apply to the women, and the women's capture and sexual violation is the ultimate symbol of the city's desolation (321-332):[494]

οἰκτρὸν γὰρ πόλιν ὧδ᾽ ὠγυγίαν
Ἄϊδᾳ προϊάψαι, δορὸς ἄγ᾽ραν
δουλίαν, ψαφαρᾷ σποδῷ
ὑπ᾽ ἀνδρὸς Ἀχαιοῦ θεόθεν
περθομέναν ἀτίμως,
τὰς δὲ κεχειρωμένας ἄγεσθαι, ἐέ,
νέας τε καὶ παλαιάς
ἵππηδὸν πλοκάμων, περιρ-
ρηγνυμένων φαρέων· βοᾷ δ᾽
ἐκκενουμένα πόλις,
λαΐδος ὀλλυμένας μειξοθρόου.
βαρείας τοι τύχας προταρβῶ.

Although the sexual violation of the women is not explicitly mentioned in this passage, the language and imagery are highly evocative of sexual violence. Like the city they are also the 'prey of the spear.' The stress on the dishonourable destruction being wrought by an Achaean man (ἀνδρὸς Ἀχαιοῦ) implies a sexual context, *aner* often being used to refer to a husband or sexual partner. It suggests the city, like its women, is being sexually violated, and foreshadows their violation. As Cameron (1982) has pointed out 'ἄγεσθαι hints at marriage, but κεχειρωμένας coupled with it emphasizes the forced union.'[495] The image of women being dragged by their hair and their clothes being torn speaks clearly of the violent nature of the situation. The comparison of the women to horses increases the likely reception by the audience of a sexual component to their plight; the vocabulary of horse training, taming, and riding being used

(144), and argues that Aeschylus uses their 'fear of rape. . . [to signal] the problematic nature of women's presence in the *polis*' (149).
[494] Cf. Hom. *Il*. 2.389-392.
[495] Cameron 1971: 82.

euphemistically of sexual intercourse.[496] I would also like to suggest that line 331 is euphemistically referring to the women crying out while they are sexually violated. Verbs of destruction and undoing are frequently used to refer to sexual activity, particularly illicit and unsanctioned sexual encounters, while verbs of mingling are used to describe sexual intercourse in general.[497] Combined with the commodification and dehumanisation of the women, implied by the reference to them as 'spoils,' the unequal and non-consensual aspect of the union is emphasised. Such emotive and violent imagery of the pain and suffering of the captured women is surely meant to elicit the sympathy of the audience, and add to the *pathos* of the play.

The violent and violating nature of these women's sexual plight is stressed in the next passage, which emphasises the unlawfulness of girls who are not yet eligible for marriage being taken away as slaves at risk of sexual violation (333-342):

> κλαυτὸν δ᾽ ἀρτιτρόφους ὠμοδρόπους
> νομίμων προπάροιθεν διαμεῖψαι
> δωμάτων στυγερὰν ὁδόν·
> ἦ τὸν φθίμενον γὰρ προλέγω
> βέλτερα τῶνδε πράσσειν.
> πολλὰ γάρ, εὖτε πτόλις δαμασθῇ, ἐέ,
> δυστυχῆ τε πράσσει·
> ἄλλος δ᾽ ἄλλον ἄγει, φονεύ-
> ει, τὰ δὲ πυρφορεῖ· καπνῷ
> {δὲ} χραίνεται πόλισμ᾽ ἅπαν·[498]

The comparison of the journey of their enslavement to the journey they should have been taking to the home of a lawful husband highlights the sexual aspect of their lives as war-captives and the perverted nature of this for the women of a Greek *polis*.[499] The vocabulary used in this passage is also used as metaphors and euphemisms of sexual intercourse and sexual violation. 'Plucking' fruit

---

[496] Cameron 1971: 82. Horse imagery is used elsewhere in tragedy and other genres to stress the sexual maturity and vulnerability of young women. Anacreon *PMG* 346 and 417; Henderson [1975] 1990: 165; Calame 1997: 106-107, 238-244; Calame 1999: 156, 165; Hutchinson 2001: 282-283; Rosenmeyer 2004: 170-177; Griffith 2006: 324-326; Topper 2010 especially 112 and 116.

[497] Scafuro 1990: 128; Henderson [1975] 1990: 156, 175. Hutchinson's (1985: 97) suggested emendation of ὀλλυμένας in line 331 to οὐλομένας, if accepted, need not change the sexual connotation of this word, which can also be translated as 'ruined.'

[498] 336: West follows Page's ἦ over τί in ΣΩ; see West 1990: 112.

[499] Perverted sexual relationships and sexual violence may have been a theme within the trilogy: *Laius* and *Oedipus* may have mentioned Laius' abduction and sexual assault of Chrysippus as the origin of Apollo's curse; see Lloyd-Jones 1971: 120-121. The incestuous relationship between Oedipus and Jocasta also fits this theme.

or flowers is used as a metaphor for sexual violation and loss of virginity, and often results in the plucked object being ruined or destroyed.[500] Ripeness and fruit metaphors are used to denote sexual maturity, desirability, and female genitalia.[501] Aeschylus seems to favour the use of this imagery in relation to non-consensual unions and sexual violation and uses it *Suppliants*.[502]

The word used to designate the 'conquered' city could extend the analogy between the city and its women, while carry a sexual connotation: δαμάζω ('tame') can also be applied to sexual relations, sometimes with connotations of sexual violence and unwillingness on the part of the female partner.[503]

The language of burning and setting things on fire can refer to sexual passion, and used as metaphors for sexual intercourse, the violence and intensity of which may imply sexual violence.[504] As in the earlier passage, the city and its women may be analogous. The smoke that stains the city could be a metaphor for the sexual violation its women will endure in their slave lives; χραίνω is used by Polyxena to describe her envisioned enforced sexual relationship with a fellow-slave.[505] The images chosen by the poet to emphasise the violence of the acts and passivity of the victims, who like the city itself, are helpless to resist the onslaught of the conquering army and the destruction it brings.

Yet again we get a sense that sexual violation implicit in the life of a slave is regarded by the Athenians as a worse fate than death (336-337). We would hardly expect such a view to be expressed if Athenians did not regard sexual violation as having negative consequences for the victim and if they did not have sympathy for those who were victims of sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships.

The women focus on the suffering of the city under siege for the next nineteen lines: the killing of men and infants, and the plundering and ruination of the city's resources. They know they will not be the only ones affected by the sack. They end the First Stasimon looking to their fate

[500] Seaford 1987: 111-112; Carson 1990: 145-148; Deacy 2013: 399; Sappho F105a-c.
[501] Henderson [1975] 1990: 134-136; Carson 1990: 145-148; Sappho 105a.
[502] Aesch. *Supp*. 663, 998-999, 1015.
[503] Hom. *Il*. 3.301, 18.432. The noun *damar* ('wife') is also derived from it; see Griffith 2006: 324.
[504] Henderson [1975] 1990: 177-178. The proposed emendation of πυρφορεῖ to πυρπολεῖ ('burn with fire'), as proposed by Heimsoeth 1861 and accepted by Sommerstein 2008 I, does not change the imagery, and if correct may strengthen it.
[505] Eur. *Hec*. 366.

after they are taken away from the city, as slaves, with no hope of a legitimate marriage, only the sexual advances of their master (363-368):

> δμωΐδες δὲ καινοπήμονες νέαι
> †τλήμονες εὐνὰν αἰχμάλωτον
> ἀνδρὸς εὐτυχοῦντος†, ὡς
> δυσμενοῦς ὑπερτέρου
> ἐλπίς ἐστι νύκτερον τέλος μολεῖν
> παγκλαύτων ἀλγέων ἐπίρροθον.

There are issues with the first three lines of this quotation, the text having been corrupted and a verb apparently being lost.[506] However, I believe we get a sense of the picture the poet was trying to portray. The fate of these women is the zenith of the besieged city's sufferings. The sexual violation of the women being represented as the ultimate pathetic image shows that the Athenians did regard victims sympathetically, and conceived of the sexual violation of women on a large scale as a negative act, a socially degrading experience, and the ultimate symbol of destruction and collapse of society.

Throughout the First Stasimon the enforced sexual relationships which the Chorus fear are referred to and compared with marriage. It has been argued that the Chorus have 'an antipathy to marriage even by consent.'[507] However, as observed in the readings of the other plays, it is standard in tragedy to use the vocabulary and imagery of marriage to refer to enforced sexual relations. This does not indicate hostility to marriage in general. As there is no Greek word for 'rape'[508] the vocabulary and imagery of marriage and sexual relations had to be adapted. In tragedy, and *Seven against Thebes* in particular, this also serves the purpose of increasing the *pathos* of the situation by evoking in their minds the sort of lives and marriages the victims should have enjoyed, in contrast to the ones which they will be forced to endure.

The women's susceptibility to sexual violence not only appears in the First Stasimon but features in their response to descriptions of the heroes in the 'shield scene' (452-456):

---

[506] I am inclined to take Sommerstein's (2008 I) suggestion, derived from the evidence of the scholia to M, of supplying οἴσουσι.
[507] Byrne 1997: 146.
[508] *Contra* Byrne 1997: 147, who claims ἁρπαγή 'is Greek for rape,' although she does qualify in n. 23 (159) that it 'means rape in a sense of *seizure*.' Cf. Introduction.

ὄλοιθ᾽ ὃς πόλῃ μεγάλ᾽ ἐπεύχεται,
κεραυνοῦ δέ νιν βέλος ἐπισχέθοι
πρὶν ἐμὸν εἰσθορεῖν δόμον πωλικῶν θ᾽
ἑδωλίων ὑπερκόπῳ
δορί ποτ᾽ ἐκλαπάξαι.

Cameron (1971) has recognised the sexual imagery in this passage, with the recurrence of the horse imagery with the use of πωλικῶν to refer to the girls and the 'phallic implications' of δορί.[509] As a metaphor for the erect penis, weapons such as spears and swords are not only apt in their shape but also as 'mechanical extensions of a man's strength and a means by which a man can exert his strength and will upon other (weaker) objects,'[510] implying the use of force and violence.

In *Seven against Thebes*, Aeschylus uses the Chorus to heighten the dramatic tension of the play. Their reactions to the preparations for the siege and the gathering enemy forces convey the seriousness and terror of the situation. Their predictions of the siege realistically describe what occurred when cities were sacked. The use of actual and euphemistic sexual imagery, as well as the stress on the violent and violating aspects in these events, is clearly meant to enhance the audience's sympathy for the Chorus and their fate. As a dramatic device its utilisation only makes sense if the audience would have had sympathy for victims of sexual violence.

Unlike the other plays studied, in *Seven against Thebes* the sexual aggressors are represented negatively, and they are not portrayed as being motivated by sexual desire. I believe the reason for this is the sexual violence of the enemy is meant to increase the audience's already negative perception of them. This is an invading force of Greeks, besieging another Greek city, as seen through the eyes of the free inhabitants of that city. Aeschylus' use of the sexual violence employed by the invading force to increase their negative characterisation demonstrates that under the wrong (i.e. negatively motivated) circumstances sexual violence was regarded as an act which would not only arouse sympathy for the victim but condemnation of the aggressor.[511]

[509] Cameron 1971: 83.
[510] Henderson [1975] 1990: 44, 120.
[511] Harris 2006d.

Euripides' *Children of Heracles*

This is another play, like *Hecuba*, in which a young woman prefers death by sacrifice to the risk of being taken in war, and subsequent sexual degradation she foresees as a consequence. There are further indicators that the spilling of the blood of a *parthenos* somehow corrupts her virginity, and that the act of sacrifice can be compared to sexual violation. However, the representation of the death of Heracles' daughter differs from that of Polyxena in a number of significant ways, which I believe are due to the fact that she is still of free status.

The Parthenos in this play offers her life to be sacrificed to Kore in order to secure the victory of the Athenians and her family over the tyrant Eurystheus, who has persecuted them. Primarily she does this for the sake of her brothers (532), and because she is mindful of her noble descent from Heracles.[512] She also mentions another factor: to escape the sexual violation she sees as inevitable for herself if they lose the battle and she is captured (511-514):

> κάλλιον, οἶμαι, τῆσδ᾽ — ὃ μὴ τύχοι ποτέ —
> πόλεως ἁλούσης χεῖρας εἰς ἐχθρῶν πεσεῖν
> κἄπειτ᾽ ἄτιμα πατρὸς οὖσαν εὐγενοῦς
> παθοῦσαν Ἅιδην μηδὲν ἧσσον εἰσιδεῖν.

Heracles' daughter is under no illusions about the fate that awaits a war-captive and prefers to be sacrificed to Kore rather than meet this fate. The audience's comprehension and acceptance of the girl's desire to die rather than risk sexual violation indicates that they did appreciate the experience of victims of sexual violence and would feel sympathy for their plight.

The Parthenos also seems to be acutely aware of the sexual vulnerability that the status of human sacrifice will also bestow on her, as she commands Iolaus to accompany her and act as her attendant (560-561):

> ἔπου δέ, πρέσβυ· σῇ γὰρ ἐνθανεῖν χερὶ
> θέλω, πέπλοις δὲ σῶμ᾽ ἐμὸν κρύψον παρών.

She wishes for him to cover her body after the slaughter and protect her from the gaze of any onlookers, as Polyxena covered herself in *Hecuba*. When Iolaus says he cannot stand by while she is slaughtered (564), she beseeches him to ask Demophon 'not to let my life expire in the hands of

[512] Wißmann 1997: 310-315, 323, 332-336, demonstrates that the Parthenos adopts male heroic standards though her voluntary self-sacrifice, but only because she finds herself in a situation in which it would be impossible for her to fulfil the expectations of female excellence. Through the passive manner of her death she once again conforms to feminine gender ideals.

men, but in the hands of women,'[513] a request which Demophon immediately grants her (567). Unlike Polyxena she will not have the army as an audience for the mutilation of her body, but only women. Indeed, her actual death is not reported in the play,[514] so the play's audience does not witness, even by proxy of a messenger speech, her violation. I believe the reason for this lies in the status of Heracles' daughter at the time of her sacrifice. She is not slave like Polyxena, but free, and the Athenian audience would have regarded even a description of metaphorical violation of a free Greek *parthenos* as distasteful.[515]

The idea that the Parthenos is indeed regarded as losing her virginity is made explicit in the text in lines 591-592:

> τάδ᾽ ἀντὶ παίδων ἐστί μοι κειμήλια
> καὶ παρθενείας.

As Loraux has argued, the 'perfect *parthenos*' of this play loses her *partheneia* through the sacrificial act of having her throat cut.[516] The act of piercing and resultant loss of blood equates to sexual violation. The Athenians' sympathy for this aspect of the girl's death, not just the death itself, is made plain by the reference to the loss of her virginity. Euripides' evocation of the sacrifical victim's sexual vulnerability and the implication of sacrifice as equating to sexual violation are used to increase the *pathos* of this scene. This is highly suggestive of the fact that the audience would have felt sympathy for victims of sexual violation, even if it was merely metaphorical.

Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*

Recent scholars have made much of the marriage imagery in *Agamemnon*, especially in relation to the presentation of Cassandra.[517] However, there are surprisingly few direct references to

---

[513] 565-566: μή μ᾽ ἐν ἀρσένων/ ἀλλ᾽ ἐν γυναικῶν χερσὶνἐκπνεῦσαι βίον.
[514] Some scholars have found the absence of a description of the sacrifice 'unusual' (Wilkins 1993: xxvii), and some have tried to account for it by arguing for a lacuna after 629 (Kirchhoff 1855) or even the loss of a complete scene (Wilamowitz 1935b: 82-109).
[515] Although the lead up to Iphigenia's sacrifice is recounted by the Chorus in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* the moment of her actual slaughter is not described but euphemistically passed over (Aesch. *Ag*. 248).
[516] Loraux 1987: 39-40.
[517] Seaford 1987: 128, argues that there 'is a sustained evocation of the negative elements in the situation of the bride,' namely Cassandra being taken from her paternal home; arriving at her 'husband's' home in a chariot with him; lamenting; being welcomed outside the house and persuasion being used to entice her to leave the chariot; being compared to an animal being bridled or yoked; and the imagery of unveiling. Cf. Taplin 1977: 302-306 and Jenkins 1983, who compare Clytemnestra waiting at the door of the house to the

the eponymous protagonist's relationship with the war-captive in the dialogue of the text. There is no explicit indicator of Agamemnon's motivation in conducting a sexual relationship with Cassandra. Indeed, it is not even certain that a sexual relationship has yet commenced.[518] However, Cassandra's sexual vulnerability, not just to Agamemnon but also to Apollo, is obvious. It is employed by the poet to heighten the audience's sympathy for Cassandra, a device which would only be effective if the audience had sympathy for the victims of sexual violence.

Reticence in referring to Cassandra's sexual status is perhaps hardly surprising as Agamemnon is introducing her to his wife. Agamemnon asks Clytemnestra to welcome their new slave graciously (950, πρευμενῶς) into the house, which may suggest he is at least attuned to the possibility of some sexual jealousy on the part of his wife. Lines 954-955 confirm that she is no ordinary slave, but a high status prize:

> αὕτη δὲ, πολλῶν χρημάτων ἐξαίρετον
> ἄνθος, στρατοῦ δώρημ᾽ ἐμοὶ ξυνέσπετο.

Agamemnon's sexual interest and relationship with Cassandra may be implied in the reference to her accompanying him (ἐμοὶ ξυνέσπετο), and her youthful beauty (ἄνθος).[519] Clytemnestra makes no reply to this. She seems not to treat Cassandra differently than she would any other slave, although this may be a ruse, in order to lure Agamemnon into a false sense of security.

The Chorus makes no obvious direct comment about Cassandra's vulnerability to the sexual desire of Agamemnon. They do have pity for her plight, as is evident when they try to get her to leave the carriage (1069-1071):

> ἐγὼ δ᾽, ἐποικτίρω γάρ, οὐ θυμώσομαι.
> ἴθ᾽ ὦ τάλαινα· τόνδ᾽ ἐρημώσασ᾽ ὄχον,
> ε<ἴ>κουσ᾽ ἀνάγκῃ τῆδε, καίνισον ζυγόν.

---

groom's mother waiting to welcome the couple as portrayed in vase paintings. Rehm 1994: 44 lists the comparisons noted by Seaford, and also Clytemnestra's mention of the ritual of incorporation into the household undertaken by both slaves and brides. Mitchell-Boyask 2006, argues that although visually presented as the bride of Agamemnon, and received as such by other characters, Cassandra's speech in the play reveals that she perceives herself as the bride of Apollo.

[518] Debnar 2010, believes that Cassandra is a virgin. I agree that Aeschylus portrays Cassandra as a *virginal figure* to increase the audience's sympathy for her, but I do not think the audience need to believe she *is* a virgin; cf. Iole in *Women of Trachis*, who *appears* to be a virgin when she is introduced into the household, but we later find out that Heracles has already had intercourse with her.

[519] See Seaford 1987: 111-112 for flower and plant imagery related to the depictions of brides and wedding in Greek literature.

On a closer reading we may note that the Chorus do not specify slavery as the fate they pity, or the thing to which Cassandra is being yoked. Indeed the yoking imagery and vocabulary is used of marriage and sexual unions.[520] Aeschylus may be being deliberately vague here, alluding to the sexual relationship with Agamemnon of which the audience is aware from epic, though the Chorus is possibly not meant to be, and so their comments could be interpreted as dramatic irony. Or it may simply be that slavery and the expectation of the sexual availability of slaves was so intertwined in the Greek psyche that the Chorus themselves are referring to both. If Cassandra's sexual vulnerability is implied in these lines it is further evidence that the Athenians had sympathy for the victims of enforced sexual relations.

In Cassandra's dialogue with the Chorus, they discuss the source of her prophetic power and the nature of her dealings with Apollo. In doing so, Cassandra further reveals her sexual vulnerability (1206-1212):

[K]: ἀλλ᾽ ἦν παλαιστὴς κάρτ᾽ ἐμοὶ πνέων χάριν.
[X]: ἦ καὶ τέκνων εἰς ἔργον ἦλθετον νόμῳ;
[K]: ξυναινέσασα Λοξίαν ἐψευσάμην.
[X]: ἤδη τέχνησιν ἐνθέοις ἡρημένη;
[K]: ἤδη πολίταις πάντ᾽ ἐθέσπιζον πάθη.
[X]: πῶς δῆτ᾽ ἄνατος ἦσθα Λοξίου κότῳ;
[K]: ἔπειθον οὐδέν᾽ οὐδέν, ὡς τάδ᾽ ἤμπλακον.

Cassandra describes Apollo as a 'wrestler' (1206: παλαιστής). Fraenkel (1950) rightly stressed that this image relates to an actual physical struggle between the god and Cassandra.[521] The close physicality of her encounter with Apollo is indicated in the detail she provides of the god 'breathing his delight upon me' (1206). Her relationship with Apollo appears never to have been consummated, Cassandra having cheated the god by withdrawing her consent (1208).[522] However, the aggressive and violent aspect of the god's desire has been clearly demonstrated,[523] and her vulnerability to the violent sexual advances of the god is surely meant to enhance the audience's sympathy for her.

[520] See Seaford 1987: 111 and n. 58; Rehm 1994: 44, 172 n. 10.
[521] Fraenkel 1950 III: 555. See Henderson [1975] 1990: 169-170 for wrestling as a metaphor for sexual intercourse.
[522] *Contra* Kovacs 1987.
[523] Also noted by Mitchell-Boyask 2006: 273.

Morgan (1994) has suggested that Aeschylus wished 'to stress the element of consent' as befitting the characterisation of the god in the rest of the trilogy.[524] The poet's inclusion of this theme in relation to the sexual machinations of the god implies that the Athenian audience would have had some comprehension of women's consent to sexual intercourse. The use of language evocative of the Athenian marriage formula in line 1207,[525] and Cassandra's assumption in her reply that *her* consent was essential to the physical act of the union (despite the fact that the contract was generally between the groom and the bride's *kyrios*) may hint at the consent of the bride to a marriage was seen as desirable in fifth-century Athens.[526] Nevertheless, the compulsion Cassandra faced is never far away from the minds of the audience. Having withdrawn her consent, the Chorus recognises she would have incurred the god's ill-will (1211).

Though it is not substantiated by any other evidence in the play or trilogy, Cassandra interprets her imminent death as the result of Apollo's anger. She presents herself as the victim of the god's violence. The language Cassandra uses is evocative of sexual violence, when she announces, 'behold, Apollo himself is stripping me of my prophetic dress,' (1269-1270: ἰδοὺ δ᾽, Ἀπόλλων αὐτὸς οὑκδύων ἐμέ/ χρηστηρίαν ἐσθῆτ᾽). Having already learnt of the god's 'desire' (1204: ἱμέρῳ) for her and her wrestling with him (1206), Apollo stripping her of her clothes certainly has a sexual, and violent, implication.[527]

A few lines later Cassandra tells us, 'and now the prophet is destroying me, his prophetess, having led me to such a place of deadly misfortunes,' (1275-1276: καὶ νῦν ὁ μάντις μάντιν ἐκπράξας ἐμὲ/ ἀπήγαγ᾽ ἐς τοιάσδε θανασίμους τύχας). The imagery of a man leading a woman certainly has sexual connotations,[528] and verbs of destruction, as noted above, can be used of sexual violation.[529] Even Cassandra's prediction of her death fits that of a victim of sexual violation. She tells us, 'I am to be slaughtered in a hot bloody sacrifice' (1278: θερμῷ κοπείσης φοινίον

[524] Morgan 1994: 126, 'Apollo encourages Orestes to kill his mother but in the end the decision to do so must be his own.'
[525] Fraenkel 1950 III: 555.
[526] Cf. Harris 2015a.
[527] Mitchell-Boyask 2006: 273, remarks that Apollo's 'invisible assault on her. . . strongly itself suggests a rape,' but does not expand on this.
[528] Mitchell-Boyask 2006, relates this to the marriage imagery of the play, but as we have seen it is also used in descriptions of sexual violence, and the leading away of war-captives to lives of slavery and sexual vulnerability.
[529] See 'Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*' section; Scafuro 1990.

προσφάγματι). As we have seen in other instances of human sacrifice, Cassandra's bloody death symbolises sexual violation.[530] All this presents Cassandra as a sexually victimised and pitiable figure. For this imagery to have the optimum effect the audience must have had sympathy for victims of sexual violence.

After the deaths of Agamemnon and Cassandra, Clytemnestra reveals her knowledge of his sexual relationship with the war-captive (1438-1447):

> κεῖται γυναικὸς τῆσδε λυμαντήριος,
> Χρυσηΐδων μείλιγμα τῶν ὑπ᾽ Ἰλίῳ,
> ἥ τ᾽ αἰχμάλωτος ἥδε, καὶ τερασκόπος
> καὶ κοινόλεκτρος τοῦδε, θεσφατηλόγος
> πιστὴ ξύνευνος, ναυτίλων δὲ σελμάτων
> ἱστοτρίβης. ἄτιμα δ᾽ οὐκ ἐπραξάτην.
> ὃ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως, ἣ δέ τοι κύκνου δίκην
> τὸν ὕστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόον
> κεῖται, φιλήτωρ τοῦδ᾽· ἐμοὶ δ᾽ ἐπήγαγεν
> †εὐνῆς† παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς.

Clytemnestra criticises her husband for his sexual exploits during the campaign, but perhaps in keeping with the presentation of her perverse character she establishes herself as the victim in Agamemnon's sexual exploits. In her eyes it is she whom he has ruined (λυμαντήριος), not the captives he has violated, whom she perceives as being charmed (μείλιγμα), and seduced by Agamemnon. Indeed, she attributes to Cassandra an active role in her sexual relationship with Agamemnon: she is referred to in the nominative for much of the passage, and even in the masculine in 1446, as the lover (φιλήτωρ) of Agamemnon, portraying her as the active partner, and Agamemnon as the passive one, thereby emasculating him. This, however, was surely not received by the audience as an accurate representation of Cassandra's agency in her relationship with Agamemnon, but reflects Clytemnestra's own perversion of gender roles within the play. Indeed this passage is interpreted by some as an example of 'flyting,' a piece of invective and therefore not a statement of facts.[531] Credence is lent towards this interpretation by Aeschylus' use of the obscene ναυτίλων δὲ σελμάτων/ ἱστοτρίβης (1442-1443) in this passage, which is generally

[530] See 'Euripides' *Hecuba*' and 'Euripides' *Children of Heracles*' sections.
[531] Debnar 2010: 137; Moles 1979: 180; Martin 1989: 68-77.

interpreted as referring to Cassandra rubbing (τρίβειν) Agamemnon's erection (ἱστός) on board the ship.[532] This imagery draws attention to Cassandra's degraded social position and, after the sympathetic portrayal of her previously, would have surely heightened the *pathos* of her fate.

In the last line and a half it is uncertain who the subject of the verb is.[533] Cassandra has been referred to in the nominative for much of the preceding speech, but Agamemnon has just been referred to with τοῦδ᾽, which could indicate the switch of focus back to him.[534] I prefer to read Agamemnon as the subject. By switching her focus back to him Clytemnestra thus transforms Cassandra from a sexual subject to a sexual object. In doing so she simultaneously enhances her own masculine characteristics,[535] and further emasculates Agamemnon. She reverses not only the traditional gender roles, but their sexual roles too: Agamemnon had thought to bring Cassandra into the house to enjoy sexually, alongside his legitimate wife, but in killing them both Clytemnestra has not only thwarted him in this but also sexually violated Cassandra herself,[536] at least metaphorically, and this has given her pleasure in addition to the adulterous bed she had been sharing with Aegisthus.[537] Aeschylus shows Clytemnestra to be a truly perverted female character, that no one could possibly feel sympathy for, and so her victim, Cassandra, is made all the more sympathetic.[538]

The Cassandra we see in *Agamemnon* is the ultimate sexual victim, the object of divine infatuation, which, though never consummated, seals her destruction, the spear-captive, compelled

---

[532] Young 1964: 15; Koniaris 1980: 42; and Borthwick 1981: 1-2 all citing Strabo 8.6.20 for ἱστός used as a pun for an erect penis; also see Tyrrell 1980, and Henderson [1975] 1990: 176 for the erotic meaning of τρίβειν. *Contra* Diggle 1968: 2-3, who disagrees with Young's reading and interpretation as he does not believe that Aeschylus could be so vulgar. Diggle, however, does keep a sexual meaning to the line by emending ἱστοτρίβης to κοιτοτρίβης giving 'wearing out her bed of the ship's benches.'
This line may be intended to recall Hom. *Il.* 1.31, in which Agamemnon, refusing to ransom Chryseis to her father, Chryses, tells him that his daughter will work Agamemnon's loom and share his bed (ἱστὸν ἐποιχομένην καὶ ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιόωσαν). Bertolín 2008: 97, has argued that in this context 'the loom is correlated with women's general submission, and specifically with their sexual submission.' Greenberg 1993: 199 n. 12, believes that '[t]he possibility of taking *histon* (a rod or a pole used as a mast or a loom) in an obscene sense, while attractive, is weakened enormously by the lack of any persuasive parallel. Agamemnon may be crude, but he is probably not that crude.' It appears, however, that Clytemnestra is that crude. Her use of *histos* to refer to a 'mast' rather than 'loom,' which would be more appropriate to her gender, emphasises her perverted character and usurpation of masculine roles in the play.
[533] See Pulleyn 1997: 565-566 on the possible meanings of this passage and its erotic undertones.
[534] Denniston & Page 1957: 203-204.
[535] Aesch. *Ag*. 10-11, 351.
[536] Also recognised by Debnar 2010: 137-138. However, I do not agree with her that Cassandra needs to be perceived as a virgin for her slaughter to be a sexual violation. Indeed, if she was not a virgin this enhances the perverted nature of Clytemnestra's sacrifice.
[537] Debnar 2010: 137-138; Wohl 1998: 107; Vickers 1973: 381-382; Pulleyn 1997: 566; Moles 1979.
[538] Zeitlin 1965, sees Clytemnestra's murder of Cassandra as overstepping boundaries and invalidating her claim to righteous vengeance.

to please her master, and the metaphorically violated victim of a perverted sacrifice. It is these three aspects of Cassandra's life which Aeschylus stresses, suggesting that her sexual victimisation would gain the sympathy of the audience and add to the tragedy of her character's portrayal. This would only be dramatically effective if the audience would have had sympathy for those who were the victims of sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships.

Euripides' *Andromache*

As the title of this play suggests, Andromache is a central figure, who dominates the first half of the drama.[539] Consequently, Euripides' description of Andromache and her captive life is detailed. Euripides sets this play a number of years after the end of the Trojan War, in the household of Neoptolemus. As the play begins, Andromache is being persecuted by Neoptolemus' new and legitimate wife, Hermione, and her father, Menelaus. They believe Andromache is trying to usurp Hermione's position within the household to ensure her son becomes Neoptolemus' heir by using magic to make Hermione childless. At the beginning of the play they are taking advantage of the hero's absence in order to kill Andromache and her child (29-48).[540]

It is Andromache herself who opens the play by delivering the prologue. She is a sympathetic figure from the start of the tragedy, as her status as a suppliant at the altar of Thetis demonstrates.[541] Her account of her previous life as a princess, given as a legitimate wife to Hector and mother to his legitimate heir, is strongly contrasted to her present life: after seeing her husband and son killed, and her city destroyed, she was given to Neoptolemus as a war-prize after the Greeks' victory (1-15). Having been brought to a foreign land, she has lived for a number of years as Neoptolemus' slave, and become the mother of his illegitimate child (24-25):[542]

> κἀγὼ δόμοις τοῖσδ᾽ ἄρσεν᾽ ἐντίκτω κόρον,
> πλαθεῖσ᾽ Ἀχιλλέως παιδί, δεσπότῃ δ᾽ ἐμῷ.

[539] Despite this she may not appear after line 765 (even if she does her part is played by a mute) when the focus of the play switches from the plot against her life to the plot against Neoptolemus'. However, she is mentioned a number of times after she leaves the stage, and her and the child's futures are foretold in the epilogue (1243-1249).

[540] Though many critics refer to him as Molossos, the child is not actually named in the play.

[541] Indeed she remains as a suppliant until line 410, only leaving the altar when Menelaus threatens to kill her son if she does not.

[542] Even the concerned and sympathetic Peleus regards the child as illegitimate, 'having been born three times a bastard' (636: τρὶς νόθος πέφυκε), as his mother is not legitimately married to Neoptolemus, is a slave, and is foreign. This is, however, a fifth-century Athenian definition of illegitimacy.

We go on to discover that when Neoptolemus married Hermione, according to Andromache, he seems to have ended their sexual relationship (29-31):

> ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν Λάκαιναν Ἑρμιόνην γαμεῖ
> τοὐμὸν παρώσας δεσπότης δοῦλον λέχος,
> κακοῖς πρὸς αὐτῆς σχετλίοις ἐλαύνομαι.

Hermione (and possibly the Chorus) believe that the sexual relationship is on-going at the time of the play.[543] Whether Neoptolemus has recommenced his sexual relationship with Andromache, or the other characters simply imagine this is so, is unclear. Kovacs (1980) has argued vehemently in favour of the sexual relationship between Neoptolemus and Andromache never ceasing.[544] However, from the evidence in the text I believe it is impossible to know if the sexual relationship is meant to be seen as on-going at the time of the play as it simply does not matter for Euripides' purposes. Hermione simply needs to believe her position within the household is threatened. It does not reflect badly on Andromache if the sexual relationship with Neoptolemus is on-going, as she would have no choice in the matter. Euripides just needs to make clear that she is not intentionally trying to usurp Hermione's position in order to maintain her status as a sympathetic character.

Andromache's position as Neoptolemus' slave, and under compulsion to have sexual relations with him, though she is unwilling, is presented sympathetically by the poet in the prologue and throughout the play.[545] Andromache herself mentions the sexual aspect of her

[543] In lines 32-39 Andromache tells the audience that Hermione claims Andromache is poisoning her and wishes to supplant her position as wife; that she herself was never Neoptolemus' willing sexual partner, and has relinquished that role, though Hermione will not be persuaded. The Chorus speak of strife caused by double marriage in lines 120-125 and 465-470; they speak of Andromache and Hermione as rivals in 181-182; in 487 they refer to Andromache as ἑτέρῳ λέχει (literally, 'one of the two beds/spouses'); and they attribute the death sentence on Andromache and her child to her bed in lines 497-500. However, they are always sympathetic to Andromache (see below) and do not seem to believe that she is trying to supplant Hermione as mistress of the house. Hermione accuses Andromache of trying to supplant her in lines 155-157, and it is clear she thinks there is an existing sexual relationship between her and Neoptolemus in 170-173, 177-180, and 239. When Orestes asks Hermione at line 907 whether Neoptolemus loves another instead of her, Hermione replies that it is Andromache he loves. In lines 932-935 she claims that women visiting her home aroused her suspicions and indignation against a sexual relationship between Neoptolemus and Andromache. Menelaus certainly seems to believe his daughter's suspicions of an on-going sexual relationship between Andromache and her master, he speaks of Hermione being deprived of her husband in lines 370-371 and 672-673, and accuses Andromache of committing outrages and wrongs in lines 433-434 and 317-318, which presumably refer to Hermione's accusations that Andromache is making her childless and trying to usurp her position.

[544] Kovacs 1980: 15-18.

[545] *Contra* Kovacs 1980: 13-15.

relationship with her master on five occasions.[546] On two of those occasions she clearly stresses that she was an unwilling sexual partner. The first comes in the prologue (32-39):

> λέγει γὰρ ὥς νιν φαρμάκοις κεκρυμμένοις
> τίθημ᾽ ἄπαιδα καὶ πόσει μισουμένην,
> αὐτὴ δὲ ναίειν οἶκον ἀντ᾽ αὐτῆς θέλω
> τόνδ᾽, ἐκβαλοῦσα λέκτρα τἀκείνης βίᾳ·
> ἀγὼ τὸ πρῶτον οὐχ ἑκοῦσ᾽ ἐδεξάμην,
> νῦν δ᾽ ἐκλέλοιπα· Ζεὺς τάδ᾽ εἰδείη μέγας,
> ὡς οὐχ ἑκοῦσα τῷδ᾽ ἐκοινώθην λέχει.
> ἀλλ᾽ οὔ σφε πείθω, βούλεται δέ με κτανεῖν.

Andromache stresses her unwillingness as Neoptolemus' sexual partner twice in this passage. Partly this is to refute the charges of Hermione, but it also makes Andromache a more sympathetic figure. Kovacs (1995) argues that line 37 (νῦν δ᾽ ἐκλέλοιπα) does not mean Andromache has ended the relationship with Neoptolemus, but rather has left the house.[547] He is quite right to state that as a slave she does not have the autonomy to refuse a sexual relationship with her master,[548] but I think the expression should be understood as a denial of Hermione's accusation, that Andromache has been trying to usurp her position. This is reinforced by line 39, in which she says that she cannot persuade Hermione. By emphasising her lack of agency in the matter Euripides makes her persecution by Hermione and Menelaus all the more pitiable and unjust. For this to be effective the audience must have had some conception of the issue of women's consent within sexual relationships.

The second occasion on which Andromache stresses her reluctance in the sexual relationship with Neoptolemus comes in her confrontation with Menelaus (390-393):

> ἐκοιμήθην βίᾳ
> σὺν δεσπόταισι· κᾆτ᾽ ἔμ᾽, οὐ κεῖνον κτενεῖς,
> τὸν αἴτιον τῶνδ᾽, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφεὶς
> πρὸς τὴν τελευτὴν ὑστέραν οὖσαν φέρῃ;

[546] Eur. *Andr*. 24-25, 30, 32-39, 390-393, 401-403.
[547] Kovacs 1995: 277, n. a.
[548] Kovacs 1995: 277, n. a; cf. Kovacs 1980: 16-17.

Stevens (1971) in his commentary on *Andromache* has argued that *bia* in line 390 means '"constraint" rather than physical force.'[549] I see no evidence in the text, however, to prove that physical force was not used. Certainly in this passage Andromache is putting the responsibility firmly on Neoptolemus. She is not suggesting that he is liable to punishment for his sexual conduct towards her because he was perfectly within his rights as her master to treat her as such. She is merely pointing out the absurdity of Menelaus punishing her for a matter in which she had no agency in. Andromache's lack of agency will also have increased the audience's sympathy for her.

On the other three occasions that Andromache mentions her sexual relationship with Neoptolemus, her status as a slave is closely linked to the sexual encounters.[550] Euripides' stress on her slave status in these passages emphasises the compulsion she would have been under and her inability to reject Neoptolemus' sexual advances. But, at the same time, stressing the slave status of Andromache would reduce any negative connotations of Neoptolemus' actions because he is now her master, and she is sexually available to him.

Euripides dwells upon Andromache's misfortune and makes her present position all the more pathetic by contrasting it to her previous marriage and social position on many occasions, starting with the prologue (1-55). Allan (2000) argues that Euripides' repeated use of the word δοθεῖσα in lines 4 and 15 'enhance[s] the contrast between the two journeys.'[551] One from her father's house to become legitimate wife to Hector in Troy (4: δάμαρ δοθεῖσα παιδοποιὸς Ἕκτορι), and the other away from her husband's city to Greece as a slave as a reward for Neoptolemus' actions at Troy (14-15: τῷ νησιώτῃ Νεοπτολέμῳ δορὸς γέρας/ δοθεῖσα λείας Τρωϊκῆς ἐξαίρετον). It is also perhaps intended to remind us of the sexual aspect of both relationships, as well as having an ironic tinge when we learn a few lines later that rather than providing an heir for Hector as his legitimate wife (we have already been told that Astyanax has been killed in lines 9-10), Andromache, as his slave, has borne an illegitimate son to Neoptolemus (24-25).[552]

[549] Stevens 1971: 143.
[550] Eur. *Andr*. 24-25, 30, 401-403.
[551] Allan 2000: 94.
[552] *Contra* McClure 1999: 169, who interprets δοθεῖσα as giving 'an air of legitimacy to her relationship with Neoptolemus.'

As Dué (2006) states, the contents of the prologue 'are reshaped in the form of laments at key moments elsewhere in the play.'[553] In spite of this Andromache only laments her enforced sexual relationship with Neoptolemus once (399-403):

> ἥτις σφαγὰς μὲν Ἕκτορος τροχηλάτους
> κατεῖδον οἰκτρῶς τ᾽ Ἴλιον πυρούμενον,
> αὐτὴ δὲ δούλη ναῦς ἐπ᾽ Ἀργείων ἔβην
> κόμης ἐπισπασθεῖσ᾽· ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ἀφικόμην
> Φθίαν, φονεῦσιν Ἕκτορος νυμφεύομαι.

The placement of this lament is interesting: It comes just before she leaves the altar in agreement with Menelaus to sacrifice herself to save her son's life. The context is her utter despair at the situation she has found herself in, having to choose between her own life and that of her child. It also comes shortly after her assertion that Neoptolemus is to blame for the situation that has arisen, not her (390-393). This lament is aimed at inducing pity in the audience, as well as trying to secure the sympathy of the other characters for her within the play. Her mention of being dragged by the hair hints at the violence she endured when taken as a war-captive. This image alludes to the sexual violence to which she is now vulnerable because being dragged by the hair is a commonly associated with sexual assaults. Interestingly, despite this being part of the most negative portrayal of Neoptolemus in the play, he is not the one described as behaving violently towards Andromache. It is only after this violence that she is engaged in a sexual relationship with Neoptolemus.

In a previous lament Andromache's susceptibility to violence and sexual abuse is alluded to (109-112):

> αὐτὰ δ᾽ ἐκ θαλάμων ἀγόμαν ἐπὶ θῖνα θαλάσσας,
> δουλοσύναν στυγερὰν ἀμφιβαλοῦσα κάρᾳ.
> πολλὰ δὲ δάκρυά μοι κατέβα χροός, ἀνίκ᾽ ἔλειπον
> ἄστυ τε καὶ θαλάμους καὶ πόσιν ἐν κονίαις.

The reference to her being taken from her bedroom is completely unnecessary unless Euripides wanted to stress the risk of sexual violence and violation that faced Andromache as a slave.

Andromache's plight is received sympathetically by other characters. A former Trojan slave of Andromache's comes to warn her of Menelaus' plan out of pity for her.[554] The Chorus also

[553] Dué 2006: 254.

express their pity for Andromache on a number of occasions, and pity her general situation, though they make no mention of the sexual compulsion she is under (141-146):

> οἰκτροτάτα γὰρ ἔμοιγ᾽ ἔμολες, γύναι Ἰλιάς, οἴκους
> δεσποτᾶν ἐμῶν· φόβῳ δ᾽
> ἡσυχίαν ἄγομεν
> (τὸ δὲ σὸν οἴκτῳ φέρουσα τυγχάνω)
> μὴ παῖς τᾶς Διὸς κόρας
> σοί μ᾽ εὖ φρονοῦσαν εἰδῇ.

Their pity for the sexual aspect of her enslavement could be implied, as we know her sexual relationship with Neoptolemus began on return to his household. The Chorus, however, immediately switches their focus to the threat posed by Hermione. Although the enforced aspect of Andromache's sexual relationship with Neoptolemus is used in order to arouse sympathy for her, the negative consequences come from the jealousy felt by Hermione; she is in no way being persecuted or mistreated by Neoptolemus.

The Chorus express their pity for Andromache after the speech which includes her assertion of her unwillingness in the sexual relationship with Neoptolemus, and her lament concerning the violence of her enslavement and her sexual relationship with her master (421-422):

> ὤκτιρ᾽ ἀκούσασ᾽· οἰκτρὰ γὰρ τὰ δυστυχῆ
> βροτοῖς ἅπασι, κἂν θυραῖος ὢν κυρῇ.

The misfortunes to which they refer not only include Andromache's loss of Hector, enslavement, and current risk to her life, but also her enforced sexual relationship with Neoptolemus, which she has mentioned on two separate occasions in the preceding passage, and to which she attributes her current situation.[555] This passage demonstrates that it is not just those close to the victims of sexual assaults who have sympathy for their predicament.

Despite Andromache's unwillingness in regard to her sexual relationship with Neoptolemus, he is never portrayed negatively in regards to his actions towards her, and is actually presented as a more positive character than in most sources concerning him.[556] Though

---

[554] Eur. *Andr*. 56-62. Whether her pity is because she is being persecuted by Hermione, or due to her general position is unclear.
[555] Eur. *Andr*. 390-391, 403.
[556] Euripides' apparent rehabilitation of Neoptolemus in this play has been noticed by a number of scholars, in particular Anderson 1997: 138 and Allan 2000: 25-26, who both note the suppression of the hero's

Andromache makes it clear that she has never wanted a sexual relationship with him and finds her present position almost intolerable,[557] she speaks positively of Neoptolemus himself, representing him as a noble figure, whom she respects and trusts, portraying him as a good and loving father to their son.[558] He is not criticized by the other characters for his original sexual relationship with Andromache, but he is criticized a number of times by various characters for (allegedly) maintaining a sexual relationship with Andromache, or at least keeping her and her child in his household.[559]

It does seem as though Andromache possessed a higher status in the household than the other slaves. We are frequently reminded that she is a war-captive and was not born a slave.[560] Although, like the other slaves, she is Neoptolemus' possession, the play continually emphasises her higher status, and economic value, as Neoptolemus' special prize from the Trojan plunder.[561] Andromache's status within the household seems to upset Hermione and Menelaus. Lines 163-173 suggest that Hermione does not think Andromache has accepted her present condition and slave status, but still has delusions of freedom and high status:

> ἦν δ᾽ οὖν βροτῶν τίς σ᾽ ἢ θεῶν σῶσαι θέλῃ,
> δεῖ σ᾽ ἀντὶ τῶν πρὶν ὀλβίων φρονημάτων
> πτῆξαι ταπεινὴν προσπεσεῖν τ᾽ ἐμὸν γόνυ
> σαίρειν τε δῶμα τοὐμὸν ἐκ χρυσηλάτων
> τευχέων χερὶ σπείρουσαν Ἀχελῴου δρόσον

---

involvement in the deaths of Priam and Astyanax. Though Andromache witnessed the death of her first child, Neoptolemus is not linked to it (9-10), and the death of Priam is only mentioned on one occasion (169). Pohlenz 1954 II: 119, argues that line 9 demonstrates in this version of the myth Neoptolemus did not murder Astyanax. The absence of any reference to Neoptolemus' murder of Astyanax by Menelaus and Hermione is notable. It would suit their purpose to mention his slaughter of Andromache's first child to taunt Andromache, and provide another criticism for her relationship with Neoptolemus (as they use Achilles' murder of Hector at lines 170-173). It could also be used as a precedent and justification for the murder of her second child. It is surprising that when Menelaus tries to justify the murder of Andromache and her child in the lines 515-522, by arguing that it is foolish to leave enemies and their offspring alive when you can kill them (presumably to mitigate the risk of them taking revenge), that he does not mention the murder of Astyanax when this precise argument is popularly the chief motivation for the Greeks' and Neoptolemus' actions in other versions of the myth.

[557] Cf. Eur. *Andr*. 26, 98-99, 404.

[558] Eur. *Andr*. 269, 416-418. As Allan 2000: 174 n. 69, argues, Andromache does this in order to emphasise the relationship between Neoptolemus and their son, to save the child.

[559] Eur. *Andr*. 120-125 the Chorus talk of Neoptolemus' 'double marriage' (123-124: λέκτρων/ διδύμων) which has led to 'wretched strife' (122: ἔριδι στυγερᾷ), and in 465-470 of 'double marriages' (465: δίδυμα λέκτρ᾽) in general causing strife (467: ἔριν). In lines 177-180 Hermione criticises Neoptolemus' behaviour arguing the 'it is not right for one man to hold the reins of two women' (177-178: οὐδὲ γὰρ καλὸν/ δυοῖν γυναικοῖν ἄνδρ᾽ ἕν᾽ ἡνίας ἔχειν). Orestes in line 909 describes a 'double marriage' (δίσσ᾽...λέχη) as 'trouble' (κακόν).

[560] Eur. *Andr*. 98-100, 109, 155, 401-403, 583, 871, 908, 932, 1243.

[561] Eur. *Andr*. 14-15, 584.

γνῶναί θ᾽ ἵν᾽ εἶ γῆς. οὐ γάρ ἐσθ᾽ Ἕκτωρ τάδε,
οὐ Πρίαμος οὐδὲ χρυσός, ἀλλ᾽ Ἑλλὰς πόλις.
ἐς τοῦτο δ᾽ ἥκεις ἀμαθίας, δύστηνε σύ,
ἥ παιδὶ πατρός ὃς σὸν ὤλεσεν πόσιν
τολμᾷς ξυνεύδειν καὶ τέκν᾽ αὐθεντῶν πάρα
τίκτειν.

Hermione intends to see that Andromache submits to her new role and position in life, and wants to be treated with the respect and reverence she deserves as her mistress. The reference to sweeping the floors may indicate that Andromache has not previously had to do any of the menial tasks usually given to slaves. Neoptolemus' apparent good treatment of Andromache may have been regarded positively by the audience and will have implied a positive motivation for his conducting a sexual relationship with her.

The only clue we have from the entire play about Neoptolemus' motivation for conducting a sexual relationship with Andromache comes from an unreliable source and is ambiguous. When Orestes enquires about the cause of Hermione's marital problems and asks her, 'does your husband love some other woman's bed instead of yours?' (907: ἄλλην τιν᾽ εὐνὴν ἀντὶ σοῦ στέργει πόσις;), she replies in the affirmative. Whether either is referring to Neoptolemus' emotional feelings for Andromache, or are merely using love as a metaphor for sexual intercourse is unclear. Earlier in the play when the child and Andromache are about to be put to death the child beseeches Neoptolemus to come to help his loved ones (509: μόλε φίλοις ἐπίκουρος), though this tells us more about his own affectionate relationship with his father than about Neoptolemus' feelings for Andromache. This play is consistent in its portrayal of Andromache as a sympathetic figure, while not condemning Neoptolemus as a negative character.

Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*

This play is unique in extant Greek tragedy because three types of actual or attempted sexual violence are present: Deianeira's recollection of the threat of enforced marriage to the river god, Achelous;[562] the attempted sexual assault against her by the centaur, Nessus;[563] and the focus

[562] Discussed in Chapter Four.
[563] Discussed at the end of this section.

of this section, the sexual violation of a war-captive, Iole.[564] Although Iole never speaks in the play, she is presented as an exceptionally sympathetic character through the reaction of others to her and her plight. We also have the motivation of her sexual aggressor, in this instance Heracles, stressed on a number of occasions. His motivation is discussed by others, along with their reaction to his motivation and deeds. It is striking that although Heracles' actions are never openly characterised as negative or condemned by others, this does not alter their sympathy for Iole or her sufferings. This is indicative of the fact that, for the Athenians, the experience of the victim could still be represented and received sympathetically even though the aggressor was perceived as not punishable for their actions.

From the time the captive women first enter, they are presented by the other characters, especially Deianeira, as pitiable figures (243: οἰκτραί). Indeed, it is the sight of these newly enslaved women that tempers her joy at Heracles' recent success. They remind her of how quickly fortunes can change (293-297), and the lamentable fate that awaits those on the losing side (298-302):

> ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἶκτος δεινὸς εἰσέβη, φίλαι,
> ταύτας ὁρώσῃ δυσπότμους ἐπὶ ξένης
> χώρας ἀοίκους ἀπάτοράς τ᾽ ἀλωμένας,
> αἳ πρὶν μὲν ἦσαν ἐξ ἐλευθέρων ἴσως
> ἀνδρῶν, τανῦν δὲ δοῦλον ἴσχουσιν βίον.

The captive-women were born free and are analogous to Deianeira herself and the Chorus of young women, as well as the wives and daughters of the men in the audience. In this way Sophocles humanises the women and reminds the audience of their original high status, emphasising the *pathos* of their situation, and inciting sympathy for their plight. Although their sexual vulnerability is not mentioned here, it is certainly implied. From the repeated references to their fathers, rather than husbands, it is apparent these are young women. The mention of their homelessness and exile from their native lands brings to mind the women leaving their paternal homes for marriage and the commencement of sexual relationships in the same way as Deianeira left her father and her native land when she married Heracles (562-563).

Deianeira's attention then turns to the character we later discover is Iole (307-313):

[564] I do not believe Iole is meant to be interpreted as a slave in this tragedy; see below.

ὦ δυστάλαινα, τίς ποτ᾽ εἶ νεανίδων;
ἄνανδρος, ἢ τεκνοῦσσα; πρὸς μὲν γὰρ φύσιν
πάντων ἄπειρος τῶνδε, γενναία δέ τις.
Λίχα, τίνος ποτ᾽ ἐστὶν ἡ ξένη βροτῶν;
τίς ἡ τεκοῦσα, τίς δ᾽ ὁ φιτύσας πατήρ;
ἔξειπ᾽· ἐπεί νιν τῶνδε πλεῖστον ᾠκτισα
βλέπουσ᾽, ὅσῳπερ καὶ φρονεῖν οἶδεν μόνη.

The extent of Deianeira's pity for Iole stresses the poet's sympathetic portrayal of the girl. Her sexual vulnerability is implied by Deianeira's question as to her marital status. The question indicates that she is sexually mature but still young enough to be a virgin; ἄνανδρος (308) literally means 'unmanned' and so stresses clearly the sexual aspect of marriage. Iole is clearly meant to be perceived as standing out from the crowd due to her appearance and demeanour.[565] Deianeira's obvious pity for her would have enhanced the audience's sympathy.[566]

The extent to which Iole's traumatic experience has affected her is stressed by Lichas (322-328):

οὔ τἄρα τῷ γε πρόσθεν οὐδὲν ἐξ ἴσου
χρόνῳ διήσει γλῶσσαν, ἥτις οὐδαμὰ
προύφηνεν οὔτε μείζον᾽ οὔτ᾽ ἐλάσσονα,
ἀλλ᾽ αἰὲν ὠδίνουσα συμφορᾶς βάρος
δακρυρροεῖ δύστηνος, ἐξ ὅτου πάτραν
διήνεμον λέλοιπεν. ἡ δέ τοι τύχη
κακὴ μὲν αὐτή γ᾽, ἀλλὰ συγγνώμην ἔχει.[567]

Iole is clearly traumatised by her capture and the destruction of her city, but there is also an overt sexual aspect to her experience which we shall later learn, and would further explain to the audience her extreme reaction to her predicament. Though Deianeira does not yet know her to be the object of Heracles' desire, Lichas is well aware of this fact. The sexual aspect of Iole's suffering would presumably enhance the audience's sympathy for the girl who is sympathetically

[565] Deianeira later describes her as: κάρτα λαμπρὰ καὶ κατ᾽ ὄμμα καὶ φύσιν (379).
[566] Easterling 1982: 117.
[567] 328: Lloyd-Jones & Wilson 1990a follow KZg in reading αὐτή, over Zo's αὖτη (accepted by Easterling 1982), as it provides a more significant contrast; see Lloyd-Jones & Wilson 1990b: 158.

treated and received by the other characters in the play, some of whom already know the full extent of her experience.[568]

The audience may recognise the girl as Iole, and the object of Heracles' desire, from the epic, *Capture of Oechalia*, in which Iole and Eurytus seem to have been prominent figures.[569] Whether in this epic Heracles seized Iole for himself or for his son Hyllus, as in Pherecydes' account of the myth, is uncertain.[570] Sophocles' introduction of Iole echoes the introduction of Cassandra in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*. Like Cassandra, Iole is welcomed at the door of the house by its mistress, in a perverted echo of the Athenian wedding ceremony when the mother of the groom welcomes the bride. Iole remains silent in the face of Deianeira's questions (307-321), as Cassandra refuses to answer Clytemnestra (Aesch. *Ag*. 1035-1068). However, Sophocles contrasts Deianeira with Clytemnestra, as she treats Iole sympathetically.[571]

In this play we learn more about the motivation of the aggressor than in any other tragedy. We are told repeatedly that desire for Iole has seized Heracles and this is why he attacked her city. The messenger tells us that Heracles sacked Oechalia 'for the sake of winning this girl' (352-353: τῆς κόρης/ ταύτης ἕκατι), because 'Eros alone of all the gods, persuaded him to perform these feats of arms' (354-355: Ἔρως δέ νιν/ μόνος θεῶν θέλξειεν αἰχμάσαι τάδε).[572] Heracles is not responsible for his actions but responding to god-sent desire. It is said that Heracles 'has been heated by desire' (368: ἐντεθέρμανται πόθῳ). This suggests that some external force beyond Heracles' control is responsible for his actions, which to some extent negates any negative connotations they could have been viewed as having.

We are told that Heracles' first recourse was not to violence. He attempted to convince Eurytus, however, 'he could not persuade her father to give him his daughter so that he could have her as a secret wife' (359-360: οὐκ ἔπειθε τὸν φυτοσπόρον/ τὴν παῖδα δοῦναι, κρύφιον ὡς ἔχοι

[568] Lichas is fully aware of her identity and experience at this point. Heracles later confirms unambiguously that he has conducted a sexual relationship with Iole (1225-1226: τοῖς ἐμοῖς πλευροῖς ὁμοῦ/ κλιθεῖσαν αὐτὴν).
[569] Creophylus, *Capture of Oechalia*, T1 and F1.
[570] Pherec. F82a (Fowler 2000). Bacch. 16.29: Heracles carries on a sexual relationship with Iole. However, it is uncertain if this predates Sophocles' account or is based upon it due to the similarity of plot and themes; cf. Hoey 1979; March 1987: 62-66.
[571] Webster 1936: 168; Pierrepont Houghton 1962: 94-95; Hoey 1979: 216; March 1987: 70; Garner 1990: 102; Segal 1994: 63.
[572] Cf. 431-433, 476-478.

λέχος) and so launched a military assault on the city. Heracles had first asked for the consent of her father for an, albeit illegitimate, union with Iole, which may have further reduced the negative aspects of his actions. After all there are plenty of examples in myth of Heracles' casual sexual relationships,[573] and in some cases the fathers actively encouraged their daughters to sleep with the semi-divine hero.[574]

Deianeira has no words of censure for her husband when she first appeals to Lichas to tell her the truth about Iole's identity and relationship with Heracles. She accepts that his desire for Iole is god-sent, and that he is powerless to resist it (441-448):

> Ἔρωτι μέν νυν ὅστις ἀντανίσταται
> πύκτης ὅπως ἐς χεῖρας, οὐ καλῶς φρονεῖ.
> οὗτος γὰρ ἄρχει καὶ θεῶν ὅπως θέλει,
> κἀμοῦ γε· πῶς δ᾽ οὐ χἀτέρας οἵας γ᾽ ἐμοῦ;
> ὥστ᾽ εἴ τι τὠμῷ τ᾽ ἀνδρὶ τῆδε τῇ νόσῳ
> ληφθέντι μεμπτός εἰμι, κάρτα μαίνομαι,
> ἢ τῆδε τῇ γυναικὶ, τῇ μεταιτίᾳ
> τοῦ μηδὲν αἰσχροῦ μηδ᾽ ἐμοὶ κακοῦ τινος.

Deianeira claims that she does not see Heracles having another sexual partner as 'shameful' (448: αἰσχροῦ), or a threat to her own position, nor does Deianeira's sympathy and tenderness towards Iole disappear; cf. 444. Some see this line as indicating Deianeira thinks of Iole as already being in love with Heracles, and that she interprets the girl as a sexual subject.[575] I, however, prefer to read it with Deianeira understanding Iole as a sexual object, susceptible to the sexual desire which Eros plants for her in others. Eros has not only ruled Deianeira in her passion for Heracles, but first made her the object of Heracles' desire; it was only after the marriage that she became deeply attached to him (27-28). Like Iole is now, Deianeira has been the object of unwanted and violent desire from both Achelous and Nessus, and may be viewing the girl in the light of these experiences, as a victim of Eros, but as a sexual object, not a subject.

[573] They are referred to by Deianeira in line 459-460.
[574] Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.4.10.
[575] Stinton 1990b: 219-221; Wohl 1998: 39-40; cf. Winnington-Ingram 1980: 80-81 and n. 27.

A number of scholars have interpreted Deianeira's speech at this point as deceptive.[576] Indeed, the audience may have detected a degree of insincerity in her claims that Heracles' bringing a mistress into the marital home was not shameful or a hardship for Deianeira (447-448). They would have been familiar with the complications which could arise from having two sexual partners residing in the familial *oikos*. As we have seen in the 'Euripides' *Andromache*' section, maintaining a wife and mistress in the same household could be envisaged as problematic. Certainly, in fifth-century Athens it was regarded as morally dubious and insulting to wives to maintain a mistress in the marital home.[577]

A sinister aspect to Deianeira's speech may have been more apparent to the original audience as her character in earlier myth may have been more combatative and less sympathetic. Deianeira's name means 'man-slayer' and she seems to have originally been an Amazon-like figure. It is possible that she may have been presented as intentionally killing Heracles in some sources, and seen as an equal to Clytemnestra.[578] Indeed, March (1987) argues that the length of the prologue and its emphasis on Deianeira is the result of Sophocles' need to present 'his own unique

[576] For a review of previous scholarship on this see Hester 1980; cf. Carawan 2000.

[577] In [Dem.] 59.22 we are told that Lysias housed a *hetaira* and her procuress at the home of a friend (whom we are specifically informed is unmarried) out of respect for his wife and female relatives. In 59.30, we are told that Neiara was sold her freedom on the condition she leave Corinth when her owner-patrons, who resided there, were about to marry. [Andoc.] 4.14: Alcibiades' wife leaves him and tries to dissolve their marriage because he brought slave and free prostitutes into their home. However, sexual relationships carried on outside the home seem to have been socially acceptable. Cf. Harris 2015a: 306-307. The tradition of wifely jealousy over long-term affairs carried on within the household is evident in epic: Laertes does not have a sexual relationship with Eurycleia as he is mindful of his wife's anger (Hom. *Od*. 1.433); the jealousy of Amyntor's wife leads her to encourage her son, Phoenix, to attempt to alienate the girl's affection for his father (Hom. *Il*. 9.449-952). It becomes a common theme in tragedy and is usually related to an actual, potential, or perceived loss of status by the wife, either by the introduction of another woman or an illegitimate child into the household, or because of abandonment. Cf. Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*; Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*; Euripides' *Andromache*, *Electra*, *Ion* (caused by the introduction of a supposed illegitimate child), *Medea* (caused by abandonment), *Trojan Women* (Cassandra knows Clytemnestra's jealousy of her will lead to Agamemnon's death, cf. 356-364 and 404-405). Even the presence of an attractive ward in a household can lead their guardian's wife to mistreat them, as may have been the cause for the excessive persecution of the heroines in Euripides' *Antiope* and Sophocles' *Tyro*. In Euripides' *Melanippe Captive* the Queen, upon learning Melanippe is the mother of her husband's adoptive children, may suspect an illicit affair between Melanippe and her husband.

[578] The earliest mention of Deianeira in relation to Heracles' death is in Hes. *Cat.* 25.18-25, though her characterisation and motive appear to be ambiguous; cf. Easterling 1982: 16; March 1987: 49-51; Gantz 1993: 432; Carawan 2000: 194. In Bacch. 5.167-168 Heracles desires to know if the great hero Meleager has an unmarried sister who is like him in 'stature/nature' (φυάν). This Deianeira may, therefore, possess warrior-like characteristics, although it could just imply a noble character. In Bacch. 16 Deianeira is presented as innocent, though it is uncertain if this text predates *Trach*. or is based upon it; see Hoey 1979; March 1987.

For Deianeira as an Amazon-like figure see Jebb 1892: xxxi-xxxii; Hoey 1979: 219; Carawan 2000: 191-192, citing Apollod. 1.8.1 and the scholion to Apollonius of Rhodes 1.1212. Though the sources are later Hoey argues convincingly that their contradiction of 'the Sophoclean version implies that their version was the traditional one' (219).

Deianeira is still associated with Clytemnestra as a husband murderer in late sources; cf. [Plut.] *De placitis philosophorum*, *Moralia* 881D; Hester 1980: 5; Carawan 2000: 191 n. 7.

characterisation of Deianeira.'[579] The many echoes of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* throughout the play may have been due to Sophocles desire to keep the audience guessing as to whether Deianeira's actions were intended to cause Heracles' death, and/or to highlight the contrast between the natures of the two heroines, which would increase the irony of the result of Deianeria's actions.[580]

The audience's knowledge of Deianeira's traditional characterisation would have provided dramatic tension during this portion of the play. The audience would not be sure of her true nature or intentions after Sophocles' sympathetic characterisation of her as a gentle and timid woman, both in the prologue and First Stasimon (497-530), which follows this scene. The ambiguity of her language and her intent in anointing the robe adds to this.

It would have been easy for Sophocles not to mention Deianeira's sympathetic feelings towards Iole and her suffering once Deianeira has learnt the truth, but he stresses her pity for the girl (459-467):

> τὸ δ᾽ εἰδέναι τί δεινόν; οὐχὶ χἀτέρας
> πλείστας ἀνὴρ εἷς Ἡρακλῆς ἔγημε δή;
> κοὔπω τις αὐτῶν ἔκ γ᾽ ἐμοῦ λόγον κακὸν
> ἠνέγκατ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ὄνειδος· ἥδε τ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἂν εἰ
> κάρτ᾽ ἐντακείη τῷ φιλεῖν, ἐπεί σφ᾽ ἐγὼ
> ὤκτιρα δὴ μάλιστα προσβλέψασ᾽, ὅτι
> τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς τὸν βίον διώλεσεν,
> καὶ γῆν πατρῴαν οὐχ ἑκοῦσα δύσμορος
> ἔπερσε κἀδούλωσεν.

The subject of the verb in line 463 is ambiguous, with scholars disagreeing as to whether it is referring to Heracles or Iole.[581] Regardless of who the subject of the verb is, Deianeira still expresses sympathy for Iole as a victim of sexual violence. There is evidence to support her sincerity here as, unlike other spurned wives, she never attempts to mistreat Iole, even after she learns of the effects of the robe.[582]

---

[579] March 1987: 66.
[580] Hoey 1979; Hester 1980; March 1987. On the echoes of the *Oresteia* see especially Webster 1936: 170-172, 177; Hoey 1979: 216; Fuqua 1980: 37 n. 97; Garner 1990: 100-110; Pozzi 1994: 584.
[581] Heracles: Kamerbeek 1970: 113; Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990b: 160; Davies 1991: 132. Iole: Winnington-Ingram 1980: 81 n. 27; Easterling 1982: 130; Wohl 1998: 40.
[582] In most cases of wifely jealousy the mistress is killed or persecuted: Clytemnestra kills Cassandra; Medea kills the princess; Hermione persecutes and attempts to kill Andromache. Sophocles is diverging from the norm, and so makes Deianeira more sympathetic.

Heracles did not regard his own behaviour as negative. The reaction of the other characters reveals that they do not see anything reprehensible in his actions, as Lichas' speech demonstrates (479-483):

> καὶ ταῦτα, δεῖ γὰρ καὶ τὸ πρὸς κείνου λέγειν,
> οὔτ᾽ εἶπε κρύπτειν οὔτ᾽ ἀπηρνήθη ποτέ,
> ἀλλ᾽ αὐτός, ὦ δέσποινα, δειμαίνων τὸ σὸν
> μὴ στέρνον ἀλγύνοιμι τοῖσδε τοῖς λόγοις,
> ἥμαρτον, εἴ τι τῶνδ᾽ ἁμαρτίαν νέμεις.

Lichas has suppressed the true story in order not to upset Deianeira. There is no hint in the text, however, that Heracles has actually transgressed any laws and could be reproached in any way. The only negative effect his actions are perceived as having is the possibility of arousing his wife's jealousy.

It is possible that Heracles' desire is not meant to be perceived by the audience as negative as the attested motivation of Heracles in introducing Iole into his household is to treat her as a 'wife' (428, 429: δάμαρτα). Heracles apparently intends for Iole to occupy a high status position within the household and to be treated with respect afforded to a legitimate wife. This, as well as the sexual aspect of his relationship with Iole, is clearly stressed by Deianeira herself (539-540):

> καὶ νῦν δύ᾽ οὖσαι μίμνομεν μιᾶς ὑπὸ
> χλαίνης ὑπαγκάλισμα.

It seems that Deianeira does not see her social position at risk of being usurped, only her sexual one: ταῦτ᾽ οὖν φοβοῦμαι μὴ πόσις μὲν Ἡρακλῆς/ ἐμὸς καλῆται, τῆς νεωτέρας δ᾽ ἀνήρ (550-551).[583]

However, we may detect a hint of irony and bitterness in Deianeira's words at this point: As Easterling (1982) notes, '*μία χλαῖνα* would normally suggest the harmonious union of a pair of lovers,'[584] and so emphasises the perverted nature of the situation and the *ménage à trois* Deianeira envisages as her future marital situation. Carawan (2000) notes the 'bitter irony' in the surrounding lines (536-542).[585] After being told the true account of the sack and its cause, Deianeira suspects a sexual relationship has already commenced (536: κόρην γὰρ, οἶμαι δ᾽ οὐκέτ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ ἐζευγμένην).

[583] Winnington-Ingram 1980: 80.
[584] Easterling 1982: 141; cf. Kamerbeek 1970: 127.
[585] Carawan 2000: 205.

Fuqua (1980) notes the 'tension between κόρην and ἐζευγμένην.'[586] Deianeira's description of Iole as φόρτον (537) and ἐμπόλημα (538) dehumanises Iole, emphasising her status as a possession, and contrasting Iole's status to her own one as Heracles' free and legitimate wife.[587] Deianeira's resentment is more apparent when she refers to Iole's as the 'reward [Heracles] has sent for keeping his house for so long' (542: οἰκούρι᾽ ἀντέπεμψε τοῦ μακροῦ χρόνου).[588] Her feelings of betrayal by Heracles can be detected form the ironic use of πιστός in line 541.[589]

Deianeira claims that Heracles is blameless in her eyes for admitting another woman into the house because his desire is a disease (543-544):

> ἐγὼ δὲ θυμοῦσθαι μὲν οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι
> νοσοῦντι κείνῳ πολλὰ τῇδε τῇ νόσῳ.

Heracles' desire has been previously referred to as a disease (445). Like a disease his desire has negative consequences, in this case upon others, but it also implies that the sufferer is not responsible for his actions while in the midst of it. Although Deianeira is merely referring to the negative impact that introducing Iole into the household will have on her, the audience surely have in mind the negative effects of Heracles' desire on Iole herself and her country. It seems then that desire could be violent and have negative consequences,[590] but this does not impact on the way in which the aggressor's motivation is interpreted. Coming straight after Deianeira's bitter remarks of 536-542 the audience might have had some cause to doubt her sincerity here, and interpret her traditional character as coming to the fore.

I do not intend to outline a definitive motivation for Heracles' ordering Hyllus to marry Iole after the hero's death. There is no evidence in the text beyond his wish for no man other than his son (and heir) to have possession of the girl he has had a sexual relationship with (1225-1227).[591] I do, however, think it necessary to discuss this scene as others have used his treatment of Iole (and Hyllus) in it to interpret Sophocles' characterisation of Heracles, both negatively and positively.

---

[586] Fuqua 1980: 44 n. 114.
[587] Fraenkel 1950 III: 686, observes that line 538 draws on Aesch. *Ag*. 1447, due to their similar rhythm. Garner 1990: 103, notes that in these scenes both women 'focus on the sexual insult that the captive women represent.'
[588] Kamerbeek 1970: 127.
[589] Easterling 1982: 141, notes it is also used ironically by Sophocles in *OT* 385.
[590] See Segal 1995b: 32, for desire as 'a demonic energy' in this play.
[591] Segal 1995b: 63.

Heracles' actions been have variously interpreted as an indication of his sexual jealousy;[592] his concern to maintain his property as a symbol of his heroic honour,[593] which is being taken to the extreme due to his self-centeredness;[594] and as an example of his enduring love for Iole.[595] What none of the critics seem to have picked up on is the sexual relationship itself cannot be Heracles' primary motivation here. Earlier in the play we learnt that Heracles was perfectly willing to let his legitimate wife, Deianeira, remarry after his death. He had specifically informed her what to take as her dowry and as her personal possessions should he not return (161-162). This would not have been necessary if he had intended her to remain a widow in his house and never have a sexual relationship with another man.

I am not convinced that Sophocles includes this scene as a further example of the brutal and negative characterisation of Heracles. The heroic setting and semi-divine nature of Heracles goes some way to mitigating the negative connotations of his actions. This is comparable to the lack of blame attributed to the gods in the 'girl's tragedy' plays (at least once the absence of negative intent has been reaffirmed at the end of the play). Indeed, the slightly savage, almost god-like nature of Heracles has been noted by Bowra (1944). More recently the Sophoclean Heracles has been perceived as more of an elemental force, like the monsters he fights within the play.[596] None of the other characters in the play regard Heracles as a negative figure, and he is more than once described as the 'best of men.'[597] Just as the sympathy of the other characters for Iole will have influenced the audience, surely their admiration for Heracles will have affected the audience's judgement of him.[598]

Hyllus and Iole are the mythical progenitors of the Heraclidae,[599] and perhaps Sophocles needed to unite them at the end of the play to satisfy the audience's expectations.[600] It has been suggested that the audience may have interpreted Heracles as having privileged information about

[592] Winnington-Ingram 1980: 85.
[593] MacKinnon 1971: 41; Easterling 1982: 225.
[594] Easterling 1981: 68-69; Easterling 1982: 10-11.
[595] Bowra 1944: 142.
[596] Bowra 1944: 135-136; Letters 1953: 16, 187, 194; Adams 1957: 108-109, 130; Galinsky 1972: 52, recognises Heracles' 'superman-like' nature but regards it as negative; Wender 1974: 4, sees Heracles as 'hyper-masculine,' although I am very sceptical of her interpretation of him as a 'typical Athenian [man];' Sorum 1978: 63-64; Segal 1995b: 26-28. In these analyses Deianeira is usually interpreted as the perfect foil to Heracles, being domestic, compassionate, and civilized.
[597] By Deianeira (177), Hyllus (811-812), and the Chorus (1112-1113).
[598] Waldock 1951: 85.
[599] Easterling 1981: 69; Easterling 1982: 11, citing Hdt. 9.26 and Thuc. 1.9; Segal 1995b: 63.
[600] Jebb 1892: 176; Waldock 1951: 88-90; Segal 1995b: 51, 63.

Hyllus and Iole's status as the ancestors of the Heraclid dynasty at this point in the play, and is ensuring that this occurs.[601]

Another effect of the betrothal is to highlight Iole's free status by ensuring the audience perceived her as being eligible for legitimate marriage. Although war-captives were the property of their captors, and generally thought of as slaves, this state need not be permanent and captives could be ransomed or released.[602] There is no indication that these former war-captives would suffer any loss of status or be regarded as unmarriageable. In epic Briseis is told by Patrocolus that she will become Achilles' legitimate wife when they return to Phthia.[603] He tells her this to cheer her up, but the sentiment would have been useless if there was absolutely no chance of it happening. In tragedy Tecmessa seems to be treated as Ajax's wife, especially after his death, and their child as his legitimate heir.[604] Even in this play we are told that Heracles has served as a slave to Omphale, which does not seem to lead to any long-term effects on his status. Indeed, evidence from the fourth century indicates that war-captives could enter into legitimate marriages once they had been freed.[605]

In Iole's case I believe Sophocles intended her to be regarded as an abducted bride.[606] Heracles introduces Iole as a free girl, referred to as a *parthenos*, and identified as the daughter of

---

[601] Adams 1957: 130-133, who perceives this union as part of Zeus' will; Segal 1995b: 63-65.

[602] Chryses attempts to ransom his daughter, Chryseis, in the first book of the Iliad, but when he is refused to prays to Apollo. After a plague affects the army, the girl is returned to her father. Hom. *Il*. 6.425-428: Achilles released Andromache's mother after she was ransomed by her natal family. Although we are told she dies in her father's house, and so has not remarried, there is no indication of the time frame between her release and death. She could also be too old to remarry. On the ransoming of war-captives see Bielman 1994, especially 278-289, 297-301.

[603] Hom. *Il*. 19.297-299.

[604] Like Hyllus, Ajax does not already have a legitimate wife, and like Iole, Tecmessa is originally from a noble and wealthy family. Status of birth seems to be an important qualification in the ability to be seen as a legitimate wife.

[605] Dem. 19.194-195. These girls are referred to as αἰχμάλωτοι. This passage will be discussed in more detail in the conclusion to this chapter.

[606] MacKinnon 1971, argues that Iole is a slave and Heracles is not proposing legitimate marriage but concubinage. His arguments are successfully refuted in Segal 1994, although he also reads Iole as a slave. I do not believe Heracles has seized the girl with the intention of her reducing her to slave status. Iole is never referred to individually as a slave, and certainly once her identity is revealed to Deianeira she is never referred to as one. Iole is a spear-captive (αἰχμάλωτος – 417), a girl (κόρη – 352, 536), a woman (γυνή – 400, 447, 486), a foreign woman (ξενή – 310), a younger woman (νεωτέρας – 551), child (παῖς – 585), a marriageable girl/virgin (παρθένος – 1219), a bride (νύμφα – 857, 894), and a wife (δαμάρ – 428, 429, 1124). The messenger tells Deianeira that Heracles has sent Iole home 'not as a slave' (367: οὐδ' ὥστε δούλην). I believe her status is intended to be more comparable to an abducted bride. This makes her betrothal to Hyllus at the end of the play a lot less problematic in terms of the legitimacy of the marriage; cf. MacKinnon 1971; Segal 1994. If Iole is meant to be perceived as having free status this would further justify Deianeira's reaction and jealousy, as her position within the household would be under greater threat than if the girl was merely a slave.

Eurytus (1219).[607] She is given in marriage, by her *kyrios*, Heracles,[608] to be a legitimate wife. If this is the case, it has further implications on our understanding of Athenian sympathies for the victims of sexual assaults. Consequently, the *pathos* of her situation would be solely derived from Iole being the object of Heracles' desire, and the impact this has had on her and her community, not the fact that she has been enslaved.

It is worth noting that one of the effects of the exchange between Hyllus and Heracles is the demonstration that Iole has not been negatively affected, at least in her social position, by Heracles' desire and seizure of her. Just as the gods in other tragedies restore victims of sexual assaults and enforced sexual relationships to their previous status and promise them legitimate marriages, so Heracles ensures the same for Iole. This coming at the point of his being burnt on the funeral pyre on Mount Oeta, an act which the audience will have associated with his deification, points to Heracles' actions and status becoming more those of a divine figure, rather than a mere mortal hero.[609]

Excursus: Is Heracles No Better than Nessus?

The only instance of actual sexual violence which is related in the text of Sophocles' *Women of Trachis* is the sexual assault Nessus commits against Deianeira. Some scholars regard this assault as comparable to Heracles' behaviour towards Iole, and believe that '[w]hen Heracles reenacts with Iole Nessus' attempted rape of Deianeira, he destroys any notion of progress in the orderly exchange of women through legitimate marriage.'[610] However, I am not convinced that the Athenian audience would have interpreted the actions of Heracles as equivalent to the actions of Nessus. Rather, I prefer to read Nessus as a threat to 'the most central institution founding the city, the orderly exchange of women through marriage.'[611] This would mean that, as his slayer, Heracles

[607] Segal 1994: 63 sees it as 'emphasising both her marriageable status. . . and noble birth.'
[608] Rehm 1994: 81 and 190 n. 34, in which he cites examples for husbands arranging marriages for their widows; cf. Dem. 27.4-5, in which the daughter's marriage is also arranged, and 36.28-29.
[609] Galinsky 1972: 52 does not believe that Sophocles is hinting at Heracles' apotheosis as he sees him as unworthy of this due to his failure to rise above his nature. Stinton 1990c: 479-490, argues (*contra* Easterling 1981) against there being any allusions to Heracles' apotheosis. He believes that drawing attention to Heracles' apotheosis would 'undermine the tragic impact of the close' (480). He also believes that 'apotheosis from the pyre was not the version likely to be widely known to the first audience of the *Trachiniae*' (482); cf. Stinton 1990d. *Contra* Holt 1989, who gives a detailed argument for Sophocles alluding to Heracles' apotheosis.
[610] Segal 1995c: 90. However, the account of Nessus' assault on Deianeira comes *after* we have been told of Heracles' seizure of Iole.
[611] DuBois 1982: 96.

is the defender of legitimate female exchange. But how are his actions towards Iole distinct from the actions of Nessus towards Deianeira? I believe Sophocles' description of Nessus' attack on Deianeira would be perceived by the Athenian audience as fundamentally different to Heracles' actions towards Iole, primarily due to the motivation of the aggressor and the context of the assaults.

It is first necessary to look at the description of the incident. Sophocles has Deianeira relate her experience (555-567):

> ἦν μοι παλαιὸν δῶρον ἀρχαίου ποτὲ
> θηρός, λέβητι χαλκέῳ κεκρυμμένον,
> ὃ παῖς ἔτ᾽ οὖσα τοῦ δασυστέρνου παρὰ
> Νέσσου φθίνοντος ἐκ φονῶν ἀνειλόμην,
> ὃς τὸν βαθύρρουν ποταμὸν Εὔηνον βροτοὺς
> μισθοῦ ᾽πόρευε χερσίν, οὔτε πομπίμοις
> κώπαις ἐρέσσων οὔτε λαίφεσιν νεώς.
> ὃς κἀμέ, τὸν πατρῷον ἡνίκα στόλον
> ξὺν Ἡρακλεῖ τὸ πρῶτον εὔνις ἐσπόμην,
> φέρων ἐπ᾽ ὤμοις, ἡνίκ᾽ ἦν μέσῳ πόρῳ,
> ψαύει ματαίαις χερσίν· ἐκ δ᾽ ἴυσ᾽ ἐγώ,
> χὠ Ζηνὸς εὐθὺς παῖς ἐπιστρέψας χεροῖν
> ἧκεν κομήτην ἰόν· ἐς δὲ πλεύμονας
> στέρνων διερροίζησεν.

The poet's desire for the audience to perceive the victim sympathetically is evident. He could have had this incident occur at any point in Deianeira's marriage but he sets it in her youth, just after her marriage to Heracles. Her youthful vulnerability and newly emerged sexuality are obviously meant to arouse the sympathy of the audience for her ordeal.[612] The word used by Sophocles to describe the manner of Nessus' assault 'wanton' (565: ματαίαις), Aeschylus has Danaus use to characterise the Aegyptids' actions when pursuing their forced marriages against the wishes of the Danaids and their father.[613] It is important to note that Deianeira no long-term negative effects because of

[612] As I shall demonstrate in Chapter Four the threat or actual instances of sexual violation and forced marriage appear to be used by the tragedians to make female characters more sympathetic. This device would only work if the original audience was pre-disposed to feel sympathy for victims of sexual violence.
[613] Aesch. *Supp*. 229.

Nessus' assault. This supports the hypothesis that when a woman's *kyrios* have proof that she has been the unwilling victim of sexual violence he would not treat her any differently from before.

In this account Nessus is portrayed as a negative figure. In his attempted sexual violation of Deianeira he is breaking a number of social norms. He has evidently had Deianeira entrusted to his care by her husband; he is betraying this trust. He has been paid to carry her across the river safely, and has thus broken a contract. Deianeira has made it clear she has been given in legitimate marriage to Heracles by her father. Through his attempted sexual assault Nessus is trying to bypass this legitimate institution. We are not told of Nessus' motivation. It appears that, rather than being motivated by desire, he has merely taken advantage of the situation. The attack takes place in the middle of the crossing; he may assume that Deianeira has no choice but to submit to it, or that Heracles would not dare (or be able) to do anything about it midstream without risking the life of his wife. These factors, in conjunction with the monstrous and animalistic nature of the aggressor, would surely have led the audience to perceive them as negatively motivated.[614] Heracles, meanwhile, is perfectly justified in killing the violator of his wife, as any member of the audience would have understood this as a case of lawful homicide.[615]

One should contrast this with the representation of Heracles' actions and motivations: he is seized by desire for the girl and first attempts to satiate that desire in a socially acceptable manner by asking her father's permission (359-360). When this fails, compelled by Eros, the only option left open to him is to destroy her city, kill her father, and seize the girl.[616] In regard to his treatment of the girl herself Heracles apparently wants her to retain the high status she has enjoyed in the house of her father and would treat her as almost equal to Deianeira. His betrothal of her to Hyllus at the end of the play, whatever its motivation, ensures that she is not negatively affected (in her social status) by his former actions.

When Deianeira is describing the potency of the venom she tells the Chorus, 'it kills every creature which it touches' (715-716: χὤνπερ ἂν θίγῃ,/ φθείρει τὰ πάντα κνώδαλ᾽). Easterling (1982), following Kamerbeek (1970), translates τὰ πάντα κνώδαλ᾽ as 'the whole host of wild creatures,' and believes this is meant to hint at the negative and uncivilised aspects of Heracles'

[614] DuBois 1982: 28, draws attention to the fact that centaurs are notoriously lustful and uncivilised.
[615] Dem. 23.53; Harris 2006c.
[616] Soph. *Trach*. 352-355, 431-433, 476-477.

character which has been brought out by *eros*.[617] However, I am not entirely convinced by this association, especially as immediately before we are told: τὸν γὰρ βαλόντ᾽ ἄτρακτον οἶδα καὶ θεὸν/ Χείρωνα πημήναντα (714-715:). This directly associates Heracles with the immortal centaur, renowned for his wisdom and civilised nature,[618] and is surely meant to portray him in a positive light and as a stark contrast to the uncivilised Nessus.

The two instance of sexual violence discussed in this section indicate that it was the motivation of the aggressor, his intention towards the victim, and his subsequent treatment of her that would lead the Athenians to judge him positively or negatively. However, regardless of the aggressor's intentions, when the fact of the woman's unwillingness is recognised by others, she is always treated sympathetically.

Euripides' *Alcestis*

In *Alcestis* we get a sense of the sexual vulnerability of slaves who were not war-captives. In this play Heracles, after rescuing Alcestis from the Underworld, tries to leave her with Admetus using the tale that she is a prize he has won in an athletic contest (1028-1029). Women were not generally regarded as sexual objects at the disposal of any man, and there would be a negative reaction to a man who was seen to be violating a free-born woman, as is made evident when Heracles insists that he has not stolen her, but won her legitimately with much effort (1035-1036: οὐ γὰρ κλοπαίαν ἀλλὰ σὺν πόνῳ λαβὼν/ ἥκω· χρόνῳ δὲ καὶ σύ μ᾽ αἰνέσεις ἴσως). In the Greek world women cannot be stolen with impunity, but they can be won in contests or wars, without any negative effects on those who end up possessing them.

Admetus is reluctant to take the woman into his house, as he does not want her in his wife's former quarters, but is concerned that if she is given other rooms she will be liable to the sexual advances of the young men who occupy the house (1049-1054):

> ποῦ καὶ τρέφοιτ᾽ ἂν δωμάτων νέα γυνή;
> νέα γάρ, ὡς ἐσθῆτι καὶ κόσμῳ πρέπει.
> πότερα κατ᾽ ἀνδρῶν δῆτ᾽ ἐνοικήσει στέγην;
> καὶ πῶς ἀκραιφνὴς ἐν νέοις στρωφωμένη

[617] Easterling 1982: 162, cf. 5; Kamerbeek 1970: 159.
[618] DuBois 1982: 29.

ἔσται; τὸν ἡβῶνθ᾽, Ἡράκλεις, οὐ ῥᾴδιον
εἴργειν·

There is no hint in this speech that he would regard the actions the young men negatively, and it appears that they will not be at risk of punishment if they do have sexual contact with the woman. The perceived motivation for their possible actions is desire, as is evident by the reference to her youth and appearance. It is perfectly natural to Admetus that the young men of his household would attempt to have sexual contact with the young and attractive slave girl, and he can apparently neither prevent them from doing so nor sanction them: her slave status means that she is sexually available. The woman's consent is not mentioned, but as she is a slave this is not a factor. Unlike the other plays the negative effects on the victim are not stressed. This is probably due to the fact that the audience know her to really be Alcestis, and therefore not actually at risk of sexual violation, and so would do nothing to increase the *pathos* of the play.

Conclusions

The initial force and violence of the capture of the female inhabitants of defeated cities are not disguised in tragedy. We are presented with the violence and trauma these women witnessed and endured: the destruction of their homes, cities, and the slaughter of their fathers, husbands, brothers, and sometimes children. Women's vulnerability to sexual violence in these circumstances is stressed throughout tragedy, and is regularly referred to as the final demonstration of the defeated city's utter desolation.[619] These themes are used to provide *pathos* and were already present in the Greek literary tradition, having been utilised in epic.[620] Defeat in war meant death for the men and children, and enslavement and sexual servitude for the women, as the curse in Hom. *Il*. 3.298-301 indicates. Nestor's sees the victory over the Trojans as culminating in sleeping with their wives,[621] though how far this is seen as an act of revenge for the abduction of Helen, mentioned in the next line, is uncertain.[622]

[619] See especially 'Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*' and 'Euripides' *Trojan Women*' sections; Aesch. *Sept*. 321-332, 363-368; Eur. *Andr*. 109-112, *Hec*. 905-942, *Tro*. 28-29, 197-206, 562-567.
[620] E.g. Hom. *Od*. 8.521-531, *Il*. 4.237-239, 24.725-736; cf. Kern 1999: 154-162; Dué 2006, especially 1-8.
[621] Hom. *Il*. 2.354-355.
[622] Also noted by Dué 2006: 4 n.7.

Bonds of affection are portrayed as forming quickly in epic, especially on the part of the captors/masters.[623] This theme seems to continue in tragedy, with Agamemnon being represented as having strong sexual desire for Cassandra, and pursuing her interests (cf. 'Euripides *Hecuba*' section). However, to do this to an excessive extent is portrayed as being regarded negatively by others within the play, which may have also been the case for the audience. The desire and affection captors show may have been an intentional device used by the authors to minimise any negative connotations carrying on enforced relationships with these women could have had.

Tragedy, continuing another theme seen in epic, gives the impression that it is the subsequent treatment of sexual partners (consenting or not) that reflects a man's character and how his actions would be perceived. The good treatment of captive-women seems to be a positive quality. Evidence from a number of the plays implies that the sexual relationship itself, regardless of whether the woman was a willing participant, created erotic *charis*.[624] This led to the imposition of obligations upon the sexual aggressor to protect their sexual partner, look after their interests, and to treat them and any offspring well in return (cf. 'Euripides' *Hecuba* – Cassandra' section).

War-captives in long-term sexual relationships were of higher status than ordinary slaves. One portion of Tecmessa's argument to Ajax, words which she puts into the mouths of his enemies, implies that even as an unofficial sexual partner she would have held a position of honour and glory (Soph. *Aj*. 501-503).[625] This picture is borne out not only in this play, in reference to Hesione, but also the treatment of Andromache in her name-play of Euripides (cf. above).[626] Whatever Heracles' true intention regarding Iole's status as a sexual partner no one who knows her circumstances regards her as an ordinary slave (cf. Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*' section).

Evidence from fourth-century oratory reveals that the sexual vulnerability of war-captives was recognised as a contemporary concern, and that the good-treatment of war-captives was seen as a positive quality by the Athenians. In Demosthenes 19, Satyros asks Philip of Macedon to release two young women, daughters of his deceased friend, who were captured when Olynthus

---

[623] Cf. Hom. *Il*. 9.413-420, 19.333-356, regarding Achilles' feelings for Briseis; Hom. *Il*. 1.113-115: Agamemnon regards Chryseis as equal to Clytemnestra.
[624] *Pace* Scodel 1998.
[625] Easterling 1984: 3.
[626] Teucer stresses Hesione's nobility, high-birth, and that she was not just a common slave (Soph. *Aj*. 1299-1304). Eur. *Andr*. 163-173: Hermione complains that Andromache has not learnt her new position and does not carry out menial tasks usually performed by slaves.

was seized. It is expressly stated that these girls are of marriageable age (194: ἡλικίαν ἔχουσαι γάμου), which may hint at their sexual vulnerability.[627] Satyros promises to dower the girls himself and arrange suitable marriages for them, which indicates that former war-captives, whether they had been the victims of sexual violence or not, would not suffer any reduction in status upon being freed.[628] This supports the hypothesis that if women were believed to be the unwilling victims of sexual violence they would be treated sympathetically and not be subject to any punishments or sanctions.

Conversely, the mistreatment of formerly free citizen women, especially that with sexual and violent connotations would be regarded negatively, and was used in the courts to make an opponent look bad. Demosthenes accuses Aeschines of getting drunk at a banquet and having an Olynthian captive-woman whipped when she would not recline on the couches with the guests or sing.[629] Demosthenes stresses the woman's good birth and character (196: ἐλευθέραν δὲ καὶ σώφρονα), and the scene strongly suggests that she was being treated not as a respected citizen woman, but as a *hetaira*, emphasising the sexual component to her treatment,[630] and her sexual vulnerability. This implies that Aeschines was behaving hubristically. The vocabulary may stress the woman's sexual vulnerability: the words used to refer to the whip (197: ἱμᾶντα and ῥυτῆρα) being used for reins and horse training. The use of the word to refer to the flogging is interesting, ξαίνει, is often used to refer to carding wool; as a free woman she would have ideally worked wool, and it might be intended as pathetic imagery to emphasise that she is being mistreated.

Pseudo-Andocides 4 criticises Alcibiades for buying one of the Melian captive-women and having a child with her. The source's claim that as he had argued for the severe punishment of the Melians, it made his relationship with the woman even more audacious, as he was responsible for her enslavement and the destruction of her family and city.[631] The author says that this is the kind of situation that the Athenians regard as terrible (23: δεινά) when they see it in tragedies. Though the speech is spurious and most likely dates to the fourth century BC,[632] this line does suggest that

[627] MacDowell 2000: 287.
[628] Dem. 19.194-195.
[629] Dem. 19.196-198.
[630] MacDowell 2000: 288.
[631] [Andoc.] 4.22-23.
[632] See Edwards 1995: 131-136.

tragic audience would regard the sexual victimisation of war-captives with sympathy. Plutarch seems to have access to the same speech, or its source, and also relates the story of the Melian woman and Alcibiades raising the illegitimate child he had by her, but adds that the people regarded this as a positive action on his part.[633] Although Plutarch wrote much later, and his source is possibly spurious, if Alcibiades raising the child was regarded positively, it supports the hypothesis of the sexual aggressor not be regarded negatively, or punishable, if he should care in the interests of his victim and any offspring he had by her.[634]

Although the sexual vulnerability of defeated and enslaved women seems to have been recognised as a consequence of war in fifth and fourth centuries BC it was perhaps considered distasteful or inappropriate to mention in certain genres. Thucydides does not mention a single instance of sexual violence, or even allude to the sexual vulnerability of war captives. This may be due, however, to the author's focus on the effects of the war on the *polis*-level, rather than the personal one.[635]

The evidence from epic, tragedy, and oratory does indicate that the vulnerability of female war-captives to acts of sexual violence was seen as a negative consequence of warfare. As such, those who were victims of such violence would be regarded with sympathy and pitied.[636] The sexual aggressors, on the other hand, were not automatically regarded as behaving negatively, especially if they were motivated by desire and/or entered into long-term relationships with the captives, and looked after their interests. However, if the aggressors' actions were presented as being motivated by their hubristic characters, or employing excessive violence and cruelty, they would be regarded as negative (cf. 'Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*' section). This attitude appears to have continued in later antiquity, with Pausanias's (10.22.2) condemnation of the Gauls' sexual violation (referred to as *hybris*), not being motivated by sexual desire (*eros*).[637]

---

[633] Plut. *Alc*. 16.
[634] Cf. Harris 2006d.
[635] Thucydides rarely mentions women at all, though he does mention their capture and enslavement on occasion (see Kern 1999: 135-162; Gaca 2010), and their sexual vulnerability may be implied by his audience.
[636] Cf. Kern 1999: 162.
[637] Cf. Harris 2006d: 312-313.

Chapter Four: Forced Marriage

In extant tragedies there are a number of occasions in which female characters are faced with the prospect of marrying against their will or are actually forced to do so. These plays are pertinent to a study on the representation of sexual violence in tragedy because they deal with the issue of women's consent, the sexual aspect of the marriage generally being stressed. Another feature of these plays, which does not seem to have been widely recognised by earlier scholarship, is that the women's sexual victimisation appears to be used in order to make women who are formerly unsympathetic in myth more appealing and sympathetic to the tragic audience. This plot-device can be used to provide justification for negative actions taken by those affected by forced marriage (though not always in the same play).[638]

The plays I shall be examining in this chapter are Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*; Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*; and Euripides' *Electra*, *Helen*, and *Iphigenia at Aulis*. In the majority of these plays the person forcing the heroine(s) into marriage (not always the potential husband) is presented as behaving hubristically: abusing or usurping positions of authority and using actual, and/or threats of, violence to compel the women to submit to the marriage.[639]

Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*

The entire plot of this play is based on the attempts of the Danaids to escape forced marriages with their Aegyptid cousins. The fifty daughters of Danaus have fled to the homeland of their ancestress, Io, in order to seek protection from the city of Argos against the marital intentions of their cousins. In this play the Aegyptids are characterised negatively as hubristic, violent, lustful, and impious. The vulnerability and desperation of the Danaids is emphasised, making the audience sympathetic to their plight. The Danaids' reluctance to marry their cousins is recognised by other

[638] I refer to this theme as a plot device as a number of these accounts seem to have been invented or utilised by the tragedians for no other purpose than making the women more sympathetic characters and/or as motivating factors for negative actions already associated with them in the mythic tradition. Only in Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* is the threat of forced marriage a standard and necessary feature of the myth.

[639] The texts used are West [1990] 1998 for Aeschylus; Sommerstein 2008 III for the Asechylean fragments; Diggle's OCTs for Euripides; and Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990a for Sophocles. All the translations are my own. The following editions have been consulted: Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980; Bowen 2013; Sommerstein 2008 I and III; Easterling 1982; Davies 1991; Dale 1967; Allan 2008; Denniston 1939; Kovacs 1998.

characters and they are treated sympathetically by them.[640] The presentation of the Aegyptids may have been used by Aeschylus to justify the Danaids' murder of their cousins though the reconstruction of the other plays of the trilogy is difficult because they exist only in fragments.[641] Consequently, this section is not concerned with the trilogy as a whole, or why the Danaids resist marriage to the Aegyptids,[642] but solely on how they represent the situation in which they have

[640] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 I: 39, note that the Danaids' 'determination not to be forced into a repugnant marraige is sympathetically treated, and is. . . guaranteed to make an overwhelming impression by the sheer dominance of their role.' However, they see the characterisation of the Danaids themselves as largely ambivalent (38). Buxton 1982: 72, reads Aeschylus's presentation of the Danaids as sympathetic, though he stresses the *bia* of the Aegyptids rather than the *hybris*. Bednarowski 2010, reads Aeschylus' representation of the Danaids as ambiguous, though his study largely focuses on the Danaids' suicide threat made before Pelasgus (455-467).

[641] It is generally accepted that the other plays in the trilogy were *Egyptians* and *Danaids*, the satyr play being *Amymone*, though some substitute *Chamber-makers* for *Egyptians*. For a detailed discussion and review of previous scholarship see Garvie [1969] 2005: 187-190; Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 I: 23-24. The place of the *Danaids* as last in the trilogy seems fairly secure after the discovery of *P. Oxy*. 2256 fr. 3, which gives the result of a tragic competition at the Great Dionysia, in which Aeschylus won first prize, although the names of the first two plays are missing the third play and satyr-drama are recorded as *Danaids* and *Amymone*.

A major issue for the reconstruction of the trilogy is the paucity of fragments from the other plays. Only one word is attested from *Egyptians*. Although *Suppliant Women* is widely regarded as the first play, this has been contested, most notably in recent years by Rösler [1993] 2007 and Sommerstein 1995: 117-123. They have argued that *Egyptians* came first in the original production, and was set in Egypt. They propose a plot consisting of the background to the enmity between Danaus and his brother Aegyptus, and the former learning of an oracle predicting his death. The oracle theory was first proposed by Sicherl 1986, although he accepted the general ordering and did not think the existence of the oracle was revealed as the cause of the conflict until the last play. The placing of *Egyptians* as the first play in the trilogy has been refuted by Garvie in the preface to the second edition of his study on the trilogy (xviii-xix). It is uncertain whether the oracle was even a feature used by Aeschylus; cf. Garvie [1969] 2005: xvii-xix. I follow Garvie [1969] 2005: 185-186, 197, in placing *Egyptians* second in the trilogy, and think that the play was probably set after the defeat of the Argives by the Aegyptids. The Danaids were presumably compelled to come to terms with the Aegyptids to secure peace, but that their father (who was possibly now the ruler of Argos) devised the plan to murder the grooms on the wedding night; cf. Winnington-Ingram 1983: 61-64. The attribution of *Egyptians* as the title need not imply that they were the primary chorus in this play, this could have still been the Danaids, with the Egyptians as a secondary chorus; cf. Garvie [1969] 2005: 201. It may have been that Aeschylus had run out of alternative titles for Danaus' daughters.

The two fragments which survive from *Danaids* confirm that the action apparently took place on the morning after the wedding and murder of all but one of the Aegyptids (F43), and that Aphrodite appeared at some point and gave praise of mutual sexual desire leading to successful and fertile marriage (F44). Whether this was given in the context of some kind of trial scene (of Hypermestra by her father for sparing Lynceus; or the other Danaids and/or Danaus by the Argives or Lynceus for the murders) is uncertain. Rather than being part of a 'trial-scene' I think it would be better placed in an epilogue designed to pardon both the actions of the Danaids and justify the actions of Hypermestra in sparing Lynceus, with the purpose of reconciling the Danaids to marriage. The passage represents marriage as the right and proper state for all creation, while stressing the ideal or mutuality and equality in sexual matters; cf. Winnington-Ingram 1983: 59.

The plot of *Amymone* probably consisted of one of Danaus' daughters being rescued from the threat of an enforced sexual encounter with a (group of) satyr(s) by the god Poseidon, and subsequently seduced by him. A fragment indicates that a major theme in the tetralogy was the inevitability of marriage for women, as the right and proper state (F13). Cf. Garvie [1969] 2005: 233; Winnington-Ingram 1983: 66, 71.

[642] It has been variously argued that the Daniads are merely opposed to marriage with the Aegyptids or that they are opposed to marriage in general. For surveys of previous scholarship and detailed arguments for both sides see Garvie [1969] 2005: 215-225; Ireland 1974; MacKinnon 1978; Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 I: 30-37; Winnington-Ingram 1983: 59-61; Turner 2001: 28-32. The exact motivation for the Danaids' resistance to marrying their cousins is never made clear. Headlam 1900: 111 believes this is intentional. Winnington-Ingram 1983: 60 follows Headlam and believes the lack of a specific motivation is designed to

found themselves, how it is received by the other characters, and the characterisation of the Aegyptids in this play.

From the prologue Aeschylus has the Danaids emphasise their general innocence and the hardships they are enduring in order to escape the threat of forced marriage (4-15):

Δίαν δὲ λιποῦσαι
χθόνα σύγχορτον Συρίᾳ φεύγομεν,
οὔτιν᾽ ἐφ᾽ αἵματι δημηλασίαν
ψήφῳ πόλεως γνωσθεῖσαι,
ἀλλ᾽ αὐτογενῆ φυξανορίαν,
γάμον Αἰγύπτου παίδων ἀσεβῆ τ᾽
ὀνοταζόμεναι <διάνοιαν>.
Δαναὸς δὲ, πατὴρ καὶ βούλαρχος καὶ στασίαρχος
τάδε πεσσονομῶν κύδιστ᾽ ἀχέων ἐπέκρανεν,
φεύγειν ἀνέδην διὰ κῦμ᾽ ἅλιον,
κέλσαι δ᾽ Ἄργους γαῖαν.[643]

The Danaids make it clear they have not committed any crimes and have reluctantly left their homeland to avoid marriage to their cousins. Even at this point the Aegyptids are characterised negatively: they have 'impious thoughts' (9-10: ἀσεβῆ. . . <διάνοιαν>). They do not inform us why they wish to avoid the marriage; we can only assume it has something to do with the character of the Aegyptids or the type of marriage they are pursuing. The subjectivity of the Danaids and their personal aversion to the Aegyptids is stressed. The Danaids have acted of their 'own accord' (8: αὐτογενῆ), and as Bakewell (2013) points out, 'the feminine gender and plural number of the participle ὀνοταζόμεναι emphasise that it is the women themselves who object to marriage.'[644]

'concentrate attention upon the violence of the pursuit and the loathing which it engenders. The violence of the Egyptians puts them in the wrong; they are guilty of *hubris*, and their victims deserve the pity of the Argives.'

[643] 8: The line is corrupt. M reads: ἀλλ᾽ αὐτογένητον φυ[..]ξανορὰν (M[a]). The emendations of αὐτογενῆ and φυξανορίαν, proposed by Turnebus 1552 and Ahrens 1832 respectively, are accepted by most recent editors (Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980; West [1990] 1998; Sommerstein 2008 I; Bowen 2013). For a full discussion of the issues with the line and proposed solutions, and a justification (*contra* Thomson 1971: 27-28) for αὐτογενῆ referring to the Danaids' own will, rather than 'kin' (making the incestuous nature of the relationships the reason for their rejection of the marriages); see Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 12-15. 10: There appears to have been a lacuna at the end of this line, for which Weil 1866 suggested διάνοιαν, which makes sense and fits the metre. It is used by Aeschylus in *Sept*. 831; cf. Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 15; Bowen 2013: 144.

[644] Bakewell 2013: 61.

This seems to imply that the Athenians may have had some appreciation for the issue of women's consent to marriage.[645]

Some argue that the emphasis upon their innocence concerning murder may be an allusion to their later murder of their cousins, alerting the audience to the traditional form of the myth.[646] It is also possible that in earlier versions of the myth the Danaids came to Argos only after the murders and that their supplication was aimed at cleansing the pollution they attained from the murders. As a result, Aeschylus would need to quickly stress his departure from the earlier tradition.[647] The statement of the Danaids that their first recourse was not to murder but to flight may reflect positively on them. The stress they place on their actions being orchestrated by their father may hint at the murder-plot being his idea, absolving the women of some of the responsibility.[648] Their claims of innocence would strengthen their appeals as suppliants.

The visual representation of the Danaids characterises them as innocent. In lines 21-22 we are told they are carrying boughs (σὺν τοῖσδ᾽ ἱκετῶν ἐγχειριδίοις,/ ἐριοστέπτοισι κλάδοισιν). Carrying wool-woven branches shows they are not carrying weapons and demonstrates a suppliant's peaceful intentions. They stand as symbols of sanctity, making the suppliant seem 'unthreatening and favoured by the gods.'[649] However, as ἐγχειρίδιος can be used of a dagger it may prefigure the murders.[650]

On a number of occasions the Danaids stress their unwillingness to marry the Aegyptids and give this as the reason for their supplication. The first is at 26-39:

καὶ Ζεὺς σωτὴρ τρίτος, οἰκοφύλαξ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν,
δέξασθ᾽ ἱκέτην τὸν θηλυγενῆ
στόλον αἰδοίῳ πνεύματι χώρας·
ἀρσενοπληθῆ δ᾽ ἑσμὸν ὑβριστὴν Αἰγυπτογενῆ,
πρὶν πόδα χέρσῳ τῇδ᾽ ἐν ἀσώδει

[645] This is not to say that their consent would be considered legally essential, but where there was a valid reason (such as hubristic behaviour on the part of the groom) for antipathy to the marriage or its continuation the Athenians may have been sympathetic to the women's plight; cf. Harris 2015a.
[646] Gantz 1978; Bednarowski 2010: 206.
[647] The epic poem *Danaids* may have located the murders in Egypt; cf. Garvie [1969] 2005: 179; Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 11.
[648] Sommerstein 1977; Zeitlin 1992.
[649] Naiden 2006: 56.
[650] Winnington-Ingram 1983: 66.

θεῖναι, ξὺν ὄχῳ ταχυήρει
πέμψατε πόντονδ᾽· ἔνθα δὲ λαίλαπι χειμωνοτύπῳ,
βροντῇ στεροπῇ τ᾽ ὀμβροφόροισίν τ᾽ ἀνέμοις, ἀγρίας
ἁλὸς ἀντήσαντες ὄλοιντο,
πρίν ποτε λέκτρων ὧν Θέμις εἴργει,
σφετεριξάμενοι πατραδελφείαν
τήνδ᾽ ἀεκόντων, ἐπιβῆναι.

The Danaids characterise the Aegyptids as hubristic in their pursuit of their reluctant cousins (30: ὑβριστήν). Their reference to the Aegyptids mounting their unwilling beds stresses the issue of the women's non-consent and makes the threat of sexual violation seem very real and imminent. The participle σφετεριξάμενοι in line 38, a legal term,[651] could be used to imply the Aegyptids' usurpation of their uncle's authority over the Danaids.[652] This would fit with theme of the authority of the woman's *kyrios* being usurped in other plays dealing with the threat of (or actual) forced marriage. Although Danaus' authority over his daughters is not stressed in the play, the fifth-century Athenian audience would certainly have regarded the arrangement of their marriages as his prerogative. The use of σφετεριξάμενοι implies that the Aegyptids consider their cousins property, foreshadowing the Danaids' fears that they will be treated like slaves.[653] Though never actually substantiated with legitimate evidence, the Danaids' claim to *Themis* so early in the play will, no doubt, have influenced the audience's perceptions of them, especially when contrasted with the *hybris* of the Aegyptids.

Danaus seems to regard his daughters' consent to their marriages as equal to his own (227-229):

πῶς δ᾽ ἂν γαμῶν ἄκουσαν ἄκοντος πάρα
ἁγνὸς γένοιτ᾽ ἄν; οὐδὲ μὴ᾽ν Ἅιδου θανών
φύγῃ ματαίων αἰτίας πράξας τάδε.

This passage emphasises the immorality of a man who pursues a forced marriage. It is considered remarkable that Danaus' paternal rights are not stressed in the play, particularly as under Athenian

[651] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 35, σφετεριξάμενοι can be used in a political sense to mean 'to seize wrongfully,' and could hint at some political discord between Danaus and his nephews and brother.
[652] This is the reading followed by Bowen 2013: 57, 151.
[653] See discussions of lines 333-339, 826-884, and 903-918.

law the consent of the woman's *kyrios* was the only one needed to contract a legal marriage on her behalf.[654] It has been argued that Aeschylus concentrates on the women's consent in order to stress 'the moral justness of the Danaids' cause.'[655] If this is the correct interpretation of Aeschylus' motivation, it follows that in order for this to be effective the audience would have had to have some regard for the consent of women to marriage and sexual congress.[656] If this was the case, it follows that they would feel sympathy for those forced to enter into marriages and sexual relationships.

In their appeals to the gods for assistance the Danaids associate their reluctance to marry the Aegyptids with the men's violent and hubristic nature:

77-82: ἀλλά θεοὶ γενέται κλύετ᾽ εὖ τὸ δίκαιον ἰδόντες·
ἦβαν μὴ τέλεον δόντες ἔχειν παρ᾽ αἶσαν,
ὕβριν δ᾽ ἑτύμως στυγόντες,
πέλοιτ᾽ ἂν ἔνδικοι γάμοις.

104-111: ἰδέσθω δ᾽ εἰς ὕβριν
βρότειον οἷος νεάζει πυθμὴν
δι᾽ ἀμὸν γάμον τεθαλώς
δυσπαραβούλοισι φρεσίν
καὶ διάνοιαν μαινόλιν
κέντρον ἔχων ἄφυκτον †ἄτᾳ δ᾽ ἀπάτᾳ† μεταγνούς.[657]

Again the Danaids contrast their own stance with that of the Aegyptids. Whereas their cousins act out of '*hybris*' (81, 104: ὕβριν) and pursue what is contrary to 'destiny' (80: αἶσαν) they merely want the gods to ensure what is 'right' (78: δίκαιον, 82: ἔνδικος). In contrasting the behaviour of the Aegyptids to the wishes of the Danaids Aeschylus compares the women's morality to the men's immorality. By espousing the Greek ideals of justice, right, piety, and self-control, the Danaids will

[654] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 I: 35, II: 183.
[655] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 I: 36.
[656] Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* 671 mentions both the father's and daughter's unwillingness to Zeus' desired 'marriage' to Io.
[657] 105: I have retained M's reading of βρότειον. Neither Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 nor Sommerstein 2008 have an issue with it. I find West's proposed Βήλειος unconvincing as the Danaids do want to differentiate themselves from the Aegyptids, contrasting the Aegyptids' *hybris* with their claim to *dike*; cf. West 1990: 133-134. I accept Whittle's οἷος over M's οἷα at line 105.
110: I accept West's obelization †ἄτᾳ δ᾽ ἀπάτᾳ†.

have no doubt won sympathy from the audience when compared with the hubristic, lustful, violent, and impious Aegyptids.[658]

Though the 'desire' (110: κέντρον) of the Aegyptids is mentioned a number of times, its cause is not.[659] In most instances of sexual violence related in tragedy the primary motivation of the aggressor is desire for the victim motivated by their beauty, which is generally interpreted as a positive motivation (as discussed in previous chapters). No particular quality of the Danaids is mentioned as a motivation for the Aegyptids' desire. This, combined with the presentation of the men as generally licentious, may have led the audience to perceive them as negatively motivated. Their desire is another symptom of their *hybris*. This would in turn increase the audience's sympathy for the Danaids, as it would heighten the likelihood of their believing the Danaids' claims that they would be regarded as possessions and mistreated, with no one else to turn to for protection.

The Danaids lament their troubles (112-116):

> τοιαῦτα πάθεα μέλεα θρεομένα λέγω,
> λιγέα βαρέα δακρυοπετῆ.
> ἰή, ἰή,
> ἰηλέμοισιν ἐμπρεπῆς {θρεομένη μέλη}
> ζῶσα γόοις με τιμῶ.[660]

As we have seen in other tragedies, the act and language of lament encourage the audience to perceive the character who is lamenting sympathetically, and to have pity for their situation. By emphasising their lamentations here and at various points throughout the play,[661] Aeschylus stresses the severity of the situation for the Danaids as well as their vulnerability. The lament in this situation would only have been fully effective if the Athenians were sympathetic to those who were the victims, or at risk at, of sexual violation and forced marriage.

---

[658] Robertson 1936, believes the main purpose of the play is to dramatise the opposition of *dikê* and *hybris*. Cf. Turner 2001: 41 and n. 44, for the Danaids representing Greek values while the Aegyptids possess negative barbarian values.
[659] See Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 97 for κέντρον as a term for sexual desire.
[660] 115: gloss from 112.
[661] Aesch. *Supp*. 69-75 and 194: Danaus advises his daughters to use the language of lament. The frequent prayers and appeals to the gods will have had a similar effect on the audience as lament, increasing the *pathos* of the Danaids situation and stressing their vulnerability.

From their exchange with Pelasgus the Danaids express their fear that they will be mistreated in their marriages to the Aegyptids (333-339):

[**<Π>**]: τί φῆς ἱκνεῖσθαι τῶνδ᾽ ἀγωνίων θεῶν
λευκοστεφεῖς ἔχουσα νεοδρέπτους κλάδους;
[<Χ>]: ὡς μὴ γένωμαι δμωΐς Αἰγύπτου γένει.
[Π]: πότερα κατ᾽ ἔχθραν, ἢ τὸ μὴ θέμις λέγεις;
[<Χ>]: τίς δ᾽ ἂν φίλουσ᾽ ὄνοιτο τοὺς κεκτημένους;[662]
[<Π>]: × – ∪ – × – ∪ – × – ∪ – >
[<Χ>]: × – ∪ – × – ∪ – × – ∪ – >
[<Π>]: σθένος μὲν οὕτω μεῖζον αὔξεται βροτοῖς.
[<Χ>]: καὶ δυστυχο<ύ>ντων γ᾽ εὐμαρὴς ἀπαλλαγή.

The Danaids fear suffering reduced status within the marriage and being treated as slaves. Bakewell argues that κεκτημένους (337) suggests 'the Aegyptids intend to acquire and treat them like property.'[663] The audience would certainly have felt sympathy for those who suffered a reduction of status through marriage or enslavement. It is possible that some statement regarding a dowry or buying a husband has dropped out between 337-338, or that the Danaids evaded the question asked in 336 and the reference to buying in M should be accepted. The complaint of buying a husband as a master is paralleled in Euripides' Medea (232-234), an instance when a woman feels wronged by her husband and has no one else to protect or defend her interests. A woman's dowry usually guaranteed her status within legitimate marriage and provided some security against abuse because if the woman was mistreated her male relatives could initiate a divorce and a suit for the return of the dowry (*dike proikos*).[664] However, in the case of these cousin-marriages there seems to be no one else who would be able to act on the Danaids' behalf if they were mistreated. It has puzzled a number of commentators as to why, when they do not want to be married to the Aegyptids, the Danaids fear the marriage would be easy to dissolve (339).[665] I

[662] M reads τίς δ᾽ ἂν φίλους ὤνοιτο τοὺς κεκτημένους; (Who would buy kin as masters?).
The line has been amended: φίλουσ᾽ is Bamberger's (1856b: 111) emendation; ὄνοιτο is attributed to Robortello 1552, though McCall 1982 has shown this to have originally been a typographical error. This reading more directly answers the question asked in 336. However, M's reading fits better with the response of Pelasgus in 338. Wilamowitz [1914] 1958 proposed a two line lacuna after 337, followed by Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 272-273, as 'in 338 has no possible referent in the transmitted text' (272).
[663] Bakewell 2013: 63.
[664] Cf. Harrison 1968: 45-60; MacDowell 1978: 87-89. On dowries see Schaps 1979: 74-88.
[665] Garvie [1969] 2005: 220, citing Wolff 1957: 116; Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 274.

think the issue here lies in the fact that as the Aegyptids seem to be their only kin the women would have no one to defend their interests should their husbands want to dissolve the marriages,[666] or to ensure their dowry was returned. In these marriages the Danaids would be completely dependent on the whims of their husbands. Without any external protection they would occupy a status very much like that of a slave. This further supports their allegations of *hybris*, as to treat a free person as though they were a slave was to commit *hybris*.[667]

The Danaids seem to think that their mere reluctance to marry the Aegyptids and their own suppliant status will be enough to persuade Pelasgus to support their cause. When this does not work because of Pelasgus' fear of the people's disapproval (365-369) they appeal to justice and stress the *hybris* and impiety of the Aegyptids:

392-396: μή τί ποτ᾽ οὖν γενοίμαν ὑποχε<ί>ριος
κράτεσίν ἀρσένων· ὕπαστρον δέ τοι
μῆχαρ ὁρίζομαι γάμου δύσφρονος
φυγάν. ξύμμαχον δ᾽ ἑλόμενος Δίκαν
κρῖνε σέβας τὸ πρὸς θεῶν.

418-432: φρόντισον καὶ γενοῦ πανδίκως
εὐσεβὴς πρόξενος·
τὰν φυγάδα μὴ προδῷς,
τὰν ἔκαθεν ἐκβολαῖς
δυσθέοις ὀρμέναν·

μηδ᾽ ἴδῃς μ᾽ ἐξ ἑδρᾶν πολυθέων
ῥυσιασθεῖσαν, ὦ
πᾶν κράτος ἔχων χθονός·
γνῶθι δ᾽ ὕβριν ἀνέρων
καὶ φύλαξαι κότον.

μή τι τλᾷς τὰν ἱκέτιν εἰσιδεῖν
ἀπὸ βρετέων βίᾳ δίκας ἀγομέναν

[666] Seaford 1987: 117-118, argues that fear of abandonment is a legitimate reason to reject a marriage.
[667] Dem. 21.180.

ἱππαδὸν ἀμπύκων,

πολυμίτων πέπλων τ᾽ ἐπιλαβὰς ἐμῶν.

In the first passage their reference to 'Justice' (395: Δίκαν) and 'what is honourable before the gods' (396: σέβας τὸ πρὸς θεῶν) implies that the Aegyptids' actions are unjust, dishonourable and impious. Again we have the morality of the Danaids contrasted with the immorality of the Aegyptids, making the aggressors seem more negative and the Danaids deserving of sympathy and assistance. In the second passage the Danaids stress the negative aspects of the Aegyptids further.[668] They draw attention to their persecutors' immorality by claiming to have suffered a 'godless banishment' (421-422: ἐκβολαῖς/ δυσθέοις). Critics have pointed out that the Danaids left Egypt of their own accord and criticise them for being disingenuous.[669] However, I do not believe Aeschylus meant the audience to interpret it as a literal banishment by the Aegyptids, but rather that the Danaids were compelled to leave due to their cousins' unreasonable behaviour. As they have told us in the prologue, they have not been exiled because of a public decree (6-7); they have left their country because of the behaviour of private individuals, which further implies that the Aegyptids are hubristic.

The Danaids draw attention to the Aegyptids' impiety by claiming that they will seize them 'as plunder from a sanctuary' (423-424: ἐξ ἑδρᾶν πολυθέων/ ῥυσιασθεῖσαν). This imagery stresses a number of themes: the physical violence which they are at risk of; that the Aegyptids see them as objects and possessions; and the sacrilegious nature of the Aegyptids who are prepared to steal from the sanctuaries of the gods.[670] The Danaids ask Pelasgus to 'recognise the *hybris* of men' (426: γνῶθι δ᾽ ὕβριν ἀνέρων). They are explicitly stating that the Aegyptids are acting hubristically towards them. Again the actions of the Aegyptids are regarded as 'against justice' (430: βίᾳ δίκας). The imagery the Danaids use to describe their situation as they are being led off

[668] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 330, note that the 'choral ode repeats in concentrated form all the main motifs of the preceding amoibaion. . . Combined with this recapitulation is a depiction of the seizure of the girls from the sanctuary. . . which, by developing in emotive detail a theme only suggested in 392-3, achieves a climax of exceptional power.'

[669] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 332, refer to this phrase as 'basically inconsistent' though they go on to concede that it could be 'credited with a subjective validity, in so far as the Aegyptiads' marriage-plans are the sole and compelling cause of the flight' (332-333).

[670] This would be regarded as an offence against the gods. As we saw in Euripides' *Trojan Women*, Athena was angry at the Greeks because Ajax dragged the suppliant Cassandra from her temple.

is also highly allusive, 'like a horse by the headband, and grabbed by my woven robes' (431-432: ἱππηδὸν ἀμπύκων,/ πολυμίτων πέπλων τ᾽ ἐπιλαβὰς ἐμῶν). This imagery evokes the sexual violation the Danaids will suffer after their seizure. It highlights the Aegyptids' treatment of them as possessions that are less than human. As we have seen repeatedly, horse imagery is used to refer to women who are sexually mature, ready for marriage, and consequently at risk of sexual violation.[671] It is a popular image for war-captives who are sexually vulnerable due to their newly enslaved and objectified state.[672] While utilising the imagery of the Aegyptids treating them like horses, the Danaids attempt to retain their humanity: In other examples of this kind of horse imagery, the women, especially those captured in war are often described as being dragged or seized by their hair. Here the Danaids refer to their headbands and their fine robes in order to stress their free, human, and non-objectified state. Aeschylus' use of the term ἄμπυξ, which can equally refer to the headbands of women and horses,[673] allows him to contrast the sympathetic image of the apparently helpless Danaids with the hubristic Aegyptids, who would treat the women as livestock. The Danaids are not uncivilised creatures and should not be treated as such by hubristic men. The audience would surely agree with this sentiment and are likely to sympathise with the Danaids and their cause because of it.

The Greeks' ability to feel pity for those who were victims of sexual violence which was characterised as *hybris* is demonstrated by Pelasgus (486-489):

> καὶ γὰρ τάχ᾽ ἄν τις οἰκτισας ἰδὼν τάδε
> ὕβριν μὲν ἐχθήρειεν ἄρσενος στόλου,
> ὑμῖν δ᾽ ἂν εἴη δῆμος εὐμενέστερος·
> τοῖς ἥσσοσιν γὰρ πᾶς τις εὐνοίας φέρει.[674]

Pelasgus acknowledges the weakness of the Danaids as a reason why the people will support their cause.[675] In this passage Aeschylus shows the audience that other people will perceive the

[671] Cf. Chapter Two, 'Sophocles' *Tyro A* and *B*' section.
[672] Cf. Chapter Three, especially 'Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*' section.
[673] LSJ A.2.
[674] 486: οἰκτισας ἰδὼν is Linwood's (1843: 237) emendation, M's οἶκτος εἰσιδὼν appearing to be corrupt.
[675] This passage seems to have been overlooked by Turner 2001, who claims that the Danaids fail to meet the criteria of supplication which he lists as the suppliant being 'in the right by virtue of striving toward a socially accepted goal. . . or . . . suffering hardship from a position of weakness' (28). Turner then goes on to claim that '[t]he Danaids fail to meet either of these criteria. Consequently, their assumption of the

vulnerability of the Danaids, which would likely strengthen the already sympathetic portrayal of their situation. This passage shows that the Aegyptids' actions would be interpreted as *hybris*, which would result in them being perceived negatively by the people. It appears that although they would pity the plight of the Danaids, it is the motivation and actions of the Aegyptids being understood as *hybris* that will lead the people to support the Danaids' cause. This seems to support the thesis that although the Athenians felt pity for the victims of actual or threatened sexual violence, they would only perceive that violence and the aggressor as negative and deserving of punishment or prevention if the aggressor was negatively motivated.[676]

Pelasgus' prediction seems to have been well substantiated, for when he returns he is able to inform the Herald that (940-944):

> ταύτας δ᾽ ἑκούσας μὲν κατ᾽ εὔνοιαν φρενῶν
> ἄγοις ἄν, εἴπερ εὐσεβὴς πίθοι λόγος·
> <. . . . . .>
> τοιάδε δημόπρακτος ἐκ πόλεως μία
> ψῆφος κέκρανται, μήποτ᾽ ἐκδοῦναι βίᾳ
> στόλον γυναικῶν.[677]

It seems that Pelasgus has been able to persuade the people to support the Danaids' cause without proof that the Aegyptids had no legal claim over them. We should, perhaps, interpret the Danaids' ability to convince Pelasgus of the Aegyptids' *hybris* as overriding any legal claim that the men may have had. The ability of the Aegyptids to embrace persuasion would demonstrate that they were not hubristic and there would no longer be any issue, whereas the use of violence would prove the Danaids' claims concerning the hubristic nature of their cousins and ensure their ongoing protection. This passage demonstrates that the original audience would have had some appreciation

---

suppliant's role is invalid' (28). But as the passage shows the Danaids are presented and regarded by Pelasgus and the Argives to be in a position of weakness. It could also be argued that resisting *hybris* would be seen as a socially acceptable goal, if this is their reason for refusing to marry the Aegyptids and they do not indeed reject marriage *per se*.
Naiden 2006: 4, emphasises the personal decision of the *supplicandus* as accounting for the success of the supplication, in which the supplicant's ability to 'defend themselves against suspicions of wrongdoing, and thus justify asking for pity' are deciding factors.

[676] Harris 2006d.

[677] Hartung 1854 proposed a lacuna after 941. This seems probable if M's τοιάδε is accepted in 942 a lacuna would be required.

of the issue of women's consent regarding marriage as it is the Danaids' consent the Aegyptids need.

As we have seen in other instances of threatened sexual violation, the Danaids see suicide as preferable to enforced marriages to the Aegyptids.[678] The Danaids' threat to Pelasgus (462-465) has been used to judge Aeschylus' characterisation of the Danaids, or at least their actions, as negative.[679] However, their threats to Pelasgus may not have been received negatively by the audience.[680] The Danaids consider the option of suicide on a number of occasions. They also consider suicide when they are alone (160-161 and 786-799), which may have led the audience to interpret it as the only option left open to them, and therefore not to regard the threat of suicide made in the presence of Pelasgus as maliciously motivated. The sexual aspect of the forced marriage may be alluded to in lines 789-790, reminding the audience of the physical and sexual violence the Danaids are at risk of from their cousins, inciting pity for their plight and justifying their reasons for suicide. The Danaids' willingness to go to such lengths to escape the sexual advances of their cousins emphasises the desperation and overall vulnerability.

The Danaids wish for death as an escape from marriage to their cousins.[681] They particularly fear their sexual violation within the marriage, which is indicated by the reference to the 'marriage-bed' (804-805: κοί-/τας γαμηλίου). I have demonstrated in previous chapters that death or suicide was often seen as preferable to sexual violation in tragedy.[682] This will become a common theme in the representation of the threat of forced marriage too. The audience's acceptance of women's desire to die or commit suicide rather than submit to forced marriage and

---

[678] Aesch. *Supp*. 160-161, 462-465, 786-799.

[679] Kitto [1939] 1961: 11; Burian 1974: 9-10; Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 I: 38, call it 'audacious blackmail'; Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 II: 360; Turner 2001: 35-36; Bednarowski 2010: 195 and n. 5.

[680] Naiden 2006: 84 regards threats as an inversion of the reciprocity part of the suppliant's argument. Naiden rightly points out that the threat does not lead Pelasgus to accept their supplication; it merely gets him to introduce their father to the assembly so they can judge their right to be accepted as suppliants (85). Bednarowski 2010: 197, argues that the audience's 'evaluation of the ethical implications of the threat would have depended almost entirely on the underlying justice of the Danaids cause.' He goes on to argue that '[a]lthough a threat of this nature involves calculation and perhaps manipulation, Athenian audiences would not have considered it inherently unscrupulous' (201). Cf. Parker 1983: 185, for suicide at altars as the last resort of suppliants, either as a threat or curse.

[681] Aesch. *Supp*. 779-782, 800-807.

[682] Bednarowski 2010: 198 n. 10, adduces Aesch. *Diktyoulkoi* F47, as the only example in tragedy of a woman threatening suicide in order to avoid sexual violation. But the desire for death to escape sexual violation is expressed a number of times, other characters expect women who are at risk of sexual violation to commit suicide, and young girls agree to be victims of human sacrifice in order to avoid sexual violation; cf. Chapter Three.

sexual violation indicates that the Athenians did have some understanding of the issue of women's consent to sexual intercourse.

Aeschylus has the Danaids continue to stress their fear and vulnerability, as well as the violent, lustful, and hubristic nature of the Aegyptids after they have convinced Pelasgus to support their cause and he has left the stage:

524-528: ἄναξ ἀνάκτων, μακάρων
μακάρτατε καὶ τελέων
τελειότατον κράτος, ὄλβιε Ζεῦ,
πιθοῦ τε καὶ γένει σῷ
ἄλευσον ἀνδρῶν ὕβριν εὖ στυγήσας·

748-752: μόνην δὲ μὴ πρόλ<ε>ιπε, λίσσομαι πάτερ·
γυνὴ μονωθεῖσ᾽ οὐδέν· οὐκ ἔνεστ᾽ ἄρης.
οὐλόφρονες δὲ καὶ δολ<ι>ομήτιδες,
δυσάγνοις φρεσίν κόρακες ὥστε βω-
μῶν ἀλέγοντες οὐδέν.[683]

755-759: οὐ μὴ τριαίνας τάσδε καὶ θεῶν σέβη
δείσαντες ἡμῶν χεῖρ᾽ ἀπόσχωνται πάτερ.
περίφρονες δ᾽ ἄγαν, ἀνιέρῳ μένει
μεμαργωμένοι, κυνοθρασεῖς, θεῶν
οὐδὲν ἐπαΐοντες.

762-763: ὡς καὶ ματαίων ἀνοσίων τε κνωδάλων
ἔχοντος ὀργάς χρὴ φυλάσσεσθαι κράτος.[684]

The continued stress by the Danaids upon the negative qualities of the Aegyptids and their own fear and vulnerability when they no longer need to win the support of Pelasgus would have reinforced the audience's perception of them as vulnerable and sympathetic characters. Once again they stress the *hybris* and impiety of the Aegyptids, emphasising their violent and immoral natures. In these

[683] 750: οὐλόφρονες is Valckenaer's emendation of δουλόφρονες in M; δολ<ι>ομήτιδες is Askew's emendation of δολομήτιδες in M. Both of these emendations are followed and cited by West [1990] 1998.
[684] 762-763: Here I follow the reading of Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980, amending M's ἔχοντες to ἔχοντος, which allows κράτος to be kept unchanged.

passages the physical and sexual threat they pose to the Danaids is also apparent: *hybris* (528: ὕβριν) has violent and sexual connotations; the Danaids claim that they will be unable to defend themselves as they have no fight in them (749), stresses their vulnerability and implies that the Aegyptids are violent; and they fear being physically seized by the Aegyptids (756). The licentious and unrestrained natures of the Aegyptids are emphasised through the comparisons with animals and the Danaids' descriptions of them: they are 'like ravens' (751: κόρακες ὥστε), scavenging birds who steal from altars;[685] they are 'raging, with the shamelessness of dogs' (758: μεμαργωμένοι, κυνοθρασεῖς), which stresses their lustfulness and aggression, qualities associated with dogs;[686] and phrase ματαίων ἀνοσίων τε κνωδάλων (762), neatly emphasises their violence, lack of restraint, licentiousness, impiety, and uncivilised behaviour.[687] The stress the Danaids place on the physical violence they fear from the Aegyptids and their lack of sexual restraint emphasises the sexual aspect of the forced marriage, not just reduced status and vulnerability to mistreatment, would arouse pity within the audience.

With the imminent arrival of the Aegyptids the Danaids appeal once more to the gods for assistance (808-821):

†ἴυζευ δ᾽ ὀμφὰν†, οὐράνια μέλη
λιτανὰ θεοῖσι καὶ <θεαῖς>,
τέλεα δέ {μοι} πως πελόμενά μοι
λυσίγαμ᾽ ἄχειμ᾽. ἔπιδε πάτερ,
βίαια μὴ φίλοις ὁρῶν
ὄμμασιν, ἐνδίκως· σεβί-
ζου δ᾽ ἱκέτας σέθεν, γαιάοχε παγκρατὲς Ζεῦ.

γένος γὰρ Αἰγύπτιον ὕβριν
δύσφορον < ∪ – > ἀρσενογενὲς·
μετά με δρόμοισι διόμενοι

[685] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 106.
[686] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 108.
[687] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 114 think ματαίων has 'a connotation of lewdness.'

φυγάδα μάταισι πολυθρόοις
βίαια δίζηνται λαβεῖν.[688]

The Aegyptids are once more characterised as hubristic (817: ὕβριν), violent (812 and 821: βίαια), and licentious (820: μάταισι). Friis Johansen & Whittle (1980) have suggested that the close proximity of μάταισι to βίαια. . . λαβεῖν may imply sexual violation.[689] The Aegyptids are described as hunting the Danaids (819: διόμενοι), which characterises sexual pursuit as negative.[690] This representation of the Aegyptids implies that they will marry the Danaids through physical and sexual violence, and reinforces the idea that the Aegyptids see the Danaids as less than human, regarding them as possessions. This suggests that the women will be mistreated by them within the marriage. This imagery, which forms part of a suppliant's prayer to Zeus, would surely elicit sympathy from the audience. The apparent stress on the sexual aspect of the Aegyptids' violence would only make sense if the poet expected it to enhance the effect upon the audience, indicating the Athenians did pity victims of sexual violence.

The Danaids' characterisation of the Aegyptids is borne out by the appearance of the Herald, who threatens and abuses the Danaids, and is disrespectful to the gods and the laws of Argos.[691] Though much of the scene is fragmentary, corrupt, and difficult to translate, we do get an impression of the *hybris* and violence of the Aegyptids, as well as the fear and vulnerability of the Danaids. In lines 826 and 827 the Danaids appear to refer to the Aegyptids as 'seizers' (μάρπτις), and make reference to sending forth loud cries (829: βοᾶν ἀμφαίνω), presumably shouts for help, and violent sufferings (830-831: πόνων/ βιαίων ἐμῷ). They claim that the Aegyptids 'show their

[688] 808-811: There are problems with the text of these lines; see Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 156-162 for a detailed discussion of these lines.
808: West [1990] 1998 transmits M's reading of ἴυζευ δ᾽ ὀμφὰν.
809: <θεαῖς> proposed by Bamberger 1856c: 130.
810-811: I have followed West's ([1990] 1998) reading, who adopts Headlam's (1898: 192) λυσίγαμ᾽ and Weil's (1866) ἄχειμ᾽, over M's λύσιμά· μάχιμά δ᾽. Although not entirely satisfactory it gives a general sense of the original sentiment; that the Danaids' prayers aim at releasing them from the prospect of marriage to their cousins.
818: The metre appears to be iambic, though with half an iamb missing, it is generally agreed that a verb has been lost from the line. I adopt West's suggestion of ἔφαν᾽.
[689] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 170.
[690] This verb is also used of Theoclymenus' negatively represented pursuit of marriage to Helen in Euripides' *Helen*.
[691] Zeitlin 1992: 215; Belfiore 2000: 56. It is uncertain whether a secondary Chorus of Aegyptids, or their slaves, enter with the Herald; cf. Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 172-173; *contra* Belfiore 2000: 56. I accept the arguments for a secondary Chorus. I refer to them as Aegyptids, as even if they are slaves I believe them to be analogous to their masters.

insolence in a savage-minded way, intolerable on ship or on land' (833-834: βλοσυρόφρονα χλιδᾷ/ δύσφορα ναΐ κἀν γᾷ). The Danaids are ordered to the boat and threatened with physical violence including tearing their hair and clothes (839: τιλμοὶ τιλμοί),[692] tattooing them (839: στιγμοί), and threatening to bloody them and cut off their heads (840-841: πολυαίμων φόνιος ἀποκοπὰ κρατός).[693] They do not care if the Danaids are willing or unwilling (862: θέλεος ἀθέλεος), and will use force to compel them (863: βίᾳ βιᾶται). The Danaids speak of outrages or maltreatment (877: λύμας), and committing *hybris* (880: ὑβρίζοντ), presumably in reference to the behaviour of the Aegyptids. They are then ordered to the boats again, this time with the threat of being dragged by their hair (884: ὁλκὴ. . .πλόκαμον).

The apparent accuracy of the Danaids' description of the Aegyptids will have reassured the audience of their basic honesty and lent further credence to their claims and reluctance to marry their cousins. The violent and hubristic natures of the Aegyptids are evident. They do not challenge the Danaids' accusations of *hybris*, but simply issue more orders and threats. Their own speech reveals them to be violent and shows that they will treat the Danaids as one would expect a runaway slave to be treated.[694] This reinforces the Danaids' picture of marriage to them as a form of slavery.[695]

When the scene becomes more complete the violence of the Herald is apparent (903-910):

[K]: εἰ μή τις εἰς ναῦν εἶσιν αἰνέσας τάδε,
λακὶς χιτῶνος ἔργον οὐ κατοικτιεῖ.
[X]: ἰὼ πόλεως ἀγοὶ πρόμοι, δάμναμαι. [905]
[K]: ἕλξειν ἔοιχ᾽ ὕμας ἐπισπάσας κόμης, [909]
ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀκούε <τ᾽ ὀ> ξὺ τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων.

[692] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 183.
[693] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 184, do not believe this is a serious threat as they cannot comprehend why the Aegyptids would want their prospective brides to be killed. It could be intended to demonstrate the extent of their *hybris*, and that they are not interested in the women themselves but are trying to usurp their uncle and gain the Danaids' inheritance, which if one or two were killed would be redistributed among the others.
[694] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 184, note that this is a way of punishing runaway slaves; cf. Jones 1987: 147-148.
[695] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 I: 30, citing Aesch. *Supp*. 221, 335, 392-393, 791; Belfiore 2000: 57.

[<X>]: διωλόμεσθ᾽· ἄεπτ᾽ ἄναξ πάσχομεν. [908]

[<K>]: πολλοὺς ἄνακτας, παῖδας Αἰγύπτου, τάχα [906]

ὄψεσθε· θαρσεῖτ᾽, οὐκ ἐρεῖτ᾽ ἀναρχίαν.

Once again the Danaids are threatened with physical violence; their clothes will be torn (904) and they will be dragged by their hair (909). Indeed, it has been argued that διωλόμεσθ᾽ (908) indicates that the threat of being dragged by the hair is being carried out.[696] The Danaids stress their vulnerability when they declare that they are 'being overpowered' (905: δάμναμαι), 'utterly destroyed' (908: διωλόμεσθ᾽), and are 'suffering outrage' (908: ἄεπτ᾽. . . πάσχομεν). By his actions here, the Herald clearly shows that Danaids' assertion that the Aegyptids would treat them as slaves was correct, and the Danaids will be completely subject to the Aegyptids.[697] During his encounter with Pelasgus the Herald gives further evidence of the objectification of the Danaids by their Aegyptid cousins, referring to them as 'my/our lost property' (918: τἄμ᾽ ὀλωλόθ᾽) the use of the neuter to refer to the women attests to their objectification.[698] Pelasgus accuses the Herald of impiety towards the Greek gods (921),[699] and he admits to revering only the Egyptian gods (922).

We get an impression of the general sexual vulnerability of the Danaids from their father Danaus when he prepares them for the entrance into the city (996-1009):

ὑμᾶς δ᾽ ἐπαινῶ μὴ καταισχύνειν ἐμέ,
ὥραν ἐχούσας τήνδ᾽ ἐπίστρεπτον βροτοῖς.
τέρειν᾽ ὀπώρα δ᾽ εὐφύλακτος οὐδαμῶς·
θῆρες δὲ κηραίνουσι καὶ βροτοί, τί μήν.
καὶ κνώδαλα πτεροῦντα καὶ πεδοστιβῆ,
καρπώματα στάζοντα κηρύσσει Κύπρις,
κἄωρα μωλύουσ᾽ ἅμ᾽, ὡς μαίνειν ἔρῳ,
καὶ παρθένων χλιδαῖσιν εὐμόρφοις ἔπι
πᾶς τις παρελθὼν ὄμματος θελκτήριον
τόξευμ᾽ ἔπεμψεν, ἱμέρου νικώμενος.
πρὸς ταῦτα μὴ πάθωμεν ὧν πολὺς πόνος,
πολὺς δὲ πόντος οὕνεκ᾽ ἠρόθη δορί,

[696] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 228.
[697] Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980 III: 229.
[698] The use of the possessive pronoun suggests the Herald to be analogous with the Aegyptids.
[699] The Herald has already declared that he does not fear the Greek gods in 893.

μηδ᾽ αἶσχος ἡμῖν, ἡδονὴν δ᾽ ἐχθροῖς ἐμοῖς
πράξωμεν.[700]

This is the first hint we have had in the entire play that the beauty of the Danaids could be the cause of others' desire for them. The emotive imagery of tender fruit vulnerable to destruction by men and beasts will have enhanced the audience's perception of the sexual vulnerability of the Danaids. As I shall observe in the other forced marriage plays, the vulnerability of the female protagonists to other male characters and men in general is mentioned. I believe the sexual vulnerability of the women is stressed to emphasise the immediacy of the threat against them. As a result, they are made more sympathetic to the audience. This device would only work if the poet expected the audience to regard potential victims of sexual violence sympathetically.

Towards the end of the play a secondary chorus warn the Danaids not to reject Cypris completely, and stress the importance of Desire and Persuasion in sexual relationships (1034-1042).[701] This is not at odds with the sentiments the women express at the close of the play: they wish not to enter sexual relationship by compulsion (1031-1032); pray to Zeus not to be married to the sons of Aeyptus (1052-1053) or bad husbands (1062-1064). The secondary chorus certainly seems to accept their aversion to the Aegyptids as well-founded (1043-1051).

From the close of *Suppliant Women* we get the impression that the Danaids do not consent to marriage with the Aegyptids based on the nature and actions of the grooms, and as this is due to the hubristic nature of the sexual aggressors it is regarded as a perfectly legitimate reason to reject the marriage. It appears to be a reason that would earn the sympathy and support of others. The speech of the secondary chorus supports the rejection of sexual relationships based upon force, especially when the use of force is due to the hubristic nature of the aggressor, but approves of those based on mutual sexual desire and persuasion. These themes seem to have been present in the other play in the tetralogy. The speech of Aphrodite from *Danaids* (F44) stresses the success of

[700] 1002: I follow the reconstruction West [1990] 1998.
1003: I retain M's reading of χλιδαῖσιν, which is followed by Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980, Sommerstein 2008 I, and Bowen 2013, over West's χλιδῇσιν.
[701] It is debated whether this secondary chorus consists of handmaids or Argive soldiers.

sexual relationships based on mutual desire.[702] This supports the Danaids' claim that they should be able to avoid forced marriages, but also condemns the forceful actions of the Agyptids.

The satyr-play which concluded the original performance was the *Amymone*. In this play Amymone is rescued from the unwanted sexual advances of a satyr by Poseidon, who then seduces her. Thus the plot of the trilogy seems to have been condensed. As Winnington-Ingram (1983) neatly summarises it:

> In either case a woman who has rejected sexual desire under the mode of *bia*, or force and violence, comes to accept it under the mode of *peitho*, of persuasion and enchantment. She who would not be forced is successfully wooed.[703]

Indeed, one fragment (F13: σοὶ μὲν γαμεῖσθαι μόρσιμον, γαμεῖν δ᾽ ἐμοί) could be taken as being spoken by Poseidon when he is attempting to persuade Amymone to submit to his sexual advances. Like Aphrodite's speech it represents marriage and reproductive sexual relations as inevitable for all creation.

Any argument relating to a precise theme in a tetralogy in which only one play remains extant and the evidence for the others are scant is tentative. However, it does seem that in this set of plays, which won first prize at the Great Dionysia, the major theme was the consent of women to marriage and sexual relationships.[704] The remaining play and fragments appear to strongly advocate mutual sexual desire between couples, while condemning unequal and forced relations in sexual matters. This suggests that the original audience was interested in these issues and sympathetic to the ideals related in this tetralogy.

---

[702] F44:
ἐρᾷ μὲν ἁγνὸς οὐρανὸς τρῶσαι χθόνα,
ἔρως δὲ γαῖαν λαμβάνει γάμου τυχεῖν·
ὄμβρος δ᾽ ἀπ᾽ εὐνάεντος οὐρανοῦ πεσὼν
ἔκυσε γαῖαν, ἡ δὲ τίκτεται βροτοῖς
μήλων τε βοσκὰς καὶ βίον Δημήτριον
δένδρων τ᾽ ὀπώραν· ἐκ νοτίζοντος γάμου
τέλειός ἔστι· τῶν δ᾽ ἐγὼ παραίτιος.
[703] Winnington-Ingram 1983: 71.
[704] *P. Oxy*. 2256 fr. 3.

Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*

Women of Trachis provides an example of the threat of marriage by compulsion with the tale of the river-god Achelous wishing to marry Deianeira. The violent aspect of the Achelous' lust is made apparent by his elemental nature and the eventual resolution of the threat through one-on-one combat.[705] Patterns discerned in other accounts of sexual violence and forced marriage are present: the aggressor is of higher status than the girl and her reluctant father, being the god of the largest river in Greece;[706] desire due to the potential victim's beauty is given as the motivation (25); and the victim's plight seems to be presented and treated sympathetically.

In the prologue we learn Deianeira's history; in her youth she faced the prospect of an enforced marriage to the monstrous river god, Achelous (4-17):

> ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν ἐμόν, καὶ πρὶν εἰς Ἅιδου μολεῖν,
> ἔξοιδ᾽ ἔχουσα δυστυχῆ τε καὶ βαρύν,
> ἥτις πατρὸς μὲν ἐν δόμοισιν Οἰνέως
> ναίουσ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἐν Πλευρῶνι νυμφείων ὄκνον[707]
> ἄλγιστον ἔσχον, εἴ τις Αἰτωλὶς γυνή.
> μνηστὴρ γὰρ ἦν μοι ποταμός, Ἀχελῷον λέγω,
> ὅς μ᾽ ἐν τρισὶν μορφαῖσιν ἐξήτει πατρός,
> φοιτῶν ἐναργὴς ταῦρος, ἄλλοτ᾽ αἰόλος
> δράκων ἑλικτός, ἄλλοτ᾽ ἀνδρείῳ κύτει
> βούπρῳρος· ἐκ δὲ δασκίου γενειάδος
> κρουνοὶ διερραίνοντο κρηναίου ποτοῦ.
> τοιόνδ᾽ ἐγὼ μνηστῆρα προσδεδεγμένη
> δύστηνος ἀεὶ κατθανεῖν ἐπηυχόμην,
> πρὶν τῆσδε κοίτης ἐμπελασθῆναί ποτε.

Terrified by Achelous, Deianeira was afraid of marriage to such an extent that she prayed for death. Once again, it seems the Athenians would have viewed death as a better option for the victim than sexual violation. This suggests they did have some appreciation for women's consent or reluctance in sexual matters, and would have had sympathy for those who faced this dilemma. The sexual

[705] Easterling 1968: 65; Segal 1995b; Sorum 1978.
[706] Easterling 1982: 73.
[707] Here I prefer ὄκνον, which is found in most manuscripts and printed by Easterling, as opposed to ὄτλον, found in Lγρ and printed by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson; see Easterling 1982: 73 and Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990b: 150 for discussion.

aspect of marriage being a considerable factor in her fear is indicated by her reference to 'approaching this marriage-bed' (17: τῆσδε κοίτης ἐμπελασθῆναί).[708] Though the text does not say so explicitly, her father appears to have been reluctant to give his daughter to Achelous. We are told that the river-god came as a suitor on three separate occasions, in three different monstrous forms, seemingly to be refused or put off every time. Whether Oeneus is mindful of her fear or simply appalled at the prospect himself is unknown; it is Deianeira's reluctance that Sophocles stresses.

Oeneus did not directly decide who his daughter's husband would be. Instead, it was settled by a wrestling match (18-28):

> χρόνῳ δ᾽ ἐν ὑστέρῳ μέν, ἀσμένῃ δέ μοι,
> ὁ κλεινὸς ἦλθε Ζηνὸς Ἀλκμήνης τε παῖς·
> ὃς εἰς ἀγῶνα τῷδε συμπεσὼν μάχης
> ἐκλύεταί με· καὶ τρόπον μὲν ἂν πόνων
> οὐκ ἂν διείποιμ᾽· οὐ γὰρ οἶδ᾽· ἀλλ᾽ ὅστις ἦν
> θακῶν ἀταρβὴς τῆς θέας, ὅδ᾽ ἂν λέγοι.
> ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤμην ἐκπεπληγμένη φόβῳ
> μή μοι τὸ κάλλος ἄλγος ἐξεύροι ποτέ.
> τέλος δ᾽ ἔθηκε Ζεὺς ἀγώνιος καλῶς,
> εἰ δὴ καλῶς. λέχος γὰρ Ἡρακλεῖ κριτὸν
> ξυστᾶσ᾽.

Desire is given as the motivation for sexual aggression with Deianeira blaming her plight on her beauty (25).[709] The fact that the choice of her groom was decided by a contest between Achelous and Heracles and that Heracles arrived 'just in time' (18) suggest that Oeneus felt compelled not to refuse the river-god outright. This indicates a possible abuse of status on the part of the god. Such abuse, especially relating to sexual matters was often associated in the fifth century with the actions of tyrants, and by implication hints at *hybris*.[710] Certainly the audience would have been sympathetic towards a girl whose father felt pressured into granting her to a particular suitor.[711] The text seems to imply that Deianeira's fear of marriage specifically relates to the suit of the

[708] Easterling 1982: 76.
[709] Easterling 1982: 76.
[710] Eur. *Supp.* 452-455; Hdt. 3.80.3.
[711] Cf. 'Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*' section.

monstrous Achelous, and not a rejection of the institution in general, as Deianeira is glad at the appearance of Heracles (18) and she asserts that Zeus decided rightly (26). These details suggest that the Athenians could be sensitive to the issue of women's consent to marriage. If this were not the case their inclusion in the characterisation of Deianeira as a sympathetic figure would not be effective and therefore make them redundant.

Unlike the examples we shall see in the Euripidean plays, which appear to be his own innovation,[712] the threat of forced marriage for Deianeira (or at least Heracles having Achelous as a rival suitor), seems to have already existed in the poetic tradition.[713] But as Easterling (1968) points out, unlike the Nessus-myth, which is essential to the plot of the play, Sophocles 'had no such obligation to use Achelous.'[714] Sophocles must, therefore, have had some important motivation for utilising this myth in the way he did. The Achelous myth does not just feature in the prologue; the battle between Heracles and Achelous is the focus of the First Stasimon (497-530). I believe the reason that Sophocles opens the play with Deianeira's experience of threatened sexual violation is twofold. Firstly, the battle between Heracles and Achelous reflects the themes we see later in the play in relation to Iole.[715] This is made plain by the First Stasimon's ambiguous opening that could refer equally to Heracles' battle for Iole or the one for Deianeira. Secondly, Deianeira's meekness and terror of violence and sexuality signals to the audience her characterisation as a gentle and tender woman, and is probably intended to contrast strongly with earlier representations of Deianeira as an Amazon-like figure, a 'slayer of men' as her name suggests, and a bitter and jealous wife who intentionally kills Heracles.[716] To judge by the artistic evidence, Sophocles may even have changed the nature of Deianeira's reaction to Achelous as her suitor.[717]

In recounting the battle and Deianeira's terror in the First Stasimon, Sophocles reminds the audience of their original sympathy for Deianeira and the delicacy of her nature, which is

---

[712] Or at least relatively less well-known in the case of *IA*, as no sources for this predate Euripides' play.
[713] Archilochus, 276, 286, 287; Pindar 249a (Snell); Jebb 1892: xix-xx; Easterling 1982: 15; Gantz 1993: 432.
[714] Easterling 1968: 64.
[715] See Chapter Three. Ormand 1999: 45 believes that 'the experiences of Iole and Deianeira are analogous.'
[716] See 'Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*' section in Chapter Three.
[717] Davies 1991: 61, '[v]isual depictions of the story often portray *Heracles* as the aggressor and Deianeira as expressing anguish and sorrow at the worsting of *Achelous*' (stress author's own). Cf. Isler 1970: 12.

highlighted with the closing imagery of her as a calf leaving its mother (529-530). The reiteration of these features of Deianeira's characterisation, just before we discover her use of the 'love charm' from Nessus and its effects, suggests forced marriage is a deliberate device used to create a Deianeira who is a sympathetic figure. The prospect of her sexual victimisation being used to enhance the audience's sympathy strongly indicates that the Athenians did have sympathy for victims of sexual violence and those compelled to marry, and that it was a device which could be used to make formerly unsympathetic characters more appealing.

Euripides' *Helen*

This play probably provides the most obvious example of the threat of forced marriage being used to make an unpopular character more sympathetic to the audience. The threat of forced marriage is a major device in the characterisation of the 'new Helen,' a woman who never went to Troy and is a paragon of female virtue and wifely chastity.[718] The aggressor, Theoclymenus, is presented as a violent and hubristic tyrant, who attempts to abuse the position inherited from his father as Helen's protector.[719] Once again desire provoked by the woman's beauty seems to be the motivation. Helen's predicament is met with much sympathy from the Chorus of Greek slave-women and Theoclymenus' prophetess sister, Theonoe. The importance of the sexual aspect of the forced marriage is stressed on a number of occasions, both directly and indirectly, through comparisons of Helen to victims of enforced marriage and non-consensual sexual assaults. Helen's fear of sexual violation and her vulnerability to it are apparent when she first meets Menelaus. The comparisons of Helen to victims of sexual violence and the stress on her sexual vulnerability are evidence for the view that the Athenians had sympathy for the victims of sexual assault. If this were not the case the inclusion of these references and plot devices would have made little sense.

Many scholars perceive Helen's comparison with Persephone and other victims of sexual assaults as allusions to Helen's abduction by Hermes (and her supposed abduction by Paris) and the

[718] The innocent Helen is not a Euripidean innovation but dates back to Stesichorus' second *Helen Palinode* (Pl. *Phdr*. 243a; *P. Oxy*. 2506 fr.26 col.i; Campbell 1991: 92-97). Herodotus, though not believing in an innocent Helen, has her spend the duration of the Trojan War in Egypt under the care of Proteus (2.112-120); see Allan 2008: 18-28.

[719] Proteus is not referred to as Helen's guardian (*kyrios*), though we are told that she was given to him for safe-keeping (910).

threat of forced marriage to Theoclymenus.[720] However, few have noted the effect of these repeated comparisons, which is to reinforce Euripides' sympathetic characterisation of Helen.[721] For this plot device to be effective, the audience must have had sympathy for victims of enforced marriages and sexual assaults, which implies that they showed some regard to whether women were willing sexual partners.

Though the 'new Helen' was not Euripides' innovation, the character of Theoclymenus and the forced marriage plot device seem to be.[722] The audience's sympathy for Helen is no doubt increased by the presentation of Theoclymenus as violent and hubristic. While Helen sits as a suppliant at the tomb of Proteus in order to escape the advances of the new king she tells us (60-68):

> ἕως μὲν οὖν φῶς ἡλίου τόδ᾽ ἔβλεπεν
> Πρωτεύς, ἄσυλος ἦ γάμων· ἐπεὶ δὲ γῆς
> σκότῳ κέκρυπται, παῖς ὁ τοῦ τεθνηκότος
> θηρᾷ γαμεῖν με. τὸν πάλαι δ᾽ ἐγὼ πόσιν
> τιμῶσα Πρωτέως μνῆμα προσπίτνω τόδε
> ἱκέτις, ἵν᾽ ἀνδρὶ τἀμὰ διασώσῃ λέχη,
> ὡς, εἰ καθ᾽ Ἑλλάδ᾽ ὄνομα δυσκλεὲς φέρω,
> μή μοι τὸ σῶμά γ᾽ ἐνθάδ᾽ αἰσχύνην ὄφλῃ.

[720] Pippin 1960: 156, perceives Helen's displacement to Egypt as similar to Persephone's captivity in the Underworld, and acknowledges the circumstances of their abductions as similar. She does not, however, connect Helen's threatened forced marriage to Persephone's forced marriage.
Podlecki 1970: 409, notes that the reference to Pan's sexual assault of the naiad evokes the threat Theoclymenus poses to Helen.
Segal 1971: 569-570, observes the parallel between Helen's and Persephone's abductions, the violence apparent in the account of Pan and the naiad, and beauty being the motivation in the assault of Callisto, though he does not believe that sexual violence featured in the myth of Cos.
Wolff 1973: 63-65, notes Helen's resemblance to Persephone. He perceives echoes of Helen's abduction by Paris and the threat now posed by Theoclymenus in the Chorus' reference to the naiad and Pan.
Robinson 1979: 163-166, sees 'Helen's threatened marriage to Theoclymenus. . .[as] analogous to Persephone's forced marriage by Pluto' (164). He goes on to list a number of elements throughout the play which would lead the audience to identify Helen and Theoclymenus with Persephone and Hades.
Juffras 1993: 45-46, recognises that the 'identification of Helen with the victims of male sexual aggression will be made again and again through repeated allusions to mythological abductions and rapes' (45), in order to 'reinforce the image of Helen as an innocent and chaste wife' (46). She also notes the stress Euripides places on the objectification of Helen through allusions to Persephone, Callisto, Cos, and the Naiad (48-49), but fails to see that this device is used to make her more sympathetic to the audience.
Allan 2008, repeatedly notes in his commentary that the comparisons and allusions to victims of sexual violence emphasise the threat Theoclymenus poses.

[721] Papi 1987: 34-35, recognises that Helen's prologue speech and her attribution of her supplication at the tomb of Proteus in order to escape sexual violation by Theoclymenus is intended to make her more sympathetic to the audience, but is intensely cynical as to the level of risk Euripides portrays. She does not discuss the allusions and comparisons to other victims of sexual violence.

[722] Allan 2008: 24.

From the first mention of Theoclymenus' desire to marry Helen we are presented with a violent and aggressive image of him, 'hunting' (63: θηρᾷ, the present tense implies an immediacy in the threat) after a marriage with Helen. As Allan (2008) notes, 'the hunting metaphors . . . suggest a raw and dangerous sexuality.'[723] The language of hunting to describe Theoclymenus' pursuit of Helen is also used at 314, where Helen describes him as 'the man hunting my marriage' (ὁ θηρεύων γάμους). Theoclymenus even describes himself as 'chasing' Helen (1184: διώκομεν). The image of Theoclymenus as a hunter which pervades the play is a constant reminder to the audience of the violent threat he poses to Helen and increases their sympathy for her.[724]

Theoclymenus is characterised as a tyrant. In fact, this word is used to describe him in several passages.[725] To the fifth-century audience this would have brought with it connotations of *hybris*.[726] The implication of Theoclymenus' hubristic character is borne out by his disrespect for the institution of *xenia* and the gods, as he seeks to kill all Greeks who visit his land.[727] This is extremely negative behaviour that would have shocked the audience. Indeed, Menelaus cannot believe what the Old Woman has told him.[728] The negative characterisation of Theoclymenus lends credence to Helen's accusations.

When Helen and Menelaus have recognised each other, she describes her current circumstances, and within five lines Theoclymenus is characterised as a tyrant, hubristic, violent, and as someone who disregards the rights and authority of others (783-787):

[Ἑ]: ἥκεις ἄελπτος ἐμποδὼν ἐμοῖς γάμοις.
[Μ]: ἦ γὰρ γαμεῖν τις τἄμ᾽ ἐβουλήθη λέχη;
[Ἑ]: ὕβριν γ᾽ ὑβρίζων ἐς ἔμέ, κἀν ἔτλην ἐγώ.
[Μ]: ἰδίᾳ σθένων τις ἢ τυραννεύων χθονός;
[Ἑ]: ὃς γῆς ἀνάσσει τῆσδε Πρωτέως γόνος.

Euripides has Helen make a direct accusation of *hybris* against Theoclymenus in line 785 indicating that the Athenians took accusations of sexual assault and harassment seriously. Menelaus' response

[723] Allan 2008: 156.
[724] Eur. *Hel*. 153-154, 1169-1170. Cf. Segal 1971: 583.
[725] Podlecki 1970: 414: 'Theoclymenus behaves as the Greeks of this period expected a *tyrannos* would, applying *hybris* to unwilling females.' Theoclymenus is referred to as a tyrant at lines 552, 786, 809, 817.
[726] For the *hybris* of tyrants relating to sexual violence see Eur. *Supp*. 452-455; Hdt. 3.80.3.
[727] Eur. *Hel*. 155, 437-440, 479-480, 778, 1171-1176.
[728] Eur. *Hel*. 449, 501-502.

once again stresses the connection between tyranny and *hybris*, characterising Theoclymenus as a typical wicked and sexually licentious tyrant.

Theoclymenus' abuse of his position and disrespect for the authority of others are evident even after Helen and Menelaus have escaped. When Theoclymenus discovers Theonoe has aided their escape by not telling him of Menelaus' true identity, he intends to kill her, leading to an argument with a slave who tries to prevent him (1634-1636):

[Θεο]: τἀμὰ λέκτρ᾽ ἄλλῳ διδοῦσα.

[Θερ]: τοῖς γε κυριωτέροις.

[Θεο]: κύριος δὲ τῶν ἐμῶν τίς;

[Θερ]: ὃς ἔλαβεν πατρὸς πάρα.

[Θεο]: ἀλλ᾽ ἔδωκεν ἡ τύχη μοι.

[Θερ]: τὸ δὲ χρεὼν ἀφείλετο.

Here, it is clear that Theoclymenus does not respect the rights or authority of Helen's true *kyrios*, claiming supreme authority for himself. His sexual desire is stressed by his reference to his potential marriage to Helen as *lektra* ('bed'). This close association with physical gratification and usurping the authority of others will have been received by the audience as further evidence of his hubristic nature, making him a negative figure in their eyes. It would justify Helen's actions and deceit, maintaining the audience's sympathy for her and her legitimate husband.

Some have interpreted Theoclymenus more positively.[729] Those who do so neglect the characterisation of him before his appearance or claim it is exaggerated. It is true that he shows some piety for the tomb of his father, but this is necessitated by the plot, which needs to explain how Helen has remained safe from his advances. Theoclymenus would not drag Helen from the tomb by force himself, but she does fear what would happen if she left.[730] She thinks it possible that Theoclymenus has tasked someone with the job of dragging her from it.[731] It is true that for him Helen's consent is preferable, but there is no hint that it would have been essential. In the *Lysistrata* sex with a compliant wife is presented as preferable, but the lack of consent and

[729] Grube 1941: 348, sees Theoclymenus, after he appears on stage as 'a pious and kindly man. This contradiction between his filial piety and his desire to make Helen his wife . . . is easily explained by the fact that he is in love.' Blondell 2013: 206, 'Theoclymenus is no rapist. . .[t]he marriage is contingent on her consent, albeit under duress (294). Theoclymenus desires her 'good will' (1425).'
[730] Eur. *Hel.* 316.
[731] Eur. *Hel.* 542.

resistance would not stop a husband, only make the experience less enjoyable for him.[732] Indeed, Theoclymenus' intention to kill her husband or anyone who may take news of Helen's whereabouts to him, in order to remove any impediment to his own marriage to her, has been emphasised on a number of occasions. Helen herself believes that if Theoclymenus discovers Menelaus he will be killed and she will be married by force (833: θανῇ· γαμοῦμαι δ᾽ ἡ τάλαιν᾽ ἐγὼ βίᾳ). The threat posed by Theoclymenus is very real and violent.

We are not told in the prologue that Helen's beauty is the motivation for Theoclymenus' desire to marry her. However, Helen's beauty is so canonical that Euripides did not need to labour the point. When Theoclymenus appears on stage there are a number of comments that suggest her beauty is the motivation. Theoclymenus refers to Helen as 'the bed-mate whom I desire' (1183: ἄλοχος ἧς ἐφίεμαι). Referring to Helen as ἄλοχος emphasises the sexual nature of Theoclymenus' desire. That his desire has been aroused by her beauty is indicated when he instructs Helen 'do not waste away your complexion with too many tears' (1419: μή νυν ἄγαν σὸν δάκρυσιν ἐκτήξῃς χρόα). He gives her this advice when she is supposedly mourning the death of her first husband, Menelaus. The attempt of Theoclymenus to curb Helen's mourning would further alienate the audience's sympathy for him by portraying him as impious and disrespectful of Menelaus' status.

Throughout the play Helen attributes her misfortunes and those of others to her infamous beauty.[733] On a number of occasions it is stressed that desire caused by the victim's beauty motivates sexual assaults, and that there is a negative impact on the victim. We are left in no doubt that the desire caused by Helen's beauty is a destructive force, as it has been for other victims of sexual violence before her (375-385):

> ὦ μάκαρ Ἀρκαδίᾳ ποτὲ παρθένε
> Καλλιστοῖ, Διὸς ἃ λεχέων ἀπέ-
> βας τετραβάμοσι γυίοις,
> ὡς πολὺ κηρὸς ἐμᾶς ἔλαχες πλέον,[734]

[732] Ar. *Lys.* 162-163.
[733] Eur. *Hel.* 260-261. For Helen's beauty in relation to the cause of the Trojan War cf. 27-28, 304-305, 364-365.
[734] This line is emended by Diggle 1994: 178-179, from ὡς πολὺ μητρὸς ἐμᾶς ἔλαχες πλέον, followed by Kovacs 2002a: 52 and Allan 2008: 193, who thinks 'μητρὸς introduces a pointless reference to Leda, spoiling the connection between H[elen] and Callisto.' Robinson 2006: 154, follows Dale 1967: 92, in accepting the reference to Leda as a comparison between intercourse with Zeus in a metamorphosed state.

ά μορφᾷ θηρῶν λαχνογυίων
†ὄμματι λάβρῳ σχῆμα λεαίνης†[735]
ἐξαλλάξασ᾽ ἄχθεα λύπας·
ἅν τέ ποτ᾽ Ἄρτεμις ἐξεχορεύσατο
χρυσοκέρατ᾽ ἔλαφον Μέροπος Τιτανίδα κούραν[736]
καλλοσύνας ἕνεκεν· τὸ δ᾽ ἐμὸν δέμας
ὤλεσεν ὤλεσε πέργαμα Δαρδανίας
ὀλομένους τ᾽ Ἀχαιούς.

The women in this passage have suffered due to their beauty. In Callisto's case her beauty aroused desire in Zeus. Though it is unclear in this passage whether she was Zeus' willing sexual partner, I think we are meant to read her as unwilling as this fits the themes of the play and makes her suffering all the more pitiable.[737] Another point of comparison with Helen is that both of these women were removed from their native lands because of their beauty and from human society forever through their metamorphosis. Helen has been taken from Sparta to Egypt, the barbarian land of the dead, and fears that she will never return home. The stress placed in this passage on the negative consequences faced by victims of sexual assaults implies that the Greeks did have sympathy for the victims.

The audience's sympathy for Helen regarding the sexual aspect of the enforced marriage can be inferred from her repeated references to it. From the first we hear of Theoclymenus' advances it is not her marriage (γάμος) Helen wants to preserve but her marriage-bed (66: λέχη). It is true that Hermes has informed her that she must remain chaste if she is to be reunited with her husband and return home (56-59):

θεοῦ τόδ᾽ εἰσήκουσ᾽ ἔπος
Ἑρμοῦ, τὸ κλεινὸν ἔτι κατοικήσειν πέδον

However, in the examples given the women are transformed after intercourse, whereas in the case of Leda, Zeus was the swan and the metamorphosis was a device used in order to facilitate the intercourse (Eur. *Hel*. 16-21). Helen's beauty is the subject from line 383, which suggests that she is meant to be one compared to the other women.

[735] Deleted by Dingelstad 1865: 52, followed by Allan 2008; obelised by Diggle 1994.

[736] This figure is generally identified as Cos. Robinson 2006: 157-159, has convincingly argued that she should be identified as Taygeta, making both women in this passage the mothers of Peloponnesian heroes.

[737] The mythical tradition varies, though as we have already heard, Zeus had intercourse with Leda by deceit (Eur. *Hel*. 16-21).

Σπάρτης σὺν ἀνδρί, γνόντος ὡς ἐς Ἴλιον
οὐκ ἦλθον, ἢν μὴ λέκτρ᾽ ὑποστρώσω τινί.

However, Helen stresses the immediate and negative physical consequences for herself which have caused her to supplicate the tomb, 'my body, at least, may not incur dishonour here' (67: μή μοι τὸ σῶμά γ᾽ ἐνθάδ᾽ αἰσχύνην ὄφλῃ). Helen's wish to preserve not only her first marriage, but her disgust at Theoclymenus is also stressed later. When Helen thinks Menelaus is dead, she briefly considers her options, including marriage to Theoclymenus, but concludes, 'whenever a husband who is hateful has sex with his wife even her own body is hateful to her' (296-297: ὅταν πόσις πικρὸς/ ξυνῇ γυναικί, καὶ τὸ σῶμ᾽ ἐστιν πικρόν). This comment shows that Athenian males were aware of the role played by women's desire within marriage and suggests that they would have had sympathy for those who were forced to conduct a sexual relationship with husbands they found repellent. After reaching this conclusion Helen sees her only option as death (298: θανεῖν κράτιστον· πῶς θάνοιμ᾽ ἂν οὐ καλῶς;).[738] Once again we have evidence that the Athenians would have understood the mentality of women who see suicide as preferable to submitting to sexual violation. This would not be the case if they did not sympathise with victims of sexual violence.

The numerous allusions and comparisons to other victims of sexual violence and enforced marriages are designed to make Helen more sympathetic. The most common comparison (both direct and indirect) is to Persephone. Like Persephone, Helen has been abducted by a god with the full knowledge and consent of her father, Zeus (44-48):

λαβὼν δέ μ᾽ Ἑρμῆς ἐν πτυχαῖσιν αἰθέρος
νεφέλῃ καλύψας — οὐ γὰρ ἠμέλησέ μου
Ζεύς — τόνδ᾽ ἐς οἶκον Πρωτέως ἱδρύσατο,
πάντων προκρίνας σωφρονέστατον βροτῶν,
ἀκέραιον ὡς σώσαιμι Μενέλεῳ λέχος.

In Helen's case Zeus has not contrived her abduction in order to force her into marriage but to preserve her existing marriage and chastity. Helen's vulnerability to sexual violation (presumably

[738] A sentiment reiterated in line 837. This line is deleted by Diggle 1994, who seems to mistakenly attribute the deletion of 298-302 to Clark, however it appears to sate back to Badham, recorded in Lightfoot 1858. However, it is retained by Allan 2008 and Kovacs 2002a, following Hartung 1851b, who only deletes 299-302. I prefer to retain the line.

caused by her beauty) is emphasised here. She has been given to Proteus because he is the 'most self-controlled of men' (47). The implication is predominantly sexual, especially considering the next line, which refers specifically to Helen's chastity. Abduction by a deity will no doubt be fresh in the mind of the audience when they learn of the threat of forced marriage to Theoclymenus, which Helen is now facing. It reinforces the image of Egypt as the Underworld.[739] There are numerous other references and comparisons to Persephone, which no doubt will have alerted the audience to the similarities between their situations and increased their sympathy for Helen.[740]

In Helen's more detailed account of her abduction by Hermes she states that he took her while she was plucking flowers and gathering them into her garments.[741] This image not only reflects the abduction of Persephone related in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* but also echoes Apollo's seizure of Creusa, which took place before the sexual assault in *Ion*.[742] Indeed, as I have already discussed, the flower-picking motif had a long tradition in Greek literary portrayals of divine abductions and sexual assaults.[743] This detail in Helen's abduction by Hermes highlights her sexual vulnerability in order to make her more sympathetic.[744]

The allusions and comparisons to victims of sexual assaults are not just made by Helen herself but also the Chorus, which suggests that they too interpret the danger towards Helen as real and they have sympathy for her situation. The most striking comparison of Helen to a victim of sexual violence comes from the Chorus (184-190):

> ἔνθεν οἰκτρὸν ὅμαδον ἔκλυον,
> ἄλυρον ἔλεγον, ὅτι ποτ᾽ ἔλακεν
> <- - ∪> αἰάγμα-
> σι στένουσα νύμφα τις
> οἷα Ναΐς ὄρεσι †φυγάδα

[739] Jesi 1965: 57; Wolff 1973: 64 and n. 11; Robinson 1979: 165; Juffras 1993: 46-47, who also notes that Hermes escorts the dead to the Underworld.
[740] Helen invokes Persephone at line 175, and the Second Stasimon (1301-1368) concerns Demeter's search for Persephone; cf. Robinson 1979: 165-166. Wolff 1973: 63, lists Helen and Persephone's similarities: abducted (50, 246, 1312, 1322; 606 and 1671), by deceit (238, 1322), from a flowery meadow (243ff.; *Hom. Hymn Dem*. 6f, 426f); presumed dead (286).
[741] Eur. *Hel*. 244-245: χλοερὰ δρεπομέναν ἔσω πέπλων/ ῥόδεα πέταλα.
[742] Eur. *Ion* 888-889: εὖτ᾽ ἐς κόλπους/ κρόκεα πέταλα φάρεσιν ἔδρεπον.
[743] See Chapter One; cf. Motte 1973; Bremer 1975; Cairns 1997; Deacy 2013.
[744] The similarity to Creusa's experience is noted by Segal 1971: 570. Juffras 1993: 47 also compares Helen's abduction to Creusa's assault, though not as a direct allusion but in the context of 'the abduction of a young girls from a meadow by a god. . .[being] a common motif in Greek mythology.' Cf. Juffras 1993: 47 n. 9 and n. 10; Allan 2008: 178.

γάμωνϯ[745] ἰεῖσα γοερόν, ὑπὸ δὲ
πέτρινα γύαλα κλαγγαῖσι
Πανὸς ἀναβοᾷ γάμους.

From the moment the Chorus enter, the audience are made aware of their concern and sympathy for Helen. It is interesting that even though they are Greek women who have been captured and enslaved, their own sexual vulnerability is not stressed.[746] I believe this omission is intentional on the part of Euripides, who does not want to shift the focus from Helen and risk dividing the sympathies of the audience. The Chorus has come in alarm, afraid that Helen is under physical threat. Their comparison of her cries to those made by a nymph or naiad trying to escape, then being forcibly submitted to the sexual advances of Pan emphasises the sexual threat they perceive she is under from Theoclymenus.[747] There may also be another allusion to a victim of divine sexual assault in this passage, the assault of Creusa by Apollo. If Euripides' *Ion* predates or was part of the same trilogy as *Helen* the audience might have perceived the naiad 'under rocky hollows. . .with Pan,' as alluding to Apollo's assault of Creusa, which took place in a rocky cave sacred to Pan.[748] As I have demonstrated in Chapter One, Euripides portrays Creusa's situation sympathetically. If Euripides is alluding to Creusa, his aim may be to make Helen more sympathetic. Allan (2008) points out that the 'frequent references to forms of lament. . . evoke the sympathy and pity associated with real-life *gooi* and *thrênoi*, and trigger these responses for the audience.'[749] Because the subjects of these laments are often the sexual vulnerability of Helen and others, the Greek audience would have regarded the victims of sexual assaults and enforced sexual relationships sympathetically.

Helen's plight is compared with other mythical victims of sexual violence, namely the Trojan women who have been captured after the fall of Troy and enslaved (1112-1116):

θρήνων ἐμοὶ ξυνεργός,
Ἑλένας μελέας πόνους

[745] <L> P.
[746] Eur. *Hel*. 192-193.
[747] Wolff 1973: 65; Juffras 1993: 48, who notes the importance of the cry for help in gaining assistance and indicating consent; cf. Richardson 1974: 6; Allan 2008: 173.
[748] Eur. *Ion* 492-506. *Helen* was produced in 412 BC, along with *Andromeda*. Zacharia 2003 has proposed that *Ion* was part of this trilogy. However, there is no secure evidence for the dating of *Ion*; see Martin 2010.
[749] Allan 2008: 171.

τὸν Ἰλιάδων τ᾽ ἀει-
δούσᾳ δακρυόεντα πότμον
Ἀχαιῶν ὑπὸ λόγχαις.

I demonstrated in Chapter Three that the Athenian audience would have had sympathy for the fates of war-captives, in particular their sexual vulnerability and risk of enforced sexual relationships with their captors. Though an accepted consequence of war; the situation was seen as lamentable and deserving pity. By evoking a scenario of sexual violation after capture in war rather than just using mythical imagery, Euripides brings Helen's situation into the present and stresses the physical violence associated with it. This implies that the Athenians did have sympathy for victims of sexual assaults and enforced sexual relationships regardless of the context.

Theonoe's sympathy for Helen's predicament would also affect the way the audience viewed her and her situation. Theonoe agrees that the behaviour of her brother is a 'folly' (1018: μωρία).[750] She helps Helen and Menelaus in order to impede her brother's impiety (1021: δυσσέβεια). Though not overly critical of her brother, she describes his actions in a way that implies their hubristic nature. Furthermore, she does not think he will welcome her interference (1020). Helen's ability to win favour with a positive character like Theonoe suggests that the audience too would have perceived Helen in a sympathetic light.

Helen's feelings of sexual vulnerability are highlighted when she meets Menelaus:

541-546: ἔα, τίς οὗτος; οὔ τί που κρυπτεύομαι
Πρωτέως ἀσέπτου παιδὸς ἐκ βουλευμάτων;
οὐχ ὡς δρομαία πῶλος ἢ βάκχη θεοῦ
τάφῳ ξυνάψω κῶλον; ἄγριος δέ τις
μορφὴν ὅδ᾽ ἐστίν ὅς με θηρᾶται λαβεῖν.

550-552: ἀδικούμεθ᾽, ὦ γυναῖκες· εἰργόμεσθα γὰρ
τάφου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε, καί μ᾽ ἑλὼν θέλει
δοῦναι τυράννοις ὧν ἐφεύγομεν γάμους.

[750] This word features in a sexual context to denote licentiousness or lack of control in a number of Euripidean plays: *Hipp*. 644 and *Ion* 545 when Xuthus is contextualising his assault upon Ion's supposed mother. Cf. Allan 2008: 257; Barrett 1964: 282, also citing *Andr*. 674; *El*. 1035; *Hipp*. 966; *Tro*. 989 and 1059; and F331. Barrett states, 'though a euphemism the word remains strongly condemnatory.'

The fear of sexual violation by someone other than the main aggressor is a feature noted in other tragedies that include the plot device of forced marriage. This further stress on the sexual vulnerability of the female protagonist enhances the credibility of the threat already faced and is highly suggestive of sexual violence being used to make them appear more sympathetic. The comparisons of Helen to a 'filly or a bacchant' (543) emphasise that the vulnerability she feels is of a sexual nature. As I have discussed in Chapters Two and Three, horse imagery, especially unbroken foals, is used to imply the sexual maturity and vulnerability of victims of sexual violence.[751] The sexual vulnerability of bacchants and their comparability with victims of sexual violence has been noted in relation to Antiope in Chapter Two. Euripides' added emphasis on the sexual vulnerability of Helen implies that the audience would have sympathy for victims of sexual violence. The hunting metaphor and the characterisation of Theoclymenus as an impious tyrant reinforce Euripides' negative portrayal of Theoclymenus and highlights the immediacy of the threat he actually poses to Helen. The aim of this is to enhance Euripides' characterisation of the 'new Helen' by making her more sympathetic to the audience. His use of this device, however, is only explicable if the Athenians had sympathy for victims of sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships.

Euripides' *Electra*

In this play we have an example of a forced marriage instigated by the woman's (nominal) *kyrios*.[752] Aegisthus' actions and his motivation for forcing Electra to marry far below her station are presented as negative and hubristic, and are condemned as such by a number of characters. Meanwhile, Electra is treated sympathetically by other characters. One surprising feature about this marriage is that Euripides presents it as unconsummated; the actual *pathos* of Electra's situation is derived from her much-reduced and poor status. Nevertheless, that the audience would have had greater sympathy for her if she had been the victim of sexual violence or compulsion

[751] See Chapter Two 'Sophocles' *Tyro A* and *B*' section; Chapter Three 'Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*' section.
[752] Aegisthus is not Electra's legitimate *kyrios*, see below.

within the marriage is apparent. It is also emphasised by the Farmer's sexual restraint being stressed and commended on a number of occasions.

The forced marriage plot device seems to be intended to make the female protagonist more sympathetic to the audience and provide justification for her part in the plot to murder Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. Electra's involvement in the matricide of Clytemnestra, a feature of all three of the extant tragedies concerning this myth,[753] had the potential to make her a negative figure in the eyes of the Athenian audience, for whom the mistreatment of a parent was a great taboo, and murder often resulted in associated pollution.[754] In Euripides' version of this tale Electra's role in the murder of Clytemnestra is the greatest; not only is she present at the murder, but she actually guides Orestes' sword (1225). This, as well as her apparent preoccupation with her own poor condition, has led many scholars to regard Euripides' characterisation of her as negative.[755] Many of these opinions, I feel, have been successfully refuted by Zeitlin (1970), Thury (1985), Lloyd (1986b), Michelini (1987), and most recently by Papadimitropoulos (2008).[756] The overall cause of

---

[753] Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers*; Sophocles' *Electra*.

[754] Parker 1983: 104-143; Harris 2015b. However, instances of just (lawful) homicide did not incur pollution; cf Harris 2015b: 16.

[755] Sheppard 1918, reads Electra as a shallow and materialistic woman who 'dwells on externals' (138), an apparently negative feature of her character which is often cited in later scholarship. Her characterisation is perceived as negative by Kitto [1939] 1961; Conacher 1967; Vellacott 1975; Gellie 1981; Hartigan 1991; and Raeburn 2000. Some commentators have even taken it so far as to claim that Electra's presentation of her own predicament and characterisation of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra are a blatant lies, and that Aegisthus and Clytemnestra are represented in the rest of the play as more positive characters than Electra and Orestes; cf. England 1926; Grube 1941; O'Brien 1964; Barlow [1971] 2008; Arnott 1981; Tarkow 1981.

[756] Zeitlin 1970, perceives Electra's reaction to the Chorus' invitation to the festival and offer to borrow clothes is not just evidence of a martyr complex or an ill-tempered character but 'is far more an outward token of her inner isolation' (648), and celebrating a festival 'conflicts with her private grief' (649). She is, after all, a character who has been 'orphaned,' 'rejected,' and 'bereft' (649). Kovacs 1985: 309, rightly interprets her rejection of festivals as a result of the 'indignities inflicted on Electra by her father's murderers: poverty means shabby dress, which in turn means – for a princess, at any rate – exclusion from festivals.' On attending the festival being incompatible with Electra's grief and mourning for her father see Lloyd 1986b: 6-7. Zeitlin also recognises the 'unfortunate tendency on the part of commentators to concentrate on castigating Electra's self-pity and bitterness, while minimizing the real hardships she must endure' (650 n. 23).

Thury 1985, recognises that poverty is not Electra's main motivation for revenge, following Pohlenz 1954 I: 314f., and Steidle 1968: 66-85. She argues that 'for Electra materialistic terms are almost a metaphor for her dishonoured and outcast state' (8). I would go further as to argue that they are the demonstration and proof of her maltreatment and the *hybris* of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra.

Lloyd 1986b, I believe rightly, argues 'that much of Electra's behaviour is better understood in terms of Greek conventions of lamentation than in terms of modern psychology' (2). He stresses Electra's actual poverty (2), which would have been 'exceptionally degrading for a princess' (3). More of the valid and insightful points made by Lloyd will be discussed below.

Michelini 1987: 188, recognises that Electra has genuinely suffered, and that 'Electra has suffered a wound to her pride, and such a wound is a legitimate and honorable cause for revenge. . . Failure to revenge will mean acquiescence to a lower status; and, once confined to this status, the victim will not be seen as deserving compensation.' However, she fails to recognise the treatment of Electra as *hybris* and an offence against Agamemnon and Orestes, too.

the negative representation of Electra, her motivations, and the validity of those motivations, in previous scholarship is due to the underestimation of the gross mistreatment of Electra by Aegisthus and Clytemnestra when they force her to marry the poor Farmer,[757] and the lack of consideration for the Farmer's condemnation of their actions in the prologue, which have either been ignored or played down.[758] Those who regard Electra negatively overlook the fact that her mistreatment and current state are represented as a further offence to Agamemnon, and against Orestes, demonstrating the *hybris* of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra.[759] This *hybris* not only affects Electra's male relatives but also her person, and would be increased if the Farmer had taken advantage of his sexual rights over his wife.[760] It is made clear on a number of occasions that the sexual aspect of *hybris* would have been regarded primarily as an offence against Electra.[761] This distinction indicates that the Athenian audience appreciated the direct physical and psychological effects sexual violence and compulsion had upon the victim.

In the prologue the Farmer informs us what has happened to Electra since the death of her father (19-28):

> ἡ δ᾽ ἐν δόμοις ἔμεινεν Ἠλέκτρα πατρός,
> ταύτην ἐπειδὴ θαλερὸς εἶχ᾽ ἥβης χρόνος
> μνηστῆρες ἤτουν Ἑλλάδος πρῶτοι χθονός.
> δείσας δὲ μή τῳ παῖδ᾽ ἀριστέων τέκοι
> Ἀγαμέμνονος ποινάτορ᾽, εἶχεν ἐν δόμοις
> Αἴγισθος οὐδ᾽ ἥρμοζε νυμφίῳ τινί.

Papadimitropoulos 2008, adds points not included in Lloyd's thesis which support 'a relatively positive evaluation of Orestes and Electra' (114). He does not think that Electra's personal motivation for revenge would have been regarded as evidence for her negative characterisation by the audience (115), and that '[c]ritics who erroneously and subconsciously view the siblings' behaviour through the distortive lens of Christianity tend to underestimate the fact that, according to ancient Greek mentality, any sort of insult or misdemeanor calls for requital' (115 n. 7).

Another indicator that Electra is not meant to be perceived negatively is that the Farmer makes no complaints of her behaviour. He does not sleep with her because he does not regard himself as worthy, not because her character is odious and she constantly reminds him of her high-status (cf. Hermione's insufferable pride in Euripides' *Andromache* as a cause of Neoptolemus rejecting her sexually). Indeed it has been noted, even by some that view Electra negatively, that she is considerate towards her husband and shows him respect; cf. Michelini 1987: 191; Hartigan 1991: 109; Papadimitropoulos 2008: 117.

[757] Papadimitropoulos 2008: 117.

[758] England 1926: 98, one of the few who regard Electra negatively to actually mention the Farmer's characterisation of Aegisthus in the prologue, seems to imply that Electra has coloured his view and 'the "bumpkin" is prepared to believe any evil of Aegisthus.'

[759] Arnott 1981: 183, does recognise that for Electra 'Aegisthus is the embodiment of *hybris* (58; cf. 266, 331),' but sees this as merely a symptom of her distorted 'double-vision.'

[760] Lloyd 1986b: 14, as Electra's *kyrios* Orestes 'would be wronged were she to be maltreated.'

[761] See below.

ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτ᾽ ἦν φόβου πολλοῦ πλέων,
μή τῳ λαθραίως τέκνα γενναίῳ τέκοι,
κτανεῖν σφε βουλεύσαντος ὠμόφρων ὅμως
μήτηρ νιν ἐξέσωσεν Αἰγίσθου χερός.

Whenever Electra's marriage is discussed, it is made clear that in giving her to a husband of such low status Aegisthus has behaved hubristically, abusing his position within the palace, and usurping the authority of her true *kyrios*, Orestes.[762] By referring to the palace as Agamemnon's house, the Farmer emphasises that Aegisthus is usurping his role and that he had no real right to carry out Electra's wedding. His refusal to marry her off when she reached the appropriate age would have been regarded negatively. Aegisthus' paranoia and fear of a child that Electra may bear become so powerful that he plans to kill her. This, rather than showing his strength and decisiveness in dealing with all threats to his throne, makes him look even weaker, especially when we learn that it was Clytemnestra who stopped him, which confirms Electra's assertion that her mother was the dominant partner.[763] Clytemnestra, the 'savage-minded' (27: ὠμόφρων), did not intercede on her daughter's behalf out of love and motherly feeling but from fear of public resentment (30: ἔδεισε μὴ φθονηθείη). By murdering her second daughter, she would have completely undermined her excuse for killing Agamemnon and made her position all the more precarious.[764]

Aegisthus decided to marry Electra to a poor farmer so that she would bear inferior and powerless children, unable to avenge their grandfather (34-42).[765] The Farmer then reveals that the marriage is unconsummated (43-46):

---

[762] Lloyd 1986b: 14; Papadimitropoulos 2008: 117-118; Eur. *El.* 224, 259, 365. In Dem. 45.3-4 Apollodorus tells how he had previously brought a charge of *hybris* against Phormion (a freedman) for marrying Apollodorus' widowed mother (as per the terms of his father's will) while Apollodorus was away from Athens. The case is slightly complicated as the status of his mother, Archippe, is unclear: her former husband was also a freedman who had been granted citizenship, and it is contested whether this would also have been conferred upon her as well as his sons; cf. Bonner 1919; Whitehead 1986; Carey 1991. The charge was later dropped.

[763] *Contra* Arnott 1981: 184.

[764] Euripides' Clytemnestra seems to be extremely concerned with public opinion; cf. 643-645, and her 'justification' of Agamemnon's murder at 1018-1048, which is easily undermined by Electra's response 1069-1093.

[765] Kubo 1967, identifies this as the common mythic and literary *topos* of a parent (generally a negatively characterised tyrannical and/or hubristic figure) preventing a daughter from marrying through fear of a grandchild, and/or marries her to someone of lower status in order to minimise a perceived threat.

ἦν οὔποθ᾽ ἁνὴρ ὅδε (σύνοιδέ μοι Κύπρις)
ἤσχυν᾽ ἐν εὐνῇ: παρθένος δ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἐστὶ δή.
αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ ὀλβίων ἀνδρῶν τέκνα
λαβὼν ὑβρίζειν, οὐ κατάξιος γεγώς.

The stress the Farmer places on not having violated Electra sexually (he mentions it twice in two lines) strongly suggests that the act of sexual violence against the body of the victim was an issue of consideration for the Athenians, not just any indirect offence against her male relatives. The Farmer then goes on to explain the reasons for his sexual restraint are motivated by respect for Agamemnon *and* Electra's own high status.[766] *Her* social position is a consideration for him, not just her father's, and it is she whom he will not insult (literally 'commit *hybris* against'); she is the direct object within this sentence. Sexual violence was not just an offence against the woman's family, but primarily against the woman herself.

The Farmer intends to keep Electra safe until Orestes returns. The Farmer's reference to the spring not being that far away (77-78), rather than showing that the work Electra is carrying out is not really that demanding,[767] demonstrates that he is not putting her, a nobly-born girl who would normally live a protected life, at risk. Collecting or searching for water in an isolated location is, after all, almost as risky an activity for a virgin as picking flowers in a meadow.[768] This risk is emphasised when Electra is alarmed by the appearance of Orestes and his companions. It is clear Electra is not only concerned for her own safety (which could be due to Aegisthus' former desire to kill her) but also the safety of the young women of the Chorus (215-219):

οἴμοι· γυναῖκες, ἐξέβην θρηνημάτων.
ξένοι τινὲς παρ᾽ οἶκον οἵδ᾽ ἐφεστίους
εὐνὰς ἔχοντες ἐξανίστανται λόχου·
φυγῇ σὺ μὲν κατ᾽ οἶμον, ἐς δόμους δ᾽ ἐγὼ
φῶτας κακούργους ἐξαλύξωμεν ποδί.

[766] Throughout tragedy the sexual aggressor is always of higher status than the victim, a pattern followed in New Comedy. This is the only extant example of a lower-status male specifically saying he will not take sexual advantage of a higher status woman, which becomes a theme in ancient novels. Cf. Heliod. *Aeth*. 1.19; Xenophon of Ephesus 2.9.
[767] Conacher 1967: 205.
[768] Aeschylus, *Amymone*; Hdt. 6.137. Rivers are dangerous places for sexually vulnerable young women; cf. Sophocles *Tyro A*, *Tyro B* and *Women of Trachis* (twice).

This secondary threat of sexual violence is a feature in a number of plays in which the forced marriage plot-device is used, and is possibly intended to emphasise the women's sexual vulnerability.[769]

We learn that the Farmer pities Orestes, Electra's legitimate *kyrios* (47-49):

> στένω δὲ τὸν λόγοισι κηδεύοντ᾽ ἐμοὶ
> ἄθλιον Ὀρέστην, εἴ ποτ᾽ εἰς Ἄργος μολὼν
> γάμους ἀδελφῆς δυστυχεῖς ἐσόψεται.

This is an indication that the treatment of Electra would be considered not just an act of *hybris* against her person but indirectly against her male kin. Orestes, in the guise of her brother's friend, says he pities her brother when he discovers her low marriage (248: ᾤμωξ᾽ ἀδελφὸν σόν). Electra confirms that the Farmer does not regard the marriage as legitimate because Aegisthus did not have the authority to contract it (259: οὐ κύριον τὸν δόντα μ᾽ ἡγεῖται, ξένε). Orestes suggests that ξυνῆκ᾽· Ὀρέστῃ μή ποτ᾽ ἐκτείσῃ δίκην (260), if he takes sexual advantage of Electra when she had not been given in marriage by her legitimate *kyrios*. Line 260 could be interpreted to show that Orestes thinks of the offence solely in terms of himself, but, as Electra's *kyrios*, he would be duty-bound to act upon her behalf. The response of Electra seems to indicate that she sees the Farmer's actions as being positively motivated (261: τοῦτ᾽ αὐτὸ ταρβῶν· πρὸς δὲ καὶ σώφρων ἔφυ).

The Farmer regards having a sexual relationship with Electra as an act of *hybris* against her family, as Electra reveals when she explains to the unrecognised Orestes why her marriage has not been consummated: γονέας ὑβρίζειν τοὺς ἐμοὺς οὐκ ἠξίου (257).[770] Here we have further evidence that Electra's low-status marriage is an act of *hybris* not just against her but also her family. It is obvious from Orestes' response to the account he receives of the Farmer's actions and motives that the sexual aspect of the marriage, and the physical violation of Electra's body, is an important factor in defining who has committed *hybris* (262: γενναῖον ἄνδρ᾽ ἔλεξας, εὖ τε

[769] Cf. Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*, Euripides' *Helen*, and in Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* Danaus reminds his daughters that they are susceptible to the sexual desire which they trigger in others (996-1005).
[770] Hartigan 1991: 110, has proposed that Electra perceives herself as having sexually rejected the Farmer. I can find no hint of this in the text. Whenever Electra mentions their celibacy the onus is always on the Farmer as instigating it; cf. 43-46, 68, 253, 255, 257, 261, 365.

δραστέον). Because he has not consummated the marriage and has taken no active role in Electra's degradation, the Farmer is not guilty of *hybris*. The intention and motivation in men's relationships and dealings with women were important to how the Athenians perceived their actions. Having put Electra in that situation as a result of his malice, Aegisthus is guilty of *hybris*, as is made clear by Orestes, 'why did Aegistheus commit these outrages against you?' (266: τίνος δέ σ᾽ οὕνεχ᾽ ὕβρισ᾽ Αἴγισθος τάδε;). Once Orestes has learnt of the Farmer's exemplary behaviour, all responsibility falls upon Aegisthus. It is worth noting that here Orestes understands Electra as the object of Aegisthus' *hybris*, not himself. Orestes is not just concerned with the indirect result against him, but Electra's situation and her suffering. This suggests that this insult would be an issue of concern for the audience too.

The charge of *hybris* against Aegisthus is explicitly made by Electra when giving her explanation as to why she is collecting water herself (57-59):

> γόους τ᾽ ἀφίημ᾽ αἰθέρ᾽ ἐς μέγαν πατρί, [59]
> οὐ δή τι χρείας ἐς τοσόνδ᾽ ἀφιγμένη [57]
> ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ὕβριν δείξωμεν Αἰγίσθου θεοῖς.

It is not true that unlike other tragic Electras, she is unconcerned with the offences and crimes against Agamemnon.[771] In this play Euripides stresses Electra's condition because he is trying to show the continued offence against Agamemnon through the mistreatment of his children by Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, their usurpation of his throne, and their theft of the spoils he brought back from Troy.[772] Both of Agamemnon's children are deprived of their inheritance, excluded from palace life, and threatened with death by Aegisthus.[773] Electra does not seem to have even been given a dowry or possessions to take with her to her marital home. One would expect the

[771] Or that Electra is more concerned with her own reduced state; cf. Grube 1941: 301; O'Brien 1964: 29; Conacher 1967: 205; Zeitlin 1970: 665; Hartigan 1991: 122.

[772] Lloyd 1986b: 4, attributes this accusation in earlier scholarship to a 'misunderstanding of various aspects of Electra's lament,' and points out that in this Euripidean play 'the murder of Agamemnon is a crime not only against him personally but also against the whole house of Atreus (thus Steidle [1968] 67). Part of the badness of what happened to Agamemnon is precisely that his children are maltreated as a result of his death.' Mossman 2001: 380, points out that Clytemnestra's grand entrance at 988 'not only expresses her sexual shamelessness, but also her ill-gotten gains, reflecting the association of sexual misconduct and misappropriated wealth.'

[773] Eur. *El.* 17, 27, 32-34, 58-63, 85, 115-121, 130-139, 184-187, 202-210, 233-236, 246-251, 264-265, 303-310, 503-507, 586-589, 914, 1004-1006, 1008-1010, 1086-1093. I have included references to Electra's poor condition as I believe they are intended as evidence of her mistreatment.

Chorus or Clytemnestra to ask her why she could not wear clothes she had brought with her from the palace when her shabby dress is mentioned.[774] As Lloyd has demonstrated, her actions are 'appropriate for someone suffering ὕβρις' as the vocalisation and demonstration of her pitiful state acts as an appeal for assistance and proof of the offence.[775] That part of this offence could be considered to be the sexual aspect of the marriage is implied by the Farmer's insistence that he has not conducted a sexual relationship with Electra.

The audience would have perceived not just the reduction of Electra's status of as pitiable and a negative aspect of her forced marriage, but also her sexual availability to her husband. The fact that Aegisthus marries Electra to a poor man to lower the status of her children and reduce the threat to his position clearly highlights the sexual aspect intended within the marriage. Electra tells Orestes the Farmer is οὗτος κέκληται πόσις ἐμὸς τῆς ἀθλίας (366) suggesting her marriage is seen as a thing of pity. Because it is not generally known that it has not been consummated the sexual aspect of marriage could be a factor in this. The Farmer does not think that to keep Electra in his house and accept her help with the household chores is to behave hubristically. On the other hand, we have already seen that he would consider himself to be committing *hybris* were he to conduct a sexual relationship with her.[776] The emphasis on the Farmer's sexual restraint and the positive reception of his restraint by the other characters are additional indications that the Athenians felt sympathy for those in enforced sexual relationships.[777]

Euripides has the Farmer stress his sexual restraint, referring to it as σῶφρον, a recognised positive quality, and a feature of Proteus' character in *Helen*. Eur. *El*. 50-53:

> ὅστις δέ μ᾽ εἶναί φησι μῶρον, εἰ λαβὼν
> νέαν ἐς οἴκους παρθένον μὴ θιγγάνω,
> γνώμης πονηροῖς κανόσιν ἀναμετρούμενος
> τὸ σῶφρον ἴστω καὐτὸς αὖ τοιοῦτος ὤν.

Though the Farmer believes that some people may think him foolish for not sleeping with the woman he has married, he judges their standards to be wrong. We are perhaps meant to contrast

[774] Eur. *El*. 190-192, 1107-1108.
[775] Lloyd 1986b: 3.
[776] Eur. *El*. 46, 257.
[777] Electra in lines 68, 253, 255, 257, and 261, and Orestes at 262, once he has been convinced he is not motivated solely by fear.

him here with Aegisthus, who would not have been so restrained, and is so sexually unrestrained as to have committed adultery with another man's wife, murdered him, usurped his position, and disinherited his children. Aegisthus is the embodiment of *hybris*. Electra uses his lack of sexual restraint to emphasise this.[778] The Farmer, the embodiment of *sophrosyne*, is an anti-Aegisthus. The characterisation of two dramatic figures being based to such an extent on their sexual behaviour towards women and its motivations shows that for the Athenians such behaviour was an important consideration.

The sexual restraint of the farmer is a positive feature of his character, as is apparent from Electra's praise for him. She expresses her gratitude for his friendship (67-70):

> ἐγώ σ᾽ ἴσον θεοῖσιν ἡγοῦμαι φίλον·
> ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γὰρ οὐκ ἐνύβρισας κακοῖς.
> μεγάλη δὲ θνητοῖς μοῖρα συμφορᾶς κακῆς
> ἰατρὸν εὑρεῖν, ὡς ἐγὼ σὲ λαμβάνω.

Electra's use of ἐνυβρίζω, a compound of *hybris*, demonstrates the Farmer's positive behaviour to her in general, while hinting at the sexual aspect, and highlights the contrast to Aegisthus' behaviour. Orestes and Castor also regard the Farmer's self-restraint as a positive characteristic and sign of nobility, which deserve reward.[779]

The stress Euripides places on Electra's continued virginity within the marriage has led a number of scholars to assume that Electra is obsessed with sex and utterly sexually frustrated in her virgin state.[780] I feel this reading lacks support in the text itself. Electra has nothing but praise for the restraint of the Farmer, perceiving his actions as being positively and nobly motivated. She defends his character to (the unrecognised) Orestes. As for her repeated references to the sexual relationships of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, I interpret these as being intended to show their base and perverted characters, especially when contrasted with the restrained nature of the Farmer. By proclaiming her virginity over the body of Aegisthus (945-946), Electra does not demonstrate her

---

[778] Eur. *El*. 945-948.
[779] Eur. *El*. 262, 1287.
[780] Sheppard 1918; Grube 1941: 303; Tarkow 1981: 152; Hartigan 1991: 122. Zeitlin 1970, who, although not condemnatory of Electra, does think her situation as a married virgin 'increases her bitterness and frustration' (650).

preoccupation with sexuality or resentment at her anomalous state.[781] Her declaration is rather designed in order to mock him and his plan because Aegisthus believed the marriage to have been consummated (270). It also highlights the Farmer's sexual restraint (although he is not mentioned) in contrast to Aegisthus' licentiousness, further proof of his hubristic nature.

It is true that Electra does refer to marriage a number of times,[782] but generally only when questioned by Orestes about her circumstances. Electra's references to marriage are intended to emphasise the social, rather than the sexual, perversity of her marriage to the poor Farmer, which 'deprives her of her proper social status and of her normal role in the family and the community.'[783] The only time she takes the initiative in mentioning marriage is after she has assisted in the killing of Clytemnestra, when she bemoans the fact that has no hope of a marriage now (1198-1200). Rather than indicating 'her obsession with her virginity,'[784] this passage actually stresses the severity of the crime, and the effect of the pollution she believes that she has incurred through the murder of her mother. The pollution incurred would make her as much of a social outcast as she has been throughout the rest of the play, and is meant to reflect this, although we are soon told by the deified Castor that Electra will not incur pollution, but will be married to Pylades, thereby having her status restored.

We have, in Euripides' *Electra*, a marriage forced upon a girl by a hubristic step-father because of his own cowardly and evil motives, which is used as a plot device to make the heroine and her actions more sympathetic and justifiable to the audience. The marriage being unconsummated does remove one aspect of the girl's suffering, but it does not negate the intent of Aegisthus, who knows nothing of the Farmer's sexual restraint and is the type of person who would least expect it. Indeed, the behaviour of the Farmer is intended to serve as a foil to that of Aegisthus and stresses his hubristic nature and the severity of his crimes. We also get the impression that *hybris*, when referring to sexual matters, is regarded as being directed at the female

[781] Denniston 1939: xxix, thinks that Electra is 'acutely sensitive to her equivocal status, neither matron nor maid. She observes bitterly at 945-946 that she must maintain a virginal reserve on certain subjects.'
[782] Eur. *El*. 247, 249, 312-313, 1198-1200.
[783] Zeitlin 1970: 650.
[784] Zeitlin 1970: 666.

victim, and affecting her relatives indirectly. It is not a crime against a man committed through a woman, but a crime against a woman, which only affects her male relatives by association.

Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*

In the *Iphigenia in Aulis* we have one of the most clear-cut cases of sexual violence and forced marriage in extant Greek tragedy. The account of forced marriage is unique in the corpus of extant Attic tragedy because it is related by the woman herself in bald and unambiguous terms as a direct accusation against the sexual aggressor. It is Clytemnestra's account of her marriage to Agamemnon (1148-1165):

> πρῶτον μέν, ἵνα σοι πρῶτα τοῦτ᾽ ὀνειδίσω,
> ἔγημας ἄκουσάν με κἄλαβες βίᾳ,
> τὸν πρόσθεν ἄνδρα Τάνταλον κατακτανών·
> βρέφος τε τοὐμὸν †σῷ προσούρισας πάλῳ†,
> μαστῶν βιαίως τῶν ἐμῶν ἀποσπάσας.
> καὶ τὼ Διός σε παῖδ᾽, ἐμὼ δὲ συγγόνω,
> ἵπποισι μαρμαίροντ᾽ ἐπεστρατευσάτην·
> πατὴρ δὲ πρέσβυς Τυνδάρεώς σ᾽ ἐρρύσατο
> ἱκέτην γενόμενον, τἀμὰ δ᾽ ἔσχες αὖ λέχη.
> οὗ σοι καταλλαχθεῖσα περὶ σὲ καὶ δόμους
> συμμαρτυρήσεις ὡς ἄμεμπτος ἦ γυνή,
> ἔς τ᾽ Ἀφροδίτην σωφρονοῦσα καὶ τὸ σὸν
> μέλαθρον αὔξουσ᾽, ὥστε σ᾽ εἰσιόντα τε
> χαίρειν θύραζέ τ᾽ ἐξιόντ᾽ εὐδαιμονεῖν.
> σπάνιον δὲ θήρευμ᾽ ἀνδρὶ τοιαύτην λαβεῖν
> δάμαρτα· φλαύραν δ᾽ οὐ σπάνις γυναῖκ᾽ ἔχειν.
> τίκτω δ᾽ ἐπὶ τρισὶ παρθένοισι παῖδά σοι
> τόνδ᾽· ὧν μιᾶς σὺ τλημόνως μ᾽ ἀποστερεῖς.

This passage is probably one of the most neglected passages in extant tragedy. Many commentators do not mention it at all, and those that do gloss over the details or label it as irrelevant or evidence of Clytemnestra's self-centeredness.[785] It is uncertain whether this myth is a Euripidean

[785] The neglect of this passage and Clytemnestra's role in this play has been noted by Michelini 1999-2000: 49 n. 46 and Gibert 2005: 228. Conacher 1967 mentions that Clytemnestra makes a speech but not its

innovation.[786] The passage has been rejected as an interpolation or at best an addition made by someone else after Euripides' death.[787] Whether or not it was written by Euripides himself it was still seen as an appropriate speech for inclusion in the tragedy by someone. Over the years, and especially more recently, the passage has gained some recognition as important in the characterisation of Clytemnestra, relevant to the themes of the play, and pertinent to the dramatic situation.[788] Indeed, Diggle (1994) is more positive about its authenticity.[789]

---

contents; Sorum 1992: 538, mentions the murders but omits the forced marriage. Kitto [1939] 1961: 367 and Frey 1947: 48, do not go into detail about Clytemnestra's accusations and see them as not relevant to the dramatic situation. Rivier 1944: 80-81; Bonnard 1945: 93 (who does not mention the content of the speech) and Vellacott 1975: 46-47 regard Clytemnestra's speech negatively, as more concerned with herself and her own status than her daughter and her safety, and pity Agamemnon for marrying such an unfeeling, self-centred woman! Aretz 1999: 166-167, reads Clytemnestra as self-centred, obsessed with her own status and Agamemnon's ingratitude. However, when Clytemnestra first discovers the plan to kill her daughter she is concerned for Iphigenia (880-886), and the criticism of the self-centred nature of her speech, I believe, is due to a fundamental misunderstanding of its purpose. The lack of emotional appeals is probably a result of the poet not wanting to prefigure the emotional speech of Iphigenia, as Gibert 2005: 230 has suggested. Neither does Clytemnestra need to beg for Iphigenia's life, she is there to do it herself. There is no hint of Agamemnon criticising Clytemnestra or her actions in the play.

[786] Those who believe that Euripides invented this tale include Smith 1979: 178; Foley 1982: 163. Most scholars are more cautious: Grube 1941: 433 n.1, calls it an 'uncommon legend'; Wassermann 1949: 183, admits it could be 'invented by Euripides or on purpose taken from an otherwise unknown myth'; Michelini 1999-2000: 48-49, twice calls it 'unfamiliar'; Burgess 2004: 42, refers to it as 'hardly standard' and notes the lack of evidence for it before this play. Gibert 2005: 229, admits it could be either but sees the main issue as how Euripides uses the tale. For references to those who believe in an early source for the myth see Gibert 2005: 241 n.9.

[787] Kovacs 2002b: 157-158 and 2003: 95-96 attributes this passage to a fourth-century 'Reviser,' and brackets lines 1148-1184 in his Loeb edition (2002b). There are a number of motivations for interpolations by actors or producers: the increased numbers of professional and famous actors led the expansion of some roles; the desire to make the play more 'melodramatic' and appealing to the tastes of fourth-century audiences; and to add new dimensions to familiar plots and characters; see Page 1934, especially 16-18, 23, 54-55, 116-121, 186, 214-216. The detail of Agamemnon's sexual assault, and Clytemnestra's subsequent marriage to her attacker, reflect the motif common in New Comedy (though in those cases the female victims all appear to have been unmarried). However, sexual relationships which begin in violent circumstances, as I have demonstrated, are not unknown in tragedy, and the New Comedy plots may have been based on tragic motifs. Therefore, this detail could be authentic to the fifth-century, if not to Euripides himself, who may have died before its completion. In both genres, victims of sexual violence are regarded sympathetically.

[788] Grube 1941: 433-434, argues that Clytemnestra makes 'a strong speech, and the references to the past are thoroughly in place, for they heighten her claim to be a good wife, and give more point to her threats.'

Smith 1979: 178, sees Clytemnestra's speech as reflecting the themes of the play. He believes her account echoes the situation of Iphigenia - both are 'the object of negotiation among men,' whose wishes Clytemnestra once acquiesced to, prefiguring Iphigenia's consent to her sacrifice. Cf. Wißmann 1997 for tragic victims of self-sacrifice as figures who reinforce the patriarchal order.

Luschnig 1988 recognises Clytemnestra's victimisation (32) and presentation throughout the play as a 'perfect wife' (38, 89).

Michelini 1999-2000: 48-50, appreciates Clytemnestra's speech for its contribution towards her characterisation within the play. I disagree with her argument that we are meant to perceive that Clytemnestra's loyalties were changed through impregnation, after all six lines separate her reconciliation to Agamemnon and her bearing of his children. Her designation of the union as a 'rape-alliance' (49), I believe undermines the role of Tyndareus in the legitimization of the eventual reconciliation, especially in the mind of Clytemnestra, rather I would see their union as closer to an abduction marriage.

Burgess 2004: 42, proposes that 'the point of her tale is to suggest that she has already performed a service for Agamemnon which is hardly worthy of a repayment in the form of the slaughter of the second of her children.'

I believe the intended effect of this passage is to maintain Clytemnestra's sympathetic character, which has been evident throughout this play, as well as acting as a further justification to her murder of Agamemnon when he returns from Troy.[790] As an argument to save Iphigenia, it would have been perceived by the Athenians as wholly appropriate for her to use the evidence of her previously exemplary behaviour, despite the circumstances of her marriage to Agamemnon, to demonstrate that she did not deserve to be deprived of a daughter.

This passage is extremely relevant for this thesis because it is written as a first-hand account from the victim of an incident of sexual violence, the reaction of her family, and its long-term effects.[791] The violent nature of the encounter is not in doubt, nor is Clytemnestra's unwillingness (1149-1152). The motivation is unclear. Some have claimed that because Agamemnon married Clytemnestra, his desire for her must have been his motivation.[792] Though desire is usually presented as the primary motivation for the sexual assaults of tragedy, I do not believe that was the case here. Desire in tragedy, when not stemming from a hubristic personality or motive, is usually portrayed as a positive motivation, not having any direct negative effects on the victim or her family.[793] Agamemnon would not necessarily need to kill her husband or her child in order to satisfy his desire, rather the murder of husband and child(ren), and the subsequent (sometimes forced) marriage of a former ruler's wife is a common pattern in political coups. This is

---

Gibert 2005, sees the details of Clytemnestra's speech as reflecting themes within the play. He notes that her experience is comparable, in certain aspects, to 'ordinary Greek marriage' (231). He emphasises in particular her lack of agency and personal choice, due to women's status as 'passive objects in the transactions' (233). Gibert (239-240) proposes that Iphigenia's situation echoing Clytemnestra's is stressed in the staging of the play. Iphigenia clutching the baby Orestes in the presence of her 'husband' Achilles acting as a 'scenic reinforcement' in which 'Iphigenia appears as another Clytemnestra' (239). The comparison between the situations of the two young women may have even been perceived as going further; as I have noted in relation to other plays which include virgin sacrifice the sacrificial act is equated with sexual violation. Iphigenia, therefore, really will be another Clytemnestra, bereft of family and husband, and violated.

[789] Cf. Page 1934: 186, does not believe that there was 'sufficient evidence to justify particular deletions.'

[790] Noted by Wassermann 1949: 184; Luschnig 1988: 89; Sorum 1992: 538; Michelini 1999-2000: 50; Gibert 2005: 230.

[791] This case of sexual violation leading to lawful marriage is quite unique in extant tragedy. Any extended relationship between victim and aggressor is usually unequal, the victim being a war-captive, and technically of slave status.

[792] Gantz 1993: 549 believes that as Agamemnon married Clytemnestra 'the implication is thus that his motive for the murders was to obtain her.' Michelini 1999-2000: 49, states that the motivation could have been desire or hatred (presumably for Tantalos). Gibert 2005: 231, points out that 'Agamemnon's actions are left unmotivated,' but believes that the audience may have interpreted *erōs* as his motivation as it is one of the themes of the play. If the motivation was desire it would be due to Clytemnestra's beauty, which is specifically commented on by Achilles (821-822).

[793] Any negative effects on the victim are usually due to pregnancy and are indirect. The one exception is Iole, although we are told that this was the result of originally being refused by her father.

exactly what happens in Clytemnestra's relationship with Aegisthus (though Orestes escapes death by being smuggled away from the city), and is the prelude to the plot of *Cresephontes* (in which older children are apparently killed, and Merope forcibly married by Polyphontes). Agamemnon's motivation in killing Tantalos may have been perceived by the audience as political and as the result of the feud between Thyestes and Atreus. Tantalos is almost certainly Thyestes' son.[794] Apollodorus tells us that Thyestes was restored to the throne of Argos (*Epit*. 2.14) and that 'Agamemnon became king of Mycenae and married Clytemnestra, after killing her former husband Tantalos, son of Thyestes, along with his child.'[795] This passage, if it is solely based on the information in Euripides' play, suggests this pattern of actions could be interpreted as having political motivations.[796] A political motivation, whether to regain the throne of Argos or to create a valuable political alliance with Tyndareus and his sons, is consistent with the politically ambitious Agamemnon portrayed in this play.[797] This personal ambition to the detriment of others could be interpreted as hubristic behaviour, a characteristic of other figures in tragedy who instigate forced marriages.

This clear-cut case of sexual violation by a human aggressor allows the poet to show the response of the woman's family in a way that was not possible when the perpetrator was a god and the incident concealed. Clytemnestra's brothers immediately march against Agamemnon and recover their sister. It was apparently up to her *kyrios*, Tyndareus, to decide Agamemnon's fate. It has puzzled some critics that Tyndareus then gives his daughter in legitimate marriage to Agamemnon after his actions.[798] The answer for this must lie in the reasons Agamemnon gives to

---

[794] Gantz 1993: 549, citing Apoll. *Epit*. 2.16 and Paus. 2.18.2; Gibert 2005: 241 n.7. The ancestral Tantalos is mentioned by the Chorus earlier in the play (504-505), which suggests that we are meant to read this Tantalos as a cousin of Agamemnon.

[795] Apoll. *Epit*. 2.16, trans. by Hard 1997.

[796] Dio Chrys. 11.46: Agamemnon sought to marry Clytemnestra in order to secure an alliance with her brothers.

[797] Agamemnon is characterised as politically ambitious (334-358). Luschnig 1988: 83, sees Tyndareus as represented as an important political figure in this play, citing 1031. Burgess 2004: 41, perceives Clytemnestra's reconciliation to Agamemnon 'as a consequence of the political accommodation between Tyndareus and Agamemnon.'

[798] Smith 1979: 178; Luschnig 1988: 117; Gibert 2005: 231-232, though his comment that Clytemnestra was ineligible for marriage, having already been married and had a son (232) is somewhat puzzling. Remarriage was common in ancient Greece, even after unions had produced children. The legitimacy of the marriage is stressed a number of times prior to Clytemnestra's revelations. It is repeatedly stated that the Old Man was given to Agamemnon by Tyndareus as part of Clytemnestra's dowry when she went with him to Argos as his

Tyndareus when supplicating him, which were probably intended to be perceived by the audience as demonstrating that no offence was meant to Clytemnestra or her natal family. As Naiden (2006) has shown, supplication was a quasi-legal institution, and in order for the supplicant to be successful they needed to make a convincing argument to justify their actions.[799] It was then up to the *supplicandus* to judge these arguments and agree to accept the supplicant only if he deemed him innocent of wrong-doing.[800] The family quarrel must have been given as his primary motivation for the murders.[801] A secondary motivation for the forced marriage, either desire due to the beauty of Clytemnestra, or Agamemnon's wish to cement a political alliance with Tyndareus and his sons through marriage to Clytemnestra, would have been perceived as perfectly understandable and not deserving of punishment. So, implicitly we have further evidence that sexual violence, when not negatively motivated (i.e. not meant to cause offence to the woman or her natal family), could be seen as excusable by the Athenians. Agamemnon taking Clytemnestra as his legitimate wife is additional proof of his positive intentions towards her and shows that his actions were not intended to cause offence to her or her family.

Once given to Agamemnon by her father as his lawful wife and reconciled (καταλλαχθεῖσα)[802] to him, Clytemnestra appears to hold no grudge against her new lawful husband, and carries out all her wifely duties with aplomb.[803] Only Agamemnon's deceitful plan to secretly sacrifice their oldest daughter has caused this outburst. Once again he threatens to deprive her of a child, this time by deceit. This undermines her role in the running of the household and does not show Clytemnestra the respect she feels she deserves. Treating her child by him as he once treated her child by his enemy leads Clytemnestra to reinterpret Agamemnon's original

---

wife (46-48, 860, 869-870). This Old Man, more loyal to Clytemnestra than her husband (871), offers an interesting parallel to the Old Man in *Ion*.

[799] Naiden 2006: 78-104. Arguments can include reciprocity, family ties, fairness, and appeals to pity.

[800] Naiden 2006: 105-162.

[801] The murder of the children of enemies to prevent later revenge is a common theme in Greek tragedy and literature in general. Gibert 2005: 234, states that 'Agamemnon certainly acted in accordance with traditional wisdom when he murdered his enemy's son,' citing *Cypria* F25; Hdt. 1.155; Eur. *Andr*. 519; and Eur. *Heracl*. 166-168, 1006-1008, with further references in Wilkins 1993: 243 n. 28.

[802] The verb used is in the passive. This makes it clear that she was not reconciled to Agamemnon on her own initiative, but as a dutiful daughter was obeying the wishes of her father, trusting his judgement and accepting his interpretation of Agamemnon as remorseful. Clytemnestra, like Iphigenia, was a dutiful daughter. This will have served to make her a more sympathetic figure in the eyes of the audience.

[803] This would strengthen Clytemnestra's argument, demonstrating that she is the epitome of female virtue, obedient to her father and a wife beyond reproach, which makes Agamemnon's deceit and betrayal all the worse.

motivations.[804] Clytemnestra now reproaches him for his former actions (1148). Women who are the victims of sexual violence interpret the motivation of that violence in the light of the way the aggressor subsequently treats them and their children. In repeating his child-murder Agamemnon is demonstrating to Clytemnestra that his justification of his original actions and motivations was false and that his remorse for any offence caused to her or her family insincere. In order to further his own political ambitions he will do it all again. This is a serious betrayal: it undermines his bond and relationship with Tyndareus, the basis for his marriage to Clytemnestra, and reveals his ingratitude for her exemplary behaviour.

Clytemnestra's revelation further supports the argument that it is the intent of the aggressor, not the manner in which they have acted, which led the Athenians to classify a sexual assault as a criminal and punishable act.[805] Her speech draws attention to the fact that one of the strongest indicators of motivation is how the aggressor treats his victim afterwards. If the aggressor shows that he is willing to account for his actions, show the victim and her family respect, and have her as his lawful wife, there is no complaint to be made by either the victim (at least publicly) or her family, but only for as long as he treats his wife and family properly.

Conclusions

In these plays the negative portrayal of the aggressors further emphasises the vulnerability of the victims and makes them more sympathetic to the audience. The negative behaviour of the aggressors is criticised by other characters within these plays, while the victims are treated sympathetically. The women's reluctance in regard to the marriage (especially the sexual aspect of marriage) is acknowledged and treated as an important factor. In all cases we can detect the opposition of the women's *kyrioi* to the union. However, their unwillingness is not stressed to a great extent and the onus is always on the issue of the women's non-consent. Legally only the consent of a woman's *kyrios* was required to make a marriage valid, and not the woman's, but the

[804] Clytemnestra's reinterpretation of Agamemnon's motivations offers a further explanation for Griffin's (1990: 146) uncertainty as to why Clytemnestra accepted the murder of one child but not another.
[805] Harris 2006d.

picture we are presented with in tragedy regarding forced marriage suggests that the issue of female consent to marriage was important on a personal level.[806]

Iphigenia in Aulis differs slightly from the other plays in this category. No specific motivations for Agamemnon's actions are given. Though this event certainly seems to be considered as a contributing factor to Clytemnestra's future murder of her husband, it is not the catalyst for her rage. This is also the only play in which the victim's family are (eventually) reconciled to the aggressor and willingly give the woman in legitimate marriage. The play is therefore an interesting source for how a woman's family reacts to, and deals with, sexual violation. It appears to support the hypothesis that when the assault was not intended to cause offence to the victim, or her natal family, she may be reconciled with the aggressor and given in legitimate marriage.[807] Thus her social status is in no way affected by her victimisation.

[806] Cf. Harris 2015a: 298-302.
[807] Cf. Harris 2006d.

Conclusion

Tragedy is a complex source of evidence from which to draw conclusions about the lives and views of fifth-century Athenians. However, tragedy's consistent representation of the negative effects of sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships upon women, and its repeated use of these themes to elicit sympathy for female characters, indicates that the Athenians did have an appreciation of the concept of women's consent to sexual relations and did not regard sexual violence as an offence solely against the woman's *kyrios* and family, but primarily as an offence against the woman herself. The presence of women at tragic performances, or the tragedians' awareness of them as a secondary audience, may have contributed to the sympathetic portrayal of victims of sexual violence. However, this would have been counter-productive to the original success of the tragedies unless a significant portion of the male audience would also be able to comprehend the sympathetic reception of the victims.

I have shown that for the Athenians it did 'matter' whether women consented to sexual relationships not sanctioned by their *kyrios*;[808] and that they had an understanding of the emotional and psychological effects of enforced sexual relations upon women, even if they did not regard all instances of sexual violence as transgressing laws or social norms.[809]

In Chapter One I examined the portrayal of the sexual assault of Creusa by the god Apollo in Euripides' *Ion*. For much of this play Creusa is ignorant of the god's intention to secure the safety and social positions of her and their child. After many years she presumes that the god has let their child perish, is making her childless, and is allowing her line to die out, granting the rule of Athens to an illegitimate child of her foreign husband. This leads her to interpret the original assault as negatively motivated and to criticise the god for his actions. Those to whom she describes her ordeal and treatment by the god believe her story and treat her with sympathy. When she learns the truth (that Apollo has cared for her child, and made sure that her and her son's statuses remained secure), she reinterprets the original motivation for the assault and is satisfied with the god's compensation for his violation of her; her illegitimate child will be able to inherit

[808] Sommerstein 2006: 244, *contra* Omitowoju 2002.
[809] Harris 2006d.

her father's throne, and she will have more children by her husband. The happy ending to the play, however, should not overshadow the fact that Euripides has presented a sexual encounter which is explicitly characterised as non-consensual, and developed sympathetic picture of the victim's pain and trauma as the consequence of the god's violence.

Chapter Two demonstrates that desire was not seen as a negative motivation for sexual violence and that the aggressor would not be regarded negatively if he was prepared to acknowledge and safeguard any children born from the encounter. This pattern seems to have continued in New Comedy, transposed to non-mythical setting, which supports the hypothesis that it would be regarded as acceptable to the Athenians. The victims who concealed their pregnancies were usually persecuted and punished by their *kyrios*. This seems to occur because their deception leads the *kyrios* to assume that the victim has been willingly seduced, and so he punishes her accordingly. However, when the girl is vindicated by the revelation of the identity of the sexual aggressor, her status is restored. She is sometimes reconciled with her *kyrios*, indicating that this substantiates her claim to have been the unwilling victim of sexual violence. The victims in the 'girl's tragedy' plays seem to be represented sympathetically and treated sympathetically by other characters except her *kyrios* (and his wife). This suggests that the audience would have had sympathy for a girl who found herself pregnant due to a non-consensual sexual encounter. The subsequent mistrust and punishment by her *kyrios* would enhance the *pathos* of the situation for dramatic effect.

In examining the representation of the sexual violence committed against slaves and war-captives in Chapter Three, I noted that the development of the *pathos* in a number of plays is based on the threat and occurrence of sexual violence in the context of warfare. I have proposed that for this imagery to be effective the audience must have been predisposed to feel sympathy for unwilling victims of sexual violence. In the majority of these plays, despite the sexual violence being directed at war-captive and slaves, which was socially acceptable, the aggressors in these scenarios are still presented as being motivated by sexual desire to conduct relationships with the women. This may reflect the fact that in Athens the law against *hybris* also applied to slaves as well as the free, and sexual violence with the intention to humiliate the women and solely as a

demonstration of the power of the victors would have been perceived by the Athenian audience as hubristic, and therefore negative. This seems to be borne out by the picture presented in Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*.

In Chapter Four I have shown that the tragedians used the sexual victimisation of a number of mythical heroines as a plot-device, in order to make them more sympathetic to the audience. I noted in this chapter that they present sexual aggression as hubristic in order to present the male aggressors as negative characters. A sexual aggressor is portrayed as hubristic when their victimisation of the woman is aimed at lowering her social status and insulting her and her legitimate *kyrios*. The aggressors tend to be presented as usurping the power of the legitimate *kyrios* in contracting the woman's marriage, either by attempting to marry her himself without the approval of her *kyrios* or by marrying her to someone else. In all these instances the female victims are also unwilling to be married. Their reluctance regarding the sexual aspect of the marriage is always stressed, often more than the reluctance of their *kyrios*, which demonstrates that the consent of women to sexual intercourse was understood to be an issue by the Athenian audience.

My survey of the representation of sexual violence in tragedy shows that instances of sexual violence and enforced sexual relationships pervade the genre. Though the actual consent or non-consent of the women to sexual acts are not mentioned in every instance, the compulsion they face to be sexually acquiescent is not suppressed.

I have discerned that the tragedians use the threat and actuality of enforced sexual relationships to incite the sympathy of the audience for female characters in tragedy. This demonstrates that the Athenians, in general, did have sympathy for the victims of such relationships.

I have shown that where the non-consent of the woman could be guaranteed she would not be punished or persecuted for being involved in a sexual liaison not sanctioned by her *kyrios*.

I have observed that the tragedians generally go to great lengths to stress that the aggressors in a number of these situations are not motivated by negative emotions or intent to shame and humiliate the victim and her family, but are portrayed as acting on sexual desire, sometimes god-sent. They further prove their positive motivations by treating the women well and

caring for the offspring of their unions. This does not, however, detract from the sympathy afforded to the victim, but does demonstrate that no personal offence was meant to them or their male relations.

It may be shocking to the modern reader that not all those who have forcible or coerced sexual intercourse with unwilling women are viewed as reprehensible. But from the study of tragedy I think we learn something important about the Athenian psychology of sexual violence and an issue that we need to recognise: just because the aggressor was not regarded as morally or criminally wrong did not absolve him from any responsibility for his actions. This is demonstrated by the aggressors being presented as showing care for any children resulting from the assault. Their female victims also see themselves as deserving of *charis*, whether they have submitted willingly or not. However, just because victims of sexual violence in tragedy are not necessarily regarded as a victim of a crime, does not mean that their suffering is marginalised. They can be and are received and treated with sympathy by other characters.

I believe the approach I have used to examine the tragedy texts could easily be applied to other genres to obtain a comprehensive picture of the representation of sexual violence within the texts. Rather than looking at the specific words used to describe the act of sexual violence and just analysing what the consequences were for the victim and aggressor, the presentation of both characters, before and after the assault, needs to be taken into consideration. The motivations of the aggressor need to be analysed to determine whether they are presented as positive or negative. The aggressor's subsequent behaviour and actions also need to be considered. The actions of the victim during and after the incident should be assessed (Does she tell anyone? Who? Does she become pregnant? What happens to the child?) We also need to examine how other characters react to accounts of the assault or the discovery of the girl's pregnancy (Do they believe her? Are they sympathetic?). The genre of the text has to be taken into consideration. What kind of details regarding the assault would be appropriate or pertinent to the author's generic or rhetorical needs? Approaching the sources with these issues and questions in mind, in order to build up a holistic picture of the representation of sexual violence in literature will surely result in a more rounded picture of Athenian *attitudes* to sexual violence in its different forms and contexts.

This thesis has demonstrated that the Athenians did take the issue of sexual violence seriously and that they regarded the consent of the victim as an important aspect in determining the nature of the encounter. The Athenians clearly had sympathy for victims of sexual violence. The Athenian men who wrote these plays and the audiences that watched them understood the effect that sexual violence had on women. Though they could differentiate between different types of sexual violence, based on the motivation of the aggressor, I do not believe that we get the impression that sexual violence against women was perfectly acceptable, just that its effects could be mitigated.

Appendix: Review of Scholarship on Sexual Violence in Euripides' *Ion*

This appendix is a survey of how sexual violence in Euripides' *Ion* is presented in scholarship from the end of the 19th century to demonstrate the variety in the reception of the incident, the stances on Apollo's character, and the analyses of the nature of his relationship with Creusa.

Verrall's (1895) summary of the prologue says that Creusa 'became by Apollo's violence the mother of a boy.'[810] Verrall makes note of Creusa's allegations against the god in her first conversation with Ion, and the revelations in her monody.[811] He discusses Athena's assertion at the end of the play that 'everything has been done well by Apollo,' but does not mention the praise that Creusa then offers to the god (1609-1613).[812] Norwood (1920) in his summary of the *Ion* states that 'Creusa, owing to the violence of Apollo, bore a child.'[813] He admits that the sexual assault dominates the entire play.[814] However, both of these scholars see Euripides as an atheist and believe a number of his plays, including the *Ion*, to be critical of Apollo and Delphi. This leads them to interpret the assault as a negative action of Apollo, and a device used by Euripides to undermine the audience's perception of the god.

Wassermann (1940), in discussing the reproaches against Apollo made by earlier scholarship, lists the first as being that he 'violates Creusa.'[815] He rightly emphasises that 'Euripides, in the prologue (11), lays stress on the violation,'[816] but argues that the poet merely does this to draw out different aspects of the god's character. The violence epitomized in his behaviour towards Creusa is offset by the care and benevolence he shows towards his son, the future of Creusa's autochthonous line, Athens and its empire, and Creusa's future happiness (in the form of children by her marriage with Xuthus) after the revelation of Ion's true lineage has been

[810] Verrall 1895: 131.
[811] Verrall 1895: 141-142.
[812] Verrall 1895: 156-157.
[813] Norwood 1920: 236.
[814] Norwood 1920: 237: 'were it not that the basis of the story is so painfully sexual, the *Ion* would perhaps be the most popular of Greek plays.'
[815] Wassermann 1940: 588.
[816] Wassermann 1940: 588.

made known to her. Wassermann does make some valid points about how the difference in their status affects the way Apollo approaches Creusa, which may have had some impact on how his actions were perceived by the audience.[817]

However, Wassermann then goes on to argue that in the misogynistic society of ancient Athens, the female victim's opinion did not matter, and was of no concern to anyone. He states: 'whether she likes it or not, does not count in a society with a definitely inferior status of women. There is no individual choice either when her father later gives her in marriage to Xuthus.'[818] There is no condemnation for her marriage with Xuthus being based on a military alliance. Ion gives no hint that he thinks this is anything other than an acceptable reason for a marriage, and none of the other characters seem to resent Xuthus' status until they perceive him as trying to make a non-Athenian bastard son his heir. Indeed, Creusa shows much affection for her husband. Even after she thinks he has betrayed her she cannot bring herself to kill him (977). Her betrothal and marriage to Xuthus were contracted and carried out properly by her father, presumably with all the proper and fitting rituals which made the marriage valid. This is in strong contrast to her encounter with Apollo. She explicitly states that the encounter that engendered Ion had none of the trappings of ritual or respectability (1474-1475), and it is stressed many times by Hermes, Creusa, and Athena that Apollo purposefully concealed his encounter with Creusa, and the evidence of it (the pregnancy and birth) from her father.[819] Her marriage with Xuthus does not bring Creusa the shame and anguish caused by having to conceal her assault, pregnancy, birth, and exposure of the baby. Nor do I think an experienced tragedian would have devoted so much of the dialogue to Creusa's experience, and the reactions of other characters to her revelations (all of whom take her story extremely seriously and are appalled at what she reveals to them), if the audience would have thought that the victim's opinion did not matter.

In his chapter on the *Ion*, Grube (1941) does not mention Apollo's use of force against Creusa when summarizing the prologue.[820] Not until discussing Ion's accusations about the gods

[817] Wassermann 1940: 589: '[t]he god cannot declare his love and ask the girl whether she likes him. Will and action coincide for him.'
[818] Wassermann 1940: 589.
[819] Hermes (14); Creusa (340, 860, 868, 1484, 1487); Ion (365, 438-439); Athena (1595-1596).
[820] Grube 1941: 261.

does Grube refer to the incident as 'rape,'[821] and later refers to it as Creusa's 'union with Apollo.'[822] He never goes into detail about Creusa's accounts of the incident.[823] Grube refers to the incident as 'rape' again in his discussion of the Athena's defence of Apollo in the epilogue (1595-1600). In response to those who see Apollo's portrayal in this play as extremely negative, he claims that:

> The defence of Apollo is neither ironical nor ineffective. Apart from the original rape the god has behaved well; the violent accusations made against him by Creusa were not justified. The rape itself was necessary to provide Athens and her empire with divine ancestry. Could any Athenian deny that it was worth the price? Not even Creusa herself who now freely approves of Apollo's conduct (1609). By this I do not mean that the fifth-century audience believed in the literal truth of the legend, only that in the presentation of it there is little in the conduct of the god that would outrage their moral sense.[824]

Conacher (1959) barely alludes to the assault until referring to 'the adulterous rape' in a footnote fifteen pages in to his twenty-page article.[825] Despite discussing Ion's lineage in great detail, the development of the myth in which Apollo is Ion's father, and the anti-Apolline stance of Euripides that other scholars detect in the play, until this footnote the only criticisms levelled at Apollo seem to be his abandonment of the mother and child, his inability to make sure his original plan for the revelation of Ion's identity came to fruition successfully, and the apparent false oracle he gives to Xuthus concerning Ion's paternity.[826]

Burnett, in her 1962 article, argues against what she sees as traditional scholarship's regard for the play as a failure, or at best, a vehicle for Euripides' anti-Apolline agenda. First, she refers in a brief summary of the play to Apollo as having 'ravished' Creusa.[827] She argues that Creusa was fortunate due to the successful concealment of the pregnancy and child-birth, the subsequent

---

[821] Grube 1941: 265.
[822] Grube 1941: 267.
[823] Grube 1941: 270.
[824] Grube 1941: 277.
[825] Conacher 1959: 34 n. 41. Even here he only considers Ion's reaction to his limited knowledge of the situation (339, 341, 437 ff., 1523-1527). Conacher does not reference Hermes' statement of lines 10-11, Creusa's own account in her monody (885-901), or the information she has given Ion which lead to these statements (336-400).
[826] Conacher 1959.
[827] Burnett 1962: 89.

maintenance of her high status and marriage, that she will eventually bear two sons to her husband, and:

> One last detail, reserved as final proof that Creusa was blessed in her association with Apollo, is added by Athena, who reveals that Apollo's care had shielded her from even the pains of childbirth (1596) so that she suffered neither shame nor travail. Creusa herself kindled her doubt into a flaming grievance; from her inability to trust Apollo she created a conviction that their son was dead, and this is the source of her apparent suffering.[828]

However, in attempting to rehabilitate Apollo, I feel Burnett tends to go too far in undermining Creusa's experience of Apollo's attack. She neglects the physical, emotional, and psychological impact of the incident on her, her understanding of it, and its aftermath. She refers to the incident as 'seduction,' and Creusa's denunciations of the god as a sort of face-saving protest of sexual innocence:

> Neither lechery nor criminal violence is among the complaints made against Apollo by his 'victim,' Creusa. . . Creusa is not a lascivious woman, and her honor demands an affidavit of her unwillingness; the traditional form of the story of the rape of a mortal by a god equally demands this detail. Once her reluctance is established, Creusa has no complaint to make about her seduction; her charge is not one of rape but of desertion and nonsupport.[829]

I have two major points to address from this passage. First, the statement that 'the traditional form of the story of the rape of a mortal by a god equally demands this detail [of the girl's unwillingness]' is not correct. In many of the accounts of divine and mortal couplings the issue of consent is rarely mentioned. In the case of Tyro, though technically 'raped by the deception' of Poseidon, when he took the guise of the river god Enipeus, the myths relate that Tyro was in love with the river god, and regularly went to bathe in his waters in the hope of having a relationship with him.[830] Semele is anever mentioned as being unwilling. Indeed, she was visited by Zeus on at least two occasions according to some versions of the myth.[831]

---

[828] Burnett 1962: 90.
[829] Burnett 1962: 90-91.
[830] Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.8; Hom. *Od.* 11.235-257.
[831] Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.4.3.

Second, 'her charge is not one of rape' because our concept of rape did not exist in classical Athens.[832] Her charge is indeed 'of desertion and nonsupport' but only in so far as this (in her mind) proves that Apollo's attack was dishonourable, and that he is not concerned with, or at worst even intended to cause her and her household, shame, and dishonour. A woman does not need to be a willing sexual partner to make a claim of 'desertion and nonsupport.' After the child is born it becomes the symbol of the outrage afflicted on the mother, as the Chorus shows.[833] In the Athenian mind, the treatment of the child represents the motivation of the perpetrator towards his 'victim.' This is further exemplified within the play by Xuthus' treatment of Ion, and Ion's reaction to Xuthus' account of the boy's supposed conception.

In the introduction of Burnett's (1970) translation of the *Ion* she refers to Creusa as being 'seduced.'[834] Her commentary on the text offers little in the way of discussion about the accounts of Creusa's relationship with Apollo and the other characters' reactions to hearing her versions of the events. In her 1971 monograph she even accuses Creusa of telling Ion 'lies about the god.'[835]

LaRue (1963), in her discussion of Creusa's monody, refers to Apollo as a 'seducer,'[836] 'the god who raped and deceived,'[837] and later states that 'Creusa's hypomnesis reminds the god of how he came to her as a rapist, or perhaps we should use the word seducer, as Grube recommends, for Creusa's sarcastic description does seem to portray Apollo as a pretty boy, a golden-haired seducer,'[838] before referring to the incident as 'rape' again further down the same page. However, Grube does not actually 'recommend' that we refer to Apollo as a 'seducer,' rather he says that Creusa's 'touching reference to his beauty (888) hints at seduction rather than rape.'[839] To contextualise his quote further, Grube makes this statement in response to those that read the Ion as an anti-Apolline text due to the 'rape' and false oracle.

---

[832] Cf. Harris 2006d.
[833] Eur. *Ion* 506.
[834] Burnett 1970: 9.
[835] Burnett 1971: 123.
[836] LaRue 1963: 126.
[837] LaRue 1963: 127.
[838] LaRue 1963: 132.
[839] Grube 1941: 50.

Wolff (1965) refers to the incident as 'Creusa's unwilling union with Apollo.'[840] He points out that 'violence is at the heart of the story from the beginning. Apollo took Creusa by force (βία, 11, 437, 892), a characteristically Olympian way, Ion remarks (445).'[841]

Vickers (1973) recognises the incident as one of sexual violence, and notes Creusa's unwillingness, her experience of the incident, and the sympathy the other characters express for her upon hearing the tale. However, he sees this play as an example of tragedy being used to criticise myth and omits Creusa's reinterpretation of Apollo's actions and motivation at the end of the play.[842]

Willetts (1973) in his four-page summary of the plot of the *Ion* never refers to Creusa as a victim of sexual violence.[843] The language he uses when referring to the manner in which Ion was begotten seems to portray Creusa a fairly active participant.[844] In his account of the prologue of Hermes he refers to Apollo as Creusa's 'lover,'[845] and later refers to the incident as 'her affair with Apollo.'[846]

Walsh (1978) refers to Creusa as having been 'raped,'[847] but later refers to the incident as 'her adventure with Apollo.'[848] While a year later, Forehand (1979) uses the neutral term, 'mating,' in order to refer to Apollo's relations with Creusa.[849]

Sinos (1982) acknowledges the effect that the characterization of Apollo has had on critical interpretations of the play but firmly believes that there is nothing in the play itself which is 'sufficient evidence to condemn Apollo, nor are there sufficient grounds to suppose that the poet intended any implicit criticism of the god and his oracle at Delphi.'[850] Sinos never mentions Hermes' reference to the assault and only discusses the account in Creusa's monody, which he seems to romanticise:

---

[840] Wolff 1965: 170.
[841] Wolff 1965: 176. However, βία is not used in 892, though this line does describe Apollo seizing Creusa by her wrists and taking her to the cave.
[842] Vickers 1973: 328-337.
[843] Willetts 1973: 206-209.
[844] Passive verbs are used to describe Creusa's role in the original Greek text.
[845] Willetts 1973: 206.
[846] Willetts 1973: 207.
[847] Walsh 1978: 306.
[848] Walsh 1978: 312.
[849] Forehand 1979: 175.
[850] Sinos 1982: 129.

> Yet as if overcome by the natural pleasure of divine abduction, her words pass after a musical interlude (881-85) into a kind of dream-dance, violent, slow and beautiful. . . Here the act of telling transforms the violence of the act, and Creusa steps momentarily and perhaps unwillingly into the hedonistic world of Apollo. 'Kupridi charin prassōn'; this is hardly a description of rape.[851]

His conclusion is that:

> Creusa has been seduced rather than raped. . . she fumes at the personal affront of having been abandoned by her lover rather than the intrinsic weakness on the god's part.[852]

Gellie (1984) regards the *Ion* as a comedy. For him the repeated accounts of Apollo's sexual violence towards Creusa allow the audience to be morally outraged and enjoy their own superiority. He asserts that as the audience knows the truth of Apollo's care for his child they can appreciate the misunderstanding and frustration of the characters. Although he concedes that 'we never succeed in feeling completely at ease about the rape.'[853]

Troiano (1985) in her article reassessing the character of Apollo as portrayed in the play as a whole, and the relation between this portrayal and the genre of the *Ion*, is consistent in her references to the assault on Creusa as 'rape.'[854] In general she sees Euripides' characterisation of Apollo as 'ambivalent.'[855]

Lloyd (1986a) offers a good review of prior scholarship's readings of Apollo's actions, and an insightful and measured reading of the play. He makes number of valuable points in response to earlier scholarship, especially Burnett, many of which I have also made independently of this article.[856] Lloyd deems the assault to be rape, although he does not go into detail about any of Creusa's accounts of the incident.[857]

Saxonhouse (1986) refers to Apollo's violence and calls the act 'rape,' but argues that this merely reflects the violence by which cities are established in real life.[858]

---

[851] Sinos 1982: 130.
[852] Sinos 1982: 131.
[853] Gellie 1984: 97.
[854] Troiano 1985.
[855] Troiano 1985: 49.
[856] See discussion of the text in Chapter One.
[857] Lloyd 1986a: 33-45.
[858] Saxonhouse 1986.

Scafuro (1990) sees the incident as rape and challenges critics' assertions that Creusa never mentioning the charge of violence herself indicates that she was seduced and is solely aggrieved at the perceived desertion rather than the assault.[859] She points out that both shame and Creusa's character account for 'the absence of graphically violent language.'[860]

Dunn (1990) sees the *Ion* as a 'social comedy' which dramatizes conflict between 'human and divine, male and female, foreign and Athenian,'[861] through its portrayal of Creusa's relationship with Apollo and her interactions with the other characters. He believes that the play is unique in tragedy in its presentation of the violence of rape, its sympathetic presentation of the victim, and the presentation of other characters' sympathy for the victim.[862] As I have shown, however, there are plenty of instances in tragedy when sexual violence, or the threat of it, is used to inspire sympathy for the plight of female characters from both other characters in the play and the audience. Indeed I believe this is the main purpose of the theme of sexual violence in tragedy.

Farrington (1991) believes that Apollo oversees all the action of the play and has a 'benevolent plan for the future glory of Athens.'[863] He regards the ignorance of the mortal characters as leading to their criticisms of Apollo. Although he recognises the attack upon Creusa as an instance of sexual violence, he sees her chief criticism of the god being his neglect of the child as in her accounts of the incident she does not 'dwell upon any sordid sexual violence.'[864] However, as I argue in Chapter One, the absence of a graphic description of the assault by Creusa has more to do with the genre than any lack of criticism on the part of the victim.

Loraux (1993) does not discuss Apollo's assault upon Creusa in detail or his motivation, but does regard her as a victim of sexual violence.[865] Zeitlin (1989) also regards Creusa as a victim of sexual violence, without going into detail about the accounts of the assault on Creusa.[866]

Rabinowitz (1993) is another scholar who sees the lack of a specific charge and blatant language of sexual violence in Creusa's monody as Euripides' 'attempt to redeem Apollo. . . by

[859] Scafuro 1990: 141 n. 37; Burnett 1971: 90-91; Saxonhouse 1986: 262-264; Wassermann 1940: 590-591.
[860] Scafuro 1990: 141-145.
[861] Dunn 1990: 130.
[862] Dunn 1990: 132. He does qualify these statements by limiting them to the surviving tragedies.
[863] Farrington 1991: 121.
[864] Farrington 1991: 122.
[865] Loraux 1993: 184-236.
[866] Zeitlin 1989: 144-197.

legitimizing that initial moment, making rape seem like seduction. . .'[867] She explains the apparent paradoxes in the description of the incident in the play by arguing that both readings are ideologically necessary:

> If a woman has been raped, *male* sexual morality is put in question; if a woman has been seduced, *female* sexual morality is put in question. It is important to the line descended from Kreousa that she be above reproach and thus that she was raped; it is important to the reputation of the god that he be above reproach and thus that she desired him. The *Ion* occupies the ambiguous middle ground in this paradox.[868]

But, our ideas of sexual morality are very different from those of the ancient Athenians, and it is wrong to try to classify actions related in Greek literature as moral or immoral by our standards. For us a non-consensual sexual act is rape, but as Harris (2006d) has shown, there is no word in ancient Greek that directly corresponds with our definition of the word 'rape,' and so it follows that there was not a single attitude towards acts of non-consensual sex.[869] It is not possible for us to designate a sexual assault as moral or immoral, as the Athenians obviously had criteria different from our own on judging whether this was the case. I believe that these criteria did include the absence of the woman's consent to the sexual act, but as only one factor.

Lefkowitz (1993) neglects the evidence of Hermes' prologue and the other accounts of the Apollo's assault, concentrating solely on lines 881-902. She follows Burnett (1962 and 1970) in claiming that Apollo 'did not use force.'[870] She posits that as Creusa 'does not try to escape' she was seduced by the god,[871] and that 'the reason for her sorrow is not regret that she had intercourse with the god, but that he abandoned her and her son.'[872]

Hoffer (1996) looks at Euripides' dramatization of the relationship between violence and culture. In examining the representation of Cresua,[873] and her interactions with Ion,[874] he consistently refers to the incident as 'rape.'[875] He rightly argues that 'scholars who deny that

[867] Rabinowitz 1993: 195.
[868] Rabinowitz 1993: 197.
[869] Harris 2006d: 297-299.
[870] Lefkowitz 1993: 27.
[871] Lefkowitz 1993: 27.
[872] Lefkowitz 1993: 28.
[873] Hoffer 1996: 299-303.
[874] Hoffer 1996: 303-312.
[875] Hoffer 1996.

Apollo's rape is transgressive overemphasize the concluding exoneration (1595-1613) and ignore the unanimous blame which the human characters have leveled (*sic*) against him, not only for the false charge of letting the baby die, but also for the rape.'[876] However, he does not note that the human characters reach these conclusions due to their incomplete knowledge of the god's actions subsequent to the assault.

Lee (1997) sees the assault against Creusa as rape, but highlights the fact that all negative comments made by the characters regarding Apollo's actions towards Creusa and the child are mistaken and 'made in ignorance,' and that '[t]he rape is to be seen in the light of its results.'[877] He believes that 'Kreousa's ugly memories of the rape are overshadowed by her delighted reunion with its fruit.'[878] However, I believe that the revelation of Apollo's protection of the child allows Creusa to reinterpret the motivation of the god.

Despite Giannopoulou's (1999-2000) study looking at divine agency in the *Ion* he does not examine Apollo's assault upon Creusa, and only mentions once that 'the god has raped her.'[879]

The confusing effect these various interpretations have upon how the exact nature of Creusa's relationship with Apollo is referred to in later scholarship is clearly seen in Zacharia's (2003) reading of Creusa's monody. Within three pages she refers to the incident as 'rape,' 'her secret love-affair with Apollo,' and 'assault.'[880] Although generally a good reading of *Ion* her analysis of Creusa's attack seems to have been skewed slightly by her acceptance of Dunn's assertion of the uniqueness of Creusa's liaison with the god being bluntly referred to as a 'rape' and that only in this play is a victim of sexual assault portrayed and treated sympathetically.[881]

Sommerstein (2006) supports Scafuro's conclusions that in the *Ion* 'it is made perfectly explicit at the outset that Apollo committed rape, and this is later confirmed in a long, poignant narrative monody by Kreousa herself.'[882] His concern in this article is the issue of the girl's consent. He does not discuss the play in detail, nor does he mention Creusa's praise for Apollo at the end of the play.

---

[876] Hoffer 1996: 306 n.53.
[877] Lee 1997: 32.
[878] Lee 1997: 32.
[879] Giannopoulou 1999-2000: 261.
[880] Zacharia 2003: 89-91. Generally she refers to the incident as 'rape.'
[881] Zacharia 2003, Dunn 1990.
[882] Sommerstein 2006: 237; Scafuro 1997.

Bibliography

Abbreviations are those used in *L'Année Philologique*.

Editions, Texts and Translations:

Aelian, *De Natura Animalium*: Trans. by Schofield, A. F. 1959. London.
Aeschines, *Against Timarchos*: Fisher, N., ed. 2001. Oxford.
Aeschylus, *Tragoediae*: West, M. L., ed. [1990] 1998. Stuttgart.
Andocides, *Greek Orators IV*: Edwards, M., ed. 1995. Warminster.
Apollodorus, *The Library*, 2 Volumes: Trans. by Frazer, J. G. 1921. Cambridge MA.
Aristophanes, *Works*, 4 Volumes: Henderson, J., ed. 1998-2002. Cambridge MA.
Aristotle, *Poetics*: Trans. by Fyfe, W. H., revised by Russel, D. A. 1995 Cambridge MA.
Aristotle, *Politics*: Trans. by Rackham, H. 1932. London.
Catullus, *The Complete Poems*: Lee, G., ed. 1990. Oxford.
Demosthenes, *Orationes*, 4 Volumes: Dilts, M. R., ed. 2002-2009. Oxford.
Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses I*: Trans. by Cohoon, J. W. 1932. London.
Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History III*: Trans. by Oldfather, C. H. 1939. London.
Euripides, *Euripidis Fabulae*, 3 Volumes: Diggle, J., ed. 1981-1994. Oxford.
Euripides, *Fragments*, 2 Volumes: Collard, C. and Cropp, M. J., eds. 2008. Cambridge MA.
Heliodorus, *Aethiopica*, 3 Volumes: Rattenbury, R. M. and Lumb, T. W., eds. Trans by Maillon, J. 1960. Paris.
Herodotus, *Historiae*, 2 Volumes: Hude, K., ed. 1927. Oxford.
Hesiod, *Fragmenta Hesiodea*: Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L., eds. 1967. Oxford.
Hippocrates, *Works X*: Potter, P, ed. 2012. Cambridge MA.
Homer, *Opera*, 3 Volumes: Monro, D. B. and Allen, T. W., eds. 1902-1917. Oxford.
Isaeus, *Isaeus*: Trans. by Forster, E. S. 1927. Cambridge MA.
Lysias, *Orationes cum Fragmentis*: Carey, C., ed. 2007. Oxford.
Menander, *Works*, 2 Volumes: Arnott, W. G., ed. 1976-1996. Cambridge MA.
Ovid. *Fasti*: Trans. by Frazer, J. G., revised by Goold, G. P. [1931] 1996. Cambridge MA.
Pindar, *Pindari Carmina, cum fragmentis*, 2 Volumes: Snell, B., ed. 1955-1964. Lipsiae.
Pindar, *Works*, 2 Volumes: Race, W. H., ed. 1997. Cambridge MA.
Plato, *Laws*, 2 Volumes: Trans. by Bury, R. G. 1926. Cambridge MA.
Plato, *Lysis*, *Symposium*, *Gorgias*: Trans. by Lamb, W. R. M. 1925. Cambridge MA.
Plato, *Republic*, 2 Volumes: Emlyn-Jones, C. and Preddy, W., eds. 2013. Cambridge MA.
Platus, *Works*, 5 Volumes: de Melo, W., ed. 2011-2013. Cambridge MA.
Plutarch, *Lives IV*: Trans. by Perrin, B. 1916. London.
Seneca, *Tragedies II*: Fitch, J. G., ed. 2004. Cambridge MA.
Sophocles, *Sophoclis Fabulae*: Lloyd-Jones, H. And Wilson, N. G. 1990a. Oxford.
Sophocles, *Sophocles III: Fragments*: Lloyd-Jones, H., ed. 1996. Cambridge MA.
Terence, *Works*, 2 Volumes: Barsby, J. ed, 2001. Cambridge MA.
Thucydides, *Historiae I*: Jones, H. S. and Powell, J. E., eds. 1942. Oxford.
Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*: Trans. by Miller, W. 1925. London.
Xenophon, *Scripta Minora*: Trans. by Marchant, E. C. 1925. London.
Xenophon of Ephesus, *Anthia and Habrocomes*: Henderson, J. ed. 2009. Cambridge MA.
Early Greek Mythography, Volume 1: Fowler, R. L., ed. 2000. Oxford.
Greek-English Lexicon: Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R., revised by Jones, H. S., ninth ed. with supplement. 1996. Oxford.
Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC: West, M. L., ed. 2003. Cambridge MA.
Greek Iambic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC: Gerber, D. E., ed. 1999. Cambridge MA.
Greek Lyric I: Sappho and Alcaeus: Campbell, D. A., ed. [1982] 1990. Cambridge MA.

Greek Lyric II: Anacreon, Anacreontea, Choral Lyric form Olympus to Alcman: Campbell, D. A., ed. 1991. Cambridge MA.
Greek Lyric III: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and Others: Campbell, D. A., ed. 1991. Cambridge MA.
Greek Lyric IV: Bacchylides, Corinna, and Others: Campbell, D. A., ed. 1992. Cambridge MA.
Inscriptiones Graecae II²: Kirchner, J., ed. 1913. Berlin.
Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae. 1981-1999. Zürich.
Minor Attic Orators II: Lycurgus, Dinarchus, Demades, and Hyperides: Trans. by Burtt, J. O. 1954. Cambridge MA.
Oxford Classical Dictionary: Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A., eds., third ed. revised. 2003. Oxford.
Oxford Latin Dictionary: Glare, P. G. W., et al. 1982. Oxford.
Poetae melici graeci: Page, D., ed. 1962. Oxford.
Suplementum Epigrahicum Graecum 21. 1965.
Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta: Nauck, A., ed. [1856] 1889. Leipzig.
Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Volume 1: Snell, B., ed. 1981. Göttingen.
Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Volume 2: Kannicht, R. and Snell, B., eds. 1981. Göttingen.
Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Volume 4: Radt, S., ed. 1977. Göttingen.
Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Volume 5 in 2 Parts: Kannicht, R., ed. 2004. Göttingen.

Cited Works:

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
Adams, S. M. 1957. *Sophocles the Playwright*. Toronto.
Adkins, A. W. H. 1966. 'Basic Greek Values in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Hercules Furens*.' *CQ* 16: 193-219.
Ahrens, H. L. 1832. *De causis quibusdam Aeschyli nondum satis emendati commentatio*. Göttingen.
Alexiou, M. [1974] 2002. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Revised by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos. Lanham.
Allan, W. 2000. *The* Andromache *and Euripidean Tragedy*. Oxford.
----------., ed. 2008. *Euripides:* Helen. Cambridge.
Anderson, M. J. 1997. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford.
Anderson, W. S. 1982. 'Euripides' *Auge* and Menander's *Epitrepontes*.' *GRBS* 23: 165-177.
Aretz, S. 1999. *Die Opferung der Iphigeneia in Aulis: Die Rezeption des Mythos in antiken und modernen Dramen*. Stuttgart.
Arnott, W. G. 1981. 'Double the Vision: A Reading of Euripides' *Electra*.' *G&R* 28: 179-192.
----------., ed. 1996. *Menander: Volume 2*. Cambridge MA.
Bakewell, G. W. 2013. *Aeschylus'* Suppliant Women*: The Tragedy of Immigration*. Madison.
Bamberger, F. 1856a. *Opuscula Philologica*. Collected by F. G. Schneidewin. Lipsiae.
----------. 1856b. 'Coniectaneorum in Aeschyli *Supplices* pars prior,' in Bamberger 1856a: 107-113 = *Zimmermanni Diar. Antiq*. 6 (1839): 878-885.
----------. 1856c. 'Coniectaneorum in Aeschyli *Supplices* pars altera,' in Bamberger 1856a: 113-135 = *Zimmermanni Diar. Antiq*. 9 (1842): 693-712.
Barlow, S. A. [1971] 2008. *The Imagery of Euripides*. Bristol.
----------., ed. 1986. *Euripides:* Trojan Women. Warminster.
Barrett, W. S., ed. 1964. *Euripides:* Hippolytus. Oxford.
Beazley, J. D. 1963. *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters*. Second edition. Oxford.
Bednarowski, K. P. 2010. 'The Danaids' Threat: Obscurity, Suspense and the Shedding of Tradition in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*.' *CJ* 105: 193-212.
Belfiore, E. S. 2000. *Murder Among Friends: Violations of Philia in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
Bertolín, R. 2008. 'The Mast and the Loom: Signifiers of Separation and Authority.' *Phoenix* 62: 92-108.
Bielman, A. 1994. *Retour à la Liberté: Libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne*. Lausanne.
Blaiklock, E. M. 1952. *The Male Characters of Euripides: A Study in Realism*. Wellington.

Blok, J. and Mason, P., eds. 1987. *Sexual Asymmetry: Studies in Ancient Society*. Amsterdam.
Blondell, R. 2013. *Helen of Troy: Beauty, Myth, Devastation*. Oxford.
Blundell, M. W. 1989. *Helping Friend and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*. Cambridge.
Bonnard, A. 1945. '*Iphigénie à Aulis*: Tragique et poésie.' *MH* 2: 87-107.
Bonner, R. J. 1919. 'Apollodorus vs. Phormio, Criminal Assault.' *CPh* 14: 83-84.
Borecky, B. 1955. 'La Tragédie *Alopé* d'Euripide: À propos du motif d'une jeune fille éduite et d'un enfant rejeté et retrouvé,' in *Studia Antiqua: Antonio Salač Septagenario Oblata*. Prague: 82-89.
Borthwick, E. K. 1981. '*'ΙΣΤΟΤΡΙΒΗΣ*: An Addendum.' *AJPh* 102: 1-2.
Bowen, A. J., ed. 2013. *Aeschylus:* Suppliant Women. Oxford.
Bowersock, G. W., Burkert, W., and Putnam, M. C. J., eds. 1979. *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M.W. Knox on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. New York.
Bowra, C. M. 1944. *Sophoclean Tragedy*. Oxford.
Bremer, J. M. 1975. 'The Meadow of Love and Two Passages in Euripides' *Hippolytus*.' *Mnemosyne* 28: 268-280.
Bremmer, J. N. 1997. 'Myth as Propaganda: Athens and Sparta.' *ZPE* 117: 9-17.
Brown, P. G. McC. 1991. 'Athenian Attitudes to Rape and Seduction: The Evidence of Menander, *Dyskolos* 289-293.' *CQ* 41: 533-534.
Burgess, D. L. 2004. 'Lies and Convictions at Aulis.' *Hermes* 123: 37-55.
Burian, P. 1974. 'Pelasgus and Politics in Aeschylus' Danaid Trilogy.' *WS* 8: 5-14.
----------., ed. 1985. *Directions in Euripidean Criticism*. Durham NC.
----------. 1997. 'Myth into *Muthos*,' in Easterling 1997a: 178-208.
Burkert, W. 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. London.
----------. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Trans. by J Raffan. Cambridge MA.
Burnett, A. P. 1962. 'Human Resistance and Divine Persuasion in Euripides' *Ion*.' *CPh* 57: 89-103.
----------., ed. 1970. Ion *by Euripides*. Chicago.
----------. 1971. *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides Plays of Mixed Reversal*. Oxford.
Bushnell, R., ed. 2005. *A Companion to Tragedy*. Malden MA.
Buxton, R. G. A. 1982. *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Peitho*. Cambridge.
----------. 2007. 'Tragedy and Greek Myth,' in Woodard 2007: 166-189.
Byrne, L. 1997. 'Fear in the *Seven against Thebes*,' in Deacy and Pierce 1997: 143-162.
Cairns, D. 1993. *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.
----------. 1996. '*Hybris*, Dishonour, and Thinking Big.' *JHS* 116: 1-32.
----------. 1997. 'The Meadow of Artemis and the Character of the Euripidean *Hippolytus*.' *QUCC* 57: 51-75.
Cairns, D. and Liapis, V., eds. 2006. *Dionysalexandros: Essays on Aeschylus and his fellow tragedians in honour of Alexander F. Garvie*. Swansea and Oakville CT.
Calame, C. 1997. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece*. Trans by D. Collins & J. Orion. Lanham.
----------. 1999. *The Poetics of Eros in Ancient Greece*. Trans. by J. Lloyd. Princeton.
----------. 2007. 'Greek Myth and Greek Religion,' in Woodard 2007: 259-285.
Cameron, A. and Kuhrt, A., eds. 1983. *Images of Women in Antiquity*. London.
Cameron, H. D. 1971. *Studies on the* Seven against Thebes *of Aeschylus*. The Hague.
Campbell, D. A., ed. 1991. *Greek Lyric III: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and Others*. Cambridge MA.
Cantarella, E. 2005. Gender, Sexuality, and Law,' in Gagarin, M. and Cohen, D., eds. 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge: 236-253.
Carawan, E. 2000. 'Deianira's Guilt.' *TAPhA* 130: 189-237.
Carey, C. 1991. 'Apollodoros' Mother: The Wives of Enfranchised Aliens in Athens.' *CQ* 41: 84-89.
----------. 1995. 'Rape and Adultery in Athenian Law.' *CQ* 45: 407-417.
Carson, A. 1982. 'Wedding at Noon in Pindar's *Ninth Pythian*.' *GRBS* 23: 121-128.
----------. 1990. 'Putting Her in Her Place: Women, Dirt, and Desire,' in Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin 1990: 135-169.

Carter, D. M. 2007. *The Politics of Greek Tragedy*. Bristol.
----------., ed. 2011. *Why Athens? A Reappaisal of Tragic Politics*. Oxford.
Clark, A. C. 2003. '*Tyro Keiromene*,' in Sommerstein 2003: 79-116.
Cohen, B. 1997. 'Divesting the Female Breast of Clothes in Classical Sculpture,' in Koloski-Ostrow, O. and Lyons, C. L., eds. *Naked Truths*. London: 66-92.
Cohen, D. 1991. *Law, Sexuality and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
Cole, S. G. 1984. 'Greek Sanctions against Sexual Assault.' *CPh* 79: 97-113.
Collard, C., ed. 1991. *Euripides:* Hecuba. Warminster.
----------. 1995. '*Melanippe Wise & Captive*,' in Collard, Cropp, and Lee 1995: 240-280.
----------. 2004. '*Antiope*,' in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert 2004: 259-329.
Collard, C. and Cropp, M. J., eds. 2008. *Euripides Fragments*. 2 Volumes. Cambridge MA.
Collard, C., Cropp, M. J., and Lee, K. H., eds. 1995. *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays, Volume I*. Oxford.
Collard, C., Cropp, M. J., and Gibert, J., eds. 2004. *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays, Volume II*. Oxford.
Conacher, D. J. 1959. 'The Paradox of Euripides' *Ion*.' *TAPhA* 90: 20-39.
----------. 1967. *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme and Structure*. Oxford.
----------. 1980. *Aeschylus'* Prometheus Bound*: A Literary Commentary*. Toronto.
Cook, A. B. 1894. 'Animal Worship in the Mycenaean Age.' *JHS* 14: 81-169.
Craik, E., 1990. 'Sexual Imagery and Innuendo in *Troades*,' in Powell 1990: 1-15.
Croally, N. T., 1994. *Euripidean Polemic: The* Trojan Women *and the Function of Tragedy*. Cambridge.
Csapo, E. and Slater, W. J. 1994. *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor.
Dale, A. M., ed. 1967. *Euripides:* Helen. Oxford.
Davies, M., ed. 1991. *Sophocles*: Trachiniae. Oxford.
Deacy, S. 2013. 'From "Flowery Tales" to "Heroic Rapes": Virginal Subjectivity in the Mythological Meadow.' *Arethusa* 46: 395-413.
Deacy, S. and Pierce, K. F., eds. 1997. *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds.* London.
Debnar, P. 2010. 'The Sexual Status of Aeschylus' Cassandra.' *CPh* 105: 129-145.
Denniston, J. D., ed. 1939. *Euripides*: Electra. Oxford.
Denniston, J. D. and Page, D., eds. 1957. *Aeschylus:* Agamemnon. Oxford.
Diggle, J. 1968. 'Notes on the *Agamemnon* and *Persae* of Aeschylus.' *CR* 18: 1-4.
----------., ed. 1981. *Euripidis Fabulae*. Volume 2. Oxford.
----------., ed. 1984. *Euripidis Fabulae*. Volume 1. Oxford.
----------., ed. 1994. *Euripidis Fabulae*. Volume 3. Oxford.
Dindorf, W. 1870. *Lexicon Sophocleum*. Leipzig.
Dingelstad, H. 1865. *De Euripidis* Helena. Münster.
Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford.
----------. 1996. 'Democratic Contradictions and the Synoptic Illusion of Euripides' *Ion*,' in Ober, J. and Hedrick, C., eds. *Dēmokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*. Princeton: 249-270.
Dowden, K. and Livingstone, N., eds. 2014a. *A Companion to Greek Mythology*. Chichester.
----------. 2014b. 'Thinking through Myth, Thinking Myth Through,' in Dowden and Livingstone, eds. 2014a: 3-23.
Dräger, P. 1993. *Argo Pasimelousa*. Stuttgart.
DuBois, P. 1982. *Centaurs and Amazons*. Ann Arbor.
Dué, C. 2006. *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy*. Austin.
Dunn, F. M. 1990. 'The Battle of the Sexes in Euripides' *Ion*.' *Ramus* 19: 130-142.
Easterling, P. E. 1968. 'Sophocles' *Trachiniae*.' *BICS* 15: 58-69.
----------. 1981. 'The End of the *Trachiniae*.' *ICS* 6: 56-74.
----------., ed. 1982. *Sophocles'* Trachiniae. Cambridge.
----------. 1984. 'The Tragic Homer.' *BICS* 31: 1-8.
----------., ed. 1997a. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.
----------. 1997b. 'Form and Performance,' in Easterling 1997a: 151-177.

----------. 1997c. 'Constructing the Heroic,' in Pelling 1997a: 21-37.
Edwards, M., ed. 1995. *Greek Orators IV: Andocides*. Warminster.
Engelmann, R. 1890. 'Tyro.' *JDAI* 5: 171-179.
England, E. T. 1926. 'The *Electra* of Euripides.' *CR* 40: 97-104.
van Erp Taalman Kip, A. M. 1987. 'Euripides and Melos.' *Mnemosyne* 40: 414-419.
Euben. J. P., ed. 1986. *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*. Berkeley.
Farmer, M. S. 1998. 'Sophocles' Ajax and Homer's Hector: Two Soliloquies.' *ICS* 23: 19-45.
Farrington, A. 1991. 'ΓΝΩΘΙΣΑΥΤΟΝ. Social Self-Knowledge in Euripides' *Ion*.' *RhM* 134: 120-136.
Fisher, N. R. E. 1992. *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*. Warminster.
Foley, H. P. 1982. 'Marriage and Sacrifice in Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*.' *Arethusa* 15: 159-180.
----------. 2001. *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton.
----------. 2003. 'Choral Identity in Greek Tragedy.' *CPh* 98: 1-30.
Forehand, W. E. 1979. 'Truth and Reality in Euripides' *Ion*.' *Ramus* 8: 174-187.
Fowler, R. L., ed. 2000. *Early Greek Mythography: Volume 1*. Oxford.
Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J., eds. 1998. *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. London.
Fraenkel, E., ed. 1950. *Aeschylus:* Agamemnon. 3 Volumes. Oxford.
Frey, V. 1947. 'Betrachtungen zu Eur. *aul. Iph*.' *MH* 4: 39-51.
Friedrich, R. 1996. 'Everything to Do with Dionysos? Ritualism, the Dionysiac, and the Tragic,' in Silk 1996: 257-283.
Friis Johansen, H. and Whittle, E.W., eds. 1980. *Aeschylus:* Suppliants. 3 Volumes. Copenhagen.
Fuqua, C. 1980. 'Heroism, Heracles, and the *Trachiniae*.' *Traditio* 36: 1-81.
Gaca, K. L. 2010. 'The Andrapodizing of War Captives in Greek Historical Memory.' *TAPhA* 140: 117-161.
Galinsky, K. 1972. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford.
Gantz, T. 1978. 'Love and Death in the *Suppliants* of Aischylos.' *Phoenix* 32: 279-287.
----------. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore.
Garner, R. 1990. *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*. London.
Garvie, A. F. [1969] 2005. *Aeschylus'* Supplices*: Play and Trilogy*. Bristol.
Gellie, G. H. 1980. 'Hecuba and Tragedy.' *Antichthon* 14: 30-44.
----------. 1981. 'Tragedy and Euripides' *Electra*.' *BICS* 28: 1-12.
----------. 1984. 'Apollo in the *Ion*.' *Ramus* 13: 93-101.
Giannopoulou, V. 1999-2000. 'Divine Agency and *Tyche* in Euripides' *Ion*: Ambiguity and Shifting Perspectives.' *ICS* 24/25: 257-271.
Gibert, J. 2005. 'Clytemnestra's First Marriage: Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*,' in Pedrick and Oberhelman 2005: 227-246.
Gill, C. 1996. *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue*. Oxford.
Goff, B. E. 2004. *Citizen Bacchae: Women's Ritual Practice in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
Goldhill, S. 1987. 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology.' *JHS* 107: 58-76.
----------. 1994. 'Representing Democracy: Women at the Great Dionysia,' in Osborne and Hornblower 1994: 347-369.
----------. 1996. 'Collectivity and Otherness – The Authority of the Tragic Chorus: Response to Gould,' in Silk 1996: 244-256.
----------. 1997. 'The Audience of Athenian Tragedy,' in Easterling 1997a: 54-68.
Gould, J. 1980. 'Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens.' *JHS* 100: 38-59.
----------. 1996. 'Tragedy and Collective Experience,' in Silk 1996: 217-243.
Graf, E. 1884. *Die Antiopasage bis auf Euripides*. Dissertation Zürich-Halle.
Graf, F. 2007. 'Religion and Drama,' in McDonald and Walton 2007: 55-71.
Greenberg, N. A. 1993. 'The Attitude of Agamemnon.' *CW* 86: 193-205.
Gregory, J. 1991. *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians*. Ann Arbor.

Griffin, J. 1990. 'Characterization in Euripides: *Hippolytus* and *Iphigeneia in Aulis*,' in Pelling 1990: 128-149.
Griffith, M. 1977. *The Authenticity of* Prometheus Bound. Cambridge.
----------., ed. 1983. *Aeschylus:* Prometheus Bound. Cambridge.
----------. 2006. 'Horsepower and Donkeywork: Equids and the Ancient Greek Imagination: Part Two.' *CPh* 101: 307-358.
----------. 2011. 'Extended Families, Marriage, and Inter-City Relations in (Later) Athenian Tragedy: Dynasts II,' in Carter 2011: 175-208.
Grube, G. M. A. 1941. *The Drama of Euripides*. London.
Habash, M. 1995. 'Two Complementary Festivals in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*.' *AJPh* 116: 559-577.
Halliwell, S. 1986. *Aristotle's* Poetics. London.
Halperin, D. M. 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexualtiy: And Other Essays on Greek Love*. London.
Halperin, D. M, Winkler, J J., and Zeitlin, F. I., eds. 1990. *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*. Princeton.
Hard, R. 1997. *Apollodorus: The Library of Greek Mythology*. Oxford.
Harris, E. M. 1998. 'Review Article: Deacy & Pierce 1997.' *EMC* 40: 483-496.
----------. 2006a. *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens: Essays on Law, Society, and Politics*. Cambridge.
----------. 2006b. 'Did Solon Abolish Debt-Bondage?' in Harris 2006a: 249-269 = *CQ* 52 (2002): 415-430.
----------. 2006c. 'Did the Athenians Regard Seduction as a Worse Crime than Rape?' in Harris 2006a: 283-295 = *CQ* 40 (1990): 370-377.
----------. 2006d. 'Did Rape Exist in Classical Athens? Further Reflections on the Laws about Sexual Violence,' in Harris 2006a: 297-332 = *Dike* 7 (2004): 41-83.
----------. 2006e. 'Women and Lending in Athenian Society: A *Horos* Re-Examined,' in Harris 2006a: 233-246 = *Phoenix* 46 (1992): 309-321.
----------. 2015a. '"Yes" and "No" in Women's Desire,' in Masterson, M., Rabinowitz, N. S., and Robson. J., eds. *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*. London: 298-314.
----------. 2015b. 'The Family, the Community and Murder: The Role of Pollution in Athenian Homicide Law,' in Ando, C. and Rüpke, J., eds. *Public and Private in Ancient Mediterranean Law and Religion*. Berlin: 11-35.
Harrison, A. R. W. 1968. *The Law of Athens: The Family and Property*. Oxford.
Hartigan, K. V. 1991. *Ambiguity and Self-Deception: The Apollo and Artemis Plays of Euripides.* Frankfurt am Main.
Hartung, J. A., ed. 1851a. *Euripides' Werke: Helene*. Leipzig.
----------., ed. 1851b. *Sophokles' Werke. Bd. 8: Sophokles' Fragmente*. Leipzig.
----------., ed. 1854. *Aeschylus Werke*: Danaiden. Leipzig.
Hausmann, U. 1958. 'Zur *Antiope* des Euripides (zum Homerischen Becher Athen 11798 s.II a).' *MDAI (A)* 73: 50-72.
Headlam, W. 1898. 'Aeschylea.' *CR* 12: 189-193.
----------. 1900. 'Upon Aeschylus – I.' *CR* 14: 106-119.
Heimsoeth, F. 1861. *Die Wiederherstellung der Dramen des Aeschylus*. Bonn.
Henderson, J. [1975] 1990. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. Oxford.
----------. 1991. 'Women and the Athenian Dramatic Festivals.' *TAPhA* 121: 133-147.
Henrichs, A. 1990. 'Between Country and City: Cultic Dimensions of Dionysus in Athens and Attica,' in Griffith, M. and Mastronarde, D. J., eds. *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*. Atlanta: 257-277.
Hesk, J. 2007. 'The Socio-Political Dimension of Ancient Tragedy,' in McDonald and Walton 2007: 72-91.
Hester, D. A. 1980. 'Deianeira's 'Deception Speech.' *Antichthon* 14: 1-8.
Hexter, R. and Seldon, D., eds. 1992. *Innovations of Antiquity*. London.
Hoey, T. F. 1979. 'The Date of the *Trachiniae*.' *Phoenix* 33: 210-232.

Hoffer, S. E. 1996. 'Violence, Culture, and the Workings of Ideology in Euripides' *Ion*.' *ClAnt* 15: 289-318.
Holt, P. 1989. 'The End of the *Trachiniai* and the Fate of Herakles.' *JHS* 109: 69-80.
Humphreys, S. C. 1993. *The Family, Women and Death: Comparative Studies*. Ann Arbor.
Hunter, V. 1990. 'Gossip and the Politics of Reputation is Classical Athens.' *Phoenix* 44: 299-325.
Hurwit, J. M. 2007. 'The Problem with Dexileos: Heroic and Other Nudities in Greek Art.' *AJPh* 111: 35-60.
Hutchinson, G. O., ed. 1985. *Aeschylus:* Septem contra Thebas. Oxford.
----------. 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Oxford.
Huys, M. 1990. 'Euripides' *Auge*, fr. 265, 272, 278, 864N² and the Role of Herakles in the Play.' *SEJG* 31: 169-185.
----------. 1995. *The Tale of the Hero Who Was Exposed at Birth in Euripidean Tragedy*. Leuven.
----------. 1996. 'Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides:' Sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus? Part I.' *APF* 42: 168-178.
----------. 1997. 'Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides:' Sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus? Part II.' *APF* 43: 11-30.
Ireland, S. 1974. 'The Problem of Motivation in the *Supplices* of Aeschylus.' *RhM* 117: 14-29.
Isler, H. P. 1970. *Acheloos, eine Monographie*. Bern.
Jebb, R. C., ed. 1892. *Sophocles, Volume V:* The Trachiniae. Cambridge.
Jenkins, I. 1983. 'Is There Life After Marriage? A Study of the Athenian Abduction Motif in Vase Paintings of the Athenian Wedding Ceremony.' *BICS* 30: 137-145.
Jesi, F. 1965. 'L'Egitto infero nell'Elena di Euripide.' *Aegyptus* 45: 56-69.
Jones, C. P. 1987. 'Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity.' *JRS* 77: 139-155.
Jones, N. F. 2004. *Rural Athens under the Democracy*. Philadelphia.
de Jong, I. J. F. 1991. *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech*. Leiden.
Jouan, F. and Van Looy, H., eds. 1998. *Euripide Tome 8.i Fragments:* Aigeus-Autolykos. Paris.
Juffras, D.M. 1993. 'Helen and Other Victims in Euripides' *Helen*.' *Hermes* 121: 45-57.
Kaffarnik, J. 2013. *Sexuelle Gewalt gegen Frauen im antiken Athen*. Hamburg.
Kambitsis, J., ed. 1972. Antiope *d'Euripide: édition commentée des fragments*. Athens.
Kamerbeek, J. C., ed. 1970. *The Plays of Sophocles: Commentaries. Volume 2* The Trachiniae. Leiden.
Kannicht, R., ed. 2004. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Volume 5 in 2 Parts. Göttingen.
Kannicht, R. and Snell, B., eds. 1981. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Volume 2. Göttingen.
Kapparis, K. A. 1999. *Against Neaira [D. 59]*. Berlin.
Karamanou, I. 2003. 'The Myth of Alope in Greek Tragedy.' *AC* 72: 25-40.
----------. 2006. *Euripides* Danae *and* Dictys*: Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Leipzig.
Kearns, E. 2013. 'Pindar and Euripides on Sex with Apollo.' *CQ* 63: 57-67.
Kern, P. B. 1999. *Ancient Siege Warfare*. London.
King, H. 1983. 'Bound to Bleed: Artemis and Greek Women,' in Cameron and Kuhrt 1983: 109-127.
Kirchhoff, A., ed. 1855. *Euripidis Tragoediae*. Berlin
Kirkwood, G. M. 1965. 'Homer and Sophocles' *Ajax*,' in Anderson, M. J., ed. *Classical Drama and Its Influence*. London. 53-70.
Kiso, A. 1984. *The Lost Sophocles*. New York.
----------. 1986. '*Tyro*: Sophocles' Lost Play,' in Betts, J. H., Hooker, J. T., and Green, J. R., eds. *Studies in Honour of T. B. L. Webster*. Bristol. Vol. 1: 161-169.
Kitto, H. D. F. [1939] 1961. *Greek Tragedy*. London.
Koniaris, G. L. 1973. '*Alexander, Palamedes, Troades, Sisyphus* – A Connected Tetralogy? A Connected Trilogy?' *HSPh* 77: 85-124.
----------. 1980. 'An Obscene Word in Aeschylus: I.' *AJPh* 101: 42-44.
Kovacs, D. 1980. *The* Andromache *of Euripides: An Interpretation*. Chico.
----------. 1985. 'Castor in Euripides' *Electra* (*El*. 307-13 and 1292-1307).' *CQ* 35: 306-314.
----------. 1987. 'The Way of a God with a Maid in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*.' *CPh* 82: 326-334.
----------., ed. 1995. *Euripides II:* Children of Heracles, Hippolytus, Andromache, and Hecuba. Cambridge MA.
----------., ed. 1998. *Euripides III:* Suppliant Women, Electra, and Heracles. Cambridge MA.

----------., ed. 1999. *Euripides IV*: Trojan Women, Iphigenia Among the Taurians, and Ion. Cambridge MA.
----------., ed. 2002a. *Euripides V:* Helen, Phoenician Women, and Orestes. Cambridge MA.
----------., ed. 2002b. *Euripides VI:* Bacchae, Iphigenia at Aulis, and Rhesus. Cambridge MA.
----------. 2003. 'Towards a Reconstruction of *Iphigenia Aulidensis*.' *JHS* 123: 77-103.
Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods: Performance of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford.
Kubo, M. 1967. 'The Norm of Myth: Euripides' *Electra*.' *HSPh* 71: 15-31.
Laiou, A. E., ed. 1993. *Consent and Coercion to Sex and Marriage in Ancient and Medieval Societies*. Washington D.C.
Lape, S. 2001. 'Democratic Ideology and the Poetics of Rape in Menandrian Comedy.' *ClAnt* 20: 79-199.
LaRue, J. 1963. 'Creusa's Monody: *Ion* 859-922.' *TAPhA* 94: 126-136.
Lee, K. H., ed. 1976. *Euripides:* Troades. Basingstoke.
----------., ed. 1997. *Euripides:* Ion. Warminster.
Lefkowitz, M. R. 1986. *Women in Greek Myth*. London.
----------. 1993. 'Seduction and Rape in Greek Myth,' in Laiou 1993: 17-37.
----------. 2002. '"Predatory" Goddesses.' *Hesperia* 71: 325-344.
Letters, F. J. H. 1953. *The Life and Work of Sophocles*. London.
Lightfoot, J. B. 1858. 'Notes on some Corrupt and Obscure Passages in the *Helena* of Euripides.' *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* 4: 153-186.
Linwood, W. 1843. *A Lexicon to Aeschylus*. London.
Lloyd, M. 1986a. 'Divine and Human Action in Euripides' *Ion*.' *A&A* 32: 33-45.
----------. 1986b. 'Realism and Character in Euripides' *Electra*.' *Phoenix* 40: 1-19.
----------. 1988. '*Prometheus Bound*: Review of Saïd 1985.' *CR* 38: 8-9.
Lloyd-Jones, H. 1971. *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley.
----------., ed. 1994. *Sophocles II:* Antigone, The Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus. Cambridge MA.
----------., ed. 1996. *Sophocles III: Fragments*. Cambridge MA.
----------. 2003. 'Zeus, Prometheus, and Greek Ethics.' *HSPh* 101:49-72.
Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N. G., eds. 1990a. *Sophoclis Fabulae*. Oxford.
----------. 1990b. *Sophoclea: Studies on the Text of Sophocles.* Oxford.
Longo, O. 1990. 'The Theater of the *Polis*,' trans. by J. J. Winkler, in Winkler and Zeitlin 1990: 12-19 = 'Il teatro della città.' *Dioniso* 49 (1978): 5-13.
Loraux, N. 1987. *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman*. Trans. by A. Forster. Cambridge MA.
----------. 1993. *The Children of Athena*. Princeton.
Luppe, W. 1984. 'Euripides-Hypothesis in den Hygin-Fabeln *Antiope* und *Ino*?' *Philologus* 128: 41-59.
Luschnig, C.A.E. 1976. 'Euripides' *Hecabe*: The Time is Out of Joint.' *CJ* 71: 227-234.
----------. 1988. *Tragic Aporia: A Study of Euripides'* Iphigenia at Aulis. Berwick.
MacDowell, D. M. 1976. '*Hybris* in Athens.' *G&R* 23: 14-31.
----------. 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens*. Ithaca.
----------. 1992. 'The Enforcement of Morals.' *CR* 42: 345-347.
----------., ed. 2000. *Demosthenes:* On the False Embassy (Orations 19). Oxford.
MacKinnon, J. K. 1971. 'Heracles' Intention in His Second Request of Hyllus: *Trach.* 1216-51.' *CQ* 21: 33-41.
----------. 1978. 'The Reason for the Danaids' Flight.' *CQ* 28: 74-82.
MacLachlan, B. 1993. *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry*. Princeton.
MacLeod, C. W. 1982. 'Politics and the *Oresteia*.' *JHS* 102: 124-144.
March, J. R. 1987. *The Creative Poet: Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry.* London.
Markantonatos, A., ed. 2012. *Brill's Companion to Sophocles*. Leiden.
Marsh, T. 1992. 'Epilogue: The (Other) Maiden's Tale,' in Richlin 1992: 269-284.
Martin, G. 2010. 'On the Date of Euripides' *Ion*.' *CQ* 60: 647-651.
Martin, R. P. 1989. *The Language of Heroes*. Ithaca.
Martino, G. 1996. 'La *Tyro* e *l'Elettra* di Sofocle: Due tragedie a lieto fine?' *PP* 51: 198-212.

Mason, P. G. 1959. 'Kassandra.' *JHS* 79: 80-93.
Mastronarde, D. J. 1999-2000. 'Euripidean Tragedy and Genre: The Terminogy and its Problems.' *ICS* 24/25: 23-39.
Mayhew, R. 1999. 'Behaviour Unbecoming a Woman: Aristotle's *Poetics* 15 and Euripides' *Melanippe the Wise*.' *AncPhil* 19: 89-104.
McCall, M. 1982. 'Robortello's "Conjecture" at Aeschylus, *Supplices* 337.' *CQ* 32: 228-230.
McClure, L. 1999. *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*. Princeton.
McDonald, M. and Walton, J. M., eds. 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*. Cambridge.
Meier, C. 1993. *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.
Meridor, R. 1989. 'Euripides' *Troades* 28-44 and the Andromache Scene.' *AJPh*: 110:17-35.
Michelini, A. N. 1987. *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition*. Madison.
----------. 1999-2000. 'The Expansion of Myth in Late Euripides: *Iphigenia at Aulis*.' *ICS* 24/25: 41-57.
Mitchell-Boyask, R. 2006. 'The Marriage of Cassandra and the *Oresteia*: Text, Image, Performance.' *TAPhA* 136: 269-297.
Moles, J. L. 1979. 'A Neglected Aspect of *Agamemnon* 1389-92.' *LCM* 6: 179-189.
Monk, J. H. 1811. 'ΑΙΣΥΛΟΥ *ΠΡΟΜΗΞΕΥΣ ΔΕΣΜΩΤΗΣ*,' *Quarterly Review* 5: 203-229.
Moodie, G. 2003. 'Sophocles' *Tyro* and Late Euripidean Tragedy,' in Sommerstein 2003: 117-138.
Morgan, K. A. 1994. 'Apollo's Favourites.' *GRBS* 35: 121-143.
Mossman, J. 1995. *Wild Justice: A Study of Euripides'* Hecuba. Oxford.
----------. 2001. 'Women's Speech in Greek Tragedy: The Case of Electra and Clytemnestra in Euripides' *Electra*.' *CQ* 51: 374-384.
Motte, A. 1973. *Prairies et jardins de la Grèce antique: de la religion à la philosophie*. Brussels.
Nagler, M. N. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study of the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley.
Naiden, F. S. 2006. *Ancient Supplication*. Oxford.
Nauck, A. [1856] 1889. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig.
Norwood, G. 1920. *Greek Tragedy*. London.
Oakley, J. H. and Sinos, R. H. 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*. Madison.
O'Brien, M. J. 1964. 'Orestes and the Gorgon: Euripides' *Electra*.' *AJPh* 85: 13-39.
Ogden, D. 1997. 'Rape, Adultery and the Protection of Bloodlines in Classical Athens,' in Deacy and Pierce 1997: 25-41.
Omitowoju, R. 1997. 'Regulating Rape: Soap Operas and Self Interest in the Athenian Courts,' in Deacy and Pierce 1997: 1-24.
----------. 2002. *Rape and the Politics of Consent in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
O'Neill, E. G. 1941. 'The Prologue of the *Troades* of Euripides.' *TAPhA* 72: 288-320.
Ormand, K. 1999. *Exchange and the Maiden: Marriage in Sophoclean Tragedy*. Austin.
Osborne, R. and Hornblower, S., eds. 1994. *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. Oxford.
Owen, A. S., ed. 1939. *Euripides:* Ion. Oxford.
Packman, Z. M. 1993. 'Call it Rape: A Motif in Roman Comedy and Its Suppression in English-Speaking Publications.' *Helios* 20: 42-55.
Page, D. L. 1934. *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy, Studies with Special Reference to Euripides'* Iphigeneia in Aulis. Oxford.
----------., ed. 1942. *Select Papyri III: Literary Papyri: Poetry*. Revised ed. Cambridge MA.
Papadimitropoulos, L. 2008. 'Causality and Innovation in Euripides' *Electra*.' *RhM* 151: 113-126.
Papi, D. G. 1987. 'Victors and Sufferers in Euripides' *Helen*.' *AJPh* 108: 27-40.
Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
Parmentier, L., ed. 1942. *Euripide. Tome IV*. Paris.
Patterson, C. 1986. '*Hai Attakai*: The Other Athenians.' *Helios* 13: 49-67.
Pearson, A. C., ed. 1917. *The Fragments of Sophocles, edited with additional notes from the papers of Sir R.C. Jebb and Dr. W.G. Headlam*. 3 Volumes. Cambridge.
Pease, A. S. 1943. 'The Son of Neptune.' *HSPh* 54: 69-82.
Pedrick, V. and Oberhelman, S. M., eds. 2005. *The Soul of Tragedy: Essays on Athenian Drama*. Chicago.
Pelling, C., ed. 1990. *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford.

----------., ed. 1997a. *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Oxford.
----------. 1997b. 'Conclusion,' in Pelling 1997a: 213-235.
----------. 2000. *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian*. London.
Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. [1968] 1988. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford.
Pierce, K. F. 1997. 'The Portrayal of Rape in New Comedy,' in Deacy and Pierce 1997: 163-184.
Pierrepont Houghton, H. 1962. 'Deianeira in the *Trachiniae* of Sophocles.' *Pallas* 11: 69-102.
Pippin, A. N. 1960. 'Euripides' *Helen*: A Comedy of Ideas.' *CPh* 55: 151-163.
Podlecki, A. J. 1970. 'The Basic Seriousness of Euripides' *Helen*.' *TAPhA* 101: 401-418.
----------. 1990. 'Could Women Attend the Theater in Ancient Athens? A Collection of Testimonia.' *AncW* 21: 27-43.
----------., ed. 2005. *Aeschylus:* Prometheus Bound. Oxford.
Pohlenz, M., ed. 1954. *Die griechische Tragödie*. 2 Volumes. Göttingen.
Pomeroy, S. B. 1975. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York.
Powell, A., ed. 1990. *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality*. London.
Pozzi, D. C. 1994. 'Deianeira's Robe: Diction in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*.' *Mnemosyne* 47: 577-585.
Price, S. R. F. 1999. *Religions of the Ancient Greeks*. Cambridge.
Pritchard, D. M. 2014. 'The Position of Attic Women in Democratic Athens.' *G&R* 61: 174-193.
Pulleyn, S. 1997. 'Erotic Undertones in the Language of Clytemnestra.' *CQ* 47: 565-567.
Rabinowitz, N. S. 1993. *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women*. Ithaca.
----------. 2011. 'Greek Tragedy: A Rape Culture?' *EuGeStA* 1: 1-21. (http://eugesta.recherche.univ-lille3.fr/).
Radt, S., ed. 1977. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Volume 4. Göttingen.
Raeburn, D. 2000. 'The Significance of Stage Properties in Euripides' *Electra*.' *G&R* 47: 149-168.
Reckford, K. J. 1985. 'Concepts of Demoralization in the *Hecuba*,' in Burian 1985: 112-128.
Redfield, J. 1982. 'Notes on the Greek Wedding.' *Arethusa* 15: 181-201.
Rehm, R. 1994. *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton.
Rhodes, P. J. 2003. 'Nothing to Do with Democracy: Athenian Drama and the *Polis*.' *JHS* 123: 104-119.
Richardson, N. J., ed. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford.
Richlin, A., ed. 1992. *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Oxford.
Rivier, A. 1944. *Essai sur le tragique d'Euripide*. Lausanne.
Robert, C. 1916. '*Tyro.*' *Hermes* 51: 273-302.
Robertson, H. G. 1936. '*Δίκη* and *Ὕβρις* in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*.' *CR* 50: 104-109.
Robortello, F., ed. 1552. *Aeschyli Tragoediae septem*. Venice.
Robinson, D. B. 1979. 'Helen and Persephone, Sparta and Demeter: The 'Demeter Ode' in Euripides' *Helen*,' in Bowersock et al. 1979: 162-172.
----------. 2006. 'Stars and Heroines in Euripides' *Helen* (*Helen* 375-85),' in Cairns and Liapis 2006: 151-172.
Roselli, D. K. 2011. *Theater of the People: Spectators and Soceity in Ancient Athens*. Austin.
Rosenmeyer, P. A. 2004. 'Girls at Play in Early Greek Poetry.' *AJPh* 125: 163-178.
Rosivach, V. J. 1975. 'The First Stasimon of the *Hecuba* 444ff.' *AJPh* 96: 349-362.
----------. 1998. *When a Young Man Falls in Love: The Sexual Exploitation of Women in New Comedy*. London.
Rösler, W. [1993] 2007. 'The End of the *Hiketides* and Aischylos' Danaid Trilogy,' trans. by M. Lloyd, in Lloyd, M. ed., *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Aeschylus*. Oxford: 174-198 = 'Der Schluss der *Hiketiden* und die Danaiden-Trilogie des Aischylos.' *RhM* 136 (1993): 1-22.
Rutherford, R. B. 2012. *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation.* Cambridge.
Saïd, S. 1985. *Sophiste et tyran ou le problem du Prométhée enchaîné*. Paris.
Saxonhouse, A. W. 1986. 'Myths and the Origins of Cities: Reflections on the Autochthony Theme in Euripides *Ion*,' in Euben 1986: 252-273.
Scafuro, A. C. 1990. 'Discourses of Sexual Violation in Mythic Accounts and Dramatic Versions of 'The Girl's Tragedy'.' *Differences* 2: 126-159.

----------. 1997. *The Forensic Stage: Settling Disputes in Graeco-Roman New Comedy*. Cambridge.
Schaps, D. M. 1977. 'The Woman Least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names.' *CQ* 27: 23-30.
----------. 1979. *Economic Rights of Women in Ancient Greece*. Edinburgh.
Scodel, R. 1980. *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*. Göttingen.
----------. 1998. 'The Captive's Dilemma: Sexual Acquiescence in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades.*' *HSPh* 98: 137-154.
----------. 2005. 'Tragedy and Epic,' in Bushnell 2005: 181-197.
Seaford, R. 1987. 'The Tragic Wedding.' *JHS* 107: 106-130.
----------. 1990a. 'The Imprisonment of Women in Greek Tragedy.' *JHS* 110: 76-90.
----------. 1990b. 'The Structural Problems of Marriage in Euripides,' in Powell 1990: 151-176.
----------. 1996. 'Something to Do with Dionysos – Tragedy and the Dionysiac: Response to Friedrich,' in Silk 1996: 284-294.
Séchan, L. 1926. *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*. Paris.
Segal, C. 1971. 'The Two Worlds of Euripides' *Helen*.' *TAPhA* 102: 553-614.
----------. 1981. *Tragedy and Civilization: An Interpretation of Sophocles*. Cambridge MA.
----------. 1993. *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow*. Durham NC.
----------. 1994. 'Bride or Concubine? Iole and Heracles' Motives in the *Trachiniae*.' *ICS* 19: 59-64.
----------. 1995a. *Sophocles' Tragic World: Divinity, Nature, Society*. Cambridge MA.
----------. 1995b. 'Myth, Poetry, and Heroic Values in the *Trachinian Women*,' in Segal 1995a: 26-68 = 'Sophocles' *Trachiniae*: Myth, Poetry, and Heroic Values.' *YClS* 25 (1976): 99-158.
----------. 1995c. 'Time, Oracles, and Marriage in the *Trachinian Women*,' in Segal 1995a: 69-94 = 'Time, Oracles, and Marriage in the *Trachiniae*,' *Lexis* 9/10 (1992): 63-92.
Seidler, A. 1811-1812. *De versibus dochmiacis tragicorum Graecorum*. Lipsiae.
Sheppard, J. T. 1918. 'The *Electra* of Euripides.' *CR* 32: 137-141.
Sicherl, M. 1986. 'Die Tragik der Danaiden.' *MH* 43: 81-110.
Sidwell, K. 2001. 'Melos and the *Trojan Women*,' in Stuttard, D. and Shasha, T., eds. *Essays on Trojan Women*. York.
Silk, M. S., ed. 1996. *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond*. Oxford.
Simon, E. 1981. 'Antiope I.' *LIMC* 1.1: 854-857.
Sinos, D. 1982. 'Characterization in the *Ion*: Apollo and the Dynamism of the Plot.' *Eranos* 80: 129-134.
Sissa, G. 1990a. *Greek Virginity*. Trans. by A. Goldhammer. London.
----------. 1990b. 'Maidenhood withough Maidenhead: The Female Body in Ancient Greece,' in Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin 1990: 339-364.
Smith, W.D. 1979. 'Iphigeneia in Love,' in Bowersock et al. 1979: 173-180.
Snell, B. 1964. *Scenes from Greek Drama*. Berkeley.
----------., ed. 1981, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Volume 1. Göttingen.
Sommerstein, A. H. 1977. 'Notes on Aeschylus' *Suppliants*.' *BICS* 24: 67-82.
----------. 1995. 'The Beginning and the End of Aeschylus' Danaid Trilogy,' in Zimmermann, B. ed. *Griechisch-römische Komödie un Tragödie*. Stuttgart: 111-134.
----------. 1997. 'The Theatre Audience, the *Demos*, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus,' in Pelling 1997a: 63-79.
----------. 1998. 'Rape and Young Manhood in Athenian Comedy' in Foxhall and Salmon 1998: 100-114.
----------., ed. 2003. *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments*. Bari.
----------. 2006. 'Rape and Consent in Athenian Tragedy,' in Cairns and Liapis 2006: 233-251.
----------., ed. 2008. *Aeschylus: Works*. 3 Volumes. Cambridge, MA.
----------. 2009. *Aeschylus*: The Persians and Other Plays. London.
----------. 2012. 'Fragments and Lost Tragedies,' in Markantonatos 2012: 191-209.
Sorum, C. E. 1978. 'Monsters and the Family: the Exodus of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*.' *GRBS* 19: 59-73.
----------. 1992. 'Myth, Choice, and Meaning in Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*.' *AJPh* 113: 527-542.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2003. *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*. Lanham.
Stanford, W. B., ed. 1963, *Sophocles:* Ajax. London.
----------. 1983. *Greek Tragedy and the Emotions: An Introductory Study*. London.
Steidle, W. 1968. *Studien zum Antiken Drama*. Munich.
Stevens, P. T., ed. 1971. *Euripides:* Andromache. Oxford.
Stinton, T. C. W. 1990a. *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
----------. 1990b. 'Notes on Greek Tragedy, I,' in Stinton 1990a: 197-235 = *JHS* 96 (1976): 121-145.
----------. 1990c. 'The Scope and Limits of Allusion in Greek Tragedy,' in Stinton 1990a: 454-492 = Stinton, in Cropp, M., Fantham, E., and Scully, S. E., eds. 1986. *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher*: 76-102.
----------. 1990d. 'The Apotheosis of Heracles from the Pyre,' in Stinton 1990a: 493-507 = *JHS*, Suppl. 15 (1987): 1-16.
Sutton, D. F. 1984. *The Lost Sophocles*. London.
Swift, L. 2010. *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford.
Synodinou, K. 1987. 'Tecmessa in the *Ajax* of Sophocles.' *A&A* 33: 99-107.
Taplin, O. 1977. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*. Oxford.
----------. 1986. 'Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A *Syknrisis*.' *JHS* 106: 163-174.
Tarkow, T. A. 1981. 'The Scar of Orestes: Observations on a Euripidean Innovation.' *RhM* 124: 143-153.
Thalmann, W. G. 1978. *Dramatic Art in Aeschylus'* Seven against Thebes. New Haven.
Thomson, G. D. 1929. 'ΖΕΥΣ ΤΥΡΑΝΝΟΣ: A Note on *Prometheus Vinctus*.' *CR* 43: 3-5.
----------. 1971. 'The *Supplices* of Aeschylus.' *Eirene* 9: 25-30.
Thury, E. M. 1985. 'Euripides' *Electra*: An Analysis Through Character Development.' *RhM* 128: 5-22.
Tomaselli, S. and Porter, R., eds. 1986. *Rape: An Historical and Social Enquiry*. Oxford.
Topper, K. 2010. 'Maidens, Fillies and the Death of Medusa on a Seventh-Century Pithos.' *JHS* 130: 109-119.
Troiano, E. 1985. 'The *Ion*: The Relationship of Character and Genre.' *CB* 61: 45-52.
Turnebus, A., ed. 1552. *Aeschyli tragoediae sex*. Paris.
Turner, C. 2001. 'Perverted Sacrifice and Other Inversions in Aeschylus' Danaid Trilogy.' *CJ* 97: 27-50.
Tyrrell, W. B. 1980. 'An Obscene Word in Aeschylus: II.' *AJPh* 101: 44-46.
Valakas, K. 1993. 'The First Stasimon and the Chorus in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*.' *SIFC* 11: 55-86.
Van Looy, H. 1964. *Zes Verloren Tragedies van Euripides. Studie met Kritische Uitgave en Vertaling der Fragmenten.* Brussels.
----------. 1998. '*Antiope*' in Jouan & Van Looy 1998: 213-274.
Vellacott, P. 1975. *Ironic Drama: A Study of Euripides' Method and Meaning*. Cambridge.
Vérilhac, A-M. and Vial, C. 1998. *Le mariage grec du VI^e^ siècle av. J.-C. à l'époque d'Auguste*. Paris.
Vernant, J-P. 1980. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. Trans. by J. Lloyd. Sussex.
----------. 1990. 'The Historical Moment of Tragedy in Greece: Some of the Social and Psychological Condition,' in Verant, J-P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. 1990. *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. Trans. by J. Lloyd. NewYork: 23-28.
Verrall, A. W. 1895. *Euripides the Rationalist: A Study in the History or Arts and Religion.* Cambridge.
Versnel, H. S. 1987. 'Wife and Helpmate: Women of Ancient Athens in Anthropological Perspective,' in Blok and Mason 1987: 59-86.
Vickers, B. 1973. *Towards Greek Tragedy*. London.
Vikman, E. 2005. 'Ancient Origins: Sexual Violence in Warfare, Part 1.' *Anthropology & Medicine* 12: 21-31.
Von Arnim, H. 1913. *Supplementum Euripideum*. Bonn.
Vysoký, Z. K. 1964. 'Die beiden Fassungen der Melanippe-Fabel bei Euripides.' *LF* 87: 17-32.
Waldock, A. J. A. 1951. *Sophocles: The Dramatist*. Cambridge.
Walsh, G. B. 1978. 'The Rhetoric of Birthright and Race in Euripides' *Ion*.' *Hermes* 106: 301-315.

Wassermann, F. M. 1940. 'Divine Violence and Providence in Euripides' *Ion*.' *TAPhA* 71: 587-606.
----------. 1949. 'Agamemnon in the *Iphigenia at Aulis*: A Man in an Age of Crisis.' *TAPhA* 80: 174-186.
Waterfield, R. 2001. *Euripides:* Orestes *and Other Plays*. Oxford.
Webster, T. B. L. 1936. 'Sophocles' *Trachiniae*,' in *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on his Seventieth Birthday*. Oxford: 164-180.
----------. 1967. *The Tragedies of Euripides*. London.
Wecklein, N. 1923. 'Die *Antiope* des Euripides.' *Philologus* 79: 51-69.
Weil, H., ed. 1866. *Aeschyli quae supersunnt tragoediae*: Supplices. Giessen.
Welcker, F. G. 1839. *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus, Vol. 1: Aeschylus, Sophokles*. Bonn.
Wender, D. 1974. 'The Will of the Beast: Sexual Imagery in the *Trachiniae*.' *Ramus* 3: 1-17.
West, M. L. 1990. *Studies in Aeschylus*. Stuttgart.
----------. [1990] 1998., ed. *Aeschylus: Tragoediae*. Stuttgart.
White, S. 2001. 'Imitations of Theodicy in *Prometheus Bound*.' *JHS* 121: 107-140.
Whitehead, D. 1986. 'Women and Naturalisation in Fourth-Century Athens: The Case of Archippe.' *CQ* 36: 109-114.
Whitman, C. H. 1974. *Euripides and the Full Circle of Myth*. Cambridge MA.
Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, U. von., ed. [1914] 1958. *Aeschyli Tragoediae*. Berlin.
----------. 1935a. *Kleine Schriften I: Klassische griechische Poesie.* Berlin.
----------. 1935b. 'Exkurse zu Euripidis *Herakliden*,' in Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1935a: 82-109 = *Hermes* 17 (1882): 337-364.
----------. 1935c. 'De tragicorum graecorum fragmentis commentatio,' in Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1935a: 176-208 = *Index scholarum publice et privatim in academia Georgia Augusta per semester aestivum a.d. XV. m. aprilis usque ad d. XV. m. augusti a. MDCCCLXXXXIII habendarum*. Gottingae.
----------. 1935d. 'Melanippe,' in Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1935a: 440-460 = *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 1921: 63-80.
Wilkins, J., ed. 1993. *Euripides:* Heraclidae. Oxford.
Willetts, R. F. 1973. 'Action and Character in the *Ion* of Euripides.' *JHS* 93: 201-209.
Wilson, N. G. 1982. 'Two Observations on Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*.' *GRBS* 23: 157-163.
Winkler, J. J. and Zeitlin, F. I., eds. 1990. *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama ans Its Social Context*. Princeton.
Winnington-Ingram, R. P. 1969. 'Pindar's *Ninth Pythian Ode*.' *BICS* 16: 9-15.
----------. 1980. *Sophocles: An Interpretation*. Cambridge.
----------. 1983. *Studies in Aeschylus*. Cambridge.
Wißmann, J. 1997. *Motivation und Schmähung: Feigheit in der* Ilias *und in der griechischen Tragödie*. Stuttgart.
Wohl, V. 1998. *Intimate Commerce: Exchange, Gender, and Subjectivity in Greek Tragedy*. Austin.
Wolff, E. A. 1957. *Aeschylus' Danaid Trilogy: A Study*. Dissertation Columbia University.
Wolff, C. 1965. 'The Design and Myth in Euripides' *Ion*.' *HSPh* 69: 169-194.
----------. 1973. 'On Euripides' *Helen*.' *HSPh* 77: 61-84.
Woodard, R. D., ed. 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology*. Cambridge.
Woodbury, L. 1972. 'Apollo's First Love: Pindar, *Pyth*, 9.26 ff.' *TAPhA* 103: 561-573.
Young, D. C. C. 1964. 'Gentler Medicines in the *Agamemnon*.' *CQ* 14: 1-23.
Zacharia, K. 2003. *Converging Truths: Euripides'* Ion *and the Athenian Quest for Self-Definition*. Leiden.
Zanker, G. 1992. 'Sophocles' *Ajax* and the Heroic Values of the *Iliad*.' *CQ* 42: 20-25.
Zeitlin, F. I. 1965. 'The Motif of the Corrupted Sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*.' *TAPhA* 96: 463-508.
----------. 1970. 'The Argive Festival of Hera and Euripides' *Electra*.' *TAPhA* 101: 645-669.
----------. 1986. 'Configurations of Rape in Greek Myth,' in Tomaselli & Porter 1986: 122-151.

----------. 1989. ‘Mysteries of Identity and Designs of the Self in Euripides’ *Ion*.’ *PCPhS* 35: 144-197.
----------. 1990. ‘Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama,’ in Winkler and Zeitlin 1990: 63-96.
----------. 1992. ‘The Politics of Eros in the Danaid Trilogy of Aeschylus,’ in Hexter and Seldon 1992: 203-252.
Zielinski, T. 1927. ‘De *Auge* Euripidea.’ *Eos* 30: 33-53.