

POURING OUT TEARS: ANDROMACHE IN HOMER AND EURIPIDES

BY

REBECCA M. MUICH

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Philology  
in the Graduate College of  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2010

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor David Sansone, Chair  
Associate Professor Maryline Parca  
Associate Professor Ariana Traill  
Assistant Professor Angeliki Tzanetou

## ABSTRACT

This thesis begins to examine the role of Andromache in the Trojan War saga and tradition by providing an in-depth analysis of Andromache in the *Iliad*, Euripides' *Andromache* and Euripides' *Trojan Women*. Using theories of character derived from the narratological study of modern fiction, it strives to draw attention to the role of Andromache's character in each work and the methods of characterization each author uses. The close analysis of the mechanics of character-building aids in the delineation of the themes Andromache helps to develop in each work and aids in establishing the continuity of the character between her epic and tragic manifestations. The thesis shows how the Homeric poet and Euripides utilize three features in Andromache's characterization. First, by making her a paragon of feminine virtue, the authors position her as a useful comparandum for the actions of other, more dangerous women. Second, by focusing attention on the nature of her victimization, the authors call into question the prevailing social values of the time, and the actions of victors in war. Third, by highlighting Andromache's role as mourner, the authors closely examine the particular suffering of women in times of war. The thesis concludes that Andromache has remained a powerful, iconic figure in the Trojan War tradition because of her role as a representative of the universal hardships facing women during and after wartime.

*For Jon*  
*animae dimidium meae*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is my distinct pleasure to acknowledge the many individuals whose help and support contributed to the completion of this project and degree. First and foremost I must thank my adviser and director Dr. David Sansone, who encouraged the idea that eventually became this dissertation and who patiently worked through several incarnations of the project despite the difficult distance situation. I am also happy to thank my committee, Dr. Maryline Parca, Dr. Angeliki Tzanetou, and Dr. Ariana Traill for their close readings, helpful suggestions, patience and encouragement. I am grateful to Dr. Scott Garner who read drafts of the first three chapters and whose insights greatly shaped my thinking on the whole project. I would also like to thank Mrs. Mary Ellen Fryer for her help in completing the dissertation and degree on time. I am very pleased to acknowledge the encouragement and support of my friends and colleagues at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and Wake Forest University. Their kind interest in my work and their unrelenting optimism helped more than I can ever say. I benefitted especially from the support of my dear friends Jill and Matt Barber, Stephanie Aktipis, Danielle Carpenter, Ingrid Albrecht, and Loula Strolonga. Joe, Kathy, Joe, and Rachel Muich have been unswervingly dedicated to helping me succeed from the beginning. Words are not enough to adequately thank them for always being there. The Zarecki family, Steve, Marcia, Dawn, and the kids, made me feel like one of their own and added their love and support along the way. I cannot forget to thank Fizzgig for her unique contributions to my work and for making me feel useful and important on even the worst of days. Finally, I am so happy to acknowledge my husband Jon and the hard work he put into this project and this degree. He has done an admirable job of the difficult task of advising, listening to, cheering for, and generally taking care of a stubborn graduate student for eight years now. I could not have finished were not for his unwavering belief in me, and it is to him that I affectionately and gratefully dedicate this work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: METHOD .....	1
CHAPTER 2: ANDROMACHE’S SELF DEFINITION AND SPEECHES IN THE <i>ILIAD</i> .....	38
CHAPTER 3: DIRECT DEFINITION AND INDIRECT PRESENTATION IN THE <i>ILIAD</i> .....	83
CHAPTER 4: EURIPIDES’ <i>ANDROMACHE</i> .....	133
CHAPTER 5: EURIPIDES’ <i>TROJAN WOMEN</i> .....	181
CONCLUSION.....	220
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	223

## Chapter 1: Method

### I. Introduction

Particular characters from classical mythology have endured in the art and literature of Western civilization because something about their story or their experiences has resonated with audiences for centuries. Because of their persistence in artistic and literary works through time, they have, in the words of Uri Margolin, “become common cultural property,” characters who retain their symbolic meaning even when extracted from any particular textual or visual representation.<sup>1</sup> The very names of some characters, for example “Odysseus” or “Medea,” are enough to signify a particular set of properties which have been “culturally entrenched or codified” to the extent that a character or person who exemplifies these qualities need not even be named “Odysseus” or “Medea” but may be referred to as “*an* Odysseus” or “*a* Medea.”<sup>2</sup> The durability and popularity of these characters are manifested in the fact that each of their stories presents a moral dilemma, ethical question, or emotional response which speaks to readers across generations. Though the details of the character’s life or actions or genre of the story may vary from work to work, certain core elements of the character retain their power in each work and ultimately become inseparable from the character herself. The critical studies of mythological characters who have appeared in several textual and visual representations have examined both the consistency and inconsistency of characterization and have analyzed how each character exemplifies, challenges, or perverts the ethics and morals of a given society at a given time.<sup>3</sup> But no such in-depth study exists for Andromache, a character whose literary legacy reaches far back to the earliest origins of Western literature and stretches far into modern theatre, film and fiction.

---

<sup>1</sup> Uri Margolin, “Characters and Their Versions.” *Fiction Updated: Theories of Fictionality, Narratology, and Poetics*, ed. Calin-Andrei Mihailescu and Walid Hamarneh (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1996) 116.

<sup>2</sup> Margolin 117.

<sup>3</sup> William Stanford’s *The Ulysses Theme* examines the Odysseus/Ulysses character from ancient to modern literature. Stanford claims that Odysseus has remained popular because his character and exploits were varied and ambiguous, and because a hallmark of his characterization is adaptability. There have been several works on Helen in literature, either examining her character only in ancient literature, or comparing her ancient characterizations to medieval, renaissance, or modern characterizations. Mihoko Suzuki’s *Metamorphoses of Helen* offers an explicitly feminist reading of the character in the literary tradition starting with the *Iliad* and ending with Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*; Matthew Gumpert’s *Grafting Helen* looks at the tradition of the Helen character in ancient literature and in French literature, aiming to discuss a figure within a tradition as well as the history of literary tradition itself; Norman Austin’s *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom* focuses exclusively on the variant story of Helen remaining in Sparta while her *eidolon* goes to Troy, and discusses Helen as a focal point for shame, either her own or the Greeks’.

This thesis is intended to be the first step towards a comprehensive study of Andromache's important place in ancient literature.

This is not to say that the literary representation of Andromache has been completely ignored. Jacqueline de Romilly has traced the transformations of Andromache's character from Homer to Baudelaire, but she declines to look too deeply into the reasons behind the transformations, choosing to focus instead of the universality of her experience.<sup>4</sup> Gérard Genette looks at the continuations of Andromache's story as part of a larger discussion of how continuations of the Trojan War saga allow the reader to retroactively examine the interpretation of the epic *ethos*.<sup>5</sup> Genette argues that the heroic "world situation," that is, war, continues to captivate poet and audiences as long as there is space for "the expression of that pathetic other truth, whereby a woman's voice is heard to say that heroism is not man's most profound, or noblest, calling."<sup>6</sup> He does not, however, provide a survey of the various transformations of her character or even delve too deeply into the themes her character touches upon, but rather argues that her character type is a necessary element in securing the longevity of the Trojan War saga. Both studies conclude that the experience of female suffering is universal and therefore its representation is essential to the survival of these epic sagas, but the examination of the literary character herself suffers from the breadth of the approaches. As each modern author strives to identify the unifying themes in various works, there is little discussion of the character's purpose in a particular text and little attention paid to an author's methods of creating such a vibrant and memorable character.

The paucity of in-depth studies of Andromache may be attributable to the details of her personal story. Unlike other ancient Greek mythological figures who have merited book-length discussions of their characterization in several works, Andromache is unique in that her story emphasizes submission rather than defiance. Though most women in mythological stories are subjected to terrible events similar to Andromache's (such as the deaths of loved ones,

---

<sup>4</sup> See Jacqueline de Romilly, *Tragédies Grecques au Fil des Ans*. (Les Belles Lettres, 1995). De Romilly strives throughout her chapter to connect Andromache to themes of sorrow and exile, and to relate them to contemporary experiences. She ends her study by stating that Andromache today may have the traits of a Bosnian mother, and Astyanax might be a Rwandan child (De Romilly 42).

<sup>5</sup> Gerard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (U of Nebraska P, 1997) 183.

<sup>6</sup> Genette 187.

enslavement, abandonment, isolation, exile, and alienation), most of these women choose to confront moral, ethical, or societal expectations rather than submit to an unendurable fate. One thinks of the murders committed or orchestrated by Clytemnestra, Electra, Hecuba and Medea; the self-sacrifices of Polyxena, Iphigenia, and Antigone; and Helen's blatant manipulation of sexuality. The "misbehavior" of these women is both entertaining and illuminating. While their actions terrify, thrill, or excite, they also draw attention to the social or cultural tensions which motivate such extreme reactions. Andromache's actions have the opposite effect. Instead of facing her tragedies with subversive defiance, she submits to unimaginable suffering. The authors surveyed in this study represent Andromache following ideal behavioral norms, despite the fact that she criticizes the social *ethos* which leads to her suffering and deliberates whether she should continue to uphold her standards of excellent behavior in the face of devastating reversals of fortune. In this respect, her experiences most closely represent the contemporary experiences of women in a time of war.

This thesis provides an in-depth look at Andromache in the *Iliad*, Euripides' *Andromache* and Euripides' *Trojan Women*. Using theories of character derived from the narratological study of modern fiction, it strives to draw attention to the role of Andromache's character in each work and the method of characterization each author uses. The close analysis of the mechanics of character-building is intended to aid in the delineation of the themes Andromache helps to develop in each work and to aid in establishing the continuity of the character between her epic and tragic manifestations. The study begins by positioning Andromache as a secondary character in the *Iliad* who clearly represents the interests and concerns of innocent women during the war. The Homeric poet uses her character to describe the anxieties of family members waiting at home while warriors go to battle, and to question the *mores* of the warrior code by drawing attention to the devastating effects war has on the families of the heroes. Following chapters then examine how this Homeric creation is taken up and adapted by Euripides to suit his own tragic program. By emphasizing and amplifying Andromache's Homeric qualities, Euripides creates a character who helps explore the complex themes and issues surrounding war in 5<sup>th</sup> century Athens. As a widow and bereaved mother, a slave and concubine, Andromache's character helps the author to question the limits of civility and the nature of barbarity; to reinforce the ideology of feminine goodness; and to expose hard truths about the victimization of women and children in war. Andromache's laments in each of these works draw attention to her



plight in particular as a woman navigating troubled waters both during and after the war, and women's plight in general during the Trojan War and its aftermath. But Andromache's story, as represented in Homeric epic and Euripidean tragedy, also shows how the treatment of innocent victims of war delineate what is heroic and unheroic; what is barbaric and civilized with respect to the different cultural contexts of each work. The study concludes that the power of Andromache's character lies in the fact that she is a manifestation of the aftereffects of the war. She embodies the complex combination of victimization, lamentation, memory, and survival which inevitably follows upon the destruction wrought by war.

### *Andromache: A Character History*

There is a certain amount of evidence, quite a lot of it iconographical, which suggests that Andromache was not invented for the *Iliad*, but was rather part of a greater tradition of stories about the Trojan War.<sup>7</sup> Information culled from the *Iliad* itself suggests that she, her father, or her home city of Thebe Hypoplakos might have been more central to other Trojan War stories outside of the *Iliad*. Her own lament in Book 6 reports the name of her father, the circumstance of his death (and the deaths of her brothers and mother), and the nature of his burial (6.414-28). The narrator makes reference to her marriage to Hector when he recounts the many gifts Hector brought to her to before her marriage (22.472). The story of Eëtion's death at Achilles' hands has often been connected to the sieges of Lyrnessos and Pedasos, the cities from which the captive women Chryseis and Briseis came (1. 366-69; 2.688-694; 19.290-99). The elaborately detailed reports of these sieges, and the repeated reference to goods seized from them (9.186-9; 9.364-7; 16.152-3; 23.826-9), have led some scholars to suggest that these episodes might have formed another poetic tradition, which the Iliadic poet appropriated and incorporated into his own version of the saga.<sup>8</sup> Extant iconographical evidence shows that Andromache, or someone who is likely her, appears in works attested from the sixth-century BCE to the sixth century CE, but her identity is confirmed on only a small number of those works.<sup>9</sup> Many of the works in

---

<sup>7</sup> Jonathan Burgess, *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2001) 64-65. Kullman argues that Hector, Andromache, and Astyanax were *ad hoc* inventions in the *Iliad* (Burgess *op.cit.* 63). Burgess argues strongly against Kullman, especially in regard to Hector (Burgess 63-65). His strongest argument for the traditionality of Andromache is the fact that there is strong traditional evidence for Hector and Astyanax.

<sup>8</sup> See Walter Leaf, *The Iliad. Vols. I-II*. 2nd edition (Hakkert, 1971) 242-3 on "The Great Foray," 242-3; John Zarker, "King Eëtion and Thebe as Symbols in the *Iliad*," *Classical Journal* 61 (1965): *passim*.

<sup>9</sup> Odette Toucheffe-Meynier, "Andromache," *LIMC* (1981) 773.

which she is securely identified depict an Iliadic scene: Andromache meeting Hector before battle (22 artifacts); Andromache at Hector's death, either positioned on the ramparts (6 artifacts) or at the foot of the walls (3 artifacts); Andromache at Hector's funeral (2 artifacts).<sup>10</sup> Extant iconographical evidence also depicts Andromache participating in several scenes from the Trojan War saga not included in the narrative frame of the *Iliad*, such as accompanying Priam to the camp of the Achaeans to ransom Hector's body (2 artifacts); watching the Amazons arrive at Troy (2 artifacts); appearing in various contexts during the destruction of the city, but usually with a baby assumed to be Astyanax (8 artifacts).<sup>11</sup>

The *Iliad* and iconographical record may also preserve information about Andromache's involvement in another poetic tradition aside from the stories of the raids on the cities surrounding Troy. Christos Tsagalis, in an interesting but somewhat speculative argument, analyzes in detail the connection between Andromache and Dionysus, suggesting that she was part of a "rival" Theban song tradition which was eventually incorporated into the Iliadic tradition. Tsagalis first considers the implications of the maenad simile and the various connections between the exemplum of Lycurgus, who threatened Dionysus, and the *homilia* scene between Hector and Andromache, both in Book 6.<sup>12</sup> Tsagalis also attempts to connect Andromache to Dionysus and Thebes through her Amazonian characterization. He remarks that Andromache's name "recalls" an Amazon, and argues that several aspects of her characterization in the *Iliad*, especially the military advice she gives to Hector at 6.433-9 and the care she gives to his horses at 8.185-190, confirm his hypothesis that she was originally a warrior.<sup>13</sup> Tsagalis grounds his argument in the assumption that the Amazon identified as "Andromache" in 20 extant ancient artifacts is meant to be the same Andromache of the *Iliad*. He supports the

---

<sup>10</sup> Touchefeu-Meynier 768-771.

<sup>11</sup> Touchefeu-Meynier 771-773.

<sup>12</sup> Christos Tsagalis, *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics* (Harvard UP, 2008) 6. Tsagalis argues that the participle *μαίνομενος* can have a Dionysiac meaning when attributed to Andromache, not simply the warlike meaning it has for the rest of the epic. He also notes that there are other overlaps between the Lycurgus story and the *homilia* scene: the nurses who care for Dionysus and Astyanax (*τιθήνη*); and the epithet *ἀνδροφόνος* applied to both Hector and Lycurgus (Tsagalis 7-8).

<sup>13</sup> Tsagalis 14. He notes that there are several references to her knowledge of military affairs in the *Iliad*: the advice she gives to Hector at 6.433-9, the care she gives to his horses at 8.185-190, the care she might give to his armor at 17.206-8, and the fact that she is the only daughter with seven brothers, which naturally masculinizes her. Tsagalis next lays out Hector's connection to Thebes (16-18); Eëtion's connection to Thebes (18-20); and allusions to the Boetian Thebes in the *Iliad* (22-26).

assumption by calling attention to a 5<sup>th</sup> century Attic kylix which depicts Andromache (identified by inscription) protecting a baby by brandishing a club against a menacing warrior.<sup>14</sup> Tsagalis connects the Amazonian Andromache to Thebes through Ares, to whom the Amazons were “cherished beings.” Ares, in turn, is linked to Thebes through his daughter Harmonia. Therefore, Tsagalis writes, “Ares is the mythical ‘filter’ through which Andromache’s link to Boeotian Thebes is effectuated.”<sup>15</sup> Tsagalis concludes that the maenadic references to Andromache in *Iliad* 6 and 22 “result from the *Iliad*’s sophisticated use of older mythical material, where the Dionysiac allusions would be at home and where Andromache, Hector, and the mythological context they are placed in would be related to Dionysus and Thebes.”<sup>16</sup> This is certainly an intriguing suggestion, and other aspects of his argument will be discussed below, but unfortunately, Tsagalis’ argument is based entirely on evidence found in the *Iliad* and on the assumption that the Iliadic Andromache must be based on the Amazonian Andromache. No other extant source makes any reference to a Theban or Amazonian origin for Andromache.

There are extant fragments of other ancient Greek poems which do mention Andromache. Fragment 44 Lobel-Page of Sappho is an epithalamium which narrates the wedding of Andromache to Hector, paying special attention to the wealth of her dowry and the sights, sounds and smells of Troy as the city prepares to welcome the bride. As Leah Rissman has shown, this poem (fragmentary though it is) is heavy with allusions to Homeric poetry.<sup>17</sup> Though the Homeric poem does not narrate the wedding itself, there are elliptical references to the wedding in the descriptions of Andromache’s father Eëtion and the “countless gifts” Hector offers to Andromache. There is no way to know if there was a separate Aeolic tradition of the Trojan War saga, but Sappho’s conscious adaptation of Homeric vocabulary and metric structure

---

<sup>14</sup> Tsagalis 14. Artifact described by Touchefeu-Meynier at 772. This connection is further strengthened by the name “Andromache” on a list of Amazons found among the scholia vetera to *Il.* 3.189. It should be noted, however, that this is not the only iconographic representation of Andromache fighting. Two other 5<sup>th</sup> century Attic vessels depict a young woman, most likely Andromache, defending herself against a warrior with a club. Both of these images, however, are securely anchored in Trojan War contexts: both images are grouped with Priam and Astyanax (Touchefeu-Meynier 772).

<sup>15</sup> Tsagalis 15.

<sup>16</sup> Tsagalis 28.

<sup>17</sup> Leah Rissman, *Love As War* (Hain, 1983) 119-141.

suggests that she was familiar with, and probably drawing from, the Iliadic tradition.<sup>18</sup> Among the extant fragments of the Epic Cycle are a few lines of the *Ilias Parva* and *Iliou Persis* which relate Andromache's fate after the fall of Troy. Both fragments recount the death of Andromache's son Astyanax, and the fact that she was taken as a concubine by Neoptolemus.<sup>19</sup> The plots of the fifth-century tragedies *Andromache* and *Trojan Women* by Euripides show the influence of the Cyclic imagining of her fate.

Even though the plots of Euripides' tragedies are tied to an earlier poetic tradition for some portions of Andromache's story, it is not possible to tell if that is the case for all variants of her story. For example, since the Epic Cycle recounts how Andromache was given to Neoptolemus after the fall of Troy, and Andromache is given to Helenus in the epilogue of Euripides' *Andromache*, it seems reasonable to suppose that Strabo's tale of Andromache ruling as queen of the Molossians might be based on the same traditional tale. Likewise, Pausanias' claims that Andromache had three children by Neoptolemus and Andromache followed one of them to rule his kingdom also has some grounding in earlier poetic versions. But variants from very late stories, such as the existence of Laodamas, Hector and Andromache's second son, are harder to reconcile as part of a pre-existing poetic tradition.<sup>20</sup> Part of the difficulty is the sheer number of known written sources available to the authors at that point in time: for example, Griffin names the *Iliad*, the mythological libraries of Apollodorus and Hyginus, the Cyclic poems, Vergil's *Aeneid*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and Pliny as potential inspirations for Dictys' version.<sup>21</sup> Of course, some details may simply have been invented. Another part of the difficulty is the fact that there is no attestation to some of these variants in other media, or, if there is, it is difficult to tell which medium influenced the other. Although the details of her

---

<sup>18</sup> Though Burgess notes that 7<sup>th</sup> century poets likely knew Trojan War material from the Epic Cycle, not necessarily Homer: Hesiod, Alcman, Alcaeus, Sappho, Stesichorus, Ibycus and Simonides all use Trojan War characters, themes or motifs in their poems. Burgess notes that Alcaeus and Sappho seem to have an "obsessive interest" in Trojan War myth which may be independent of Homer, but part of a greater Cyclic tradition. Burgess cites Martin West, "The Rise of the Greek Epic" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108 (1988): 151.

<sup>19</sup> *Ilias Parva* (Davies F 20 = Bernabé 21 lines 6-8) ἐκ δ' ἔλετ' Ἀνδρομάχην ἡύζωνον παράκοιτιν/Ἐκτορος, ἣν τε οἱ αὐτῶι ἄρεστές Παναχαιῶν/δῶκαν ἔχειν ἐπίρον ἀμειβόμενοι γέρας ἀνδρί. In Proclus' summary of the events of the *Iliou Persis* in the *Chrestomathia*, he recounts what happens to Andromache and Astyanax after the fall of the city: καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς Ἀστυάνακτα ἀνελόντος, Νεοπτόλεμος Ἀνδρομάχην γέρας λαμβάνει. καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ λάφυρα διανέμονται (268-270).

<sup>20</sup> Dictys 3.20. But cf. Casey Dué, *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis* (Rowan and Littlefield, 2002) 4-5 (especially n. 15) who does accept the proposition that Dictys may preserve a traditional variant.

<sup>21</sup> Nathaniel Griffin, *Dares and Dictys* (J.H. Furst, Co., 1907) 3 n.1.

extra-Iliadic or extra-Cyclic life are open to interpretation, it is clear that Andromache was part of the greater Trojan War tradition which eventually became part of the canonized Iliadic and Cyclic texts. But Andromache's history as a traditional character matters little to the continuity of her character in later literature. Though Andromache's Iliadic characterization may contain tinges of a previous characterization from another oral tradition, in all other literary representations Andromache most resembles the character defined by her Iliadic qualities (the lamenting good wife and mother), not the qualities suggested by a potential Amazonian connection (knowledgeable in warfare). Though the plots of Euripides' tragedies show the influence of the Cyclic poems in their details, the characterization of his Andromache plays off of her Iliadic presentation. There are no other hints of an Amazonian Andromache or a Theban Andromache elsewhere.

Despite the fact that most later literary representations of Andromache depend upon an interplay with her Iliadic characterization, Andromache remains a popular figure in Trojan War narratives and allusions. Andromache appears in texts from the earliest archaic poetry of ancient Greece to the latest antique epic poetry of Dares and Dictys. Not every text tells the same portion of her life story. Indeed, a biography of sorts can be reconstructed from ancient texts. Not all of the texts feature Andromache as a main character, but taken as a whole, it is possible to recount the major events of Andromache's life from her marriage to her death.

The *Iliad* provides the name of her father, Eëtion, the place of her birth, and the existence of her unnamed mother and seven brothers. The *Iliad* alludes to the fact that her father, presumably a powerful man, married her to Hector, the son of another powerful man, Priam, king of Troy. The wedding itself is narrated in the fragment of Sappho's epithalamium. Around the time of their marriage (one must guess here), the Achaeans attack Troy, beginning a ten-year siege effort known as the Trojan War. Andromache's reminiscences in the *Iliad* provide the information for what happens to her family during the war: her father and brothers are killed by Achilles, her mother is ransomed and later dies, and Andromache gives birth to Hector's son, Astyanax.<sup>22</sup> The *Iliad* recounts the death of Hector and his funeral, but it is the fragments of the Cyclic epics which report the capture and destruction of Troy and the allotment of the Trojan women to Greek captors. Fragments of the *Ilias Parva* and *Iliou Persis* report that Andromache

---

<sup>22</sup>Dictys' epic contains a major variant to the *Iliad's* story: Andromache has two children by Hector, Astyanax and Laodamas (3.20). Dares lists Andromache among the children of Priam, but Hector is also thus listed, indicating that she is included as a daughter-in-law (section 4).

was taken as a concubine by Neoptolemus, Achilles' son and Astyanax was thrown from the walls of Troy.<sup>23</sup> The events occurring right after the capture of the city and in the years after the Trojan War were immensely interesting to Euripides and later authors. Euripides' *Andromache* recounts how Neoptolemus takes Andromache to his home in Epirus, where he has a wife, Hermione, the daughter of Menelaus and Helen. Hermione is unable to bear children to Neoptolemus, but Andromache gives birth to one son.<sup>24</sup> In the epilogue of *Andromache*, Thetis gives Andromache to Helenus in marriage, since Neoptolemus was killed at Delphi. Vergil imagines Andromache's life with Helenus in the *Aeneid*. According to that epic, Andromache lives with Helenus in his settlement in Chaonia.<sup>25</sup> What happens to her after Vergil's report of her in Chaonia is not taken up by any author of fiction. Two travel writers, Strabo and Pausanias, mention Andromache in their surveys of the Greek world. According to their reports, after Helenus dies, Andromache lives with her son Pergamus, who founded the eponymous city. She dies there.<sup>26</sup>

Certain stages of Andromache's life, the fall of Troy and the distribution and dispersal of the Trojan women, have been more frequently represented in drama and literature than others.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> See note 13. Euripides' *Trojan Women* and Seneca's *Troades* concern the allotment of all the Trojan Women and the murder of Astyanax, though neither explicitly names the murderer. The lost *Andromacha Aechmalotis* of Ennius might have dramatized some or all of these events. Quintus of Smyrna simply notes that Neoptolemus takes Andromache at the end of the war (book 14). Dictys writes that Neoptolemus takes Andromache and gives her two sons to Helenus (5.13). Dares writes that Helenus supplicates Agamemnon to spare the Trojan women. Agamemnon agrees, and Helenus takes Cassandra, Andromache and Hecuba to the Chersonese (sections 41-43).

<sup>24</sup> This is the plot of Euripides' *Andromache*, though in that play, there is only one unnamed child, presumably Molossus. Pausanias attributes three children named Molossus, Pielus, and Pergamus to Neoptolemus (1.11). Dictys recounts a similar story, but the child is Laodamas, the second of Hector's children (6.12-13).

<sup>25</sup> This portion of the story is told in *Aeneid* 3.320-345, 3.482-489. Andromache tells Aeneas that when Neoptolemus was killed, Helenus inherited Chaonia. Pausanias is the only source to attribute a son, Crestinus, to their union (1.11). Strabo records a variant story, in which Andromache ruled as queen of the Molossians (13.1.27). The connection to the Molossians is recorded by Dictys at 6.7. Neoptolemus had lived among them while repairing his ships and remained on good terms with them. In Dictys' epic, after Andromache and Laodamas escape Hermione and Menelaus, Peleus and Thetis send her off to live with the Molossians when they learn she is pregnant with Neoptolemus' child (6.13). There is no mention of how Laodamas fits into the new situation, but it does explain how Neoptolemus' son becomes the ruler of the Molossians.

<sup>26</sup> Pausanias is the only source that records Andromache's death. He claims there is a shrine to her there in Pergamum (1.11).

<sup>27</sup> Margolin calls the phenomenon in which the same temporal stage is told by more than one author "total overlap" as opposed to "intersection" or "partial overlap" in which some portions of temporal stages previously narrated in one text are integrated into another temporal stage narrated in another (Margolin 119). Margolin notes that total overlap is rare, but classicists are familiar with Roman "remakes" of Greek mythological stories in several genres. It should also be noted that these authors most likely did not intend their works to be "sequels" or "prequels" of an

Whether recounted for the complex themes this part of story addresses, or for pure entertainment value, these stages have remained popular for ages. Andromache's life after the war has not interested authors to the same extent as the war stages. When ancient authors do choose to depict her in a post-war stage, as Euripides and Vergil do, it is clear that the authors are using her character to flesh out a particular thematic point in the context of a larger discourse about the after-effects of war. The stories of Andromache's life after the death of Helenus are recounted in connection with local lore by travel writers, and so it seems as though this portion of her story, whether part of an earlier poetic tradition or not, was not nearly as enticing to ancient authors as the earlier parts.

### *Text Selection*

The two main criteria for determining the selection of texts for this study are centrality of character and degree of characterization. It is obvious that texts in which Andromache is a central character also provide the highest degree of characterization, as is the case in Euripides' *Andromache* and Seneca's *Troades*. However, some works in which Andromache is not a central character do utilize vivid characterization, such as the *Iliad* and Vergil's *Aeneid*. In these works Andromache is not a participant in the central plot, but the less important subplots in which she is a player explore themes important to the work as a whole, and therefore require a higher degree of characterization. On the other hand, one work singularly situates Andromache as a central player in the progression of the narration, but does not characterize her beyond using the most basic descriptors: this is Sappho's epithalamium. Other works in which Andromache is both a secondary character and characterized to a lesser degree are the Trojan War narratives of the Epic Cycle, Dares and Dictys, and Quintus of Smyrna. In these works Andromache is simply woman endowed with a proper name, enacting the actions necessary to drive the plot forward.

This study will examine only the *Iliad*, Euripides' *Andromache* and Euripides' *Trojan Women* as the central texts. These texts are the earliest representations of Andromache being characterized to a suitable degree and playing a suitably important role in the text. The texts in this study also present Andromache in several different temporal stages: during the war itself

---

existing work. Margolin states that there is a difference between "reidentification over time," a situation in which the "lifestory" of one character is told in separate temporal stages in separate works (as in sequels and prequels), and "identification across storyworlds" in which the same temporal stage of the story is told in several texts, though the characterization may vary (Margolin 121). The latter seems to be more often the case in Classical literature than the former. It seems that ancient authors were more interested in retelling a story than in extending it (e.g. A. *Choe*, Soph. *El.*, Eur. *El.*; Eur. *Cycl.*).

(*Iliad*), immediately after the war (*Trojan Women*), and years after the war (*Andromache*). Because Homeric epic exerts a heavy influence on Greek tragedy with respect to story, poetry, and characterization, the comparison between epic and tragic texts offers the opportunity to assess the mechanics of continuation, especially between genres. This study shows how Euripides essentially amplifies Andromache's Homeric characterization, adapting her epic qualities and modifying them to better represent 5<sup>th</sup> century cultural ideology. These works offer the opportunity to assess the consistency of characterization over biographical time, historical time, and genre. Even though this study is not comprehensive, it will provide a heuristic model for the analysis of later versions of Andromache's character in other works of literature.

This study is limited only to stories which narrate or dramatize the events of the Trojan War. Many of the *loci classici* pertaining to Andromache, however, are not part of a Trojan War narrative or dramatization, but rather are references to the character as an exemplum of particular behavior, as a symbol of particular themes, or as an *objet d'art* for critical consumption.<sup>28</sup> These *loci* are evidence that Andromache had become common cultural currency even in antiquity. Something about her story had become so entrenched in the culture of the time that the mere mention of her name could evoke a complex of emotions and ideas. This phenomenon occurs as early as the fourth century BCE: in Plato's *Ion*, the rhapsode cites Andromache as an example of a story which makes him and his audience cry.<sup>29</sup> As a consumer and producer of Greek poetry in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, that rhapsode is already able to distill her story and extract from it a commonly-felt response. This phenomenon, while interesting, is unfortunately outside the scope of this dissertation, which seeks to explain the original allure or power of the character in the texts which would have been most influential in the creation of these other artistic representations. In other words, it seeks to define those qualities which allowed her to become part of a cultural inheritance.

---

<sup>28</sup> One example of artistic representation is an *ekphrasis* of all the statues in the gymnasium of a man named Zeuxippos in Constantinople, which includes statues of Andromache and other Trojan women (*Greek Anthology*, Book 2). Another artistic representation is Pausanias' description of the painting of Polygnotus in the Lesche at 10.35.9. The poets of Roman elegy and satire use Andromache as the signifier of a type of woman, extracting the character from her epic and tragic contexts and repurposing her type-characteristics to fit their own poetic programs. See Ovid *Amores* 1.9.33; *Ars Amatoria* 2.641, 2.709, 3.107, 3.519; *Heroides* 5.107, 8.13; *Remedia Amoris* 383; Propertius 2.2.1; 2.22.31; Juvenal 6.502; Martial 3.76.4; 5.53.2; 1.9.33. These works best exemplify how a literary character can become a type, so ingrained in the cultural imagination that she can signify a specific property set even when utilized outside her original generic context. These writers do not write about Andromache; they are writing about "an Andromache."

<sup>29</sup> Pl. *Ion* 535b-c.



Before introducing the method of analysis utilized in this study, it is necessary to situate it among the other methods of analyzing character and characterization developed in Homeric and tragic studies. The texts of both genres tell stories that originated as traditional tales, stories orally transmitted for generations. Despite the fact that the epics and tragedies were composed under vastly different circumstances, the approaches scholars have taken to understand character in these works are not quite so divergent.

## II. Character and Characterization in Homeric Epic

### *Mind, Individual, Ethics, and Values*

The study of character in Homeric studies has been directed for the most part by the belief that literary characters should have the personality traits and psychological depth of real individuals. Therefore, as Jasper Griffin notes, Homeric scholars were at times reluctant to study character seriously since they considered the unity, or consistency, of a character impossible due to the multi-author and formulaic nature of oral composition.<sup>30</sup> Because the make-up of the character supposedly came from fragments of songs stitched together into a cohesive whole, the characters of those stories were (supposedly) similarly fragmented. But an interest in the working of mind represented in fiction shifted attention away from the conditions under which the characters were created and toward the “real person” qualities the characters possessed. Thus, the study of character was shaped by the commonly-held belief that Homeric characters had a limited psychology. Based on the way the Homeric poet represents mental faculties in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, E.R. Dodds and Bruno Snell famously suggested that there was no concept of a unified consciousness in Homeric epic.<sup>31</sup> James Redfield similarly states that Homeric man has no “innerness.” Characters reveal themselves only in speech and act, and the audience has

---

<sup>30</sup> Jasper Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Clarendon, 1980) 51.

<sup>31</sup> See Eric Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (U of California P, 1951) 15-16. Dodds argues that there is no concept of the soul as a force of consciousness in Homer – in fact, the soul (*psychē*) is only mentioned when it departs the body in death. He suggests that *thumos*, which he calls “the organ of feeling” is actually “objectifying emotional desires.” He claims that the Greeks understood these abstract forces as outside of themselves, and not part of themselves. See also Bruno Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind* (Harvard UP, 1953) ix-xi. While Dodds is concerned with teasing out the sources of irrational behavior in Homer, Snell is more interested in proving that “individual intellect and individual soul” were not recognized in Homeric epic (ix). The basis of Snell’s entire argument may be summed up by a sentence from his preface: “If some things do not occur in Homer though our modern mentality would lead us to expect them, we are entitled to assume that he had no such knowledge of them” (xi). Based on the fact that the Homeric poems utilize several words to denote soul (*thumos*, *noos*, *psychē*), he argues that the Greeks of the time did not consider the intellect or soul to be an integrated whole, but rather a small group of organs, each performing their specific function (Snell 12-14).

no access to the consciousness at all.<sup>32</sup> This viewpoint has been roundly criticized, especially by Stephen Halliwell, who argues that such an argument is faulty because it is based on a lack of terminology, which he calls a “lexical bias.”<sup>33</sup> Halliwell, among others, has shown that the Homeric epics do present “innerness” through a variety of narrative techniques: a character’s address to his own *thumos*, a particularly evocative simile, an introductory or capping formula, a refined description of word or deed, a particularly revelatory speech, and so on.<sup>34</sup> “Innerness,” then, is not only revealed through the explicitly narrated functioning of the mind, but through the combination of narrated behaviors, actions, and speeches of the characters.

The focus has since shifted from psychological coherence to other internal and external elements which help to define a real person as an individual. Some studies seek to evaluate the moral “character” of the literary figures by assessing the degrees of individuality, morality, responsibility, and agency they display in the epics. Halliwell’s work shows that this approach cannot be divorced from the previous, psychology-centered approach, for in order to evaluate the motivations and responsibilities of an individual within a particular global and social context, the critic must first assume that the character has a sophisticated psychology, one that allows for ethical motivation and agency, as well as a responsibility for actions.<sup>35</sup> Christopher Pelling

---

<sup>32</sup> James Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad* (Duke UP, 1994) 24.

<sup>33</sup> Steven Halliwell “Traditional Conceptions of Character.” *Character and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling (Clarendon, 1990) 37. See also Baruch Hochman, *Character in Literature* (Cornell UP, 1985) 56. Hochman concurs, stating that we should also not assume that ancient authors had no conception of comprehensive psychology, even if they lacked the terms with which to discuss it.

<sup>34</sup> Jeffrey Barnouw’s *Odysseus, Hero of Practical Intelligence* describes the various ways the Homeric poet represents cognitive faculties, and shows how these conceptions pre-date the ideas of Plato, Chrysippus, Hobbes, Leibniz, Peirce, and Dewey.

<sup>35</sup> Halliwell 33. See also Christopher Gill, “The Character-Personality Distinction.” *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling (Clarendon, 1990) 2. Gill goes even further by attempting to differentiate between “character” and “personality” in literary characters. Gill’s definition of “character” is similar to Halliwell’s in that it is the process of making moral judgments, assuming the character is placed in an ethical framework and is ascribed psychological and moral agency. His definition of “personality” acknowledges the fact that ascribing psychological depth to artificially constructed people is difficult at best. For Gill, the personality of the character is determined by the response of the reader. It is the essence of being which inspires an empathetic rather than moral response. An evaluation of personality also assumes that the character can be “psychologically passive” – that is, her nature and behavior can be determined by forces outside her control (Gill 2). This distinction, to me, is difficult to support because it is ultimately based on reader-response. It is certainly possible to evaluate a character’s behaviors based on the ethical and moral context described in the Homeric poems, and also to evaluate the motives for such behavior based on evidence from the text. But Gill’s definition of personality is based on the reader’s response to the character and the way she “feels” about the motivations of such behavior. There is no real discussion of what textual matter adds up to personality – whether it is indicated in

argues that a central theme in epic poetry is the establishment of personal identity within society, which hinges on the realization of the self as individual. This realization comes through testing the boundaries of accepted norms, for if a character chooses to “individuate” himself or herself, to belie normative expectations, he or she must acknowledge and accept the consequences of his actions.<sup>36</sup> The push for individuation, for marking one’s place in the community, derives from the ancient Greek belief that morality and ethics were inherently normative. Pelling observes, after Christopher Gill,<sup>37</sup> that our modern assumption about character tends to clash with ancient assumptions because we identify the individual through his or her idiosyncrasies, while the ancients expect each individual to conform to normative behaviors.<sup>38</sup> Modern scholars, in Gill’s words, are used to a “subjective-individualist” understanding of individual and character, in which a person is defined as a individual at the center of a “unique, subjective (first-personal) perspective.”<sup>39</sup> The Greeks preferred an “objective-participant viewpoint,” in which psychological workings are considered to be objective, and the individual is a participant in communal and interpersonal values and morals.<sup>40</sup> Hence any exploration of identity and character must pit the individual against his community.

This trend in the study of character partially developed from the work done by scholars like Arthur Adkins on the Homeric system of values. Adkins proposes that Homeric values privileged a competitive, rather than cooperative standard of *arete*.<sup>41</sup> Studies such as Collins’ *Characterization in the Iliad*, Zanker’s *The Heart of Achilles*, Redfield’s *Nature and Culture in*

---

certain verse-formula or conditioned by epithets – in short, Gill does not examine what precipitates the emotional response to the “personality.”

<sup>36</sup> Christopher Pelling, “Introduction.” *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed Christopher Pelling (Clarendon, 1990) vi. Halliwell suggests that each culture recognizes “certain fundamental factors in human experience,” which include “a basic recognition of the psychological identity of individuals,” the presupposition that individuals are endowed with the power of choice and self-directed agency, criteria for rationality, and a concept of responsibility. Halliwell admits that these presuppositions vary in degree from culture to culture, but maintains that they are able to operate even without a fully articulated formulation of the concept within a given culture (Halliwell 35).

<sup>37</sup> Christopher Gill, *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy* (Clarendon, 1996) 2.

<sup>38</sup> Pelling vii.

<sup>39</sup> Gill, *Personality*, 8.

<sup>40</sup> Gill, *Personality*, 10.

<sup>41</sup> Arthur Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility* (Clarendon, 1960) 46.

*the Iliad* have examined how closely characters (particularly warriors) adhere to the social ideals promoted in the Homeric poems, and have analyzed the presented motivations and rationales for deviations from these expectations.<sup>42</sup> These studies rely on the presentation of a unified consciousness for the character. For this reason, such studies are rarely applied to secondary characters in the *Iliad*, like women, whose inner consciousnesses are not as readily accessible.

As Adkins points out, the standard of *arete* for Homeric women is quite different than for Homeric men. Homeric society promotes what Adkins calls “quiet virtues” for women: decorum, skill in weaving and housekeeping, chastity and faithfulness.<sup>43</sup> Women’s characters are simply judged by their actions – they either adhere to the standard of *arete* or they do not. Since there is no room for ambiguity in the “quiet virtues” as there might be in actions performed by men in a competitive environment, and since this ethical system ideally limits women’s interaction with other individuals, there are no strictly ethical studies of Homeric women. Few women in the Homeric epics are characterized with any depth, but those who are – Helen<sup>44</sup> and Penelope – are presented as extraordinary specimens. Accordingly, these women have become favorite topics of feminist readings and other critical investigations. Marilyn Katz studies Penelope as the embodiment of indeterminacy in the *Odyssey*; Nancy Felson-Rubin analyzes the narrator’s representation of the character and notes ambiguities in verbal and non-verbal cues; Barbara Clayton argues that Penelope’s actions, especially her weaving and unweaving of Laertes’ shroud, metaphorically inscribe on the *Odyssey* the principle of the “feminine”; finally Richard Heitman argues that Penelope needs to be recognized as the foremost character in the Ithacan portions of the story, and that scholars need to start taking her at her word instead of constantly searching for ambiguities. As these works all argue, there is no doubt that Penelope possesses the “quiet virtues” described by Adkins, for Agamemnon himself enumerates them at the end of the poem. It is the disparity between word and deed, the tests, and the indeterminate marital state which create such a deep characterization for Penelope.

---

<sup>42</sup> See Leslie Collins, *Studies in Characterization in the Iliad* (Athenäum, 1988). Collins looks at characters who are “ethically distinct” from the typical Homeric warrior, in particular Paris; Redfield studies Hector through what he calls the “limitations” of the heroic ethic. See also Graham Zanker, *The Heart of Achilles* (U of Michigan P, 1994). studies Achilles by questioning what motivates heroes to cooperate with each other and what defines the range of cooperation.

<sup>43</sup> Adkins 36-37.

<sup>44</sup> See the introductory section above for an overview of the very different approaches scholars have taken to understand Helen’s character in the Homeric epics and beyond.

## Other Methods

One relatively recent trend in Homeric character studies has been tracing the origins of a Homeric character back to the store of traditional tales available to the Homeric poet. Laura Slatkin's *The Power of Thetis* uses the allusions to stories about Thetis in the Homeric text as a starting point for reconstructing other traditional narratives featuring Thetis. Casey Dué's *A Homeric Variation on a Lament by Briseis* conducts a similar inquiry for Briseis, though she also analyzes Briseis in comparison with other Homeric women who share her social status (Andromache, Chryseis, Helen, Penelope) and introduces the concept of character substitution.<sup>45</sup> Jonathan Burgess' most recent work *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles* also uses this method to sketch out the tradition of Achilles' death in Cyclic literature and cult worship.

Irene de Jong's work *Narrators and Focalizers* was the first to utilize the system of analysis known as narratology as a means of analyzing the Homeric epics. Since the publication of her work, narratological analysis has found a comfortable place in Homeric scholarship, but there has been no introductory study of a narratological approach to characterization. De Jong has outlined a method for interpreting characterizing traits in her *Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. She notes that traits can be explicitly named or implicitly suggested, and that characterization can be narratorial (based on the information reported by the narrator) or actorial (based on the information provided by the character).<sup>46</sup> De Jong's definitions of methods of characterization do closely align with the method of analysis utilized here, but the method does not look beyond the mechanics of characterization at issues of complexity or thematic purpose. Narratological theories of character and characterization have already been utilized in a book-length study of Homeric character. In *Nestor: Poetic Memory and Greek Epic*, Keith Dickson

---

<sup>45</sup> Dué, 40-44. See also the arguments of Tsagalis, as discussed earlier in the introduction.

<sup>46</sup> For definitions of these terms see the glossary in Irene De Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge UP, 2001) xii. She provides analyses of the characterizations of Telemachus (20), Penelope (36 and 289), and Odysseus (133-134). In *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. Irene de Jong, René Nünlist, Angus Bowie (Brill, 2004) de Jong adds more analytic tools to her glossary of terms: actorial motivation (xv), synoptic or gradual characterization (xv), and periphrastic denomination (xvii). Cf. Schlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (Methuen, 1983) *passim*. All of de Jong's observations mesh well with Schlomith Rimmon-Kenan's direct description and indirect presentation, which I will discuss below. Rimmon-Kenan's method is superior, however, in that it is more developed. De Jong's system advocates a careful consideration of the character as constructed in the text, but does not consider how the character's role in the story (primary or secondary) affects the roundness or flatness of the characterization. She discusses development and innerness only cursorily, whereas Rimmon-Kenan proposes three scales for determining complexity of character. Finally, de Jong does not address the thematic function of the characters. In summary, her method of characterization is in line with Rimmon-Kenan's but she does not consider how that characterization is put to work in the larger thematic context of the epic.

argues that Nestor is not really so important as an individual, but that he is the exemplar of a type: a wise old man. Dickson prefers the structuralist methods of Roland Barthes to De Jong's particular strain of narratology, but the systematic analysis of the epithets and formulas used to modify Nestor is similar to other narratological methods, including De Jong's and the one proposed here.

### **III. Character and Characterization in Greek Tragedy and Euripides**

The mystery behind the composition and the textual codification of the epics, the interest in their historical value and connection to archaeological finds and anthropological theories, as well as the sheer number of characters, events, motifs, and themes have provided enough material to distract scholars from addressing character directly. This could not be the case in Greek tragedy. Tragedies are not as lengthy, deal with a shorter narrative time frame, contain fewer characters, motifs, and themes, and were created and performed in a known, if not completely understood, historical and cultural context. Studies of tragedies of other cultures and time periods (in particular Shakespearean tragedy) suggested that tragedies were intended to reveal character, and were, in essence, character studies. Therefore scholars of Greek tragedy also focused on the individual, and the individual's role in the tragedy.

The current study of character in Greek tragedy has been directed by both the nature of the tragic genre and the evolution in the way scholars study fictional, literary characters. One of the defining features of the tragic genre is the interplay between the poetic tradition of the mythological stories the tragedians choose to dramatize and the tragedians' own inventiveness. The fact that tragedians rarely invented characters meant that they were working within a highly allusive tradition – the events of the play recast ancient plots, but they also reproduced, and even challenged, ancient ethics and morals. To a certain extent, even the language was reproduced – the manipulation of the aesthetics of epic and lyric poetry helped to create a new, tragic aesthetic. The evolutions in the way scholars understood the purpose of tragedy, the Greek conception of self, individual, and consciousness, the different structural elements of the drama, and the reliance on potentially inappropriate critical tools have helped to build a long and fascinating history of scholarship on this topic. The following section attempts to summarize the trends and findings.

### *The Homeric Tradition in Fifth Century Athens*

One cannot understate the importance of poetry in the Athenian cultural heritage of the fifth century. It is generally accepted that Homeric and Hesiodic poetry were cultural institutions in ancient Greece, acting as both performed art and didactic medium. Simon Goldhill suggests that the study of poetry and choric training were part of childhood and adolescent education, and that the poetry itself, particularly Homeric poetry, was the primary repository of ethical values, mythology, and cosmology in fifth-century Athens.<sup>47</sup> Eric Havelock goes so far as to describe poetry, Homeric poetry in particular, as a sort of state-funded cultural institution, blurring the lines between “aesthetic object” and “curriculum.”<sup>48</sup> Homeric poetry was also still an artistic product for the cultural consumption of the city, being performed at the Panathenaic festival.<sup>49</sup> Goldhill concludes that “[t]he Homeric texts, then, were essential not only to the actual procedure of teaching, but also to the fabric of Athenian social attitudes and understanding as a privileged source of an authority for knowledge, behavior, and ethics.”<sup>50</sup>

Robert Garner remarks that Homeric poetry had an immediate impact on tragedians since it would have been part of their education and professional training.<sup>51</sup> As Garner’s extensive study shows, Homeric poetry remained influential in the creative output of tragedians. The poets used epithets, words, and full verses, verbatim or modified, from the Homeric poems to evoke a Homeric scene which would be familiar to their audience. Tragedians were the inheritors and conservators of this poetic tradition, but they also challenged the tradition and found ways to be innovative within it.<sup>52</sup> It was in the development of character, plot, and theme that the tragedians began to challenge the ethical and moral worldview presented in the Homeric poems.<sup>53</sup> This innovation, and the challenge inherent within it, was encouraged by Aristotle, who advised

---

<sup>47</sup> Simon Goldhill, *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge UP, 1986) 140. See also Eric Havelock, *Preface to Plato* (Belknap-Harvard UP, 1963) 27.

<sup>48</sup> Havelock 29.

<sup>49</sup> Goldhill 141.

<sup>50</sup> Goldhill 142.

<sup>51</sup> Robert Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy* (Routledge, 1990) 2.

<sup>52</sup> Goldhill 143.

<sup>53</sup> See Jacob Nyenhuis, *Homer and Euripides: A Study in Characterization* (Diss. Stanford U, 1963) 4. Nyenhuis argues that the Homeric epics were the only real source available to tragedians for “characterization.” The plots may have come from lyric or cyclic poetry (4).

tragedians to use traditional stories, but to discover new ways to present the material.<sup>54</sup> These changes, as well as changes dictated by the new genre of performance, demanded a change in the way character was presented to the audience and articulated within the play itself.

Just as some Homeric scholars relied on the system of Homeric ethics and values to analyze the actions and motivations of Homeric characters, in the same way scholars of tragedy have attempted to define an ethical framework within which to situate tragic characters and their motivations. The complicating factor in this effort is the relationship between tragic plots and characters and traditional stories. Tragic poetry was heavily influenced by the aesthetics, events, and characters of traditional poetry, yet tragedians did not simply dramatize epic narration. The words, thoughts, and deeds of the tragic characters reveal individuals struggling with and challenging the heroic *ethos*. Gill notes that this is a real problem for analyzing character from his “character-viewpoint,” the approach based on evaluation of moral, ethical character. He reminds the reader that the characters exist in the legendary past and are represented as stylized versions of traditional heroes or heroines.<sup>55</sup> Goldhill notes that by the fifth century in Athens, there was a great difference in social outlook between the democratic ideal of the time and the values espoused and promoted by the Homeric poems.<sup>56</sup> Each of the three major tragedians interacts with this tradition in a different way. Aeschylus and Sophocles seem to embrace it, and generally represent their characters struggling within the traditional heroic *ethos*, while Euripides seems to challenge those values outright.

#### *Scholarly Approaches to Character in Greek Tragedy*

Early studies mostly concerned themselves with the representation of the tragic figure on the stage to the real humans in the audience. These studies sought to evaluate tragic characters based on criteria which promoted “realism,” a concept familiar from the modern novel’s tendency to characterize literary figures as highly idiosyncratic individuals. Aristotle’s discussion of character in the *Poetics* set the stage for this kind of analysis. To him, well-

---

<sup>54</sup> *Poetics* XIV (1453b.22-26).

<sup>55</sup> Christopher Gill, “The Question of Character and Personality in Greek Epic” *Poetics Today* 7 (1986): 262.

<sup>56</sup> Goldhill 144. He notes, for example, that there were contrasting ideas of military involvement. In the Homeric epics, the hero and his motivations represented military excellence. Fighting was personal and the hero was motivated by shame and glory. In the 5<sup>th</sup> century, however, fighting was collective. Soldiers were organized into phalanxes, and soldiers fought on behalf of their polis, not for themselves (Goldhill 144-145). There was also a shift in “moral vocabulary.”



constructed characters are essentially like real humans and idealized. He argues that the tragedian should create characters with four things in mind: first, that the characters be good, by which he means that they have good moral characters relative to their class and gender; second, that they be appropriate, meaning that they should act in accordance with gender and class behavior expectations; third, that they have a likeness to real humans; and fourth that they be consistent.<sup>57</sup> He believes that the best tragedians present characters who are similar to real people, but slightly better.<sup>58</sup> The same desire for mimesis and idealization extends to the construction of plots. Aristotle states that tragic plots should relate the kinds of things that might occur (he still advises that plots should be taken from traditional tales), and the action should proceed according to what is probable and necessary for the action.<sup>59</sup> Similarly, he states that characters should also be created according to probability and necessity, and should be slightly enhanced.<sup>60</sup> The only method of characterization assessed by Aristotle is “thought,” which is the revelation of moral make up through the effects of speech.<sup>61</sup> In summary, in Aristotle’s mind, all the elements of a tragedy should work together to present people and events which mirror the experiences of an individual in the audience, but they should be slightly larger-than-life.

Aristotle’s emphasis on “probability and necessity” was later translated by modern scholars like Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (on Sophocles) and Walter Zürcher (on Euripides) as “realism.” For these scholars, characterization was successful if the tragic character was a unified construction, acting in or reacting to situations as any human would in real life. For both scholars, successful characterization created a consistent character whose motivations were clearly stated and whose actions followed upon those motivations. Both were expecting the same level of mimetic representation found in a modern novel, and the results of their studies were, not surprisingly, extreme. Zürcher concluded that Euripides did not create any “individuals.”<sup>62</sup> Blaiklock, working in a similar vein, focuses on the “realism” of the male

---

<sup>57</sup> *Poetics* XV (1454a.16-28).

<sup>58</sup> *Poetics* XV (1454b.8-10).

<sup>59</sup> *Poetics* XI (1451a.36-38).

<sup>60</sup> *Poetics* XV (1454b.8-10).

<sup>61</sup> *Poetics* XIX (1456a.34-1456b.8).

characters in Euripides' plays, calling them "realistic" if they seem to represent a person or a type of person one might plausibly meet on the street. In his view, the representation of female characters could be "romantic."<sup>63</sup> The lack of any kind of criteria for determining what "realistic" or "consistent" means highlights the subjective nature of these studies.

This approach was eventually pronounced unsatisfactory. In an article on character in Sophocles, P.E. Easterling argues that it is an "anachronistic injustice" to read ancient tragic characters as "real" individuals with idiosyncrasies.<sup>64</sup> She argues that depth in character (in Sophocles, at least) is conveyed in ambiguity of persons or episodes. Actions may not be explicitly motivated, but this makes room for a variety of interpretations, and is ultimately closer to the experience of real life.<sup>65</sup> Goldhill later elaborates on this argument, adding that tragic character is different from character in the Victorian novel in that

the public, masked persona does not suggest a similar focus on idiosyncrasies of personality, and criticism whose aim or method of explication is based on inclusive modern notions of 'character' as a person's whole personality seems to ignore the tensions both in the notion of the self, and between 'character' and 'discourse' in these plays.<sup>66</sup>

For other scholars the lack of idiosyncrasies, or everyday detail, points to a certain flatness of character in general.<sup>67</sup> They suggests that many Greek characters are actually "type" characters, and that the masks and other stylized elements of the theatre help to "stunt" individuality.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> See Louise Pearson Smith, *Studies of Characterization in Euripides: The Medea, Elektra, and Orestes* (Diss. Princeton U, 1975) and Nyenhuis. Both relate in detail the studies of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Zürcher. See also Hugh Lloyd-Jones, "Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on the Dramatic Technique of Sophocles." *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1972) 218. Lloyd-Jones' assessment of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's study of Sophocles also clarifies his argument: Lloyd-Jones notes that Wilamowitz-Moellendorff did not think that character-drawing was a concern of Sophocles' because he thought of character-drawing as a representation of psychology or idiosyncrasy. Lloyd-Jones points out that Sophocles was in fact interested in character-drawing, but for him character was about being human, not about being a unique individual. This distinction will be further defined in the discussion below.

<sup>63</sup> Edward Musgrave Blaiklock, *The Male Characters of Euripides* (New Zealand UP, 1952) xv.

<sup>64</sup> P.E. Easterling, "Character in Sophocles." *Greece & Rome* 24 (1977): 123. Easterling does believe that tragic characters should be interpreted as human-like. In an earlier article on character in Aeschylus, she writes that dramatists may be ambiguous in their presentation of character, but they are not trying to create puzzles, to deceive or to be unreliable storytellers. See also P.E. Easterling, "Presentation of Character in Aeschylus." *Greece & Rome* 20 (1973): 15. She argues that tragic characters have "human intelligibility" – they are not simply symbols or thematic place-markers, but representative of human experience.

<sup>65</sup> Easterling, "Character in Sophocles", 126.

<sup>66</sup> Goldhill 174.

The reaction among scholars of tragedy against the insistence on “consistency” and “individuality” as determined by Victorian or modern notions of psychology closely resembles the change in direction of Homeric scholarship once the notions espoused by scholars like Snell and Dodds, as mentioned above, gave way to a more precise discussion of ancient conceptions of individuality and the self. Scholars of tragedy similarly advocate looking to ancient Greek conceptions to provide a model for analyzing character in Greek tragedy. Christopher Gill proposes a dichotomous way of analyzing tragic character. He labels one approach the “character-viewpoint,” which analyzes the character as a moral agent, a rational, consistent human, based on the normative matrix of human nature.<sup>69</sup> The second approach is the “personality-viewpoint” which takes into consideration the conscious or sub-conscious desires of the individual, external forces or impulses, and unpredictability, irrationality, and inconsistency.<sup>70</sup> Gill believes that by taking a double approach to the analysis of character, critics could avoid applying inappropriate labels such as “inconsistent.” Later, Gill builds on this idea and rejects the Snellian notion that modern ideas should be considered normative when analyzing Greek conceptions of the self, and argues that our understanding of how the Greeks conceived of the self and individuality must be grounded in the socio-cultural context of fifth century Athens.<sup>71</sup> A recent study on Euripides’ *Bacchae* by Chiara Thumiger synthesizes the evolution of this approach to character.<sup>72</sup> Thumiger suggests that it is only through the

---

<sup>67</sup> Chiara Thumiger, *Hidden Paths: Self and Characterization in Euripides’ Bacchae* (Institute of Classical Studies, 2007) 20. Thumiger argues that the reader or onlooker does not think of tragic figures as ‘complete personalities’ with inner lives and motivations and feelings. This is because tragic characters seem to be more “exemplary” than “real.”

<sup>68</sup> Thumiger 54 But this also becomes problematic, because the notion of “type” in theatre could refer to a stock character from comedy or a personality type. Lesky remarks that tragic characters are not “types” in the modern sense, since they lack individual features, but he notes that they are not the stock characters familiarized by Greek comedy, either. He prefers to think of them as “personalities” (Thumiger 124). See also Charles Garton, “Characterization in Greek Tragedy,” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 77 (1957): 248. Garton also warns against reading tragic characters as “flat” or as “types,” since those readings assume the character comes together around one or two qualities.

<sup>69</sup> Gill, “The Question of Character”, 252. This is also Aristotle’s approach – to evaluate characters as “good” or “bad” within an ethical framework as well as “appropriate” or “inappropriate” with respect to their identity.

<sup>70</sup> Gill, “The Question of Character”, 253.

<sup>71</sup> Gill, *Personality*, 4-5.

<sup>72</sup> Thumiger 3-7 begins with Snell and traces the responses to his ideas from the last 50 years. She concludes that the mainstream philosophy of the mind has been “materialist” and “objectivist.” Beginning again with Gill’s 1996

exploration of the self that character may be defined and analyzed; and she defines the “self” as “mind and consciousness.”<sup>73</sup> But she repeats the same criticism of earlier scholars who lament the lack of “idiosyncrasies” by stating that there is no developed sense of “individuality” in tragic characters because personal, ephemeral information about the individual (which she feels is part of the Homeric epic) is lacking in tragedy.<sup>74</sup>

Another approach considers how the dramaturgical elements of the plays affect characterization. John Gould, for example, notes that characters are functions of the attributes, language, and thoughts given to the character by the playwright and realized by the actor – they are not qualities of an actual individual with a life off-stage.<sup>75</sup> Gould highlights the difference between figures onstage and the individuals in the audience: “the experience of the *dramatis personae* is stylized, simplified, and modified in ways which prevent that sense of a simple continuity or overlap between their experience and our own.”<sup>76</sup> Gould names masks, the public, outdoor performance, the chorus, costumes, and language as elements which stylize the tragic experience and distance the audience from the figures onstage.<sup>77</sup> Brian Vickers focuses on the power of the language of tragedy, and its ability to convey a range of human experience despite the fact that the actors are wearing masks. He reminds the reader that masks and other stylized elements of tragedy were developed strictly for theatrical purposes, not as a means of generalizing or flattening the characters.<sup>78</sup>

### *The Innovations of Euripides*

Even though each tragedian interpreted the cultural tradition he inherited in his own way, Euripides was notable for his departures from audience expectations. The history of the creation of Greek tragic genre has often been thought of as a linear development, with Sophocles

---

study, she reports that the current trend is to assume that there was no concept of “person,” in Greek thought or philosophy, which would account for the “meagreness” in representing the inner consciousness .

<sup>73</sup> Thumiger 3.

<sup>74</sup> Thumiger 23.

<sup>75</sup> John Gould, “Dramatic Character and ‘Human Intelligibility’ in Greek Tragedy.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 24 (1978): 43.

<sup>76</sup> Gould 49.

<sup>77</sup> Gould 49.

<sup>78</sup> Brian Vickers, *Towards Greek Tragedy* (Longman, 1973) 65.

representing the apex of aesthetic and ideological output, and Euripides representing the anti-climax of that moment of creative synergy. But the more recent understanding of the evolution of the genre paints Euripides in quite a different light. His plays, perhaps more so than those of Sophocles, reflect the changes in Athenian attitudes towards war, ethics, and knowledge. The change of perspective also affects the characters and characterizations of the individuals in the traditional tales.

Ann Michelini's study of Euripides in relation to the tragic tradition points out some of the more drastic changes he makes to the genre, especially when compared to the formal and thematic preferences of Sophocles.<sup>79</sup> She lists some of the ways in which Euripides develops the genre: a greater interest in myth and a looser interpretation of plot points; less reliance on "naturalism" in a Sophoclean sense, and a greater commitment to formalism; and the use of a variety of modes in the presentation of the story.<sup>80</sup> All of these formal and stylistic preferences are important for the study of character in Euripides, but the most important change in this respect may be the introduction of a "new kind of protagonist."<sup>81</sup> She suggests that Sophoclean drama focuses on characters whose stories evoke Homeric epic.<sup>82</sup> But Euripides often chose an "inappropriate" hero or heroine: a person of lower social rank, old men, women, slaves, barbarians, and so on.<sup>83</sup> The plights of the characters pose difficult moral questions to the audience by making seemingly monstrous characters sympathetic. Michelini presents Orestes and Medea as examples – characters who flout cultural norms in the least sympathetic manner, yet ultimately persevere and even gain divine favor.<sup>84</sup> Michelini argues that shift of interest to

---

<sup>79</sup> Ann Michelini, 54-55.

<sup>80</sup> Michelini, *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition* (U of Wisconsin P, 1987) 63-65. By Sophoclean "naturalism," she means that the action of the play tends to develop from the interaction of the characters. See also Goldhill 161.

<sup>81</sup> Michelini 63.

<sup>82</sup> Michelini 62. Goldhill further elaborates on the anti-war themes by suggesting that many of Euripides' plays challenge the notion that manhood is construed from military involvement. Euripides diverts the focus of war-action away from warriors and fixes it on the suffering of women, which is presented as the direct result of the promotion of militaristic values. This re-focusing of the results of war strains the connection between the Homeric, heroic ethos of the traditional stories and the militarism of the 5<sup>th</sup> century (Goldhill 165-166).

<sup>83</sup> See T.B.L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (Methuen, 1967) 13. In Webster's estimation, the greatest change Euripides makes to Greek tragedy is to represent his characters as ordinary, modern people, and to make the connection of events "naturalistic."

<sup>84</sup> Michelini 63-64.

unlikely protagonists also opened the theatre for the exploration of certain shocking and outrageous themes,<sup>85</sup> such as the violation of religious conventions, sexual taboos, deviance (especially sexual) of women, the bizarre and grotesque, and patriotism.<sup>86</sup> This shift also translates to new formal considerations: the use of Sophistic rhetoric to defend or impugn a particular vice required more *agon* scenes, staging all three actors at once;<sup>87</sup> and the inclusion of all types of individuals, from all social classes, also led to less stylized language.<sup>88</sup>

Euripides' interest in controversial figures, acts, and topics requires him to use tragic methods of characterization for purposes his predecessors did not. Yet, at the same time, Euripides interacts with the same tradition as his contemporaries, and so his mythological characters must be continuations of the figures familiar to his audience from their childhood and from other performance contexts, yet they must still "fit" into his own drama and represent the themes he meditates upon, whether they mesh with traditional views or not.

The following section is an introduction to the narratological method this study utilizes to examine the relationship between the various incarnations of Andromache in Homeric epic poetry and Euripidean tragic poetry. The elements of this method do share common ground with some of the scholarly trends outlined above: an interest in the representation of the character as a real, non-fictional human; an interest in the fundamental connection between the character and the consciousness; and an emphasis on the importance of the literary conventions of each genre to the characterization of fictional humans. What this method offers that previously discussed methods do not is a model of evaluation based on a plurality of criteria instead of only one or two, such as access to the consciousness or adherence to social norms. It also presents a model based on degrees rather than polarities. Overall, though, it is meant to study the character as a construct of the text, and a participant in a world with rules and customs defined by the imaginations of the authors themselves.

---

<sup>85</sup> Michelini 70. Michelini argues that Euripides takes a stance of alienation against his audience, incorporating elements of the new historical, philosophical, and rhetorical genres of the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>86</sup> Michelini's general discussion runs from 75-93.

<sup>87</sup> Michelini 97.

<sup>88</sup> Michelini 98.

#### IV. Method

This study uses a two-pronged narratological method for analyzing the character and characterization of Andromache. The first approach is called *mimetic*, because it recognizes the character as a person-like fictional individual (but not an actual person). Most mimetic approaches are based on structuralist theories of character and characterization. The second approach is called *thematic*, and considers the character in terms of the themes she or he is connected to in the course of the work. James Phelan's work *Reading People, Reading Plots* examines the interplay of the three elements of a character (adding *synthetic* to mimetic and thematic). He argues that each character has some mimetic, synthetic, and thematic function, but authors may foreground one function over the others as part of the character's characterization.<sup>89</sup> The following chapters will show how the basic elements of Andromache's characterization, or her mimetic qualities, complement and advance her thematic function in the selected texts. This narratological approach provides a systematized examination of the ways in which textual representation affects characterization. This will prove to be an important springboard for considering how a change in genre or mode of representation changes the character and characterization of a represented figure. It also addresses, through thematic analysis, how Euripides in particular drew on the thematic dimensions of the character created by Homer and incorporated them into his own texts while simultaneously producing new thematic functions for the character to suit the needs of his text.<sup>90</sup> Thematic interpretation is the foundation of any study of the continuation of character in several texts. While mimetic elements are determined by features of the text and the temporal stage of the story, thematic dimensions, the core elements of a character, can exist independently of any text, and accompany the character as she moves from text to text. Genette shows that the continuation of any story, what he calls textual

---

<sup>89</sup> See James Phelan, *Reading People Reading Plots* (U of Chicago P, 1989) 2. Phelan identifies the synthetic function as the artificiality of the fictional character. In other words, the reader is aware that the character she is reading about is not real. I will not discuss the synthetic function of characters in this study. As Phelan notes on pg. 3, the synthetic aspect of a character is more or less foregrounded in any given fictional work. Drawing attention to the artificiality of a character, and therefore to the artificiality of the work itself and the process of creating it, is a concern of modern, not classical, fiction. Whether or not the Homeric or tragic audiences believed the stories they were enjoying were historically true does not matter, since the narrator and characters of the stories never indicate any awareness of artificiality.

<sup>90</sup> The thematic elements of a character are divided into dimensions and functions. A thematic dimension is "any attribute a character may be said to possess when that character is *considered in isolation from the work* in which he or she appears." A thematic function is "a particular application of the attribute *made by the text* through its developing structure" (Phelan 9). The italics are mine.

continuation, can take many forms. The later text may present the story at a different temporal stage or temporal/spatial framework, or shift the focus of a story onto a character who was marginal in the original, or transform the mode of presentation of the story from narrative to drama or prose to verse.<sup>91</sup> Any, or all, of these transformations between stories or texts affects the characters within the stories and the methods of characterization.

### *Mimetic*

Mimetic theories conceptualize characters as fictional humans. In general, they argue that most modern literary characters are human-like, understood by the reader as human, and thus best conceptualized as having human traits.<sup>92</sup> Schlomith Rimmon-Kenan summarizes this viewpoint thus:

characters are nodes in the verbal design; in the story they are – by definition – non (or pre-) verbal abstractions, constructs. Although these constructs are by no means human beings in the literal sense of the word, they are partly modeled on the reader's conception of people and in this they are person-like.<sup>93</sup>

Characters are person-like because they have person-like traits. By tallying and interpreting the clues provided in the text, the reader assigns traits to the characters and proposes character qualities. But authors do not create characters who are fully-formed, independent, unique individuals, and for good reason. Some literary characters are more person-like than others – that is, some characters are more fully complex, like real people, than others. E.M. Forster coined the terms “round” and “flat” in 1927 to account for these differences. A “flat” character, by his definition, is “constructed round a single idea or quality: when there is more than one factor in them, we get the beginning of the curve towards the round.”<sup>94</sup> Flat characters do not change. They do not develop. They are not “changed by circumstances; they moved through circumstances.”<sup>95</sup> “Round” characters are simply the opposite of flat. Forster writes that the

---

<sup>91</sup> These various transformations are the topic of Gerard Genette's *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (U of Nebraska P, 1997). Genette takes under consideration a variety of textual transformations pertaining to structure, story, time, character, and genre.

<sup>92</sup> Hochman 17. Hochman probably goes farthest in this belief, claiming that “prevailing forms of consciousness, as well as the modes, verbal and otherwise, in which we formulate them, are the same in both life and art.” To Hochman, we think of fictional characters and humans in the same way -- in psychological terms.

<sup>93</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 33.

<sup>94</sup> E.M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (Harcourt Brace, 1927) 103-4.



“test of the round character is whether it is capable of surprising in a convincing way. If it never surprises, it is flat. If it does not convince, it is a flat pretending to be round.”<sup>96</sup>

The concept of round and flat is complemented by the concept of “type.” Gerald Prince defines a character type as “a static character whose attributes are very few and who constitutes a paradigm case of a given quality, attitude or role (the miser, the braggart, the *femme fatale*, the hypochondriac, etc.).”<sup>97</sup> Prince’s definition implies that characters who manifest a type are inherently flat, to use Forster’s term. They cannot surprise, for their qualities conform to a recognized paradigm of traits.<sup>98</sup> However, even characters who are considered round by Forster’s standards can still be a type – for example, Achilles, who is arguably the roundest character in the *Iliad*, is still a semi-divine warrior and therefore shares certain qualities with other heroic sons of gods or goddesses. Typing does not necessarily constrain a character, but rather may provide a springboard for more in-depth characterization.

---

<sup>95</sup> Forster 105-106 Forster’s litmus test for flatness is whether or not a character’s identity may be summed up in one sentence. For example, he sums up Mrs. Micawber of Charles Dickens’ *David Copperfield* as “I will never desert Mr. Micawber” (Forster 104).

<sup>96</sup> Forster 118.

<sup>97</sup> Gerald Prince, *Dictionary of Narratology. Revised Edition* (U of Nebraska P, 2003) 103. See also Robert Scholes, James Phelan and Robert Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (Oxford UP, 2006) 204. Scholes suggests that the paradigm of traits used to identify a type usually refer to something “outside” the character (though that definition is rather vague). He lists religion, psychological traits, physiological traits, intellectual abilities, social status, and geographic origin as possible traits which determine type.

<sup>98</sup> This assumption has recently come under question. The development of reader-response theory (or cognitive theory) has changed the way critics think about types. It is now generally accepted that we understand all characters as types, or confluences of types. Hochman holds perhaps the most radical viewpoint on this matter. He argues that we, as readers, apprehend and understand characters in the same way that we apprehend and understand the people we meet in real life. He writes, “What links character in literature to people in life, as we fabricate them in our consciousness, is the integral unity of our conception of people and of how they operate...in my view, even the clues that we take in and use to construct an image of a person are virtually identical in literature and in life” (Hochman 36). He continues on to say that “typing” is a completely natural response when meeting someone new, whether fictional or real. We think of that person in terms of type (or a given paradigm of traits) until we get to know them better and can think of him as an individual (Hochman 46). See also H. Porter Abbott, *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative, Second Edition* (Cambridge UP, 2008) 136. Abbott considers the argument that no character can match the “complexity and changeableness of people as they really are” simply by virtue of being fictional, literary constructs. He suggests that because of this, “all characterization, however “round,” involves some degree of flattening” (Abbott 136). He argues that all cultures and subcultures include numerous types which circulate through various literary modes, but when we apply that same paradigm of traits to a real person, we seem to deny their humanity. He writes, “to limit someone to a character type is to deny her capacity to surprise us with behavior that exceeds the limits of the type”. He suggests, similarly to Hochman, that typing may be part of our “mental equipment” and that “narrative equipment” might not ever be able to capture the true complexity of humans. But he emphasizes that a character who conforms to a type does not have to be “flat” – “round” characters may be the confluence of several types (Abbott 42).

These earlier concepts sort characters according to a binary relationship between flat and round. Rimmon-Kenan rejects the notion of a binary-based system of classification. She suggests classifying characters as points along three different continua: complexity (the amount of traits attributed to a character), development (change),<sup>99</sup> and penetration into the “inner life” (access to consciousness). On one end of the complexity continuum are characters constructed around a single trait or one dominant trait, like allegorical figures, caricatures, or types, and at the other are “complex” characters. On one end of the development continuum are characters who are static, and at the other characters who develop. On one end of the “inner life” continuum are characters whose consciousness is presented from within, and on the other characters whose consciousness is not presented at all – they are viewed only from the outside.<sup>100</sup>

The process of characterization requires the author to embed character qualities in the text. These qualities are apprehended by the audience or reader from several sources in the text: direct description from the narrator or other characters, internal monologue, the speech and action of the characters, and so on. All of these qualities are sorted out according to type of quality inferred, and all reports of actions and speeches are evaluated for reliability. A human-like character with human-like characteristics emerges from all this information, and based on the amount and kind of qualities she possesses, she may be categorized according to Rimmon-Kenan’s sliding scales. With regard to an actual “theory” of characterization, most scholars agree that a character’s building blocks are traits. Rimmon-Kenan suggests that a character is reconstructed from the text based on the hierarchical arrangement of his or her traits, or qualities.<sup>101</sup> By separating these details into particular categories, patterns will emerge which

---

<sup>99</sup> “Development” is what I think Forster is hinting at with “predictability” and ability to “surprise.” The developed or developing character deliberates and then makes choices based on how she individually responds to the circumstances in front of her, not with regard to how a character of her type would normally respond. I think this particular category also speaks to Hochman’s proposition that it is struggle which defines development. He notes that characters struggle with morals, emotions, and societal expectations – their reactions to these pressures are what constitute development (Hochman 51).

<sup>100</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 40-41.

<sup>101</sup> Rimmon-Kenan’s work relies on structuralist theories of character laid out by Seymour Chatman and James Garvey. See Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Cornell UP, 1978) 126. Chatman’s lasting contribution to character analysis is his “paradigm of traits.” Conceived of as a response to the “story-grammar” theories of Barthes, Greimas, and Todorov, Chatman argues that there are so many instances of direct description in modern fiction that it seems inconceivable that theorists would insist on thinking of character only as an actant. For this see Seymour Chatman, “On the Formalist-Structuralist Theory of Character,” *Journal of Semantics* 1 (1972): 59. He states in “Formalist-Structuralist Theory” that “the ‘meaning’ of character I take to be the set of personal traits that delineate him, set him apart from others, make him memorable to us” (63). Later, in

then point to a character trait.<sup>102</sup> The cohesiveness of these details and traits is what produces a “character.”<sup>103</sup>

Rimmon-Kenan defines characterization as the act of “assembling various character-indicators distributed along the text-continuum and, when necessary, inferring the traits from them.”<sup>104</sup> She proposes two types of character-indicators: direct definition and indirect presentation. Direct definition “names the trait by an adjective, an abstract noun, or possibly some other kind of noun or part of speech,” while indirect presentation “does not mention the trait but displays and exemplifies it in various ways, leaving to the reader the task of inferring the quality they imply.”<sup>105</sup> Direct definition only counts as direct *characterization* if the naming is done by the most authoritative voice in the text.<sup>106</sup> Indirect presentation is more complicated.

---

*Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Chatman elaborates on his original point: the audience appreciates character traits for their own sake, regardless of whether or not they affect the action of the story (Chatman 112). He defines a trait as “a narrative adjective out of the vernacular labeling a personal quality of character, as it persists over part or whole of the story” (Chatman 125). They need to be distinguished from “ephemeral psychological phenomena” like feelings, moods, thoughts, etc. (Chatman 126), and are not subject to the limitation of events (128). Cf. James Garvey, “Characterization in Narrative” *Poetics* 7 (1978): 63-68. James Garvey also rejects the actantial model and builds on Chatman’s paradigm of traits. Garvey thinks of characterization as that which “invests an identified character with an attribute or set of attributes (also called ‘traits’, ‘qualities’, or ‘characteristics’) which add descriptive material of a particular sort to the argument node” (Garvey 63). Garvey points out that different characters have different degrees of centrality in the narrative, and therefore not all identified (named) characters are actually characterized. Garvey also makes several observations about characterization which Rimmon-Kenan later refines: for example, a character may be defined by being “pitted against” another character (analogy); characters may change their attributes instantaneously or gradually (development sliding scale); and attributes may be explicitly stated by the narrator or another character, or through a character’s own statements, acts, clothing, and name (direct and indirect presentation) (Garvey 66-68). Both Chatman and Garvey attempt to refocus the discussion of character on mimetic rather than non-mimetic qualities. Chatman wants to think about traits not as unnecessary, decorative information, but those qualities of character which make the character most human and thus most engaging to the reader. Garvey is interested in defining more precisely the categories of traits and making the distinction between characters in the story-level of the text and the narrative-level of the text and showing how the level which a character inhabits profoundly affects their characterization.

<sup>102</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 37-38.

<sup>103</sup> The main principles of cohesion are: repetition of the same behavior, similarity of behavior on different occasions, contrast in behavior, and implication. Rimmon-Kenan’s implication is based on Garvey’s propositions, which state that one attribute naturally implies another. For example, the possession of physical attributes implies the possession of psychological attributes, and the possession of at least one psychological attribute implies the possession of other psychological attributes, and so on (Rimmon Kenan 39-40).

<sup>104</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 59.

<sup>105</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 60.

<sup>106</sup> Rimmon-Kenan includes this qualification because of the question of narratorial-reliability, first posed by Wayne C. Booth in *The Rhetoric of Fiction*.

Rimmon-Kenan states that “a presentation is indirect when rather than mentioning a trait, it displays and exemplifies it in various ways.”<sup>107</sup> The sources of indirect presentation are varied: actions, speech, external appearance, and environment. Actions may be one-time or habitual, and can be defined as acts of commission, omission, or contemplated act. They can, but do not need to have, a symbolic dimension. Speech is a more unreliable source of information. What one character says about another serves to characterize both speaker and referred individual. The form or style of speech characterizes as well as the content.<sup>108</sup> There may be a connection in the text between the external appearance of the character and his or her characterization, as well as between the physical surroundings of a character and his or her human environment. Rimmon-Kenan also notes that all direct definitions and indirect presentations may be reinforced by analogies, such as analogous names, landscapes, or characters.<sup>109</sup>

### *Thematic*

Rimmon-Kenan finishes her discussion with a caveat: it is not sufficient to simply name the means of characterization in a text. She then provides a suggested program for later scholarly work on character:

It may be instructive, for example, to establish which type of characterization predominates in a given text or for a given character. This can then be related, according to the interests of the critic, to the kind of character in question, the thematic concerns of the work, the genre to which it belongs, the preferences of the author, the norms of the period, and the like.<sup>110</sup>

This is why the second approach, the thematic approach, is important. Phelan explains that thematic dimensions are attributes “viewed as vehicles to express ideas or as representative of a larger class than the individual character.”<sup>111</sup> He notes that while the mimetic elements of a

---

<sup>107</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 61.

<sup>108</sup> When modern literary critics talk about the form or style of speech, they often mean the stylistic aspects, or the nuance of speech which may serve to indicate a character’s place of origin, race, or social status. For classical scholars, the form of speech often means first the type of speech, then the stylistic aspects taken within the type. “Types” of speech could refer to formal distinctions, such as prayer, supplication, lament, or address to the self, which are common in epic. Tragic examples would be *rhexis*, *stichmythia*, *agon*, monologue, and so on. “Type” could also refer to a rhetorical type, such as forensic, epideictic, or deliberative. Each type capitalizes on specific formal patterns, vocabulary, figures of speech, and in some cases, poetic meter.

<sup>109</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 67-70.

<sup>110</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 70.

character come together to present a picture of a person-like figure, the thematic functions develop as the character's traits and actions reveal some "propositions" about the class of people represented by the character or the ideas dramatized by the character. This creates an interplay between the mimetic and thematic elements of the character, ultimately affecting the way the audience "reads" the character's actions.<sup>112</sup> Phelan notes that the effectiveness of thematic functions depends on the effectiveness of mimetic functions – if the character is not "believable," then the interplay will not work.<sup>113</sup>

While the centrality of a character in a text may affect the degree to which her mimetic elements are developed, this is not really an issue for thematic elements. What secondary characters may lack in complexity, development, or psychological openness, they make up for in thematic function. Though "round" characters are the focus of the progression of the plot and the epicenter of the interplay of the most important themes of the work, flat characters are not to be discounted as window-dressing. Forster notes that they are a great advantage to an author because they provide instantaneous impact. They do not need to be introduced and developed – their "meaning" is readily apparent.<sup>114</sup> Hochman notes that the marginal characters create space so that the central character "can be experienced in all her vividness, complexity, and coherence."<sup>115</sup> Phelan concludes that "the actions of a minor character, though not significantly advancing or retarding the actual forward movement of the narrative, take on a thematic function that plays a significant part in the progression by affecting the response of the authorial audience to the mimetic and thematic functions of the protagonist."<sup>116</sup> In other words, the reader best understands the development of the main, complex characters when she is conditioned by her

---

<sup>111</sup> Phelan 12.

<sup>112</sup> Phelan 13.

<sup>113</sup> Phelan 43.

<sup>114</sup> Forster 105.

<sup>115</sup> Hochman later notes that even though these secondary characters are likely flat, they still "come to exist in our consciousness as figures who have a larger existence as integral being than anything that might be suggested by the scale of their presentation of their function in the text. We cannot say much about them and certainly know virtually nothing about such life experiences as they might have had or about the underlying complexities of their hypothetical motives. Yet we do apprehend them as themselves, and as relatively complex beings who tease us with the intimation that we might have done well to know them." To him, their flatness does not lessen the degree of the impact they make upon the reader (Hochman 68).

<sup>116</sup> Phelan 198.

response to the themes the secondary, flat characters address. By downplaying his or her complexity, the author highlights the one or very few qualities or values that character is meant to represent, thus shining a light on concerns which may not be within the purview of the main, complex characters.

### *Continuation*

The various transformations that accompany each new retelling of a story have an impact on the mimetic and thematic elements of any character whose story is told in several texts and genres. The first important transformation is the temporal relationship between the “original” text (for this study, the Homeric epic) and the later text. Temporal stage is important because it determines whether the author is trying to distinguish his characterization from the work of another, or extend another’s characterization into his own work. Euripides’ *Andromache* and *Trojan Women* dramatize events which happen after the events Homeric epic (a temporal relationship called *analeptic*), and the *Trojan Women*, though produced after *Andromache*, dramatizes events which happen before those in *Andromache* (a temporal relationship called *proleptic*).<sup>117</sup> This means that Euripides does not dramatize any of the events told in the *Iliad*, and therefore is extending aspects of the Homeric *Andromache* into his own work. The second important transformation concerns the story itself. Transformations to the story usually occur as reductions or augmentation. For this study, the most important kind of augmentation is “amplification,” which Genette defines as “thematic extension and stylistic expansion.”<sup>118</sup> According to Genette, this is the basic resource of classical tragedy, for, in inheriting the store of traditional tales preserved in their own cultural tradition and by learning poetry from a young age, tragedians ultimately produce variations on themes already created by their predecessors.<sup>119</sup> Amplification, and other reductions and augmentations, are often the result of what Genette calls “transmodalization,” or the change in presentation of the story from narration to dramatization.<sup>120</sup> The most notable effect of the change from narrative to drama is the compression of the duration

---

<sup>117</sup> Other temporal relations besides *proleptic* and *analeptic* are *elliptic* (filling in gaps) and *paraleptic* (a story which happens at the same time as the original, but to different characters and perhaps in a different place) Genette 177.

<sup>118</sup> Genette 262. In other words, the new text adds new themes to the themes which are already present in the original text, and elaborates upon the stylistic aspects which made up the original.

<sup>119</sup> Genette 262-263.

<sup>120</sup> Genette 277-278.

of time.<sup>121</sup> But dramatization also has a direct effect on characterization. Genette explains it thus:

....all speeches are in direct discourse except those reported by one of the characters, who is then placed in the position of a narrator and enjoys the freedom of choice inherent in narrative; no focalization is possible, since all actors are equally present on the stage and constrained to speak by turns....the only dramatic viewpoint is that of the audience, who may, of course, direct and modulate their attention as they wish, but in a manner not susceptible to being programmed by the text.<sup>122</sup>

So the dramaturgical conventions of Greek tragedy will slightly alter the analysis of characterizing material in the presentation of Andromache's story. Without the presence of a single, authoritative and reliable narrative voice, tragic characterizations are less stable, but the sources from which the information may be drawn are more complex: each individual characterizes another based on his or her own observations or experiences; the chorus represents a combination of narratorial and actorial voices, depending on the play; the drama allows for more opportunities of self-expression without narratorial conditioning.

The same principles which govern the transformation of stories from text to text (augmentation and reduction) also govern the transformation of a single character from text to text. Margolin names four operations of change in a character between texts: addition, deletion, substitution, and rearrangement.<sup>123</sup> He suggests that the features of a character who becomes part of a cultural heritage are a "conglomeration of salient or core features of several versions," and it is not necessary for each version to possess the exact same qualities.<sup>124</sup> But in order for those core features to coalesce, all later versions of a character should possess qualities which are

---

<sup>121</sup> Genette notes that narration has a "temporal flexibility" that tragedy does not, allowing the narrator and characters to move forward and backward in time. Thus, he argues, tragedy "resorts" to narrative models (like messenger speeches and prologues) when analeptic exposition is necessary (Genette 278). See also Barbara Goward, *Telling Tragedy* (Duckworth, 1999).

<sup>122</sup> Genette 280-282. As Goward puts it, the audience members cannot interpret events happening on stage any better than they could outside the theatre (theoretically), and so they can make only provisional assumptions about characters. The characters onstage are uncertain of how to interpret the unfolding events, and so the possibility of certainty in characterization seems to be denied (Goward 10).

<sup>123</sup> Margolin, 119. These are basically the same as Genette's ideas of augmentation (addition) and reduction (deletion). Substitution is simply the combination of addition and deletion. Genette does not discuss rearrangement, but Margolin does not really elaborate on what "rearrangement" means in the production of a character.

<sup>124</sup> Margolin 117.

“similar, compatible, or at least consistent” with the qualities of the original.<sup>125</sup> This is why the two-pronged approach (mimetic and thematic) is important for studying a character over time and text. Mimetic qualities indicate thematic functions which eventually become dimensions – the qualities the individual possesses even when isolated from any text. It is not the quantity of changes which are made, but the quality – if a later text represents a character five, ten, or twenty years after the original text, or if a later text places ancient characters in a modern-day city, the character would still be recognizable as “her” if her core elements, or dimensions, remain the same.

## V. Conclusion

This narratological system of character and characterization analysis is a desirable system for this study for three reasons. First of all, the basic elements are applicable to both epic and tragedy. Though tragedy lacks a narrator, a mediating voice, Barbara Goward, among others, has shown that other dramaturgical elements (such as the chorus, the messenger, and the messenger-speech) can assume the same narratorial authority in a tragedy.<sup>126</sup> Regardless of whether or not an authoritative voice is present in a text, direct definition and indirect presentation, drawn from the character herself, other characters, or a narrator, can be analyzed in both genres.

Secondly, this system avoids prescriptive statements about character and characterization. Literary figures are evaluated as possessing a *degree* of complexity, development, and mental representation. There are no prescriptive criteria for what constitutes coherent or consistent characterization. This is especially helpful when it comes to assessing development or mental representation. Though our understanding of how the ancient Greeks understood the workings of their mind or the individual’s place in society has evolved over time and has become more

---

<sup>125</sup> Margolin 119.

<sup>126</sup> As she puts it, each character takes a turn as a narrator/narratee (Goward 12). She notes that the chorus is a kind of hybrid – it can act as a major character in the story, involved in the events unfolding on stage, or it can act more like an external narrator, existing in an undefined narrative-temporal plane (Goward 12-13). Main characters may assume narratorial authority during analeptic speeches (Goward 22). Messenger speeches are also analeptic speeches, and they become more authoritative through narrator-distance – the character who delivers it is often anonymous, and not necessarily directly involved in the action of the play (Goward 31). Euripides often creates a “formal frame” for the action of his plays by using a formal narrative in the prologue and *exodos* (Goward 121-122).



accommodating, these distinctions are largely unimportant for this kind of analysis, since this system begins from a neutral standpoint.

Finally, this method provides more traction for the study of women in ancient literature. The mimetic approach acknowledges that characters may be represented to different degrees in different criteria, while the thematic approach recognizes that important themes may be just as easily centered around a secondary character as a primary character. These considerations are more helpful in Homeric epics than in Greek tragedy (especially Euripides), where women are often the primary characters of plays, where their mental processes are often highlighted, and where the themes are often connected to the plights to their characters. In Homeric epic, however, only Helen and Penelope have been allowed to be truly “deep” and “developed,” and for vastly different reasons. This combined approach may shed a little more light on the role of other female characters in Homeric epic.

#### *An Outline of the Study*

Chapters Two and Three address the character and characterization of Andromache in the *Iliad*. Chapter Two looks specifically at Andromache’s self-definition and her speeches. Based on the scholarship done on Homeric speeches and Greek female laments, it proposes that Andromache’s laments are highly critical of the heroic *ethos* described in the *Iliad*. Chapter Three considers the direct definition of other characters and indirect presentation in the *Iliad*. Direct definition in Homeric epic often takes the shape of epithets, and so the chapter begins with a catalogue of Andromache’s traits. The second part of the chapter analyzes indirect presentation from the narrator’s descriptions of Andromache’s actions to others’ comments about her. Chapter Three concludes with an analysis of Andromache’s thematic function in the *Iliad*, and suggests that Andromache is a character created to be a highly sympathetic representative of the typical experience of women in times of war. Chapters Four and Five consider Andromache in Euripides’ *Andromache* and *Trojan Women*, respectively. Using the same methods of analysis, these chapters examine how Euripides characterizes Andromache in each work, paying special attention to her speeches. Chapter Four also considers how the direct description of other characters, in particular Hermione and Menelaus, develop her thematic function within that work. Chapter Five also address how the episodic structure of the *Trojan Women* affects characterization. Each chapter begins with a look at the transformations which take place in Andromache and her story as she moves from epic to tragedy, and from earlier tragedy

(*Andromache*) to later tragedy (*Trojan Women*). Each chapter ends with a discussion of the relationship between the Euripidean Andromache and the Homeric Andromache. The conclusions point out what Euripides preserves and what he modifies and will identify the core elements which make a character recognizably “Andromache.” The study ends with a formal Conclusion.

## Chapter 2: Andromache's Self-Definition and Speeches in the *Iliad*

### I. Introduction

In the *Iliad*, Andromache is clearly a secondary character, and her characterization is restricted in almost every aspect: she appears in the narrative only at critical moments in Hector's own story, she interacts with and speaks only to her husband and the members of her *oikos*, and she speaks almost exclusively in lament.<sup>1</sup> Yet the *homilia* scene of Book 6 remains one of the most beloved scenes of the epic, and her pathetic lament at Hector's funeral leaves audiences convinced in the power of marital love. If Hector is the best example of the heroic *ethos*, Andromache, his wife, is his feminine counterpart, the best example of feminine *ethos*. But, as the restrictions listed above suggest, she is not characterized to the same degree as Hector is. It is therefore her thematic function which is foregrounded over her mimetic function in the *Iliad*.

An assessment of Andromache's speeches will begin the discussion of Andromache's character in the *Iliad*. This chapter will address only two aspects of Andromache's characterization: the direct definition she herself speaks (or self-definition) and the indirect presentation she herself presents (speeches). Despite the fact that Andromache is not a primary character in the epic, her characterization is memorable because it is so dependent upon her speeches, which are mostly in the form of laments. Andromache speaks only four times in the epic, adding up to a scant 99 lines of verse.<sup>2</sup> With the exception of the short address Andromache makes to her servants in Book 22, all of Andromache's speeches in the *Iliad* are *gooi*, solo songs of mourning performed by kinswomen during the Greek funeral ritual.<sup>3</sup> By establishing Andromache as the consummate mourner, the widow lamenting the death of her

---

<sup>1</sup> The only other female character in the *Iliad* so restricted is Briseis, who speaks only once in Book 19 when she performs a lament for Patroclus (19.287-300). This connection between Andromache and Briseis will be explored below.

<sup>2</sup> 6.407-439; 22.450-9; 22.477-515; 24.725-45 for a total of 99 lines.

<sup>3</sup> For the definition and description of *gooi*, see Christos Tsagalis, *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004) 5; Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002) 13. For the difference between *gooi* and *threnoi*, musical laments or set dirges, see Alexiou 12 and 103. For a catalogue of *goos*-types in the *Iliad* (single, antiphonal and triadic; anticipatory, mixed/concealed, informal/ritualistic, and formal/ritualistic), see Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 16. Even though Andromache's speech in Book 6 is addressed to a living Hector, I will argue below that the speech is actually a lament.

hero-husband, the Homeric poet creates an indelible image of Andromache which has drastically affected all of her subsequent characterizations. The image of Andromache as mourner has become the central image around which later continuations have coalesced.

Andromache's speeches also have a significant effect on her thematic function within the *Iliad* itself. Andromache and other lamenting women in the *Iliad* enjoy a brief moment of authority when they are allowed to speak or sing publicly about their pain and anxieties upon the death of a loved one. As a ritual or even spontaneous speech-act that was the privilege and duty of women to perform, the lament throughout its tradition has wielded the ambivalent power of circumscribing the role of women within Greek society as well as investing women with the momentary authority to comment upon and even challenge the difficulties their role necessarily prescribes for them.<sup>4</sup> As P.E. Easterling observes, the purpose of the *goos* is to celebrate the hero and actively contribute to the preservation of his *kleos*. Yet in carrying out this initiative, the woman must acknowledge how the hero's very pursuit of that *kleos* ensures her own degradation and despair. She writes, "In expressing grief – their own and the community's – the women give strong emotional and ritual coloring to the events narrated, but their mourning goes beyond cries and groans: they also offer comment, articulating the issues at stake."<sup>5</sup> The relationship between *goos* and *kleos* mirrors the relationship between men and women in heroic society. Sheila Murnaghan notes that by articulating the issues at stake, laments "become testaments of what it is like to be a woman in a world focused on male interests and values."<sup>6</sup> The momentary authority conferred by lament ultimately has the potential to subvert the

---

<sup>4</sup> For anthropological field studies on women's lament in ancient and modern Greece, see Alexiou, Gail Holst-Warhaft, *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature* (London: Routledge 1992), Anna Caraveli "The Bitter Wounding: The Lament as Social Protest in Rural Greece," *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*, ed. Jill Dubisch (Princeton: Princeton UP 1986), Nadia Seremetakis, *The Last Word: Women, Death, and Divination in Inner Mani* (Chicago, U of Chicago P, 1991), Nancy Sultan, *Exile and the Poetics of Loss in Greek Tradition* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999). See also Katherine Derderian, *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy* (Leiden: Brill, 2001) 39. She emphasizes that the *goos* is a woman's speech genre: "The woman's emphatic connection to the heroes as mother, wife, and mourner underlines her authority as a speaker or singer who mediates the final ritual passage of the dead hero into stable death and the critical transition of the household from the heroes to their sons."

<sup>5</sup> Patricia Easterling, "Men's *kleos* and Women's *goos*: Female Voices in the *Iliad*" *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 9 (1991): 149. Sultan focuses on the role of women in the preservation of the hero's *kleos*, and suggests that the woman's voice is the hero's "other" voice, the immortal voice (53). Her presence when he is dead is vital, for "the hero's *kleos* can be severely compromised if he is denied the presence of mourning women – especially a loving wife – at his death-bed" (75).

<sup>6</sup> Sheila Murnaghan, "The Poetics of Loss in Greek Epic" *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*. Margaret Beissinger, Jan Tylus, and Susanne Wofford (Berkeley: U of California P, 1999) 208.

dominant value system by blaming the heroes for dying and leaving their families bereft rather than praising the heroic nature of their deeds.<sup>7</sup> By recasting the death of the hero in light of their personal loss, lamenting women become potentially dangerous figures for the community. In fact, legislation passed in Greek city-states in the sixth and fifth centuries prohibiting certain features of public funerals confirms the potentially subversive nature of these laments. As the *polis* began to exert its control over the worship and commemoration of the dead, it was no longer desirable for women to be seen controlling certain aspects of family and religious affairs.<sup>8</sup> There was also the danger that a lamenting woman, in a state of uncontrollable emotionality, might incite reciprocal violence to avenge the death of her husband or child, further threatening the safety of the community.<sup>9</sup> For the female laments of the *Iliad*, however, the issue is not whether the lamenting woman might incite the relatives of the deceased to vengeance, for the epic recounts a war, and the violence will continue until the war ends. The issue here is the assignment of blame – rather than blaming the Achaeans or Trojans for killing a loved one, the lamenting woman may blame her husband taking the risks which led to his death. As Derderian puts it, this assignment “tends to uncover potentially dangerous tensions or to assign blame within the social group rather than translating tensions to the exterior.”<sup>10</sup> The inclusion of such laments in Homeric epic, a genre created specifically to recount the *klea andron*, qualifies the commemoration of the heroes by granting space for the representation of the consequences of these heroic deeds.<sup>11</sup>

The potential for this kind of subversion of values is the defining feature of

---

<sup>7</sup> Christine Perkell, “Reading the Laments of *Iliad* 24” *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond* ed. Ann Suter (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990) 93.

<sup>8</sup> For the change in public and private funeral rituals in sixth and fifth century Greece, and for the legislation silencing public female mourning in the fifth century, see Alexiou 17-21, Holst-Warhaft 4. Nicole Loraux *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Trans. Anne Sheridan (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986) is the seminal work on the restructuring of the public funeral ritual in 6<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE Athens, its connection to the evolution of the *polis*, and its effect on the genesis of different poetic genres.

<sup>9</sup> Alexiou 22. Alexiou notes that this is still a common concern at funerals, especially in communities which advocate blood vendettas, such as Sicily and Inner Mani. See also Holst-Warhaft 6, Caraveli and Seremetakis *passim*.

<sup>10</sup> Derderian 41.

<sup>11</sup> Murnaghan writes, “Lament threatens to undermine the *kleos*-conferring function of epic because it stresses the suffering caused by heroic death rather than the glory won by it” (Murnaghan 204).

Andromache's laments in the *Iliad*. While other mourners of the *Iliad*, particularly the mothers Thetis and Hecuba, and wives/concubines Briseis and Helen, make profoundly personal statements about the depth of their personal despair upon the deaths of their loved ones, or reflect fondly on pleasant memories from the past, Andromache refuses to perform such singer-centric songs.<sup>12</sup> Andromache's laments do not subvert in the sense that she incites her husband's relatives to dangerous reciprocal violence, or in anyway jeopardizes the stability of the community. Rather these laments show, in the most pitiable way possible, what exactly is at stake for women during times of war. Her laments threaten to undermine the commemoration of Hector in the sense that she brings to the fore the suffering of his child, his people, and his wife rather than unabashedly praising him for the good he did as Troy's predominate warrior. This chapter will demonstrate how, through her self-definition, through the stylistic preferences of her speeches, and through the content of the speeches themselves, Andromache both embodies and speaks the most damning criticism of the social apparatus which aggressively promotes the pursuit of *kleos*.

## II. Direct Definition

When a character speaks about herself, direct definition becomes self-definition. Self-definition reveals the way the character defines her role in society, and how she evaluates her own actions or inactions. In the *Iliad*, Andromache's self-definition is, not surprisingly, quite limited. Because they are mostly laments, Andromache's speeches follow a highly stylized system of representation. Laments may be as personal or impersonal as the singer wishes, but they are intended to mourn the passing of a loved one and articulate the personal consequences the mourners endure upon his death. So even though some aspect of the individual is presented in the lament, usually in the degree of grief the woman feels, it is rare that a lament is used to imply anything more about a character's complexity, ability to develop, or inner state. Therefore, Andromache's self-definition cannot tell the audience everything about her or her role in the *Iliad*. It can only act as a starting point for a more holistic analysis.

Andromache mentions only in passing the fact that she is Hector's wife, *γυνή* (*γυναῖκα* 6.432), and calls herself Astyanax's mother, *μήτηρ*, only once at line 22.499. Though

---

<sup>12</sup> According to Tsagalis, *Epic Grief, passim*, there are eight lamenters in the *Iliad*: Agamemnon, Andromache, Thetis, Achilles (two laments for Patroclus at 18.324-342, 19.315-337), Briseis, Hecuba (two laments for Hector at 22.432-436, 24.747-759), Priam, and Helen. I question the inclusion of Agamemnon.

Andromache does reflect on her role as wife and mother, what is of most concern to her is her future role as a widow, *χήρη* (6.408; 6.432; 22.484; 22.499; 24.725). She uses this word in each lament as part of a “widowed wife and orphaned child” motif intended to draw attention to the pain Hector’s family will suffer should he die in battle. Andromache does become a widow in the course of the action of the *Iliad*, but her references to her widowhood are not meant to evoke the moment of the transition from wife to widow at Hector’s death, but to paint a portrait of widowhood endured by Andromache for years after Hector’s death. Andromache’s laments are meant to draw attention to the transformation of social status she and their son will undergo if Hector should die, and her laments (especially the laments of 22 and 24) spell out in detail the particular difficulties each will face because of Hector’s absence. This obsession with the future brings a sense of cohesiveness to her laments and forms the basis of her criticism of Hector’s heroic *ethos*. This one term also helps to solidify Andromache’s status as a representative figure in the *Iliad*. She is the only person who uses the word *χήρη* in the singular in all of the *Iliad*, though she is certainly not the only woman in the *Iliad* who is or soon will be a widow.<sup>13</sup>

The qualitative traits Andromache assigns to herself are similarly limited. She refers to herself as ill-fated, *ἄμμορος* (6.408), and to herself and Hector together as ill-fated, *δυσάμμοροι* (22.485; 24.727), as well. The only other word she uses to describe herself is wretched, *δύστηνος* (22.477), which she uses the moment she discovers that Hector is dead.<sup>14</sup> In characterizing herself as ill-fated, Andromache draws on a lament tradition which often blamed fate for the death of a loved one.<sup>15</sup> What is interesting here is that she casts both herself and her husband as

<sup>13</sup> Nicholas Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume VI: Books 21-24* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 159.

<sup>14</sup> This *ἐγώ* expression as part of a lament has already been used by Thetis (*ὦ μοι ἐγὼ δειλή* 18.53) and Hecuba (*τέκνον ἐγὼ δειλή* 22.431), but here the personal pronoun is the first in a grouping of personal pronouns in the first A section. See also Charles Segal “Andromache’s Anagnorisis: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22.437-476” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75 (1971): 57. Segal suggests the word *δύστηνος* links her to Priam, the other major sufferer of Book 22. The word is not common in the *Iliad* (only five occurrences in all) and is only used as a personal exclamation here and in Priam’s speech at 22.59.

<sup>15</sup> Alexiou discusses the connection between fate and the lament at length. Her immediate concern is the etymology of the word *moirologi*, the general word today for the lament for the dead (Alexiou 110). In uncovering the origins of the word, Alexiou notes that the term *moira* is found in formulaic phrases in Homer as the agent of death (in other words, a personified force). She argues that, despite the subtleties of difference in meaning between *moira* and *tuche* in epic and tragedy, the fundamental idea is the same: the inescapability of man’s allotted fate (Alexiou 113). Tsagalis succinctly describes the common fate thusly: “This topic is developed by use of the first and second person personal pronouns linking mourner and dead in the sphere of suffering” (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 29). In note 116, he adds his criticism of Alexiou’s use of Iliadic examples, and suggests that she emphasizes the separation between mourner and deceased while he emphasizes the connection. He then cites this lament as evidence, stating that

ill-fated, which she does when speaking about the fate of their son, Astyanax. By retroactively characterizing their marriage as a union of star-crossed lovers, Andromache may attribute Astyanax's fate to the bad luck he received from his parents. The dual adjectives also further emphasize Andromache's strong connection to Hector, which will be discussed at length below. Andromache only once makes mention of the depths of her despair, and that is at 22.477 when she calls herself *δύστηνος*. This adjective is used quite commonly in tragedy, especially for lamenting women, and here it carries a similar significance. This term is also used in traditional lament formulae as a way for women to vocalize their individual suffering, and Andromache takes full advantage of that tradition.

Andromache's self-definition can really indicate very little about her complexity, capacity to develop, or inner consciousness. What it can demonstrate is Andromache's own preoccupation with her future. Taken out of their spoken context, these descriptors can highlight some interesting aspects of her characterization, but ultimately it is the speeches themselves, and the descriptions of Andromache within her speeches, which are the more powerful characterizing content.

### III. Indirect Presentation

Andromache's speeches characterize her through both their stylistic features and their content.<sup>16</sup> Because almost all of Andromache's speeches are laments, the speeches must be analyzed with respect to the traditional structural and stylistic elements of these songs.<sup>17</sup> This

---

Andromache "employs first and second person pronouns – not to differentiate her fate from that of Hector, but to emphasize their unbroken bond, their common suffering."

<sup>16</sup> For studies on how the stylistic features of speech (not necessarily laments) characterize Homeric characters or ethnic groups, see Adam Parry "Language and Characterization in Homer." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 76 (1972); Paul Friedrich and James Redfield "Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles." *Language* 54 (1978); Jasper Griffin "Homeric Words and Speakers." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986); Irene de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam: B.R. Gruner, 1987); Hillary Mackie *Talking Trojan* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1996). For Homeric speech as a carrier of illocutionary speech-acts, see Richard Martin *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989).

<sup>17</sup> Laments are only one type of speech embedded into the text of the *Iliad*. For a study of the several speech types in Homeric epic, see Anton Fingerle *Typik der homerischen Reden*. Diss. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (München, 1939); for a similar concept applied to repeated scenes, not speeches, see Walter Arend *Die Typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1975). By identifying the smallest units of meaning like formulae and motifs, these studies reveal a patterned system of composition. For a study which focuses on only one speech type, see Deborah Beck *Homeric Conversation* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2005) on conversational speech-types. The seminal work on the structures, themes, motifs, and stylistic qualities of laments is Alexiou. Eugen Reiner *Die*



analysis will show that Andromache declines to use her laments only as an expression of her personal grief upon the death of Hector. Instead, she uses her moments of authority to express explicit criticism of Hector's heroic *ethos*, implying that the pursuit of *kleos* which led him to his death was the direct cause of her (and Astyanax's) current state of despair and future state of slavery and degradation. This is not to imply that Andromache does not make any references to her own personal grief or find a way to personalize her laments – it is only to suggest that in her laments Andromache prioritizes commentary over reflection, thus making her laments more critical than the other laments of the *Iliad*. Andromache criticizes the heroic *ethos* through tightly constructed narratives about her past, her future, and the future of Astyanax. By adopting the sophisticated narrative techniques the Homeric narrator himself employs, Andromache distances herself from the story she tells, refraining from injecting too much of her personal opinion into the narrative and allowing the pathetic stories she recounts to “speak” for themselves and evoke pity from the audience. This is also the strategy she employs when turning her attention to her own state of grief. Instead of using “I” statements over and over to fully convey her sense of grief, she relates what her future actions will be. By focusing on actions instead of feelings, Andromache makes the pathos of her situation dependent upon the situation itself, and not the intensity of her personal grief. Because she is the representative of all young wives and mothers in the *Iliad*, her fears, concerns, and actions are amplifications of theirs.

The *goos*, or amateur lament song, is traditionally composed in a tripartite structure. The first section is the initial address to the dead man; the second section is the narrative portion, in which the mourner crafts the story of her relationship to the dead man and elaborates on how his death affects her individually; and the third section is a renewed address, again calling the dead man by name and tying together the ends of the thread of the lament in a ring structure.<sup>18</sup> The

---

*rituelle Totenklage der Greichen* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938); Gerhard Petersmann “Die monologische Totenklage der *Ilias*.” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 116 (1973); and Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, are all philological, not anthropological, studies of traditional laments.

<sup>18</sup> Alexiou 133. “The mourner begins with a preliminary address to the dead, then remembers the past or imagines the future in a predominantly narrative section, and finally renews her opening address and lament. This is ternary form, ABA, in which the opening section, an address or appeal, is reinforced and modified by the intervening narrative of the second section. While by no means every lament conforms to this pattern, there is a sufficient number of examples, early and late, to establish its traditional basis beyond doubt.” See also Dieter Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970) for a fuller study of ring-composition in various Homeric speeches, and Dieter Lohman, *Die Andromache-Szenen der Ilias* (Zurich: Georg Olms, 1988) for

tripartite structure of the traditional lament used in the *Iliad* exaggerates and emphasizes the narrativity of Andromache's laments because the middle part is designed to be a specifically narrative space. On the one hand, the allocation of a narrative space does make it easier to understand how Andromache's laments are structured more like narratives than other Iliadic laments, but on the other, the tripartite structure makes it almost too easy to assume that it is only the narrative portion of the lament which contains the critical message. This is not true. The first and third portions of the lament are intended as spaces for the mourner to directly address the deceased. In Andromache's case, these sections of her laments contain a higher concentration of traditional lament formulae, figures, and elements, but their traditional nature in no way dilutes their potential for criticism or characterization. In working within the tradition, Andromache, like the other Iliadic mourners, chooses from a pool of typical elements those which best express her message.

#### *Traditional Lament Elements in Andromache's Iliadic Laments*

Each tripartite lament of the *Iliad* likely contains at least a few typical elements such as the praise of the deceased, a comparison, antithesis between mourner and deceased, a death-wish, antithesis between past and present, ring-composition, and an antiphonal element.<sup>19</sup> The typical elements help to classify Andromache's speeches as laments, and situate her comments in the larger context of traditional songs. But, when considered in comparison to all Iliadic laments, the typical elements also help to differentiate Andromache's laments from the laments of the other mourners. Andromache uses three particular typical elements in each of her three laments: address, reproach, and the motif of widow and orphan.

The tripartite lament structure includes an initial address and a renewed address, giving the singer the opportunity to call the deceased by name, or some other term, at least twice in the course of the speech or song. Andromache naturally addresses Hector in her laments, but the terms she uses in the place of his name help to define the kind of bond shared between this

---

his application of these ideas to Andromache's laments. Derderian suggests that the narrative portions of the laments situate both the deceased and the mourner within kinship and social groups, underlining the importance of the deceased within those groups (Derderian 36).

<sup>19</sup> Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 15 and 28-32. Most of these elements were already catalogued by Alexiou. For the tripartite structure, see 133; for antithesis, see 150; for the contrast between past and present, see 165; for the contrast between the mourner and the dead, see 171; for the wish and the curse, see 178; for praise and reproach, see 182. Unlike Alexiou, Tsagalis does not study the figurative elements of the lament, such as the symbols of light, journeys, support, spring and harvest, and the tree (Alexiou 185ff.) Tsagalis also changes the terminology of his elements slightly: the element termed *antithesis between mourner and deceased* on 15 is termed *common fate* on 29.

husband and wife. In the lament of Book 6, Andromache tries to convince Hector to remain closer to the walls when he fights and to not take as many risks on the frontline. Andromache addresses Hector as *δαμόνιε* (6.407), a term of endearment meant to convey the intimacy between speaker and addressee.<sup>20</sup> This tender address leads into a harsher reproach from Andromache, and reveals how strenuously she is trying to persuade him. Her narrative foreshadows the sufferings she will endure by recalling her past sufferings, and so her renewed address at line 6.429 attempts to draw as much pity from Hector as possible. Andromache tells Hector that he is now her father, mother, and brothers as well as her bedmate: *Ἐκτορ, ἀτὰρ σύ μοι ἔσσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ/ἥδ' ἐκασίγνητος, σὺ δέ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης* (6.429-430).<sup>21</sup> While she explicitly states that Hector's role as husband now encompasses the roles of parents and siblings for her, implicitly, she reminds him that she has no protection of any kind aside from him.<sup>22</sup> Therefore,

<sup>20</sup> See Richard Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of Homeric Dialect* (Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1977) s.v. *δαμόνιος*. He derives the adjective from *δαίμων*, providing this definition: "Under superhuman influence, 'possessed,' whose actions are unaccountable or ill-omened." In the vocative, he outlines five meanings: 1) "in stern reproof," 2) "In more or less stern remonstrance," 3) "conveying an implication of folly or senselessness," 4) "indicating a degree of wonder, the person addressed showing himself superior to what his outward man would indicate," and 5) "with original sense lost sight of, merely in affectionate address" (82). See also Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologie de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots*. 4 vols. (Paris: Klincksieck, 1968) s.v. *δαμόνιος*. Chantraine says that the adjective has some relation to *δαίμων*, and translates it as "admirable, surprising, possessed by a god." He notes that it is employed with different tones in different passages (247). See also Geoffrey Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: Books 1-4*. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985). Kirk ad loc. 1.561 writes "*δαμονίη* expresses affectionate remonstrance here, as it does when Andromache and Hektor use the term to address each other at 6.407 and 486; often it implies a stronger rebuke, as at 4.31. Derivation from *δαίμων* is obvious, but the precise development of different nuances of meaning, as with many colloquialisms, is not" (Kirk 111). One example of a colloquial use comes at 2.200, when Odysseus tries to halt distressed captains. Here Kirk writes, "it is a traditional and formal mode of address, purporting to assume that the person addressed has some relic of heroic connexion with the gods, usually as a form of exaggerated (and here definitely ironical) politeness" (Kirk 136). Helen famously addresses Aphrodite as *δαμονίη* at 3.399. Kirk ad loc. suggests "here the term is directed to a goddess, and its implications are a little different – or rather they are made even more familiar and ironical, because the proper application is to a mortal" (Kirk 323-4). See also Jasper Griffin, "Homeric Words and Speakers." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986): 40. Griffin suggests that the term "conveys an attitude of shock or rebuke on the part of the speaker toward the person addressed." See also Eleanor Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996) 141. Dickey notes that Homer uses the term only in the vocative. She believes it expresses astonishment and criticism of the addressee, or creates intimacy between speaker and addressees and "urges compliance with the speaker's requests." She argues that ultimately, it is wrong to seek one blanket translation for each use (Dickey 142).

<sup>21</sup> Kirk *ad loc.*, reads these lines as evidence of "passionate affection" as well as a reminder of the duty Hector owes to Andromache. The last point is important for the characterization of Andromache's laments. Each lament focuses on Hector's duty to an individual, and in Book 6, that individual is his wife.

<sup>22</sup> Alexiou notes that it was common for the female mourner to complain to the dead of the hope, comfort, or protection of which his death deprived her. This is often expressed by identifying the deceased with an object of support or defense, such as a pillar holding up the roof of a house (Alexiou 193). Andromache does not use similes or metaphors in her addresses to Hector in this lament – if she wishes him to understand how she feels, she states it plainly without using figurative language. This is partially noticed by Tsagalis when he discusses the theme of *mors*

the risks he takes on the battlefield are even more dangerous because she has no one else to turn to should he die. The address of Book 22 is more in line with typical lament openings than any of her other laments. She begins with an anguished expression of grief: *Ἐκτορ ἐγὼ δύστηνος* (22.477).<sup>23</sup> What follows is a long meditation on their cruel fate, so the initial address suits the tone of the introductory lines. The renewed address of this lament is notable because Andromache does not name Hector outright. She has been telling a story about Astyanax's future, and at line 22.507 she slips Hector back into the lament through the relative clause *οἷος γὰρ σφιν ἔρυσσεν πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρά*. In this manner she can effectively conflate father and son before she re-introduces Hector into the narrative, blurring the line between living and dead and commenting on the intertwined fate of father and son. The first address section of the lament of Book 24 is the shortest introductory address of all three laments. It is almost completely formulaic, but it is effective because it ties up all the loose ends from her lament in Book 6. She calls Hector "husband," *ἄνερ*, instead of by name, creating a sense of ring-composition to the laments since she first addressed him as "dear one," *δαιμόνιε*, not by name, in Book 6.407.<sup>24</sup> In Book 6, she was striving to maximize Hector's pity by emphasizing her affection and attachment to him. In Book 24, she now strives to express as clearly as possible the despair the death of her husband has caused her. The emphasis is on the loss of her protector: since he is dead, she will become a slave, and their child may be killed. In her final address, though, Andromache begins to enumerate the personal ramifications of his loss. She tells Hector that he leaves behind a great amount of sorrow for his parents and for her as well: *ἀρητὸν δὲ τοκεῦσι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔσθῃκας*, *Ἐκτορ· ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα λελείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρά* (24.741-742). She sorrows not only for the difficulties of her future, but also for the loss of her husband himself. Andromache's addresses show the depth of attachment Andromache felt toward her husband, and convince the

---

*immatura* in the lament of Book 24. He argues that, in other Iliadic instances of the hero dying young, the dead man is often compared to a falling tree. Cf. Alexiou 198. In the lament of Book 24, however, there is no vegetal imagery. Tsagalis explains this by stating that virtually everything said about Hector must be linked to Andromache and Astyanax somehow (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief* 104).

<sup>23</sup> This *ἐγὼ* expression has already been used by Thetis (*ὦ μοι ἐγὼ δειλή* 18.53) and Hecuba (*τέκνον ἐγὼ δειλή* 22.431), but here the personal pronoun is the first in a grouping of personal pronouns in the first A section. Segal suggests the word *δύστηνος* links her to Priam, the other major sufferer of Book 22. The word is not common in the *Iliad* (only five occurrences in all) and is only used as a personal exclamation here and in Priam's speech at 22.59 (57).

<sup>24</sup> Perkell reads *ἄνερ* as withholding, not conferring affection. She notes that both Hecuba and Helen address Hector with a "superlative expression of affection" in their laments in Book 24, but Andromache does not (Perkell 98).

audience that she truly loved him. The intimate terms of address add another layer of pathos to her laments.

On the one hand, the way Andromache addresses her deceased husband makes it clear to the audience that she loved him dearly, but on the other hand, her reproaches of his actions clearly demonstrate her criticism of his choices. Almost the moment after she speaks the term of endearment in her address, she follows with a hard accusation: that Hector's strength will be his undoing, that he does not pity her or Astyanax, and that he will leave them: *φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος, οὐδ' ἐλεαίρεις/παῖδά τε νηπίαχον καὶ ἔμ' ἄμμορον, ἣ τάχα χήρη/σεῦ ἔσομαι* (6.407-409). This reproach, almost an accusation, seems particularly harsh, especially in Book 6 when Hector is still alive. She essentially accuses Hector of not prioritizing correctly – in seeking his *kleos*, he willingly and thoughtlessly abandons his family.<sup>25</sup> In Book 22, Hector is dead, and Andromache's reproach takes a slightly different form. He not only leaves her, but he also leaves her with heavy pain: *νῦν δὲ σὺ μὲν Αἴδαο δόμους ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης/έρχεται, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερῶ ἐνὶ πένθει λείπεις/χήρην ἐν μεγάροισι* (22.484-486). This recalls her reproach of Book 6, but instead of the second person singular *ἐλεαίρεις* (6.407), she reproaches him for abandonment with *λείπεις* (24.726). The reproach of 24.725-7 is an exact repetition of 22.483-485. These reproaches are especially effective because Andromache is the only mourner who uses them. By using second-person singular verbs, these few lines in each lament seed the notion that Andromache is critical of the heroic *ethos* by making her reproach very personal. A wife accuses her husband of abandonment here – it is not a sweeping statement on the habitual choices of Homeric heroes, but it is effective in its intimacy. The small-scale reproach is absorbed into the large-scale narrative, in which Andromache's criticism addresses the realities of the fate of women and children who become the victims in war.

Closely related to the reproach is the motif of the widow and orphan. Astyanax is an important element in Andromache's laments, and his fatherless future is one of Andromache's main concerns. She often accuses Hector of leaving her a widow and their child an orphan, bluntly explaining in a tight, typical formula the consequences of his death. The grieving widow

---

<sup>25</sup> See Karl Ameis and Karl Hentze, *Homers Ilias*. 4th edition (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1905). Ameis-Hentze *ad loc.* view this address as a mild accusation (Ameis-Hentze 128). See also David Monro, *Homer Iliad* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1884). See also Alexiou 182. "Just as the unfulfilled wish might, in certain contexts, be turned into a curse, so too the praise of the dead was often reversed: instead of seeking his goodwill by praise, as was usual, you provoked him by reproaching, blaming, or abusing him."

motif, as Griffin points out, is one of the several Iliadic motifs which are inherently pathetic.<sup>26</sup> There is no one who would not feel pity for Andromache and Astyanax, knowing their situation. The first instance immediately follows her reproach in Book 6 when she says that Hector does not pity their child or her, and that she will quickly become a widow: οὐδ' ἐλεαίρεις/παῖδά τε νηπίαχον καὶ ἔμ' ἄμμορον, ἣ τάχα χήρη/σεῦ ἔσομαι (6.407-8). In Book 22, she notes that Hector leaves her a widow in their halls (λείπεις/χήρην ἐν μεγάροισι, 22.483-4) and that their child is still only a baby (παῖς δ' ἔτι νήπιος αὖτως, 22.484). Finally, in Book 24.725-6, she presents the transformation of herself into a widow and their young child into an orphan as the direct result of Hector's death, repeating verbatim 22.483-5.<sup>27</sup> As mentioned above, Andromache is the only person who uses the term χήρη in the *Iliad*, and therefore she is the only mourner who employs this motif in her laments.<sup>28</sup> This very strongly indicates Andromache's thematic function as the consummate mourner, the eternal widow. Even though she does become a widow in reality in the course of the *Iliad*, in her laments, this change of social status carries far-reaching consequences which will reverberate long after Hector has been buried. By using this motif, she evokes not only the immediate consequence, but her long-term suffering as well.

The repetition of these typical elements does much to shape Andromache's thematic function in the *Iliad*, and very little to contribute to her mimetic function. The different terms she uses to address her husband Hector show an intimacy between them and an abiding devotion on her part, which serves to make her criticisms within the laments all the more notable. The reproaches which are featured in each lament are at once critical and pathetic: in Book 6, the reproaches were spoken to a living man and were intended to help sway his decision-making, but in Books 22 and 24 the reproaches were spoken to a dead man. The later reproaches recall the first, and remind the audience that Hector did not heed her advice. These reproaches, spoken to a man who cannot answer, are sadly critical, and act as bleak introductions to the narratives which

<sup>26</sup> Jasper Griffin "Homeric Pathos and Objectivity." *Classical Quarterly* 26 (1976): 173 and Jasper Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980) 120.

<sup>27</sup> Alexiou states that this is not outright blame, but a means of reminding the dead of his forgotten duties. The use of the verb you leave (λείπεις) was traditional and especially common in funerary inscriptions (Alexiou 183).

<sup>28</sup> No other mourner laments her husband in the *Iliad* (Briseis's situation is complex – her lament for Patroclus references the sadness she felt for her dead husband and family, though the lament implies that Patroclus' method of consoling her was to promise re-marriage to her family's killer). Though two other women lament Hector (Hecuba and Helen), neither of them have borne his child. Therefore, the concern of the orphaned child is Andromache's alone.

fully spell out the consequences of Hector's death. Finally, the motif of widow and orphan mark Andromache as a uniquely representative individual. Since no other mourner deploys this motif, these concerns are Andromache's alone in the *Iliad*, but they represent the real concerns of real women in times of war.

#### *Narrative Techniques in Andromache's Iliadic Laments*

What most effectively distinguishes Andromache's laments from the laments of other mourners of the *Iliad* is her adoption of sophisticated narrative techniques, in particular tertiary focalization and embedded speech, in her recounting of events. Tripartite laments allocate space for the mourner's narrative about her past with the deceased, but the narratives of Andromache's laments are more than just brief remembrances of past events or attitudes. The narrative sophistication of her laments is not limited to the narrative portion of the lament, but can extend into the addresses as well. With this sophisticated narrative voice, Andromache becomes a storyteller, crafting stories with interesting and sympathetic characters. These stories illustrate, first for Hector, then for the funeral audience, the small-scale, intimate consequences of the hero's death. The *Iliad* presents heroic death in the context of hard-fought battles, and the deaths of heroes like Patroclus and Hector have far-reaching consequences on the fates of the Achaeans and Trojans. But the death of the hero has equally devastating consequences on the family and *oikos*, which would not be represented in the *Iliad* were it not for Andromache's laments.

What follows is an analysis of Andromache's role as narrator, her deployment of certain narrative techniques and an examination of how she puts narrative distance between her own feelings and reactions upon the death of her husband. This analysis uses the narratological system Irene de Jong presents in *Narrators and Focalizers*<sup>29</sup> to demonstrate how Andromache uses narrative techniques to refrain from infusing her narratives with her own emotions concerning the death (or impending death) of Hector.

---

<sup>29</sup> In *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, de Jong breaks the text down into two fundamental categories: character-text (the speech of each character) and narrator-text. Her method posits the existence of several narrators (the primary narrator as well as the characters themselves) as well as the ability of each narrator to focalize their narrations (to present the story from the perspective of another character), and therefore recognizes a multiplicity of perspectives throughout the epic.

## Book 6

The first lament of Book 6, which takes place on the wall of the city, is “anticipatory” because Hector is still alive and in front of the mourning Andromache when she performs her song.<sup>30</sup> The narrative of Andromache’s Book 6 lament begins after she reproaches her husband for not pitying her, his wife, or their son. Andromache attempts to persuade Hector to fight closer to home by narrating the death of her family in Thebes. This narration is called an external analepsis, because it refers to past events which were not narrated within the *Iliad* itself.<sup>31</sup> This is an argumentative strategy designed to exhort her husband to take a particular course of action.<sup>32</sup> Andromache begins by explaining why she has no father or mother:

οὐδὲ μοι ἔστι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ.  
ἦτοι γὰρ πατέρ’ ἄμὸν ἀπέκτανε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,  
ἐκ δὲ πόλιν πέρσεν Κιλικίων εὖ ναιετάουσιν,  
Θήβην ὑψίπυλον· κατὰ δ’ ἔκτανεν Ἡετίωνα,  
οὐδὲ μιν ἐξενάριξε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τό γε θυμῷ,  
ἀλλ’ ἄρα μιν κατέκχευε σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν  
ἦδ’ ἐπὶ σῆμ’ ἔχεεν· περὶ δὲ πτελέας ἐφύτευσαν  
νύμφαι ὀρεστιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.  
οἳ δέ μοι ἑπτὰ κασίγνητοι ἔσαν ἐν μεγάροισιν,  
οἳ μὲν πάντες ἰῶ κίον ἥματι Ἄϊδος εἴσω·  
πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς  
βουσὶν ἐπ’ εἰλιπόδεσσι καὶ ἀργεννῆς ὄϊεσσι.  
μητέρα δ’, ἣ βασιλευεν ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑληέσση,  
τὴν ἐπεὶ ἄρ’ ἀνέειρεν ἦγαγ’ ἄμ’ ἄλλοισι κτεάτεσσιν,  
ἂψ ὃ γε τὴν ἀπέλυσε λαβὼν ἀπερείσι’ ἄποινα,

<sup>30</sup> Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 6. Tsagalis suggests that Agamemnon’s speech to Menelaus in Book 4 after Menelaus is struck by Pandarus’ arrow is an anticipatory lament (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 112). I am not quite convinced. Beck argues that the *homilia* scene only appears to be a conversation, but in fact does not follow the normal alternating sequence of speech typical in conversation scenes. Andromache makes the first speech in the sequence, but Hector makes the following three speeches, first refusing Andromache’s request, then making a prayer for Astyanax, and finally attempting to comfort Andromache. She notes, “it is striking that in fact, the husband and wife never exchange ideas of feelings” (Beck 128). Italics author’s.

<sup>31</sup> For a description of the external analepsis in character-text, see de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 161. The term “external” refers to the fact that the details recounted by the secondary narrator did not occur within the text of the primary narrator, or the text of the *Iliad* as we have it. For an analysis of the analepses as hortatory or apologetic, see Norman Austin, “The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*,” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 7 (1966): 295-312. Tsagalis categorizes these analepses as “argumentative,” for Hector already knows the information. Andromache is attempting to arouse pity in Hector by emphasizing his importance in an ascending scale of affection (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 121).

<sup>32</sup> As de Jong explains, the contents of external analepses within character-text are already familiar to the internal audience (Hector). The speaker concentrates on the details of the past event which are relevant to the current context (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 161. Tsagalis argues that this narrative is an extended comparison. “In this case, the ‘Comparison’ refers to other losses of dear one she has suffered in the past, rather than to the dear ones themselves...it is thus only too natural that Hector means everything to her, that he determines her whole existence” (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 37).



πατρός δ' ἐν μεγάροισι βάλ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα (413-428).

The external analepsis unfolds in three parts: first she narrates how Achilles killed her father and sacked her native city of Thebes (6.414-16), and describes how Achilles respected Eëtion's body, erecting a tomb for him in the nearby woods, which were populated by nymphs (6.416-420). Next she narrates how Achilles killed her seven brothers all on the same day, while they were shepherding outside the city (421-4). Finally, she tells the death of her mother, whom Achilles returned to her father's home after he killed her husband and sons (6.425-28).<sup>33</sup> Andromache heaps loss upon loss, building up an emotional crescendo meant to wring every last bit of pity from her husband.

It is remarkable that so much of this lament focuses on the role Achilles played in Andromache's past.<sup>34</sup> Andromache becomes a more convincing storyteller by adopting the epithets of Achilles, *δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς* and *ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς* as part of her storytelling technique. But she does not simply name the killer of her family: she goes so far as to focalize the narration of events through Achilles' perspective, a strategy called tertiary focalization.<sup>35</sup> The focalization of events begins at line 6.416 when Andromache explains how Achilles acts after he kills her father: *κατὰ δ' ἔκτανεν Ἡετίωνα, / οὐδέ μιν ἐξενάριξε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τό γε θυμῷ, / ἄλλ' ἄρα μιν*

---

<sup>33</sup> See Marilyn Arthur, *The Divided World of Iliad VI.* *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. Ed. Helene Foley. New York: Gordon and Breach, 1981. 19-44. Arthur connects the list of the deaths of Andromache's family members to Kakridis' scale of affection (see note 98). She notes that, in Book 6, the poet uses the scale of affections three times to effectively convey "Andromache's extraordinarily strong love for Hector" (Arthur 32). For the importance of Andromache's family in this lament, see Wolfgang Schadewaldt, "Hector and Andromache" in *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Trans. Gabriele Wright and Peter Jones (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997) 133. He writes, "both husband and wife speak from the full, total necessity of their existence, which was sketched out for them in the law according to which they grew up, was shaped and hardened through the discipline of their rank and through their fate, and confirmed by the role which they now aim to fulfill."

<sup>34</sup> The loss of Andromache's family at the hands of Achilles is replicated in the case of Briseis. Briseis' lament over Patroclus also calls upon the losses she suffered in the past, but as part of a different strategy. Briseis' suffering over the loss of her family is emphasized in her lament, because Patroclus (the deceased man she is presently mourning) endeared himself to her by refusing to allow her to cry and by comforting her with promises of a future wedding to Achilles (*οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδέ μ' ἔασκες, ὅτ' ἄνδρ' ἐμὸν ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς / ἔκτεινεν, πέρσεν δὲ πόλιν θείοιο Μύνητος, / κλαίειν* 19.295-7). Briseis' reference to the sadness she felt over the death of her family retroactively alerts the audience to Andromache's lack of emotion. Andromache's tale of woe is not meant to illustrate the kindness of her husband in caring for her after they died, but is meant to convince her husband of his importance because with him dead, she will have no other consolation.

<sup>35</sup> As de Jong explains, a speaking character may embed the focalization of another character, usually to achieve rhetorical effect. The speaker does not set aside his or her own speech objectives when focalizing another character's viewpoint – on the contrary, the speaker usually "intrudes" upon the tertiary focalization with his or her own feelings and interpretations (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 37 and 169).

κατέκχη σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν/ἢ δ' ἐπὶ σῆμ' ἔχεεν (6.416-419). With the phrase σεβάσσατο γὰρ τό γε θυμῷ, Andromache allows Achilles' feelings about what happened to color the presentation of the events. Once the audience (and Hector) knows that Achilles felt reverence toward Eëtion and took care with his body, the audience “reads” the rest of Achilles' actions against Andromache's family, especially the ransoming of her mother, as similarly honorable.<sup>36</sup>

While narrating the deaths of her natal family, Andromache illustrates the inevitable bond she and Hector share with Achilles.<sup>37</sup> Kirk suggests this strategy is a “pathetic and rhetorical embellishment” because Hector would already know the details of the deaths of Andromache's family.<sup>38</sup> Though the analepsis certainly appeals to the audience's sense of pathos, it also lays important contextual groundwork. Andromache's retelling of her mother's ransom had already emphasized the fact that women could prove to be valuable commodities to invading warriors. The implication is that Andromache's value is measured by the amount of goods she commands – without a husband or a father to acknowledge and substantiate that value, she is worthless to an Achaean warrior, and therefore not worth kind treatment.<sup>39</sup> The emphasis therefore rightly belongs on Achilles' attitude of reverence towards his victims. When Andromache's current familial situation is fully understood, it becomes clear why Andromache might refer to past attitudes.

Even if the introduction of Achilles into Andromache's narrative fails to impress Hector, its impact is not lost on the external audience. Though Andromache and Hector are unaware that

---

<sup>36</sup> See John Zarker, “King Eëtion and Thebe as Symbols in the *Iliad*,” *Classical Journal* 61 (1965): 111. Zarker suggests Andromache's lament subtly reminds the audience that the wrath of Achilles is a new development, for he previously displayed the humane respect for the dead expected in all heroes.

<sup>37</sup> Tsagalis writes that the name of Achilles is present even when not spoken – the analepses “implicitly reveal yet explicitly conceal the identity of Hector's killer” (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 122). Later he also states that in the comparison between Andromache's lament and Briseis' lament, Achilles is both the parallel and the antithesis of Hector (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 141). Murnaghan makes Andromache's lament for Hector an implicit lament for Achilles, “since that woman [a Trojan woman] is, in the event, Andromache herself, the *Iliad* reveals that Andromache's suffering actually benefits both of the mortal enemies Hector and Achilles: both win glory by causing her grief” (Murnaghan 214).

<sup>38</sup> Kirk 214.

<sup>39</sup> Kirk argues that Andromache's mother becomes associated with the spoils as part of the recurring motif of the wealth of Eëtion and Thebe (Kirk 216). As I will discuss in Chapter 3, the wealth of Eëtion is important to Andromache's characterization as the suitable wife for Hector. The narrator and Hecuba describe her as πολὺδωρος, which likely has some connection to material goods, whether they be a dowry or a reference to the gifts a groom offers to the bride. The women of Eëtion's family are denoted as valuable by the description of the amount of money and goods put forth to ensure their safety and security, whether as captives or as brides.

Hector's death will come at the hand of Achilles,<sup>40</sup> the external audience, familiar with the tradition, knows Hector's fate, and can perceive in Andromache's analepsis a pathetic foreshadowing of future sadness.<sup>41</sup> The lament is not only anticipatory because it mourns a man who is still alive – it also foreshadows the dissolution of another family at Achilles' hands.<sup>42</sup> Here the analepsis ends, and Andromache again returns her attention to the present.

Because Andromache's narrative foreshadows the sufferings she will endure through the recollection of her past sufferings, the renewed address at line 6.429 draws out the pathos of Andromache's situation even more for the external audience and makes her appeal even stronger for her internal audience, Hector. The imperatives Andromache employs (ἐλέαιγε and μῖμν' 6.431) to try to persuade Hector to stay back are a formal reminder that this lament is anticipatory. Though the renewed address fits the tripartite structure, the speech departs functionally from the lament, since Hector is still alive and still open to persuasion. Andromache again brings up her future as a widow and Astyanax's future as an orphan, but in this instance it is a negative purpose clause (μὴ παῖδ' ὀρφανικὸν θήγης χήρην τε γυναῖκα 6.432) – this future is avoidable, if only Hector would be persuaded.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> *contra* Tsagalis. See also Hector's response to Andromache regarding his views on fate 6.486-489.

<sup>41</sup> See Malcolm Willcock, *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad Books I-VI*. (London: Macmillan and St. Martin's, 1970) 74. Willcock emphasizes that Andromache would be dealt with by Achilles quite differently from her mother because her mother's father was alive to pay the ransom.

<sup>42</sup> See George Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1933) 44. "The distinction should be kept in mind between foretelling, which gives the future action with certainty and in more or less detail, and foreshadowing, which gives a clue or hint, more or less definite, it is true, but stripped of exact details...When an event is merely foreshadowed, there is often added to the anticipation an element of uncertainty, not concerning the outcome, but concerning the manner of fulfillment." This is an instance of foreshadowing – there is no doubt of the outcome, but the manner of fulfillment is cause for concern. Thus Andromache's warning speech only arouses anxiety about the further role of Achilles in her future, but does not foretell exactly how he will cause her further pain.

<sup>43</sup> See Ioannis Kakridis, "The Role of the Women in the *Iliad*." *Eranos* 54 (1956): 24. Kakridis suggests that this is the primary purpose of all women in the *Iliad*: "It is the main poetic mission of a woman in the *Iliad* to consciously exert this restraining power over men, trying to avert them from doing their duty as they should." In this way, the poet increases the heroism of the men. Arthur takes a more moderate stance: "Andromache, then, does not ask Hector to play the coward, but that he give up his quest for *kleos* – that he not fight in the forefront where...men win glory and fame. Andromache's speech, therefore, is not only an expression of sincerely felt emotion; it is also a suggestion for a course of action by which Hector can honor his commitment to her and his responsibility as the defender of Troy" (Arthur 33). Perkell reads Andromache's appeal as evidence of the competing ideologies of Hector and Andromache. For Andromache, war is about survival, not about accruing glory – Hector replies that his own sense of shame will not allow him to consider that outlook (Perkell 99). Beck reads the failed attempt at persuasion as emblematic of the nature of Iliadic conversations. She argues that "the *Iliad* uses conversation, or the lack of it, to show the isolation of its characters and the primacy of conflict in human interaction" (Beck 144-5).

The inclusion of the closing lines of Andromache's anticipatory lament in the *Iliad* have been the subject of debate for centuries. The lines are a request to Hector to martial his troops around a fig tree near a weak spot in the wall, where the Achaeans have already made three attacks:

λαὸν δὲ στῆσον παρ' ἐρινεόν, ἔνθα μάλιστα  
ἀμβατός ἐστι πόλις καὶ ἐπίδρομον ἔπλετο τείχος.  
τρὶς γὰρ τῇ γ' ἐλθόντες ἐπειρήσανθ' οἱ ἄριστοι  
ἀμφ' Αἴαντε δύω καὶ ἀγακλυτὸν Ἰδομενῆα  
ἡδ' ἀμφ' Ἀτρεΐδης καὶ Τυδέος ἄλκιμον υἱόν.  
ἢ πού τίς σφιν ἐνίσπε θεοπροπίων ἐὺ εἰδώς,  
ἢ νυ καὶ αὐτῶν θυμὸς ἐποτρύβει καὶ ἀνώγει (6.433-39).

Based on the tripartite structure of laments, these final lines should be part of the final address to the deceased. The problem, however, is that Andromache has already suitably concluded her lament in the preceding lines. These lines are challenging not only because they seem to be an extension of a speech which had already concluded, but also because the rational advice Andromache offers seems so out of place after her impassioned plea.

The discussion of these lines has generally followed two avenues: a discussion of the content of Andromache's advice – that the wall was weak in the area near the tree and that the Achaeans had already made three attacks there; and a discussion of the implication of the advice itself, whether or not Andromache was right to give Hector advice, and whether or not it is consistent with her characterization. To begin with the first part of the discussion, commentators have approached the question by attempting to ascertain whether or not there was any evidence that the wall around Troy was weak in that area. On the one hand, Aristarchus argues that there is no truth to this claim;<sup>44</sup> Willcock suggests that the vulnerability was an *ad hoc* invention by the Iliadic poet to suit Andromache's needs;<sup>45</sup> but on the other hand, Kirk suggests that there may be internal evidence that the wall was weak by pointing out that Helenus had just told Hector to station the troops around the gates (6.80) and Hector had just told Paris that fighting was breaking out around the walls (6.327f.);<sup>46</sup> and Leaf mentions that there was a legend

---

<sup>44</sup> Kirk *ad loc.* gives the reasons why Aristarchus wished to athetize these lines: 1) the words were inappropriate for Andromache because she sets herself as equal to Hector in generalship; 2) the lines contain an untruth because there is no evidence that the wall was weak in that sector or that fighting had broken out close to the wall; 3) Hector directs his answer to previous points (also noted by Ameis-Hentze 130).

<sup>45</sup> Malcolm Willcock *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad Books I-VI* (London: Macmillan and St.Martin's, 1970) 216.

recorded by Pindar *O.* 8.31-46 that the wall was weak in that section because the mortal Aiakos constructed it instead of Apollo and Poseidon, though he concedes that Pindar may have taken his inspiration from these lines of Homer.<sup>47</sup>

The weakness in the wall, whether invented or legendary, is only important with respect to the three attacks Andromache claims have happened at that spot already. There is no other mention of these attacks in the *Iliad*. Kirk suggests that the attacks must be recent since Achilles is not included among the number of attacking warriors.<sup>48</sup> Tsagalis initially argues that the absence of Achilles among the Greek leaders attacking the wall not as evidence of the recentness of the attacks, but because

Andromache's strategy throughout her *ῥόος* is to puzzle with her advice and conceal her true thoughts by relating the two external analepses to her father and brothers. It is exactly because she wants to allude to Achilles' final pursuit of Hector in Book 22 that she does not mention him; she presents him as a danger to her own family, not to Hector, as she did in 409-410, when she foresaw her husband's death at the hands of all the Achaeans without mentioning Achilles.<sup>49</sup>

This is an unconvincing argument, since Andromache's lament did not conceal any information about her past, nor does she make any absolute predictions about the future. Tsagalis later presents a more interesting argument, claiming that the lines are actually meant to reference a rival Theban oral tradition, in which seven warriors attack the seven gates of Thebes. He notes, though, that this tradition did not exactly suit the plot of the *Iliad*, and so it is the Trojans who attack the Achaean walls, rather than vice versa. The lines are given to Andromache because of a connection between a variant of her traditional character and the Theban tradition.<sup>50</sup>

Because the weakness of the wall and the previous attacks of the Achaeans are not mentioned elsewhere in the *Iliad* (or the Homeric or Cyclic corpus, for that matter), commentators have struggled to find reasons for either their inclusion or exclusion. One other issue underpins these discussions, which commentators have generally ignored: the issue of how

---

<sup>46</sup> This is one of the arguments that Kirk *ad. loc.* presents as a response to the arguments for athetizing the lines.

<sup>47</sup> Leaf 289.

<sup>48</sup> This is another of Kirk's arguments listed as a response to the arguments for athetizing the lines.

<sup>49</sup> Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 128.

<sup>50</sup> Christos Tsagalis, *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2008) 24-25.

Andromache would know about the weakness in the wall, the attacks, and the names of the men who made them. The general impropriety of the advice Andromache gives will be discussed below, but it is worth noting first that a woman's presence on the wall, and her knowledge of the names of the warriors, is not all that unusual when considered against other evidence presented in the *Iliad*. The narrator of the *Iliad* presents Andromache going to the wall twice. In Book 6, Hector's housemaid tells him Andromache left when she heard that the Trojans were losing to the Achaeans: ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πύργον ἔβη μέγαν Ἰλίου, οὐνεκ' ἄκουσε/τείρεσθαι Τρῶας, μέγα δὲ κράτος εἶναι Ἀχαιῶν (6.386-7). In Book 22, the primary narrator takes care to relate that no herald goes to tell Andromache that Hector has died: οὐ γάρ οἱ τις ἐτήτυμος ἄγγελος ἐλθὼν/ἡγγειλ' ὅττι ῥά οἱ πόσις ἔκτοθι μίμνε πύλων (22.438-9). She rushes out after hearing the sounds of mourning. Helen also goes to the walls, and her visit there is a highlight of Book 3. Driven there by news from a disguised Iris (3.121-124), a tearful Helen (δάκρυ χέουσα 3.142) is drawn into conversation with her father-in-law Priam (3.161-170). In addition, Hecuba also appears at the walls in Book 22, also in tears (δάκρυ χέουσα 22.81), when she calls down to Hector to ask him not to fight Achilles (22.82-89). These women are there after receiving news about their men, or specifically to see their men, and they all go in a state of tears. So the presence of women on the walls is not exactly unusual, and therefore it seems reasonable to suppose that the women would pay attention, especially after 10 years, to the events they observe while there.

Andromache's naming of the six heroes is admittedly more unusual. Only one woman in the *Iliad* seems to be familiar with other Achaean heroes besides Achilles, and that woman is Helen. In fact, she knows them better than even Priam, who in Book 3 asks her to sit next to him and tell him about the men he sees on the plain before him: ὥς μοι καὶ τόνδ' ἄνδρα πελώριον ἐξονομήνης/ὅς τις ὄδ' ἐστὶν Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ ἡὺς τε μέγας τε (3.166-7). She goes on to name Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Ajax; she mentions Idomeneus and Menelaus in passing; she also looks for her brothers Castor and Polydeuces (3.172-242). Helen is identifying the men from her past, but Andromache would have no cause to know the Aiantes, the Atreides, Idomeneus or Diomedes unless she had seen them often or heard about them often. Aside from these two instances, the other mortal women in the *Iliad* make no mention of other Achaean warriors besides Achilles and Patroclus: Andromache names Achilles in her Book 6 lament (6.4.14, 423), and Briseis similarly names Achilles as the killer of her family and her potential husband in her Book 19 lament for Patroclus (19.295, 297). As mentioned above, the *Iliad* does present Trojan

women going to the walls, prompted by news from heralds or other sources, looking for their men in battle. Antenor also makes mention of Odysseus' and Menelaus' diplomatic trip inside the walls of Troy (3.204-224), and it is reasonable to assume that there must have been other meetings at some point in the course of the war. The issue here is that there is no indication of regularity of these occurrences. If the women often go to the walls, or if there is regular, official communication between the armies, then the detailed knowledge Andromache displays at the end of her lament in Book 6 would not seem extraordinary. But too often commentators imply that Andromache's frenzied rush was a one-time occurrence, an extraordinary circumstance. If the opposite assumption is made, that Andromache (or the Trojan women in general) often sought visual confirmation for oral reports, then perhaps the lines would not seem so surprising.

Setting aside the issues of probability and regularity, though, it cannot be denied that one of the more difficult elements of this passage is the fact that Andromache gives Hector military advice, even going so far as to use an imperative (στῆσον 6.433) in her address to him. Aristarchus found this most difficult to reconcile, since, to him at least, it seems as though Andromache is setting herself up as Hector's equal in generalship.<sup>51</sup> Other commentators are more concerned with the tone of the lines. According to some, they do not match the tone of her previous lament,<sup>52</sup> and according to others, Hector does not even acknowledge the arguments she presents in his response, so the lines seem to be unnecessary.<sup>53</sup> Nevertheless, the blatant military nature of the lines does add an interesting facet to Andromache's characterization. Up to this point, the narrator and Andromache herself have characterized her as a good and valuable wife, so this foray into military affairs seems out of character. Tsagalis notes that this interplay

---

<sup>51</sup> Kirk *ad. loc.*

<sup>52</sup> Kirk argues *ad loc.* that the tactical suggestion at the end of the speech does not fit the emotional tone of Andromache's speech and is anticlimactic (in agreement with Leaf 289). He also notes that if these lines did not exist, lines 6.431f. could create a ring-form conclusion with 6.407-9 (in agreement with Lohmann, *Andromache Szenen*, 33 ff.).

<sup>53</sup> Noted by Aristarchus and cited by Kirk *ad loc.*; Ameis-Hentze 130; Kirk *ad loc.* suggests that Hector's reply that τάδε πάντα (6.441) are on his mind could include Andromache's tactical advice; Tsagalis adds that line 6.492 (πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει) would make no sense without Andromache's tactical suggestion (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 124-5 n. 341). He argues that the final lines of Andromache's speech ought to remain in the text because of the allusions they contain to other lines, including the use and metrical placement of the word ἐρνεόν, and its role as the "metonymic equivalent of danger and death for the Trojans" (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 126); and the emphatic use of the numeral τρίς (6.435) as an allusion to the chase of Hector by Achilles in Book 22. He argues (somewhat unconvincingly) that Andromache's lines ἢ πού τις σφιν ἔνισπε θεοπροπίων ἐὺ εἰδώς, / ἢ νυ καὶ αὐτῶν θυμὸς ἐποτρύναι καὶ ἀνώγει (6.438-9) are answered, "albeit in a disguised form, as Hector picks them up, reverses their order and adjusts them to his own situation" (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 127).

between Andromache and Hector is actually similar to the interactions between Hector and Polydamas, in the sense that Polydamas gives Hector sound advice that Hector does not heed.<sup>54</sup> Tsagalis later argues that Andromache’s military knowledge may be traceable to a rival tradition in which Andromache was an Amazon.<sup>55</sup> The other information Tsagalis puts forward to advance this argument will be addressed below, but an Amazonian tradition is not necessary to understand why Andromache is characterized in this way for this scene.

The whole of the *homilia* scene is constructed to bring Hector and Andromache together in a liminal space between the domestic sphere of Troy and the military sphere of the plain, Hector uncharacteristically leaving the battlefield to move through the city, and Andromache uncharacteristically rushing out of her home towards the battlefield.<sup>56</sup> She and Hector are considered the ideal male and female representatives of the heroic *ethos*. That system thrived because of the separation and seclusion of women and the observation of strict customs about the division of labor. By allowing Andromache to test those boundaries throughout the scene by rushing out of her home towards the wall and speaking about battle, the poet provides Hector with the opportunity to firmly re-establish them in his response to her lament by describing that division of labor:

ἀλλ’ εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σ’ αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε,  
 ἰστόν τ’ ἡλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε  
 ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι· πόλεμος δ’ ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει  
 πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ’ ἐμοί, τοῖ Ἰλίῳ ἐγγεγάασιν (6.490-493).

Andromache’s “unladylike” behavior does not need to be explained by an Amazonian nature – it is just as easily understood as anxiety, which will be explored at length in the following chapter. Andromache does overstep her bounds and does go too far in speaking to her husband about his affairs. But then again, so does Helen in Book 3 when she berates Paris for leaving his duel with Menelaus (3.428-436); and so does Hecuba, when she questions Priam’s sanity after he announces that he will visit Achilles in the Achaean camp (24.201-216). By emphasizing Andromache’s departure from her domestic sphere and sending her back by the end of the scene, the poet pathetically introduces Andromache as a good, but anxious wife. This characterization

<sup>54</sup> Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 128. According to Tsagalis, this makes Andromache “alien to a woman.”

<sup>55</sup> Tsagalis, *Oral Palimpsest*, 14. See Chapter 1 for a further discussion of this argument.

<sup>56</sup> See Arthur and Schadewaldt, *passim*, and the discussion in Chapter 3.



is bolstered by comparing the interaction between Hector and Andromache in Book 6 with the interactions between Paris and Helen in Books 3 and 6. In that relationship, it is Helen who is anxiously conscious of maintaining correct gender expectations – after she berates Paris in Book 3, she switches tactics in Book 6 and sweetly persuades him to return to the front (6.337-338). The interaction is flattering to neither party: Paris is portrayed as effeminate and emasculated, while Helen, though she recognizes the shame both she and her husband endure because of their actions, is portrayed as lustful, falling into Paris’ bed after the most cursory attempts at persuasion on Paris’ part. But Hector and Andromache are exemplary, and so this deviation from the norm only increases the audience’s sympathy for the pair.

Andromache’s lament of Book 6 seeds themes which will be taken up again later in the epic: the importance of her natal family to her understanding of her fate and the fear of widowhood. The narration of the death of her family and the use of tertiary focalization introduce Andromache as a sophisticated narrator and also hints at the central role Achilles plays in determining the future of Andromache’s family. This lament, the first introduction to Andromache, also lays the groundwork for the later laments by clearly articulating what is at stake when Hector goes to fight in the forefront. The formulaic addresses and motifs bring to life the typical anxieties women suffer while their men fight, but Andromache’s list of losses and her impassioned renewed address to Hector as her father, mother, and brother as well as husband personalize her anxiety and increase sympathy for her character. The final lines of the lament acknowledge Hector’s strength and its potential for destruction (*φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος* 6.407) by asking him to consciously scale back his participation on the front. Andromache clearly establishes the connection between Hector’s decision and the fates of his family. Her following laments in Books 22 and 24 will explore the consequences of Hector’s decision not to take her advice.

### *Book 22*

The lament of Book 22, unlike the lament of Book 6, addresses a dead man.<sup>57</sup> The scene in which Andromache hears about, and later sees, the death of her husband is intricately detailed, and her following lament is its equal in complexity. Though Andromache’s lament in Book 22 utilizes several of the typical elements of lament -- fate shared with the deceased, contrast, and

---

<sup>57</sup> Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 6. Tsagalis terms this lament “ritualistic,” because the lament suggests the functions of the funeral without being sung at an actual funeral. He also terms it “triadic,” because it is the third lament in a sequence of three, following laments by Priam and Hecuba in Book 22.

antithesis -- there is little doubt that the completed song is nothing short of a virtuoso solo performance, interweaving the grief over a severed connection, the subtleties of the reciprocation-based social and familial relationships of the Homeric world, and the role of ritual in the consolation of the bereaved.<sup>58</sup>

After Andromache utters her anguished cry, “Hector, I am wretched!” she then continues into a meditation of their shared fate, constructed as a contrast.<sup>59</sup> Andromache again returns to the past, thinking about the couple’s individual paths toward their wedding, and positing that they were equally ill-fated. She concludes that it was their shared and complementary ill-fate in the past led to Hector’s present demise:

*Ἑκτορ ἐγὼ δύστηνος· ἴῃ ἄρα γεινόμεθ' αἴσῃ  
ἀμφοτέροισι, σὺ μὲν ἐν Τροίῃ Πριάμου κατὰ δῶμα,  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Θήβῃσιν ὑπὸ Πλάκῃ ὑλήεσση  
ἐν δόμῳ Ἡετίωνος, ὃ μ' ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐοῦσαν  
δύσμορος αἰνέμορον· ὥς μὴ ὥφελλε τεκέσθαι.  
νῦν δὲ σὺ μὲν Αἴδαο δόμους ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης  
ἔρχεαι, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερὴν ἐνὶ πένθεϊ λείπεις  
χήρην ἐν μεγάροισι· πάϊς δ' ἔτι νήπιος αὐτῶς,  
ὃν τέκομεν σύ τ' ἐγὼ τε δυσάμμοροι· (22.477-485).*

These introductory lines emphasize the fatal connection between husband and wife through personal pronouns, with *ἐγὼ* being used 3 times<sup>60</sup> and *σύ* 4 times<sup>61</sup> in addition to usages in other cases.<sup>62</sup> The repeated use of nominative pronouns emphasizes the individuality of

<sup>58</sup> Willcock comments on this complexity: “That she should be concerned at this moment with the sad life of an orphan, and the cruelty of other boys, has been thought strange, as also her later concern with Hektor’s clothes, left in the house (22. 510-14). As often, however, Homer understands more than his critics; these are considerations which might well occur to a wife and mother at such a time” (Willcock 248).

<sup>59</sup> Alexiou 165. Alexiou describes contrast variously: the contrast can be made between past and present, or the fate of the mourner with the fate of the dead. The common formula was to contrast one clause containing a word for “then” or “before” with another clause containing the word “now.” It was frequently a means of transitioning from the address part of the lament into the narrative part of the lament, or from narrative to final address (Alexiou 166).

<sup>60</sup> 22.477, 479, 485

<sup>61</sup> 22.478, 482, 485 (twice)

<sup>62</sup> *μ'* (22.480); *ἐμὲ* (22.483); *σοι* (22.486). Alexiou argues that “in ancient Greek, the use of the second person pronoun, in all cases, with verbs, relatives, and participles, was a universal mode of ritual address in praise of god, hero or man, to be found in the *hymnos*, *enkōmion*, *epitaphios* and *threnos* alike. But whereas in the lament, the dead man’s fate, introduced by the pronoun [*σὺ*] (you), was contrasted with the mourner’s present or future condition, introduced by [*ἐγὼ*] (I), in the other three forms it was more usual to emphasize exclusively the power and virtue of the god or hero” (Alexiou 171-2). She goes on to state that in ancient laments, the second person singular copula was used most frequently in the past tense as a means of address, in order to emphasize the contrast between mourner and deceased (Alexiou 173). Alexiou emphasizes the double contrast, going so far as to say they are

husband and wife, but the nominative plural adjectives *ἀμφοτέροι* (22.478) and *δυσάμμοροι* (22.485) effectively link Andromache to Hector through time and space. The bond of their shared fate is strengthened by the distance between the two at their times of birth – Hector was in Troy in the house of Priam (22.478) while Andromache was born in Thebe Hypoplakos, in the house of Eëtion (22.479). Andromache’s connection to her father’s house is again emphasized in the following line, when the relative clause shifts the locus of the ill-fate away from Andromache and onto Eëtion, who, being *δύσμορος* himself (22.481), reared Andromache to a similar fate (22.481). Despite the fact that Eëtion and the rest of her family are dead, Andromache again recalls him in her lament, summoning up her personal history and the inevitable loss which follows as a way to connect herself more deeply to her husband. Eëtion’s wealth and power may have been great, but ultimately his ill-fate was to be shared with his daughter. The only possible fate for their son, whom they both produced, is an evil one – as Andromache just demonstrated in her description of her relationship with her father, the ill-fated beget the ill-fated.<sup>63</sup> By simultaneously recalling her natal family and binding herself more tightly than ever to Hector, Andromache again comments on the ways in which marriage shapes the life and experience of women in heroic society.

The “now” portion of the introductory contrast also aids in the transition of the concerns of the lament from the ill-fated union between Hector and Andromache toward the future of their son:

νῦν δὲ σὺ μὲν Αἴδαιο δόμους ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης  
ἔρχεαι, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερόντι ἐνὶ πένθει λείπεις

---

inseparable (Alexiou 177). In this particular passage, the usage is different – instead of emphasizing contrast, Andromache uses the pronouns to emphasize unity. Instead of the contrast between past and present, deceased and mourner, the emphasis is on unity in the present, despite distance in the past.

<sup>63</sup> Tsagalis reads the sharing of a common fate as the “transformation process engendered by the lament” (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 40). According to his interpretation, the mourner seeks to “assimilate himself/herself with the experience of the dead person, because in this way grief can heal the internal wounds caused by the loss of a dear one....the motif of common fate shared by both mourner and deceased becomes the thematic means enabling the mourner to create a figurative cohesion between himself/herself and the deceased” (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 40). The emphasis on the healing aspects of the expression of grief based on theories generated from anthropological field studies is out of place in this particular lament. Andromache imagines a sad fate for Astyanax and blames herself and his father for “passing on” their own ill-fate to him. There is no attempt at “moving past” grief or “communalizing” her grief. The following argument made by Tsagalis suits the interpretation of the lament better: “The *Iliad* has used this traditional feature of lament performance to weave a special narrative thread around Hector, Andromache, and their son, Astyanax, all of whom become a compositional unit and are treated as such. It can now be better understood why whenever the *Iliad* refers to one of them in a non-battle context, it has to refer to the others” (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 41). The fate of one cannot be separated from the fate of the others, and that is the explicit message here.

*χήρην ἐν μεγάροισι· παῖς δ' ἔτι νήπιος αὐτῶς,  
ὃν τέκομεν σύ τ' ἐγώ τε δυσάμμοροι· οὔτε σὺ τούτῳ  
ἔσσεαι, Ἕκτορ, ὄνειαρ, ἐπεὶ θάνατος, οὔτε σοὶ οὗτος (22.483-486).*

Andromache again employs the motif of widow and orphan to shift the focus from the past to the present. Hector now lies beneath the ground in the house of Hades, and he leaves her a widow in their home, bearing a terrible sadness (22.482-483). After Andromache recognizes how their shared fate is passed on to their son, she uses the personal pronoun *σύ* to link Hector to Astyanax (related by the demonstrative *τούτῳ* 22.485) instead of herself. Line 22.485 ends with the juxtaposition of father and son (*σὺ τούτῳ*) and line 22.486 also terminates with the juxtaposition of father and son (*σοὶ οὗτος*).<sup>64</sup> It is *ὄνειαρ* in line 22.486 which establishes the theme of her meditation in the narrative portion of her lament: the reciprocal relationship between father and son.

Following upon a complex introductory address, the narrative section is no less complex or subtle. The narrative portion of Andromache's lament is a tertiary focalization of Astyanax's future without his father. It features an external prolepsis<sup>65</sup> and an external analepsis. In the prolepsis, Andromache imagines for Astyanax his future without his father, envisioning briefly how he will be challenged for the right to his property, but dwelling fully on the social marginalization which he will suffer because of his lack of a father. The analepsis provides a contrast to this bleak future – Andromache recalls the comfort of Astyanax's present life, eating fat meat on the knees of his father and sleeping comfortably under the protection of a nurse. But because of Hector's position in Troy, all of that will change for the boy. This focalization is successful in arousing pity for the boy because Andromache presents her description through the "eyes" of Astyanax, only referring to herself as an outside party, the widowed mother to whom he will run when he is cast out from the banquet.

Andromache begins the prolepsis at line 22.488, stating that there will always be trials and worries for Astyanax:

*ἦν περ γὰρ πόλεμόν γε φύγη πολύδακρυν Ἀχαιῶν,  
αἰεὶ τοι τούτῳ γε πόνος καὶ κήδε' ὀπίσσω  
ἔσσοντ'· ἄλλοι γάρ οἱ ἀπουρίσσουν ἀρούρας.*

<sup>64</sup> Richardson observes that the transposition of the pronouns is highlighted by their parallel position at the end of the verses (Richardson 159).

<sup>65</sup> See de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 81. A prolepsis is a narrative of events yet to happen in the course of the narration. De Jong does not discuss external prolepses in character-text (speeches).

*ἥμαρ δ' ὀρφανικὸν παναφήλικά παιῖδα τίθησι* (22.487-490).

First, some other men (*ἄλλοι*) will attempt to take his property.<sup>66</sup> Second, on the day he becomes an orphan he will be cut off from his peers (22.490). This line contains two phrases of interest: first, the *ἥμαρ δ' ὀρφανικὸν* recalls the *ἐλεύθερον ἥμαρ* (6.455) Andromache will lose when Hector dies and the *δούλιον ἥμαρ* (6.463) she will have to endure instead. Hector was the one who used these terms when he addressed Andromache in Book 6 – now Andromache uses a similar term when thinking of her son.<sup>67</sup> The second term, *παναφήλικά*,<sup>68</sup> sets the tone for Andromache's musings in the following lines. What Astyanax is losing is not only a father, but his chance for a “normal” childhood – in contrast to the scene recalled by Andromache at the end of her narrative, one in which Astyanax is surrounded by loved ones, this one term emphasizes abandonment and marginalization.

Lines 22.491-499 describe the marginalization in detail:

*πάντα δ' ὑπεμνήμυκε, δεδάκρυνται δὲ παρειαί,  
δευόμενος δέ τ' ἄνεισι πάϊς ἐς πατρός ἐταίρους,  
ἄλλον μὲν χλαίνης ἐρύων, ἄλλον δὲ χιτῶνος·  
τῶν δ' ἐλεησάντων κοτύλην τις τυτθὸν ἐπέσχε,  
χείλεα μὲν τ' ἐδίην', ὑπερώην δ' οὐκ ἐδίηνε.  
τὸν δὲ καὶ ἀμφιθαλὴς ἐκ δαιτύος ἐστυφέλιξε,  
χερσὶν πεπληγὼς καὶ ὀνειδείοισιν ἐνίσσων·  
ἔρρ' οὕτως· οὐ σὸς γε πατήρ μεταδαινύται ἡμῖν.  
δακρυόεις δέ τ' ἄνεισι πάϊς ἐς μητέρα χήρην* (22.491-499).

Andromache imagines a conspicuously needy (*δευόμενος* 22.492) Astyanax entering a banquet-scene, in which the companions of his father are eating. Astyanax moves from man to man, tugging on a cloak or tunic for attention (22.493). An anonymous “someone” will give him some food or drink, but nothing substantial (22.494-5). Finally, a child with both parents living (*ἀμφιθαλὴς*) will drive him out of the banquet uttering harsh words, because Astyanax's father does not dine among them (22.496-7). Astyanax then returns to his widowed mother in tears

<sup>66</sup> Redfield explains that it is important for the father to be alive to transfer the control of property to the son. The father's authority establishes the authority of the son (Redfield 111).

<sup>67</sup> Mackie argues that in using this phrasing, Andromache is imitating an “idiosyncratic feature of her husband's style.” She notes that there are 23 instances of *ἥμαρ* phrases in the *Iliad*. Eight of them occur in the narrator-text. Both Achilles and Hector use them more than once in their character-text – Achilles has three, and Hector five (Mackie 101).

<sup>68</sup> A *hapax legomenon*.

(22.499).<sup>69</sup>

The rich imagery and pathetic touches of the banquet scene in particular evokes pity for the boy Astyanax, especially through the harsh words of Astyanax's agemate. This imagined speech of an anonymous individual is called a "*tis*-speech" by de Jong. The purpose of such speeches is to allow the character to evaluate his or her actions by putting the vocalization of the criticism in the mouth of another character.<sup>70</sup> One of the most famous *tis*-speeches of the *Iliad* occurs in Book 6, when Hector imagines what an anonymous Achaean will say when he sees the enslaved Andromache in the future.<sup>71</sup> In this instance, however, the evaluated behavior is not Andromache's – it is actually Hector's. The young man will not drive Astyanax out of the banquet because of something Andromache has done. Andromache will be there to offer helpless consolation when Astyanax returns to her in tears. In this portion of the lament, Andromache has already focalized the narration through Astyanax's eyes. Within that focalization, she is imagining a prolepsis, and has embedded a *tis*-speech within her own focalized character-text. In essence, she has removed herself, the secondary narrator, farther and farther away from the scene which she narrates – in fact, she exists only as a "character" within the scene, there to help describe the suffering of Astyanax. This removal occurs at the moment of the lament when Andromache is most critical of Hector. In developing so elaborate a prolepsis for their child within the lament narrative, Andromache implicitly blames Hector, the dead man, for subjecting their son to such a fate. By distancing herself from the action and

---

<sup>69</sup> The description of Astyanax's future is an extension of the *homilia* scene in Book 6. Hector imagined Astyanax becoming prominent among Trojans, Andromache imagined him becoming an orphan (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 130; *op.cit.* Lohmann, *Andromache Szenen*, 1988).

<sup>70</sup> See Irene de Jong, "The Voice of Anonymity: *tis*-Speeches in the *Iliad*." *Eranos* 85 (1987): 177. The brief speech of the anonymous boy is emblematic of *tis*-speeches, which are "speeches which a speaking character envisions to be spoken at some point in the future by an anonymous 'somebody' (*tis*)." She later explains that *tis*-speeches are tertiary text which take the narratee even farther away from the control of the narrator and even deeper under the thrall of the character (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 83). See also John Wilson, "*καί κέ τις ὧδ' ἐρέει*: An Homeric Device in Greek Literature" *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 (1979): 2. According to Wilson, the content of the *tis*-speeches is either "shameful or glorious and reflects the psychology of the speaker who projects it." Wilson proposes three functions for *tis*-speeches: negative (dissuasive), persuasive, and predictive, which "can bring fame or shame in the future without demanding an immediate response" (Wilson 2-3). In this instance, the 'anonymous somebody' is characterized as a Trojan youth who would be about Astyanax's imagined age. The embedded *tis*-speech here alludes to the embedded *tis*-speech of Book 6 and negates the wish of Hector (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 131). On ἀμφιθαλής, Leaf comments, "The word was closely connected in the early days with the all-important idea of luck. It was thought that an orphan was proved by his misfortune to be no favorite of the gods" (Leaf 465). Here, Andromache laments that Hector's and her own ill-fate foretold Astyanax's bad luck even before he was born.

<sup>71</sup> 6.460-462.

interpretation of the scene, she allows the pathos of the situation to speak for itself without adding her own voice to the mix.

The detailed scene of a child at a banquet recalls another banquet-scene already described in the epic: the one described by Phoenix to Achilles.<sup>72</sup> In Book 9, when the embassy approaches Achilles about returning to battle, Phoenix uses his relationship with Achilles as a foster-father as a means of persuasion. Phoenix reminds Achilles how much Peleus, his biological father, loved and trusted Phoenix:

ὁ δέ με πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο,  
καί μ' ἐφίλησ' ὥς εἴ τε πατήρ ὃν παῖδα φιλήσῃ  
μοῦνον τηλύγετον πολλοῖσιν ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι,  
καί μ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθηκε, πολὺν δέ μοι ὥπασε λαόν (9.480-3).

He also reminds him how much Achilles himself loved Phoenix as a child: *ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐθέλεσκες ἅμ' ἄλλω/οὔτ' ἐς δαῖτ' ἶέναι οὔτ' ἐν μεγάροισι πάσασθαι* (9.486-7). In fact, Achilles would not eat his evening meal unless Phoenix himself held him upon his knees and fed him at the banquet: *πρὶν γ' ὅτε δῆ σ' ἐπ' ἐμοῖσιν ἐγὼ γούνεσσι καθίσσας* (9.488).<sup>73</sup> Phoenix describes this shared memory in great detail, lingering on the affection mutually felt between the two and the more amusing detail of the spit-up Achilles left on his tunic after dinner: *πολλάκι μοι κατέδυσας ἐπὶ στήθεσσι χιτῶνα/οἴνου ἀποβλύζων ἐν νηπιέῃ ἀλεγεινῇ* (9.490-1). Phoenix attempts to establish a connection between himself and the stubborn hero, reminding Achilles to view him as a father figure and thus to honor him as he would a father.<sup>74</sup> Because Phoenix took such care to describe the bond built between Achilles and himself during banquets, the audience feels even more the loss Astyanax endures without his father. None of the men at the banquet take Astyanax upon their knees in a sponsoring gesture – he is left completely unattended, outside the protection of any

<sup>72</sup> As Richardson *ad loc.* observes.

<sup>73</sup> See Brian Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 3: Books 9-12* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 126. Hainsworth *ad loc.* references *Od.* 16.443-4 for another description of a child set on a knee. He explains, “Phoenix’ role is that of a proud friend of the family, not that of a menial. In the Odyssean passage, it is Odysseus himself who is represented as offering meat and wine to the infant Eurymachos.” Ameis-Hentze *ad loc.* explains the appearance at the banquet as an introduction: “wenn der Vater zu anderen Fürsten zum Mahle geladen war, wobei auch de Knaben zu erscheinen pflegten.” See also Christopher Wilson, *Homer: Iliad Books VIII and IX* (Wiltshire: Aris & Phillips, 1996) 240. Wilson observes that “the length at which Phoenix dwells on the details of Akhilleus’ childish helplessness is a measure of the importance he attaches to the theme; his help to Akhilleus when Akhilleus was himself helpless now entitle (*sic*) him to appeal to Akhilleus.”

<sup>74</sup> See Harry Avery, “Achilles’ Third Father.” *Hermes* 126 (1998): 391. Avery suggests that Phoenix is presented as a second father figure in order to put pressure on Achilles. He claims the relationship “sharpens the tragedy by showing the hero rejecting the pleas and arguments of one who stands to him in the place of a father.”

man. The anonymous man who does give him food gives him only a little – this is a gesture of pity, not one of acceptance or care.

The behaviors exhibited by Phoenix and Achilles in the banquet scene from Book 9 serve as the contrasting context for the Astyanax scene, providing a model which Astyanax will never be able to act out himself. What is implied in Andromache's lament and elaborated in Phoenix's speech is that the son has the obligation to aid the father in all that he does: *ἀλλὰ σὲ παῖδα θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ/ποιεύμην, ἵνα μοί ποτ' αἰκία λοιγὸν ἀμύνῃς* (9.494-5). Hector himself was excruciatingly aware of his obligation to increase the *kleos* of his father through heroic actions on the battlefield, which he reminds Andromache of in Book 6: *οὐδέ με θυμὸς ἄνωγεν, ἐπεὶ μάθον ἔμμεναι ἐσθλὸς/αἰεὶ καὶ πρότεροι μετὰ Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι/ἀρνύμενος πατρός τε μέγα κλέος ἢδ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ* (6.444-6). Hector's prayer for Astyanax in Book 6 asks that Astyanax become more heroic than his father: *καὶ ποτέ τις εἴποι πατρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων/ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιόντα* (6.479-80) – the result being honor for Hector as well as for himself.<sup>75</sup> In that way, Astyanax could be an aid to his father just as Hector is an aid to Priam.<sup>76</sup>

But Achilles' debt to Phoenix is not one that may be fulfilled only on the battlefield. It is one which involves the willingness to be persuaded by the wisdom and experience of the older man, and to recognize the goodwill of the man who demonstrated his love through fostering. As soon as Phoenix reminds Achilles of the love and attention he gave to him when he was a child, he suggests the best course of action in the present troubles: *ἀλλ', Ἀχιλεῦ δάμασον θυμὸν μέγαν· οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχειν* (9.496-7). It is this debt to which Andromache refers. In Hector's prayer for Astyanax, the young man returns to his mother a triumphant warrior, like to his father in his military prowess – in Andromache's prolepsis, the young boy returns to his mother a social outcast, with no Hector to offer any kind of comfort: *δακρυόεις δέ τ' ἄνεισι παῖς ἐς μητέρα κήρην* (22.499). In Book 6, Andromache's lament stressed how Andromache's natal and married families are conflated in Hector, and in Book 22 the lament highlights his role as father. The loss of Hector for Andromache signals the final destruction of all of her family, while for Astyanax it signals the loss of the opportunity to fully participate in the foundational social relationships of Homeric society.

<sup>75</sup> See Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 130 for more on the intratextual references between Hector's prayer for Astyanax in Book 6 and Andromache's presentation of his future in her lament in Book 22.

<sup>76</sup> Redfield argues that Hector's primary social role is that of "worthy son" and in that respect he is set in direct contrast with Paris, the most worthless son (Redfield 113).



The loss is emphasized to an even greater extent by the external analepsis, which picks up without grammatical break at line 22.500:

Ἀστυάναξ, ὃς πρὶν μὲν ἐοῦ ἐπὶ γούνασι πατρὸς  
μυελὸν οἶον ἔδεσκε καὶ οἶων πίονα δημόν·  
αὐτὰρ ὅθ' ὕπνος ἔλοι, παύσαιτό τε νηπιαχεύων,  
εὔδεσκ' ἐν λέκτροισιν, ἐν ἀγκαλίδεσσι τιθήνης,  
εὐνῇ ἐνι μαλακῇ, θαλέων ἐμπλησάμενος κῆρ·  
νῦν δ' ἂν πολλὰ πάθῃσι, φίλου ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἀμαρτῶν,  
Ἀστυάναξ, ὃν Τρῶες ἐπὶ κλῆσιν καλέουσιν (22.500-506).

Andromache says that Astyanax used to eat on the knees of his father, eating fat sheep.<sup>77</sup> This beginning describes the alternate experience of the imagined banquet – the pain Astyanax will suffer as an orphan is worse because he was once like the baby Achilles. He had a doting father who held him on his knees and fed him the very best food. Andromache draws out the analepsis by imagining other aspects of Astyanax's past life: when he was tired and stopped playing with his toys (22.502), he would go to his soft bed in the arms of his nurse, his heart full of comfort (22.503-504). But now for Astyanax the difference will be great. Raised in luxury, he will become an orphan, starved of both food and affection.

The narrative elements of this lament shape a critical response to Hector's choice to fight, and ultimately die. Her criticism is based on the connection of her family's dissolution to a larger *Iliadic* theme: the father/son relationship. First, Andromache focalizes Astyanax's loss by disappearing from the narration. Though the address sections of the lament present the difficulties Andromache faces now that Hector really is dead, she refrains from expounding at length over her individual woes. The vocabulary of sorrows and suffering is all for Astyanax: at line 22.488 he will have pain and difficulties (πόνος καὶ κήδε'), and at line 22.505 he suffers greatly (πολλὰ πάθῃσι). She highlights the reciprocal nature of the father/son relationship in her transitional couplet of lines 22.485-486: Hector cannot help Astyanax, and Astyanax cannot help Hector.<sup>78</sup> Once again, it is clear how these narrations effectively address the internal and

---

<sup>77</sup> Richardson *ad loc.* notes the connection between Astyanax and Achilles in Book 9.485-91, but does not pursue the connection further.

<sup>78</sup> Ameis-Hentze *ad loc.* 22.486 suggest something similar: "dabei ist auch daran zu denken, dass es dem Kinde versagt ist, dem Vater die Wohltaten der Erziehung (P 302) durch Pflege im Alter zu vergelten." Derderian also considers how the death of the father affects the son's place in society: "The *goos* draws an analogy between the interrelated separation of death and of orphanhood; the essential connection of the father's task with the son's identity is embodied in Andromache's account of Astyanax's name stemming from the heroic activity of his father and implying continuation in the son" (Derderian 38).

external audiences. The internal audience can “hear” Andromache’s criticism of Hector within the *tis*-speech and “see” the humiliation Astyanax will suffer. The external audience can connect the banquet scenes narrated at two separate points in the text and make a thematic connection, understanding Andromache’s criticism to concern not only the one, tragic moment in Astyanax’s future, but to address the social marginalization and lack of guidance Astyanax will face his whole life.

The following couplet acts as a transitional section in Andromache’s lament. She caps her discussion of Astyanax’s future without a father with an enjambed naming of her son, then re-introduces her dead husband into the lament with the following relative clause: *Ἀστυάναξ, ὃν Τρωῆς ἐπὶ κλησιν καλέουσιν· οἷός γάρ σφιν ἔρυσσεν πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρά* (22.506-7). The renewed address begins with the adverb *νῦν* (22.508) which begins a description of the current state of Hector’s body. The contrast is based upon Hector’s former role as protector of the city, which was mentioned only in the final relative clause of the narrative section. The driving force of the final address is the current state of defilement of Hector’s body, a marked contrast to the preceding description of Astyanax’s formerly comfortable life. Yet the juxtaposition is powerful because both father and son have suffered extreme degradation in Andromache’s lament:

*νῦν δὲ σὲ μὲν παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν νόσφι τοκήων  
αἰόλαι εὐλαὶ ἔδονται, ἐπεὶ κε κύνες κορέσονται,  
γυμνόν· ἄτάρ τοι εἴματ’ ἐνὶ μεγάροισι κέονται  
λεπτὰ τε καὶ χαρίεντα, τετυγμένα χερσὶ γυναικῶν.  
ἀλλ’ ἥτοι τάδε πάντα καταφλέξω πυρὶ κηλέω,  
οὐδὲν σοὶ γ’ ὄφελος, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐγκείσεται αὐτοῖς,  
ἀλλὰ πρὸς Τρώων καὶ Τρωϊάδων κλέος εἶναι* (22.508-514).

These first lines also include the motif of the warrior dying far from his home. This anxiety is an overarching theme in the *Iliad*, since the Greek warriors constantly run the risk of dying in a foreign land. In Andromache’s lament, however, the anxiety surrounding a death in a foreign land is considered through the perspective of the family left at home. Priam presented one of the emotional difficulties which face a family whose relative has died in a foreign land in his own lament at line 22.426-428: *ὥς ὄφελεν θανέειν ἐν χερσὶν ἐμῇσι· τῷ κε κορεσσάμεθα κλαίοντές τε μυρομένω τε/μήτηρ θ’, ἥ μιν ἔτικτε δυσάμμορος, ἥδ’ ἐγὼ αὐτός*. When the body is not present for the bereaved family to see, it is difficult to take satisfaction in the ritual of mourning.

Andromache’s anxiety concerns not the therapeutic elements of ritual, but correct enactment. She references the *εἴματ’* left behind in their home, made by feminine hands (22.510-

11), clothes she and her servants made for Hector, clothes in which he would be buried.<sup>79</sup> The reference to the clothes creates an antithesis within the final address: the clothes, present in the home, made by Hector's women as a means of completing the burial ritual properly, are useless because of the absence of Hector's body.<sup>80</sup> Andromache says she will burn the clothes on the pyre, and although the clothes can be of no help to Hector, they are an act of honor before the Trojan men and women (22.512-515). It is most fitting that her final utterance is *κλέος εἶναι* (22.514).<sup>81</sup> As befits Hector's wife, the wife of the man so aware of his duty to accrue *kleos* for his father and for himself, Andromache commits herself to the completion of her duty and the accretion of Hector's *kleos*. Unlike the laments of Priam and Hecuba in Book 22, which lamented the lost opportunity to find solace in the ritual laying to rest of their son,<sup>82</sup> Andromache does not present her grief in the same way – she chooses to focus her attention on the smaller detail of the clothes, now unnecessary. The triviality of the clothes adds to the pathos of her lament.<sup>83</sup>

The lament of Book 22 is notable for its narrative and thematic complexity. Andromache uses the concept of ill-fate and the death-wish to reinforce her connectedness to Hector and to demonstrate how their futures are intertwined. As she did in the narrative section of the Book 6 lament, she contextualizes her relationship to Hector within her status as the daughter of Eëtion. Andromache recalls her natal family and how they have shaped her fate up to the point of

---

<sup>79</sup> Richardson observes “her act of burning them [the clothes] will be a kind of ‘substitute’ funeral rite in his honour. It is all that she can do, and it appropriately symbolizes both her devotion as a wife and her despair at his loss” (Richardson 162).

<sup>80</sup> Many scholars discount the action as having ritual significance, and emphasize the honor the action confers on Hector. Leaf writes, “The idea seems to be that, as Hector is not to be burnt with the garments, they will not go with him to the other world, his soul will wander naked on the hither side of the river...Still, the ceremony will be a funeral rite to do him honour, and will at least console the survivors” (Leaf 466). Griffin also reads Andromache's actions as conferring honor upon Hector: “Hector will derive no benefit from the burning of his clothes, and purely psychological motives replace superstition. Andromache shows the richness of Hector's household and the completeness with which her own life is destroyed...” (Griffin, *Life and Death*, 3). Derderian suggests that the offering has a rhetorical function as well, emphasizing Hector's final state as naked and vulnerable (Derderian 43).

<sup>81</sup> Derderian observes that this is the only lament to explicitly mention *kleos*, but in the context of offering textiles at the funeral, not in reference to the lament itself (Derderian 42-43). Richardson *ad loc.* shifts the focus to Hector and Hector's own devotion to *kleos*: “It is appropriate that her speech should close with the thought of Hector's glory, for this was the mainspring of all his actions during his lifetime, and this is what will now survive for those who are left behind.”

<sup>82</sup> *τὼ κε κορυσσάμεθα κλαίοντέ τε μυρομένω τε* (22.427).

<sup>83</sup> Segal 38.

Hector's death. In Book 6, the death of Eëtion and the rest of her family forged an even closer connection between Hector and Andromache. In Book 22, the connection is revealed to be cosmic – Andromache's natal family was ill-fated, and, as Priam himself surmises in Book 22, he and Hecuba were ill-fated when they bore Hector.<sup>84</sup> The connection between Hector and Andromache was not only based on her need for him after the death of her natal family. The death-wish which follows again recalls the prominence of Andromache's natal family in her construction of her connection with Hector (22.481).<sup>85</sup> The lament moves forward and backward in time fluidly, beginning in the past, looking forward to a bleak future for Astyanax, moving back again to provide a contrasting context for the sufferings lying in wait for him in the future, settling in the present only momentarily and finally ending in the future.<sup>86</sup> The result of the sliding between spatial and temporal boundaries is to create a profound sense of connectedness between the members of the family unit.<sup>87</sup> The fate of one engenders the fate of the others, for good or for ill.

#### *Book 24*

In a sense, this lament is a synthesis of the previous two laments, a summary of concerns the mourner presented to the dead man now that he is stretched before her. This lament takes place at Hector's funeral, during the *prothesis*.<sup>88</sup> As Hector's wife, Andromache holds the privilege of cradling Hector's head in her arms while she sings, while the other women line up

---

<sup>84</sup> τὼ κε κορεσσάμεθα κλαίοντέ τε μυρομένω τε/ μήτηρ θ', ἣ μιν ἔτικτε δυσάμμορος, ἥδ' ἐγὼ αὐτός (22.427-8).

<sup>85</sup> See note 25. In contrast to the death-wish in Book 6, which Tsagalis interprets as a sign of Andromache's emotional connection to Hector, this death-wish is an example of the first kind: a means of expressing self-blame. Her wish never to have been born is not prompted by a desire to avoid the news of Hector's death – she wishes she was not born in order that Hector would not die.

<sup>86</sup> Tsagalis notes that the lament of Book 24 “unites past, present and future in relation to his life and death” (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 105). Tsagalis argues that “epic discourse is, to some extent, *tenseless* and that dealing with tenses in Homer on a horizontal time-axis prevents us from understanding their function within the performance.” It is her perception or remembrance of events with respect to the moment of performance which dictates the tenses used by the narrator of the speech (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 105). Italics author's.

<sup>87</sup> Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 41 and 104.

<sup>88</sup> Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 6. Tsagalis terms this lament “formal” or “ritual” because it takes place during the actual funeral. He also calls it “antiphonal” because women wail in response to Andromache's lament before Hecuba takes her turn leading the mourning. See also Richardson 350. He also notes that the lament of Book 22 was triadic as well, though in that sequence Andromache's lament was the last, not the first. See also Alexiou 5-14 for a description of the stages of the ancient Greek funeral.

around the dead body. She also has the right to sing her lament first.<sup>89</sup> The triadic lament structure provides a grander scope for thematic closure. Because each woman represents a different relationship to the hero, their laments provide evidence of how the hero's choices variously affect his dependents.<sup>90</sup> This is the shortest of Andromache's laments. Her final speech recalls the motifs and themes touched on in previous laments, but also displays signs of reflection and meditation in her imagining of the future. Like the other laments, this lament features the use of sophisticated narrative strategies, though deployed in a much shorter narrative space.

True to the pattern set by her previous two laments, Andromache does not dwell upon her personal deprivation in the narrative section of her final lament. Instead, she presents a synthesis of the themes she has been exploring in her previous laments, and in some cases, adapts themes

---

<sup>89</sup> Ioannis Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (New York: Garland, 1987), 19. These social rankings and the order of the final laments manifest Kakridis' ascending scale of affection. According to Kakridis, conjugal love is shown in all traditional stories as higher in the esteem of the hero than the love of friends or blood-relatives. Kakridis explains that the scale shows that the husband loves his wife more than his friends, parents, brothers or sisters and that she is loved by him more than she is loved by her own friends, parents, brothers and sisters. The same is true for the scale of affection for the wife. Kakridis also explains that the scale of affection can manifest itself in a typical order of appearance of loved ones. In the first order, the character meets his friends, then his parents, then his spouse. In the second order, he meets friends, mother, father, brothers/sisters, then spouse (Kakridis 20). Hector's individual scale is revealed at three other places in the *Iliad*. In Book 6, when Hector returns to the city, he meets his female relatives in an ascending scale of affection, meeting first his mother, then his brother and sister-in-law, and finally his wife. For a fuller discussion of the importance of the scale of affection in this scene, see Arthur. The second is at the beginning of Book 24, when Apollo reproaches the other gods for allowing Achilles to defile Hector's body for so long. He reminds them that Hector offered them countless sacrifices when alive, and questions their abandoning him now:

τόν νῦν οὐκ ἔτλητε νέκυν περ ἔοντα σαῶσαι  
 ἧ τ' ἀλόχῳ ἰδέειν καὶ μητέρι καὶ τέκεϊ ᾧ  
 καὶ πατέρι Πριάμῳ λαοῖσί τε, τοί κέ μιν ὄκα  
 ἐν πυρὶ κήαιεν καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερίσαιεν (24.35-8).

Apollo lists the family members concerned as wife, mother, child, father, and finally the Trojan people. Similarly, when Priam returns to Troy with Hector's body, Cassandra sees them coming and announces their arrival to the Trojans. The Trojans run to the gates to meet Priam, with Andromache and Hecuba leading the way: *πρῶται τόν γ' ἄλοχός τε φίλη καὶ πότνια μήτηρ/τιλλέσθην ἐπ' ἄμαξαν εὐτροχον αἵξασαι ἀπτόμεναι κεφαλῆς* (24.710-12). Again, the wife and mother have access to the body first, and they will be the first to vent their grief at the funeral. Richardson reminds the reader that the same women who lament Hector in Book 24 greeted him in Troy in Book 6 (Richardson 350). This order is actually a reversal of the order propounded by Kakridis, but reflective of the conventions of the funeral ritual, which place the most important relatives first instead of last.

<sup>90</sup> Murnaghan notes that the laments of each woman revisit themes introduced when Hector met each of them in his return to the city in Book 6 (Murnaghan 209). Holst-Warhaft notes that "the last words of the poem, as of life itself, belong to the women, and their laments are a vehicle for summarizing the artistic and philosophical themes of the narrative" (Holst-Warhaft 110). In fact, the last character to speak is Priam, who commands the Trojan men to bring wood into the city in order to burn Hector's pyre. But the women certainly have the final "thematic" say.

and features from the laments of others. She caps it with a general commentary on the dangers of heroic action.<sup>91</sup> She begins by surmising what will happen to Astyanax:

...οὐδέ μιν οἶω  
 ἥβην ἵζεσθαι· πρὶν γὰρ πόλις ἥδε κατ' ἄκρης  
 πέρσεται· ἥ γὰρ ὄλωλας ἐπίσκοπος, ὅς τέ μιν αὐτὴν  
 ῥύσκει, ἔχες δ' ἀλόχους κεδνὰς καὶ νήπια τέκνα,  
 αἱ δὲ τοι τάχα νηυσὶν ὀχήσονται γλαφυρῇσι,  
 καὶ μὲν ἐγὼ μετὰ τῇσι· σὺ δ' αὖ, τέκος, ἢ ἐμοὶ αὐτῇ  
 εἴψαι, ἔνθα κεν ἔργα ἀεικέα ἐργάζοιο,  
 ἀδελύων πρὸ ἄνακτος ἀμειλίχου, ἢ τις Ἀχαιῶν  
 ῥίψει χειρὸς ἐλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου, λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον,  
 χωόμενος, ᾧ δὲ ποῦ ἀδελφεὸν ἔκτανεν Ἴκτωρ  
 ἢ πατέρ', ἢ καὶ υἱόν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν  
 Ἴκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν ὁδᾶς ἔλον ἄσπετον οὐδᾶς.  
 οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος ἔσκε πατήρ τεὸς ἐν δαΐ λυγρῇ (24.727-739).

Andromache demonstrates an evolution in her thinking from the time when Hector died to the time of his funeral. For the first time, Andromache considers a future without Troy when she says “οὐδέ μιν οἶω/ἥβην ἵζεσθαι· πρὶν γὰρ πόλις ἥδε κατ' ἄκρης/πέρσεται.” (24.727-9). The lament for Astyanax in Book 22 represented only one possible future, in which Astyanax negotiated Trojan society without a father. But Andromache no longer thinks this future is viable.<sup>92</sup> The prophecy of the destruction of Troy is directly linked to the loss of Hector.<sup>93</sup> She describes Hector as the protector (ἐπίσκοπος 24.729), who looked after the grave Trojan wives and the little children.

This term recalls the lament of Hecuba for Hector in Book 22. In Hecuba's lament, she lists the several qualities that Hector possessed while alive, including εὐχολή, ὄνειδος, φερόν, and

<sup>91</sup> Tsagalis notes that she “tries to encompass every possible aspect of his life and show that his loss will have serious repercussions for the whole city” (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 133).

<sup>92</sup> This passage is also the culmination of a slow building up of anticipation for the external audience. As Duckworth notes, “Homer frequently take pains to build up for the reader an atmosphere of foreboding long before definite foreknowledge of the event is given” (Duckworth 53). In the lament of Book 6, Andromache foreshadowed the death of Hector at the hands of Achilles. In the lament of Book 22, she foreshadowed the future of Astyanax, presented with slightly more certainty because Hector had died. In this lament, the tone is no longer one of foreshadowing, but one of foretelling. The dread has been accumulating since Book 6, and finally Andromache puts into words the likely futures of both herself and her child.

<sup>93</sup> Duckworth argues that this passage of the *Iliad* is foretelling, not foreshadowing the future (Duckworth 22). Taken in concert with other foretellings by Agamemnon (4.158-168), Hector (6.447-449) and her own lament at 22.485-407, this passage contributes to the overall feeling that Troy is doomed. Even though the foretold events happen outside the timeframe of the Iliadic text, the impact of the imagery remains with the reader “almost as vividly as if the poet had extended his epic to include them” (Duckworth 32). Placed at the end of the epic, in Andromache's final speech, I suggest that this instance of foretelling is crucial in later characterizations of Andromache.

κῦδος (22.433-435). Hecuba's lament was a meditation of the past set in contrast with the present. Andromache's lament in Book 24 is a meditation of the present set in contrast with the future. Hector's death precipitates the destruction of the city: *πρὶν γὰρ πόλιν ἦδε κατ' ἄκρης/πέρσεται* (24.727-8) and the enslavement of the wives and children in the city he protected: *ἔχες δ' ἀλόχους κεδνὰς καὶ νήπια τέκνα* (24. 730). Hecuba also highlights the reputation Hector enjoyed throughout the city, using the prepositional phrases *κατὰ ἄστυ* (22.433) and *κατὰ πτόλιν* (22.434). Andromache's lament has moved from the particular (the fate of Astyanax) to briefly consider the general (the fate of all of Troy) by touching on the sense of ownership which all Trojans felt for Hector – he was an aid to them all, *Τρῳσὶ τε καὶ Τρῳῆσσι* (22.434). Andromache brings the lament back to the particular again by stating that she now will join them at the ships of the Greeks (24.732).

Then there is an abrupt apostrophe, in which Andromache shifts address from Hector to Astyanax. The vocative *σὺ δ' αἶ τέκος* (24.732) announces the change of addressee.<sup>94</sup> The effect of the change is to blur the line of distinction between father and son. It becomes unclear, for a moment, whom Andromache is lamenting. The lament is as much a lament for the death of Astyanax's future as it is for his dead father – father and son momentarily become one. This conflation of father and son is the first mark of Andromache's change of vision for the future. In her lament in Book 22, Andromache directs the whole of her lament to Hector. The two are connected when she sings a couplet in which father and son were both featured, in reference to the reciprocal nature of the father/son relationship (22.506-7). But there is never the sense that she believes Astyanax will die – in fact, the whole lament focuses on the degraded state of his future life. But now that Hector has died, it seems more likely to Andromache that Astyanax will also face the same fate.

Without pausing, Andromache creates two possible futures for Astyanax: one is to become a slave with Andromache, working unwillingly for a king (24.732-4), and the other is to

<sup>94</sup> Tsagalis writes: "Hector has traditionally been linked so much with the fate of Andromache and his son, Astyanax, that virtually everything said about him has to bear some connection with the other members of his family." Therefore, the "striking" shift in address from Hector to Astyanax makes it seem as if Astyanax has already died (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 104). The presence of Astyanax at the funeral is questionable – McLeod believes he is not there, enhancing the rhetorical and pathetic effect of her reference (McLeod 151). Ameis-Hentze also say that the apostrophe to her child suggests his presence, but it is impossible for her to be holding him because she is cradling Hector's head in her arms (Ameis-Hentze 147). See also Irene de Jong, "Silent Characters in the *Iliad*." *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Ed. Jan Bremer, Irene de Jong, and J. Kalff. (Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner, 1987) 109-110. De Jong suggests that the *οὔτος* of 24.732 suggests that he is present near Hector's bier and cites evidence of children at the *prothesis* illustrated on geometric vases as evidence.

die at the hand of an anonymous Achaean, who will take him by the hand and hurl him from the wall (24.734-8). This “alternative” external prolepsis recalls and contrasts the external prolepsis of Book 22. The first alternative provides another contrast to the luxurious life Astyanax enjoyed while Hector was still alive. In Book 22 Astyanax lost that life because his father was no longer there to provide sponsorship into that social stratum – but in Book 24 Astyanax loses that opportunity because that social system itself no longer exists. His hardship is no longer being cast out from society, but being a foreign slave in another. The second alternative connects this lament to Book 22 through the anonymity of the perpetrator in the two prolepses. In Book 22, an anonymous age-mate, with both parents living, casts Astyanax out of the banquet since he had no one to sponsor him there. In Book 24, an anonymous Achaean will cast Astyanax off the wall. The anonymity adds to the disgrace. Hector’s death by the greatest Greek hero is a cause for *kleos* everlasting, but once Hector is gone, the opportunity for Astyanax to gain the same kind of *kleos* is obliterated. He is as disposable in death as in life – without accruing the kind of glory Hector did for Priam, there is no need for any young boy or Achaean to claim the honor of dishonoring Hector’s child.

The introduction of an anonymous Achaean introduces another opportunity for tertiary focalization, indicated in line 24.736 with the participle *χωόμενος*. This participle focalizes the feelings of the anonymous Achaean as he hurls Astyanax over the wall, angry at Hector and taking vengeance in the death of Hector’s son. This particular tertiary focalization is especially striking because the change of emotion is so abrupt. Andromache had just been envisioning the gruesome death of her son while lamenting her dead husband, heaping sadness upon sadness. By inserting the anger of the anonymous Achaean into her lament, Andromache changes the tone and purpose of her lament. Though she had only just lamented him as the protector of the city and its people, she now critiques Hector’s never-ending drive for *kleos*.<sup>95</sup> She continues to address her son as she recounts the reasons why some Achaean would desire to kill him, essentially blaming Hector:

χωόμενος, ᾧ δὴ που ἀδελφεὸν ἔκτανεν Ἑκτωρ  
ἢ πατέρ’ ἢ καὶ υἱόν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν  
Ἑκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν ὀδᾶξ ἔλον ἄσπετον οὐδας.

<sup>95</sup> Perkell argues that all three laments of 24 comment on “Hector’s dedication to the pursuit of heroic glory” (Perkell 95). She suggests that the laments are another strategy through which “the poet problematizes the traditional values of heroic epic.” The laments go beyond the *topoi* to respond to Hector’s choices in general (Perkell 96).



οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος ἔσκε πατήρ τεὸς ἐν δαΐ λυγρῇ (24.736-739).

It is Hector's prowess in battle which leads to the pitiless death of his son, the ultimate act of vengeance for a dead brother, father, or son.<sup>96</sup> Andromache once again uses an anonymous someone to distance herself from the criticism she expresses – in Book 22 it is the *tis*-speech of the young Trojan, and in Book 24 it is the tertiary focalization of the angry Achaean. In both cases, she criticizes the risks Hector takes with the lives of his dependents, especially Astyanax. The adjective *μείλιχος* is also subtly critical. Briseis used it when lamenting Patroclus, remembering that he always attempted to console her when she wept for her murdered family (19.300). Helen will use this adjective shortly hereafter to describe Hector's kindness to her (24.775). Andromache takes this word, so appropriate for the lament of a loved one, and twists it to invert the context in which it is used. Briseis and Helen lament their loved ones *because* he was kind; Astyanax must die because his loved one was *un*-kind.

When Andromache describes how Hector's pitiless stances in battle will likely lead to the death of her son, she continues the lament with “τῷ καί μιν λαοὶ μὰν ὀδύρονται κατὰ ἄστυ” (24.740). The word *τῷ* is used as “therefore” in two other laments: in Briseis' lament for Patroclus at line 19.300 and in Helen's lament for Hector which follows in line 24.773. These two laments are connected because in each case, a woman is lamenting the death of a man to whom she is not related. Each woman describes the good treatment she received from the deceased, who was connected to her master/husband in some way.<sup>97</sup> After the description, the woman initiates a description of her act of mourning with *τῷ*, “for this reason.”<sup>98</sup> The women are justifying their tears because they are not kin and therefore have neither the obligation to mourn nor the privilege of mourning first. When Andromache uses this same phrasing at 24.740, it seems that she is speaking for the people of Troy, who are not the kin of Hector, but who feel a

---

<sup>96</sup> Perkell interprets Andromache's blaming as born of “grief and sense of victimization” (Perkell 98). I cannot see how Andromache herself is expressing a sense of “victimization” in this lament. Holst-Warhaft argues that Andromache's lament does not praise Hector at all, but rather contains elements of blame. She notes further that not one of the women lamenters praises Hector's actions on the battlefield (Perkell 112-3). See also Maria Pantelia, “Helen and the Last Song for Hector.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 132 (2002): 24-25. Pantelia argues that Andromache blames Hector because she does not understand him: “Andromache understands neither Hector's desire to win heroic *kleos*, nor the power of song to confer it.”

<sup>97</sup> Briseis laments Patroclus, the companion of her master/lover Achilles; Helen laments Hector; her brother-in-law.

<sup>98</sup> Briseis says, “τῷ σ' ἄμοτον κλαίω τεθνηότα μείλιχον αἰεῖ” (19.300) and Helen says “τῷ σέ θ' ἅμα κλαίω καὶ ἔμ' ἄμμορον ἀχνυμένη κῆρ” (24.773).

sense of relation to him because he felt an obligation to them (just as Patroclus felt an obligation to Briseis or Hector to Helen). Andromache again remains at a distance until the very last lines, speaking for the people who are present at the funeral, watching the performances of the lament.

In the final section, in the renewed address, Andromache finally gives voice to her personal pain, only after taking into consideration the fate of the Trojans and her son. In her renewed address, Andromache claims the right to be most pitied among Hector's kin, the one who suffers especially (μάλιστα 24.742).<sup>99</sup> As Nancy Sultan has explained, the wife of the hero is important because it is through the female expression of *ponos* that the hero gains "heroic immortality (known in Archaic poetry as *kleos*)."<sup>100</sup> The ἄλγεα λυγρά (24.742) concern the deprivation she feels because Hector did not die at home. This concern was already presented in Priam's and Andromache's laments in Book 22, and was played out among the Trojans for the space of two books in the *Iliad* when Hector's body was controlled by Achilles. But this is not Andromache's complaint – her lament is that there was no final word for her:

ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα λελείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρά.  
οὐ γάρ μοι θνήσκων λεχέων ἐκ χειρὸς ὄρεξας,  
οὐδὲ τί μοι εἶπες πυκινὸν ἔπος, οὗ τέ κεν αἰεὶ  
μεμνήμην νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέματα δάκρυ χέουσα (24.743-45).

Just as the wife claims the special privilege of mourning first and holding the head of the deceased, Andromache herself claims the special privilege of suffering even more than the rest of the family because of the intimacy between husband and wife.<sup>101</sup> This intimacy, and Andromache's justification for claiming a privileged status in mourning, was established in Book 6 when Hector visits Troy. In Hector's reply to Andromache's lament, he states explicitly by the correlatives τόσσον...ὅσσον (6.450-54) that he is more saddened by the thought of her descent into slavery than by the various sufferings of his other family members.

It is at last in these final words to Hector that Andromache reflects on the particulars of her own future without him. While Hector in Book 6.454-465 imagines a future for Andromache in which she was weaving or drawing water in the home of some Greek king, far away from

---

<sup>99</sup> Tsagalis argues that this is the "comparison" motif in the final lament. The comparison is not between Hector and others, but "*the pain his death has caused*. The lamenter has suffered the greatest pains compared to the people of Troy and Hector's parents" (Tsagalis, *Epic Grief*, 38). Emphasis author's.

<sup>100</sup> Sultan 14.

<sup>101</sup> This privilege is also reinforced by Kakridis' scale of affection.

Troy, Andromache never described any future for herself beyond the fact that she would be a widow. She now describes a much more detailed future for Astyanax and Troy itself in the narrative portion of this lament.<sup>102</sup> Even when she does consider her future without Hector, it is not her life as a captive which occupies her mind – it is her enduring sadness. This particular aspect of her lament is expressed as a reproach, which turns the audience’s mind to Book 6, when she first reproached Hector for not pitying her.<sup>103</sup> Andromache’s characterization hinges on a connectedness between husband and wife which is not paralleled elsewhere in the *Iliad*,<sup>104</sup> so it seems fitting that her final words over him are a rebuke that he did not die at home where he could have imparted some kind of word (*πυκινὸν ἔπος* 24.744) to her for her to remember.<sup>105</sup> In her final lament she does not dwell on the quality of her future life, but her ability to cope with her future life. She imagines lamenting forever: *αἰεὶ/μεμνήμην νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμέρας δάκρυ χέουσα* (24.745-6).

This lament also touches on the motif of dying far from home, and meditates on the themes of marriage and the father-son relationship introduced in the previous laments. Like the laments of Book 6 and Book 22, this speech uses narrative distancing to criticize the choices of the hero seeking *kleos*. But perhaps most importantly, this is the lament in which Andromache reveals her own sorrow. Unlike the other laments, she claims the right to feel the worst kind of sorrow there is, and looks forward to a lifetime of enduring that pain. The hard truth, however, is that Andromache’s enduring sorrow is insurance for Hector’s *kleos*. Hector himself imagines it in Book 6 when he embeds the *tis*-speech of a man who sees Andromache working as a slave:

---

<sup>102</sup> McLeod notes that “another distinctive feature of Andromache’s lament in this book is its more accurate prevision of the future: she is to be enslaved, and Astyanax, if not enslaved with her, to be thrown to his death from a tower” (McLeod 149).

<sup>103</sup> Alexiou notes that this final lament begins and ends with gentle reproaches from the widow Andromache (Alexiou 183).

<sup>104</sup> Priam shows enough respect for Hecuba to ask her her opinion about how he should proceed in the recovery of his son’s body – though he does not take her advice, he does submit to her call to religious piety. Briseis’ reliance on Achilles is elaborated by her in her lament over Patroclus, but though Achilles presents the nature of their connection variously throughout the *Iliad*, she considers herself a captive longing to be united to a master.

<sup>105</sup> Sultan reads *πυκινόν* as “intimate” or “wise.” In Andromache’s final lament, she reads these final lines as a commentary on the failed transfer of *epos* to a beloved intimate: “How can she take possession of his *kleos* in her performed laments if he has not transferred it to her within the charged performative discourse of an *epos*? Andromache is concerned because, as his wife, this duty is hers above all of the other female kin” (Sultan 93). Perkell interprets Andromache’s words as regret over the lost opportunity for Hector to convey a word of love (Perkell 101).

καί ποτέ τις εἶπῃσιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσας·  
 Ἐκτορος ἥδε γυνή ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι  
 Τρώων ἵπποδάμων ὅτε Ἴλιον ἀμφεμάχοντο.  
 ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει· σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος  
 χήτῃ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἧμαρ (6.459-463).

Her continued existence, and the fact that she will be forever mourning him, guarantees Hector's immortality.

### *Comparative Evidence*

Andromache's distance from her narratives in her laments is largely created through the strategies of tertiary focalization and embedded speech, but other stylistic choices also reinforce that distance. Andromache avoids the self-referential expression of grief so common among other mourners. Other mourners use first person singular verbs or nominative participles to indicate that they are mourning, for example: ὦ μοι ἐγὼ δειλή, ὦ μοι δυσαριστοτόκεια (Thetis, 18.54); τῷ σ' ἄμοτον κλαίω τεθνηότα μείλιχον αἰεῖ (Briseis, 19.300); οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι (Achilles, 19.321); τῶν πάντων οὐ τόσον ὀδύρομαι ἀχνύμενός περ/ὥς ἐνός οὗ μ' ἄχος ὅξυ κατοίσεται Ἄϊδος εἴσω, Ἰκτωρος (Priam, 22.424-6); τέκνον ἐγὼ δειλή· τί νυ βείομαι αἰνὰ παθοῦσα (Hecuba, 22.431); and τῷ σέ γ' ἅμα κλαίω καὶ ἔμ' ἄμμορον ἀχνυμένη κῆρ (Helen, 24.773). But Andromache does this only once, at the moment when Hector dies: Ἐκτορ ἐγὼ δύστηνος (22.477). In 102 lines of spoken text, Andromache uses a first person singular verb only four times: ἔσομαι (6.409); δεῖδω (22.455); καταφλέξω (22.512); μεμνήμην (24.745). None of these make any reference to the act of mourning.

Another way to express sadness commonly used in other Iliadic laments is to make mention of pain in the heart or the soul, for example: εἶδετ' ἀκούουσαι ὅσ' ἐμῷ ἐνὶ κήδεα θυμῷ (Thetis, 18.53); Πάτροκλέ μοι δειλῇ πλεῖστον κεξαρισμένε θυμῷ (Briseis, 19.287); αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ/ἀκμηνον πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐνδον ἐόντων/σῇ ποδῇ (Achilles, 19.319-21); ἀχνυμένη κῆρ (Helen, 24.773). Andromache never uses θυμός or κῆρ to express the pain she feels. When she does express feelings of grief, she prefers to use an impersonal *emoi*-construction with a substantive for "grief" or "pain" instead of verbal forms. See for example: ἐμοὶ δέ κε κέρδιον εἶη/σεῦ ἀφαμαρτούση χθόνα δύνειναι· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄλλη/ἔσται θαλπωρὴ ἐπεὶ ἂν σύ γε πότμον ἐπίσπης/ἄλλ' ἄχε' (6.410-13); see also her final, most famous expression of grief at 24.742-5:

Ἐκτορ· ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα λελείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρά.  
 οὐ γὰρ μοι θνήσκων λεχέων ἐκ χειρὸς ὄρεξας,  
 οὐδέ τί μοι εἶπες πυκινὸν ἔπος, οὗ τέ κεν αἰεῖ

*μεμνήμην νύκτάς τε καὶ ἥματα δάκρυ χέουσα.*

The narrative tone of Andromache's laments is enhanced by the fact that she does not use figurative language in her laments at all. Compare Thetis' lament for Achilles, in which she compares him to a young tree: ὁ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνεϊ ἴσος·τόν μὲν ἐγὼ θρέψασα, φυτὸν ὥς γουνῶ ἀλωῆς (18.56-57), or Hecuba's lament for Hector in Book 22, in which she compares him to a god: οἷ σε θεὸν ὥς/δειδέχατ' (22.434-435), and her lament for Hector in Book 24: νῦν δέ μοι ἐρσήεις καὶ πρόσφατος ἐν μεγάροισι/κεῖσθαι, τῷ ἵκελος ὃν τ' ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων/οἷς ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσσιν ἐποιχόμενος κατέπεφεν (24.758-760). Andromache does not talk about Hector's body at all except in Book 22 when she laments that it will be eaten by worms. Thetis' and Hecuba's laments are hearkening back to a time in the past when their sons were young and whole. Andromache is not interested in revisiting the happy moments of her past in these laments.

Because she makes so little reference to the actual "act" of mourning, and because she distances herself, the secondary narrator, from the emotion of grief, she leaves her speeches open to explore other concerns besides her own experience. Thus she is able to use her laments as warnings (Book 6) and as occasions for criticism (Books 22 and 24). Because she establishes a sense of personal distance from grief in each of her three laments, the occasions when she does make reference to her own despair carry a greater impact. For the most part, however, Andromache is willing to allow the devastating consequences of Hector's death speak for themselves without superimposing her own reactions to the tragedy.

### *Mimetic Function*

Andromache's laments hold up for examination the world behind the walls of Troy and shed light on the potential and real dangers the families of the warriors face every time the warrior makes his stand in battle. The narratives vividly bring to life figures from her past in Thebes and her little son Astyanax. But despite the fact that speech is often used in Homeric epic to reveal the workings of the mind or emotional states, Andromache herself is largely absent from her laments. Therefore, these laments are not very helpful in creating a human-like, complex figure. Her complexity cannot be evaluated since she speaks in almost the exact same style and tone through the whole epic. Her innerness is likewise not really represented because she makes no reference to her soul or heart as other lamenters do, and she refrains from using first person singular verbs to indicate states of emotion. The topics of her laments merely suggest some character traits. Because of the evidence she presents to Hector to convince him to

remain closer to the walls, she may know something about battle; because she decides that she will burn Hector's clothing as a testament to his *kleos*, she may be characterized as dutiful, or at least attentive to the demands of ritual execution; and because of her constant worry over Astyanax and Hector, she may be a good mother and wife. At the most, the laments can tell us that Andromache does develop somewhat in the course of the *Iliad*. In her laments of Books 6 and 22, the worst future she could imagine for Astyanax was a future as a marginalized orphan. But in her lament of Book 24, it is clear that she has had some time to re-evaluate this position. She now believes that he will, at best, become a slave along with her, or, at worst, be killed by a vengeance-seeking Achaean. There is no indication how this change of mind effects Andromache's overall characterization, but it does foreshadow the coming tragedy of the allotment and dispersal of the Trojan women and Astyanax's death.

There is one feature of her laments which does inject some of her own humanity into her speeches. There is a real sense in her laments that Hector and Andromache shared a mutual affection. The nickname she uses in Book 6, the connection emphasized in Book 22 and the regret of not being there for Hector's last breath in Book 24 all convey a sense of intimacy which is not present among the other couples of the *Iliad*, save for Achilles and Patroclus. That intimacy is vital to her characterization, as it makes her suffering a little more pathetic to the audience. With her final words, *δάκρυ χέουσα*, Andromache imagines the never-ending sadness which will be her future without her husband, not just because of her degraded social status, but also, one feels, because she will truly miss him. Interestingly, though, the very elements which prohibit the laments from creating a fully mimetic character in Andromache are the same elements which strengthen her thematic function.

#### **IV. Thematic Function**

The fact that Andromache only laments in the *Iliad* characterizes Andromache as the representative of the myriad of nameless Trojan (and Achaean) wives so often mentioned in the epic, but rarely seen. As the symbol of feminine suffering in times of war, it is fitting that she also be the mouthpiece of feminine criticism of the heroic *ethos*. The *Iliad* is an epic about war, and Andromache in the epic endures anxieties and sufferings while commanding the respect and privilege befitting the army wife. The attention Andromache pays to the husband/wife relationship in her laments helps to articulate the very different experiences men and women

have in Homeric society, especially in extreme situations like war. Andromache clearly describes how the wife is utterly dependent upon her husband to provide the simple basics of survival as well as emotional support in times of difficulty. Through her recollections of the fate of her own family, she also illuminates how the value of a woman in times of war is determined by her estimated value to her husband and father. Her laments, however, also illustrate how the husband is dependent upon his wife to act as a living monument to his memory. Andromache's laments demonstrate how unbalanced this relationship is – in exchange for her safety, freedom, and perhaps even her child, a woman is supposed to remember the excellence of her husband. Andromache's laments can only contextualize these broader issues within the scope of her own experience, but other aspects of her characterization exaggerate the distance between husband and wife. The direct description and indirect presentation of Andromache by the narrator and other characters of the *Iliad* add support to the characterization here only suggested in her laments, and help to develop even further the themes her laments meditate upon.

## Chapter 3: Direct Definition and Indirect Presentation in the *Iliad*

### I. Introduction

The previous chapter demonstrated how Andromache's thematic function is foregrounded over her mimetic function in her self-definition and speeches in the *Iliad*. Andromache's laments create vivid narratives explicitly critical of the hero's reckless pursuit of *kleos*, but they provide little mimetic characterization. This chapter continues the examination of Andromache in the *Iliad* by analyzing the direct definition and indirect presentation supplied by the narrator and the other characters of the *Iliad*. To recapitulate, this system of analysis recognizes the difference between directly naming a personal trait (and the degree of reliability with which these traits are ascribed based on who the speaker is) and adducing traits based on other information (actions, thoughts, words, external appearance, environment, and so on).<sup>1</sup> The descriptions and presentations from the narrator and characters add another layer of meaning to Andromache's character and characterization. They help to circumscribe her role within the broad scope of the epic, and help to define her thematic functions through her interactions with other characters and their concerns. This chapter maintains that Andromache in the *Iliad* is characterized to a low degree on Rimmon-Kenan's sliding scales, but still has a strong and memorable thematic function.

There is no such thing as a completely objective presentation of a character in the *Iliad*. As de Jong writes, in any narrative there is always a "selection, arrangement, interpretation" of the events of the story.<sup>2</sup> While the narrator's information is considered authoritative and reliable,<sup>3</sup> the narrator is by no means objective, and therefore the audience's reception of any

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter 1 for a comparison of de Jong's and Rimmon-Kenan's methods. According to Rimmon-Kenan's definition, speech is one means of indirect presentation as it "can be indicative of a trait or unit of traits through its content and through its form" (Rimmon-Kenan 63). The previous chapter explains that this seemingly simple kind of analysis becomes complicated by our knowledge of Homeric speech-types and Homeric speech.

<sup>2</sup> Irene de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam: B.R. Gruner, 1987) 45.

<sup>3</sup> Rimmon-Kenan notes that when characterizing information is provided by the most authoritative voice of the narrative, the audience is "implicitly called upon" to accept the information as reliable, whereas information coming from another character may be considered indicative of the speaker's characterization as well (Rimmon-Kenan 60). The condition for reliability in a narrator is speaking or acting in accordance with the norms of the work. See Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction, Second Edition* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983) 158.



character is heavily influenced by the rhetorical and narrative devices employed by the narrator in the presentation of the story.<sup>4</sup> This phenomenon is manifested on a smaller scale in Andromache's laments, when she herself becomes a narrator similar to the Homeric narrator. She uses specific narrative devices to select, arrange, and interpret the past and future events presented in her narratives and to arouse specific emotions in her audience. Likewise, the Homeric narrator selects, arranges, and interprets the information about the Trojan saga he chooses to present, including the nature and qualities of his characters. Narratorial information is further mediated by the practice of focalization, which allows the narrator to adopt the perceptions of a character in the presentation of the story. The actual speech of a character presents another complication, since any attempts at characterizing another character inevitably lead to reverse-characterization, often revealing more information about the signifying character than the signified.

## II. Direct Definition

Direct definition is the most straightforward way to build a character because the narrator or another character explicitly names a trait using an adjective, noun, abstract noun, or brief description. The number and variety of traits assigned to a character are important facets in determining character type, character complexity and development, and the representation of an inner consciousness. Repetition of traits is important as well, as it indicates which traits the poet wishes to stress for characterization. Likewise, the context in which the trait is named is also important, as it reveals the narrator's purposeful selection of traits and develops the themes

---

<sup>4</sup> De Jong suggests, in fact, that most of the narrator's "rhetoric" is aimed at the characters – that is, in trying to arouse specific emotions concerning the characters. She concludes that in the *Iliad*, the main emotions the narrator attempts to evoke are admiration and pity (De Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 98). This notion of narrative "rhetoric" proceeds from the presupposition that the narrator is not the same person as the implied author, or in this case, the Homeric poet. The narrator is responsible for the act of narration, or the transmission of the narrative discourse, which makes up the text of the epic. Garvey understands the narrator and narratee to be one order of characters within a text, while the characters narrated in the story itself are another order (De Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 66). De Jong outlines the indicators of the narrator-narratee relationship on ppg. 44-45 and 54-60. Chapter 1 of that work discusses the ways in which the narrator intersperses his own evaluation of events in the narration. See also Scott Richardson, *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1990) and the "Homer" chapter in *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Ed. Irene de Jong, René Nünlist, and Angus Bowie (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 15-16. For a variant view on the separation between narrator and author, see Robert Rabel *Plot and Point of View in the Iliad* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997) 8ff. Unlike de Jong and Richardson, Rabel identifies the narrator with the Muse(s). The actual invocations of the Muse(s) are therefore spoken in the voice of the poet/author (23-26), whereas de Jong, assumes the invocations of the Muse(s) necessitate their separation from the narrator (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 44-45). For this study, I assume that the narrator is separate from the author and the Muse(s).

which the character exemplifies. The character sketched in direct definition is usually only in outline, for the importance of certain traits is usually fleshed out in indirect presentation. As Rimmon-Kenan states, direct definition, by its nature, “is akin to generalization and conceptualization.”<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, even the traits which may have a generalizing or typifying force may be successful in evoking an emotional response when given a specific context.

In Homeric epic, direct definition is provided by noun-epithet formulae. Direct definition for each character is highlighted within the text by his or her epithets, and the epithets may be easily collated and categorized under a variety of headings addressing social status, physical qualities, and mental capability, among others. Since the publication of Milman Parry’s thesis on oral formulaic theory, there has been an ongoing debate about whether or not epithets can confer significant meaning on the nouns they modify. The question which is most pertinent to a study in characterization is whether or not generic epithets, or epithets which are applied to more than one noun, carry significant enough semantic weight to be considered a characterizing trait.<sup>6</sup> The uncertainty is partially founded, in some cases, on the wide application of generic epithets to several groups or individuals (for example, men and women, gods and humans, animals and humans), which makes it difficult to associate the implied trait with any type of individual. Scholars have been quick to defend the semantic properties of the generic epithet.<sup>7</sup> Hainsworth

---

<sup>5</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 60.

<sup>6</sup> See Milman Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. ed. Adam Parry (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971) 22. Parry’s famous conclusion is that “the use of the fixed epithet, that is, of the ornamental as opposed to particularized epithet, is entirely dependent on its convenience in versification.” He thinks the question of poetic choice is moot because the poet may not have felt or even known that he had a choice. He further argues that the traditional Homeric audience would have “habitual indifference” to the meaning of fixed or ornamental epithets (Parry 141).

<sup>7</sup> See William Whallon, *Formula, Character, and Context* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1969); Paolo Vivante, *The Epithets in Homer: A Study in Poetic Values* (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1982); Steven Lowenstam, *The Scepter and the Spear: Studies on the Forms of Repetition in the Homeric Poems* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1993); Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Revised Edition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999). Whallon thinks that epithets always have meaning, and notes that “as a rule,” epithets “refer to its noun and lack special association with any context, while other elements refer to their context and lack special association with any noun” (Whallon 65). He notes that while some epithets have little to do with the context of use, the most memorable ones are exemplified by the context of the scene (Whallon 29). Vivante argues that the meaning of the epithet is inextricably bound to the noun itself: it is a “characterizing word or group of words that is so intimately bound to a certain noun as to form with it one sole image” (Vivante 13). Lowenstam argues that generic epithets “confer color on the Homeric world, which is usually depicted only in outline. Color is not essential to the picture, but it adds dimension. And again, the assertion that color is dispensable is not equivalent to stating that the wrong colors have been applied to the picture” (Lowenstam 41). Nagy takes a completely different view: he argues that the noun + epithet formulas actually predate Homeric

in particular notes that generic epithets can be placed on a spectrum between relevance and redundancy, and can move back and forth between the two depending on the context in which they are used.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the repetition of generic epithets does not diminish the power of the trait described by the epithet, but rather refines it. Parry himself says the generic epithets are not meant to distinguish heroes from each other, but rather to define what it means to be a hero.<sup>9</sup> In this respect, the wide application of generic epithets has a typifying effect. It helps to establish the foundational traits of a character type, creating a base which the poet may further embellish. But another issue is the fact that some generic epithets appear to be applied “inappropriately.”<sup>10</sup> The classic example for this argument is ἀμύμων Αἴγισθος (*Od.* 1.29), often translated “blameless Aegisthus.” If an epithet such as “blameless” is attributed to a character whose actions clearly cannot be evaluated as blameless, then the semantic precision of the epithet must not be as important as its metrical value.<sup>11</sup> The notion that an epithet may be inappropriately applied has been strongly argued against by Lowenstam, who points out that the poet attempts to “shun discordant allocations,” and by Clarke, who suggests that inappropriate epithets may signify a larger, implicit poetic tradition.<sup>12</sup> Anne Amory Parry takes on the famous example of “blameless Aegisthus,” and, in an exhaustive study, shows how a comparative approach to this generic epithet requires the translator to re-interpret the epithet’s meaning.<sup>13</sup> From a narratological

---

hexameter, and therefore the choice of epithet must carry poetic and traditional relevance, not simply metrical relevance (Nagy 2-3).

<sup>8</sup> See Brian Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 3: Books 9-12* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993). Hainsworth suggests that relevance and redundancy in the meaning of epithets are ends on a spectrum, and the epithet will move back and forth depending on the context in which it is applied (Hainsworth 21).

<sup>9</sup> Parry 118.

<sup>10</sup> Parry, drawing inspiration from Düntzer, argues that inappropriate application of epithets is proof of the ornamental status of generic epithets (Parry 124), and of the audience’s indifference to the meaning of the epithet (Parry 151).

<sup>11</sup> See Parry 22. Parry writes that the use of ornamental epithets is “entirely dependent upon its convenience in versification.”

<sup>12</sup> See Lowenstam 35; Matthew Clarke “Formulas, meter, and type scenes.” *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Ed. Robert Fowler (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004) 129. Lowenstam, pointing out the variety of metrically sound alternatives available to the poet for any given name, suggests that the poet attempted to “shun discordant collocations,” and that the poet used his traditional phrases with an ear toward “appropriateness” (Lowenstam 35). More recent scholarship has aimed to prove that epithets previously believed to be inappropriate simply need to be reinterpreted. Clarke, for example, notes that more recent trends in Homeric scholarship allow that an inappropriate epithet may signify a larger, implicit tradition (Clarke 129).

standpoint, both the repetition of generic epithets and the fact that meaning is context-based make epithets attractive analytical tools.<sup>14</sup> The basis of a narratological character study is the combination of repetition and comparison. Both repeated applications and one-time applications of a trait are important for defining a character. The wide application of a trait (in the form of a generic epithet) builds a pool of subjects which help to define the trait within the ethos of the narrative, and a pool which in turn offers models to better understand the trait in the studied character.

### *Block Characterization*

This review of the direct definition of Andromache will include several types of delivery methods, including the speech of another character, terms of address, and narrator-comment. One important method of defining the traits of a character, and one deployed in Andromache's case, is block characterization. This technique provides the most important information about a character when the character first appears in the narrative.<sup>15</sup> This often results in a short break in the narrative discourse, which draws even more attention to the character being introduced. In

---

<sup>13</sup> Anne Amory Parry, *Blameless Aigisthus: A Study of AMUMΩN and Other Homeric Epithets* (Leiden: Brill, 1973) 2.

<sup>14</sup> De Jong suggests that epithets at least invite the narratee to feel something for the individual, and believes that the repetition of epithets is "one of the most powerful rhetorical instruments of the NF<sub>1</sub> (primary narrator and focalizer)" (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 137). She suggests that an epithet should be considered descriptive or evaluative based on the type of text in which it is employed, that is, simple or complex narrator-text or character-text (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 140). Vivante sees the repetition of epithets as crucial to the building of character. Epithets are repeated because there is a recurrence of a certain kind of act or state of being (Vivante 46).

<sup>15</sup> De Jong notes that characterization is affected by presupposition: thus major characters are not properly "introduced" because it is assumed that the audience will already be familiar with their biographical details (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 95). See also S. Richardson 37. Vivante notes that the sudden appearance of a character on a scene or a sudden encounter with a character can contain "flagrant" instances of epithets (Vivante 34). In this block characterization much information about Andromache's genealogy is divulged which, at the time, seems extraneous to the moment and actually halts the flow of the plot. In fact, the story of Andromache's family does play an important part of her own speeches, which have been outlined in Chapter 1. See also Casey Dué *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002). Her work on Briseis has demonstrated how such clues about a character's genealogy or past may indicate a greater tradition of stories related to that character. See also John Zarker. "King Eëtion and Thebe as Symbols in the *Iliad*." *Classical Journal* 61 (1965): 110-14. See in addition Walter Leaf *The Iliad. Vols. I-II*. 2nd edition (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971). Leaf has suggested "The Great Foray" as a working title for the epic which told the tale of Achilles' devastation of the lands surrounding Troy, which would include the stories of Eëtion and his family, Chryses and Chryseis, and Briseis. See Geoffrey Kirk. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: Books 1-4* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985) 211 for a synopsis of information pertaining to Thebe and Lyrnessos. From a strictly narrative standpoint, S. Richardson also notes that such introductions are not really meant to develop the character but to aid in the evaluation of the scene at hand. That way the narrator can "take advantage" of the introduction to cast the character in a favorable or unfavorable light (S. Richardson 38-39).

Book 6, after Hector does not find Andromache at home, the narrator relates their meeting and gives a short breakdown of who Andromache is:

ἔνθ' ἄλοχος πολύδωρος ἐναντίη ἦλθε θέουσα  
 Ἀνδρομάχη θυγάτηρ μεγάλητορος Ἡετίωνος  
 Ἡετίων ὃς ἔναιεν ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑλήεσση  
 Θήβη Ὑποπλακίη Κιλίκεσσ' ἄνδρεςσιν ἀνάσσων·  
 τοῦ περ δὴ θυγάτηρ ἔχεθ' Ἐκτορι χαλκοκορυστῇ (6.394-398).

This brief introduction identifies her most important social roles (wife of Hector, daughter of Eëtion) and provides some qualitative information (πολύδωρος). By using block characterization to introduce an individual, despite the fact that it causes a short break in the course of the narrative, the narrator is able to condition the way the audience “reads” that character and her actions from the beginning.<sup>16</sup> In this instance, there are small touches of extraneous information which encourage the audience to consider Andromache in a positive light: the qualitative adjective πολύδωρος, the use of the patronymic and the short identification of Eëtion and his connection to Hector. Even though the circumstances of the meeting are unusual, the narrator has already predisposed the audience to think well of the character. As the narrative continues, the initial impression of the character is compared against the other information presented along the way.

### *Catalogue of Traits*

The name “Andromache” is used seven times in the *Iliad* (6.371, 6.377, 6.395, 6.405, 8.187, 17.208, 24.723). The only epithet used to describe Andromache directly in an epithet + proper name formula is λευκώλενος, “white-armed” (6.371, 6.377, 24.723). At 6.395 and 8.187, her name is accompanied by θυγάτηρ, for “daughter.” The significance of λευκώλενος and θυγάτηρ will be discussed below. Her name stands without added epithet at 6.404 and 17.208. There are six words used to describe Andromache’s social/familial roles: ἄκοιτις, “wife” (6.374), ἄλοχος, “wife” (6.366, 6.394, 6.482, 6.495, 22.437, 24.36, 24.710), γυνή, “wife” (6.432, 6.441, 6.460, 6.515), θυγάτηρ, “daughter” (6.395, 6.398, 8.187), μήτηρ, “mother” (6.471, 6.481, 22.499), and χήρη, “widow” (6.432, 22.483, 22.499, 24.275). “Widow,” χήρη, will not be discussed here since it is Andromache who describes herself as a widow, and the term therefore belongs to the

<sup>16</sup> S. Richardson also notes that such introductions are not really meant to develop the character but to aid in the evaluation of the scene at hand. In this manner the narrator can “take advantage” of the introduction to cast the character in a favorable or unfavorable light (S. Richardson 38-39).

discussion of her speeches.<sup>17</sup> Though these terms do not name traits, they build intra- and intertextual networks of individuals who share the same gender and social identities.<sup>18</sup> In reviewing the epithets and qualitative traits applied to individuals within the same network, the exact meaning of the trait may be crystallized, or may be proven to be typical of the social role, or unique to that social role. Such networks also become the basis of comparisons. If one individual is not assigned a trait typical of the social role, that is considered significant; likewise, if one character is assigned a trait no other individual has, that is also significant.

Most epithets are qualitative traits, and they signify various qualities: physical features, mental capability, moral uprightness, emotional state, possession of material goods, and so on. If the exact meaning of a descriptor is unclear, especially in the case of generic epithets, it can be helpful to analyze the use of the epithet in comparison to instances when it is applied to a similar character. For the epithets describing Andromache, such an approach is paramount, as some of the epithets ascribed to her are both unclear in definition and widely applied (*φίλος, πότνια, ἀμύμων*), while others are unclear in definition and narrowly applied (*πολύδωρος*). Adding to the challenge of fully understanding what traits Andromache possesses is the fact that most of the epithets are not attached to her name, but rather to a word indicating social role. Thus, instead of *ἀμύμων Ἀνδρομάχη*, we have *ἀμύμονα τέτμεν ἄκοιτιν*, raising the question of what the difference is between ascribing a trait directly to an individual and ascribing the trait to the individual's social role.

Like most characters in Homeric epic, Andromache is identified with a signature epithet and a patronymic. Andromache's signature epithet, or the one applied directly to her name, is "white-armed" *λευκώλενος* (6.371, 6.377, 24.723). It is not a particularized epithet: Helen, for one, is also called *λευκώλενος* (3.121). Hera is called "white-armed" the most often in the *Iliad* (24 times), and, though she has epithets describing other physical features (such as *βοῶπις*), this is the one applied most often to her. This is the only information the audience receives about Andromache's physical appearance, and the only epithet applied directly to her name.<sup>19</sup> Epithets

---

<sup>17</sup> In fact, the word is not used for any other woman in the *Iliad*, and is not used at all in the *Odyssey*. See the discussion in the previous chapter.

<sup>18</sup> See Lowenstam 44.

<sup>19</sup> Most epithets refer to only one physical feature. Portraiture seems to be rare in Homeric epics with a few notable exceptions: the description of Thersites at 2.212-220; the description of Agamemnon at 3.166-170; Odysseus at

referring to physical features are common, but it does not follow that they are devoid of thematic function. The narrator draws attention to Andromache's arms when they hold precious cargo. At 6.482-484, Andromache takes her child from Hector after he prays for a successful future for the boy, and the family shares a moment of joy in the midst of sadness. The epithet does not appear again until 24.723-24, when Andromache cradles Hector's head in her arms during her lament for him. The epithet has already been used twice, but its application at that point in the narrative is especially apt. This is an excellent example of how the semantic power of the generic epithet is determined by the context in which it is used.

Andromache's patronymic is not an adjectival form of her father's name (like *Πηληϊάδης*, or *Κρονίδης*), but is a combination of the noun *Συγάτηρ* and her father's epithet + name formula *μεγαλήτωρ Ἡετίων*.<sup>20</sup> What is notable in this formula is that Eëtion is the individual who is described by an epithet, not Andromache. Metrical contingencies notwithstanding, it emphasizes the greatness of her father and her connection to so admirable a man. In the *Iliad*, the patronymic is applied to Andromache's name at her introduction in 6.395, providing genealogical information and seeding the "loss of family" theme Andromache will elaborate on in her first lament. The patronymic is again applied at 8.187, when Hector urges his horses to repay him for the kindness Andromache has shown. By referencing Andromache's father at this moment, Hector hints at the worthiness of Andromache, who was born to so great a father. The previous chapter revealed how Eëtion plays an important role in Andromache's laments, and the use of the patronymic in direct definition indicates that she, like most Homeric characters, is closely associated with her father.

So far, the narrator has described Andromache via her white arms and her renowned father. All other descriptors applied to Andromache are not part of a formula with her name, but rather with her social identity. In fact, it appears to be more important to the narrator and other characters to describe the *kind* of wife, daughter or mother Andromache is, rather than Andromache herself independently of those roles. This use of elliptic definition helps to characterize Andromache as a type, not as an individual. Two epithets, *φίλη* and *πότνια*,

---

3.192-198; Ajax at 3.226-27 during the *Teichoskopia*. For each man, the physical description is linked to their respective qualities. See also S. Richardson 40-41.

<sup>20</sup> Carolyn Higbie, *Heroic Names, Homeric Identities* (New York: Garland, 1995) has pointed out that patronymics have a variety of functions within the Homeric epic: providing information, identifying a new figure, adding an emotional element to moments of high drama, and, of course, providing metrical flexibility.

demonstrate this quite well. The term *φίλη*, often translated as “dear” or “beloved,” is applied widely to men and women in Homeric epic,<sup>21</sup> and Andromache is called the “dear wife” (*ἄλοχος φίλη*) of Hector five times (6.366, 6.394, 6.482, 6.495, 24.710). Cunliffe defines *φίλη*, when it modifies persons, first as “Held in affection or regard, dear, beloved, loved”; and second, as “loving, friendly, kindly.”<sup>22</sup> Chantraine suggests that the affective meaning of the epithet is secondary, and that the term originally pertained to people who live in the home. He further suggests that in Homer, the epithet acts as a possessive adjective, denoting “inalienable possessions.”<sup>23</sup> Lowenstam suggests that at some point, *φίλη* referred to an individual who fulfilled the duties of her social position.<sup>24</sup> But in Andromache’s case, the contexts of use do not suggest that there is an emphasis on social propriety. Instead, the uses occur at moments of high emotion, signifying the affection of Hector for his wife. The uses in Book 6 occur during the *homilia* scene, notable for its dramatic speeches and overt emotional tone. Here the epithet emphasizes two things: first of all, the concern the warrior has for his family at home, and secondly the affection Hector feels for Andromache. His affection is emphasized in the order in which he visits the women in Book 6. Hector refuses Helen’s offer of hospitality in order to go home to see his “beloved wife and little child” (6.366), using a common formula to refer to them. By saving that visit for the end, he marks them as foremost among his concerns. The final use, in Book 24.710, reminds the audience that Andromache (and Hecuba) are just like the countless other wives and mothers who must greet the corpse of their loved one when it returns from war. When they meet the wagon at the gates, the focus of Book 24 shifts from the father of the dead warrior to his women, those who are charged with the care and mourning of the corpse.

Andromache is clearly not the only “beloved wife” in the epic, and the various contexts in which the formula is used belie the complex emotions warriors feel for their women in times of war. For instance, in Book 5 Sarpedon tells Hector (in the same formulaic language Hector uses in Book 6) that he left behind his own wife and child as a reminder that Hector should be a

<sup>21</sup> 14 times + *μήτηρ*; 37 times + *πατήρ*; 10 times + *πόσις*; 11 times + *ἄλοχος*; 14 times + *παίς*; 72 times + *υἱός*. See Lowenstam 20.

<sup>22</sup> See Richard Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of Homeric Dialect* (Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1977) s.v. *φίλος*, 408-409.

<sup>23</sup> See Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots*. 4 vols. (Paris: Klincksieck, 1968) 1204-1206.

<sup>24</sup> Lowenstam 20.



more attentive leader, effectively reminding him that the stakes are high for all the warriors: ἔνθ' ἄλοχόν τε φίλῃν ἔλιπον καὶ νήπιον υἱόν (5.475); in Book 4, Agamemnon, encouraging his men, evokes the capturing of the Trojan wives and children, illustrating the threat to women and children in addition to other warriors: ἡμεῖς αὖτ' ἄλόχους τε φίλας καὶ νήπια τέκνα/ἄξομεν ἐν νήεσσιν (4.238-9); on Achilles shield in Book 18 the wives and children of the warriors of one of the warring cities hold the ramparts, demonstrating their involvement in martial matters: τεῖχος μὲν ῥ' ἄλοχοί τε φίλαι καὶ νήπια τέκνα/ῥύατ' ἐφ' ἑσταότες (18.514-15). Since no other single woman is distinguished with the formula φίλη + ἄλοχος, Andromache is presented as the denominated representative of these anonymous women.

The qualitative epithet πότνια, often translated as “honored” or “queenly,” is joined with μήτηρ at 6.471 to describe Andromache. Andromache is called μήτηρ only three times in the *Iliad*. The first is at 6.471, which is also the instance of the combination πότνια + μήτηρ. The second is at 6.481, spoken by Hector during his prayer for Astyanax, and the third is at 22.499, which Andromache herself uses during her lament. Even though Astyanax is highlighted in the *homilia* scene of Book 6 and his future is meditated upon at length in Andromache’s lament of Book 22, Andromache’s motherhood is not explored with much depth in the *Iliad*. The women who are most associated with motherhood in the *Iliad* are the mothers of warriors on the battlefield, particularly Hecuba and Thetis, who combined make up 13 of the 20 references to a πότνια μήτηρ in the *Iliad*.<sup>25</sup> Just as Hecuba is highlighted as a mother and downplayed as a wife because of her relationship to the preeminent Trojan warrior Hector, so Andromache’s role as wife of the warrior is privileged over her role as mother of his son. Like φίλη, the epithet πότνια is applied widely, and overwhelmingly to mortal women.<sup>26</sup> The exact meaning of πότνια is difficult to define. Chantraine proposes the translation “mistress of the house,” based on an etymological connection to δέσποινα.<sup>27</sup> Cunliffe defines it as either “mistress, queen” or as a title of honor given to goddesses or joined with μήτηρ to mean “lady mother.”<sup>28</sup> Lowenstam explains

<sup>25</sup> It is worth noting that the formula πότνια μήτηρ does not apply to all mothers. Hera is quite often called πότνια, but never a πότνια μήτηρ, despite the fact that her son Hephaestus has a prominent role in at least three Iliadic scenes (as the comic relief at the end of the banquet in Book 1, as the craftsman of the shield in Book 18, as the fire which battles Scamander in Book 21).

<sup>26</sup> This epithet is used 49 times in the *Iliad*, with 20 of those instances used in the formula πότνια μήτηρ.

<sup>27</sup> Chantraine 932.

that the term has its etymological roots in terms which relate to legitimacy and power – so a *πότνια μήτηρ* is a “wedded” mother, who gives birth to legitimate offspring.<sup>29</sup> The application of the epithet *πότνια* to *μήτηρ* at 6.471 is explained by the context of the scene. Hector and Andromache are laughing at their son, who is scared of his father’s helmet. Here Hector is described as *πατήρ τε φίλος*, emphasizing his role as father. Applying Lowenstam’s definition of “wedded,” Andromache is described as the “wedded mother,” who, together with the “dear father” is gazing at her child. The emphasis on their roles as parents unite Hector and Andromache with Astyanax as a family for just one moment, since they will never again meet after this scene.

The meanings of the last two qualitative epithets *ἀμύμων* and *πολύδωρος* are difficult to interpret, though for different reasons. First of all, *ἀμύμων*, usually translated as “blameless” because of its etymological relationship to *μῶμος*,<sup>30</sup> is actually quite widely applied in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*,<sup>31</sup> but in Andromache’s case, difficulty in interpretation stems from both an issue of gender and an issue in definition. The epithet is applied overwhelmingly to men in Homeric epic. In the *Iliad*, the epithet *ἀμύμων* is applied to only two women: Andromache at 6.374, when the narrator defines Andromache as a *ἀμύμονα ἄκοιτιν*, and an anonymous nymph at 14.444 when the narrator describes the woman who gave birth to Satnios, a victim of Oilean Ajax (*νύμφη τέκε νηῖς ἀμύμων*).<sup>32</sup> Three mortal women are called *ἀμύμων* in the *Odyssey*: Hermione, Nausikaä, and Penelope. The problem of definition stems from the combination of epithet + social role instead of epithet + name. First of all, Andromache herself is not called *ἀμύμων* – she is called an *ἀμύμων wife*. In a similar vein, Hermione is called an *ἀμύμων θυγάτηρ* (*Od.* 4.4), Nausikaa an *ἀμύμων κόρη* (*Od.* 7.303), and Penelope an *ἀμύμων μήτηρ* (*Od.* 15.15).

---

<sup>28</sup> Cunliffe derives the translations from the base *pot-*, as in *δεσπότης*, master. s.v. *πότνια*, 341. Chantraine also compares *δέσποινα* (932), supporting the translation as “mistress of the house” (Chantraine 932).

<sup>29</sup> Uses of *πότνια* which are not applied to *μήτηρ* derive their meaning from the etymological root meaning “power” – and thus goddesses like Athena and Artemis, who are not mothers, may also be described by the epithet (Lowenstam 25-26).

<sup>30</sup> Cunliffe s.v. *ἀμύμων*, defines it as “An epithet of persons of general commendation, noble, illustrious, goodly, or the like” (Cunliffe 26). Chantraine defines it as an honorific title concerning the social power of heroes, but maintains that it has no moral signification (Chantraine 79).

<sup>31</sup> 65 times in the *Iliad*. For a discussion of the etymology of the word, see Amory Parry 9-10.

<sup>32</sup> See Amory Parry footnote on pg. 12 for this extraordinary occurrence.

This indicates that the epithet should be translated with the social role taken into account.<sup>33</sup> But the epithet is directly applied to the nymph in the *Iliad* and to Penelope in another occurrence in the *Odyssey* (24.194), creating a familiar epithet + proper name formula, indicating that whatever trait ἀμύμων signifies, it can be applied to people as well as their performance in a particular social role. In fact, the epithet can be applied directly to an individual; or to some kind of occupation, like priest or seer; or to social role, like child, father, or son; or to inanimate objects, like woven fabrics, walls, a bow, or a plan or story.<sup>34</sup> Such a wide application makes it difficult to propose one simple translation, but it is possible to at least suggest an idea behind the word. Amory Parry concludes that in most cases, ἀμύμων should be interpreted as relating to physicality, while Lowenstam concludes that in most cases ἀμύμων should be interpreted as relating to skill or cunning.<sup>35</sup> Vivante proposes that the meaning should be “conveying a native perfection in people or things.”<sup>36</sup>

With regard to Andromache in particular, Amory Parry notes that Andromache may perhaps be “blameless” in some way, however her moral virtue does not come under question in the *Iliad* except in an implicit contrast with Helen, who is not present in the context of use. Therefore, she suggests that the meaning should refer to her beauty.<sup>37</sup> After a discussion of the epithet as applied to Penelope, Amory Parry does admit that the epithet can indicate “good,” but sees no reason why beauty cannot be maintained as one of a wife’s virtues.<sup>38</sup> Lowenstam also

---

<sup>33</sup> Lowenstam’s system of analyzing an epithet begins with listing all epithets (including the one examined) which modify the person or social role and then categorizing them according to quality defined. He then re-evaluates the meaning of the epithet based on its category with respect to the noun in question, not with respect to a fixed definition (see Lowenstam 19-20). Lowenstam notes that for the nouns meaning “wife” (παράκοιτις, ἄκοιτις, and ἄλοχος) in both Homeric epics, all epithets applied to those nouns may be placed in the following categories: mortality, marital state, physical qualities, moral attributes (including ἀμύμων), social relations, and miscellaneous (there are only two miscellaneous epithets, and they both describe Penelope) (Lowenstam 23).

<sup>34</sup> See Amory Parry for a full outline and see Lowenstam 49.

<sup>35</sup> Amory Parry 15; Lowenstam argues that, based on what we know about Homeric ethics and values, a “blameless” individual is one who possesses a prize virtue, be it bravery, cunning, or beauty (Lowenstam 47). If one applies the meaning of “blameless” or “superior” to each of the semantic spheres outlined above, the common denominator is “skillful” or “cunning.” “The practices are skillfully performed, the practitioners are cunning in their skill, and the objects are skillfully contrived” (Lowenstam 50).

<sup>36</sup> Vivante 107. According to him, “perfection” expresses something naturally present. It has no moral meaning, but lends itself to more implications, which is more notable when used predicatively (Vivante 107).

<sup>37</sup> Amory Parry 14; 17-18.

discusses the epithet as applied to Penelope, and concludes that it must strengthen one of the other epithets used to describe her.<sup>39</sup> However, he does not address Andromache, and the same method would not prove fruitful in her case since no epithets are ascribed directly to Andromache except *λευκώλενος*.<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, whether one adopts one interpretation over the other, the result is the same in Andromache's case. The epithet *ἀμύμων* does not serve to individuate her any more than *φίλη* or *πότνια* do. Ultimately, it is a typifying epithet, indicating, depending on the interpretation, that she is a beautiful wife, a skillful wife, or a blameless wife. Because there is no textual exegesis of what qualities make a wife skillful or blameless, except by virtue of implicit or explicit comparison to wives who have clearly transgressed the bounds of normative behavior, the audience is left to understand that she is simply exemplary.<sup>41</sup> The interpretation of its use for Andromache depends on its placement in the context of use. The use of the epithet in the *Iliad* occurs during the *homilia* scene, when Andromache rushes out of her home to meet Hector on the walls, and then gives him tactical advice while attempting to persuade him to hang back from the fiercest fighting. The discussion in the previous chapter argued that, even though these actions and words test the boundaries of correct behavior for women, they do not characterize Andromache as transgressive, but rather anxious. The epithet *ἀμύμων* is integral in establishing that point. Whatever nuance of meaning is meant to be conveyed by the epithet, because the narrator uses the epithet before the description of these

---

<sup>38</sup> Amory Parry argues, "since beauty is included as one of Penelope's qualities as a wife, it remains a matter of individual judgment whether we choose 'beautiful' or 'good' for *ἀμύμων* in this passage" (Amory Parry 137). She goes on to observe that Penelope's goodness is compared explicitly with Klytemnestra's badness, but Andromache's "domestic virtue" is compared implicitly to Helen's reliance on "sexual appeal." "At any rate, Andromache, especially in the famous scene with her husband and infant son, has a domestic charm that few readers have been able to resist." She maintains that the epithet refers to beauty first, but there can be overtones of "good" (Amory Parry 138).

<sup>39</sup> Lowenstam 50 note 98.

<sup>40</sup> In comparison, in the course of the *Iliad* the narrator or another character calls Helen *ῥιγεδανή* (19.325), *Ἀργεΐη* (4.19, etc.), *εὐπατέρεια* (6.292), *ἡύκομος* (7 times, 9.339, etc.), *λευκώλενος* (3.121), and *τανύπεπλος* (3.228). In the course of the *Odyssey* the narrator or another character calls Penelope *ἀμύμων* (24.194), *ἀναΐτιος* (20.135), *βρότος* (5.218), *δῖα γυναικῶν* (9 times, 16.458, 21.42, 20.147, etc.), *ἐχέφρων* (7 times, 17.390, 4.111, etc.), *περίφρων* (47 times, 1.329, 4.787, etc.), *πινυτή* (4 times, 23.361, 20.131, etc.), *σχετλίη* (23.150).

<sup>41</sup> See Arthur Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility: A Study of Greek Values* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960). In his famous study of Homeric values, Adkins considers women's *arete* in the Homeric poems, and comes to the following conclusions: the Homeric poems commend "quiet virtues": beauty, skill in weaving and housekeeping, chastity, faithfulness. He notes that men determine the nature of *arete* for both women and men. Since women do not need to physically defend themselves, the nature of their *arete* promotes co-operative rather than competitive virtues (Adkins 36-37).

actions and words, in context it serves as a means of confirming Andromache's typical goodness despite the fact that she behaves in a fashion her husband and household servant consider brash.

The epithet *πολύδωρος*, used at 6.394 and 22.88, is the most difficult to interpret of all the epithets applied to Andromache. In contrast to the situation with *ἀμύμων*, the epithet *πολύδωρος* is applied to only two characters in the Homeric corpus: Andromache and Penelope (*Od.* 24.294). The word is also difficult to translate. Though the translation "many-gifted" seems obvious, there has been much debate about the nature of the implied gifts. Some scholars are quick to associate them with wedding gifts,<sup>42</sup> while others prefer to think of the gifts as metaphorical.<sup>43</sup> In all three Homeric uses, the epithet is applied to the word *ἄλοχος*, indicating that the trait must relate to the woman's identity or behavior as wife. In the first use in the *Iliad*, the narrator calls Andromache *ἄλοχος πολύδωρος* as she comes rushing up to Hector in Book 6 to begin the *homilia* scene. This is part of the block characterization which introduces Andromache to the audience and includes information about her father. In the second use in the *Iliad*, Hecuba begs Hector to remain within the walls of Troy and not to fight Achilles in the open, reminding him that if he dies outside the walls, she, and his wife, will not be able to mourn him:

εἴ περ γὰρ σε κατακτάνη, οὗ δ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε  
κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι φίλον θάλος, ὃν τέκον αὐτή,

<sup>42</sup> Anthropologists and archaeologists are concerned with the difference between *ἔδνα* and *δῶρα*, who gives them, and at what point during the wedding ceremony. They all view the epithet *πολύδωρος* as evidence of gifts presented to the groom from the father of the bride. They all offer "richly-dowered" or "bearing many gifts" as translations. See Moses Finley, "Marriage, Sale, and Gift in the Homeric World." *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*. Ed. Brent Shaw and Richard Saller (New York: Viking, 1982) 234-241; Walter Lacey, "Homeric EΔNA and Penelope's KYPIOΣ." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 86 (1966): 55-8; Ian Morris, "The Use and Abuse of Homer." *Classical Antiquity* 5 (1986): 105-110; Ioannis Perysinakis, "Penelope's EΔNA Again." *Classical Quarterly* (1991): 297-302; Claudine Leduc, "Marriage in Ancient Greece." *A History of Women in the West I*. Ed. Pauline Pantel (Cambridge: Belknap-Harvard UP, 1992) 235-244. Literary critics seem to follow the same lines of argument: Cunliffe describes it as "bringing (her parents) a great bride-price" (Cunliffe 337). Leaf outlines two possibilities related to marriage: that the "gifts" refer to the *ἔδνα* which were given by the groom to the bride's father; that the gifts were given by the suitor, prompted by "human nature" to bestow even though the custom of handing over *ἔδνα* was extinct (Leaf 286). Kirk *ad loc.*, interprets it as a "wife who brought many gifts in the form of a dowry...rather than merely a generous one" (Kirk 210-211); see also Nicholas Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume VI: Books 21-24* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993). N. Richardson suggests that the gifts are the gifts she received from her parents (115).

<sup>43</sup> Cunliffe also allows the metaphorical meaning: "or perhaps, bountiful (cf. *ἡπιόδωρος*)" (Cunliffe 337). See also Karl Ameis and Karl Hentze. *Homers Ilias*. 4th edition (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1905) Book 6, 128. Ameis-Heinze offer "die gabenreiche, vielspendende," comparing *ἡπιόδωρος* at 6.251. Leaf's third possibility is metaphorical: that it is similar to *ἡπιόδωρος* and simply means "generous" or "open-handed" (Leaf 286). For an in-depth study of the meaning of *ἡπιόδωρος*, see Susan Edmunds, *Homeric Nepios* (New York: Garland, 1990) 24, and Jasper Griffin, "Homeric Words and Speakers." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986): 38. Morris and Perysinakis suggest that the gifts could be metaphorical and that the name of Priam's son Polydorus would be inappropriately attributed if the word related only to the wedding ceremony (Morris 110; Perysinakis 302 note 19).

οὐδ' ἄλοχος πολύδωρος· ἄνευθε δέ σε μέγα νῶϊν  
Ἀργείων παρὰ νηυσὶ κύνες ταχέες κατέδονται (22.86-89).

It is clear that Hecuba is using Andromache as a means of persuasion, and adding the epithet *πολύδωρος* for emotional impact. This use is closely mirrored by its use in the *Odyssey*. In Book 24, Laertes, unknowingly addressing his son, tells him that Odysseus must have died long ago, even though Laertes and his wife never mourned him, nor did Penelope: οὐδ' ἄλοχος πολύδωρος, ἐχέφρων Πηνελόπεια/κῶκυς' ἐν λεχέεσσιν ἐὼν πόσιν, ὡς ἐπέώκει/ὀφθαλμούς καθελοῦσα: (*Od.* 24.294-96). In this case, the addition of Penelope and the attendant epithets is pathetic, drawing attention to the sadness caused by Odysseus' absence. The similarities between Hecuba's and Laertes' speeches are strong: first of all, both speeches address the "dead" man, the one who may be mourned; secondly, both address the anxiety of death away from loved ones and the deprivation of ritualized mourning; third, both are spoken by a parent of the husband in question; and fourth, neither scene has anything to do with gifts exchanged as part of the wedding ceremony.

The explication of the term in Andromache's case suffers from the same difficulties as the explication of *ἀμύμων*. In the *Odyssey*, *πολύδωρος* is coupled with *ἐχέφρων* as epithets describing Odysseus' wife. This could suggest that one of Penelope's "gifts" is her intelligence, a conjecture supported by the frequent application of intelligence-related epithets to Penelope throughout the *Odyssey*. But, as previously mentioned, there are no such specific epithets for Andromache, with the exception of *λευκώλενος*. Thus the only "gift" which may be securely proposed in Andromache's case is her beauty.<sup>44</sup>

Based on the contexts of use described above, a translation denoting the gifts as metaphorical would suffice in each case. The translation could easily be "many-gifted" or "generous" or even "talented," if taking Penelope's second epithet into consideration. But why discount the allusion to the wedding ceremony? After all, the epithet is only applied to *ἄλοχος*. Even if it is unclear, in anthropological terms, at least, whether *πολύδωρος* refers to the gifts the bride inspires the groom to give, or the gifts the bride brings along to her new home as part of her dowry, certainly the implication is that the individual is being evaluated on an economic

<sup>44</sup> A review of note 40 above shows that three of the epithet + name formulas for Helen relate to physical features, while three of the formulas for Penelope relate to her mind. These groupings clearly present the feature highlighted for each character, and indeed the one which defines her characterization. But for Andromache, there is only one epithet + name formula, which means that her character lacks the forceful characterization created by direct definition which the poet uses for Helen and Penelope.

level. A wife's worth is partially determined by her wealth. Hector gave *μυρία ἔδνα* (22.472) to win Andromache as his wife, and treasures from Eëtion's hoard are scattered throughout the *Iliad*. The epithet could just as easily mean "valuable" as "many-gifted," and not change the characterization of Andromache or Penelope at all. Material wealth is only one facet of excellence, and so the wife who is "valuable" in the economic sense is intangibly valuable as well. The money or goods Hector lays out for Andromache "buys" him something of value, be it the alliance of Eëtion, a piece of his wealth, the generic "goodness" of his daughter, or simply a well-connected mother for Hector's child. Whatever the "value" is that the epithet suggests, the use of the epithet is meant to evoke that value in a pathetic context. Hector and Odysseus are causing pain to their valuable wives, and that is the material point. Even if this is not what the exact interpretation of the term should be, it is clear that the trait ascribed is positive.<sup>45</sup> Since it is affixed to the noun *ἄλοχος, πολύδωρος*, like *ἀμύμων*, should be counted as one of the epithets which defines Andromache as a type. Andromache is a "generous wife" or "bountiful wife" or "valuable wife," but there is little information in the *Iliad* to explain what individual qualities add up to that trait.

### *Terms of Address*

Terms of address are counted as direct definition because they reveal the emotions of the speaking character toward the signified character. In the *Iliad*, Andromache is addressed twice, both times by Hector in Book 6. Hector never addresses her by her name, and so the terms he uses act as a barometer of sorts for his fluctuating emotions throughout the *homilia* scene. The first use occurs after Andromache has finished her lament. Whereas Andromache addressed Hector as *δαίμονιε*, Hector addresses Andromache as *γύναι* (6.441), a term which is generally positive in tone.<sup>46</sup> His initial remarks reveal that his mind is at odds with hers, for while she is

<sup>45</sup> Lowenstam groups this epithet, along with *ἡπιόδωρος*, an epithet for Hecuba, in a category headed "social reciprocity." He suggests that the epithet *πολύδωρος* means that Andromache meets the requirements of reciprocity dictated by her social relationships (Lowenstam 23).

<sup>46</sup> See Eleanor Dickey *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996). Dickey classifies it as a "neutral" term in poetry (Dickey 87). There are only 4 instances of the address *γύναι* in the *Iliad*. Antenor calls Helen *γύναι* at 3.204 when he agrees with her on her description of Odysseus; Paris calls Helen *γύναι* at 3.438 when he asks her not to reproach him for leaving the battle with Menelaus; Hector calls Andromache *γύναι* at 6.441, and Priam calls Hecuba *γύναι* at 24.300 when she brings him wine for a libation before he sets off to recover Hector's body. In the *Odyssey*, the form of address occurs more frequently, but the distribution is about equal in width: Alkinoös thus addresses Arete at 8.424, Menelaus addresses Helen at 4.266, Odysseus addresses Nausikaä at 6.168, and Enipeus addresses Tyro at 11.248. Odysseus addresses Penelope as *γύναι* 15 times in the *Odyssey*, with 8 addresses occurring while he is disguised. The only ambiguous use of the term comes in *Od.* 19.81,

thinking of her own safety, he is thinking of his *kleos*. He says that his mind is on the matters which she brings up, but follows this initial acknowledgment with the adversative “but,” (ἀλλὰ 6.441) indicating that her feminine concerns are subordinate to his own masculine concerns and distancing himself from her (6.440-446).<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, he does reveal that her suffering weighs heaviest on his mind, and the term here seems to carry a tone of intimacy.

Hector employs the second term of address, *δαιμονίη*, when he notices that she is truly distraught over his decision to return to the front. Once again he uses the same term she used to address him, and urges her not to grieve too much in her heart for him (μή μοί τι λίαν ἀκαχίζεο θυμῷ 6.486). The exact meaning of the adjective has been debated, though it is clear that the term is related to *δαίμων*.<sup>48</sup> What has been overlooked is that the meaning of the term seems to change with the gender of addresser and addressee. When a man addresses a man, the term almost always expresses surprise (negative in tone) or criticism, emphasizing the divergence in

---

when the disguised Odysseus addresses Melantho. Though it is clear he does not like her, while in disguise he addresses her politely.

<sup>47</sup> This exposition of societal norms is timely within the structure of the book. As mentioned above, Andromache’s goodness or blamelessness is implicitly compared with Helen’s transgressive behavior. In Book 6 the marriage of Andromache and Hector is explicitly compared with the marriage of Paris and Helen. Earlier in the book, when Hector visits their home to check on his brother, he discovers that Helen had to convince her husband with sweet words to return to battle (μαλακοῖς ἐπέεσιν 6.337), which was a change in tactic for her from Book 3, when she vehemently reproached Paris for his cowardice (3.428-436). The roles they play in the marriage are the inversion of the norm. Based on the circumstances surrounding their union and the consistent description of each as less-than-good, there seems to be little effort on the part of the narrator to garner sympathy for the couple. See Loudon, pg. 55ff for an elaboration on the theme of the doublet marriage.

<sup>48</sup> Cunliffe s.v. *δαιμόνιος*, derives the adjective from *δαίμων*. He provides this definition: “Under superhuman influence, ‘possessed,’ whose actions are unaccountable or ill-omened.” In the vocative, he outlines five meanings: 1) “in stern reproof,” 2) “In more or less stern remonstrance,” 3) “conveying an implication of folly or senselessness,” 4) “indicating a degree of wonder, the person addressed showing himself superior to what his outward man would indicate,” and 5) “with original sense lost sight of, merely in affectionate address” (Cunliffe 82). Chantraine says that the adjective has some relation to *δαίμων*, and translates it as “admirable, surprising, possessed by a god.” He notes that it is employed with different tones in different passages (Chantraine 247). Kirk *ad loc.* 1.561 writes “*δαιμονίη* expresses affectionate remonstrance here, as it does when Andromache and Hektor use the term to address each other at 6.407 and 486; often it implies a stronger rebuke, as at 4.31. Derivation from *δαίμων* is obvious, but the precise development of different nuances of meaning, as with many colloquialisms, is not” (Kirk 111). One example of a colloquial use comes at 2.200, when Odysseus tries to halt distressed captains. Here Kirk writes, “it is a traditional and formal mode of address, purporting to assume that the person addressed has some relic of heroic connexion with the gods, usually as a form of exaggerated (and here definitely ironical) politeness” (Kirk 136). Helen famously addresses Aphrodite as *δαιμονίη* at 3.399. Kirk *ad loc.* suggests “here the term is directed to a goddess, and its implications are a little different – or rather they are made even more familiar and ironical, because the proper application is to a mortal” (Kirk 323-4). Griffin suggests that the term “conveys an attitude of shock or rebuke on the part of the speaker toward the person addressed” (Griffin 40). Dickey notes that Homer uses the term only in the vocative. She believes it expresses astonishment and criticism of the addressee, or creates intimacy between speaker and addressees and “urges compliance with the speaker’s requests” (Dickey 141). She argues that ultimately, it is wrong to seek one blanket translation for each use (Dickey 142).



viewpoints between interlocutors (Hector to Paris at 6.521) or outright disbelief (Ajax to Hector at 13.810). When a man addresses a woman, the tone is never negative. When men address women in the *Iliad*, the term is used to begin an exchange as a term of endearment, not to respond to a speech with surprise or criticism (Hector to Andromache at 6.486, Priam to Hecuba at 24.194). In the *Odyssey*, the term is only used by Odysseus himself, twice for Penelope (23.166, 23.264), and once for Melanthe (19.71). Odysseus refers to Penelope as *δαιμονίη* in Book 23, after he has revealed himself to her. The use expresses the questioning surprise (but not criticism) which defines the exchanges between husband and wife once Odysseus discloses his true identity. When Odysseus addresses Melanthe, he is still disguised as a beggar and asks her politely (though he is described as *ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν* at 19.70) why she dislikes him so. The courteous use of the term maintains the distinction between beggar and servant. Therefore, when Hector calls Andromache *δαιμονίη*, the term is not one of rebuke or even surprise. It may best be understood as a simple term of endearment.

The use of *γύναι* and *δαιμονίη* emphasize Andromache's thematic function. In both instances, Hector honors his wife by acknowledging her importance to him, even though he does not take her advice. It must be noted that he does not criticize or invalidate her concerns, but simply explains that his own are, by nature, incompatible.

#### *Narrator Comment*

Just as forms of address are direct definition mediated by the emotions of the speaking character, so narrator-comments are direct definition mediated by the emotions of the narrator.<sup>49</sup> The narrator breaks the stream of the narrative discourse to comment on the situation the character is in. In direct address made by another character, the speaking character is likewise characterized, as Hector demonstrates in the examples above. But in narrator-comment, the narrator is not characterized, for he does not exist as a character on the text level. Instead, the result is something akin to "audience conditioning." The narrator uses this rhetorical device and his authoritative position to reveal his own emotions about the situation and to evoke the same emotions in the audience. The narrator-comment occurs in Book 22 when the narrator describes Andromache weaving and preparing a bath for Hector. He calls Andromache *νηπίη* (22.445) because no messenger has come to tell her that Athena had killed Hector by Achilles' hands:

---

<sup>49</sup> A true apostrophe uses an address in the vocative and a verb in the second person, while a narrator-comment uses an appositional address and a verb in the third person.

κέκλετο δ' ἀμφιπόλοισιν εὐπλοκάμοις κατὰ δῶμα  
 ἀμφὶ πυρὶ στήσαι τρίποδα μέγαν, ὄφρα πέλοιτο  
 Ἑκτορι θερμὰ λοετρὰ μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι  
 νηπίη, οὐδ' ἐνόησεν ὅ μιν μάλα τῆλε λοετρῶν  
 χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος δάμασε γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (22.442-446).

The adjective, in enjambed position, clearly emphasizes Andromache's ignorance as worthy of pity. The meaning of the adjective depends entirely on context.<sup>50</sup> The adjective *νήπιος* is part of a common formula for young children, indicating their innocence and lack of knowledge of the world.<sup>51</sup> Warriors often call each other *νήπιος* with the sense of "lacking sense",<sup>52</sup> and use the phrases "even a fool could see" or "a fool sees once a thing is done" when discussing tactics.<sup>53</sup> But in an evaluative commentary, the narrator only calls a limited group of people *νήπιος*,

<sup>50</sup> Cunliffe s.v. *νήπιος*, gives "young, of tender years" and "such as a child's is, feeble" and "childish, foolish, thoughtless, senseless, credulous" for uses applied to individuals (Cunliffe 279). The subtleties in meaning are easily understood in the distribution of applications in Homeric epic. In the *Iliad*, the adjective is used in the plural for the Danaans, Trojans, and children. In the singular, thirteen individuals are described as *νήπιος*, though Astyanax and Patroclus have the most instances by far with four apiece. In the *Odyssey*, the adjective is applied to Odysseus' companions, the suitors, and children in the plural and to ten individuals in the singular, with Telemachos garnering the most applications with seven. According to de Jong, the narrator stresses the ignorance of the character when he uses *νήπιος*. It "refers to the limitations of the human race, its restricted knowledge of the true nature of things or course of events, its inability to determine its own fate" (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 86). The comment is usually used to exploit the difference between the character's "optimistic expectations" and the narrator's description or prediction of the true (disastrous) state of affairs. "Signaling the contrast between hope and delusion, it expresses and elicits pity, despite the fact that the delusion is often brought about by the character's own tragic error" (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 87). In Andromache's case, however, the delusion was not due to her own error, therefore making the effect all the more tragic. S. Richardson notes that the word is used for characters whose actions will be their downfall, or who think their fate can be averted. It is not a contemptuous evaluation, but rather shows pity (S. Richardson 162). Normally these instances are followed by a negative statement beginning with *οὐδέ* for a singular person, and are sometimes followed by a relative clause for many. See for example the Trojans rushing the Achaeans' battlements 12.127, the Trojans trying to get Patroclus' body from Ajax 17.236, the Trojans accompanying Aeneas on a mission 17.497, the Trojans agreeing to stand with Hector against Achilles 18.311, Agamemnon thinking he could take Troy in one day 2.38, Nastes, who wore gold to the war 2.873, Asios rushing against the Achaean embattlement 12.113, Patroclus asking Achilles for his armor 12.113, Patroclus not heeding Achilles' advice 16.686, Achilles for doubting the power of the gifts of the gods 20.264, Tros, trying to persuade Achilles to ransom him instead of kill him 20.466. Kirk ad 2.38 writes, "*νήπιος*: a typical Homeric expression, literally 'childish', but often (as LSJ remark on 22.445) indicating no more than lack of complete knowledge" (Kirk 118). N. Richardson compares lines 20.264 and 16.8.

<sup>51</sup> See Edmunds 25-27 for a comprehensive analysis of *νήπιος* modifying children. Individual children are named at 5.480 (Sarpedon's son), 5.688 (Sarpedon's son), 6.366 (Astyanax), 6.400 (Astyanax), 9.440 (young Achilles), 22.484 (Astyanax), 24.726 (Astyanax). The formula *νήπια τέκνα* is very common at the line-end together with words like *ἀλόχους* or *ἄλοχοί τε φίλοι* (2.136, 2.311, 4.238, 6.95, 6.276, 6.310, 11.113, 17.223, 18.514, 22.63, 24.310).

<sup>52</sup> See Edmunds 60-63 for a comprehensive analysis of *νήπιος* modifying adults. Dione to Aphrodite about Diomedes 5.406; Hector to Patroclus 16.833; Hector to Polydamas 18.295; Achilles to Lykaon 21.99; Achilles to Hector 22.333; Hector to the Achaeans 8.177; Hera to her co-conspirators 15.104; Poseidon to Aeneas 20.296; the ghost of Patroclus remembering his past self 23.88; Achilles to Patroclus in the "little girl" simile 16.8

<sup>53</sup> Diomedes 7.401, Menelaus 17.32, Ajax 17.269, Achilles 20.198

pointing to different meanings.<sup>54</sup> In several instances, including the application to Andromache, the adjective describes “some kind of failure of mental perception,” which is often indicated by the juxtaposition of the adjective with words like *οἶδα* and *νοέω*. Even though the translation is often “fool,” Edmunds notes that in most cases, there is no logical way that the character could know what had happened.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, Andromache is not being reproached for being *νηπίη*, but pitied.

The direct definition for Andromache, based mostly on the system of generic epithets, overwhelmingly reinforces Andromache’s representative function. None of the epithets offer genuinely individuating information. Instead, the epithets work together to present Andromache as a typically good wife, mother, and daughter. The epithets applied directly to her name point out one physical feature and emphasize the greatness of her father. The qualitative epithets are not applied directly to her name, but rather to a social role, and in effect they do not signify any trait beyond “goodness.” The direct addresses made by Hector demonstrate the affection and respect Hector feels for his wife, but do not tell the audience anything more about the kind of person his wife is. Finally, the adjective deployed in narrator-comment applies strictly to thematic function, stressing the pathos of Andromache’s situation. In terms of Rimmon-Kenan’s sliding scales, then, it is clear that Andromache is not very complex. The several traits used to describe her are neither very diverse nor very precise. There is no way to track any kind of development through this kind of direct description, since there are so few epithets ascribed to Andromache and they are all complementary in sense. There are also no epithets which describe mental capabilities, indicating a low degree of access to her inner consciousness, a major factor in characterization. Based on direct definition alone, Andromache’s characterization relies heavily on established types. Further characterizing information must be derived from indirect

---

<sup>54</sup> Trojans, *Il.* 18.310; Odysseus’ companions, *Od.* 1.8; the suitors, *Od.* 22.32. In each of the preceding instances, the term is used to comment negatively on the group’s foolishness. The singular uses are: Aretos and Chromios *Il.* 17.497; Asios *Il.* 12.113; Achilles *Il.* 20.264; Patroclus *Il.* 16.46, 16.686; Tros *Il.* 20. 466; and Andromache *Il.* 22.445. In each of these instances, the poet seems to be marking the attitude or beliefs of the character to be pitiable, with two exceptions. In Achilles’ case, the comment draws attention to the fact that Achilles was afraid of his new armor because he did not understand the nature of such gifts. In Patroclus’ case, at 16.686, the term almost means something like “possessed,” as it describes Patroclus’ mindset as he disobeys Achilles’ order not to press the walls of Troy. According to Griffin, the narrator does so to “comment on the deluded behaviour of his characters” (Griffin 40). Griffin notes that the narrator does not use the word in apostrophe, but only in third person: “The emotional nuance is thus not as unrestrained as when the characters talk to each other with such epithets in the vocative” (Griffin 40).

<sup>55</sup> Edmunds 88-89.

presentation and examined against the traits provided in direct definition. Andromache's traits will be more firmly established if there is repetition in certain actions (as there is repetition in certain definitions); if there is similarity or contrast between her actions, thoughts, words and the traits ascribed to her; or if other traits can be implied from what is provided.<sup>56</sup> Direct definition lays the foundation for the character, but indirect presentation determines how solid that foundation is.

### **III. Indirect Presentation: Evidence from the Narrator and Other Characters**

This section reviews and evaluates the narrative and rhetorical techniques used by the narrator and other characters to characterize Andromache in her important scenes, namely Books 6 and 22 as well as the shorter mentions in Books 8, 17, and 22.<sup>57</sup> Even the famous scenes of Books 6 and 22 are made up of a rather paltry amount of verses, and there is a large break between her initial appearance in Book 6 and her next substantial scene in Book 22.

Nevertheless, these few lines succeed in creating a memorable character because of the variety of techniques employed to portray an emotionally sympathetic woman. Each scene builds on previous scenes and speeches to fully exploit Andromache's potential for evoking pity. In each scene, the narrator uses different narrative techniques to present Andromache's fragile emotional state. The Book 6 *homilia* scene, a series of speeches separated by brief descriptions of nonverbal behavior, relies on description by the narrator and the idealized concepts of Hector to introduce Andromache. Different speakers in Books 8, 17, and 22 use her name at critical plot points to evoke the emotions attached to her pathetic situation. Finally, in Book 22, the narrator focalizes Andromache's reaction to the news of her husband's death without the interruption of interlocutors. The emphasis on Andromache's emotional state supports her thematic function, but limits her mimetic function in the same way that her laments do. By depicting Andromache repeatedly in some distressed state, the narrator does not leave any room for ambiguity in the role Andromache plays in the narrative. But the same repetition does not leave room for much complexity, development, or revelation of inner consciousness.

#### *Book 6*

---

<sup>56</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 39-40.

<sup>57</sup> Book 24 is not included here because there is very little narration about Andromache's actions or emotions during the scene of Hector's funeral. The scene is centered around the three laments.

Andromache enters into the narrative at the moment when all the attention of the primary narrator is on the domestic space and what happens there during the war. The audience first learns about her at 6.365-366, when Hector tells Helen not to detain him in her home because he desires to go home and see his wife and child. Up to this point in the story, the narration has only penetrated the domestic space of Troy briefly in Book 3, during the Teichoskopia (3.161-244). The characterization of Andromache in this scene relies on several narrative techniques. On a thematic level, the importance of the meeting between the two, often called a *homilia* scene, is marked by its position as the last meeting in a series of three, and by the break it causes in Hector's physical progression through the city.<sup>58</sup> Andromache's character is indirectly presented by the descriptions of the narrator as well as the descriptions by her husband Hector and their housemaid. Therefore, characterizing material comes from several different sources and is a good mix of direct definition and indirect presentation. What is most notable about Andromache's characterization in this scene is the intense focus on her emotional state. Andromache addresses her husband in a lament, voicing her concerns about his eagerness to fight on the front lines and trying to impart to him his importance to her. Even though Hector is still very much alive, the way the narrator describes Andromache suggests that this is a final farewell. Andromache's tears, coupled with her lament/address, evoke a funeral scene, casting a pall over the exchange. Hector provides most of the other characterizing material, and his visions for Andromache are also bleak. While his musings do reveal more about his own character than Andromache's, they do enhance her thematic function, commenting on the disparate fortunes of men and women from a different, masculine perspective. The speeches take up most of the lines of the scene – other characterizing content comes from the brief descriptions of actions in between speeches.

The narrator manages to introduce the important facts about Andromache's past and to suggest her importance to the narrative at the very beginning of the *homilia* scene. Hector's

---

<sup>58</sup> See Ioannis Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (New York: Garland, 1987) 20 for an explanation of the scales of affection, and Kakridis 49 for a description of how this scene uses the different scales in three different places. The first is the order in which Hector meets the women when he makes his way toward his home. See also Wolfgang Schadewaldt, "Hector and Andromache" in *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Trans. Gabriele Wright and Peter Jones (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997) 129, and Marilyn Arthur, "The Divided World of *Iliad* VI." *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. Ed. Helene Foley (New York: Gordon and Breach, 1981) 27. For a detailed discussion of the scale of affection in the *Iliad*, especially pertaining to the storyline of Hector and the mythological paradigm of Meleager, see Maureen Alden, *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000) 262-277; 311-318.

meeting with Andromache begins with a dramatic act of omission.<sup>59</sup> Hector has left the home of Paris and Helen specifically to see his wife and child, and when he arrives, he discovers that they are not there (6.369-372). The surprise of Andromache's absence causes a break in the narrator's focalization of Hector's progress through the city when the narrator inserts information that Hector has no way of knowing, setting up a brief moment of dramatic irony.<sup>60</sup> In lines 6.372-376, the narrator reveals that Andromache has left the house with an attendant, and under severe emotional stress, indicated by the participles *γοόωσα* and *μυρομένη*. After inserting this brief notice, the narrator again takes up the focalization of Hector's trip home when he speaks to the housekeeper. The participles *γοόωσα* and *μυρομένη* represent vocalizations associated with ritual mourning. As a participle, *γοόων* is actually quite rare in the *Iliad*, occurring only 8 times.<sup>61</sup> Similarly rare is *μυρόμενος*, occurring only 11 times, but consistently describing male mourning. In fact, Andromache is the only female described by this participle.<sup>62</sup> If the participles supply the state of Andromache as she left, the epithet *ἀμύμων* (6.374) might supply an excuse.

The subsequent conversation between Hector and the servant further develops the presentation of Andromache as emotionally motivated. Hector asks the servant where his wife is, embedding within the question the suitable alternate locations where she might have gone.<sup>63</sup>

πῇ ἔβη Ἀνδρομάχη λευκώλενος ἐκ μεγάρου;  
 ἥε πη ἐς γαλόων ἢ εἰνατέρων εὐπέπλων  
 ἢ ἐς Ἀθηναίης ἐξοίχεται, ἔνθα περ ἄλλαι  
 Τρῳαὶ εὐπλόκαμοι δεινὴν θεὸν ἰλάσκονται; (6.377-380).<sup>64</sup>

<sup>59</sup> Rimmon-Kenan categorizes actions as one-time or habitual. These types of actions are further subdivided into acts of commission (performed), omission (ought to be, but are not performed), and contemplated (unrealized plan or intention) (Rimmon-Kenan 61-61).

<sup>60</sup> See also Schadewaldt 131.

<sup>61</sup> Though it is mostly women or feminine abstracts (Psyche) who lament with the word *γοόωσα*, the masculine plural forms of the present participle are used to describe the Achaeans and the Myrmidons lamenting the death of Patroclus. Lines 16.857, 22.363 and 23.106 all depict the Psyche of the dead warrior lamenting as it leaves the corpse. Kirk *ad loc.* frustratingly says only that this phrase is used of Patroklos' *ψυχή* at 23.106 and "applies more aptly to the Trojan women generally" (208). Only two other women are described as *γοόωσα* (which in itself seems odd in a story rife with mourning): Aigialeia, the wife of Diomedes, and Psyche, as she leaves the bodies of dead men.

<sup>62</sup> Kirk *ad loc.* writes "'Wailing and lamenting' seems rather overdone of Andromakhe, who is unhappy but controlled when Hektor finds her" (Kirk 208).

<sup>63</sup> Arthur 30.

<sup>64</sup> See Richard Seaford, "Dionysus as the Destroyer of the Household: Homer, Tragedy, and the

The servant replies that she is not in those places, but, because she heard that the Achaeans were surpassing the Trojans, she went to the wall, as the narrator has already indicated:

Ἑκτορ ἐπεὶ μάλ' ἄνωγας ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι,  
οὔτε πη ἐς γαλόων οὔτ' εἰνατέρων ἐυπέπλων  
οὔτ' ἐς Ἀθηναίης ἐξοίχεται ἔνθα περ ἄλλαι  
Τρῳαὶ ἐυπλόκαμοι δεινὴν θεὸν ἰλάσκονται,  
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πύργον ἔβη μέγαν Ἰλίου, οὔνεκ' ἄκουσε  
τείρεσθαι Τρῶας, μέγα δὲ κράτος εἶναι Ἀχαιῶν.  
ἦ μὲν δὴ πρὸς τεῖχος ἐπειγομένη ἀφικάνει  
μαινομένη ἐῖκυϊα· φέρει δ' ἅμα παῖδα τιθήνη (6.382-389).

Using the simile *μαινομένη ἐῖκυϊα*, meaning “like a raving woman” (6.389) to describe Andromache’s exit from the house, the servant indicates that Andromache acted irrationally.<sup>65</sup> As Scott notes, similes are often used to describe the motion or emotion of a character.<sup>66</sup> This short simile depends on the adjective *εἰοικώς* and the participle *μαινόμενος* to evoke the image of a maenad. Much criticism of this scene centers around the Dionysian associations with the participle *μαινόμενος* and the thematic implications of maenadism within the scene. Indeed, she is the only mortal woman who is compared to a raving woman, and it is clear that this image can have specific Dionysian meaning, especially since *μαινομένοις Διωνύσοις* is mentioned in close proximity at 6.132. For Andromache the term is particularly sensitive because the action which

---

Polis.” *Masks of Dionysus*. Ed. T. Carpenter and C. Faraone (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993) 145 for a discussion of how the ritual supplication of Athena attracts the Dionysian metaphor.

<sup>65</sup> Rimmon-Kenan does not discuss simile as a means of characterization. By her definition, analogy “depends upon the prior establishment, by other means, of the traits on which it is based” (Rimmon-Kenan 67). She notes three kinds of analogy are used in characterization: analogous names, analogous landscapes, and analogous characters. The epic simile may also be added to that list. The form, content, and function of Homeric simile have been studied extensively. See Mark Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume V: books 17-20* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991): 25-39. Edwards’ introduction addresses the formal difference between short and long similes, provides an overview of simile content and simile function, and discusses the different theories of connection between simile and narrative. This simile and the maenad simile at 22.460 have not received much scholarly attention as similes. Edwards discusses them as examples of short similes which function in a manner similar to formulaic epithets, conveying the same kind of information but taking different metrical shapes (Edwards 25). See also William Scott, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Similes* (Leiden: Brill, 1974). According to Scott, it seems likely that the maenad was not a “traditional” simile. Scott notes that non-traditional similes are more dependent upon the particulars of the narrative than traditional similes, and therefore are more “mysterious” (Scott 81).

<sup>66</sup> Scott argues that similes may help make up for a lack of vocabulary related to complex emotions, psychological phenomena, or the soul. He lists several methods of revealing emotions in Homeric epic: direct statement, using a simile to modify specific emotions, portraying physical acts as symptomatic of emotion, and allowing a character to directly relate an emotion (Scott 28).

prompts the simile is her departure from the home, which is the hallmark of women's worship of Dionysus.<sup>67</sup>

However, within the context of the scene, it seems as though the participle is meant to emphasize her frenzied mental state rather than any Dionysian associations. The participle

---

<sup>67</sup> The first obstacle to the correct interpretation of this simile lies in the question of whether or not a maenad was a concept familiar to the Homeric audience. De Jong frames the discussion in this way: "similes refer to things which take place and have taken place repeatedly and, therefore, can be expected to be known to the chief NeFe<sub>1</sub> (primary narratee-focalizee, or external narratee)" (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 94). But, she is quick to add, the narrator and narratee are constructs of the text, and therefore not completely representative of the actual, historical author and historical audience. She notes that the historical audience is always changing, and thus some similes are more successful than others at different periods of time: for example, animal behavior and psychological phenomena remain unchanged and thus familiar comparanda today, but some technology like tanning or dyeing is no longer widely practiced, and therefore unfamiliar (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 94). While this distinction acknowledges the gaps in knowledge between ancient and modern audiences, it does not fully address what degree of familiarity is expected in the original audience when a simile is presented in the narrative. De Jong argues that it is difficult to ascertain to what extent the similes reflect the historical world of the poet, and that some phenomena, procedures, or behaviors are not omnitemporal (she cites weighing wool and the process of tanning as examples) (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 94). But the very fact that the author uses a particular concept as a simile suggests that the audience would be familiar with it. Thus N. Richardson suggests that the ellipsis about Dionysus at 6.132-133 confirms that Homer knew about maenads (N. Richardson 156), and Ameis-Hentze say the use of the word is evidence that the poet and audience knew about the cult of Dionysus (Ameis-Hentze Book 22, 34). Leaf states outright that the word does not appear to be associated with maenads, but offers no alternative (Leaf 462).

The next obstacle to correct interpretation is the accurate evaluation of the influence of Dionysian themes in the *Iliad*. See G. Aurelio Privitera, *Dionisio in Omero e nella Poesia Greca Arcaica* (Rome: Edizione dell'Ateneo, 1970). Privitera's study on the Dionysian allusions in Homer concludes that Dionysiac myths were part of heroic epic in general and of Trojan War epics in particular. His discussion of Andromache centers on forging connections between the two traditions via the word *τιθήνη*. He suggests that the Homeric poet may have had knowledge of a work about the *pathe* of Dionysus, which may have influenced the way he composed the Andromache scenes in Books 6 and 22. See in particular Privitera 60-64. See also Christos Tsagalis *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2008). Tsagalis' chapter in *The Oral Palimpsest* is the most recent work to discuss the maenad simile in depth, and like Privitera, Tsagalis argues that "the absence of the god Dionysus and the systematic and almost exclusive correlation between Andromache and Dionysus" are by-products of competing song traditions. He believes the Dionysiac references in the *Iliad* point to a lost Theban epic, and that the characterizations Iliadic Andromache, Hector, and Astyanax include intertextual allusions. See in particular Tsagalis 1-10; 14-15; 28. Establishing a connection with a Dionysian tradition allows scholars to discover Dionysian themes in the Iliadic text. Richard Seaford argues that the maenad simile symbolizes a complex of ideas associated with the worship of the cult of Dionysus, ideas frequently addressed in tragedy: the destruction of the household and reversal of ritual. By comparing Andromache-as-maenad to other women described as maenads in tragedy, Seaford tracks thematic patterns: the women are confined by men in the household, from which they depart in a state of frenzy. In each instance, the destruction of the household is at hand and each woman laments the death of a dear one. See in particular Seaford 142-143. Marilyn Arthur's reading of the scene as dislocating a man and woman from their gender-defined spheres is a precursor of Seaford's ritual-based argument (Arthur 30).

Of course, the simile is notable for other reasons, and some commentators choose to ignore Dionysian implications. Ameis-Hentze simply describe the action as "die Folge ihrer angstvollen Besorgnis" (Ameis-Hentze Book 6, 127). Kirk *ad loc.* addresses the repetition of similes: "She has rushed to the fortifications like a madwoman (cf. 132 *μαινομένηοιο*), a maenad that is, just as she will *μαινάδι ἴσση* at 22.460ff., when she runs out of her palace to the tower as she suddenly realizes Hektor must be dead. Deliberate cross-references by the singer over long intervals are often implausibly urged by scholars of the printed text, but in this case the echo is unmistakable and the poet's foreshadowing both subtle and pathetic" (Kirk 210).



*μαϊνόμενος* is not always associated with Dionysus in the *Iliad*. There are only 20 instances in the *Iliad* of the verb *μαίνομαι*, its participial forms, and the noun *μαινάς*. The words are used in various ways: first, as an intransitive verb describing the action of a warrior or a god on the battlefield;<sup>68</sup> second, as an intransitive verb metonymically describing the action of a warrior on the battlefield by referencing his hands or spear;<sup>69</sup> third, in similes which compare the raging of a fire to a warrior on the battlefield;<sup>70</sup> fourth, as a participle describing “wits” or “hearts”, not necessarily in the context of battle;<sup>71</sup> fifth, to describe individuals, not actions, participially;<sup>72</sup> and finally as a simile of the maenad.<sup>73</sup> The reference to Dionysus at 6.132 and the simile of 22.460 are clearly related to Dionysian themes, but it seems as though the rest of the uses fall into two distinct contexts of meaning: the first regards actions on the battlefield motivated by some kind of irrational mental state, and the second regards the loss of the basic ability to reason due to some strong emotional impetus, not Dionysian frenzy. Andromache’s actions in Book 6 belong to the latter category, and her prompt is her anxiety over unconfirmed rumors: οὔνεκ’ ἄκουσε/τείρεσθαι Τρῶας, μέγα δὲ κράτος εἶναι Ἀχαιῶν (6.386-7).

Richard Seaford argues convincingly for reading Dionysian subtext into the scene because Andromache’s exit from the household and rush to find Hector threatens to confuse the gendered division of space in the epic, a threat often associated with maenadic behavior.<sup>74</sup> But Helen in Book 3 exhibits the same behavior when Iris tells her of the duel between Paris and Menelaus. Responding to the news, she cries as she goes to the wall accompanied by two servants:

Ὦς εἰποῦσα θεὰ γλυκὺν ἴμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ  
 ἀνδρὸς τε προτέρου καὶ ἄστεος ἥδ’ ἐτοκῆων·  
 αὐτίκα δ’ ἀργεννήσι καλυψαμένη ὀδόνησιν

<sup>68</sup> Ares at 5.717, 5.831, 15.128; Diomedes at 5.185, 6.101; Hector at 8.355, 9.238, 21.5.

<sup>69</sup> Hector’s spear 8.111, Diomedes’ spear 16.75, Hector’s hands 16.245.

<sup>70</sup> 15.605-606.

<sup>71</sup> Athena describes her father’s raging heart at 8.360, Iris asks Athena and Hera if their hearts are mad when then attempt to enter battle against Zeus’ orders 8.413, the gods are angry at Achilles’ heart because its maddened state has kept him from ransoming Hector’s body 24.114, 24.135.

<sup>72</sup> Dionysus 6.132

<sup>73</sup> Andromache 6.389, Andromache 22.460.

<sup>74</sup> Seaford 134.

ὀρμᾶτ' ἐκ θαλάμοιο τέρεν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα  
οὐκ οἶη, ἅμα τῇ γε καὶ ἀμφίπολοι δὺ' ἔποντο,  
Αἰθήρη Πιττῆος θυγάτηρ, Κλυμένη τε βοῶπις.  
αἶψα δ' ἔπειθ' ἵκανον ὄθι Σκαιαὶ πύλαι ἦσαν (3.139-145).

In the Book 6 scene, the simile of “raving woman” is applied to Andromache by the servant who observed her exit with another servant and Astyanax. This was her interpretation of Andromache’s behavior, not the narrator’s. Notably, in the fourth category of use of the verb *μαίνομαι*, in which “wits” or “hearts” are called “raving” or “maddened,” it is another character who is moved to attribute “madness” to the subject’s actions: Athena by her father’s cross-purposes, Iris by the goddesses’ disobedience, the gods by Achilles’ sacrilegious behavior – this is not the narrator creating a deliberate symbolic context, but the other characters utilizing a participle to impugn another’s motivations.<sup>75</sup> Seaford shows that in the instances where women are compared to maenads in tragedy, the trigger for maenadic behavior is the destruction of the household or the death of a loved one.<sup>76</sup> Both concerns are in play in Andromache’s case, as she herself outlines in her Book 6 lament. But Seaford’s argument is too focused on creating continuity in theme between epic and tragedy to be completely helpful in this scene. Tragic maenads respond to a completed event, but Andromache’s madness is driven by a fear of destructive future events. As will become clear after the discussion of Book 22, the raving simile and maenad similes are means for the poet to represent the madness which results from sustained anxiety over the safety of a loved one.

Though the speeches of the *homilia* scene provide the most characterizing information, the inter-speech verses provide helpful visual descriptions. Lateiner notes that nonverbal behavior can betray inner thoughts, ironize spoken words, or subvert outward displays, all adding to the depth and subtlety of characterization.<sup>77</sup> The introductory formula to Andromache’s lament provides an important visual cue. Andromache stands near Hector and literally “pours

<sup>75</sup> As Scott notes, similes used in direct speech are comparisons drawn for immediate effect (Scott 50).

<sup>76</sup> Seaford 125. Seaford is intent on illustrating how the destruction of the household (which is constituted by marriage) signifies the “evocation and negation of the transition from maiden to wife” (Seaford 125). He goes on to discuss how maenadism is antithetical to marriage, but in the context of this passage in the *Iliad*, the emphasis should be placed on the anxiety over the household.

<sup>77</sup> See Donald Lateiner, *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behavior in the Iliad* (Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 1995) 22. According to Lateiner, such gesticulations and vocalics as weeping, crying, and laughing “display emotional and situational responses that, intentionally emitted or not, provide others with ‘body clues,’ messages about our psychological state or perception of relative status” (Lateiner 12).

out tears” δάκρυ χέουσα (6.405) before taking his hand and calling him by name (6.406). This formula recalls the introduction to the character just a few verses above, when the narrator described her as γοόωσα and μυρομένη as she left the house. This image of Andromache crying will be taken up three separate times in the following series of speeches. Some form of this formula appears 20 times in the *Iliad*, 4 of which describe Andromache.<sup>78</sup> Weeping and lamentation occur frequently in the *Iliad*, but this formula is not used in the context of ritual lamentation.<sup>79</sup> The characters so described cry in response to several stimuli: frustration with the choices of leadership, despair on the battlefield, anxiety over a son’s destiny, and fear for the life of a child. It is only when the phrase is used to describe groups of people that it is connected specifically to funeral rituals. Taken in concert with μαινομένη, this affective phrase reinforces the connection between Andromache and the emotional, rather than reflective or rational response. The intimacy between husband and wife is emphasized by Andromache’s nonverbal behavior. She moves close to Hector coming into his private space, and she takes his hand and calls him by name: ἔν τ’ ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ ἔπος τ’ ἔφατ’ ἔκ τ’ ὀνόμαζε (6.406).<sup>80</sup>

The narrator again draws attention to the fluctuating emotions of the scene at line 6.471. Astyanax has just yelped in fear of his father, eliciting a laugh from his parents: ἐκ δ’ ἐγέλασσε πατήρ τε φίλος καὶ πότνια μήτηρ. When Hector finishes his prayer and returns his son to his wife, she laughs again, but this time through her tears: δακρύνειν γελάσασα (6.484). Hector seems to finally appreciate her distress, and using the same conventionalized gesture Andromache used above, χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεξεν ἔπος τ’ ἔφατ’ ἔκ τ’ ὀνόμαζε (6.485), he attempts to console her. After he commands her to return home, Andromache obeys, though her emotions get the better of her and she turns back: ἐντροπαλιζομένη (6.496) again pouring out tears: δάκρυ χέουσα (6.496).

<sup>78</sup> Andromache: 6.405, 6.459, 6.496, 24.745. Kirk ad loc. 6.405 says the phrase gives the scene a “unique intimacy” (Kirk 213).

<sup>79</sup> Achilles is described this way twice, at the beginning of the epic (1.357 and 1.360); Agamemnon twice (8.245 and 9.14), and Ajax once (17.648). None of these occurrences are funerals or related to death in any way. Among women, Thetis (1.413, 18.340, 18.428) and Andromache are most often described in this way, followed by Hecuba twice (22.79 and 22.81) and Helen once (3.142). Though these instances occur in response to fear of death or because of death, they are not part of a funeral ritual. There are, however, references to *groups* mourning in this manner, especially groups of Trojan men and women (18.340, 24.714, 24.786). These instances refer specifically to tears for the dead, in the first case Patroclus, and in the second two, Hector.

<sup>80</sup> Lateiner notes that such verbal formulae often denote ritualized and conventional gestures, postures, and vocalics. The messages these non-verbal signals send are various, but one typical use of ritualized gesture is to provide a “thematic-key” for reading the intention behind an action (Lateiner 11). In this case, Andromache’s actions signal a posture of supplication. See also my discussion of Andromache’s plea for pity in the previous chapter.

Andromache makes no verbal response to any of the three speeches Hector makes to her. The narrator reports her nonverbal actions after each, but her lack of a verbal response only highlights the participles used to describe her emotions. Everything in these descriptions confirms her absolute obedience to Hector: she does not criticize any of his visions of the future, nor object to being sent home, rendering her look back even more heart-wrenching.

Hector's speeches contribute a very different kind of information to Andromache's characterization. His aim is to console her, somewhat, by expressing to her how important she is to him, just as she did in her own lament in this scene. Hector's first speech, a response to Andromache's lament, does not really answer any of Andromache's concerns, but instead presents an ideology in opposition with Andromache's.<sup>81</sup> The speech is a match in structural complexity to Andromache's lament, but perplexing as a response – he does not immediately acknowledge or reiterate any of the points Andromache makes in her lament. It is a valuable source of information about Homeric ethics, and while Hector comments upon the societal expectations which inform his decision to return to war, he also comments upon how those same expectations affect Andromache, and therefore wives in general. The pathos of their situation is heightened because it is clear that it is inherently tragic. The gendered expectations of Homeric society dictate that Hector pursue *kleos* at the expense of Andromache's suffering.

---

<sup>81</sup> The opposing ideologies of this scene have been observed by several commentators. Schadewaldt reads the speeches in the scene as an "archetypal dispute" (Schadewaldt 132). He writes that "the loving wife and fighting husband stand opposite each other, and two worlds assert themselves in them, two basic realms of life, which although they fit together like two hemispheres become increasingly aware of their incompatibility" (Schadewaldt 133). See also Susan Farron, "The Portrayal of Women in the *Iliad*," *Acta Classica* 22 (1979): 23 and Mary Lefkowitz "The Heroic Women of Greek Epic," *The American Scholar* 56 (1987): 508. Farron reads this opposition as indicative of women's role in the *Iliad* in general: they are "constantly frustrated in their dealings with their men." Emotions are emphasized only to show how ineffectual they are in persuading the warrior to take their feelings into consideration (23). Lefkowitz takes a more positive approach, noting that Hector does not take exception to her address or her expression. The poet creates a woman who is capable of understanding the world around her, and is possibly better suited to understand its consequences than her warrior husband. Kirk *ad loc.* writes: "The recurrent and deliberate conjunction of two styles normally kept distinct, even if not completely so, is certainly significant: the severe and heroic on the one hand, the intimate and compassionate on the other. That emerges not only in the contrasting attitudes of Hektor and Andromache themselves but also in the alternation of heroic themes....and more personal ones" (Kirk 219). See also Oliver Taplin *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992) 120 and Deborah Beck *Homeric Conversation* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2005) 19-20; 128. Taplin interprets the scene with a series of binary oppositions: "optimism and pessimism, fear and bravery, union and separation, laughter and tears...male and female." Beck argues that from a purely formal standpoint, the encounter does not resemble a conversation. Conversations are exchange-based and reciprocal, "essentially a simultaneous, interdependent exchange of turns at speaking" (Beck 19-20). She notes that in this scene, there is a lack of engagement in the give-and-take on Hector's part (Beck 128). Hector addresses Andromache in a series of three speeches, not in an exchange. She never responds to anything he says, but only gives the initial address.

Though his opening lines reveal the discrepancy between the concerns of Hector and Andromache, Hector soon turns his attention to future suffering which he believes to be inevitable. At lines 6.447-449 Hector announces to Andromache that he is well aware that Troy will fall: *εὔ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε οἶδα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν/ἔσσεται ἡμᾶρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἰρὴ/καὶ Πριάμος καὶ λαὸς ἐϋμμελίῳ Πριάμοιο*.<sup>82</sup> This certainty provides the transition into Hector's slightly macabre acknowledgement of his affection for his wife. He tells her that he will be most devastated by her suffering when she is taken captive by some Achaean:

*ἀλλ' οὐ μοι Τρώων τόσσον μέλει ἄλγος ὀπίσσω,  
οὔτ' αὐτῆς Ἑκάβης οὔτε Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος  
οὔτε κασιγνήτων, οὔ κεν πολέες τε καὶ ἑσθλοὶ  
ἐν κονίῃσι πέσοιεν ὑπ' ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν,  
ὅσσον σεῦ, ὅτε κέν τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων  
δακρύνεσσαν ἄγῃται ἐλεύθερον ἡμᾶρ ἀπούρας (6.450-455).*

The detailed listing of his relatives adds to the honor Hector confers upon his wife by naming her as the most emotionally moving victim.<sup>83</sup> Hector embellishes the image by adding the participle *δακρύνεσσαν* (6.455) to describe Andromache as she is dragged away and forced into slavery.

Hector takes up that image and expands it, imagining what would come to pass when his prophecy is realized, thus creating an external prolepsis:<sup>84</sup>

*καὶ κεν ἐν Ἀργεὶ ἐοῦσα πρὸς ἄλλης ἰστὸν ὑφαίνοις,  
καὶ κεν ὕδωρ φορέοις Μεσσηϊδος ἢ Ὑπερείης  
πόλλ' ἀεκαζομένη, κρατερὴ δ' ἐπικείσεται ἀνάγκη·  
καὶ ποτὲ τις εἴπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσαν·  
Ἐκτορος ἥδε γυνὴ ὅς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι  
Τρώων ἵπποδάμων ὅτε Ἴλιον ἀμφεμάχοντο.  
ὥς ποτὲ τις ἐρέει· σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος  
χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἡμᾶρ.  
ἀλλὰ με τεθνηῶτα χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτει  
πρὶν γέ τι σῆς τε βοῆς σοῦ θ' ἐλκηθμοῖο πνέεσθαι (6.456-465).*

<sup>82</sup> These lines are a verbatim repetition of lines spoken by Agamemnon to Menelaus at 4.163-165. See Christos Tsagalis, *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004) 16. Tsagalis categorizes Agamemnon's speech to Menelaus as an anticipatory lament based on elements in the speech which are also found in other laments, like the words *στενάχων* and *ἐπεστενάχοντο* in the introductory formula (4.152-153) and the address. He also categorizes Andromache's speech to Hector in Book 6 as an anticipatory lament.

<sup>83</sup> This listing of relatives is the third time a scale of affection is used in the scene. The second occurs in Andromache's lament for Hector. See Kakridis 49.

<sup>84</sup> A prolepsis is an "anticipation of events still to be told" (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 81). A prolepsis is external if it refers to events outside the time-span of the events narrated in the *Iliad* (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 84). Interestingly, de Jong does not really treat external prolepses at length.

In this micro-narrative, the secondary narrator Hector focalizes Andromache's experiences as a slave, highlighting her unwillingness (*ἀεκαζομένη* 6.458) to perform her duties of weaving and fetching water (6.456-458).<sup>85</sup> In Hector's narrative, someone will see Andromache crying and will identify her as Hector's wife, a remark which will produce a fresh pain because she lacks such a man to ward off her slavery.<sup>86</sup> Hector ends the prolepsis with a death wish, hoping that he is dead before he hears her being dragged away.

The prolepsis depicts a fate which would be typical<sup>87</sup> of captives, and the characterizing participles of *ἀεκαζομένη* and *δάκρυ χέουσα* do little to individuate Andromache from any other potential captive.<sup>88</sup> The *tis*-speech of the anonymous "someone" reveals more about Hector's own characterization than it does about Andromache: the security and longevity of his *kleos* is Hector's foremost concern, as is evidenced by the substitution of *Ἑκτορος ἥδε γυνή* for her name.<sup>89</sup> Similarly, the rationale Hector provides for her *νέον ἄλγος* is devoid of any substantive

---

<sup>85</sup> This instance is unique because Hector is focalizing Andromache's future experience while she stands before him. The purpose of the speech is not to relate Andromache's experience to another party – the purpose is to relate her own experiences as a means of sympathizing. Hector acknowledges her pain and admits that her suffering would cause him suffering in return. Though there is no indication that his sympathy will compel him to change his mind and capitulate to her request to stay behind, it marks Andromache as worthy of pity and compassion. De Jong, in discussing this passage, does not call this technique "focalization" despite the fact that it meets her own criteria for such: "Although Hector tries to put himself mentally into the position of Andromache, the *tis*-speech reveals his own preoccupations..." (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 177). This produces an interesting interplay between the two speeches. There is practically no mention of second-person narrative in scholarship on the *Iliad*. De Jong does not mention it at all until her chapter entitled "Homer" in the edited volume *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. She gives three examples: Zeus reminding Hera of past punishment (*Il.* 15.18-20); Achilles reminding Thetis of her past support of Zeus (*Il.* 1.394-406); Menelaus reminding Helen of how she almost exposed the Greeks hiding in the Trojan Horse (*Od.* 4.266-288) (20). All of these narratives, however, are analeptic. Hector's is uniquely proleptic.

<sup>86</sup> Kirk 6.459-62 states that Hector's reaction to Andromache's imagined fate might seem self-centered, but it is typically heroic. Hector also knows that she will be remembered mainly through himself (Kirk 222).

<sup>87</sup> Hector's prolepsis is also idealized in the sense that in it Andromache's grief over his death is her primary concern. The nature of Andromache's sufferings depicted in Euripides' later tragedies will challenge Hector's conception of Andromache's future.

<sup>88</sup> This is the only instance of a participial use of *ἀέκων* in the *Iliad*, but there are 33 instances of some form of "unwilling" in the *Iliad* (In fact, it looks like the only other unwilling woman is Briseis (*ἀέκουσ'*) at 1.347 when she is unwilling to leave Achilles to go with Agamemnon). Also compare Agamemnon's threats to make Chryseis a slave in his home before he returns her (1.29-31).

<sup>89</sup> For a definition of embedded speech see de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 168. De Jong notes that *tis*-speeches belong entirely to the mind of the speaker. She says that *tis*-speeches are "the (hopeful or fearful) evaluation by the speaking character of his own behavior, which he – and this is characteristic for the Homeric shame culture – puts into the mouth of somebody else" (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 177-178). See also John Wilson, "*καί κέ τις ὦδ' ἐθέει*: An Homeric Device in Greek Literature" *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 (1979): 2. Wilson likewise acknowledges that the *tis*-speech reveals the psychology of the speaker. Kirk comments on the effects of the *tis*-

motivation. The demonstrative *τοιούδ'* (6.463) suggests Hector's current greatness and hints at future, potential accomplishments.<sup>90</sup> It is Andromache's future lot to act as a living monument to his *kleos*. Her own feelings about her situation are of little importance in Hector's narration. In spite of his rather self-centered conception of Andromache's future, Hector's death wish echoes the sentiment he expressed at line 6.444-445 – he is disturbed by the thought of her suffering. But he does not wish that his vision of the future be controverted. The connection between feminine suffering and masculine achievement also makes manifest the tragedy of Andromache's character, and the wives of warriors in general. Their suffering is almost required in order for the warrior's fame to endure, though the women themselves have done nothing to deserve such pain.

The majority of the *homilia* scene has focused on the interplay between husband and wife, but Hector now turns his attention to his son and reaches out to him. Hector prays that Astyanax may survive and thrive, imagining a future in which the boy becomes a fierce warrior, fierce enough to rival his own prowess:

Ζεῦ ἄλλοι τε θεοὶ δότε δὴ καὶ τόνδε γενέσθαι  
 παῖδ' ἐμὸν ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ περ ἀριπρεπέα Τρώεσσιν,  
 ὥδε βίην τ' ἀγαθόν, καὶ Ἰλίου ἴφι ἀνάσσειν.  
 καὶ ποτέ τις εἴποι “πατρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων  
 ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιόντα· φέροι δ' ἔναρα βροτόεντα  
 κτείνας δῆϊον ἄνδρα, χαρεΐη δὲ φρένα μήτηρ.” (6.476-481).

Once again Hector envisions the future and even embeds a *tis*-speech into the narrative, but the subject and tone are almost the complete opposite of his previous vision.<sup>91</sup> In the previous

---

speech “Such comments by unnamed persons are a typical and successful Homeric device, often for drama and variety but also to reflect the heroic need – and especially Hektor's – for public approval” (Kirk 222). This also alludes to the connection between the ritual lament and memorialization discussed in the previous chapter. De Jong writes, “He [Hector] devises a kind of oral epitaph for himself, indicating how he hopes to be remembered” (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 177). Though the vocabulary utilized in this scene does not explicitly indicate ritual mourning, the image of the weeping widow likewise symbolizes the connection, as it prompts the witness to verbally recall the excellence of the dead warrior, substituting his own voice for the voice of the grieving widow.

<sup>90</sup> In line 6.463, Hector says that the lack of such a husband (*χήτει*) will be a fresh sorrow for Andromache. This notion of the lack of a certain kind of man is repeated at 19.324 when Achilles imagines that Peleus is feeling the lack of such a son (*χήτει τοιοῦδ' υἱός*). Achilles himself does not indicate what “such a son” could do at that point, but Priam, in his interview with Achilles in Book 24, urges him to remember his own father. Priam tells him that Peleus is likely beset by neighbors after his land, and with no son to defend him: *καὶ μὲν που κεῖνον περιναίεται ἀμφὶς ἐόντες/τείρουσ', οὐδὲ τίς ἐστὶν ἀρῆν καὶ λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι*. (24.488-489). Similarly, Hector pronounces that “such a husband” could “ward off the day of slavery” for his wife. Both instances demonstrate the obligation of the warrior to care for his dependents, be they elderly parents or helpless women.

prolepsis, Hector shows how Andromache will best increase his *kleos* through her suffering. But in this prolepsis, he describes how Astyanax will best help his father: through his military prowess.<sup>92</sup> Andromache's role in this particular narrative is to look on her son's accomplishments (and by extension, Hector's accomplishments), with joy and implicit approval: *χαρείη δὲ φρένα μήτηρ* (6.480-481). The incongruity in representation reaffirms the vast disparity in the relationships between men, women, and war. Andromache best reflects Hector's *kleos* through her suffering, while Astyanax best reflects it through his own accomplishments. Here again, Andromache acts as a representative, almost a nameless character. She was the "captive widow" in the previous prolepsis, and here she is the "proud mother."

In his final speech, Hector responds to Andromache in a manner more closely aligned with the way she addressed him at the beginning of their interaction. First, the narrator tells us that Hector pities (*ἐλέησε* 6.484) his wife – which was what she entreated him to do in the first place.<sup>93</sup> Then he touches her and calls her by name, and the formula closely resembles the formula which described her action in taking his hand and calling him by name (6.485). He attempts to comfort her, then tells her to go home again back to her work at the loom, and to see that the handmaidens do their work as well. He, as a man, must see to the fighting, but he especially, with the understanding that this is his job as a leader in Troy:

*ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε  
 ἰστόν τ' ἡλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε  
 ἔργον ἐποίχασθαι· πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει  
 πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί, τοὶ Ἴλιω ἐγγεγάασιν* (6.490-493).

---

<sup>91</sup> Arthur, in fact, calls it a "fantasy," a "utopian vision of the nuclear family as the ideal reconciliation between opposing interest; it is unity in which war is not a threat for women and children, and where women are a support in this venture for their husbands." Andromache's Book 22 lament is therefore a "counter-fantasy," an equally unlikely future (Arthur 35). Taplin reads the discrepancy between the two prolepses as characteristic of the nature of the scene, expressing Hector's hopes and fears together (Taplin 123).

<sup>92</sup> James Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*, Expanded Edition. (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1994) 125.

<sup>93</sup> Schadewaldt notes that this is the only time husband and wife really "come together" in the scene (Schadewaldt 137). Farron suggests that Hector does not "take his wife completely seriously as a human being" and therefore does not consider her military advice and tells her to stick to her chores (Farron 24). This view seems a little extreme, especially in light of the fact that Hector does pity her. See also Kevin Crotty, *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's Iliad and Odyssey* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994). Crotty notes that much of what defines *eleos* in the *Iliad* is Hector's resistance to it in this scene. It allows the warrior to express fears which would otherwise be discouraged and not acted upon (Crotty 50). He argues that "*Eleos* rests in the warrior's perception that his own good is deeply involved with another's well-being." Therefore, the plight of the suppliant becomes the plight of the warrior (Crotty 48). The warrior is most susceptible to entreaties made by members of his family because they are part of his identity and persist even in defeat on the battlefield (Crotty 46).



His final words are the corrective for the dramatic irony which introduced the scene. Hector “sets to rights” what was wrong when Andromache rushed out of the house. His reordering of the domestic sphere signals the end of the emotional meeting between the two.

Andromache’s return home again draws upon the language of the ritual lament which introduced her into the action at the beginning of the scene. But instead of simply characterizing her wailing, Andromache’s return induces in all the women a desire for lament

αἶψα δ’ ἔπειθ’ ἵκανε δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας  
 Ἑκτορος ἀνδροφόνιοιο, κιχήσατο δ’ ἔνδοθι πολλὰς  
 ἀμφιπόλους, τῆσιν δὲ γόον πάσῃσιν ἐνώρσεν.  
 αἶ μὲν ἔτι ζῶν γόον Ἑκτορα ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ·  
 οὐ γάρ μιν ἔτ’ ἔφαντο ὑπότροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο  
 ἵξεσθαι προφυγόντα μένος καὶ χεῖρας Ἀχαιῶν (6.497-502).

Here the mourning takes on a decidedly more “sinister” tone, to borrow a phrase from Kirk.<sup>94</sup> Whereas the mourning participles *γοόωσα* and *μυρομένη* used at the beginning of the scene serve as thematic seeds to help set the tone for the exchange, the proleptic lament at the close of the scene foreshadows the actual laments which will soon be performed for Hector. The narratees know this will be the last time the husband and wife will meet.

The narrator sets off Andromache’s introduction into the story through her act of omission and the slowing of Hector’s progression through the city back to the battlefield. Andromache’s and Hector’s speeches present the opposing, gendered ideologies of war, cleverly cross-assigned to Paris and Helen in Book 3. Hector’s speeches create an idealized wife in two alternate potential futures: in the first, the captive widow preserves her husband’s *kleos* through her suffering; in the second, the approving mother looks with joy on her son’s accomplishments. How Andromache herself would be feeling in these situations is given little attention. She exists in these prolepses as a type, a representative of the feminine component to the masculine pursuit of *kleos*.

The actions of Andromache herself in the scene represent the idealized wife *during* the war: she is governed by emotions, now anxious over bad news from the front, now brought to tears by entreaties, now laughing at her child, now obeying her husband. The various participles used to describe her throughout the scene track these swings in emotion. What is not

<sup>94</sup> As Kirk *ad loc.* suggests, the mourning is “prophetic and sinister” (Kirk 225).

represented, however, are her thoughts.<sup>95</sup> After her initial speech to Hector, she does not speak again in the scene, allowing her tears to communicate for her. This lack of insight into her thoughts and fears at this most crucial moment strengthens the pathos of the scene and presents a stabilized characterization to the audience. There is no reflection on past mistakes to call into question past motivations and current states of affairs; there is no discrepancy between word and deed or even thought and deed to send mixed-messages to internal and external audiences. Andromache's purpose here is clear.

### *Books 8 and 17*

Between Books 6 and 22 Andromache is mentioned in the text three times: by Hector in Book 8 (8.184-190), by Zeus in Book 17 (17.201-208), and by Hecuba in Book 22 (22.82-89). In each of these instances, Andromache's name is "dropped" by a character to remind the internal and external audience of her connection to Hector, and to evoke the themes she represents at moments when Hector's story arc takes a critical turn. Andromache's past actions are highlighted in these brief mentions, not her current actions, and so these references offer a respite from the emotions which motivate Andromache in Books 6 and 22. These name "drops" heighten the drama and pathos of Hector's situations by alluding to the suffering he will cause his wife. Therefore, the actions brought up by the characters in these references are meant to signify her worthiness as a wife to the larger-than-life Hector.

In Book 8, Andromache's name comes up in the text when Zeus begins to favor Hector on the battlefield, thus beginning his drive toward meeting Patroclus in Book 16. Hector asks his horses to repay him for the kindness Andromache gave them in the past: when her heart was inclined, she mixed wheat and wine together for the horses to eat:

---

<sup>95</sup> Schadewaldt observes something to this effect, and states that she does not have the inner strength of Helen or the greatness of Thetis. "Andromache's love has a quality that is absolute and elemental; it is not for nothing that the poet describes her anxiety as 'like a woman gone mad' (Schadewaldt 134). That statement should be amended to read "Andromache's *characterization* has a quality that is absolute and elemental." For some commentators, this one-dimensional representation is enough to inspire an in-depth analysis of personality and character. See in particular Walter Perry, *The Women of Homer* (London: William Heinemann, 1898) 153: "There is not in all literature a more exquisite picture of a gentle, modest, and affectionate woman than that of Andromache, the loving spouse of the noble Hector, and mother of the little Astyanax. She has all the delicacy, sweetness and refinement, the heart and soul devotion to her husband and her child, which we only expect to find in periods of the best and highest civilization. Her tenderness and tears, her sad and undeserved fate, fill us with an unwonted pathos, and we feel angry with the gods for laying such a weight of misery on such a tender and innocent soul. We see her only twice in the *Iliad*, and yet how fully we seem to know her, and how warmly we love her!" His comments speak to the power of a flat characterization – though Andromache does not in fact display directly or indirectly all the traits he credits her with, the foregrounding of the external manifestations of her emotions at the expense of their internal sources allows the reader to attribute any quality he likes.

Ξάνθε τε καὶ σὺ Πόδαργε καὶ Αἰΐων Λάμπε τε δῖε  
νῦν μοι τήν κομιδὴν ἀποτίνετον, ἣν μάλα πολλήν  
Ἀνδρομάχη θυγάτηρ μεγάλῃτορος Ἡετίωνος  
ὑμῖν παρ προτέροισι μελίφρονα πυρὸν ἔθηκεν  
οἷόν τ' ἐγκεράσασα πιεῖν, ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνώγοι,  
ἣ ἐμοί, ὃς πέρ οἱ θαλερὸς πόσις εὐχόμεαι εἶναι (8.185-190).

The implication that Andromache enjoyed caring for Hector's horses has led some commentators to argue that this is further evidence of her connection to an Amazonian tradition.<sup>96</sup> It certainly shows Andromache moving and participating in Hector's military sphere. It also shows how Hector considers her actions to be reflective of or attributable to him as well – he claims a favor based on an obligation to his wife. The recollection of the quiet, peaceful scene is a surprising utterance in the heat of battle, and it clearly emphasizes the difference between Hector's martial world and Andromache's domestic world. The horses serve as a point of connection, inhabitants of both spheres and symbols of fate shared by husband and wife.

Andromache is next mentioned at the beginning of Book 17, when the Trojans gain access to Patroclus' dead body, and Hector manages to acquire Achilles' armor. Hector runs away from the battle a short distance to change into the armor and to send back his own to Troy. Zeus watches Hector and comments to himself in the form of an address to Hector. He observes that Hector has no thought of death at the moment, though death is hard on his heels. Zeus recommits himself to helping Hector in battle to make up for the fact that he will not make it home from the fighting, and that Andromache will not receive Achilles' armor from him:

ἃ δειλ' οὐδέ τί τοι θάνατος καταδύμιός ἐστιν  
ὃς δὴ τοι σχεδὸν εἴσι· σὺ δ' ἄμβροτα τεύχεα δύνεις  
ἀνδρὸς ἀφριστῆος, τὸν τε τρομέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι·  
τοῦ δὲ ἐταῖρον ἔπεφνες ἐνῆέα τε κρατερόν τε,  
τεύχεα δ' οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἀπὸ κρατός τε καὶ ὤμων  
εἶλεν· ἀτάρ τοι νῦν γε μέγα κράτος ἐγγυαλίζω,  
τῶν ποινὴν ὃ τοι οὐ τι μάχης ἐκνοστήσαντι  
δέξεται Ἀνδρομάχη κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πηλεΐωνος (17.201-208).

While Hector's request of the horses is based on the actual kindness Andromache showed to them, Zeus' apostrophe imagines Andromache in an unlikely future, much as Hector's prayer for Astyanax in Book 6 envisioned an unlikely future. In a manner similar to that very speech in Book 6, in Zeus' apostrophe Andromache is actively engaged in Hector's military exploits, implicitly taking joy in his glory. Zeus' apostrophe is an expression of pity for Hector, who is

<sup>96</sup> Tsagalis, *Oral Palimpsest*, 14-15.

unaware of his fate and thus unaware of the impending suffering awaiting Andromache.<sup>97</sup> The brief mention of her name evokes the intrinsic contradiction of the warrior who fights on behalf of his family only to lead to their destruction.

In Book 22, Hecuba calls to Hector from the wall and begs him not to fight Achilles. She urges him to pity her and his wife, who will be deprived of his body should he fall beyond the safety of the city:

εἴ περ γάρ σε κατακτάνη, οὗ σ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε  
κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι φίλον θάλλος, ὃν τέκον αὐτή,  
οὐδ' ἄλλοχος πολύδωρος· ἄνευθε δέ σε μέγα νῶϊν  
Ἀργείων παρὰ νηυσὶ κύνες ταχέες κατέδονται (22.86-89).

This speech employs the motif of “dying away from home,” which both Hecuba and Priam employ in their supplications and laments for Hector. The mention of Andromache, however, is meant to evoke his pity for her specifically and to recall the fact that it was the privilege and duty of the wife to oversee and lead the funerary rituals and laments for the deceased. Hecuba reminds Hector that the deprivation of ritual affects them all – his family loses their opportunity for ritualized expression of grief, while his body is desecrated. While there are no past actions brought up in this reference, Hecuba does call Andromache *πολύδωρος*, suggesting, at the very least, Andromache’s value to Hector, making his death all the more devastating.

The direct definition of these scenes reinforces the importance of the connection between Hector and Eëtion formed through Hector’s marriage to Andromache. In Book 8, she is called by her patronymic, *Ἀνδρομάχη θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος Ἡετίωνος* (8.187). When Hector names himself as her husband at 8.190, he emphasizes his connection to Eëtion through her. The significance of *ἄλλοχος πολύδωρος* in Book 22 as a means of evoking pity has already been discussed above, but the use of *πολύδωρος* also recalls the economic value of the marriage between Hector and Andromache. The indirect presentation of these scenes seems at first blush to complicate Andromache’s characterization by depicting her engaged in activities considered extraordinary for women.<sup>98</sup> The care she gives to Hector’s horses, in particular, is interesting, since no other women is described as sharing that interest.<sup>99</sup> Paying attention to the horses

---

<sup>97</sup> Edwards *ad loc.* reads the phrase as expressing “strong sympathy” for Hector (Edwards 82).

<sup>98</sup> Farron misses the mark by claiming that these brief mentions reveal the tragedy of women in the *Iliad*, “that amidst horrible losses and suffering, all they can do is perform their domestic chores” (Farron 24). These scenes clearly relate to past efforts and potential futures, and are not meant to develop the plight of women in times of war.

suggests that Andromache might actually be fond of the horses themselves, and this, in addition to the patronymic version of her name, may lend credence to Zarker's suggestion that they were actually given to Hector by Eëtion.<sup>100</sup> Even though showering such attention on horses is indeed extraordinary, these lines may benefit from a reading against a similar relationship between horses and their caretaker. Care of horses again comes to the fore at 23.279-284 when Achilles tells the assembled host that his horses are mourning the loss of Patroclus, who washed them and anointed their manes with olive oil. Andromache and Patroclus are similar in that they have the most intimate relationships with the heroes of the *Iliad*, and in that their suffering is elaborated upon as a means of further developing the heroic tempers of Achilles and Hector. In both instances the care shown by Andromache and Patroclus, and the reciprocal care the horses feel for them, are evoked as a means of commenting upon the actions of the heroes. Andromache's desire to care for the horses and her delight in receiving the armor from Hector when he returns from battle may indicate a predilection for battle, or may simply further indicate her devotion to her husband. These lines, even in addition to the final lines of her lament in Book 6, are not certain enough evidence to securely attribute a bellicose trait to Andromache in the *Iliad*.

Even if these mentions do not add anything of substance to Andromache's mimetic characterization, they do add significantly to her thematic function. It has been noted that the study of the structural patterns of the *Iliad* helps to reveal the thematic importance of the characters and reveals the greater significance of minor characters.<sup>101</sup> Books 8-17 form a "movement" within the story, beginning with Hector's rage on the battlefield and ending with his donning of Achilles' armor. Zeus' temporary favoring of Hector begins in Book 8 and ends in Book 17, which coincides with the mentions of Andromache. Andromache's involvement in this movement or cycle is clearly tied to the most critical moments of Hector's own story arc. She

---

<sup>99</sup> Tsagalis believes that it is evidence of her ability in war and her military knowledge. He cites in addition the advice she gives Hector in Book 6 and the fact that she is the only daughter among seven brothers, which naturally masculinizes her (Tsagalis, *Oral Palimpsest*, 14-15). N. Richardson reads this as evidence of the "practical side to her character" (N. Richardson 153).

<sup>100</sup> Zarker suggests that the horses may have been part of the dowry which accompanied Andromache from Thebe (Zarker 113). This would also add an allusion to their wedding, thereby strengthening the connection of the passage to the theme of marriage. See also Kenneth Atchity, "Andromache's Headdress," *Critical Essays on Homer*. Ed. Kenneth Atchity, Ron Hogart, and Doug Price. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1987. Atchity interprets this as evidence of her "comprehensively domestic relationship with Hector" (Atchity 160).

<sup>101</sup> Bruce Louden, *The Iliad: Structure, Myth, and Meaning* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006) 4-5.

symbolizes the domestic sphere for which he is ostensibly fighting, and to which he will never return.

### *Book 22*

Andromache does not appear again in the narrative until the climactic Book 22. The objective is the same: the narrator aims to show Andromache in a state of emotional distress in order to fully drive home the consequences of Hector's actions for his audience. Watching the good wife and mother suffer arouses pity and compassion for her plight. In this scene, the narrator uses dramatic irony, commentary and simile, verbalized expression of fear, and symbolism rather than exchanges between characters to characterize Andromache. But more importantly for Andromache's characterization is the fact that there are many points of contact between the *homilia* scene of Book 6 and Book 22. The repetition of affective states, the repetition of the maenad simile, and the repetition of Andromache speaking her concerns out loud confirm the propositions made about her character in the early stages of the epic. The repetition of certain narrative devices, such as the dramatic pause, also suggest thematic continuity as well. The narrator attempts to recall the emotions evoked in the audience in Book 6, and to make a thematic connection between the previous meeting of husband and wife and the present parting of the two.

The narration of Andromache's episode in Book 22 is another instance of dramatic pause in the narrative, just as her absence in Book 6 paused the flow of the narrative of Hector's progression through the city. The tension of this scene is created by the unmet expectation of Andromache's presence at the wall.<sup>102</sup> The individuals Hector meets in Book 6 and the series of supplicants and lamenters in Book 22 followed the same predictable pattern based on the scale of affection.<sup>103</sup> But Andromache's absence disrupts the series of lamenters and causes a halt in the progression of the action and a change in scene. Line 22.437 simultaneously closes out Hecuba's lament with the formulaic 'Ὡς ἔφατο κλαίονσα', and then switches the scene to Andromache, who is ignorant of what has passed outside the walls: ἄλοχος δ' οὐ τώ τι

---

<sup>102</sup> Louden notes that the "delay" in Andromache's meeting with Hector in Book 22 was added for dramatic effect in order to parallel their near miss in Book 6 (Louden 33).

<sup>103</sup> See N. Richardson 105-6 for the triadic speeches at the beginning and end of the book. Andromache, Hecuba, and Priam form a triad twice: first in their attempts to dissuade Hector from returning to battle, which is stretched over several Books, since Andromache makes her attempt at their meeting *on* the wall in Book 6, while Hecuba and Priam make their attempts *from* the wall in Book 22. The order is reversed in their laments, but there is another delay between the performances of the parents and the wife.

πέπυστο/Ἐκτορος (22.437-48). The substitution of ἄλοχος for Andromache's name highlights the wife as the most important relative on the scale of affection, and also recalls the domestic sphere Andromache represents.<sup>104</sup>

The drama of the pause is heightened by the dramatic irony caused by Andromache's absence on the wall. The poet increases the pathos of her ignorance by taking the time to describe a domestic scene.<sup>105</sup>

ἀλλ' ἢ γ' ἴσθ' ὅν ὕφαινε μυχῷ δόμου ὑψηλοῖο  
δίπλακα πορφυρέην, ἐν δὲ θρόνα ποικίλ' ἔπασσε.  
κέκλετο δ' ἀμφιπόλοισιν εὐπλοκάμοις κατὰ δῶμα  
ἀμφὶ πυρὶ στῆσαι τρίποδα μέγαν, ὅφρα πέλοιτο  
Ἐκτορι θερμὰ λοετρὰ μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι (22.440-444).

This brief description lends a sense of continuity between the two major scenes of the *Iliad* featuring Andromache. At the end of Book 6, Hector had told Andromache to return home and return to weaving and managing the household. This is exactly what she is doing in Book 22 – carrying on with her duties as her husband advised her.<sup>106</sup> Even more to the point, she is optimistically preparing for his return, weaving a robe for him, and ordering the handmaidens to prepare his bath.<sup>107</sup> The impact of the change in characterizing methods becomes more clear as the narrator “sets a scene” for the audience. In creating a happy domestic scene and placing an optimistic Andromache in the middle, the audience, expecting the impending disaster, is already pitying her ignorant state. The narrator primes the pump through his subtle comment *νηπίη, οὐδ'*

---

<sup>104</sup> See the discussion of Book 8 above for a similar use of the term. See also Charles Segal “Andromache's *Anagnorisis*: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22.437-476.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75 (1971): 37. Segal notes that Andromache's name is not used at all during the entire scene.

<sup>105</sup> Descriptions of settings and descriptions of people or things are two kinds of narrative pauses defined by S. Richardson 36. He argues that in general the Homeric narrator is not interested in the object of his descriptions so much as the effect of his descriptions (S. Richardson 50). Usually, the description is a “preface” to some important action (58). For de Jong, description is an implicit means of evaluation or emotionalization (de Jong, *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives*, 17).

<sup>106</sup> N. Richardson elaborates on the connections between Books 6 and 22 (N. Richardson 152-3).

<sup>107</sup> Andromache's weaving has received much scholarly attention. Louden, like others, notes the similarities between Helen's weaving in Book 3 and Andromache's in Book 22: they are both folded, double robes; while weaving they both discuss the need to see their husbands; as a result of the news they receive while weaving, they rush off in an emotional state, accompanied by servants; both go to the tower where they are met by a throng; Helen is eager to see her brothers as Andromache is eager to see her husband (Louden 60-62). Atchity notes that unlike Helen, Andromache does not weave motifs which indicate an awareness of her own self-importance (Atchity 160). He also compares the futility of her persistence in weaving to the futility of Hector's attempt to face Achilles (Atchity 162). Segal interprets the flower motifs she weaves as symbolic of new life and rebirth (Segal 40).

ἐνόησεν ὃ μιν μάλα τῆλε λοετρῶν/χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος δάμασε γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (22.445-446), indicating his pity of Andromache's ignorance and the uselessness of her efforts.<sup>108</sup>

The quiet domesticity is interrupted by the sound of Hecuba's wailing: *κωκυτοῦ δ' ἤκουσε καὶ οἴμωγῆς ἀπὸ πύργου* (22.447).<sup>109</sup> The narrator then works the emotions of the audience by dramatically detailing Andromache's suspicion and fear. The anxiety begins with the aural prompt of Hecuba's wailing, again forging another link to the scene in Book 6 when Andromache rushes to the walls because of a rumor she hears at home. Andromache then drops her shuttle and calls out to her handmaidens:

τῆς δ' ἐλελίχθη γυνῆ, χαμαὶ δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε κερκίς·  
ἦ δ' αὖτις δμῳῇσιν εὐπλοκάμοισι μετηύδα  
δεῦτε δύω μοι ἔπεσον, ἴδωμ' ὅτιν' ἔργα τέτυκται.  
αἰδοίης ἐκυρῆς ὁπὸς ἔκλυον, ἐν δ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῇ  
στήθεσι πάλλεται ἥτορ ἀνὰ στόμα, νέρθε δὲ γούνα  
πήγνυται· ἐγγὺς δῆτι κακὸν Πριάμοιο τέκεσσιν.  
αἶ γὰρ ἀπ' οὐατος εἴη ἐμεῦ ἔπος· (22.448-454).

Andromache's initial response is symbolic – the drop of the shuttle halts her domestic productivity literally and figuratively. Now the narrator wishes to describe Andromache's inner fear and turmoil, but he uses a different strategy than in Book 6. In that scene, the narrator relied on participles describing Andromache's emotional state, such as *δακρυόεσσα*, *δάκρυ χέουσα*, and *γελάσασα*, to indicate the emotions behind her actions, but in this scene, the narrator allows Andromache herself to relate the actions or physical effects revealing her emotions. She relates that her impulse to go is based on something she heard (*ἔκλυον* 22.451), and then describes the physical effects the anxiety is having on her: her heart is rising up to her mouth, and her limbs are frozen (22.451-2).<sup>110</sup> She is certain some evil is near, and utters a prohibitive wish (22.454). This is one of the few times in the epic when Andromache actually vocalizes what she is feeling or thinking, and because she uses her own voice to vividly describe the grip her fear and anxiety have on her, the emotions feel more urgent and immediate to the audience.

<sup>108</sup> S. Richardson notes that direct comment is one of the techniques used by the narrator (along with apostrophe) “to excite in the audience feelings of sympathy, and he [the narrator] reserves for special moments the technique of alluding overtly to the catastrophe precipitated by the present action” (S. Richardson 162). De Jong's observation that *nepios*-comments often highlight the contrast between hope and delusion seems particularly apt here (de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 86).

<sup>109</sup> See S. Richardson 117 ff. for means of transition between scenes.

<sup>110</sup> Another example of what Lateiner categorizes as out-of-awareness affective displays – physical reactions which could not be controlled even if the subject wished to do so (Lateiner 12).



She then begins a lengthy fear clause, essentially prophesying exactly what she will discover when she reaches the wall: that Achilles has killed Hector alone, away from the city, because Hector could never stay back in the crowd (22.454-9):<sup>111</sup>

....ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἰνῶς  
 δεῖδω μὴ δὴ μοι θρασὺν Ἑκτορα δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς  
 μούνον ἀποτμήξας πόλιος πεδῖον δὲ δίηται,  
 καὶ δὴ μιν καταπαύσῃ ἀγνηροῖης ἀλεγεινῆς  
 ἥ μιν ἔχουσ', ἐπεὶ οὐ ποτ' ἐνὶ πληθυῖ μένεν ἀνδρῶν,  
 ἀλλὰ πολὺ προθέεσκε, τὸ ὃν μένος οὐδενὶ εἴκων (22.455-459).

Andromache's concerns here again echo Book 6, but they call to mind her initial lament rather than the description of her actions. Andromache begins her address to Hector in the *homilia* scene with the warning that his own strength will be his undoing: φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος (6.407), and finishes her lament with a request that he stay back from the fighting: λαὸν δὲ στῆσον παρ' ἐρινεόν, ἔνθα μάλιστα/ἀμβατός ἐστι πόλις καὶ ἐπίδρομον ἔπλετο τεῖχος (6.433-434). She anticipates here that Hector did not heed her advice. Again, the audience's response to her anxiety is strengthened because Andromache speaks these fears out loud, revealing something of her inner consciousness that was absent from the indirect presentation of character up to this point. Andromache's emotions are not included in the scene as a way to dramatically contrast her stance on the war to Hector's eagerness for battle – they are the focus of the scene.

The emotional response to the sound of wailing is amplified by the simile of the maenad raving, *μαινάδι ἴση* (22.460), used by the narrator when the progression of the scene begins again. Again, the *homilia* scene of Book 6 is recalled, since both similes describe the frenzied woman as she leaves the house, and both departures are preceded by the receipt of an aurally transmitted prompt. In Book 22, however, Andromache is compared directly to a maenad, not a raving woman, thus eliminating other possible interpretations, and it is the narrator, the authoritative voice, who draws the comparison. Even though some scholars have questioned whether or not the use of the simile proves the historical audience's knowledge of the cult of Dionysus,<sup>112</sup> the

<sup>111</sup> This fear clause recalls some of the fears Andromache shared with Hector in Book 6 – she initially told him that his courage would be his death, and now she voices her fear that her inclination was true. See N. Richardson 156. The clause also foreshadows some of the themes and motifs she will revisit in her later laments: first, that his courage was “grief-causing,” which essentially summarizes the entire thematic content of all of her laments; second, that he would not stay back and would back down to no one, which she again recalls in her lament of Book 24, when she tells Astyanax it is likely he will die because of some Achaean seeking vengeance for Hector's brutality in battle.

separate works of Privitera and Tsagalis conclude convincingly that Dionysus and maenadism were well-known to Homeric audiences.<sup>113</sup> Andromache's situation as it stands now in Book 22 also better supports the thematic implications of the maenad simile. As Seaford has argued, the maenad symbolizes the abandonment of the domestic sphere and the disruption of feminine domestic productivity, therefore threatening the stability of the community.<sup>114</sup> In Dionysian cult worship, the god is the catalyst of the abandonment, but in the *Iliad*, it is concern for a warrior husband that produces the frenzied effect. While the *Iliad* uses the anxieties of the families at home as a recurring motif in battlefield speeches and supplications, there is no detailed meditation on the kind of sustained mental anguish women endure while their men are at the front. This simile manages to convey the "madness" which overtakes women at home, waiting for news. Of course, the comparison is even more apt because the narrator has been mining the marriage of Hector and Andromache as a source of pathos since Book 6. That the simile of the maenad here precedes the rejection of an important wedding gift reinforces its association with the disruption of the marriage-forged *oikos*.

Charles Segal has noted the similarity between this scene in Book 22 and the moment of *anagnorisis* in a tragedy.<sup>115</sup> After building the tension in the narrative through the description of the domestic scene and Andromache's frenzied departure from her home, the verb *νόησεν* in line 22.463 finally resolves it, and Andromache finally knows what the audience has known all along.<sup>116</sup> Just as the maenad simile symbolized the disruption and abandonment of the *oikos*

---

<sup>112</sup> N. Richardson argues that, since this is the only use *μαινάς* in the Homeric corpus, it might be wrong to consider it an allusion to the cult of Dionysus. But he also suggests that the ellipsis about Dionysus at 6.132-133 confirms that Homer knew about maenads (N. Richardson 156). He compares line 22.260 to the Homeric Hymn to Demeter 386. In fact, *μαινάς* is quite rare in early Greek literature. Up to the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE, the word appears only 5 times: *Il.* 22.460; *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 386; Pindar *Py.* 4.216; Aesch. *frag.* 382.1; Aesch. *Eu.* 500. Semonides, Alcaeus, Aesop, Heraclitus, Aeschylus, Theognis, Anacreon, and Pindar all use forms of the verb *μαίνομαι*. Sappho, Archilochus, Pindar, Hecataeus, Aeschylus all use forms of *μαινόλις*, the feminine form of the noun *μαινόλις*. In the *Iliad* and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, the term is used as a simile. In all other instances, it refers to the female worshippers of Dionysus.

<sup>113</sup> See footnote 66 above. Segal suggests, however, that the denoted realm of experience would be "unusual" for a Homeric audience (Segal 47-48).

<sup>114</sup> Seaford 116 and 121. Louden reads the connection in a completely different way: "In twice comparing Andromache with a madwoman and in her accurate prediction of Hektor's death, the *Iliad* figures Andromache as the same mythic type that the post-Homeric tradition uses for Cassandra" (Louden 33).

<sup>115</sup> Segal 36-37. Segal bases his definition on the one proposed by Aristotle in *Poetics* XI.

brought on by Andromache's anxiety for her husband, so the dramatic response of her realization symbolizes the dissolution of her marriage, literally undoing the rituals associated with the wedding celebration.<sup>117</sup> Once Andromache sees the horses dragging Hector back to the Achaean ships, she faints: *τὴν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐρεβεννὴ νύξ ἐκάλυψεν, ἥριπε δ' ἐξοπίσω, ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐκάπυσσε* (22.466-467). The verb *καλύπτω* recalls the *anakalupteria* of the wedding, when the veil of the bride is finally pulled back and her husband gazes on her for the first time that day. Andromache's faint is a reversal of that process. The veil of darkness again covers her as she and Hector are again separated. The undoing of the ceremony continues when Andromache tears away her headdress, a gesture previously performed by her mother-in-law when she saw Hector killed (22.406). The headdress she rips off, as the narrator informs the audience in an external analepsis, was an elaborate creation given to her by Aphrodite on her wedding day:

*τῇλε δ' ἀπὸ κρατὸς βάλε δέσματα σιγαλόεντα,  
ἄμπυκα κεκρύφαλόν τε ἰδὲ πλεκτὴν ἀναδέσμη  
κρήδεμνον θ', ὃ ῥά οἱ δῶκε χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ  
ἥματι τῷ ὅτε μιν κορυθαίολος ἠγάγεθ' Ἔκτωρ  
ἐκ δόμου Ἡετίωνος, ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα* (22.468-472).

This one dramatic act packs significant symbolic meaning.<sup>118</sup> The act is certainly meant to draw attention to the occasion of the gift-giving: her wedding to Hector.<sup>119</sup> And, as Lateiner notes,

---

<sup>116</sup> Also, Andromache is the only featured woman who is portrayed as anxiety-ridden by a lack of news. The tragic turns of Hecuba and Thetis, etc. are based on knowledge and knowing – Hecuba sees her son killed, Thetis knows her son's future, Helen's husband is deposited in her room before her. The tension derives from the anxiety of not knowing. Interestingly enough, the character whose experience most closely mirrors Andromache's is Achilles as he waits in the camp unaware of Patroclus' death (17.401-411). The difference, however, is that his ignorance is not presented for pathetic effect. When it is time for Achilles to learn the truth, it comes to him straight from the battlefield, from an eyewitness (18.18-21). Andromache learns the truth in a far more dramatic fashion, and thus the scene is again played for pathos. Though Achilles' reaction to the news mirrors Andromache's (18.22-27; note especially the use of the verb *καλύπτω*), ultimately the inherent differences between Achaean warrior and Trojan wife keep Achilles' grief from being truly tragic. Even though he was unaware of Patroclus' death as Andromache was unaware of Hector's, Achilles suffers almost no negative consequences in the wake of Patroclus' death, while Andromache must face an unendurable fate.

<sup>117</sup> Seaford writes, "and because a household is constituted by marriage, in each case its destruction, and the consequent isolation of the female, is associated with the evocation and negation of the transition from maiden to wife" (Seaford 125).

<sup>118</sup> Rimmon-Kenan notes that "one-time actions tend to evoke the dynamic aspect of the character, often playing a turning point in the narrative." Even if the action does not represent "constant" qualities of the character, it is not "less characteristic" than other actions. In fact, Rimmon-Kenan states, "its dramatic impact often suggests that the traits it reveals are qualitatively more crucial than the numerous habits which represent the character's routine" (Rimmon-Kenan 61).

gestures and actions like these are completely controllable, and therefore have a different effect than affective displays like crying or weeping.<sup>120</sup> The act itself of ripping away the headdress symbolizes the undoing of the ceremony,<sup>121</sup> but the fact that the headdress was a gift of Aphrodite complicates the meaning of the action. The gift indicates divine sanction of the union, and the narrator uses the names of her father and husband to reiterate the wealth and prestige of the men to whom Andromache was attached. Yet despite the auspiciousness of the beginning of their union, the violence of warfare, and fate itself, has negated it. The audience is again reminded that gifts from the gods are as dangerous as they are beautiful.<sup>122</sup>

The narrative techniques utilized in this scene create a firm connection to the characterization of Andromache in Book 6. Andromache is depicted doing exactly what Hector had asked her to, but also suffering the same anxieties she did before, and voicing the same concerns. The presentation of Book 22 is highly narrative in the sense that the entire scene is narrated and focalized through one character, and she is the only character who speaks.<sup>123</sup> Tension is created by a pause in progression and dramatic irony through an act of omission.

---

<sup>119</sup> Similarly to descriptions of environments, descriptions of objects implicitly provide evaluation or evoke emotion. Of Andromache's headdress, de Jong says it "evokes the pathos of her situation following Hector's death" (de Jong, *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives*, 17).

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Hecuba's gesture at 22.405-407: ἡ δὲ νῦ μήτηρ/τίλλε κόμην, ἀπὸ δὲ λιπαρὴν ἔρριψε καλύπτρην/τηλόσε. In comparison to affective displays like crying and weeping, gestures are completely controllable, and therefore contain unambiguous and explicit visual messages. They can constitute an entire non-verbal message, or they can mark plot progression (Lateiner 15). In this case, Andromache's gesture constitutes the entire message to the internal audience, while the gesture in addition to the description of the *κρήδεμνον* comprises a more comprehensive message for the external audience. N. Richardson notes that the woman wore her *κρήδεμνον* for the wedding ceremony. He reads the scene as an inversion of a type scene: as Andromache and Helen have done before, a woman normally covers her head to go out of the house (N. Richardson 157). Segal argues that the gesture symbolizes a fall from womanly happiness and fulfillment and a cancellation of status, an interpretation which applies to both Hecuba and Andromache. But Andromache's scene is more developed because she is the more important character (Segal 50).

<sup>121</sup> Atchity similarly reads this gesture as a symbol of dissolution and death. He also sees the description of her wedding day as an implicit comparison to the disorderliness of Paris' acquisition of Helen (Atchity 164).

<sup>122</sup> Paris remarks at 3.65 that gifts from the gods should not be cast away. Yet the most important divine gift of the epic, Helen herself, is the cause of the war and suffering. It is revealed that Achilles' horses, which belong to his father Peleus, were a gift from the gods, though there is no mention of the occasion of the gift (16.381 and 16.867). On the occasion of Peleus' marriage to Thetis, the gods presented him with armor, which he in turn gave to his son (18.84). In short order these gifts, handed down to Achilles, become harbingers of doom – this was the armor and these were the horses Patroclus wore and drove when he met his fate on the battlefield. In 19.3, Thetis presents the armor made by Hephaistos to Achilles. This armor signified his re-entry into battle and his choice to accept his fate of an early death.

<sup>123</sup> See De Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, 67 for a nice discussion of Andromache as focalizer in this scene.

Pathos is evoked through narrator-comment, the only time it is used for a woman.<sup>124</sup> Verbs are predominantly aorist, and participles are kept to a minimum. The narrator lingers on descriptions of domestic environment, objects, and physical manifestations of emotion. Symbolism drives home important points, and the narrator highlights the dropped shuttle, the maenad, and the headdress at each important moment in the scene. As a result, the kind of characterizing information is different than before, but the continuity between the scenes, and the repetition of important character traits and affects confirm Andromache's characterization as obedient and sensitive to her husband's needs.<sup>125</sup> The continued focus on her emotional state, albeit through different narrative techniques, also solidifies the implication that Andromache's internal turmoil is meant to amplify her thematic function in the *Iliad*. In Book 22, Andromache speaks some of her anxieties, which seems to open her consciousness to the audience for a moment. But, ultimately, little is learned about Andromache that the audience did not already know. But the effect of her speech is dynamic: there is absolutely no need for Andromache to lapse into self-reflections or for the narrator to examine her thoughts as she watches her husband being dragged away. The violence of her reaction is enough to demonstrate the depth of her emotion. The objects used in the scene as symbols of home (shuttle) and marriage (headdress) confirm Andromache's role as a "good wife" type. She is meant to represent, in the most pathetic, heart-wrenching manner possible, the plight of the wives left behind by their warrior husbands.

### *Conclusion*

The methods of characterization used by the narrator to construct Andromache in the text create a character best understood as a representative of a type rather than an individual. The epithets used in direct definition usually modify a social identity, rather than Andromache herself, and the epithets themselves define her as "good" in a typical way – beautiful, correct in behavior, respected and loved by her husband. The indirect presentation in Book 6 relies on participles and non-verbal behavior to present her emotional, but not intellectual reaction to Hector's speeches, while Hector's proleptic visions present her as the "grieving widow" and "proud mother" types. The indirect presentation in Book 22 describes her carrying out her gender-defined duties of housework. Again, the narrator presents her emotional reaction to Hector's death, but instead of relying on participles and brief descriptions of nonverbal behavior,

---

<sup>124</sup> Noted by Segal 42.

<sup>125</sup> See also Segal 40.

the narrator narrates almost exclusively the physical manifestations of her fear and shock. This scene also relies on symbolism to tie the character of Andromache to larger themes.

On Rimmon-Kenan's sliding scales, Andromache would be considered simple rather than complex because so few traits are ascribed to her, and there is little variety among the traits. In comparison to Helen, whose remarkable beauty is denoted by several different epithets, or Penelope, whose sharp intellect is her most celebrated trait, Andromache seems to lack dimension. This characterizing material also offers almost no access of her inner-consciousness. Her emotions are foregrounded in each scene, but there is very little representation of thought. Despite the fact that inner consciousness is most often expressed in speech in Homer, there are other means of indicating mental faculties in Homeric epic: through non-verbal behavior (which may indicate a disconnect between thought and deed or thought and speech), and through similes or metaphors. Some Homeric characters, like Penelope and Odysseus, also have epithets which celebrate their mental acuity. But in Andromache's case, each of these techniques is used to describe an emotion, rather than a reflective or meditative thought. Based on this information, Andromache is also a static character instead of a developing character. Andromache is a secondary character, and her scenes are of short duration, and so it is not necessary that she be as finely drawn as the primary characters. Nevertheless, the power of her character is such that it inspired repeated characterization and expansion in later retellings of the Trojan War story. That fact can be attributed to the strong thematic function of the character.

#### **IV. Thematic Function**

Hecuba casts Andromache as a bereaved wife in Book 22 when she attempts to dissuade Hector from fighting Achilles. The bereaved wife is a component of several pathetic motifs in the *Iliad*, such as "far from home," "dying unburied," in conjunction with "bereaved parents," and in the motif employed almost exclusively by Andromache herself, "orphaned child and widowed wife." These motifs are employed in several different spoken contexts (e.g. battlefield taunts, supplications, laments).<sup>126</sup> Jasper Griffin has argued that allusions to bereaved wives are intrinsically emotional – the simple mention of her situation, even without the embellishment of

---

<sup>126</sup> Jasper Griffin, "Homeric Pathos and Objectivity." *Classical Quarterly* 26 (1976): 161-87, *passim*, has an excellent discussion of how pathetic motifs are used in different speech and narrative contexts while still emphasizing the significance of death in the *Iliad*.

elaborate pathos, is enough to provoke an emotional response.<sup>127</sup> The power to cause this kind of powerful response lies in the futility of the situation in which the parents, children, and wives of the heroes find themselves. They suffer emotional distress and physical hardship or even death through no fault of their own, and their suffering is conditioned by the paradox of the warrior endangering his family by fighting to preserve them.<sup>128</sup> Andromache's undeserved suffering brings to light the "problem" of heroic culture, the unflagging promotion of male *kleos* at the expense of the safety and well-being of the non-combatants at home. Therefore, her characterization reflects that tragedy – once she is established as "good," she is consistently depicted in emotional torment. All of her nonverbal behavior in Book 6 relates to emotions, and the entire narrative of Book 22 is an extended reaction-scene, focusing sharply on her heart-stopping fear and the shock of her realization. The maenad simile is also intended to describe the frenetic release of built up anxiety. Even though the details of her situation are enough to evoke pity (the fact that she has no living family is surely included to make her suffering even more undeserved), the narrative techniques in each scene heap even more pathos on her plight.

The thematic function of the figures in the above mentioned motifs is best illustrated through the example of the mentions of Andromache in Books 8, 17, and 22. Books 8 through 17 feature the rise and fall of Hector's dominance on the battlefield. For a time, he is favored by Zeus, and he wreaks havoc upon the Achaeans. The narrative is restricted to the battlefield and the Achaean camp – there are no more representations of Troy or the Trojan royal family until Book 22. Yet Andromache is deliberately brought into the narrative in Books 8 and 17, at the beginning and end of Hector's *aristeia*. In both instances, Hector and Zeus recall some past behavior of hers which demonstrate her absolute devotion to Hector. By simply naming her and recalling two of Andromache's simple, habitual activities, the speakers call up all the motifs and themes to which Andromache is connected. Though she contributes nothing to the progress of the plot at those points, the audience appreciates the reminder that whatever the results of Hector's *aristeia* may be, the consequences will be far-reaching. Hecuba's supplication in Book 22 clearly includes Andromache as the "bereaved wife" motif appended to the "bereaved parents" motif in a supplication to a warrior. Again, Hector stands on a dangerous precipice – he

---

<sup>127</sup> Griffin, "Homeric Pathos," 173 and Jasper Griffin *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980) 120.

<sup>128</sup> Nancy Felson and Laura Slatkin. "Gender and Homeric Epic." *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Ed. Robert Fowler (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004) 96. As Redfield puts it, "the man who, on behalf of his family, must leave his family, so that his very defense of them becomes a betrayal" (Redfield 123).

faces a difficult decision, one that he knows will define his legacy for years to come. Each scene draws on the paradox of the warrior fighting to protect his family while simultaneously endangering them – Hector is praised for his stalwart devotion to his city and his father’s *kleos*, yet Andromache’s suffering is great because of it.

Andromache’s thematic function is strengthened in the longer scenes because the narrator focuses on Andromache’s marriage, which is essentially the cause of her suffering. The *homilia* scene presents a dramatized meditation on the paradox of the warrior betraying his family while attempting to protect them. The opposing ideologies embodied by the typical warrior husband and non-combatant wife are presented in the first two speeches of the scene, and it is clear that Hector is motivated not only by concern for his family, but also by shame and a desire for glory. His final speech, an attempt to comfort his wife, reveals that there is no middle ground to be found in this conflict of interests – Fate decides whose interests will prevail, and so there is nothing to do but return to the business of promoting the status quo – husband to the battlefield and wife to the home. The Book 6 lament and *homilia* scene recall Andromache’s connection to Hector and present the current state of affairs, but the Book 22 scene depicts the moment of the dissolution of the connecting bond, and the realization that Fate has chosen to make Andromache suffer. As Andromache comes to learn the truth about Hector’s fate, the narrator employs several symbols signifying the end of domestic production and the reversal of the marriage ceremony. Hector failed in his attempt to protect his family, and the symbolic reversal of the ceremony which connected Andromache to Hector signals the dissolution of that bond and her deprivation of a protector.

The emotional suffering of the widow and bereaved mother established in the direct definition and indirect presentation complements the criticism Andromache voices in her laments. While Andromache’s laments articulate the various consequences at stake for the family of the intrepid warrior, the narrator describes her continual anxiety and mental anguish as she awaits news from the front. The focus on her marriage, both its inception and its dissolution, complements the formulaic elements her laments: her various addresses to Hector as her “dear one” and her husband, her absolute dependence on him now that her natal family is gone (Book 6), their ill-fated connection (Book 22), and the deprivation of closure caused by his death on the battlefield (Book 24). Andromache’s status as a married woman defines her future sufferings as well as her current anxiety. In her lament in Book 22 she makes reference to watching helplessly



as her son is marginalized; in Book 24 she imagines that she will be shipped off to Greece with her son and the other Trojan women, or that she will endure her son's death before she departs. Andromache's laments are sophisticated narratives that point out the unbalanced nature of the heroic value system. The direct definition and indirect presentation of her characterization balances these bold statements by creating as sympathetic a character as possible. It is clear that Andromache sings critical laments not because of a transgressive nature or a desire to subvert, but because her suffering is cruel and undeserved.

The poet of the *Iliad* has created in Andromache the perfect representative of the experiences of women in times of war. Through indirect presentation and direct definition, the poet establishes Andromache as a typical wife and mother with typically good qualities. This broad characterization serves to make her a sympathetic character, for the emotional anxieties she suffers cannot be of her own doing, for they are all externally motivated. By putting the most detailed and critical laments into the mouth of the most typically good and sympathetic female character, the poet lends credence to their message. Andromache's laments do not give voice to the individual anguish of a wife, and they are not meditations on her own agency in her suffering – they simply relate the facts, the truth of what happens to wives and children when warriors fight and die. This straightforward characterization becomes the kernel for later literary characterization of Andromache, the “core elements” which will be taken up in continuations of the Trojan War saga and her own personal story. Any vestiges of other Amazonian or Theban traditions vanish in future characterizations. It is the Homeric Andromache who survives and is taken up by Euripides centuries later.

The typical, Homeric goodness of Andromache becomes the foundation for her tragic incarnations. The absolute goodness of her character, the absence of ambiguity in her representation cast light into the shadows of the characterizations of other, less absolute characters. Thrown up against an iconic image of goodness and virtue, the flaws of others, whether they are cruelty, baseness, or even youthful indiscretion, become amplified for examination by the tragic poet. By exploring Andromache's victimization at length, Euripides seeks to define the boundaries between heroic and unheroic, Greek and barbaric, noble and base.

## I. Introduction

Although the influence of other sources is traceable in Euripides' *Andromache* and *Trojan Women*, nevertheless it is the Homeric epic that most strongly influences the characterization of Andromache in Euripides' plays. Therefore, this and the following chapter are at once positive and comparative studies: each will analyze the character and characterization of Andromache in the play itself, suggest her thematic function, and analyze the continuity of character, characterization and theme between the tragic presentation and the epic presentation of the figure. In *Andromache*, Euripides creates Andromache from a solid, Homeric base. She is still virtuous and good, devoted to Hector, and lamenting his loss, all qualities and activities she displays in the *Iliad*. Euripides makes Andromache's "epic" nature an important part of her characterization. By attributing heroic, epic qualities to a lowly, foreign spear-bride, Euripides intends to call into question the qualities of the noble Greeks thrown into conflict with her: Hermione and Menelaus. In the *Iliad*, Andromache's typical goodness was a means of making her suffering all the more pathetic, and her critical comments all the more authoritative. In *Andromache*, this same typical goodness evokes a slightly different response. In the *Iliad*, Andromache blames her suffering on her husband's pursuit of *kleos*, a dangerous yet undeniably noble and heroic pursuit valued and honored in Homeric society. Her suffering is almost necessary for the commemoration of her heroic husband, and though his death makes her a widow and their child an orphan, his conduct was nothing but exemplary. But in *Andromache*, Andromache's suffering comes at the hands of Hermione and Menelaus. Though their concerns are perhaps understandable, the escalation of violence is cruel and unnecessary and the threats they make on Andromache's life and the life of her child reveal their own baseness. Andromache's suffering at the hands of the Spartans is not necessary. This is a domestic, not an external conflict, and her suffering is motivated by hate, prejudice, and insecurity, not by valorous attempts to defend home and hearth. Andromache in *Andromache* addresses the conflicts of the home, and helps to define what is and is not heroic beyond the context of the battle.

In extant Greek literature composed before Euripides' *Andromache*, Andromache herself is not a popular character. The surviving fragments of the Epic Cycle note only that she was given to Neoptolemus after the fall of Troy, and that her son Astyanax was thrown from the walls of the city, either by Neoptolemus or Odysseus.<sup>1</sup> A fragment of an epithalamium by Sappho, fragment 44 L-P, narrates the wedding of Hector and Andromache and the joyous celebration of Troy for their nuptials. Andromache is characterized to a very slight degree in what survives of this fragment: the narrator refers to her as “quick-glancing” (ἐλικοώπιδα 5), “delicate” or “graceful” (ἄβραν 7) and, along with Hector, “godlike” (θεοεικέλοις 34). Though the extant versions of these poems are fragmentary, it is clear that Euripides used the Cyclic tradition of Andromache being given to Neoptolemus to formulate the plots of *Andromache* and *Trojan Women*. Euripides may have drawn from Sappho's description of Hector and Andromache's wedding for his characterization of Andromache, which will be discussed below.

The influence of Homeric epic is everywhere evident in Greek tragedy, from the plots of the plays themselves to the very diction spoken by the characters. Naturally, the differences between the genres of epic and tragic poetry demand that the characters of these stories, and the means tragic poets employ to bring them to life, be distinct. However, as Chapter 1 of this study shows, there is no need to set aside the previously employed method of character analysis. Tragic poets employ direct definition, indirect presentation, and analogy to flesh out their characters, just as epic poets do. It is the absence of a single, authoritative narrator that changes the presentation of the story, but that absence does not preclude the existence of richly developed characters. Other dramaturgical elements and spoken set pieces present to the audience and the reader characterizing content similar to that which a narrator would provide, simply repackaged for performance on the stage.

The very structure of *Andromache* seems to be designed to create a strong and compelling character in Andromache from the start. Euripides focuses the action of the first 463 lines around her immovable figure: she has taken asylum as a suppliant in the Thetideion, and the internal plots of the action are revealed bit by bit as each interlocutor tries to lure her out of her protected spot. It is in these interactions that her character is defined and distinguished. When she is finally drawn from the Thetideion and the plot against her and her son is revealed,

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Ilias Parva* (Davies F 20 = Bernabé 21) ἐκ δ' ἔλετ' Ἀνδρομάχην ἠΰζωνον παράκοιτιν/Ἐκτορος, ἣν τε οἱ αὐτῶι ἀρεστῆς Παναχαιῶν/δῶκαν ἔχειν ἐπίηρον ἀμειβόμενοι γέρας ἀνδρῶι (6-8).

there is little need for further characterization. Euripides allows the life-threatening action of the play to test the character he created for her. When she is delivered by Peleus and withdraws from the action at line 765, the strength of her characterization is not diminished by her absence. The interpersonal conflicts (and the social tensions underlying them) uncovered and exacerbated during her time onstage continue to play themselves out in the remaining action, intermingled with the ironic rescue of Hermione and the equally ironic homecoming of the hero Neoptolemus.

Despite the fact that the tripartite structure of *Andromache* seems perfectly calibrated to create a strong, memorable character in Andromache herself, the play has not escaped criticism for its unconventional plot design.<sup>2</sup> The hypothesis of Aristophanes of Byzantium labels it τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα τῶν δευτέρων, and scholars for generations to follow have attacked or apologized for its perceived defects. The play is divided into three parts, with lines 1-765 focused on Andromache; 802-1008 focused on Hermione, and 1047-1288 focused on Peleus.<sup>3</sup> This division makes it impossible to position any one character as the central character, the singular focus of the action of the plot and the sympathy of the audience, and thus (in the estimation of some) weakens the strength of the drama.<sup>4</sup> Structural irregularities notwithstanding, different scholars have offered a different unifying figure, presenting arguments based on characterization, theme, or story pattern.<sup>5</sup> Another approach to interpreting the play has been to focus a keener eye on the patterns

---

<sup>2</sup> The term “unconventional” is here used with respect to Aristotle’s conception of sound tragic plot design. See Anne Pippin Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides’ Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971) 1. As Burnett explains, “Aristotle described the best tragic praxis as the imitation of a single arc of overturn by means of one fictional event of major peripeteia, an event that would bring the central figure round preferably from good fortune into bad. He opposed the combination of several reversals in a single play, and he particularly opposed the mixing of the negative form of overturn with the opposite.” See *Poetics* XIII.5-7.

<sup>3</sup> Phillip Stevens, *Euripides: Andromache* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971) 5-8. He states that there is clearly a causal connection between the three parts. Each section shows a character in despair, feeling herself or himself to be deserted; each express their despair in lyrics; and each is eventually rescued. Despite this similarity, “[t]he last scenes have on the face of it only a tenuous connection with the initial pathos and peril of Andromache, a connection that is not greatly strengthened by the brief allusion in the epilogue to her subsequent fate or even by her silent presence, if she is on stage.” See also Kenneth Aldrich, *Euripides: Andromache* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska Press, 1961) 61-63.

<sup>4</sup> See Albin Lesky, *Greek Tragedy*. 3rd ed. Trans. H. Frankfort (London: Ernst Benn, 1978). Lesky, for example, attributes the lack of unity to the disappearance of Andromache after 765: “Euripides has certainly created a most wonderful woman in the figure of Andromache....but her disappearance in the second half of the play destroys its unity and is not compensated for by the fact that she is mentioned in the prophecy of Thetis” (159).

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Antonio Garzya, *Andromacha* (Naples: G. Scalabrini, 1963); Jan Kamerbeek, “L’Andromaque d’Euripide.” *Mnemosyne* 11 (1943): 47-67; Hartmut Erbse, “Euripides’ *Andromache*.” *Hermes* 94 (1966): 276-97; Michael Lloyd, *Euripides: Andromache* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1994); Judith Mossman, “Waiting for Neoptolemus: The Unity of Euripides’ *Andromache*.” *Greece and Rome* 43 (1996): 143-56; and William Allan, *The*

emerging from the plot structure. Anne Pippin Burnett has shown that the tragedy consists of three typical story patterns (suppliant tragedy, rescue tragedy, divine punishment tragedy) and that the characters adopt a new typical role in each story mutation. She argues that Euripides builds a new kind of plot, one not centered on a single figure.<sup>6</sup> More recently scholars have moved the discussion about the difficulties of the play away from the structural difficulties and towards thematic unity, trying to arrange the action around a single idea, to varying degrees of success.<sup>7</sup> This approach has also met with criticism, most recently from William Allan who argues that the *Andromache* is structured in such a way as to make discontinuity and surprise

---

*Andromache and Euripidean Tragedy* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000). Garzya puts the emphasis on Hermione as the figure of *pathos* (Garzya xxxvi-xxxvii); Kamerbeek suggests that unity of the play is found in the relationship between Andromache and Hermione (Kamerbeek 62); Erbse thinks Andromache is the unifying figure (Erbse 279). Lloyd acknowledges that the play has three distinct sections, but feels that the play has a focus in the absence and return of Neoptolemus. He classifies the *Andromache* as a *nostos* play (Lloyd 3-4). Mossman argues convincingly that Neoptolemus is the central, unifying figure of the play. He is vividly characterized through the other characters' descriptions and remembrances of him (Mossman 146), he is kept in the forefront of the audience's mind throughout the play (Mossman 149-153), and his absence increases the *pathos* of the suppliant situation and the suspense of the Hermione/Orestes story (Mossman 153). Allan argues that Neoptolemus is a "source of suspense" and "central to the play's dynamic" (Allan 47).

<sup>6</sup> Burnett explains how typical roles are transferred between characters and how three typical story patterns are combined. She analyzes the play as an experiment in "role-changing." It begins as a suppliant tragedy with one suppliant, two villains, and one royal champion. In the second section, one of the villains from the suppliant play becomes a helpless heroine rescued by an outsider champion from an unseen villain (Neoptolemus). In the third section, a "tragedy of divine punishment," the rescuer from the second section becomes the villain, and the unseen villain becomes the hero, while the royal champion of the first section becomes the helpless relative. Throughout all of this, only one character remains true to her "original role and character," and that is Andromache (Burnett 130-13). Cf. Kevin Lee, "Euripides' *Andromache*: Observations on Form and Meaning," *Antichthon* 9 (1975): 6 who agrees with the tripartite structure, but suggests Peleus for the "hero" of the third section, not Neoptolemus.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., Humphrey Kitto, *Greek Tragedy: A Literary Study*. 3rd ed. (London: Methuen, 1966); Desmond Conacher, *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme and Structure* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1967); Aldrich; Patricia Boulter, "Sophia and Sophrosune in Euripides' *Andromache*," *Phoenix* 20 (1966): 51-8; Lee, Ian Storey, "Domestic Disharmony in Euripides' *Andromache*," *Greece & Rome* 36 (1989): 16-27; Nancy Rabinowitz, "Proliferating Triangles: Euripides' *Andromache* and the Traffic in Women," *Mosaic* 17 (1987): 111-25; and Poulheria Kyriakou, "All in the Family: Present and Past in Euripides' *Andromache*," *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997): 7-26. Kitto argues that the unity lies in the idea of the play, which is to criticize Spartan *Machtpolitik* (Kitto 230-1). For Conacher the tragedy is moving toward the separation of the "evil" Spartan elements from the "noble" Trojan and Phthian elements, a separation worked out on the personal and dynastic levels (Conacher 172-173). Aldrich sees the play coalescing between two themes: the marriage of Neoptolemus and Hermione and the causes and effects of the war (Aldrich 68-70). Boulter thinks the unifying theme is the conflicting ideas of morality, and he examines different representations of *sophia* and *sophrosune* in the tragedy (Boulter 53). Lee considers the play to be a meditation on the difference between *nomos* and *physis*, exemplified most clearly in the *agon* between Andromache and Hermione (Lee 9). Storey focuses on the domestic disharmony and domestic dislocation pervasive in the tragedy (Storey 181). Rabinowitz believes the disjointed nature of the plot reinforces the "disorder in the gender system" represented by the relationships of Hermione and Andromache with the men in the tragedy (Rabinowitz 112). Kyriakou also explores the representation of family relationships in the tragedy (Kyriakou 8).

“expressive” forces and therefore he does not advocate looking for a unifying structural element.<sup>8</sup>

The structure and unity of the play does affect the characterization of Andromache in *Andromache*, but it will not be sole focus of this chapter. As Allan suggests, the play itself presents the audience and readers with a “plethora of interdependent issues.”<sup>9</sup> Although she is on stage only from lines 1-765 of the tragedy, Andromache’s character engages the most interesting and controversial themes of the play, calling into question the stability of the two-woman household, the tensions between Greeks and foreigners, and the qualities which separate the noble from the base. In addition to navigating these difficult waters, the character must also negotiate her survival as a mother and concubine in a foreign, hostile land. By drawing attention to the suffering of a “barbarian” captive woman, Euripides opens the view of the audience to a host of unsavory issues befalling both the *oikos* and the *polis*.<sup>10</sup> Andromache’s positioning as a catalyzing figure in these conflicts depends on her possessing a multiple identity. The following section will define her status within the *oikos* and the *polis* through an analysis of direct definition.

## II. Direct Definition

Even though Greek tragedy does not utilize the same system of epithets as epic poetry, there is no shortage of direct descriptors applied to Andromache in *Andromache*. The lack of a narrator in Greek tragedy allows all direct description of any character to convey additional meaning: by defining the social status or personal qualities of a character, the speaker reveals his or her personal opinions and perceptions, therefore helping to flesh out the various conflicts within the tragedy. In describing the utility of direct definition in analyzing character and characterization, Rimmon-Kenan suggests that direct definition can only be considered direct

---

<sup>8</sup> Allan 82.

<sup>9</sup> Allan argues that the tragedy cannot be unified by an overarching theme, since it raises “a plethora of interdependent issues” (Allan 46). See also Susan Phillippo, “Family Ties: Significant Patronymics in Euripides’ *Andromache*,” *Classical Quarterly* 45 (1995): 355-56.

<sup>10</sup> See Froma Zeitlin, *Playing the Other* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996). Zeitlin famously explained a woman’s function in a Greek tragedy thus: “[F]unctionally, women are even an end in themselves, and nothing changes for them once they have lived out their drama onstage. Rather, they play the role of catalysts, agents, instruments, blockers, spoilers, destroyers, and sometimes helpers or saviors for the male characters. When predominantly represented, they may serve as antimodels as well as hidden models for that masculine self and concomitantly, their experience of suffering or their acts that lead them to disaster regularly occur before and precipitate those of men” (347).

characterization if the definition comes from the most authoritative voice in the narrative.<sup>11</sup>

Rimmon-Kenan's caveat was born from the wariness of the modern, unreliable narrator.

However, a similar warning might be applied to tragic characterization: not every speaker will describe another character faithfully or objectively. This kind of unreliability, however, actually presents the audience or reader with insights into the thematic function of a character. It is clear that all the speaking characters of *Andromache* define Andromache's social status(es) accurately. There is, however, an instability in the description of her personal traits and qualities. It will therefore fall to other means of analysis (indirect presentation and analogy) to determine which qualities may be securely ascribed to Andromache in an objective manner, and which reflect the personal opinions and prejudices of the speakers.

### *Self-definition*

The transformation of the story from Troy to Phthia necessitates drastic changes in Andromache's social and familial roles. Andromache's conception of herself, and therefore the words she uses to describe herself, refer to all stages of her life, from her happy days in Troy to her present miserable conditions. Andromache first identifies herself in the prologue as the "childbearing wife of Hector" (δάμαρ...παιδοποιός Ἑκτορι, 4)<sup>12</sup> and secondly as a "slave" (δούλη, 12)<sup>13</sup> and "spear-prize" (δορὸς γέρας, 14).<sup>14</sup> By having her refer to herself as the wife of Hector before making any references to her current situation, Euripides reveals Andromache's mindset from the start.<sup>15</sup> Andromache brings up her degraded status again in her lament when she asks why she had to become the "slave of Hermione" (Ἑρμιόνας δούλαν, 114) and in her scene with Menelaus when she berates him for entering into a contest with "an unfortunate slave-woman" (γυναικὶ δυστυχεῖ/δούλῃ, 327-328). In addition to preferring to think of herself as the wife of Hector instead of the slave of Hermione, Andromache also recalls her past status as a ruler in Troy. When talking to a former servant who followed her to Phthia, she refers to herself as the

---

<sup>11</sup> Rimmon-Kenan 60. See Chapter 1, n. 103.

<sup>12</sup> Stevens notes that in Euripidean tragedy, δάμαρ is used to emphasize the married state (Stevens 88).

<sup>13</sup> Lloyd notes that in Euripides' tragedies, Trojan captives are always distinct from "real slaves". He compares *Hec.* 888-97 (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 110).

<sup>14</sup> I have not included γυνή because of its ubiquity and neutrality. Also, Lloyd notes that the adjective παιδοποιός also contributes to the vision of Hector and Andromache's marriage as "normal and productive" (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 108).

<sup>15</sup> Lee sees this disparity as evidence of the conflict between Andromache's *nomos* and *physis* (Lee 10).

former “queen” (ἀνάσσει, 65), and in her *agon* with Hermione she reminds the young girl that the Phthians would never allow any of Andromache’s children to rule because of her past noble status in Troy (τύραννος ἢ Φρυγῶν, 204).

With respect to qualitative descriptors, Andromache is not quite as preoccupied with her past. In her prologue, she refers to herself as formerly “enviable” (ζηλωτός, 5), but immediately follows with a reference to her present state, calling herself “a most wretched woman” (δυστυχεστάτη γυνή, 6). Andromache’s references to herself onward from the prologue only call into attention her current state. She refers to herself as “unfortunate” (δυστυχεῖ, 65) and “all-wretched” (παναθλίαν, 67) when talking to her former servant; as “wretched” (αθλία, 385)<sup>16</sup> and “unfortunate” (δυστυχής, 386) in her reply to Menelaus after he issues his ultimatum; as a “wretched victim” (θύμα δάιον, 506) and “wretched” (α τάλαινα, 534) in the lament sung with her son; and as “unlucky” (δυσδαίμονα, 751) and “weak” (ασθενῆ, 754) in her final admonition to Peleus. She apostrophizes herself once as “wretched one” (ὦ δύστηνος, 71). In general, Andromache does not attempt to delineate any personal qualities, but instead chooses to comment upon her circumstances.

### *Definition of Others*

Andromache names four social and/or familial roles for herself: wife of Hector, slave, spear-prize, and queen. Other characters use the same terms to define her complicated identity, but their additions and deletions speak to the way they think of her. Almost every character refers to Andromache as a captive or “spear-bride” (αἰχμαλάωτον 583; 871; 908; 962; 1059; 1243; δορίκτητος γυνή, 155). This appears to be the most neutral representation of her current status. Only Peleus refers to her as a “prize” (γέρας, 582), which suggests more about Neoptolemus’ worthiness as a warrior and less about Andromache herself or her status in the household.<sup>17</sup> Only Hermione and Menelaus refer to Andromache as a “slave” (δούλη, 155; 434; 860).<sup>18</sup> They

<sup>16</sup> “αθλίος is often hardly distinguishable in meaning from δυστυχής, but it can have the further connotation of moral degradation, which would be relevant here” (Stevens 142).

<sup>17</sup> The term γέρας also recalls Chryseis and Briseis and the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon from *Iliad* 1. That warriors used women as prizes in recognition of valor connects Neoptolemus to his father Achilles and suggests that he is similarly skilled in warfare and esteemed by his men. Allan notes another connection reported in *Il.* 9.667-8: that Neoptolemus’ mother was a captive after Achilles captured Scyros (Allan 14).

<sup>18</sup> See Isabelle Torrance, “Andromache *Aikmalotos*: Concubine or Wife?” *Hermathena* 179 (2005): 47. Torrance observes that the term δούλη is used to describe Andromache more often in the first 500 lines of the play than in the



are the ones who perceive Andromache's status within Neoptolemus' household as threatening to their own interests, and therefore they seek to remind her of her station. Menelaus, Hermione, and Orestes call Andromache the "wife of Hector" (δάμαρ δ' ἥδ' Ἑκτορος, 656; Ἑκτορος ζυνευέτιν, 908; γυναικὸς Ἑκτορος, 960).<sup>19</sup> Menelaus recalls Hector as a means of laying grounds for sympathy with Peleus, who has come to Andromache's defense. Hermione and Orestes use this term in their discussion of current events of Phthia when Orestes first appears on the scene after Peleus takes Andromache away and Menelaus returns to Sparta. There seems to be nothing behind it save identification. Andromache is also identified as the wife of Neoptolemus. The chorus calls her "bride" (νύμφα 140) in their first ode. During Hermione's histrionic suicide attempts, both Hermione and her nurse refer to Andromache as a "fellow-wife" (συγγάμωι, 836) or "illicit bed-fellow" (νόθοισι λέκτροις, 928). They both cast the trouble in the home as domestic strife born from a man having two wives.<sup>20</sup> This suits the theme of the stasimon, in which Hermione laments the fact that she let other women talk her into believing Andromache was a threat. Finally, the two terms which actually matter the most to the putative action of the tragedy are "suppliant" (ἐδραία, 265) and "mother" (μᾶτερ, 504). These are the two roles upon which the movement of the plot hinges: fearing for her life, Andromache hides her child and takes refuge in the Thetideion. Menelaus uses the child to force Andromache out of asylum. Yet the true conflicts of the play are internal and the result of Andromache's presence in the house. Thus it is her status as slave or foreigner or even wife of Hector which is most pertinent to the themes explored here.

While social roles are easily organized by title, qualitative traits are better organized by speaker. There is a definite dichotomy in the way the Spartan contingent defines Andromache as opposed to all other characters. To begin with, Andromache's former servant and the chorus seem to offer a realistic and sympathetic description of Andromache's current status. Her own servant reminds her that she is currently "bereft of friends" (ἔρημος εἶ φίλων, 78), and the chorus

---

later parts. She is also called *αἰχμάλωτος* more often in the later part of the play than in the earlier part. Torrance suggests that this difference is due to Hermione's reflection on her actions in her dealings with Andromache.

<sup>19</sup> Phillippo argues that "wife of Hector" may be considered a type of patronymic because it emphasizes her connection to a family member from her past (Phillippo 356).

<sup>20</sup> Lloyd, *Andromache*, 114. Concubines do appear in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but the strife caused by keeping a concubine and wife in the same home is not a central theme of the narrative. In fact, as Allan notes, the captivity of women during the Trojan war caused no marital friction since the wives of the warriors were far away (Allan 13).

seeks to remind her that she is constrained by the necessities of slavery (δεσποτᾶν ἀνάγκαις, 132), and, in the scheme of things, actually “nothing” (οὐδὲν οὖσα, 134). The chorus reminds Andromache while she is on stage that her status as foreigner as well as slave prevents her from having any real hope of salvation, calling her an “Asian woman” (Ἀσιήτιδα γένναν, 119), “a girl of Ilium” (Ἰλιάς οὖσα κόρα, 128), and “a wretched Trojan girl” (τὰν τάλαιναν Ἰλιάδα κόραν, 489).<sup>21</sup> Despite the fact that these reminders are fairly regular throughout the play, the chorus clearly sympathizes with Andromache, calling her “most pitiable” (οἰκτροτάτα, 141), and their reminders are not meant to be taken as insults. On the other hand, Menelaus and the Spartan nurse clearly mean to insult Andromache when referring to her foreigner status. Menelaus emphasizes Andromache’s foreignness to Peleus in an attempt to win him over to his point of view, calling her a “barbarian woman” (γυναιῖκα βάρβαρον, 649) and a “stranger” (ξένης, 670). The nurse, while attempting to comfort the hysterical Hermione, reminds her charge that Andromache is a “Trojan woman” (γυναιῖκα Τρωιάδ’, 867), which is admittedly neutral in tone, but also a “barbarian woman” (γυναικὸς βαρβάρου, 870), claiming that Neoptolemus would surely take Hermione’s side in a disagreement with such a creature. Both Hermione and Menelaus are clearly invested in weakening Andromache’s resolve to remain in the Thetideion, and both attempt to talk her out of the sanctuary before threatening her. Both daughter and father also remark about Andromache’s virtue and intelligence. Hermione first ascribes to Andromache “ignorance” (ἀμαθίας, 170) for sleeping with the son of the man who killed her family, a quality which she attributes to her barbarian upbringing. Later in the *agon*, as Andromache begins to gain momentum through her rhetorical questions, Hermione asks her why she seems to be characterizing herself as “chaste” (σώφρων, 235) and why she is suggesting she (Hermione) is not. After receiving an unsatisfactory answer, Hermione calls Andromache “clever” (σοφῇ, 245), suggesting that she believes Andromache’s arguments to be based on rhetorical manipulation rather than a fair representation of the truth. Menelaus also believes Andromache to be “less intelligent” (ἥσσον φρονοῦσα, 313) because she thought she might escape death by hiding her child and taking refuge in a sanctuary. As the scene between them unfolds, it becomes clear that Menelaus’ form of intelligence is actually based on force, while Andromache’s is the real thing.

---

<sup>21</sup> Even though it would seem that “foreigner” would best be categorized as a social role, I suggest that in the context of this tragedy, its deployment actually refers to unfavorable personal traits.

The various terms used to address Andromache throughout the play are also organized neatly according to speaker. The breakdown of terms likewise demonstrates a clear dichotomy between the Spartans and the Phthians (or Trojans) in their perceptions of Andromache. Andromache's servant only once refers to her as "mistress" (δέσποινα, 56), the word that opens their brief conversation about Andromache's reversal of fortune before Andromache sends her away to fetch Peleus. Andromache and this servant are the only two characters who mention anything about Andromache's past as a ruler in Troy. All other characters are interested only in her point of origin as foreign with respect to themselves, or in her role as the wife of the hated Hector. The servant also addresses her as "wretched one" (ὦ δύστηνη, 68), a sentiment echoed by the chorus to varying degrees. They call her "most wretched one" (ὦ δυστυχεστάτα, 139), "all-suffering one" (ὦ παντάλαινα, 140), and "wretched woman" (δύστηνε γύναι, 496). Two characters echo this sentiment: Hermione in a cruel tone (δύστηνε, 170), and Peleus in a sympathetic one (ὦ τάλαινα, 748). Andromache's foreignness also comes into play when the other characters address her. The chorus remains as neutral in their address as they were in their description, calling her simply "woman of Ilium" (γύναι Ἰλιάς, 141). Hermione, however, lashes out at Andromache at the end of the *agon*, when she has been bested by Andromache's superior arguments and driven to brash anger after the *stichomythia*. Within the space of a line, she calls Andromache a "barbarian creature" (ὦ βάρβαρον σὺ θρέμμα, 261)<sup>22</sup> and "stubborn in insolence" (σκληρόν θράσος, 261), venting her frustration and revealing once again the cruelty born from her immaturity.

### Conclusion

Direct definition offers a starting point for discussing the sliding scales of character complexity, development, and inner depth for Andromache. In contrast to her Homeric characterization, direct definition in *Andromache* actually suggests some complexity for Andromache. The complexity arises from the notable co-presence of past and present perspectives: she is at once a Trojan mistress and a foreign slave; the wife of Hector and a spear-bride of Neoptolemus. This multiplicity of identities is partially permitted by Andromache's own jumbled understanding of who she is: she continually presents herself as the wife of Hector alone, not of Neoptolemus, despite the fact that Hector has been dead for several years. While she believes this to be a positive and honorable position, Hermione, Menelaus, and Orestes, who identify her as Hector's wife, consider this a strike against her, reinforcing her outsider status.

<sup>22</sup> "θρέμμα is not in itself abusive....but it is often used with an abusive epithet" (Stevens 125).

Andromache alone makes mention of her former elite status, for this is not acknowledged at all by her detractors – in fact, even the chorus, who is sympathetic to her plight, remind her that she is nothing. The descriptions of the other characters in the tragedy suggest a complexity in her thematic function within the play, which will be discussed below.

The personal traits ascribed to her are predictable: almost everyone (including herself) agrees that she is pitiable or at least in a pitiable position, because she is a foreign, friendless slave. Equally predictable is the difference in the terminology defining Andromache's foreign status used by those sympathetic to her (her servant, the chorus) and those unsympathetic (the Spartans). The only qualities which actually constitute Andromache's personal qualities as unrelated to her current situation are *ἀμαθία*, *σώφρων*, *σοφή*, *σκληρὸν θράσος*, and *ἥσσον φρονοῦσα*, all used by either Hermione or Menelaus. Being spoken by the Spartans, these are not meant to be compliments, but are actually insults or reproaches. Nevertheless, they speak to a quality that the characters recognize in Andromache: her cleverness. This trait also suggests a higher degree of the representation of her inner consciousness. Though little about her intelligence can be deduced from the simple naming of the trait, the very fact that it is referenced is a clear departure from her Homeric characterization.<sup>23</sup> The attention given to the development of Andromache's acumen may simply be attributed to the tragic poet's interest in rhetorical argument, but, as the following section will show, in Andromache's case it is not a generic description.

In this tragedy, there is not much space for development, a fact reflected in the traits and roles assigned to Andromache. Though Andromache's past experiences have a considerable impact on her present as depicted in the play, there is actually very little development shown within the play itself. In her understanding of her current position, there is a real opportunity for Andromache to develop, to cast off her tenacious hold on her past status and experiences and to recognize the reality of her current situation and capitulate to her fate. The action of the play, and the characterization of Andromache herself, depend on her unwillingness to "develop" in this sense. So even though direct definition yields few qualitative traits and the character of Andromache does not need to develop in the course of the play, the character is still complex because of the variety of statuses she holds both in reality (widow, slave, foreigner, spear-bride, mother) and in the perception of herself and the other characters (wife of Hector, wife of

---

<sup>23</sup> It was Penelope who was clever and circumspect, and who displayed those traits in her words, thoughts, and actions.

Neoptolemus, barbarian). The following section will discuss further the implications laid out by direct definition for Andromache's character. Through her actions and her speeches, Andromache will show just how invested in the past she is, and how clever and wise she has become through her life experience.

### III. Indirect Presentation

#### *Andromache: Actions*

In the *Iliad*, the narrator takes care to describe several mundane actions in detail. Even in moments of high drama, such as the *homilia* with Hector in Book 6 and the *anagnorisis* in Book 22, Andromache makes no grand gestures. Rather, her trivial actions are imbued with pathos through the dramatic context and timing created by the narrator. In contrast, all of Andromache's actions in *Andromache* are meaningful in a transparent way. The play depicts a woman in a fight for her life, and her actions, though few, correspond to her role in three separate tragic story patterns used by Euripides for Andromache. Her actions in hiding her child and taking asylum and supplicating Peleus are determined by her role as a suppliant at an altar at the beginning of the play;<sup>24</sup> her second action is determined by her role as a self-sacrificing mother;<sup>25</sup> and her overall compulsion to act is determined by her role as a wife left behind in a *nostos* play.<sup>26</sup>

In the prologue, Andromache explains her suppliant status, relating how, responding to a perceived threat from Hermione and Menelaus, she has smuggled her child to an undisclosed

---

<sup>24</sup> Four other plays by Euripides begin with a suppliant at an altar: *Heracl.*, *Supp.*, *HF*, and *Hel.*. See Lloyd 107-108. Burnett reads all of Andromache's part of the play as an extended suppliant pattern (Burnett 132). She notes that the villain is split into two (Hermione and Menelaus). According to her, "[t]he initial confrontation is mechanically gratuitous, but the whole suppliant action takes its ethical colour from its magnificent and shocking exchange" (Burnett 133). See also n. 6.

<sup>25</sup> Lloyd notes that Andromache's reasons for sacrificing herself are in line with reasons given in other speeches of self-sacrifice from *Heracl.*, *Hec.*, *Ph.*, *IA*, and *Alc.* (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 128). See also Nancy Rabinowitz, *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993) 31. Rabinowitz argues that Euripides alone dramatizes voluntary sacrifice. She highlights sacrificial virgins like Iphigenia, Polyxena and Makaria; and the sacrificial wife Alcestis. Rabinowitz argues that these sacrifices are made either for the interest of the *polis* and the erotic enjoyment of men (sacrificial virgins, 31) or for the interest of men (sacrificial wife, 67). Andromache's sacrifice seems to confound both of these patterns. She is not a virgin, but she is not a wife, either. Her choice to sacrifice herself does not ensure the victory of the *polis*, since the survival of her child presents a complication in the Aeacid dynasty; similarly her sacrifice does not immediately aid Neoptolemus.

<sup>26</sup> Lloyd, *Andromache*, 3-4.

location and has come herself to the Thetideion to seek asylum from her overwrought mistress Hermione. Her narrative emphasizes her passive role in the events leading up to the action of the play: she was given (*δοθεῖσα*, 15)<sup>27</sup> to Neoptolemus and came to Troy as a slave. She sleeps with Neoptolemus, an act which she does against her will (35, 38, 390). Now she is persecuted by Hermione (*ἐλαύνομαι* 31). She admits that she has thus far relied on the life of her son to protect her from potential harm, depending on Neoptolemus' fondness for him as a means of security: *καὶ πρὶν μὲν ἐν κακοῖσι κειμένην ὅμως/ἐλπίς μ' αἰεὶ προῆγε σωθέντος τέκνου/ἀλκὴν τιν' εὐρεῖν/κἀπικούρησιν κακῶν* (26-28). Thus far it is clear that Andromache is motivated by a simple desire for survival. In the absence of her protector Neoptolemus, she acts shrewdly by safeguarding her asset, securing her own position, and seeking aid from another quarter: Peleus, the grandfather of Neoptolemus and her son's great-grandfather. The internal assessment of her actions is both implicitly and explicitly unfavorable. The unsuitability of Peleus as a savior is remarked upon briefly by the slave woman Andromache guilts into going after him. She suggests that he may be a little too old to help (*γέρων ἐκεῖνος ὥστε σ' ὠφελεῖν παρῶν* 80), but she goes anyway. The chorus, who is sensitive to Andromache's difficult situation with Hermione, nevertheless interprets her actions as futile and inappropriate. To the members her actions suggest an unwillingness to accept her fate as a slave:

*λεῖπε δεξιμήλον  
δόμον τᾶς ποντίας θεοῦ. τί σοι  
καιρὸς ἀτυζομέναι δέμας αἰκέλιον καταλείβειν  
δεσποτᾶν ἀνάγκαις;  
τὸ κρατοῦν δέ σ' ἔπεισι· τί μόχθον  
οὐδὲν οὔσα μοχθεῖς;* (130-134).

Andromache's next action is leaving the Thetideion after being issued an ultimatum by Menelaus. In the prologue she suggested that her son was a kind of insurance policy, an asset who guaranteed her own safety as long as he was alive. Yet in the course of making the decision between sacrificing herself for the life of her child or sacrificing her child's life for her own, she indicates that she does have strong maternal feelings for the boy.<sup>28</sup> He is the dearest part of her

<sup>27</sup> She was previously given to Hector by her father in marriage (4). See Laura McClure, *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1999) 169. The repetition of the participle suggests that her relationship to Neoptolemus is meant to resemble a marriage.

<sup>28</sup> See Bernd Seidensticker, "Women on the Tragic Stage." *History, Theory, Drama: Dialogues in Athenian Drama*. Ed. Barbara Goff (Austin: U of Texas P, 1995) 157. Taking steps to protect the family or the sacredness of rituals is frequently a concern of women in Greek tragedy. But contrast Elaine Fantham, "Andromache's Child in Euripides

life (ὀφθαλμὸς βίου 406), the only thing worth living for. She also acts in accordance with what is right and virtuous, acting as any parent would and therefore avoiding shame: οὐ δῆτα τοῦμοῦ γ' οὔνεκ' ἀθλίου βίου· ἐν τῷιδε μὲν γὰρ ἐλπίς, εἰ σωθήσεται, / ἐμοὶ δ' ὄνειδος μὴ θανεῖν ὑπὲρ τέκνου (408-410).<sup>29</sup> There is no internal response to this action. The chorus simply notes that the situation is pitiable, and reproaches Menelaus for not coming to an agreement with her. Menelaus eagerly reveals his ruse, and the course of the action continues without dwelling upon the gravity of Andromache's decision.

Andromache's last major dramatic gesture is to supplicate Peleus for aid. She adds that his unwillingness to help would reflect shamefully on him (αἰσχρῶς 576), again revealing a concern with what is right and proper and a willingness to use that to her advantage. At this point, Andromache is all but forgotten while Peleus and Menelaus battle in a heated discussion. Andromache exits the stage in Peleus' retinue.<sup>30</sup>

By forcing Andromache to make choices which may determine her survival, Euripides indicates that her "true" character is on display. In *Andromache*, Andromache proves to be shrewd in her assessment of the threat and the lengths to which she will go to get aid. She displays her concern with virtue and right action by making the "right" choice to sacrifice herself for her son, and by appealing to the same sense of shame in Peleus in order to procure his aid. She also briefly displays an affection for her son altogether lacking in the *Iliad*. Though it was clear Astyanax was valued by his parents, cared for, and pitied, there was little emphasis placed on the affectionate connection between mother and child. The servant and the chorus, both sympathetic to her plight, suggest implicitly and explicitly that she is taking actions inappropriate for her station. Nevertheless, Andromache's actions do lend support to the qualitative trait of "cleverness" (σοφῇ), named by Hermione. Both Hermione and Menelaus attack Andromache's

---

and Seneca." *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy: Essays Presented to D.J. Conacher*. Ed. Martin Cropp, Elaine Fantham, S.E. Scully (Calgary: U of Calgary P, 1986) 269. Fantham believes it is difficult to evaluate Andromache's feelings for the boy because her sentiment is grounded in "objective arguments." She also believes that because the boy was Neoptolemus' son, Andromache would have a hard time feeling affection for him (Fantham 270).

<sup>29</sup> Women who act as guardians of kin or overseers of ritual in Greek tragedy are often further characterized as strong individuals who are willing to sacrifice themselves (Seidensticker 158).

<sup>30</sup> Contrast Herbert Golder, "The Mute Andromache." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113 (1983): 131-2. Golder believes that Andromache remains on stage for the entire play as a mute character. He argues that her mute presence would be especially effective because "words are one of her defining and enabling powers." By having her remain on stage, Euripides is better able to connect Andromache to Thetis, when she finally appears as the *deus ex machina* (Golder, 132).

intelligence, but their attacks only reveal their own inferiority in that regard. In comparison to Hermione and Menelaus, Andromache *is* wise – it is only her low social status which allows them to cast aspersions on her actions.

### *Andromache: Speeches*

Andromache's characterization in *Andromache* relies, unsurprisingly, most heavily on the speeches made by her and the other characters of the play. In this respect alone, the characterization of Andromache is quite different from her characterization in the *Iliad*. In the epic, the restriction of her speech to lament created a powerful thematic impact. In *Andromache*, however, it is not the type of speech but the content which will provide the most compelling characterizing material. The catalogue of social roles from direct definition demonstrates how many identities Andromache has in *Andromache*. The impact of her dramatic speech must therefore be examined with respect to her social roles as a foreign slave, and in accordance with her gender. As Laura McClure has shown, even though tragedy presents women as speaking in a variety of discourses, women's speech still reinforces the prevailing ideology of silence and seclusion.<sup>31</sup> Yet tragedians use women as "a means of expressing anxiety about the transmission and consolidation of power among the political elite in the democratic *polis* through the control of speech."<sup>32</sup> One of the disconcerting features of women's speech in Greek tragedy is that it gives women some means of prevailing over men.<sup>33</sup> Euripides in particular depicts women and slaves as besting men in speech.

### Types of Speech: Lament

The lament is an important part of Andromache's characterization in *Andromache*. Though it is somewhat unusual for a main character to speak the prologue, the *rhexis* of the prologue is not an unusual type of speech. The lament, however, is a special speech-type, one that is usually (but not exclusively) sung by women in tragedy, and one that connects the action of the play quite closely to a woman's ritual obligations in real life.<sup>34</sup> Andromache sings two lyric laments in the course of the play: the first occurs right after her meeting with her former

---

<sup>31</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 24.

<sup>32</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 28.

<sup>33</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 68.

<sup>34</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 44. See also Mark Griffith, "Antigone and Her Sister(s): Embodying Women in Greek Tragedy." *Making Silence Speak*. Ed. Laura McClure and Andre Lardinois (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2001) 123.



servant and before the *parodos*.<sup>35</sup> The lament is sung for herself and not in a ritual context.<sup>36</sup> The second lament is an antiphonal song sung with her child, a pre-emptive lament before they are put to death by Menelaus. Again, the lament is sung for herself and her child, and is not part of a funeral ritual. The first lament is even more special because it is the only extant monody sung in elegiac meter in Greek tragedy and the earliest example of elegiac *threnos*.<sup>37</sup> Lyric meters are often used to indicate the deep emotion of the singer, and so the choice of meter perfectly fits the nature of the song Andromache sings.<sup>38</sup> Andromache's monodic lament in *Andromache* recalls her laments in the *Iliad*, and creates a point of continuity between the Homeric Andromache and the Euripidean Andromache. Andromache herself says in the proem that she is always lamenting (ἤμειψ δ' οἷσπερ ἐγκείμεσθ' αἰεὶ/θρήνοισι καὶ γόοισι καὶ δακρύμασιν/πρὸς αἰθέρ' ἐκτενοῦμεν· 91-93), a state of affairs which fittingly expands upon Hector's prediction of her future from *Iliad* Book 6.<sup>39</sup>

The lament itself recalls the cause of the Trojan War, the death of Hector, and Andromache's captivity.<sup>40</sup> The death of Hector and Andromache's captivity were recounted in

---

<sup>35</sup> Though Allan notes that Euripides liked to put a monody before the *parodos*: see *Hec.* 59ff, *El.* 112ff.; *Tro.* 98ff.; *Hel.* 164ff (Allan 55).

<sup>36</sup> See Casey Dué, *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy* (Austin: U of Texas P, 2006) 16. Dué notes that tragic laments are typically divorced from any ritual context. She also notes that "[c]aptive women frequently lament themselves in anticipation of death and disaster, because lament is the only medium through which women have a sanctioned public voice, the one weapon they have with which to defend themselves in desperate circumstances" (Dué 16).

<sup>37</sup> See Denys Page, "The Elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*." *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on His Seventieth Birthday, January 2, 1936*. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 206. Lloyd notes that Euripides often has his heroine perform a lament before or during the *parodos*, and he uses the word *elegos* to describe the lament (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 111). Page famously suggested that the song was reminiscent of a Doric lament tradition. He is ultimately concerned with whether or not Andromache's song can provide any information about that tradition (Page 216-217). Page also suggests that the use of the Doric dialect in *Andromache* might have something to do with the political background of the play (Page 223). As Allan points out, even though elegiac meter was often used in songs at symposia and public festivals, it was also commonly used for sepulchral epigrams. Allan also suggested that the elegiac meter evokes the hexameter of the Iliadic laments (Allan 200-201).

<sup>38</sup> Lesky 157. See also Laura McClure, "Female Speech and Characterization in Euripides." *Lo Spettacolo delle Voci*. Ed. Francesco De Martino and Alan Sommerstein (Bari: Levante-Editori, 1995) 40. McClure argues that gender also plays a role in the deployment of certain meters: men speak twice as many iambic lines as women, and women sing twice as many lyric monodies as men.

<sup>39</sup> See discussion below. McClure also suggests that women tend to be characterized as more emotional than men and therefore more pitiable. The emotional tone of lyrics is therefore more often suited to women's song than to men's (McClure, "Female Speech," 59).

the prologue by Andromache herself (8-15). In this song, she explicitly names the culprit: the marriage of Paris: Ἰλίοι αἰπείναι Πάρις οὐ γάμον ἀλλά τιν' ἄταν/ἀγάγετ' εὐναίαν ἐς θαλάμους Ἑλέναν (103-104). This is the first of several references to Paris and Helen and the cause of the Trojan War in *Andromache*. It is fitting that Andromache be the first character to recall the ruin that disastrous union caused: as the sympathetic character of the play, it is her suffering, and the causes of her suffering, which captivate audience and reader. Andromache also makes use of several typical features of tragic laments. She makes explicit reference to the tears she shed upon being led away as a slave (πολλὰ δὲ δάκρυά μοι, 111) and uses a simile to describe in detail the depth of her sorrow while she clutches the statue of the goddess as suppliant (τάκομαι ὡς πετρίνα πιδακόεσσα λιβάς, 116). She also apostrophizes herself as “wretched me!” (ὦ μοι ἐγὼ μελέα, 113), a feature used often by women in laments.<sup>41</sup> The tone of the lament extends the sense of passivity Andromache cultivated in her prologue. She is careful to say that none of the events were of her making; she suffers through the insensitivity and cruelty of others.

In the second lament, Andromache and her child give voice their despair as they await execution. The lament is split in two by the interruption of Menelaus, who is looking on. This lament features many of the elements common to antiphonal lyric songs. The inclusion of a speaking child is not unusual in Euripides,<sup>42</sup> and it gives the playwright the chance to utilize figurative language common to the songs of mothers and children, in particular the images of young chicks under a mother's wing: μάτερ μάτερ, ἐγὼ δὲ σᾶι/πτέρυγι συγκαταβαίνω (504-505). Andromache herself also appropriates the language of sacrifice, calling herself a “wretched victim” (θῦμα δάιον, 507), and she uses a simile to compare her crying to a trickling stream: λείβομαι δάκρυσιν κόρας/στάζω λισσάδος ὡς πέτρας/ λιβάς ἀνάλιος, ἃ τάλαινα (532-4).<sup>43</sup> But perhaps the most notable feature of this lament is Andromache's call to her husband for aid. It seems

---

<sup>40</sup> The laments of captive women narrate the past in order to contrast past and present experiences. They do not lament the dead in a ritual context, but lament rather the situation the deceased leaves the captive woman in (Dué 14-15).

<sup>41</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 44.

<sup>42</sup> See Grigoris Sifakis, “Children in Greek Tragedy.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 26 (1979): 68-69. Sifakis notes that children in Greek tragedy are always in great danger that they cannot comprehend. He also argues that Euripides always has his children express their sentiments in an emotional climax, and always in song (Sifakis 73). Fantham states that his inclusion here only reinforces the belief that tragedians thought of children as mini-adults (Fantham 271).

<sup>43</sup> Lloyd notes that the use of similes to describe the weeping singer was common in Euripidean lyric (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 113). Cf. *Il.* 16.2-4 and Niobe at *Il.* 24.613ff. for trickling.

natural that a mother and son should call out to the man who should be their savior, but the difference here is that Andromache addresses Hector, her dead Trojan husband, not Neoptolemus, the father of her child: ὦ πόσις πόσις, εἶθε σὰν/χεῖρα καὶ δόρυ σύμμαχον/κτησαίμαν, Πριάμου παῖ (524-526). This evidence speaks strongly to the co-presence of past and present in Andromache's mind. She calls out to the man she holds to be her husband, despite the fact that he can be of no help whatsoever to her.

Andromache's laments provide a strong link between her Iliadic characterization and her Euripidean characterization. She is presented as an eternal widow, constantly grieving for her dead husband even after bearing children to another man. The laments themselves are typical to tragic laments in their stylistic features. They show Andromache living in the past as well as the present. She recalls the first cause of the war, the destructive marriage of Paris and Helen, and the effects it had even before Andromache became a slave to Hermione. She calls out to her dead husband for aid, despite the fact that Neoptolemus would be the most suitable savior.

#### Stylistic Features of Other Speeches

Andromache's other speeches show a preference for certain stylistic features which also contribute to her characterization. In the back-to-back scenes with Hermione and Menelaus, Andromache shows a marked preference for *hypophora* to point out the faults in her opponents' arguments.<sup>44</sup> In her confrontation with Hermione, Andromache uses rhetorical questions to take aim at Hermione's main accusation that Andromache is trying to supplant her in Neoptolemus' household:

εἴπ', ὦ νεᾶνι, τῷ σ' ἐχεγγύωι λόγῳ  
 πεισθεῖσ' ἀπωθῶ γνησίων νυμφευμάτων;  
 ὥς ἡ Λάκαινα τῶν Φρυγῶν μείων πόλις  
 τύχῃ θ' ὑπερθεῖ καμ' ἐλευθέραν ὀρεῖς;  
 ἢ τῷ νέῳι τε καὶ σφριγῶντι σώματι  
 πόλεως τε μεγέθει καὶ φίλοις ἐπηρμένῃ  
 οἶκον κατασχεῖν τὸν σὸν ἀντὶ σοῦ θέλω;  
 πότερον ἴν' αὐτῇ παιῖδας ἀντὶ σοῦ τέκῳ  
 δούλους ἐμαντῇι τ' ἀθλίαν ἐφολκίδα;  
 ἢ τοὺς ἐμούς τις παιῖδας ἐξανέξεται  
 Φθίας τυράννου ὄντας, ἢν σὺ μὴ τέκῃς;  
 φιλοῦσι γάρ μ' Ἑλλήνες Ἐκτορός γ' ὕπερ;  
 αὐτῇ τ' ἀμαυρὰ κοῦ τύραννος ἢ Φρυγῶν; (192-204)

<sup>44</sup> See Michael Lloyd, *The Agon in Euripides* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992) 29. Lloyd defines *hypophora*: the speaker poses a problem or question and various answers or solutions are suggested, usually in the form of rhetorical questions, then rejected by other rhetorical questions. This technique shows sophistication in argument by displaying the speaker's ability to manipulate hypothetical situations (Lloyd, *Agon*, 30).

She points out that she, as a slave in a foreign land, has no reasonable hope for taking a privileged place in Neoptolemus' house. She is growing older, she is friendless, her children would be bastards and would never be welcomed as rulers in Phthia, and her connection to Hector is still fresh in everyone's mind.

In the scene with Menelaus, Andromache uses rhetorical questions to demonstrate Menelaus' lack of foresight in backing his daughter without hesitation:

τέθνηκα τῇ σῇ θυγατρὶ καὶ μ' ἀπώλεσεν·  
μιαρφόνον μὲν οὐκέτ' ἂν φύγοι μύσος.  
ἐν τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς καὶ σὺ τόνδ' ἀγωνιῇ  
φόνον· τὸ συνδρῶν γὰρ σ' ἀναγκάσει χρέος.  
ἦν δ' οὖν ἐγὼ μὲν μὴ θανεῖν ὑπεκδράμω,  
τὸν παῖδά μου κτενεῖτε; καίτα πῶς πατήρ  
τέκνου θανόντος ῥαιδίως ἀνέξεται;  
οὐχ ὧδ' ἀνανδρον αὐτὸν ἢ Τροία καλεῖ·  
ἀλλ' εἴσιν οἱ χρεή, Πηλέως γὰρ ἄξια  
πατρός τ' Ἀχιλλέως ἔργα δρῶν φανήσεται,  
ᾧσει δὲ σὴν παῖδ' ἐκ δόμων· σὺ δ' ἐκδιδοὺς  
ἄλλωι τί λέξεις; πότερον ὡς κακὸν πόσιν  
φεύγει τὸ ταύτης σῶφρον; ἀλλ' οὐ πείσεται.  
γαμεῖ δὲ τίς νιν; ἢ σφ' ἀνανδρον ἐν δόμοις  
χῆραν καθέξεις πολίον; ᾧ τλήμων ἀνὴρ,  
κακῶν τοσούτων οὐχ ὀρᾷς ἐπιρροάς;  
πόσας ἂν εὐνάς θυγατέρ' ἠδικομένην  
βούλοι' ἂν εὐρεῖν ἢ παθεῖν ἀγὼ λέγω; (334-351)

Andromache's questions shed light on what would likely happen should Menelaus and Hermione succeed in killing her: Hermione would suffer pollution and Menelaus would have to face a negative public opinion; by killing her son they would anger Neoptolemus and would compel him to expel Hermione from his home; Menelaus would then have to find another husband for an unappealing daughter or keep her in his house until he dies. It is clear that Menelaus has not thought about the far-reaching consequences of his and Hermione's actions.

The use of *hypophora* reveals Andromache's superior reasoning skills.<sup>45</sup> She is older than Hermione, and the confrontation between the women is enhanced by the disparity in their ages and life experiences; but in Menelaus' case, Andromache is uncovering his own lack of

<sup>45</sup> As Lloyd notes, the winners of *agones* are usually the more sympathetic characters and usually have the better arguments. There is no evidence of a villain gaining his or her ends through an *agon* (Lloyd, *Agon*, 16).

foresight and his general foolishness. Peleus' attacks on him and Menelaus' feeble defenses will further support the supposition that Menelaus is but an imposter of the heroic ideal, a cruel man only interested in consolidating his own power. Andromache's intellectual superiority over Hermione is not surprising, given the difference in their age and maturity. The true inappropriateness of Andromache's tactics is based on the disparity of their social positions. Andromache even says in a brief proem that she is somewhat hesitant to respond to Hermione's accusations in full, since she does not wish to incur Hermione's resentment.<sup>46</sup> At the same time, she also believes that her arguments are just, and it is clear she thinks they will win the day:

ἐγὼ δὲ ταρβῶ μὴ τὸ δουλεύειν μέ σοι  
 λόγων ἀπώσῃ πολλὰ ἔχουσιν ἔνδικα,  
 ἣν δ' αὖ κρατήσω, μὴ πὶ τῷιδ' ὄφλω βλάβην.  
 οἱ γὰρ πνέοντες μεγάλα τοὺς κρείσσους λόγους  
 πικρῶς φέρουσι τῶν ἐλασσόνων ὕπο·  
 ὅμως δ' ἑμαυτὴν οὐ προδοῦσ' ἀλώσομαι (186-191).

Andromache is also dismissive of Hermione because of her youth. She begins her response by lamenting youth as an evil for mankind (κακὸν γε θνητοῖς τὸ νέον ἔν τε τῷι νέωι/τὸ μὴ δίκαιον ὅστις ἀνθρώπων ἔχει 184-185), addresses Hermione as “young woman” (ὦ νεᾶνι 192), reproaches her for speaking about shameful things (νέα πέφυκας καὶ λέγεις αἰσχρῶν πέρι; 238), and then openly tells her that she is lacking sense (λέγω σ' ἐγὼ νοῦν οὐκ ἔχειν ὅσον σ' ἔδει 252). Hermione threatens to burn Andromache out of the Thetideion, and Andromache counters with a dare (σφάζ', αἰμάτου θεᾶς βωμόν 260). It is clear that she does not think much of Hermione's threats. With Menelaus, however, it is quite different. The disparity is not in their age, but in their sex, and right behavior between man and woman is a different thing from appropriate behavior between mistress and slave. After Andromache questions Menelaus' ability to reason, the chorus reproaches her for going too far as a woman speaking to a man (ἄγαν ἔλεξας ὡς γυνὴ πρὸς ἄρσενας 363). Menelaus also holds real power over Andromache because he has her son. She cannot dismiss his threats the way she ignores Hermione's.

Another prominent stylistic feature of Andromache's speech is the gnomic statement. One such statement appears in almost all of Andromache's speeches. In the introduction to her

<sup>46</sup> This formula is used quite often in *proemia*. Lloyd argues that it is used to underline the difficulties or disadvantages the speaker may face, or it may be used to create a prejudice against the other speaker (Lloyd, *Agon*, 25). See also Ruth Scodel, “Verbal Performance and Euripidean Rhetoric.” *Illinois Classical Studies* 24-25 (1999-2000): 138. According to Scodel, this “framing” suggests that the audience should listen to the speech within the context of specific generic and social conventions.

lament, she contends that it is not possible to call a man happy until one sees how he lives his last day before dying: *χρὴ δ' οὔ ποτ' εἰπεῖν οὐδέν' ὄλβιον βροτῶν, / πρὶν ἂν θανόντος τὴν τελευταίαν ἰδῆις / ὅπως περάσας ἡμέραν ἤξει κάτω* (100-102).<sup>47</sup> In her speech against Hermione, Andromache claims that youth is an evil for mankind: *κακόν γε θνητοῖς τὸ νέον ἔν τε τῷ νέῳ / τὸ μὴ δίκαιον ὅστις ἀνθρώπων ἔχει* (184-185). Later in the same speech she teaches Hermione that it is virtue, not beauty, that wins over a husband: *φίλτρον δὲ καὶ τόδ'· οὐ τὸ κάλλος, ὦ γύναι, / ἀλλ' ἀρεταὶ τέρπουσι τοὺς ξυνευέτας* (207-208). Continuing in the same vein, Andromache also explains the correct way for a woman to treat her husband, even if she is married to a bad one: *χρὴ γὰρ γυναῖκα, καὶ κακῷ πόσει δοθῆι, / στέργειν ἄμιλλάν τ' οὐκ ἔχειν φρονήματος* (213-214). In her speech against Menelaus, Andromache tells him that men should not make mountains out of molehills and should avoid acting like women: *οὐ χρὴ 'πὶ μικροῖς μεγάλα πορσύνειν κακὰ / οὐδ', εἰ γυναῖκές ἐσμεν ἀτηρόν κακόν, / ἄνδρας γυναῖξιν ἐξομοιοῦσθαι φύσιν* (352-354).<sup>48</sup> Finally, when Andromache decides to sacrifice herself in order to save her son, she presents her choice as one that any parent would make: *πᾶσι δ' ἀνθρώποις ἄρ' ἦν / ψυχὴ τέκν'· ὅστις δ' αὖτ' ἄπειρος ὦν ψέγει, / ἥσσον μὲν ἀλγεῖ, δυστυχῶν δ' εὐδαιμονεῖ* (418-420).

Some of these sayings have the tone of philosophical dogma (man is not truly happy until he is dead), while others sound more like old-wives' tales about marriage and motherhood bandied about by women during a social visit (virtue and not beauty is more pleasing to a husband). Each of the statements use impersonal verbs to give them a gnomic sense, and the statements often apply to “everyone.” The deployment of these kinds of statements, especially within the context of the *agon*, sets the speaker up as the possessor of conventional wisdom learned through life experience. The implicit message is that Andromache is wiser than her opponents simply because she possesses and understands conventional wisdom. These statements have a different tone in each confrontation. When Andromache uses them with Hermione, they have a distinct didactic tone: the older, more experienced woman telling the younger, inexperienced bride about how to make a marriage work. When she uses them with Menelaus, the tone is a little more insulting. In Hermione's case, Andromache's status as an older woman, formerly married quite happily to a powerful man actually created common

<sup>47</sup> Lloyd *ad. loc.* states that this is a commonplace in Greek thought and often cited in tragedy. It was attributed to Solon (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 111).

<sup>48</sup> Lloyd *ad. loc.* calls this Menelaus' “characteristic fault” (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 126).

ground between them. But there is no common ground between Menelaus and Andromache, and so the saying which might seem didactic when used against Hermione comes out sounding like an insult.

One final feature prominent in many of Andromache's speeches is the criticism of women. When Andromache's former servant hesitates to go beg Peleus to come to Andromache's aid, she wonders how she will explain her absence from the house. Andromache simply states: *πολλὰς ἂν εὖροις μηχανάς· γυνὴ γὰρ εἴ* (85), implying that all women are skilled in deceit. In the introduction to her lament, Andromache states that all women enjoy recounting their sorrows: *ἐμπέφυκε γὰρ/γυναιξὶ τέρψις τῶν παρεστώτων κακῶν/ἀνὰ στόμ' αἰεὶ καὶ διὰ γλώσσης ἔχειν* (93-95). A main feature of Andromache's *agon* with Hermione is the obsession with sexuality which Andromache finds shameful. She suggests that Hermione's obsession with Neoptolemus' sex life, and her unwillingness to share him with others, is making it seem as though all women ever think about is sex. She tells Hermione *καίτοι χεῖρον' ἄρσένων νόσον/ταύτην νοσοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ προύστημεν καλῶς* (220-221), basically confirming the assumption that women do desire sex more than men, though they are able to disguise it better. Finally, after the *agon* with Hermione ends and Hermione returns to the palace, Andromache remarks:

*δεινὸν δ' ἔρπετῶν μὲν ἀγρίων  
ἄκη βροτοῖσι θεῶν καταστήσαι τινα,  
ὃ δ' ἔστ' ἐχίδνης καὶ πυρὸς περαιτέρω  
οὐδείς γυναικὸς φάρμακ' ἐξηύρηκέ πω  
κακῆς· τοσοῦτόν ἐσμεν ἀνδράποισ κακόν* (270-273).

This indicates an interesting blend of self-distancing and self-identification. Andromache is willing to criticize women for their most stereotypical faults (deceptive, full of complaints, sex-obsessed, difficult), yet she also includes herself among them. The comment to her servant seems to be a throw-away comment made by Euripides and not at all part of Andromache's characterization in *Andromache*. It would be the height of hypocrisy for Andromache to accuse a woman for being deceptive when she herself has just concealed her own son. It seems as though the comment is meant to be an encouragement, an exhortation to embrace the natural wiliness of women and use it to her advantage, as Andromache herself does. The comments against Hermione, however, clearly show Andromache adopting the male criticisms of women to chastise a particularly difficult and offending young bride. Though Andromache includes herself among these sex-obsessed and difficult women by using the first-person plural verb forms

νοσοῦμεν, προύστημεν and ἔσμεν, she nevertheless distances herself from incurring the same kind of blame or censure by highlighting in her speeches the ways that she avoided earning such criticism. This distance also has some implications for Andromache's thematic function in the tragedy. As McClure states, "By viewing herself and other women with the distrust characteristic of men, Andromache not only affirms her own probity but also serves as a mouthpiece for the play's didactic message about the peril engendered by women and marriage."<sup>49</sup>

Lloyd notes that *agon* speeches are self-consciously rhetorical, and that all speakers are consciously represented as skilled.<sup>50</sup> In Andromache's case, her rhetorical superiority is notable because she is a character for whom the use of such rhetorical devices is not obviously appropriate, since she is a foreign female slave.<sup>51</sup> The use of *hypophora*, gnomic statements and criticisms against women in her speeches characterize Andromache as an individual with superior reasoning skills, and an individual who believes herself to be superior to her interlocutors.<sup>52</sup> The conflict with Hermione has been caused by Hermione's youthful arrogance and stubbornness, and the difference in their ages allows Andromache to take a more didactic tone with the young bride. The rhetorical questions point out the flaws in Hermione's reasoning, and the gnomic statements and criticisms of women relate to the experiences of married women. With Menelaus, the tone of Andromache's speech is different. The rhetorical questions reveal Menelaus' own lack of foresight, which cannot be attributed to his age. The gnomic statements therefore sound more like insults. In each case, the use of these stylistic features belies Andromache's inability to act in accordance with her current social and domestic status. Though her flight to the Thetideion is understandable given the threat, the dressing down of her captors is ill-advised. Her addresses to her captors, whether in an *agon* or in another kind of speech, will not persuade them to act any differently than they plan, but they do help to articulate for the

---

<sup>49</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 182.

<sup>50</sup> Lloyd, *Agon*, 34-35. See also Scodel 131. Scodel notes that speakers will not be incompetent unless their characterization explicitly calls for it (Scodel 133).

<sup>51</sup> Lloyd, *Agon*, 54.

<sup>52</sup> Scodel argues that argument based on contemporary rhetoric was first developed for the stage by Euripides. Earlier forms of verbal performance (as is shown in epic poetry) relied on providing traditional wisdom through maxims and examples and applying it to the present situation (Scodel 135).



audience what is at stake.<sup>53</sup> This inappropriate deployment of rhetorical skill adds depth to Andromache's characterization and helps to develop her thematic function as the "noble barbarian."

### Traits Discerned Through Speeches

The topics of Andromache's speeches also suggest that she self-identifies as a virtuous person who is noble in character. In her speech she demonstrates a preoccupation with virtue and shame that other characters do not seem to have.<sup>54</sup> Even under the threat of death, Andromache still chooses the virtuous action of sacrificing herself for the sake of her son. She says that it would be shameful if she did not act in such a way: *ἐν τῷιδε μὲν γὰρ ἐλπίς, εἰ σωθήσεται, ἔμοι δ' ὄνειδος μὴ θανεῖν ὑπὲρ τέκνου* (409-410).<sup>55</sup> Similarly, she supplicates Peleus for help on the ground that he would incur shame if he did not bring her aid: *ῥῦσαί με πρὸς θεῶν· εἰ δὲ μή, θανούμεθα/αἰσχρῶς μὲν ὑμῖν, δυστυχῶς δ' ἔμοι, γέρον* (575-576). In her *agon* against Hermione, Andromache shows her concern with shame by reproaching Hermione for talking incessantly about sex, which Andromache thinks is shameful. She tells Hermione that she is young and speaking about shameful things: *νέα πέφυκας καὶ λέγεις αἰσχρῶν πέρι* (238). Andromache demonstrates her conscious avoidance of shame by describing her virtuous acts of the past. She relates to Hermione that she suckled the bastard children of Hector whenever he strayed, in order not to offend him:

*ὦ φίλταθ' Ἐκτωρ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν σὴν χάριν  
σοὶ καὶ ξυνήρων, εἴ τί σε σφάλλοι Κύπρις,  
καὶ μαστὸν ἤδη πολλάκις νόθοισι σοῖς  
ἐπέσχον, ἵνα σοι μηδὲν ἐνδοίην πικρὸν* (221-225).

By doing this, she says, she drew her husband to her through her "virtue" (*ἀρετῇ* 226). Even though Hector was "tripped up" by his affairs, Andromache's response ensured that no shame was brought upon them. Andromache also makes choices within the narrative of the tragedy based on her own sense of virtue. Later in the play, when Andromache refuses again and again

---

<sup>53</sup> Scodel 132.

<sup>54</sup> For Boulter, this is the real conflict between the two conflicting ideas of marriage. Andromache represents *sophia* and *sophrosune* (Boulter 53).

<sup>55</sup> Lloyd discusses how Andromache's speech of self-sacrifice is similar to other sacrifice speeches (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 128).

to leave the Thetideion and submit to Menelaus, she claims that if she were discovered to be drugging Hermione to make her sterile, she would submit to punishment from Neoptolemus:

ἡμεῖς γὰρ εἰ σὴν παῖδα φαρμακεύομεν  
καὶ νηδὺν ἐξαμβλοῦμεν, ὥς αὐτὴ λέγει,  
ἐκόντες οὐκ ἄκοντες, οὐδὲ βώμιοι  
πίτνοντες, αὐτοὶ τὴν δίκην ὑφέξομεν  
ἐν σοῖσι γαμβροῖς, οἷσιν οὐκ ἐλάσσονα  
βλάβην ὀφείλω προστιθεῖσ' ἀπαιδίαν (355-360).

Of course, she says this with the confidence of a person who knows she is innocent, but her words still reveals a consciousness of what is right and what is punishable.<sup>56</sup>

The didactic tone of her interaction with Hermione is reinforced by a brief exchange within their stichomythia. Hermione asks Andromache why she is talking to her as though she were more chaste: τί σεμνομυθεῖς καὶ ἀγῶν' ἔρχημι λόγων/ὥς δὴ σὺ σώφρων, τὰμὰ δ' οὐχὶ σώφρονα; (234-235). Andromache simply replies that Hermione certainly doesn't seem chaste based on what she says. In fact, Andromache soon says that Hermione does not have the sense she ought to have: λέγω σ' ἐγὼ νοῦν οὐκ ἔχειν ὅσον σ' ἔδει (252). As if on cue, Hermione's comments devolve into emotional outbursts, and after a particularly ominous threat, Hermione huffs on the stage.

Perhaps more than any other quality, Andromache's speeches confirm that she believes herself to be of noble character, and perhaps superior to Hermione and Neoptolemus. She hints at this in the brief proem of her *agon* speech against Hermione, saying that her lowered status as a slave may prevent her from speaking to Hermione, even though she has many just points to make and seems confident that they would win:

ἐγὼ δὲ ταρβῶ μὴ τὸ δουλεύειν μέ σοι  
λόγων ἀπίωσθι πόλλ' ἔχουσιν ἔνδικα,  
ἦν δ' αὖ κρατήσω, μὴ ἐπὶ τῷιδ' ὄφλω βλάβην.  
οἱ γὰρ πνέοντες μεγάλα τοὺς κρείσσους λόγους  
πικρῶς φέρουσι τῶν ἐλασσόνων ὕπο·  
ὅμως δ' ἐμαυτὴν οὐ προδοῦσ' ἀλώσομαι (186-190).

<sup>56</sup> Lloyd remarks that Euripides could have made Hermione more sympathetic, but he gives Andromache every advantage: she is an innocent victim of the plot; she has the better argument about how a wife should act; she is resolute when facing real danger; she gives birth to the son who turns out to be the sole descendent of the House of Aeacus (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 9). Kitto suggests that since the play was meant to be an indictment of the Spartans, Andromache's job was simply to be as unlike Hermione as possible and to reveal Hermione's nonsense through talking sense herself (Kitto 233). He rejects the notion that she is the dominating force in the tragedy, and calls her merely the first victim of Spartan machinations (Kitto 235).

The assumption here is that any compunction Andromache might feel about speaking frankly to her mistress is dispelled by her confidence in the superiority of her arguments.<sup>57</sup> Andromache does not recount the justness of her arguments in her extended scene with Menelaus, but she does indicate that she believes he is of weak character. After Menelaus reveals that he has found her son and proposes an ultimatum, Andromache delivers a tirade against the Greek leader, expressing her shock that he should act so ignobly. She finally spits: οὐκ ἀξιῶ/οὔτ' οὔν σέ Τροίας οὔτε σοῦ Τροίαν ἔτι (328-329). Andromache's opinion can hardly matter, and her voicing it certainly does not help her case, but she cannot seem to hide her disdain for a man whose reputation is so at odds with reality. When Andromache finally decides to leave the Thetideion to save her son, and Menelaus reveals that he will hand him over to Hermione anyway, Andromache does not hold back her abuse:

ὦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔχθιστοι βροτῶν  
 Σπάρτης ἔνοικοι, δόλια βουλευτήρια,  
 ψευδῶν ἄνακτες, μηχανορράφοι κακῶν,  
 ἐλικτὰ κοῦδὲν ὑγιᾶς ἀλλὰ πᾶν πέριξ  
 φρονοῦντες, ἀδίκως εὐτυχεῖτ' ἂν' Ἑλλάδα.  
 τί δ' οὐκ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν; οὐ πλεῖστοι φόνοι;  
 οὐκ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, οὐ λέγοντες ἄλλα μὲν  
 γλώσσηι, φρονοῦντες δ' ἄλλ' ἐφευρίσκεσθ' αἰεί;  
 ὅλοισθ' (445-453).<sup>58</sup>

Hermione similarly rages against Andromache, spouting slurs and making threats when she realized she was bested. Her outburst came at a structurally similar point: at the end of a *stichomythia* in which emotions kept running higher and higher. As Andromache learns of Menelaus' treachery and his unwillingness to consider just action, she similarly attacks him with a flurry of damaging words, ending with a curse. She then claims that Menelaus' punishment is not so grievous as he thinks:

<sup>57</sup> Lloyd notes that this is a rhetorical commonplace, but is also suitable for Andromache's situation (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 117).

<sup>58</sup> It is this last exchange with Menelaus which has led so many critics to interpret this tragedy as an anti-Spartan treatise. Kitto phrases this most strongly, writing: "This hard but brilliant tragedy is, not incidentally but fundamentally, a violent attack on the Spartan mind, on *Machtpolitik*; in particular on three Spartan qualities, arrogance, treachery and criminal ruthlessness" (Kitto 230). He later writes, "The play is a denunciation of Sparta, not a tragedy of mankind" (Kitto 232). Stevens notes that the condemnation of the Spartans is "implicit" in the manner in which their characters are presented, and made explicit by Andromache's denunciation (Stevens 11-12). Stevens, however, dismisses the idea that the tragedy intended to reference contemporary ideas, since it is not clear that Orestes is meant to represent a similar Spartan "villainy," and the chorus does not address the attitudes of the Spartans at all (Stevens 12). See Lloyd, *Andromache*, 129-130 for a discussion of the historical resonances of this scene.

ἐμοὶ μὲν θάνατος οὐχ οὕτω βαρὺς  
ὅς σοι δέδοκται· κείνα γάρ μ' ἀπώλεσεν,  
ὅθ' ἡ τάλαινα πόλις ἀνηλώθη Φρυγῶν  
πόσις θ' ὁ κλεινός, ὅς σε πολλάκις δορὶ  
ναύτην ἔθηκεν ἀντὶ χειρσαίου κακόν (453-457).

This last passage is the final evidence she gives in believing herself to be superior: by devalorizing his punishment, Andromache reminds Menelaus that there is little he could do to hurt her now – her past sufferings were so terrible that nothing he could do to her, not even death, could compare.

#### *Other Characters: Speeches*

In *Andromache*, the conflicts of the play focus on Andromache's disruptive presence in the household of Neoptolemus. As a displaced and degraded individual, Andromache deals with the disruption in her own way, as the discussion above outlines. The rest of the characters conceptualize Andromache according to their position on the ensuing domestic conflict. The characters who are sympathetic to Andromache, her former servant and the chorus, characterize Andromache as unwilling to recognize the realities of her current situation. Those characters who are unsympathetic, that is, the Spartans, characterize her as over-confident in her cleverness and as a barbarian.

The servant who accompanied Andromache from Troy essentially corroborates Andromache's conception of what has happened to her since the fall of Troy. She continues to address her as “mistress” and implies that she still thinks of Andromache as a superior:

δέσποιν', ἐγὼ τοι τοῦνομ' οὐ φεύγω τόδῃ  
καλεῖν σ', ἐπεῖπερ καὶ κατ' οἶκον ἡξίου  
τὸν σόν, τὸ Τροίας ἡνίκ' ὠικοῦμεν πέδον,  
εὔνοος δ' ἐκεῖ σοι ζῶντί τ' ἦ τῶι σῶι πόσει (56-59).

Though she is a friend, she also points out some of the hard truths about Andromache's situation: that she is bereft of friends ἔρημος εἶ φίλων (78); that the person she asks for help, Peleus, is an unsuitable savior due to age γέρων ἐκεῖνος ὥστε σ' ὠφελεῖν παρών (80); and that the messengers she sent to him did not care about her μῶν οὖν δοκεῖς σου φροντίσαι τιν' ἀγγέλων; (82). Even though Andromache is fully aware that she is no longer a queen, these observations coming from a friend serve as a reminder of how hopeless her situation is.

While Andromache's former slave is clearly supportive of Andromache's position, the chorus of Phthian women is essentially neutral in opinion. They do not hesitate to take sides

against their countrymen or rulers when they feel Andromache is being badly treated, but they also think Andromache is going too far in her arguments with the Spartans: ἄγαν ἔλεξας ὡς γυνὴ πρὸς ἄρσενας/ >/καί σου τὸ σῶφρον ἐξετόξευσεν φρενός (363-65). They seem to be most interested in ameliorating the escalating conflict: at 121-125 they tell Andromache that they have come to see if they could broker an agreement between her and Hermione; at 232-233 they urge Hermione to come to some kind of agreement with Andromache; at 423-424, they tell Menelaus that he should forge an agreement between Andromache and Hermione; at 642-644, they subtly criticize Peleus for causing a quarrel with friends; at 691-693, they reproach both Menelaus and Peleus for being foolish; at 727-28, despite being Phthian themselves, they rebuke Peleus for being unrestrained and irascible. Because they are not looking to take sides, they are better equipped to recognize what is pitiable and what is appropriate, and they provide relatively balanced assessments of character.

The first choral ode is an address to Andromache while she sits on the floor of the Thetideion. They tell her that even though she is Asian, and they Phthian, they would like to help her find some common ground with Hermione: Φθιάς ὅμως ἔμολον ποτὶ σὰν Ἀσιήτιδα γένναν (119). For the chorus, the current stalemate is the result of Andromache's own stubbornness.

They urge her in a series of imperative statements to recognize her station in life as a slave:

γνώθι τύχαν, λόγισαι τὸ παρὸν κακὸν εἰς ὅπερ ἦκεις.  
 δεσπότης ἀμιλλᾷ  
 Ἰλιάς οὐσα κόρη Λακεδαίμονος ἐγγενέταισιν;  
 λείπε δεξιμῆλον  
 δόμον τᾷς ποντίας θεοῦ. τί σοι  
 καιρὸς ἀτυζομέναι δέμας αἰκέλιον καταλείβειν  
 δεσποτᾶν ἀνάγκαις;  
 τὸ κρατοῦν δέ σ' ἔπεισι· τί μόχθον  
 οὐδὲν οὐσα μοχθεῖς; (126-134).

They continue in the same vein asking her to understand that she is a foreigner and not among friends:

ἀλλ' ἴθι λείπε θεᾶς Νηρηίδος ἀγλαὸν ἔδραν,  
 γνώθι δ' οὐσ' ἐπὶ ξέναις  
 θυμῷ ἀπ' ἀλλοτρίαις  
 πόλεος, ἔνθ' οὐ φίλων τιν' εἰσορᾷς  
 σῶν, ὧ δυστυχεστάτα,  
 ὧ παντάλαινα νύμφα (135-140).

Finally they assure her they are well-disposed to her, and that they pity her; but they cannot support her outright because they fear the rulers:

οἰκτροτάτα γὰρ ἔμοιγ' ἔμολες, γύναι Ἰλιάς, οἴκους  
δεσποτᾶν ἐμῶν· φόβωι δ'  
ἡσυχίαν ἄγαμεν  
(τὸ δὲ σὸν οἴκτῳ φέρουσα τυγχάνω)  
μὴ παῖς τᾶς Διὸς κόρας  
σοί μ' εὔφρονοῦσαν εἰδῆι (141-146).

From the chorus' viewpoint, then, it is possible to characterize Andromache as someone who has not yet come to terms with the upheaval of her life. Though Andromache's Trojan servant does not state it outright, she hints that some of Andromache's expectations are unreasonable given her circumstances.

Hermione and Menelaus are not interested in any objective assessment of Andromache's situation. Though Hermione is characterized as an irrational and brash young girl, and Menelaus is characterized as unscrupulous, they still contribute to Andromache's characterization by constructing her identity as the barbarian "other." This is accomplished largely through direct definition, as it is only the Spartans who refer to her as a "barbarian," but this is also accomplished through their own speeches.<sup>59</sup> Hermione's accusations against Andromache stem from a completely prejudiced viewpoint of easterners, which she reveals in her *agon* speech against Andromache:

σὺ δ' οὔσα δούλη καὶ δορίκτητος γυνή  
δόμους κατασχεῖν ἐκβαλοῦς' ἡμᾶς θέλεις  
τούσδε, στυγοῦμαι δ' ἀνδρὶ φαρμάκοισι σοῖς,  
νηδὺς δ' ἀκύμων διὰ σέ μοι διόλλυται·  
δεινὴ γὰρ ἡπειρώτις ἐς τὰ τοιάδε  
ψυχὴ γυναικῶν· (156-160).

She later reveals that she believes all easterners to be sexually perverse and lawless:

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 (173-176).

<sup>59</sup> Lloyd notes that Greek "chauvinism" is confined to Menelaus and Hermione, and is not displayed by Peleus (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 5). Lloyd argues that Euripides' portrayal of Greek chauvinism would not have offended his audience, since the character who hold these views are very often the enemies of Athens during the Peloponnesian War (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 117).

Hence her treatment of Andromache is shaded by her own jealousy of Neoptolemus' preference for Andromache over her, and by her own opinions of foreigners. She accuses Andromache of being ignorant for sleeping with Neoptolemus, and she attributes it to her own "barbarian" upbringing:

*ἐς τοῦτο δ' ἥκεις ἀμαθίας, δύστηνε σύ,  
ἢ παιδὶ πατρὸς ὃς σὸν ὤλεσεν πόσιν  
τολμαῖς ξυνεύδειν καὶ τέκν' αὐθεντῶν πάρα  
τίκτειν. τοιοῦτον πᾶν τὸ βάρβαρον γένος (170-173).*

Hermione also accuses Andromache of believing herself to be superior to Hermione, despite the fact that, in Hermione's opinion at least, Andromache has absolutely no hope of ever regaining her former status. Hermione actually envisions Andromache getting her comeuppance should she escape death:

*ἦν δ' οὖν βροτῶν τίς σ' ἢ θεῶν σῶσαι θέληι,  
δεῖ σ' ἀντὶ τῶν πρὶν ὀλβίων φρονημάτων  
πτῆξαι ταπεινὴν προσπείσειν τ' ἐμὸν γόνυ  
σαίρειν τε δῶμα τοῦμὸν ἐκ χρυσηλάτων  
τευχέων χειρὶ σπείρουσαν Ἀχελώϊου δρόσον  
γνῶναι θ' ἢ ἔν' εἴ γῆς. οὐ γάρ ἐσθ' Ἐκτωρ τάδε,  
οὐ Πριάμος οὐδὲ χρυσός, ἀλλ' Ἑλλὰς πόλις (163-169).*

Evidently Andromache has not done a very good job concealing her disdain for her masters. Hermione's desire to make Andromache grovel at her feet suggests that Andromache's pride might be making things difficult. Like the chorus, Hermione imagines that Andromache will have to "recognize" (*γνῶναι*, 168) the truth.

Andromache's foreignness is clearly cause for concern for Menelaus as well, though not quite in the same way as Hermione. Whereas Hermione's misconceptions about Easterners allowed her to trump up some charges against the foreign Andromache, Menelaus does not actually reveal any negative conceptions of easterners. His concern is more with her outsider status, not with any strange customs she may or may not participate in. In Menelaus' eyes, Peleus is taking sides against the family, and he expresses his surprise that such a famous man would do this:

*ὅτ' ὦν σὺ Πηλεὺς καὶ πατρὸς κλεινοῦ γεγώς  
κῆδος συνάψας, αἰσχρὰ μὲν σαυτῷ λέγεις  
ἡμῖν δ' ὀνειδῇ διὰ γυναῖκα βάρβαρον  
τήνδ', ἣν ἐλαύνειν χρῆν σ' ὑπὲρ Νεῖλου ῥοὰς  
ὑπὲρ τε Φαῶσιν, κάμει παρακαλεῖν αἰεὶ,  
οὔσαν μὲν ἠπερῶτιν, οὐ πέσσηματα*

πλεῖσθ' Ἑλλάδος πέπτωκε δοριπετῇ νεκρῶν,  
τοῦ σοῦ τε παιδὸς αἵματος κοινουμένην (647-654).

Menelaus reminds Peleus of the sorrow the Trojans have caused for the Greeks, and for Peleus in particular. He goes on to link Andromache to Achilles' killer, Paris, through her marriage to Hector, allowing him to express even more surprise that Peleus would support her (655-56). Menelaus also relates Andromache's outsider status to the rule of Phthia. He questions whether Phthians would consent to be ruled by foreign bastards, especially if Hermione does not have a child:

καίτοι φέρ' ἄψασθαι γὰρ οὐκ αἰσχρὸν λόγου·  
ἦν παῖς μὲν ἡμῇ μὴ τέκηι, ταύτης δ' ἄπο  
βλάστωσι παῖδες, τούσδε γῆς Φθιώτιδος  
στήσεις τυράννους, βάρβαροι δ' ὄντες γένος  
Ἑλλησιν ἄρξουσ'; (662-666)

Unlike Hermione, Menelaus has little to say against Andromache herself. He is more concerned with painting her as a foreign, and therefore dangerous, presence within Neoptolemus' household, one he and Peleus should be working together to counteract, not fighting over.

### Conclusion

In contrast to her characterization in the *Iliad*, Euripides presents in Andromache a much more mimetic character. The tragic poet uses a variety of characterization tools to create the illusion of depth.<sup>60</sup> A major contributing factor to Andromache's depth in *Andromache* is the fact that she is the focus of the first half of the play. Her actions, past and present, come under the scrutiny of several characters, and both she and the other characters are given opportunities to express their opinions, beliefs and prejudices with respect to her situation. Another contributing factor to Andromache's highly mimetic characterization is the layering of evidence geared toward creating one trait. In the *Iliad*, many of the epithets attributed to Andromache were not supported by the actions and speeches represented in the epic. The audience simply applied the traits to the character in addition to, or even in spite of, the other evidence presented in indirect presentation. In *Andromache*, however, the actions and speeches of Andromache and the other characters twine together in a way to indicate confirmable traits for Andromache. A crucial contribution to this nexus of information is increased access to the consciousness of all the

---

<sup>60</sup> *Contra* Allan, who argues that "Andromache as presented is by no means complex: she is always noble, but her simplicity is made admirable and moving" (Allan 87).



characters, but especially Andromache. By giving her a voice which speaks more than lament, Euripides has opened Andromache's consciousness beyond what was available in the *Iliad*.<sup>61</sup> Through her resourceful actions, the use of sophisticated rhetorical devices, gnomic statements, and the observations of others, it is possible to characterize Andromache as clever. She has proven that she has the drive and the resourcefulness to survive in a hostile environment, and she has also proven herself to be a skilled speech-maker. Andromache's speeches and courageous actions also show that she is preoccupied with avoiding shame and acting in a virtuous way, even when she is in situations which endanger her own life, and this is corroborated in the frustration shown by Hermione and Menelaus in their dealings with her. The observations of the other characters, however, suggest that for all of Andromache's concern with shame and virtue, she refuses to adapt to her new situation in life. Yet this stubbornness is in accordance with her own perception of her status: she acts inappropriately because she believes herself to be more noble than her oppressors, for she is the wife of Hector, prince of Troy.<sup>62</sup> The representation of differing perspectives and prejudices, essentially the inner lives of the characters, adds to the complexity of Andromache's character. Because he builds Andromache's character with several kinds of material (her own perceptions, the opinions of others, speeches, actions, and so on), Euripides allows the audience to get to know Andromache in a way similar to how they would get to know a real person – they are presented with a variety of information, very little of it completely objective, and they must shape their opinions of the character based on their own interpretations and observations. The increased mimetic function of Andromache's character in *Andromache* has repercussions on her thematic function as well. Since her characterization depends on the representation of several perspectives on her role and status in Neoptolemus' house, her thematic function must address the reasons behind these dangerously different ideas.

#### IV. Thematic Function

Andromache's thematic functions in *Andromache* are closely aligned with the multiplicity of her identities within the tragedy. As a representative of the lowly social statuses

---

<sup>61</sup> Allan suggests that "Euripides is less interested in depicting inner experience as such than in exploring (and exploiting) the contrasts between characters, and our moral reactions to them" (Allan 87). He goes on to say that characters fluctuate between degrees of evolution and wholeness, psychological depth or complexity (Allan 88).

<sup>62</sup> Lee argues that Andromache's unwillingness to accept her current situation is one example of the unifying theme of *nomos* vs. *phusis* (Lee 10).

of spear-bride, mother of a bastard, and foreigner in a Greek home, Andromache's character is purposefully set to odds against other characters with legitimate statuses: the lawful Greek wife of the man of the house; the Greek father of the Greek wife.<sup>63</sup> In order to explore the difficult themes of domestic disruption and the true nature of nobility, Euripides endows each character with unlikely and somewhat ironic attributes: the foreign spear-bride most resembles a virtuous, Homeric matron; the young, Greek bride is boastful and deceitful; the established, Greek hero and politician is petty and irresolute. Therefore the good and bad personal qualities spring from unsuspected sources, calling into question the true cause of strife and discord within the fictional household of the stage as well as the basis of the social and political *mores* of the time.

The intense verbal conflicts between the characters as well as the marked differences in their ages, ethnicity, and social status have led several scholars to advance the notion that the play is best understood as a study in binary oppositions.<sup>64</sup> Andromache is set up to explicitly oppose Hermione in status, ethnicity and age, being a foreign slave and spear-bride who has already been married and who has borne children. The *agon* between Hermione and Andromache sets up a system of binary opposites: wife vs. concubine; young woman vs. older woman; barren woman vs. fertile woman; Greek woman vs. foreign woman; master vs. slave. Likewise, the impact of the scene with Menelaus and Andromache also relies on the power of

---

<sup>63</sup> Allan calls this the "technique of characterization by opposition and interaction" (Allan 110).

<sup>64</sup> Many critics have forwarded the binary opposition model as a means of understanding the play. Kitto notes that in plays like these, which focus on social wrongdoing, the characters are divided into victims and oppressors, with the drama focusing on the suffering of the victims (Kitto 252). See also Paul Kovacs, *The Andromache of Euripides: An Interpretation* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980) 75. These binaries seem to Kovacs to define the characters as well. He writes: "The individuals in this play never stand by themselves or for themselves. They are always seen as part of their several groups, connected by ties of blood to them and deriving their character from them." He divides the characters among the Phthian dynasty, the Spartan group (which includes Orestes), and Andromache and her son (whom he assumes is Molossus) (Kovacs 75). He concludes that the individuality of the characters is of no importance to the tragedy. He writes: "An interest in the psychological depth or complexity of any of the characters...leads to stultification" (Kovacs 83). Cf. Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989) 1. On a related note, Hall notes that the inclusion of a barbarian perspective in Greek tragedy is often an exercise in self-definition, since the barbarian is considered to be the opposite of the noble Greek. Lloyd suggests that the characterization of the two women is "developed systematically" in order to make their polarization all the more vivid: Andromache is the submissive wife to Hector and to Neoptolemus, though by compulsion; Hermione represents the independence of a rich wife; Andromache can tolerate her husband "tripping up," but Hermione cannot; Hermione's faults are typically "female," while Andromache voices male criticisms of femininity (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 9). See also Phillip Vellacott, *Ironic Drama: A Study of Euripides' Method and Meaning* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975) 118. While most critics think of Andromache and Hermione as diametrically opposed, Vellacott sees a similarity in the fact that they are both deeply unhappy. He ties their unhappiness to the aftermath of the war, writing "This duel of shabby insults and vicious threats shows primarily two women equally robbed of dignity by what war and society – both the creation of the male – have done to them" (Vellacott 119).

binary opposites: man vs. woman; Greek vs. foreigner. But the binary opposites themselves are not the theme of the tragedy – it is the conflicts which pit the opposites against each other which develop the greater themes of the play. Oppositions in themselves are not interesting – it is the conflicts caused by the differences, the sparks flying between the two strongly charged individuals which expose the tensions Euripides wants to explore. The relationships between the main characters cannot be understood as merely “oppositions.” For example, the conflict between Andromache and Hermione is not only about the spear-bride Andromache’s favored place in the household. It also has to do with Hermione’s youth and misunderstanding, Andromache’s sense of superiority and her storied past, and the poisonous influence of outside opinions such as those expressed by Hermione’s nurse and the women who come to visit her in her home.

Andromache’s entanglement with Hermione in the first major conflict of the play begins the development of the theme of domestic disharmony engendered by bad marriages. Euripides’ characterization of Andromache as overtly concerned with virtuous behavior and stereotypically critical of women is of utmost importance to this theme. Andromache is characterized as a virtuous and devoted wife, despite the fact that she is not actually married to Neoptolmeus. This interesting characterization is likely due to the ingenuity of Euripides, who takes the typically “good” wife of the Homeric epic, degraded her social status, and put her at odds with a “bad” Spartan girl, a doublet of her mother Helen.<sup>65</sup> The Homeric nature of Andromache (which will be discussed at length below) positions her to be an effective foil to both Hermione and Menelaus. Her recollection of the nature of her marriage to Hector and the advice she gives to Hermione marks Andromache as possessing those qualities valued in women, and her status as a foreign concubine only reinforces the deficiencies in Hermione’s character.<sup>66</sup> The disparities in their character are further emphasized by the difficulty of their domestic situation. The presence

---

<sup>65</sup> According to Stevens, this whole sequence was likely invented by Euripides (Stevens 5). Stevens says: “It is characteristic of Euripides to take a bald fact in the epic tradition, such as the handing over of Andromache to Neoptolemus as his slave, and to imagine what her feelings would be and ask what effect the introduction of such a woman into the household might have. The fact that he was probably the first to dramatize this aspect of the situation confirms his special interest” (Stevens 9). Allan thinks her characterization is about the “impact” of her Homeric characteristics. He writes: “He [Euripides] takes up features of her epic role, but pointedly elaborates their impact by setting Andromache herself in conflict with enemy Greeks, both male and female, and in a domestic context which magnifies both her own heroism and the pettiness of her persecutors” (Allan 14). Allan notes that this is the first known reference to a second Trojan marriage for Andromache (to Helenus, Hector’s brother) (Allan 31).

<sup>66</sup> Helene Foley, *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2001) 87. Foley argues that the tragic concubine often takes on the qualities of epic wives or concubines.

of a concubine in the household causes several problems: the first, exemplified by the actions of Hermione, is the jealousy of the legitimate wife, and the second, exemplified by the concerns of Menelaus, is the legitimacy of the children of the union. What is interesting about Andromache's characterization in *Andromache* is that she is never referred to explicitly as "concubine." The closest any character comes to stating outright that Andromache is a concubine is when Hermione calls her Neoptolemus' "illicit bedfellow" (νόθοισι λέκτροις, 928), drawing attention to the fact that Andromache's child is illegitimate. Though Andromache herself never calls Neoptolemus her husband and never refers to herself as his wife, other characters do refer to her as his *wife*: the chorus calls her "bride" (νύμφα, 140) and Hermione's nurse refers to Andromache as a "fellow-wife" (συγγάμωι, 836). The third choral ode even implies that the situation in Neoptolemus' household is a double-marriage:

οὐδέποτε δίδυμα λέτρ' ἐπαινέσω βροτῶν  
οὐδ' ἀμφιμάτορας κόρους,  
ἔριδας οἴκων δυσμενεῖς τε λύπας·  
μία μ' οἱ στεργέτω πόσις γάμοις  
ἀκοινώνητον ἀνδρὸς εὐνάν (465-470).

It is clear, therefore, that, whatever Andromache thinks is the case, the rest of the characters believe Hermione and Andromache are "competing" in wifely virtue. Therefore, Andromache's identity as foreigner and slave becomes all the more important: Euripides is using a typically inferior individual to demonstrate the best noble, Greek qualities, calling into question the acts of the truly noble, Greek characters.<sup>67</sup> Andromache's thematic function here is but a small part of the larger theme of domestic disharmony. The marriage under siege at the beginning of the play does in fact come apart as Hermione re-enacts her mother's infidelity and escapes with Orestes. The strife Andromache endures with Hermione is considered an outgrowth of the disharmony of the marriage of Menelaus and Helen, and the later, catastrophic union of Paris and Helen. The strife within that household could even be attributed to an even earlier cause: the strained union of Peleus and Thetis. It is the re-ordering of that union which sets things to right again at the end of the play, and Andromache, the virtuous wife, is again given a true husband.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>67</sup> According to Lee, the distinction between barbarian and Greek is evaluated under two headings in *Andromache*: the first is moral, and the second is personal (Lee 12). In exploring this theme of domestic disharmony, Euripides makes Andromache morally superior to Hermione.

<sup>68</sup> See Storey 182-186 for a review of the disharmony within the several marriages represented in *Andromache*.

Andromache's status as a slave also helps to develop the theme of nobility and baseness. Hall notes that Euripides often explicitly calls Greek superiority into question through the characterization of a "noble barbarian." The noble barbarian is "a character of barbarian ethnicity....invested with Hellenic virtues such as courage or self-control, in which they equal or surpass their counterparts."<sup>69</sup> The superior arguments of Andromache, the lowly slave, paint the supposedly noble Spartans as petty, deceitful villains.<sup>70</sup> Andromache's vitriolic denouncing of the Spartan nature, and the baseness of the Spartans in general, certainly suggest an anti-Spartan sentiment in the play, but the larger aim is to present the villains as acting contrary to their assumed greatness.<sup>71</sup> Both Hermione and Menelaus make much of their wealth and power. Hermione first appears on stage dripping with luxurious goods and presumes to speak freely because of her father's wealth:

κόσμον μὲν ἀμφὶ κρατὶ χρυσέας χλιδῆς  
στολμόν τε χρωτὸς τόνδε ποικίλων πέπλων  
οὐ τῶν Ἀχιλλέως οὐδὲ Πηλέως ἄπο  
δόμων ἀπαρχὰς δεῦρ' ἔχουσ' ἀφικόμην,  
ἀλλ' ἐκ Λακαίνης Σπαρτιάτιδος χθονὸς  
Μενέλαος ἡμῖν ταῦτα δωρεῖται πατήρ  
πολλοῖς σὺν ἔδνοις, ὥστ' ἐλευθεροστομεῖν (147-153).

Similarly, Menelaus is quite concerned with his status and his shows of power. In his response to Andromache, he agrees that domestic concerns are trivial to him, but yet a necessary concern of the moment: γύναι, τάδ' ἐστὶ σμικρὰ καὶ μοναρχίας/οὐκ ἄξι', ὡς φήεις, τῆς ἐμῆς οὐδ' Ἑλλάδος (366-367). He finally leaves the stage after proclaiming that a military matter near home is far more important than this domestic matter: καὶ νῦν μὲν (οὐ γὰρ ἄφρονον σχολὴν ἔχω)/ἄπειμ' ἐς οἴκους· ἐστὶ γὰρ τις οὐ πρόσω/Σπάρτης πόλις τις, ἢ πρὸ τοῦ μὲν ἦν φίλη, /νῦν δ' ἐχθρὰ ποιεῖ (732-735). He abandons his daughter without so much as a word to her. Both Andromache and Peleus describe in detail the poor decisions Menelaus made in the past, especially with respect to his wife and his decision to go to war for an unvirtuous woman. The addition of Orestes to the action does not help matters. Though Andromache does not participate directly in this storyline, it is a further

<sup>69</sup> Hall 211.

<sup>70</sup> See Katerina Synodinou, *On the Concept of Slavery in Euripides* (Ioannina: U of Ioannina P, 1977) 58. She writes that "Euripides seems to demonstrate the vanity of such distinctions as Greek and barbarian, free and slave. The free Greeks are shown to be more savage than the barbarian Andromache."

<sup>71</sup> Hall notes that Euripides often uses Trojan captives as binary opposites to the Athenian enemies in the Peloponnesian War (Hall 212).

development of the same theme: the “noble” Spartan family is again and again proven to be base and vile in comparison with the virtuous actions of the foreign slave Andromache and the beaten-down old man Peleus.<sup>72</sup>

Andromache’s thematic function in *Andromache* is conditioned by the multiplicity of statuses she holds during the course of the play. Her position in the household is of vital interest to her two main persecutors, Hermione and Menelaus, and her unjust suffering at their hands casts the behavior of the supposedly noble Greeks into question. Andromache’s ability to hold up their behavior for critical examination is not due only to her embattled position in the household or her foreign ethnicity. The success of her thematic function depends on the fact that Euripides fashions her as a continuation of her Homeric character. If Andromache were characterized as significantly different from her *Iliadic* incarnation, she would not have been so effective in *Andromache*. Euripides essentially takes the core dimensions of Andromache’s epic persona and adds enough 5<sup>th</sup> century sensibility to make Andromache both a signifier of older, Homeric principles and a possessor of contemporary virtues.

## **V. Continuation: Homeric Touchstones and Thematic Amplification**

The successful continuation of a character from text to text depends upon whether or not the core elements of the character remain the same. If that nucleus of qualities is not represented, then it is only the name of the character which is passed along. In Chapters 2 and 3 the Homeric Andromache is defined as a flat character with strong thematic function. Despite the complications surrounding the interpretation of Andromache’s Homeric qualities, the sense is certain: Andromache is “blameless” in a typical, exemplary way, and she is “many-gifted” in the sense that she came from a wealthy family, bringing much additional wealth to her husband’s family. Indirect description of Andromache in the *Iliad* centers on her role as Hector’s wife. Her actions are evaluated as either appropriate or inappropriate for a wife, though in the final tallying, any aberration from expected behavior is excused by the depth of feeling she shows for her husband. The strength of Andromache’s character in the *Iliad* lies in her laments. The exemplary wife is critical of the choices her husband makes and draws attention to the consequences his actions in war will have on his family at home. These laments offer little

---

<sup>72</sup> “In characteristic Euripidean fashion, Euripides inverts dramatic and social norms by making the slave woman and her aging rescuer embody the noble values of a bygone era, while the Spartan Menelaus and his daughter project a vulgar and bourgeois attitude characteristic of demagogues in contemporary Athens” (McClure, *Spoken*, 176).

characterizing content for Andromache herself, but the criticisms of her laments provide a memorable thematic counterpoint to the pervasive theme of *kleos*.

Nyenhuis argues that Euripides' method of characterization is to "expand or reshape already well-established traditional mythical figures." He suggests that Euripidean characterizations of Trojan War figures are deeply rooted in Homeric characterization.<sup>73</sup> This meshes nicely with Margolin's ideas of character augmentation and reduction: addition, deletion, substitution and rearrangement. These transformations take place partially because of the change in genre, or transmodalization: when Euripides adapted aspects of the epic narrative for the tragic stage, some aspects of Andromache's characterization also changed. But the changes are also due to "amplification," the thematic and stylistic expansion which often accompanies transmodalization.<sup>74</sup> Helene Foley argues that the Homeric epic plays an especially important role in shaping tragic women. She writes that "[e]vocation of epic models can play a critical role in the creation of these domestic characters, precisely because the epic wife belongs more fully to her partners and tends to adhere voluntarily to social ideals."<sup>75</sup> In Euripides' *Andromache*, the reverberations of the transmodalization from epic to tragedy are felt especially in the characterization of the mythical figures. The conflicts between them are based on the oppositions of their qualities, but more importantly on the way their tragic qualities play against their epic qualities.

In *Andromache*, Andromache becomes a foil for Hermione and Menelaus because Euripides exaggerates her Homeric "goodness." But it is not the same kind of "goodness" portrayed in the epic, though aspects of that characterization do shine through in the tragedy. Andromache's "goodness" has a particular 5<sup>th</sup> century cast to it: her criticism of other women, her cleverness and rhetorical skill, and her recollection of her relationship with Hector all suggest qualities which were desirable in tragic characterizations, but not epic. Yet Euripides suggests, through other aspects of her characterization, that these qualities reflect epic or heroic attitudes and values. Andromache's characterization is almost "hyper-Homeric." She is associated with her Homeric character through a few well-thought-out allusions to her Homeric character, yet

---

<sup>73</sup> Jacob Nyenhuis, *Homer and Euripides: A Study in Characterization* (Diss. Stanford University, 1963) 160.

<sup>74</sup> See Chapter 1 Section III for a review of Margolin's and Genette's ideas on continuation.

<sup>75</sup> Foley 90. She provides Tecmessa from Sophocles' *Ajax* as an example, noting how similar she is to the Iliadic Briseis and Andromache.

she is virtuous in the 5<sup>th</sup> century sense, not simply the Homeric sense. Therefore it is important for Euripides to maintain the continuation of Andromache's character from the *Iliad*, which he does by alluding to Homeric epithets, plot lines, and story patterns.

First of all, *Andromache* itself is a continuation of the *Iliad*. The tragedy certainly references the events of the *Iliad* often enough (in particular in Andromache's prologue and monodic lament). Though the Homeric epic does not address the fate of Andromache or the other Trojan women after the war, in the *homilia* scene of Book 6 Hector imagines Andromache's future after the fall of Troy:

ἀλλ' οὐ μοι Τρώων τόσσον μέλει ἄλγος ὀπίσσω,  
οὔτ' αὐτῆς Ἑκάβης οὔτε Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος  
οὔτε κασιγνήτων, οἳ κεν πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοὶ  
ἐν κοινήσι πέσοιεν ὑπ' ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν,  
ὅσσον σεῦ, ὅτε κέν τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων  
δακρύνεσσαν ἄγεται, ἐλεύθερον ἡμαρ ἀπούρας·  
καὶ κεν ἐν Ἄργει εἰσὶν πρὸς ἄλλης ἱστὸν ὑφαίνοις,  
καὶ κεν ὕδωρ φορέοις Μεσσηϊδος ἢ Ὑπερείης  
πόλλ' ἀεκαζομένη, κρατερὴ δ' ἐπικείσεται ἀνάγκη·  
καὶ ποτέ τις εἴπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσας·  
“Ἐκτορος ἦδε γυνή, ὅς ἀριστευέσκε μάχεσθαι  
Τρώων ἱπποδάμων, ὅτε Ἴλιον ἀμφιμάχοντο.”  
ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει· σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος  
χῆπτ' τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἡμαρ.  
ἀλλὰ με τεθνηῶτα χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτει,  
πρὶν γέ τι σῆς τε βοῆς σοῦ θ' ἐλκηθμοῖο πυθέσθαι. (Il. 6.450-465)

Certain features of this vision find their realization in Euripides' tragedy.<sup>76</sup> Andromache does become a slave, though not in Argos or Messeis or Hyperia, and it is unclear whether she weaves or carries water as Hector supposed she would. What does find expression in Euripides' tragedy is the unwillingness (ἀεκαζομένη, Il. 6.458) with which Andromache performs her duty as a slave, which appears to be primarily sharing the bed of Neoptolemus.<sup>77</sup> In the prologue of

<sup>76</sup> Lloyd also notes that *Iliad* 6 predicts Andromache's life as a slave (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 1). See also Robert Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London: Routledge, 1990) 133 and John Davidson, “Euripides, Homer, and Sophocles.” *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century*. Ed. Martin Cropp, Kevin Lee, and David Sansone (Champaign, IL: Stipes, 2000. 117-28) 124.

<sup>77</sup> Even though she acknowledges that Andromache's claim that she entered into a sexual relationship with Neoptolemus against her will is true, Torrance still argues that Andromache's character in *Andromache* “provokes a certain measure of discomfort for a Greek audience” (Torrance 48) because there are aspects of her relationship with Neoptolemus which suggest that their relationship is not really “over” (Torrance 51). Torrance points out as evidence the vocabulary of marriage inherent in the participle *δοθεῖσα* (4 and 15); the birth of a child; the conversation between Peleus and Menelaus that suggests Andromache receives preferential treatment (Torrance



*Andromache*, Andromache explains that she slept with Neoptolemus against her will, οὐχ ἐκοῦσ' (36), but cannot seem to persuade Hermione that she does not want to supplant her in Neoptolemus' house. During her meeting with Menelaus, she reminds him that she was compelled to sleep with Neoptolemus by force: ἐκοιμήθην βίαι/σὺν δεσπότηισι (390-391). Euripides is also careful to insert reminders of the powerful necessity (ἀνάγκη, *Il.* 6.458) that constrains Andromache and confines her to the degraded status of household slave. In their first ode, the chorus asks her to recognize her fate and to cease weeping over the necessities of slavery: τί σοι/καιρὸς ἀτυζυμέναι δέμας αἰκέλιον καταλείβειν/ δεσποτᾶν ἀνάγκαις; (130-132). The reality of her slave-status leaves her powerless.

As a continuation of the *Iliad*'s story, *Andromache* is also a continuation of Andromache's character. One of the most poignant points of contact between the Homeric epic and the Euripidean tragedy is Andromache's conception of herself as Hector's wife. In Hector's vision of the future in *Iliad* 6, an anonymous man will come upon Andromache weeping and lamenting, and will remark that she was the wife of Hector, the noblest warrior of Troy. The anonymous person refers to Andromache only as the "wife of Hector," (Ἔκτορος ἥδε γυνή, *Il.* 6.460) suggesting that her identity is entirely expressed in this relationship. Andromache herself maintains that connection in *Andromache* by consistently referring to Hector as her husband: πόσιν μὲν Ἔκτορ' (8); τὸν ἐμὸν μελέας πόσιν Ἔκτορα (107); πόσιν (227); πόσις θ' ὁ κλεινός (456). These references serve as a reminder of her past life as the wife of a powerful and respected warrior, and recall the depictions of Hector and Andromache from the *Iliad*. In the context of *Andromache*, however, Andromache's connection to Hector is more likely to bring her trouble than to offer some kind of protection. Andromache is not unaware of the fact that Hector was a hateful person to her captors. In her *agon* with Hermione, Andromache reminds Hermione that she is of no threat to her because of her past connection to Hector: φιλοῦσι γάρ μ' Ἕλληνες Ἔκτορός γ' ὕπερ;/αὐτὴ τ' ἀμαυρὰ κοῦ τύραννος ἦ Φρυγῶν; (203-204). Menelaus tells Peleus that he

---

657-658); Andromache admitting that she relies on Neoptolemus (268-269); and Andromache's own belief that Neoptolemus prefers her to Hermione (207-208). This is a confusing argument because all of the evidence Torrance cites suggests Neoptolemus' preference for Andromache, not Andromache's emotional attachment to Neoptolemus. The fact that a slave and concubine trusts or relies upon her master does not need further qualification as emotionally motivated. The repetition of δοθεῖσα does recall the vocabulary of marriage because Andromache is being explicitly compared to Hermione in wifely virtue. Implying that Neoptolemus and Andromache have "feelings" for each other actually undercuts the power of the themes of the play. Andromache would then be reduced to the adulterous "other woman," disrupting what promises to be a flourishing marriage, instead of being the lowly outsider victim, thrust into an existing domestic disruption. This is simply not the case.

should not protect Andromache because she had a share in Achilles' death through her marriage: τοῦ σοῦ τε παιδὸς αἵματος κοινουμένην./Πάρις γάρ, ὃς σὸν παῖδ' ἔπεφ' Ἀχιλλέα,/Ἐκτορος ἀδελφὸς ἦν, δάμαρ δ' ἦδ' Ἐκτορος. (654-656).

Hector also imagines that the anonymous person's reminder will bring fresh pains to Andromache because she lacks such a man (τοιούδ' ἀνδρὸς, *Il.* 6.463) to ward off her day of slavery. That lack is also an important part of the *Andromache*. In her darkest hour, the moment before she is struck down by Menelaus, she calls to her husband, Hector, and his hand and spear: ὦ πόσις πόσις, εἶδε σὰν/χεῖρα καὶ δόρυ σύμμαχον/κτησαίμαν, Πριάμου παῖ (523-525). Of course, he cannot save her, but the consequences of his absence are far greater than he could have imagined. This lack of a husband is also somewhat ironically expressed in *Andromache* in the absence of Neoptolemus.<sup>78</sup> Though Andromache is careful never to call Neoptolemus her husband, his absence is nevertheless a central feature of the tragedy. In fact, there is no man such as Hector in the play – there is no representative of the heroic tradition to speak of. Menelaus is proven to be a *poseur* on several fronts.<sup>79</sup> Andromache expresses surprise that a man so petty could have taken Troy: σὺ δὴ στρατηγῶν λογάσιν Ἑλλήνων ποτὲ/Τροίαν ἀφείλους Πριάμον, ὥδε φαῦλος ὢν;...οὐκ ἄξιῶ/ οὐτ' οὖν σὲ Τροίας οὔτε σοῦ Τροίαν ἔτι (324-329). Peleus views him with contempt, saying σὺ γὰρ μετ' ἀνδρῶν, ὦ κάκιστε κάκ' κακῶν;/ σοὶ ποῦ μέτεστιν ὡς ἐν ἀνδράσιν λόγου; (590-591). Neoptolemus is the kind of man who could save Andromache and who, by implication, could represent the same heroic qualities as Hector. Though Andromache does not express explicit admiration for Neoptolemus, she is aware that he is esteemed by his peers, and she uses that to her advantage in her speech against Menelaus:

ἦν δ' οὖν ἐγὼ μὲν μὴ θανεῖν ὑπεκδράμω,  
τὸν παῖδα μου κτενεῖτε; κἄντα πῶς πατήρ  
τέκνου θανόντος ῥαδίως ἀνέξεται;  
οὐχ ὥδ' ἀνάνδρον αὐτὸν ἢ Τροία καλεῖ.  
ἀλλ' εἴσιν οἱ χρεή, Πηλέως γὰρ ἄξια

<sup>78</sup> Lloyd considers Andromache a *nostos* play. He writes: “the pattern of this type of play is that the head of the household is absent; he suffers while he is away, and his absence leads to problems at home; his return is a crucial event, coming only after much preparation and foreshadowing” (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 3). He notes later that Euripides makes the pattern ironic when Neoptolemus returns as a corpse (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 4). Lloyd believes it would be hard to call Neoptolemus the “hero” of the play, despite the fact that the play follows a *nostos* pattern (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 4).

<sup>79</sup> See Lloyd, *Andromache*, 6. Stevens believes that the death of Neoptolemus was presented in the tragedy as it was to comment on the end result of the great war. Neoptolemus' death was not just retribution, but also an outrage (Stevens 14). Kovacs stretches a bit when he argues that the Phthians and the Trojans are the most “natural” allies based in part on Neoptolemus' valiant death at Delphi (Kovacs 76).

πατρός τ' Ἀχιλλέως ἔργα θρῶν φανήσεται,  
ὥσει δὲ σὴν παῖδ' ἐκ δόμων· (338-344).

The messenger's narration of Neoptolemus' death also paints him as a noble warrior. He went to Delphi to make amends for an earlier fault (1106-1108), and fights valiantly against the Delphians (1119-1160).<sup>80</sup> But Andromache must look to someone else for aid – to aged Peleus, grandfather of Neoptolemus. He succeeds in saving her, but through insults and intimidation, not through his strength and valor.

Laments are a critical part of Andromache's characterization in the *Iliad*, and Euripides honors that characterization in *Andromache* by including the monodic and antiphonal laments. Her laments in the *Iliad* determined her thematic function, allowing her to draw the audience's and reader's attention to the plight of the wife and mother. In *Andromache*, her laments again serve that purpose, but the situation is once again modified. What is more important in *Andromache* is the fact that she laments at all. This marks her as the perpetual widow, and connects her to the *homilia* scene in Book 6. Her monodic lament does address the consequences of wartime actions on the homefront, but the disturbance is a domestic, not a martial one. It is the marriage of Paris and Helen which has caused her current, lamentable situation, not Hector's willingness to continually seek glory. As befits a tragedy, the conflict is thoroughly domestic, contained within the *oikos*. Domestic disharmony in one *oikos* has caused a similar disharmony in another.

In the *Iliad* the epithets *ἀμύμων* and *πολύδωρος*, were special to Andromache. Their meanings are difficult to interpret clearly, but, as the previous chapter explains, they both serve to characterize Andromache in a typically “good” way. Though the exact notion indicated by *ἀμύμων* cannot really be translated into one word or phrase, Euripides retains the idea that Andromache was exemplary in behavior and qualities from the *Iliad*. Though no one in *Andromache* praises her directly as virtuous or good, her dealings with Hermione and Menelaus and her decision to sacrifice herself for the sake of her child define her as stereotypically good in comparison to the deceitful Greeks. The term *πολύδωρος* does seem to have some concrete bearing on Andromache's characterization in *Andromache*. One of the major points of conflict between Andromache and Hermione is the difference in their social status and the problems it

---

<sup>80</sup> Allan notes another similarity between Hector and Neoptolemus in their deaths: their bodies were mutilated by opposing forces even after they had died (Allan 112). Davidson says that Neoptolemus is “Iliadized” in the messenger's speech (Davidson 123). See also Garner 134.

causes within Neoptolemus' household. One of the issues at hand is money – because Hermione comes from a wealthy, Spartan family, she considers it her right to treat Andromache in any way she sees fit. In the *Iliad*, Andromache's wealth and status are presented as a way to show how well-matched she is to Hector.<sup>81</sup> The gifts and goods surrounding the wedding exchange are often mentioned in the *Iliad*, though not necessarily a major point of Andromache's characterization. The material goods associated with Andromache and the role the exchange of gifts plays in a wedding are featured in Sappho's fragment, however, when the narrator recounts the many golden bracelets, purple robes, trinkets, silver drinking cups, and ivory that make up Andromache's dowry.<sup>82</sup> The epithalamium is one indication of the importance of those gifts in solidifying the connection made between husband and wife, marital and natal families on the occasion of a wedding. The wedding song also shows that such gifts are a cause of joy, a symbol of the good match made between the "godlike" bride and groom. This is the sense of the epithet in the *Iliad*. Andromache's material wealth is referenced in a similar way in *Andromache*. In the prologue, Andromache recalls how well-matched she was to Hector: Ἀσιάτιδος γῆς σχῆμα, Θηβαία πόλις, ὅθεν ποθ' ἔδνων σὺν πολυχρύσῳ χλιδῇ/Πριάμου τύραννον ἐστίαν ἀφικόμην/δάμαρ δοθεῖσα παιδοποιὸς Ἑκτορι (1-4).<sup>83</sup> The blessedness of her former life was determined by the wealth of her family and her ability to bear children. This is somewhat ironically taken up in *Andromache* as Hermione, who explicitly references the wealth possessed by her natal family, remains childless and hated by her husband. It is clear that these basic qualities consistently characterize Andromache in the *Iliad* and *Andromache*.

Andromache's characterization in *Andromache* clearly draws on elements from her characterization in the *Iliad*. But Euripides also features certain Homeric story patterns in his tragedy, some of which did not originally pertain to Andromache at all. One pattern that does actually recall Andromache in the *Iliad* is the pattern of the son of the hero put in danger's way while his father is absent.<sup>84</sup> If Neoptolemus is Hector's doublet in *Andromache*, surely his son is

<sup>81</sup> See, for example, *Il* 22.86-88, when Hecuba tells Hector that his family, including his ἄλλοχος πολύδωρος, will not be able to mourn him should he fall to Achilles.

<sup>82</sup> πόλλα δ' [ἐλί]γματα χρύσια κάμματα/πορφύρε[α] κατὰ τ[...]να, ποίκιλ' ἀθύρματα/ἀργύρεα τ' ἀνάρε[ι]σμα [ποτή]ρε[ια] καλέφαις (L-P 44. 8-10).

<sup>83</sup> Lloyd, *Andromache*, ad loc. also makes the connection with Andromache's Iliadic characterization.

the doublet for Astyanax. In the prologue, Andromache reveals that she has smuggled Neoptolemus' son out of the house because she fears for his safety. Neoptolemus is not at home, and can be of no aid to his son (ὁ γὰρ φυτεύσας αὐτὸν οὔτ' ἐμοὶ πάρα/προσωφελῆσαι παιδί τ' οὐδὲν ἐστ' 49-50). This corresponds almost exactly with Andromache's lament in Book 22 of the *Iliad*, when she mourns that Hector can be of no aid to Astyanax and Astyanax loses the opportunity to aid him in return (οὔτε σὺ τούτῳ/ἔσσεαι, Ἴκτορ, ὄνειαρ, ἐπεὶ θάνες, οὔτε σοὶ οὔτος *Il.* 22.485-486). The rest of her Iliadic lament outlines the obstacles facing Astyanax in the future: challenges to his land-rights, social marginalization, and potential slavery (*Il.* 22.488-506). It is not until her lament in Book 24 that Andromache reveals that she has reconsidered the situation and now believes that Astyanax will perish in Troy because of his father's bravery (*Il.* 24.732-735). In the prologue of *Andromache*, Andromache recalls what actually did happen to Astyanax: he was thrown from the walls when the Greeks took Troy (9-11). Knowing the grisly fate of young Astyanax, the tragic audience cannot help but sense impending doom for the young son of Neoptolemus, especially in Neoptolemus' absence.<sup>85</sup> It is some time before the actual threat is revealed, and even then, Euripides connects the fate of Neoptolemus' son to the fate of Astyanax when Menelaus says that it is stupid to leave the children of enemies alive (καὶ γὰρ ἀνοία/μεγάλη λείπεν ἐχθροὺς ἐχθρῶν/ἐξὸν κτείνειν/καὶ φόβον οἴκων ἀφελέσθαι 519-522). In both stories, the *Iliad* and *Andromache*, mother and child are put in jeopardy by the absence of the heroic father.

The absence of Neoptolemus also casts Andromache as a Penelope awaiting the return of her husband.<sup>86</sup> The son of the hero is likewise placed in harm's way, but Neoptolemus' boy is not as old as Telemachus and therefore unable to negotiate those trials alone. Unlike Penelope, Andromache does not face the difficult choice of naming a suitor to replace her absent husband, but like Penelope she must use her wits to stave off the necessity of making a difficult decision. Whereas Penelope devised the trick of the web to avoid choosing a suitor, Andromache conceals her son to avoid choosing between his death or her own.

---

<sup>84</sup> Stevens believes Euripides "assumed the existence of a single child of Andromache by her master" (Stevens 5). Allan reads the staging of a single son, instead of the several later sources attribute to Andromache and Neoptolemus, as a conscious allusion to Astyanax in the *Iliad* (Allan 15). See also Davidson 124, and Torrance 57.

<sup>85</sup> As Lloyd notes, "children in tragedy are pathetic victims, whose role is to be threatened, killed, or orphaned" (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 133).

<sup>86</sup> Foley 97.

Euripides' tragedy *Andromache* can be said to amplify certain Homeric themes, expanding them somewhat to suit his tragic program. The most obvious topic of expansion in *Andromache* is the status of wives and concubines in the Homeric household. The taking of spear-brides and the presence of concubines in the home provided grounds for some of the most important conflicts in the Homeric epics. The *Iliad* begins with strife over captured spear-brides, with Agamemnon angered over the loss of his γέρας Chryseis and provoking another crisis by taking Briseis.<sup>87</sup> Agamemnon, when relating his reluctance to return Chryseis, notes that he esteems her more than his own wife Clytemnestra, prefiguring to a certain extent the preference of Neoptolemus for Andromache over Hermione: καὶ γάρ ῥα Κλυταιμνήστρης προβέβουλα/κουριδῆς ἀλόχου, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐνὶ χερσίων/οὐδέ μιν οὐδὲ φονήν, οὐτ' ἄρ' φρένας οὔτε τι ἔργα (Il. 1.113-115). It is Agamemnon's second spear-prize, Cassandra, who causes destruction within his household: unlike Hermione, Clytemnestra was strong enough to take decisive action in her husband's absence and again when he returns with a concubine (*Od.* 11.421-3). Strife caused within a household by an existing concubine is also well-documented in the *Iliad*. Phoenix relates how his mother compelled him to sleep with his father's concubine because of her own jealousy:

ὅς μοι παλλακίδος περιχώσατο καλλικόμοιο,  
τὴν αὐτὸς φιλέεσκεν, ἀτιμάδεσκε δ' ἄκοιτιν,  
μητέρ' ἐμήν· ἢ δ' αἶν' ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων  
παλλακίδι προμιγῆναι, ἵν' ἐχθρήρει γέροντα.  
τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα· πατήρ δ' ἐμὸς αὐτίκ' οἷσθ' εἰς  
πολλὰ κατηρᾶτο, στυγεράς δ' ἐπέκλετ' Ἑρινῶς,  
μή ποτε γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλον υἱὸν  
ἐξ ἐμέθεν γεγαῶτα· (Il. 9. 449-456).

That act later led him to murder and exile. In his description of Eurykleia in the *Odyssey*, the narrator relates how Laertes paid handsomely for Eurykleia but never slept with her, as was his right, for his wife Antikleia was clearly against it (*Od.* 1.433). Though these conflicts were not the main focus of either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, they all signified the potential for strife and discord within the home. These subordinate plotlines or brief recollections all have thematic value as counterpoints to the stories of masculine excellence on the battlefield. The warriors seek glory in war, but conflicts are not only found on the battlefield, and one's reputation is not only won in fighting an external enemy. There seems to be no way to sever the ties between conflicts at home and conflicts on the battlefield for the warriors – strife in one quarter is likely

---

<sup>87</sup> Kyriakou 17.

to have repercussions on the other. The story of Andromache in *Andromache* borrows bits from each of these Homeric stories, but it amplifies the theme in a way to expose the nasty truths about legitimate unions at home. Andromache may be the Chryseis or Cassandra or Eurykleia of the situation, but she acts as the legitimate wife would act. She is also special because, unlike Chryseis, Briseis, and Cassandra, Andromache is not a virgin. She is a widow, who has already established a reputation for wifely virtue, as Penelope has.<sup>88</sup> This makes her uniquely suited to the theme of domestic disharmony in *Andromache*, and will again provide a starting point for her meditation on reputation and marriage in Trojan Women.

Andromache's Penelopean (or Andromachean) qualities are also amplified in her description of her relationship with Hector. In *Andromache*, the concubine Andromache presumes to criticize Hermione and offer her advice based on her experience as the excellent wife of an excellent warrior. When arguing with Hermione about why Neoptolemus does not like her, Andromache reveals that she did everything she could to be accommodating to Hector, even suckling his bastard children by other women:

ὦ φίλταθ' Ἐκτωρ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν σὴν χάριν  
 σοὶ καὶ ξυνήρων, εἴ τί σε σφάλλοι Κύπρις,  
 καὶ μαστὸν ἤδη πολλάκις νόθοισι σοῖς  
 ἐπέσχον, ἵνα σοι μηδὲν ἐνδοίην πικρὸν (221-225).

This was most certainly not a feature of her Iliadic character.<sup>89</sup> In fact, sexuality of any kind was not a feature of either Andromache's or Hector's characterization. Agamemnon's appraisal of Chryseis' charms in relation to his wife's is part of the initial conflict of the *Iliad*; the sexual relationship between Paris and Helen was established and explored in Books 3 and 6 to a certain extent; Achilles claims that he loves Briseis as he loves a wife; the narrator in passing notes that both Achilles and Patroclus sleep with a captive woman in the Achaean camp. But aside from

---

<sup>88</sup> Torrance 54-55. Torrance simply notes that this fact further "complicates" her characterization in *Andromache* by lending more credence to the fact that she was treated as Neoptolemus' wife.

<sup>89</sup> Foley in fact argues that such "extreme (even active) wifely tolerance" was never required in Homer (Foley 99). This is somewhat confusing, given that the example of Theano comes from the *Iliad*, but that kindness was not taken as the rule in the *Iliad*, but rather an extraordinary circumstance. Lloyd believes Andromache's claim is an *ad hoc* invention by the character for the sake of the argument (Lloyd, *Andromache*, 119). Vellacott argues that the theme of the play is "the position of women in Greek society presented against the background of a war which, years after it ended, is still dominating the life and destiny of men and women, whether they were involved in it or not" (Vellacott 117).

Paris and Helen, the sexual relationship between mortal spouses is not really explored at all.<sup>90</sup> Paris and Helen are special, at any rate, since their relationship began as an adulterous affair. But for all the tenderness expressed between Hector and Andromache, neither one overtly expresses sexual desire, and there is no description in the *Iliad* of normative sexual *mores* between monogamous spouses. Therefore, Andromache claiming that Hector did sleep with women outside of his marriage, and that she was happy to help with the care of his bastards is a departure from her Iliadic characterization. Astyanax was the only child of Hector in the *Iliad*, and he played an important thematic role as the helpless child of the *kleos*-seeking warrior, one of the many *νήπια τέκνα*. But the detail does have its foundation in the *Iliad*. In fact, it is Theano who suckles her husband's bastard child in the *Iliad* (ὅς ῥα νόθος μὲν ἔην, πύκα δ' ἔτρεφε δῖα Θεανὼ/ῖσα φίλοισι τέκεσσι, χαριζομένη πόσει ᾧ *Il*.5.70-71). Bastard children were depicted favorably in Homeric epic (Teucer *Il* 8.283; Megapenthes *Od*. 4.10-14; Odysseus (in disguise) *Od*. 14.200-4), but there was never any hint that Hector would have kept concubines or would have fathered other children. The substitution of Andromache for Theano in Euripides' rendering of the past creates continuity for the Euripidean Andromache, who is now the concubine bearing bastard children instead of the wife accepting them to please her husband. She has the authority to advise Hermione on the correct treatment of concubines and bastards (meaning herself and her son) based on her (revised) experiences from her first marriage. This revision of Iliadic details also illustrates the difference between the representation of sexual *mores* in epic and tragedy. Andromache is clearly considered to be virtuous and obsessed with shame, and she recalls her care for Hector's bastards with pride. Her acceptance of the situation signals a slight change from the Homeric characterization of wives and concubines: epic Clytemnestra, Phoenix's mother, and Antikleia were not so willing to forgive the dalliances of their husbands. But tragic Andromache takes it all in stride, even going so far to claim that it would be an indication of a woman's immoderate sexual appetite to be so jealous of a husband. Euripides here has augmented Andromache's Homeric characterization in a way to make her espouse ideas in accord with 5<sup>th</sup> century ideas of virtue and shame, and he does it by repurposing bits of Homer for another use.

---

<sup>90</sup> Book 14 features the encounter between Zeus and Hera, which shows some similarities with the encounter between Paris and Helen in Book 3.



Andromache's tragic character is one of a few Trojan women whose post-war stories are dramatized in tragedy, along with Tecmessa, Cassandra, Polyxena, and Hecuba. In comparing the story of her life after the war with the lives of the other Trojan Women, what is most interesting is that, as Nancy Rabinowitz has noted, Andromache's legacy is distinguished by her ability to endure.<sup>91</sup> Cassandra and Polyxena go willingly to their deaths, and Hecuba's horrifying act of vengeance precedes her metamorphosis on the way to Greece. It is Andromache alone who must continually negotiate her survival, to find ways to reconcile her former status with her current status. In *Andromache*, she manages to do this almost in spite of her Homeric characterization. Thematically, she acts as a foil to Hermione and Menelaus, uncovering the unsavory aspects of their characters, while modeling the virtuous and shameful behavior that would be expected of Greek women. Though her "Homeric" goodness angers and rankles her persecutors, through her "Euripidean" cleverness, resourcefulness, and virtue, she manages to survive. The final work in this study, Euripides' *Trojan Women*, depicts Andromache at the moment when she must make that decision to survive, even while facing the unimaginable prospect of losing her child. Once again characterized as possessing the amplified, tragic version of Homeric goodness, she does not act as a foil to any character, but she stands as one of many who question the prevailing wartime ethos.

---

<sup>91</sup> Rabinowitz, "Proliferating Triangles," 121.

## I. Introduction

To create this memorable version of Andromache in *Trojan Women*, Euripides takes character elements from her Homeric representation and focuses on only one of the tragic themes she represented in *Andromache*. A certain story pattern from Homer and *Andromache* is repeated: once again Andromache's son is now in danger because of the death and/or absence of her husband/protector. She also laments again in *Trojan Women*, which seems to have become a regular feature of her characterization. Thematically, Andromache in *Trojan Women* explores the way marriage, and other sexual unions, both define and devastate the life of a woman. Because Euripides does not expand the story enough to include a depiction of Andromache struggling to settle into her new home in Phthia, he can touch on the themes of barbarianism and perverted nobility without devoting much time to developing them. Likewise, since he begins the story well after the action of the *Iliad* is over, he can reference the most pertinent moments of the epic without detailing how the different kind of stress prolonged war places on the families of warriors at home. *Trojan Women* captures Andromache in a transitional stage in her life-story – no longer a wife and not yet a slave, she mourns the past and dreads the future.

Euripides' *Trojan Women*, like his *Andromache*, has an “unconventional” structure. The episodic nature of the plot -- in which Hecuba and the chorus remain onstage while the women of the Trojan royal family are allotted to Greek captors and Helen returns to Menelaus – has been both praised and criticized.<sup>1</sup> The main theme of the drama is unquestionably the suffering

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Ra'anana Meridor, “Some Observations on the Structure of Euripides' *Troades*,” *Scripta Classica Israelica* 11 (1991/2): 1-21; Humphrey Kitto, *Greek Tragedy: A Literary Study*. 3rd ed. London: Methuen, 1966); Albin Lesky, *Greek Tragedy*. 3rd ed. Trans. H. Frankfort (London: Ernst Benn, 1978); Desmond Conacher, *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme and Structure* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1967); Shirley Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1986); Justina Gregory, “The Power of Language in Euripides' *Troades*,” *Erano* 84 (1986): 1-9 and *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1991); Thomas Sienkiewicz, “Euripides' *Trojan Women*: An Interpretation,” *Helios* 6 (1978): 81-95; and Anne Suter, “Lament in Euripides' *Trojan Women*,” *Mnemosyne* 56 (2003): 1-28. See Meridor for an analysis of the defects of the play in Aristotelian terms (Meridor 2). Kitto notably remarks that everything in the play is contrived to be as unhappy as possible. He argues that “[c]onsidered superficially, the play lacks both unity and a tragic idea” (Kitto 212). Lesky takes a view opposite to Kitto and writes that “the shadow of the dreadful destruction that ended the great legendary war gives these scenes emphatic unity” (Lesky 166). Conacher believes that the power of the play increases until the end, and that no one episode could be as powerful on its own (Conacher 138). Conacher also finds unity in the systematic way that hope is introduced and then stamped out in each new episode (Conacher 139). Barlow similarly argues against Kitto that the constant presence of Hecuba onstage provides a cohesive character for

caused by warfare,<sup>2</sup> though critics are quick to point out that the prologue ensures that the audience remembers that the Greeks will not go unpunished for their cruel treatment of the Trojans and their hubristic neglect of their ritual obligations.<sup>3</sup> The play was known to be produced in 415 BCE as part of Euripides' Trojan trilogy, coming after *Alexander*, *Palamedes*, and preceding the satyr-play *Sisyphus*. Knowing the definite date of production has induced several scholars to speculate about the influence of certain famous incidents of the

---

the play, and that there is a definite *tonal* unity to the drama (Barlow 32). Gregory argues that thematic unity is expressed in the different ways each woman responds to change. She believes the play is as much about survival and endurance as it is about destruction and loss (Gregory, "Power of Language," 1-2). Sienkiewicz also sees unity in the cumulative effect of the episodes as well as in the irony of each, and believes that the chorus, not Hecuba, is the central character of the play because it incorporates the entire city and its tragedy (Sienkiewicz 83-87). Suter also believes that thematic unity is found in the composite effect of the episodes. She argues that the unifying element of the play is lament – not only the formal laments of the play, but also the lament elements present in almost every speech of the play (Suter 6). Gregory similarly, sees continuity in the fact that each episode attempts to interpret the present in light of the past (Gregory, *Instruction*, 157).

<sup>2</sup> As Shirley Barlow eloquently puts it, "Their [the Trojan women's] will and capacity for emotion under these extreme circumstances is what interests the dramatist" (Barlow 26). See also Valeria Ando, "Matrimonio e guerra nel discorso tragico: una lettura delle *Troiane* di Euripide." *Studi di filologia classica in onore de G. Monaco, I: Letteratura greca* (Palermo: Università di Palermo, 1991) 251-64; Francis Dunn, "Beginning of the End in Euripides' *Trojan Women*." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 136 (1993): 22-35; Adrian Poole, "Total Disaster: Euripides' *The Trojan Women*." *Arion* 3 (1976): 257-87; and Neil Croally, *Euripidean Polemic* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994). Ando also identifies the suffering as explicitly feminine. She argues that the "dramatic nucleus" of the play is the confusion of the private, feminine world by war (Ando 256). Dunn notes that the absolute destruction guaranteed at the beginning allows the play to portray "characters whose desires achieve nothing, who suffer mightily, but can never act. This inversion of the action allows Euripides to dramatize the hopeless situation of the women of Troy (Dunn 33). He goes on to claim that this inversion makes the drama "undramatic" in the sense that there is no end or goal to the play, only suffering (Dunn 35). Poole believes that the drama cannot only be about suffering in wartime, but must instead be about the suffering caused by a total destruction of a world. As he puts it, "What we are asked to watch is the variety of tactics that human beings instinctively adopt in order to avoid naked, appalling fact" (Poole 267). He suggests that the real tragedy lies in the fact that "old hopes, roles, gestures and values linger on posthumously, and perhaps even passionately, into a new reality with which they are totally unsynchronized" (Poole 276). Croally believes that the context of war and its aftermath provides the richest opportunities to question received wisdom (Croally 12).

<sup>3</sup> Kitto suggests that the Greeks are the "collective tragic hero or agent," while the Trojans are the "collective victim" (Kitto 213). See also Kevin Lee, *Euripides Troades* (London: Bristol Classical, 1976): xv; Barbara Goff, *Euripides Trojan Women* (London: Duckworth, 2009) 38; and Cecilia Luschnig, "Euripides' *Trojan Women*: All is Vanity." *Classical World* 65 (1971): 9. Burnett observes that it is the Greeks who endure the "typical" reversal of fortune, but it is extra-dramatic (292). On this point see also Meridor, "Observations", 2-3. Dunn makes an interesting argument that Euripides uses elements typical to the ending of a play in his prologue, and elements typical of the prologue in his ending. By so doing, Euripides gives the sense that the tragedy of the Greeks has resolved itself in the prologue, and so the audience wants to see how the characters will cope with a "dead-end situation" (Dunn 31). Suter observes that, of the lines of the play which do not contain lament elements, the majority are spoken by the Greeks (Suter 11).

Peloponnesian War, namely the massacre on the island of Melos and the Sicilian Expedition, on Euripides' own creative process.<sup>4</sup>

The episodic nature of the plot has a profound effect on Andromache's characterization in *Trojan Women*. Her time on stage is quite condensed in comparison to her character in *Andromache*, and therefore her thematic function is rather concentrated. Hecuba remains on stage for the duration of the play, but the other women (Cassandra, Andromache, Helen) have only the space of an episode to introduce and resolve their personal crises. Because of this compression, the representative nature of each character is highlighted.<sup>5</sup> As Barlow notes, the poet tries to present "normal people caught up in abnormal circumstances."<sup>6</sup> Euripides presents in one drama women with divergent life experiences: Cassandra is a mad, virgin priestess; Andromache is a young widow and mother; Polyxena is a sacrificial virgin; Helen is an adulterous wife; Hecuba is the old widow and mother.<sup>7</sup> Therefore each woman also corresponds

---

<sup>4</sup> See Barlow 26-27; Croally allows that there is no reason to assume that the audience would not view the events happening on stage through the lens of the events happening during the Peloponnesian War, even though the play does not mention the Peloponnesian War explicitly (Croally 232-234). See also Ruth Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980); A. Maria Van Erp Taalman Kip "Euripides and Melos." *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987): 414-19; Joseph Roisman, "Contemporary Allusions in Euripides' *Trojan Women*." *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1997): 38-47; and Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989). Scodel admits that the question of whether or not the play was composed in response to the events on Melos depends on several factors which we cannot know: when during the winter the city fell, how long it took Euripides to compose a tragedy, how much time was required to train a chorus, and so on. She does argue, though, that the invasion of Sicily must have been under discussion well before the time of production, and so "[t]he play must have been seen as a protest and warning in the early spring of 415" (Scodel, *Trilogy*, 139). Van Erp Taalman Kip addresses the questions Scodel raises, and argues convincingly that it is unlikely that Euripides would have, or could have, composed *Trojan Women* as a reaction to the events on Melos in 416-415 BCE (Van Erp Taalman Kip 414-417). Roisman, like Croally, focuses on the audience's perception of the events presented on stage. He notes that Euripides does show a preference for Athens by denigrating Sparta and other Peloponnesian War enemies in his plays, but that he was not trying to draw any definite parallels between the events on stage and contemporary events. Roisman argues that "Euripides reserved for the Athenian spectators the option of rejecting the recognition of themselves in the depiction of the Greeks, who were the target of Athena's wrath. The play gives ample opportunities to the Athenians to identify the criminals of the war with their enemies, the Spartans" (Roisman 47). Hall also supports the idea that it was the Spartans who were the "Greeks" of the *Trojan Women*, not the Athenians (Hall 214-218).

<sup>5</sup> Lee sums up Andromache's characterization in this way: "All the virtues of the ideal wife are found in Andromache and she attracts us by her tenderness towards Astyanax and her constancy to Hector. She is, however, more of an abstraction than person" (Lee xxiv). His "abstraction" seems to correspond to my "representation." See also Ando 260, who calls her a "paradigm."

<sup>6</sup> Barlow 30. Gregory phrases the same idea as "oscillations of despair and fortitude characteristic of human beings in extreme situations" (Gregory, *Instruction*, 157). In contrast to this emotional reading, Burnett reads each episode as a "revision or distortion of a familiar tragic movement." So Cassandra's speech is actually a proleptic messenger speech and Helen is a suppliant who is at first pursued and then rescued (Burnett 292).

to a particular literary type: sacrificial virgin, good wife, sorrowful mother, and whore.<sup>8</sup> The age and marital status of each woman largely determines what mechanisms she employs to cope with the disasters dramatized in the play, and Euripides highlights these differences in the lyric songs (or an *agon*) performed by each woman in addition to a more straightforward *rhesis*.<sup>9</sup>

## II. Direct Definition

The condensed characterization of Andromache in *Trojan Women* is most noticeable in the relatively small number of terms used to describe her in the play. The fact that Andromache is in a transitional stage from wife of Hector to slave of Neoptolemus is evident in the different social roles she assumes for herself. Interestingly, the other characters make no mention of her future role in Neoptolemus' household. Their interests are on Andromache's present and, to a certain extent, her past.

### *Self Definition*

As in *Andromache*, the terms Andromache uses to describe herself in *Trojan Women* belie the fact that she is in the process of a profound life-change. Her descriptors recall her recently-past life with Hector, calling herself "your wife" while addressing him *σῶς δάμαρτος* (590), and look forward to her near-future as spear-bride *αἰχμάλωτος* (678) and slave to Neoptolemus. But she also says that Neoptolemus wanted her for his wife, *δάμαρτα* (660),<sup>10</sup> not just his concubine. Aside from the double-labeling of her relationship with Neoptolemus, this conflicting perspective does not really play itself out in Andromache's self-definition in *Trojan*

---

<sup>7</sup> See also Barlow 32; Meridor, "Observations", 10; See also David Stuttard, *An Introduction to Trojan Women*. Brighton: Company Dionysus, 2005; Ruth Scodel, "The Captive's Dilemma: Sexual Acquiescence in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98 (1998): 137-54. Stuttard identifies the main types as virgin, wife-mother, and whore (39). This diversity also indicates the kind of future each woman could expect in captivity. Hecuba, who is beyond child-bearing age, will only have value as a living memorial of the Greek triumph at Troy, whereas Cassandra, Andromache, and Polyxena additionally have sexual value (see Scodel, "Captive Women," 145). Ando similarly suggests that the disruption or perversion of each woman's marriage also determines the representation of each character (Ando 256).

<sup>8</sup> Lee, xxiv. I do not agree with him, however, that "most of the characters show few signs of personality."

<sup>9</sup> As Gregory observes, "nobility remains intact, for the women have brought with them from the past the individual resources to survive and to endure" (Gregory, *Instruction*, 157-158). She thinks that the "resources" are embodied in each woman's use of *logos* (158).

<sup>10</sup> Barlow *ad loc.* says that the word is "usually applied to a legitimate spouse and often stresses the status and dignity of the role." She suggests that Andromache may be using it to "create irony, pathos and a convincing trait of character." She thinks Euripides may be deliberately recalling *Andromache* (Barlow 192).

*Women*, as opposed to *Andromache*. She is reporting Neoptolemus' idea of the relationship, not her own. In fact, from the way she describes herself, she seems to see nothing positive about her new union with Neoptolemus. As she enters the stage in the cart, she tells Hecuba that she and Astyanax have become the spoils of war, *λεία* (614),<sup>11</sup> for Neoptolemus. She later reveals that she worries that any attempt to be civil towards Neoptolemus will make her seem "bad" to Hector: *κακῇ...τῶι θανόντι* (663). In her first *rhesis*, Andromache spends a significant amount of time reminiscing about her marriage to Hector. When she apostrophizes her dead husband toward the end of the speech, she recalls that she married him untouched *ἀκήρατον* (675) and a virgin *τὸ παρθένειον* (676). This is expected of a bride in the proper, legal transaction that is the ancient wedding. The fact that Andromache brings it up now signals her concerns for her future. In worrying about what her new relationship with Neoptolemus will suggest about her own character, she reveals that she is anxious about beginning a new sexual relationship. She presents the issue as though she has some kind of agency in the situation, as though she must make some kind of decision about how she will deal with a new partner.<sup>12</sup> This is in stark contrast to her situation when she married Hector – she had no divided loyalties, no son to consider, no need to think about how her sexuality might determine the safety of her son in the future.

Andromache's main topic in her first *rhesis* is her status as a wife, and how the war and the fall of Troy are forcing her to reconsider the personal traits she cultivated as Hector's wife. The topic of her second *rhesis* is the impending death of her son, and how her marriage to Hector obliquely led to this disastrous end. Andromache refers to herself as a mother three times in this speech, *μητέρ'* (741, 757, 761), and laments that this unimaginable situation is making her wretched, *ἀθλίαν* (741). The repeated use of *μήτηρ* clearly marks a departure from Andromache's characterization in *Andromache*. Though the peril of her child was a central feature of that play, Andromache herself does not call herself "mother," though her son addresses her with that term. In *Trojan Women*, it is clear that Andromache cares deeply for Astyanax and is devastated when she learns of his gruesome fate. Motherhood for her is grouped with

---

<sup>11</sup> Lee *ad loc.* says that the "use of the word *λεία* adds bitterness to Andromache's remark, since it is normally used of cattle which have been captured from the enemy" (Lee 183).

<sup>12</sup> Scodel argues that captive women do acquire "a certain freedom to decide how they will negotiate the balance between loyalty to the past and manipulation of their own sexual value to improve conditions in the present and the future" (Scodel, "Captive" 142). This will be discussed further below.

marriage as aspects of her former life which have been proven to be futile. Though Andromache does not discuss excellence in motherhood as she does for wifely virtue, it is clear that she considered the bearing of children to be part of a woman's *telos*.

### *Others' Definition*

Only Talthybios and Hecuba talk about Andromache in *Trojan Women*. They do not mention her new status as concubine to Neoptolemus, but they do touch on her other social identities. Talthybios, when he approaches to tell Andromache the decision of the Greeks, calls her the wife of Hector Ἐκτορος δάμαρ (709), in what is clearly an attempt to show respect and indicate his own pity for her in light of the horrible news he is about to deliver. Aside from this one usage, Hecuba and Talthybios refer to Andromache as “mother” four times between them, using a form of μήτηρ three times (783; 792; 1140), and ἡ τεκοῦσα (1175) once. This is understandable since both Hecuba and Talthybios exclusively discuss Astyanax with her. Hecuba mentions Andromache's slavery to Neoptolemus only in the context of discussing how to provide the best future for Astyanax. Talthybios strongly advises Andromache not to do anything irrational or excessive after she learns the news about her son. After Astyanax's death and Talthybios' transfer of his body to Hecuba, each again refers to Andromache as “mother.” Only one qualitative trait is attributed to Andromache by another character, and that is μογερός (783),<sup>13</sup> used to define Andromache's quality as a mother.

The only other source of direct definition for Andromache in *Trojan Women* are terms of address. These do not introduce any new social roles or qualitative reports beyond what has already been used in the play. Andromache is addressed as a “wretched” woman: δύστηνε γύναι (573); ὦ μελέα (589); σχετλία (596); and a child: ὦ παῖ (632); ὦ φίλη παῖ (697).<sup>14</sup> All of these terms clearly reflect the pity the speakers feel for Andromache and her plight, and their affection for her.

There is quite a bit less direct definition in *Trojan Women* than in *Andromache* or the *Iliad*. This is due partially to the fact that, unlike in *Andromache*, Andromache interacts only with Hecuba, the Chorus, and Talthybios, all characters who are sympathetic to her plight. In

---

<sup>13</sup> See Werner Biehl, *Euripides Troades* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1989). Biehl *ad loc.* notes that this epithet, here used to describe Andromache's passive suffering during the war, will be used in 790 by Hecuba to describe Hector (Biehl 301).

<sup>14</sup> Biehl *ad loc.* suggests that this affectionate address emphasizes Hecuba's maternal feelings for Hector (Biehl 280).

addition, there is not the same variety of social terms and qualitative descriptors used to describe Andromache. This is due to two things: the first is the temporal stage of the story. At this moment, Andromache is thinking of herself only as the wife of Hector and the wife and spear-bride of Neoptolemus. Her slavery is certainly waiting for her, but for now it is in the future, and not a present concern. She is most often called a mother, which corresponds to the central role of Astyanax's death in this play. The second factor is that she interacts only with sympathetic characters. Though Talthybios is not Trojan, he treats the Trojan women as captives, and not as inferior barbarians. His recommendation that Andromache recognize her weak position has nothing to do with the inferiority of her status or the place of her birth, but with the reality of the outcome of the battle. All of the qualitative descriptors used by Andromache and others refer to her pitiable and wretched current position. Though Andromache will dwell at length on the past, and Hecuba and Talthybios on the future, no one attempts to characterize her herself, but rather her actions, which will be discussed below.

Direct definition in *Trojan Women* does not build a strong starting point for discussing the characterization of Andromache. The only suggestion of complexity is the fact that Andromache calls herself the wife of two men: Hector and Neoptolemus. This bigamy of sorts is a representation of Andromache's inner conflict as she tries to reconcile the fact that her past actions have led her to the wretched present, and as she contemplates the best way to negotiate a rocky future while still maintaining her present scruples. But this complexity is not revealed by the terms themselves – it is only suggested. There is little in direct description which suggests development of character. The qualitative descriptors are uniform throughout the play, which indicates that characters do not perceive her any differently at the completion of their interaction with her than they did when she first appeared on stage. Finally, direct description tells us nothing of Andromache's inner state. There are no descriptors of mental activity of any kind.

### III. Indirect Presentation

#### *Actions*

Andromache comes onto the stage as a passive victim being carried towards her future in a cart laden with the detritus of her past: Ἐκάβη, λεύσσεις τήνδ' Ἀνδρομάχην/ξενικοῖς ἐπ' ὄχοις πορθιμειομένην; (568-569). She cannot fight (and is strongly advised not to fight by Talthybios: μήτε σθένουσα μηδὲν ἰσχύειν δόκει./ἔχεις γὰρ ἀλκὴν οὐδαμῇ (728-729)) against the order to kill her



son. Her capacity to act, really act, is therefore limited. The only two actions she does take within the narrative time frame of the play itself is to cover Polyxena after she is sacrificed (626-627) and appeal to Neoptolemus not to bring Hector's shield to Phthia, but to leave it in Troy to be buried with Astyanax (1130-1144). Both actions take place offstage.<sup>15</sup> Actions do have a central role in Andromache's characterization in *Trojan Women*, but they all belong to the past and the future, not to the present. As she desperately considers the best course of action to take with her new "husband," Andromache meditates at length in an analeptic reflection on her earlier virtuous acts of omission – not going outside and not receiving women into the house (647-653). She also recalls her acts of commission – "handling" her husband in a way that only the most virtuous and well-matched wives can do (654-656). Her meditations also consider actions of the future: knowing that she will have to capitulate to her new master's sexual advances, she debates whether or not to fully open her heart to him – in other words, to learn how to handle him in the same way she learned to manage Hector. Hecuba advises her to do so, for the sake of her son, but once Astyanax is taken out of the equation there seems little need for Andromache to attempt to make Neoptolemus feel generous towards her. Yet, as Talthybios reports, she has already succeeded somewhat, since Neoptolemus agreed to forfeit a valuable war prize out of pity for her.

The other characters do not evaluate Andromache's past actions, and, in fact, do not even acknowledge that part of her *rhexis*. Instead, they do focus on her present and future. At the end of her *rhexis* the chorus says that Andromache teaches them their own misfortunes: ἐξ αὐτὸν ἥκεις συμφορᾶς· θρηνοῦσα δὲ τὸ σὸν διδάσκεις μ' ἔνθα πημάτων κυρῶ (684-685). Her narration of her past, present, and future actions creates a conceptual context through which they can understand what is happening to them. As she speaks, they hear themselves in her. Hecuba's response to Andromache's *rhexis* ends with advice for future action. She suggests that Andromache try to win Neoptolemus over in order to keep Astyanax safe. The little boy is Troy's hope for the future. In making this suggestion, Hecuba is focusing on Andromache's role as a mother. All the actions she suggests Andromache should take are in the service of Astyanax. Once Talthybios has effectively crushed their hopes for Astyanax's future, he, too, advises Andromache on how best to act. He reminds her that one woman is certainly no match for the

<sup>15</sup> Croally argues that ritual activity in the play is either impious or ironic. He also notes that the war and destruction of the city has denied women the privilege of the public performance of ritual, with the notable exception of lamentation (Croally 83).

Achaeans, yet in even warning her he suggests that her curses may have some power or some effect on the Achaeans.

The actions Andromache performs within the narrative frame of the drama itself occur offstage, but do suggest an attention to the performance of ritual, even under less-than-ideal circumstances. She manages to cover Polyxena as she passes by on the wagon; she begs Neoptolemus to let Hecuba arrange a funeral for Astyanax since she will have to leave so quickly with him to return to Phthia. Her execution of ritual obligation is certainly admirable and speaks to her devotion, but does not provide strong characterizing material.

### *Speeches*

In *Trojan Women*, it falls to Andromache's speeches to provide the richest characterizing material for her character in the drama. Andromache's first speech is an antiphonal lament, which immediately recalls her beautiful laments from the *Iliad* and her monody in *Andromache*. She then speaks two *rheseis*, very clearly defined by their two topics: marriage and motherhood. Although Andromache only performs three speeches in *Trojan Women*, there are some stylistic features which are especially powerful in each speech and which contribute something important to her characterization. Ultimately, though, it is the revelation of Andromache's thoughts and fears which help to make her short time on stage memorable.

### Lament

Andromache's antiphonal lament in *Trojan Women* draws on several typical lament elements. First of all, like many tragic laments, this lament is not sung as part of a funeral ritual. This kind of lament, in which the women express their own grief in a *polis*-sanctioned, public manner, is common in tragedy.<sup>16</sup> Alexiou notes that tragedians were especially fond of the antiphonal lament, which was hardly represented in epic, because of its "inherently tragic personality."<sup>17</sup> Some of the typical features of this kind of lament, such as an increased frequency of interjectional cries and the transition into stichomythic dialogue (as in lines 610-633), increase the tension in a dramatic scene.<sup>18</sup> This lament also features stylistic elements

---

<sup>16</sup> See Casey Dué, *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy* (Austin: U of Texas P, 2006). Dué notes that tragic laments are typically divorced from the funerary ritual (9).

<sup>17</sup> See Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002) 132.

<sup>18</sup> Alexiou 135-136. Alexiou speculates that stichomythic dialogue may have evolved from antiphonal lament (Alexiou 137). Barlow notes that this kind of *kommos*, which incorporates broken dialogue, is more characteristic of the later rather than earlier Euripidean plays (Barlow 188).

typical of ancient laments. Andromache laments the loss of her husband (μόλοις, ὦ πόσις μοι/.../σᾶς δάμαρτος ἄλκαρ./σύ τ', ὦ λῦμ' Ἀχαιῶν/.../ κοιμίσαι μ' ἐς Ἴδου, 587-594) and city (οἶδε πόθοι μεγάλοι/.../οἰχομένης πόλεως, 595-596) and home (καταλειπομένην σε δακρύω/...καὶ ἐμὸν δόμον ἐνθ' ἐλοχεύθην, 601-602) all together.<sup>19</sup> The lament also contains several interjections like οἶμοι, αἰαῖ and φεῦ φεῦ which were not featured in her laments from the *Iliad* or *Andromache*, but which suit the antiphonal structure of this lament. Andromache also addresses Hector: μόλοις, ὦ πόσις μοι (587) and again at 591 ὦ λῦμ' Ἀχαιῶν. This recalls the tripartite structure of the Iliadic laments, in which the lament begins and ends with an address to the deceased.<sup>20</sup>

Du   observes that laments of captive women often narrate the past in order to contrast it with the future.<sup>21</sup> Andromache and Hecuba do not narrate at length. In a short statement before the stichomythic dialogue begins, Andromache recalls how Paris brought destruction to Troy for the sake of a woman:

δυσφροσύναισι θεῶν, ὅτε σὸς γόνος ἔκφυγεν Ἴδαν,  
ὃς λεχέων στυγερῶν χάριν ὤλεσε πέργαμα Τροίας·  
αἵματόεντα δ   θεᾶι παρ   Παλλάδι σ  ματα νεκρῶν  
γυψὶ φέρειν τέταται· ζυγὰ δ' ἤνυσε δούλια Τροίαι (597-600).

Andromache clearly blames Paris and Helen for the destruction of Troy, and specifically names their marriage as the source of strife. This brief mention serves as an introduction to the marriage theme. Andromache, in her forthcoming *r  sis*, is about to bemoan the futility of her own attempts to maintain a perfect marriage. The marriage theme is continued into the following choral ode, often called the Ganymede ode, which points out the futility of past divine marriages to Trojans. The theme is developed even further in the following episode, the *agon* between Helen and Hecuba before Menelaus. The theme is finished back where it began, when the adulteress is (nominally) made to answer for the “hateful marriage” that brought Troy’s destruction.

The antiphonal nature of this lament characterizes Andromache as a type, or a representative— this is not Andromache lamenting only her own troubles, but her engaging in a

<sup>19</sup> Biehl *ad loc.* reads these lines as especially painful because these were the places where she first found the fulfillment of her life as a woman (Biehl 256).

<sup>20</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 44 talks about typical lament features (interjectional cries, commands, refrain and repetition, specific forms of address, metaphor and symbolic language).

<sup>21</sup> Du   15.

group lament and foregrounding her personal woes. The insistence on personal right to grieve (τί παιῶν' ἐμὸν στενάξεις; 578) strikes the viewer as intensely personal – she seeks her own sense of consolation, yet still commiserates with and sings with her mother-in-law.<sup>22</sup> Unlike the monody in *Andromache*, her song is not just about her own experience. The loss of husband, home, and city are not unique to her, and she herself will not directly lament Hector in this tragedy as she does in the *Iliad* and *Andromache*. One of the features which make Andromache's monody in *Andromache* so moving is her recollection of the sadness she felt when Hector died and the profound effect his death had on her current, wretched circumstances. But in *Trojan Women*, the tragedy depicts a temporal stage between the *Iliad* and *Andromache*. She is still experiencing the painful events which will inform her Andromachean laments. In fact, the most devastating blow has yet to be struck: as far as she knows, she will be going to Phthia with Astyanax, Hector's son.

### Andromache's Speeches

It is difficult to argue that Andromache shows a marked preference for certain rhetorical devices and tropes when she only has three real speeches in *Trojan Women*. But her two *rheseis*, well-balanced and well-constructed speeches, do utilize three stylistic features which add some color to Andromache's characterization. Her use of apostrophe, gnomic statement, and pejorative statements against women recalls her earlier characterization in *Andromache* and illustrates Euripides' desire to keep the characterization of Andromache in each play as consistent as possible.

One feature that regularly occurs in Andromache's speeches is address.<sup>23</sup> Her second *rhesis* is punctuated with apostrophes to several different objects and things, bearing witness to the depth of her despair as she catalogues her grievances.<sup>24</sup> She first turns her attention to her child after she learns that he will be killed: ὦ φίλτατ', ὦ τιμηθεὶς τέκνον (740). At 745 she

---

<sup>22</sup> Lee ad loc. reads the passage as Andromache saying that lamentation is fitted to her situation alone (Lee 176). Biehl reads Andromache's comment as indicative that the *kommos* begins as a kind of "agon" of complaints, but later smoothes itself out into "togetherness": "Von hier aus entwickelt sich geradezu ein Agon der Klagen, der allerdings nach dem anfänglichen Gegeneinander dann mehr und mehr zu einem Miteinander, zu einem 'um die Wette laufen' in der Klage fuhrt" (241).

<sup>23</sup> See Laura McClure, "Female Speech and Characterization in Euripides." *Lo Spettacolo delle Voci*. Ed. Francesco De Martino and Alan Sommerstein (Bari: Levante-Editori, 1995) 51. McClure notes in her sociolinguistic study that the vocative with ὦ was an expression frequently used by women in tragedy.

<sup>24</sup> Barlow is especially appreciative of this speech, noting how the apostrophes, rhetorical questions, and crescendo of personifications would give "great scope" to the actor (Barlow 195).

addresses her bed, metonymically standing in for her marriage: ὦ λέκτρα τάμ' ἀ δυστυχῆ τε καὶ γάμοι. She then addresses her son again: ὦ παῖ, δακρύεις; (749) and again at 757: ὦ νέον ὑπαγκάλισμα μητρὶ φίλτατον, and finally his skin at 758: ὦ χρωτὸς. Soon her anguish transforms into anger, and she next addresses the Greeks, accusing them of devising barbarian evils: ὦ βάρβαρ' ἐξευρόντες Ἑλλήνες κακά (765). She then zeroes in on Helen, and lays the blame for the war and all the resulting deaths at her feet: ὦ Τυνδάρειον ἔρνος (766).<sup>25</sup> Andromache's address to her child mid-*rhexis* is intended to increase the *pathos* of the situation. This gives the poet the chance to draw attention to the pitiable behavior of the child, who has been in his mother's arms throughout the episode. The third address is purely pathetic, with Andromache simply putting into words how much she loves her child and how empty the exercise of motherhood has been. Her final addresses to the Greeks and to Helen are made in anger, and represent her feelings of outrage. Both of these final addresses contain an insult, as she accuses the Greeks of acting like barbarians, and accuses Helen of being born from all manner of evil and destructive forces. The mid-*rhexis* addresses allow the audience and reader to track Andromache's shifts in emotion. Her addresses to her husband and son are filled with the despair of loss, while her addresses to the Greeks and Helen are filled with anger.

The gnomic statement was an important part of Andromache's speeches in *Andromache*, and they helped to characterize her as a possessor of conventional wisdom, a woman who had more life experience than her mistress, and one who was certainly more clever. In *Trojan Women*, Andromache again uses gnomic statements, but to a slightly different end. The first statement is a strong, controversial statement: that it is better to die than to live a life of suffering: τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τῷ θανεῖν ἴσον λέγω, / τοῦ ζῆν δὲ λυπρῶς κρεῖσσόν ἐστι κατθανεῖν (636-7).<sup>26</sup> Andromache explicitly frames this as an argument: κάλλιστον λόγον / ἄκουσον (634), the kind of opening one might make in a court of law,<sup>27</sup> though she claims that she makes the statement as a

<sup>25</sup> Biehl ad loc. notes that these two apostrophes are especially powerful as angry counterpoints to the emotional apostrophes she made as a mother in the preceding lines (Biehl 296).

<sup>26</sup> Goff argues that this scene is like a debate in which Andromache must persuade Hecuba that death is better than a sorrowful life (Goff 57-58). Biehl notes that this gnome was stated elsewhere. He cites the *Certamen* 78, Theog. 425-7; Soph. *O.C.* 1224ff.; Cic. *Tusc.* I.48, 114 (Biehl 265). Croally states that Andromache's view of death expressed here was extreme, even by 5<sup>th</sup> century standards (Croally 113).

<sup>27</sup> Goff observes that Andromache is self-conscious about the presentation of her argument (Goff 59). To Conacher, this self-conscious adoption of rhetorical tropes makes Andromache's speech "disappointing." He continues, "The speech abounds in the bitter ironies and classic dilemmas of pathetic rhetoric; only the peroration addressed to

way to ease Hecuba's mind about the death of Polyxena: ὥς σοι τέρψιν ἐμβάλω φρενί (635). This kind of framing recalls Cassandra's speech at the beginning of the play, and the way she explicitly framed it as a persuasive speech: πόλιν δὲ δείξω τήνδε μακαριωτέραν (365). Andromache follows this initial statement with two others pertaining to death and happiness: ἀλγεῖ γὰρ οὐδὲν τῶν κακῶν ἡμισθιμένος· ὁ δ' εὐτυχήσας ἐς τὸ δυστυχὲς πεσὼν/ψυχὴν ἀλλάττει τῆς πάροιθ' εὐπραξίας (638-640). As was the case in *Andromache*, these broad statements are impersonal, and are meant to apply to everyone.<sup>28</sup> Later she reports another chestnut of conventional wisdom concerning newly married women and sex: καίτοι λέγουσιν ὥς μί' εὐφρόνη χαλαῖ/τὸ δυσμενὲς γυναικὸς εἰς ἀνδρὸς λέχος (665-666). This has the distinct flavor of an old-wives tale, or at least the kind of wisdom women would share with each other.<sup>29</sup> This again recalls the characterization of Andromache in *Andromache*, since, in that play, she also used folksy, conventional wisdom to explain to Hermione how a good wife was supposed to act.<sup>30</sup> In *Andromache*, these gnomic or folksy statements are used to set up Andromache as an authoritative figure in her disagreements with Hermione and Menelaus. They serve to illustrate Andromache's stereotypical "goodness" in contrast to the stereotypical "badness" of the Spartans, and they help to develop Andromache as a "noble slave" set in contrast to the "barbaric Greeks." But in *Trojan Women*, Andromache is not in disagreement with anyone – she is speaking in a *rhexis*, not participating in an *agon*. She argues that death is preferable to suffering as a means of consoling Hecuba, but also as a means of introducing the topic of her *rhexis*. Because she focuses so clearly on the futility of goodness, it seems that her consolatory statements are the first indication of her nihilistic vision of her future. Andromache's musings on sex have a different function, though. Here Andromache is revealing her inner thought process, walking the audience through the alternatives set before her: either submit to Neoptolemus and dishonor Hector, or preserve her devotion to Hector but endanger her child. In putting forth the nugget of folk wisdom, Andromache is suggesting one solution only to debunk

---

Hector's shade saves it from banality" (Conacher 142). Scodel notes that all the main characters of the play present "logical and disputatious" formal *rhexeis*, which she believes are inappropriate to the characters and circumstances, yet typical of Euripides' tragic style (Scodel, *Trojan Trilogy*, 11).

<sup>28</sup> See *Andr.* 100-102; 418-420.

<sup>29</sup> Lee believes these lines are "amongst the best in the whole play. In a short space they give us an insight into the nobility and determination of Andromache's character" (Lee 192).

<sup>30</sup> See *Andr.* 207-208; 213-214.

it. This provides the audience with a glimpse into her inner struggle, and helps to characterize her as morally upright.

Andromache's *rhexis* is also filled with negative comments about women. This also recalls her characterization in *Andromache*, in which Andromache often espoused the typical patriarchal view of women's roles and qualities in order to identify her as a good and virtuous woman who exemplified the traditional 5<sup>th</sup> century feminine values. A similar dynamic is at work here in *Trojan Women*, especially with respect to speech.<sup>31</sup> Andromache claims that she did not allow gossiping women into her home, and instead relied upon her own mind as a resource: *ἔσω τε μελάθρων κομψὰ θηλειῶν ἔπη/οὐκ εἰσεφρούμην, τὸν δὲ νοῦν διδάσκαλον/οἴκοθεν ἔχουσα χρηστὸν ἐξήρκουν ἐμοί* (651-653). In an aside, Andromache does suggest that it is unclear whether or not women should be blamed for their gossip: *κἂν προσῆι κἂν μὴ προσῆι/ψόγος γυναιξίν* (647-648). But in her mind, the fairness of the situation is not the issue. If talking and gossiping with other women is considered blameworthy, Andromache sets out to avoid it. She also holds with the commonly-held belief that women should strive for silence. She notes that as a virtuous wife, she tried to remain quiet before her husband: *γλώσσης τε σιγῇν ὄμμα θ' ἥσυχον πόσει/παρεῖχον* (654-55). Andromache next makes reference to the bad qualities of women when she is considering how best to negotiate her new sexual relationship with Neoptolemus. She repeats the conventional wisdom that one night in the bed of a man helps dispel a woman's antipathy (665-666). Yet in the next lines, she says that she cannot stand women who love another man instead of her husband: *ἀπεπτυσ' αὐτὴν ἥτις ἄνδρα τὸν πάρος/καινοῖσι λέκτροις ἀποβαλοῦσ' ἄλλον φιλεῖ* (667-668). The timing of this statement is particularly interesting, since, by the end of the episode, she curses Helen, the very woman who left behind the bed of one man and loves another. These statements about the unsavory habits of women, be it their propensity to gossip or their willingness to love another man, do not play the same featured role that they do in *Andromache*. Of course, in that play, there was one woman, Hermione, who seemed to exemplify all of the negative qualities of women Andromache was so against. Hermione herself even admits to being swayed by the speech of gossiping women to attempt to drive Andromache out of the house. In *Trojan Women*, there is no "bad" woman present, but there is one lurking in the background. Andromache's parting curse of Helen (*ὄλοιο* 772) forecasts her appearance on

---

<sup>31</sup> Croally suggests that the contemptuous view of other women is a feature of the characterization of the model wife (Croally 93).

the stage, but Andromache will not interact with Helen the way she did Hermione. What these statements add to her characterization in *Trojan Women* is similar to what they added in *Andromache*: more evidence that Andromache is a good and virtuous wife by fifth-century standards.

The stylistic features Andromache favors in her speeches do not add much complexity to the portrait already painted by direct definition. The few statements against women provide the most qualitative information. These help to identify her as a possessor of womanly virtue, as one who recognizes the difference between good and bad behavior and one who knows how best to please a man. Though her statements are not exactly charitable towards her own sex, in making them she distances herself from that ‘type’ of woman and confirms her own blamelessness. The mid-*rhexis* addresses and gnomic statements are surely intended to be pathetic and to make the most of her suffering. The addresses to her husband, son, and marriage make her despair all the more palpable, while her addresses to the Greeks and Helen make her anger all the more vivid. These are pure expressions of emotion, a look directly into Andromache’s soul. The gnomic statements are somewhat perplexing. On the one hand, it is clear that, in speaking about death, Andromache is making a highly stylized argument about the preference of death over life, similar to the highly stylized arguments Cassandra made for the victory of the Trojans in the beginning of the play. On the other hand, her “they say” statement about women and new sexual partners is not an argument crafted by her, but a thought she herself is chewing over, conventional wisdom she herself has received. Though Andromache seems to believe what she herself says, she does not contemplate suicide, and she is not given an opportunity to sacrifice herself. It seems that she will simply endure. The second statement is clearly posed as a coping mechanism for herself. She seemingly rejects it out of hand, though Hecuba advises her to adopt it for Astyanax’s sake. This proposal and rejection also suggests Andromache’s virtue by contrasting her with Helen, who did not subscribe to the same tenets of feminine virtue. It appears, therefore, that all of the stylistic features Andromache prefers in her speeches are intended to either bolster her characterization as a good and virtuous wife or make her emotional expressions as pathetic as possible.

The contents of Andromache’s speeches strengthen the bonds between her *Trojan Women* figure and her character in *Andromache* and the *Iliad*. There is a great amount of overlap in the thematic function of her character in each work. In the *Trojan Women*, Andromache’s



character is truly forged through her speeches. It is through her own spoken words that it becomes clear that, as in the *Iliad*, Andromache in *the Trojan Women* is a typical character with a strong thematic function.

This is especially noticeable in Andromache's comments on marriage. In Andromache's mind, her suffering is predicated entirely upon her reputation as an exemplary wife.<sup>32</sup> At lines 642-656, Andromache gives a detailed exegesis on the qualities which marked her out as exceptional:

ἐγὼ δὲ τοξεύσασα τῆς εὐδοξίας  
 λαχοῦσα πλεῖστον τῆς τύχης ἡμάρτανον.  
 ἃ γὰρ γυναιξὶ σώφρον' ἔσθ' ἠύρημένα,  
 ταῦτ' ἐξεμόχθουν Ἑκτορος κατὰ στέγας.  
 πρῶτον μὲν, ἔνθα (κἂν προσῆι κἂν μὴ προσῆι  
 ψόγος γυναιξίν) αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἐφέλκεται  
 κακῶς ἀκούειν, ἥτις οὐκ ἔνδον μένει,  
 τούτου παρεῖσα πόδον ἔμιμνον ἐν δόμοις·  
 ἔσω τε μελάρων κομψὰ θηλειῶν ἔπη  
 οὐκ εἰσεφρούμην, τὸν δὲ νοῦν διδάσκαλον  
 οἴκοθεν ἔχουσα χρηστὸν ἐξήρουν ἐμοί.  
 γλώσσης τε σιγῇν ὄμμα δ' ἥσυχον πόσει  
 παρείχον· ἥϊδ' ἂν δ' ἄμ' ἐχρῆν νικᾶν πόσιν  
 κείνῳι τε νίκην ὧν ἐχρῆν παρίεναι.

Andromache's musings address the two most commonly restricted female activities: moving about in public, and speaking. As Laura McClure has argued, female speakers in Greek tragedy often reinforce the fifth-century Athenian ideology of silence and seclusion for women.<sup>33</sup> Andromache's meditations here superbly illustrate the dramatic paradox of a woman speaking in public while still reaffirming prevailing ideology. Andromache consciously adopts the societal expectations (as indicated by the participles *τοξεύσασα* and *λαχοῦσα*). Her success is based on her own innate ability – she says that she relied on her own mind as a resource (not outside sources) and knew (ἥϊδ' ἂν) how best to manage her husband. Andromache's success is therefore related to her own wisdom and good counsel, and her decision to strive for a good reputation.

Andromache's criticism of the speech of other women within the *oikos*, presumably contextualized as gossip, also speaks to her virtue. Gossip, or speech exchanged between women within the *oikos*, reinforces feminine values and experiences. Since this speech was

<sup>32</sup> See Barlow 190; Croally 90-93; 216; Ando 259. Gregory terms this phenomenon “reverse causation” (Gregory, “Power of Language,” 5).

<sup>33</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 24.

exchanged without male supervision, there was potential for the subversion of male values in these meetings.<sup>34</sup> McClure notes that fifth-century drama portrays women as inveterate gossipers and chronicles the destructive consequences of their chatter.<sup>35</sup> There is perhaps no better example of this than Hermione's appalling treatment of Andromache in *Andromache*. Hermione blames the gossip of other women for convincing her that Andromache was the cause of her marital problems (*Andr.* 929-953).<sup>36</sup>

Andromache's goodness is reinforced by her subsequent musings on her future alliance. In a manner similar to Cassandra, Andromache conceptualizes her relationship with Neoptolemus as a marriage (*Ἀχιλλέως με παῖς ἐβουλήθη λαβεῖν/δάμαρτα* 659-660), despite the fact that she admits that she will be a spear-bride and slave (*δοιλεύσω*, 660; *αἰχμάλωτος ἐς δοῦλον ζυγόν*, 678).<sup>37</sup> Andromache, ever-loyal to Hector, struggles to decide how best to treat her new "husband." She feels that if she employs the same talents as she did with Hector, she may be betraying his memory; yet if she treats Neoptolemus poorly, he will treat her poorly in return:

*κεῖ μὲν παρώσασ' Ἑκτορος φίλον κῆρα  
πρὸς τὸν παρόντα πόσιν ἀναπτύξω φρένα,  
κακὴ φανοῦμαι τῷ θανόντι· τόνδε δ' αὖ  
στρυγοῦσ' ἐμαυτῆς δεσπόταις μισήσομαι* (661-664).

Andromache is clearly unwilling to treat Neoptolemus as she would Hector. She admits that conventional wisdom has taught her that one night with a man is enough to change a woman's mind about a man (665-666), but in Andromache's mind, this is distasteful behavior perpetrated by hateful women (667-668). In fact, Andromache goes so far as to say that such behavior is even contrary to reason. She argues that dumb animals are reluctant to wear a yoke with another

---

<sup>34</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 58.

<sup>35</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 59.

<sup>36</sup> See also McClure, *Spoken*, 59.

<sup>37</sup> Croally addresses the vocabulary of marriage in *Trojan Women* at 86-88. He concludes that even relationships which are not actual marriages "can only be described in the qualified terms of marriage" (Croally 88). Though it is true that the vocabulary used by Cassandra and Andromache to describe their imminent relationships with Agamemnon and Neoptolemus respectively is the same vocabulary used to describe legal unions, I submit that this is due to the thematic exploration of marriage as a destructive force. Cassandra explicitly states that her marriage will be as destructive as Helen's; Andromache's meditations hinge on how a typically good wife acts in a new, unwanted union. Whether or not the impending unions are actually marriages is not important, since they are conceived of as marriages by the women speaking about them.

mate, so it only stands to reason that rational humans would be justified in doing the same (671-672).<sup>38</sup>

Andromache concludes her *rhesis* with an address to Hector, recalling how well-matched they were.<sup>39</sup> This brief outline is a neat complement to the exegesis on proper behavior Andromache mentioned earlier. Andromache may have acted correctly with any man, but she was particularly happy with Hector because he possessed the best qualities of a man, and he was the first man to sleep with her:

σὲ δ', ὦ φίλ' Ἑκτορ, εἶχον ἀνδρ' ἀρκοῦντά μοι  
ξυνέσει γένει πλούτῳ τε κἀνδρείῳ μέγαν·  
ἀκήρατον δέ μ' ἐκ πατρὸς λαβὼν δόμων  
πρῶτος τὸ παρθένειον ἐζέυξω λέχος (673-676).

Everything about their union was picture-perfect: the husband was the exemplary Homeric hero, the wife was the exemplary Homeric and tragic wife, and their married life was successful because of Andromache's innate goodness and understanding.<sup>40</sup> Andromache's marriage is represented in such detail because it needs to be clear which demographic she represents in the destruction of Troy. The details are also necessary to provide the appropriate foil for Andromache's analogous character, Helen. The *agon* between Helen and Hecuba follows on this scene, and the juxtaposed representations of ideal marriage and ruined marriage help the audience to understand the simple unfairness of the events depicted in the tragedy.

Andromache also blames the success of her marriage for her son's demise as well as her own lamentable future. Although she presented an ideal pairing between ideal hero and ideal wife in her first *rhesis*, nevertheless in the second *rhesis* this same pairing is denigrated as wretched because of the horror which befalls its offspring:

ὦ λέκτρα τὰμὰ δυστυχῇ τε καὶ γάμοι,

---

<sup>38</sup> Barlow *ad loc.* 669 argues that this comparison "shows how strongly rhetorical Andromache's speech is" (Barlow 192). Croally believes that Andromache's decision to respect her past and her dead husband is based on her adoption of "ideology" that governs women's behavior rather than on "perceived emotional benefits for herself" (Croally 216). It is undeniably true that Andromache is concerned with her reputation and is mindful of how her actions will be interpreted within the context of expectations for women in the artificially-created "tragic" society. Yet it is difficult to argue that Andromache has no emotional investment in her decision, especially since the following lines, her apostrophe to Hector, relate so clearly how happily married she once was.

<sup>39</sup> See Biehl *ad loc.* 673 (Biehl 274).

<sup>40</sup> See Helene Foley, *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2001) 60. This representation is the perfect example of Foley's idea of "tragic nostalgia for the aristocratic marital system represented in Homer and some archaic poetry."

οἷς ἦλθον ἐς μέλαθρον Ἑκτορός ποτε,  
οὐ σφάγιον <υῖόν> Δαναΐδαις τέξουσ' ἐμόν,  
ἀλλ' ὡς τύραννον Ἀσιάδος πολυσπόρου (745-748).

In the two *rheseis*, Andromache presents two very different perspectives on her marriage. The analeptic remembrances of her behavior and the nature of her marriage with Hector are almost uniformly positive – it is only the current state of affairs which leads Andromache to reconsider the blessings of that union. Proleptic discussions of the marriage to Neoptolemus are uniformly pessimistic, with Andromache even displaying resistance to the very idea. Certainly, necessity will compel her to comply, but her initial aversion to remarriage speaks to the joy and fulfillment she found in her first.

Another characterizing topic in Andromache's speeches is despair. This feeling is certainly not limited to her, but, when Andromache's own kind of despair is contrasted with Cassandra's incredible optimism, it becomes clear that Euripides is attempting to represent as many responses to trauma as possible.<sup>41</sup> Andromache's despair is not vitally connected to her views on her past and future marriage. It is simply her own "take" on the new reality facing the women. Her thoughts immediately drift towards nihilism, while Hecuba insists on the necessity of maintaining and encouraging hope in the midst of a crisis.<sup>42</sup> Andromache stakes her "claim" on her despair in line 578, at the very beginning of the antiphonal lament. She asks Hecuba why she sings *her* paean: τί παιᾶν' ἐμόν στενάζεις; They then fall into a seamless antiphonal lament, but it is clear that each woman sings her own troubles. Andromache clearly insists that in the face of such pain and suffering, it is far better to be dead, to be Polyxena, than to be alive: ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐμοῦ/ζώσεως γ' ὅλωλεν εὐτυχεστέρῳ πότμῳ (630-631). She soon elaborates on that sentiment in an argument presented as one would present an argument in court:

τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τῷ θανεῖν ἴσον λέγω,  
τοῦ ζῆν δὲ λυπρῶς κρεῖσσόν ἐστι κατθανεῖν.  
ἀλγεῖ γὰρ οὐδὲν τῶν κακῶν ἡμισθιμένος·  
ὁ δ' εὐτυχήσας ἐς τὸ δυστυχὲς πεσὼν

<sup>41</sup> Barlow argues that Andromache's desperation is similar to the desperation of Cassandra's madness. "Both women are torn apart by the abnormal circumstances in which they find themselves: some violation of their natural responses occurs, and they are forced to extremes of bitterness which in normal times would appear to run against the natural grain of their dispositions" (Barlow 191). I question the idea of the "natural grain of their dispositions," especially for Cassandra, whose madness was an accepted fact.

<sup>42</sup> See Ra'anana Meridor, "Troades 28-44 and the Andromache Scene." *American Journal of Philology* 110 (1989): 28-29. Meridor provides an interesting discussion on how Euripides tries to hook the audience into hoping that Astyanax will survive in *Trojan Women*.

ψυχὴν ἀλᾶται τῆς πάροιθ' εὐπραξίας.  
κείνη δ', ὁμοίως ὥσπερ οὐκ ἰδοῦσα φῶς,  
τέθνηκε κοῦδ' ὁρᾷ τῶν αὐτῆς κακῶν (636-642).

Andromache continues on to explain how her marriage, and her own attempts at virtuous behavior, were in fact in vain since they only brought her more suffering in the end. The end of the speech again returns to Polyxena and another comparison:

ἄρ' οὐκ ἐλάσσω τῶν ἐμῶν ἔχει κακῶν  
Πολυξένης ὄλεθρος, ἣν καταστένεις;  
ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ὃ πᾶσι λείπεται βροτοῖς  
ξύνεστιν ἐλπίς, οὐδὲ κλέπτομαι φρένας  
πράξειν τι κεδνόν· ἥδ' οὐδ' ἐστὶ καὶ δοκεῖν (679-683).

The absence of hope is an important narrative device for this scene. Hecuba's response to Andromache's despair is advice to act the good wife to Neoptolemus, and to see hope for Troy in Astyanax.<sup>43</sup> Her hope for the future is so clearly pinned on the little boy that it seems inevitable that such hope should be crushed. Sure enough, Talthibios appears only moments later to tell Andromache that the Greeks have ordered Astyanax to die. If Andromache despaired before, she has now reached her limit. She acknowledges that this fate is far worse than her enslavement/marriage to Neoptolemus (οἴμοι, γάμων τόδ' ὥς κλύω μεῖζον κακόν 719), and that her grief is now beyond all measure (αἰαῖ μάλ'· οὐ γὰρ μέτρια πάσχομεν κακά 720).

Finally, Andromache also addresses the ideas of Greek and barbarian, noble and ignoble. After very pathetically addressing her son upon learning her fate, Andromache is filled with anger and questions the actions of her captors. She asks why the Greeks are committing barbarian evils (ὦ βάρβαρ' ἐξευρόντες Ἑλληνες κακά,/τί τόνδε παῖδα κτείνεται' οὐδὲν αἴτιον 764-765) and insinuates that the very cause of the war was in no way noble or worthy of the fight to begin with (ὦ Τυνδάρειον ἔρνος, οὐποτ' εἴ Διός,/πολλῶν δὲ πατέρων φημί σ' ἐκπεφυκέναι 766-67). Andromache's anger is not extraordinary given the circumstances, nor is her curse. McClure notes that women and slaves are often used on stage to subvert prevailing male ideology.<sup>44</sup> The topics of barbarianism and the ignoble behavior of the noble were clearly delineated in *Andromache*, and formed the thematic backbone of the play. In *Trojan Women*, Euripides holds the behavior of the victorious Greeks up for scrutiny. The prologue had already recounted the

<sup>43</sup> Conacher believes that Hecuba's resurrection of hope is the significance of the debate between Andromache and Hecuba (Conacher 142).

<sup>44</sup> McClure, *Spoken*, 27.

arrogant negligence of the gods which caused Athena to turn against her former favorites (67-73). But their cruelty continues within the narrative time-frame of the drama itself when they decide to put the innocent baby Astyanax to death (λέξας ἀρίστου παῖδα μὴ τρέφειν πατρός, 723); yet allow Helen, the very cause of the war, to live.<sup>45</sup> Scholars have argued that, in staging the stories of the Trojan women, Euripides challenges his audience in the way they identify with the characters on the stage. As Croally notes, when non-Greeks are the protagonists of the play, it is inevitable that the audience will identify with them and sympathize with them in proportion to the nobility demonstrated by the characters, whether or not they are stereotypically “barbarian.”<sup>46</sup> Andromache does not associate herself with barbarians – to her, they are another group of people altogether.<sup>47</sup> Andromache so clearly possesses the admired virtue of *sophrosune*, and so clearly exemplifies what it means to be an excellent Greek wife that one cannot imagine that Euripides is not casting the behavior of the Greeks as stereotypically barbarous.

---

<sup>45</sup>Burnett 292-294.

<sup>46</sup> Croally 111. On the preceding pages Croally argues that Euripides inherits from other authors and popular art the attempt to rewrite the Trojan War “under the sign” of the Peloponnesian War (Croally 103-104). The “other” is no longer an outside but an enemy within, and therefore “barbarians” become “friends” (Croally 113-115). See also Dué 148-150. Scodel observes that in this play, the Trojans are nobler than the Greeks, and that there is a transfer of “barbarian” values to the Greeks (Scodel, *Trojan Trilogy*, 113-114). Andromache’s observations are also a particular example of Goldhill’s broader statement that “Euripides challenges, then, the direct linkage of fifth-century militarism to Homeric heroism not only by shifting the focus away from the arguments and deeds of the battlefield to their final outcome, not only by depicting his heroes as devoid of the grandeur of heroic values, but also by questioning the constant applicability of the charged language of warfare to the conditions it produces. Euripides uses the stories of the Trojan War to mark a disjunction in the lineage of Greek military values.” See Simon Goldhill, *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986) 166.

<sup>47</sup>Barlow says that these lines “might be said to contain the heart of the play.” She thinks it is “somewhat inappropriate” that Andromache should be thinking in terms of Greeks and barbarians at all, since Andromache herself is Trojan, and the Greeks would conceptualize them as barbarian (Barlow 197). Croally notes that Euripides represents the Trojans as barbarians throughout the play by making reference to their tyrannical political system, beautiful clothing and exotic music (Croally 108). But Hall demonstrates that tragedians radically redefine the barbarian in tragedy. She argues that since 5<sup>th</sup> century Athens was a democracy which had fought and defeated Persia and had founded the Delian league, “Hellenic” was becoming synonymous with “free” and “barbarian” with “slave” (Hall 101). She goes on to argue that “tragic drama therefore provided in its turn cultural authorization for the perpetuation of the stereotype” (Hall 103). She observes that stereotypes “project onto target groups characteristics which are the opposite of qualities admired in the group creating the stereotypes.” Hall identifies those admired qualities in the virtues canonized by 4<sup>th</sup> century philosophy: *sophia*, *andreia*, *sophrosune*, and *dikaosune* (Hall 121). The vices correspond with the virtues: *amathia*, *deilia*, *akolasia*, *adikia*. Barbarian characters usually manifest one or more of these vices (Hall 122). As the 5<sup>th</sup> century progresses, there is less ethnographic distinction among barbarians in tragedy, and they become a single category embodying the character traits opposite of the central Hellenic values (Hall 161). The traits which were typically attributed to barbarians could be attributed to Greeks behaving outrageously (Hall 203). This corresponds to the “noble barbarian” construction of Greek tragedy (Hall 211).

The topics of Andromache's speeches add depth to Andromache's characterization. Her obsession with her marriage is an important thematic function, but in terms of indirect characterization, it is a vehicle through which she can display her better qualities. As the exemplary wife, Andromache claims that she was chaste, that she acted to please her husband and to adhere to the customs of the time, and that she was from a noble family. She suggests resourcefulness as a trait when she says that she did not listen to other women, but rather kept her own counsel.<sup>48</sup> Andromache's despair and her anger towards the Greeks and Helen help to foreground her thematic function by making Andromache a representative of collective experiences and feelings. Euripides wanted her to be representative of a certain kind of experience, and so her nihilistic viewpoint clashes sharply with Cassandra's fabricated optimism and Hecuba's insistence on hope. Similarly, Andromache's angry outburst touches on complicated themes of identity and blame, nobility and ignobility. But it would be a stretch to characterize Andromache as nihilistic or wrathful, since it is clear that the views she professes to espouse are the result of the extraordinary situation in which she finds herself. Nothing in these speeches suggests that Andromache's character is developing, and there is no need for her to develop within the narrative frame of the story. Each episode is a snapshot of sorts, capturing the mental states of the moment for each different woman. In this respect, the speeches grant greater access to the consciousness of Andromache than was available in the *Iliad*. She reveals her inner thoughts and considerations and expresses her anger and despair through her words, not just her actions. Her character is given more depth than her character in the *Iliad*, since she herself reflects on her own situation, its causes, and its likely consequences. The audience is made to understand why she feels the way that she does – she does not simply display her emotions for the sake of evoking *pathos*.

#### Others' Speeches

Interestingly, in *Trojan Women* only the chorus actually provides solid characterizing content for Andromache. When other characters like Hecuba or Talthybios speak to Andromache about her behavior, they always refer to her future actions, advising her on how best to act given her current circumstances. Talthybios' messenger speech provides a straight-up narration of her actions before she sails away with Neoptolemus, and this is the closest he comes to actually attributing any qualities to her.

---

<sup>48</sup> Gregory calls it an "intellectual bent" (Gregory, *Instruction*, 167).

After Andromache's first *rhesis*, the chorus breaks in to separate her speech from Hecuba's, and tells Andromache that she "teaches" them about their own suffering: ἐς ταῦτόν ἥκεις συμφορᾶς· θρηνοῦσα δὲ/τὸ σὸν διδάσκεις μ' ἔνθα πημάτων κυρῶ (685-6).<sup>49</sup> This is perhaps the most perfect expression of her thematic function in the work. Andromache laments, speaking openly about her sorrows. Listening to her, the chorus hears their own experiences in her voice, and they realize the true depth of their pain. They view Andromache as their representative, a spokesperson of sorts, who gives voice to the collective experience they are currently enduring.

The *rheseis* of Hecuba and Talthibios which immediately follow upon Andromache's both attempt prescribe her future actions for her, either in the form of advice or commands. Hecuba suggests that Andromache should in fact do what she is loath to even consider: to be a good wife to Neoptolemus in the same sense that she was to Hector. Hecuba issues a series of gentle commands: first Andromache should stop mourning Hector (τὰς μὲν Ἑκτορος τύχας/ἔασον 697-698), then she should honor her new master and make him love her (τίμα δὲ τὸν παρόντα δεσπότην σέθεν,/φίλον διδοῦσα δέλεαρ ἀνδρὶ σῶν τρόπων 699-700).<sup>50</sup> She is adamant that there is hope in the future of Astyanax, for he may grow up to found another Troy:

κἂν θρᾶϊς τὰδ', ἐς τὸ κοινὸν εὐφρανεῖς φίλους  
καὶ παῖδα τῶνδε παιδὸς ἐκθρέψειας ἂν  
Τροίαι μέγιστον ὠφέλημ', ἵν' οἱ ποτε  
ἐκ σοῦ γενόμενοι παῖδες Ἴλιον πάλιν  
κατοικίσειαν καὶ πόλιν γένοιτ' ἔτι (701-705).

Hecuba believes it is Andromache's responsibility to provide the best possible chance for Troy's survival by ensuring the safety of Astyanax.<sup>51</sup> Her advice speaks to Andromache strictly as a mother. She does not touch on any of Andromache's personal qualities in the course of her counsel. Her concern is simply that Andromache do what is best for her son, and to put aside whatever personal qualms she may have about dishonoring Hector's memory.

<sup>49</sup> Biehl ad loc. says that the chorus expresses its "solidarity": "Zwischenverse im Munde des Chors, der seine Solidarität mit dem unglücklichen Los Andromaches bekundet" (Biehl 276).

<sup>50</sup> Barlow believes that Hecuba takes a much more practical and pragmatic view throughout the work, and that she is "committed to survival" (with the one exception of her attempt to rush into the burning Troy at the end of the drama) (Barlow 193-194).

<sup>51</sup> Hecuba's advice does not take into account Andromache's past feelings for Hector, nor does she advise her to find a way to reconcile her devotions of the past with the reality of the present and future. She tells her to forget the past (see Scodel, "Captive's Dilemma," 149). Fantham observes that this scene uses retrospective irony evoking *Andromache*, in which Andromache's good behavior did not keep her, or her child, safe (Fantham 271).



Talthybios is charged with the unlucky duty of telling Andromache that the Greeks have decided to kill Astyanax. He is well aware that this is a difficult situation, and actually begins the discourse with a request that Andromache not hate him (*Φρυγῶν ἀρίστου πρὶν ποθ' Ἐκτορος δάμαρ/μή με στυγήσῃς* 709-710). Once he delivers the terrible news, he, too, has a sequence of suggestions on how she may best bear the circumstances. He first tells her to let it be (*ἀλλ' ὥς γενέσθω καὶ σοφωτέρα φανῇ* 726), and to grieve over her troubles in a way that befits her birth (*μήτ' ἀντέχου τοῦδ', εὐγενῶς δ' ἄλγει κακοῖς* 727), to recognize that she is powerless (*μήτε σθένουσα μηδὲν ἰσχύειν δόκει./ἔξεις γὰρ ἀλκὴν οὐδαμῇ· σκοπεῖν δὲ χρή* 728-729), and to not do or say anything to provoke shame (*τούτων οὐνεκ' οὐ μάχης ἐράν/οὐδ' αἰσχρὸν οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἐπίφθονόν σε θρᾶν/οὐδ' αὖ σ' Ἀχαιοῖς βούλομαι ῥίπτειν ἀράς* 732-734). He delivers the threat of the Greeks, that they will not allow Astyanax to be buried if she does anything to make the army angry. His final advice is to remain silent and to bear her misfortunes well (*σιγῶσα δ' εὔ τε τὰς τύχας κεκτημένη* 737).<sup>52</sup> In the course of giving his advice, or rather, issuing his commands, Talthybios does address a few personal qualities. He first suggests that she bear the news “more wisely” (*σοφωτέρα*), and that she act in a way becoming to her birth (*εὐγενῶς*).<sup>53</sup> He also advises her not to do anything shameful (*αἰσχρὸν*). Andromache herself had just discussed these very qualities in her first *rhesis*, saying that Hector was a match for her in rank, and that she tried to live in a way which would avoid gossip. Talthybios was not present for Andromache’s speech, but his exhortations advise acting in a manner proper to a good, obedient woman, which the audience knows Andromache to be. On the textual level, Talthybios’ injunctions clearly allude to the very qualities Andromache was only just recently examining. On the story level, they provide the perfect motivation for Andromache’s emotional outburst. No woman, no person could take such news “more wisely,” “nobly” or with an eye toward “shame.” It is because Andromache does subscribe to the “silent and secluded” dictum of the time that her outbursts are all the more extraordinary and pathetic.

<sup>52</sup> Barlow *ad loc.* 726 suggests that Talthybios “from his sympathy with Andromache presumes to give her advice.” She also thinks that Talthybios, “though a Greek, has standards of decency and is appalled at the excesses of his countrymen” (Barlow 195). While I believe that the latter statement is tenable, it seems a stretch to suggest that Talthybios is actually giving Andromache advice. Hecuba may advise because of the intimacy she shares with Andromache; Talthybios, though sympathetic to her plight, can only gently command. He has not earned any intimacy with Andromache or the personal nature of her problems. Lee’s reading that Talthybios “sympathetically urges” Andromache seems to fit the situation slightly better (Lee 202).

<sup>53</sup> As Scodel puts it, “the women are at least expected to express their nobility by submission” (Scodel, *Trojan Trilogy*, 108).

After Astyanax is killed, Talthybios brings his body back to Hecuba for burial. During the exchange, he narrates events which happened offstage: Andromache's request that Astyanax be buried in his father's shield, and her departure with Neoptolemus.<sup>54</sup> Before she left, Talthybios reports that she sang another lament for her country before Hector's tomb: πολλῶν ἐμοῖ/δακρύων ἀγωγός, ἥνίκ' ἐξώρμα χθονός,/πάτραν τ' ἀναστένουσα καὶ τὸν Ἑκτορος/τύμβον προσενέπουσα (1130-1133). He notes that her condition was extremely pathetic, drawing tears from him himself. He then says that Andromache begged Neoptolemus to bury Astyanax: καί σφ' ἡιτήσατο/θάψαι νεκρὸν τόνδ', ὅς πεσὼν ἐκ τειχεῶν/ψυχὴν ἀφῆκεν Ἑκτορος τοῦ σοῦ γόνος (1133-1135). As a mother, Andromache is clearly concerned for the welfare of her child, but she also makes a request that pertains to her own role as a wife: she asks Neoptolemus to bury Astyanax in Hector's shield, which she (according to Talthybios, at least) assumed he would hang in the house at Phthia, or perhaps in the bedroom itself: φόβον τ' Ἀχαιῶν, χαλκόνωτον ἀσπίδα/τήνδ',.../.../μηδ' ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν θάλαμον οὔ νυμφεύσεται (1136-1139).<sup>55</sup> She specifies that the body should be given to Hecuba to bury, since she herself will not have time to do it before their departure:

σὰς δ' ἐς ὠλένας  
δοῦναι, πέπλοισιν ὡς περιστείλῃς νεκρὸν  
στεφάνοις θ', ὅση σοι δύναμις, ὡς ἔχει τὰ σά·  
ἐπεὶ βέβηκε καὶ τὸ δεσπότης τάχος  
ἀφείλετ' αὐτὴν παῖδα μὴ δοῦναι τάφῳ (1142-1146).

This is the only true narration of Andromache's activities by a narrator in Greek tragedy. In his rather short report, Talthybios relates his first-person account of what he himself witnessed and

<sup>54</sup> There are two major works on messenger-speeches in Euripides: Irene de Jong, *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech* (Leiden: Brill, 1991) and James Barrett, *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy* (Berkeley: U of California P, 2002). Though Talthybios is a messenger and this is a messenger speech, his speech was not examined by de Jong in her 1991 study of messenger speeches in Euripides. She has three criteria a speech must meet before it can be classified as a "messenger" speech: 1) the identity of the speaker must not be one of the protagonists, 2) the content of the speech must be narrative (the verbs must be in a past tense), 3) there must be an introductory dialogue (de Jong 179-180). Talthybios' speech in *Trojan Women* does not meet the third criterion (de Jong 180). Barrett has excluded Talthybios from his study for similar reasons (Barrett 223-224). Yet Talthybios has been a character of interest to scholars because of the obvious sympathy he feels for the Trojan women. See Kristine Gilmartin, "Talthybios in the *Trojan Women*," *American Journal of Philology* 91 (1970): 221, and Michael Dyson and Kevin Lee, "Talthybios in Euripides' *Troades*," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 41 (2000): 170. Gilmartin remarks that Talthybios is notable for being sympathetic to their plight while still representing order and rule. She considers it important that this example of Greek scruple comes in the form of the herald, the established means of communication between vanquished and victor. Dyson and Lee characterize him as humane and scrupulous but lacking in understanding of the gods.

<sup>55</sup> Lee thinks Andromache's request was "perfectly natural" since Astyanax was also Neoptolemus' property (Lee 256).

participated in to a small extent. He does not attempt to focalize Andromache's experience in the interchange that he observes, but rather reports his own *reaction* to what he observes. He adopts a position similar to the audience's for just a moment: watching her lament and say her farewell to Hector, watching her interact with her new master, he cannot help but cry, to feel pity for her.

Talthybios' report provides the reader with several clues about Andromache's characterization in *Trojan Women*. First and foremost, her farewell lament evokes again all the laments she has sung in her previous incarnations. Talthybios' summary is enough to suggest that Andromache performed a lament featuring topics typical to the tragic lament: the loss of the city as well as the husband. Talthybios' report of his own reaction to her song provides evidence of its power to evoke pathos and pity. Secondly, Andromache's concern for the execution of the burial of Astyanax speaks to her virtue, and recalls her act of covering Polyxena when she saw her from the cart on her way to the ships. She specifies that Hecuba care for the body and wrap it in winding sheets and wreaths. The attention to detail here again recalls her attention to ritual previously described by her in her encounter with Polyxena's body. Her attention to the final details, even though she is being hustled away by an anxious Neoptolemus, also speaks to her devotion as a mother. Her final *rhexis* addresses her son at length, and it is clear that she has true affection for the boy. Talthybios narrates the scene of the mother doing the last thing she can do for her son.

When Andromache requests that Astyanax be buried in his father's shield, Talthybios reports that she did not want to see Hector's possessions in Neoptolemus' home, especially not in the bed she will share with Neoptolemus. This short request recalls Andromache's first *rhexis*, and her concern about forsaking her husband for another man. Euripides here uses *νυμφεύσεται*, "to become a bride," to describe their impending relationship, lending credence to Andromache's assertion that her interactions with Neoptolemus, though hateful to her, should mirror the interactions she had with Hector. His description of her actions characterizes her as a woman excessively devoted to Hector, and one who is concerned with all that is right. It also speaks to the power of her lament, and its ability to evoke pathos and pity even in her enemies. This lament was the hallmark of her Iliadic characterization and an important part of her characterization in *Andromache* as well.

## Conclusion

On Rimmon-Kenan's scales of complexity, development, and representation of consciousness, Andromache in *Trojan Women* falls somewhere between Andromache of the *Iliad* and Andromache of *Andromache*. The direct definition used of Andromache only provides the barest bones of identity and quality. Andromache is identified as the wife of Hector, mother of Astyanax, and slave/spear-bride of Neoptolemus. The only qualities directly attributed to her are wretchedness, stemming from the pitiable situation in which she now finds herself. It therefore falls to indirect presentation to create a more convincing mimetic representation, if there is going to be one at all.

In fact, indirect presentation does not add much more to Andromache's characterization. The actions she takes within the narrative time-frame of the play suggest that she, like most women in tragedy, is attentive to the execution of ritual. The antiphonal lament she sings with Hecuba is created from several lament formulae, and serves as an expression of despair for the victims without including much development of the individuals. Andromache's extra-dramatic actions, especially the ones she describes in the analeptic sections of her first *rhexis*, highlight her typical "goodness," and the pains she took to be considered a virtuous wife. Since Andromache is only one of four women featured in the play, she does not have many opportunities to speak at length, and so there is little repetition of rhetorical figures or elements in her speech. The use of apostrophe provides another means of expressing her fluctuating emotions, while her gnomic statements and negative comments against women confirm that she is ideologically "good." Thus far it seems clear that, in *Trojan Women*, Euripides prefers to use indirect presentation to fill in the qualities which would lead to her typification as a "good wife."

The content of Andromache's speeches also reinforces the fact that she was a virtuous individual. Her meditations on her marriage to Hector and her future marriage to Neoptolemus suggest a woman who is loyal to her husband and concerned with her own shame and reputation. Her expressions of despair, especially in the form of her assertion that oblivion is preferable to a sorrowful life, do not really suggest any personal qualities, but rather hint at the desperation of her situation. Finally, the speeches of others do not really suggest any other qualities beyond stereotypical goodness. Both Hecuba and Talthybios exhort her to exercise her virtuous nature for the good of her son and herself. Talthybios speaks to her nobility and her concern for her reputation in particular. It is Talthybios' messenger speech which suggests that Andromache

may have taken her mother-in-law's advice, at least to a limited extent. After mourning the loss of her city and husband, Andromache begs, and wins from Neoptolemus the favor of burying her son in Hector's shield.

Andromache must be characterized in the space of a very short episode and a brief messenger speech. Because the play is set up to be an examination of various kinds of responses to crisis and victimization, it is not necessary for Andromache to have a strong mimetic function in *Trojan Women*. In order for her character to be effective in the play, Euripides need only provide enough characterizing information to convince the audience that Andromache is in fact the virtuous wife she was in the *Iliad* and *Andromache*. Indirect presentation does not add complexity to Andromache's character. Her actions and speech do attribute more traits to her than simply being "wretched," but there is no real complexity in the catalogue of traits. She is a good woman, through and through. It is also unnecessary for Andromache to develop in the play. She is depicted as struggling with the death of Hector, and then suffering a final blow in the course of the play when she learns she must give up her son. Her act of deliberation, as in *Andromache*, is not intended to show the character changing her perspective or "growing" in the psychological sense. It is a way for the poet to examine the existing values of the day and consider how they should be applied to these extraordinary situations. Though it is unclear in the end whether Andromache does choose to consent to a relationship with Neoptolemus, by giving his assent to her requests he indicates that she may be winning him over. Indirect presentation does, however, present a more fully mimetic representation of Andromache's consciousness. The process of deliberation is highlighted here, while in *Andromache* it was conflict which was the most indicative of the workings of the consciousness. Andromache's emotions are also expressed through her speech far more than through narration. Her own conflicting emotions, the anger mixed in with fear and despair, find their fullest expression in her moving songs and *rheseis*. Her emotions evoke similar responses in her audience, but the inner conflict presented also creates a more human, more dynamic character.

#### **IV. Thematic Function**

Though Andromache's deliberative and emotional speeches do create a slightly more mimetic character than her incarnation in the *Iliad*, Andromache's thematic function is still foregrounded over her mimetic function. The structure of the play has a great deal to do with

this. Since Andromache's character is meant to represent the life experiences of young mothers and widows within the stage-time of one episode, there is a concentration of her thematic function which was not really necessary in the *Iliad*. Euripides must immediately make it clear what themes Andromache's character is supposed to address, and to find a way to make her character examine those themes in a way which is compatible with her characterization in the *Iliad* and *Andromache*. In *Trojan Women* it is clear that Andromache's most important thematic function is to explore the role marriage plays as both the ultimate goal and ultimate destructor of a woman's life. She also participates in the overarching, unifying theme of the tragedy, which is unwarranted cruelty towards victims.

Marriage is a pervasive theme in all the episodes.<sup>56</sup> It is mostly conceived of as a destructive force or an exercise in futility. Cassandra thinks of her impending concubinage as a marriage, even to the point of singing a wedding song and carrying wedding torches in a mockery of the traditional ritual (308-341). She also thinks of her "marriage" as a vehicle for revenge, comparing its potential for destruction to the proven destructive nature of Helen's marriage to Paris (353-360). Hecuba explicitly blames Helen's marriage for the destruction of her own family in her *rhesis* after Cassandra's departure (498-499). The chorus also blames the wedding of Helen for their troubles after Andromache's final *rhesis* (780-781). The chorus' Ganymede ode touches on the futility of the divine marriages and unions with the ancestor's of the Trojans (840-859). Helen actually argues that her marriage to Paris benefitted Greece since in choosing Aphrodite as the most beautiful goddess, Paris was not granted the gifts of Athena or Hera, which would have been disastrous for Greece (924-934). Hecuba also laments the unfulfilled marriage prospects of Astyanax as she prepares his burial (1167-1170 and 1218-1220).

In keeping with this theme, Andromache conceptualizes her marriage to Hector as the instrument of her downfall. While the marriages mentioned above are either instruments of personal vengeance (Cassandra) or harbingers of doom for an entire people (Paris and Helen, the weddings of the Trojan ancestors), Andromache's marriage was actually quite successful and beneficial to the people of Troy. It is personal aftermath with which Andromache is concerned, the consequences she herself faces as an individual because of her marriage, rather than the fate of all of Troy. Andromache forms her argument around an assessment of her own behavior. Her

---

<sup>56</sup> See also Croally 86.

reputation gained her the attention of Neoptolemus, who wished to take her as his wife (657-660). In Andromache's mind, this is catastrophe on two fronts: the first is that this new, unsought union will make her a slave in the house of murderers. The second is that this new, unsought union might force her to betray Hector (660-663). The appearance of betrayal is no small thing to Andromache – her previous remarks show that she was very conscious of maintaining an excellent reputation, and Talthibios even appeals to her conscientiousness when he tells her not to do anything shameful in retaliation. Andromache's musings reveal, moreso than Cassandra's re-imagining or Helen's justifications, the central role marriage plays in defining a woman and a woman's worth. Even the possibility of appearing unfaithful to Hector is enough to torment Andromache.

Andromache follows up her statements of concern about her reputation with expressions of her sincere attachment to Hector. She reasons that even animals will not easily go with a new yoke-mate, and so it is unreasonable to assume that it is any different for humans (669-670). She also reveals that she was completely content in her relationship with Hector because he was strong in understanding, wealth, nobility, and courage (673). Their marriage was a conventional one: she was given to him as a virgin and eventually bore him a child. Again, Andromache here represents the normative marriage experience – she married a man of her own social sphere, went to him untouched, and bore him a child. Their union was ideal. But this is the very cause of pain for Andromache. Knowing how perfect the institution of marriage can be, it is all the more difficult for her to understand women who willingly forsake a marriage for another man (663-664). It also makes the prospect of her future all the more grim. Mindful of her reputation and certain that she could never match so well with anyone besides Hector, she is afraid to even contemplate a new intimate relationship. These concerns weigh so heavily upon her that Andromache argues that death would be preferable to entering into so disagreeable a situation. Her insistence that this is a fate worse than death resonates with the other Trojan captives. Because Andromache must continually negotiate the forging of new sexual bonds, she exemplifies the common future of them all. Cassandra, the extraordinary prophetess, is convinced she is going to her death, and Hecuba is too old to be anything but a nurse or houseslave. Yet Andromache's fight for survival will be a fight that most of the Trojan captives will understand and undertake themselves.

The same sense of destruction arising from perfection colors Andromache's final speech to her son. She claims that the success of her marriage, the nobility of Hector and the fruitfulness of their marriage bed were all for naught because of Astyanax's death: τὸ δ' ἐσθλὸν οὐκ ἐς καιρὸν ἦλθέ σοι πατρός./ὦ λέκτρα τὰμὰ δυστυχή τε καὶ γάμοι,/οἷς ἦλθον ἐς μέλαθρον Ἑκτορός ποτε,/οὐ σφάγιον <υἱόν> Δαναΐδαις τέξουσ' ἐμὸν (744-747). After reiterating that Hector will not return to save Astyanax or any of the Trojans, she tells Astyanax that all her labors as a mother were in vain: διὰ κενῆς ἄρα/ἐν σπαργάνοις σε μαστὸς ἐξέθρεψ' ὅδε,/μάτην δ' ἐμόχθουν καὶ κατεξάνθη πόνους (758-760). The vanity of the exercise of motherhood comes from the dissolution of her marriage. The sole purpose of marriage was the production of offspring, a child to bond father and mother together as well as their respective families. Andromache's success here has now given her sorrow beyond measure, grief which she cannot endure. In meeting all societal expectations and in striving to represent the absolute best qualities in a woman, Andromache has set herself up for the most precipitous fall.

In Andromache's mind, her marriage to Hector directly causes Astyanax's death. Talthybios tells her that the Greeks are afraid to leave Astyanax alive, lest he grow to maturity and seek vengeance for Hector's death. Astyanax has been present on stage throughout the episode, and has likely been snuggled in Andromache's arms while she has been talking and singing. When Talthybios delivers his news, Euripides takes the opportunity to create a moving and tearful goodbye between mother and son, and then to give Andromache a chance to voice her hate and frustration over the actions of the Greeks (764-779). Her chastisement recalls her role in *Andromache* as the noble barbarian, the refined savage who ironically holds the supposedly civilized Greeks up for examination. In *Trojan Women*, Andromache suggests that the Greeks are barbarians because of their behavior: ὦ βάρβαρ' ἐξευρόντες Ἕλληνες κακά (764). But the polarity of Greek vs. barbarian is not as starkly represented in *Trojan Women* as it is in *Andromache*. In this play, the Greeks are similarly characterized as unscrupulous and negligent, but the women are not characterized as barbarian. The polarity is therefore modified to something like Greeks vs. victims, though, in the final calculation, the characterization of the Greeks is largely the same, regardless of who occupies the other pole of the conflict.

*Trojan Women* is a play about the victims of the war and, secondarily, the punishment of the victors. The *pathos* of women's situation comes from the fact that they have done nothing wrong to deserve such punishment. As daughters, wives, and mothers, they have led good, even



exemplary lives, yet their suffering is unimaginable. The pain is made more acute once it becomes plain that the true source of their suffering, Helen, will survive the war and return home unpunished despite Hecuba's best efforts. In Helen, Euripides combines the themes of marriage as destructive force and the cruelty of the victors. Helen's own disregard of her first marriage, and the pain and suffering caused by her second marriage, devalue the institution itself and make a mockery of those who strive to uphold its essential values. Her manipulation succeeds where Andromache's steadfastness fails, and the final outcome is simply unjust. The Greeks fail to recognize the true threat that Helen presents, and Menelaus' decision to accept her explanations for her behavior is perhaps the most cruel blow to the Trojan women. It is little wonder that Hecuba questions the gods so fiercely in the play, and contemplates suicide in the end.

## V. Continuation: Homeric Touchstones and Thematic Amplification

As the latest-published work in this study, *Trojan Women* has an intertextual relationship with both the *Iliad* and *Andromache*. Euripides, as he did in *Andromache*, builds Andromache around her Homeric characterization and puts in her mouth the cultural values representative of the 5<sup>th</sup> century. But he also bears in mind his previous characterization of Andromache, and is careful not to nullify any of the characteristics created for her.<sup>57</sup> Accordingly, he structures the budding relationship between Neoptolemus and Andromache in a way which hints at its earlier representation in *Andromache*, and in fact there is a strong connection between the themes Andromache addresses in *Andromache* and *Trojan Women*.<sup>58</sup> But Euripides interacts with the Homeric tradition in *Trojan Women* in a slightly different way than he did in *Andromache*. The Homeric influence on *Trojan Women* is best characterized as “situational allusion.”<sup>59</sup> Garner finds only two lines of Homeric poetry repeated in *Trojan Women*.<sup>60</sup> But the story itself picks up

<sup>57</sup> See also Meridor, “Andromache Scene”, 25.

<sup>58</sup> See also Meridor, “Andromache Scene”, 25.

<sup>59</sup> John Davidson, “Homer and Euripides’ *Troades*.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 45 (2001): 68.

<sup>60</sup> Robert Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London: Routledge, 1990) 165. δούλειαν ἀμέραν (*Tro.* 1330) = δούλιον ἥμαρ (*Il.* 6.463); νεκροῦ μορφά, νεκύων ἀμενηνὸν ἄγαλμα (*Tro.* 193) = πολλὰ δὲ γυννοῦσθαι νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάκηνα (*Od.* 10.521, 536; 11.29, 49). *Trojan Women* alludes to Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* more than any other work through Euripides’ depiction of Cassandra (Garner 165). See also Davidson 66.

where the *Iliad* left off, prompting one scholar to characterize the *Trojan Women* as “an impassioned Homeric sequel.”<sup>61</sup>

*Andromache* interacted with the Homeric epic at several points in the story itself and in several points of the text. The characters recalled events from the war represented in the *Iliad*; the story itself builds on scenes, motifs, and story patterns from the *Iliad*; and the characters both recall and pervert their Iliadic incarnations. But *Trojan Women* is different in that the focus of the tragedy is on the women of the story, and so there are not quite as many opportunities to recall the Iliadic representation of events. The “situational allusion” to the *Iliad* is created by the temporal stage of the Trojan saga. The tragedy begins well after the *Iliad* concluded, with the city having been taken and burned. Hector, Paris, and Priam are all dead, as is Achilles. But Euripides keeps the *Iliad* at hand in his characterization of Andromache by connecting her thoughts and reflections to her laments from the epic. Whereas for *Andromache* Hector’s proleptic vision of Andromache’s life as a slave was the kernel of Andromache’s experience, in *Trojan Women* the foundational scenes are Andromache’s own proleptic visions, related in her laments of Books 22 and 24.<sup>62</sup>

Euripides’ continuations of the story illustrate in a most interesting way the truth of what Hector had predicted in the *Iliad*. To Hector, it was not so important that he be correct on where Andromache was serving or what she was doing. What really mattered was that she would always be recalling his (Hector’s) memory. He understood that the longevity of his own renown depended on her survival and her loyalty to his memory. Euripides’ plays demonstrate the costs of that gendered division of labor; while Hector’s memory does in fact linger in the minds of his enemies as he hoped it would (see *Andr.* 203-204; 654-656 and *Tro.* 709-712; 723), his excellence has caused the worst kind of pain for his family. This is what Andromache herself voiced in the *Iliad*, lamenting her lot as the living monument to her husband’s glory, lamenting the inevitable death of her son. Her love for and loyalty to Hector were unquestioned, but did not in anyway help her cope with his passing. In fact, her devotion to him only causes her more personal trouble, making it more difficult to cope and adapt rather than easier. As Scodel notes,

---

<sup>61</sup> Davidson 79.

<sup>62</sup> See also Davidson 69.

the unshakable devotion of a captive woman to the victims of a war only continually demonstrates the triumph of the victor and her captor.<sup>63</sup>

Before turning to Books 22 and 24 of the *Iliad*, it is worth returning to the *homilia* scene of Book 6 once more to trace out a connection between Andromache's speech in that scene and her first *rhesis* in *Trojan Women*. In this speech, Andromache, in an apostrophe to Hector, recalls how well suited they were to each other, declaring that Hector was her perfect match in four crucial categories: ξυνέσει γένει πλούτῳ τε κἀνδρείαι μέγαν (674). More than one commentator has noticed that this piling up of nouns recalls Andromache's listing of relatives in *Iliad* Book 6, when she tells Hector that he is her father, mother, brother and husband: Ἐκτορ, ἀτὰρ σύ μοι ἔσσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ/ἥδ' ἐκασίγνητος, σὺ δέ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης (*Il.* 6.429-430).<sup>64</sup> Both speeches suggest that Andromache's marriage to Hector resulted in a sort of personal completion or fulfillment. In the *Iliad*, Hector fulfills an external need: Andromache has no natal family, and so he must take on those responsibilities himself in addition to being her husband. In *Trojan Women*, he fulfills an internal need, providing a masculine counterpart to her own feminine excellence. In Book 22 of the *Iliad*, Andromache is convinced that this connection was cosmic, and fated (*Il.* 22.477-481). They were so well-suited that they even shared the same bad fortune.

Aside from the fact that *Trojan Women* amplifies some of the feelings Andromache professes for Hector in the *Iliad*, the tragedy draws most heavily on the endangerment of Astyanax Andromache imagines in her laments. Andromache faces a second crisis in the course of the *Trojan Women* when Talthybios returns to tell her that the Greeks have decided to execute Astyanax. This unimaginable blow is even more devastating because only moments before Hecuba was advising Andromache to try to make Neoptolemus happy for the sake of Astyanax's future (699-705). This motif of child-as-hope was also utilized in *Andromache*, but with respect to Andromache's own safety, not in the grander sense of cultural preservation. Euripides creates

---

<sup>63</sup> Scodel, "Captive's Dilemma," 142.

<sup>64</sup> Barlow ad loc. notes that "[b]oth passages use four nouns in succession to describe Hector's qualities, but the nouns here in 674 'understanding, rank, wealth and courage' are abstract and therefore colder and more distant than Homer's simple persons...The extreme verbal neatness of 674 is somehow at the expense of a strong emotional effect achieved in the Homer and just missed here" (Barlow 193). Lee ad loc. writes "Andromache's protestation of her love for Hector and of her contentment in living with him is consistent with the admirable character she displays in the sixth book of the *Iliad*. There, in the farewell scene, we find a similar protestation of love and affection" (Lee 194). See also Goff 58; Davidson 67. Davidson also sees a parallel to that Iliadic scene in the way Astyanax clings to his mother in *Trojan Women* (Davidson 71).

a scene which brings to fruition all the anxieties Andromache had for the future of her child while Hector was still alive and fighting during the war. In her second *rhexis* of *Trojan Women*, she addresses her son at length, evoking the same worries she voiced in the *Iliad*. The first part of the *rhexis* recalls her lament in Book 22 (*Il.* 22.485-486), from the moment when Hector died. She laments that Hector's excellence has meant death for Astyanax and has not helped him in any way: ἡ τοῦ πατρὸς δέ σ' εὐγένει' ἀποκτενεῖ, / ἢ τοῖσιν ἄλλοις γίγνεται σωτηρία, / τὸ δ' ἐσθλὸν οὐκ ἐς καιρὸν ἦλθέ σοι πατρός (742-744); she apostrophizes her marriage as the cause of Astyanax's troubles: ὦ λέκτρα τάμ' αὖ δυστυχῇ τε καὶ γάμοι, / οἷς ἦλθον ἐς μέλαθρον Ἑκτορός ποτε, / οὐ σφάγιον <υῖόν> Δαναΐδαις τέξουσ' ἐμόν (745-746); she repeats again that Hector will not return, and his kinsmen will be of no help either: οὐκ εἴσιν Ἑκτωρ κλεινὸν ἀρπάσας δόρυ / γῆς ἐξανελθὼν σοὶ φέρον σωτηρίαν, / οὐ συγγένεια πατρός, οὐκ ἰσχυρὸς Φρυγῶν (752-754). The very cause of death, Hector's excellence and courage, recalls Andromache's lament in Book 24 when she tells Hector that Astyanax will die because of his mercilessness in battle:

ἢ τις Ἀχαιῶν  
 ῥίψει χειρὸς ἐλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου, λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον  
 χωόμενος, ᾧ δὴ πού ἀδελφὸν ἔκτανεν Ἑκτωρ  
 ἢ πατέρ', ἡὲ καὶ υῖόν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν  
 Ἑκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν ὁδᾶξ ἔλον ἄσπετον οὐδᾶς.  
 οὐ γὰρ μείλιχος ἔσκε πατήρ τεός ἐν δαΐ λυγρῇ (*Il.* 24.734-39).

Andromache dealt with Astyanax's death in the prologue of *Andromache* (*Andr.* 9-10), but the motif of the child in peril in the absence of his father was utilized again in the threat against Neoptolemus' son. Menelaus' desire to kill that boy is based on the same rationale for the Greeks wanting to kill Astyanax in *Trojan Women*. Andromache seems to be almost inextricably connected to this motif. *Trojan Women* in particular emphasizes the love she has for Astyanax and the deep connection between mother and child. In *Andromache*, this was downplayed somewhat as her son was absent through the first part of her time onstage, but in *Trojan Women* he has been in her arms since she first entered, a potent visual reminder of Andromache's responsibility to both the past and the future of Troy. In *Andromache*, bearing a child was considered one of the foremost duties of a married woman, and the purpose of brokering a marriage between families in the first place. Andromache's child in either work has his own significance as the preserver of a cultural tradition (Astyanax) or the inheritor and progenitor of a new tradition (Neoptolemus' son). The threat against these children symbolizes the threat against the Trojan or Phthian way of life, the attempts of the conquerors to stamp out

any vestige of hope of the victims. In achieving her *telos* of marriage and motherhood, Andromache acts as nurturer of a cultural inheritance, whether through honoring her husband's memory or keeping the inheritance alive in a new generation. The war victimizes her twice – one purpose is taken from her when Hector dies, and the second when they take her son. She herself cannot serve as the last vestige of a fallen city – she can only symbolize its destruction through her own losses.

In *Andromache*, Euripides creates an Andromache who is meant to recall the typically good and virtuous Andromache of the *Iliad*. There is no elaboration in the *Iliad* of what constitutes “goodness” in women. Through the epithets attributed to her and through Andromache's emotional interactions with Hector and laments, the audience comes to understand that she is good in a simple sense, without needing an explicit description of “goodness.” In *Andromache*, Euripides endeavors to present an explicit description through his characterization of Andromache. She herself elaborates on what makes her a good wife, and she even gives advice to a patently bad wife, further demonstrating her wisdom and experience. Almost all the good qualities Andromache claims for herself are compatible with her actions in the *Iliad* save one: sexual *sophrosune*. As the previous chapter shows, this is a quality hardly explored in the *Iliad*, and not at all touched on in Andromache's case. Therefore, it is clear that Euripides is manipulating the Homeric tradition in order to make Andromache's Homeric goodness compatible with 5<sup>th</sup> century ideas of feminine goodness. This is also his tack in *Trojan Women*.

In this tragedy, the immediate catastrophe of Hector's death is over, and Andromache must face the next new crisis. Her meditations on how best to live with Neoptolemus have no basis in the *Iliad*. There was never any suggestion, by either Hector or Andromache, that Andromache would have to form a new sexual relationship as a result of her new social status as slave.<sup>65</sup> But in Euripides' *Andromache*, the audience sees that this has been the case, though Andromache swears that part of their relationship ended once Neoptolemus married Hermione (*Andr.* 29-30). Andromache's resolve in *Trojan Women* not to give in to Neoptolemus (667-672) recalls her adamant claims in *Andromache* that their sexual relations occurred against her will (*οὐχ ἔκοῦσ'*, *Andr.* 36; *ἐκοιμήθην βίαι/σὺν δεσπότηισι* *Andr.* 390-391) and her repeated references to her “husband” Hector (*πόσιν μὲν Ἑκτορ'* *Andr.* 8; *τὸν ἐμὸν μελέας πόσιν Ἑκτορα* *Andr.*, 107; *πόσιν*

---

<sup>65</sup> See Scodel, “Captive's Dilemma,” 139.

*Andr.* 227; πόσις θ' ὁ κλεινός *Andr.* 456). And yet, Talthybios reports in *Trojan Women* that Neoptolemus agreed to allow her to bury her son in Hector's shield (1131-1145). Though he may not care much about the burial of a child, he would certainly have cared about the loss of Hector's shield, an important and conspicuous trophy. To allow it to be buried in Troy, and not displayed in his home as a testament to his honor and valor, surely indicates either a temper unlike any of the other heroes of the Trojan War saga, or a true concern for Andromache and a willingness to bend to her desires.<sup>66</sup> Perhaps Euripides dramatizes here Andromache acting in a way that is pleasing to her husband, or already learning how to manage him as she learned how to manage Hector. Or perhaps Neoptolemus is already well-disposed to her, since, because of her reputation, she was considered too generous a prize to be allotted by sortition, and was thus given to Neoptolemus as a special honor. Neoptolemus' capitulation should perhaps be read in the context of his "working" relationship with his concubine in *Andromache*. In that drama, Andromache feels no love for Neoptolemus, but she is certain he will come to her aid once he hears that she and his son are in danger (*Andr.* 268-269). The allegations made by Menelaus that Neoptolemus prefers her to Hermione also suggest an attachment on Neoptolemus' part (*Andr.* 657-658). Even though Talthybios' messenger scene is heart-wrenching in its own right, it is interesting that Euripides does not challenge his previous conception of Neoptolemus' and Andromache's relationship. Perhaps Neoptolemus' capitulation to Andromache's wishes on the shores of Troy was the first of many.

In *Andromache*, Andromache's goodness, including her *sophrosune*, was developed through her conflict with Hermione. A great portion of their *agon* was spent in delineating what expectations for her husband are proper for a good wife to have, and what behavior incurs shame instead of renown. In *Trojan Women*, Andromache does not compete with anyone in virtue. Acting as a representative of a particular gendered experience, she speaks about her virtuous goals as a way of demonstrating how futile such an exercise was for all Trojan women in her position (643-661). Any comparisons (especially with Helen) are implicit, not explicit as they were in *Andromache*. The topics addressed in the two dramas, however, show significant overlap. In *Trojan Women* Andromache describes the actions she took as she was striving to gain renown for her virtue: she stayed indoors and avoided contact with gossipy women (647-

---

<sup>66</sup> But Davidson sees a parallel between Astyanax being buried with his father's shield and Eëtion being buried with his own armor in *Iliad* 6. "Like his father, Neoptolemus now has certain scruples about carrying off the armor as loot" (Davidson 73).

653). Andromache goes on to say that she was quiet and tranquil before her husband, but she learned how to manage him, discovering when to let him have his way and when to push for her own (654-656). The picture she paints in *Andromache* is similar. Submissiveness is central to her advice, and so is accommodation (*Andr.* 213-228). She also focuses on chastity and prudence, which again come up in *Trojan Women* when she remembers conventional wisdom about women and sex (665-666). Finally, Andromache's injunction against gossiping women in *Trojan Women* was earlier vindicated in *Andromache*, as Hermione laments to her nurse that it was the dangerous talk of other women who convinced her that Andromache was a threat to her household (*Andr.* 943-950). Euripides takes an interest in the kinds of feminine worries and virtues which are simply not part of the Iliadic tradition, yet he strives to preserve the continuation of the characters over the gap between Homeric epic and Athenian tragedy. In *Andromache* he fleshes out the character the Homeric poet creates by allowing her to speak in modes other than lament. By opening up her consciousness, even to the limited degree of *Trojan Women*, the character becomes more richly layered, and concepts of feminine virtue are concretized. Yet lament is still an important feature of Andromache's tragic characterization. Here, though, as above, the effects of transmodalization are felt, as Andromache's tragic laments bear little resemblance to her Homeric laments.

While lament is the foundational feature of Andromache's characterization in the *Iliad*, as a thematic feature of the *Iliad*, it is not nearly so pronounced. In tragedy, however, the situation is reversed – lamentation takes center stage, so to say, and positive representations of heroism and valor are far fewer.<sup>67</sup> As was the case in *Andromache*, lament is an integral element in the characterization of Andromache in *Trojan Women*. Andromache's lamentation in *Andromache* secures her function as the living monument to Hector, just as he had predicted. In the monody of that play, Andromache says that she will add on her current troubles to the laments she always lifts to the skies: ἡμεῖς δ' οἷσπερ ἐγκείμεσθ' ἀεὶ/θρήνοισι καὶ γόοισι καὶ δακρύμασιν/πρὸς αἰθέρ' ἐκτενοῦμεν (*Andr.* 91-93). In *Trojan Women*, Andromache's lament does not recall the *Iliad* so strongly, nor does it have the same characterizing power. In this tragedy, Andromache is depicted in that interesting liminal stage – Hector is dead and buried, but she has not yet left Troy. Her antiphonal lament with Hecuba hits all of the typical formulaic elements of a lament for husband, home, and city, but she says very little about the details of her relationship with

---

<sup>67</sup> Davidson 78.

Hector. Therefore, her antiphonal lament reinforces her role as a representative. She participates in a group song rather than a solo, adding her voice to a chorus of voices singing of an experience that is at once individual and universal. Interestingly, her laments in the *Iliad* perform a similar function – they serve as representations of a universal experience. But those songs are Andromache’s alone, and do speak to individual concerns. It is Talthybios’ report of her final laments, her farewell to Hector and her lamentation for the city which suggests, at least, the beginnings of her characterization as a consummate mourner. In *Andromache*, Andromache claims that she is always lamenting Hector, as he himself predicted in *Iliad* Book 6. In *Trojan Women*, her indirectly-reported farewell lament represents the inception of that kind of mourning – as she transitions from wife to captive, her laments will serve as a long-lasting memorial to Hector. As a woman in a time of war, grief follows upon grief, as more loved ones are taken away. But as a wife, a woman, an integral part of the Trojan saga, her tears are necessary. In Euripides’ tragedies, lamentation is not the thematic counterpart to the pursuit of *kleos* which characterizes the action of the epic – it becomes the characterizing feature of the tragic genre itself. Andromache’s association with lament associates her with tragedy. Instead of serving as the tragic figure in the epic, Euripides makes her the central figure in his epic-tinged tragedies.



## Conclusion

Andromache, despite being a minor character in the *Iliad* and having a questionable, or perhaps unknowable traditional background, remains a popular figure in the various retellings and re-imaginings of the Trojan War saga. This study has shown that her popularity is likely due to a few important features of her characterization. First is her characterization as an exemplary woman. She is considered to be a paragon of femininity, regardless of time or era, and so she can be put to use in a variety of ways, especially in establishing social *mores* for women in a time period and acting as a comparandum for the behavior of others. Second is the nature of her victimization. She does nothing to directly cause her suffering, and so her character can be used in several ways to illustrate and amplify difficult themes regarding war, whether it be the value of the heroic code represented in epic or the scruples of the victorious Greeks represented in tragedy. Third is her lamentation and mourning, which combines the previous two features. She mourns to fulfill her ritual duty as a woman, to commemorate the life and heroism of her husband. But as a victim herself, her mourning also becomes a way for her to articulate her own sufferings brought on by the loss of husband and child and by the cruel nature of war. What Andromache does is provide a story, a traditional touchstone, for women in times of war.

The fact that she is “blameless” and “good” makes her the perfect foil for other characters whose qualities may not be so easily defined or evaluated. In the *Iliad*, this is achieved by making her a secondary and relatively simple character. It is clear that she exists to enrich the reading of Hector’s character and decisions. Knowing her attachment to him and the consequences she will endure because of his decisions, the audience can read his actions as the complicated things they are – Hector acts as a hero should act, yet his wife suffers. Andromache’s laments are heartrending and moving, but inevitable. The fates of Hector and Andromache are destined – at least Hector believes they are so – and so just as the man fights and the woman cares for the home, the man dies and the woman suffers and mourns in his absence. The story of Hector and Andromache in the *Iliad* clearly delineates the expectations of men and women within the Homeric social system, and Andromache’s laments clearly point out the inequality inherent in these expectations.

In tragedy, Andromache is again a foil against which other characters and decisions of the other actors are amplified and examined. This is accomplished not by making her secondary

and flat, but by making her even more Homeric, even more elaborately detailed as “good.” Whereas in the *Iliad*, her blamelessness/goodness was expressed through a few epithets, in tragedy it is layered in several methods of representation: spoken argument; ritual action; recollection of past actions; externalized vocalization of interior thoughts. This kind of characterization simultaneously serves the needs of the play by setting her perpetual goodness against the more complex or indeterminate qualities of the other characters and articulates for the modern audience the customs and beliefs of women’s roles and *mores* in the 5<sup>th</sup> century. In *Andromache*, she acts as a means of exploring both feminine goodness and Greek goodness in her dealings with Hermione and Menelaus. Her position as a concubine, woman, and Trojan enhances the way the audience reads Hermione and Menelaus. War recedes into the background somewhat, but its influence is still present – Andromache’s victimization has not ended with the end of the war, and the actions of those taken in times of war continue to resonate in the present, continue to affect the choices and attitudes of the current players, not only with respect to how they act towards Andromache, but also with respect to how Andromache thinks about herself.

The victimization and suffering of the good woman finds expression in her mourning. As a character in *Trojan Women* she is put to different use. She does indeed explore ideas of feminine and Greek goodness once again, but the context is quite different. She does not participate in the structuring of polarities as she does in *Andromache*. Similarly to the *Iliad*, she simply articulates what the good woman suffers in times of war. Her characterization in *Trojan Women* echoes that of her characterization in *Andromache* in that she is a “noble barbarian” used to flesh out the wickedness of the Greeks. But this is muted because of the temporal stage of the story and the transitional stage in her identity – she is only contemplating slavery at this point, not participating in it and ironically remaining a paragon of wifely virtue. Here, she is not the only “noble barbarian,” set against specific attackers with specific agendas – she is only one Trojan woman suffering with others the general cruelty of the Greeks. The war is still very much present. In the *Iliad*, there were no aspersions cast upon the Greeks, no implications that they were excessively cruel, or that her suffering was in any way directly connected to the actions of the Greeks, for it was directly connected to the actions of Hector. But in *Trojan Women*, it is the Greeks who are blamed, not Hector; it is the external enemy, not the *mores* of the society; this kind of suffering is not destined, not necessary as it seemed to be in the *Iliad*, but rather entirely

preventable had the Greeks been more virtuous. The externalization of the enemy changes things in a broad sense, and she is characterized in a broad manner to reflect these changes.

What binds all of Andromache's incarnations together is the constant presence of the war in the background of her stories. It is no accident that most celebrated literary representations of Andromache situate her either during the war itself or dealing with the aftermath. The *Aeneid* seems to be unique in this regard, since it takes place so long after the war is over, but in reality that story is also about the immediate aftereffects of the war: the limits of endurance, the difficult relationship survivors have with memory. The fact that only travel writers seem to have any interest in her life or story outside of the context of the war likely has to do with the traditions of local lore, but it does suggest a certain thematic connectedness between Andromache and the suffering of war. The anxieties Andromache endures during the war and the conflicts she faces after the war explain why her character has endured for so long. Through her story it is clear that the trauma of war defines the heroic and the unheroic, the barbaric and the civilized. More particularly, it is clear that it is in the treatment of the victims of war that those lines are established. Andromache's goodness serves to amplify and brightly illuminate the way others treat her (and by extension, victims). The absence of ambiguity in her own characterization casts the actions of others in the harshest light possible. The audience cannot help but react sympathetically: surely there is no reason to widow a good wife and mother? Surely there is no reason to kill a baby? Surely there is no reason to threaten a slave and concubine who has never overstepped her bounds? But it is not only because of her goodness that Andromache has endured. That particular aspect of her character focuses attention on the actions of others: Greeks, warriors, men, and dangerous women. But Andromache's mourning focuses attention on her, and by extension, other women like her. It is through this song tradition that the story of women is recalled and preserved. When Andromache laments, in any literary representation, she recalls her suffering and the suffering of women. She recounts the grief, sadness, and anger that belong to women and women alone. It does not matter who is to blame for her suffering: in epic the blame is internal, in tragedy it is external. But the effects are the same in any representation. Whether a victim of her own husband's jealousy or the victim of his enemies' cruelty, she suffers the loss of her husband, child, home, marriage, and dignity. And that is a reality that is universal through space and time.

## Bibliography

### *Text Editions*

- Aristotelis de arte poetica liber*. Ed. Robert Kassel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965. Print.
- Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Ed. Malcolm Davies. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988. Print.
- Euripidis fabulae*, vol. 1. Ed. James Diggle. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Euripidis fabulae*, vol. 2. Ed. James Diggle. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Homeri Opera vol. I Iliad (Books I-XII)*. Ed. David Monro and Thomas Allen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920. Print.
- Homeri Opera vol. II Iliad (Books XIII-XXIV)*. Ed. David Monro and Thomas Allen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920. Print.
- Homeri Opera vol. III Odyssey (Books I-XII)*. Ed. Thomas Allen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1917. Print.
- Homeri Opera vol. IV Odyssey (Books XIII-XXIV)*. Ed. Thomas Allen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1917. Print.
- Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta*, pt. 1. Ed. Albert Bernabé. Leipzig: Teubner, 1987.
- Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Ed. Edgar Lobel and Denys Page. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. Print.

### *Works Cited*

- Abbott, H. Porter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.
- Adkins, Arthur. *Merit and Responsibility: A Study of Greek Values*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960. Print.
- Alden, Maureen. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- Aldrich, Kenneth. *The Andromache of Euripides*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1961. Print.
- Alexiou, Margaret. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002. Print.
- Allan, William. *The Andromache and Euripidean Tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- Ameis, Karl and Karl Hentze. *Homers Ilias*. 4th edition. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1905. Print.
- Amory Parry, Anne. *Blameless Aigisthus: A Study of AMUMΩN and Other Homeric Epithets*. Leiden: Brill, 1973. Print.
- Ando, Valeria. "Matrimonio e guerra nel discorso tragico: una lettura delle Troiane di Euripide." *Studi de filologia classica in onore de G. Monaco, I: Letteratura greca*. Palermo: Università di Palermo, 1991. 251-64. Print.
- Arend, Walter. *Die Typischen Scenen bei Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1975. Print.
- Arthur, Marylin. "The Divided World of Iliad VI." *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. Ed. Helene Foley. New York: Gordon and Breach, 1981. 19-44. Print.
- Atchity, Kenneth. "Andromache's Headdress." *Critical Essays on Homer*. Ed. Kenneth Atchity, Ron Hogart, and Doug Price. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1987. Print.
- Austin, Norman. "The Function of Digressions in the Iliad." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 7 (1966): 295-312. Print.
- Austin, Norman. *Helen of Troy and Her Shameless Phantom*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994. Print.

- Avery, Harry. "Achilles' Third Father." *Hermes* 126 (1998): 389-97. Print.
- Barlow, Shirley. *Euripides Trojan Women*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1986. Print.
- Barnouw, Jeffrey. *Odysseus, Hero of Practical Intelligence*. Lanham: UP of America, 2004. Print.
- Barrett, James. *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2002. Print.
- Beck, Deborah. *Homeric Conversation*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2005. Print.
- Biehl, Werner. *Euripides Troades*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1989. Print.
- Blaklock, Edward. *The Male Characters of Euripides: A Study in Realism*. Wellington: New Zealand UP, 1952. Print.
- Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction, Second Edition*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983. Print.
- Boulter, Patricia. "Sophia and Sophrosune in Euripides' *Andromache*." *Phoenix* 20 (1966): 51-8. Print.
- Burgess, Jonathan. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001. Print.
- . *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2009. Print.
- Burnett, Anne. *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971. Print.
- . "Trojan Women and the Ganymede Ode." *Yale Classical Studies* 25 (1977): 291-316. Print.
- Caraveli, Anna. "The Bitter Wounding: The Lament as Social Protest in Rural Greece." *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*. Ed. Jill Dubisch. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 169-94. Print.
- Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire Étymologie de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots*. 4 vols. Paris: Klincksieck, 1968. Print.
- Chatman, Seymour. "On the Formalist-Structuralist Theory of Character." *Journal of Literary Semantics* 1 (1972): 57-79. Print.
- . *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978. Print.
- Clarke, Matthew. "Formulas, meter, and type scenes." *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Ed. Robert Fowler. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. 117-38. Print.
- Clayton, Barbara. *A Penelopean Poetics: Reweaving the Feminine in Homer's Odyssey*. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2004. Print.
- Collins, Leslie. *Studies in Characterization in the Iliad*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1988. Print.
- Conacher, Desmond. *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme and Structure*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1967. Print.
- Cunliffe, Richard. *A Lexicon of Homeric Dialect*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1977. Print.
- Croally, Neil. *Euripidean Polemic*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. Print.
- Crotty, Kevin. *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994. Print.
- Davidson, John. "Euripides, Homer, and Sophocles." *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century*. Ed. Martin Cropp, Kevin Lee, and David Sansone. Champaign, IL: Stipes, 2000. 117-28. Print.
- . "Homer and Euripides' *Troades*." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 45 (2001): 65-79. Print.

- Derderian, Katherine. *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy*. Leiden: Brill, 2001. Print.
- Dickey, Eleanor. *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996. Print.
- Dickson, Keith. *Nestor: Poetic Memory and Greek Epic*. New York: Garland, 1995. Print.
- Dodds, Eric. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1951. Print.
- Duckworth, George. *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1933. Print.
- Du , Casey. *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002. Print.
- . *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2006. Print.
- Dunn, Francis. "Beginning of the End in Euripides' *Trojan Women*." *Rheinisches Museum f r Philologie* 136 (1993): 22-35. Print.
- Dyson, Michael, and Kevin Lee. "Talthybius in Euripides' *Troades*." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 41 (2000): 141-73. Print.
- Easterling, Patricia. "Presentation of Character in Aeschylus." *Greece & Rome* 20 (1973): 3-19. Print.
- . "Character in Sophocles." *Greece & Rome* 24 (1977): 121-29. Print.
- . "Men's κ  ος and Women's γ  ος: Female Voices in the *Iliad*." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 9 (1991): 145-51. Print.
- Edmunds, Susan. *Homeric Nepios*. New York: Garland, 1990. Print.
- Edwards, Mark. *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume V: books 17-20*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. Print.
- Erbse, Hartmut. "Euripides' *Andromache*." *Hermes* 94 (1966): 276-97. Print.
- Fantham, Elaine. "Andromache's Child in Euripides and Seneca." *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy: Essays Presented to D.J. Conacher*. Ed. Martin Cropp, Elaine Fantham, S.E. Scully. Calgary: U of Calgary P, 1986. Print.
- Farron, Susan. "The Portrayal of Women in the *Iliad*." *Acta Classica* 22 (1979): 15-31. Print.
- Felson, Nancy, and Laura Slatkin. "Gender and Homeric Epic." *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Ed. Robert Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 91-116. Print.
- Felson-Rubin, Nancy. *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1991. Print.
- Fingerle, Anton. *Typik der homerischen Reden*. Diss. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universit t M nchen, 1939. Print.
- Finley, Moses. "Marriage, Sale, and Gift in the Homeric World." *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*. Ed. Brent Shaw and Richard Saller. New York: Viking, 1982. 233-45. Print.
- Foley, Helene. *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2001. Print.
- Forster, Edward. *Aspects of the Novel*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1927. Print.
- Fredrich, Paul, and James Redfield. "Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles." *Language* 54 (1978): 263-88. Print.
- Garner, Robert. *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.
- Garton, Charles. "Characterization in Greek Tragedy." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 77 (1957): 247-54. Print.
- Garvey, James. "Characterization in Narrative." *Poetics* 7 (1978): 63-78. Print.

- Garzya, Antonio. *Andromacha*. Naples: G. Scalabrini, 1963. Print.
- Genette, Gerard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 1997. Print.
- Gill, Christopher. *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996. Print.
- . "The Character-Personality Distinction." *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Ed. Christopher Pelling. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. 1-31. Print.
- . "The Question of Character and Personality in Greek Epic." *Poetics Today* 7 (1986): 251-73. Print.
- Gilmartin, Kristine. "Talthybius in the *Trojan Women*." *American Journal of Philology* 91 (1970): 213-22. Print.
- Goff, Barbara. *Euripides Trojan Women*. London: Duckworth, 2009. Print.
- Golder, Herbert. "The Mute Andromache." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113 (1983): 123-33. Print.
- Goldhill, Simon. *Reading Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986. Print.
- Gould, John. "Dramatic Character and 'Human Intelligibility' in Greek Tragedy." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 24 (1978): 43-67. Print.
- Goward, Barbara. *Telling Tragedy: Narrative Technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides*. London: Duckworth, 1999. Print.
- Gregory, Justina. "The Power of Language in Euripides' *Troades*." *Eranos* 84 (1986): 1-9.
- . *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1991. Print.
- Griffin, Jasper. "Homeric Pathos and Objectivity." *Classical Quarterly* 26 (1976): 161-87. Print.
- . *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980. Print.
- . "Homeric Words and Speakers." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986): 36-57. Print.
- Griffin, Nathaniel. *Dares and Dictys: An Introduction to the Study of the Medieval Versions of the Story of Troy*. Baltimore: J.H. Furst, Co., 1907. Print.
- Griffith, Mark. "Antigone and Her Sister(s): Embodying Women in Greek Tragedy." *Making Silence Speak*. Ed. Laura McClure and Andre Lardinois. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2001. 117-36. Print.
- Gumpert, Matthew. *Grafting Helen: The Abduction of the Classical Past*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2001. Print.
- Hainsworth, Brian. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 3: Books 9-12*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print.
- Hall, Edith. *Inventing the Barbarian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989. Print.
- Halliwel, Steven. "Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character." *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Ed. Christopher Pelling. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. 32-59. Print.
- Havelock, Eric. *Preface to Plato*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap-Harvard UP, 1963. Print.
- Heitman, Richard. *Taking Her Seriously: Penelope and the Plot of Homer's Odyssey*. Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 2005. Print.
- Higbie, Carolyn. *Heroic Names, Homeric Identities*. New York: Garland, 1995. Print.
- Hochman, Baruch. *Character in Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985. Print.
- Holst-Warhaft, Gail. *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- de Jong, Irene. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam: B.R. Gruner, 1987. Print.

- . "The Voice of Anonymity: *tis*-Speeches in the *Iliad*." *Eranos* 85 (1987): 69-84. Print.
- . "Silent Characters in the *Iliad*." *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Ed. Jan Bremer, Irene de Jong, and J. Kalff. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner, 1987. 105-21. Print.
- . "Homeric Words and Speakers: An Addendum." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108 (1988): 188-9. Print.
- . *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech*. Leiden: Brill, 1991. Print.
- . *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.
- . "Glossary." *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Ed. Irene de Jong, René Nunlist, and Angus Bowie. Leiden: Brill, 2004. xv-xvii. Print.
- . "'Introduction.'" *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Ed. Irene de Jong, René Nunlist, and Angus Bowie. Leiden: Brill, 2004. 1-10. Print.
- . "Homer." *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Ed. Irene de Jong, René Nunlist, and Angus Bowie. Leiden: Brill, 2004. 13-24. Print.
- Kakridis, Ioannis. "The Role of the Women in the *Iliad*." *Eranos* 54 (1956): 21-7. Print.
- . *Homeric Researches*. New York: Garland, 1987. Print.
- Kamerbeek, Jan. "L'Andromaque d'Euripide." *Mnemosyne* 11 (1943): 47-67. Print.
- Katz, Marylin. *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1991. Print.
- Kirk, Geoffrey. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985. Print.
- Kitto, Humphrey. *Greek Tragedy: A Literary Study*. 3rd ed. London: Methuen, 1966. Print.
- Kovacs, Paul. *The Andromache of Euripides: An Interpretation*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980. Print.
- Kyriakou, Poulheria. "All in the Family: Present and Past in Euripides' *Andromache*." *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997): 7-26. Print.
- Lacey, Walter. "Homeric ΕΔΝΑ and Penelope's ΚΥΠΙΟΣ." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 86 (1966): 55-8. Print.
- Lateiner, Donald. *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behavior in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 1995. Print.
- Leaf, Walter. *The Iliad. Vols. I-II*. 2nd edition. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971. Print.
- Leduc, Claudine. "Marriage in Ancient Greece." *A History of Women in the West I*. Ed. Pauline Pantel. Cambridge: Belknap-Harvard UP, 1992. 235-95. Print.
- Lee, Kevin. "Euripides' *Andromache*: Observations on Form and Meaning." *Antichthon* 9 (1975): 6-14. Print.
- . *Euripides Troades*. London: Bristol Classical, 1976. Print.
- Lefkowitz, Mary. "The Heroic Women of Greek Epic." *The American Scholar* 56 (1987): 508-13. Print.
- Lesky, Albin. *Greek Tragedy*. 3rd ed. Trans. H. Frankfort. London: Ernst Benn, 1978. Print.
- Lloyd, Michael. *The Agon in Euripides*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992. Print.
- . *Euripides: Andromache*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1994. Print.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. "Tycho von Wilamovitz-Moellendorff on the Dramatic Technique of Sophocles." *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1972): 214-28. Print.
- Lohmann, Dieter. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970. Print.
- . *Die Andromache-Szenen der Ilias*. Zurich: Georg Olms, 1988. Print.



- Loraux, Nicole. *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986. Print.
- Louden, Bruce. *The Iliad: Structure, Myth, and Meaning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. Print.
- Lowenstam, Steven. *The Scepter and the Spear: Studies on the Forms of Repetition in the Homeric Poems*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1993. Print.
- Luschnig, Cecilia. "Euripides' *Trojan Women*: All is Vanity." *Classical World* 65 (1971): 8-12. Print.
- Mackie, Hillary. *Talking Trojan*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1996. Print.
- MacLeod, Colin. *Homer: Iliad Book XXIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982. Print.
- Margolin, Uri. "Characters and Their Versions." *Fiction Updated: Theories of Fictionality, Narratology, and Poetics*. Ed. Calin-Andrei Mihailescu and Walid Hamarneh. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1996. 112-32. Print.
- Martin, Richard. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989. Print.
- McClure, Laura. "Female Speech and Characterization in Euripides." *Lo Spettacolo della Voci*. Ed. Francesco De Martino and Alan Sommerstein. Bari: Levante-Editori, 1995. 35-60. Print.
- . *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1999. Print.
- Meridor, Ra'anana. "Troades 28-44 and the Andromache Scene." *American Journal of Philology* 110 (1989): 17-35. Print.
- . "Some Observations on the Structure of Euripides' *Troades*." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 11 (1991/2): 1-21. Print.
- Michellini, Ann. *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition*. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1987. Print.
- Monro, David. *Homer Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1884. Print.
- Morris, Ian. "The Use and Abuse of Homer." *Classical Antiquity* 5 (1986): 81-138. Print.
- Mossman, Judith. "Waiting for Neoptolemus: The Unity of Euripides' *Andromache*." *Greece and Rome* 43 (1996): 143-56. Print.
- Murnaghan, Sheila. "The Poetics of Loss in Greek Epic." *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*. Ed. Margaret Beissinger, Jane Tylus and Susanne Wofford. Berkeley: U of California P, 1999. 203-220. Print.
- Nagy, Gregory. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry. Revised Edition*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999. Print.
- Nyenhuis, Jacob. *Homer and Euripides: A Study in Characterization*. Diss. Stanford University, 1963. Print.
- Page, Denys. "The Elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*." *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on His Seventieth Birthday, January 2, 1936*. 1936. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967. 206-30. Print.
- Pantelia, Maria. "Helen and the Last Song for Hector." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 132 (2002): 21-7. Print.
- Parry, Adam. "Language and Characterization in Homer." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 76 (1972): 1-22. Print.
- Parry, Milman. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. ed. Adam Parry. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971. Print.

- Pelling, Christopher. "Preface." *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Ed. Christopher Pelling. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. v-vii. Print.
- Perkell, Christine. "Reading the Laments of *Iliad* 24." *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond*. Ed. Ann Suter. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. 93-117. Print.
- Perry, Walter. *The Women of Homer*. London: William Heinemann, 1898. Print.
- Perysinakis, Ioannis. "Penelope's ΕΔΝΑ Again." *Classical Quarterly* (1991): 297-302. Print.
- Petersmann, Gerhard. "Die monologische Totenklage der *Ilias*." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 116 (1973): 3-16. Print.
- Phelan, James. *Reading People, Reading Plots*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1989. Print.
- Phillippo, Susanna. "Family Ties: Significant Patronymics in Euripides' *Andromache*." *Classical Quarterly* 45 (1995): 355-71. Print.
- Poole, Adrian. "Total Disaster: Euripides' *The Trojan Women*." *Arion* 3 (1976): 257-87. Print.
- Prince, Gerald. *Dictionary of Narratology. Revised Edition*. 1987. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 2003. Print.
- Privitera, G. Aurelio. *Dionisio in Omero e nella Poesia Greca Arcaica*. Rome: Edizione dell'Ateneo, 1970. Print.
- Rabel, Robert. *Plot and Point of View in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997. Print.
- Rabinowitz, Nancy. "Proliferating Triangles: Euripides' *Andromache* and the Traffic in Women." *Mosaic* 17 (1987): 111-25. Print.
- . *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993. Print.
- Redfield, James. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector, Expanded Edition*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1994. Print.
- Reiner, Eugen. *Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938. Print.
- Richardson, Nicholas. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume VI: Books 21-24*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print.
- Richardson, Scott. *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1990. Print.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Schlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Methuen, 1983. Print.
- Rissman, Leah. *Love As War*. Königstein: Anton Hain, 1983. Print.
- Roisman, Joseph. "Contemporary Allusions in Euripides' *Trojan Women*." *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1997): 38-47.
- de Romilly, Jacqueline. *Tragédies Grecques au Fil de Ans*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995. Print.
- Schadewaldt, Wolfgang. "Hector and Andromache" in *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Trans. Gabriele Wright and Peter Jones. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997. 124-42. Print.
- Scholes, Robert, James Phelan, and Robert Kellogg. *The Nature of Narrative*. 1966. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- Scodel, Ruth. *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980. Print.
- . "The Captive's Dilemma: Sexual Acquiescence in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98 (1998): 137-54. Print.
- . "Verbal Performance and Euripidean Rhetoric." *Illinois Classical Studies* 24-25 (1999-2000): 129-44. Print.

- Scott, William. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Similes*. Leiden: Brill, 1974. Print.
- Seaford, Richard. "Dionysus as the Destroyer of the Household: Homer, Tragedy, and the Polis." *Masks of Dionysus*. Ed. T. Carpenter and C. Faraone. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993. Print.
- Segal, Charles. "Andromache's Anagnorisis: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22.437-476." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75 (1971): 33-57.
- Seremetakis, Nadia. *The Last Word: Women, Death, and Divination in Inner Mani*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. Print.
- Siedensticker, Bernd. "Women on the Tragic Stage." *History, Theory, Drama: Dialogues in Athenian Drama*. Ed. Barbara Goff. Austin: U of Texas P, 1995. 151-73. Print.
- Sienkiewicz, Thomas. "Euripides' *Trojan Women*: An Interpretation." *Helios* 6 (1978): 81-95. Print.
- Sifakis, Grigoris. "Children in Greek Tragedy." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 26 (1979): 67-80. Print.
- Slatkin, Laura. *The Power of Thetis. Allusions and Interpretations in the Iliad*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991. Print.
- Smith, Louise. *Studies of Characterization in Euripides: The Medea, Elektra, and Orestes*. Diss. Princeton University, 1975. Print.
- Snell, Bruno. *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*. Trans. T.G. Rosenmeyer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1953. Print.
- Stanford, William. *The Ulysses Theme*. Dallas: Spring, 1992. Print.
- Stevens, Philip. *Euripides: Andromache*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971. Print.
- Storey, Ian. "Domestic Disharmony in Euripides' *Andromache*." *Greece & Rome* 36 (1989): 16-27. Print.
- Stuttard, David. *An Introduction to Trojan Women*. Brighton: Company Dionysus, 2005. Print.
- Sullivan, James. "The Agency of the Herald Talthybios in Euripides' *Trojan Women*." *Mnemosyne* 60 (2007): 472-7. Print.
- Sultan, Nancy. *Exile and the Poetics of Loss in Greek Tradition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999. Print.
- Suter, Ann. "Lament in Euripides' *Trojan Women*." *Mnemosyne* 56 (2003): 1-28. Print.
- Suzuki, Mihoko. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1989. Print.
- Synodinou, Katerina. *On the Concept of Slavery in Euripides*. Ioannina: U of Ioannina P, 1977. Print.
- Taplin, Oliver. *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992. Print.
- Thumiger, Chiara. *Hidden Paths: Self and Characterization in Euripides' Bacchae*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2007. Print.
- Torrance, Isabelle. "Andromache *Aikmalotos*: Concubine or Wife?" *Hermathena* 179 (2005): 39-66. Print.
- Toucheffe-Meynier, Odette. "Andromache." *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 1. Zürich and München: Artemis, 1981. 767-773. Print.
- Tsagalis, Christos. *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004. Print.
- . *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2008. Print.
- Van Erp Taalman Kip, A. Maria. "Euripides and Melos." *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987): 414-19. Print.

- Van Nortwick, Thomas. "Like A Woman: Hector and the Boundaries of Masculinity." *Arethusa* 34 (2001): 221-35. Print.
- Vellacott, Philip. *Ironic Drama: A Study of Euripides' Method and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975. Print.
- Vickers, Brian. *Towards Greek Tragedy*. London: Longman, 1973. Print.
- Vivante, Paolo. *The Epithets in Homer: A Study in Poetic Values*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1982. Print.
- Webster, Thomas. *The Tragedies of Euripides*. London: Methuen, 1967. Print.
- West, Martin. "The Rise of Greek Epic." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108 (1988): 151-172. Print.
- Whallon, William. *Formula, Character, and Context*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1969. Print.
- Willcock, Malcolm. *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad Books I-VI*. London: Macmillan and St. Martin's, 1970. Print.
- Wilson, Christopher. *Homer: Iliad Books VIII and IX*. Wiltshire: Aris & Phillips, 1996. Print.
- Wilson, John. "καί κέ τις ὥδ' ἐρέει: An Homeric Device in Greek Literature" *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 (1979): 1-15. Print.
- Zanker, Graham. *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 1994. Print.
- Zarker, John. "King Eëtion and Thebe as Symbols in the *Iliad*." *Classical Journal* 61 (1965): 110-14. Print.
- Zeitlin, Froma. *Playing the Other*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996. Print.