LAMENT IN EURIPIDES' TROJAN WOMEN

ANN SUTER

ABSTRACT

This article summarizes the findings of an unpublished PhD dissertation, "The Form of Lament in Greek Tragedy" by E. Wright, which provide for the first time objective criteria for identification of lamentation in tragedy. It applies these criteria to the Trojan Women, and argues, on the basis of metrical and stylistic devices, that virtually every scene in the Trojan Women shows the characteristics of lament. The play is, from both the minute technical, and the overall structural, point of view, a lament. This provides explanations for some of the long-standing critical issues of the play, e.g., no unity, no plot, an ill-conceived prologue. The article then considers also how the Trojan Women fits into current discussions of lament as a gendered genre. It replies especially to work on the development of 5th-century Athenian attitudes towards female lament, in which a pattern of increased criticism and restriction, it is argued, is reflected in the changing treatment of lament in Athenian tragedy. The treatment of lament in the Trojan Women does not conform to this perceived development. This suggests that there were still a variety of attitudes current and influential in late 5th-century Athens towards female lamentation.

This essay has two purposes: first, to offer an answer to what seems the eternal question of the unity, or lack of unity, or irrelevance of the lack of unity, of Euripides' Trojan Women, and second, to investigate the nature and implications of Euripides' use of lament in the Trojan Women in the context of current discussions of lament as a gendered voice. The play's laments have so far been studied only individually;1) the formal structure of lament itself has not been seen as the model for the structure of the whole play. I think that the structure and content of ritual lament hold the key to why Euripides did some of the things that have been so criticized in the play (for example, no plot, no peripeteia, no closure, a prologue
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that has nothing to do with the play).  

And despite the play’s obvious abundance of lamentation, the play has not been included in current discussions of lament as a gendered genre, or in analyses of the relation of tragic lament to the social world of 5th-century Athens and its efforts to control female lamentation in private and public funeral rites of the polis. In fact, there is good reason for the play’s absence from these discussions, for it often forms an exception to the arguments and generalizations which they develop.

The incorporation of ritual lament into 5th-century tragedy by the three major tragic dramatists has been much studied. An important contribution to this field is Elinor Wright’s careful analysis of the meters and stylistic features of tragic lament. Her findings permit us at last to identify occurrences of lament by a set of objective criteria rather than by general, often subjective, notions of what seems to us to be a scene of lamentation. She identifies as lament

2) Easterling (1993: 8) comes close to describing Euripides’ use of lament in this play when she says “the thrénoi we . . . find [in tragedy] are adapted in . . . subtle ways to their dramatic contexts” (8). She speaks of themes and imagery, however, not formal dramatic structure. Cf. Segal (1993) also (n. 1).

3) For example, Foley (1985, 1993, 2001); Loraux (1986, 1990 (=1998)); Holst-Warhaft (1992); Segal (1993). Foley (1985), looking into ritual irony, discusses the Iphigenia at Aulis, the Phoenissae, the Herakles, and the Bacchae. Lamentation is a ritual, but not the kind that Foley focusses on that is newly-established in the play. Likewise, lamentation in the Trojan Women does not offer the possibility of irony that she notes in the plays discussed in her book. Foley (1993 and 2001) Parts 1 and 3.2, discuss the Orestea, Seven against Thebes, Helen, Antigone, Sophocles’ Electra, and Euripides’ Suppliant Women. The parallel she argues for between the treatment of female lamentation in these plays and the historical evidence for the 5th century attitudes towards female lamentation is not reflected in the Trojan Women. See discussion below. Loraux (1986) discusses Euripides’ Suppliant Women; (1990 (= 1998)), Antigone and Sophocles’ Electra. In the Mothers in Mourning (1998) she argues that the fear of women’s lamentation that she sees in Greek men can be traced, with the help of Greek myth, to their fear of mothers as murderers of their sons (e.g., 55). But what can be made of Hekabe’s lamentation for her sons and grandson in the Trojan Women? or of Hekabe herself, who twice in this myth was about to kill her son and did not? Holst-Warhaft (1992) discusses the Orestea, Persians, Seven against Thebes, Antigone, Medea and Euripides’ Suppliant Women. Segal (1993) focusses on the Alcestis, the Hippolytos, and the Hekabe, and has a short discussion (29-33) on one of the Trojan Women’s “reduced laments” (vide infra for explanation of the term). Zeitlin (1996: chap. 8), whose thesis might have been useful for this play, does not discuss the Trojan Women.

4) Wright (1986). As this dissertation (regrettably) remains unpublished, I summarize its findings on the metrical and stylistic characteristics of tragic lament in some detail. I urge anyone working on the subject of tragic lament to consult it.
a passage which displays a combination of factors: contextual, topical, and metrical. Beginning with passages where a ritual lament is clearly being portrayed onstage (e.g., Persians 908-1077, Seven against Thebes 961-1004), she isolates “essential recurring features” which “seem by their frequent appearance to represent laments for the audience” (Wright 3). She then examines the extant corpus of tragedy and develops a list of passages where these factors appear.

A lament in Wright’s terms is a passage in lyric or spoken meter given on the occasion of death by a character, alone or with other characters, or in a kommos with the chorus (Wright, 1986: 2). A lament takes place at the end of a play.5) To the standard topoi of lament (expression of grief and loss, contrast between past and present, praise for the dead, anger at the dead for abandoning the bereaved, anger at and a desire for vengeance on those responsible for the death),6) she adds the desire of the mourner to die and a description of the mourning and funeral rites offered for the deceased. She identifies also various stylistic features, such as anaphora, anadiplosis, polyptoton, repetition (especially of proper names), address to the dead, series of questions typically beginning τί or πῶς, typical vocabulary, and inarticulate cries. She makes her greatest contribution, however, in her analysis of the meters of tragic lament. The metrical signposts are antiphony, and a bipartite progression in which the first part of the lament is in a lyric meter, usually anapests or iambics, and the second part, beginning always with a new strophe, is in iambic-dichmiacs, and exhibits a sudden increase in the speed of responsion and a heightening of emotion (Wright, 1986: 52).

The essential factors which Wright isolates as diagnostic of lamentation may or may not derive from actual ritual lament; it is not possible to know for certain. Nevertheless, the presence of the features outlined above seems designed to trigger in the audience the emotional response that a lament would (Wright, 1986: 3). If all of these features are present, Wright terms the passage a “full” lament. Often, however, only some of the essentials appear together; these

5) Nilsson (1951: 87) also insists that lament should come at the end, according to its “alte Stellung”. This statement is made in the context of his argument for the origins of tragedy in lament.

6) She follows here the guidelines of Alexiou’s seminal study of 1974.
occasions she identifies as “reduced” laments.7) The missing elements are (always) a location at the end of the drama, and (usually) the complete and specific metrical progression of a full lament. Context, subject matter and stylistic features indicate the presence of lament in these situations, as well as, sometimes, short runs of iambic-dichorics. The purpose of the reduced lament is similar in all its appearances: to integrate lamentation into an unclimactic moment of the play (Wright, 1986: 119) while permitting the action of the play to progress (Wright, 1986: 123), thereby modifying the reduced lament’s emotional impact so as to save the greatest effect for the climax—whether a full lament or something else—at the play’s end (Wright, 1986: 117).

The reduced lament is a flexible tool, capable of subtle commentary on its dramatic context. The suggestion of lamentation, by stylistic or metrical devices, “enhances the audience’s understanding of the dramatic context by forcing them to view it in the light of lamentation” (Wright, 1986: 156). Ag. 1448-576 is an example of a reduced lament (Wright, 1986: 69-71): the chorus of Argive elders tries again and again to begin a lament for their dead king, but Clytaimestra repeatedly interrupts them in recitative anapests, correcting their assessment of what has just happened, and refusing to join them as they try to lament. This interchange is the more impressive because it comes at the end of the play, in the presence of the king, where a full lament would be appropriate and expected. An example of a reduced lament in a situation where lament is not expected is Jocasta’s speech to Polyneices (Ph. 301-54), where she pleads with him not to attack Thebes. The meter is iambic-dichorics, there is repetition, and several of the expected topoi. This “conveys to the attentive audience the impression that Jocasta considered her son dead when he left, and that his parents lamented him as if he were” (Wright, 1986: 154). It functions as a proleptic lament, foreshadowing Polyneices’ death.

7) Wright classifies reduced laments further into “included” laments, “modified” laments, “incomplete” laments, and “monodic” laments. For simplicity’s sake, I have grouped these together in my analysis of the Trojan Women.
A word is appropriate here to explain the lament terminology used in this article:8) *gooi* are solo songs by the kin of the dead; *thräños* are group songs by non-kin. The *kommoi* of actor and chorus are made up of *goos* and *thräños* in responsion.9) This usage is surely a simplification of what actually went on on the Athenian stage, where inarticulate wailings may have occurred often in the course of the performance of the play, but it must suffice for the (equally simplified) schema that I suggest at the end of my argument.

The laments which Wright identifies in the *Trojan Women* include the full lament for the death of Troy (1287-332) which ends the play, and five reduced laments: the first choral ode, which also laments the city of Troy (511-67, 582); Andromache's and Hekabe's joint lament for Hektor (577-607); Andromache's for Astyanax (740-63); Hekabe's for Astyanax (1167-206); and Hekabe and the chorus for Astyanax (1216-59). This total—one full lament and five reduced laments—is far higher than for any other of the extant plays.10) These six passages represent a number of the types of lament familiar.


9) Several variations have been added in tragic drama to the Homeric practice, and even the notions which seem most basic to antiphony in Homer—solo and group, kin and non-kin—are not always observed in tragic lament.

Laments have been analyzed in different, overlapping ways, most deriving ultimately from Alexiou (1974: chs. 6, 7, and 9); a comprehensive typology is sorely needed. They have been typed according to who is performing and the musical form and content (*gooi, thräños, kommoi*); according to the occasion on which they are performed (in a ritual over a body, as an anticipated lament, as a commemorative song long after the funeral); according to different metaphors for death (the lament of marriage-as-death, or departure-as-death, or journey-as-death); and according to who or what is being lamented (the self-lament, the hero's lament, the city lament). Another possibility is that the *thräños* was "most often associated with male mourning" (Johnston, 1999: 101-2 with bibliography *ad loc.*), and the *goos* with women. This correlation is not observed in the *Trojan Women*, however. Derderian's examination of male and female lament in Homer finds the most important distinctions are when and where the lament is sung, and the presence or absence of the body (2001: ch. 1).

10) The next highest is Euripides' *Suppliant Women*, which has one full, and two reduced, laments. See Wright (1986: ix-x) for her summary table of laments.
from Homer and tragedy. There is one ritual lament over a body. The rest are laments for the dead outside of a funeral context; they include a lament for someone already dead, two proleptic laments for an anticipated death, and two laments for the city.

What Wright has done is invaluable in assessing the essentials that the ancient audience of the *Trojan Women* would have recognized and responded to intellectually and emotionally as lamentation, and without doubt the concentration of lament elements is strongest in the lines that she tabulates. But the elements which she has identified as being diagnostic of lament can be found in virtually every scene in the play, even when on the narrative level the passage has little to do with lament or death.\(^{11}\) Indeed, some of the passages seem hardly more than complaints, or general comment on a situation, which borrow from the technical usages of lament.\(^{12}\) This prevalence of lament does not mean that there are not the *logoi* in the play that scholars have found (Gregory, 1991: ch. 5), nor that the *rhēseis* of the four main characters are not "logical and disputatious" (Scodel, 1980: 11). But as Shirley Barlow comments, "Scodel is right in drawing attention to the analytical quality of many of the speeches, but wrong in assuming that they are . . . lacking in emotional impact. . . . \[I\]n this play both modes work to produce a composite effect" (Barlow, 1986: 31). This composite effect, I believe, is the result of the lament elements which are always bubbling just below the surface of the text and constantly breaking through.

I accept as laments the passages that Wright identifies (Wright, 1986: chs. 6 and 7). To argue the presence of lament in the rest of the play, I will analyze a few scenes only, choosing some that have been discussed for other reasons and have seemed to some not to count as lamentation, and others for their high degree of concentration of lamentation elements.\(^{13}\) Then I will discuss the lament

---

11) The *agōn* is the chief exception, but even it has typical lament elements and a place in the play's overall lament structure. *Vide infra.*

12) See modern examples of this in Caraveli (1986).

13) A comparable analysis might be made of other plays to see how unusual the *Trojan Women* in fact is in this respect. Cursory looks at the likeliest to yield similarly pervasive lamentation—Euripides' *Suppliant Women* and Aeschylus' *Persians*—do not yield the same results.
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function of the *agon*. None of these scenes, it should be remembered, is primarily a lament, nor do I claim that any one is; however, they all show elements of lamentation in enough concentration so that we may imagine that they would have recalled lament to a contemporary audience.

Let us take these scenes in the order in which they come in the play. The prologue: Poseidon describes the dead city of Troy which he must leave, using the standard lament *topos* of the contrast of then and now (γόν δέ), in standard vocabulary: ἔρημα (15), λείπω (25), ἔρημία (26), κοινωνία (28). He points out the figure of Hekabe δύσκρεα χέουσα (33), and lists the dead of Hekabe’s immediate family. Then he addresses the dead city (ὁ ποτ’ εὐνυχόσα, χαίρε μοι, πόλις ... ἡθ’ ἀν ἐν βάθροις ἔτι, 45-7) with a reprise of the then/now *topos* (ποτ’/ἔτι). Athena enters and for forty lines, there is a discussion and arrangement of the punishment due to the Greeks for failing to condemn Ajax for his desecration of her altar. This punishment will serve as vengeance for the death of the city and the people just listed. Poseidon makes this connection in his final few lines, which bring us back to the ἔρημία (97) of the sacked city. The prologue has several of the identifying features of lament, then; the chief ones missing are appropriate meters and cries. A prologue would necessarily be in iambic trimeter. The lack of cries seems consistent with the characters of Poseidon and Athena: deities never take part in laments in tragedy; perhaps the high emotion reflected by cries and lyric meters was not considered appropriate to divine dignity. It is also just the beginning of the play, so we would expect the most intense emotion to be saved for later in the drama.

Next comes Hekabe’s monologue. She is lying on the ground (as if dead?), and she addresses herself in lyric anapests (ἄνα, ἔπαερε,

---


15) I analyze 98-152 here. Wright seems undecided whether to count 122-52 as a monodic lament (see chapter 8 and tables 4 and 5, which appear to contradict each other). I think the lines are definitely a reduced lament, and that Hekabe mourns, in monodic form, for herself, her family, and her city.
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There are repetitions with polyptoton (-δαίμον, δαίμονος, δάιμονα; Τροία, Τροίας; πλεῖ, πλεῖ; προς-, πρός). Then comes perhaps the most diagnostic sound of lamentation, the inarticulate wail αἰαῖ αἰαί (105); then the series of questions standard at the beginning of a lament, when the lamenter debates whether to lament (τί . . . στενάχειν; τί μὲ χρῆ σιγᾶν; τί δὲ μὴ σιγᾶν; τί δὲ θρηνησαί; 106-11). There are more cries (οἴμοι . . . οἴμοι 115, αἰαῖ 130, ὁμαί 138). She calls the other women to mourn with her (αἰαι ἱγμεν, 145), and leads out the dirge, using the technical term ἔξαρχος (147) and the traditional mourning image of the bird (147). The chorus enters and joins her with a typical question τί θρέεις; The following kommos continues the lyric anapests of the monody, and is full of cries (161, 164, 168, 173, 177, 187, 190, 194, 197) and other requisites of lamentation.

In the next scene, the herald of the Greek army, Talthybios, arrives to inform the women of their allotment to the Greek army. The metrical structure of the scene is an excellent example of lamentation firmly controlled by a context of iambic trimeter. Talthybios makes his announcements in iambic trimeters; Hekabe questions him, and responds to his answers, in iambic-dochmiacs. In her lines there are cries (241, 250, 265, 278, 281), and at the end (279), she “invites herself to begin the κομμός, the ritual lament” (Lee, 1976: 21), describing the traditional tearing of hair and scratching of cheeks: ἀρασσε κράτα κοῦρμον, / ἐλκ' ὄνυξεσσι δίπτυχον παρειάν (279-80). Here, then, Euripides suggests that Hekabe sees the allotment as a kind of death, part of the death of Troy. Talthybios cuts her and the chorus off, however, turning to the soldiers who are with him with an order to bring out Cassandra.

Cassandra enters, in her own way joining the would-be lament. Her first line (308) is iambic trimeter with two extra metrum iambs, containing two repetitions (ἀνεκε πάρεκε; ἰδοὺ ἰδοὺ). She then breaks into dochmiacs interspersed with (mostly) iambics; the pattern is 16) Questions as traditional: Alexiou (1974: 161-5); ἔξαρχο as a traditional term: Alexiou (1974: 131-2); bird imagery: Alexiou (1974: passim).

repeated in the antistrophe. The speech contains *polyptoton* (311, 312), repetitions (310, 314, 322, 331, 335; 321; 326), anaphora (308, 310, 314, 320, 326, 330, 332). The conception of marriage as a kind of death is common in Greek literature and ritual; here the two are presented as inextricably combined: Cassandra addresses Hymen, the marriage god, in dochmias, the meter of lament. Her marriage will indeed be her death. This speech is an example of an astrophic solo, elsewhere (and I believe here also) used for self-lament in a situation of extreme alienation. In such situations, lamenters are, or feel themselves to be, so cut off from their family (who normally would be the ones to lament them) that they feel they must lament themselves (Wright, 1986: 130, 135). This is certainly so in Cassandra’s case: her madness alienates her in the present scene; and later in Argos, her death will take place far from her family. ）

At 353 Cassandra comes out of her fit, and speaks in iambic trimeter through 443, with an intermediate passage for the chorus and Talthybios (406-23). The chorus’s two lines have *polyptoton*; I do not identify any lament characteristics in Talthybios’ speech. At 443 Cassandra changes suddenly into trochaic tetrameter, with an increase in emotional intensity as she delivers her strange prophecy about Odysseus, and recalls her impending death in a then/now description (446-50). This change parallels the progression that we find in full laments from an iambic meter to another meter, with the same heightening of emotion. In the iambic section, she rehearses the funeral rites that the dead of Troy received in the past, and counsels Hekabe to cease her mourning now: again, the traditional

18) Rehm (1994) traces in some detail the entwined themes of death/funerals and marriages in the *Trojan Women*, especially that of Cassandra’s (129-30). See also Krummen (1998).

19) In calling this speech a reduced lament, I differ from Croally (1994: 73), who says “She [Cassandra] surely employs ritual language, but she certainly does not lament”. Wright’s signposts of meter and specific rhetorical devices are conclusive, I believe. They help us to restore—albeit, alas, somewhat mechanically—some of the aural effect of ancient drama. See Wright (1986: 13) for a discussion of and bibliography on “[m]eter... as the only indicator of the lost modes which carried for the Greeks the ethos of lamentation”. For other examples of the lament of marriage-as-death, see Lardinois (2001: 81-2) on Sappho. He points out also (note 31) that the Danaids in Aeschylus’ *Suppliants* also “are presented as lamenting” in anticipation of their marriages at 69-76 and 112-6.
then/now pattern. In the trochaic section, she bids her holy garments farewell, and her mother; there is *polyptoton* (452, 458); appropriate vocabulary (*λείπω* 452); questions (455). Above all, there is the desire for and assurance of vengeance against Agamemnon, one of those responsible for her, and Troy’s, death.

Other examples of lament elements are abundant. Wright marks the end of the reduced lament of Hekabe and Andromache at 607 when the latter first enters. Yet the chorus picks up the lament in 608 with *anadiplosis* (*δάκρυονος, δέκρυο*), and in the following exchange (610-33, in iambic trimeter) there are cries, repetitions, more *anadiplo-sis*, descriptions of lament, a then/now sequence. Andromache tells Hekabe about Polyxena’s death (620-31), and the conversation seems a straightforward communication of information. The Greek, however, shows elements of lamentation in almost every line: *polyptoton* (621), repetitions (625), cries (624, 628, 629), a description of the services of burial rendered the dead (626-7), and *anadiplosis* (630-1).

This is perhaps enough analysis to give an idea of how Euripides is presenting the whole *Trojan Women* as a lament, suggesting this in a variety of ways and in differing degrees of intensity. The major exception to the unremitting lamentation in the play is the reunion of Menelaos and Helen, and the subsequent *agôn* between Hekabe and Helen. Hekabe’s short speech before the *agôn* proper (890-4), urging Menelaos to kill Helen, comes closest to lamentation: a concentration of *ai* and *oi* sounds, repetitions and *anadiplosis*. For the most part, however, in these scenes there are almost no lament elements, and the meter is iambic trimeter throughout. Here the burden of lament is carried entirely in traditional *topos*: vengeance on the one held responsible for the deaths being mourned.

The other passages where there is no noticeable lamentation are mostly short, two or three line speeches, comments by the chorus which conclude scenes or make a bridge to the next scene, e.g., 341-2, 568-76, 684-5; or comments by characters, usually somewhat longer and with similar functions, e.g., 686-707 or 1156-66. Even so, Hekabe’s attitude towards the Greeks who kill Astyanax, whom she taunts viciously in this last passage, while it has none of Wright’s characteristics, is paralleled elsewhere: for instance, in the *Choephoroi*
It is noteworthy that in the majority of the passages which do not show lament elements, it is Greeks who are speaking, for example, Talthybios at 294-307, 708-39, 1123-55, 1260-70, 1284-6. And of course, the *agôn* is a scene with two Greeks and Hekabe, who, as many have noted, is at her most Greek here.\(^{20}\) In fact this makes perfect dramatic sense: it would be mistaken to expect the Greeks to mourn the fall of Troy and the death of Trojans.\(^ {21}\) The surprise is rather that Talthybios shows the sympathy for Hekabe and the respect for the child Astyanax that he does when he helps her to prepare the body for burial. This expression of sympathy has, however, been foreshadowed in his short speech at 782-9, where he introduces Hekabe's first (anticipatory) lament for Astyanax, not in the expected iambic trimeter, but in the very lament anapests of Hekabe's speech that follows (790-8), which Wright designates as a reduced lament.\(^ {22}\)

Moving now from analysis of words and lines which suggest lamentation, let us look at the play as a whole and compare it to a lament. The purpose of the ritual lament is “to honour and appease the dead [and to] give expression to a wide range of conflicting emotions” (Alexiou, 1974: 55). It seeks to mend the fabric which has been torn by loss, and to reconcile those close to the dead to their loss. Reconciliation may require various things, depending on the circumstances of the death: acceptance, forgiveness, vengeance. The contradictory purposes that sometimes emerge from the twin impulses to reconciliation and to revenge are a part of many laments.\(^ {23}\) The lament itself utilizes traditional imagery and

\(^{20}\) Forensically speaking, as well as in her tactical alliance with Menelaos against Helen, whose death both sides apparently want. See Croally (1994: 116).

\(^{21}\) This is another instance of where the aural aspects of the performance might have offered possibilities of understanding that are all but lost to us today.

\(^{22}\) Easterling (1993: 19) also notes Talthybios' unusual behaviour in the context of Astyanax's burial rites, but does not comment further.

\(^{23}\) See Caraveli (1986), Foley (1993), and Holst-Warhaft (1992) for the divisiveness of modern lament. Achilles’ mourning of Patroklos, which to be satisfied requires the death of Hektor, is an ancient example. See Seaford (1994: ch. 5).
themes which have as their function the symbolic mediation between life and death, between the living and the dead, between whatever conflicting elements a particular death includes.\textsuperscript{24} This mediating function of the imagery helps to reconcile the bereaved to the death by visualizing it as a separation, but not a final one.

The overarching feature of the emotional structure of the \textit{Trojan Women} is just this mediation, or reconciliation, of opposites.\textsuperscript{25} Elements diametrically opposed to one another at the beginning of the play join in the final scenes. On the one hand are the Greeks, the army, the men, the victors, represented usually by Talthybios; on the other, the Trojans, the civilians, the women, the vanquished, represented usually by Hekabe. On the one hand, the cause of the deaths that the play laments;\textsuperscript{26} on the other, those who have suffered those deaths and lament them. The emotional tension between these groups grows steadily as the play progresses, until it explodes in the bitterness of the \textit{agon}. But in the very next scene, after the departure of Menelaos and Helen, the opposites join in a common task and the tensions are resolved in the lament and burial of Astyanax. Talthybios and Hekabe share the chores: Talthybios has washed the body, the soldiers dig the grave. The women gather flowers, Hekabe speaks the lament. The women mourn in response, the soldiers carry the body to the grave. Together they bury Troy's last remnant, and together prepare to sail to homes which they think they will share. The whole of the dramatic time of the play is essentially one moment, the moment (to use an Aristotelian term) of \textit{anagnórisis}, of the realization of a turnabout of events, of a drastic alteration in life. This is also the function, the "dramatic moment" of a lament, which is made up of the efforts by the bereaved to realize and to articulate to themselves a new state of affairs.\textsuperscript{27}
The action of the play is also taken from lament, from the traditional mediating images of death as a voyage and death as marriage (Alexiou, 1974: 19). For what happens onstage is that the women of Troy find out to whom they have been allotted as slaves and concubines, and set off on a sea voyage. The play acts out the image of death as marriage and death as a sea voyage. This is most explicit in Cassandra’s self-lament, but is implicit for the other women as well, in the arrangement Athena has made with Poseidon for the wreck of the Greek fleet, in which all Trojans on board will die along with the Greeks. The chorus, when it laments its impending departure into a life of slavery, is lamenting its own death; this time, the sea voyage will actually be death, not just a metaphor.

The formal structure of the Trojan Women also follows the pattern of lament. The basic structure of a lament is that of antiphony between two kinds of groups—solo and group, and kin and non-kin. The parts spoken or sung by kin (usually solos, gooi) were narratives of the dead person’s life, of the life shared by the lamentor with the dead, or the life they might have had that was cut short by death. Because these parts were sung by close kin, they could include very personal elements. The parts sung by non-kin (usually in groups, threnoi) developed more generalized, universal themes.

The antiphony in the Trojan Women conforms to this model. The chorus and individual characters alternate their group and solo parts to the lament for Troy and its people, the lament which is in fact the play (see Chart). The chorus laments the life they once led and the city itself, alone in the three stasima, and with Hekabe in the two kommoi at the beginning and end of the play. They are non-kin to the main characters and to one another, and lament in general terms their city and the life they led there. Individual characters respond with laments for individual Trojans, always their kin. They say things that only someone close to the dead would know.

Individual laments include Cassandra for herself (308-461); Hekabe for her sons, Priam, her daughters and Cassandra (474-84). Hekabe and Andromache’s lament (577-631) mentions or refers to Hekabe’s téxêa, and individually to Hektor, Priam, and Polyxena. Andromache

28) See Alexiou (1974: esp. chs. 6 and 7); Wright (1986: ch. 1) for the various structures ritual and tragic lament have taken.
finally focusses on Astyanax (740-63) and Hekabe mourns him too (790-8). At the last, Hekabe laments Astyanax (1167-225). The custom of recalling intimate details of the dead one in a lament is particularly startling in Cassandra’s self-lament: she says things which only she in her madness knows, and unlike the ordinary lament, they are about her future. Hekabe recalls her hopes for Cassandra’s marriage (‘not by the spear’s edge’, 347).29) Andromache saw Polyxena’s death, and performed what funeral rites for her she could (622-7). She bears eyewitness testimony to Hekabe, but does not elaborate further, saving her main lament for Astyanax, mixing into it memories of Hektor as well. She mentions Astyanax’s ‘sweet fragrant body’ (758) and remembers nursing him ‘swaddled . . . at this mother’s breast’ (759). Hekabe’s lament over Astyanax’s body is the closest to a ritual lament for an individual that the play offers, a full solo goos. Her praise of Astyanax is necessarily simple, as he never grew to an age to perform great deeds; she mentions his curls (1175) and his hands (1178); she recalls his loving boasts in a supremely touching memory of a scene from their life together (1180-4), and his skill in riding and archery (1209-10). The burden of her words is taken up with thoughts of what might have been and can never be. She speaks of the present, and her own wretched need to bury him (1185-6), and the difficulties of doing it properly (1200-3). Her final address is both to him (1209, 1218-20) and to Hektor’s shield, on which he will be buried (1194-9, 1221-5).

The group laments include the two kommoi (Hekabe and chorus) and the three choral odes. In the first kommos, Hekabe names Troy (99-100) and asks the traditional series of uncertain questions.30) She utters cries of woe, and calls on the women of Troy to join her lament, which she leads off (εἴκαρξα, 147). She uses the traditional image (Alexiou, 1974: esp. 93-7) of the mourning bird (145-8). The chorus joins the kommos with more cries and expresses its fear of the life to come as slaves to the Greeks. In the first ode (511-67),

29) Translations in this article are from Lattimore (1958).
30) Vide supra. Note θρήνως (111), that is, ‘sing a threnos’. If Euripides is using the term in its technical sense, he is indicating that Hekabe is beginning a group song of non-kin, which is exactly what the structure calls for here (see Chart). The use of lament terms in tragedy is not strict, however, so the point should not be pressed.
the chorus mourns the death of its city, remembering what happened to it, and to them, on the previous night: the short-lived, false joy, then the utter destruction. In the second (799-858), they remember the first destruction of Troy, its recovery and the time when it was in the gods' favour—it alludes to the stories of Ganymede and Zeus, and Tithonos and Eos—and ends with the contrast of the city's present abandonment by the gods. The last ode (1060-117) accuses Zeus of betraying Troy, describes Troy's present abandonment, and ends with a call for vengeance on Menelaos. The second *kommos* of Hekabe and the chorus is a final invocation and farewell to Troy and its dead as the women are led to the Greek ships. The odes, like the *kommoi*, are concerned with the whole city, not individuals. They lend themselves to interpretation as commentary on larger issues raised by the myth—responsibility for the war, justice, the relation of the divine and human, the nature of the gods. The second, final *kommos* is, in Wright's terminology, a full lament, chiefly of Troy city, but encompassing all those dead (Hekabe names Priam, 1312) whom the survivors remember. In this it balances and echoes the opening *kommos* as a 'now', in contrast to much of the subject matter of the three odes, which is chiefly 'then'.

How does the *agon* fit into this structure (see Chart)? In the pattern of solo/group and kin/non-kin antiphony, it is parallel to the individual laments for Cassandra, Polyxena, and Astyanax. It comes when we would expect a lament for an individual by an individual and partially fulfills this expectation in that it articulates the desire for revenge on the person responsible for their deaths by the person who is closest to them all. However, the lament over the body of Astyanax, which will fulfill our expectations completely, is coming, and its temporary postponement permits several things which are important for the play's emotional progression and dramatic climax. First, the postponement permits the subject of anger and revenge to be aired fully on both the individual and group level (*agon* and third ode) in close succession, thereby permitting, second, the uninterrupted build-up of emotion over the death of the last of Troy (Astyanax in Hekabe's *Lament*, the city itself in the second *kommos*) as the final climax of the play. Lastly, it permits a steady progression of the mediation and resolution of opposites in
the lament and burial of Astyanax and the lament and farewell to Troy. The progression of this mediation and resolution would have been interrupted and distorted if the sequence had been (1) *agôn* with its desire for revenge—(2) lament for Astyanax—(3) ode 3 with its desire for revenge—(4) lament for the death of the city. In the order that Euripides chose to present his scenes, the emotional structure of the play achieves its resolution at the same time as the formal climax of the lament structure.

Wright has identified a bi-partite pattern of metrical development as being characteristic of lament. The first section, in lyric iambics usually, gives way to faster, wilder iamb-dochmias. If the lament has responsion between two groups, the speed of the responsion picks up. Sense sometimes deteriorates into cries; emotion always intensifies. The list of laments which Wright identifies in the *Trojan Women* (see Chart) shows the same pattern as an individual lament. The pace of lamentation quickens through the play, from a relatively calm beginning to an intensity that, after the *agôn*, is unremitting.

The play ends with a full lament. This ending has been criticised as inconclusive:

The action is already complete at the beginning of the play, and the ending is unmarked because nothing more has happened.... The opening scene between Poseidon and Athena is largely independent of the play: the prophecy concerning the Greek fleet refers to times, people, and places far removed from the women of Troy.31) Furthermore, the closing scene, because it lacks the usual features of the epilogue, cannot give meaning or coherence to the preceding episodes; no summary or moral ties the action together, and no concluding prophecy shows where it will lead.32)

The argument is, then, that the second part of the prologue belongs in an epilogue. Then the prediction of the destruction of the Greek fleet would come right before it happened, not with a lot of irrelevant things in between. But quite apart from the irony that would be lost if the audience did not know about the destruction of the

31) Will the women of Troy miraculously *not* drown with the army, then, when the Greek ships carrying them all go down in Poseidon’s storm?
32) Dunn (1996: 109 and ch. 2 *passim*). See O’Neill (1941) and Meridor (1984), for defenses of the relevance and appropriateness of the prologue.
fleet when hearing the women anticipate their future, and quite apart from the critical viewpoint that this knowledge gives us of the relation of divine justice to human notions of justice as we hear Helen and Hekabe go at each other in the *agôm*, and quite apart from the fact that the play’s end itself fulfills a prophecy (see below), we can appreciate now that for a lament to be a full lament, to fulfill its emotional, structural and mediating purposes, it must end the play. There can be no epilogue to tell us of the storm, for nothing can come after the lament without ruining its emotional finality.33)

Critics who find this end unsatisfying have forgotten perhaps that this is exactly the way the *Iliad* ends: in lamentation (for Hektor) and with a prediction, stated earlier in the narrative, of death (Achilles’) which will take place outside the story.34) The events of the *Trojan Women* are the end of Troy, and Euripides has taken his cue from the end of the *Iliad*. The lamentation and burial of Astyanax, accomplished by Talthybios and Hekabe and all the opposites that they represent, and the lament for Troy which follows them, are a perfect parallel to the reconciliation of Achilles and Priam and the death ritual of Hektor’s funeral.35) Dunn’s amusing formulation, that the “*Trojan Women* begins at the end and remains stuck there” (Dunn, 1996: 109) is actually accurate. The whole play is a lament for the people and city of Troy and laments are one moment in time.

Finally, this ending is entirely appropriate from yet another perspective, that of the *Trojan Women* as the third play in a trilogy.36) The *Alexandros* opens with Hekabe’s dream of the firebrand which will destroy Troy, and the *Trojan Women* ends with Troy in flames. The prophecy of Hekabe’s dream has been fulfilled. Even as full laments always come at the end of a play, so a play that is a lament comes at the end of a trilogy.

33) Cf. Meridor (1984: 209): “[The prediction’s] . . . location in the prologue indicates . . . that the poet . . . does not wish the announcement to affect [the audience] at the end of the play.”
34) Seaford (1994: ch. 5) analyses the ending of the *Iliad* from this perspective in great detail. Goward (1999: ch. 8) also offers Homeric models for tragedy.
36) For arguments on the idea that the three plays presented by Euripides in 415 were meant to be a connected trilogy, see Scodel (1980) (pro), and Koniaris (1973) (contra), with bibliographies. The interpretation in the present essay of the *Trojan Women* as a lament supports Scodel’s point of view.
The conception of the *Trojan Women* as the last play of a trilogy, a play that begins at the end and stays there, also explains its lack of *peripeteia*.\(^{37}\) The whole play is a lament, and laments have no *peripeteia*. They are one moment in time, efforts to accept and adjust to the new death. The sharp reversal of fortune of this story’s *peripeteia* took place before the play opened: the fall of Troy came the previous night, and is described in the first *stasimon*. In the play itself, the women come to terms with their change of fortune in their laments.\(^{38}\)

Given, then, that the *Trojan Women* is a lament, and that lament is the female genre par excellence, how does Euripides’ use of this female genre function in the context of late 5th-century Athens? Two areas of inquiry suggest themselves: first, was Euripides using the lament genre as a vehicle for public statement, as lament was used, we think, in real life? Was he using the genre of a normally marginalized group to say things in this tragedy that he felt he couldn’t say—or say as persuasively—in a male voice? Second, what can the laments in the *Trojan Women* tell us about the development in 5th-century Athens of attitudes towards female lamentation? How does the evidence of the *Trojan Women* fit into current scholarship on this subject?

It has long been argued that the *Trojan Women* was, in part, a political statement criticizing the Athenian atrocities committed against the Melians the previous year (e.g., Lattimore, 1958: 122-4). Some take aspects of the play to refer to the upcoming Sicilian expedition also: the play is a warning to Athens of the dangers of *hubris* as it prepares for this expedition. In this reading, the Greeks = Athens, Troy = Melos, and the storm that will overwhelm the Greek fleet and punish Greek arrogance = the potential catastro-

\(^{37}\) Kovacs (1999: 7) is the most recent statement of this criticism. Earlier critics who complained of the play’s “shapelessness” (Lattimore, 1958: 124) and poor construction (Kitto, 1973: 190) imply the same.

\(^{38}\) This situation is very like that in the *Oedipus at Colonus*, about which noone, I think, has complained of a lack of *peripeteia*. Oedipus’ life had its great shock before the beginning of the play. In the *Oedipus at Colonus*, Oedipus reviews his change of fortune, defending himself and his actions. The play then shows the end of his life, and Antigone and Ismene lament him (1670-750). There is even a prediction of the future in his curse on his sons, delivered in the middle of the play—all as in the *Trojan Women*. 
There were other war atrocities which might have inspired Euripides to choose this topic, and it does not matter whether the behaviour of the Greeks in the play had a specific analogue in contemporary events. The Melian atrocities could have come to mind whether or not they were the model for Euripides. By the same token, the prologue’s prediction of the naval disaster to the Greek fleet might or might not have been included to bring to mind the newly-voted Sicilian expedition. Such a storm was already part of the Trojan War myth; its disaster would in any case have reminded the contemporary audience of Athens’ own upcoming naval expedition.

The women in the play lament Troy and its dead, and they also lament the passing of their own past lives as they look forward to their journey to slavery. We saw above how this journey can be seen as the acting out of a common lament image for dying, and how, in lamenting their passage to their life of slavery, the women are, unbeknownst to themselves, lamenting their own deaths also. For they, although innocent, will die with the guilty Greeks in Athena’s storm. In the reading of the play where the Greeks and Troy are, respectively, Athens and Melos, what Euripides may be suggesting is that all Athens risks perishing in the Sicilian expedition—not just the guilty few who vote for it or fight in it. Athens herself is in danger because of her hubris. In this reading, the play is a proleptic lament for Athens.

Why did Euripides use women for his criticism? Why the voice from the margin? Once again, the fact that the play is a lament perhaps holds a clue to the answer. The criticism is put into the mouths of women, and into a genre which traditionally included

39) For example, Norwood (1960: 244); Murray (1915: 6); Maxwell-Stuart (1973); Pucci (1977); Gregory (1991). Kovacs (1999: 3-4) summarizes the reasons against seeing reference to Melos in the play, but does not mention Sicily. Some scholars follow van Erp Taalman Kip (1987) in believing that there was not time between the Melian massacre and the first performance of the Trojan Women for the play to refer to it.

40) See the list compiled by Lattimore (1958: 122-3).

41) A whimsical suggestion: was the second half of the prologue indeed written at the last moment to do this very thing? Did the prologue originally end with Poseidon’s farewell to Troy at 45-7, where some later scholars think it should have?
expressions of anger and rebuke of those responsible for the deaths mourned. Several scholars have recently commented on the use of the chorus to urge unpopular courses of action,\(^{42}\) or to “articulate[,] thoughts for which the definition of the proper subject matter of public political debate had left no footing” (Humphreys, 1993: x). Gould finds that Euripides used choruses more and more for this,\(^{43}\) especially choruses whose dramatic character was drawn from groups thought of as “other”, that is, women, foreigners, slaves. He sees these choruses as lacking in authority, however, and often marginal to the main action of the drama, as they “bring to . . . tragedy an experience alternative to that of the main hero, . . . one that is . . . both ‘collective’ and ‘other’” (Gould, 1996: 219), and one that “express[es], not the values of the polis, but far more often the experience of the excluded, the oppressed, and the vulnerable” (Gould, 1996: 224).

In the \textit{Trojan Women}, we have a dramatic situation which offers several challenges to this generalization, as Gould realizes in part (Gould, 1996: 222 and n. 21). The chorus in the \textit{Trojan Women} is at the center of the action in the play rather than marginal to it. The chorus also does not oppose the main character, whom I take to be Hekabe. For such opposition, we must take the off-stage Greek army to be the collective hero. Its onstage representatives, however, Menelaos and Talthybios, seem rather to be won over to the women’s point of view in the play than to represent an opposing ethos of a heroic male world: Menelaos agrees with Hekabe about Helen’s guilt; Talthybios loathes his duty of announcing Astyanax’s death (709-11), and later joins in the burial rites for him. Gould also points out the helplessness of the choruses, even when they are the center of the action, because they are always in the control of men who will decide their fates. This indeed is true of the \textit{Trojan Women}, at least in the conventional way Gould discusses. The punishment of Helen is really in Menelaos’ hands, not Hekabe’s. The future of all the women is really in the army’s hands. So the women would

\(^{42}\) Henderson (1990), Gould (1996), Goldhill (1996). Euripides often used women to voice criticism. The \textit{Trojan Women} is unusual in that it uses lamenting women. \textit{Vide infra.}

LAMENT IN EURIPIDES’ TROJAN WOMEN

seem here to have no authority either, but for one thing: they can lament. And lament is the authoritative voice of women, the one place where, traditionally, they spoke with power, and were heard.44) Goldhill realizes a more flexible notion of “authority” in his comment “that the chorus can speak with the full weight of a collective authority is crucial to tragedy’s explorations of authority, knowledge, [and] tradition”.45) This “collective authority” surely encompasses lament. So Euripides’ use of a group—in the Trojan Women, both chorus and female characters—ordinarily without power in the public sphere is within the bounds of dramatic tradition, but his use of a lamenting group is a particularly pointed effort to make an ordinarily marginal, powerless group of victims heard. They are heard, and heard sympathetically, within the limits of the dramatic situation. And the very fact that the Greeks onstage are in sympathy with the women, that the male heroic ethos is represented only offstage by the Greek army, encourages us to see the audience in the theatre as the true audience of the laments. For the lamentation inside the play has no audience to speak of.46) The uprootedness of chorus and characters from their proper “spatial coordinates”47) aids this: there is virtually no one to serve as a normal lament audience within the play; the women lament to the play’s audience.

The analogy of the play’s situation to political events in Athens also encourages the interpretation that the lament—a proleptic lament for Athens—is addressed by the chorus of women as a warn-

44) We do not need an image of “Greek women coming back from the cemetery . . . march[ing] into their city’s agora to make demands” (Loraux, 1998: 27) to accept that laments were authoritative statements that men paid attention to. Why the repeated fuss over women lamenting in public if men were not concerned by what they were saying and doing? Cf. Holst-Warhaft (1992: 26): the anti-lament legislation of the 6th and 5th centuries “hardly supports a notion of lament as the expression of the helpless and downtrodden”.


46) Menelaos does not witness lamentation; the case of Talthybios is discussed below.

47) Goldhill (1996: 246). I agree also with Goldhill’s view that the fact that this chorus and the characters with whom they are aligned are “other” to the free, male, Athenian audience in the theatre does not mean that they cannot speak to them on issues of relevance. Yes, the Trojan women are foreigners lamenting foreigners, but “tragedy’s detour through the world of the other is integral to its—authoritative—sophia” (253). On the subject of the ‘otherness’ of the Trojan women, see also Croally (1994).
ing and a plea to the public in the theatre. Jeffrey Henderson, in the introduction to his translation of the *Lysistrata*, describes the usefulness to Aristophanes of using women to criticize the war with Sparta. “Through his women, Aristophanes could rebuke and advise the Athenians without appearing to be partisan, and in case the spectators should be offended they would have to admit that it was only women talking” (Henderson, 1988: 10). Euripides uses a similar ploy in the *Trojan Women*, the lament genre, which shares the usefulness of the female perspective with Aristophanes’ choice in the *Lysistrata*.

This is a very different role for lament in tragedy, and shows a different attitude towards it, from the one Foley suggests had developed by the late 5th century in Attic tragedy. It is rewarding to examine the use of lament in the *Trojan Women* in the light of her analysis of the progression of public attitudes towards this genre.

Foley seeks to understand funerary legislation from the early 6th through the late 5th century in different parts of Greece. She is interested in particular in the aspects of the laws which imposed limitations on female mourning in public during the funerals of private citizens, and seeks to trace Athenian attitudes towards this female activity by looking at the way female lamentation is presented, and the reactions it provokes, in Attic tragedy. She analyzes five plays: the *Seven against Thebes* (467), the *Choephoroi* (458), *Antigone*
(late 440s), Euripides’ *Suppliant Women* (mid-420s) and Sophocles’ *Electra* (early 410s). She sees in the *Antigone* a “provocative[ ] use of] lament to exacerbate the tensions and contradictions in . . . the political system” (Foley, 2001: 54), and argues that in the *Seven against Thebes* Aeschylus has the chorus “move to the outer boundaries of female assertiveness” (Foley, 2001: 53) against the specific orders of Eteocles. In the *Choephoroi* and Sophocles’ *Electra*, the heroines and the chorus use lamentation to urge on revenge—that is the objective of the plot and approved by the ethic of the myth. In the *Choephoroi* a man (Orestes) even takes part in the *kommos*. But in the later *Electra*, Orestes refuses the help of Electra’s lamentation (Foley, 2001: 158-9). In other words, the three earlier (pre-war) plays permit lamentation to operate as a legitimate activity, even in opposition to male authority in the persons of Eteocles and part of the chorus in the *Antigone*.51) By contrast, Orestes’ refusal to let Electra’s lament help his revenge constitutes a curtailment of her behaviour that parallels Athenian efforts in funerary legislation to control female lament in real life. And Theseus in Euripides’ *Suppliant Women* “echos mainstream Athenian ideology in pointedly suppressing the discourse of lamentation in the *Suppliants*” (Foley, 2001: 44). She concludes: “At least the plays of the second half of the fifth century seem to pay considerably greater obeisance to contemporary ideology in the way that lamentation by women is represented on the stage” (Foley, 2001: 54).

Where does the *Trojan Women* of 415 fit into this development? Clearly, it does not follow Foley’s chronology. This is not necessarily because that chronology is wrong; but either it must be loosened to include the evidence of this play, or the “contemporary ideology” must be re-formulated. Foley recognizes the *Trojan Women* as an exception to other later plays in that it includes “a lamenting chorus of women or a *kommos* dominating the stage action, and in particular, impinging on the political sphere” (Foley, 2001: 54). Then she notes that the lamenters are barbarians, that they lament in a fallen city, and that some Greeks help them (Foley, 2001: 54). It is not clear why these facts excuse the *Trojan Women* from her

51) Foley notes the considerable ambiguity of this ‘approval’, especially in the *Seven against Thebes*. 
chronology. Euripides is using an Other—both barbarian and female—to make a statement about politics. So far this is not unusual, if we acknowledge Goldhill’s observations (vide supra n. 43). But Euripides lets the women—chorus and characters alike—lament unimpeded, in the manner of the Choephoroi of 458. Euripides has given us no internal audience, comparable to Eteocles or Theseus, which criticizes them or tries to silence them. We are presented instead, in the figure of Talthybios, with a Greek, male, free, soldier who begins in the play as a possible analogue to Eteocles or Theseus, but who ends by participating in the funeral ritual for Astyanax. In his first appearance at 235, he exchanges lines with Hekabe, announcing in iambic trimeter the fates of Cassandra, Polyxena, and Hekabe herself. Hekabe replies in iambic-doichmiacs, the meter of lament. Here Talthybios is, on the level of meter, trying to control Hekabe’s tendency to lament. But next Talthybios remarks to Cassandra on her ill-omened references to Agamemnon and the Greeks (408-10, 417-9), saying he ‘throw[s] to the winds’ her ‘scolding’ words. Here he shows more understanding and self-restraint than anger or effort to control. When he comes back, the unwilling (709-11) bearer of the news that Astyanax must be killed, he thinks ahead, and advises Andromache in her distress not to compromise by curses her son’s chances for ‘burial and the dirge of honor’ (736). Euripides then indicates Talthybios’ sympathy for the lamenting women by giving him a speech in anapests at 782-9 which introduces Hekabe’s anticipated lament for Astyanax in the same meter (790-8). Euripides ends Talthybios’ role, after the child’s death, by having him voluntarily join in the funeral rites and direct the soldiers under his command to help. The internal audience in this play then—Greek, free, male, of military age—may begin by reflecting “mainstream Athenian ideology” on female lamentation, but in the course of the play, this audience is moved not only not to suppress the lamentation, but actually to join in the funeral rites. We must assume that his behaviour is acceptable, for Euripides does not offer an external incident to explain away his attitude, or criticize his behaviour in any way.

Euripides is “impinging on the public sphere” here in a way quite different from the earlier Antigone. In the Antigone, although by the end of the play half the chorus expresses some sympathy to Antigone,
they do not prevail, and they certainly did not help her to bury Polyneices. In the Trojan Women, Euripides has male authority treat mourning women in a way that goes back to the Seven against Thebes. In the Seven, lamenting women are set in opposition to male authority, which wishes to silence them, but half the chorus are sympathetic to Antigone’s point of view and they join her in performing Polyneices’ burial rites. In the Trojan Women, the representative of male authority ends by joining the women also. Perhaps this can be so, in the Trojan Women at least, because of the women’s utter powerlessness; sympathy for them carries no dangers. But this reading operates only on the level of the play’s immediate dramatic context, and ignores the audience outside the play and the message being sent to them through what I have called a proleptic lament for Athens and the sympathetic Greek male who hears it. Foley noted that the characters in the play are barbarians and so, she implies, they present no political context which can be construed as analogous to Athens. The analogous political context is not as obvious, perhaps, as in Euripides’ Suppliant Women, but it is there, in the reading that sees Melos, and especially the Sicilian expedition, in the background of the play.

What this use of lament in tragedy may mean in relation to funerary legislation or about attitudes towards female lament is ambiguous, but the date of the play—415—suggests that there were still a variety of attitudes at work in Athens in the late 5th century on the subject of female lamentation. What is not ambiguous, however, is that this public female activity continued to be common enough and powerful enough to make it a useful tool to the dramatist, even as it may have been at the same time a concern to others in Athenian public life. Lamentation is not only used in the Trojan Women to comment on female lament itself. Euripides also used lament in this play, I believe, in the same way women are said to have used it in real life: to comment on activities in the public sphere that affect them.
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LAMENT for TROY

**(kommos/ thrēnos)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kommos</th>
<th>Ode 1</th>
<th>Ode 2</th>
<th>Ode 3</th>
<th>Kommos 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>invocation,</td>
<td>narrative</td>
<td>(past</td>
<td>(past</td>
<td>invocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions,</td>
<td>(thrēnos)</td>
<td>prosperity:</td>
<td>misery:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ἐξάρχω’</td>
<td>(past</td>
<td>Zeus and</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(98-196)</td>
<td>life shared</td>
<td>Ganymede)</td>
<td>abandoned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122-52*)</td>
<td>by</td>
<td></td>
<td>by Zeus;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lamenters</td>
<td></td>
<td>vengeance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td>on Menelaos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lamented)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(511-67*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1060-117)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(799-858)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1287-332*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAMENTS for INDIVIDUALS

**(goi)**

|                   | Hekabe and | Hek. and Andr. | Hekabe for |
|                   | Cassandra  | for Polyxena;  | Asystanax  |
|                   | for        | Andr. for Asty.;|            |
|                   | Cassandra  | Hek. for Asty. |            |
|                   |            | (577-798)      |            |
|                   |            | (577-607*)     | (agón)     |
|                   |            | 740-99*        | (914-1032) |
|                   |            | (790-8*)       | (1167-225*)|

NOTE: The unmarked line numbers refer inclusively to scenes; line numbers marked * are identified by Wright as lament.