Reading a myth, reconstructing its constructions[1]

Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood

MYTHS ARE STORIES by which communities live and think; they are structured by, and express, a society's realities and values, its perceptions of the world, and its place in it, and articulate its ideologies, setting out paradigms of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour; they also explore problems and possibilities. Hence they are inevitably polysemic and multifunctional, and often also multivocal. The Greek world had a long extremely complex history of complex and changing realities (and so also ideologies) with radical changes, for centuries before and after the emergence and crystallization of the polis. This is one of the factors underlying the complexities of the Greek mythological discourses; another is the intensity and breadth of the cultural interactions in the world that generated them, long and shifting interactions between Greek communities, and also, most importantly, with a variety of non Greek others, especially in the East, over many centuries. These are circumstances that facilitate complexities of representations, partly through the generation of dissonances and consequent self reflection and potential multivocality.

These complexities make Greek myths especially vulnerable to reductionist, culturally determined, readings, in which the myth is structured in accordance with the hierarchies of modern perceptual casts and filters, so that, for example, one aspect of a complex myth is privileged, and its other important meanings and functions are marginalized. In this paper I will illustrate this process, by considering a myth which has been interpreted in such a reductionist way, as a political myth with a simple message, but which, I will argue, in ancient Greek eyes had expressed a variety of meanings, and explored problems that pertained to different aspects of Athenian life and ideology. In the process I will be considering the methodologies of reading Greek myths and suggesting that it is possible to reconstruct at least the basic parameters that shaped the processes through which the

ancient Athenians made sense of the myth, minimizing the intrusion of culturally determined assumptions and filters.

The myth I will be discussing is that of the rape of the Athenian women by the Pelasgians.[2] According to this myth Pelasgians had come to Athens, stayed for some time, and during their stay built the Pelargikon wall. Then the Athenians expelled them, for reasons that differ in the different variants. In Hekataios' version it was because the Athenians had coveted the previously worthless land which they had given to the Pelasgians as a reward for building the wall, and which the Pelasgians had improved by superior cultivation. In what Herodotos calls 'the Athenian version' it was because the Pelasgians had maltreated the Athenians' sons and daughters who went to fetch water—for in those days they had no servants— and then plotted to attack Athens. The expelled Pelasgians went to Lemnos (or Lemnos and Imbros); in revenge for their expulsion, they abducted many of the Athenian women who were celebrating a festival of Artemis at Brauron and made them their concubines (*pallakas*). These women had many children, and they brought up their sons in the Athenian speech and manners. Eventually, the solidarity and superiority of the sons of the Athenian women made their Pelasgian fathers perceive them as a threat to their legitimate sons, so the Pelasgians killed both their sons and their Athenian mothers. After that, their land, animals and women became barren.[3] The Pelasgians consulted the Delphic oracle and the Pythia told them to pay the Athenians whatever penalty the Athenians wanted. So they went to Athens and offered to pay the penalty, but the Athenians wanted their land, and ordered the Pelasgians to deliver it in the same condition as a couch and a table they had finely adorned at the prytaneion. The Pelasgians replied with an *adynaton*: they would deliver their land to the Athenians when a ship with a north wind accomplished the journey from the Athenians' country to Lemnos in one day—which seemed impossible; but when the Chersonese on the Hellespont was made subject to Athens, Miltiades did it.[4]

In an alternative variant the girls abducted by the Pelasgians were saved by Hymenaios, and as a result, the wedding song Hymenaios is sung in his honour by those who are married according to the law.[5] Finally, another version, implied,

2   On this myth see Hdt. 6.137.1-138.4; see also 4.145; Hekataios *FGrH* 1 F 127; Ephoros *FGrH* 70 F 119; Philoch. *FGrH* 328 FF 99-101; Schol. BT Hom. *Il.* 1.594; Plut. *Mor.* 247d-e, 296b; Scholia in Aelium Aristidem 13.111.1-2; see also Charax *FGrH* 103 F 18; Kleidemos *FGrH* 323 F 16; Strabo 5.2.4; 9.1.18; 9.2.3; Paus. 1.28.3; Chorikios Gazaeus 17.85-6. See also Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb.1, 405-21, Osborne 1985:161f., 168, De Simone 1996:52, 66-71. On the Pelargikon wall and its relationship with the Pelasgians see also De Simone 1996:68-70, 80f., Briquel 1984:284-89. On Eur. *Hyps.* and Ar. *Lemniai* see below.

3   Hdt 6.138.1-139.2.

4   Hdt. 6.139.2-140.1.

rather than articulated, in Plutarch,[6] involves two significant differences. First, the sons of the Athenian girls had survived, and their descendants had a further history, in which they went to Laconia. In the Herodotean version[7] of the story involving Lemnians going to Laconia these Lemnians had been the descendants of the Argonauts, driven out of Lemnos by the Pelasgians; the Spartans received them and gave them land, and also gave them their daughters in marriage.[8] In Plutarch's version those incomers were the children of the Tyrrhenians / Pelasgians of Lemnos and Imbros and the Athenian women whom they had abducted from Brauron, expelled from the two islands by the Athenians. Eventually, these Tyrrhenians / Pelasgians founded Lyktos in Crete and conquered other cities. The account concludes with the statement that these people consider themselves to be kinsmen of the Athenians on their mothers' side and colonists of the Spartans. The second significant difference is that in Plutarch's version the Pelasgians / Tyrrhenians had also stolen the *xoanon* of Artemis from Brauron; for this is what is implied by the story that the descendants of the Pelasgian / Tyrrhenian Lemnian men, who were *mixobarbaroi*, had been carrying around with them a *xoanon* of Artemis which had been taken to Lemnos from Brauron.[9]

There are, then, three versions of the rape of Athenian girls by the Pelasgians. First, the version that Herodotos calls Athenian, also found in the Atthidographers;[10] second, the failed attempted rape involving Hymenaios; and finally, the version in Plutarch, involving a different outcome, the survival of the sons of the Pelasgians and the Athenian women. Herodotos' 'Athenian version' and the Hymenaios myth involving the rescue are, we shall see, complementary. They both pertain to marriage. Plutarch's version is an alternative to a part of Herodotos'

---

5   See Schol. Hom. *Il.* 18.493 (Hymenaios saved some Athenian girls who had been abducted by Pelasgians). Phot. *Bibl.* 321a speaks simply of pirates and Athenian girls, with no further details. In Serv. *Aen.* 4.99 the pirates are not identified as Tyrrhenians / Pelasgians and the cult in which the girls had been taking part was that of Demeter at Eleusis. On the myth of Hymenaios saving the Athenian girls see Jolles 1914:128 with a full list of sources. See also Sissa 1990:106-9. The fact that much later sources, such as Servius, transfer the rape to the sanctuary and cult of Demeter at Eleusis, is correlative with the fact that to non Athenians with limited access to the conceptual universe of Archaic and Classical Athens, Eleusis, the world renowned cult, was a more obvious, and to their eyes even more appropriate, locus for such a significant event. The other versions of the myth of Hymenaios do not concern me here. On Hymenaios in general see Jolles 1914:126-30; see also Bellefonds 1990:583-85, Bellefonds 1991:197-212.

6   Plut. *De mul. vir.* 247a-e; *cf. Quaest. Graec.* 296b-c.

7   Hdt. 4. 145.

8   The story continues, but the rest does not concern us here.

9   Plut. *De mul.vir.* 247d-e.

10   Another variant of this version, attested in a late source, will be discussed below, for reasons that will become apparent.

Athenian version, and it involves the generation of *mixobabarbaroi*, the rejection of these *mixobabarbaroi* by the Athenians, a more open attitude by the Spartans, and the eventual Hellenization of the *mixobabarbaroi*. Two arguments suggest that the variant in which the Lemnians who went to Sparta were the children of the Pelasgians and the Athenian girls is a later transformation of the Herodotean version in which they were the children of the Argonauts. First, the myth is structured through an Athenian *versus* Spartan opposition, in which, to begin with, the allegedly more open and hospitable Athenians rejected people who had some kinship claim on them, while the Spartans accepted them, and it ends with a claimed affiliation to both: Athenian maternal descent and the identity of a Spartan colony. This suggests that this form of the myth had been articulated after this opposition had become significant, after, I would suggest, the Peloponnesian war. Second, this version places the Athenian conquest of Lemnos not very long after the abduction;[11] from the perspective of fifth century Athenians this would have put the abduction in the immediate past, which for them would have been absurd, since in their perceptions the Pelasgians had left a very long time ago. I therefore suggest that this version is late, and is unlikely to have been an Athenian myth, especially since it claims that Artemis' *xoanon* had been stolen from Brauron. Its emphasis is on events after the Pelasgians' departure from Lemnos, and it explores the category *mixobabarbaroi*.

Herodotos speaks of the abductees as many among the Athenians' women.[12] But Philochoros, who was an Athenian, a participant in the culture who had himself held religious office, specified first, that the abduction took place at the Brauronia, and second, that these 'women' were unmarried girls, *parthenoi*. The extant reports of his text give different accounts of the girls' identity: in one scholion[13] Philochoros is cited as saying that they abducted the girls who were bears (*parthenous arkteuomenas toi theoi*), in another[14] as saying that they abducted girls who were basket-bearers, *kanephorous parthenous*. He may well have said that they abducted both, at the very least he appears to have mentioned both. As we shall see, this is important, for both the *arkteia* and the office of *kanephoros* were associated with marriageability. This version in Philochoros was almost certainly the Athenian version, which was reflected in Herodotos in a less than precise form as regards the victims, perhaps because the rape of the women is

11 This would be the case even if we assume that both *paides* and *mixobarbaroi* are used metaphorically here, to mean 'descendants' and mixed 'Greek and barbarians'—rather than 'sons' and 'half Greek half barbarian.'

12 See also Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 296b, who speaks of the daughters and *gynaikas* of the Athenians; *cf.* Plut. *De mul. vir.* 247a (*gynaikas*).

13 Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 100.

14 Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 101.

arguably of almost incidental importance in his narrative, and certainly because Herodotos' viewpoint was that of an outsider, while for the Athenians the juxtaposition 'females,' 'Brauron' and 'religious context' had very distinct meanings that evoked, and helped articulate the aspect of the myth that pertained to, girls' transitions.

Harpokration and Photios[15] cite Euripides' *Hypsipyle*[16] and Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and *Lemniai* [17] for the fact that the *arkteuomenai parthenoi* were called *arktoi*. A reference to the *arkteia* in Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, which was concerned with a Lemnian woman who had saved her father when the other Lemnian women had murdered all their men,[18] suggests that this tragedy had referred to the rape of the Athenian girls by the Pelasgians of Lemnos, for it is in this myth that Lemnos, Brauron, *arkteia* and women converge. This rape had not yet happened at the time of the Euripidean tragedy's action, for in the mythological chronology, set out by Herodotos, the Pelasgians had expelled the descendants of the Argonauts from Lemnos.[19] Thus, this could not be a reference to a past event,[20] it is a reference to the future, a prophecy, perhaps some kind of foundation legend. It is possible that the *arkteia* had been mentioned in this tragedy as an institution founded to ensure that such things would never happen in Athens. Athens is where proper marriages are acted out, thanks to the acculturation of women with the help of the *arkteia*, Lemnos is the place where women are wild. Aristophanes' *Lemniai* also seems to have implicated the Thoas-Hypsipyle story, and it is perhaps likely to have referred, in some way, to one of the tragedies concerned with the Lemnian women.

The myth of the rape of the Athenian girls by the Pelasgians has been seen by modern scholars as, above all, a political myth, the creation of Athenian propaganda seeking to legitimate the Athenian conquest of Lemnos. Jacoby characteristically stated 'nobody has ever doubted' that the Brauron rape myth (which he thinks was invented in the last decade of the sixth century) 'is meant to justify the Athenian conquest of Lemnos and the expulsion of its inhabitants.'[21] He also argued that it had been Herodotos who had created (what Herodotos presents as) the 'Athenian version' of the myth, by putting together two previously separate

---

15   Harp. *s.v. arkteusai*; Phot. *s.v. arkteusai* (*Photii Patriarchae Lexicon* vol. 1, Berlin 1982 [ed. by C. Theodoridis] 2825).

16   Fr. 767 N2. Bond 1969:139.

17   Ar. *Lys.* 645; *Lemniai* fr. 370K.

18   See below for a brief discussion of this myth.

19   Hdt. 4.145; *cf.* also Paus. 7.2.2; see De Simone 1996:41-2, 52-53, *cf.* also Calame 1996:129f.

20   Bond (1969:139) thinks it was one of the tales of Lemnos told by Hypsipyle but the chronology makes this impossible.

21   Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb. 1, 409.

Athenian stories, the story that the Pelasgians had built the Pelargikon, and 'the Athenian justification for the conquest of Lemnos;' and that it had been Herodotos who first identified the Pelasgian builders of the wall with the predatory inhabitants of Lemnos, thus assigning to the Pelasgians a character foreign to them (in Herodotos and elsewhere).[22] The political reading of the myth was also accepted by its most recent commentator known to me, Rausch, who speaks of an invention of a new myth to legitimate the conquest of Lemnos.[23] In a comment indicative of the depth of his politicization of the myth's reading Jacoby stated that the localization at Brauron belongs to the invention, that any place of the Attic east coast would have done as well, but the Brauronia as a great women's festival offered itself conveniently, and the choice may also have been determined by the fact that the family of Miltiades, who achieved the vengeance, had its home at Brauron.[24] Osborne recognizes that the myth's localization at Brauron was significant, and suggests that the myth had meanings connected to the meanings of the foundation myths of the *arkteia*, pertaining to the wildness of the *parthenos* that will be tamed by marriage.[25] But he appears to accept, and certainly does not reject, the view that this myth had been created to justify the Athenian conquest of Lemnos, and he cites Jacoby's statement about nobody doubting that this was so.

This established view of the myth's construction sounds reasonable to modern ears; however, as I will try to show, when read (as much as possible) through Athenian eyes the myth has several other meanings, an important nexus of which is intimately connected with the Brauron cult, with which the myth is associated; and this, I will argue, suggests that the universal agreement of modern scholars is the result of a culturally determined perceptual cast which privileges the political dimension and marginalizes everything else. In my view, this myth was not constructed to justify the conquest of Lemnos; it was an earlier myth, which was eventually reshaped and redeployed in a new version that encompassed the conquest.

But how, if at all, can we decide who is right? The exploration of this question raises important methodological issues, of which the most obvious is how to avoid the danger of culturally determined judgements, and ensure that we do not produce a culturally determined construct which reflects modern concerns, in the

---

22 Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb.1, 410 (see also 411, 417-8); *cf.* also Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb.2. Notes 311 n. 24.

23 Rausch 1999:12-3, Rausch (1999:7-17) places the conquest of Lemnos by the Athenians with the help of Miltiades, then tyrant of the Chersonese, during the Ionian Revolt in 498 BC. Brulé (1987:291, 318 *cf.* 192) noted that Pelasgians were appropriate rapists, and also (1987:192, 291) that the fact that the rape took place at Brauron was significant, but he did not develop this further.

24 Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb.2:311 n. 22.

25 Osborne 1985:161f., 168.

same way that the privileging of the political had reflected the concerns of an earlier age. One clear strategy is that we must not begin by trying to answer the question; for such an operation will structure the discourse through culturally determined 'organizing centres,'[26] thus inevitably distorting the attempt to reconstruct the ancient realities. Instead, we need to try to read the myth as much as possible through ancient Athenian eyes, reconstruct as much as possible the ways in which they had made sense of it. Obviously, in order to do this we need to reconstruct the assumptions that had shaped their perceptual filters. Where, then, do we begin?

I suggest that we should begin by setting the basic parameters for the reconstructions of the ancient meanings by reconstructing an important category of assumptions through which Greek myths articulated meanings, the myth's schemata. Through sets of comparisons between myths, and between myths and social and religious realities and ideologies, it has become clear that myths are structured by schemata, such as 'erotic abduction,' which are themselves structured by, and express, the realities, beliefs and ideologies of the society which produced them.[27] For example, myths about the abduction of girls, which in the Greek collective representations functioned also as metaphors for marriage, are structured by the schema 'erotic abduction,' which reflects, is structured by, and thus also expresses as messages, among other things, certain perceptions pertaining to marriage, the wildness of the unmarried girl who needs to be tamed, and relations between the sexes in general. Myths are polysemic and operate at different levels. They are shaped by different aspects of the realities, ideologies and beliefs of the society that generated them—as well as by their context and the conventions of the genre in which each particular formulation is articulated. Thus, meanings are created in each myth, in interaction with the myth-reader's assumptions, through the interaction of the different schemata that structure it, for it is this interaction that helps shape the specific forms the schemata take in particular myths, and particular versions—and thus also the specific forms that those myths and versions take. Consequently, the identification of the mythological schemata that structure the myth, through comparisons with different myths, sets in place the main parameters for the reconstruction of a myth's meanings, and prevents significant mythological elements from being underprivileged through culturally determined filterings.

26 On this notion of organizing centres, and the ways in which, through them, culturally determined questions structure the discourse in culturally determined ways and corrupt the attempt to reconstruct (as much as possible) the ancient realities see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995:414.

27 I discussed such schemata (with special reference to myths of parent-children hostility) in Sourvinou-Inwood 1979:8-18, Sourvinou-Inwood 1989:136f., Sourvinou-Inwood 1991:252-55.

I will now set out the schemata which, in interaction with each other, structure the myth of the rape of the Athenian women by the Pelasgians. Both Herodotos' 'Athenian version' and the variant in Hekataios, which does not mention the rape, articulate a violent de-Pelasgianization of Attica. In this myth the Pelasgians are unambiguously non Athenian, indeed barbarian.[28] In most versions, but not in the Herodotean one, the Pelasgians were identified with the Tyrrhenians.[29] Thus, the first schema structuring this myth is the schema 'expulsion of the Pelasgians.' That the 'expulsion of the Pelasgians' is a mythological schema is shown by the fact that it also appears in several other myths, and the variant 'expulsion—revenge—tragic outcome' also structures the myth of the expulsion of the Pelasgians from Thessaly in the myth of Kyzikos[30]—though the specifics of the revenge are different. Kyzikos, in that myth, had been the king of the Pelasgians who had lived in Thessaly before they were expelled by the Aeolians. After the expulsion, Kyzikos founded Kyzikos, which prospered. When the Argonauts arrived at Kyzikos the Pelasgians, angry because of their expulsion, attacked them; Kyzikos was killed.

Both these myths articulate a localized expulsion of Pelasgians, who go and live in another place, and then take some sort of revenge for their expulsion. Both articulate the de-Pelasgianization of Greek areas that were somehow associated with the Pelasgians. The Pelasgians, who in these myths are non Greeks, go and live elsewhere, and then take revenge for their expulsion. The Athenian variant is different from other myths of Pelasgian expulsions in that here the Pelasgians who were expelled were newcomers, correlatively with the Athenians' claim to autochthony.[31] For the fact that in their representations the Athenians were autochthonous, entails that a Pelasgian presence in Attica could be explained in one of two ways— given the explanatory modalities and schemata available in Greek mythology: they had come to Athens from the outside, were received by the Athenians, and had stayed on—or alternatively left again; or, alternatively, the Athenians had themselves been Pelasgians. Both explanations had been articulated, the first in our myth the second in Herodotos.[32]

---

28 I discuss Greek perceptions of the Pelasgians' ethnicity Sourvinou-Inwood 2003.

29 Philochoros (*FGrH* 328 F 100), for example, refers to the abductors as Tyrrhenians, as well as Pelasgians, while Herodotos only calls them Pelasgians. Philochoros also identified the Pelasgians with the Sinties (*FGrH* 328 F 101); on the Sinties see De Simone 1996:43f., 73f., and see also below.

30 See Konon *FGrH* 26 F 1 (41); Ephoros *FGrH* 70 F 61. In other versions the inhabitants of Kyzikos are not Pelasgians: according to the version in Apollonios Rhodios (*Argon.* 1.947-1077. *Cf.* also Apollod. 1.9.18) Kyzikos was the king of the Thracian Doliones.

31 On Athenian autochthony see Loraux 1981, Parker 1996:138f., Thomas 2000:117-22. The fact that in Hom. *Il.* 2.547f. Erechtheus is born of the Earth suggests that the autochthony myth was early, and that what happened in the Classical period is particular ideological constructs out, and deployments, of this autochthony (see Parker 1987:193ff.).

The fact that the schema 'expulsion of the Pelasgians' structures also other myths, and the variant 'expulsion of the Pelasgians—vengeance of the Pelasgians—tragic outcome' also structures the Kyzikos myth, suggests that Herodotos' Athenian version was structured by a schema that expressed perceptions pertaining to the Pelasgians that were significant in the Greek collective representations; and this sits uncomfortably with Jacoby's theory that the 'Athenian version' had been created by Herodotos, who in the process gave the Pelasgians a character foreign to them in Herodotos and elsewhere.[33] The notion that the character of vengeful rapists is alien to the Pelasgians is evidently based on the fact that the Pelasgians have 'culture-hero-like people' traits, in the Herodotean rape myth superior building skills, and in Hekataios also superior agricultural skills. The culture-hero people aspect characterizes the Pelasgians also in other myths,[34] and it is correlative with Pelasgos' persona as a culture hero.[35] But in the mythological mentality this does not entail that bad behaviour is alien to such people. On the contrary, the ambivalent traits of the Pelasgians in Herodotos' Athenian version of the rape myth also characterized the Pelasgians in other myths.[36] The Pelasgians are represented as ambivalent also in the Kyzikos myth, for on the one hand they had prospered, and they also had a good king, and on the other they were negatively coloured because they attacked the Argonauts.[37] A myth in Plutarch[38] (another segment of which was referred to above) associates the Pelasgians' arrival with both war and positive innovations: when the descendants of the Tyrrhenians who had raped the Athenian girls went to Laconia they married Laconian women, but then had to leave and they went to Crete; there they fought the locals, and their

32 On Herodotos' treatment of the Athenian claim to autochthony see now Thomas (2000:117-22), who comments, on the notion of the Athenians being Pelasgians, that (*op. cit.* 120) Herodotos seems to be taking the autochthony myth literally and rationalizing it into current ethnic definitions; if they had always lived in Attica they were Pelasgians earlier (120f.). See also above n. 28.

33 Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb.1, 410 (see also 411); *cf.* also Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb.2. Notes 311 n. 24.

34 For example, according to Hdt. 2.49-50 they had taught the Greeks religious knowledge. In one myth (see Ephoros *FGrH* 70 F 119, F 142; Hes. fr. 319M-W; *cf.* Strabo, 9.2.4) the Dodona oracle was a Pelasgian foundation. See also the *Pelasgika grammata* in Dionysios Skytobrachion *FGrH* 32 F 8 (Diod.Sic. 3.67.1).

35 *Cf. e.g.* Paus. 8.1.4-6; Schol. Eur. *Or.* 932, 1646.

36 Only very few myths allow us to assess the nature of the Pelasgians, since, mostly, we do not have detailed versions of myths involving Pelasgians, especially of myths, such as those of their expulsions, in which the Pelasgians are non Greek others who left.

37 See Konon *FGrH* 26 F 1 (41).

38 Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 296b; see also *De mul. vir.* 247a-e, where the Pelasgians who went to Crete had three leaders, said to be Lacedaemonians.

leader Pollis[39] set in place certain institutions concerning religious personnel and those who buried the dead.

The Pelasgians were characterized by ambivalent traits because they were conceptually associated with primeval times, and the Greeks associated primeval times with ambivalence, often characterized the pre- (main) heroic-age past as (to a greater or lesser extent) ambivalent.[40] The ambivalence of primeval people is another schema that structures this myth. The Pelasgians are also associated with serious sexual misbehaviour (in combination with revenge) in the myth of the eponymous heroine of Phryconian Larisa. Strabo says that the inhabitants of that city honoured Piasos who, according to the ancient accounts, had been a king of the Pelasgians; he had raped his daughter Larisa, and she killed him.[41]

Herodotos' Athenian version, then, which represents the Pelasgians as ambivalent, is in harmony with, and so reflects, the Greek collective representations of the Pelasgians. Hekataios' version,[42] which represents the Pelasgians as unambivalently positive, was a rationalizing version by a rationalizing author, in which their 'culture-hero-like people' aspect was further developed, and correlatively, following a rationalizing logic that has difficulties with the ambiguities and ambivalences of mythopoea, their negative behaviour was eliminated. This interpretation gains support from the fact that both the 'bad,' and the 'culture-hero-like people' aspect of the Pelasgians were further developed in other versions of the myth of the rape, for this shows that this ambivalence was indeed a significant aspect of the representations of the Pelasgians: Philochoros says that the Pelasgians were called Sinties because they raped the Athenian girls, for *sinesthai* means to harm;[43] according to Eratosthenes, the Sinties / Pelasgians were *goetes* who invented *deleteria pharmaka*;[44] Hellanikos says that the Lemnians were called Sinties because they first invented weapons for war,[45] and Porphyrios that they were called Sinties because they first invented weapons for war, which harm people.[46]

In these circumstances, it is clear that the myth under discussion does not consist of two parts put together by Herodotos, one involving good Pelasgian wall builders and another a myth of justification of the conquest of Lemnos. The

39   This is a Spartan name; the other leader was called Delphos.

40   On the ambivalence of the remote past associated with the age of Kronos see Sourvinou-Inwood 1997a:1f. with bibl.

41   Strabo 13.3.4; see Larson 1995:137.

42   For Jacoby (*FGrH* IIIb.1, 408) Hekataios *FGrH* 1 F 127 told an Athenian story.

43   Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 101.

44   Eratosthenes *FGrH* 241 F 41.

45   See Hellanikos *FGrH* 4 F 71.

46   Schol. BT Hom. *Il* 1.594.

ambivalent representations of the Pelasgians articulated in the Herodotean myth as a whole reflects the ambivalent representations of the Pelasgians elsewhere in Greek mythology as does the 'Pelasgians' expulsion' schema; therefore, the Herodotean myth of the expulsion and rape is a complex Athenian myth in harmony with other local myths about Pelasgians. Furthermore, as we shall see when we have considered the other schemata, this myth expresses important perceptions concerning, among other things, marriage and male—female relations, which are intimately connected with the Brauronian cult of Artemis, whose sanctuary was the locus of the rape; thus, far from being a simple piece of political propaganda focussed on justifying the conquest of Lemnos, this was a rich, complex and polysemic myth intimately connected with the cult with which it was associated.

The myth of the Pelasgian rape involves a hostile rape by enemies of the abducted girls' community. This rape was an act of aggression and revenge, which followed the Pelasgians' earlier plot to attack Athens; the two are correlative, both were attacks on the Athenian polis, which suffered harm as a result. Though only a section of the female population suffered directly in the rape, the whole community was humiliated and harmed. This myth, then, is also structured through the schema 'the enemy hurts the community by attacking its weakest members, women, at a moment when they are exposed as a group, in certain types of religious festivals,' which expresses meanings significant to Greek communities, since versions of it also structured several other myths. An Athenian myth that presents itself as history, the story that Solon had lured the Megarians to a trap, by dressing up youths in the clothes of the women who had been celebrating the preliminary part of the Thesmophoria on the shore at Kolias, depends on the assumption that the Megarians could not have resisted the opportunity to capture the Athenian women at a festival.[47] Several versions of this schema structure some of the myths that tell stories about the enmity and war between Spartans and Messenians, which present themselves as history. A mild version of the schema structures the story according to which, during the Messenian war, Aristomenes had captured the noblest and wealthiest among the Spartan *parthenoi* who were performing dances in honour of Artemis at Karyai; having prevented some of his men from violating them (which they were trying to do, contrary to Greek custom), he released them for a large ransom, still *parthenoi*.[48] In another story, Aristomenes and the other Messenians unsuccessfully tried to capture the Spartan women who were celebrating a festival of Demeter at Aigila in Laconia.[49] The story about an

47 Plut. *Sol.* 8.4; Brumfield 1981:82.
48 Paus. 4.16.9-10; Calame (1977:267-74), who also discusses a different variant.
49 Paus. 4.17.1.

incident that had taken place before the beginning of the war is structured by a more negative version of the schema.[50] According to the Spartan story, Messenian men had violated the Spartan virgins who had gone to the festival of Artemis Limnatis, and killed the Spartan king who had tried to prevent it; the violated virgins had committed suicide. This was not quite an enemy coming from the outside, for Messenians as well as Spartans had shared in the sanctuary where the outrage had taken place, and therefore the violators were both insiders and outsiders. Here the killing of the king is correlative with the rape of the virgins; both acts harm and humiliate the community. In the Messenian version of this story there was, as in the Athenian Solon story, an element of transvestism, of young men dressed up as girls, as part of a ruse. This, and other elements, relate these myths to the ritual sphere of adolescent initiations.[51] For in these myths the schema 'the enemy hurts the community by attacking its weakest members, women, at a moment when they are exposed as a group, in certain types of religious festivals' takes a form that involves festivals implicating initiatory rituals, interacts with schemata pertaining to girls' transitions, as, we shall see, is also the case in the Athenian myth.

In the Spartan myths the rapes are either averted (or partly averted, as when Aristomenes protected the girls from his own men), or they end in disaster, as in the Artemis Limnatis story. The version of the rape at Brauron in which the rape was not averted also ends in disaster. These hostile abductions and rapes are thus wholly negatively coloured. The schema that structures them articulates the notion of the vulnerability of women in public spaces in the course of religious festivals, especially, as in our myth, in the *eschatiai* areas that are appropriate for rites of transition,[52] but which are also more vulnerable to enemy attacks. Through this representation, a more general notion is inevitably also articulated (for it is contained in that representation), that communities (and social units, like the *oikos*) are vulnerable through their women; and that, therefore, there is a tension between on the one hand the fact that it is necessary for the community and the *oikos* that women should not be confined, indeed should be exposed in public spaces for religious purposes, and on the other the fact that this exposes them to potential danger. The myth of the Pelasgian rape articulates the fear that they may be harmed: the women in this myth are subjected to rape and hostile abduction. At some level of perception this rape would also have functioned as a metaphor for

50   Antiochos *FGrH* 555 F 9; Strabo 6.1.6; 8.4.9; Paus. 4.4.1; see Calame 1977:254-62.

51   See Calame 1977:261, who argues that the Spartan and the Messenian versions of the cause of the Messenian war represent the historicization of the foundation myths of the cult of Artemis Limnatis; see also Calame 1977:260ff. On rituals and the Messenian wars see also Robertson 1992:219-31.

52   See *e.g.* Brulé 1987:192f.

all potential harm that could come to women exposed in public spaces, which involved, in male Athenian perceptions, a spectrum of dangers, at one end of which was the hostile rape by enemies acted out in the myth, and at the other seduction, a danger that figured most prominently in male Athenian representations; thus, in this myth, the former would also have functioned as a metaphor for the latter; this metaphorical relationship would not have been necessarily explicitly perceived, but it would have helped reinforce the representation of potential danger, and, conversely, would have helped express the relevant male anxieties in a context that legitimated them. One particular version of the tension between the desirability of exposing women in public spaces and the anxiety that this makes them, and the community, vulnerable, is articulated in the version in Philochoros, according to which the Pelasgians had abducted *arktoi*, which was almost certainly the common Athenian version: the tension between on the one hand the desirability of acculturating the young *parthenoi* by sending them to live in the *eschatiai* at Brauron for a certain period of time, as an important part of their preparation for marriage, and on the other the manifold (perceived) dangers involved in the fact that the heads of the girls' *oikoi* in effect temporarily relinquished authority over them, and sent them to be bears at Brauron, where, in theory, anything could happen.

The Pelasgian rape myth, which, we saw, was (like the Spartan stories) wholly negatively coloured, was structured through negative versions of two established mythological schemata pertaining to the erotic sphere; first a negative transformation of the schema 'erotic encounter at the fountain,'[53] and then a vengeful abduction, structured through a negative, perverted, version of the schema 'girl abducted from a sanctuary of, or a chorus of girls dedicated to, Artemis.'[54] Some erotic abductions in Greek mythology are metaphors for marriage.[55] But this mass abduction, motivated by hatred and the desire to punish the girls' community, involving the hostile Pelasgians, who had been rejected as *synoikoi*, and leading not to marriage but to a wretched concubinage, is a negative reversal of such myths and metaphors. This negative transformation of schemata structuring myths pertaining to marriage is, in this myth, located at the sanctuary of the most important of the Athenian cults concerned with girls' transitions to marriageability and marriage, the cult of Artemis at Brauron.[56] It is thus comparable to the Spartan myths that are connected with cults involving initiations, that had been histori-

---

53   On which see Buxton 1994:112.

54   See Calame 1977:176f., 189f., Sourvinou-Inwood 1991:75 (where I include the rape at Brauron and note that the myth's meanings were closely connected with the cult's concerns), 102-06.

55   See Sourvinou-Inwood 1991:65-87.

56   See Sourvinou-Inwood 1988:*passim*, esp. 67, 111-17, Sourvinou-Inwood 1990:45-60.

cized and transformed into negative versions involving hostile actions. Myths structured by a version of the schema 'abduction as a metaphor for marriage' located in *eschatiai* areas (which are associated with initiatory rituals and the myths that refract them) lent themselves (because those areas were also often frontier areas that were especially vulnerable to outside enemies) to the transformation, with the help of the real life model 'rape of women by enemies,' into the schema 'the enemy hurts the community by attacking its weakest members, women, at a moment when they are exposed as a group, in certain types of religious festivals;' and myths structured by this mythological schema were *par excellence* prone to being historicized; for the slot 'enemy' attracted various historical enemies in different places and times in the context of the modality of Greek history-telling that involved the structuring of historical material, reflecting historical events, through mythological schemata.[57]

In the Athenian version of the Pelasgian rape myth, as it is reflected in Philochoros, the abducted girls were directly connected with rites of marriageability. As we saw, Philochoros is cited in one scholion as saying that the Pelasgians had abducted *arktoi*, and in another as saying that they abducted *kanephoroi*;[58] he may have said that they abducted both, and at the very least he had mentioned both. I suggested elsewhere that the few older girls shown in one of the images refracting the *arkteia*, on the red figured krateriskos I, together with several *arktoi*, and apparently involved in a supervisory capacity in the rite, were represented through the iconographical type that corresponds to the *kanephoros* age.[59] This would coincide with the combination of *kanephoroi* and *arktoi* in this reconstruction of Philochoros' account. Both the *arkteia* and the ritual office of the *kanephoros* were closely related to marriage: the *arkteia*, a rite of transition out of childhood, prepared for marriageability,[60] while the office of *kanephoros* was closely associated with marriageability,[61] which is why sometimes the girl who is abducted in abductions that lead to marriage was a *kanephoros*.[62] The Pelasgian abduction, we saw, is a negative reversal of abductions that were metaphors for marriage; if it had included the abduction of *arktoi*, who were not yet marriageable, as well as (or instead of) *kanephoroi* and girls of an appropriate age to be *kanephoroi*, this would

---

57   See Sourvinou-Inwood 1991:265ff. See also 244-65.

58   Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 100; F 101.

59   Sourvinou-Inwood 1988:65, 103-04 n. 307 (and *cf.* pl. i). On the identification of the icono-
     graphical type that corresponds to the *kanephoros'* age see *op. cit.* 54ff.

60   See Sourvinou-Inwood 1988:*passim*, esp. 67, 111-17, Sourvinou-Inwood 1990:45-60.

61   See Sourvinou-Inwood 1988:54-57, 94-97 nn. 253-66, Sourvinou-Inwood 1991:111, 130 nn.
     59f., 134 n.105 with bibl.

62   See *e.g.* Akousilaos *FGrH* 2 F 30.

have been another negative alteration of the paradigmatic model of abduction as a metaphor for marriage.

I hope to have shown elsewhere that images of erotic abductions and pursuits that lead to marriage, and which are metaphors for marriage, included a few, lightly sketched, elements indicating the girl's 'consent' that deconstructed the dominant discourse which presented the act as being imposed by force by the male; and also that this subordinate 'consent' facet is correlative with, and is determined by, the nuptial dimension of the myths, the fact that they were metaphors for marriage; and that it expressed perceptions pertaining to the Athenian representations of marriage, which involved both men gaining control of women and women giving themselves to men—with apparent reluctance, since they were ideally chaste (virginal) brides who would become chaste (virtuous) wives.[63] This notion of female consent was also a metonymic sign for a wider set of correlative and associated perceptions pertaining to the facet of marriage ideology that involved reciprocity, rather than coercive imposition, such as the expectation, in Athenian ideality, that marriage involved love between husband and wife.[64] The myth of the Pelasgian rape did not lead to marriage, and it involved the enemies of the girls' community raping them as an act of revenge; therefore it would have been perceived to have excluded any element of female consent. For the parameters that shaped its perception by those who shared in the assumptions that had shaped it would have excluded the representation 'violence deconstructed by consent as a correlative to certain perceptions of marriage' and perceived the myth as expressing the opposite, brutal coercion—not deconstructed by any hint of consent.

That the myth of the rape by the Pelasgians at Brauron is a negative reversal of myths in which erotic abductions lead to marriage, which are metaphors for marriage, is confirmed through an independent argument. Like the different Spartan stories, the Herodotean version of the myth of the rape at Brauron and the version involving a rescue by Hymenaios offer alternative outcomes: in the first disaster, in the version involving Hymenaios the girls are rescued and all is well. Inevitably, as was the case with the Spartan stories, each of the two versions helped shape the meanings of the other. Both express meanings that are directly related to

63   Sourvinou-Inwood 1991:67, 68ff., cf. 85. See also Redfield 1982:191. Cf. also, on consent, Lefkowitz 1993:17-37.

64   For example, the epitaphs, which reflect ideality, sometimes speak of a reciprocal emotional attachment between man and wife (see e.g. Carmina Epigraphica Graeca 2.530), as do other texts (see for example, Xen. Symp. 8.3. See also Xen. Symp. 9.2-7, where, when the men became sexually aroused, it was to their wives that they went for sex, and those who did not have wives decided to get married. Here sex equals marital sex as a matter of course. And this was at a symposion which included an erotic performance; in fact, the erotic relationship portrayed in this sexually arousing performance was between the god Dionysos and his wife Ariadne).

the Brauronian cult. The fact that it is Hymenaios that saved the girls, and that, as a result of the rescue, the wedding song Hymenaios is sung in his honour, articulates the notion that the cancellation of the Pelasgian rape was perceived as symbolically equivalent to 'wedding.' The Hymenaios variant spells out that a successful abduction by the Pelasgians is the negative opposite of wedding and marriage.[65]

This myth helped define a *parthenos*' proper transition to womanhood by articulating a transgressive transition, for the norm is also defined through its transgression. The transition in this myth is negative and transgressive in several ways: (leaving aside the fact that it ultimately ended in murder, which colours negatively the whole process) it led to the status of *pallake* (which made the Athenian women inferior in status to that of the men's non Greek legitimate wives) and mother of illegitimate sons; it took place by vengeful force in the hands of hostile outsiders; and it excluded any element of female consent. Female consent was symbolically important in marriage, and this notion was articulated, to a greater or lesser extent, even at the most 'coercive' end of the spectrum of nuptial representations, where marriage was represented through the metaphor of erotic pursuit and abduction. I argued that the myth of the Pelasgian rape excludes the possibility of female consent, and articulates the opposite, brutal coercion, not deconstructed by any hint of consent. If this is right, this negative paradigm would have helped reinforce the definition of proper marriage as including an element of female consent, perceived also as a metonymic sign for a wider set of correlative and associated perceptions pertaining to marriage.

The concubinage to which these perverted transitions had led was negatively coloured; it was represented as a perverted variant of Athenian marriage, since it was the result of transgressive rape and led to multiple murders and the tearing apart of the family-type units of pseudo-wife / mother—pseudo-husband / father—sons.

The Athenian girls' concubinage at Lemnos is a negatively polarized version of concubinage; first, because it was motivated by hostility; second, because they lived in a foreign, non Greek, country; and finally, because though Athenian women could be concubines, the paradigm of concubinage involved non Athenian women as concubines of Athenian men.[66] In this myth there is a transgressive reversal of this paradigm: Athenian women become the concubines of non

---

65   The specification in Schol. Hom. *Il.* 18.493 that because Hymenaios had saved the Athenian girls from the Pelasgians those girls who were being married according to the law sang a hymn called *hymenaios* in his honour, as though invoking him, shows that in the ancient perceptions Hymenaios' rescue of the girls was perceived to be correlative with legitimate marriage—which is therefore opposed to the concubinage that was the fate of the girls who had not been rescued by Hymenaios.

Athenian, barbarian, and negatively coloured, men, who, motivated by malice, as a punishment for all Athenians, had taken them by force, and removed them to an uncivilized non Greek place. Polarization is a common mythopoeic modality; through this negatively polarized version of concubinage this myth articulates a negative representation of the institution of concubinage in general: it explores, and sets out the potentially destabilizing effect of concubinage, here represented as a perverted variant of marriage, on the central institution of marriage.[67]

One of the representations articulated in this myth is that concubines may be more fertile than wives, and, above all, that the sons of concubines may be better than, and represent a danger to, their legitimate brothers, and that they in turn are vulnerable. Thus, in this polarized version located elsewhere, but made symbolically more openly permeable through the girls' Athenian identity, the potential of concubinage to destabilize legitimate marriage is articulated at a distance, as is the possibility that the sons of concubines may be superior to the legitimate sons, which in Greek eyes was a potentially dangerous representation. This is the viewpoint of the polis; but the fact that the concubines are here Athenian and the men barbarians had the inevitable result that the myth's Athenian readers were zoomed more closely towards, implicitly adopted also the focalization, the viewpoint, of, the concubines. Myths are multivocal as well as polysemic, and I suggest that this exploration of concubinage had also constructed, next to the dominant discourse, that was polis—and male—oriented also aspects of the female perspective.

The reason why illegitimate sons were vulnerable is because of a representation, implicitly articulated in this myth, which is at odds with the dominant ideol-

---

66 And, of course, after Perikles' citizenship law of 451, Athenian men could not marry foreign women, they could only have them as concubines.

67 According to Osborne (1985:168) in this myth, the Lemnian men come from outside, find women in a public space, outside the domestic context, and take them away to become concubines, to remain outside the domestic context, untamed by marriage, wives and not wives and thus particularly dangerous. 'Their existence outside accepted categories puts the Lemnians—husbands and not husbands—and the children—Lemnians and not-Lemnians—in an equally problematic position. The killing ... is a result and a reflection of the breakdown of the distinctions which constitute civilized life.' In my view, it is not quite right that concubines were perceived as being outside the domestic context, nor is it quite right that their concubinage involved the breakdown of the distinctions which constitute civilized life. For concubinage was an Athenian institution, and thus category, and this is a polarized version of that category, which is at the same time an exploration of that institution, and its effect on marriage. What is the case is that in this myth concubinage is represented as a perverted variant of marriage; that (through the myth of Hymenaios—but also through the rape myth's connection with the Brauronian cult, which was inextricably connected with girls' marriageability) it is juxtaposed to lawful marriage, which is what normative Athenian ideology perceives as the normal fate of Athenian girls, and it is represented (this concubinage, and, by extension, concubinage in general) as a perverted variant of marriage, involving a breakdown of the norms; instead of being proper wives, as Athenian girls are normatively destined to be, they are wives and not wives.

ogy of our times, and so is in danger of being marginalized in modern readings. Our ideologies privilege blood over legitimacy, and biological over legal relationships, but in this myth it is an implicit assumption, which the myth implicitly rearticulates, that what mattered to the dominant males was their legitimate sons; they were the ones that had to be protected. This would not have registered as alien with the Athenians, it would not have been perceived as part of the Pelasgians' otherness and negativity, for it is correlative with the fact that in Athens illegitimate sons did not have rights of inheritance, and could not continue a man's *oikos*—with the significant consequences that this entailed in Athens. I suggest that this was a point at which the Athenian males would have felt the Pelasgians as not unlike themselves; the myth would have zoomed the Pelasgians towards the Athenians' own reality—while at the same time the Pelasgians' viewpoint would have been distanced by the fact that the illegitimate sons' mothers were Athenian. It was not the way the Pelasgians saw the problem, but the solution they adopted to resolve it that was wrong

The sets of meanings reconstructed here, which pertain to girls' transitions, marriage, and the rearing of children, which, we saw, account for, and are thus confirmed by, the Hymenaios variant, are significant in the religious context in which the myth belongs, which helps confirm that these readings are not culturally determined constructs, and shows that this myth was an integral part of the mythology of the Brauronian cult, which was centrally concerned with transitions, marriage and women.

This myth illustrates the fact that the myths that help make up the complex (and, within certain parameters, multivocal) web of the Athenian polis discourse were not necessarily the voices of men's desires, even in sexual matters. What actual Athenian women had felt and wanted is inaccessible to us; since affect is culturally determined,[68] it is not methodologically legitimate to assume that certain feelings and desires are 'natural,' and therefore universal, and impose them on ancient societies. But the commonsense perception that Athenian wives did not enthusiastically embrace their husbands' choice to have concubines is confirmed by tragic representations such as that of the sympathetically constructed Deianeira's sorrow in Sophocles' *Trachiniai*.[69] If this is right, the women's viewpoint coincided with the interests of the polis, for, the myth of the Pelasgian rape suggests, concubinage threatened the stability of the *oikos*, which the polis privileged very highly. Concubinage, to the polis, was a marginal institution.[70] This myth articulates (among

---

68 Though the parameters of variability and the details of the modalities in which this cultural determination operates are a matter of controversy—which does not concern me here. For an example of a minimalist position (*i.e.* one accepting minimal cultural determination) see Golden (1988: 152-63) who, however, does not deny the culturally determined nature of emotional feelings (*op. cit.* 159).

many other representations) the notion that the individual males' desire for maximum sexual gratification should ideally be restrained, for it privileges the competing representation that such practices threaten the stability of the *oikos*, but also bring disaster to the individual men involved.

The well known passage from the pseudo-Demosthenic speech[71] that claims that men had wives for the purpose of producing legitimate children and to have them as faithful guardians of their households, *hetairai* for pleasure, and concubines for the daily care of their bodies is, of course, an ideological construct shaped by a forensic context conducive to the stressing of distinctions and of the procreative role of wives.[72] But how would this construct have been coloured in the eyes of the Athenian audience? Pelling suggests[73] 'Apollodoros can present this categorisation which his audience may aspire to rather than ridicule, and that well behaved males might be expected not to avoid *hetairai* and concubines, but to keep them distinct from their wives.' I would put it somewhat differently: that this is one possible discourse of Athenian male desires, one possible presentation of what well behaved males might be expected to want. The men in Xenophon's *Symposion*[74] (who were not hampered by financial considerations if they had been inclined to promiscuity) are presented as equating sex with marital sex, for when they became sexually aroused they went to their wives to have sex, and those who were unmarried decided to get married. Most importantly, our myth suggests that men would be foolish to do what Apollodoros claims as the norm, and that one reason for this is that the procreation of illegitimate children through concubines (which here would have encompassed the category of *hetairai*, any woman with whom men have sex, and who therefore could produce their illegitimate children) may desta-

69 I cannot discuss here the complexities of reconstructing attitudes on the basis of tragic contructs. I have set out illustrations of the very complex relationships between tragic female characters and real life elsewhere (Sourvinou-Inwood 1989:134-48, Sourvinou-Inwood 1997b:253-96), but here I am claiming a minimum correlation between the two, that a sympathetically constructed Deianeira was representable.

70 An illustration of the marginality of concubinage for the polis is the fact that the Archaic homicide law (Dem. 23.53) which specifies the women in respect of whom a man may kill an adulterer mentions not a free born *pallake*, but a *pallake* from whom the man intends to have freeborn children; the *pallake*'s freeborn status was a necessary, but not sufficient condition for having freeborn children; it is the children that mattered to the polis, and normally, and certainly in the normative ideology, men had freeborn children from their wives. *Cf.* [Dem.] 59.122 and the most recent discussion in Pelling (2000:189-94). It is, in my view, highly dubious that those freeborn children from *pallakai* could be citizens (on this debate see a brief discussion with bibliography in Pelling 2000:191, 295 n.9).

71 [Dem.] 59 (*Against Neaira*) 122.

72 See on this most recently Pelling 2000:191-94.

73 Pelling 2000:194.

74 Xen. *Symp.* 9.2-7.

bilize and threaten their *oikos* and lead to disaster. It is not impossible that the (at least partial) convergence between the (basic lines of what may be roughly reconstructed as the) female viewpoint, and the representations articulated in the myth, which was part of the web of the polis discourse, may be correlative with the context of the myth's construction; that the particular slanting in the representation of concubinage, though obviously consistent with the polis' major concern with the stability of the *oikoi*, may have been correlative with the fact that this myth was the product of Brauronian mythopoea, which constructed mythology that was part of the polis discourse, expressing the ideologies of the polis, but which was focussed on women, in ways that may not have entirely excluded a partial focalization through women, and may even have had an input from some of the influential women, above all the priestess, in the Brauronian sanctuary.

This, then, was a myth about the expulsion of the Pelasgians and at the same time an exploration of marriage and of its alternatives. The negatively polarized version of concubinage articulated in this myth, and the transgressive abduction, are symbolically connected with an earlier stage in society, through the involvement as transgressive agents of the Pelasgians, who were conceptually primeval, and, correlatively, also ambivalent. These characteristics made them especially suitable counters for deployment in the exploration of 'other' possibilities, of alternatives and negative paradigms, that helped define and characterize the present norms. For the fact that the Pelasgians were conceptually associated with the primeval past made them appropriate agents for articulating alternatives; and the fact that they were ambivalent made them especially appropriate for constructing negative paradigms: while their negative side (or at least negative potential) made them appropriate for exploring and articulating negative paradigms, their positive side allowed the negative exploration to be less distanced from the Athenians' own realities. The same effect of placing this exploration both symbolically near and at a distance is produced by the fact that the Pelasgians were both *synoikoi* of the Athenians and very different from them. Clearly, in the Athenian representations, the Pelasgians functioned as an ambivalent other, that had once been near and are now afar. It is an inventive, but uncivilized other, especially in terms of social intercourse and relations between the sexes. These representations of the Pelasgians, I suggest, articulated the perception of an uncivilized past at a symbolic distance. It was the past here, but it is now located elsewhere, and even when it was located here it was other. In this way the institution of concubinage is explored at a distance, in a polarized form, in which the negative aspects refract fears and realities or potential realities of Athenian life in the present. Clearly, raping the Athenian women in revenge for their expulsion, suited the character of the Pelasgians in the Greek representations, as it suited the cult of Artemis at Brauron that such a rape myth should be connected with its sanctuary.

It was, in my view, inevitable that the Pelasgians as *synoikoi* would also have been seen as mythological representations of metics, distorted and negative representations, in which alienness and distance are emphasized.

In most versions of our myth, though not in Herodotos,' the Pelasgians were identified with the Tyrrhenians.[75] Such versions are structured also by a version of the schema 'transgressive behaviour by Tyrrhenians towards deities and/or their cult.' In the other myths structured by this schema the outcome is different, the Tyrrhenians' transgressive behaviour had been aimed directly at the deity or cult and failed. The Tyrrhenian pirates who abducted Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysos*[76] failed and were punished. More directly comparable is the myth associated with the festival Tonaia in Samos, in which the Tyrrhenians, acting as agents of the Argives, had unsuccessfully tried to steal the statue of Hera.[77] The comparability between this myth and that of the rape is closer in the version in which the Pelasgians / Tyrrhenians had stolen the *xoanon* of Artemis from Brauron.[78] To put it differently, the fact that a variant of the Pelasgian rape myth had been generated, in which the Pelasgians / Tyrrhenians had stolen the *xoanon* of Artemis, suggests that this myth was perceived to have been somehow related to myths of the Tonaia type in which Tyrrhenians steal, or try to steal, a Greek deity's statue.[79] This schema would have increased further the Pelasgians' negative colouring.

Herodotos ends his account of the murder by the Pelasgians of their sons and their Athenian mothers with the comment that because of this crime, and of the

75   See, for example, Philoch. *FGrH* 328 FF 99-101. The identification of the Pelasgians with the Tyrrhenians is a complex question. According to Briquel (Briquel 1984: esp. 18, 20, 22 n. 100, 52f., 58, 110f., 132-40, 141, 221) the identification is at least as early as the late sixth century, the notion of the Pelasgian origin of the Etruscans was already in Hekataios and Herodotos had chosen to reject it (on Herodotos' rejection of the Pelasgian origin of the Etruscans see Briquel 1984:128, 132f., 134, 136.). On the identification of the Pelasgians with the Tyrrhenians see also De Simone 1996:51-65, 77f., *cf*. 79-83; 88f. (and *passim*).

76   Which dates either from the sixth or the seventh century (see Henrichs 1987:109, *cf*. 122 n. 92; Janko 1982:184).

77   See on this myth Menodotos *FGrH* 541 F 1.

78   There are traces, in later mythography, of another involvement of a Pelasgian / Tyrrhenian with an Athenian ritual, in the variant of the myth concerning the Aiora in which Aletis was the daughter of Maleos or Maleotes the Tyrrhenian (See Briquel 1984:264-75, 293ff. for the testimonia and a discussion of this and the other myths involving Maleos). According to Strabo (5.2.8), Maleos was a king of the Pelasgians in Regisvilla, who went to Athens. In other myths also there may be traces of an association between Maleos and other Greek cults; Maleos dedicated a stone, called Maleos' stone, to Poseidon, at the entrance of the Phaistos harbour to protect Phaistos from the sea; a Maleos or Melas invented the trumpet. In addition, Maleatas was an epithet of Apollo.

79   We do not know the date of the myth of the Tonaia, but its connection with the festival suggests that it is early—though not necessarily in that form.

earlier deed done by the women who had killed their husbands, a 'Lemnian crime' was a Greek proverb for any deed of cruelty.[80] The story in the dominant versions of the myth of the Lemnian women,[81] which was well known in Athens, can be briefly summarized as follows. The Lemnian women had offended Aphrodite, who made them smell bad;[82] their husbands rejected them and slept with Thracian concubines; the Lemnian women then murdered their husbands and all other men, except for Hypsipyle, who saved her father Thoas and then reigned in an island without men, until the Argonauts came, and had sex with the Lemnian women; Hypsipyle had male offspring from Jason.

This is a very complex myth, structured by many schemata. As Burkert has shown,[83] it articulates an aetiological refraction of a new fire festival, and there are also comparabilities with the Thesmophoria and other festivals in which normality is temporarily disrupted. This is a Greek myth about Lemnos. Whether the non Greek pre-Athenian Lemnians had had a new fire festival, of which a myth of this kind was an aetiological refraction, the forms of the myth as we have them are Greek myths, and any ritual elements refracted in them are refracted through perceptual filters shaped by Greek mythicoritual assumptions. In the Greek *imaginaire* Lemnos was the island of Hephaistos,[84] and was associated with fire.[85] It was thus an appropriate locus in which to place a new fire festival and its mythological refractions in the *imaginaire*. Whether or not any non Greek Lemnian ritual reality had gone into the relevant constructions is not important for our purposes. What is important is that at some point mythological material refracting a new fire festival, and material involving the Argonauts visiting Lemnos and having sex with, and descendants from, non Greek Lemnian women, had gone into the making of the myth of the Lemnian women as we know it.

Here we are concerned with the 'crime by bad women' aspect of the myth. The Lemnian women are among the dreadful women mentioned in Aeschylus' *Choephoroi*,[86] where Klytemestra's crime is compared to those of other women

---

80 Hdt. 6.138.4.

81 See Aesch. *Cho.* 631-38; Herodoros *FGrH* 31 F 6; Myrsilos *FGrH* 477 F 1; Theolytos *FGrH* 478 F 3; Kaukalos *FGrH* 38 F2; Aesch. *Hypsipyle*, *TGrF* 3, 352; and *Lemniai TGrF* 3, 233f.; Soph. *Lemniai TGrF* 4 pp. 336ff.; Pind. *Pyth.* 4.251-54; *Ol.* 4.19-27; Eur. *Hyps.*; Apollod. 1.9.17; Ap. Rh. *Argon.* 1.609-26; cf. Ar. *Lys.* 299f.; see Burkert 1970:1-16, Detienne 1972:172-84, Gantz 1993:345f., Bowie 1993:186-95. Aristophanes, we saw, had written a comedy entitled *Lemniai* and so had others (see refs. in Burkert 1970:155 n. 5).

82 There are different variants as to the reason for the Lemnian women's bad smell, see Myrsilos *FGrH* 477 F 1; Kaukalos *FGrH* 38 F 2.

83 Burkert 1970:1-16.

84 See *e.g.* Hom. *Il.* 1.593; cf. further references in Burkert 1970:3 n. 4.

85 See *e.g.* Hellanikos *FGrH* 4 F 71; see also on Lemnian fire Burkert 1970:5f.

who had destroyed men: Althaea, Skylla, the Lemnian women. Their actions are presented as the result of the women's reckless minds and ruthless passions which subjugate them, and which perverts and ruins the marriages of men and beasts.[87] Whether or not these emphases are an Aeschylean, or generally Athenian, construct, it is clear that one of the schemata structuring the Lemnian women myth in the form in which it is known to us is the schema 'wives out of control.' This schema, and the concerns it helped articulate, are relevant to the concerns of the Brauronian cult, which had helped acculturate the Athenian girls so that they became good wives, and, ideally at least, did not get out of control—though the perceived danger that they still might do so is explored through a variety of myths, at a greater or lesser symbolic distance. I argued elsewhere that the barbarian woman is deployed in the exploration of the Greek male's closest other, Greek women, in highly complex and sophisticated ways, through modalities that involve both distancings and zoomings between 'barbarian woman' and 'Greek woman.'[88] The myth of the Lemnian women distanced to the barbarian other the mass murder of men by their wives and other women over whom they had authority, and who owed them loyalty, which in Greek eyes was especially atrocious, focussing the partial zooming on the woman who was innocent of murder. The Danaids, all but one of whom had also murdered their husbands, had a claim to some Greek ancestry, but were not, when they came, Greek. It was, of course, the danger that Greek women may get out of control that was explored through these myths. The Lemnian women, who did not behave like proper wives, but like wild animals, are a negative paradigm, the opposite of what the Athenian girls were supposed to become with the help of the *arkteia*. It is to avoid this outcome that the Brauron cult acculturates the girls, ensuring that such things could not happen in Athens, that women were 'tamed,' a process in which the *arkteia* was a crucial stage, and which culminated in marriage[89]—while at the same time admitting that the process can be reversed by the very metaphor of the bear, who can be tamed, but can also revert to wildness, as some of the myths associated with the *arkteia* make clear.[90] The strong connection between the *arkteia* and the Lemnian women myth is reflected in the fact that, as the references to the *arkteia* in Euripides'

---

86   Aesch. *Cho.* 585-651. On this ode see Garvie 1986:201-22, Gould 1980:55, Zeitlin 1978:155, 164f., Stinton 1979:252-62.

87   See Aesch. *Cho.* 596-601.

88   Sourvinou-Inwood 1997b:253-96.

89   See Sourvinou-Inwood 1988:28ff., 111-15, 147f., Sourvinou-Inwood 1990:54-58.

90   See the myth in Suda *s.v. arktos e Brauroniois*, which involves a little girl being harmed by a tame bear with whom she had been playing, and whom she had overexcited.

Hypsipyle and Aristophanes' *Lemniai* suggest, in the Athenian perceptions the Lemnian women myth was associated with Brauron and the *arkteia*.

The schema 'taking concubines leads to disaster' helps structure both the Lemnian women myth and the myth of the Pelasgian rape. The forms this schema takes in the two myths are different. In the Lemnian women myth the Lemnian wives are the central actors, in the myth of the Brauron rape the Lemnian wives play no role. In the myth of the Lemnian women the concubines are Thracian, and of no importance—in the myth of the rape the concubines are Athenian, and an important focus in the story. The Lemnian women version, in which the concubines are of lower status than the wives, corresponds to the normal life situation.

In the (dominant variant of the) Lemnian women myth the wives had offended a deity, a schema which triggers off disaster in Greek mythology, and eventually committed a dreadful crime. In the rape myth the Athenian girls were the victims of an offence which also had a religious dimension (they had been abducted from a sanctuary, while celebrating a religious festival) and ended up murdered, together with their children. Both sets of evil-doers, then, had also offended a deity. In the Lemnian women myth these evil-doers are non Greek women, and their victims are non Greek men. In the Pelasgian rape myth the evil-doers are non Greek men, and their victims are Athenian women. In the first the focus is gender; disaster happens because the wives are bad; their non Greek ethnicity is a distancing device and a symbol. In the second ethnicity is the deciding factor in, and a symbol of, the inappropriateness of the concubinage, and the descent to disaster; their Athenian ethnicity made the concubines and their sons better than the Pelasgians' wives and theirs. At the same time this inappropriate concubinage articulates a strong version of what can happen with any concubines and their children. Because concubinage is articulated through these negative versions, it is itself coloured negatively. In other words, though it is inappropriate concubinage and bad wives that are are at the forefront in these two myths, the dangers inherent in all concubinage, and the possibility of any woman going bad, are also explored. In Athenian ideality Athens is where proper marriages are acted out, involving women who had been acculturated with the help of the *arkteia*; Lemnos is the place where women are wild. But Greek myths deconstruct the oppositions they set up, to bring out the complexities and ambivalences in their conceptual universe. Thus, this myth articulates also another ambivalence, besides the potential reversibility of the 'taming' hinted at through the figure of the bear: though the Athenian girls were in the process of being acculturated, they became victims of barbarian males, and ended up in the place where transgressive marriages are acted out: they became *pallakai* in Lemnos, played a role that corresponded to that of the Thracian concubines in the myth of the Lemnian women. Because the Lemnian women myth deploys wives as instruments, the women's viewpoint is

also articulated, albeit in connection with negative figures, which deconstructs its validity, but does not wholly eliminate it; and because in the Pelasgian rape myth the concubines were Athenian women, which focalized the myth at least to a significant extent through the concubines, the concubines' viewpoint was also articulated—in a subdued voice.

The close comparabilities between the myth of the Lemnian women and that of the Pelasgian rape show that the two are related, and I suggest that one is a transformation of the other. If this is right it would help make sense of the fact that the Lemnian women myth came into the orbit of Brauron; for the semantic connection was not necessarily sufficient to explain the association; after all, the myth of the Danaids was not, to my knowledge, connected to Brauron as a negative paradigm—it was connected to another women's cult, the Thesmophoria. The notion that the myth of the Pelasgian rape and that of the Lemnian women are related brings up the question of the latter myth's date. Burkert suggested that, as the story that Hypsipyle had a son from Jason is known to the *Iliad* (7.468-9), both myth and ritual must antedate 700, and concern the pre-Greek inhabitants of Lemnos.[91] He is probably right—though the possibility cannot be totally excluded that the killing of the men may not necessarily have been part of the nexus 'Argonauts have sex with, and sons from, Lemnian women' attested in Homer. If it is right that the Lemnian women myth was early, Lemnos, perceived as being inhabited by non Greeks, would have been established early as a place in which transgressive marriages were acted out; this would have offered a paradigmatic 'transgressive marriage' locus when the myth of the Pelasgian rape was constructed, or expanded—and the interaction between these myths would have created a context conducive to bringing the myth of the Lemnian women into the semantic orbit of the Brauron cult. This would explain why, when the myth of the Pelasgian rape was constructed the Athenian women's concubinage was located on Lemnos. In the interpretation that assumes that this myth had been created as a justification for the conquest of Lemnos, the reason for the selection of Lemnos as the homebase of the rapists is obvious: Lemnos is what all this is about. But since I am suggesting that the myth was not constructed as part of that justification, I am exploring the factors that are correlative with, and thus may account for, the choice of Lemnos. One such factor, then, is that, through the Lemnian women myth, Lemnos may have been already established as a place where transgressive marriages were acted out.

It is not impossible that another, alternative or complementary, factor in determining the choice of Lemnos may have been a preexisting association between Lemnos and the Pelasgians. Lemnos is in the general area where Greek representa-

91   Burkert 1970:14.

tions located the Pelasgians of the present. We do not know when the Lemnians became identified with the Pelasgians in the Greek representations. In Homer Lemnos was inhabited by Sinties,[92] who were eventually identified with the Pelasgians and the Tyrrhenians.[93] There was an actual historical connection between the Etruscans / Tyrrhenians and the pre-Greek population of Lemnos,[94] and it is likely that a refraction of this historical reality had been deployed (to serve mythological purposes) in the myth associating Lemnos with the Pelasgians who were identified with the Tyrrhenians. I shall return to this question, after discussing a version of the rape myth attested in a late source, which can only be properly assessed after the completion of the discussion of the Herodotean version.

This reconstruction of the construction of the myth, in which the selection of Lemnos was correlative with the island's association with transgressive marriages, is, I submit, the most likely, in that it accounts for all our scarse data in ways that are in harmony with the modalities of Greek mythopoea. But the scarsity and nature of the data entail that other possibilities cannot be excluded. Thus, if the Lemnian women myth had not been early, in the unlikely possibility that it had been constructed at the same time as the myth of the Pelasgian rape the selection of Lemnos could be accounted for in terms of, first, its earlier connection with the Argonauts, which involved a sexual relationship between Jason and Hypsipyle and resulting offspring (thus involving a matrix in which the isssues of ethnicity, gender and mixed offspring were implicated), and second, the fact that, of all the non Greek places in the general area where Greek representations placed Pelasgians in the present, Lemnos was especially significant, because of this connection with the Argonauts and its association with Hephaistos.

Such hypotheses about the circumstances of the construction of the myth of the Pelasgian rape and the factors shaping the choice of Lemnos as the locus of the concubinage are destined to remain speculative—unless new evidence changes the situation. But certain things pertaining to the general context in which this part of the myth was constructed are, I would argue, clear. The concubinage at Lemnos segment of the myth is symbolically equivalent, and antithetical, to the lawful marriage that is the outcome of the variant of the Pelasgian rape myth that involves Hymenaios. We do not know whether the Hymenaios variant and the Lemnos variant had been constructed at the same time, or when this construction or

92 Hom. *Il.* 1.594; *Od.* 8.294. See also Hellanikos *FGrH* 4 F 71. On the Sintians in Lemnos see De Simone 1996:43f., 73f.

93 See Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 101. See also Jacoby *FGrH* IIIb (Supplement) 1, 420-1 ad F 101.

94 Two late Archaic inscriptions from Lemnos in a native language which has affinities with Etruscan show that there had been some connection between the non Greek peoples of Lemnos and the Etruscans (For the first see Hornblower 1996:348, with bibl., *cf.* 36. For both see De Simone 1996:7-38, 85ff.).

constructions had taken place. But it is clear that the part of the myth after the Pelasgians' expulsion and before the barrenness on Lemnos expressed meanings pertaining to marriage, male-female relations and offspring. The concerns of the Lemnian segment are correlative with those of the rape segment and also of the cult with which the rape is associated. In these circumstances, I submit that the myth had been constructed in connection with these concerns, in the context of the Brauron cult; and that the concubinage at Lemnos had been created, either at the same time as the Hymenaios myth, or later, as an extension of that myth with an alternative outcome, but in the same context. This is a complex myth about women, relations between the sexes and offspring and about Pelasgians as ambivalent others that were once near, though separate, and are now afar.

Of course, the very last segment of the myth does articulate a justification for the conquest of Lemnos—though even this segment was not, in Greek eyes, simply political propaganda legimating the conquest, it had also (inevitably) performed, when taken with the rest of the myth, the significant function of integrating a newly acquired non Greek Lemnos in the Athenian conceptual map in a way that related more closely the past to the present. The segment that can unequivocally be seen to be the product of post-conquest mythopoea legitimating the conquest of Lemnos is that which reflects the historical events: the *adynaton* postulated by the Pelasgians as a condition for giving up their land to the Athenians, accomplished in the new historical reality of the Athenian possession of the Chersonese. But where does this post-conquest construct begin? Does it include only the barreness / oracle / *adynaton* part or the whole Lemnos segment? I argued that both its meanings and its relationship to the Hymenaios myth suggest that the concubinage at Lemnos was constructed in connection with the Brauron cult. The consideration of the myth's last segment will produce another, independent, argument to support the view that the concubinage was not part of the post-conquest mythopoea, and that the latter's product begins with the Pythia's response. For this last segment, I will now try to show, contains elements that are odd, in the sense of being unparalleled (in this form) in the Greek myths known to me; while they do not go against Greek mythological 'logic,' they stretch the established modalities in ways that seem to me to fit less the mythological, and more the rationalist, mentality—which is not the case in the rest of the myth. I use the term 'rationalist mentality' to refer to something (the operations of which [and so also some of its defining parameters] I will try to illustrate) which is other than the 'mythological' mentality that shapes traditional Greek myths (the 'syntax' structuring the multidimensional web of Greek mythology, shaping the deployment of schemata that articulate collective representations according to established mythological modalities), and which operates through reason-based logic.[95]

The syntax structuring the mythemes that make up the last segment of the myth is significantly different from that which structures comparable myths. For here the punishment for the Pelasgians' crime is deferred, and they are uniquely let off without paying the price the oracle had recommended. In so far as they eventually paid the penalty of losing their land, the mythological mentality is not violated. But since life had continued in Lemnos, the Greeks would have understood the barrenness to have ceased when the Pelasgians responded to the Athenians' request with an *adynaton*.[96] This means that it had stopped though the Pelasgians had not then paid the penalty that the Athenians had asked for, and therefore had not done what the oracle had told them to do.[97] This, I believe, is unique, as is, to my knowledge, the fact that the penalty is paid in the recent past (of Herodotos' readers, the present of the post conquest mythopoea) for a wrong committed in the heroic age.[98]

There are, of course, many instances in which certain things happen in the heroic age which directly affect, or are fulfilled in, the present. That things happened in the heroic age which affect the present is inherent in the perception of the Greek heroic age as the time in which rites, cults and institutions of the present were founded. The modality that involves something starting in the heroic age and being fulfilled in the present structured, for example, foundation myths in which a heroic age figure predicts, and, in one way or another, legitimates, the foundation of a colony, which will take place in the historical age: the myth that legitimated the historical foundation of Cyrene through the gift of a clod of earth given to the Argonaut Euphemos by a *daimon*[99] belongs to this group, as does the foundation myth of Kroton, according to which Herakles had accidentally killed Kroton and foretold to the natives that in later times a famous city will be built

95   As opposed to 'mythological logic'—in which the word 'logic' is used metaphorically. The use of this opposition 'rationalist vs. mythological mentality' has no implications concerning the relationship between 'myth' and 'reason' (on which see now Buxton 1999). It is a different distinction from that drawn by Griffiths (1999:169 and n. 2) between the mode of *mythos* and the mode of *logos* that coexist in Herodotos.

96   The *adynaton*, is, of course, a traditional element. In my view, this type of *adynaton* expresses also the notion that people, mere mortals, cannot fathom how things will turn out.

97   On this oracular response (Parke and Wormell 1956:37 no. 83) see also Fontenrose (1978: 311f.), who remarked (312) that 'the story is peculiar in that the Pelasgians did not carry out the oracle's direction to pay the Athenians whatever penalty they asked; they put a condition on fulfilment …. In spite of the Lemnians' not really doing what the oracle demanded, the famine apparently came to an end.' See also Crahay 1956:82, 268ff.

98   Fontenrose (1978:312) attempts to calculate the perceived interval in terms of years; but in Greek eyes the past was structured through conceptual schemata that made the heroic age a very different period from the present.

99   Pind. *Pyth.* 4.9-56. See Malkin 1994:174-81.

bearing the name of Kroton.[100] This modality appears superficially comparable to that structuring the story of the Pelasgians, but in fact the comparability is very limited; for in those foundation myths nothing is left unfinished in the heroic age.

The same is true of comparable myths in which the ultimate end of a chain of events that had begun in the heroic age takes place in historical times, but does so as a further development, not, as in the Pelasgian story, as the completion of a nexus of elements that belong together, structured by a schema expressing funda-mental Greek perceptions, such as 'crime-punishment-redemption through obedience to the oracle.' For example, in the case of the hero of Temesa,[101] this nex-us 'crime-punishment-redemption through obedience to the oracle' takes the form 'one of Odysseus' sailors was stoned to death; his ghost inflicted harm on the people of Temesa; the Pythia commanded them to propitiate him, and they did, with a sanctuary, a temple, and a yearly sacrifice of a girl.' The people of Temesa had done wrong, were punished and then paid the price the oracle had instructed them to pay, and so normality returned—all in the heroic age. The further events in the narrative, which involved Euthymos (in the fifth century) freeing the town of the annual sacrifice of a girl by defeating the hero, belong to another stage in the story, which is connected with the first, to form a larger nexus, structured by the schema 'human sacrifice—cessation of human sacrifice.' But the first part, which took place in the heroic age, formed a self contained nexus. This is different from the Pelasgian story, where normality would have implicitly been understood to have resumed in the heroic age, while the penalty was paid in the recent past. In the last segment of the myth of the Pelasgian rape, then, a nexus which is elsewhere inextricably bound is split into two, one part of which takes place in the heroic age and the other in the present and the syntax of its elements (that reflects and ex-presses important representations) has been reversed, thus altering the traditional relationship between atonement and redemption.

There is a certain comparability between this segment of the Pelasgian rape myth and another story, which is part of the mythicoritual nexus of the Locrian Maidens.[102] The dominant variant of this myth is that in Timaios,[103] according to which three years after the Trojan War the Locrians, having been hit by a plague, consulted the Delphic oracle and were told to send maidens to Troy regularly in order to propitiate Athena for the rape of Kassandra by the Locrian Ajax; so they

---

100 Diod. Sic. 4.24.7. On the foundation myths of Kroton see Leschhorn 1984:28ff., Malkin 1994:134ff.

101 Paus. 6.6.7-11. The hero of Temesa was mentioned as a possible parallel in the discussion after my paper at the Symposion.

102 For the texts in which the myth is attested see Parke and Wormell 1956:134f. nos. 331-3. For the myth and its context and meanings see Graf 1978:61-79.

103 Timaios *FGrH* 566 F 146; see also Apollod. *Epit.* 6.20-22 and Aelian fr. 47.

did.[104] This myth is structured by the traditional mythological schema 'a leader offends a deity, a plague attacks the community, the oracle is consulted, the penalty it orders is paid, normality resumes.' In one version the tribute of maidens had to be sent for a thousand years, in another until the goddess was appeased; when the Locrians considered the thousand years to have passed, in the third century BC, they stopped sending the tribute; they were then hit by a plague and the oracle told them that they had disobeyed its injunction and ordered them to resume the rite.[105] This further narrative is structured by the mythological mentality that governed the main part of the myth. But there is another variant of the story, in which there was a long gap between offence and atonement, and which is therefore not structured by the established mythological schema of 'offence—punishment—oracular consultation—atonement—end of punishment.' Strabo, after mentioning the myth that the Locrians began to send maidens to Troy soon after the Trojan war, argues that this whole story of Ajax and Kassandra is un-Homeric, and states that the Locrian girls were first sent after the Persian conquest of the Troad, that is, after 547/6[106]—a view believed to be reflecting Demetrios of Skepsis.[107] Strabo does not tell a story, he simply makes this statement in the context of his discussion of the claim by the inhabitants of Ilion that Troy had not been deserted after the Trojan War, claim in which the institution of the Locrian Maidens was used as part of the argument.[108] Thus, the notion that the girls were first sent to Troy after the Persian conquest is part of an attempt to determine which of the conflicting versions of Troy's fate after the Sack is historically correct. The myth of the Pelasgian rape is a myth that presents itself as history. The story in which the atonement involving the Locrian Maidens began in the heroic age is a myth, structured by a traditional mythological schema, which explains a rite by attaching it to a Trojan War myth, and it also presents itself as history. The Strabo variant transforms the traditional mythological schema as part of an attempt to reconstruct accurately past historical events, which was perceived to necessitate reconciling the Locrian Maidens myth with the perceived historical reality of an interruption in the occupation of Troy. In my view, whether or not this variant actually reflects any historical reality, the fact that it is part of an attempt to reconstruct that reality entails that it is the product of a rationalizing mentality, which restructures mythological material to try to make some kind (different kinds) of

104 The particulars, some of which vary in the different versions, are complex and do not concern us. Graf 1978:61-79 has shown that this myth refracts an initiatory rite.

105 See Parke and Wormell 1956:134.

106 Strabo 13.1.40.

107 See Graf 1978:74 n. 89 with bibl.

108 Strabo 13.1.40-42.

logical sense, in this case reconstruct historical reality—even if this stretches tradi-
tional mythological mentality to the limit. It was not generated through a process
governed by the traditional mythological mentality, for this mentality operates by
structuring historical material through schemata that articulate mythologically
significant representations. Graf's view of the nature of the two variants of the
Locrian Maidens myth (part of a discussion which aims at reconstructing histori-
cal reality, while I am only concerned with the myth, not its complex relationships
to reality) is broadly comparable to the one set out here—which shows that I am
not structuring the evidence to fit my interpretation. He considers the information
that the Maidens were first sent to Troy after the Persian conquest to be precise and
credible, and the notion that the institution had begun three years after the Trojan
War to have originated in the mythological tradition and be worthless as historical
fact.[109]

This variant of the myth of the Locrian Maidens, then, is comparable to the last
segment of the Pelasgian story, in that here also the rationalizing attempt at recon-
structing history[110] did not violate mythological mentality, in that the penalty had
been paid, albeit in the historical past, rather than in the heroic age; but it stretched
the mythological schemata in ways that may make sense to a logical perception of
the situation, but do not quite fit the modalities of Greek mythopoea. The stretch-
ing of the traditional schemata in the Locrian Maidens' story may have been per-
ceived as less extreme than that in the Pelasgian rape myth. First, because the past
in which the atonement had begun in the Strabo variant of the Locrian Maidens'
story was very much further removed from the present, even the present of Deme-
trios of Skepsis, let alone Strabo, and so was symbolically much more distanced,
than in the myth of the Pelasgian murders, where the penalty was paid in the
immediate past of the narrative's construction. Then, it is not clear when in the
variant reflected in Strabo the Locrians had been instructed by the oracle to pay
the penalty—if there ever had been a story telling this variant, if it had not simply
consisted of a rebuttal of the traditional time of the institution's beginnings. It is
therefore not clear that any disobedience of the oracle had been involved, let alone
that there had been, as is implied in the Pelasgian story, a resumption of normality
despite the disobedience. Thus, the last segment of the story of the Pelasgian
murders would appear to be stretching the limits of Greek mythological mentality
significantly further than the rationalizing variant of the Locrian Maidens story. In
any case, the fact that the one other instance of this type of 'heroic age—present'
gap-and-disjunction occurs in a rationalizing attempt to reconstruct historical
reality adds further support to my argument that the last segment of the

109 Graf 1978:74f. and n. 89.
110 Whether or not a construct of Demetrios of Skepsis.

Herodotean myth of the rape had not been constructed in the same mythopoeic process that had shaped the rest of the myth as we know it, but was, unlike most of the myth, the later product of a rationalist mentality.

Even the Pythia's response takes a rare form in this segment of the myth, for it involves an open-ended injunction, in which the injured party has control, is supposed to decide in a totally open-ended way what the penalty should be.[111] The nearest parallel[112] is the story of Euenios in Herodotos,[113] according to which Euenios of Apollonia had fallen asleep while guarding a flock sacred to the Sun, and wolves came and killed about sixty sheep. When the people of Apollonia found out what had happened they condemned him to be blinded. But after they blinded him, their flocks bore no offspring, and their land did not produce fruit as before. The oracles of Dodona and Delphi told them that they had blinded Euenius unjustly, and that for their affliction to stop they had to 'make him such restitution ... as he himself chooses and consents.' The Apolloniats then tricked Euenios, who was unaware of the oracle, into saying that he would accept as compensation certain lands and a house, which they then offered him as restitution (and the gods gave him the gift of divination). Though Euenios was angry over the trickery when he found out about the oracle, the Apolloniats had done what the oracle had told them to; and this is a fundamental difference between the Euenios myth and the last segment of our myth. The Apolloniats may have tricked Euenios to limit the scope of the open-ended injunction of the oracles, but they did obey that injunction; and the restitution took place in the story's present, there was no jump from the heroic age to the present. The same is true of the version of the Minotaur story in Apollodoros,[114] which also involves an open-ended injunction: the oracle told the Athenians who had been hit by famine and pestilence that they must compensate Minos for Androgeos' death by giving him whatever satisfaction he asked for;

111 Crahay (1956, 82 [cf. 270]) says that the expiation recommended belongs to a type which, in his view, is also found elsewhere, a type in which the guilty party must submit to the conditions dictated to him by the victim or his representative, but he only mentions as a specific parallel the story of Euenios on which see below. Elsewhere (Crahay 1956, 312) he puts together, into one category, the response to the Pelasgians, the one concerning Euenios and that concerning Aesop (see below).

112 Which was suggested to me by Professor Robert Parker.

113 Hdt. 9.93f. See also Crahay 1956:82ff., Fontenrose 1978:321f., and esp. Griffiths 1999:169-82. In the version of the myth in Konon FGrH 26 F 1 (30) the hero is called Peithenios. According to Griffiths (1999:172) the Herodotean narrative about Euenios is mythos—as opposed to logos—'it hums and buzzes with the tones and harmonics of Greek traditional belief;' and its components 'identify it as a narrative which blends folktale and cultic aetiology.' It is, he suggests (Griffiths 1999:178), 'a gobbet of what we may unhesitatingly categorize as mythos' in the middle of a long stretch of logos.

114 Apollod. 3.15.8.

he asked them to send seven youths and seven maidens to be fed to the Minotaur; and they did. This type of open-ended injunction itself involves, I suggest, an extension of an open-ended injunction of the type found in the oracle's injunctions to propitiate specific dead people, which was only on the surface open-ended, in that there existed established modalities for propitiating the dead.[115] When this type of injunction is extended to a living person it becomes genuinely open-ended. The oracular response in our myth, then, is an extension of an extension,[116] and it is another, albeit minor and less striking, manifestation of the fact that this segment of the myth stretches the Greek mythological mentality to its limits, without violating it; it extends the modalities of Greek mythopoea to create unprecedented forms.

The fact that the schema 'wrong doing—punishment—oracular consultation—penalty paid' that structures the last segment of the myth takes a strange form fits the notion that this segment had been constructed, for the purpose of saying something specific, that the Athenians are entitled to Lemnos, by a member of the culture, who operated through a rationalist (rather than mythological) mentality, which manipulated and structured material on the basis of some kind of logical sense, rather than through schemata articulated by, and articulating, Greek collective representations—in some ways comparable to Hekataios' manipulation of the nature of the Pelasgians.

In these circumstances, I suggest that different arguments, though not conclusive in themselves, point strongly to the conclusion that it was the segment beginning with, or following, the barrenness that was added, or radically reshaped, in post-conquest mythopoea, to provide a justification for the conquest of Lemnos. Either the oracle had given a different answer in the pre-conquest myth, or that myth had ended with the murder of the Athenian concubines and their sons, and what happened to the Pelasgians afterwards had been of no interest to the Athenian myth—until Lemnos became of interest to them, and the story was extended, through the development of the potential included, in Greek eyes, in the murder of the Athenian girls. This choice may have been facilitated by the fact that such post-conquest mythopoea was obviously associated with Miltiades and the Philaids, to whom Brauronian mythology was especially familiar.

115 See, for example, Parke and Wormell 1956:34 no. 75, Fontenrose 1978:304 Q126. See also some versions of the oracle instructing the Delphians to propitiate Aesop whom they had killed (Parke and Wormell 1956:26f. no. 58, Fontenrose 1978:304 Q 107, cf. also Hdt. 2.134.4, Crahay 1956:84f.).

116 Somewhat different, but also stretching traditional patterns to their limits, is the injunction to the Spartans to seek recompense from Xerxes for the death of Leonidas, which is combined with the injunction to accept whatever he gave (Hdt. 8.114.1), in what is self-evidently not a traditional myth, but a story about Xerxes' arrogant reply that came true in ways he did not expect. See also Crahay 1956:312-15, Fontenrose 1978:319 Q 153.

The possibility cannot be excluded that traces of the earlier version of the myth of the rape by the Pelasgians may have survived in a late source: the version summarized by a scholiast to Aelius Aristides[117] may conceivably be reflecting, in however altered a form, (the basic lines of) the myth before it had been reshaped by post-conquest mythopoea. According to this version, the Pelasgians who lived in Tyrrhenia had been expelled from Thessaly and gone to Athens, where they abducted some Athenian women by force, and then went to Lemnos; the Lemnians became afflicted by sickness and consulted the oracle who told them that the sickness will continue until they surrender the Pelasgians to the Athenians; so they did. Here, then, first, the Pelasgians and the Lemnians are different people, and second, the schema 'bad behaviour—divine punishment—oracular consultation—obedience to the oracle's injunction—restoration of normality' appears in its traditional form: the Lemnians obeyed the oracle's injunction immediately, and so the Pelasgians, whose actions had brought about divine anger, were punished,—and, it is to be understood, normality returned to Lemnos. On my reconstruction, the concubinage at Lemnos had been part of the pre-conquest myth, but the scholiast's extremely brief narrative does not explicitly mention it. However, the fact that in terms of Greek mythological mentality the murders are a much more appropriate correlative to, and thus trigger for, the pestilence than an abduction, however hostile, suggests, I submit, that the myth the scholiast was summarizing had included the concubinage and murders.

The fact that in this version the Lemnians are not the same as the Pelasgians, who were incomers, whom the Lemnians surrendered to the Athenians, entails that this myth did not represent the Lemnians in a negative light, nor did it make them appear to owe a debt to the Athenians. It is conceivable that the absence of these two representations, which constructed a justification of the Athenian conquest in the post-conquest myth, suggests that this is not a version of the post-conquest myth, that it may be partially reflecting the myth of the Pelasgian rape before it was reshaped by post-conquest mythopoea. If this is right, the identification of the Lemnians with the Pelasgians would have taken place in this post-conquest mythopoea.[118]

I hope to have shown several things about this myth. First, that Herodotos had not created it, by stitching together a story about good wall building Pelasgians and the justification for the conquest of Lemnos, and ascribing to the Pelasgians a character foreign to them. On the contrary, the wall building and the rape belong together; when taken together these two mythemes represent the Pelasgians as ambivalent, which is how the Pelasgians are represented in the Greek collective representations in general. Second, that the myth is rich, polysemic and multivocal, and

117 Scholia in Aelium Aristidem 13.111.1-2.

expresses complex meanings pertaining on the one hand to the Athenian past and the de-Pelasgianization of Attica, and on the other to girls' transitions, marriage, male—female relations and offspring, a nexus of concerns intimately connected with the Brauronian cult, which is the locus of the rape. The meanings articulated in this myth are in harmony with meanings in other myths, and also with the society's ideologies, in so far as they can be independently reconstructed. Finally, I have shown that the last segment of the myth, which begins with the oracle and provides the justification for the conquest, is different in nature from the rest of the myth, that it contains a cluster of peculiarities that suggest that it had been constructed through a manipulation of traditional material governed by a 'rationalist' rather than mythological mentality.

Because of the nature of the evidence and the limitations of access, it cannot be proved beyond reasonable doubt, and certainly not to someone determined to make sense of myths in ways that seem reasonable to us, that this myth with all its complexities was not created *ex novo* as a justification for the conquest of Lemnos. But I hope to have shown that this is extremely unlikely, and that it entails unlikely implications; for this hypothesis to be sustainable it would have to be postulated that in that context a lot of complex mythopoea had been invented and developed, which had nothing to do with the conquest, and which pertained to, and focussed on, girls' transitions, marriage, concubinage, relations between the sexes in general, and sons. Obviously, we do not have the access to the culture that would allow us definitely to exclude this possibility. But I submit that this is not how Greek mythopoea works when its workings become in any way visible to us. It is true that its *bricolage* modality would have allowed earlier material pertaining to these concerns to be deployed in any such mythopoea, but here it is not simply the material, but the myth's *structuring* schemata, representations and perceptions that are focussed on these Brauronian concerns[119]—intertwined with representations of the Pelasgian others; except, that is, in the last segment, which is indeed structured by the representation 'justification for the conquest of Lemnos.' This

---

118 If the reconstruction suggested here is right in its basic lines, the representations that would have gone into the making of the selection to identify the Lemnians with the Pelasgians in this mythopoea would have been, first, (the representation articulated in the earlier myth as reconstructed here) 'Pelasgians went to Lemnos as incomers and then left;' second, the perception, based on historical reality, that the pre-Greek inhabitants of Lemnos were related to the Tyrrhenians / Etruscans; and finally, perhaps also the representation 'the Pelasgians are the same as the Tyrrhenians,' if it had been earlier than this post-conquest mythopoea (on the date of this identification see above n. 75). These representations, in interaction with each other, and also with the perception that Lemnos was in the general area where Greek representations located the Pelasgians in the present, would have generated the identification of the Pelasgians with the pre-Greek inhabitants of Lemnos, in the context of the construction of the post-conquest form of the myth with its justification of the conquest.

suggests that only this last segment was constructed, and added to the myth, as a post-conquest legitimation. This is also suggested independently by the fact that this segment is different from the rest of the myth, contains odd elements, and seems governed by a 'rationalist' rather than mythological mentality. Thus, the two arguments converge, and there is a correspondence between the meaning 'legitimation of the conquest' articulated in the last segment and the presence of elements governed by a 'rationalist' mentality—a correspondence which the hypothesis that the whole myth was constructed as a post-conquest justification would need improbably to postulate is a total coincidence.

In these circumstances, I suggest that it is perverse to resist the conclusion that this myth had been constructed in connection with the cult of Artemis at Brauron, and in interaction with the myth of Hymenaios, as well as the myth of the Lemnian women's crime, to express certain perceptions pertaining to a variety of concerns: perceptions of the Pelasgians, and the Athenian past, and through the representation of the Pelasgians in Attica as latecomers who stayed for a certain time and then were expelled, also of Athenian autochthony; perceptions pertaining to a community's vulnerability through its women, and the vulnerability of women who were exposed in public spaces on religious occasions, and the tension between these fears and the desirability of so exposing them—one particular version of which was the tension between the desirability of acculturating the wild *parthenoi* on the one hand, and the dangers of their *kyrios* relinquishing authority over them and sending them to be bears at Brauron on the other; perceptions pertaining to marriage, the desirability of proper marriage, perceived as including a consensual element, and the undesirability, and destabilizing effect, of concubinage; and the importance of legitimate sons—as opposed to biological offspring in general. This

119 I suggested elsewhere that the *arkteia* had been reorganized in the context of the 're-foundation' of the city through the Kleisthenic reforms in the very late sixth century (Sourvinou-Inwood 1988:113f.). If the conquest of Lemnos had taken place at that time, it would not, in theory, be impossible for that conquest to have brought the island into prominence in the collective representations of the time, and for this to have helped determine the choice of Lemnos as the raping Pelasgians' home-base. If so, what of the comparabilities between the Lemnian women myth and the Pelasgian rape myth? We would have to believe that either the Lemnian women myth had also been invented by Athenian mythopoea at that time, or that the myth had preexisted, but only came into play when, and because of the fact that, Lemnos was on the news, despite the fact that this myth had established Lemnos as the place where transgressive marriages were acted out. Both possibilities appear unlikely, but this may be a culturally determined judgement, and a convergence of 'Lemnos on the news' and 'this brings attention to the Lemnian women myth which suits Brauron, and thus provides a model helping to shape the new myth' is perhaps not totally unlikely. However, I must make clear that none of this matters very much for our purposes; for even if the conquest of Lemnos had brought the island in the forefront of perceptions and motivated its choice as the locus for the Athenian girls' concubinage, this would not alter the fact that this would be Brauronian mythopoea about girls' transitions, not political mythopoea aiming at justifying the conquest.

myth of the Pelasgian rape was eventually reshaped in a mythopoeic process that followed the Athenian conquest of Lemnos to construct a justification for that conquest and at the same time integrate a newly acquired non Greek Lemnos in the Athenian conceptual map in a way that related more closely the past to the present.

This myth illustrates the fact that the myths that help make up the complex web of the Athenian polis discourse were not necessarily the voices of men's desires. In this myth there is a certain (at least partial) convergence between the (basic lines of what may be roughly reconstructed as) the female viewpoint, and the representations articulated in the myth, which were part of the web of the polis discourse. This may be correlative with the context of the myth's construction; the choices that shaped it, obviously consistent with the polis' major concern with the stability of the *oikoi*, may have been correlative with the fact that this was the product of Brauronian mythopoea, which was focussed on, and so may have been implicitly partially focalized through, women, and may even have had an input from some of the influential women, above all the priestess, in the Brauronian sanctuary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bellefonds, P.L. 1990. 'Hyménaios,' *LIMC* 5 (Zurich):583-85

—. 1991. 'Hyménaios: une iconographie contestée,' *MEFRA* 103:197-212

Bond, G.W. 1969. Euripides, *Hypsipyle* (Oxford)

Bowie, Angus M. 1993. *Aristophanes. Myth, ritual and comedy* (Cambridge)

Briquel, Dominique 1984. *Les Pélasges en Italie. Recherches sur l'histoire de la légende.* Bibl. de l'Ecole française d'Athénes et de Rome 252 (Paris)

Brulé, Pierre 1987. *La fille d' Athènes. La religion des filles à Athènes à l'époque classique. Mythes, cultes et société* (Paris)

Brumfield, Allaire C. 1981. *The Attic festivals of Demeter and their relation to the agricultural year* (Salem)

Burkert, Walter 1970. 'Jason, Hypsipyle, and new fire at Lemnos. A study in myth and ritual,' *CQ* 20:1-16

Buxton, Richard 1994. *Imaginary Greece. The contexts of mythology* (Cambridge)

—. (ed.)1999. *From myth to reason? Studies in the development of Greek thought* (Oxford)

Calame, Claude 1977. *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* (Rome)

—. 1996. *Mythe et histoire dans l'antiquité grecque. La création symbolique d'une colonie* (Lausanne)

Crahay, R. 1956. *La littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote* (Paris)

De Simone, C. 1996. *I Tirreni a Lemnos. Evidenza linguistica e tradizioni storiche* (Florence)

Detienne, Marcel 1972. *Les jardins d'Adonis. La mythologie des aromates en Grèce* (Paris)

Fontenrose, Joseph 1978. *The Delphic oracle. Its responses and operations with a catalogue of responses* (Berkeley)

Gantz, Timothy 1993. *Early Greek myth. A guide to literary and artistic sources* (Baltimore and London)

Garvie, Alex F. 1986. *Aeschylus, Choephori* (Oxford)

Golden, Marc 1988. 'Did the ancients care when their children died?,' *G&R* 35:152-63

Gould, John 1980. 'Law, custom and myth. Aspects of the social position of women in Classical Athens,' *JHS* 100:38-59

Graf, Fritz 1978. 'Die lokrische Mädchen,' *SSR* 2:61-79

Griffiths, A. 1999. 'Euenius the negligent nightwatchman (Herodotus 9.92-6),' in Richard Buxton (ed.), *From myth to reason? Studies in the development of Greek thought* (Oxford): 169-82

Henrichs, Albert 1987. 'Myth visualized. Dionysos and his circle in sixth-century Attic vase-painting,' in *Papers on the Amasis painter and his world* (Malibu):92-124.

Hornblower, Simon 1996. *A commentary on Thucydides* Volume II: Books iv-v.24 (Oxford)

Janko, Richard 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns. Diachronic development in Epic diction* (Cambridge)

Jolles, A. 1914. 'Hymen, Hymenaios,' in *RE* 9:126-30.

Larson, Jennifer 1995. *Greek heroine cults* (Wisconsin)

Lefkowitz, Mary R. 1993. 'Seduction and rape in Greek Myth,' in A.E. Laiou (ed.), *Consent and coercion to sex and marriage in Ancient and Medieval societies* (Washington):17-37.

Leschhorn, W. 1984. *'Gründer der Stadt.' Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart)

Loraux, Nicole 1981. *Les enfants d'Athéna* (Paris)

Malkin, Irad 1994. *Myth and territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge)

Osborne, Robin 1985. *Demos. The discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge)

Parke, H.W. and D.E.W. Wormell 1956. *The Delphic oracle* (Oxford)

Parker, Robert 1987. 'Myths of early Athens,' in Jan Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek mythology* (London):187-214

—. 1996. *Athenian religion. A history* (Oxford)

Pelling, Christopher 2000. *Literary texts and the Greek historian* (London)

Rausch, Mario 1999. 'Miltiades, Athen und "die Rhamnusier auf Lemnos" (*IG* I(3) 522bis),' *Klio* 81:7-17

Redfield, James 1982. 'Notes on the Greek wedding,' *Arethusa* 15:181-201

Robertson, Noel 1992. *Festivals and legends. The formation of Greek cities in the light of public ritual* (Toronto)

Sissa, Giulia 1990. *Greek virginity* (Cambridge, Mass and London)

Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane 1979. *Theseus as son and stepson. A tentative illustration of the Greek mythological mentality* (London)

—. 1988. *Studies in girls' transitions. Aspects of the arkteia and age representation in Attic iconography* (Athens)

—. 1989. 'Assumptions and the creation of meaning. Reading Sophocles' *Antigone*,' *JHS* 109:134-48

—. 1990. 'Lire l'arkteia—lire les images, les textes, l'animalité,' *DHA* 16:45-60

—. 1991. *'Reading' Greek culture. Texts and images, rituals and myths* (Oxford)

—. 1995. *'Reading' Greek death* (Oxford)

—. 1997a. 'The Hesiodic myth of the five races and the tolerance of plurality in Greek mythology,' in Olga Palagia (ed.), *Greek offerings. Essays on Greek art in honour of John Boardman* (Oxford)

—. 1997b. 'Medea at a shifting distance. Images and Euripidean Tragedy,' in J.J. Clauss and S.I. Johnston (eds.), *Medea. Essays on Medea in myth, literature, philosophy and art* (Princeton):253-96

—. 2003. 'Herodotus (and others) on Pelasgians. Some perceptions of ethnicity,' in P. Derow and R. Parker (eds.), *Herodotus and his world. Essays from a conference in memory of George Forrest* (Oxford):103-44

Stinton, T.C.W. 1979. 'The first stasimon of Aeschylus' *Choephori*,' *CQ* 29:252-62

Thomas, Rosalind 2000. *Herodotus in context. Ethnography, science, and the art of persuasion* (Cambridge)

Zeitlin, Froma I. 1978. Zeitlin, 'The dynamics of misogyny. Myth and mythmaking in the Oresteia,' *Arethusa* 11:149-84