The Portrayal of the Trojans in Euripides and its Implications for Greek Attitudes towards Barbarians in the Late Fifth Century

Marc Bonaventura

ORCID: 0000-0003-0526-1157

This thesis is submitted in total fulfilment of the degree of

Master of Arts

School of Historical and Philosophical Studies

University of Melbourne

October 2016

Abstract

This thesis examines the portrayal of the Trojans in Euripides' tragedies, particularly the *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, and *Troades*. It primarily investigates whether the Trojans are presented as noble and admirable figures, or denigrated as stereotypical eastern barbarians. These results are integrated with recent developments in scholarship regarding Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks to determine what Euripides' depiction of the Trojans can reveal about how late fifth-century Athenians viewed and perceived easterners.

In keeping with recent scholarly developments, which tend to focus on the extensive tradition of cultural interaction, influence, and exchange between Greeks and non-Greeks, this thesis argues against the existence of an all-pervasive Greek/barbarian polarity in fifth-century Athens. Instead, Athenian attitudes towards non-Greeks were considerably diverse and can best be described as a coexistence of conflicting views. Composing his plays in this intellectual environment, Euripides was not constrained by a dominant ideology governing representations of easterners, and so was relatively free to portray the Trojans as he wished.

In the *Andromache*, Euripides reverses the conventional Greek/barbarian polarity. Through her virtuous behaviour, Andromache transcends the accusations of barbarism levelled against her by the Spartan characters, who themselves are demonised in the play. The *Hecuba* presents a stark contrast between the honourable Trojans, who are completely distinct from the eastern barbarian stereotype, and the Thracian king Polymestor, who possesses all the undesirable qualities of the Thracian barbarian stereotype. In the *Troades*, Euripides depicts the Greeks as barbarous and the Trojans as honourable and virtuous, contradicting the Greek/barbarian polarity and consistently blurring the boundary between Greek and barbarian.

Ultimately, this thesis argues that Euripides' Trojan tragedies contain a complex discourse on ethnicity and barbarism. Generally, Euripides does not portray the Trojans as barbarians, but rather affords them a sympathetic and favourable treatment. However, his Trojan tragedies provide a useful reflection of the plurality of Athenian attitudes towards non-Greeks. The Greek characters often express the rhetoric of polarity against the Trojans, who, through their honourable and virtuous behaviour, are elevated above

these accusations of barbarism and depicted as admirable characters. In addition, Euripides occasionally portrays characters in accordance with pejorative barbarian stereotypes, such as Polymestor in the *Hecuba*. These hybrid representations of non-Greeks should not be regarded as contradictory or erroneous, but rather as reflective of the diversity of attitudes towards non-Greeks which coexisted in fifth-century Athens.

Declaration

1. This thesis comprises of only my original work towards the Master of Arts.
2. Due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used.
3. This thesis is fewer than the maximum word limit in length, exclusive of tables, maps, bibliographies and appendices.

Signature:
Date: 26/10/2016

Contents

Introduction

Euripides's portrayal of barbarians has generated strong interest among scholars in recent decades, although few studies have focused exclusively on the Trojans. Some studies examine barbarians in Euripides or in Greek tragedy more broadly,[1] and these naturally discuss the Trojans. Those which investigate Euripides' representation of the Trojans tend to focus on either one aspect of their depiction, such as the captive women's lament[2] or the character of Andromache,[3] or one particular play.[4] The most comprehensive treatment is Mattison's study,[5] which examines the depiction of the Trojans in Attic tragedy with a focus on its implications for the contemporary Athenian sense of identity.

Although Mattison's study is the most comprehensive to date, her thesis contains minimal engagement with the vast body of scholarship regarding Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks in the fifth century. Conversely, this thesis will integrate a study of Euripides' Trojans with recent developments in the scholarship on Greek attitudes towards foreigners and the Greek/barbarian polarity, which contextualises Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans and is crucial for understanding the motives behind his depiction of them. It will primarily examine how the Trojans are depicted in Euripides' tragedies, especially the *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, and *Troades*, to determine whether they are noble and sympathetic figures or denigrated as stereotypical eastern barbarians. In addition, it will investigate the intellectual environment in which Euripides was composing, particularly the diversity of Greek attitudes towards barbarians, to determine how Euripides engages with these views in his representation of the Trojans. It will also discuss what Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans reveals about Athenian attitudes towards easterners in the late fifth century. Instead of an isolated study of Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans, this thesis effectively treats Euripides' Trojans as a case study for the broader question of how late fifth-century Athenians regarded foreigners, particularly those of the Near East.

This thesis contains three principal contentions:

---

[1] Saïd 2002 examines barbarians in Euripides, while Hall 1989 and Bacon 1961 analyse barbarians in tragedy more broadly. Papadodima 2013 covers fifth-century literature, including a chapter on tragedy.
[2] Dué 2006.
[3] Muich 2010.
[4] *Andromache*: Papadodima 2010; *Hecuba*: Morwood 2014, Segal 1993, Kovacs 1987; *Troades*: Croally 1994.
[5] Mattison 2009. See also Erskine 2001, who briefly discusses the Trojan portrayal in tragedy.

1. Athenian attitudes towards non-Greeks in the late fifth century (and fifth century in general) were not dominated by an all-pervasive Greek/barbarian polarity, but are best described as a coexistence of conflicting views.
2. Euripides does not portray the Trojans as stereotypical eastern barbarians, but rather elevates them above the Greek characters as noble and sympathetic characters, deliberately challenging the views of xenophobic Greeks who were prejudiced against easterners.
3. Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans reflects the plurality of attitudes towards non-Greeks held by fifth-century Athenians, as his plays contain the rhetoric of polarity but also command respect and admiration for the Trojans through their honourable and virtuous behaviour.

Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter. It will examine fifth-century Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks, providing an overview of the scholarship and an analysis of the primary evidence. The first half of the chapter will discuss arguments supporting the existence of a dominant Greek/barbarian polarity, while the second half will cover scholarship which either denies the existence of a Greek/barbarian polarity, or at least challenges its significance in fifth-century Athenian society. By providing perspective on the intellectual environment in which Euripides was composing, the chapter serves as a necessary prelude to the analysis of Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans.

Chapter 2 will investigate Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans in the *Andromache*. It will focus on Andromache and assess the accusations of barbarism directed at her by the Spartan characters, comparing them to her behaviour to determine whether Andromache's portrayal justifies or contradicts these accusations. It will also discuss whether the play's ending, which attributes distinguished ancestry to the Molossians, can shed any light on the Trojan portrayal.

Chapter 3 will analyse the *Hecuba*. It will examine how Euripides employs the term βάρβαρος and whether the play promotes an opposition between royalist Trojans and democratic Greeks. It will also include a discussion of the Thracian king Polymestor and whether the Thracians or Trojans should appropriately be regarded as the barbarians of the play.

Chapter 4 will examine the representation of the Trojans in the *Troades*. It will focus primarily on the clarity, consistency, and importance of the Greek/barbarian polarity, but will also comment on the influence of contemporary events, such as the Melian incident and Sicilian expedition, on the play and the possibility that the *Troades* was produced as part of a connected trilogy.

The thesis will conclude with a brief discussion of the Phrygian slave in the *Orestes*. In particular, it will examine whether or not he reflects the eastern barbarian stereotype and how his depiction relates to the other Trojan characters in Euripides.

This thesis will not discuss the *Rhesus* in depth. It is true that the *Rhesus* heavily features the Trojans, and the question of how the play portrays Trojans, Thracians, and Greeks is an interesting and divisive one.[6] Points of discussion include individual characterisation,[7] ethnic stereotypes,[8] wealth,[9] and the notion of a common sense of barbarian community.[10] However, despite the wealth of subject matter, since it seems unlikely that the *Rhesus* was composed by Euripides,[11] or even that it was composed in the fifth century at all,[12] this thesis will avoid an in-depth examination of the play.

[6] Liapis 2012: xlvi-xlvii finds the non-Greeks more sympathetic than the Greeks, while Delebecque 1951: 403 interprets the *Rhesus* as 'une tragédie hostile aux Barbares'. Alternatively, Burnett 1985: 50 asserts that undesirable behaviour is committed by all, including Trojans, barbarians, Greeks, and gods.
[7] Hector is rash (76-7), malleable (138), rude (266), and strategically deficient (105-8), while Burnett 1985: 20-24 outlines Dolon's character as greedy, braggadocious, bestial, cowardly, a pretender at ferocity, and ineffective. On the Greek side, Odysseus is criticised for being a rogue (498-509) and not fighting face to face (510-11), and Liapis 2012: l-li claims that the play constantly presents Odysseus and Diomedes in a negative light.
[8] These include Phrygian cowardice (814-15, cf. 249) and Thracian drunkenness (418-19).
[9] Troy's wealth (169, 960) and Rhesus' luxurious equipment (303, 305, 340, 382) are stressed.
[10] Both Hector (404-5) and Rhesus' charioteer (833-4) appeal to a common barbarian identity. According to Liapis 2012: xlvii, βάρβαρος in the *Rhesus* denotes 'a status one can take seriously and even be proud of'.
[11] Liapis 2012: lxx. Alternatively, Ritchie 1964 and Burnett 1985: 50-51 both ascribe the play to Euripides early in his career.
[12] Liapis 2012: lxxi-lxxii argues for a fourth-century composition date.

Chapter 1: The Greek/Barbarian Polarity in Fifth-Century Athens

Introduction

Recent scholarship regarding fifth-century Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks is extremely conflicted. Individual studies have reached vastly different conclusions and no clear consensus emerges. This is due partly to the widely conflicting views on foreigners, ranging from denigration to admiration, which can be readily found in Classical Greek literature and art, and partly to the difficulties of assessing the impact of significant historical events such as the Persian and Peloponnesian wars on Greek perceptions of non-Greeks. Moreover, it is unclear how closely the attitudes towards foreigners in surviving Classical literature and art reflect those of the Athenian, or wider Greek, population as a whole.

Scholars who have recently tackled the question tend either to argue in favour of a prominent Greek/barbarian polarity, or to question the polarity as simplistic and inaccurate. The former category includes Edith Hall (1989) and François Hartog (1988), who focus on Athenian tragedy and Herodotus respectively, David Castriota (1992), who examines public Athenian art, and Paul Cartledge (2002). In addition, John Coleman (1997) and Christopher Tuplin (1999) argue for the presence of Greek ethnocentrism and Greek ethnic prejudice respectively, Jonathan Hall (2002) asserts that Greek self-identity in the fifth century was defined in opposition to a barbarian other, and Benjamin Isaac (2004) identifies an early form of racism, which he labels 'proto-racism', originating in late fifth-century Greek society. On the opposite end of the spectrum lie Margaret Miller (1997), who examines fifth-century Athenian appropriation of and receptivity to Achaemenid Persian culture, Joseph Skinner (2012), who focuses on the development of Greek ethnographic thought, and Efi Papadodima (2013), who surveys fifth-century Greek literature. In more generalised studies, Erich Gruen (2011a) and Kostas Vlassopoulos (2013a) both urge a scholarly reconsideration of the accuracy and usefulness of the Greek/barbarian polarity as a model for understanding Greek relations with foreigners.

Before analysing Euripides' Trojans, it is necessary to examine the scholarship concerning fifth-century Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks. This will provide insight into the contemporary intellectual environment and so add perspective to Euripides' representation of the Trojans. In particular, it will reveal where Euripides' Trojan

portrayal can be situated within the diverse and conflicting attitudes towards foreigners which coexisted in the fifth century.

The first half of this chapter will discuss scholarship supporting the existence of a developed Greek/barbarian polarity in fifth-century Athens. After examining the nature of barbarian stereotypes, it will assess the role of the Persian Wars in the development of the polarity, before evaluating whether tragedy supports such a dichotomy. Then, it will discuss the potential late fifth-century degeneration of the polarity, before examining how the Trojans fit into the conventional polarity and analysing the view that, although the polarity existed, it is insufficient for describing the complex reality of Greek/barbarian interactions.

The second half will examine scholarly views which either deny the existence of a Greek/barbarian polarity or question its importance and prevalence in Classical Greek society. First it will assess the rigidity or fluidity of the Greek/barbarian distinction, before discussing the origins and semantics of the term βάρβαρος. The focus will then switch to intercultural communication and exchange, iconography, and intra-Hellenic disputes, before ultimately examining the possibility that conflicting attitudes towards non-Greeks coexisted in fifth-century Athens.

1. The barbarian stereotype

The nature of the barbarian stereotype

The Greek stereotype of the barbarian included many different qualities. Tuplin lists the key characteristics: disorder, lack of proper sensibilities, cruelty, lustfulness, deviousness, stupidity, ignorance of the Rule of Law, and subordination to despotic government.[1] Examples of these stereotypical traits can be found throughout Greek literature. Herodotus cites intelligence as a traditional distinction between Greeks and barbarians, describing the Greek race as δεξιώτερον καὶ εὐηθείης ἠλιθίου ἀπηλλαγμένον μᾶλλον (1.60.3),[2] and Aristotle ascribes despotism to Asia, asserting that Asiatic ἔθνη are

[1] Tuplin 1999: 49. Jüthner 1923: 8-9 argues that the barbarian is presented as mentally, socially, and morally inferior to the Greek.

[2] He outlines this traditional distinction to express surprise that the Athenians were duped by Peisistratus' ruse of dressing a tall woman as Athena to reclaim the tyranny (Hdt. 1.60.4-5). An alternative reading of Hdt. 1.60.3 is also possible, as in the Teubner edition of Rosén (1987), it is τὸ βάρβαρον ἔθνος that is intellectually superior.

continuously ἀρχόμενα καὶ δουλεύοντα (*Pol.* 1327b28).[3] In addition, Vlassopoulos offers several instances of what he labels the 'discourse of alterity': Pausanias refuses to mutilate Mardonius' body, because τὰ πρέπει μᾶλλον βαρβάροισι ποιέειν (Hdt. 9.79.1); Thracian mercenaries slaughter the inhabitants of Mycalessus (Th. 7.27-9); climate (αἱ ὧραι) and monarchy (τῆς… Ἀσίης τὰ πολλὰ βασιλεύεται) are responsible for Asian effeminacy and cowardice (Hp. *Aër* 16); and Isocrates' summation of the polarised image of the barbarian (4.150-51).[4] In Aeschylus' *Persae*, Edith Hall maintains that the three principal barbarian flaws are hierarchicalism, immoderate luxuriousness, and unrestrained emotionalism,[5] while Harrison believes that the play contrasts Athenian democracy and Persian monarchy.[6] According to Castriota, the opposition of hubris and σωφροσύνη is at the centre of the Greek/Persian polarity in Aeschylus and Herodotus.[7] All these examples attest to the complexity and diversity of the barbarian stereotype, which encompassed a vast range of characteristics.[8]

Barbarian stereotypes can be divided into two categories: socio-political, which encompasses the tyranny/democracy and slavery/freedom oppositions, and ethical, which includes patterns of conduct.[9] Of these, the political distinction is probably the more important.[10] Moreover, barbarian stereotypes often embody the opposite of ideal Greek values and customs.[11] For this reason, Edith Hall understands Greek discourse on the barbarians as 'an exercise in self-definition',[12] revealing more about the Greeks than the foreign subjects of their stereotypes. For instance, the barbarian traits of stupidity, cowardice, cruelty, lack of restraint, and lawlessness correspond to the Greek virtues of wisdom (σοφία), courage (ἀνδρεία), discipline (σωφροσύνη), and justice (δικαιοσύνη).[13]

[3] Conversely, European non-Greeks are free, but intellectually inferior (*Pol.* 1327b23-5).
[4] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 192-3.
[5] Hall 1989: 80. Goldhill 2002: 54 stresses the centrality of wealth, as Aeschylus emphasises Persian luxury from the opening parodos (cf. πολύχρυσος at 3, 9, 45, 53).
[6] Harrison 2000: 77. Similarly, De Romilly 1993: 284 argues for a strong contrast between 'le people libre' and 'peuple qui s'humilie devant un souverain absolu'.
[7] Castriota 1992: 19. Georges 1994: 123 argues for a strong barbarian stereotype in Herodotus, while Hartog 1988: 375 maintains that Herodotus constantly presents a contrast between Greeks and others.
[8] Although it was not all-encompassing. For instance, Croally 1994: 108 n.89 notes that the Greeks did not regard religion as a key difference between themselves and barbarians.
[9] Papadodima 2013: 140.
[10] Croally 1994: 107; Hall 1989: 2.
[11] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 190-91. Cartledge 2002: 11 understands the Greek/barbarian antithesis as a 'strictly polar dichotomy, being… jointly exhaustive and mutually exclusive'.
[12] Hall 1989: 1. Similarly, Cohen 2000: 5 argues that the polarity 'obtained unique resonance as a self-defining construct'.
[13] Coleman 1997: 202. Mitchell 2007: 25 likewise observes that Panhellenism contrasted Asiatic luxury, wealth, and slavery with Greek simplicity and freedom.

This opposition likely lies behind Tuplin's argument that the Greeks 'largely regarded themselves as better than barbarians',[14] or Coleman's suggestion that they were ethnocentric, despising foreigners and believing in the superiority of their own culture.[15]

In Plato's *Politicus*, as the stranger explains to the younger Socrates the principles of dividing things into classes, he attests that many Greeks divided mankind into Greeks and barbarians:

> εἴ τις τἀνθρώπινον ἐπιχειρήσας δίχα διελέσθαι γένος διαιροῖ καθάπερ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐνθάδε διανέμουσι, τὸ μὲν Ἑλληνικὸν ὡς ἓν ἀπὸ πάντων ἀφαιροῦντες χωρίς, σύμπασι δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις γένεσιν, ἀπείροις οὖσι καὶ ἀμείκτοις καὶ ἀσυμφώνοις πρὸς ἄλληλα, βάρβαρον μιᾷ κλήσει προσειπόντες αὐτὸ διὰ ταύτην τὴν μίαν κλῆσιν καὶ γένος ἓν αὐτὸ εἶναι προσδοκῶσιν·
>
> 262c-d

Two important points can be taken away from this passage. The first is that many Greeks regarded barbarians as a uniform group (γένος ἓν αὐτὸ, 262d), classifying all non-Greeks under the blanket term βάρβαρος (βάρβαρον μιᾷ κλήσει προσειπόντες, 262d). The second is the inadequacy of this view, as in reality 'the barbarian race' consists of innumerable tribes who are unrelated and linguistically diverse (ἀπείροις… καὶ ἀμείκτοις καὶ ἀσυμφώνοις, 262d). As Harrison notes, although the Greeks occasionally treated the barbarians as a homogeneous group (πρόπαντι βαρβάρων γένει, A. *Pers.* 434; τὸ βάρβαρον γένος, E. *Andr.* 173; S. fr. 587 Radt), or one which spoke the same 'barbarian language' (S. *Aj.* 1262-3; X. *An.* 1.8.1; Pl. *Tht.* 163b; D.S. 5.6.5; Arr. *An.* 3.6.6),[16] there were significant differences in the way they represented foreign peoples.[17] Accordingly, one must acknowledge the existence of various stereotypes for different peoples. Generally, eastern barbarians (Persians/Phrygians/Lydians) were associated with effeminacy, softness, cowardice, and servility, and northern barbarians (Thracians/Scythians) with crudeness, savagery, and ferocity.[18] More specifically, the

[14] Tuplin 1999: 47. According to Long 1986: 132-3, the Greeks believed in their military and intellectual superiority.
[15] Coleman 1997: 175. Isaac 2004: 1 even claims that 'early forms of racism… were common in the Graeco-Roman world', including Classical Greece.
[16] Nippel 2002: 290-91 argues that this tendency developed in the second half of the fifth century.
[17] Harrison 2002: 7.
[18] Papadodima 2010: 3-4.

Phrygians had a reputation for cowardice in Greek literature,[19] while the Lydians were associated with wealth, luxury, and effeminacy,[20] traits which, according to Herodotus, they passed on to the Persians (1.71.4).[21] This thesis will focus on eastern barbarian stereotypes, because these are the most relevant for understanding how Euripides portrays the Trojans.

Evidence for barbarian stereotypes can also be found in iconography. Castriota (1992 & 2005) argues strongly for a Greek/barbarian polarity in official fifth-century Athenian art. He maintains that the Marathon painting on the Stoa Poikile displayed Persian arrogance, greed for power, and a preoccupation with wealth,[22] while the Amazons on the Stoa complemented the Persian stereotype with their uncontrollable appetite, immoderation, and insatiable desire.[23] He also asserts that the Parthenon contrasts the male Greek or Athenian ethos against the female, animal, and barbarian,[24] claiming that it expresses the Greek/barbarian polarity more stridently than ever before on a public Greek monument.[25] Such themes also appear in the private medium of vase-painting. McNiven, for instance, argues that the frontal face, unprecedented gesture, and lascivious pose of the Persian on the famous Eurymedon vase illustrate his lack of self-control and possibly his fear,[26] and Raeck identifies a greater focus on Persian luxury in the second half of the fifth century.[27] Accordingly, the range of Greek media which can express barbarian stereotypes and reinforce the Greek/barbarian polarity is rather diverse.

Barbarism and slavery

It is worth also commenting on the link between barbarism and slavery. According to Edith Hall, most Athenian slaves were non-Greeks, which helped generate arguments that barbarians were generically inferior, or slavish by nature.[28] Synodinou presents evidence from Aeschylus (*Pers.* 180-200, 241-2) and Herodotus (7.104.4-5) that the Greeks

[19] DeVries 2000: 341. Long 1986: 141 describes Phrygians as the 'paragon of timidity'.
[20] Spawforth 2001: 380. DeVries 2000: 357 observes that the Lydians acquired a reputation for softness.
[21] To these stereotypes, Hall 2002: 180 adds savage and polygamous Thracians, crude and uncultured Scythians, and deceitful Egyptians.
[22] Castriota 2005: 93.
[23] Castriota 2005: 94.
[24] Castriota 1992: 165.
[25] Castriota 1992: 174.
[26] McNiven 2000: 89.
[27] Raeck: 1981: 227.
[28] Hall 1989: 2; see also Coleman 1997: 181 for an almost identical argument.

harboured the notion that barbarians could be political slaves, but the concept of natural slavery, that barbarians were slaves not due to νόμος, but due to their φύσις, is best associated with Aristotle. As Nippel notes, Aristotle preferred natural slavery over the idea of slavery as the result of social convention (*Pol.* 1253b20ff., 1255a5ff.),[29] and he even quotes Euripides (βαρβάρων δ᾽ Ἕλληνας ἄρχειν εἰκός, *IA* 1400 = *Pol.* 1252b8) to justify his linking of barbarism and slavery: ταὐτὸ φύσει βάρβαρον καὶ δοῦλον ὄν (*Pol.* 1252b9). However, Aristotle lived in the fourth century, and there is little evidence that his theory of natural slavery was prevalent when Euripides was composing in the late fifth century. In any case, Synodinou (1977) explores whether or not Euripides depicts natural slaves and concludes that he rejects the concept of slavery by nature.

The closest precedent to Aristotle's views is the Hippocratic treatise *On Airs, Waters, Places*, written in the late fifth or early fourth century.[30] It claims that all things grow bigger and better (καλλίονα καὶ μέζονα, 12.7-8) in Asia and that the inhabitants are gentler and milder (ἠπιώτερα καὶ εὐοργητότερα, 12.9).[31] It holds climate (αἱ ὧραι, 16.3) and customs (διὰ τοὺς νόμους, 16.11) responsible for the ἀπολεμώτεροί (16.2) and ἡμερώτεροι (16.2) inhabitants of Asia, and asserts that Europeans are μαχιμώτεροι (23.22) due to the variability of their climate (τῷ μεταβαλλομένῳ, 23.19) and the absence of monarchy: οὐ βασιλεύονται ὥσπερ οἱ Ἀσιηνοί (23.23). Aristotle echoes these sentiments (*Pol.* 1327b23-34), arguing that Greece's geographical location, between the cold parts of Europe and temperate Asia (1327b29-30), enables it to enjoy the best of both worlds, namely courage (ἔνθυμον, 1327b30), intelligence (διανοητικόν, 1327b31), freedom (ἐλεύθερόν, 1327b31), and optimal political institutions (βέλτιστα πολιτευόμενον, 1327b31-2). However, the Hippocratic treatise does not endorse natural slavery, a theory more appropriately attributed to Aristotle in the fourth century, nor does it even attest to biological differences between Greeks and barbarians,[32] as its focus is primarily on climate and cultural practices.

Barbarian stereotypes exist throughout Greek literature and iconography and contain a plethora of characteristics, both socio-political and ethical. They generally connote a lack

[29] Nippel 2002: 292.
[30] Coleman 1997: 190.
[31] Cf. Hdt. 9.122.3, where Cyrus links soil to the temperament of its inhabitants: φιλέειν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν μαλακῶν χώρων μαλακοὺς γίνεσθαι.
[32] Harrison 2002: 128.

of control and intelligence, and an inclination towards despotism and servility, although the theory of natural slavery is better associated with the fourth century. Although the Greeks occasionally referred to 'the barbarian race' as a whole, they possessed different stereotypes for various foreign peoples. This thesis will focus on eastern barbarian stereotypes, as some scholars claim that the Trojans acquired the traits of these in the Classical Period.

2. The Persian Wars

Polarity invented after the Persian Wars

Scholars who argue for a developed Greek/barbarian polarity in the fifth century disagree over whether it originated after or before the Persian Wars. Edith Hall is a strong advocate for the former view, locating the invention of the Greek/barbarian polarity in the 'specific historical circumstances during the early years of the fifth century BC, partly as a result of the combined Greek military efforts against the Persians',[33] a view shared by many others.[34] Even Papadodima, who questions the scholarly utility of the polarity, acknowledges that a popular conception of barbarian moral and military inferiority existed shortly after the Persian Wars.[35] According to this school of thought, the earliest literary example of the Greek/barbarian polarity is Aeschylus' *Persae*.[36]

In order to argue that the polarity originated after the Persian Wars, one must disprove its existence in the Archaic Period. Jonathan Hall finds 'no hint during the Archaic period of the sharp dichotomy between Greek and barbarian',[37] and Edith Hall maintains that lineage and valour trumped ethnicity in the world of heroes.[38] Since the most influential Archaic texts were the Homeric epics, scholars who locate the invention of the polarity after the Persian Wars argue that the *Iliad* presents minimal ethnic or cultural distinctions between Trojans and Achaeans,[39] and that Homeric poetry contains minimal ethnocentric

[33] Hall 1989: 1-2.
[34] Meier 2011: 28; Cartledge 2002: 13; Dubuisson 2001: 4-5; Hall 1997: 44; Bengtson 1974: 159-60, who notes that the Persian Wars also led to 'eine völlig neue Anschauung von der hellenischen Vergangenheit'.
[35] Papadodima 2010: 41.
[36] Hall 1989: 57; McNiven 2000: 87. However, Walser 1984: 1-8 argues against the existence of pejorative views of the barbarian during the Persian Wars, asserting instead that 'das peiorative Barbarenbild… scheint erst in der Mitte des 5. Jh. entstanden' (5).
[37] Hall 2002: 103.
[38] Hall 1989: 54, although she acknowledges the occasional existence of ethnography, exoticism, and a chauvinist tone in Archaic poetry.
[39] Hall 1989: 1-55; Malkin 1998: 145; cf. Richardson 1993: 16. Jüthner 1923: 2 asserts that Homer 'ließ alle nationalen Unterschiede außer Betracht'.

and derogatory barbarian stereotyping,[40] or observe that a sense of equity and neutrality characterises the Trojan and Achaean depictions.[41] As Taplin notes, Trojans and Achaeans share the same political and social structures, kinship institutions, funeral customs, housing, clothing, agriculture, food, furniture, and armour.[42]

To assert that the Greek/barbarian polarity was invented after the Persian Wars suggests that a revolution took place in Greek perceptions of the other. This process is most clearly explained by Jonathan Hall's model of 'aggregative' and 'oppositional' Hellenic self-definition. Essentially, Hall argues that Hellenic self-definition in the Archaic Period was 'aggregative', which involved 'evoking similarities with peer groups which were then cast in terms of fictive kin relationships within the "Hellenic Genealogy"',[43] whereas in the Classical Period it was 'oppositional', defined 'through differential comparison with a barbarian outgroup'.[44] This change was accompanied by a shift from ethnic to cultural criteria as the basis for defining Hellenic identity in the fifth century.[45] Similarly, Malkin attributes the emergence of solidified 'oppositional' Greekness to the external threats of the Persians and Phoenicians in the fifth century,[46] but one critic of this approach is Skinner, who challenges the notion that a hazy collective sense of identity rapidly converted into a Greek/barbarian opposition after the Persian Wars.[47]

Polarity existed before the Persian Wars

Some scholars have recently questioned the notion that the Greek/barbarian polarity developed after the Persian Wars. Tuplin suggests that mainland Greeks may have imported the barbarian from east Greece after 480,[48] and Mitchell elaborates, arguing that mid-sixth-century invasions of Ionian territory helped generate barbarian stereotypes.[49] Coleman traces the process further back to the seventh and sixth centuries, arguing that the Mermnad rulers of western Asia Minor helped foster the Asiatic stereotype through

[40] Cartledge 2002: 53. Heath 2005: 531, Mackie 1996: 9, and Taplin 1992: 110-14 all maintain that the Trojans are not portrayed as alien or barbarian.
[41] Erskine 2001: 51-6; Tuplin 1999: 54; cf. Silk 2004: 86 and Weil 1965: 26.
[42] Taplin 1992: 112. Diller 1962: 41 argues for the prominence of 'Zusammengehörigkeit im Menschlichen'.
[43] Hall 2002: 179.
[44] Hall 2002: 179.
[45] Hall 2002: 7.
[46] Malkin 2001: 7.
[47] Skinner 2012: 3-4.
[48] Tuplin 1999: 57.
[49] Mitchell 2007: 15; cf. Kim 2013: 25.

their wealth, absolute power, and promotion of tyrannies.[50] These alternative views emerge from scepticism that a sophisticated Greek/barbarian polarity could arise out of a vacuum immediately after the Persian Wars. As Kim explains, since a fully developed barbarian stereotype exists in Aeschylus' *Persae* (produced in 472), it must have originated before the Attic tragedians.[51]

This scepticism has led some scholars to suggest that the Persian Wars, instead of generating the invention of the barbarian, radically accelerated a process which had already begun in the Archaic Period. Vlassopoulos, for instance, understands the Persian Wars as a 'catalyst that sped up an already existing process',[52] while Harrison suggests that the conflict sharpened pre-existing contrasts.[53] In addition, Coleman claims that Greek opinions of non-Greeks before the Persian Wars 'already tended toward the negative',[54] Cohen asserts that the polarity already existed under the early democracy,[55] and Malkin, although he labels the Persians 'the whetstone against which a common Greekness was sharpened',[56] concedes that oppositional/antithetical identities were a gradual process built on precedents.[57] Without downplaying the significance of the Persian Wars, these scholars all maintain that the Greek/barbarian polarity was already developing in the Archaic Period.[58]

If the development of the polarity was already underway before the Persian Wars, then evidence for it should appear in Archaic literature and iconography. Tuplin finds such evidence in early epic and lyric, including the pejorative use of βάρβαρος in Heraclitus (fr. 107), the possibility that βαρβαρόφωνοι (*Il.* 2.867) has more than linguistic overtones, and the general variation between approval, neutrality, and hostility in attitudes towards

[50] Coleman 1997: 188.
[51] Kim 2013: 31.
[52] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 188.
[53] Harrison 2002: 4. Similarly, Long 1986: 131 asserts that it developed and extended prejudices towards barbarians which the Greeks had previously felt.
[54] Coleman 1997: 189.
[55] Cohen 2000: 5.
[56] Malkin 2001: 7.
[57] Malkin 2001: 7.
[58] Conversely, Mitchell 2007: 114 and Dué 2006: 61-2 both de-emphasise the importance the Persian Wars, the latter arguing for a steady and gradual development of the polarity through the Archaic and into the Classical Period.

non-Greeks.[59] Others have focused on the *Iliad*.[60] Coleman, for instance, argues for a Homeric bias against the Trojans, since they have fewer heroes,[61] a smaller description in the catalogue,[62] clamorous speech (3.2-3; 4.433-5), lack of social and military cohesion, and less assertive and warlike speech.[63] Moreover, Nastes (2.867-75) seems to reflect a luxurious and effeminate barbarian stereotype,[64] and according to Hornblower, the presence of specific Trojan rituals such as sacrificing horses to rivers and singing θρῆνοι (24.720-21) appears to be early evidence for Greek/barbarian differentiation.[65] In addition, Pinsent observes the occasional presence of Trojan perfidy (4.124-6; 21.450-52), indiscipline,[66] and general cultural inferiority.[67] Literary evidence is also supplemented by iconography. As Vlassopoulos notes, the late sixth century saw non-Greeks represented as such: Ethiopians as dark-skinned, Egyptians with distinctive clothing, shaved heads, and circumcised genitals, and Amazons with the Thracian pelta, Scythian trousers, or the Phrygian cap.[68]

Scholars supporting the existence of a prominent Greek/barbarian polarity in the fifth century are divided over whether it developed after or before the Persian Wars. Those in the former category deny the existence of the polarity in the Archaic Period and tend to

[59] Tuplin 1999: 54-5.
[60] The notion that the poet of the *Iliad* is biased can be traced back to the Alexandrian scholiasts, who claim that ἀεὶ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής (BT in 10.14). Among modern scholars, Van der Valk 1985b & 1953 and Griffin 1980: 4-5 both argue for a pervasive Achaean/Trojan contrast. Similarly, Edwards 1987: 173 interprets the *Iliad* as a 'mighty Greek achievement against a foreign foe', while Robert 1950: 310 labels it 'un poème de l'hellénisme uni contre le Barbare'.
[61] The heroes they do have possess dubious military prowess. Paris is criticised for being an archer (11.385-6), and despite leading the host (3.16, 19), he retreats in terror into the crowd (3.31-2) and is later abused by Menelaus (3.369-70). Hector retreats before Ajax (13.193-4), flees from Achilles (22.136-7), and his defeat of Patroclus is aided by Apollo and Euphorbus (16.804-7). According to Farron 1978: 40, Hector's reputation is contradicted by his mediocre/cowardly performance against major Achaean heroes.
[62] Sixteen contingents in 62 verses (2.816-77), whereas the Achaeans have twenty-nine contingents in 266 verses (2.494-759).
[63] Coleman 1997: 187. Mackie 1996 compares Trojan and Achaean language styles and concludes that the former is reflective, introspective, and praise-oriented, whereas the latter is aggressive, outward-directed, and used for public blaming.
[64] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 171; Georges 1994: 14. Similarly, Paris is labelled εἶδος ἄριστε (3.39; 13.769), a term used to compliment women (2.715; 3.124; 6.252; 13.365), appears after battle as if he has been dancing (3.392-4), and is susceptible to romantic passion (3.442).
[65] Hornblower 2008: 38-9.
[66] Dolon is overconfident (10.319-27) and Asius undisciplined (12.110-15). According to Redfield 1994: 128, Hector's three principal flaws stem from overconfidence: he promises the army victory (8.489-541), refuses to withdraw the army from the battlefield (18.243-313), and refuses to withdraw within the walls (22.25-130).
[67] Pinsent 1984: 152 n.3. The Trojans are labelled ὑβρισταί (13.633), ὑπερφίαλοι (e.g. 3.106; 13.621; 21.459), ὑπερηνορέοντες (4.176), and ὑπέρθυμοι (e.g. 6.111; 9.233; 11.564), the first three of which are applied to the suitors in the *Odyssey* (e.g. 24.282; 1.227; 2.266).
[68] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 187-8.

support Jonathan Hall's thesis that Hellenic self-definition transitioned from 'aggregative' to 'oppositional' due to the conflict with Persia. Conversely, those in the latter category attribute the development of the polarity to the late sixth century or even earlier, locating evidence for it Archaic literature and iconography.

3. Athenian tragedy

Polarity reinforced by Athenian tragedy

Opinion is divided as to whether Athenian tragedy reinforces or challenges the Greek/barbarian polarity. Strong proponents of the former stance include Edith Hall, who argues that tragedy presents a 'gulf between Hellene and barbarian',[69] Jonathan Hall, for whom the barbarian in Attic tragedy 'articulates a discourse of alterity',[70] and Nippel, who maintains that the image of the Persians worsened in tragedy in the second half of the fifth century.[71] Tragedy's interest in the barbarian, according to Edith Hall, arises from the poets producing and reflecting Athenian and Panhellenic ideology.[72] Some of Euripides' flawed barbarians include Polymestor (*Hec.*), Thoas (*IA*), Theoclymenus (*Hel.*), Medea (*Med.*), and the Phrygian slave (*Or.*), a list compiled by Coleman, who concludes that Euripides' 'stereotypical barbarian characters reflect common attitudes of [Athenian] society'.[73]

Tragedy can reinforce the polarity in various ways. It can differentiate barbarians linguistically, through cacophony and foreign vocabulary, and morally, depicting them as emotional, stupid, cruel, subservient, and cowardly,[74] or they can be characterised through their language, customs, character, and temperament.[75] Alternatively, tragedy can treat barbarians as a single, homogeneous category representing the opposite of fundamental Greek values.[76] Perhaps the most striking instance of a barbarian in tragedy is the cowardly, effeminate, and subservient Phrygian slave in Euripides' *Orestes* (1369-1536), whom Long regards as 'the finest expression of Greek thinking about the stereotypical

[69] Hall 1989: 3-4.
[70] Hall 2002: 176.
[71] Nippel 2002: 290.
[72] Hall 1989: 2. Similarly, Jüthner 1923: 18 argues that tragedy was 'seit jeher von warmem Nationalgefühl und stolzem Selbstbewußtsein durchweht'.
[73] Coleman 1997: 192.
[74] Hall 1989: 17.
[75] Hall 2002: 189.
[76] Hall 1989: 161.

barbarian'.[77] In addition, costume can also reinforce the polarity. Battezzato links the female Dorian costume with stereotypes of a lack of decorum and luxury,[78] arguing that Euripides connected Dorian costume with 'the corrupting influence of barbarian (or, more specifically, Trojan) wealth'.[79] He singles out Helen, asserting that she substantiates the correlation between Dorian dress code and orientalism, luxury, and immodesty.[80]

Polarity problematised/subverted in Athenian tragedy

In contrast, many scholars claim that Athenian tragedy, in particular Euripides,[81] challenges the conventional Greek/barbarian polarity. For example, Saïd suggests that Euripides questions the validity of the polarity,[82] Dué asserts that tragedy tested and temporarily blurred the Greek/barbarian distinction,[83] and Papadodima maintains that tragedy presents the polarity as problematic or insufficient.[84] Even Edith Hall, the most vocal proponent of a Greek/barbarian polarity in tragedy, admits that tragedy explored and occasionally questioned its validity.[85] There are various explanations for Euripides' apparent subversion of the polarity. According to Saïd, the intra-Hellenic conflict of the Peloponnesian War dispelled the need for a contrast between Greek civilisation and barbarian savagery,[86] whereas Edith Hall suggests that Euripides' inversion of the polarity indicates that the dogma of Hellenic superiority was so ingrained and fundamental that its inversion 'produce[d] striking rhetorical effects'.[87]

Wealth and luxury are essential to Euripides' subversion of the polarity. As Saïd notes, wealth in Euripides is often removed from its former possessors and has passed into Greek hands,[88] and Papadodima presents examples of tragic Greeks adopting Troy's wealthy

[77] Long 1986: 132. For further discussion, see the final chapter of this thesis.
[78] Battezzato 1999: 344.
[79] Battezzato 1999: 344. However, Battezzato 1999: 352-3 also notes that Euripides employs the male Dorian costume to indicate moral integrity, as in the case of Amphiaraus (*Hyps.*).
[80] Battezzato 1999: 356. Helen is frequently associated with Asian luxury (e.g. E. *Cyc.* 182-5; *Tr.* 991-2; *Or.* 1113-14; *Hel.* 927-8), but this could also indicate Euripides' subversion of the polarity, as the Greek Helen transcends ethnic boundaries to embody barbarian luxury.
[81] Although Mitchell 2007: 124 traces the phenomenon back to Aeschylus' *Suppliants*.
[82] Saïd 2002: 64.
[83] Dué 2006: 166.
[84] Papadodima 2013: 32.
[85] Hall 1989: 162. For instance, Kranz 1933: 109 observes that Euripides often attributes Greek σωφροσύνη to characters who 'ihrer Natur nach barbarische Wildheit und Fremdheit in sich tragen sollten'.
[86] Saïd 2002: 89.
[87] Hall 1989: 222.
[88] Saïd 2002: 66.

lifestyle: *El.* 314-18, 966; *Or.* 349, 1110-12, 1426-36, 1468; cf. *Tr.* 1107-9, 1021-5.[89] Alternatively, costume can indicate the breakdown of Greek/barbarian distinctions, as it does in the *Bacchae*,[90] or even mannerisms and behaviour, which lead Mitchell to identify Helen in the *Troades* and Hermione in the *Andromache* as barbarians.[91] Finally, context is integral for determining whether tragedy supports or undermines the polarity. Often when an evaluative Greek/barbarian contrast is apparently set up, the context will reveal that it is actually being blurred or undermined,[92] as the anti-barbarian outbursts in Euripides' plays are 'often deeply ironic and do not necessarily reflect Euripides' own views'.[93]

But what exactly were Euripides' own views? Many scholars maintain that this is impossible to discern and prefer to stress the complexity and ambiguity in Euripides' portrayal of the barbarian.[94] Edith Hall argues that Euripides is a poet of the sophistic enlightenment who presents 'arguments adopted by both sides on nearly every issue of contemporary interest',[95] while Jonathan Hall asserts that Euripides' presentation of non-Greeks is inconsistent.[96] Accordingly, Isaac focuses on prose in his study of racism in antiquity, since interpreting tragedy 'results only in conclusions based on implicit judgements expressed on the stage'.[97] Although it is unnecessary to discount tragedy entirely, one can nevertheless argue persuasively that Euripides' portrayal of the barbarian is inconsistent.

Scholars arguing for a pervasive Greek/barbarian polarity disagree over its presence in Athenian tragedy. Some believe that tragedy reinforces it, while others claim that tragedy undermines and problematises the distinction, challenging the prevalent view in Athens at the time. This problematisation can be effected through character portrayal, wealth, costume, and also the ironic context in which Greek characters express anti-barbarian

[89] Papadodima 2013: 226 n.529.
[90] Saïd 2002: 66.
[91] Mitchell 2007: 22.
[92] Papadodima 2010: 39; cf. Matthiessen 2008: 31.
[93] Kim 2013: 37 n.6.
[94] Di Benedetto 1971: 217-18, however, argues that Euripides insists on the Greek/barbarian dichotomy in his final tragedies, reversing his previous impartial attitude, a change he attributes to the Spartan/Persian alliance.
[95] Hall 1989: 222.
[96] Hall 2002: 180.
[97] Isaac 2004: 277.

rhetoric. The only certainty is that the barbarian portrayal in Athenian tragedy, particularly the plays of Euripides, is complex and ambiguous.

4. Late fifth-century degeneration

Some scholars argue that the Greek/barbarian polarity was degenerating in the late fifth century. According to Mitchell, the polarity was under theoretical pressure,[98] while Croally claims that the distinction's rigidity was being eroded,[99] and Long observes the emergence of a new school of thought which held that all men were essentially similar.[100] This breakdown of the polarity is attributed to the sophists, who promulgated many new ideas including the equality of all men and the absence of a natural Greek/barbarian distinction.[101] For instance, Hippias claims that all men are συγγενεῖς τε καὶ οἰκείους καὶ πολίτας… φύσει (Pl. *Prt.* 337c-d), Plato questions a simplistic Greek/barbarian polarity (*Pol.* 262c-d), and Antiphon seems to claim that no natural distinction exists between Greeks and barbarians (*P.Oxy.* 1364 & 3647 = DK 87B44b).[102] Antiphon's fragment appears to suggest human equality,[103] although sceptics are unconvinced that Antiphon is condemning Greek ethnocentric prejudices.[104] Long lists further examples: Democritus claims the wise man can live anywhere (DK 68B247), Antiphanes says a good master can replace the homeland of a slave (265), and the Hippocratic *On Airs, Waters, Places* attributes the stature and character of Persians and Scythians to the environment (12, 18).[105]

This evidence has led Croally to argue for 'a late fifth-century perception that… this [Greek/barbarian] division was both incorrect and unhelpful'.[106] It is this new teaching of equality, particularly the doctrine that slaves and free men are naturally similar (φύσει δ' οὐθὲν διαφέρειν, Arist. *Pol.* 1253b21-2), that Aristotle seems to struggle against, responding by promulgating his theory of natural slavery (*Pol.* 1260a7-11).[107] Moreover,

[98] Mitchell 2007: 29.
[99] Croally 1994: 113.
[100] Long 1986: 148.
[101] Conacher 1998: 67 argues that the sophists were probably critical of the Athenian conviction that Greeks were superior to barbarians.
[102] Isaac 2004: 174; Croally 1994: 112.
[103] Coleman 1997: 196.
[104] Tuplin 1999: 59. According to Hall 1989: 220, Antiphon is merely arguing that all people are biologically similar.
[105] Long 1986: 148-9.
[106] Croally 1994: 112.
[107] Long 1986: 150.

these ideas can even be traced back to Herodotus and Thucydides. Herodotus employs the discourse of polarity against Spartans, comparing them to Persians and Egyptians (6.58-60), while Thucydides observes that Greeks in the past resembled barbarians through piracy (1.5.1) and wrestling with belts (1.6.5), concluding that πολλὰ δ᾽ ἂν καὶ ἄλλα τις ἀποδείξειε τὸ παλαιὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ὁμοιότροπα τῷ νῦν βαρβαρικῷ διαιτώμενον (1.6.6). Conversely, Isaac argues that the polarity originated in the late fifth century, asserting that Greek attitudes towards Persians turned negative not in Aeschylus' time, but in Euripides'.[108] Although Isaac is almost a lone voice, his views are understandable due to the contradictory movements in Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks of the late fifth and early fourth centuries, as outlined by Harrison.[109]

There is a relatively common perception in scholarship that the Greek/barbarian polarity was eroding in the late fifth century, largely due to the sophists' radical new ideas on the polarity's inadequacy and the natural equality of all men. Euripides himself may have been influenced by these views, especially if similar concepts exist in his plays. However, the contradictory nature of the textual evidence from the late fifth and fourth centuries has even enabled Isaac to propose that the polarity originated in the late fifth century.

5. Trojans and the polarity

Trojans orientalised in fifth century

It is worth examining the Trojans in isolation, as not all scholars agree that they were included in the polarity. Some argue strongly for their inclusion, contending that in the fifth century the Trojans are barbarised and assimilated into a group containing Phrygians, Persians, and barbarians,[110] or attributing the new barbarian Trojan image to the anti-Persian context.[111] Tragedy is often central to the argument. Dué notes that Trojans in tragedy, particularly Sophocles, receive foreign attributes,[112] Castriota claims that tragedy presented Hecuba, Cassandra, and Paris as barbarians characterised by irreverence and arrogance towards Greek norms and laws,[113] and Jonathan Hall identifies references to the Trojans as Phrygians (S. *Aj.* 1054; E. *Tr.* 773; *Andr.* 194, 204; *IA* 682) or barbarians

[108] Isaac 2004: 277.
[109] Harrison 2002: 6.
[110] Croally 1994: 104.
[111] Erskine 2001: 89.
[112] Dué 2006: 114.
[113] Castriota 1992: 102. Conversely, Erskine 2001: 75 maintains that the Trojans are orientalised through wealth, dress, political organisation, and their court, rather than moral failings.

(E. *Hel.* 666; *Tr.* 771) as evidence for their orientalisation.[114] Others are more circumspect, including Vlassopoulos, who notes that while myth can barbarise the Trojans, it can also be employed in very different ways,[115] and Anderson, who argues against a 'simple one-to-one correlation between Trojans and the stereotypical barbarian'.[116]

Fundamental to the orientalisation of the Trojans was their assimilation to the Persians and the conflation of the Trojan and Persian Wars.[117] Erskine argues that in the aftermath of the Persian Wars, the Trojans became the 'mythical forerunners of the Persians'.[118] According to Castriota, this transformation took place in the second quarter of the fifth century,[119] and Papadodima notes that the Sophoclean fragments present Trojans as similar to Persians in language (fr. 517-21 of *Shepherds*; fr. 56 of *Captive Women*; fr. 183 of *Helen's Marriage*) and in certain habits (fr. 620 of *Troilus*).[120] In addition, there was an attempt in early tragedy and public art to rewrite the Trojan War, just like the Amazonomachy and Centauromachy, under the sign of the Persian War.[121] Immediately after the Persian Wars, Simonides explicitly connected the Persian and Trojan Wars (frs. 10-17 West).[122] Moreover, after defeating the Persians who held Eion in 476 (Th. 1.98.1), Cimon erected three herms, the third of which compared his siege to the Athenians who fought under Menestheus at Troy (Aeschin. 3.183-5).[123]

Iconography provides perhaps the best evidence for the orientalisation of the Trojans. In fifth-century Greek art Trojans can stand for Persians,[124] but they were also compared to monstrous mythical figures, such as Centaurs, Giants, and Amazons.[125] For instance, the Painted Stoa grouped the Trojan War with the Amazonomachy and the Battle of Marathon, effectively linking the Trojans with Persians and Amazons.[126] According to

[114] Hall 2002: 177.
[115] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 195.
[116] Anderson 1997: 106.
[117] For a discussion of the Trojan identification with Phrygians, see section 1 of chapter 2.
[118] Erskine 2001: 61. Similarly, Jüthner 1923: 3 argues that the Persian Wars caused the Trojan War and Homeric epic to be reevaluated.
[119] Castriota 1992: 102.
[120] Papadodima 2014: 264.
[121] Croally 1994: 104.
[122] Hall 2002: 175.
[123] Hölschier 2011: 57 claims that this presented the Trojan War as a 'demonstration of Athenian virtue'.
[124] McNiven 2000: 89.
[125] Erskine 2001: 73.
[126] Erskine 2001: 70.

Castriota, on the Painted Stoa Polygnotus reworked the Iliupersis into a 'paradigm of Greek excellence and united resistance against barbarian perfidy',[127] similar to the Cnidian Lesche where he represented Troy's destruction as an act of Hellenic justice and retribution.[128] In addition, the Parthenon reliefs depicted the Trojan War alongside battles against the Giants, Amazons, and Centaurs, from which Edith Hall deduces that the Trojans were by this time orientalised.[129] Similar trends exist in Attic vase painting. For instance, vase representations of the Judgement of Paris change at the end of the fifth century, as can be seen from an Attic red-figure hydria (ca. 420-400) where Paris is elaborately dressed and trousered,[130] but othering of the Trojans is attested even as early as the late sixth century, from which an Attic black-figure hydria shoulder (ca. 520-10) portrays the Trojans as archers wearing peaked hats.[131] Castriota concludes that the Trojans appeared almost exclusively as Asiatic barbarians in vase painting of the later fifth and fourth centuries,[132] whereas Vlassopoulos is more cautious, observing that although Trojans could be orientalised in certain scenes, in battle scenes they always reflected the heroic model.[133]

Trojans excluded from polarity

Conversely, some scholars maintain that the Trojans were exempt from the Greek/barbarian polarity. For example, Mattison (2009) does not question the polarity's prevalence, but argues strongly that the Trojans were excluded. She maintains that the Trojans problematise the polarisation of ethnicities, instead of being merely displaced Persians.[134] Dué expresses a similar argument, claiming that the Trojans are 'portrayed sympathetically in the vast majority of Greek poetry and art throughout the fifth century'.[135] Tragedy is fundamental to this argument. Dué asserts that the Trojans of Athenian tragedy are not barbarians, but rather constitute a special case, retaining similarities to the Trojans of epic,[136] while Croally observes that Euripides' Trojan War

[127] Castriota 1992: 131.
[128] Castriota 1992: 127.
[129] Hall 1989: 102.
[130] Woodford 1993: 19-20. Raeck 1981: 86 maintains that the second half of the fifth century saw the Trojans begin to be depicted with barbarian costume.
[131] Woodford 1993: 56.
[132] Castriota 2005: 97.
[133] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 194-5.
[134] Mattison 2009: 3.
[135] Dué 2006: 113-14.
[136] Dué 2006: 62 n.18.

problematises the identification of Greek as against barbarian.[137] Even Edith Hall acknowledges that most noble barbarians in tragedy are Trojan, since they retain their heroic characterisation from epic.[138]

Some even suggest that the Trojans may function as representative Athenians. Dué notes that the Greekness of the Trojan women's tragic laments 'overrides the otherness of ethnicity and social status',[139] and claims that fifth-century Athenians would have identified with the conquered Trojans rather than the excessive behaviour of the victorious Achaeans.[140] Similarly, Mattison argues that in tragedy the Trojans are more closely aligned with Athens than Persia,[141] and concludes that they are 'co-opted as models of Athenian values'.[142] Although Erskine generally argues that the Trojans were denigrated in tragedy, even he acknowledges the Greeks' ambivalence towards the Trojans,[143] pointing out that many Greeks had Trojan names,[144] and that 'many communities in the Greek world incorporated [the Trojans] into their own traditions and self-image'.[145]

There are two conflicting views as to the relation of the Trojans to the polarity. Some believe that the Trojans were orientalised in the fifth century, adopting stereotypical eastern barbarian traits and becoming assimilated to the Persians, while the Trojan War was compared to the Persian Wars. Conversely, others argue that they are presented sympathetically, retain their own unique identity, and are aligned more closely with the values of Athens than Persia.

6. Polarity inadequate

Finally, many scholars criticise the Greek/barbarian polarity as an inadequate model for representing the complexity and diversity of Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks. One such criticism, as Almagor and Skinner note, concerns the tendency of scholarship to

[137] Croally 1994: 115.
[138] Hall 1989: 212.
[139] Dué 2006: 112.
[140] Dué 2006: 98.
[141] Mattison 2009: 10.
[142] Mattison 2009: 13.
[143] Erskine 2001: 47.
[144] Erskine 2001: 78.
[145] Erskine 2001: 126.

overemphasise its significance.[146] For instance, Mitchell argues that 'the power and pervasiveness of [non-Greek stereotypes]… is generally overstated',[147] while Gruen, referring to antiquity in general, acknowledges occasional prejudice, but advises against a 'blanket characterization of xenophobia and ethnocentrism, let alone racism'.[148] Responding to Edith Hall's seminal book, *Inventing the Barbarian* (1989), Croally maintains that she 'underestimated the difficulties of maintaining a secure distinction between Greeks and barbarians',[149] and the author herself even admits that her work was bound up in its Cold War historical context.[150] It is true, as Kim argues, that the existence of the rhetoric of polarity, even if it is ironic or challenged, must reflect its importance in classical intellectual discourse,[151] but this is not the only way in which Greeks reacted to or interacted with non-Greeks.

In fact, Kim himself points out that the reality of Greek interactions with non-Greeks was probably very different from the simplistic dichotomy,[152] and this touches upon the second common criticism of the polarity: simplicity. Mitchell questions the Greek/barbarian opposition as simplistic,[153] and Vlassopoulos similarly stresses that non-Greeks were more than mere strangers, enemies, or Others.[154] He cites the story of Apollonides (Xen. *An.* 3.1.30-32), who was outed as a non-Greek due to his pierced ears (3.1.31), but observes that Apollonides could speak fluent Greek and pass for a Greek, concluding that the polarity 'often broke down in practice'.[155]

Other concerns with the Greek/barbarian polarity include its relative importance and the extent of its acceptance in Greek society. For example, Papadodima questions whether the Greek/barbarian contrast was the predominant one in tragedy, suggesting that there may have been many other equally important areas of interest.[156] Moreover, Kim's assertion that the Greek-barbarian polarity was 'established and accepted as a fact (at least

[146] Almagor & Skinner 2013: 4-5.
[147] Mitchell 2007: 124.
[148] Gruen 2011a: 3.
[149] Croally 1994: 54 n.121.
[150] Hall 2006: 189.
[151] Kim 2013: 37 n.6.
[152] Kim 2013: 37 n.5.
[153] Mitchell 2007: 29.
[154] Vlassopouos 2013a: 31.
[155] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 141.
[156] Papadodima 2010: 7.

by certain elements within Greek society) in the fifth century BC'[157] leaves open the possibility that it was not universally accepted. This possibility is picked up by Luraghi, who stresses the uncertainty over the extent to which these patterns were typical of Greeks, or Athenians, or a smaller group to which Herodotus and the tragedians belonged.[158]

7. Fluid boundary between Greek and barbarian

So far this chapter has discussed scholarly views which support the existence of a developed Greek/barbarian polarity in the fifth century. The remainder of this chapter will examine views which either question the polarity's existence or undermine its significance and prevalence in Greek society.

One way to challenge the polarity's significance is to argue for a fluid boundary between Greek and barbarian. For instance, Saïd maintains that the Greek/barbarian boundary can easily be crossed,[159] Papadodima observes that 'ethnicity is often treated as something fluid, negotiable, or debatable',[160] and according to Jonathan Hall, barbarians were located at the other end of a linear continuum which permitted crossing.[161] Moreover, Papadodima lists two methods by which tragedy can undermine the polarity: when Greek characters demonstrate stereotypical barbarian behaviour, and when Greek accusations of barbarism against non-Greeks appear unpersuasive, unsustainable, or rhetorical.[162] One can also add instances when barbarian characters exhibit Greek virtues such as courage and self-control, equalling or surpassing their Greek counterparts, a phenomenon observed by Edith Hall.[163] One example of fluid ethnic boundaries in tragedy occurs in Euripides' *Orestes*, when Tyndareus accuses Menelaus of having become a barbarian: βεβαρβάρωσαι, χρόνιος ὢν ἐν βαρβάροις (485).

[157] Kim 2013: 26.
[158] Luraghi 2014: 215.
[159] Saïd 2002: 100.
[160] Papdodima 2013: 311. McInerney 1999: 28-35 argues for the fluidity, flexibility, and mutability of Greek ethnic identity in the Archaic Period, concluding that 'Greek tribes were capable of constantly shifting their borders, their dialects, and their histories' (35).
[161] Hall 2002: 8. As Lévy 1976: 157 observes, a barbarian 'pouvait ainsi, bien que Barbare, valoir individuellement plus qu'un Grec'.
[162] Papadodima 2010: 9.
[163] Hall 1989: 211.

There are many literary examples, particularly in the historians, which support a fluid Greek/barbarian boundary. Although Pausanias denounces mutilation of the dead as a barbarian act (Hdt. 9.79), he himself appears to cross the ethnic boundary by his admiration for Persian wealth (Hdt. 9.82) and adoption of Persian attire (Th. 1.130.1), Persian and Egyptian bodyguards (Th. 1.130.1), and a Persian table (Th. 1.130.1).[164] He also displayed tyrannical tendencies (τυραννίδος μᾶλλον ἐφαίνετο μίμησις ἡ στρατηγία, Th. 1.95.3) and was formally accused of μηδισμός (Th. 1.95.5). In addition, Coleman catalogues instances of Greeks behaving with barbaric cruelty, including the murder of Phanes' sons by Greek mercenaries (Hdt. 3.11.2), the burning of political opponents by Arcesilaus (Hdt. 4.164), the civil war in Corcyra (Th. 3.81), where πᾶσά… ἰδέα κατέστη θανάτου (Th. 3.81.5), the Spartan execution of Plataean and Athenian captives (ἀπέκτεινον καὶ ἐξαίρετον ἐποιήσαντο οὐδένα, Th. 3.68.1), the Melos incident, where the Athenians ἀπέκτειναν Μηλίων ὅσους ἡβῶντας ἔλαβον, παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραπόδισαν (Th. 5.116.4), and the Athenian vote in support of a massacre at Mytilene (Th. 3.36).[165]

Some even challenge the very existence of the polarity, a radical new approach to Greek/barbarian relationships which, as Vlassopoulos notes, has emerged from the post-colonial critique of Western imperialism.[166] These approaches include questioning the rigidity of the Greek/barbarian paradigm,[167] challenging the contrast between the Greek polis and Oriental despotism,[168] and arguing that the Greeks 'had far more mixed, nuanced, and complex opinions about other peoples'.[169] Proponents of this new approach have questioned the polarity's existence in Herodotus and Aeschylus. For instance, Isaac maintains that Herodotus did not think in the stereotypical pairs of East/West, Asia/Europe, Greek/barbarian, or tyranny/individual freedom,[170] Coleman claims that Herodotus' representation of foreigners is often sympathetic and devoid of negative stereotypes,[171] and Gruen observes the even-handedness and occasional admiration Herodotus displays for non-Greeks, which later led Plutarch to label him φιλοβάρβαρος

[164] Similarly, Themistocles flees to Persia and helps the Persian King, adopting Persian customs in the process (Th. 1.137-8).
[165] Coleman 1997: 203-4.
[166] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 2.
[167] Almagor & Skinner 2013: 5.
[168] Vlassopoulos 2007: 101.
[169] Gruen 2011a: 3.
[170] Isaac 2004: 492.
[171] Coleman 1997: 196.

(*De Mal. Her.* 12).[172] In addition, Skinner and Gruen catalogue instances which cast doubt on the polarity in Herodotus.[173] Similarly for Aeschylus' *Persae*, Gruen highlights the shared genealogy of Greeks and Persians, and claims that the expedition's failure was not due to monarchic institutions or any intrinsic flaw of the Persian character, emphatically denying that the play emblematises 'an essentialist divide between Greek and barbarian'.[174] Gruen's argument finds support in Isaac's claim that there is 'no evidence that in fifth-century Greece Persia was seen as inferior',[175] although Isaac's claim is a product of his belief that the polarity originated at the end of the fifth century.

A new school of thought has recently emerged, challenging the prevalence and significance of the polarity, and arguing instead for a fluid and permeable Greek/barbarian boundary, drawing evidence from tragedy and the historians. Some have even questioned the polarity's existence, or at the very least its presence in key fifth-century literature, including Herodotus and Aeschylus' *Persae*.

8. βάρβαρος and barbarism

In order to question the Greek/barbarian polarity or challenge its presence in certain literature, one must examine the origins, semantics, and usage of the term βάρβαρος.

Origins of the term βάρβαρος

The *communis opinio* is that βάρβαρος was originally onomatopoeic (cf. Str. 14.2.28) and referred to incomprehensible speech,[176] not necessarily connected with a sense of superiority.[177] The original meaning of βάρβαρος is difficult to determine, as there are only four Archaic attestations of the term (*Il.* 2.867; Anacr. fr. 423; Hecat. fr. 119; Heraclit. fr. 107), but nevertheless Cartledge maintains that it originally had few of the

[172] Gruen 2006: 296. Kim 2009: 72 suggests that Herodotus, living in the multi-ethnic Persian Empire, may have been 'profoundly affected by… East Mediterranean pluralism'.
[173] Skinner 2012: 250; Gruen 2011b: 80.
[174] Gruen 2011a: 20. Similarly, Harrison 2000: 43 prefers a more nuanced interpretation over the stark polarity which Edith Hall reads into the play, and Dihle 1994: 37 argues that the Greek triumph is not attributed to 'einer naturgegebenen Überlegenheit des Griechen gegenüber dem Barbaren'. Conversely, DuBois 1982: 82-9 asserts that the play reinforces the Greek/barbarian polarity, although he concedes that there is some sympathy and likeness between Greeks and Persians.
[175] Isaac 2004: 276.
[176] Hall 1989: 4; Meier 2011: 37; Coleman 1997: 178; Jüthner 1923: 1. However, Hall 2002: 112 and Weidner 1913: 303-4 are not convinced.
[177] Nippel 2002: 281. De Romilly 1993: 283 denies that the original term indicated contempt.

pejorative/orientalist connotations it later had in the Classical Period.[178] As Kim suggests, the term may have derived from the Old Persian *barabara* ('he who carries a burden/load'), referring to Persian subjects who had become taxpayers.[179] If this is true, then hostility towards barbarians could have been originally directed at taxpayers to the Persian king, and not towards an ethnic entity, although βάρβαρος quickly became equated with foreign speech, as taxpayers to the Persian king were or should be non-Greeks.[180]

βάρβαρος not necessarily pejorative

The notion of βάρβαρος in the Classical Period as a pejorative label encompassing all non-Greeks is fundamental to arguments for a developed fifth-century Greek/barbarian polarity. For instance, Zacharia claims that βάρβαρος indicated a lack of control, bloodthirsty behaviour, and self-indulgence, in addition to its linguistic meaning,[181] and even Gruen admits that the term could indicate cultural or intellectual inferiority, lack of refinement, various insensibilities, brutality, chicanery, and a tendency to embrace despotism.[182] However, βάρβαρος in classical contexts was not necessarily pejorative and could just indicate 'foreigner' or 'non-Greek'.[183] As Gruen argues, βάρβαρος 'need not be pejorative, let alone hostile, nor indeed even an allusion to inferiority'.[184] Strong evidence for this exists in tragedy, particularly Euripides, who can disassociate the use of βάρβαρος as an ethnic designation and as a pejorative value term.[185] As Papadodima explains, although βάρβαρος can be used as a synonym for 'non-Greek' (E. *Rh.* 404-5, 833-4), it can also be used in a broadly pejorative sense referring to a universal condition or aspect of human nature (E. *Hel.* 501, *Hec.* 1129; Ar. *Av.* 1573).[186]

This distinction is crucial, as it indicates that the use of βάρβαρος as an ethnic designation is not necessarily pejorative, while the pejorative sense of βάρβαρος transcends ethnic boundaries. As Papadodima explains, the ethical use of barbarism, applicable to Greeks

[178] Cartledge 2002: 13; cf. Dauge 1981: 10-11. Lévy 1991: 67 argues that it is pejorative in Heraclitus but merely ethnographic in Hecataeus.
[179] Kim 2013: 34. Alternatively, Weidner 1913: 304 traces its origin to the Semitic *barbaru* ('foreign').
[180] Kim 2013: 36.
[181] Zacharia 2008: 26.
[182] Gruen 2006: 295.
[183] Kim 2009: 11.
[184] Gruen 2011a: 76.
[185] Saïd 2002: 87.
[186] Papadodima 2014: 259; cf. Matthiessen 2008: 31-2.

and non-Greeks, weakens the notion of a firmly established Greek/non-Greek antithesis.[187] Similarly, Vlassopoulos argues that the Greeks could conceive of barbarism as referring to a set of moral characteristics which Greeks and non-Greeks could exhibit,[188] and Mitchell suggests that barbarism and nobility are 'not fixed by simple continental determinism'.[189] These alternative senses of βάρβαρος seem to contradict the idea of a rigid fifth-century Greek/barbarian polarity.

The importance of context

Context is essential when evaluating an instance of βάρβαρος, particularly in tragedy. As Papadodima observes, Greek characters' ethnocentric attacks in tragedy are often controversial, ambiguous, or ironic,[190] and they often speak of barbarian traits in heated moments of conflict, rendering their words accusations rather than theoretical statements.[191] While tragedy may seem to promote a polarised worldview when Greek characters denigrate non-Greeks as barbarians, this anti-barbarian talk, especially in Euripides, is always invalidated by the context,[192] and derogatory references to barbarism are often uttered in contexts where questionable Greek behaviour is to be interpreted, excused, or justified.[193] From this consistent complication, questioning, and downplaying of the polarity, Papadodima concludes that tragedy represents the Greek/barbarian polarity as 'an altogether insufficient and problematic structure for both making sense of the world and assessing human value'.[194]

Despite its unclear origins, βάρβαρος in the Classical Period was not always pejorative. It could be an ethnic designation, simply meaning 'non-Greek', or an ethical term, applicable to both Greeks and non-Greeks. The latter usage, which transcends ethnic boundaries, combined with the fact that tragedy often overturns Greek accusations of barbarism against non-Greeks through context, appears to contradict the notion of a rigid fifth-century Greek/barbarian polarity. However, any conclusions must be tentative, as Euripides could have been reacting against the prevalent views of his time.

[187] Papadodima 2010: 10.
[188] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 193.
[189] Mitchell 2007: 27.
[190] Papadodima 2010: 5.
[191] Papadodima 2010: 5.
[192] Saïd 2002: 85.
[193] Papadodima 2013: 200.
[194] Papadodima 2013: 139.

9. Cultural connections

Scholars questioning the polarity commonly stress the extensive cultural contacts between Greeks and non-Greeks.[195] These include Greek admiration for barbarians, close familiarity, cultural interaction and exchange with the Near East, and ethnic ambivalence in genealogy.

Greek admiration for barbarians

Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks were incredibly diverse and included admiration for their virtues and wisdom. As Vlassopoulos notes, Greeks could depict foreign sages possessing alien wisdom, Persian kings as ideal rulers, and non-Greek communities as utopias.[196] For instance, Xenophon admires the Persians' aristocratic virtues,[197] and he even elevates barbarians above model Greeks in his Pharnabazus-Agesilaos interview and the *Cyropaedia*.[198] In addition, stories of Greek wise men visiting the courts of non-Greek kings can serve various purposes: they can express the superiority of Greek values, such as when Solon remains unswayed by Croesus' wealth (Hdt. 1.29-33) and advises him against declaring anyone blessed before his death (1.32.7), portray a clever proposal, such as when Bias or Pittacus convince Croesus not to build ships to attack the islanders (Hdt. 1.27), illustrate their search for foreign wisdom, such as when the Greeks visit Amasis, or portray external criticism of Greek cultural practices and values.[199] In fact, as Kim argues, the Greeks openly accepted that Asiatic βάρβαροι might have wisdom which anticipated or even surpassed their own.[200]

Greek familiarity with the Near East

The Greeks had a long history of close ties with the Near East, especially through employment, diplomacy, and ξενία relationships. Vlassopoulos argues for a 'diversity of interactions [with non-Greeks]… in every period of the first millennium BCE',[201] and

[195] McInerney 2014: 9 highlights the importance of these contacts by arguing that Greek ethnic identity developed within the close confines of the Greek mainland, but also through the diasporic experience which involved founding colonies, establishing trade emporia, and serving as foreign mercenaries.
[196] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 224.
[197] Coleman 1997: 198.
[198] Cartledge 2002: 64, although he maintains that Xenophon was not trying to weaken the symbolic and cultural impact of the Greek/barbarian polarity.
[199] Vlassopoulos 2013b: 65.
[200] Kim 2009: 46-7.
[201] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 19.

Skinner denies that unprecedented levels of barbarian contact catalysed the development of early ethnographic prose, stressing instead the material evidence for extensive intercultural contact.[202] For instance, even in the Archaic Period Greeks were serving in Egypt and the Near East as craftsmen, administrators, and mercenaries,[203] and as Miller notes, many adult Athenian males would have had 'some personal experience of the peoples of the Persian Empire, and even of Persians'.[204]

These private modes of interaction were complemented by public contact. Not only did large numbers of Greek mercenaries fight in the Persian Empire,[205] but many Greek communities even fought on the Persian side during the Persian Wars (Hdt. 7.93-5).[206] Moreover, throughout the fifth century, Athens engaged in diplomatic negotiations with Persia,[207] and through such activity some Athenian envoys witnessed the Achaemenid luxury culture in the palaces of satraps and the king at Susa.[208] Another mode of intercultural interactions was through ξενία relationships. For example, the Delphians granted Croesus special privileges after he donated gifts to them (Hdt. 1.54). As Cartledge points out, elite Greeks who engaged with non-Greeks on an individual and occasionally intimately familiar basis would not have regarded them all as uniformly slavish, effeminate, and disorderly barbarians.[209] Accordingly, it is not surprising that stories concerning non-Greeks can stress shared or universal values (Hdt. 3.14, 119) rather than polarity and alterity.[210]

Cultural interaction and exchange with the Near East

The Greeks had an extensive history of trade and material exchange with the Near East. As Vlassopoulos observes, by 800 Greek pottery could be found from the Levantine coast to Sardinia and South Italy, and Syrian and Phoenician metal ware, jewellery, seals, vases, and statuettes could be found in the Aegean and the western Mediterranean.[211] By

[202] Skinner 2012: 234. As McInerney 1999: 20 observes, Iron Age and Archaic Greeks joined in colonising ventures and created complex trade networks across the eastern and western Mediterranean.
[203] Harrison 2002: 2. To this list, Nippel 2002: 279 adds pirates, long-distance traders, soothsayers, doctors, and singers. See also West 1997: 624-5.
[204] Miller 1997: 3.
[205] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 50.
[206] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 55. However, Coleman 1997: 195 notes that they did so under duress.
[207] Miller 1997: 108.
[208] Miller 1997: 133.
[209] Cartledge 2002: 63.
[210] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 200.
[211] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 78.

Herodotus' time, there had been centuries of cultural contact and exchange, and intercultural encounters were the norm in a world shaped by the networks that moved goods, people, ideas, and technologies.[212] These trends did not stall in the fifth century, but as Miller asserts, there was 'a considerable amount of 'international' trade… between Greece, particularly Attica, and the Achaemenid Empire'.[213] It is this wider context of abundant intercultural contact, mobility, and exchange which Almagor and Skinner stress as fundamental for the analysis of contemporary ethnographic texts.[214]

Greek trade with the Near East was more than an exchange of goods, as the Greeks, especially the Athenians, appropriated Persian wares and clothing as part of an elite luxury culture which Miller (1997) labels the 'Perserie'. Being at war with the Persians did not necessarily cause Greeks to reject Persian achievements in luxury goods, lifestyle, social practice, or religious knowledge,[215] but rather the evidence indicates that 'wealthy Athenians embraced Persian luxury and incorporated into their own world some of its symbols and practices'.[216] For instance, some Athenians adopted some adaptations of Achaemenid vessels, adding handles and a base to 'Hellenise' oriental forms,[217] evidence exists in literature, epigraphy, and iconography that the Athenians adopted foreign garments, including the sleeved chiton (χιτών χειριδωτός), the κάνδυς, and the ἐπενδύτης,[218] and the Athenians from the later sixth century on adopted the parasol from Asia Minor as a status symbol, although it was only associated with women.[219] Although there are some dissidents,[220] Greek appropriation of Persian luxury items seems to contradict the notion that Greeks rejected foreign cultures and regarded them as inferior.

The Near Eastern influence on Greek culture was substantial, and has recently been elucidated by Burkert (1992), who argues for a strong Near Eastern influence on Greek

[212] Vlassopoulos 2013b: 50.
[213] Miller 1997: 88.
[214] Almagor & Skinner 2013: 1.
[215] Hölschier 2011: 59.
[216] Miller 1997: 189.
[217] Miller 1997: 152.
[218] Miller 1997: 155.
[219] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 161-2.
[220] Harrison 2002: 11 argues that cultural borrowings do not necessarily disprove a pejorative prejudice against Persia, and Mattison 2009: 15 claims that the Greek adoption of Persian culture reinforced their military victory, resulting in a military and symbolic domination of Persia.

religion and literature in the orientalising period (ca. 750-650),[221] and West (1997), who catalogues extensive evidence for West Asiatic influence on Greek poetry and myth from 750-450. This influence can be seen in pottery, as some Attic potters 'reacted to specific shapes of the Achaemenid repertoire',[222] and architecture, as the Odeion was constructed to appear Persian to a Greek.[223] Other examples of Greek adoption and adaptation include their script, which derived from the Phoenician alphabet, coinage, which was a Lydian invention (cf. Hdt. 1.94), and monumental sculpture, the techniques of which they adopted from the Egyptians.[224] In addition, the Old Oligarch observes that the Athenian dialect, way of life, and style of dress consisted of a mixture from all Greeks and non-Greeks ([X.] *Ath.* 2.8).[225] Even Greek myths and mythical themes frequently appear to have Near Eastern precedents or cognates.[226] The fundamental point, as Vlassopoulos notes, is not whether Greek culture influenced non-Greek or vice versa, but rather the importance of cultural interaction and exchange, as opposed to an approach which supports an East/West polarity.[227]

Ethnic ambivalence

Ethnic ambivalence also supports the idea of close ties between Greeks and non-Greeks. As Edith Hall observes, the ethnicity of mythical heroes could change according to the ideological requirements of the imaginations interpreting their stories,[228] and the ethnic ambivalence of characters like Cadmus or the Phoenician women seems to blur the boundaries between Greeks and foreigners.[229] As Papadodima observes, place of birth combined with genealogies can lead to famous Hellenic figures having their Greekness questioned, such as the Atreids.[230] The barbarisation of mythical heroes could also serve a practical purpose, linking Greeks and barbarians through fictive kinship.[231] However, the ethnic ambivalence was not restricted to mythical heroes. As Hornblower notes,

[221] In addition, Burkert 2004 examines not just the eastern influence on Greek culture, but also the dynamics of cultural interaction.
[222] Miller 1997: 135.
[223] Miller 1997: 239.
[224] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 226-7.
[225] West 1997: 10-59 provides a brief summary of the common features between Greek and Near Eastern material and social culture.
[226] West 1997: 439-93.
[227] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 3-4.
[228] Hall (E) 2002: 144, who proceeds to (145-6) outline the ethnic changes of mythical figures, including Trojans/Phrygians, Medea, and Tereus.
[229] Papadodima 2010: 41.
[230] Papadodima 2010: 41.
[231] Vlassopoulos 2013b: 55.

Greeks who settled new regions tended to recategorise the locals as Greeks,[232] and kinship ties and the capacity of societies to change over time both provided an intellectual bridge between Greek and non-Greek.[233] Finally, a real-world example of ethnic ambivalence is the story of Apollonides (X. *An.* 3.1.30-32), which is deemed to support Greek xenophobia, but actually generates confusion over his identity, as it remains unclear whether he was actually a Lydian, or perhaps a native of Aeolis or Boeotia who adopted Lydian customs.[234]

Instead of favouring a Greek/barbarian polarity, many scholars have focused on the extensive patterns of intercultural connections, interactions, and exchange between Greeks and non-Greeks, particularly those of the Near East. The admiration Greeks expressed for eastern virtues and wisdom, their familiarity with the Near East through employment, diplomacy, and ξενία relationships, the exchange of goods between Greece the Near East, including the appropriation of Persian luxury items in fifth-century Athens, and the ambivalence of ethnicity all provide a counterpoint to the rhetoric and images of polarity.

10. Iconography

Persians and Phrygians

Iconographic evidence can also contradict the notion of a prevalent fifth-century Greek/barbarian polarity. Many scholars deny that easterners were consistently denigrated in Classical Greek art. For instance, although Vlassopoulos admits that the earliest depictions of Persians portrayed them as defeated, humiliated, or engaged in shameful flight,[235] he also observes that Greek artists from the 450s onwards incorporated Persians into the balanced-fight iconographies which they employed during the Archaic Period to depict fights against Trojans or Amazons.[236] Alternatively, Gruen argues for neutrality throughout the fifth century, maintaining that fifth-century Attic vase painting 'does not cast the Persian as a despised and inferior being'.[237] In addition, Mitchell explains the famous Eurymedon vase, which appears to depict a Greek about to penetrate

[232] Hornblower 2008: 39.
[233] Hornblower 2008: 41.
[234] Vlassopoulos 2013b: 52.
[235] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 189. Similarly, Raeck 1981: 225 maintains that vase paintings 'die Perser zum Gegenstand des Spottes machen'.
[236] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 189.
[237] Gruen 2011a: 44.

a submissive Persian, as the exception rather than the rule,[238] while Gruen questions the traditional interpretation of the vase, casting doubt over the striding figure's Greekness, the ethnic identity of the crouched figure, and the easterner's pose.[239]

According to DeVries, the theme of Phrygian cowardice, so prominent in literature, is absent from Attic vase painting.[240] From the second quarter to the end of the sixth century, the Phrygians, particularly Midas and his henchmen, are presented just like Greeks,[241] but in the first half of the fifth century the presentation of the Midas saga changes, with eastern dress occasionally shown.[242] However, there is no evidence that they are associated with cowardice in art, unlike the Lydians, who receive pejorative judgements in both literature and art.[243] This may hold relevance for understanding the artistic representation of the Trojans, due to the common association of Trojans with Phrygians in the Classical Period.

Trojans

Although sixth-century vase painters were aware of ethnic differences, as their depictions of Scythians, Thracians, and Cimmerians demonstrate,[244] Erskine argues that there is no evidence in archaic iconography of an ethnic distinction between Achaeans and Trojans.[245] Similarly, Vlassopoulos observes that Trojans in battle scenes on vases are presented with identical clothes and weapons to the Greeks, even though Priam and Paris can occasionally be depicted with oriental clothes,[246] and Mattison notes that Trojans begin to acquire Phrygian caps after the Persian Wars, although they are never physically different.[247] This apparent reluctance of fifth-century vase painters to orientalise the Trojans freely could indicate Athenian respect for the Trojan heroes.[248]

[238] Mitchell 2007: 135.
[239] Gruen 2011a: 42-4.
[240] DeVries 2000: 342.
[241] DeVries 2000: 348.
[242] DeVries 2000: 349.
[243] DeVries 2000: 363.
[244] Erskine 2001: 58. However, Raeck 1981: 222 argues that barbarian warriors were not portrayed pejoratively in the sixth century.
[245] Erskine 2001: 58.
[246] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 194; cf. Castriota 1992: 106.
[247] Mattison 2009: 53.
[248] Erskine 2001: 81-2.

Many scholars argue that Athenian images of the sack of Troy condemn the brutality of the Greeks and portray the Trojans sympathetically. For example, Ferrari (2000) disagrees with Castriota and argues that the Ilioupersis is represented as a paradigm of wrongful conquest, with the sack of Troy reflecting the recent Persian sack of Athens. In addition, Dué maintains that fifth-century Athenian monumental art condemns the Achaeans' hubris,[249] and Mattison notes that Ilioupersis images tend to show the barbarity of the Greeks.[250] Contrary to the arguments of Castriota,[251] Dué claims that the Stoa Poikile focused most on the suffering of the Trojans and brutality of the Greeks,[252] while Stansbury-O'Donnell argues that Polygnotus' Lesche paintings contain multiple indications of barbaric Greek behaviour.[253] Similarly, Dué asserts that the Ilioupersis is portrayed on the Parthenon as hubristic and unjustified.[254] Similar images can be found in vase paintings. Woodford presents several examples: an Attic black-figure amphora (ca. 550) shows Priam taking refuge on an altar while being battered by Neoptolemus wielding Astyanax's body,[255] an Attic red-figure krater (ca. 465) depicts Neoptolemus battering Priam with Astyanax's body and Ajax dragging Cassandra from Athena's statue,[256] and an Attic black-figure amphora (ca. 570-60) portrays three Greeks holding Polyxena's body while Neoptolemus 'with matter-of-fact cruelty plunges the knife into her neck'.[257] In addition, the Mykonos Ilioupersis pithos (ca. 7th cent.) represents the profusion of violence against the helpless, expressing horror at the event.[258]

Many scholars challenging the Greek/barbarian polarity have drawn their arguments from iconography. They question whether the Persians were consistently denigrated in fifth-century art, observe that Phrygian cowardice is absent from iconography, and note that the Trojans are ethnically similar to the Greeks. Moreover, they argue that visual

[249] Dué 2006: 115.
[250] Mattison 2009: 57. Even Castriota 1992: 97 concedes that Greek behaviour in Ilioupersis images is 'anything but exemplary'.
[251] Castriota 2005: 98 argues that the Stoa Poikile focuses on the rectitude of the Greeks 'bypassed the savage and impious excesses committed by the Greeks'.
[252] Dué 2006: 106.
[253] Stansbury-O'Donnell 2005: 85. Ferrari 2000: 123-4 maintains that Polygnotus' Ilioupersis paintings focus on the violation of Cassandra and the failure of the Achaean kings to punish Ajax.
[254] Dué 2006: 96.
[255] Woodford 1993: 109.
[256] Woodford 1993: 110.
[257] Woodford 1993: 111. Similarly, Ferrari 2000: 122-3 briefly surveys Athenian vase depictions of the Ilioupersis and concludes that they focus on violation, savagery, and excess.
[258] Anderson 1997: 187. Moreover, Anderson 1997: 197 notes that representations of Neoptolemus murdering Priam and Astyanax 'immortalize him as a bloodthirsty murderer'.

representations of the Ilioupersis condemn Greeks' excessive brutality and sympathise with the Trojans.

11. Intra-Hellenic disputes

Another method of de-emphasising the polarity's importance is to focus on intra-Hellenic disputes. As Vlassopoulos notes, although Greek states could exploit Panhellenism to achieve hegemony, the Greek world 'lacked a centre and was perennially ravaged by hostilities among its members'.[259] Similarly, Papadodima claims that intra-Hellenic conflict was much more dangerous than the Greek/barbarian opposition,[260] and Kim observes that local differences and affiliations amongst Greeks were often just as important as ethnic similarities.[261] This is particularly relevant for Athenian tragedy. For instance, Edith Hall acknowledges that tragedians can downplay the critique of the barbarian world when characters criticise another Greek state,[262] and Papadodima identifies intra-Hellenic disputes as a mechanism which weakens the Greek/barbarian polarity's power, offering as an example Euripides' *Heracleidae*, which applies inter-ethnic themes to intra-ethnic disputes.[263] The most prominent non-barbarian enemies in tragedy are the Spartans, the principal Athenian enemy in the Peloponnesian War.[264] According to Mitchell, for Euripides the Spartans are the true 'barbarian' enemy, including Hermione and Menelaus in the *Andromache*, Helen and Menelaus in the *Troades*, and the barbarity and violence demonstrated by the Heracleidae,[265] particularly Alcmene's desire to kill the captive Eurystheus (*Heracl.* 965, 975-7, 1022-4) despite Athenian objections (966, 1018-19). The barbarians who confront these Peloponnesians or Thebans, as Edith Hall observes, almost turn into friends, and 'assume the role of surrogate Athenians',[266] which only further undermines the Greek/barbarian polarity.

[259] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 61.
[260] Papadodima 2013: 210.
[261] Kim 2009: 9.
[262] Hall 1989: 213.
[263] Papadodima 2010: 10.
[264] Hall 1989: 213 observes that Greeks who are portrayed negatively in tragedy are always associated with Athens' enemies in the Peloponnesian War.
[265] Mitchell 2007: 28.
[266] Hall 1989: 214.

Accordingly, the widespread nature of intra-Hellenic disputes, especially their importance in Athenian tragedy and iconography,[267] offers a counterpoint to the rhetoric of Panhellenism and undermines the idea of a rigid fifth-century Greek/barbarian polarity.

12. Coexistence of conflicting views

Greek representations of non-Greeks are rife with contradictions. For instance, Edith Hall notes that the Greek portrayal of the barbarian world contains tyrants and savages, but also idealised peoples and harmonious relations with heaven,[268] and Miller argues that the Athenians' private and public appropriation of Persian culture contradicted public rhetoric, which condemned the Oriental.[269] This is well illustrated by the example of Thales of Miletus. As Vlassopoulos observes, Thales is grateful to be a human rather than an animal, a man rather than a woman, and a Greek rather than a barbarian (D.L. 1.33), a story supporting polarity and conflict,[270] but he is also mocked by a Thracian servant girl for falling into a pit while studying the stars (Pl. *Tht.* 174a), a story demonstrating the complexity of the barbarian representation, as here a barbarian slave can poke fun at Greek philosophy.[271] In addition, Herodotus presents Thales as a Phoenician (1.170.3), and rather than denigrating him, he commends his widsom, wisdom which he in part learned from the barbarians (D.L. 1.24), and wisdom which is again on display when Thales advises Croesus (Hdt. 1.75), a story which reveals that a proud Greek could unashamedly serve a barbarian king who subjugated Greek communities.[272] Accordingly, Vlassopoulos concludes that the Thales case proves that conflict and polarity, as well as interaction and exchange, were all essential characteristics of Greek relations with non-Greeks.[273]

It is clear, as Vlassopoulos points out, that the traditional approach, which presents chronological divisions between the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods and regards political events such as the Persian Wars (490-79) and Alexander's conquests (334-23) as effecting major changes in the Greek/barbarian relationship, is seriously

[267] Mitchell 2007: 148 notes that Athenian public representations of victory 'did not just feature Greeks defeating Persians, but also Athenians defeating other Greeks'.
[268] Hall 1989: 149.
[269] Miller 1997: 243. Moreover, Isaac 2004: 175 claims that Antiphon's views are opposed to the proto-racist attitudes of other Greeks, including the author of *On Airs, Waters, and Places*.
[270] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 4-5.
[271] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 5.
[272] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 5-6.
[273] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 7.

flawed,[274] the major flaw being the 'assumption that each historical period is dominated by a single form of interaction between Greeks and non-Greeks'.[275] Instead, the reality is that conflicting views and attitudes towards non-Greeks coexisted in the Archaic and Classical Periods. Greeks throughout the Classical Period continued working for foreign kings and admiring alien wisdom, while also generating polarised images of barbarians.[276] Unilateral approaches to Greek relations with non-Greeks are therefore misguided. Those which focus heavily on the polarity fail to account for the range of ways Greek culture employed non-Greeks and their cultures, as well as the fact that only a limited part of surviving literature and art supports a polarity,[277] whereas those which stress the openness of Archaic Greek culture neglect the fact that the polarity was already present from the beginning of Greek literature in Homer.[278]

The most balanced approach is that recently adopted by Kostas Vlassopoulos is his monograph, *Greeks and Barbarians* (2013). He acknowledges the need for an approach that caters for the role of non-Greek cultures in shaping Greek culture as well as the role of polarity and conflict,[279] and proposes a new model of understanding Greek relationships with non-Greeks through four parallel yet interconnected worlds: the world of networks, the world of *apoikiai*, the Panhellenic world, and the world of empires.[280] This approach is particularly attractive because it does not rely on a simplistic Greek/barbarian polarity, satisfactorily accounts for the rhetoric of polarity and the warmth and receptivity towards non-Greeks which are found in Greek sources of all periods, and remains valid and consistent throughout various chronological periods. As Vlassopoulos sums up, '[i]t was the coexisting interaction of Greek culture with the four parallel words that created a Barbarian repertoire that was both Hellenocentric and universalist in its scope'.[281]

[274] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 9-10.
[275] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 10, who maintains that the changes attributed to the Persian Wars and Alexander's conquests long predated them.
[276] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 10.
[277] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 162.
[278] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 162-3, who comments that it is 'unfortunate that these diametrically opposed approaches exist side by side without any consistent effort to combine them or explain their contradictory coexistence' (162).
[279] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 163.
[280] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 11.
[281] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 329.

Conclusion

How can one summarise Greek attitudes towards non-Greeks in the fifth century, particularly the late fifth century when Euripides was composing? As this chapter has demonstrated, this is a very complex issue and there is no scholarly consensus. One approach is to postulate a developed Greek/barbarian polarity as a model for understanding relations between Greeks and non-Greeks. Despite the disagreement among supporters of this view as to whether the polarity developed before or after the Persian Wars, its relation to tragedy, whether it was degenerating in the late fifth century, and whether the Trojans were included, the fact remains that the rhetoric of polarity existed in fifth-century Greek literature and art, although some scholars have overemphasised its significance. An alternative approach is to focus on the long tradition of close contact, openness and cooperation Greeks shared with the Near East. This approach is also persuasive, as there is no doubt that the Greeks idealised, worked for, and praised the wisdom of non-Greeks, and shared an extensive tradition of cultural interaction, influence, and exchange with the Near East.

These approaches are not mutually exclusive. In fact, the reality must have been a combination of the two – a coexistence of conflicting views and attitudes. Some sections of fifth-century Athenian society would have been strongly xenophobic and despised non-Greeks as culturally inferior, whereas others would have been more open and accepting towards foreigners. Accordingly, Euripides was relatively free to portray the Trojans as he wished, as although he was somewhat constrained by the Homeric precedent, there was no dominant Greek/barbarian polarity which he was obliged to follow. He could assimilate the Trojans to Persian or Phrygian stereotypes and denigrate them, expressing strong Panhellenic values, or present them sympathetically, as noble characters, perhaps even embodying ideal Athenian virtues, since both of these articulations of Trojan identity had pre-Euripidean precedents in the fifth century. Therefore, it is necessary to examine Euripides' plays closely to determine which approach he followed, or whether he presents multiple conflicting portraits of the Trojans, reflecting the pluralism of the society in which he was composing.

Chapter 2: The *Andromache*

Introduction

This chapter examines how Euripides depicts the Trojans in the *Andromache*. It will investigate whether Euripides' Trojans reflect the contemporary eastern barbarian stereotype, and focuses on Andromache, the only Trojan who plays a significant role.

Initially, this chapter will comment on the significance of the Trojan/Phrygian conflation, before discussing the merits of the accusations of barbarism levelled against Andromache by the Spartan characters. In particular, it will assess Andromache's conduct to determine whether or not she behaves like a stereotypical eastern barbarian, and if not, whether any other characters act in such a way. After discussing two other key elements of the eastern barbarian stereotype – excessive luxury and servility – it will evaluate whether Andromache is a pathetic character. Ultimately, it will discuss the tragedy's peculiar ending, relating it to the play's socio-historical context and commenting on its significance for understanding Euripides' depiction of the Trojans.

1. Trojans as Phrygians

On six occasions in the *Andromache*, Trojans are referred to as Phrygians (194, 204, 363, 455, 592, 1044). In the *Iliad* the Phrygians are Trojan neighbours and allies,[1] fighting alongside the Trojans at Troy (2.862-3; 10.431; cf. 3.184-7), yet the two are clearly distinguished.[2] However, in tragedy Trojans and Phrygians are regularly treated as synonyms,[3] a phenomenon observed by Strabo (14.3.3; cf. 12.8.7). According to a scholiast on the *Iliad*, Aeschylus was the first to conflate the two (Σ A on 2.862),[4] but as Edith Hall points out, if one accepts Wilamowitz' reading Φρύγες in Alcaeus 42.15, then the correlation could have originated much earlier than the tragedians.[5] In any case, it is clear that Euripides did not innovate by equating the Trojans with Phrygians. Nevertheless, although this conflation is frequent in Euripides, it is comparatively rare in Aeschylus and Sophocles.[6] Therefore, it is likely that Euripides' decision to repeatedly equate Trojans with Phrygians served a specific purpose.

---

[1] Gregory 1999: 41.
[2] They even have separate languages in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (111-16).
[3] Stevens 1971: 119; Bacon 1961: 156.
[4] Hall 1988: 16.
[5] Hall 1988: 17, although she (17-18) notes the existence of other readings which omit the Phrygians.
[6] Bacon 1961: 101 n.45 observes that in Aeschylus the two terms are synonyms only in fr. 446 Radt, and in Sophocles only in *Ajax* 1054, fr. 339 (=368 Radt) *Lacaenae*, and fr. 344 (=373 Radt) *Laocoon*.

Within the context of the dramatic narrative, the references to Trojans as Phrygians are unlikely to be pejorative. Andromache accounts for four out of the six occurrences (194, 204, 363, 455), and the chorus for another one (1044). It is implausible that Andromache or the chorus, which is highly sympathetic to her cause, would intend to denigrate the Trojans by the Phrygian label. From their point of view, the two terms must simply be synonymous. The only potential pejorative use of Φρύξ occurs when Peleus, insulting Menelaus' manliness, reminds him that he lost his wife πρὸς ἀνδρὸς Φρυγὸς (592), referring to Paris. Stevens argues for a tone of contempt in Peleus' words,[7] which seems reasonable since the belittling of Paris would increase the insult to Menelaus, and the Homeric Paris certainly displays effeminacy and cowardice comparable with the later Phrygian stereotype. However, although Peleus' reference to Paris here may constitute an anachronistic insult, he is allied to Andromache and the Trojan cause, so his criticism is unlikely to be directed at the Trojans in general.

What impact would the Phrygian identification have had on the audience? Erskine asserts that it reinforces the Trojans' non-Greek identity.[8] This is true, but it does so in a manner which renders the Trojans and their culture accessible to the audience. To the Athenians, the Trojans only existed in legend and literature. In other words, there was no possibility for a fifth-century Athenian to meet or interact with a Trojan. Conversely, the Athenians were well acquainted with the Phrygians, particularly through slavery,[9] and as a result their association with the Trojans served to combine literary-heroic credentials with an intelligible contemporary reference.[10]

According to Edith Hall, once Trojans were identified with Phrygians, the pejorative contemporary resonances of that term, such as effeminacy, luxury, cruelty, and despotism, began to alter the way they were portrayed.[11] More bluntly, Croally asserts that to call Troy Phrygian is to barbarise it.[12] However, it is unlikely that Euripides' motive was to align the Trojans with the barbarian Phrygian stereotype, since the context

[7] Stevens 1971: 168.
[8] Erskine 2001: 73.
[9] Stevens 1971: 167-8 notes that Phrygians (and Lydians) constituted a high proportion of Athenian slaves in the fifth century (cf. Ar. *V.* 433, 1309), a fact alluded to by anachronisms in tragedy (e.g. E. *Alc.* 675-6).
[10] Hall 1988: 13.
[11] Hall 1988: 15-16; cf. Lloyd 2005: 142-3.
[12] Croally 1994: 105.

of the references to Trojans as Phrygians (with the potential exception of 492) suggests that the two terms are simply synonymous, and the play as a whole, as the rest of this chapter will argue, elevates the Trojans as noble and virtuous figures. Moreover, as chapter 1 demonstrated, fifth-century Athenian attitudes towards easterners, including Phrygians, were incredibly diverse and not universally pejorative. Some Athenians who held prejudicial views against the Phrygians would have no doubt applied these views to the Trojans, only to be surprised when the play failed to meet their expectations of cowardly, servile, and effeminate Trojans. For many other Athenians, however, the conflation would have merely added a level of realism to the Trojans, and it is more plausible that this is what Euripides hoped to achieve.

Alternatively, Euripides may have conflated Trojans and Phrygians simply to follow Aeschylus' (or Alcaeus') precedent, or even to distance his Trojans slightly from their familiar Homeric counterparts. There are many potential motives, but not enough evidence to support Edith Hall's claim that the Trojans' acquisition of the new name Φρύγες was 'the most significant step in the process of their 'barbarisation''.[13]

2. Are the Trojans stereotypical eastern barbarians?

Accusations of barbarian behaviour against Trojans

Hermione accuses Andromache of using drugs to make her barren and repulsive to Neoptolemus. Andromache refers to the charges in the prologue (32-3) and Hermione later reiterates them directly to Andromache:

στυγοῦμαι δ᾽ ἀνδρὶ φαρμάκοισι σοῖς,
νηδὺς δ᾽ ἀκύμων διὰ σέ μοι διόλλυται·
δεινὴ γὰρ ἠπειρῶτις ἐς τὰ τοιάδε
ψυχὴ γυναικῶν· 157-60

While Hermione's focus is on blaming Andromache for her troubles (φαρμάκοισι σοῖς… διὰ σέ, 157-8), with her mention of the ἠπειρῶτις ψυχὴ γυναικῶν, she transcends the purely personal and involves ethnicity. Hermione's criticism is no longer directed solely at Andromache, but at all Asian women, to whom she attributes a proficiency in φάρμακα. Although she does not use the term βάρβαρος, Hermione still employs an eastern stereotype to represent Andromache's alleged behaviour as foreign, implying that Greek

[13] Hall 1988: 15.

women would not act in such a way. According to McClure, Hermione's principal rhetorical strategy is an attack on barbarian φύσις, one which ultimately fails.[14] For instance, her accusations are clearly ludicrous,[15] and even her stereotype is dubious, since Greek men regarded all women, not just Asiatic women, as being skilled in φάρμακα.[16] If anything, Hermione's accusations reveal more about her own character, the deficiencies of which Andromache later pinpoints as the real reason why she cannot produce children (205-31),[17] and they are weak evidence of Euripides attributing barbarian qualities to the Trojans.

In her tirade against Andromache, Hermione also criticises the moral standards of barbarians, including their lack of appropriate νόμοι:

> ἐς τοῦτο δ᾽ ἥκεις ἀμαθίας, δύστηνε σύ,
> ἢ παιδὶ πατρός ὃς σὸν ὤλεσεν πόσιν
> τολμᾷς ξυνεύδειν καὶ τέκν᾽ αὐθεντῶν πάρα
> τίκτειν. τοιοῦτον πᾶν τὸ βάρβαρον γένος·
> πατήρ τε θυγατρὶ παῖς τε μητρὶ μείγνυται
> κόρη τ᾽ ἀδελφῷ, διὰ φόνου δ᾽ οἱ φίλτατοι
> χωροῦσι, καὶ τῶνδ᾽ οὐδὲν ἐξείργει νόμος. 170-76

Once again, Hermione begins with a personal focus (δύστηνε σύ… σὸν, 170-71) before branching out with a generalised statement grouping all non-Greeks under one collective label: τοιοῦτον πᾶν τὸ βάρβαρον γένος (173).[18] With barbarians, among which she includes Andromache, Hermione associates incest, emphasised by a tricolon of juxtapositions (174-5), as well as murder of kin (175-6), and the lack of adequate laws (νόμοι) to regulate such behaviour (176). Whereas she previously criticised the φύσις of Asiatic women, Hermione now reproaches barbarians for their inadequate νόμοι.

However, Hermione's arguments are not particularly persuasive. Chapter 1 noted the importance of context when evaluating accusations of barbarism. In this case, Hermione

[14] McClure 1999: 174.
[15] Saïd 2002: 83 calls them 'gratuitous' and Allan 2000: 98 labels them 'grotesque'.
[16] Lloyd 2005: 118. However, foreigners generally were regarded more likely to use magic (e.g. Medea, and Zalmoxis in Herodotus and Plato's *Charmides*).
[17] As Lloyd 2005: 110 notes, Hermione's sterility is not a biological problem, as she later imagines the possibility of children (941).
[18] Lloyd 2005: 119 observes that Hermione sets up a binary contrast with the Greeks (cf. *Hec.* 328-31, 1199-1201).

is very emotional and her desire to insult Andromache as much as possible overrides the need to form logical arguments. She accuses Andromache of ἀμαθία for having children with the son of her husband's murderer (170-73), as if Andromache chose to become Neoptolemus' concubine. In addition, Hermione's criticism of barbarian moral standards is undermined by the abundance of incest and kin-killing in the royal houses of Greek mythology,[19] including her very own house of Atreus,[20] and by barbarian disapproval of kin-killing elsewhere in tragedy (*IT* 1174; cf. Hdt. 1.137).[21] Accordingly, Hermione's words are the product of a young woman affected by emotion and jealousy, and it is unlikely that Euripides intended the audience to approve of such sentiments regarding Trojans or other easterners.

Every Spartan character denigrates Andromache as a barbarian. Hermione uses the term to refer to the Trojans as a whole (βαρβάρων νόμοισιν, 243) and to Andromache in the stinging insult ὦ βάρβαρον σὺ θρέμμα (261). Her intention is to insult and degrade Andromache and her people. Similarly, Menelaus employs the term to stress Andromache's non-Greek nature (γυναῖκα βάρβαρον, 649), reinforced by reminders of her Asiatic origin (ἠπειρῶτιν, 652) and foreigner status (ξένης, 670), and to degrade her children: βάρβαροι… ὄντες γένος (665). Lastly, the Spartan nurse also describes Andromache as a barbarian (γυναικὸς βαρβάρου, 870) and draws attention to her non-Greek status (γυναῖκα Τρῳάδ', 867). Muich is right to argue that Menelaus and the Spartan nurse intend to insult Andromache when referring to her foreigner status,[22] but they also have additional motives. Menelaus is attempting to persuade Peleus to support the Spartan cause and alienate him from Andromache,[23] while the Spartan nurse seeks to reassure Hermione that Neoptolemus will not punish her. Only Hermione has the sole intention of abusing Andromache by calling her a barbarian.

Although βάρβαρος always refers to Andromache or the Trojans in the *Andromache*, this does not necessarily indicate that the Trojans are barbarised. Only Spartan characters,

[19] Papadodima 2010: 19; Allan 2000: 130; Kovacs 1980: 100 n.6. As examples, Hall 1989: 188 identifies Orestes, Alcmaeon, Oedipus, and Althaea.
[20] Papadodima 2010: 20; Stevens 1971: 117. McClure 1999: 175 argues that Hermione's association with the house of Atreus and her future liaison with Orestes almost comically undercut her position.
[21] Torrance 2005: 49 n.30.
[22] Muich 2010: 141.
[23] Sorum 1995: 383-4 notes that Menelaus plays to patriotism and ignores the Greek father of Andromache's son (663-6).

who are very hostile towards Andromache or have other motives for highlighting her barbarian nature, label her as a barbarian, which suggests that this view may not be endorsed by the play as a whole. If Euripides favoured this portrayal of Andromache, then she would reflect stereotypical eastern barbarian qualities through her actions. Therefore, it is necessary to examine Andromache's behaviour and determine whether the Spartan accusations of barbarism have any substance.

The portrayal of Andromache

Andromache's behaviour is consistently honourable throughout the play. As Muich notes, her speech displays a preoccupation with virtue and shame unparalleled among the other characters.[24] She willingly chooses to sacrifice herself for her son (ἐμοὶ δ' ὄνειδος μὴ θανεῖν ὑπὲρ τέκνου, 410),[25] invokes a sense of shame in her supplication of Peleus (575-6), and rebukes Hermione for talking αἰσχρῶν πέρι (238). Moreover, Andromache is too proud to flatter Menelaus and Hermione in an attempt to save her life: ἀθώπευτόν γέ σε / γλώσσης ἀφήσω τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ παῖδα σήν (459-60). For these reasons, scholars maintain that Andromache's nobility overshadows the accusations of barbarism levelled at her by the Spartans.[26]

Andromache's devotion to female virtue and propriety is most evident in her debate with Hermione on the role of women within marriage.[27] She relates to Hermione how she even suckled Hector's illegitimate children:

> ὦ φίλταθ' Ἕκτορ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν σὴν χάριν
> σοὶ καὶ ξυνήρων, εἴ τί σε σφάλλοι Κύπρις,
> καὶ μαστὸν ἤδη πολλάκις νόθοισι σοῖς
> ἐπέσχον, ἵνα σοι μηδὲν ἐνδοίην πικρόν.
> καὶ ταῦτα δρῶσα τῇ ἀρετῇ προσηγόμην
> πόσιν· 222-7

Andromache's admission here is particularly shocking and at odds with the depiction of her marriage in the *Iliad*. Although the Athenians had a relaxed moral attitude to extra-

[24] Muich 2010: 156.
[25] Allan 2000: 166 describes Andromache as the play's most noble, resourceful, and self-sacrificing character.
[26] Lloyd 2005: 119 claims that Andromache's nobility undercuts Hermione's chauvinism, and Hall 1989: 213 argues that her virtue ironically deflates the Spartans' vituperative emphasis on her barbarian provenance.
[27] Lévy 1976: 157 n.11 describes Andromache in the debate as 'le parangon des vertus conjugales'.

marital sexual relationships (at least for men),[28] Andromache's image here would have surprised the audience due to its apparent inconsistency with the epic tradition.[29] Although there is a Homeric precedent for a wife rearing her husband's illegitimate children (*Il.* 5.70-71), and later evidence for other children of Hector (Hellanic. *FGrH* 4 F 31), Andromache's claim here seems to be an *ad hoc* invention by Euripides.[30] This divergence from the epic tradition stresses Andromache's complete and utter devotion to Hector, reinforced by her extreme affection (ὦ φίλταθ᾽ Ἕκτορ, 222) and her attribution of blame to Aphrodite for his extramarital affairs (223). As Lloyd notes, Andromache defines the true ἀρετή of a wife as submission to her husband,[31] and she stresses the importance of feminine virtues earlier in her speech, declaring that ἀρεταὶ τέρπουσι τοὺς ξυνευνέτας (208). In fact, the play's opening establishes Andromache's marriage to Hector as the ideal and standard against which other relationships are measured, as even in death she is devoted to her husband (97, 107-8, 222-5).[32] However, although her new attachment to Neoptolemus causes her pain (26, 36, 390-91), Andromache remains loyal to her new role and defends his trustworthiness and valour against Menelaus and Hermione (205-14, 268, 339-43, 358-60).[33] Accordingly, Andromache admirably balances her devotion to Hector with her newfound duties to Neoptolemus.

Andromache contrasts her own exemplary submission and devotion to Hector with Hermione's behaviour:[34]

> σὺ δ᾽ ἤν τι κνισθῇς, ἡ Λάκαινα μὲν πόλις
> μέγ᾽ ἐστί, τὴν δὲ Σκῦρον οὐδαμοῦ τίθης,
> πλουτεῖς δ᾽ ἐν οὐ πλουτοῦσι· Μενέλεως δέ σοι
> μείζων Ἀχιλλέως. ταῦτά τοί σ᾽ ἔχθει πόσις. 209-12

[28] Allan 2000: 135.
[29] Morwood 2000: 151 describes the image as 'very surprising indeed'.
[30] Lloyd 2005: 121.
[31] Lloyd 2005: 121. Torrance 2005: 62 argues that Andromache is not submissive, but fierce, and that sympathy for her is compromised by her fights with men. However, the virtue of submissiveness Andromache endorses relates only to her husband and is unaffected by her quarrel with Menelaus.
[32] Storey 1993: 182.
[33] Stavrinou 2014: 391. Torrance 2005: 52 asserts that Neoptolemus and Andromache have a positive relationship, whereas Storey 1993: 182 argues for disharmony in their relationship.
[34] Kamerbeek 1943: 54 highlights the importance of an Andromache/Hermione contrast, maintaining that Euripides 'a construit son drame en grande partie sur l'antithèse Andromaque – Hermione'.

Andromache characterises Hermione as disrespectful to Neoptolemus' homeland (210) and his family (211-12), and preoccupied with wealth and status (211).[35] As Papadimitropoulos points out, in contrasting her extreme female submissiveness with Hermione's failure to accept her husband's authority, Andromache displays her superiority.[36] Therefore, instead of acting like the eastern barbarian the Spartans accuse her of being, Andromache embodies a feminine ἀρετή in keeping with the Athenian ideal of the subordinate and submissive wife, completely devoted to her husband.

Andromache's rhetorical skill also elevates her above the eastern barbarian stereotype. For instance, her reply to Hermione (184-231) reveals the influence on Euripides of recent advances in speech construction,[37] and her rhetorical prowess is ironically at odds with her status as a foreign slave.[38] Andromache's repertoire includes an argument from probability (192-204), a hallmark of rhetorical sophistication in the late fifth century,[39] and a *reductio ad absurdum*:

> εἰ δ᾽ ἀμφὶ Θρῄκην τὴν χιόνι κατάρρυτον
> τύραννον ἔσχες ἄνδρ᾽, ἵν᾽ ἐν μέρει λέχος
> δίδωσι πολλαῖς εἷς ἀνὴρ κοινούμενος,
> ἔκτεινας ἂν τάσδ᾽; εἶτ᾽ ἀπληστίαν λέχους
> πάσαις γυναιξὶ προστιθεῖσ᾽ ἂν ηὑρέθης.
> αἰσχρόν γε· 215-20

Here Andromache asks Hermione if she would kill her fellow wives (218) if she were married to a polygamous Thracian king (216-17),[40] a deed which would taint all women with the charge of sexual insatiability (ἀπληστίαν λέχους, 218). As Allan notes, this technique highlights Hermione's obsessive jealousy and defuses her earlier charge of Trojan polygamy (177-8).[41] The best indicator of Andromache's rhetorical prowess,

[35] Lloyd 2005: 9-10 observes that Andromache represents the submissive wife, while Hermione represents the independence of the rich and high-born wife.
[36] Papadimitropoulos 2006: 150.
[37] Goebel 1989: 33-5 notes its similarities to Gorgias' *Palamedes*, indicating that Euripides consciously employed patterns of the late fifth-century rhetorical technique.
[38] Allan 2000: 132. Cox 2000: 199 notes that Andromache speaks with the skill of an Attic orator. More specifically, Muich 2010: 155 argues that Andromache's use of *hypophora*, gnomic statements, and criticisms against women demonstrates her superior reasoning skills.
[39] Lloyd 2005: 120.
[40] Euripides may have derived his information on Thracian polygamy from Herodotus 5.5. Lloyd 2005: 119 argues that Andromache regards the polygamous Thracians as barbarians from her viewpoint. However, there is no indication that Andromache is being dismissive of the Thracians, or deriding their polygamy, as Hall 1989: 135 suggests, as opposed to merely stating it as a fact.
[41] Allan 2000: 134. Priam's polygamy is not mentioned in the *Andromache*.

however, is Hermione's response to her arguments, which includes an acknowledgement of her intelligence followed by a death threat (σοφὴ σοφὴ σύ· κατθανεῖν δ᾽ ὅμως σε δεῖ, 245), and the infuriated outburst ὦ βάρβαρον σὺ θρέμμα καὶ σκληρὸν θράσος (261).[42] Bested in argument, Hermione resorts to threats of violence to re-establish her superiority. Even though Andromache's arguments are unsuccessful, as she cannot persuade Hermione and Menelaus, Muich is correct to argue that the inappropriate deployment of rhetorical skill adds to Andromache's characterisation and helps to develop her thematic function as the 'noble barbarian'.[43] In other words, despite some criticism from the chorus (ἄγαν ἔλεξας ὡς γυνὴ πρὸς ἄρσενας, 364),[44] Andromache's rhetorical skill transcends the audience's expectations of an eastern female slave, and so ironically presents her as even more civilised and intelligent than her Spartan counterparts, the very ones who label and denigrate her as a barbarian.

Although the Spartans denigrate Andromache as a barbarian, nowhere in the play does Andromache substantiate these claims with her behaviour. Instead, she acts honourably, values female virtue and propriety, and demonstrates impressive rhetorical skill. Hermione and Menelaus, however, receive a much less flattering portrayal, raising the question of who exactly the real barbarians are in the play.

Diatribes against the Spartans

Just as Hermione critiqued Trojan moral standards (170-76), so Andromache denounces the Spartans for their deceitful, violent, and greedy nature:

> ὦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔχθιστοι βροτῶν
> Σπάρτης ἔνοικοι, δόλια βουλευτήρια,
> ψευδῶν ἄνακτες, μηχανορράφοι κακῶν,
> ἑλικτὰ κοὐδὲν ὑγιές ἀλλὰ πᾶν πέριξ
> φρονοῦντες, ἀδίκως εὐτυχεῖτ᾽ ἀν᾽ Ἑλλάδα.
> τί δ᾽ οὐκ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν; οὐ πλεῖστοι φόνοι;
> οὐκ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, οὐ λέγοντες ἄλλα μὲν

[42] Allan 2000: 97-8 points out that Hermione (245) and Menelaus (440) are reduced to blustering threats by Andromache's superior case and skill in arguing for it.
[43] Muich 2010: 156.
[44] Torrance 2005: 43 argues that this lack of self-restraint differentiates her from the Homeric Andromache. However, Andromache does not interact with hostile Greek men in the *Iliad*. If she did, and if the life of her son was at stake, she may well have dispensed with her customary self-restraint.

γλώσσῃ, φρονοῦντες δ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ ἐφευρίσκεσθ᾽ ἀεί; 445-52

The parallels are immediately obvious. Like Hermione, Andromache is clearly emotional, having just been informed by Menelaus of her son's grim prospects for survival (444). In addition, Andromache also employs a tricolon, here a tricolon of couplets (446-7, cf. 174-5), which stresses the deviousness and mendacity of the Spartans. She ends with a catalogue of vices, including violence (πλεῖστοι φόνοι, 450), greed (αἰσχροκερδεῖς, 451), and duplicity (451-2). As Hall notes, Andromache's words lie parallel to, and undercut, the viciousness of Hermione's anti-barbarian rhetoric.[45] The key difference, however, is that Andromache's accusations are supported by the Spartans' conduct in the play,[46] which lends them a grain of truth. One cannot know how heavily contemporary events influenced this anti-Spartan diatribe,[47] but in any case these accusations are more than mere generalisations, and so deserve to be taken more seriously than those Hermione levels against the Trojans.

Similarly, Peleus denigrates Spartan women for their promiscuity, as well as the customs which are responsible for it:

οὐδ᾽ ἂν εἰ βούλοιτό τις
σώφρων γένοιτο Σπαρτιατίδων κόρη·
αἳ ξὺν νέοισιν ἐξερημοῦσαι δόμους
γυμνοῖσι μηροῖς καὶ πέπλοις ἀνειμένοις
δρόμους παλαίστρας τ᾽ οὐκ ἀνασχετῶς ἐμοὶ
κοινὰς ἔχουσι. κᾆτα θαυμάζειν χρεὼν
εἰ μὴ γυναῖκας σώφρονας παιδεύετε; 595-601

His focus is on chastity (σώφρων, 595; σώφρονας, 601), the absence of which among Spartan women he attributes to their independence (ἐξερημοῦσαι δόμους, 597), suggestive clothing (598), and sharing of athletic facilities with men (599-600), a practice Peleus cannot tolerate (599). The common use of athletic spaces which were strictly reserved for men in Athens would have shocked the audience, and Peleus' criticism of the independence of Spartan girls aligns him ideologically with Andromache, who

[45] Hall 1989: 214.
[46] Morwood 2000: 154 argues that Andromache's outburst is justified by her treatment by Hermione and Menelaus, while Lloyd 2005: 134 and Stevens 1971: 148 both note its relevance to the dramatic situation.
[47] Lloyd 2005: 134 argues that Andromache's words gain resonance from the Peloponnesian War, and Stevens 1971: 148 suggests that they are influenced by patriotic sentiment. Jardé 1923: 211 claims that the tirade 'répond admirablement aux sentiments du peuple athénien après 421', and suggests that the play was composed between 421-17.

reflects the traditional feminine virtues of submission and devotion to her husband. However, the primary targets of Peleus' tirade are Helen and Hermione. Immediately before these words, he denounced Helen's chastity, labelling her πασῶν κακίστην (595), and immediately after he taunts Menelaus over Helen's unfaithfulness (602-4). In addition, Peleus recounts his hesitation over letting Neoptolemus marry the daughter of such a disreputable mother (619-23).

Although Peleus' diatribe is directed at Spartan women, it is also a criticism of Menelaus. As Lloyd notes, Peleus rebukes Menelaus for his inability to control women (592-3, 627-31) and his consistent readiness to kill because of them (605-15, 624-6, 632-4),[48] even holding him accountable for the death of his son Achilles (614-15). Furthermore, Peleus criticises Menelaus' excessive force when he ties Andromache up (719), suggesting that he is afraid that Andromache will attack him: ἢ μὴ ξίφος λαβοῦσ᾽ ἀμυνάθοιτό σε / ἔδεισας; (721-2). In keeping with the theme of Spartan violence, Peleus claims that Spartans only excel in one activity, warfare (724-6). Despite the Spartans' prowess in this field, Peleus asserts that Menelaus is unworthy of his reputation at Troy (703-5), sentiments which are echoed by Andromache (οὐκ ἀξιῶ / οὔτ᾽ οὖν σὲ Τροίας οὔτε σοῦ Τροίαν ἔτι, 328-9, cf. 456-7), who also calls him a puffed up nobody (319-20) and a φαῦλος (325), ranking Neoptolemus above him (341).[49]

Once again, just like the Spartan accusations of Trojan barbarism, it is necessary to assess whether or not these stereotypes of Spartan behaviour are supported by the Spartans' conduct in the play.

Spartan conduct

Hermione is consistently characterised negatively.[50] From the first reference to her, the audience is reminded that Hermione is a Spartan (τὴν Λάκαιναν Ἑρμιόνην, 29),[51] a fact which is repeatedly emphasised (194, 486, 889).[52] This is relevant to the discourse on

[48] Lloyd 2005: 142. Kyriakou 1997: 13 asserts that Peleus presents Menelaus as an incorrigible dupe and a weak cuckold (602-12, 619-23, 627-31).
[49] Torrance 2005: 42.
[50] Amoroso 1994: 140-41 asserts that she represents 'tutti i difetti che l'uomo ateniese poteva trovare nella moglie'.
[51] Stevens 1971: 95.
[52] Stevens 1971: 115 observes that Euripides constantly reminds the audience of the Spartan nationality of Hermione and Menelaus.

Greeks and barbarians, because, as Papadodima notes, it places the negative emphasis on her location of birth rather than her Greekness.[53] Hermione derives pleasure from imagining Andromache prostrating herself before her in the manner of barbarian *proskynesis* (δεῖ σ'… πτῆξαι ταπεινὴν προσπεσεῖν τ᾽ ἐμὸν γόνυ, 164-5), and her nurse chastises her for publicly revealing her breast (κάλυπτε στέρνα, σύνδησον πέπλους, 832), an almost barbaric display of public female nudity which reveals Hermione's shameless nature.[54] In fact, it even recalls Peleus' condemnation of the promiscuity of Spartan women (πέπλοις ἀνειμένοις, 598). Similarly, the same verb is used to describe Hermione deserting Neoptolemus' home (ἐξερημοῦσαν, 991) and the Spartan girls leaving their homes for the athletic fields (ἐξερημοῦσαι, 597).[55] As Dué points out, Hermione's identity as a sex-crazed murderess (161-2, 241-2, 245) undercuts her denigration of Andromache, blurring the distinction between Greek and Trojan,[56] and her bold speech throughout the first half of the play is consistent with the widespread belief that Spartan women were more licentious and undisciplined than Athenian women, particularly in their speech.[57]

However, in the second half of the play, Hermione's bold speech is replaced by panic and regret. She regrets plotting against Andromache, understanding the significance of her actions (805-6), feeling pain (μεταλγεῖ, 814), and acknowledging her violent audacity: κατὰ… τόλμας στένω δαΐας (837). Lloyd identifies two underlying causes of Hermione's regret: fear that Neoptolemus will punish her upon his return, and the realisation that she has wronged him.[58] Hermione is certainly afraid of Neoptolemus (πόσιν τρέμουσα, 808), that he will either expel her ἐκ τῶνδ᾽ ἀτίμως δωμάτων (809), or even kill her (ὀλεῖ ὀλεῖ με, 856; cf. 920, 927). She knows that she has done wrong (815, 920), but there is disagreement over the sincerity of Hermione's apparent remorse. Some believe she is

[53] Papadodima 2010: 18 n.27.
[54] McClure 1999: 194. Lloyd 2005: 155 argues that Hermione's decision to expose her breast as well as her head confirms her lack of shame.
[55] Rabinowitz 1984: 116 notes that Hermione duplicates behaviour she regards as barbaric (170-73) by marrying her husband's murderer, Orestes.
[56] Dué 2006: 162.
[57] McClure 1999: 164-5.
[58] Lloyd 2005: 153.

feigning her repentance,[59] while others are hesitant to dismiss it.[60] In any case, Hermione makes it very clear that her regret is for having wronged Neoptolemus (δῆλα καὶ ἀμφιφανῆ καὶ ἄκρυπτα δε-/δράκαμεν πόσιν, 834-5), not Andromache and her child, so there is certainly no compassion or nobility in her regret,[61] irrespective of its dubious sincerity.

Despite her apparent change of heart, Hermione's immaturity emerges in her attempt to avoid responsibility for her actions.[62] She blames not herself, but the κακῶν γυναικῶν εἴσοδοί (930), and Neoptolemus himself, for letting such women visit her (943-6). Similarly, Hermione blames Andromache for making her infertile with poisons (157-8), rather than addressing her own character faults, which Andromache suggests are to blame (205-31). Moreover, Hermione performs an incredibly emotional lamentation. She threatens to tear her hair and scratch her cheeks (σπάραγμα κόμας ὀνύχων τε / δάι' ἀμύγματα θήσομαι, 826-7), publicly reveals her breast (830-33), and prepares to stab herself (841-2) or jump off a cliff (ποῦ… ἐκ πέτρας ἀερθῶ, 848). While tearing one's hair, disfiguring one's face and rending clothes are traditional actions of mourners, as Lloyd notes, Hermione's actions are disproportionate to her present circumstances.[63] Her excessive response becomes clear when her nurse repeatedly reassures her that her fears are unfounded, as Neoptolemus will forgive her (840) and will not divorce her (869-70). In fact, the nurse even equates Hermione's excessive fear (δειμαίνεις ἄγαν, 868) with the excessive nature of her crime (τὸ λίαν, 866).[64] Accordingly, Euripides presents an ironic contrast between Andromache's resolute response to actual danger and Hermione's excessive emotional response to imaginary danger.[65]

[59] Papadimitropoulos 2006: 151 believes it is theatrical, while McClure 1999: 193 suggests that her changed perspective demonstrates her lack of self-control. Stevens 1971: 192 is sceptical that σύννοια (805) can mean 'repentance/remorse', and Kovacs 1980: 72 advises against regarding Hermione as ennobled by her grief or as growing in moral stature.
[60] Allan 2000: 106 argues that Hermione's motives for changing her mind are not necessarily morally negligible.
[61] Aldrich 1961: 44 notes the absence of a moral sense of guilt on Hermione's part.
[62] Papadimitropoulos 2006: 151.
[63] Lloyd 2005: 155.
[64] According to McClure 1999: 194, this proves the truth of Peleus' invective, as excess governs all Hermione's actions.
[65] Lloyd 2005: 5. Allan 2000: 99 also notes a hysterical excess in Hermione's anti-barbarian tirade (170-76), whereas Torrance 2005: 47 argues that Hermione's insecurities are psychologically understandable.

Menelaus fares little better in his portrayal. Mattison identifies tyranny, violence, and austerity as three key themes when evaluating Athenian assumptions about Sparta,[66] concluding that Menelaus possesses the first two characteristics.[67] He arrogantly asserts his intellectual superiority to Andromache (ἀλλ᾽ ἐφηυρέθης / ἧσσον φρονοῦσα τοῦδε Μενέλεω, γύναι, 312-13), and the inferiority of Andromache's ethnicity (645-9). Despite Andromache's pleading, reasoning, and invective, Menelaus remains unmoved, and the main purpose of the exchange between them (309-463) is to demonstrate his unscrupulous and ruthless brutality.[68] However, despite his ruthless exterior, Menelaus is often derided for his weakness. Peleus mocks his weakness for Helen (605-9, 627-31),[69] and this, as Allan observes, along with Menelaus' military imperiousness (693-705), serves as a parallel to Hermione's (sexual) selfishness and obsession with power.[70] Even his departure from the scene of the play is suspect:

> ἄπειμ᾽ ἐς οἴκους· ἔστι γάρ τις οὐ πρόσω
> Σπάρτης πόλις τις, ἣ πρὸ τοῦ μὲν ἦν φίλη,
> νῦν δ᾽ ἐχθρὰ ποιεῖ· τήνδ᾽ ἐπεξελθεῖν θέλω
> στρατηλατήσας χὐποχείριον λαβεῖν. 733-6

This could either be a feeble *ad hoc* excuse,[71] supporting Peleus' accusation of cowardice (721-2),[72] or another reflection of Menelaus' brutality, as he intends to use force to control a city in revolt.[73] The former seems more likely, as it supports Menelaus' general portrayal in the play as a weak and cowardly man who does not live up to his reputation. Irrespective of which possibility Euripides intended, the circumstances of Menelaus' departure further reinforce his negative characteristics.

The most despicable quality of Menelaus, however, is his duplicity. Despite earlier assuring Andromache that her son would be safe if she left Thetis' sanctuary (381, cf.

[66] Mattison 2009: 78-9.
[67] Mattison 2009: 84
[68] Stevens 1971: 134.
[69] Aldrich 1961: 34 believes that Menelaus' greatest weakness is a systematic susceptibility to his family's women.
[70] Allan 2000: 66. Similarly, Kyriakou 1997: 12 notes that the selfish, greedy, and cruel Hermione resembles her opportunistic and petty father.
[71] Lloyd 2005: 148.
[72] Allan 2000: 104. Conacher 1967: 179 interprets Menelaus' departure as an example of Spartan cowardice opposed by Phthian valour.
[73] Mattison 2009: 85. Conversely, Van der Valk 1985a: 96 argues that Menelaus attempts to present his departure as honourable, as his claim that he is forced to take reprisals indicates that he is unwilling to capture a city wantonly.

314-15), upon her exit, Menelaus openly admits his mendacity (427-9) and places the fate of Andromache's son in Hermione's hands: τὰ δ' ἀμφὶ παιδὸς τοῦδε παῖς ἐμὴ κρινεῖ (431).[74] Moreover, in Sophocles' *Hermione*, Hermione was given to Orestes by Tyndareus while Menelaus was at Troy, but then given to Neoptolemus after the war.[75] However, in Euripides' *Andromache*, Orestes relates how Menelaus originally promised him Hermione before reneging on the agreement (966-70). In contrast with Sophocles, Euripides stresses the duplicitous role of Menelaus,[76] as he alters the mythology to accentuate Menelaus' deceitfulness.

Even though he is not a Spartan, Orestes aligns himself with the Spartan cause and is similarly deceitful. As McClure notes, Orestes' opening words betray his deceitful and dissembling character,[77] as he claims that he has come to inquire after his cousin (886-9), only later revealing his true purpose: the seduction of Hermione (957-67). His deceitfulness is also stressed by the patronymic Κλυταιμήστρας τόκος (1115), which the messenger applies to Orestes when describing his scheming.[78] In her anti-Spartan tirade, Andromache denigrates the Spartans as μηχανορράφοι (447), a term later applied to Orestes (1116), a cognate of which is also used of Hermione (ἔρραψας, 911). Through the cognates of ῥάπτειν, Euripides equates Orestes' own erotic scheming and the feminine domestic treachery of Hermione, as they both plan to eliminate their sexual rivals.[79] Accordingly, Orestes appears to be a perfect match for Hermione, as he demonstrates the scheming and deceit which is characteristic of the Spartans.[80]

According to Erskine, the Spartans in the *Andromache* exhibit mendacity, greed, treachery, cowardice, lack of control over women, and hunger for power.[81] All these qualities are arguably present in Hermione and Menelaus. Hermione is characterised as young and emotional, and excess pervades her behaviour. She lacks any sense of shame and expresses an irrational fear when her plot fails. Similarly, Menelaus is excessively

[74] Morwood 2000: 154 labels Menelaus' deceitful exploitation of the rules of sanctuary as contemptible.
[75] Lloyd 2005: 2; Boulter 1966: 51.
[76] Allan 2000: 17.
[77] McClure 1999: 195.
[78] Kyriakou 1997: 22 argues that Orestes is a hardened criminal, and Conacher 1967: 169 notes that Euripides' portrayal of Orestes as a self-seeking dastard contrasts with his pious presentation in Sophocles' *Hermione*.
[79] McClure 1999: 195.
[80] *Pace* Page 1936: 227 n.2, who is almost alone in defending Orestes' character.
[81] Erskine 2001: 76.

harsh and ruthless, yet also derided for his cowardice and weakness. His most prominent trait is his duplicity, and Euripides even alters the mythological tradition to stress this quality. Their conduct, ironically, closely aligns them with the eastern barbarian stereotype.

Who are the real barbarians?

As this chapter has shown, the issue of barbarism in the *Andromache* is complex. Ethnically, Andromache is the barbarian, as she is a Trojan, while the Spartans are Greeks. The Spartans often label Andromache a barbarian, and Hermione even offers a critique of the barbarian race. However, Andromache and Peleus both offer scathing criticisms of Spartan morality and honesty. Which ethnic stereotype, if any, is endorsed by the play? This chapter has argued that Andromache, through her noble and honourable behaviour, transcends the accusations levelled against her, which are shown to be groundless. She in no way represents a stereotypical eastern barbarian. Conversely, Hermione and Menelaus consistently act in a way which lends credence to the accusations of Andromache and Peleus.[82]

As Mattison explains, acquired cultural behaviour, rather than ethnicity, determines the positive or negative attributes of the characters in the *Andromache*.[83] If Euripides wished to present Andromache as a stereotypical eastern barbarian, he would have made her behave like one, which, coupled with the Spartan accusations, would present an unambiguous image to the audience. But this is not the case. Instead, if any race is barbarised in the *Andromache*, it is the Spartan race, as the Spartans repeatedly act with cruelty, violence, and deceit.[84] As Erskine observes, the Spartans are the real barbarians, as they behave like barbarians.[85] As a result, Euripides deliberately blurs the Greek/barbarian polarity,[86] perhaps inviting his audience to question and challenge the

[82] *Pace* Aldrich 1961: 58, who argues that both anti-Spartan tirades are anachronistic and refer to the time of the Peloponnesian War.
[83] Mattison 2009: 77.
[84] Conversely, Torrance 2005: 63 believes that a fifth-century slave-owning audience would have understood Menelaus' and Hermione's point of view.
[85] Erskine 2001: 76; cf. Mattison 2009: 83-4. Erbse 1966: 279 argues that the Spartans' villainy increases Andromache's nobility: 'Andromache's Entschlußkraft und Edelmut… sich von Mal zu Mal steigern, je hemmungsloser sich die Schurkereien der Gegner hervorwagen'.
[86] Stavrinou 2014: 395 n.33 suggests that a paradoxical polarity (in terms of morality and conduct) of Spartans against Phthians is created instead.

accuracy of such stereotypes, as he employs a foreign female slave to demonstrate the best noble Greek qualities.[87]

However, although Andromache does not act like a stereotypical eastern barbarian, behaviour is merely one factor to take into account when evaluating a barbarian stereotype. Another important factor is attachment to luxury.

3. Excessive wealth and luxury

Trojan and Spartan luxury

Displays of excessive luxury are a key aspect of the eastern barbarian stereotype. At the outset of the play, Andromache recalls her lavish dowry, as she came to Troy ἔδνων σὺν πολυχρύσῳ χλιδῇ (2). This is reminiscent of her Homeric epithet πολύδωρος (*Il.* 6.394; 22.88), and according to Morwood, it reminds the audience of the vast wealth of the east.[88] She also refers to her previous status as a ruler in Troy (ἀνάσσῃ, 65; τύραννος… Φρυγῶν, 204), and Hermione mentions Priam's wealth (168-9). However, these references to Trojan wealth are scarce, and in any case refer to past wealth, not to the present, and so are less relevant. After all, Andromache is now a slave in a foreign territory. As Saïd observes, Trojan wealth is often removed from its former possessors and has passed into Greek hands.[89]

As soon as she enters the play, Hermione immediately describes the luxurious clothes she is wearing and their origins:[90]

> κόσμον μὲν ἀμφὶ κρατὶ χρυσέας χλιδῆς
> στολμόν τε χρωτὸς τόνδε ποικίλων πέπλων
> οὐ τῶν Ἀχιλλέως οὐδὲ Πηλέως ἀπὸ
> δόμων ἀπαρχὰς δεῦρ᾽ ἔχουσ᾽ ἀφικόμην,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ Λακαίνης Σπαρτιάτιδος χθονὸς
> Μενέλαος ἡμῖν ταῦτα δωρεῖται πατὴρ
> πολλοῖς σὺν ἔδνοις, ὥστ᾽ ἐλευθεροστομεῖν. 147-53

[87] Muich 2010: 167.
[88] Morwood 2000: 148. Similarly, Lloyd 2005: 109 argues that it hints at the extravagant wealth of the east, mythical Troy, and contemporary Persia.
[89] Saïd 2002: 66.
[90] Stavrinou 2014: 395 n.33 maintains that here Hermione is associated with the barbarian characteristics of proneness to luxury and wealth, and Cacciatore 2003: 46 asserts that Hermione's entrance 'manifesta immediatamente la sua hybris'.

Hermione is adorned with a beautiful headdress and garment (147-8), which she brought from Sparta (151-2) and which provides her with the right to free speech (ἐλευθεροστομεῖν, 153). The parallels with Andromache's opening are immediately obvious and include shared vocabulary (χρυσέας χλιδῆς, 147; cf. πολυχρύσῳ χλιδῇ, 2). The gorgeously dressed Hermione would provide a striking visual contrast with Andromache, whose costume would have reflected her slave status.[91] While Andromache's wealth belongs to the past, Hermione's belongs to the present. In fact, since the play takes place after the Trojan War, there is a chance that some of Hermione's finery and accessories are actually Trojan plunder, which would certainly easternise Hermione in an unambiguous way.[92] Accordingly, Saïd concludes that Greece, which has become a haven of wealth, is no longer distinguishable from the barbarian universe.[93] Although Saïd's statement is a mild exaggeration, Hermione certainly has an affinity for luxury, as she later mentions her golden urns (χρυσηλάτων / τευχέων, 166-7). Her large dowry may even be responsible for the dysfunction of her union with Neoptolemus,[94] as Andromache accuses Hermione of belittling Neoptolemus' lack of wealth (209-12). In any event, Hermione is associated with excessive luxury more than Andromache.

Attitudes towards wealth and luxury

Hermione's obsession with wealth is also evident in the significance she attributes to it. Essentially, she believes that her rich dowry guarantees her power and status within her marriage,[95] including the right to speak her mind (ἐλευθεροστομεῖν, 153). She is supported in this view by her nurse, who reassures her that her substantial dowry increases her importance and status (871-3). Yet, as McClure notes, the lack of rhetorical and intellectual substance in Hermione's *rhesis* shows her to be concerned mostly with superficial appearance,[96] an assertion which is strengthened by her preoccupation with wealth and luxury.

On the other end of the spectrum sits Peleus, who praises a poor but honest man over a rich but worthless man:

[91] Lloyd 2005: 117.
[92] Mattison 2009: 89.
[93] Saïd 2002: 66.
[94] Papadimitropoulos 2006: 149.
[95] Lloyd 2005: 118.
[96] McClure 1999: 172. Kyriakou 1997: 12 argues that reliance on and exploitation of her wealth is Hermione's most repugnant feature.

κύδιον βροτοῖς
πένητα χρηστὸν ἢ κακὸν καὶ πλούσιον
γαμβρὸν πεπᾶσθαι καὶ φίλον· 639-41

As Allan notes, Peleus' speech subverts the Spartans' connection of wealth and moral superiority, and stresses instead inborn excellence and the priority of personal over material values.[97] With these words, Peleus distances himself from the Spartan viewpoint and offers an alternative philosophy, demonstrating that not all Greeks are like the Spartans.

Although there are several references to Andromache's past wealth, Hermione is the character who embodies an obsession with wealth and luxury, strengthening the thesis of barbarised Spartans. However, in the eastern barbarian stereotype, servility is just as important as excessive luxury.

4. Servility

A crucial aspect of the eastern barbarian stereotype is an excessive predisposition to servility. Andromache's slavery is repeatedly stressed. As Papadodima notes, there are two different intentions behind these references: some are pejorative and associate her slavery with her barbarism, while others merely represent a grim reality which deprives Andromache of the opportunity to defend herself.[98] The former intention is clear from Spartan references to her slavery, as Hermione (155, 860) and Menelaus (434) are the only characters to refer to Andromache as a δούλη.[99] This, combined with Andromache's constant reminders of her slave status (e.g. 25, 199-200, 328) and her apparent acceptance of her new status by addressing her handmaid as σύνδουλε (64),[100] could suggest that Andromache is deliberately portrayed as servile.

However, Euripides presents Andromache's slavery as a condition imposed upon her (νόμος), not as part of her nature (φύσις). The most neutral representation of Andromache's current status is the term αἰχμάλωτος,[101] and this is used by almost every

[97] Allan 2000: 186. Boulter 1966: 56 identifies the divergent opinions: Peleus associates wealth with baseness, Hermione associates it with power.
[98] Papadodima 2010: 16-17.
[99] Andromache also refers to herself as a δούλη (328), deliberately denigrating herself to highlight the absurdity of Menelaus competing against her (327-8).
[100] Lee 1975: 10 notes that this contradicts her handmaid's previous address to her as δέσποινα (56).
[101] Muich 2010: 139.

character, including Menelaus (583), the Spartan nurse (871), Hermione (908, 932), Orestes (962), the chorus (1059), and Thetis (1243). Conversely, δούλη is applied to Andromache most frequently by the Trojan herself (12, 114, 325, 401), followed by the hostile Hermione (155, 860, 933) and Menelaus (434). In addition, Andromache openly detests her slavery, denouncing it as a δουλοσύναν στυγερὰν (110), and declares that she is from τῶν ἐλευθερωτάτων / οἴκων (12-13). These assertions are complemented by her behaviour, which is inconsistent with what would be expected from a slave.[102] She often refers to her past status as a ruler of Troy (65, 204), and her handmaid, addressing her as δέσποιν' (56), clearly does not regard Andromache as a true slave.[103] Accordingly, Andromache is not a natural slave, but rather slavery is imposed on her, and Mattison is correct to argue that the Trojan characters' class before the Greek conquest is more significant than their ethnicity alone.[104] Slavery can be imposed on anyone and does not necessarily indicate the natural servility of that person, as even Hermione, a free Greek, fears that she may be degraded to a slave's level (927-8; cf. 860).[105]

Andromache does not display stereotypical eastern barbarian behaviour, nor is she associated with excessive luxury or a predisposition towards servility. Instead, she is one of the heroes of the play, and Euripides evokes significant pathos for her.

5. Pathos

Pathos is a significant theme from the outset of the play, where both the staging, which presents Andromache as a suppliant, and the words of her opening soliloquy, which provide her own perspective, align sympathies with the foreign woman.[106] Andromache's frequent references to her circumstances are a powerful source of pathos. She refers to her misery (ὦ δύστηνος, 71; ἀθλία, 385; τάλαινα, 534; δυσδαίμονα, 751), a view shared by her handmaid (ὦ δύστηνε σύ, 68), and to her ill-fortune (δυστυχεστάτη γυνή, 6; δυστυχεῖ, 65, cf. 386). She relates how she witnessed the σφαγὰς... Ἕκτορος τροχηλάτους (399), before being dragged herself by the hair (κόμης ἐπισπασθεῖσ', 402) to the Argive

[102] Torrance 2005: 64 suggests that a fifth-century audience would find Andromache's aggression towards Hermione and Menelaus inappropriate.
[103] Torrance 2005: 43 observes that Andromache treats the maidservant as her slave, despite addressing her as σύνδουλε (64).
[104] Mattison 2009: 123.
[105] Synodinou 1977: 110 argues that no groups of people in Euripides are predestined to be slaves or free.
[106] Stavrinou 2014: 390. Cacciatore 2003: 39 observes that in the prologue 'il passato e il presente s'intrecciano con un alternarsi di toni ora dolorosi ora melanconici'.

ships and forced to marry the son of her husband's murderer (403), an account which stresses the degrading aspect of her sufferings.[107] Even her handmaid's opening address to her, δέσποιν' (56), serves the dual purpose of increasing the pathos of Andromache's fallen status, and reaffirming her true nobility.[108]

Euripides evokes further pathos for Andromache through *Iliadic* allusions. She opens the play with the words Ἀσιάτιδος γῆς σχῆμα, Θηβαία πόλι (1), invoking her hometown Thebe, an invocation which recalls her vivid description of its violent destruction (*Il.* 6.413-28).[109] Andromache later delivers a lament in elegiac metre (103-16), the only such instance in extant Greek tragedy,[110] which draws attention to the subject matter of the lament: the destruction of Troy (103-6), the death of Hector (107-8), and her own misery (109-16). She pitifully recounts how she abandoned her husband ἐν κονίαις (112), a Homeric expression which recalls the Homeric ἐν κονίῃσι πεσών (e.g. *Il.* 11.425).[111] However, in the *Iliad* Hector is not left in the dust, but is afforded full burial rites (24.788-804). Either Andromache is exaggerating her misfortune, or Euripides is deliberately altering the epic tradition.[112] Either way, the effect is to evoke the audience's sympathy for Andromache. Lastly, Andromache's reference to wearing slavery like a veil (δουλοσύναν στυγερὰν ἀμφιβαλοῦσα κάρᾳ, 110) recalls the highly emotional scene in the *Iliad* where she casts off her veil as she faints upon seeing Hector being dragged in the dust (*Il.* 22.466-72).

Despite its Greek identity, the chorus repeatedly emphasises its sympathy for Andromache. The first quality which strikes the audience at the beginning of the parodos is the chorus' compassion for the outcast Andromache.[113] Although she acknowledges her Phthian identity, the chorus leader nevertheless expresses her desire to help the Asiatic Andromache (Φθιὰς ὅμως ἔμολον ποτὶ σὰν Ἀσιήτιδα γένναν, 119), transcending the divide between Greek and Trojan. Stevens argues that the chorus is a little condescending to Andromache here and at 127-8 (δεσπόταις ἁμιλλᾷ / Ἰλιὰς οὖσα κόρα Λακεδαίμονος

[107] Lloyd 2005: 132.
[108] Allan 2000: 54.
[109] Davidson 1999: 124.
[110] Lloyd 2005: 113; Allan 2000: 55; Page 1936: 206. Hall 2000: xxxix attributes an unusual poignancy to the lament due to its uniqueness.
[111] Davidson 1999: 117-8.
[112] Dué 2006: 158 suggests that Andromache's lament is a generic lament on behalf of all the Trojan women.
[113] Aldrich 1961: 28.

ἐγγενέτῃσιν;),[114] but it seems more likely that the chorus is attempting to keep Andromache grounded in reality by reminding her of her current status.[115] In any case, the chorus unmistakeably sympathises with Andromache for her misfortune (ὦ δυστυχεστάτα, 139) and wretchedness (οἰκτροτάτα, 141), and this sympathy is unhindered by Andromache's Trojan identity, which the chorus highlights by addressing her as γύναι Ἰλιάς (141). Conversely, the chorus regards Hermione rather differently, expressing fear of her (142-3) and portraying her as a tyrant who suppresses all opposition (145-6). The chorus remains consistent in its sympathy for Andromache, later reiterating its stance (ᾤκτιρ᾽ ἀκούσασ᾽, 421) and once again acknowledging that Andromache's foreignness is irrelevant, since οἰκτρὰ… τὰ δυστυχῆ / βροτοῖς ἅπασι, κἂν θυραῖος ὢν κυρῇ (421-2).[116] Not only does the chorus pity Andromache, but it also extends its sympathy to all Trojan women, highlighting the war's effect on them (301-2) and lamenting the fall of Troy from a Trojan perspective (1009-27).

Euripides repeatedly evokes pathos for Andromache throughout the play. This is another way Euripides blurs the distinction between Greek and barbarian, as the most sympathetic character is a Trojan woman,[117] while the Spartans receive a most unfavourable portrayal.[118] The reason why Euripides decides to elevate a Trojan woman with such honourable conduct and poignant pathos can be partly explained by the play's ending, which provides some clues as to the play's context and the motivation behind its composition.

6. The ending of the *Andromache*

The Molossian connection

Thetis' speech at the end of the play outlines how Andromache will inhabit Molossia (1244) and marry the Trojan Helenus (1245), while her son will be the sole survivor of Aeacus' family (1246-7) and his descendants will be prosperous and rule over Molossia (1248-9). Although Pindar mentions the Molossians' descent from Neoptolemus (*N.* 7.38-

[114] Stevens 1971: 110.
[115] Muich 2010: 141 argues that the chorus' reminders (e.g. 136-9) are not intended as insults, and Lloyd 2005: 116 observes that any criticism quickly gives way to strong pity.
[116] Allan 2000: 211 notes that Andromache's despair and self-sacrifice excite the chorus-leader's pity for her.
[117] Dué 2006: 113 argues that Andromache retains the sympathy of all.
[118] As Hall 1989: 213 observes, the fervour of the attack on the Spartans forces the audience into comparing them with the courageous Andromache, and pitying her.

40), Euripides innovates by having Neoptolemus settle in Thessaly, which allows him to present the Molossian dynasty as a divinely sanctioned consolation for the Aeacid house.[119] This emphasis on the Molossian kingdom, as well as the comment of a scholiast that οὐ δεδίδακται… Ἀθήνησιν (Σ *ad* 445),[120] have led scholars to speculate that the play could have been initially performed outside of Athens, perhaps even in Molossia.[121] As Lloyd notes, Athens certainly had interests in north-western Greece during the Archidamian War (431-21),[122] and Thessaly remained favourable to Athens throughout the reign of Daochus of Pharsalus (Th. 4.78.2; cf. 4.132; 8.3).[123]

The play may even have been intended to compliment the young Molossian king Tharyps. According to Thucydides (2.80), the Peloponnesians attacked Acarnania in 429, and among their allies was a Molossian contingent, led by Sabylinthus, the ἐπίτροπος… Θάρυπος τοῦ βασιλέως ἔτι παιδὸς ὄντος (Th. 2.80.6). Shortly afterwards, Tharyps came to Athens and received Athenian citizenship, an extraordinary honour, probably intended to court Molossian support.[124] Since the *Andromache* was probably produced in the mid-420s,[125] Robertson suggests that the *Andromache* may have been Euripides' parting gift to Tharyps, and that it may have been performed in Molossia, as the fate of their king's great ancestor would have been of great interest to a Molossian audience.[126] Although he concedes that it is unlikely that Euripides wrote the entire play for Tharyps, Robertson argues that he probably adapted an unpublished or unfinished work by introducing and emphasising topical points.[127] This argument is not universally accepted, [128] but remains a possibility and cannot be ignored.

---

[119] Allan 2000: 152.
[120] Butrica 2001: 189 observes that the *Andromache* did not appear in the didascaliae.
[121] Hall 2000: xxx suggests that it was written for the royal house of the kingdom of Molossia, a notion which Butrica 2001: 196 finds plausible in light of the later *Archelaus*, its Macedonian equivalent. Conversely, Storey 1993: 180 regards the evidence of external production as most doubtful, and Van der Valk 1985a: 58 asserts that it was definitely performed at Athens. Cairns 2012: 39 suggests performance in Molossia and/or Thessaly instead of, or in addition to, Athens.
[122] Lloyd 2005: 175.
[123] Allan 2000: 156.
[124] Allan 2000: 153.
[125] Storey 1993: 188, who notes that 425 is the most frequently proposed date. Van der Valk 1985a: 75 suggests a date between 428 (*Hippolytus*) and 425 (Sphacteria).
[126] Robertson 1923: 59. Butrica 2001: 190 asserts that Neoptolemus' rehabilitation, Peleus' deification, and the courage of Andromache and Peleus represent the current king's ancestors in the most heroic and admirable light possible.
[127] Robertson 1923: 60.
[128] Conacher 1967: 180 asserts that Robertson's argument would be more convincing if Euripides had invented the Molossian ending to the Andromache legend.

While Allan is right to warn against interpreting the play's positive references to Thessaly and Molossia or its anti-Spartan sentiments as purely propaganda,[129] they are nevertheless important and can shed light on Andromache's favourable portrayal. If part of Euripides' purpose in composing the play was to grant heroic ancestors to the Molossians and honour them for their contribution in the Peloponnesian War, then he would naturally avoid barbarising the Trojans, who constitute one half of that heroic ancestry.

The heroic Phthians

This argument is strengthened by Euripides' positive portrayal of the Phthians, particularly Neoptolemus. Neoptolemus' death, related by the messenger (1114-60), is admirably heroic. He stands his ground, warding off the Delphians' missiles with his shield (1129-31), an action reminiscent of Ajax in the *Iliad* (11.569-74). As Cairns explains, the steps and postures of pyrrhic dancers mimicked defensive military tactics, so the messenger's observation δεινὰς… ἂν εἶδες πυρρίχας (1135) appears to condemn Neoptolemus' murder by implying that his actions were essentially defensive.[130] Moreover, the patronymic Ἀχιλλέως... / παῖς (1149-50) associates Neoptolemus with the heroism of his father, and the simile describing his rout of the Delphians (οἱ δ' ὅπως πελειάδες / ἱέρακ' ἰδοῦσαι πρὸς φυγὴν ἐνώτισαν, 1140-1) recalls an *Iliadic* simile (22.139-44) in which Achilles pursues Hector like a hawk (κίρκος) swooping on a dove (πέλεια). Even in his death, Neoptolemus is heroised, as all the Delphians rush up to disfigure his body (1152-5), a fate parallel to that of Hector: οὐδ' ἄρα οἵ τις ἀνουτητί γε παρέστη (*Il.* 22.371).

As Stevens observes, the account of Neoptolemus' death presents him as a simple and brave warrior while discrediting Delphi and Orestes.[131] This is in contrast to other versions of Neoptolemus' fate, some of which suggest that his death was deserved.[132] For instance, in Sophocles' *Hermione*, Neoptolemus' death is the result of his own hubris towards Apollo,[133] whereas in Euripides' version Neoptolemus visits Delphi to apologise

[129] Allan 2000: 160. Van der Valk 1985a: 73 similarly argues that the *Andromache* is not a political play. Conversely, Sicalin 1983: 104 claims that the *Andromache* 'diente in starkem Maße der antispartanischen Propaganda'.
[130] Cairns 2012: 37. Borthwick 1967: 20 notes that manipulating the shield in defence (1131) and leaping in the air (1139) were the Pyrrhic dance's two principal features.
[131] Stevens 1971: 6. Allan 2000: 114 asserts that Neoptolemus' heroism stands opposed to the deceit and cowardice of the Spartans and Orestes.
[132] Conacher 1967: 169.
[133] Conacher 1967: 21.

to the god (49-55, 1106-8).[134] By portraying Neoptolemus sympathetically, Euripides ignores his traditional violent and impetuous nature.[135] Moreover, Neoptolemus is also contrasted with Menelaus. The messenger's description of Neoptolemus as a γοργός ὁπλίτης (1123) recalls Andromache's identical description of Menelaus (458). However, while Neoptolemus is squaring up for his heroic last stand against the Delphians, heavily outnumbered, Menelaus quarrels with a female slave, hardly a heroic endeavour. Menelaus is a false γοργὸς ὁπλίτης, while Neoptolemus is a real one. Although Neoptolemus is criticised by the chorus (465-70) and Orestes (909) for his disastrous decision to keep his wife and concubine under the same roof,[136] this does not detract from his heroism and honour.

Even the aged Peleus is heroised in the play, with a particular emphasis placed on his κλέος. The chorus describes his past military achievements, relating how he fought δορὶ / κλεινοτάτῳ (793-4) on the side of the Lapiths against the Centaurs (790-94). Since this is the first reference to Peleus' participation in the battle, it may be an invention of Euripides, who wanted to promote Peleus' renown as much as possible.[137] The chorus also describes his participation in the Argo's expedition (794-6), a famous voyage (κλεινὰν... ναυστολίαν, 796), and in the conquest of Troy by Heracles (797-801), where Peleus is presented as an equal partner of Heracles: κοινὰν τὰν εὔκλειαν ἔχοντ᾽ (800).[138] Moreover, Euripides heroises Peleus through his manner of speech. In contrast to Hermione, Menelaus, and Orestes, who all utilise stealth, Peleus speaks with an admirable heroic directness.[139]

Both Trojans and Phthians are portrayed positively in the *Andromache*, a fact Euripides accentuates by drawing connections between them. Throughout the play, Peleus is sympathetic to Andromache's cause,[140] and he only expresses contempt for the Spartans (595-604). In addition, the parallel between the death of Andromache's first husband, a Trojan, and her second husband, a Phthian (1152-5, cf. *Il.* 22.371), creates a special link

[134] Although Burnett 1971: 152-3 argues that Neoptolemus commits sacrilege by taking up Apollo's arms to fight (1121-2).
[135] Kyriakou 1997: 18-19.
[136] This also spells disaster for Agamemnon (A. *Ag.*) and Heracles (S. *Tr.*).
[137] Van der Valk 1985a: 68.
[138] Van der Valk 1985a: 68.
[139] Kovacs 1980: 76.
[140] Lloyd 2005: 5.

between the Trojan and Phthian royal families.[141] While Andromache easily assimilates to the house of Aeacus, this is something Hermione refuses to do, her refusal emphasised by her inability to bear children and the repeated reference to her as Menelaus' daughter by the chorus (486-7), Orestes (897), and Peleus (1049).[142] The strongest link between the two, however, is the child of Andromache and Neoptolemus, which will be the last son of the house of Aeacus (1246-7) and unite the Trojans and Aeacids. Accordingly, there seem to be two rival factions in the *Andromache*. The first consists of Andromache, Peleus, and Neoptolemus, who are presented as heroic and noble characters, the second of Hermione, Menelaus, and Orestes, who represent cruelty, violence, and mendacity.

Conclusion

Euripides' portrayal of ethnicity and culture in the *Andromache* is complex. The Spartans employ the rhetoric of polarity against Andromache, repeatedly labelling and denigrating her as a barbarian. However, this does not necessarily indicate that Euripides is barbarising the Trojans. In no way does Euripides' depiction of her align her with the eastern barbarian stereotype. She is a highly pathetic character, not at all servile or attached to luxury, and through her behaviour, particularly her impressive rhetorical skill and her devotion to female virtue and propriety, Andromache transcends the accusations of barbarism levelled against her. Instead, it is the Spartans who resemble barbarians and are demonised, Hermione for her excessive emotion, obsession with luxury, lack of shame, and irrationality, and Menelaus for his cruelty, violent tendencies, and mendacity. Unlike Andromache's case, the Spartans' conduct validates the ethnic stereotypes which are attributed to them by Andromache and Peleus.

It is possible that the Peloponnesian War context may be partly responsible for the Spartans' negative portrayal, and Andromache's noble depiction could be influenced by a desire to glorify the Molossians' ancestors, but to understand the play as mere political propaganda is simplistic and misleading. Among other themes and messages, the *Andromache* contains a sophisticated discourse on ethnic stereotypes and the Greek/barbarian polarity, one which caters to the diversity of Euripides' Athenian audience. Those who held xenophobic and prejudiced views against easterners would

[141] Allan 2000: 113 argues that it furthers the approximation of Trojan and Phthian interests.
[142] McClure 1999: 173.

have recognised and agreed with the Spartan diatribes against Andromache, but Euripides consistently challenges their convictions and exposes them as inaccurate through his portrayal of Andromache. Conversely, those who were more open-minded towards easterners would have been better positioned to appreciate the play's message that barbarism should be determined not by ethnic origin, but rather by one's conduct and morality, as Euripides presents a Trojan woman as a virtuous and honourable role model for contemporary Athenian women.

Chapter 3: The *Hecuba*

Introduction

This chapter investigates the Trojan portrayal in Euripides' *Hecuba*, assessing whether or not the play presents the Trojans as stereotypical eastern barbarians.

First, it will analyse the Trojan identification with Phrygians, the use of βάρβαρος, and the opposition between tyranny and democracy, before discussing the role of luxury and clothing in presenting a particular image of the Trojans. Then it will discuss the Trojans' status as slaves, after which the focus will switch to the Thracians and how they complicate the notion of a simple opposition between Greek and Trojan. After an evaluation of Hecuba's revenge against Polymestor, the chapter will conclude with an analysis of the substantial pity which Euripides evokes for the Trojans.

1. Greek vs. barbarian

Trojan identification with Phrygians

The Trojans are referred to as Phrygians eight times in the *Hecuba*. This identification is made by the Greeks Talthybius (492) and Agamemnon (1111), the Thracian Polymestor (1063, 1141), and the Trojans Polydorus (4), Polyxena (350), and Hecuba (776, 827). Since even the Trojans label themselves Phrygians, the identification itself is unlikely to be pejorative. In fact, the only instance of note is Talthybius' reference to the πολύχρυσοι Φρύγες (492), as it seems to present an ethnic stereotype of the Phrygians as abundantly wealthy. However, Talthybius is highly sympathetic towards the Trojans,[1] and his intention here is to contrast pathetically Hecuba's present degradation with her past fortune, a contrast reinforced by his description of Hecuba in the following line as Πριάμου τοῦ μέγ' ὀλβίου δάμαρ (493). He is hardly rebuking the Trojans for excessive luxuriousness. Once again, just like in the *Andromache*, the label Φρύξ does not appear to have pejorative connotations within the context of the play, supporting Collard's assertion that Trojans and Phrygians are free synonyms in tragedy.[2] The significance of the Trojan/Phrygian conflation has already been discussed at length in chapter 2, and the arguments expressed there are equally applicable to the *Hecuba*. Essentially, it adds

[1] See section 6 of this chapter.
[2] Collard 1991: 131.

realism to the Trojans and renders them more accessible to the Athenian audience, but is not intended to barbarise them, as this is unsupported by the rest of the play.

Use of βάρβαρος

The best evidence that the *Hecuba* barbarises the Trojans would be the persistent labelling and denigration of the Trojans as βάρβαροι. This is precisely what Odysseus does in his exchange with Hecuba:

> οἱ βάρβαροι δὲ μήτε τοὺς φίλους φίλους
> ἡγεῖσθε μήτε τοὺς καλῶς τεθνηκότας
> θαυμάζεθ᾽, ὡς ἂν ἡ μὲν Ἑλλὰς εὐτυχῇ,
> ὑμεῖς δ᾽ ἔχηθ᾽ ὅμοια τοῖς βουλεύμασιν. 328-31

Odysseus' words here are insulting,[3] and the nominative with the article (οἱ βάρβαροι, 328) in direct address is associated with speech to inferiors.[4] He contrasts Trojan customs with Greek practices and denigrates them as inferior, as they do not sufficiently honour their dead. At first glance, this may appear to indicate that the play presents Trojans as barbarians. However, Papadodima observes that many derogatory references to barbarism in Euripides are made in contexts where dubious Greek conduct is to be excused, explained or interpreted,[5] and the present case is no exception.[6] Odysseus' goal is to persuade Hecuba that Achilles should be honoured by sacrificing Polyxena, an action whose questionable morality is clear from the ambivalent Greek reactions toward it.[7] Accordingly, he links the Trojans' current misfortune to their allegedly uncivilised customs.

The argument that barbarians deserve misfortune for not honouring their dead properly is shallow and unconvincing,[8] and there is a certain irony in Odysseus defending human sacrifice as an appropriate demonstration of loyalty.[9] Since the Trojans' commitment to honour their dead is abundantly clear from *Iliad* 24, and since Odysseus generally receives a hostile portrayal in Euripides, the audience would most likely have rejected Odysseus' weak logic, as well as his labelling of the Trojans as uncivilised barbarians.

[3] Mossman 1995: 116-17.
[4] Gregory 1999: 85-6.
[5] Papadodima 2010: 40.
[6] Matthiessen 2008: 105.
[7] See section 6 of this chapter.
[8] Michelini 1987: 147.
[9] Lawrence 2010: 26 n.10.

Instead of presenting the Trojans as barbarians, these lines highlight the degeneracy of Odysseus' character as he employs a smug insult in an attempt to justify sacrificing an innocent and exemplary young girl.[10]

Unlike Odysseus, Agamemnon never refers to the Trojans as βάρβαροι. Instead, he employs the term twice to refer to the Thracian Polymestor. In the first instance, Agamemnon questions how Hecuba intends to kill Polymestor:

πότερα φάσγανον χερὶ
λαβοῦσα γραίᾳ φῶτα βάρβαρον κτενεῖς
ἢ φαρμάκοισιν ἢ 'πικουρίᾳ τινί; 876-8

The exact implications of βάρβαρος here are unclear. The term could simply mean 'non-Greek', but the context suggests that it may have pejorative connotations. By acknowledging the inferiority of the Thracian king, perhaps Agamemnon is seeking to justify to himself his complicity in Hecuba's revenge plot, or to reinforce to Hecuba that he favours her cause over Polymestor's.

Both of these motives are potentially present in Agamemnon's second use of the term, where he instructs Polymestor to speak ἐκβαλὼν… καρδίας τὸ βάρβαρον (1129). His injunction is peculiar because βάρβαρος does not refer to a person, but is employed in a neuter abstract form, 'the barbarian aspect'.[11] In any case, the implications are clear. In light of Polymestor's desire to tear Hecuba apart (1126) and lay his μαργῶσαν χέρα (1128) upon her, τὸ βάρβαρον is undoubtedly a reference to Polymestor's violence and savagery. Agamemnon is requesting a Greek manner of resolution through reason and law, as opposed to barbarian violence and threats,[12] as he appeals to Polymestor to put aside his barbaric ways. However, he has been consistently supportive of Hecuba throughout the play, so his denigration of Polymestor as barbaric may also be a means of justifying to himself his involvement in Hecuba's vengeance. Although Agamemnon refers to Polymestor's barbarism on two occasions, he never suggests or implies that any Trojan is a barbarian.[13]

[10] Matthiessen 2008: 32 describes Odysseus' words as 'nichts anderes als grausamer Hohn'.
[11] Saïd 2002: 87 notes that βάρβαρος acquires a purely moral connotation here (cf. *Hel.* 501).
[12] Barker 2009: 348.
[13] Accordingly, Meridor 1978: 32 concludes that Hecuba's revenge does not exclude her from civilised society.

Consequently, this leads to potential ambiguity when Hecuba outlines the uncompromising antipathy between Greeks and barbarians:

> ἀλλ᾽, ὦ κάκιστε, πρῶτον οὔποτ᾽ ἂν φίλον
> τὸ βάρβαρον γένοιτ᾽ ἂν Ἕλλησιν γένος
> οὐδ᾽ ἂν δύναιτο. 1199-1201

Some have regarded Hecuba's declaration as portraying an 'unbridgeable gulf'[14] separating the two races, or as indicating the 'inevitable natural hostility'[15] between Greeks and barbarians, and Edith Hall even labels it the theory of 'Panbarbarism'.[16] However, they have not satisfactorily addressed the question of who exactly constitutes τὸ βάρβαρον γένος. Does Hecuba have Trojans and Thracians in mind, or just the Thracians? As Barker points out, it is unclear whether Hecuba would include Trojans in the category of barbarian peoples, as elsewhere in Euripides she speaks of three distinct categories (*Tr.* 477-8).[17] The key lies in Hecuba's relationship with Agamemnon, particularly whether or not they are φίλοι. Hecuba appeals to φιλία in reference to Agamemnon's relationship with Cassandra (φίλας... εὐφρόνας, 828; φιλτάτων ἀσπασμάτων, 829), and when one adds Agamemnon's general sympathy for and willingness to help Hecuba (861-2), as well as the chorus' observation that custom can make the bitterest enemies friends (847-8), it is not implausible to suggest that Hecuba imagines herself and Agamemnon to be in a relationship of φιλία, however tenuous it may be.[18] If so, her declaration may only rule out the possibility of relationships of φιλία between Greeks and uncivilised barbarians like the Thracians, excluding from τὸ βάρβαρον γένος the civilised Trojans who are closer to the Greeks than the Thracians.[19]

Although he does not employ the term βάρβαρος, Agamemnon's rebuke of Polymestor for murdering his guest establishes a clear cultural opposition: τάχ᾽ οὖν παρ᾽ ὑμῖν ῥᾴδιον ξενοκτονεῖν· / ἡμῖν δέ γ᾽ αἰσχρὸν τοῖσιν Ἕλλησιν τόδε (1247-8). Here the divide is between the Thracians and the Greeks, and there is no implication that the Trojans fail to respect ξενία. As Mossman observes, Agamemnon seems to confirm Hecuba's words

[14] Saïd 2002: 70.
[15] Bacon 1961: 152.
[16] Hall 1989: 161.
[17] Barker 2009: 350 n.97.
[18] Conversely, Saïd 2002: 70 maintains that Hecuba's argument is only meant to refute the declarations of Polymestor (1175-7). However, Agamemnon's sympathy, support, and complicity in Hecuba's revenge plot undermine this argument.
[19] Segal 1993: 268 n.5 notes that Hecuba's use of the argument from kinship (834) suggests that the Trojans are less alien than the Thracians.

(1199-1201) here and with his earlier injunction to Polymestor (1129), suggesting that barbarian characteristics find no favour among Greeks.[20] However, it is telling that in both instances Agamemnon confines his criticism to Polymestor and never once accuses Hecuba or the Trojans of barbaric behaviour. Irrespective of his dubious claim to Greek moral superiority,[21] Agamemnon articulates a Greek/barbarian polarity which is confined to Greeks and Thracians, and he notably omits the Trojans from the dichotomy. Accordingly, one must not automatically assume that Hecuba includes the Trojans in her conception of τὸ βάρβαρον γένος.

To sum up, the Greek/barbarian distinction is rather clouded and uncertain, as is the precise location of the Trojans on the spectrum. Segal argues that both Trojans and Thracians are barbarians,[22] whereas Barker suggests that the Trojans are not barbarians, due to their longevity in Greek literature and their non-barbaric portrayal in the *Iliad*.[23] Others contend that the Trojans are both civilised and barbaric,[24] but the prevailing and most plausible view is that the Greek/barbarian distinction is fluid and attenuated.[25] Apart from Odysseus' insult (328-31), the Trojans are never labelled barbarians, and in light of her temporary alliance with Agamemnon,[26] it is reasonable to suppose that Hecuba excludes the Trojans when she declares that τὸ βάρβαρον γένος can never enjoy friendship with the Greeks. However, Agamemnon clearly regards Polymestor as a barbarian, a view supported by Polymestor's savage and violent behaviour.[27] But the possibility of the play endorsing a divide between Greeks and barbaric Thracians, with the Trojans enjoying the status of civilised non-Greeks, is undermined by the morally questionable actions performed by the Greeks.[28] If anything, the *Hecuba* provides glimpses of a Greek/barbarian polarity (328-31, 1129, 1199-1201, 1247-8), but the play

[20] Mossman 1995: 135.
[21] Segal 1993: 203 observes that the Greeks, have committed equally shameful deeds, and Saïd 2002: 85 identifies Polyxena's sacrifice as one such example.
[22] Segal 1993: 171.
[23] Barker 2009: 350 n.97.
[24] Burnett 1994: 157. Kovacs 1987: 116 claims that Hecuba and Polyxena are both barbarians and figures from the Greek heroic mould.
[25] Lawrence 2010: 25; Segal 1993: 186.
[26] Conacher 1967: 160-61 n.30 argues that the limited agreement between Hecuba and Agamemnon is dictated by self-interest on each side. However, he neglects Agamemnon's considerable sympathy for Hecuba, and Agamemnon hardly benefits directly from Polymestor's incapacitation.
[27] See section 4 of this chapter.
[28] Buxton 1982: 175-6 observes that the implied Greek moral superioritiy (328-31) is emphatically not corroborated by the play.

as a whole contradicts this rhetoric and consistently obfuscates the boundary between Greek and barbarian.

This blurring of ethnic boundaries is most evident when the chorus of Trojan women, lamenting the destruction of the war which resulted from Paris' judgement, expresses pity for the suffering Spartan women (650-56). Such profound sympathy for the Spartan women's tears (Λάκαινα πολυδάκρυτος, 651), losses (τέκνων θανόντων, 653), and violent expressions of grief (δίαιμον ὄνυχα τιθεμένα, 656) is unexpected and poignant, and constitutes further evidence for the collapse of the distinction between Greek and foreigner.[29] Later in the play, while recounting the sack of Troy, a chorus member compares herself to a Δωρὶς… κόρα (933), once again collapsing the Greek/barbarian distinction.[30] In this way, the chorus plays a key role in further blurring the divide between Greeks and foreigners.

Tyranny vs. Democracy

Some scholars have recently argued for a pervasive contrast between royalist Trojans and democratic Greeks in the *Hecuba*.[31] It is worth assessing the validity of this suggestion.

Although both Greeks and Trojans have kings, Erskine argues that Troy is repeatedly characterised as a tyranny, pointing to three instances in the *Hecuba*: Polydorus lamenting his mother's fall ἐκ τυραννικῶν δόμων (55) into a δούλειον ἦμαρ (56), Polyxena complaining that her λέχη… τυράννων πρόσθεν ἠξιωμένα (365-6) will be tarnished by a δοῦλος ὠνητός (365), and Hecuba mournfully comparing her past status with her present slavery: τύραννος ἦ ποτ᾽ ἀλλὰ νῦν δούλη (809).[32] Two points are worth making here. First, in all three instances a Trojan character is speaking. Nowhere in the play does a Greek label or accuse a Trojan of being a τύραννος, which one would expect if the play intentionally portrayed the Trojans as royalist Asians. Secondly, the context in each example involves the pathetic contrast between past royal status and present slavery. Accordingly, instead of characterising the Trojans as tyrants, the focus seems to be on

[29] Dué 2006: 111-12. Michelini 1987: 331 compares it to the sentimental identification between Greek and Trojan in Polyxena's death.
[30] Dué 2006: 19.
[31] Morwood 2014; Kovacs 1987: 78-114.
[32] Erskine 2001: 74-5; cf. Hall 1989: 156.

evoking pathos for the Trojans by outlining their spectacular fall from the highest possible authority to the lowest possible status.

In addition, Kovacs argues that in contrast to the Greeks, the Trojan royalty are accustomed to exalted rank and real authority.[33] It is true that βασιλεύς and its cognates are only applied to the Trojans (352, 552), and that ἄνασσα is applied to Hecuba on four occasions (61, 484, 492, 891) and ἄναξ to Priam once (349), but Agamemnon is also referred to as ἄναξ on four occasions (553, 759, 828, 1144). Perhaps the Trojans draw more attention to their past status, but as noted earlier, this occurs to generate a pathetic contrast with their current enslaved status. Moreover, Kovacs' argument that barbarian reliance on Zeus Xenios is related to dynasts having their most important dealings with one another is similarly unconvincing.[34] It is true that Hecuba stresses the importance of ξενία, but so does Agamemnon when he chastises Polymestor for violating its code (1247-8). It is inaccurate to restrict this dependence on Zeus Xenios to barbarians, as the Greeks appear to hold ξενία in the same regard. Furthermore, Morwood interprets the chorus' flattering comments about Polyxena as royalist heroine-worship:[35]

> δεινὸς χαρακτὴρ κἀπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς
> ἐσθλῶν γενέσθαι, κἀπὶ μεῖζον ἔρχεται
> τῆς εὐγενείας ὄνομα τοῖσιν ἀξίοις. 379-81

Although the chorus strongly admires Polyxena and her noble origins, this is the only instance where the Trojans praise nobility, or rather, Polyxena for living up to royal standards. Since the Greeks also display appreciation for Polyxena,[36] the chorus here is not so much praising Polyxena's royal status, but rather her conduct which reflects well on the Trojan elite.

The repeated Trojan criticism of democratic and rhetorical practices is crucial for evaluating the possibility of a tyranny/democracy opposition. The *Hecuba* is infused, somewhat anachronistically, with many words which evoke democracy, such as ξύνοδος (107), ψῆφος (196, 219, 259), and ὄχλος (521, 533, 605, 607, 868, 880). Of these terms,

[33] Kovacs 1987: 82.
[34] Kovacs 1987: 83.
[35] Morwood 2014: 198.
[36] See section 6 of this chapter.

the first two are neutral, while ὄχλος can be pejorative, suggesting a lack of discipline. It is certainly pejorative in Hecuba's criticism of the Greek army, particularly its sailors:

ἔν τοι μυρίῳ στρατεύματι
ἀκόλαστος ὄχλος ναυτική τ᾽ ἀναρχία
κρείσσων πυρός, κακὸς δ᾽ ὁ μή τι δρῶν κακόν. 606-8

Morwood assesses Hecuba's comments as totally unreasonable, as she has just heard of the sailors' admiration for Polyxena's nobility (573-80),[37] but since the same mob has recently voted to sacrifice her daughter, she has good cause to be suspicious of their treatment of Polyxena after her death. Hecuba later repeats her clear disdain for the insubordination of the ἀκόλαστος ὄχλος. She complains that the πλῆθος... πόλεος (866) can prevent individuals from doing what they think is best (867), and accuses Agamemnon of being unduly influenced by the mob (868). Contrary to the democratic ideal, Hecuba believes that rulers should be able to follow their best judgement without fear of popular reprisal.

Hecuba is also highly critical of rhetoric and demagoguery, as seen in her scathing comments to Odysseus:

ἀχάριστον ὑμῶν σπέρμ᾽, ὅσοι δημηγόρους
ζηλοῦτε τιμάς· μηδὲ γιγνώσκοισθέ μοι,
οἳ τοὺς φίλους βλάπτοντες οὐ φροντίζετε,
ἢν τοῖσι πολλοῖς πρὸς χάριν λέγητέ τι. 254-7

These words have an anachronistic feeling,[38] and as Gregory points out, by condemning the σπέρμα (254) of politicians for preferring to gratify the many over honouring their personal obligations, Hecuba inverts the conventional accusation against corrupt politicians of preferring their private interests to the public good, thus reflecting her aristocratic status.[39] Yet, despite expressing her distaste for such demagogues (255), Hecuba unashamedly begs Odysseus to change the army's mind, maintaining that his reputation alone will be persuasive (293-5). Despite her inconsistent standards, Hecuba consistently presents the Greek assembly as an unthinking and easily manipulated mob.[40] Similarly, the chorus denounces Odysseus for his rhetorical prowess as ὁ ποικιλόφρων /

[37] Morwood 2014: 195.
[38] Mossman 1995: 106 argues that the speech has a fifth-century flavour.
[39] Gregory 1999: 76; cf. *Supp.* 235-7, 412-13; Th. 2.65.7.
[40] Hall 2000: xxiii.

κόπις ἠδυλόγος δημοχαριστὴς (131-2), a series of contemptuous epithets.[41] Morwood observes that the denunciations of the democratic process fall exclusively from Asian lips,[42] and it is clear that Hecuba and the chorus display no appreciation for democracy or for skilled rhetoricians who can bend the common people to their will.

But is there some merit to this Trojan criticism of democracy? The play presents the results of a democratic process (116-40): the innocent and blameless Polyxena must be sacrificed to honour Achilles. Since human sacrifice was unacceptable among the Greeks,[43] and taking into account Neoptolemus' hesitation as he performed the deed (566) and the pity and admiration displayed by the Greeks after Polyxena's sacrifice (573-80), the democratic process has led to an absurd result: the barbaric slaying of a faultless young girl.[44] Hecuba may have a point in denouncing the Greek army, which has been manipulated by Odysseus into approving a human sacrifice (131-40). The manner of Odysseus' announcement of the army's decision to Hecuba is truly confronting (218-24),[45] and since Odysseus is generally presented as an unattractive character in tragedy,[46] his prominent role in effecting Polyxena's sacrifice dispels any theory that the play presents the sacrifice as justified and appropriate.

Kovacs and Morwood are adamant that the *Hecuba* portrays a dichotomy between democratic Greeks and royalist Trojans. For Kovacs, the contrast is between the newer democratic world of the Greek army and the older dynastic world of the barbarian nations,[47] whereas Morwood argues for the clear polarising of democratic Greeks and royalist Asians.[48] Although this contrast is present to some extent, Kovacs and Morwood afford it too much prominence.[49] In addition, the contrast is too simplistic and not quite as consistent as they claim. For instance, Kovacs maintains that Odysseus refuses

[41] Morwood 2000: 114-15 notes that this recalls the world of demagogues, such as Cleon.
[42] Morwood 2014: 194.
[43] Morwood 2000: 114, who regards Achilles' sacrifice (*Il.* 23.175-6) as the exception that proves the rule.
[44] Conacher 1967: 149 argues that Euripides' presentation of the sacrifice theme is very unfavourable to the Greeks.
[45] Morwood 2000: 116 claims that the brutality of Odysseus' chilling pronouncement is deeply shocking.
[46] Collard 1991: 138 observes how Odysseus' sturdy eloquence in Homer (*Il.* 3.221-2) and resourcefulness with words (*Od. passim*) become in later poets, particularly the dramatists, a ready glibness and devious manipulation of the unsophisticated: Hes. Fr. 198 M-W; S. *Aj.* 148 ff.; E. *Tr.* 284-8.
[47] Kovacs 1987: 82.
[48] Morwood 2014: 194.
[49] Morwood 2014: 198 claims that the contrast is extreme, whereas Matthiessen 2008: 30, more reasonably, admits that the contrast exists, but argues that 'aufs ganze gesehen ist dieser Gegensatz nicht von großer Bedeutung'.

Hecuba's appeal to repay a past favour because Greeks only act in their community's interests,[50] but Agamemnon acts in his own interests by allowing his sexual relationship with Cassandra to dictate his opinion on Polyxena's sacrifice (120-22). Similarly, his claim that the new Greek democratic state does not officially recognise crimes against ξένοι[51] is tenuous, as Agamemnon clearly favours Hecuba's cause, adjudicates in her favour (1243-5), and strongly condemns the murder of guests (1247-8). There are even similarities between the Greeks and Trojans. Although Hecuba condemns Odysseus and his rhetoric (254-7), she learns from him and employs rhetoric, as he did, to destroy rather than preserve life.[52]

Morwood even pushes the contrast's implications to unreasonable limits. He claims that the democratic audience would have found Hecuba's attitudes unsympathetic and sympathised instead with the Greek leaders who sought to operate in impossible circumstances.[53] This seems highly improbable, and it is an injustice to the *Hecuba* to interpret it as merely pro-democratic propaganda. If anything, the play challenges the audience to consider democracy's weaknesses, as the democratic process, corrupted by a crafty orator who manipulates the popular assembly, leads to the resolution that an innocent girl must be sacrificed. The *Hecuba* is not a glowing endorsement of democracy, and Lawrence points out the irony: a Greek, Odysseus, argues for human sacrifice, while a 'barbarian', Hecuba, argues against it.[54]

2. Luxury and clothing

Luxury

Gold plays an important role in the *Hecuba*, and could even be considered a *Leitmotiv*,[55] with χρυσός and its cognates appearing twenty-two times. It is particularly relevant to Polymestor's decision to kill Polydorus and Hecuba's revenge plot. However, excessive wealth is also integral to the eastern barbarian stereotype. Accordingly, to better understand the Trojan portrayal in the *Hecuba*, it is worth examining their relationship with wealth and luxury.

[50] Kovacs 1987: 83.
[51] Kovacs 1987: 83.
[52] Mitchell-Boyask 1993: 126.
[53] Morwood 2014: 202.
[54] Lawrence 2010: 25.
[55] Matthiessen 2008: 53.

Saïd argues that Euripides' Trojan tragedies are full of references to Troy's wealth.[56] Examples in the *Hecuba* include Talthybius' reference to the πολύχρυσοι Φρύγες (492), the golden mirrors of the Trojan women (χρυσέων ἐνόπτρων, 925), and the Trojan gold which accompanies Polydorus (10, 25, 27, etc.). However, this does not do justice to the close correlation between the Trojans' past wealth and pathos. Immediately after labelling the Trojans πολύχρυσοι, Talthybius describes Hecuba's pitiable present state as a δούλη γραῦς ἄπαις (495), and soon after the mention of the golden mirrors, the chorus member relates how she was led away into slavery after witnessing her husband's death (937-8). Even Hecuba's references to her former good fortune are designed to evoke pathos, as they draw a pathetic contrast with her present situation: ὦ ποτ᾽ εὐτυχεῖς δόμοι (619; cf. 282-5). Accordingly, these references to the Trojans' former wealth do not depict the Trojans as excessively luxurious and greedy, but evoke pity for their current plight, an argument supported by Mossman.[57] Arguments to the contrary tend to stretch the evidence too far, as Mattison points out in her critique of Edith Hall's argument,[58] where she notes that the single word πλουσίοισι (624) is insufficient to suggest that Hecuba is a displaced luxurious Persian.[59]

Images of wealth are also associated with the Greeks. Kovacs argues that certain passages present the Greeks as impoverished compared to the barbarians (317-18, 1217-21),[60] but there are many scenes which suggest otherwise. Achilles' shade appears χρυσέοις… σὺν ὅπλοις, (110), the chorus envisions the Greeks adorning Polyxena with gold before her sacrifice (152-3), and Neoptolemus uses a δέπας / πάγχρυσον (527-8) and an ἀμφίχρυσον φάσγανον (543) as he carries out Polyxena's sacrifice. These examples of Greek wealth balance the images of Trojan luxury and counter the notion that references to Trojan wealth are automatically unfavourable.

The Thracian Polymestor is the only character who is obsessively greedy. Polydorus accuses Polymestor of killing him χρυσοῦ… χάριν (25; cf. 27), a motive suspected by

[56] Saïd 2002: 65-6.
[57] Mossman 1995: 24 n.10 asserts that Polyxena's and the captives' lot is made more pathetic by emphasis on their former wealth.
[58] Hall 1989: 127 interprets Hecuba's reference to her palace's wealth (πλουσίοις ἐν δώμασιν, 624) as Euripides attributing excessive luxury to the Trojans.
[59] Mattison 2009: 9.
[60] Kovacs 1987: 141 n.27.

Hecuba, who declares to Polymestor ὁ χρυσός… / ἔκτεινε τὸν ἐμὸν παῖδα καὶ κέρδη τὰ σά (1206-7), the chorus (712), and Agamemnon (775), who ultimately concludes that this was Polymestor's reasoning (1243-5). Polymestor's greed also induces him to fall into Hecuba's trap. Hecuba entices him with the lure of χρυσοῦ παλαιαὶ… κατώρυχες (1002), and Polymestor cannot hide his eagerness as he inquires ἐνταῦθ᾽ ὁ χρυσός ἐστι; (1009). As Segal observes, Trojan gold motivates Polymestor's murder of Polydorus, and it is also the bait for Hecuba's trap.[61] Accordingly, Euripides employs wealth to accentuate Polymestor's character flaws, but does not use it to present the Trojans as excessively luxurious.

Clothing

If not through luxury, Euripides may seek to align the Trojans with the eastern barbarian stereotype through their attire.[62] The Trojan women's clothing on stage is unclear, but presumably they would have worn rags or some other humble attire to reflect their newly-acquired servile status. However, some passages mention Trojan clothing.

The handmaid describes Polydorus' corpse as γυμνωθέν (679), which is more likely to mean 'uncovered' rather than 'naked',[63] as Agamemnon later identifies it as Trojan through its clothing:

> τίν᾽ ἄνδρα τόνδ᾽ ἐπὶ σκηναῖς ὁρῶ
> θανόντα Τρώων; οὐ γὰρ Ἀργεῖον πέπλοι
> δέμας περιπτύσσοντες ἀγγέλλουσί μοι. 733-5

Edith Hall treats this as evidence for the gorgeous garments of eastern barbarians,[64] but Bacon points out that Agamemnon reveals nothing about the kind of clothes adorning Polydorus, only that they look different.[65] Either the style or the weaving of Polydorus' clothing could be distinctively un-Greek,[66] and this is by no means the only instance in tragedy of costumes indicating nationality.[67] Gellie observes that if Polydorus' body is wearing foreign dress, then his ghost, who delivers the prologue (1-58), is probably also

[61] Segal 1993: 160.
[62] Saïd 2002: 64 argues that in Euripides' plays the barbarian is recognisable only in his costume.
[63] Gregory 1999: 128-9 suggests that Polydorus' corpse may be clothed in an 'oriental' tunic and then wrapped in a cloak, like Hector's corpse (*Il.* 24.580-81).
[64] Hall 1989: 137.
[65] Bacon 1961: 122.
[66] Gregory 1999: 132.
[67] Collard 1991: 168 cites Greek (*Heracl.* 130, *IT* 246; S. *Ph.* 223) and non-Greek (A. *Supp.* 234) parallels.

not wearing Greek dress.[68] If this is true, then it is an example of Euripides portraying a speaking Trojan character wearing foreign attire. However, it remains as speculation due to the uncertain nature of Polydorus' clothing.

The clothing attributed to the Trojan women is ambiguous and seems to combine eastern and Greek elements. Reliving the night of the sack of Troy, a chorus member describes the scene as she prepares for bed:

> ἐγὼ δὲ πλόκαμον ἀναδέτοις
> μίτραισιν ἐρρυθμιζόμαν
> χρυσέων ἐνόπτρων λεύσσουσ᾽ ἀτέρμονας εἰς αὐγάς,
> ἐπιδέμνιος ὡς πέσοιμ᾽ ἐς εὐνάν. 923-6

Commentators have noted that the μίτρα was an oriental headdress (cf. Hdt. 1.195),[69] an eastern colouring which conveys an impression of wealth.[70] Similarly, the golden mirrors (925) may suggest eastern luxury,[71] or oriental self-indulgence,[72] and the scene as a whole is reminiscent of the royal households portrayed in *Iliad* 3 and 6.[73] However, it would be a mistake to interpret this scene as portraying the Trojans as luxurious easterners. Rather, the focus here seems to be on evoking pathos, a point observed by Mossman and Gregory.[74] Drawing attention to Troy's material abundance naturally increases pity for the Trojan women's plight after the city's sack, which the chorus member proceeds to outline (933-51).

The eastern μίτρα contrasts with the chorus member's comparison of herself to a Dorian girl, clothed only in a πέπλος (933-4). Here the Trojan woman describes herself wearing Greek dress,[75] in what Gregory labels a blurring of ethnicities.[76] There may also be allusion to Peleus' criticism of Spartan girls' lack of modesty (*Andr.* 595-600),[77] although

[68] Gellie 1980: 31 n.4.
[69] Collard 1991: 178; Bacon 1961: 117.
[70] Mossman 1995: 89.
[71] Bacon 1961: 128. Collinge 1954: 36 asserts that gold mirrors are the stock representation of Trojan luxury.
[72] Collard 1991: 179.
[73] Mossman 1995: 89. Collard 1991: 179 argues that the scene owes much to Helen's 'fragrant' bedroom (*Il.* 3.382) and other such scenes (*Il.* 6.321 ff.; *Med.* 1159 ff.).
[74] Mossman 1995: 89 observes that the μίτρα so soon to be discarded creates pathos similar to Andromache's κρήδεμνον (*Il.* 22.469 ff.), and Gregory 1999: 157 argues that the golden mirrors recall the Trojans' lost wealth.
[75] Collard 1991: 179.
[76] Gregory 1999: 158.
[77] Mossman 1995: 190; Collard 1991: 179; Michelini 1987: 332. Alternatively, see Gregory 1999: 158.

the Trojan woman's lack of dress is not a conscious decision, but the result of rushing out of the house during the chaos of the sack of Troy. Moreover, Euripides provides a description of Polyxena's robe which she tears open before her sacrifice: λαβοῦσα πέπλους ἐξ ἄκρας ἐπωμίδος / ἔρρηξε λαγόνας ἐς μέσας παρ᾽ ὀμφαλόν (558-9). Her clothing here is distinctly Greek,[78] which has led Marshall to suggest that the Greek characters' costumes reflect contemporary Athenian interests in Persian styles, while the 'foreign' Trojans are clothed in more traditional Greek garments.[79] However, there is insufficient evidence to confirm this theory, as there is minimal detail on the Greek characters' clothing. To sum up, Euripides is inconsistent when it comes to Trojan clothing. Polyxena seems to wear Greek dress, the chorus envisions itself wearing both Greek and eastern attire, and Polydorus' garments are ostensibly Trojan, whatever that entails. Accordingly, Euripides does not seem to employ clothing to portray the Trojans as stereotypical eastern barbarians.

3. Slavery

One essential aspect of the eastern barbarian stereotype was a predisposition to servility. If the Trojans readily accept their new slave status, this could indicate their cultural and moral inferiority.

Trojan status as slaves

The Trojans' servile status is emphasised throughout the play,[80] and they are consistently referred to by the Greeks and Polymestor by the terms δούλη (e.g. 495, 741, 1253), αἰχμάλωτος (e.g. 881), and αἰχμαλωτίς (e.g. 1094, 1120). Although Hecuba's precise status is uncertain,[81] the Trojan women acknowledge their servile and inferior status. Polyxena acknowledges her slave status (204), and the chorus members refer to themselves as δουλόσυνος (448) and δούλα (481), even describing the process of their enslavement (100-1). Hecuba acknowledges that she is a slave (60, 415, 822), refers to the Trojan women as αἰχμαλωτίδες (615, 1016), and addresses Agamemnon as δέσποτ' (841). Moreover, she comprehends the inferiority that comes with slavery (798), even

[78] Segal 1993: 269 n.6; Collard 1991: 179; Kovacs 1987: 82.
[79] Marshall 2001: 136.
[80] Collard 1991: 23 notes that captive slavery is one of the chorus' obsessive themes (444 ff., 479-84).
[81] Hecuba seems to be a captive slave with a slightly superior status to the other Trojan women. The handmaid and chorus address her as δέσποινα (668, 1048), and as Gregory 1999: 52 observes, Hecuba continues to order her former slaves (59-61).

requesting permission before she asks Odysseus, a free man, a question (233-5). Accordingly, it is clear that the Trojans do not dispute the fact that they are now slaves.

Trojan attitudes towards slavery

However, acknowledgement of one's slave status does not necessarily imply acceptance of that status. The only Trojan who offers any indication that she is comfortable with being a slave is Hecuba.[82] She declares that she would happily remain a slave if she could be guaranteed vengeance against Polymestor (αἰῶνα τὸν σύμπαντα δουλεύειν θέλω, 757), and later expresses her desire not to quarrel with her masters (1237).

However, this is overshadowed by the abundance of instances of Trojans detesting, resisting, and seeking to overcome their enslaved status. Polydorus expresses his contempt for the δούλειον ἦμαρ (56) which has afflicted the Trojans, sentiments echoed by the chorus (332), who are less than enthusiastic about their future as slaves: τῶν δεσποσύνων πειρασόμεναι / μόχθων· στερρὰ γὰρ ἀνάγκη (1294-5). Polyxena claims that the very name of slavery induces a longing for death (357-8), expresses disgust at the thought of a slave sharing her bed (365-6), and complains about the duties she will have to perform as a slave (360-63).

In fact, Polyxena even seeks to transcend her slave status. She repeatedly expresses that she is willing to die (θανεῖν… χρῄζουσ', 347, cf. 548-9), encourages Odysseus to take her away (ἄγ' οὖν μ', Ὀδυσσεῦ, 369; cf. 432),[83] invites Neoptolemus to strike the killing blow (564), and instructs her mother not to obstruct the process (σὺ δ' ἡμῖν μηδὲν ἐμποδὼν γένῃ, 372; cf. 404). Refusing to be defined by her enslaved status, Polyxena, by voluntarily offering herself up for sacrifice, hopes to die with dignity and nobility, a free person: ἐλευθέραν δέ μ', ὡς ἐλευθέρα θάνω, /… μεθέντες κτείνατ' (550-51; cf. 367-8).[84] In this way she far outshines the Greeks through her exemplary conduct.

Euripides does not present the Trojans as slaves by nature in the *Hecuba*. Their contempt for slavery and Polyxena's struggle against her newly-imposed status are both a testament

[82] Conacher 1967: 155 notes that Hecuba seems to accept her enslaved state, contrary to Polyxena's attitude.
[83] Hall 2000: xxxviii contrasts Polyxena's refusal to supplicate Odysseus (345) with Hecuba's readiness to supplicate (836-40).
[84] Morwood 2000: 120 argues that Polyxena makes a pattern of nobility out of her grim slaughter, and Segal 1993: 161 maintains that her voluntary death confirms royal birth and nature.

to this. Moreover, Polyxena often refers to her former status as a mistress (δέσποινα, 354) and a royal (τυράννων πρόσθεν ἠξιωμένα, 366; cf. 552), as does Hecuba: τύραννος ἦ ποτ᾽ (809). Born of a πατρὸς… ἐλευθέρου (420), Polyxena declares that slavery is οὐκ εἰωθὸς (358) to her, and explains how those who are unused to misfortune struggle to endure the yoke: ἀλγεῖ… αὐχέν᾽ ἐντιθεὶς ζυγῷ (376). These are hardly the words of 'natural' slaves. When the chorus comments on Polyxena's behaviour, all they discern is an admirable nobility (379-81), appreciating how Polyxena's inner nobility overshadows her slave status.[85]

Slavery is an issue not just for the Trojans, but also for the Greeks, as Hecuba makes clear in her criticism of Agamemnon's reluctance to assist her openly:

> οὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν ὅστις ἔστ᾽ ἐλεύθερος·
> ἢ χρημάτων γὰρ δοῦλός ἐστιν ἢ τύχης,
> ἢ πλῆθος αὐτὸν πόλεος ἢ νόμων γραφαὶ
> εἴργουσι χρῆσθαι μὴ κατὰ γνώμην τρόποις. 864-7

Hecuba is most likely thinking of Polymestor and Agamemnon as slaves to money (865) and popular opinion (866-7) respectively. In contrast to Agamemnon, whose actions are constantly scrutinised by the army, Hecuba, as a slave, is unrestricted by the politics of reputation that an army leader is subjected to and so can exact vengeance on Polymestor with impunity. A favourite Euripidean paradox is to present those in physical slavery displaying a greater freedom of spirit and probity than their 'free' masters.[86] Just as the *Hecuba* appears to discredit the notion of a Greek/barbarian polarity, particularly inasmuch as it pertains to the Trojans, Euripides may similarly seek to challenge the traditional Greek conception of slavery,[87] offering a new perspective where inner goodness, inner mastery, and inner freedom permit the true distinction between a free man and a slave.[88] In any case, Euripides does not portray the Trojans as slaves by nature.[89]

4. Thracians

[85] However, Michelini 1987: 141 argues that if Polyxena's death proves the persistence of aristocratic φύσις, Hecuba proves that humans learn and change in their learning.
[86] Collard 1991: 27.
[87] Daitz 1971: 222 argues that free/slave boundaries are blurred or even abolished, as Polyxena and Hecuba demonstrate less inner constraint than Odysseus and Agamemnon.
[88] Daitz 1971: 226.
[89] Lawrence 2010: 25.

This chapter has argued that the *Hecuba* does not portray the Trojans as barbarians or present a consistent contrast between Greeks and eastern barbarians. Instead, could the Thracians be the true barbarians in the play? Agamemnon refers to Polymestor twice as a βάρβαρος (877, 1129), and implies that the Thracians do not properly observe ξενία (1247-8). However, Polymestor's portrayal is key. If he is consistently depicted as an impious law-breaker, savage and uncivilised, then one could argue that Polymestor is the real barbarian of the *Hecuba*.

Ξενία and impiety

Euripides' *Hecuba* is preoccupied with ξενία, which is evident through the frequency of ξένος and its compounds. The chorus refers to Polymestor as a ξένος (1047),[90] as does Polydorus (7), who also mentions the special ξενία relationship Polymestor enjoyed with his father (19, 26). Hecuba employs ξένος terms most frequently, referring to Polymestor (82, 710, 890, 1235), and her question ποῦ δίκα ξένων; (715) indicates her reverence for ξενία. She also outlines the excellent treatment Polymestor often received at her dinner table (793-4), and juxtaposes Polymestor's guest-friend status with his murder of Polydorus (Θρῄξ νιν ὤλεσε ξένος, 774; cf. 1216). Even Agamemnon dwells on Polymestor's status as a host (781, 852), and he condemns the practice of killing guests as profoundly un-Greek (1247-8). Given the high regard in which ξενία was held in the Greek world,[91] Euripides appears to demonise Polymestor for murdering Polydorus by dwelling on the guest-friend status he held with the Trojans.[92] Through his actions, Polymestor has broken the sacred bonds of guest-friendship.[93]

Moreover, Polymestor is strongly criticised for his impiousness. Hecuba denounces him as an οὔτ᾽ εὐσεβῆ…/ οὐχ ὅσιον, οὐ δίκαιον… ξένον (1234-5), and labels Polymestor himself and his murder of Polydorus as 'most unholy' (ἀνοσιωτάτου ξένου, 790; cf. 792), sentiments echoed by Agamemnon, who calls him an ἀνόσιον ξένον (852). As Gregory observes, Polymestor has violated all the νόμοι of fellowship, guest-friendship, and

[90] ξένος means 'guest-friend' and can refer to a host or a guest.
[91] Nussbaum 2001: 407 defines it as the deepest and most sacred conventional relationship in which one individual can stand to another.
[92] Gregory 1999: 42 observes that Euripides dwells on Polymestor's betrayal of his guest-friend relationship with Priam and Hecuba.
[93] Mossman 1995: 168 notes that the murder of a guest ranks below only the murder of a kinsman in the horror system of Greek morality.

burial,[94] and because of this it is fitting that he is ultimately expelled from human society to a desert island (1284-5).[95] Through his violation of the sacred bonds of ξενία and his disregard for divine and human laws, Euripides presents Polymestor as highly unattractive and uncivilised.

Savagery

Polymestor's defining trait, however, is his savagery. Polydorus may provide an early reference to this by describing Polymestor λαὸν εὐθύνων δορί (9).[96] In any case, Polymestor's behaviour after his blinding openly reveals his violent and bestial nature. He emerges crawling on all fours like a wild beast of the mountains (τετράποδος… θηρὸς ὀρεστέρου, 1058; cf. 1173), eager to strike down the walls of the tent (βάλλων… ἀναρρήξω μυχούς, 1040; cf. 1175), his seething rage observed by Hecuba: θυμῷ ζέοντι Θρῃκὶ δυσμαχωτάτῳ (1055). Hecuba earlier accused Polymestor of rending Polydorus' flesh (716-17) with no pity (720), and now he desires to tear and bloody Hecuba's flesh (διασπάσωμαι καὶ καθαιμάξω χρόα, 1126), desperate to lay his μαργῶσαν χέρα (1128) upon her. Most horrifying, however, is his craving to feast on the Trojan women's flesh (1072), devouring them like a wild animal: θοίναν ἀγρίων τιθέμενος θηρῶν (1072). According to Hall, Polymestor's terrible song after his blinding delineates his wild barbarian character at its most uncontrolled,[97] and it certainly highlights his primitive and uncivilised nature.

Parallels with Polyphemus

A further indictment on Polymestor's character is his abundance of parallels with the Homeric Cyclops.[98] Polymestor's disregard for human and divine law is shared by the Cyclopes, who are lawless and arrogant, (ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων, *Od.* 9.106), especially Polyphemus (9.189), and lack the proper institutions and legislation of civilised societies, possessing οὔτ᾽ ἀγοραὶ βουληφόροι οὔτε θέμιστες (9.112). In response to Odysseus' invocation of ξενία (9.267-8), Polyphemus replies that the Cyclopes care nothing for the

[94] Gregory 1991: 111.
[95] Segal 1993: 162.
[96] Collard 1991: 131. Morwood 2000: 112 suggests that this only highlights the Thracians' warlike character, and Gregory 1999: 43 argues that δορί carries no suggestion of violence or illegality (cf. *Hipp.* 975).
[97] Hall 1989: 126. Conversely, Segal 1993: 162 denies that this behaviour was always part of Polymestor's character, but argues that Polymestor metamorphoses into a bestial monster.
[98] Zeitlin 1996: 195, Mossman 1995: 191, and Gellie 1980: 36 all note that Polymestor closely resembles Polyphemus, but Mossman and Gellie also argue that Polymestor is less sympathetic than the Cyclops.

gods (*Od.* 9.275-6),[99] before springing up, seizing two of Odysseus' companions, and dashing them against the ground (9.288-90), the participle ἀναΐξας (9.288) strikingly similar to the ἐπάξας (1070) Polymestor employs to describe his desire to leap upon the Trojan women.

Just as Polymestor is compared to a mountainous beast (θηρὸς ὀρεστέρου, 1058), so Polyphemus is compared to a λέων ὀρεσίτροφος (*Od.* 9.292), and the vocabulary used to describe Polymestor's desire to beat down the walls (βάλλων… ἀναρρήξω, 1040; βάλλων, 1175) is reminiscent of Polyphemus throwing down a heap of dried wood (βαλὼν, *Od.* 9.235) and hurling a cliff fragment at Odysseus' ship (ἀπορρήξας… ἔβαλε, 9.481-2; ἔβαλεν, 9.539). Even Hecuba's comment on Polymestor's rage (1055) is reminiscent of Odysseus observing Polyphemus' rage (*Od.* 9.350). Finally, Polymestor's desire to feast on the Trojan women's flesh (σαρκῶν ὀστέων τ᾽ ἐμπλησθῶ, 1071) recalls Polyphemus consuming the ἔγκατά τε σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα μυελόεντα (*Od.* 9.293) of Odysseus' companions and subsequently filling his stomach: ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν (*Od.* 9.296). These parallels are too numerous to be mere coincidence, and so the audience would have realised that Euripides was deliberately evoking images of the lawless, savage, and uncivilised Homeric Cyclops in his portrayal of Polymestor.

There are also many similarities between Polymestor and Euripides' Polyphemus, as depicted in the *Cyclops*, his only surviving satyr play, which was most likely produced in the last five years of his life.[100] Polyphemus is accused of impiety, labelled ἀνόσιος by Silenus (*Cyc.* 26, 31), Odysseus (*Cyc.* 348, 693), and the chorus (*Cyc.* 438), which even refers to him as ἀνοσιώτατος Κύκλωψ (*Cyc.* 378). He is also branded δυσσεβής by Silenus (*Cyc.* 30) and Odysseus (*Cyc.* 289, 311), and θεοστυγής by Odysseus (*Cyc.* 396, 602), with the expression θηρὶ τῷ θεοστυγεῖ (*Cyc.* 602) recalling the references to Polymestor as a θήρ (1058, 1173). He thoroughly deserves these accusations, boasting that he is the equal of Zeus (*Cyc.* 321). Moreover, Polyphemus is criticised for mistreating his guests, as his territory is ἄξενος (*Cyc.* 91), and he has a reputation for devouring and sacrificing his guests (*Cyc.* 126; cf. 370-71). In response to Odysseus' invocation of the laws of ξενία (*Cyc.* 299-301), the Cyclops confirms that Odysseus will receive guest-gifts

[99] This clearly indicates Polyphemus's arrogance, and Polymestor is scolded by the chorus and Agamemnon for this same character flaw (1183, 1286).
[100] Seaford 1982: 171.

(ξένια… λήψῃ τοιάδ', *Cyc.* 342): fire, salt, and the cauldron in which Odysseus will be cooked (*Cyc.* 343-4). Polyphemus' lack of respect for human and divine laws, particularly those of ξενία, recalls Polymestor's identical character flaws.

Polyphemus' language when threatening to break off and hurl a rock at Odysseus and his men (ἀπορρήξας πέτρας /… βαλών, *Cyc.* 704-5) recalls that of Polymestor (1040, 1175). Moreover, Polymestor's desire to devour the Trojan women (1070-74), mirrors Euripides' Cyclops' longing for human flesh (*Cyc.* 249) and subsequent seizing, roasting, and feasting on two of Odysseus' companions (*Cyc.* 397-404), the participle ἁρπάσας (*Cyc.* 400) also echoed by Polymestor (1125). Afterwards, Polyphemus is satisfied by the meal (πλησθεὶς βορᾶς, *Cyc.* 409), just as Polymestor would love to be satisfied by feasting on the Trojan women (ἐμπλησθῶ, 1071) It is telling that Euripides' Cyclops has so many parallels with his portrayal of Polymestor. In addition to the Homeric Cyclops, Euripides may have had Polymestor in mind when composing his version of Polyphemus. In any case, the similarities between the two only reinforce Polymestor's impiety, lack of respect for ξενία, violent impulses, and cannibalistic desires.[101]

Barbarian Thracian stereotype

The Thracians had an unfavourable reputation among the Greeks. They are consistently presented in Greek literature as greedy, savage, and cowardly,[102] and as Segal notes, from Euripides' contemporaries on to Livy, Horace, and Ovid, the Thracians were notorious for warlike violence, lack of self-control, unreliability in oaths, and drunkenness (Th. 7.29.4-5; Hdt. 5.6.2; Ar. *Ach.* 153-73).[103] Although not all Athenians would have held such prejudicial views against the Thracians,[104] the Thracian barbarian stereotype is particularly relevant to the portrayal of Polymestor. As Coleman notes, Polymestor has a catalogue of stereotypical vices, being avaricious, equivocal in his allegiance, and thoroughly mendacious.[105] Although eastern barbarian stereotypes are not relevant to Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans in the *Hecuba*, his presentation of Polymestor seems

[101] Gellie 1980: 36 likens the grotesque Polymestor to a figure of pantomime. However, the overwhelming impression generated by his behaviour is designed to evoke shock and revulsion at his primitive ways.
[102] Mossman 1995: 185.
[103] Segal 1993: 171.
[104] In fact, Segal 1993: 275 n.58 observes that the Thracians could appear sympathetically (*Rh.* 300-13).
[105] Coleman 1997: 192. Hall 1989: 108 observes that he is the only tragic criminal motivated solely by avarice, Wohl 2015: 57 labels him a 'thoroughly wicked character', and Delebecque 1951: 404 argues that Euripides 'charge sans pitié la perfidie, l'appât du gain, la cruauté sauvage des Thraces'.

to have been influenced by the contemporary barbarian Thracian stereotype. This has led Mattison to propose a triangulation of ethnicities in the *Hecuba*: Greek, Trojan, and Thracian, with the Trojans being neither Greek nor fully barbarian.[106] Although the precise status of the Trojans is unclear, it is clear that Polymestor, due to his greed, disregard for human and divine laws, unrestrained violence, and parallels with the Homeric and Euripidean Cyclops, is portrayed as primitive and cruel, in keeping with contemporary Athenian stereotypes of Thracians. As Matthiessen notes, Polymestor should be regarded as a barbarian 'sowohl ethnographisch als auch ethisch'. [107]

It is also noteworthy that Hecuba is described as Cisseus's daughter at the outset of the play (Ἑκάβης… τῆς Κισσέως, 3). In the *Iliad*, Hecuba is the daughter of Dymas (16.718) and Polydorus the son of Priam and Laothoe (21.84-8). If Hecuba's father can be identified with the Thracian king Cisseus (*Il.* 6.299, 11.223),[108] then Euripides has deliberately rearranged Hecuba's genealogy to provide her with Thracian ancestry. In light of Polymestor's savage behaviour, and the contemporary Athenian stereotypes of cruel and violent Thracians, could this attribution of Thracian ancestry foreshadow the violent nature of Hecuba's revenge against Polymestor? Mossman warns against pressing this detail too far,[109] but Euripides' decision to grant Hecuba Thracian ancestry remains significant. In any case, Hecuba's violent revenge warrants some discussion.

5. Hecuba's revenge

One cannot argue that Polymestor is barbarised through his savage and wild behaviour without commenting on the vengeance Hecuba exacts upon him. Given Hecuba's Thracian ancestry, is she associated with Polymestor, with her revenge being excessive and cruel, or does she act appropriately in her circumstances?

Vengeance

Upon discovering Polydorus' corpse, Hecuba becomes preoccupied with vengeance.[110] She repeatedly expresses her desire to take revenge (τιμωρεῖν, 749; cf. 882), asking Agamemnon to become an accomplice (790) and provide a χεῖρα… / τιμωρόν (842-3) for

[106] Mattison 2009: 117.
[107] Matthiessen 2008: 33.
[108] Gregory 1995: 390 asserts that this identification is reasonable.
[109] Mossman 1995: 34 n.33.
[110] Buxton 1982: 180 regards Hecuba's complete surrender to the passion for revenge as chilling.

her. Hecuba's obsession with vengeance is such that she is willing to endure eternal slavery if her goal can be realised (756-7), and cares little about what will happen to her in the future: οὐδὲν μέλει μοι, σοῦ γέ μοι δόντος δίκην (1274). After she has blinded Polymestor (1035) and murdered his sons (1037), Hecuba openly displays her joy: οὐ γάρ με χαίρειν χρή σε τιμωρουμένην; (1258). She is even proud of murdering Polymestor's children, repeatedly emphasising what she has done (1046, 1051).

Some scholars claim that Hecuba's revenge is excessive and barbaric. For instance, Morwood argues that it debases and narrows down Hecuba's character,[111] while Edith Hall claims that Hecuba is as culpable a villain as any other character,[112] and in Luschnig's opinion Hecuba progresses from a good queen and loving mother to an inhuman creature.[113] Others assert that the Athenians regarded blinding as barbaric (cf. A. *Eu.* 186-7),[114] or that Hecuba's revenge robs her of her moral authority and aligns her with Polymestor on an ethical level.[115] These arguments question the moral validity of Hecuba's revenge and its excessive nature.

However, the only relevant standard for assessing Hecuba's revenge is how the fifth-century Athenian audience would have received it. In Athens, the family of a murdered person was obliged to obtain retribution,[116] and this retribution, whether publicly or privately obtained, was a fundamental component of Greek justice.[117] Accordingly, there is no reason to suppose that the fifth-century audience would have found fault with Hecuba's deed,[118] and no character in the play condemns the fact or the nature of Hecuba's vengeance.[119] As Kovacs points out, there is nothing inhuman by Greek standards about Hecuba's revenge, and although it is extreme, so was the crime that provoked it.[120] Moreover, the vocabulary used to describe Hecuba's revenge is important.

[111] Morwood 2014: 203.
[112] Hall 2000: xxi.
[113] Luschnig 1976: 227. Rabinowitz 1993: 114-24 includes Hecuba among the tragic women who represent the Freudian *unheimlich* ('uncanny') murderous mother, the terrifying *mater dolorosa*.
[114] Collard 1991: 185.
[115] Mitchell-Boyask 1993: 125.
[116] Meridor 1983: 15. Mossman 1995: 169 notes that taking revenge was sometimes considered a duty.
[117] Gregory 1991: 107. Barker 2009: 346 observes that taking revenge on one's enemies conforms to normative standards of Greek morality, and Kovacs 1987: 99 argues that avenging a terrible injury is enjoined by Hecuba's aristocratic code and ordinary Greek morality.
[118] Gregory 1999: xxxii; Matthiessen 2008: 20.
[119] Gregory 1999: xxxiii.
[120] Kovacs 1987: 108.

According to Meridor, Hecuba's use of words from the τιμωρός-group would indicate to the Athenian audience that she is fighting for her right to do her duty by her child,[121] and the use of δίκη expressions for what is due to Hecuba from Polymestor, by Agamemnon (853), the chorus (1024), Hecuba (1052-3, 1274), and Polymestor (1253), appears to represent Hecuba's revenge as an official act of justice.[122] Lastly, Hecuba initially attempts to take revenge through a sanctioned channel, asking Agamemnon to intervene and only taking control when he refuses (868-75).[123] Accordingly, although the fifth-century audience may have been shocked by the ferocity of Hecuba's revenge, it would not have questioned her right to avenge her murdered son. This distinguishes her deed from Polymestor's, who murdered Polydorus and violated the sacred bonds of ξενία purely for financial gain.

Hecuba's metamorphosis

Hecuba's metamorphosis, which Polymestor prophesies at the end of the play, has also provoked scholarly debate. According to Polymestor, Hecuba will become a κύων… πύρσ᾽ ἔχουσα δέργματα (1265) and her tomb will be known as κυνὸς ταλαίνης σῆμα, ναυτίλοις τέκμαρ (1273). Many scholars argue that Hecuba's metamorphosis reflects her dehumanisation.[124] For others, the transformation reflects Hecuba's bestial behaviour,[125] and the σῆμα that Hecuba will become belongs to bestial metamorphosis, shame, and monstrosity.[126] The animal which Hecuba will become, the dog, is also significant. Elsewhere in the *Hecuba*, the dog is not presented sympathetically (1077-8, 1173).[127] Unlike the lion or the eagle, the dog ranks low on the Greek scale of animal nobility,[128] and according to Collard, the bitch is the archetypal Greek metaphor of shamelessness (cf. *Il.* 1.225; 6.344).[129] Accordingly, a strong case can be made that Hecuba's prophesied metamorphosis into a dog is an indictment upon her character, reflecting her gradual loss of humanity as she becomes consumed with revenge.

---

[121] Meridor 1978: 29.
[122] Meridor 1978: 30. Similarly, Wohl 2015: 49 argues that the play represents Hecuba's act of vengeance as δίκη.
[123] Mattison 2009: 114-15.
[124] Mitchell-Boyask 1993: 125; Reckford 1985: 118; Daitz 1971: 222. Tarkow 1984: 124 argues that the killing of her children leads to Hecuba's moral dismemberment.
[125] Hall 2000: xxiii.
[126] Segal 1993: 159.
[127] Morwood 2000: 126.
[128] Nussbaum 2001: 414, who adds that the dog's main characteristics are its keenness in tracking its prey, its tenaciousness in warding off enemies, and its protectiveness of its own territory.
[129] Collard 1991: 197.

However, there are other equally valid explanations. Mossman, for instance, disagrees that Hecuba's transformation represents the degeneration of her character,[130] and she is not alone. Meridor argues that Hecuba's transformation is not a moral evaluation of her revenge,[131] and Burnett notes that the words used to describe Hecuba's metamorphosis fail to suggest savageness or bestiality,[132] a point echoed by Zeitlin, who observes that the prophecy does not mention Hecuba's howling or snapping (cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.545-75) or her bitch-like qualities.[133] Even the implications of the dog are not immediately obvious. Dogs are ambivalent rather than straightforwardly savage,[134] as in addition to shamelessness, the dog can represent tenacity (S. *Aj.* 78), hard work (X. *Mem.* 4.1.3; Arist. *HA* 608a31), and the Greek virtue of treating one's friends well and harming one's enemies (Pl. *R.* 375a2-c2).[135] In Euripides' dog doublet, there is no indication of fiendishness or ferocity, and the word 'dog' in itself would not convey such characteristics to the Greek ear.[136] Instead, the dog represents the wild made tame, and the female dog can be an image of fecundity and fierce maternal care.[137] Accordingly, the σῆμα of the dog could represent the extreme of motherhood, a symbol for sailors of endurance through suffering.[138] It is unclear precisely what Euripides intended by Hecuba's metamorphosis, but since the Athenians would not have found fault with her revenge, then it is unlikely that the metamorphosis reflects Hecuba's dehumanisation.[139] It is just as likely to reflect an admirable quality, such as fierce maternal protectiveness.

6. Pity and pathos

A strong counterargument to the notion that Euripides barbarises the Trojans in the *Hecuba* is the significant amount of pathos which he evokes for them. Despite being ethnically other and female, the Trojan women elicit plenty of sympathy,[140] and this sympathy is also expressed by the Greeks.

[130] Mossman 1995: 163-203.
[131] Meridor 1978: 34.
[132] Burnett 1994: 151.
[133] Zeitlin 1996: 185.
[134] Mossman 1995: 201.
[135] Kovacs 1987: 146 n.68.
[136] Burnett 1994: 152.
[137] Burnett 1994: 157. Gregory 1999: xxxiv notes that the dog seems to symbolise the maternal impulse in an older woman.
[138] Dué 2006: 133.
[139] Matthiessen 2008: 26.
[140] Mattison 2009: 117.

Polydorus

Polydorus generates pity for himself during the prologue. He refers multiple times to his wretched fortune (τάλας, 20; ταλαίπωρον, 25; τλήμων, 47), and emphasises his youth (νεώτατος, 13) and vulnerability (14-15),[141] which render his fate, murdered by a guest-friend and cast into the ocean, all the more pitiable. He declares himself ἄκλαυτος ἄταφος (30), two juxtaposed negative adjectives which increase pathos through alliteration,[142] highlighting that he has been deprived of what he deserves: mourning and a burial. Immediately from the play's outset Euripides arouses sympathy for a Trojan.

The chorus

The chorus members also evoke pity for themselves. They refer to themselves as miserable (μελέαν, 447; τάλαιν', 913; τλάμων, 935), and their depiction of their future life in slavery is a grim one indeed: τάλαι-/ναν, οἰκτρὰν βιοτὰν (456-7). Moreover, they recall the disaster and suffering they have endured ever since Paris prepared his fleet (629-30). They also generate pathos for the city of Troy, which they claim has been defiled most pitiably: κηλῖδ' οἰκτροτάταν κέχρωσαι (912).

Polyxena

Polyxena is perhaps the most pathetic character in the play. The chorus labels her μελέα (149), Hecuba declares her οἰκτρά (417), and Polyxena refers to herself as δειλαία (203), τάλαινα (210), and δύστηνος (354; cf. 46). Moreover, Hecuba laments Polyxena's pitiable fate (ἀθλία τύχης, 425), and Polyxena sorrowfully observes that this is the last time she will see the sun (411-12). Polyxena's interaction with her mother in the lead up to her sacrifice also abounds in pathos,[143] as she and Hecuba both melt each other's hearts with their lamentation and wailing (433-4). Deprivation is also an important aspect of Polyxena's pitiable situation. She laments that her premature death will leave her ἄνυμφος ἀνυμέναιος (416), the alliterative juxtaposition recalling Polydorus' words (30), and Hecuba similarly mourns for her daughter's loss of her marriage and virginity: νύμφην τ' ἄνυμφον παρθένον τ' ἀπάρθενον (612). Euripides also evokes pity for Polyxena through

[141] Mossman 1995: 179 argues for an opposition between the fierce Achilles with his golden armour (110) and the hapless Trojan boy who was too young to bear arms (14-15) and died an ignoble death.
[142] Collard 1991: 132.
[143] Hall 2000: xxii regards the last parting of Polyxena from Hecuba as one of the most painful moments in western theatre.

small animal imagery, as she is either called or compared to a fawn (90), filly (142), bird (178, 337), cub (205), and heifer (526), all of which offer a picture of endangered innocence.[144]

Segal asserts that Polyxena is the only character in the *Hecuba* who displays a nobility and moral honesty that remains untarnished,[145] and his argument finds support in the Greek reaction to her sacrifice. Before describing Polyxena's sacrifice, Talthybius informs Hecuba that in retelling the sacrifice, he will have shed διπλᾶ… δάκρυα (518) due to pity (οἴκτῳ, 519) for Polyxena, as he will weep in the retelling (τέγξω τόδ᾽ ὄμμα, 520), just as he wept at her tomb. He remains sympathetic to Polyxena, praising her final words (562), and even Neoptolemus hesitates out of pity when carrying out the sacrifice: ὃ δ᾽ οὐ θέλων τε καὶ θέλων οἴκτῳ κόρης (566).[146] The Greek spectators at the sacrifice are also overcome with admiration, as they rush up to adorn Polyxena's body (574),[147] reproach those who remain passive (577-8), and praise her outstanding bravery and nobility: τῇ περίσσ᾽ εὐκαρδίῳ / ψυχήν τ᾽ ἀρίστῃ (579-80). Collard argues that the divided attitudes of the Greeks towards the sacrifice are a sub-theme,[148] and this is true before the sacrifice, but after the sacrifice Greek attitudes towards Polyxena are unanimously sympathetic.[149] This overwhelmingly positive Greek reaction indicates how the audience might be expected to react to Polyxena's words and subsequent death.[150] Conversely, Segal argues that the sacrifice is highly eroticised, as Polyxena's naked body is viewed from the perspective of the masculine gaze (558-62),[151] and identifies sexual implications in Polyxena revealing herself (560-61).[152] However, this approach neglects the waves of sympathy and admiration the Greeks express after the sacrifice, and Polyxena still remains an exemplary and blameless girl, pitied by Trojans and Greeks, and almost certainly by the Athenian audience.

[144] Gellie 1980: 32.
[145] Segal 1993: 196; cf. O'Connor-Visser 1987: 67.
[146] Segal 1993: 178 maintains that Neoptolemus' pity cues the audience towards sympathy for Polyxena.
[147] Mossman 1995: 162 contrasts this with the Greeks' mutilation of Hector's body (*Il.* 22.369-75).
[148] Collard 1991: 22.
[149] Dué 2006: 122 argues that Polyxena wins universal admiration and pity with her words (349-68), as Odysseus regrets that the Greeks must kill her (395).
[150] Dué 2006: 123. Lawrence 2010: 26 regards Polyxena as a sort of honorary Greek with whom the audience are strongly invited to sympathise.
[151] Segal 1993: 172.
[152] Segal 1993: 269 n.10. Matthiessen 2008: 17 disagrees that Talthybius' report is offensive, and O'Connor-Visser 1987: 59 maintains that he 'reports the scene in a dignified manner'.

Hecuba

Euripides devotes the most effort to generating sympathy for Hecuba.[153] Hecuba draws attention to her own misery, labelling herself μελέα (154, 186), δειλαία (156), and δύστηνος (683, 736; cf. 34, 172, 499).[154] She also describes herself as τάλαινα (233, 514, 694, 812, 813), echoed by the chorus (693), Agamemnon (1287),[155] and the handmaid (παντάλαινα, 667). Hecuba's suffering is also a key component to her pathos, and she refers to herself as ἀθλία (417), including the superlative ἀθλιωτάτη (423, 811),[156] and τλάμων (169), sentiments which are shared by the handmaid (παναθλία, 658), the chorus (τλῆμον, 721), and Agamemnon (τλῆμον, 763, 775). In fact, the chorus declares Hecuba to be πολυπονωτάτην βροτῶν (721), and Agamemnon pities her for her immeasurable suffering (783; cf. 850-51). The chorus even questions how anyone could not sympathise with Hecuba (296-8), claiming that such a person must have a στερρὸς… φύσις (296).[157] The cause of Hecuba's misery and suffering is arguably her ill-fortune (πάντα δυστυχῶ, 429), which is also observed by Talthybius (πασῶν γυναικῶν δυστυχεστάτην, 582) and Agamemnon (785), and she complains that not a day goes by without bringing grief and tears (691-2).

Deprivation is also a key facet of Hecuba's pathos. She stresses that Polydorus is the last remaining male descendant of her house (80), and labels herself ἄτεκνος (514) and ἄπαις (440, 810), the latter of which is echoed by Talthybius (495) and the handmaid, whose alliterative three word description of Hecuba (ἄπαις ἄνανδρος ἄπολις, 669) accentuates what Hecuba has lost and recalls similar descriptions of Polydorus (30) and Polyxena (416). Moreover, despite her own precarious situation, Polyxena manages to express sympathy and pity for Hecuba. She refers to her mother as παντλάμων (197), δυστάνος (198, 211), δειλαία (203), and τάλαινα (404). Polyxena weeps πανδύρτοις θρήνοις (212), not for herself, but for Hecuba's suffering, and her concern for her mother's suffering is particularly forceful since the tragic convention is for the speaker to claim to be the most

[153] Collard 1991: 133 notes that Euripides isolates and emphasises Hecuba's agony by introducing her and granting her a monody before the parodos (59-97).
[154] Collard 1991: 23 observes that Talthybius is sympathetic to Hecuba, even expressing open pity (488-98, 518-20, 580-82).
[155] Mossman 1995: 123 notes that Agamemnon, initially irritated (747-8), becomes more intrigued and sympathetic towards Hecuba (763, 765, 771, 775, 781, 783, 785).
[156] Gregory 1999: 94 argues that from this point Hecuba functions as a measure of wretchedness (cf. 581-2, 658-60, 667, 721, 783, 785-6, 811).
[157] Gregory 1999: 82 asserts that this reflects the chorus' unwavering sympathy for Hecuba.

miserable person on stage.[158] By ignoring her own grief, Polyxena evokes further pathos for Hecuba and reinforces her own status as a blameless girl with a noble character.

Polymestor

After his blinding and the loss of his children, Polymestor indulges in self-pity. In contrast to his less than sincere expression of sympathy for Hecuba (953-5), Polymestor's pity for himself is all too real. He repeatedly refers to himself as τάλας (1035, 1075, 1106, 1167, 1255), labels his eyes ταλαίπωροι (1170), and refers to his children's murder as δύστηνος (1037). Although the chorus also label Polymestor τάλας (1032, 1108) and τλῆμον (1085), this is unlikely to indicate sympathy, but draws attention to his appropriately humbled and sorry state. According to the chorus, Polymestor has suffered grievously, but his crime was equally outrageous (1086). There seems to be some sympathy when Agamemnon addresses Polymestor as δύστηνε (1116), but this pales in significance when compared to the abundance of references to Trojan sorrow and grief. The Trojans are clearly intended to be the focus of sympathy, whereas Polymestor's grief is a just reward for violating the sacred bonds of guest-friendship by murdering Polydorus and casting his body into the sea.

Conclusion

Euripides' *Hecuba* reflects the diversity of attitudes towards non-Greeks which co-existed in fifth-century Athenian society. Odysseus employs the rhetoric of polarity against the Trojans, but his arguments are unconvincing and the play as a whole does not support his accusation of Trojan barbarism. The Trojans are not presented as excessively luxurious, nor as slaves by nature, and their clothing is inconsistent, sometimes resembling Greek styles, sometimes eastern dress. In short, they do not display the moral and cultural deficiencies characteristic of the eastern barbarian stereotype. The nobility of Polyxena's character wins admiration from all, and the justice of Hecuba's revenge is never questioned. In any case, the abundance of pathos which Euripides evokes for the Trojans is a strong counterargument to the notion that he seeks to barbarise them in the play. Moreover, the reading of Kovacs and Morwood, that the *Hecuba* presents a strong contrast between royalist Asians and democratic Greeks, is too simplistic. In fact, instead

[158] Morwood 2000: 115-16.

of promoting democracy, one can argue convincingly that Euripides is challenging the very institution which lies at the heart of the Athenian πόλις.

Conversely, Euripides barbarises the Thracians through his portrayal of their king Polymestor. Agamemnon's criticism of his barbarism is justified, as throughout the play Polymestor displays a catalogue of barbarian vices with minimal redeeming qualities. Euripides emphasises Polymestor's impiety and his violation of the sacred bonds of ξενία, and presents him as savage and bestial after his blinding, with strong parallels to the Homeric Cyclops. His depiction of Polymestor is clearly influenced by the contemporary Athenian stereotype of the cruel and primitive Thracian.

Accordingly, the *Hecuba* offers a favourable portrayal of the Trojans in conjunction with a highly polarised depiction of the Thracians. Scholars who argue that polarity overwhelmingly characterised Athenian attitudes towards non-Greeks and those who deny the existence of a Greek/barbarian polarity would both struggle to explain the *Hecuba*, which provides evidence for the simultaneous coexistence in Athenian society of conflicting attitudes towards non-Greeks, ranging from polarity to admiration.

Chapter 4: The *Troades*

Introduction

This chapter examines how the Trojans are portrayed in the *Troades*. Opening with an analysis of the Trojan identification with Phrygians, it will then evaluate the Greek/barbarian polarity in the play, assessing its clarity, consistency, and significance. After discussing luxury and clothing, it will examine the significance of pathos and slavery, before concluding with an analysis of the play's historical context and the possibility of it belonging to a connected trilogy, two external factors which are essential for understanding the Trojan portrayal in the play.

1. Trojan identification with Phrygians

There are twenty-nine instances in the *Troades* where the Trojans are referred to as Φρύγες or by the adjective Φρύγιος, vastly exceeding the *Hecuba* (eight instances) and the *Andromache* (six instances). Part of the explanation of this could be due to the play's subject matter. Since the *Troades* largely consists of Trojan women lamenting for themselves and the fallen city of Troy, if 'Phrygian' is merely a synonym for Trojan, then it is only natural to expect the term to occur frequently. However, this alone cannot explain why the *Troades* has approximately quadruple the number of references to Phrygians that the *Hecuba* or the *Andromache* has. More likely, Euripides deliberately intends to draw attention to the Trojan/Phrygian identification and reinforce the concept in the audience's mind for a particular purpose.

Just like in the *Andromache* and *Hecuba*, that purpose is unlikely to be to denigrate the Trojans. The references to Trojans as Phrygians do not seem to be pejorative, and are made by the Greeks Talthybius (418, 709) and Helen (926, 960), the Trojans Hecuba (151, 476, 974, 994, 1164, 1210, 1220, 1288), Andromache (716, 754, 773), and Cassandra (338, 391, 432), the chorus of Trojan women (531, 545, 563, 567, 574, 1075, 1208), and the god Poseidon (7, 18, 24, 64). The Trojan/Phrygian identification has already been discussed in chapter two and the arguments expressed there are equally valid for the *Troades*, particularly the argument that the identification helps the audience imagine what the Trojan culture and customs might have been like. This is especially evident in the references to Phrygian clothing (338-9, 1220) and songs (545). The Greek audience could not have seen Trojan clothes or heard Trojan songs, but presumably would

have been familiar with Phrygian clothing and music, especially those who had spent time in western Anatolia.

2. The Greek/barbarian polarity

Βάρβαρος: clear divide or blurred distinction?

The term βάρβαρος is critical to understanding the Trojan portrayal, particularly whether Euripides employs it to promote a clear divide between Greeks and Trojans or creates ambiguity as to who should be regarded as βάρβαροι.

First, there are several references to customs which are designated as Greek or Trojan. Upon hearing from Talthybius that Polyxena will serve Achilles' tomb, Hecuba asks τίς ὅδ᾽ ἢ νόμος ἢ / τί θέσμιον, ὦ φίλος, Ἑλλάνων; (266-7), allowing the possibility that the Greeks have customs which are foreign to the Trojans. However, Hecuba is not seriously outlining a distinctive Greek cultural practice, but reacting with shock and incredulity to her daughter's fate, as her initial reaction indicates (265). However, Hecuba later describes some Trojan cultural practices:

> ὦ τέκνον, οὐχ ἵπποισι νικήσαντά σε
> οὐδ᾽ ἥλικας τόξοισιν, οὓς Φρύγες νόμους
> τιμῶσιν, οὐκ ἐς πλησμονὰς θηρώμενοι,
> μήτηρ πατρός σοι προστίθησ᾽ ἀγάλματα
> τῶν σῶν ποτ᾽ ὄντων· 1209-13

Here Hecuba presents horse-riding (1209) and archery (1210) as two traditional Trojan pastimes. Horses are not exclusively associated with Trojans in the *Troades*, as Argos is ἱππόβοτον (1087), nor is archery, as it is associated with Heracles, who is labelled τοξοφόρος (804). However, given Herodotus' claim that horse-riding and archery were integral to a Persian education (1.137), Hecuba's declaration of their importance among the Trojan youth may have struck the audience as non-Greek, differentiating the Trojans from the Greeks and potentially alienating the audience who would have associated these practices with easterners. However, this is curiously qualified by Hecuba's assertion that the Trojans guard against pursuing these pastimes to excess: οὐκ ἐς πλησμονὰς θηρώμενοι (1211). Here she seems to appeal to the Greek virtue of σωφροσύνη, which encompasses moderation and self-control. By combining non-Greek customs with a Greek virtue, Hecuba's words here exemplify the difficulties of distinguishing between Greek and barbarian in the *Troades*.

Both Andromache and Hecuba refer to the Trojans as barbarians. Andromache identifies Helen as a κῆρα βαρβάροις Ἕλλησί τε (771). This clear division between Greek and barbarian reflects a Greek polarised worldview, but the connotations of βάρβαρος here are purely ethnic and not pejorative.[1] Similarly, Hecuba labels the Trojans barbarians when she describes Troy as μεγάλα δή ποτ᾽ ἀμπνέουσ᾽ ἐν βαρβάροις (1277). Once again, βάρβαρος has a purely ethnic significance, as there is no reason for Hecuba to denigrate her own people here. Nevertheless, in these two instances Trojans refer to their own people as barbarians in accordance with the conventional Greek/barbarian polarity.

All other references to the Trojans as barbarians are complicated by the rhetorical motivations of the speakers. Helen tells Menelaus that the Greeks are not ruled by barbarians (οὐ κρατεῖσθ᾽ ἐκ βαρβάρων, 933), a possibility which would have eventuated had Aphrodite not prevailed in the beauty contest. In this case, βάρβαρος seems to have pejorative undertones, but Helen's denigration of the Trojans is due to her rhetorical purpose of evoking horror at the thought of Greeks being subjugated by a foreign and inferior people. Subjugation by Trojans is unlikely to have the same emotive effect on Menelaus as subjugation by barbarians.[2] In her response to Helen, Hecuba also refers to the Trojans as barbarians, claiming that Hera would not be so foolish ὥσθ'… Ἄργος βαρβάροις ἀπημπόλα (973). Her denigration of her own people is sensible here, as she seeks to highlight the absurdity of the prospect that Hera would sell Greece to barbarians, contradicting Helen's claim that she is responsible for preventing this eventuality. Therefore, in her effort to persuade Menelaus, it is reasonable for Hecuba to adopt what she assumes to be the Greek point of view.[3]

Later in the same speech, Hecuba claims that Helen went mad (992) upon seeing Paris in his βαρβάροις ἐσθήμασι (991), and that she came to Troy wanting to have obeisance made to her by barbarians: προσκυνεῖσθαι βαρβάρων ὕπ᾽ ἤθελες (1021). Hecuba's purpose in describing her Trojans thus is to highlight Helen's obsession with eastern luxury and *proskynesis* in an attempt to alienate her from Menelaus.[4] *Proskynesis* was an oriental

[1] Barlow 1986: 197 points out that βάρβαρος simply means 'non-Greek' here.
[2] Croally 1994: 141 observes that Helen is appealing to Menelaus' assumed Greek disdain for barbarians.
[3] Goff 2009: 67 notes that Hecuba's revenge requires her to identify with the Greek conquerors.
[4] Goff 2009: 68 observes that the dialectic of self and other mutates depending on the speaker's motivation.

custom (Hdt. 1.119, 134; E. *Or*. 1507) which the Greeks regarded as degrading.[5] However, Hecuba does not necessarily imply that the Trojans practice *proskynesis*, and no Trojan performs the act in the play.[6] Instead, she only suggests that Helen desired to receive *proskynesis*. Accordingly, Hecuba's description is not necessarily an accurate portrayal of the Trojans, but more likely to be a gross exaggeration which reflects poorly upon Helen for desiring to live among them.

However, on several occasions the traditional Greek/barbarian polarity appears to be deliberately contradicted. Hecuba outlines three distinct ethnic categories (Trojan, Greek, and barbarian) when she extols her children's virtues, claiming that they are children οὓς Τρῳὰς οὐδ᾽ Ἑλληνὶς οὐδὲ βάρβαρος / γυνὴ τεκοῦσα κομπάσειεν ἄν ποτε (477-8).[7] Some scholars are sceptical of the possibility of three different categories,[8] but the possibility should remain open that Hecuba does not regard the Trojans as barbarians.[9] Goff argues that Hecuba's words align the Trojan with the Greek, over against the barbarian,[10] but there is another possibility. The epithets Ἑλληνίς and βάρβαρος are both negated by an οὐδέ, but there is nothing negating Τρῳὰς. Therefore, what Hecuba seems to be claiming is that only a Trojan, but not a Greek nor a barbarian woman, could boast to have produced children as excellent as hers. In her mind, the Trojans are elevated above Greeks and barbarians. Although Hecuba's view here is inconsistent with her later references to the Trojans as barbarians (973, 991, 1021, 1277), this contradiction is in keeping with the general confusion and blurring of the Greek/barbarian polarity in the play.

Andromache even reverses the Greek/barbarian polarity. Outraged that the Greeks intend to murder her son Astyanax, she exclaims ὦ βάρβαρ᾽ ἐξευρόντες Ἕλληνες κακά (764). Accusing the Greeks of committing barbaric acts,[11] Andromache's profound declaration

[5] Morwood 2000: 143.
[6] Although Hecuba collapses onto the ground and refuses the chorus' assistance (462-8), an action she repeats at the end of the play (1305-7), where the chorus also kneels to the earth (1307), none of these instances constitutes *proskynesis*.
[7] This is the manuscript reading. An alternative reading οὐ τοιάδ᾽ οὖθ᾽ for οὓς Τρῳὰς οὐδ᾽ has also been proposed.
[8] Lee 1976: 156 argues that one must read ἄλλη before both Τρῳὰς and βάρβαρος, since Hecuba was a Trojan and a βάρβαρος, whereas Erskine 2001: 76 n.71, somewhat unconvincingly, disregards Hecuba's three-way distinction as an imagined Trojan viewpoint.
[9] Lévy 1976: 157 n.11 comments that the Trojan 'statut ethnique reste ambigu'.
[10] Goff 2009: 56.
[11] Bacon 1961: 13 argues that the play's irony is that the savages are not the Trojans but the Greeks.

is likely to have rattled the Greek audience,[12] completely turning the conventional polarity on its head and casting doubt over who are the real barbarians in the play. Barlow's comment that it is inappropriate for Andromache to think in terms of Greeks and barbarians, as she was by Greek definition a barbarian,[13] misses the point, since the *Troades* repeatedly blurs the Greek/barbarian distinction. For instance, Poseidon claims that Helen rightly belongs with the Trojan captives (34-5), even though she is a Greek. Helen also seems to cross the Greek/barbarian boundary when Andromache labels her a pest to Greeks and barbarians alike (771) and Hecuba accuses her of being attracted to Paris' oriental garb (991).[14] Moreover, Hecuba crosses the boundary by addressing the Greek Talthybius as a φίλος (267), by working together with Menelaus against Helen (912-13), and by her attack on ἀμαθία (972), a typical barbarian characteristic (cf. Ar. *Nu.* 492).[15] Even Talthybius breaches the divide by generously bathing Astyanax's corpse (1152-5).[16] In addition to the words of Hecuba (477-8) and Andromache (764), this evidence casts further doubt on who should be considered the Greeks and who the barbarians. The audience may enter the play with certain assumptions, but the *Troades* challenges the traditional ethnic polarity.[17] It consistently blurs the Greek/barbarian distinction, endorsing a new distinction based upon moral conduct. The issue of barbarism now transcends ethnicity.

Portrayal of Greeks/Trojans – virtue vs. savagery

Since the use of βάρβαρος does not support a clear or consistent ideology, one must examine behaviour and characterisation to determine who should be appropriately regarded as the barbarians of the play.

Andromache relates how she always strove to earn a good reputation (643) and went to great lengths to ensure her behaviour was always modest: ἃ γὰρ γυναιξὶ σώφρον᾽ ἔσθ᾽ ηὑρημένα, / ταῦτ᾽ ἐξεμόχθουν (645-6). Resisting the urge to leave the house, she stayed ἐν δόμοις (650), distancing herself from the κομψὰ θηλειῶν ἔπη (651). Submissive before

[12] Barlow 1986: 197 maintains that it is a slur on the values on which Greeks had prided themselves for so long.
[13] Barlow 1986: 197.
[14] Croally 1994: 108.
[15] Croally 1994: 109.
[16] Barlow 1986: 219 argues that this act of generosity prevents one from interpreting the play solely in terms of wicked Greeks and innocent Trojans.
[17] Poole 1976: 282-3 asserts that the play dispels the assumption of the immiscibility of Greek and barbarian.

her husband (654-5), Andromache knew when she could have her way and when to yield: ᾔδη… ἀμ᾽ ἐχρῆν νικᾶν πόσιν, / κείνῳ τε νίκην ὧν ἐχρῆν παριέναι (655-6). In her modesty, willingness to remain at home, rejection of gossip, and submission to her husband, Andromache displays all the virtues of the ideal Greek wife.[18] Her description of her marriage to Hector yields neatly to the demands of contemporary Athenian ideology,[19] a fact which further undermines the traditional Greek/barbarian polarity. Andromache's virtue is emblematic of the Trojans, who remain upright and admirable figures throughout the play.[20]

Conversely, the Greeks are savage and violent. Distraught over the cruelty of the Greeks, who have resolved to murder her son, Andromache invites them to feast on Astyanax's flesh (775). She emphasises their cruelty by comparing them to wild animals (cf. *Andr.* 74-5),[21] and the imagery she employs is reminiscent of that in the *Hecuba*, which stresses Polymestor's animality.[22] There is no doubt in Andromache's mind as to who the real barbarians are. Her sentiments are echoed by Hecuba, who envisions an epitaph for Astyanax which would be αἰσχρὸν (1191) for the Greeks: Τὸν παῖδα τόνδ᾽ ἔκτειναν Ἀργεῖοί ποτε / δείσαντες (1190-91). As Lee notes, the Greeks' inhumanity reaches a climax in Astyanax's murder,[23] the senseless brutality of which even Talthybius bears witness to (713, 717, 721, 723).[24] Moreover, the Greeks also decide to slay the innocent Polyxena at Achilles' tomb (622-3), another cruel and barbaric act, unfit for a supposedly civilised people.[25] These two acts of senseless violence stress the Greeks' brutality,[26] an aspect repeatedly criticised by the Trojans, and lend credence to Andromache's accusation of βάρβαρα κακά (764).

---

[18] Lee 1976: xxiv. Scodel 1998: 148 describes Andromache as the perfect exemplum of the loyal wife, and Muich 2010: 201 notes that she clearly possesses σωφροσύνη.
[19] Croally 1994: 90. Hall 2000: xxxiii claims that many audience members would have agreed with her words.
[20] Hall 1989: 220 suggests that the Trojans behave like ideal Greeks, Scodel 1980: 114 argues that they are nobler than the Greeks, and Muich 2010: 221 describes Andromache's role as a 'noble barbarian' who fleshes out the wickedness of the Greeks. Potential criticisms of the Trojans include Cassandra's bloodlust (359), Paris' disregard for the laws of ξενία (866), and, according to Amerasinghe 1973: 101, Hecuba's transition from her heroic endurance of suffering to the venomous hatred she directs at Helen. Hazel 2001: 16-17 argues that Hecuba combines Athenian and female barbarian traits.
[21] Lee 1976: 207.
[22] Saïd 2002: 88.
[23] Lee 1976: xvi.
[24] Luschnig 1971: 10.
[25] Croally 1994: 78 observes the irony that fifth-century Greeks tended to believe that only barbarians were capable of human sacrifice (cf. *IT* 380-91).
[26] Gellie 1986: 114 regards this cruelty as the driving force behind the events of the play, and Lee 1976: xvii contends that this brutality justifies the Greeks' downfall.

The Greeks are also characterised by their deceitfulness and moral inferiority. Upon discovering that she has been allocated to Odysseus, Hecuba embarks on an emotional tirade in which she comprehensively criticises her new master (283-7), accusing him of treachery (δολίῳ, 283), injustice (πολεμίῳ δίκας, 284), lawlessness (παρανόμῳ, 284), duplicity (διπτύχῳ γλώσσᾳ, 286), and even labelling him a beast (δάκει, 284). Given that Odysseus conceived the idea of murdering Astyanax (721), and since he was the villain of the *Palamedes*, the play presented immediately before the *Troades*, Hecuba's graphic portrait is especially appropriate.[27]

Similarly, Helen is characterised by her own moral failings, namely her lack of modesty and shame. Menelaus declares that her wretched death will provide an example for all women to be chaste (1056-7). This is not an isolated incident, but rather, as Koniaris observes, Helen's wickedness is stressed constantly and from many viewpoints (130-37, 766-73, 780-81, 890-94, 966-8, 1213-15).[28] In contrast to the virtuous Andromache, Helen possesses no σωφροσύνη at all,[29] but an abundance of shamelessness, as Hecuba observes that she should have displayed τὸ σῶφρον τῆς ἀναιδείας πλέον (1027).[30] Moreover, she is the only female lead never to sing in the *Troades*, potentially contrasting her calculating and manipulative character with the emotional depth of the Trojan women.[31] Her husband Menelaus is no better. Despite speaking like a leader of men, he is soon found to be hollow, blustering and threatening, but all the while soft and vulnerable.[32] Weak-minded, Menelaus is over-fond of Helen and completely helpless in the face of her beauty,[33] as can be deduced from Hecuba's anxiety that he will be led astray (1049-51).[34] He pales in comparison to the Trojan Hector, who is widely praised, even by the Greek Talthybius, who labels him ἄριστος (709, 723).

---

[27] Barlow 1986: 172 argues that the portrait is appropriate because it adds to the general image of barbarous Greeks.
[28] Koniaris 1973: 98. Similarly Dué 2006: 110 argues that Helen is universally vilified as a treacherous wife, while Andromache emerges as the embodiment of Greek wifely virtues (645-56).
[29] Croally 1994: 92.
[30] Koniaris 1973: 99 asserts that Helen is completely corrupt and shameless like her daughter Hermione in the *Andromache*.
[31] Hall 2000: xxxix.
[32] Gellie 1986: 116. Similarly, Garvie 2001: 53 labels Menelaus weak and unimpressive. Conversely, Meridor 1984: 211, regards Menelaus as a sympathetic character due to his deferential treatment of Hecuba (912-13, 1036-9, 1053-4).
[33] Lee 1976: 219.
[34] Dover 2001: 3 notes that Menelaus' plan to execute Helen back in Sparta is oddly unconvincing, and that the audience would recall the truth from the *Odyssey*.

It is clear that Euripides' portrayal of Greeks and Trojans does not conform to any simplistic Greek/barbarian polarity. Just like his use of βάρβαρος, Euripides' presentation of individual characters encourages a subversion, and potential reversal of, the Greek/barbarian polarity, as the Trojans emerge as virtuous and honourable, while the Greeks are savage, violent, and morally inferior.[35]

Rhetoric

Rhetorical prowess and the ability to craft a persuasive argument can also differentiate between Greeks and barbarians. The Trojans criticise Odysseus and Helen for their use of rhetoric. Hecuba is scathingly critical of Odysseus' duplicitous nature (283-7), accusing him of abusing his rhetorical skill to influence outcomes and completely reverse them (285-6). Similarly, after Helen's speech in the *agon*, the chorus urges Hecuba to dispel the persuasiveness of her words (967), denouncing Helen for speaking well yet possessing a wicked character: λέγει / καλῶς κακοῦργος οὖσα· δεινὸν οὖν τόδε (967-8).[36]

However, despite her denunciation of Odysseus, Hecuba herself is proficient in Greek rhetoric. This constitutes further evidence that she is more than merely an uncultured and unintelligent barbarian, and the notions of Greek and barbarian are especially significant in the *agon*.[37] By ignoring or freely interpreting inconvenient facts and inventing incidents which support her argument, Hecuba behaves like a skilled pleader in an Athenian law court.[38] Just as Andromache's description of the ideal wife coincides with contemporary Greek values (645-56), so does Hecuba formulate her arguments in the *agon* from a Greek perspective. She urges Menelaus not to leave Helen alive and therefore betray his allies whom she has killed (1044), taking the Greek side against a Greek,[39] and she adopts a Greek position of scorn against Helen's taste for the barbarian life (1020-

[35] Scodel 1980: 114 observes that the Greeks are almost caricatures of the barbarians.
[36] However, some have noted the merits of Helen's argument. Barlow 1986: 205 questions any assumptions that Hecuba wins the exchange, since Helen's argument is logically flawless if one accepts its terms, while Hecuba's is not rational throughout. Similarly, Stuttard 2005: 31 argues that there is justice to Helen's argument, while Hecuba is in the wrong for her failure to kill Paris. Alternatively, Dover 2001: 4 believes that Helen's *apologia* consists of unconvincing sophistries easily rebutted by Hecuba.
[37] Biehl 1989: 37 comments that one must interpret the *agon* 'im Rahmen der bei Euripides immer besonders reizvollen Griechen-Barbaren-Darstellungen'.
[38] Meridor 2000: 25.
[39] Croally 1994: 116.

21).[40] As Croally argues, Hecuba's speech is a model of Greek agonistic rhetoric,[41] but her 'Greekness' is only temporary and rhetorically determined, as there is little point criticising barbarian behaviour before a Greek judge from a non-Greek perspective.[42] Even her defence of the honour of Athena (971-4, 979-81), Athens' patron goddess, could bring to Hecuba's side not only rationality but also the patriotic feeling of the average Athenian spectator.[43]

Largely due to her rhetorical prowess, Hecuba manages to persuade Menelaus (1036-9) and therefore appears to win the debate.[44] Another key indicator of Hecuba's victory is Euripides' reversal of the normal speech order, granting Hecuba the opportunity to speak second and attack the specific arguments in Helen's defence, which is more likely to render her victorious in the eyes of the spectator.[45] Although scholarly opinion on Hecuba's victory is not unanimous,[46] Hecuba's proficiency in rhetoric and the Greek perspective she adopts for her argumentation present her as highly intelligent, radically distancing her from the eastern barbarian stereotype.

Impiety

Impiety is another potential characterising device at Euripides' disposal. Hecuba describes the gods as κακοὺς… συμμάχους (469), is highly critical of their conduct (612-13), and questions the merits of sacrificial offerings: μάτην… ἐβουθυτοῦμεν (1242). Openly doubting the efficacy of prayer (1280-81), she even seems to question the existence of Zeus: ὅστις ποτ᾽ εἶ σύ, δυστόπαστος εἰδέναι, / Ζεύς (885-6). Clearly, Hecuba does not have a high opinion of the gods. According to Burnett, this rebellious tendency is Hecuba's major ethical trait,[47] a trait shared by the Trojan women who can address

[40] Croally 1994: 151.
[41] Croally 1994: 109.
[42] Croally 1994: 112.
[43] Koniaris 1973: 99.
[44] Meridor 2000: 25; Conacher 1967: 144. Lee 1976: xxiii asserts that Hecuba is the sympathetic character and that her arguments are more cogent than Helen's.
[45] Koniaris 1973: 98, who adds that from the perspective of an Athenian audience in 415, Hecuba's rationalistic thesis was more likely to prevail over Helen's mythological thesis.
[46] Lloyd 1984: 313 argues that Menelaus agreeing with Hecuba is not decisive, as he has no special knowledge and does not convincingly justify his decision (cf. Demophon at *Hcld.* 236-49), and Barry 2001: 86 claims that Hecuba's argumentation is no more convincing than Helen's. Barlow 1986: 206 maintains that neither Helen's nor Hecuba's arguments are intended to be viewed as correct, but that the truth is somewhere in between.
[47] Burnett 1977: 311.

gods with ugly irreverence (1060-70, 1077-80).[48] Comparing this characteristic of the Trojan women to the Ganymede Ode (799-859), which presents Troy of the past as a place of bad faith and effeminacy, impiety, and arrogance,[49] Burnett concludes that the Trojan women reflect the qualities of Laomedon which had made Troy in its grandeur offensive to the gods.[50]

However, while there is some merit to Burnett's argument, she places too much emphasis on the negative traits of Troy,[51] and a more balanced assessment of the Trojan women's apparent impiety takes into account the context and attendant circumstances. Hecuba has been so overwhelmed by disaster (686-96) that she is forced into denying her piety.[52] It is only natural for someone who has suffered so much to question the gods' existence or the efficacy of prayer. Hecuba has already demonstrated her piety by relating how she used to lead the dance in honour of the Phrygian gods (148-52), and so it is unlikely that her newfound impiety is to denigrate her character. Instead, it accentuates the vast emotional suffering Hecuba has endured, so much so that this normally pious woman has reached the point where she is questioning not only the efficacy of prayer and sacrifice, but even the gods' existence.[53]

The Greeks are also no strangers to impiety. Poseidon recounts how the Greek violence during the sack of Troy has spilled over into the temples (15-16), with Priam being murdered near the altar of Zeus himself (16-17).[54] These outrages are condemned by Athena, formerly one of the strongest Greek supporters, who now wishes disaster upon them to teach them how to properly respect her shrines and the other gods (85-6). The unholy element of the Greeks' violence is also denounced by Trojans, first by Hecuba referring to Polyxena's sacrifice (ἀνοσίων προσφαγμάτων, 628), then by the chorus, describing Priam as ὅσιος ἀνοσίαις σφαγαῖσιν (1316), starkly juxtaposing his piety with

[48] Burnett 1977: 310-11.
[49] Burnett 1977: 308.
[50] Burnett 1977: 211. Similarly, Barry 2001: 81-4 concludes from the first and second choral ode that the Trojans' treachery has led to Troy's destruction.
[51] As Barlow 1986: 36 n.19 argues, the focus is not on Trojan misdemeanours but on their largely undeserved suffering.
[52] Waterfield 1982: 140.
[53] Barlow 1986: 226 regards Hecuba's religious scepticism as justified due to the gods' previous lack of support for her (1280-81).
[54] Dué 2006: 137 argues that emphasis from the outset is on the Greek crimes against the gods during the sack of Troy, and Blessington 2015: 66 asserts that Poseidon 'intensifies our sympathies by emphasizing the excessive violence of the Greeks'.

the impiety of his murderers. The Greeks' impiety is also evident in their treatment of the Trojan women. Athena is disgusted that the Greeks have not punished Ajax for his treatment of Cassandra in her temple (69-71), and even Agamemnon's desire for Cassandra is condemned by Poseidon as impious (43), since Apollo had designated for her to remain a παρθένος (41).[55] Accordingly, while Hecuba is arguably justified in questioning and reproaching the gods, the *Troades* offers no excuse for the Greeks' impious violence.

Divine favour

The gods' attitudes towards the Greeks and Trojans could indicate how Euripides intended those peoples to be regarded. Poseidon is presented as a pro-Trojan god, declaring that he never harboured any ill-feeling towards them (6-7). Since this contradicts his portrayal in Homeric poetry, where he is hostile to the Trojans (*Il.* 14.357-77; 20.34; 21.435-60),[56] it is possible that Euripides may have invented Poseidon's attachment to Troy (cf. *IT* 1414-15).[57] Similarly, Athena is on the Trojan side and wishes to bring them pleasure (Τρῶας εὐφρᾶναι θέλω, 65), despite the fact that they were once her enemies (τοὺς… πρὶν ἐχθροὺς, 65; cf. 59). Given that she is one of the goddesses who destroyed Troy (24; cf. 72),[58] and is responsible for the Trojan horse's construction (10), her declaration of support for the Trojans is significant.

Although the gods declare their support for the Trojans, in practice they minimally aid the Trojan cause. The chorus laments that τὰ θεῶν… / φίλτρα φροῦδα Τροίᾳ (858-9), and Hecuba even accuses them of harbouring a particular hatred against Troy (241; cf. 696). The gods' support for the Trojans involves disrupting the Greeks' homecoming (δύσνοστον αὐτοῖς νόστον ἐμβαλεῖν, 75; cf. 66) and killing many of them in the Aegean Sea (88-91), but in no way directly alleviates the suffering the Trojans have endured through the sack of Troy and their subsequent enslavement, so the Trojans are quite justified to claim that the gods have abandoned them. The gods' primary concern is not

[55] Scodel 1998: 144 argues that the *Troades* stresses the violation and perverseness in Agamemnon's lust for Cassandra.
[56] Lee 1976: 67; Scodel 1980: 65. Morwood 2000: 130 labels Poseidon an uncompromising Trojan enemy in the *Iliad*, but O'Neill 1941: 296 n.13 notes that Poseidon is not entirely anti-Trojan (*Il.* 20.292-340; 7.445-53; 8.198-207; *Od.* 4.499-511).
[57] Croally 1994: 72 n.4.
[58] Hall 2000: xxvi notes responsibility for the sack of Troy is shared among various gods: the chorus suspects Zeus (1060-70), Poseidon blames Hera and Athena (8-12, 24), and Ares also plays a role (376, 560).

to secure justice for the Trojans, but to punish the Greeks for the outrages that have been committed against their temples (69-71).[59] Therefore, while the gods' condemnation of the Greeks' conduct during the sack of Troy is likely to be shared by the audience,[60] their declarations of support for the Trojans are undermined by selfish motives and a failure to mitigate the Trojans' suffering. If anything, through their conspicuous lack of aid for the Trojans, the gods accentuate the Trojans' isolation and suffering.[61]

3. Luxury and clothing

Wealth

As Rosenbloom notes, gold had an ambivalent status in fifth-century Athens, as it occupied a place above and below the Greeks, belonging to the gods but also luxurious barbarians.[62] While references to gold are not automatically pejorative, an association and preoccupation with excessive luxury is unlikely to have been regarded favourably by fifth-century Athenians.

There are multiple references in the *Troades* associating wealth with the Trojans. Poseidon mentions Troy's significant wealth when he states that πολὺς δέ χρυσὸς… / πρὸς ναῦς Ἀχαιῶν πέμπεται (18-19), Andromache describes Hector as an ἄνδρ' ἀρκοῦντά… πλούτῳ (673-4),[63] and Hecuba refers to the Trojans as ὄλβιοι (497). Moreover, Ganymede walks χρυσέαις ἐν οἰνοχόαις (820), Paris is decked out with gold (992), and Troy itself is said to flow with gold (995). However, most of these references to Trojan wealth are located in the past. Poseidon addresses Troy as ὦ ποτ' εὐτυχοῦσα… πόλις (45), Andromache laments the loss of Troy's wealth with her utterance βέβακ' ὄλβος (582), and the chorus recalls that the golden statues of the gods are no more (1071-4). Burnett argues that Troy is steadily described as a city of extraordinary wealth, pride, and luxury,[64] but she places too much emphasis on the negative aspects of the Trojans'

[59] Fittipaldi 1979: 142 argues that the gods are incomprehensible and apathetic towards the Trojans' suffering.
[60] Garvie 2001: 53 argues that Euripides intends for the audience to share the divine sympathy for the Trojans and hostility towards the Greeks.
[61] Croally 1994: 82 maintains that the complete absence of divine support stresses the extremity of Troy's fall from grace.
[62] Rosenbloom 2006: 257.
[63] Hall 1989: 127 interprets this as evidence for the Trojans' excessive luxury, but as Mattison 2009: 9 points out, Andromache is eulogising Hector rather than luxuriating in her opulent lifestyle.
[64] Burnett 1977: 310.

character.[65] These references to Troy's wealth are not intended to denigrate the Trojans, but contrast pathetically with their present situation. By frequently dwelling on their rich and glorious past, the Trojans accentuate the magnitude of their fall from status, one of the key methods through which Euripides evokes pathos for them.

Early in the play Poseidon relates how the Trojans' wealth has now passed into Greek hands (18-19), which is telling, since Helen is the character most associated with excessive luxury. The chorus envisions Helen with χρύσεα… ἔνοπτρα (1107),[66] and Hecuba accuses her of losing her mind upon seeing Paris resplendent χρυσῷ… λαμπρὸν (992). Hecuba even suggests that Helen's obsession with wealth led her to Troy:

> ἐν μὲν γὰρ Ἄργει μίκρ᾽ ἔχουσ᾽ ἀνεστρέφου,
> Σπάρτης δ᾽ ἀπαλλαχθεῖσα τὴν Φρυγῶν πόλιν
> χρυσῷ ῥέουσαν ἤλπισας κατακλύσειν
> δαπάναισιν· οὐδ᾽ ἦν ἱκανά σοι τὰ Μενέλεω
> μέλαθρα ταῖς σαῖς ἐγκαθυβρίζειν τρυφαῖς. 993-7

Here Hecuba claims that Helen was dissatisfied with Argos' modest resources and that she came to Troy to indulge her appetites (κατακλύσειν / δαπάναισιν, 995-6),[67] suggesting with the verb ἐγκαθυβρίζειν an unlawful or at least inappropriate element to her desires. Unlike Trojan wealth, which is merely stated as a fact and not directly linked to character flaws, Helen's association with wealth is pejorative, as it entails a preoccupation with excessive luxury. As Scodel notes, Helen embodies the τρυφή of the barbarian life more than the Trojans themselves.[68] Although this portrait of Helen is generated by Trojans who are highly hostile towards her, it is clear that Helen lacks the σωφροσύνη that is central to Andromache's characterisation (645-56).

Clothing

The Trojans have a reputation for fine clothing in the *Troades*. Cassandra elucidates this reputation by addressing the Trojan women as καλλίπεπλοι (338),[69] and it is substantiated

[65] As does Barry 2001: 80, who identifies arrogance and excessive pride in the background of Hecuba's story of past grandeur and present misery.
[66] Barlow 1986: 218 notes that Helen's golden objects are indicative of what is frivolous and sinister (cf. 821, 992, 520).
[67] Croally 1994: 150 maintains that by minimalising the wealth available to Helen in Sparta (contrary to the Homeric precedent, cf. *Od.* 4.42-6, 71-5), Hecuba gains the fullest force from the picture of Helen's hedonism.
[68] Scodel 1980: 113.
[69] Morwood 2000: 134 notes the pathos in the irony that the Trojan women on stage are clothed in rags.

by the splendid garments with which Hecuba adorns Astyanax's body (1220), and by Hecuba's reference to Paris' 'barbarian clothes' (βαρβάροις ἐσθήμασι, 991), most likely referring to gorgeous eastern attire. These two examples, and several others from Euripides (*El.* 317-18, *IA* 73-4) have led Bacon to conclude that the distinguishing characteristic of Trojan dress is its richness.[70] However, just like the allusions to the past wealth of Troy, these references to the beauty of Trojan garments contrast strikingly with the Trojans' present situation. Now enslaved, their city sacked, the Trojan women are dressed in rags, garments which Hecuba anticipates will be the norm when she carries out her servile duties in Greece (496-7).[71] As Lee notes, Euripides often uses costume to stress a character's pathetic circumstances,[72] and this is precisely the point of Hecuba's words: accustomed to royal garments, she and the other Trojan women will now have to adopt plain and tattered servile clothing.

Once again, the Trojan women can be compared to Helen. Not only is Helen won over by Paris' gorgeous garments (991-2), but, despite being grouped with the Trojan captives (34-5), she even manages to adorn herself with fine clothes, drawing the ire of Hecuba (1022-5).[73] The participle ἀσκήσασα (1023), which has derogatory overtones (cf. *El.* 1071-3),[74] is reminiscent of the earlier κοσμοῦσα (982), which Hecuba uses to describe Helen glossing over her wicked behaviour, but which can also mean 'adorn' or 'embellish' with reference to clothing or accessories. Just as Helen adorns her body with finery, so does she adorn her wicked nature, therefore combining her excessive lust for beautiful clothing with her deeply flawed character. Although the Trojan women are now dressed in rags, Helen still manages to be associated through her clothing with luxury and frivolity, even in her present captivity.

Helen bears stereotypical eastern barbarian traits through her obsession with luxury and preoccupation with fine clothes. On the Trojan side, although references to their opulence and beautiful garments are made, the emphasis is located in the past. The wealth is gone,

[70] Bacon 1961: 123.
[71] Alternatively, Hazel 2001: 15 believes the chorus may have been well-dressed, as this would signal their unsuitedness to a life of slavery.
[72] Lee 1976: 159, citing *El.* 184-5 and Aristophanes' criticism of this tendency (*Ach*. 407ff.).
[73] Mattison 2009: 24-5 notes that the play contains no reference to luxurious Trojan women.
[74] Lee 1976: 241.

the women are now clad in rags, and the audience is invited to feel pathos by contrasting the Trojans' present situation with their past prosperity.

4. Pathos

The significant amount of pathos which Euripides consistently evokes for the Trojans is perhaps the strongest argument against their barbarisation in the *Troades*.

Hecuba

Euripides evokes pathos for Hecuba by dwelling on her wretchedness and fall from status, but also through her violent expressions of grief and recollections of personal trauma. Poseidon labels Hecuba ἀθλία (36), which she later echoes when referring to her troubles (489). The plethora of epithets Hecuba applies to herself to stress her miserable state include δυσδαίμων (98), μελέα (106, 136), δύστηνος (112, 120, cf. 696), τλάμων (191; cf. 1233), and δειλαία (192). The most common, however, is τάλαινα (290, 498, 504, 624, 1272, 1329). Hecuba also laments her ill-fortune, labelling herself δύσποτμος (290) and her κλῆρος as δυστυχέστατος (291, cf. 471), and stresses the pain she has suffered by her repetition of ἄλγος and its cognates (ἐπ' ἄλγεσι δ' ἀλγυνθῶ, 172; cf. 596), which generates the image of endless grief and pain piling on top of one another. Moreover, Hecuba reminds the audience of how pitiable her situation is (κρᾶτ' ἐκπορθηθεῖσ' / οἰκτρῶς, 141-2; cf. 585), a point supported by the chorus (155, 197-8). As Meridor observes, Hecuba lavishly applies pathetic descriptions to herself.[75]

Hecuba also generates pathos for herself by repeatedly mentioning how far she has fallen from her past status and prosperity. She laments that her πατρὶς ἔρρει καὶ τέκνα καὶ πόσις (107), and observes the loss of Troy and its wealth, declaring βέβακ' ὄλβος, βέβακε Τροία (583). Hecuba used to enjoy royal status (99-100, 195-6) and came from a line of proud ancestors (108-9). She was royalty and married into royalty (474), but now she has lost everything and envisions herself clothed in πέπλων λακίσματ', ἀδόκιμ' ὀλβίοις ἔχειν (497). Hecuba's sense of deprivation is neatly conveyed by the two juxtaposed epithets ἄπολις ἄτεκνος (1186), highlighting what has been taken away from her. Now enslaved, poor, and deprived of city and family, Hecuba's present circumstances form a strong

[75] Meridor 1989: 34 n.58.

contrast to her previous royal status, a contrast which she consistently stresses to significant emotive effect.[76]

Hecuba expresses her grief violently and also recalls the personal trauma she endured during the sack of Troy. Upon discovering her allocation to Odysseus, Hecuba reacts violently, envisioning striking her head and raking her cheeks with her nails (279-80). She even relives the horrors she experienced during the sack (481-3). Not only was Hecuba's husband slaughtered, but she witnessed the deed with her own eyes (τοῖσδε… εἶδον ὄμμασιν, 482), an image she is unlikely to forget. It is one thing to label herself wretched and lament the loss of her former status, but quite another to vividly recall witnessing Priam's murder. Hecuba is clearly a highly sympathetic figure,[77] and Euripides goes to great lengths to evoke pathos for her.[78]

Andromache

Andromache is also a focal point for Trojan pathos. Her initial appearance in the play, entering on a wagon loaded with Hector's armour and Trojan spoils (568-76), presents a striking image of her fall from an exalted status.[79] She repeatedly draws attention to her wretched status, labelling herself τλάμων (583), ἀθλία (741, 777), and δυστυχής (745), and her description of the χρωτὸς ἡδὺ πνεῦμα (758) of Astyanax skin presents a powerful image of the bond between mother and child which will soon be broken.[80] Like Hecuba, Andromache has also lost her husband, and she draws attention to this by eulogising Hector and relating how he met all of her needs: σὲ δ', ὦ φίλ' Ἕκτορ, εἶχον ἄνδρ' ἀρκοῦντά μοι / ξυνέσει γένει πλούτῳ τε κἀνδρείᾳ μέγαν (673-4).[81] Her miserable condition is acknowledged by others, with Hecuba describing her as τάλαινα (272) and σχετλία (596), and the chorus labelling her as μελέα (1251) and δύστηνος (573). Even the

[76] Luschnig 1971: 11 argues that Hecuba's remembrance of the past makes the present suffering more poignant, although Meridor 1989: 34 n.58 observes that Hecuba does not mention her royal past in the latter part of the play. Papadopoulou 2000: 514 asserts that the retrospective nature of all the Trojan characters is of primary dramatic effectiveness.

[77] Lee 1976: xxiv notes that Hecuba is a pathetic and moving figure, but argues, less convincingly, that her reactions are too predictable and emotions too unbalanced for her to be an absorbing personality.

[78] Biehl 1989: 32 argues that Hecuba is 'als Schmerzensmutter repräsentativ' for the Trojan women's suffering.

[79] Goff 2009: 57 compares Andromache's wagon entrance to Atossa (*Pers.*), Agamemnon (*Ag.*), and Clytemnestra (E. *El.*), concluding that it marks a precipitous fall from prosperity to doom.

[80] Lee 1976: 206 describes these words as a beautiful touch which captures the pathos and tenderness of a mother's farewell.

[81] Davidson 2001: 67 observes that this recalls Andromache's appeal at *Il.* 6.429-30, as Euripides replaces four 'people' nouns with four impersonal, abstract nouns.

Greek Talthybius recognises Andromache's pitiable situation, as he refers to her as a μήτηρ μογερά (783). Second only to Hecuba, Andromache is a highly pathetic character whose pitiable situation is drawn attention to by herself and by many other characters in the play.

Other Trojan characters

The Trojan women of the chorus also draw attention to their own suffering. Hecuba labels them as μέλεαι (144), an epithet which they then adopt and reemploy on several occasions (165, 179, 1120). To this they add τλάμων (185), δύστηνος (189), τάλαινα (518), οἰκτρά (206), and πολύδακρυς (1105). The chorus members even evoke pathos for their husbands, whom they describe as ἄθλιοι (1309), and one chorus member draws attention to what her husband has been deprived of with the phrase ἄθαπτος ἄνυδρος (1085), foreshadowing the later ἄπολις ἄτεκνος (1186) which Hecuba applies to herself. The chorus even draws direct attention to the theme of pathos and suffering by requesting a new song (511-13). According to Mattison, through this request the chorus shifts from themes of epic to the aftermath of war, and the focus is no longer on the actions of men, but rather the sufferings of women.[82]

Furthermore, through his youth and innocence, Astyanax generates plenty of sympathy. Hecuba refers to her grandson as δύσμορος (793), δυστυχής (1167), and δύστηνος (1173). However, his most common epithet is ἄθλιος, which Hecuba uses to refer to his death (1173), corpse (1186, 1200), and tomb (1246). Andromache even envisions the manner of her son's death, describing it as ἀνοίκτως (756). Much of the pathos arises from Astyanax's ignorance of what is happening, his innocence, and his inability to help himself.[83] Other Trojan characters worthy of sympathy include Cassandra, whom Hecuba labels τλάμων (248),[84] Polyxena, whom Hecuba addresses as τάλαινα (502) and whose death Poseidon regards as τλημόνως (40), Hector, to whom Hecuba attributes the epithet μογερός (790), and Priam, whose tombless and friendless death Hecuba stresses with the assonantal pair of epithets ἄταφος ἄφιλος (1313), reminiscent of similar epithet pairs applied to Hecuba (1186) and the chorus member's husband (1085).

[82] Mattison 2009: 1. Conversely, Davidson 1999: 27 argues that lamentation is already significant in the *Iliad* (cf. books 6, 22, 24), and so the new song is merely the old song which has been sung by those most immediately affected (widowed women).
[83] Dyson & Lee 2000b: 20.
[84] Although Cassandra does not believe that she should be pitied (403-4).

The city of Troy holds a special status and is itself an object of pity. The chorus repeatedly refers to Troy as τάλαινα (780, 1324, 1331), and Hecuba describes the city as δύστανος (173)[85] and ταλαίπωρος (1276), and her homeland as μελέα (601). Troy is personified,[86] and this assigns to the city a status equivalent to one of the Trojan women and accordingly directs the audience's sympathy towards it. Just like the Trojan women, Troy has also fallen from an exalted status, a fall so steep that the city no longer exists, as the chorus observes that ἀ… μεγαλόπολις / ἄπολις ὄλωλεν οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔστι Τροία (1291-2). According to Mattison, Troy is a model of an innocent, law-abiding city that was destroyed by external forces, a potential model for Athens,[87] and its destruction and the Trojan women's nostalgia could have accentuated for the Athenians the possibility of suffering the same fate, should they lose the Peloponnesian War.[88]

Euripides goes to considerable lengths to evoke pathos for the Trojans and their city. Dué describes the *Troades* as an 'unrelenting portrait of suffering',[89] and according to Kovacs, the pathos of the play and the Trojan women's misery, which they do not deserve, are unmistakeable.[90] Much of this pathos' potency is due to the perspective from which the play is told, namely from the Trojan women, the victims of the war.[91] Although some disagree that the Trojans are always sympathetic or even that they are the only sympathetic characters,[92] it is clear that that a significant theme of the play is the substantial pathos which Euripides evokes for the Trojans.

Greek sympathy

[85] Barlow 1986: 166-7 argues that this address to Troy as a person, with emphatic repetition (Τροία Τροία δύσταν', 173), indicates the women's close identification with their city.
[86] Fittipaldi 1979: 163 notes that this personification occurs through Poseidon's fond farewell (45-7) and Hecuba speaking as if Troy were an intimate friend or relative (173-5, 601ff., 1277-9).
[87] Mattison 2009: 102.
[88] Mattison 2009: 104.
[89] Dué 2006: 136.
[90] Kovacs 1997: 164.
[91] Goff 2009: 14 notes that the audience is invited to identify with the victims, even though they are barbarians and women. Similarly Munteanu 2010-11: 144 observes that the *Troades* focuses on female suffering instead of the glorification of male military prowess.
[92] Goff 2009: 39 suggests that initial sympathy for the Trojans may be undermined throughout the play, and Kovacs 1997: 176 believes that the Greeks are only slightly less pitiable than the Trojans. Alternatively, Barlow 1986: 157-8 disagrees that the Greeks are equally tragic as this detracts from the play's heart which is Troy and the Trojans.

Euripides' desire that the audience sympathise with the Trojans is also evident from his presentation of the Greek herald Talthybius, who is highly sympathetic to their cause. His sympathy is evident through his expressions of pity, use of euphemism, reluctance to relate his orders, and helpfulness.

Talthybius openly admits to feeling pity for the Trojans. He describes Hecuba as a δυστυχεστάτη γύναι (1269) and addresses her as δύστηνε (1284). His pity also extends to Andromache, whom he describes as μογερά (783) and a πολλῶν…/ δακρύων ἀγωγός (1130-31) for him, since her departure caused him significant grief.[93] Talthybius' admission of weeping indicates that he feels genuine sympathy for the Trojans and this is further supported by his eagerness to avoid causing the Trojans pain.

In his exchange with Hecuba, Talthybius employs euphemisms to lessen the impact of the unfortunate news he must deliver. Hecuba is distraught to hear that Agamemnon has fallen in love with Cassandra (256-8), yet Talthybius focuses on the positives when he asks οὐ γὰρ μέγ᾽ αὐτῇ βασιλικῶν λέκτρων τυχεῖν; (259). Talthybius is not, as Lee unconvincingly argues, completely absorbed in the Greeks' glorious position and Agamemnon's regal grandeur to the extent that he cannot appreciate the tragedy of Cassandra's concubinage,[94] but instead his words should be regarded within the frame of the conversation as a whole, during which he aims to speak euphemistically.[95] Instead of informing Hecuba that Polyxena has been sacrificed at Achilles' tomb, Talthybius vaguely reports that she will serve Achilles' tomb (264), before reassuring Hecuba that everything is well with her daughter (268) and that she is free from her troubles: ἀπηλλάχθαι πόνων (270). Although his information is not false, Talthybius omits the fact that Polyxena is dead, focusing instead on the positives of her condition to spare Hecuba the grief.

Similarly, the reluctance and hesitation Talthybius demonstrates in his conversation with Andromache reveals his sympathy for the Trojans. Having come to announce the Greek decision that Astyanax must die, Talthybius declares that he is making the announcement οὐχ ἑκὼν (710), before struggling to find the words (ἔδοξε τόνδε παῖδα ... πῶς εἴπω

[93] Dyson & Lee 2000a: 164 describe this as an extraordinary admission of overt sympathy.
[94] Lee 1976: 117-18.
[95] Gilmartin 1970: 216.

λόγον;, 713) and admitting his uncertainty as to how he should break the news (717).[96] Later on, he confesses that his herald's duties would be better performed by someone who is ἄνοικτος (787) and ἀναιδείᾳ… μᾶλλον φίλος (788-9), implying that he is overcome by pity for the Trojan women.[97]

Talthybius' sympathy also manifests itself through his actions, as he helps to perform the appropriate rituals for Astyanax's corpse. Talthybius offers to bury the corpse himself (1147-8) before revealing to Hecuba that he has already bathed the corpse and washed its wounds: ἔλουσα νεκρὸν κἀπένιψα τραύματα (1152). By taking the initiative and cleaning Astyanax's wounds, a task he is not obliged to perform, Talthybius demonstrates his sympathy for the Trojans.[98] Although his motives are unclear, as he may wash the corpse simply to speed his long-awaited return home (1154-5),[99] the significant amount of pity Talthybius expresses for the Trojans, his euphemisms, and his reluctance to deliver bad news all indicate that the Trojan cause is very close to his heart and render it unlikely that Talthybius washes Astyanax's corpse for ulterior motives.

The close relationship between Talthybius and the Trojans is also evident from the Trojan women's attitude towards him. Hecuba addresses him as a φίλος (267) and Andromache appreciates his reluctance to deliver unfortunate news (718). Although Cassandra claims that heralds are universally hated (ἓν ἀπέχθημα πάγκοινον βροτοῖς, 425), her words should not be fatal to the notion of a positive working relationship between Talthybius and the Trojans.[100] Both Hecuba and Andromache seem to be friendly enough towards him, and as Gilmartin points out, Talthybius' attitude towards Cassandra's ill-omened words about the Greeks is far less hostile than it might have been (408-10, 417-20).[101]

[96] Gilmartin 1970: 216 maintains that Talthybius here reveals his distaste for the cruel orders and his pity for the victims.
[97] Dyson & Lee 2000a: 155 assert that Talthybius' sympathy for the women and the distress which his duties cause him is unmistakeable.
[98] Lee 1976: 258 argues that Talthybius' bathing of the corpse indicates his sympathy, and Sullivan 2007: 476 maintains that Talthybius visibly and dramatically acts upon his feelings.
[99] Sullivan 2007: 476.
[100] Morwood 2000: 133 asserts that Talthybius emerges as a highly sympathetic character, despite Cassandra's criticism, and Dyson & Lee 2000a: 154 argue that Cassandra's abuse is not indicative of how Euripides intends the audience to view Talthybius.
[101] Gilmartin 1970: 216-17.

Scholarly opinions about Talthybius's character are not uniform. Conacher labels him a harsh, sinister figure, representing the Achaeans' impersonal cruelty,[102] although his view could be regarded as extreme. Most argue that Talthybius is very sympathetic towards the Trojan women,[103] and that he generally treats them well.[104] Others comment on his humanity,[105] while Dyson and Lee contend that the notion of a cruelly cynical or obtuse Talthybius is incompatible with his later and indubitably positive attitudes towards Andromache and Hecuba.[106] Finally, some commentators support an ambivalent interpretation of Talthybius' character, comparing his laudable qualities with his character flaws.[107] The ambiguous nature of Talthybius' character is well suited to the play, which, as an examination of the Greek/barbarian polarity reveals, tends to favour blurred distinctions over black and white categories.

5. Slavery

Chapter 1 argued that the theory of natural slavery is best associated with Aristotle in the fourth century. However, since the Greeks occasionally equated barbarians with slaves in the Classical Period, it is worth examining whether Euripides employs slavery to present the Trojans as barbarians.

The new legal status of the Trojans as slaves is not in doubt. Both Hecuba and the chorus refer to themselves or other Trojan women as δοῦλαι (Hecuba: 140, 251, 490, 507, 1280; chorus: 212, 233), a term which is also applied to the Trojan women by Talthybius (277, 1271). Talthybius refers to Hecuba as a λάτρις (422) and the Trojan women as αἰχμαλωτίδες (297), the latter also echoed by Poseidon (28). Hecuba describes the destination of the Trojan women as a δούλειον… μέλαθρον (1311), while Andromache speaks of a ζυγὰ… δούλια (600) and offers the clearest account of the Trojans' fall into slavery (614-15). With their slave status referred to by Greeks, gods, and the Trojan

[102] Conacher 1967: 144.
[103] Waterfield 1982: 139; Barlow 1986: 179, who observes that Talthybius' sympathy for the Trojans grows as their suffering accumulates.
[104] Muich 2010: 187 maintains that Talthybius treats the Trojan women as captives, not as inferior barbarians.
[105] Havelock 1968: 125 claims he is the most humane character in the *Troades*, and Sullivan 2007: 476 believes that Talthybius' humanity effects the dramatic action of the play more than any other factor.
[106] Dyson & Lee 2000a: 152.
[107] Lee 1976: xxiv argues that although Talthybius is puffed up with self-importance and pride in Hellas' grandeur, he also sympathises with the women. Additionally, Meridor 1984: 211 claims that Talthybius is considerate but not very sensitive, and Wohl 2015: 47-8 describes Talthybius as a model of sympathetic spectation, but notes that he still carries out the Greeks' orders.

women themselves, it is clear that the Trojans are now slaves. However, as Croally observes, the play presents multiple reasons why calling these Trojan women slaves is not a simple matter.[108]

It is one thing to be a slave by fact, another to be a slave by nature. The attitude of the Trojans towards their newfound status is the best indicator of whether they are presented as slaves by nature. The Trojan women bewail their captivity (δουλείαν αἰάζουσιν, 158), and the chorus members consistently link their servile status with suffering and tears (δούλα τλάμων, 185; cf. 518, 1105-6). Similarly, Hecuba links suffering with her servile status (191-2) and is most distressed about becoming a slave to Odysseus (283-7), while Andromache complains that she must serve in the house of her kin's murderers: δουλεύσω… ἐν αὐθεντῶν δόμοις (660). The Trojan women also express revulsion about their future slavery in Greece. Hecuba complains that she will have to guard the door or rear children (194-5), or even be forced to make bread (494), while a chorus member envisions herself drawing water from a spring: Πειρήνας ὑδρευσομένα, / πρόσπολος οἰκτρὰ σεμνῶν ὑδάτων (205-6). Since the Trojans repeatedly complain about their enslaved status, link it with suffering, and struggle to imagine themselves performing servile duties, they are not presented as slaves by nature.[109]

The possibility of a polarity between free Greeks and Trojan slaves is further complicated by the fact that the Greek characters can also be regarded as slaves. Cassandra labels Talthybius a λάτρις (424), and his reluctance in carrying out his duties (710) and the displeasure he expresses regarding the herald's job (786-9) both suggest that Talthybius is not entirely free.[110] Moreover, Menelaus seems particularly vulnerable to Helen's charms. Despite his apparent eagerness to lay his hands upon his wife (861-2) and take her back to Greece where he intends to kill her (876-9), Menelaus admits that no decision has formally been made (901), and Hecuba's warning not to look at Helen (ὁρᾶν… τήνδε φεῦγε, 891) and to avoid travelling on the same ship as her (μή νυν νεὼς σοὶ ταὐτὸν ἐσβήτω σκάφος, 1049) suggest that she is sceptical that Menelaus will follow through

[108] Croally 1994: 99.
[109] Scodel 1980: 113 argues that Euripides did not subscribe to the theory that barbarians were natural slaves.
[110] Scodel 1980: 109 and Lee 1976: xxv claim that Talthybius is as much a slave as the Trojan women.

with his resolution.[111] As Croally observes, nobility and victory are no defence against servility, for the only two supposedly free characters who appear on stage (Talthybius and Menelaus) are both compromised as to their freedom.[112] Regarding other Greeks, Helen is now a captive (35, cf. 871-2), and even Agamemnon seems to have become a captive of ἔρως by falling in love with Cassandra: ἔρως ἐτόξευσ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐνθέου κόρης (255).[113] Slavery even affects the divine, with Helen claiming that Zeus himself is a slave to Aphrodite (950).[114] Accordingly, Euripides does not denigrate the Trojans as slaves by nature, but portrays slavery in a way which encourages the audience to re-evaluate their assumptions about freedom and ask the question: is anyone truly free?

6. Historical context

Production of the Troades

The historical context in which the *Troades* was produced could potentially provide clues as to how the play should be interpreted. The *Troades* can be confidently dated to 415,[115] and Aelian (*V.H.* 2.8) and two Aristophanic scholia (*ad V.*1326; *Av.* 842) relate that Euripides produced in that year the *Alexander*, *Palamedes*, *Troades*, and *Sisyphus*, winning second prize at the Great Dionysia, with first prize going to the little known Xenocles.[116] As Goff observes, 415 falls during the Peace of Nicias, during which Athens and Sparta did not directly engage but were distracted with other adventures such as the conquest of Melos (416) and the plan to invade Sicily (415).[117]

Praise of Athens and Athenian allies

When discussing the potential destinations they may arrive at as slaves, the chorus expresses a strong preference for Athens (207-8), attracted to τὰν ἱερὰν / Θησέως ζαθέαν… χώραν (218-19). This praise for Athens is extraordinary,[118] and there does not appear to be any dramatic purpose for extolling Athens so highly. Euripides' objective

[111] Scodel 1980: 110 maintains that Menelaus' failure to carry out his sentence reveals his fundamental lack of freedom, since he has been 'captured' by Helen.
[112] Croally 1994: 100. Scodel 1980: 109 argues that the *Troades* presents the slavery of the Trojan women as well as their masters.
[113] Lee 1976: 134 notes that despite his power and authority, Agamemnon is completely subdued by one of his helpless captives.
[114] Croally 1994: 100 asserts that by making the most powerful being subject to another's power, Helen questions the confident use of the free/slave polarity.
[115] Scodel 2012: ix; Hall 2000: xvi; Barlow 1986: 26; Lee 1976: x; Conacher 1967: 127.
[116] Koniaris 1973: 85.
[117] Goff 2009: 17.
[118] Roisman 1997: 43 comments that Euripides is lavishing praise on Athens.

could have been to win the favour of the audience by expressing patriotic pride.[119] Alternatively, his reference to Athens could be ironic, forcing the audience to re-evaluate the Athenian policy of murder and enslavement, which was practiced to brutal effect in Melos the previous year (Th. 5.84-116).[120] In any case, the chorus later echoes its praise for Athens, referring to the olive as an οὐράνιον στέφανον λιπαραῖσί τε κόσμον Ἀθήναις (803).

These glowing references to Athens are supported by similar praise of Athenian allies and interests. Poseidon first pairs Thessaly and Athens in the prologue (30-31), before the chorus later praises Thessaly (214-17) and declares the region to be their second choice after Athens (218). This is particularly notable since Thessaly was an Athenian ally in the Peloponnesian War.[121] Other regions which the chorus approves of include Sicily (220-23) and Thurii (224-9), locations in the western Mediterranean which was of significant interest to the Athenians in 415. There is no dramatic justification for including Sicily and Italy,[122] and their inclusion constitutes a glaring anachronism.[123] It seems likely that Euripides is either flattering his Athenian audience,[124] or at the very least drawing attention to regions of contemporary importance.[125] Accordingly, Euripides appears to overtly praise Athens, Athens' allies, and contemporary Athenian interests.

Condemnation of Sparta and Spartan allies

Furthermore, the chorus condemns Sparta and Corinth as destinations to avoid. They denigrate Sparta as τὰν ἐχθίσταν θεράπναν Ἑλένας (211) and lament the possibility of drawing water from Peirene (205-6), the main spring of Corinth. Even though it is dramatically relevant for the Trojan women to dread being taken to Sparta, it cannot be a coincidence that Athens' bitter contemporary enemies, Sparta and Corinth, are condemned in the play, especially when compared with the chorus' glowing praise of

[119] Biehl 1989: 151 describes the Trojan women's wishes as 'eine Ovation, die patriotische Empfindungen erweckt'.
[120] Luschnig 1971: 12.
[121] Lee 1976: 101.
[122] Roisman 1997: 43.
[123] Lee 1976: 102.
[124] Barlow 1986: 168. Roisman 1997: 43 suggests that Euripides shared with his contemporaries in the excitement that preceded the Sicilian expedition.
[125] Westlake 1953: 182.

Athens and Thessaly.[126] Euripides may be attempting to secure the audience's favour, or his own opinions may be creeping into the play.[127]

Anti-war message

Some have read the *Troades* as an anti-war play, or a warning against Athenian aggression and imperialism.[128] Evidence for this reading includes the considerable amount of pathos Euripides evokes for the Trojans,[129] the troubles the victorious Greeks are set to endure on their homecoming, and Cassandra's advice that the sensible man should avoid war (400).[130] Others, however, adopt a more balanced approach. Lloyd argues that the *Troades* is neither an anti-war play nor a protest against Athenian policy, as the Greeks regarded war as a fact of life,[131] while Poole warns that the play cannot simply be read as a denunciation of war.[132] Moreover, no character condemns war itself, but rather unjust war, or war waged to no good purpose.[133] Due to the praise of Athens, the negative portrayal of Athens' enemies, and the criticism of war fought for the wrong reasons, it seems unlikely that the *Troades* is intended to constitute invective against Athenian aggression.[134] However, the possibility of an anti-war agenda is critical to understanding the Trojan portrayal in the play. If this agenda is prominent, then the Trojans' apparent lack of barbarism and the pathos Euripides evokes for them could be due to Euripides' intention to present them as war victims to further his anti-war agenda. Accordingly, any deductions about the Greek/barbarian polarity and Greek attitudes towards foreigners would be compromised. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the anti-war agenda in more depth, focusing on the two key incidents which may have influenced such an agenda: the massacre at Melos and the Sicilian expedition.

Melos

[126] See Roisman 1997: 44-6 for several instances which may allude to the stereotypes and actions of contemporary Spartans.
[127] Lee 1976: 101 suggests that the chorus' list may have been Euripides' preferences, as despite his disapproval of Athenian foreign policy in 415, he may still have loved Athens and the Athenian way of life.
[128] See Garvie 2001: 59-60. Sicalin 1983: 105 argues that, by the time he produced the *Troades*, Euripides 'erreichte pazifistische Positionen'.
[129] Waterfield 1982: 139 argues that the *Troades* is to some extent an anti-war play, whose effect is achieved largely through the portrayal of suffering.
[130] Lee 1976: 141 asserts that these words contain a Euripidean plea for non-aggression to his countrymen.
[131] Lloyd 1994: 54-5.
[132] Poole 1976: 258. Even Lee 1976: xiv concedes that the anti-war message is not the whole play.
[133] Roisman 1997: 40; Lee 1976: xx.
[134] Roisman 1997: 45; cf. Blessington 2015: 4.

A Spartan colony, Melos maintained neutrality in the Peloponnesian War, but when the Melians refused an Athenian request in 416 to join her side and become a democracy, the Athenians besieged the city, executing the male citizens and enslaving the women and children.[135] According to Lee, the massacre at Melos was one of the worst acts of unprovoked aggression and inhumanity during the war.[136] Since the *Troades* was produced in the following year, many have understood the play as a depiction of the horrors of war, a reproach to the Athenians for the atrocities at Melos, and a warning against further imperialist aggression.[137] Accordingly, some argue that Euripides' presentation of the Trojans was directly influenced by the massacre at Melos,[138] or that he at least had Melos in mind when composing the play.[139] Moreover, another consequence of the Troy/Melos and Greek/Athenian identification could be the message that all Athens risks perishing in the Sicilian expedition,[140] just like the Greeks will suffer hardships at sea after the Trojan War.

However, there are several complications with this argument. As Goff points out, the Athenians are not notably castigated in the play, but Athens is lauded as a desirable place to be (208-9),[141] and the fact that the *Troades* is part of a trilogy also undermines the Troy/Melos association.[142] Moreover, the Trojans are not Greeks but Phrygians, and Poseidon's warning involving those who destroy temples, sanctuaries, and ancestral tombs is not applicable to Athens, since the Athenians colonised Melos after disposing of its native population.[143] The emphasis on Melos seems even more misplaced when one considers the various atrocities which took place on both sides of the war before it, including the Spartans slaughtering the garrison of Plataea (Th. 3.68) and the inhabitants of Hysiae (Th. 5.83) in 417, and committing ἀνδραποδισμός at Iasos (D.S. 13.104.7), while the Athenians treated Scione in 421 (Th. 5.32) just like they later treated Melos.[144]

---

[135] Goff 2009: 28.
[136] Lee 1976: x.
[137] Scodel 1980: 11.
[138] Barlow 1986: 27; Conacher 1967: 136.
[139] Hazel 2001: 13; Garvie 2001: 45. Dover 2001: 8 believes that Melos must have flickered in the audience's minds.
[140] Suter 2003: 19, who suggests that the play is a proleptic lament for Athens.
[141] Goff 2009: 31.
[142] Goff 2009: 32. In addition, Kovacs 1997: 176 believes that the gods' role in the destruction of Troy is emphasised too much for a facile connection to be made between Troy and Melos.
[143] Dover 2001: 9. Sidwell 2001: 34-5 catalogues other differences between the sack of Troy and Melos.
[144] Green 1999: 104.

Moreover, Van Erp Taalman Kip sets out the chronological issues. She argues that it is hardly possible that Melos was annihilated before the middle of December 416, that the *Troades* was written and produced within three and a half months, that Euripides could acquire a chorus without knowing even the subject of one of his plays, and that he postponed writing his plays until there was almost no time left.[145] Conversely, although the play must have been written before the massacre at Melos, it could have been late enough that the likely outcome was known,[146] or Euripides could have made adjustments and insertions to the play after the massacre.[147] While it seems impossible that Euripides had Melos in mind when he first started composing the play, he may have intended to produce a play illustrating the suffering of war, a play which he adjusted and edited after the massacre had taken place. In any case, it is unlikely that the Melos incident was the principal overarching inspiration behind the *Troades*.[148]

Sicilian expedition

Early in 415, the same year in which the *Troades* was produced, the Athenians voted for the Sicilian expedition, which led to the disaster in 413 which spelled the end of Athenian supremacy.[149] Some argue that the *Troades* attempts to dissuade the Athenians from the Sicilian expedition,[150] and if so, Euripides would not have been alone in doubting the campaign, as Nicias had warned the assembly against undertaking it (Th. 6.18).[151] However, there are several objections to this viewpoint. The chronological argument applies again, so while Euripides may have made late adjustments to the play, it is unlikely that he could have composed the *Troades* with the Sicilian expedition in mind. Moreover, the favourable references to locations in the west are difficult to explain if Euripides opposed the expedition,[152] and the allusions to the Sicilian expedition contain no hint that Euripides either approved or disapproved of the project.[153] Instead, Westlake believes that Euripides' principal aim was to win the favour of his audience by echoing

[145] Van Erp Taalman Kip 1987: 417.
[146] Scodel 2012: x.
[147] Rosenbloom 2006: 247 n.8 argues that one should interpret the play's meaning at its known time of performance, rather than its unknown time of composition.
[148] Griffin 2001: 70 argues that Euripides probably had in mind the fate of multiple cities, not just Melos.
[149] Lee 1976: ix.
[150] Lee 1976: xv. Dué 2006: 150 maintains that fear must have been an essential part of the *Troades*, since if the Sicilian expedition failed, the smouldering ruins of Troy could be Athens.
[151] Goff 2009: 30.
[152] Roisman 1997: 42.
[153] Westlake 1953: 183. However, given the favourable references to Athens (207-8, 218-19), Sidwell 2001: 43 claims that the reference to Sicily seems to be an authorial endorsement.

its current opinions.[154] Accordingly, chronological considerations seem to rule out the possibility of the Melos affair or the Sicilian expedition being a central consideration in Euripides' composition of the *Troades*, but he may have made late alterations to the play to allude to contemporary events. In any case, it is far too simplistic to read the *Troades* as merely anti-war propaganda or a warning against Athenian imperialist aggression.[155]

7. *Alexander, Palamedes, Troades:* a connected trilogy?

Another matter which may be relevant for interpreting the *Troades* is the question of whether the three plays Euripides produced in 415 constituted a connected trilogy. Scodel argues that it is legitimate to presuppose that they were meant to be connected,[156] suggesting that there are special echoes, parallelisms of character and language, and plot developments which place the *Troades* in a kind of dramatic dialogue with the previous two plays.[157] For instance, all three tragedies are united by the theme of the innocent murdered, as Astyanax's death appears to complete a dramatic movement which began with the description of Paris' exposure in the *Alexander*,[158] Hecuba and Cassandra both play major roles in the *Alexander* and *Troades*,[159] and the first two plays raise expectations that are fulfilled in the third, as *Alexander* foreshadows the fall of Troy and *Palamedes* the destruction of the Greek fleet.[160] Despite some vocal critics,[161] it seems reasonable to assume that the surviving fragments of the *Alexander* and *Palamedes* are relevant and can assist in interpreting the *Troades*.

Evidence for the *Alexander* consists of fragments from quotation, a substantial papyrus which preserves a good portion of one scene and scraps of others, and most of a papyrus hypothesis.[162]

The *agon* deals with nobility and slavery, and by implication with other conventional distinctions among men, such as between Greeks and barbarians, which appears in the

---

[154] Westlake 1953: 190.
[155] Sidwell 2001: 32 notes that the scholarly consensus is that tragedy was in some general sense concerned with civic ideology but was not concerned with the specifics of contemporary history or matters of policy.
[156] Scodel 1980: 64.
[157] Scodel 1980: 65. Barlow 1986: 26 agrees, as does Jouan 1966: 141, who claims that the *Alexander* 'se rattache… étroitement aux autres drames de la trilogie'.
[158] Scodel 1980: 76.
[159] Barlow 1986: 28, who also notes that Cassandra prophesies the future in both plays (Snell fr. 10).
[160] Kovacs 1997: 169.
[161] Koniaris 1973: 90 argues that Euripides' plays of 415 are unconnected and that the correct interpretation of the *Troades* requires studying the play as an independent unity.
[162] Scodel 1980: 20.

Troades.[163] Alexander is an ambiguous figure, but must have been basically sympathetic,[164] and his desire to compete in the games, though being a herdsman, could be an expression of his ἀρετή, or arrogance, the boundary between the two perhaps being deliberately ambiguous.[165] Burnett believes that the balance tends more towards arrogance, claiming that the old outrageous Troy was fully depicted for the audience of the *Alexander*,[166] and arguing that there are commonplaces about the corrupting power of Trojan wealth and luxury among the *Alexander* fragments (fr. 36, 37 Snell),[167] and that a major theme of the *Alexander* was the overweening pride of race that caused the Priamids to resent being equated with a rustic cowherd (fr. 40 Snell).[168] However, given that the Trojans are not denigrated in the *Troades*, it is unlikely that this would be a key concern of the *Alexander*.[169] Instead, the emphasis on Trojan wealth, luxury, and pride could be intended to generate an image of Troy which will contrast sharply with their pathetic situation in the *Troades*, augmenting the audience's sympathy for them. Paris in the *Alexander* moves from slavery into freedom and royalty, whereas the chorus throughout the *Troades* move deeper into slavery,[170] and Hecuba's position of authority and command in the *Alexander* is a complete contrast to her being prostrated by grief in the *Troades*.[171] As Lee observes, the tragedy of the Trojans begins in the *Alexander* with the narration of Paris' birth and fate's designs upon him, and ends in the *Troades*.[172]

Evidence for the *Palamedes* is much scarcer, consisting only of fragments from literary sources, some allusions to Palamedes' depiction in tragedy, and the versions of the myth provided by the mythographers or in the scholia.[173] There is simply not enough evidence to comment on the *Palamedes*' relationship with the *Troades*, but Odysseus' deceitful and malevolent character in the *Palamedes*, where he schemes to bring about Palamedes' condemnation and execution, is consistent with and adds depth to Hecuba's strong

[163] Scodel 1980: 105.
[164] Scodel 1980: 24.
[165] Scodel 1980: 29.
[166] Burnett 1977: 310.
[167] Kovacs 1984: 53 argues that these fragments must have been referring to Paris' unexpected success in the games.
[168] Burnett 1977: 310 n.33.
[169] Lee 1976: xii notes that Hector is generous and noble in the *Alexander*, rendering his loss more pitiable in the *Troades*.
[170] Scodel 1980: 107-8.
[171] Lee 1976: xii.
[172] Lee 1976: xix.
[173] Scodel 1980: 43.

condemnation of him in the *Troades* (281-7).[174] In any case, there are certainly enough parallels between the *Alexander* and *Palamedes* and the *Troades* to conclude that the first two plays should not be neglected when interpreting the third.

Conclusion

The *Troades* presents the subversion of the conventional categories of Greek and barbarian. The Trojans are occasionally labelled as barbarians, but their behaviour in no way accords with the eastern barbarian stereotype. For instance, the chastity and virtue of Andromache strongly contrasts with the Greeks, who are portrayed as savage, violent, deceitful, and morally inferior. Instead of employing wealth, luxury, and slavery to denigrate the Trojans, Euripides uses these characteristics to generate pathos for them. The focus on the past wealth and status of Troy only serves to accentuate the fall of the now destitute and enslaved Trojans, evoking pity and sympathy for their undeserved plight. The *Alexander* shows the Trojans at the peak of their wealth and pride, while the *Troades* portrays the aftermath of their catastrophic fall. Particularly xenophobic Greeks in the audience would have perceived that their views were being challenged when the Trojans failed to accord with the eastern barbarian stereotype.

However, Euripides' treatment of the Greek/barbarian polarity in the *Troades* is more than a mere reversal of the conventional equation. Instead, it is a subversion of the polarity entirely and a reconsideration of what exactly constitutes 'Greek' or 'barbarian'. For example, Hecuba distinguishes between Greeks, Trojans, and barbarians, while Andromache accuses the Greeks of barbaric behaviour. Through Andromache's words, the validity of ethnicity as an accurate indicator of barbarism is discounted, and in its place emerges moral conduct. While the *Troades* encourages xenophobic Greeks to reassess their views, it also contains a message for Greeks who were more open-minded towards foreigners, inviting them to reconsider their basic assumptions regarding the definitions of 'Greek' and 'barbarian'.

One external factor which may have influenced the Trojan portrayal in the *Troades* is the historical context. In the aftermath of the massacre at Melos, and with plans being made

[174] Barlow 1986: 29; Poole 1976: 282; Lee 1976: xiii. Griffin 2001: 62 asserts that Odysseus is presented as an unscrupulous careerist in the *Palamedes*.

for the Sicilian expedition, Euripides may have intended the *Troades* to be an anti-war warning to the Athenian people, in which case the sympathetic portrayal of the Trojans would be due to their role as war victims in the anti-war agenda. However, chronological and other considerations seem to rule out the possibility of the Melos affair or the Sicilian expedition being the central inspiration behind the *Troades*. Instead, the Greek/barbarian polarity remains critical for evaluating the Trojan depiction in the play. It is clear that Euripides does not subscribe to the notion of an evaluative Greek/barbarian polarity. That is, he does not automatically attribute positive or negative attributes to characters based on their ethnicity. Instead, he seems to challenge the validity of the Greek/barbarian polarity in the *Troades*, presenting the Trojans as noble and sympathetic characters, while attributing to the Greeks the characteristics typically associated with stereotypical barbarians.

An Anomaly: The Phrygian Slave in the *Orestes*

This thesis has argued that Euripides consistently portrays the Trojans as noble and honourable, bearing minimal resemblance to the eastern barbarian stereotype. There is, however, one glaring exception – the Phrygian slave in the *Orestes* (1369-1536). After an unusual entrance on stage, which may have been assisted by the μηχανή,[1] the Phrygian bursts into song, contravening the convention for a tragic news bringer.[2] Through his words and behaviour, he reveals himself to possess nearly all the qualities of a stereotypical eastern barbarian.[3]

Euripides accentuates the Phrygian slave's barbarism physically, culturally and morally. He wears Asiatic slippers (βαρβάροις… εὐ-/μάρισιν, 1369-70) and recalls how he was recently fanning Helen (1426-30) in accordance with barbarian Phrygian customs (Φρυγίοισι νόμοις, 1426; βαρβάροις νόμοισιν, 1430). Similarly, he falls to the floor and performs the eastern practice of *proskynesis* before Orestes: προσκυνῶ σ', ἄναξ, νόμοισι βαρβάροισι προσπίτνων (1507). In addition, the Phrygian repeatedly evokes his own non-Greek and Asiatic origin, even when the context does not require it, such as when he mentions his flight (βαρβάροισι δρασμοῖς, 1374),[4] his shouting (βαρβάρῳ βοᾷ, 1385), or the accent of eastern mourners (Ἀσιάδι φωνᾷ, 1397). As a result, there is a strong emphasis on his non-Greek ethnicity throughout the episode.

Of course, the mere fact of eastern barbarian origin does not in itself indicate degeneracy. However, in his depiction of the Phrygian slave, Euripides combines a focus on his barbarian origins with clear moral and character deficiencies to present a paragon of eastern barbarian degeneracy. The Phrygian slave's most prominent trait is his cowardly fear. He mentions his flight from the royal house (1374, 1498-9) and envisions the possibility of further flight (1375). More generally, he describes the fear of all the Phrygian slaves (1418-19) and how they fled from Orestes and Pylades (1486, 1488), and even declares that Phrygians are vastly inferior to Greeks in warfare (1483-5). The Phrygian's panicked flight is also mentioned by Orestes (1506, cf. 1518) and implied by

[1] Wright 2008: 46.
[2] West 1987: 276.
[3] Vlassopoulos 2013a: 192 labels him a 'typical example of an effeminate, slavish Barbarian without honour or shame'.
[4] Willink 1986: 307 asserts that here the Phrygian slave 'thematically depreciates himself and his 'cowardly' race'.

the chorus: ἢ πάλαι φεύγεις φόβῳ; (1425). In addition, his excessive display of emotion is similarly unappealing. The Phrygian slave laments βαρβάρῳ βοᾷ (1385) and proclaims αἴλινον αἴλινον (1395), the term with which barbarians commence their lamentations (1395-6), and the repetition and broken syntax which pervade his song reflect his highly emotional and panicked state. Other character flaws emerge during his exchange with Orestes, including his mendacity (1510-17), which is explicitly condemned by Orestes (δειλίᾳ γλώσσῃ χαρίζῃ, τἄνδον οὐχ οὕτω φρονῶν, 1514), and his preoccupation with saving his own life at any possible cost (1509, 1517, 1523), with no regard for loyalty towards his mistress Helen. Overall, the Phrygian slave is cowardly, effeminate, emotional, deceitful, and selfish, with minimal redeeming qualities.

How can one reconcile the Phrygian slave of the *Orestes* with Euripides' portrayal of other Trojans, such as Andromache, Hecuba, and Polyxena? Although some have defended the Phrygian's diction and metre,[5] he nevertheless embodies multiple traits of the eastern barbarian stereotype which are absent from Euripides' other Trojan characters. However, there are several arguments as to why the Phrygian slave should not be regarded as reflective of the Trojan community. One such reason is the class difference. Whereas the other Trojans are royals who have recently been enslaved as prisoners of war, the Phrygian slave seems to have been a servant to Helen back in Troy. Although there is some emphasis on ethnicity in his depiction (as noted above), the Phrygian's undesirable qualities could be more closely related to his servility. After all, Orestes assumes that the Phrygian, as a slave (δοῦλος ὢν, 1522), would welcome death, to which the Phrygian replies that even a slave (κἂν δοῦλος ᾖ τις, 1523) enjoys living. Given Pylades' earlier denigration of slaves (οὐδὲν τὸ δοῦλον πρὸς τὸ μὴ δοῦλον γένος, 1115), it is possible that Orestes' declaration that the Phrygian is οὔτε... γυνὴ... οὔτ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν (1528) is not a physical reference to him being a eunuch, as Zeitlin argues,[6] but rather a criticism of his servility and cowardice. If this is true, then the nameless Phrygian slave is more of a representative of eastern slaves than of the Trojan community, a notion supported by the fact that he is never referred to as a Trojan, but rather as a Phrygian and barbarian. As

[5] Willink 1986: 305 claims that they are highly sophisticated, while West 1987: 277 argues that the Phrygian slave's language is 'articulate, high-flown, [and] typical of late Euripidean lyric'. Porter 1994: 180-82 presents a metrical analysis of his song and concludes that critics have over-exaggerated its turbulence.
[6] Zeitlin 2003: 327. The Phrygian is never explicitly referred to as a eunuch.

Mattison points out, although the Phrygian slave and Trojan women share an ethnic background, they have each acquired a vastly different culture.[7]

Alternatively, there are some notable similarities between the Phrygian slave and Orestes. While the Phrygian slave is not brave, neither are Pylades and Orestes (1349-50, 1410-15, 1461-72),[8] and according to Wolff, his desperation to live is a 'distorted reflection of the Orestes who had cried out for his life' (644 ff., 677 ff.).[9] Accordingly, Euben interprets the Phrygian as a reflection, or even extension, of Orestes,[10] while Saïd concludes that he is a grotesque caricature of Orestes, which precludes interpreting the scene as a demonstration of barbarian cowardice.[11] Another possibility is that the comic touches of the scene indicate parody rather than accurate representation. Critics have observed the ambiguity between comedy and tragedy in the scene,[12] found elements of grotesque-comic in the Phrygian's portrayal,[13] and even labelled him as a 'semi-comic character'.[14] The ludicrous, flamboyant, and even ridiculous elements of his portrayal cast doubt over the legitimacy of the Phrygian slave as a genuine ethnic portrayal. As Papadodima argues, the Phrygian slave's presentation is so exaggerated that he cannot reflect realistic patterns of barbarian behaviour.[15]

Euripides' portrayal of the Phrygian slave as a stereotypical eastern barbarian is in stark contrast to his depiction of other Trojan characters. However, since Athenian attitudes towards easterners were incredibly diverse, ranging from denigration and contempt to respect and open admiration, it is only natural for Euripides to reflect this diversity in his portrayal of the Trojans. While Euripides' general trend in the *Andromache, Hecuba*, and *Troades* is to portray Trojans as admirable and honourable figures who transcend the accusations of barbarism levelled against them, in the *Orestes* he elects to experiment by

[7] Mattison 2009: 133.
[8] Synodinou 1977: 48-9.
[9] Wolff 1983: 345. Similarly, Seidensticker 1982: 113 observes that like the Phrygian, Orestes throughout the play is 'damit beschäftigt, sein Leben zu retten'.
[10] Euben 1986: 231.
[11] Saïd 2002: 83. Conversely, Porter 1994: 247 rejects the notion of the Phrygian as Orestes' double as too extreme, locating him within the 'typology of the comic and utterly cowardly barbarian'.
[12] Dunn 1989: 247.
[13] Seidensticker 1982: 107, although he concludes that the scene is not comic: '[r]ichtig komisch ist nichts' (114).
[14] West 1987: 277. Conversely, Wright 2008: 47 disagrees that the Phrygian is comic, although he concedes that he is incongruous and grotesque.
[15] Papadodima 2013: 234.

equipping a Phrygian slave from Troy with all the undesirable traits of a stereotypical eastern barbarian. This should not be surprising, as both of these representations would have found favour among various sections of the Athenian audience. However, the Phrygian slave is very much an anomaly in Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans, and he appears to take care to ensure that the Phrygian slave is removed enough from the other Trojans, via the class distinction, similarities to Orestes, and elements of comedy and parody, so as not to taint their representation in his earlier plays.

Conclusion

Recent scholarship has been conflicted over the presence and significance of the Greek/barbarian polarity in fifth-century Athens. The rhetoric of polarity certainly existed in Classical Greek literature and iconography, but there is also compelling evidence that the Greeks worked for and on occasion idealised non-Greeks, as well as a lengthy tradition of cultural interaction, influence, and exchange which they shared with the Near East. Accordingly, Euripides was largely free to portray the Trojans as he wished, as he could elect to incorporate them into the eastern barbarian stereotype or present them as noble and sympathetic characters.

In the *Andromache*, Euripides reverses the Greek/barbarian polarity. Through her virtuous behaviour, Andromache transcends the accusations of barbarism levelled against her by the Spartans, who themselves ironically display stereotypical eastern barbarian qualities. The *Hecuba* reflects the diversity of attitudes towards non-Greeks which existed in the late fifth century. The noble and honourable Trojans, completely distinct from the eastern barbarian stereotype, provide a jarring contrast with the highly polarised depiction of Polymestor as a stereotypical Thracian barbarian. In addition, Kovacs (1987) and Morwood (2014) exaggerate the importance of the contrast between royalist Trojans and democratic Greeks. The emphasis on the Trojans' previous royal status is employed primarily to generate pathos, and although the Trojans occasionally denounce democracy, their criticism is contextually justified and the play as a whole presents democracy and its associated rhetoric and demagoguery unfavourably. In the *Troades*, Euripides subverts the Greek/barbarian polarity by depicting noble and virtuous Trojans in opposition to barbarous Greeks, and he even casts doubt upon the conventional categories of Greek and barbarian. In this way, the play elevates moral conduct over ethnicity as the principal criterion for determining barbarism. While these three plays are consistent in their portrayal of the Trojans, the *Orestes* breaks the trend by presenting a Phrygian slave who is heavily based on the eastern barbarian stereotype. However, through various means Euripides distances the Phrygian from the royal Trojans, ensuring that he does not taint their representation in his earlier plays.

Some concluding observations can now be made. Athenian attitudes towards non-Greeks in the late fifth century (and fifth century in general) were not dominated by a Greek/barbarian polarity, but are best described as a coexistence of conflicting views. The

polarity was present, but must be balanced by the long tradition of cooperation and cultural interaction with non-Greeks, which occasionally included open admiration.

Euripides' depiction of the Trojans also indicates his support for the notion that barbarism is determined by moral conduct, not solely by ethnicity. With the exception of the peculiar Phrygian slave, Euripides does not present the Trojans as stereotypical barbarians. Instead, he consistently elevates them above the Greek characters, particularly Hermione, Menelaus, Odysseus, and Helen. In doing so, he challenges the views of the xenophobic members of his audience who were prejudiced against easterners. Although Euripides presents Greek characters deploying the rhetoric of polarity against the Trojans, the rhetoric is always unsupported by the rest of the play, and this indicates a conscious interaction on Euripides' part with the contemporary Greek/barbarian polarity. However, a considerable proportion of Greeks would not have held prejudicial views against easterners, and for these audience members Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans would not have been radical or controversial. It was also possible for the same individual to hold both views in varying degrees at different times, which fluctuated depending on context and circumstance. For instance, it is entirely reasonable to imagine an Athenian agreeing with the Trojan portrayal in the *Troades* in 415, before developing a hatred for easterners after the Spartan/Persian alliance in 411 (Th. 8.17-18, 36-7, 57-8), and subsequently finding favour with the depiction of the Phrygian slave in the *Orestes* in 408.

This thesis has examined Euripides' portrayal of the Trojans, a topic recently examined by Mattison (2009). Although it agrees with Mattison's contention that Euripides' Trojans are not assimilated to the Persians or barbarised, but are afforded a sympathetic treatment, this thesis diverges from her study by situating the results within the broader issue of contemporary Athenian attitudes towards non-Greeks. It is the first comprehensive study to examine Euripides' Trojan plays with an appreciation of their essential hybridity in terms of barbarian representations, a phenomenon which is integral and likely reflective of Athenian norms, rather than an exception. This contradicts the notion that Euripides' hybrid and diverse portrayals are contradictory or not in tune with contemporary Athenian views of barbarians. Instead, they are likely to be very reflective of and in some cases reactions to or against the many diverse prevailing attitudes towards non-Greeks which were in some instances favourable, on other occasions unfavourable. In the case of the Trojans, Euripides inclines towards more positive portrayals, as through their honourable

and admirable behaviour they overcome the highly polarised rhetoric which the Greek characters often direct towards them. However, he is not averse to employing pejorative barbarian stereotypes on occasion, as demonstrated by his depiction of Polymestor in the *Hecuba* and the Phrygian slave in the *Orestes*.

Bibliography

Aldrich, KM 1961, *The* Andromache *of Euripides*, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Allan, W 2000, *The* Andromache *and Euripidean tragedy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Almagor, E & Skinner, J 2013, 'Introduction', in E Almagor & J Skinner (eds), *Ancient ethnography: new approaches*, Bloomsbury, London, pp. 1-22.

Amerasinghe, CW 1973, 'The Helen episode in the *Troiades*', *Ramus*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 99-106.

Amoroso, F 1994, 'Una lettura progressista dell'*Andromaca* di Euripide', in A Bierl & P von Möllendorff (eds), *Orchestra: Drama, Mythos, Bühne*, Teubner, Stuttgart, pp. 139-50.

Anderson, MJ 1997, *The fall of Troy in early Greek poetry and art*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Bacon, HH 1961, *Barbarians in Greek tragedy*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Barker, ETE 2009, *Entering the agon: dissent and authority in Homer, historiography and tragedy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Barlow, SA (ed.) 1986, *Euripides: Trojan women*, Aris & Phillips, Warminster.

Barry, CM 2001, '*Trojan Women*: sex and the city', in D Stuttard & T Shasha (eds), *Trojan Women*, Actors of Dionysus, York, pp. 74-89.

Battezzato, L 1999, 'Dorian dress in Greek tragedy', *ICS*, vols. 24-25, pp. 343-62.

Bengtson, H 1974, 'Hellenen und Barbaren: Gedanken zum Problem des griechischen Nationalbewußtseins', in *Kleine Schriften zur alten Geschichte*, C. H. Beck, Munich, pp. 158-73.

Biehl, W (ed.) 1989, *Euripides: Troades*, Carl Winter, Heidelberg.

Blessington, FC (ed.) 2015, *Euripides:* Trojan Women, Helen, Hecuba*: three plays about women and the Trojan War*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Borthwick, EK 1967, 'Trojan leap and Pyrrhic dance in Euripides' *Andromache* 1129-41', *JHS*, vol. 87, pp. 18-23.

Boulter, PN 1966, '*Sophia* and *sophrosyne* in Euripides' *Andromache*', *Phoenix*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 51-8.

Burkert, W 1992, *The orientalizing revolution: near eastern influence on Greek culture in the early archaic age*, trans. ME Pinder & W Burkert, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Burkert, W 2004, *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: eastern contexts of Greek culture*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Burnett, AP 1971, *Catastrophe survived: Euripides' plays of mixed reversal*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Burnett, A 1977, '*Trojan Women* and the Ganymede ode', *YClS*, vol. 25, pp. 291-316.

Burnett, AP 1985, '*Rhesus*: are smiles allowed?', in P Burian (ed.), *Directions in Euripidean criticism: a collection of essays*, Duke University Press, Durham, pp. 13-51.

Burnett, AP 1994, 'Hekabe the dog', *Arethusa*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 151-64.

Butrica, JL 2001, 'Democrates and Euripides' *Andromache* (Σ Andr. 445 = Callimachus Fr. 451 Pfeiffer)', *Hermes*, vol. 129, no. 2, pp. 188-97.

Buxton, RGA 1982, *Persuasion in Greek tragedy: a study of* Peitho, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Cacciatore, PV 2003, 'Passato e presente nel 'lamento' dell'*Andromaca* Euripidea', *Prometheus*, vol. 29, pp. 37-47.

Cairns, F 2012, 'Pyrrhic dancing and politics in Euripides' Andromache', *QUCC*, vol. 100, pp. 31-47.

Cartledge, P 2002, *The Greeks: a portrait of self and others*, 2nd edn, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Castriota, D 1992, *Myth, ethos and actuality: official art in fifth-century B.C. Athens*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Castriota, D 2005, 'Feminizing the barbarian and barbarizing the feminine: Amazons, Trojans, and Persians in the Stoa Poikile', in JM Barringer & JM Hurwit (eds), *Periklean Athens and its legacy: problems and perspectives*, University of Texas Press, Austin, pp. 89-102.

Cohen, B 2000, 'Introduction', in B Cohen (ed.), *Not the classical ideal: Athens and the construction of the other in Greek art*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 3-20.

Coleman, JE 1997, 'Ancient Greek ethnocentrism', in JE Coleman & CA Walz (eds), *Greeks and barbarians: essays on the interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks in antiquity and the consequences for eurocentrism*, CDL Press, Bethesda, pp. 175-220.

Collard, C (ed.) 1991, *Euripides: Hecuba*, Aris & Phillips, Warminster.

Collinge, NE 1954, 'Euripides *Hecuba* 925-26', *CPh*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 35-6.

Conacher, DJ 1967, *Euripidean drama: myth, theme and structure*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Conacher, DJ 1998, *Euripides and the sophists: some dramatic treatments of philosophical ideas*, Duckworth, London.

Cox, CA 2000, ‘Absence and distance in Euripides’ *Andromache*: a social commentary’, *Eos*, vol. 87, pp. 197-205.

Croally, NT 1994, *Euripidean polemic:* The Trojan Women *and the function of tragedy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Daitz, SG, 1971, ‘Concepts of freedom and slavery in Euripides’ *Hecuba*’, *Hermes*, vol. 99, no. 2, pp. 217-226.

Dauge, YA 1981, *Le barbare: recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation*, Latomus, Brussels.

Davidson, J 1999, ‘Euripides, Homer and Sophocles’, *ICS*, vols 24-5, pp. 117-28.

Davidson, J 2001, ‘Homer and Euripides’ *Troades*’, *BICS*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 65-79.

Delebecque, É 1951, *Euripide et la guerre du Péloponnèse*, C. Klincksieck, Paris.

De Romilly, J 1993, ‘Les barbares dans la pensée de la Grèce classique’, *Phoenix*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 283-92.

DeVries, K 2000, ‘The nearly other: the Attic vision of Phrygians and Lydians’, in B Cohen (ed.), *Not the classical ideal: Athens and the construction of the other in Greek art*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 338-63.

Di Benedetto, V 1971, *Euripide: teatro e società*, G. Einaudi, Turin.

Dihle, A 1994, *Die Griechen und die Fremden*, C.H. Beck, Munich.

Diller, H 1962, ‘Die Hellenen-Barbaren-Antithese im Zeitalter der Perserkriege’, in *Grecs et Barbares: six exposés et discussions*, Fondation Hardt, Geneva, pp. 39-68.

Dover, K 2001, 'Who was to blame?', in D Stuttard & T Shasha (eds), *Trojan Women*, Actors of Dionysus, York, pp. 1-9.

DuBois, P 1982, *Centaurs and Amazons: women and the pre-history of the great chain of being*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Dubuisson, M 2001, 'Barbares et barbarie dans le monde gréco-romain: du concept au slogan', *AC*, vol. 70, pp. 1-16.

Dué, C 2006, *The captive woman's lament in Greek tragedy*, University of Texas Press, Austin.

Dunn, FM 1989, 'Comic and tragic licence in Euripides' *Orestes*', *ClAnt*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 238-51.

Dyson, M & Lee, KH 2000a, 'Talthybius in Euripides' *Troades*', *GRBS*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 141-73.

Dyson, M & Lee, KH 2000b, 'The funeral of Astyanax in Euripides' *Troades*', *JHS*, vol. 120, pp. 17-33.

Edwards, MW 1987, *Homer: poet of the Iliad*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Erbse, H 1966, 'Euripides' 'Andromache'', *Hermes*, vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 276-97.

Erskine, A 2001, *Troy between Greece and Rome: local tradition and imperial power*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Euben, JP 1986, 'Political corruption in Euripides' *Orestes*', in JP Euben (ed.), *Greek tragedy and political theory*, University of California Press, Berkeley, pp. 222-51.

Farron, S 1978, 'The character of Hector in the *Iliad*', *AClass*, vol. 21, pp. 39-57.

Ferrari, G 2000, 'The Ilioupersis in Athens', *HSPh*, vol. 100, pp. 119-50.

Fittipaldi, MF 1979, *The fall of the city of Troy and its significance in Greek poetry from Homer to Euripides*, PhD diss., Yale University, New Haven.

Garvie, A 2001, 'Euripides' *Trojan Women*: relevance and universality', in D Stuttard & T Shasha (eds), *Trojan Women*, Actors of Dionysus, York, pp. 45-60.

Gellie, G 1980, '*Hecuba* and tragedy', *Antichthon*, vol. 14, pp. 30-44.

Gellie, G 1986, 'Helen in the *Trojan Women*', in JH Betts, JT Hooker & JR Green (eds), *Studies in honour of T.B.L. Webster*, vol. 1, Bristol Classical Press, Bristol, pp. 114-21.

Georges, P 1994, *Barbarian Asia and the Greek experience: from the archaic period to the age of Xenophon*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Gilmartin, K 1970, 'Talthybius in the *Trojan Women*', *AJPh*, vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 213-22.

Goebel, GH 1989, '*Andromache* 192-204: the pattern of argument', *CPh*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 32-5.

Goff, B 2009, *Euripides: Trojan Women*, Duckworth, London.

Goldhill, S 2002, 'Battle narrative and politics in Aeschylus' *Persae*', in T Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and barbarians*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, pp. 50-61.

Green, P 1999, 'War and morality in fifth-century Athens: the case of Euripides' *Trojan Women*', *AHB*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 97-110.

Gregory, J 1991, *Euripides and the instruction of the Athenians*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Gregory, J 1995, 'Genealogy and intertextuality in *Hecuba*', *AJPh*, vol. 116, no. 3, pp. 389-97.

Gregory, J (ed.) 1999, *Euripides:* Hecuba, Scholars Press, Atlanta.

Griffin, J 1980, *Homer on life and death*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Griffin, J 2001, 'The *Trojan Women*', in D Stuttard & T Shasha (eds), *Trojan Women*, Actors of Dionysus, York, pp. 61-73.

Gruen, ES 2006, 'Greeks and non-Greeks', in GR Bugh (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to the Hellenistic world*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 295-314.

Gruen, ES 2011a, *Rethinking the other in antiquity*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Gruen, ES 2011b, 'Herodotus and Persia', in ES Gruen (ed.), *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, pp. 67-85.

Hall, E 1988, 'When did the Trojans turn into Phrygians? Alcaeus 42.15', *ZPE*, vol. 73, pp. 15-18.

Hall, E 1989, *Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hall, E 2000, 'Introduction', in J Morwood (ed.), *Euripides: Hecuba; the Trojan women; Andromache*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. ix-xlii.

Hall, E 2002, 'When is a myth not a myth? Bernal's "ancient model"', in T Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and barbarians*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, pp. 133-52.

Hall, E 2006, *The theatrical cast of Athens: interactions between ancient Greek drama and society*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hall, JM 1997, *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hall, JM 2002, *Hellenicity: between ethnicity and culture*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Harrison, T 2000, *The emptiness of Asia: Aeschylus'* Persians *and the history of the fifth century*, Duckworth, London.

Harrison, T (ed.) 2002, *Greeks and barbarians*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Hartog, F 1988, *The Mirror of Herodotus: the representation of the other in the writing of history*, trans. J Lloyd, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Havelock, EA 1968, 'Watching the *Trojan Women*', in E Segal (ed.), *Euripides: a collection of critical essays*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, pp. 115-27.

Hazel, R 2001, 'Women's voices, women's hands', in D Stuttard & T Shasha (eds), *Trojan Women*, Actors of Dionysus, York, pp. 10-29.

Heath, J 2005, 'Are Homer's Trojans "hyper"?', *Mnemosyne*, vol. 58, no.4, pp. 531-9.

Hölschier, T 2011, 'Myths images, and the typology of identities in early Greek art', in ES Gruen (ed.), *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, pp. 47-65.

Hornblower, S 2008, 'Greek identity in the Archaic and Classical Periods', in K Zacharia (ed.), *Hellenisms: culture, identity, and ethnicity from antiquity to modernity*, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 37-58.

Isaac, B 2004, *The invention of racism in classical antiquity*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Jardé, A 1923, 'Sur la date de l'*Andromaque* d'Euripide', *REA*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 209-14.

Jouan, F 1966, *Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens: des origines de la guerre de Troie à l'*Iliade, Société D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", Paris.

Jüthner, J 1923, *Hellenen und Barbaren: aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewußtseins*, Dieterich, Leipzig.

Kamerbeek, JC 1943, 'L'Andromaque d'Euripide', *Mnemosyne*, vol. 11, pp. 47-67.

Kim, HJ 2009, *Ethnicity and foreigners in Ancient Greece and China*, Duckworth, London.

Kim, HJ 2013, 'The invention of the 'barbarian' in late sixth-century BC Ionia', in E Almagor & J Skinner (eds), *Ancient ethnography: new approaches*, Bloomsbury, London, pp. 25-48.

Koniaris, GL 1973, '*Alexander, Palamedes, Troades, Sisyphus* - a connected tetralogy? A connected trilogy?', *HSPh*, vol. 77, pp. 85-124.

Kovacs, PD 1980, *The Andromache of Euripides: an interpretation*, Scholars Press, Chico.

Kovacs, D 1984, 'On the *Alexandros* of Euripides', *HSPh*, vol. 88, pp. 47-70.

Kovacs, D 1987, *The heroic muse: studies in the* Hippolytus *and* Hecuba *of Euripides*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Kovacs, D 1997, 'Gods and men in Euripides' Trojan trilogy', *ColbyQ*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 162-76.

Kranz, W 1933, *Stasimon: Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie*, Weidmann, Berlin.

Kyriakou, P 1997, 'All in the family: present and past in Euripides' *Andromache*', *Mnemosyne*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 7-26.

Lawrence, S 2010, 'Stoic morality and Polyxena's "free" death in Euripides' *Hecuba*', *AClass*, vol. 53, pp. 21-32.

Lee, KH 1975, 'Euripides' *Andromache*: observations on form and meaning', *Antichthon*, vol. 9, pp. 4-16.

Lee, KH (ed.) 1976, *Euripides: Troades*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Lévy, E 1976, *Athènes devant la défaite de 404: histoire d'une crise idéologique*, Ecole Française d'Athènes, Athens.

Lévy, E 1991, 'Apparition des notions de Grèce et de Grecs', in S Saïd (ed.), *Ἑλληνισμος: quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 49-69.

Liapis, V (ed.) 2012, *A commentary on the* Rhesus *attributed to Euripides*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lloyd, M 1984, 'The Helen scene in Euripides' *Troades*', *CQ*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 303-13.

Lloyd, M 1994, 'Euripides' *The Trojan Women*: a new version by Brendan Kennelly. First Performed at the Peacock Theatre, the Abbey theatre, Dublin, on 2 June 1993', *Classics Ireland*, vol. 1, pp. 54-60.

Lloyd, MA (ed.) 2005, *Euripides: Andromache*, 2nd edn, Aris and Phillips, Warminster.

Long, T 1986, *Barbarians in Greek comedy*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.

Luraghi, N 2014, 'The study of Greek ethnic identities', in J McInerney (ed.), *A companion to ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, pp. 213-27.

Luschnig, CAE 1971, 'Euripides' *Trojan Women*: all is vanity', *CW*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 8-12.

Luschnig, CAE 1976, 'Euripides' *Hecabe*: the time is out of joint', *CJ*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 227-34.

Mackie, H 1996, *Talking Trojan: speech and community in the Iliad*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham.

Malkin, I 1998, *The returns of Odysseus: colonization and ethnicity*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Malkin, I 2001, 'Introduction', in I Malkin (ed.), *Ancient perceptions of Greek ethnicity*, Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington, pp. 1-28.

Marshall, CW 2001, 'The costume of Hecuba's attendants', *AClass*, vol. 44, pp. 127-36.

Matthiessen, K (ed.) 2008, *Euripides: Hekabe*, De Gruyter, Berlin.

Mattison, KM 2009, 'Recasting Troy in fifth-century Attic tragedy', Thesis (Ph.D.), University of Toronto, Toronto.

McClure, L 1999, *Spoken like a woman: speech and gender in Athenian drama*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

McInerney, J 1999, *The folds of Parnassos: land and ethnicity in ancient Phokis*, University of Texas Press, Austin.

McInerney, J 2014, 'Ethnicity: an introduction', in J McInerney (ed.), *A companion to ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, pp. 1-16.

McNiven, TJ 2000, 'Behaving like an other: telltale gestures in Athenian vase painting', in B Cohen (ed.), *Not the classical ideal: Athens and the construction of the other in Greek art*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 71-97.

Meier, C 2011, *A culture of freedom: ancient Greece and the origins of Europe*, trans. J Chase, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Meridor, R 1978, 'Hecuba's revenge: some observations on Euripides' *Hecuba*', *AJPh*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 28-35.

Meridor, R 1983, 'The function of Polymestor's crime in the *Hecuba* of Euripides', *Eranos*, vol. 81, pp. 13-20.

Meridor, R 1984, 'Plot and myth in Euripides' *Heracles* and *Troades*', *Phoenix*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 205-15.

Meridor, R 1989, 'Euripides' *Troades* 28-44 and the Andromache scene', *AJPh*, vol. 110, no. 1, pp. 17-35.

Meridor, R 2000, 'Creative rhetoric in Euripides' *Troades*: some notes on Hecuba's speech', *CQ*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 16-29.

Michelini, AN 1987, *Euripides and the tragic tradition*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Miller, MC 1997, *Athens and Persia in the fifth century B.C.: a study in cultural receptivity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Mitchell, L 2007, *Panhellenism and the barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Classical Press of Wales, Swansea.

Mitchell-Boyask, RN 1993, 'Sacrifice and revenge in Euripides' *Hecuba*', *Ramus*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 116-34.

Morwood, J (ed.) 2000, *Euripides: Hecuba; the Trojan women; Andromache*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Morwood, J 2014, 'Hecuba and the democrats: political polarities in Euripides' play', *G&R*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 194-203.

Mossman, J 1995, *Wild justice: a study of Euripides'* Hecuba, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Muich, RM 2010, *Pouring out tears: Andromache in Homer and Euripides*, PhD diss., University of Illinois, Urbana.

Munteanu, DL 2010-11, 'The tragic Muse and the anti-epic glory of women in Euripides' *Troades*', *CJ*, vol. 106, no. 2, pp. 129-47.

Nippel, W 2002, 'The construction of the "Other"', trans. A Nevill, in T Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and barbarians*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, pp. 278-310.

Nussbaum, MC 2001, *The fragility of goodness: luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy*, rev. edn, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

O'Connor-Visser, EAME 1987, *Aspects of human sacrifice in the tragedies of Euripides*, B.R. Grüner, Amsterdam.

O'Neill, EG 1941, 'The prologue of the *Troades* of Euripides', *TAPhA*, vol. 72, pp. 288-320.

Page, DL 1936, 'The elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*', in *Greek poetry and life (essays presented to Gilbert Murray on his seventieth birthday)*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 206-30.

Papadimitropoulos, L 2006, 'Marriage and strife in Euripides' *Andromache*', *GRBS*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 147-58.

Papadodima, E 2010, 'The Greek/barbarian interaction in Euripides' *Andromache*, *Orestes*, *Heracleidae*: a reassessment of Greek attitudes to foreigners', *Digressus*, vol. 10, pp. 1-42.

Papadodima, E 2013, *Foreignness negotiated: conceptual and ethical aspects of the Greek-barbarian distinction in fifth-century literature*, Georg Olms, Hildesheim.

Papadodima, E 2014, 'Ethnicity and the stage', in J McInerney (ed.), *A companion to ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, pp. 256-69.

Papadopoulou, T 2000, 'Cassandra's radiant vigour and the ironic optimism of Euripides' *Troades*', *Mnemosyne*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 513-27.

Pinsent, J 1984, 'The Trojans in the *Iliad*', in L Foxhall & JK Davies (eds), *The Trojan War: its historicity and context*, Bristol Classical Press, Bristol, pp. 137-62.

Poole, A 1976, 'Total disaster: Euripides' the Trojan Women', *Arion*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 257-87.

Porter, JR 1994, *Studies in Euripides'* Orestes, Brill, Leiden.

Rabinowitz, NS 1984, 'Proliferating triangles: Euripides' *Andromache* and the traffic in women', *Mosaic*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 111-23.

Rabinowitz, NS 1993, *Anxiety veiled: Euripides and the traffic in women*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Raeck, W 1981, *Zum Barbarenbild in der Kunst Athens im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Habelt, Bonn.

Reckford, KJ 1985, 'Concepts of demoralization in the *Hecuba*', in P Burian (ed.), *Directions in Euripidean criticism: a collection of essays*, Duke University Press, Durham, pp. 112-28.

Redfield, JM 1994, *Nature and culture in the Iliad: the tragedy of Hector*, 2nd edn, Duke University Press, Durham.

Richardson, NJ (ed.) 1993, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. 6, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ritchie, W 1964, *The authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Robert, F 1950, *Homère*, Presses Universitares de France, Paris.

Robertson, DS 1923, 'Euripides and Tharyps', *CR*, vol. 37, nos. 3/4, pp. 58-60.

Roisman, J 1997, 'Contemporary allusions in Euripides' *Trojan Women*', *SIFC*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 38-47.

Rosén, HB (ed.) 1987, *Herodoti Historiae*, vol. 1 (Books I-IV), Teubner, Leipzig.

Rosenbloom, D 2006, 'Empire and its discontents: *Trojan women*, *Birds*, and the symbolic economy of Athenian imperialism', in J Davidson, F Muecke, & P Wilson (eds), *Greek drama III: essays in honour of Kevin Lee*, Institute of Classical Studies, London, pp. 245-71.

Saïd, S 2002, 'Greeks and barbarians in Euripides' tragedies: the end of differences?', trans. A Nevill, in T Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and barbarians*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, pp. 62-100.

Scodel, R 1980, *The Trojan trilogy of Euripides*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Scodel, R 1998, 'The captive's dilemma: sexual acquiescence in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades*', *HSPh*, vol. 98, pp. 137-54.

Scodel, R 2012, 'Introduction', in *Euripides: Andromache, Hecuba, Trojan Women*, trans. DA Svarlien, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis, pp. vii-xxv.

Seaford, R 1982, 'The date of Euripides' *Cyclops*', *JHS*, vol. 102, pp. 161-72.

Segal, C 1993, *Euripides and the poetics of sorrow: art, gender, and commemoration in* Alcestis, Hippolytus, *and* Hecuba, Duke University Press, Durham.

Seidensticker, B 1982, *Palintonos harmonia: Studien zu komischen Elementen in der griechischen Tragödie*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Sicalin, J 1983, 'Die Krise der traditionellen Weltanschauung in der trojanischen Tragödien des Euripides', in H Kuch (ed.), *Die griechische Tragödie in ihrer gesellschaftlichen Funktion*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 103-14.

Sidwell, K 2001, 'Melos and the *Trojan Women*', in D Stuttard & T Shasha (eds), *Trojan Women*, Actors of Dionysus, York, pp. 30-44.

Silk, MS 2004, *Homer: The Iliad*, 2nd edn, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Skinner, JE 2012, *The invention of Greek ethnography: from Homer to Herodotus*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Snell, B 1937, *Euripides Alexandros und andere strassburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischer Dichter*, Weidmann, Berlin.

Sorum, CE 1995, 'Euripides' judgement: literary creation in *Andromache*', *AJPh*, vol. 116, no. 3, pp. 371-88.

Spawforth, A 2001, 'Shades of Greekness: a Lydian case study', in I Malkin (ed.), *Ancient perceptions of Greek ethnicity*, Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington, pp. 375-400.

Stansbury-O'Donnell, MD 2005, 'The painting program in the Stoa Poikile', in JM Barringer & JM Hurwit (eds), *Periklean Athens and its legacy: problems and perspectives*, University of Texas Press, Austin, pp. 73-87.

Stavrinou, AS 2014, 'Inside and out: the dynamics of domestic space in Euripides' *Andromache*', *Hermes*, vol. 142, no. 4, pp. 385-403.

Stevens, PT (ed.) 1971, *Euripides: Andromache*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Storey, IC 1993, 'Domestic disharmony in Euripides' *Andromache*', in I McAuslan & P Walcot (eds), *Greek tragedy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 180-92.

Stuttard, D 2005, *An introduction to Trojan Women*, Company Dionysus, Brighton.

Sullivan, JJ 2007, 'The agency of the herald Talthybius in Euripides' *Trojan Women*', *Mnemosyne*, vol. 60, pp. 472-7.

Suter, A 2003, 'Lament in Euripides' *Trojan Women*', *Mnemosyne*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 1-28.

Synodinou, K 1977, *On the concept of slavery in Euripides*, University of Ioannina, Ioannina.

Taplin, OP 1992, *Homeric soundings: the shaping of the Iliad*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Tarkow, TA 1984, 'Tragedy and transformation: parent and child in Euripides' *Hecuba*', *Maia*, vol. 36, pp. 123-36.

Torrance, I 2005, 'Andromache *Aichmalōtos*: concubine or wife?' *Hermathena*, vol. 179, pp. 39-66.

Tuplin, C 1999, 'Greek racism? Observations on the character and limits of Greek ethnic prejudice', in GR Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Ancient Greeks west and east*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 47-75.

Van der Valk, MHALH 1953, 'Homer's nationalistic attitude', *AC*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 5-26.

Van der Valk, M 1985a, *Studies in Euripides: Phoenissae and Andromache*, Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam.

Van der Valk, M 1985b, ‘Homer’s nationalism, again’, *Mnemosyne,* vol. 30, nos. 3/4, pp. 373-6.

Van Erp Taalman Kip, AM 1987, ‘Euripides and Melos’, *Mnemosyne,* vol. 40, nos. 3/4, pp. 414-19.

Vlassopoulos, K 2007, *Unthinking the Greek polis: ancient Greek history beyond Eurocentrism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Vlassopoulos, K 2013a, *Greeks and barbarians*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Vlassopoulos, K 2013b, ‘The stories of the others: storytelling and intercultural communication in the Herodotean Mediterranean’, in E Almagor & J Skinner (eds), *Ancient ethnography: new approaches*, Bloomsbury, London, pp. 49-75.

Walser, G 1984, *Hellas und Iran: Studien zu den griechisch-persischen Beziehungen vor Alexander*, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.

Waterfield, RAH 1982, ‘Double standards in Euripides’ *Troades*’, *Maia,* vol. 34, pp. 139-42.

Weidner, E 1913, ‘*Βάρβαρος*’, *Glotta,* vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 303-4.

Weil, S 1965, ‘The Iliad, or the poem of force’, trans. M McCarthy, *Chicago Review*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 5-30.

West, ML (ed.) 1987, *Euripides: Orestes*, Aris and Phillips, Warminster.

West, ML 1997, *The east face of Helicon: West Asiatic elements in Greek poetry and myth*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Westlake, HD 1953, 'Euripides' *Troades*: 205-229', *Mnemosyne*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 181-91.

Willink, CW (ed.) 1986, *Euripides: Orestes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Wohl, V 2015, *Euripides and the Politics of Form*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Wolff, C 1983, 'Orestes', in E Segal (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek tragedy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 340-56.

Woodford, S 1993, *The Trojan War in ancient art*, Duckworth, London.

Wright, M 2008, *Euripides: Orestes*, Duckworth, London.

Zacharia, K 2008, 'Herodotus' four markers of Greek identity', in K Zacharia (ed.), *Hellenisms: culture, identity, and ethnicity from antiquity to modernity*, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 21-36.

Zeitlin, FI 1996, *Playing the other: gender and society in Classical Greek literature*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Zeitlin, FI 2003, 'The closet of masks: role-playing and myth-making in the *Orestes* of Euripides', in J Mossman (ed.), *Euripides*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 309-41.