Recently, feminist scholars have begun to question the traditional telling of the history of rhetoric. Dissatisfied with a history which is told in terms of privileged, white males to the exclusion of all other voices, these scholars have worked to recover "lost" female rhetoricians and have begun critically rereading the traditional narrative of the history of rhetoric in terms of the gender and power structures which helped create it.

This project takes as its goal the recovery of women's lament in ancient Greece. Through close readings of classical texts, analyzing ancient legislation, and using anthropological work on modern Greek laments, I demonstrate that lament offered women in ancient Greece a unique opportunity for public performance and a powerful position to speak from. I then show how the city-state of Athens took great pains to contain this genre first by legislating against it and later by creating a rhetorical institution, the epitaphios logos (funeral oration), which worked to contain lamentation and tell a history of Athens without women. Lastly, I attempt to locate lament inside the rhetorical tradition as a form of pre-rhetoric. I show that not only was this form of speech stylistically powerful, but that it also had an underlying epistemology, one which is similar to the poetically-based rhetoric of the sophists.
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1. RECOVERING VOICES FROM THE GRAVE

Introduction to the Project

Recently, feminist scholars in the history of rhetoric have been, in the words of Cheryl Glenn, working to "re-map" the rhetorical landscape (3). Dissatisfied with the traditional, linear narrative of rhetoric which tells its history in terms of privileged, upper class, white males to the exclusion of all other voices, these scholars have begun to rethink and reshape this history. Despite this common goal, however, scholars have often disagreed about what kind of methodology should be used. In "Speaking to the Past: Feminist Historiography in Rhetoric," Susan Jarratt identifies what she sees as the two major kinds of historical work being done: "(1) histories about women who spoke and wrote in the past and (2) histories that concern themselves not solely or even at all with women but with the category of gender" (191). Scholars applying the first of these methods have worked to recover women rhetoricians and their texts in order to tell a broader version of the history of rhetoric. Although such recovery projects have a great deal of value in expanding our notions of the rhetorical landscape, such scholarship has come under attack and has occasionally been referred to as "female tokenism" and "affirmative action." (Biesecker 142-143). Critics of recovery work believe there is little value in simply adding female rhetoricians to a male cannon. Michelle Ballif claims, for example, that "efforts to make women legitimate by situating them in patronymic narratives does nothing to enfranchise them--because it does nothing to the phallogocentric economy which disenfranchised them" (95). In response to this
criticism, Jarratt suggests that recovery work needs to be supported with a second kind of historical work, that of gender studies (Jarratt, "Speaking" 193). Gender studies are useful because they analyze the way social relations are configured and the way power is distributed, and therefore, provide a method of critiquing the traditional, patriarchal history of rhetoric (193).

The purpose of this study is to offer a re-reading of women's lament in ancient Greece by using both recovery and gender methodologies. Unlike most recovery methods, however, my purpose is not the discovery of individual rhetoricians, but rather the recovery of an entire form of women's speech in antiquity, the funeral lament, a form that nearly every Greek woman would have participated in during her life. By applying a gender reading, I will show how the city-state of Athens took great pains to contain the genre of lament both by legislating against it and creating a rhetorical institution, the epitaphios logos (funeral oration), which both contained lamentation and worked to exclude women from Athenian society. Through my investigation, I will not only offer ways the lament influenced the funeral oration (generally accepted as the first kind of institutionalized rhetoric), but I will also talk about aspects of the lament which make it an interesting genre to consider as a form of pre-rhetoric, especially when put into relation with Sophistic rhetoric.

As with any kind of feminist recovery project concerning ancient Greece, there is a frustrating lack of available texts. Just as Cheryl Glenn in her book Rhetoric Retold finds herself in the position of trying to reconstruct the role of Aspasia from references in men's writing, I find myself in a similar predicament. Women's laments are primarily an oral tradition, and the only representations we have from ancient Greece are those
written by men, whether it is in law, tragedy, or epic. A critical part of my methodology, then, is to find ways around this difficult problem. Fortunately, recent work in anthropology, gender studies, and musicology has given us some powerful information about women's laments in Greek society. Although most of this work focuses on modern laments, some scholars (Margaret Alexiou, Gail Holst-Warhaft, and C. Nadia Seremekatis) have managed to reconstruct a number of the structural, political, and cultural aspects of ancient lament through comparisons with ancient texts, linguistic analysis, and historical studies. This thesis will take as part of its goal to show how this work in other disciplines has important consequences for our understanding of women's relationship to early rhetoric, especially in Athens.

In short, this thesis might best be read as responding to Susan Jarratt's request for scholarship on early forms of women's speech which "seek(s) the interplay of...women's speech with conventional rhetoric in ancient Greece" ("Speaking," 204). Chapter 1 will provide descriptions of both the lament and funeral ritual in ancient Greece. In it, I will discuss the legislation which attempted to contain women's funeral lament and the possible impetus for that legislation. Lastly, I will provide a larger picture of women's lament and its relationship to the Athenian polis, particularly in terms of how lament granted women access to both social and political power. Chapter 2, through a close reading of the public funeral and the funeral oration (epitaphios logos), will show how both the ceremony and the oration work to contain lament. I will also put particular emphasis on the narrative section of the oration, showing how it works to exclude women from the history of the polis and therefore deny their right to speak. In Chapter 3, I show how lament deserves to be looked at as an important form
of pre-rhetoric by comparing its rhetorical techniques and underlying philosophy with that of the Sophists.

A Description of Greek Funeral and Lamentation

In around 595 BC, the Athenian archon Solon passed a series of funerary reforms which imposed severe limitations on traditional funerals and the role women played in them. This legislation, in fact, strictly defined women's behavior in funerals and limited their traditional laments to private spaces. The question to understand in this chapter, then, is why the state decided to pay so much attention to funerals by limiting how women acted and spoke at them. Why did the male leaders of the state feel anxious enough that they had to include funeral regulations as some of the very first written laws of the polis? In order to understand these questions, it is first necessary to both explain what is known about the traditional Greek funeral and to introduce some of the recent anthropological and historical work done on women's laments.

The Greek funeral consisted of three stages: the prothesis (wake), the ekphora (procession to the cemetery), and the burial itself. In each of these stages, it was the women who took the most prominent role. Immediately after someone died, the female relatives closed the mouth and eyes of the deceased, then washed the corpse, anointed it, and dressed it (Garland, *The Greek Way* 23-24). Most corpses were dressed in white, but sometimes the unmarried or only recently married would be dressed in wedding attire (24-25). Then, the corpse was placed on a funeral bier and covered in herbs (wild marjoram, celery, and evergreens) which scholars believe were used to ward off evil spirits, and the head was decorated with garlands of celery and laurel (Alexiou 5). The feet of the corpse were placed facing the door, and we know that at least in later times
(Hellenistic period), coins were placed in the mouths of the dead to ensure their passage across the river Styx (Garland, *The Greek Way* 23-24).

Based on funeral vase paintings, archeological studies, and literary evidence, we also have a good picture of what the rest of the *prothesis* (wake) must have been like. As Robert Garland points out, for example, vase paintings show us that women were in much closer association with the dead than men (*The Greek Way* 29). While the women are shown standing around the bier, wailing, beating their heads and chests, and pulling out their hair, the men stand or kneel at a distance from the corpse, their right arm raised in a uniform gesture of mourning (29). Throughout the *prothesis*, women sang laments to the dead, often touching the bier or the clothing of the dead, while the men remained in the distance, represented with one hand on their sword or dagger (29).

When the *prothesis* was finished, the *ekphora* (funeral procession) would begin. In ancient times, the bier was carried on a wagon drawn by two horses and followed by a large procession (Garland, *The Greek Way* 31). Although it is not known how noisy or emotional this procession was, Solon's laws did restrict this part of the funeral both in women's role and in the number of women allowed to participate, suggesting that it might have included as much lamenting as the *prothesis*. Although there are fewer representations on vases of the *ekphora* than the *prothesis*, one black figure vase does clearly show the members of the procession playing the *aulos* (reed pipe), indicating that laments were probably sung during the procession (Alexiou 7). In addition, under Gambreion law code (one of the other city-states to adopt Solon-like funeral legislation), women are forbidden from tearing their garments, suggesting that the rending of clothes often continued during this stage of the funeral (Alexiou 7).
Tombs in early Athens were often large and richly adorned, and offerings were made to the dead on the third, ninth, and thirteenth days after the burial. They were also made on certain festivals and after one year (Alexiou 7). According to texts and vase paintings, each of these visits to the tomb seems to have offered an opportunity for the same kind of frenzy as the *prothesis*. Women sang their laments again, lacerated their flesh, and pulled out their hair (Alexiou 7-8).

Unfortunately, there is not the same kind of detailed information available for ancient laments as for the funerals themselves. In fact, not even one written lament exists from ancient Greece. By studying portrayals of lamentation in epic and tragedy in combination with studies of lament in modern Greek culture, however, some theorists (Alexiou 1974, Holst-Warhaft 1992, and Seremekatis 1991) have managed to piece together a fairly detailed picture of what ancient lament must have been like. Of course, there are dangers in this kind of methodology. In her 1970's breakthrough work on lament, Classics scholar Margaret Alexiou points out, for example, the problems in trying to reconstruct real lament from fictionalized versions in epic and tragedy. Obviously, the laments for Hector in the *Iliad*, for instance, could not be considered an entirely accurate version of the laments for ordinary people. Despite this problem, however, Alexiou claims that if these ancient texts are used in combination with the kind of anthropological research done on modern laments, it is possible to "indicate those features which belong to a common tradition" and thus gain "valuable insight into the conventions of lamentation in antiquity" (xii).

From the very earliest literary representations of lament to those still sung in the Southern Peloponnese and Crete, there are some remarkable similarities. For example,
both ancient and modern laments are sung by two sets of women together: the female relations and the professional mourners (Alexiou 13). Even in the *Iliad*, Alexiou notices that two different words are used to describe the dirges sung by women attending the funeral: *goos* (wailing) for the female relations and *threnos* (mourning song) for the professionals (13). After Hector's body is placed on the funeral bier, for example, we see both kinds of lament sung. The Trojans "brought in singers, leaders of the dirges, who sang laments/in mournful tune, while the women wailed in chorus. White-armed Andromache led their keening" (ll. 24.720-3). Andromache and the other related women wail as the professional mourners sing their *threnos*. These two groups of women then sing together antiphonally, first a "set lament," then an improvised section of song by the relatives, followed by a refrain of wailing. As Alexiou shows, this formula for lamentation has survived from ancient times, through the Christian/Byzantine era, to modern laments. In Mani (a region in the Peloponnese, south of Sparta), for example, professional mourners are still often paid for their services, and the dirge can take the form of a contest at the end of which the best mourner is congratulated (Alexiou 40). The skill of mourning is often passed down from mother to daughter, and certain Maniot families have become famous for their talented laments (41). Further evidence for this continuity in tradition can be seen in the name given to them. The laments sung today in Greece are called *mirologoi* (to sing one's own fate), a phrase first found in the *Life of Alexander* (c. 300 B.C.) (Alexiou 112). Modern laments often emphasize the tragic situation of the mourner--complaining about the pitiful life widows lead and their financial woes, for instance. As Alexiou points out, this aspect of the modern lament is very similar to the women in tragedy
who sing dirges not about the dead but instead about their own fate (Jokasta, Antigone, Hekabe, Medea, Andromache, etc) (113).

Alexiou believes that the lament has survived as well as it has in part because the funeral rituals themselves have remained remarkably similar (xiii). Despite the influence of Christianity, for example, some rural areas in Greece (Mani and several towns in Crete are the most famous) have managed to keep many of the traditional funeral rites passed down from ancient Greece. In these areas, as in ancient times, the funeral still consists of the prothesis, ekphora, and burial; the women still wash the body and close the mouth and eyes of the dead. The dead are still adorned with the traditional herbs, a coin is placed in their mouth, and the body is positioned in the traditional way. Even the priests seem to have given up trying to change the ancient customs. Alexiou shows, for instance, that throughout the Byzantine era, the Christian church tried repeatedly to put an end to traditional lament but with very little success. Similarly, in modern times, women in rural parts of Greece have kept their traditions, and priests play no part in the prothesis (Seremetakis, The Last Word 159-160). In Mani, even when, out of necessity, the prothesis is held in church instead of in the kin's home, for example, the priest allows the women to mourn traditionally and does not disturb them (Seremetakis, The Last Word 159).

For my purposes, it is important to emphasize that the lament has also retained its "extreme" nature. Despite the early laws of Solon and the later efforts of the Christian church, both of which viewed lament as dangerous, women in certain places in Greece have continued to rend their clothes, pull out their hair, and wail. It is this aspect of the lament which shall from now be the focus of my investigation. As I shall
show in just a moment, modern mourners have also kept in tact the traditional call for blood vengeance.

Legislating Lament

According to Plutarch, regulations limiting the role of women in funeral lamentation were some of the first pieces of legislation passed by Solon. Plutarch writes that Solon "subjected the public appearances of the women, their mourning and their festivals, to a law which did away with disorder and licence" (XXI. 3). He claims that the custom of women lacerating their own flesh at funerals was made illegal as was the use of "set laments" (threnos), sacrificing an ox at the grave, and burying the dead in more than three garments (XXI. 3-5). Additional information about Solon's funeral laws comes from Demosthenes. Such laws include regulating that the prothesis must occur within the confines of the home, whereas it had been previously done in public, limiting the duration of the prothesis from an indefinite period of time to only one day, and forcing women to walk behind the men during the ekphora. Finally, no women under age sixty, outside the immediate family, were allowed to participate in the ekphora (Demosthenes XLIII 62). In addition to Solon's laws, the amount of money spent on individual tombs was greatly reduced through additional legislation around 530 B.C. (Garland, "The Well-Ordered Corpse" 6).

Early theories which tried to explain funeral legislation typically viewed it as a result of either the state's desire to limit the spending on the dead or as Athenian efforts

---

1 It is interesting to note that Athens was not the only state to legislate funerals and women's role in them. Sometime between 450-400 B.C., funerary legislation from Iulis states that the corpse has to be covered up during the ekphora and that the procession must remain silent. Pittakos of Mytilene (c 650-570 B.C.) forbid the attendance of non-relatives to funerals. The Labyad phratry at Delphi inscribed a stone block with laws concerning funerals which forbid stopping the funeral procession at street corners and wailing, and also forbid women from singing dirges at the grave (Garland. "The Well-Ordered Corpse 8-13).
to control superstition. Clearly, both of these explanations fall short. As Alexiou convincingly argues, the economic reason is suspicious in that it does not explain why the laws are focused on women, nor does it make sense considering the large sums of money being spent at that time on public buildings. She also claims that superstition is an unlikely motive because the funeral legislation was passed at about the same time that hero worship was formally introduced. Since hero worship contains many of the same practices and beliefs found in burial rites, she asserts that the state must not have been very concerned about superstition (18).

A much more tempting and sophisticated argument can be found in Sourvinou-Inwood's *A Trauma in Flux: Death in the 8th Century and After*. Sourvinou-Inwood convincingly argues that between the 8th century and the classical period there occurred large changes in Greek attitudes towards death. In the earlier period, she claims that the Greeks had a more familiar and accepting attitude towards death in which the rituals played a valuable role in society and encouraged a close relationship with the dead. The rituals reflected an anger with death but also worked to normalize the community after the death. Under this model, she states, "death is accepted as man's inescapable lot, part of the life-cycle of the world, and of the community, in which the generations succeed each other, and the continuity of the community gives meaning to the discontinuity of the individual. Death is familiar, hateful rather than frightening, and contact with death and the dead is not avoided" (34). During the archaic period, Sourvinou-Inwood claims that these notions undergo a dramatic change. Because of the break-up of smaller communities with the rise of the *polis*, emerging notions of individualism, new philosophical trends emphasizing ethics, and an intense fear of disorder, a new attitude
towards death developed. This new attitude is represented by an intense fear of death and a desire for a serene afterlife. According to Sourvinou-Inwood, the funeral legislation is a way to limit "death's encroachment on community life by limiting the disruption and lowering the emotional tone of the death-ritual" (47).

In response to Sourvinou-Inwood's hypothesis, classical scholar Richard Seaford argues that her explanation fails to account for Solon's limitations on items to be used in the funeral ritual and buried with the dead (79). Seaford also claims that, if true, the process of forming new ideas toward death as well as increasingly small groups of mourners (because of the break-up of small communities) would not have required legislation (81). Neither of these objections, however, convincingly denies Sourvinou-Inwood's premise. They only show that it cannot be taken as the sole reason for the funeral legislation. The problem with Sourvinou-Inwood's explanation is that while it probably describes the larger trends in funeral changes accurately, it ignores a great deal of historical evidence which points to more specific reasons for the legislation.

Another possible explanation sees the funeral legislation as part of a trend toward replacing the traditional power of aristocratic clans with a more powerful and more centralized state government (Alexiou 18). In addition to his funeral legislation, for example, Solon gave new political rights to individuals from non-aristocratic clans (Litman 70). He also formed a new set of inheritance laws which allowed men the right to adopt sons to whom they could leave their estates. As Litman points out, these laws clearly favored the survival and power of the oikos (individual family) over the clan (Litman 28). It also gave the male head of the household the right to do whatever he chose with his property regardless of wives, daughters, or other kin. Later, around the
end of the 6th century, Cleisthenes attempted to abolish clan power completely by creating artificial descent groups based on locality rather than kin relation. These groups (deme) were then used in all state religious ceremonies and for all political purposes (Litman 50). Clearly, the emotional excess of funeral rituals would have lent themselves to kin solidarity and probably did play a role in the motivation behind funeral legislation. But even this explanation is only part of the picture which needs further exploration and more evidence.

The most detailed explanation for the funeral legislation is given to us by Plutarch. In Lives, he tells us that the legislation was a direct reaction to the largest incidence of blood feud and clan strife recorded in Athens. Plutarch writes that when Solon came to power, this feud had been continuing for a number of years. It started when Kylon and some co-conspirators tried to take control of Athens. They had taken sanctuary in the temple of Athena, but were persuaded by Megacles and his clan (the Alkmeonids) to stand trial (most likely at the Aereopagus). The Kylons agreed and then tied a string to the statue of Athena to show they were still under her protection. When the Kylon clan was passing by the shrine of the Erinyes (furies), however, the string that was connecting them to Athena broke. The Alkmeonids interpreted this event as a sign that Athena had refused the Kylons as supplicants. The Alkmeonids then slaughtered a large number of the Kylon clan, some outside the opening of the Erinyes cave and some actually inside it. This usurpation of justice led to a feud which split much of Athens into two warring factions. Plutarch claims that this feud continued until the arrival of Epimenides, a "Wise Man" from Crete, who befriended Solon. According to Plutarch, Epimenides helped stop the feud by making "the Athenians...milder in their rites of
mourning, by attaching certain sacrifices immediately to their funeral ceremonies, and by taking away the harsh and barbaric practices in which their women had indulged up to that time" (XXII. 5). It is only after these changes in Athenian funeral practices that Solon manages to convince the Alkmeonids to stand trial, whereupon they are banished from the city-state. To get a sense of how large this feud was, we need only realize that when the Alkmeonids are later banished from the polis, more than 700 families go into exile (Litman 20).

According to Plutarch, then, Solon's funeral laws are aimed at preserving the harmony of the state against the disruptive nature of the funeral rituals. By containing the rituals, the state is thus able to contain reciprocal violence. But Plutarch's narrative is somewhat questionable. First, it wasn't written until about 100 A.D., nearly 700 years after the events in question had occurred. There are thus questions as to how much of this narrative is fact and how much might have been popular myth. M. L. West explains, for example, that although there is no doubt that the Kylon/Alkmeonid feud took place and was resolved during Solon's archonship, the pieces of the story that deal with Epimenides might be fictional. West points out that although Plutarch's handling of Epimenides seems reasonable, there are other popular stories about him which are clearly myth. Some say that he was the son of a nymph, for instance, or that he spent 57 years in a cave sleeping and lived until he was 154, 157, or 299 years old (45). Despite whether Epimenides is an historical figure or not, however, Seaford cleverly implies that it might not matter. What is most important about the story, for him, is that it links the funerals with reciprocal violence in the Athenian imagination (82). Even if this is
the case, however, it still remains to be seen how funerals might have spurred this reciprocal violence.

To gain some insight into why funerals and women's lamentation were so closely linked to feuding in the Athenian imagination, we need to look no further than Aeschylus' *Oresteia*. In it, the city-state of Argos is caught in a cycle of reciprocal violence which it cannot end. Clytemnestra kills Agamemnon because Agamemnon killed Iphigenia; Orestes kills Clytemnestra because she killed Agamemnon; and at the end of the play when there is no one left to avenge Clytemnestra, the furies come out of the earth to avenge her death. For my purposes, however, what is most interesting about the play is how female lament drives this cycle of vengeance. Even in the play's first lament, for example (Cassandra's dirge for her own future death), Cassandra's last words are a plea to be avenged. She sings "I pray unto the sun, in presence of his latest light, that mine enemies may at the same time pay to my avengers a bloody penalty for slaughtering a slave, an easy prey" (1324-1326).

The most powerful example of lament spurring violence, however, is sung by the Trojan slaves at the center of the 2nd play, "The Choephori," and thus lies at the center of the Oresteia trilogy. In this, the most central scene of the play, Electra, Orestes, and the Trojan women participate in a funeral ritual for Agamemnon. As Holst-Warhaft shows, the Trojan women are something which the Athenian audience was probably quite familiar with, "'professional' women mourners who 'stage' emotional response and by doing so inspire not only pity and fear but violent action" (142). Even though these women are only the slaves of Agamemnon, they participate in the lament fully, their "cheeks marked with bloody gashes," crying, and tearing their clothes (49-
50). At the beginning of the women's lament, both Electra and Orestes are undecided about whether to kill their mother. When the women first begin singing, for example, Electra questions their cries to the gods for vengeance asking "Is this a righteous thing for me to ask of heaven?" (122). Orestes is equally uncertain. He is caught in a personal struggle, questioning whether he should kill Clytemnestra and anger the furies or leave his father unavenged and thus anger Apollo. The Trojan women, however, sing of blood vengeance, crying "may it be mine to raise a lusty shout in triumph over the man when he is stabbed and over the woman as she perishes...it is the eternal rule that drops of blood spilt upon the ground demand yet other blood. Murder crieth aloud on the spirit of vengeance" (386-402). Soon, both Orestes and Electra are persuaded by the Trojan women's dirge and can no longer restrain their desire for vengeance. Towards the end of the lament, Electra's opinion of avenging their father has altered completely, and she re-envisions herself as a bloodthirsty wolf. She urges Orestes to kill their mother and promises to reward him by honoring his death mound more than any other if he succeeds. Not only has Electra forgotten her hesitation to fulfill blood vengeance, but like her mother, she becomes willing to sacrifice a living relative to avenge a dead one.

The main question for the end of the play is how the state can somehow control or pacify this kind of female-driven violence. Just as in Plutarch's narrative, this violence can only be stopped in a court of law, where justice is decided by an Athenian jury. The older system of reciprocal violence is there represented by the Furies (Erinyes), the physical embodiment of blood vengeance. They dance and scream, chanting for Clytemnestra's revenge. Beaten in court, replaced by a new system of
justice, the furies lament their own loss of power and promise to wreak disaster upon Athens. It is only when Athena manages to soothe their laments with rhetoric that the Erinyes become the harmless Eumenides, changing their name for new responsibilities. Instead of being the instigators of vengeance, they become the protectors of marriage and are themselves buried under the court of law. Clearly, Plutarch and Aeschylus' narratives are remarkably similar. Both deal with reciprocal violence which centers around women's mourning and the furies. Both narratives show that the only way for that reciprocal violence to end is by the containment of women's voices and their replacement by a court of law. Unfortunately, what we do not know is where this narrative came from and how accurately it was related. Did Plutarch borrow the material from Aeschylus or did both narratives have their origin in some older document?

Even if we refuse to believe Plutarch's narrative or accept the Oresteia as accurately representing Athenian attitudes towards lament, there is some historical evidence which suggests Athenian law has its origins in trying to stop the reciprocal violence of the Kylon/Alkmeonid affair. The Kylon/Alkmeonid feud is said to have started between 632 and 624 BC (West 45). In 621/620 BC, Drakon created the first written laws of Athens, the most famous of which are his laws on homicide. Most scholars agree that there is little question that the timing of these laws was a direct reaction to the blood feud (Stroud 60-64; Rhodes 111-112). These laws, while they took the right to kill the enemy out of the hands of the relatives, continued to imitate feuding in that relatives, not the state, brought the killer to trial. Even in classical

---

2 For a chronology of events relevant to funeral legislation and the Kylon/Alkmeonid feud, see Appendix 1.
Athens, this system of self-help continued, and the fear of lament-inspired violence lived on. During the *ekphora*, for example, the nearest male relative of the murdered man was forced by law to carry a spear and announce to the procession his intention of prosecuting the murderer in court (Demosthenes 47.69). Even more interestingly, the right to prosecute under Drakon's laws was limited to the degree of second-cousins' children, the same degree of relationship for which female mourners were allowed to lament the dead under Solon's laws (Alexiou 22).

Perhaps the most direct evidence of lament encouraging feud, however, comes from anthropological studies of areas in Greece in which the inhabitants have preserved the traditional Greek funeral laments and rituals. In Inner Mani, for example, it is still common for professional mourners to lament the dead and sing antiphonally with the female relatives of the dead man. In this society, the link between lament and feud is especially close and can give us a good idea of how lament and feud might have been linked in pre-classical Athens. It is also a good place to make comparisons because of the long uninterrupted history of the feuds which began sometime during the fourteenth century AD and lasted until about the time of the second world war (Holst-Warhaft 43-44). Because the feuds ended so recently, anthropologists have been busy recording the laments and collecting evidence.

In European culture, as Lutz points out, anger is the only emotion in which men are seen to exceed women in both depth and strength (73). But as Holst-Warhaft shows, this is untrue for cultures like Mani, where blood feud is common. In such cultures, "not only are women frequently the initiators of revenge, but they are merciless to men who fail to take up arms" (88). In fact, Holst-Warhaft shows that...
although men and women occupy very different worlds in Mani, the women there are just as "involved in the cycle of revenge as their men, and as concerned with questions of honor" (88). In a number of revenge laments, for example, the story is of a woman who, without a man to avenge the dead, takes the responsibility herself.

In a society which has feuding and lament, the honor of the clan is more important than a woman's relationship to her husband, self-preservation, or even the preservation of her children. One of the oldest of the popular Maniot laments, for example, tells the story of a widow (Pavlos Koutalidis) whose husband was murdered eighteen years before, who sets an extra plate on the table one Easter, telling her children that the extra place is for their father who has not been avenged. She tells them to hunt down their father's killer that very day. She speaks to them, saying, "If you do otherwise/ may you have no joy/ and may my black curse/ follow you everywhere!" (qtd. in Holst-Warhaft 87).

Anthropologists have noted that Mani does not seem to be an exception, but rather that in many societies with elaborate women's lament, there seems to be a correlation with blood feud especially around the Mediterranean and the Middle East. In Black-Michaud's *Cohesive Force: Feud in the Mediterranean and the Middle East*, he writes that, in Somaliland, southern Greece, Albania, and Corsica it is customary practice for the women to improvise funerary dirges the principal object of which is to incite the dependants and close kin of the victim to wash the stain of blood from their house by spilling the blood of the killer or his near agnates. These dirges express ferociously blood-thirsty sentiments and are frequently the work of women endowed with outstanding poetical gifts. They are remembered by the kin of the victim over whose bier they were sung and are repeated by their womenfolk for years after the event to instill into the male
heirs of the deceased, who may have been infants at the time of
the killing, the necessity to bring vengeance when they grow
old enough to bear arms. (79)

Although this practice will seem brutal to most modern readers, it is important to
remember that in clan-based societies feuding is part of the accepted political structure.

Seen in this light, women's lament is thus a part of that structure and allows women a
forum for political agency. The next section of this chapter will consider lament as a
socially and politically charged genre in which the call for vengeance is only one of its
aspects. While calls for vengeance seem to have been the specific impetus for Solon's
legislation, it will be demonstrated that the lament's political power might have
provided another reason for its containment.

The Political Power of Lament

In the middle of his description of lament in Mani, Patrick Fermor, author of the
seminal guide to Mani culture, notices that the women singing the lament do not always
keep to what he assumes is the purpose of the lament: talking about the dead. In a
somewhat comic passage, he notes that the singer while leaning over the corpse,
sometimes
goest clean off the rails, drifting into personal reminiscence and
old grievances, even into questions of politics, where, without
any relevanse, problems of taxation and economy, the fall of
governments, the names of ministers and generals, the price of
salt, the Bulgarian frontier, the need for roads or a new mole for
the caiques to unload their flour—all in faultless, sixteen syllable
couplets—weave themselves into the song, until the next mourner
tactfully steers the klama (mourner) back to its proper theme. (60)

These digressions require further explanation. Clearly, they are not the result of simply
"going off the rails." and other onlookers familiar with the political issues of the area
would not find them nearly as amusing or as harmless as Fermor presents them. In fact, a minister in the government might find the reference to the Bulgarian frontier (a reference to a recent war at that time) very serious indeed, especially if delivered in front of a large crowd.

These digressions in the lament do not occur only in Mani; they are, in fact, quite common throughout the Mediterranean. In a series of studies on Cretan laments performed in the late 1970's and early 1980's, anthropologist Anna Caraveli-Chaves shows that lament often acts as a social protest in which the mourners can air their grievances against their own families or society at large, especially grievances about the "afflictions which are peculiar to women in a male-dominated social structure" ("Bridge between Worlds" 138). These women often sing about their marginalized role in society, about male guardians who have failed to protect them or deserted them, or about the sufferings of child-birth and raising children (139). Particularly interesting is a genre of laments in Crete which Caraveli entitles "widows' songs." These laments consist almost entirely of social protest against the fate and position of widows and their social isolation. Consider the following lament. (Words in parenthesis indicate the chorus which the other mourners offer as part of the lament's antiphonal structure.)

The widow stays inside the house--gossip around her all around!
The widow stays inside the house--gossip around her all around!
(Painful exile!)
She can't gaze out the window, she can't sit by the doorstep.
(Bitter widow!)
There are fresh breezes by the window, there is gay chatting by the doorstep. (Bitter widow!)
Widow, go change your name, don't let them call you widow!
(Ah! Bitter widow!)
Widow, night comes on the mountains, yet soon daylight sets in,
(Bitter widow!)
But so many plumes and feathers as a black hen has,  
(Bitter widow!)  
So many times must you sit and wait at your front door, my widow.  
(Ah, bitter woman!)  
(Recorded by Sotirios Chianis 1959)

In this lament, the widow's seclusion is absolute. She must not go outside or engage in the discourse of the community. Rather, she is the object of others' discourse, "the gossip around her all around." This lament thus offers the widow her only public opportunity to protest her fate.

The lament also offers the opportunity for women to tell their own history and console each other. In many Cretan laments, the women impart into the lament their own heroines. They sing the memory of gifted healers, craftswomen, talented mourners, and mothers, telling their tales and passing down their history from one generation to the next ("The Bitter Wounding" 170).

Cretan laments do not always focus on the personal, however; they also regularly critique powerful institutions, such as the church, the courts, and the government. In the following lament, the singer is mourning her husband (Yianni) who was killed in war.

What's wrong with you, miserable crow, wailing and squealing so?  
(Oh, I can't bear it, Yianni!)  
Are you that thirsty for blood, that hungry for young flesh?  
(How awful, my fate!)  
Go beyond Gribala mountain, go to Gribala peak  
(I can't bear it, Yianni)  
To find proud, young bodies there all bathed in dark blood  
(Oh, my luck is awful!)  
How bitter the wound! How poisonous the gunshot! Damned be the war! Damn it a thousand times! (Oh, what a horrible fate!)  
It takes children away from mothers, brothers away from brothers  
(Awful, awful fate!)
And it tears man away from wife, though they love each other.
(My fate is awful!)
And on the spot on which they part, no grass can ever grow.
(qtd. in "The Bitter Wounding" 183) (Recorded by Anna Caravelli 1978)

This lament clearly challenges the value of war for the state. If ancient laments were anything like this, one can certainly understand why the Athenian government would wish to contain this public and emotional form of protest during funerals for the war dead.

Though most of the formal laments in modern-day Crete are based on existing laments, Caravelli shows that talented mourners often adapt the words and meaning of the laments to fit the situation, all without losing meter. While she was recording laments, for example, mourners would often mention the camera and tape recorder in the room. They also added current, political topics into traditional laments. Caravelli notes that it is this ability to improvise and alter the lament which allows "the singer an avenue for social commentary on the larger world, rather than an instrument of restriction and isolation" ("The Bitter Wounding" 191)

In her 1980's studies of lament in Mani, anthropologist C. Seremetakis shows that Maniot women's laments are also imbued with political power. While in other social areas, women are often overlooked and their voices silenced, they are paid respect and listened to during their laments. In one lament, for example, a sister of the deceased demanded during her lamentation that her brother-in-law not marry because of his children. The man never remarried. He said in an interview later, that while he could have ignored his sister-in-law in other settings, he would have faced public shame had he not heeded her warning and something had happened to his children (The Last Word 128). During lament, women have a special right to speak freely and the audience has
an obligation to listen carefully. Working with the writing of Foucault and other scholars who assert that pain can be used by the subject to resist social institutions, Seremetakis theorizes that the mourners' speaking privilege is a result of the uncontrolled pain of the lament ("The Ethics" 483). According to Seremetakis, pain breaks down the usual identities and institutions which prevent women from speaking publicly and allows them a safe space from which to speak (484-485). In addition, Seremetakis claims that the collective pain of the female participants and their support of each other through antiphonal encouragement gives the performance greater validity as "truthful discourse" (507). Moreover, men are unable to respond vocally during the service and are forbidden to physically approach the mourners (503).

Traditionally, lament in Mani had enormous political influence. Before the unifying force of the Greek government took control over the area, Mani was "a stateless society devoid of any codified laws or specialized juridical and administrative institutions" (Seremetakis, "The Ethics" 503). All such decisions during this time were instead made by two separate kin-based groups: the yerondiki, a male council which had formal legitimacy to make decisions for the community, and the women mourners, who had an informal role in the decision-making process (503). Because these women would know what issues were concerned with the death they were lamenting (revenge and honor codes, marital issues, inheritance disputes, kinship issues, etc.), they could use their position to enforce collectively held responsibilities and traditions (504). Quite often, as Seremetakis points out, these women "could impose decisions on the yerondiki through the appeal to collectively held moral obligations, (obligations) that did not always conform to the political interest of the yerondiki" (504).
Clearly, each of these anthropologists is arguing that modern lament is political. Unfortunately, however, no one has tried yet to make the same case for ancient lament. The main difficulty in trying to show that ancient lament was political, of course, is our lack of authentic ancient laments. Based on a short analysis of the political system of ancient Greece, a close reading of laments in classical tragedy, and a short review of recent scholarship on women in ancient Greece, I still believe that a good case can be made.

Although we know very little about the influence of women's lament on the governments of ancient Greece, the loosely-organized clan system of Mani does have a number of similarities to the Homeric world. After the fall of the Mycenaen civilization (c. 1200 B.C.), Greece organized itself into much smaller "units, in many ways independent of each other, each headed by an aristocratic family of greater or lesser eminence" (Snodgrass 387). There were kings, but these early Greek kings did not have the same kind of power as their predecessors in Mycenae. In The Administration of Justice, Bonner and Smith state that these kings would more accurately be represented with the title "chief" and that their decisions were usually made in consultation with a counsel of lesser chiefs (1-2). Using evidence from Homer and Hesiod, they show that although this council might not have had direct authority over the chief, they certainly seem to have had considerable influence over his decisions (5). Moreover, Bonner and Smith claim that freemen also had a voice in this society by being able to speak in general assemblies (2). Although we cannot say whether women's lament was as influential in these societies as it was in Mani, the diffuse power structure of ancient
Greece would seem to be a conducive situation for women's lament to influence affairs of the state.

Unfortunately, because there are so few representations of lament from the early archaic period (only those in Homer), it cannot be said for certain if laments voiced political themes. There are, however, a number of laments from classical Greek tragedies which take up political themes. In *The Persians*, for instance, the mourners sing an anti-war lament that seems quite similar to those found in modern lament. The Persian women, upon hearing that their army has suffered a double defeat at Platae and Salamis, sing an antiphonal lament in which they claim that Xerxes, the king of Persia, has acted imprudently and therefore wasted the lives of his people (546-552). When they greet Xerxes, still in the midst of their lament, they cry, "The land bewaileth her native youth, slaughtered for Xerxes, who hath gorged the realm of Death with Persian slain...To hail thee on thy return home I will send forth the ill-omened cry of woe, the voice, versed in lamentation" (922-937). At the end of *The Seven Against Thebes*, there is an act of female solidarity against the laws of the city-state. The city's women, moved to pity by the antiphonal lament of Antigone and Ismene, agree to disregard Creon's edict forbidding the burial of Polynices and instead join Antigone in her rebellion. They say, "Let the State doom or doom not those that sorrow for Polynices. We, at all events, will go and in funeral train and join her (Antigone) in burying him. For all our race hat' a portion in this sorrow; and what a State approves as just changes with changing times" (172-176).

There is also evidence that our traditional understanding of women in Greece as cloistered and politically inactive may have been somewhat exaggerated. M. Clark, in
her 1983 anthropological study of a modern Greek village, has shown that anthropologists' understanding of gender relations is based on what information he or she has access to. Her results, which other studies have now confirmed, show that women hold much more power than previously thought. She writes,

> When we began our field study at Methane it was soon evident that characterizations of Greek women in some of the ethnographic accounts did not fit the women we were encountering. While we had read about powerless, submissive females who considered themselves morally inferior to men, we found physically and socially strong women who had a great deal to say about what took place in the village. The social and economic affairs of several households were actually dominated by older women, including the house of village officials. (122)

This tendency for scholars to oversimplify gender relations and too easily view women as submissive and powerless, according to David Cohen, has also been applied to studies of classical Greece. He points out that scholars when speaking about the status of women or issues of seclusion have often "fail(ed) to distinguish between ideology and (sometimes conflicting) normative ideals on the one hand, and social practices on the other" (136).

I have already said that women in ancient Greece took a politically active role inside the clan structure, particularly in terms of feuding. I have also discussed how the Athenian state made continual efforts to curb the power of the clans. If women's lament was indeed political, then many of the laments might well have been in opposition to the new laws and restrictions put on them by the emerging city-state. Take Solon's laws on inheritance and legalized adoption, for example. Not only would these laws have adversely affected clans, but they also would have taken a certain amount of power away from women. As Holst-Warhaft points out, the right to inherit was traditionally linked
to the right to mourn, meaning that women at least traditionally had some influence concerning property (117). With this new legislation, however, men could not only give property to whomever they pleased without concern for their kin, but they could do so without regard for women's traditional role in matters of inheritance. It seems likely, since inheritance is a significant theme in modern lament, that under the state's attack on clans, it also would have provided them with a common topic.

In addition, Alexiou points out that the more centralized the government became and the more power it gave to the *oikos* (individual family units) over the clan, the more restricted women's roles in society became. She states that "if the family, based on father right, was to be established as the basic unit of society, then the power of women in religious and family affairs must be stopped and they must be made to play a more secondary role at funerals" (21). If it is true that women argued against these new restrictions, then they would likely be seen by the state as representing and supporting an older tradition. The next chapter will examine not only how the *epitaphios logos* (funeral oration) acted to contain lament, but also how it pairs women with this older system of kinship, thereby defining them as primitive and denying the validity of their voices.
2. BURYING WOMEN’S VOICES: THE *EPITAPHIOS LOGOS* AS A NEW RHETORIC OF MOURNING

The previous chapter considered the role women had traditionally played in controlling funerals and lamenting the dead in Athens before 600 BC and analyzed what these laments might have looked like. In addition, it showed how Solon's laws limiting women's lament were aimed towards controlling the blood feuds which plagued the early city-state. This chapter looks at the *epitaphios logos*, the official funeral speech delivered in memory of the war dead in ancient Athens. A close reading of the speeches and an analysis of the standard topoi of myths used in them will show the various ways in which this rhetorical form works to suppress women's lament and replaces the true history of Athenian with a mythic history without women.

Before starting the analysis, however, it is necessary to discuss the ways in which the *epitaphios logos* has been considered by other scholars. Since Aristotle, the *epitaphios logos* has been defined as a sub-category of epideictic rhetoric. As such, it has received scant attention and has suffered from the same kinds of reading as the epideictic. This absence of critical attention is hardly surprising considering that, until recently, epideictic oratory was often defined as non-serious, due to what was traditionally seen as its lack of an immediate persuasive purpose and its emphasis on rhetorical skill over subject matter. In *Rhetoric*, Aristotle says, for instance, that the audience of epideictic rhetoric comprises spectators whose goal is not to decide an issue, as in the other two forms of oratory, but is instead simply to judge the ability of the speaker (1, 3, 2). After the decline of classical Athens, epideictic rhetoric was further devalued. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca point out that the Romans separated
epideictic from rhetoric and defined it as the study of grammarians. Epideictic, due to its closer relationship with the poetic, was included in literary prose, while forensic and deliberative rhetoric became the study of philosophy and dialectics (48-49).

Recently, however, the importance of epideictic to the field of rhetoric has been reconsidered. Dissatisfied with Aristotle’s descriptive definition of epideictic as more poetic than other kinds of rhetoric, focused on the present, and concerned with praising and blaming, scholars have tried to redefine the epideictic and its purpose (Sheard 773). Some of these authors have focused on the performance and audience experience of epideictic. Carter, for example, claims that the funeral oratories must be understood in the context of ritual and claims that their language "has power beyond the efficient, beyond the practical, beyond the measurable" (231). In his view, the purpose of funeral oratory is the celebration of community and its common values through ritual.

Similarly, Walter H. Beale focuses on epideictic in terms of speech act theory, claiming that epideictic oratory is performative and thus "a significant social action in itself" (225). Other scholars have focused on the educational function of the epideictic. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca claim that the epideictic orator is a teacher (52), and Bernard K Duffy argues that "unlike deliberative and forensic discourse, which have limited practical purposes in view, epideictic must fulfill a broad and timeless educational function" (86).

Almost all of this work, however, presents epideictic oratory as a way of celebrating the community's values in non-confrontational ways in front of an audience who already fully believes what the orator has to say. Sullivan claims that the rhetor treats the audience "as though they are already within the pale and attempts to increase
the intensity of their adherence to those values held in common" (126), and Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca write that "what he [the orator] is going to say does not arouse controversy, ... no immediate practical interest is ever involved, and there is no question of attacking or defending, but simply of promoting values that are shared in the community" (52). Although appealing to shared community values is indeed a major concern of epideictic rhetoric, it is important not to limit it too strictly to these terms. Consider how in *Rereading the Sophists* Jarratt shows that through epideictic discourse, the sophists were able to question and revise cultural ideals. Through antithesis, for example, Gorgias uses the *Encomium of Helen* to question prior assumptions and "awaken in them [the audience] an awareness of the multiplicity of possible truths" (22). Similarly, in the "Great Speech," Protagorus is able to use parataxis, retelling Hesiod's cosmogony so as to educate his students and instill in them a different understanding of the world than that which they previously held (24). Neither of these epideictic speeches attempts to increase commonly felt values or describe in poetic ways what the audience already knows.

Although the *epitaphios logoi* of the Athenian orators do not provide such a radical attack on Athenian assumptions and values as do the speeches of Gorgias and Protagorus, I will argue that the *epitaphoi* did work more subtly against an older system of ideals, constructing and praising a new system of thought--one opposed to women's control over funerals and the laments they sang. Furthermore, because epideictic is the rhetorical form most obviously connected to communicating cultural ideals, it also provides the best place to look for attitudes about gender and Athenians' own understanding of the past. In particular, I am interested in reading the funeral orations
in a historical and social context as a reaction to and subversion of women's lamentation and control of funeral rites. This kind of investigation is very similar to what Takis Poulakos calls for when he complains about the current way epideictic is being investigated and writes:

The potential of epideictic discourse to constitute the social is limited to a realm devoid of practical action, a realm where general standards of knowledge and belief-systems are communicated. To strengthen epideictic's relation to the social sphere, then, we must look beyond that abstract realm of shared beliefs and examine instead what socially specific function this form can serve. We must explore, that is, whether epideictic forms come into being, and acquire their meaning, under particular social conditions. (148-149)

Although Poulakos applies this kind of reading with a cultural materialist view of the changes occurring between classes in Athens, this same technique can be applied in a feminist/historiographical critique. My argument will show that epideictic rhetoric, in its earliest form (the epitaphios logos), was not simply delivered to an audience that would accept its values without question and that its purpose was not just to preach to the converted or support already existing values. Instead, I will claim that the epitaphios logos was part of an agon, part of a conflict to change older values and notions about the role of its citizens. This reading of the epitaphios logos will show that not only did the epitaphios logos serve as a container for emotions and women's lament, but that its role was to suppress and replace the traditional voice women had in funeral rites with the male rhetoric of an idealized and mythological city-state. Moreover, this study will also help explain the lack of women's voices that feminists have commented on in ancient rhetoric. After all, one of the main purposes of the epitaphios logos (the
earliest known form of institutionalized rhetoric\textsuperscript{1} was to exclude women from public speech and to deny their existence in the formation of the state.

This section will look at the four complete \textit{epitaphios} logoi existent: those by Pericles, Plato, Lysias, and Demosthenes. Although there are six existent speeches, Gorgias' is only a very short fragment and Hyperides' is not only a fragment but exists only in the original Greek. At first glance, our four \textit{epitaphio} seem quite a reassuring list: Athens' greatest leader, an influential philosopher, and two of the most powerful rhetoricians in Classical Athens. Upon closer scrutiny, however, almost every one of these speeches has been questioned in terms of its authorship and credibility. In fact, of the four speeches, only Demosthenes' (delivered in 338 BC after the defeat at Chaeronea) seems to have been delivered, in its existing form, to an audience of Athenians (Loraux 8).

Although it is known that Pericles did deliver funeral oratories on two occasions, 440 and 431 BC (Plutarch, Pericles 8.6), the only existing version of either of those speeches is of the speech from 431 BC as transcribed by Thucydides in his \textit{History of the Peloponnesian War} (ii. 35-46). Kennedy points out that this transcription is at best suspicious because in 431 BC Thucydides was still in exile and therefore could not have attended the speech (\textit{A New History} 21). Despite this, however, the speech does seem to follow the kind of form expected of an \textit{epitaphios logos}, and Kennedy reminds the

\textsuperscript{1} Unfortunately, we do not have an exact date for the formation of the \textit{epitaphios logos}, and critics, both ancient and modern, have long debated this question. Most scholars guess that it occurred at about the time of the Persian Wars, but it could have been as late as 464 B.C. We have to realize, however, that even this date is almost forty years before Gorgias arrived in Athens. For more about the dating of \textit{epitaphios logos}, see Loraux's \textit{Invention of Athens} page 13.
reader that "since the speech was famous in antiquity, the extension of the subject is probably not an addition of Thucydides" (*The Art of Persuasion* 155).

Like Pericles' oration, Lysias' has also been questioned in terms of authenticity. Although the oration was traditionally thought to have been delivered in 392 BC just after the defeat at Corinth (Lamb 29), scholars now tend to agree that the oration was probably only an imitation of the *epitaphios logos* and that it was not delivered to an actual audience (Lamb 28, *The Art of Persuasion* 154). This argument is especially convincing, considering that Lysias was a metic and therefore did not fit the description of a model Athenian citizen who delivered the *epitaphios logoi* (Loraux, *The Invention of Athens* 9). Some scholars (Lamb and Kennedy) have also doubted the authenticity of Lysias' oration due to its uncharacteristic style and "lack of simplicity, grace, clearness, and sense of symmetry" (Lamb 29).

Of all the funeral orations, however, Plato's *epitaphios* in *Menexenus* has been the most disturbing for scholars. That it is an imitation of a funeral speech has never been in doubt. What is unclear, however, is to what extent Plato is serious in having Socrates deliver the speech. At the beginning of the dialogue, Socrates seems to be poking fun of the form, claiming that after listening to the *epitaphios logoi*, he feels so elated that it is if he has "been living in the Islands of the Blessed" for at least three days (236c). Socrates also claims that it does not take any skill to compose a funeral oration because the form is so standard and because it is not difficult to praise Athenians to Athenians (235d). In addition to these criticisms, there are a number of historical anomalies in this speech, including having Socrates relate the Peace of Antalcidas, a treaty which didn't take place until about a dozen years after Socrates' death (*The Art of Persuasion* 158).
Despite these troubling aspects of the speech, however, many critics understand the speech to be a serious work of Plato's. According to Cicero, for example, Plato's *epitaphios* was read in public every year in Athens (*Orator* 151). Kennedy points out that although Socrates seems to be mocking rhetoricians at the beginning of the dialogue, the tone of the speech becomes quite serious once he starts, and Socrates expresses no shame at the end for having delivered it, as he does after his first speech on love in the *Phaedrus* (*The Art of Persuasion* 159). Furthermore, Duffy compares *Menexenus* and the Socrates' second speech in *Phaedrus*, pointing to both speeches as examples of how Plato tried to use epideictic rhetoric to persuade his audience of a higher truth (89). Both Kennedy and Duffy, in fact, claim that the historical anomalies in *Menexenus* are sacrificed for attaining this higher version of truth (161, 90).

Kennedy even points out that in the *Republic* (389b7) the leaders of the ideal city can tell lies as long as they are beneficial and produce the right effect on the listener. Praising men who have died for the state and providing a good example of citizenship for the audience, according to this logic, would have been justification enough for its delivery (*The Art of Persuasion* 162-163). It is, of course, still possible to read Plato's historical "mistakes" as a jab at the rhetoricians without ruining the credibility of the speech and Plato's respect for the subject matter. After all, as Kennedy observes, "it is difficult to imagine Plato being satiric on the subject of death and immortality" (*The Art of Persuasion* 159).

For the purposes of my investigation into the funeral oratory, however, these problems are not very important because I am far less interested in the degree to which Thucydides might have altered Pericles' speech, for example, than how each of these
orations uses a common *topoi*. In fact, this argument is actually stronger considering how similar these oratories are, despite their various sources (a historian, a philosopher, a metic, and an Athenian orator). For this study, even the authenticity of the texts themselves, therefore, becomes less important than how the similarities of the orations themselves imply a common form, *topoi*, and tradition that can be critiqued and subjected to gender analysis.

**Containing Lament**

Before Solon, women had an almost exclusive control over the burial rites of the dead--of this there can be little question. In chapter one, I have already discussed how the state put limits on women's funeral laments because of their disturbance of state harmony and their ability to incite blood feud. The public funeral and the *epitaphios logos* far surpasses this legislation. It is likely that despite Solon's laws, women still were in control of the funeral rites inside the home. In the public funeral, however, men and the male state completely usurp these privileges. Burial of soldiers becomes the custom and law of the fathers (*Patrios nomos*), while the women's role is denied. Men take charge of the ceremonies and speaking of the dead, while women are encouraged to remain silent. In addition, I have also given examples of how women's lament often critiques the male-dominated state. In times of war, this critique could be especially dangerous. Holst-Warhaft points out that the laments, "by focusing as (they) do on mourning and loss rather than praise of the dead, deny the value of death for the community or state, making it difficult for authorities to recruit an obedient army" (3). The public funeral and the *epitaphios logos* thus become a means for the state to take the care of the dead out of the hands of women and contain their laments in a structured
ceremony. This change in the controlling powers over death does not come easily, however. An analysis of the *epitaphios logos* and public funeral will demonstrate that the usurpation of women's lament requires a strict containment of lament, a reworking of Athenian representations of death, and ultimately a refiguring and regendering of Athenian history and mythology.

Much of what we know about the public funeral in Athens comes from Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*. What is most obvious for our purposes is how the public funeral is allowed to exceed Solon's limitations on ordinary funerals. While Solon had legislated the family funeral to be a private affair by regulating it to inside the family's house (Demosthenes XLIV 62), the funeral for soldiers takes place outside. Also in contrast with Solon's laws, anyone could bring whatever offering they pleased to the dead without restriction (Thucydides II xxxiv). Even the strict law limiting the *prothesis* to one day was extended to either two or three days, depending on how one reads the passage in Thucydides. In addition, the corpses were placed inside cypress coffins and transported to the Kerameikos (the public cemetery) in carriages (II xxxiv), obviously going beyond the financial limitations Solon had set. Most importantly, speaking of the dead again became a public affair. After the burial and the families' lament, a speaker selected by the state would deliver a eulogy for the dead (Thucydides xxxiv).

At first glance, this relaxation of the funeral laws would seem to be a consolation to the mourners and an opportunity for women to lament in public as they had once

---

4 In *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* v. 1, A.W. Gomme argues for a reading that the *prothesis* was only to take two days with burial on the third. This is opposed to other readings that the *prothesis* lasted a full three days. The exact length of the *prothesis* still remains uncertain.
done. A closer investigation, however, reveals a different view of public funerals. Instead of the families' control over the funerals being heightened, a closer look shows that the their role and voice was very much reduced. For example, the *prothesis* (wake) still took place indoors. The tents, were, in fact, representations of the private houses of the mourners, and the *prothesis* was very likely held in the agora, one of the great places of government power, with a full procession of Athenian soldiers present (Gomme 102). Think, for example, of how much the individual significance of the dead soldier would have been reduced when placed amongst hundreds or even thousands of other dead soldiers. Instead of a spectacle of family grief, the funeral becomes a large, military spectacle, reinforcing the state's relationship with the dead and reducing the importance of the family. Moreover, instead of only the family taking part in the *prothesis*, any citizen could join. The dead soldiers were even denied the customary burial in their families' tombs. Instead, they were taken to the *Kerameikos* by chariot according to their voting *deme* (an artificial political grouping devised by the archon Cleisthenes in order to reduce the political power of the clans), listed on an epigraph with their *deme*, and buried with other members of their *deme*. In death, the soldiers had exchanged their families for the state, spending eternity buried with other soldiers.

This replacement of the family with the state is also emphasized in the oration. Time and again, orators speak of the state as the real family of all Athenians. In Plato's *Menexenus*, Socrates claims that the state can act as family and can assume the role and responsibilities of each family member (just as it is taking over the female member's responsibilities for the funeral services). Socrates states, "She (the state) is to the dead in the place of a son and heir, and to their sons in the place of a father, and to their
parents and elder kindred in the place of a guardian" (249b-c) In case any reader would think that Plato is exaggerating to make fun of the funeral oration, consider that in the *Republic* he presents the ideal society as one without *oikoi* (family units), in which the state would raise all children (V 460b-462a). An even more obvious example of the families' lessened importance compared to the city-state occurs at the end of Pericles' funeral oration when he insists that parents of the dead who can still have children should. His reasoning is that not only will it help them forget their grief, but that moreover, "the state will reap a double advantage--it will not be left desolate and it will be secure" (II, xlv 3-4). Even in times of customary lament and burial of family members, citizens are encouraged to think of the state first.

Although it is certain that women were still allowed to take part in public funerals and sing their laments during the *prothesis* and burial, their role in public funerals seems to have been even more strictly controlled than under Solon's laws. While the funeral, as a public event, would have drawn large numbers of men, for example, women participating were still limited to relatives. In addition, there would have been a large number of soldiers in full battle array attending. This large difference in the number of men and women attending, in addition to the official location of the public funeral in the *Agora* and the *Kerameikos*, would certainly have taken much of the control of the funeral out of women's hands. Also consider that even though the *prothesis* was extended for the funeral legislation, this would not necessarily have benefited the female relatives. Because any male, whether citizen or foreigner, could attend the *prothesis*, its environment must have seemed more male-dominated than other funerals. Moreover, we know, that at least in modern-day Greek laments, female
mourners are very sensitive to intrusions by non-kin (Seremetakis, *The Last Word* 107) and thus would likely have been affected by the simple presence of these uninvited spectators.

In trying to define the role women were encouraged to play in the funeral, the famous quote at the end of Pericles' funeral oration is useful. While Pericles exhorts men's birth, their education and government, and their feats in battle, he only mentions women and their means of attaining honor in this short passage. He states,

> If I am to speak also of womanly virtues, referring to those of you who will henceforth be in widowhood, I will sum up all in a brief admonition: Great is your glory if you fall not below the standard which nature has set for your sex, and great also is hers of whom there is least talk among men whether in praise or in blame. (II, xlv, 2)

Unlike private funerals, the public funeral, like both war and the funeral speech itself, is considered the domain of men. The speech is therefore addressed to "fathers and sons of the dead, who were more closely associated with the honors because they had a share in the male arete" (Loraux, *Invention of Athens* 24). In a ceremony which celebrates glory, women are shown to be outside all that is being celebrated. While the funeral oration is meant to praise soldiers publicly in an epideictic speech, the only glory available to women is through silence. By addressing the women in this way, Pericles is of course also ordering them not to lament too much in public. It is no coincidence that this passage occurs at the end of the speech and that his last words are to stress that "due" lament has been given and that the time for lament has now passed.

In this male-oriented, state-centered form of oratory, the lament is presented not as a valuable and necessary part of reconciling the soldiers' deaths, but is instead devalued as only a requirement of law and tradition. Each orator downplays the
significance of mourning and lament at the burial. When finishing his oration, for example, Demosthenes tells the audience that "having spent [their] grief and done [their] part as law and custom require, disperse to your homes" (LX 37), and Socrates states that "having lamented the dead in common according to the law, go your ways" (Menexenus 249c-d) (italics mine). Even the necessity of giving the epitaphios logos itself is portrayed in this same way. When Pericles begins his oration, for example, he claims that the speech seems unnecessary to him, but that "since [their] forefathers approved of this practice as right and proper, I also, rendering obedience to the law, must endeavor to the best of my ability" (II, xxxv, 3). In Athenian society, complete rejection of proper burial and lament would have been unthinkable. One has only to remember Creon's fate in Antigone to see what the result of fully prohibiting lament would be. Each of these orators, however, manages in his rhetoric to frame lament as only customary. Moreover, by referring to it as Patrios Nomos (usually translated as ancestral custom, but Patrios means father and nomos means law), the tradition is removed from the realm of women.

Moreover, in each of the funeral speeches, the orator explicitly states that there is no need for lament. In the Menexenus, Socrates goes so far as to steal a trick from women's lament, that of speaking for the dead, and acts as channeler for the soldiers' spirits. Through the soldiers' voices, he tells their relatives "to bear the calamity as lightly as possible, and do not condole with one another, for they have sorrows enough, and will not need anyone to stir them up" (247 c-d). Indeed, a common theme through the orations is that the dead "should be glorified rather than lamented" (Menexenus 248c). Even in Lysias' oration, probably composed in 392 BC after the defeat at
Corinth (Lamb 29), a speech in which Lysias shows sympathy for the relatives of the dead and begins to mourn the current situation of the city-state, he laments only briefly then turns the lament into praise of the dead and states that "in truth I do not know what need there is to lament so sadly" (II 77).

Men's appropriation of funeral discourse from women has far larger implications than denying the value of lament, however. I would argue that the orators seek to change the very way death is perceived by the audience. In fact, they seek to escape the notions of death altogether by claiming the immortality of the soldiers by means of their discourse. Unlike women's lament, which can only mourn the dead, men's discourse has the power to grant eternal life. In each speech, the language which the orators use to speak about the dead in fact denies their very death. For example, instead of using the usual verb *apo/hanein* (to die), the orators instead describe the dead as *andres agathoi genomelwti* (good men coming into being) thereby denying the finality of their deaths and celebrating their glory (Holst-Warhaft 120). This immortality, however, comes from the orators' use of language more than through simple use of vocabulary. It is, in fact, through the orators' speeches, that the dead soldiers are kept alive in the *Athanatos mneme* (immortal memory) of the city (*Invention of Athens* 116). By giving the *epitaphios logos* and relating the deeds of past exploits, none of these dead ever really die. As Lysias states, "Of their [the soldiers'] nature it comes that they are mourned as mortals, of their valor that they are lauded as immortal" (*Funeral Speech* II 79-80). And Demosthenes calls the dead "happy" because through their deaths they have "barter[ed] little for much, a brief time for all eternity" (LX 32).
Re-gendering Athena: Using Myth to Argue for an Athenian History without Women

Until this point, the *epitaphios logos* has been considered as a container for women's lamentation and a usurpation of their traditional control over funerals. I have shown how each of the orators dismisses the need to lament the dead at all. It is important to realize, however, that these rejections of lament frame the oration by being located at its beginning and end. The middle, and longest, section of the *epitaphios logos* is always devoted to a series of mythic and historical *topoi* (topics). These *topoi* are woven into a narrative which is then used to argue for the bravery of the Athenians, the justness of the Athenian state, and the leadership role Athens deserves to play in Panhellenic politics. In this section of the chapter, I will argue that the myths play a critical rhetorical role in the development of the historical argument. By focusing on the autochthony and Theban myths, both of which turn up in each of the four *epitaphios*, I will show that they work to revise Athenian history by replacing it with a mythic past, a past in which women and mothers are rejected and lament is displaced onto other, more "primitive" Greek city-states.

In *Greek Rhetoric Before Aristotle*, Richard Enos convincingly argues that early historians saw the telling of history not as an investigation of truth, but rather as a kind of rhetoric. Enos, shows, for example, that unlike Thucydides and later historians, Herodotus, "saw history as argument and used his skills to 'account' for monumental events by building a case that uses events as proof of his interpretation" (28). This tactic of using history as rhetoric also lies at the heart of the *epitaphios logos*. In funeral oratory, the rhetor submits to the audience historical example after historical example to prove the ideals of Athenian bravery and justice. Instead of stopping with recorded
history, however, these orators attempt to give the excellence of Athens a timelessness by using examples from the mythic and immemorial past to prove their point. By doing so, Athens and its values gain the same illusion of immortality that the orators apply to the fallen soldiers. The myths are thus important as rhetoric in that they guide the audience's understanding of known history and generate a larger meaning which justifies the death of the soldiers.

It is important to point out here that myths in the *epitaphios logos* are not taken lightly. In forming the rhetorical argument of the *epitaphios logos*, in fact, each of the orators treats mythology just as they do history. In Lysias' oration, for example, the transition connecting the mythic past and Marathon is much smoother than his transition between the Persian Wars and the Peloponnesian Wars. Plato and Demosthenes go so far as to suggest that the only difference between the history and myths is that the historical events have not yet been sung enough. Instead of a suspicion of myth, there is a desire to turn history into myth. When starting to speak of the Persian Wars, for example, Demosthenes claims that those deeds "are no whit inferior to the former [the myths], still, through being closer in point of time, have not yet found their way into poetry or even been exalted to epic rank" (9-10). Plato seems to agree with this assertion and urges the poets to sing about history in the same way they do of myth (*Menexenus* 239c). In fact, none of the orators relates the myths in any way different than they handle the historical exploits. The temporal succession between mythic deeds and the historical exploits are downplayed to the point that they seem to mix together into one long argument for Athenian *arete* (character/literally translated as good men coming into being).
In considering the myths as a rhetorical move which shapes Athenian notions of their own history and values, readers must recognize that myths change over time and often are adapted to fit the cultural and political moment. This connection between the political and the mythological is especially important to keep in mind for both of the myths we are considering. They, and their use in the *epitaphios logos*, were shaped during a period in which Athenians began constructing and reshaping myths at an unprecedented rate. This reconstruction and adaptation was due to shifting social, political, and ideological ideals resulting from the new democracy in Athens (the last of the tyrants was thrown out in 510 B.C.) and from its emergence as the central power in Greece after the victory at Marathon. As William Tyrell shows, at this moment in history, the Athenians "became aware of the paucity of their heroic past and the need to expand upon it in order to substantiate their pretensions abroad" (9).

It is at this time that myths, including all the myths in the topoi of *epitaphios logos*, were adapted to support Athen's new role. These myths, in fact, served to justify not only Athenian dominance but also Athenian wars. For an example, we have to look no further than the Athenian colonization of Scyros in 476/75. The Athenians received spurious (likely bribed) instructions from the Delphic oracle to seize the bones of Theseus from Scyros, where he had been murdered. Charged with this duty and justified by a new myth of Theseus' death, Athens attacked Scyros, sold its inhabitants into slavery and colonized it themselves.\(^5\) Athenian myths, both new and adapted, became part of a rhetoric of retelling the Athenian past to both legitimize its rule over

\(^5\) For more about the colonization of Scyros and other instances of mythology being used for political purposes, see Tyrell's *Amazons: A Study in Athenian Mythmaking*, chapter 1.
the Greeks and to revise its own past into a more acceptable narrative. Our first topoi
myth, autochthony worked to do both these things.

Although the myth of Athenian autochthony dates to a reference in the Iliad
(2.545-546), autochthony gained sudden popularity in the fifth century, with an
especially large number of representations in Athenian pottery and art occurring
between 475 and 450 BC (Loraux, The Children of Athena 41). It is important to note
that it is the myth of Athenian origins and not a myth for the origins of all humankind.
During the fifth century, this myth becomes a means for Athenians to explain their
democratic system and ideals, as well as a way to separate themselves from other
Greeks.

In the myth of autochthony, the god Hephestos, mad with desire for Athena,
chases her across the plains of Athens. Although Athena manages to fight him off and
protect her virginity, Hephestos' sperm lands upon Athena's leg. She brushes this sperm
off with a piece of wool, then drops the wool on the ground, where it impregnates Ge
(the earth goddess). The result of this pregnancy is the infant Erichthonius, who springs
from the ground and becomes the father of all Athenians. Athena takes charge of the
infant and entrusts its care to Kekrops, the primordial king of the city which becomes
Athens. The Athenians are thus the only people of the world, including other Greeks,
who are not born of woman. Instead, their mother is the earth itself and Athenians are
thus free from the contamination of the womb.

In my argument, two characters in the myth of autochthony are important:
Kekrops and Erichthonius, both of whom serve as an autochthonous king. Both of these
autochthons represents a part in the evolution of Athens. Kekrops is the king who
represents the movement from savagery to civilization; it is he who first collects the people into a state and creates marriage. This king also presides over the divine eris, the argument between Athena and Poseidon over which one of them should be able to rule Athens. Kekrops sits over a tribunal selected to decide which god they should choose. Athena gives the city the first olive tree, a symbol of agriculture and civilization, while Poseidon gives the city a salt spring. Of the two, Kekrops and the tribunal select Athena, causing the enmity of Poseidon. In another version of this myth, both the men and women are allowed to vote for the decision. The women vote for Athena and the men for Poseidon. Because there is one more woman than man, the women get their way and Athena becomes the god of Athens. This apparent matriarchy angers Poseidon who threatens to flood the city if the women are left unpunished. To appease this angry god, women are from that day prohibited from voting. This second version of the myth is especially interesting in that it offers an explanation of the origins of patriarchy—why children are named after the father and why women are allowed no voice in the city-state (Tyrell, Amazons 29). But no matter which version of the myth we look at, the story of Kekrops is that of civilizing the city by taming women.

I have already said that Kekrops is the first king but that Erichthonius is the first Athenian king, but this distinction requires further clarification. For Athenians, the struggles between men and women and of becoming civilized take place during the reign of Kekrops and thus before Erichthonius (the first Athenian) was born. The birth of Erichthonius therefore mirrors Athena's gift of the olive tree—both are born directly of the earth and represent a new civilized period for Athens.
Under the myth of autochthony, women have no place in Athenian history—Athenians have a father in Erichthonius, but they do not have a human mother. It is a myth of origins in which women are conspicuously absent. As Loraux states, "The Athenian discourse about origins devolved on Erichthonius: there was nothing to say about women, and if one had to speak of them, it was enough to borrow generalities from the tradition inaugurated by Hesiod. By adopting Pandora, the city of Athens accommodated the race of women, but denied the existence of a 'first Athenian woman'" (*The Children of Athena* 10). What Loraux fails to mention, however, is that by figuring women as pre-Athenian, it links them forever with the primitive. Women continue to need the constraints which Kekrops places on them, while Athenian men are cleansed of the corruptive influences of Pandora.

Although autochthony has been studied by other scholars, its role in the *epitaphios logos* has been largely undervalued. In each of the *epitaphoi*, autochthony comes at the beginning of the narrative section and thus carries more weight than any of the other pieces of the historical argument. I would claim that the myth of autochthony is especially important for understanding the *epitaphios logos* in two ways.

First, the myth of autochthony is important because it legitimizes the subversion of women's traditional control over the rites of the dead. In face to face cultures, women exert their primary form of power through rituals of birth and death. They act as the bearers of an older, natural form of knowledge, outside the margins of men's cultural knowledge (Holst-Warhaft 48). Interestingly, the myth of autochthony, while defining women as primitive, eliminates her role as mother and thus her connection to ancient, natural forms of knowledge. Although the *Patrios Nomos* is clearly a cultural
institution, it, like Athenian law and values, spring from nature just as the men spring directly from the earth. Through this connection with nature, men have a more direct link with the earth (and thus birth and death) than do women who "in her conception and generation is but the imitation of the earth" (Menexenus 238a) The myth of autochthony thus legitimizes the role of men in giving the *epitaphios logos* (ancestral law) both a natural and cultural validity which are fused together, while women are cut off from their traditional place in the life cycle.

Secondly, through its purification of Athenian men and rejection of the corruption associated with women, the myth of autochthony works as a rhetorical move which provides a rationale for the rest of the *epitaphios* historical narrative and is thus crucial to the *ethos* (character) of Athenian men. In it, Athenian men are born just and desiring democracy because they are born from the soil and not from woman. In *Menexenus*, the character of Socrates states, "We and our citizens are brethren, the children all of one mother (the earth), and we do not think it right to be one another's masters or servants, but the natural equality of birth compels us to seek for legal equality, and to recognize no superiority except in the reputation of virtue and wisdom" (239a). Through autochthony, the past is rewritten in terms of contemporary Athenian ideals. Clan violence and the difficult transition from a face to face culture are eliminated from the cultural conscious with the elimination of the mother. Instead of blood feud and the justice of revenge, it would seem that Athenians had settled their disputes in court since the beginning of their race. This can be seen in Lysias' funeral oration when he states,

Now in many ways it was natural to our ancestors, moved by a single resolve, to fight the battles of justice: for the very beginning of their life was just. They had not been collected, like most nations, from every quarter, and had not settled in a
foreign land after driving out its people: they were born of the soil, and possessed in one and the same country their mother and their fatherland. They... used law for honoring the good and punishing the evil. For they deemed that it was the way of wild beasts to be held subject to one another by force, but the duty of men to delimit justice by law, to convince by reason, and to serve these two in act submitting to the sovereignty of law and the instruction of reason. (16-18)

Here we see that it is the autochthonous nature of the Athenians that leads to democracy and rule of law. Infused in the logic of autochthony is a system of binary oppositions in which Athenians are pure men, civilized, just, and reasonable, as opposed to foreigners born of woman who are uncivilized, unjust, and irrational. Autochthony thus justifies Athenian rule over the rest of Greece and the deaths of each soldier for the city-state.

It is through this logic that the need for wars, even those with other Greek city-states is reasoned. Based on the logic of autochthony, other Greeks, because they are born of woman, are thus seen as primitive, womanly, and barbaric. As Plato writes, the Athenians "are pure Hellenes, having no admixture of barbarism in (them). For (they) are not like many others, descendents of Pelops or Cadmus or Aegyptus or Danaus, who are by nature barbarian, and yet pass for Hellenes" (245d). It is therefore the Athenians' responsibility to be "the school of Hellas" (Thucydides xli 1) and "share their own freedom even with those who wish to be slaves" (Lysias 64).

The special role which Athens must play in Greece can be seen most clearly in a quick analysis of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*. I have already spoken of how the *Oresteia* is primarily concerned with an older system of justice through reciprocal violence. I have also discussed the ways in which lamentation is the fuel for this reciprocal violence and how the end of the play represents the struggle between an older system of justice (that of the furies) and a more civilized and male system of justice (represented by Apollo
and Athena). It is when this struggle reaches its climax that the play relocates to Athens. As I will show, it is only through Athens and its autochthonous origins that the reciprocal violence can end.

In order to judge the fate of Orestes and thus decide which system of justice shall prevail, Athena creates a jury of Athenian citizens, founding the Areopagus on the site of the Amazon’s defeat (685-6). Interestingly, Athena denies that even she, as a goddess, has a right to decide the case (474-5). This conflict must be decided by the Athenians themselves.

In presenting their argument, the Eumenides must only prove that Orestes has slain his closest blood kin, his mother. What becomes clear during the trial is that the Eumenides only care about the killing of kin. To them, civilized law, especially marriage (we can recall Kekrops' civilizing act of creating marriage at this point) means nothing compared to blood relations. They claim to seek no justice for Clytemnestra’s killing of Agamemnon precisely because Clytemnestra and Agamemnon are not related but only joined in marriage (605). Orestes, on the other hand, has slain his closest kin. This is when autochthony plays a crucial role in destroying the old system. The argument Apollo makes in Orestes' defense is that the mother is in fact not a legitimate parent of the child. He states, "the mother of what is called her child is not its parent, but only the nurse of the newly implanted germ. The begetter is the parent, whereas she, as a stranger for a stranger, doth but preserve the sprout, except God shall blight its birth" (659-663). For proof of this, Apollo points to Athena's own motherless birth. At this point, the reader must realize that for the audience watching the play, this reference would have had additional meaning considering that, in the myth of autochthony,
Erichthonious had no real mother, but was taken care of by Athena who is referred to as Erichthonious' nurse. In no other city-state and under no other city's deity could Apollo's argument have been upheld and thus the older system of reciprocal violence and lament have been usurped.

After Orestes is acquitted, the furies lament for their defeat and swear to "discharge from [their heart[s] venom, in requital for [their] grief...in drops its [Athens'] soil shall not endure" (783-784). In this lament, they express their desire for revenge, repeating what they say again and again as if chanting. Athena, on the other hand, relies on persuasion, "the soothing appeasement and spell of (her) tongue" (886) to contain the Furies' violence. Using logic, Athena offers the Furies a new role to fulfill, that of protector for Athenian marriage, crops, and fertility. Satisfied with their new role, the Furies become the Eumenides and are led to a cave located under the Areopagus, thus figuratively burying the older system of blood vengeance safely under the court of law with the Amazons.6

6 Although we will not cover the myth of the Amazons as told in the epitaphios logos, I think it is important to give it at least some attention here. According to Herbert Smyth, Aeschylus does not use the commonly held myth that the Hill of Ares received its name because it was where Ares had been put on trial for the murder of Halirrhothius (339). This replacement of the earlier myth with the legend that the law courts are instituted on the site of the defeat of the Amazons is important for our study. Remember that in the epitaphios logos, the myth of the Amazons is one of the four topos myths. I would claim that Aeschylus' reference to the Amazons and its existence in the epitaphios logos are no accident.

In The Invention of Athens, Lorius discusses the Amazons only in reference to the Persians. According to her, the Amazons stand for the effeminate Asian invaders who only the andres egalhoi of Athens can defeat. Of course there is quite a bit of credibility to this argument. I would also argue, however, that like in the Eumenides, the Amazons stand for an older system in which wild women must be contained, killed, or married. I would claim that it is no mistake that the first representations of Amazons in Athens appear in Athens in c. 575 BC (Amazons 2), just about contemporaneously with Solon's funeral legislation. Both the Amazon myth and the funeral legislation attempt to control "wild" women with primitive passions. Of course, I am not claiming that the Amazon myth is a direct parallel to the funeral legislation—so say so would clearly be an oversimplification—I would instead claim that both stem from very similar social ideals. In both, for example, women are seen as the bearers of a more primitive code which have to be tamed by men's rules. While the funeral legislation acts to control the violence of women and replace it with law courts, early Amazon myths were focused on taming the primitive through domestic roles. It is no mistake that some of these early myths of Amazons show Theseus as raping an Amazon and then
While the myth of autochthony provides a way for Athenians to rewrite their history without women, the myth of burying the Argive dead provides a lesson for the audience of the *epitaphios logos* about the proper way to speak of the dead. In this myth, the two sons of Oedipus agree to split the rule of Thebes year by year. In the first year, Eteocles (the elder brother) rules Thebes while Polyneices goes to Argos and marries the daughter of Adrastus. When Polyneices attempts to return to Thebes for his year in power, however, his brother refuses to give up the throne, causing Polyneices, with the help of Adrastus and the seven Argive chiefs, to attack the city. In the battle, the seven chiefs and both brothers die. Argos, in defeat, asks for the customary privilege of burying their dead; however, the new ruler of Thebes, Creon, forbids the ceremonies and decrees that the dead will remain on the battlefield with no burial rites. Adrastus then goes to Athens and asks for Theseus' help to get the dead returned and give them the proper ceremonies. When Creon refuses Theseus' peaceful request for the dead, Theseus attacks the city and recovers the dead through battle.

The Theban myth is ordinarily seen as the result of contemporary political struggles in Greece. As Tyrell points out, in the traditional myth as related in the Iliad (14.114) the Thebans return the dead peacefully with no need of any Athenian interference (*Amazons* 15), and Loraux claims that the myth was very likely related to power relations between Argos and Athens which were allies against Thebes. She even dates the creation of the myth to sometime after 459 BC when Athens was trying to sometimes as marrying one. According to William Tyrell, by the end of the 6th century, there is some evidence for a longer poem about Theseus and the Amazons in which after living with the Amazon, Theseus leaves her to marry Phaedra. The Amazon is then killed during the wedding ceremony, when she bursts in to seek her revenge (*Amazons* 4). This emphasis on taming women through marriage is quite analogous to how Kekrops civilizes pre-Athens by instituting marriage.
weaken Theban power (*Invention of Athens* 69). Although I agree with this political reading, I think that this myth, if compared to what we know of it as related in Euripides' *Suppliants*, would hold interesting connotations for the audience of the *epitaphios logos*.

What is most obvious about the *Suppliants* is that it is primarily about how to mourn the dead instead of being about the battle between Athens and Thebes. When Theseus enters the Acropolis, Adrastus, the children of the seven chiefs, and the female relatives are mourning and relating the tale to Theseus' mother. The women are "beating their breasts and marring their faces" (71-2). This wailing and lament grows louder as they recall their various miseries, and even Theseus' mother begins to wail. In response to this, Theseus calls for silence and chastises his mother for mourning, telling her "'tis not for thee to wail their woes" (292). After some careful consideration, Theseus realizes that it is his responsibility to see that justice is done and that the dead have gotten the proper consideration.

What should seem odd to most readers is that it is the attack on Thebes that receives the least attention in the play. While Euripides is careful to point out that Theseus is a democratic king (again pushing contemporary notions back to the immemorial past) and that he attacks for no personal gain, even refusing to attack the city itself after he has recovered the dead, most of the attention of the play is focused on what occurs after the dead are recovered. The largest lesson of the play is not that the Athenians are just and will protect their allies, but it is rather that there is a proper way to bury the war dead.
For the Athenian dead, for example, Theseus buries them on the battlefield on his own. The bodies are not even brought back to give the Athenian women a chance to lament them. Although Theseus does return the Argive dead, he washes them, puts them on the biers, and veils the bodies himself (766-7). When the women and Adrastus see the dead, they all fall into lamentation, each mourning his or her own fate. Quickly, Theseus stops Adrastus and asks him to praise the dead, not to lament, whereupon Adrastus begins a praise for the dead. In addition, Theseus will not let the mothers touch the dead as is traditionally allowed. When Adrastus asks the reason, Theseus explains that it does no good but only increases their grief.

As an Athenian, Theseus tries to stop lament because no good can come of it. And indeed, despite his best efforts, the women begin to mourn again and Evadne, wife of one of the seven Argive chiefs, mourns so deeply that she throws herself on the funeral bier committing suicide. Even the men of Argos do not seem to learn Theseus' lesson, for at the end of the play, they call for revenge. For the Athenian listening to the epitaphios logos, looking at the funeral biers and familiar with this myth, I would claim that the implications of mourning would be quite clear: Lamenting the dead is destructive and the practice of the other more primitive, more feminine Greeks.

At the beginning of this chapter, I noted how scholars have focused on epideictic as a means for reiterating culturally accepted knowledge. By positioning the epitaphios logos in relation to women's lament, however, I have been able to reveal its darker underbelly—how it contained women's voices, denied their status in society, and told an Athenian history without them. Although the epitaphios logos is
certainly not the only Athenian institution to do these things, it is probably one of the most visible because it had to do them at a point when women's authority would have traditionally been the strongest. Epideictic oratory thus gives us a unique opportunity because it deals exclusively in the realm of cultural knowledge and ideals but has to deliver them in a concrete situation, in front of a real audience, and usually at an important or particularly meaningful time. Therefore, instead of concentrating on the epideictic only for the meaning it transmits, perhaps we should be looking more closely for what it silences.
3. **(RE) WRITING LAMENT INTO THE RHETORICAL TRADITION**

That women were excluded from public and political speech in ancient Athens cannot be denied. They were considered to be perpetual minors and were kept under the supervision of their male guardians. As Helene Foley points out, this legal exclusion was justified through women's reproductive functions (hysteria, for example) which defined women as without self-control, slavish, overly emotional, and without the proper virtue required to be a full public citizen (132). Except for the occasional female rhetorician, an Aspasia or Diotoma for instance (neither of whom were Athenian), women were untrained in rhetoric and denied access to public speech. As discussed in Chapter 1, however, the funeral did offer women an opportunity for public performance, an opportunity for powerful and perhaps even overtly political speech.

In Chapter 2, I presented the ways in which the male funeral oration (*epitaphios logos*) acted as a container for women's laments. While showing that this early institutionalized form of oratory had an antagonistic relationship with women's voices is useful, defining lament only in this negative relation to the rhetorical tradition still seems incomplete. In this chapter, therefore, I will try to locate the lament inside the rhetorical tradition by investigating its underlying epistemology and analyzing some of its rhetorical techniques. By doing so, I will be able to make certain connections with formalized rhetoric, especially with sophistic argumentation. I will show that these connections between rhetoric and lament are not entirely of my own making, but were recognized even in antiquity.
Lament as Pre-Rhetoric

In *Greek Rhetoric before Aristotle*, Richard Enos asserts that although rhetoric as a formalized art occurred in the first quarter of the fifth century, it would be better to understand it as the culmination of a long and multi-branched pre-history. In Homer, for example, Enos shows that although eloquence was considered divinely inspired, humans also had the ability to produce powerful and meaningful discourse and that there was already the knowledge of certain technai (arts) to make speech powerful (10). Moreover, he provides evidence which shows an already existing awareness of certain discourse processes by which human thought could be invented and expressed through language: heuristic, eristic (argumentative), and protreptic (didactic) (3). These conceptual understandings of language would later emerge into formalized rhetoric.

While Enos traces an evolution of rhetoric beginning with Homer, moving through the rhapsodes, logographers, and finally gaining a formal epistemology with the pre-socratic philosophers, there are other forms of pre-rhetoric which had an impact on rhetoric's formation. Lament is one of these.

The first reason that lament should be viewed as pre-rhetoric is because of its linguistic power and poetic techniques. While women's reproductive powers restricted them from public roles, these very same powers gave them control over the rites of passage, including that from life to death (Sultan 97). From ancient laments to those of the present day, the basic purpose of the ritual has remained the same. Using a combination of rich poetic techniques--including antithesis, parallelism, word repetition, alliteration, and metaphor--women weave a magical song which is meant to communicate directly with the dead. As De Romilly tells us, the very root of the word
magic (goeteia) is the goos, the ritual cry of lament (13). In every lament from ancient times to modern, the lamenters call out to the dead. In ancient tragedy, for example, we can note how the laments of the Trojan women in the Libation Bearers address Agamemnon directly, asking for his help in gaining revenge (458-460). In The Persians, the lamenters actually succeed in calling the ghost of Darius out of the underworld (682). But it is not just calling out to the dead which invokes their spirit; it is the poetic power of the logos which works as a magical incantation. Even in modern Crete, anthropologist Caraveli-Chaves finds an underlying fear among the population that laments "open up perilous channels of communication between the living and the dead" (131).

Despite these fears, however, modern and ancient laments have drawn high praise from poets and those interested in the power of discourse. From ancient laments to modern, Alexiou finds not only a complex array of poetic devices and repetition, but also an intricate and highly complex symbolic structure (185-205). In modern Crete, many men, especially poets and musicians, admire the linguistic skill of lament (Caravelli-Chaves 130). The poetic skills and linguistic devices of lament appear to have been particularly admired in ancient Athens. In some Athenian tragedies, laments show up and last long enough to arguably steal the show from what seems to be the main idea of the play (The Persians, The Supplices, Seven Against Thebes), while other plays like Antigone are entirely about lament. Indeed, ancient Greek tragedies demonstrate a fascination with the rhythm, structure, and meaning of laments. It should also be noted that it is this aspect of tragedy which Plato most objects to in the Republic. Although Plato criticizes tragedy's overall emotionalism, it is grieving that he singles
out, saying that it "leads us to dwell on past sufferings and positively revel in lamentation... (the poet) calls forth the worst elements in the soul and nourishes them... he destroys the soul's reasoning part" (604d-605b).

While it is impossible to say whether women's lament influenced rhetoric as much as it did tragedy, we can show that at least Plato saw a connection. Recently, feminist scholars have pointed out that Plato's attack on sophistry often links the sophists with the feminine. Susan Jarratt, for example, shows how both women and the sophists were devalued by Plato in his system of binary oppositions. She writes, "The character projected onto the feminine as 'other' shares with Plato's sophists qualities of irrationality (or non-rationality), magical or hypnotic power, subjectivity, emotional sensitivity; all these are devalued in favor of their 'masculine' or philosophic opposites--rationality, objectivity, detachment and so on" (Rereading 65). She goes on to point out how Plato devalues sophistic rhetoric in the Gorgias as only a knack or a form of trickery like the feminine skills of cookery and cosmetics as opposed to the masculine arts of medicine and gymnastics (65).

The underlying basis for the connection Plato sees between the feminine and sophists, I believe, can be found in the emotional and hypnotic power he sees in both women's lament and sophistic rhetoric. In the Phaedrus, Plato defines rhetoric as psychagogia (the winning of men's souls) (Phaedrus 261a). As De Romilly points out, the original meaning of psychagogia is the summoning of the dead and leading the souls to the netherworld. While De Romilly rightly sees Plato as connecting the emotional language of tragedy to his critique of sophistic rhetoric (15), she fails to point out that the aspects of tragedy which most concern Plato are its imitations of women's lament.
The term psychagogia is very closely tied to women's magical speech and how it initiates the dead on their passage to the underworld. One of the lamenters' primary jobs, in fact, is to persuade the dead soul to pass peacefully into the next world. Without the proper lament and funeral rites, it is often believed that the dead might return to take their revenge upon the living (Holst-Warhaft 16).

In calling rhetoric psychagogia, Plato is implying that sophists use the same hypnotic style to guide souls of the living as women traditionally used in their contact with the souls of the dead. The connection for Plato is that sophists, through their poetic style (especially antithesis), weave language in such a way as to hypnotize the audience, to put them under a spell, and thereby to inhibit rational thought. The danger thus represented by both the "imitative" qualities of tragedy and the more dangerous powers of rhetoric are both founded upon the irrational and hypnotic speech of women in mourning.

Although Plato repeatedly criticizes this poetic style as empty and encouraging the irrational, Richard Enos claims that rhetorical techniques based on the poetic are not empty, but rather that they constitute a different way of coming to know than Plato's (63). For Enos, Empedocles is the founder of rhetoric precisely because he bridges the gap between the kind of non-rational discourse found in Homer and the obsessively rational and linear discourse idealized in Aristotle's Rhetoric. Although Enos considers Empedocles a pre-Socratic philosopher, not a sophist, he does claim that Empedocles provides a coherent theory of discourse, one that is later taken up by the sophists. We know that Empedocles composed his philosophical works in verse, applying the compositional techniques used in the creation of poetry (Enos 60-61). In particular,
Enos believes that his use of antithesis in creating dissoi logoi (a system in which the linear and rational process of coding meaning is replaced by a loosely organized juxtaposition of opposites) provides an alternative vision to Plato and Aristotle's theories of language. According to Enos, the fragments we have of Empedocles' writing offer "insights on how meaning can be synthesized through the counter-balancing of opposite notions" (62). Unlike traditional ways of reading the sophists in which they become an evolutionary stepping stone to the more rational (and thus advanced) rhetoric of Aristotle, Enos sees "the Platonic logos and Empedoclean dissoi logoi (as) epistemologies in conflict" (63).

It is in this similar area between poetry and rhetoric that I would wish to locate lament. Although lament does not seem to have the same kind of vocalized epistemology we find in Empedocles, it does share some of the same conscious methods for creating meaning. Just as Empedocles opposes binary opposites in order to synthesize meaning, I would claim that the female mourner exhibits a somewhat similar use of antithesis. By refusing to reduce the play of binary opposites, the mourners build bridges between opposite values, working to reconstruct the community which has been torn apart by death. Interestingly, although it is only through the disruption of death that women are given a privileged position to speak, it is also the role of the female mourner to put the community back in order. As Holst-Warhaft says, "in the carnival-like atmosphere induced by death, the world is turned upside-down. Social organization is temporarily disrupted and new relationships must be formed so that the fabric of society can be reknit" (28). In modern Crete, Caraveli-Chaves shows that it is this opposition and connection between opposite terms which constitutes the meaning of
lament. Instead of placing binaries in opposition, the mourner jumps back and forth from one binary opposite to another, connecting them through comparison. Life and death, child and parent, past and present are tied together, forming a bond of shared meaning (142).

This antithetical meaning making is also found in ancient laments. In the following passage from *Seven Against Thebes*, Antigone and Ismene sing an antiphonal lament over the bodies of their brothers Eteocles and Polynices, who have killed each other in battle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antigone</th>
<th>Ismene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smitten, thou didst smite</td>
<td>And slaying, thou wast slain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the spear thou didst slay--</td>
<td>By the spear thou wast slain--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy in thy deed.</td>
<td>Unhappy in thy sufferings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let lament be poured forth.</td>
<td>Let tears be poured forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>........................................</td>
<td>........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By thou own thou wast slain.</td>
<td>And thine own thou didst slay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twofold to relate--</td>
<td>Twofold to behold--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are these sorrows anigh unto those</td>
<td>Anigh, kindred unto kindred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chorus

O grievous Fate, thou bestower of affliction, and thou, awful Shade of Oedipus, black Spirit of Vengeance, verily a mighty power art thou. (956-979)
Unlike the state of Thebes, which separates the brothers even in death, identifying them in terms of hierarchically ordered binaries, Eteocles the hero and Polynices the traitor, the sisters bind the brothers back together with their song of woe.

Clearly, it would be a misrepresentation to claim that the rhetorical goals of the sophists and of female mourners were the same. Even the most well-known female sophistic Aspasia, if we believe the words of Socrates in Plato's *Menexenus*, wrote funeral speeches which tried to silence lament. On the other hand, qualities in women's laments and sophistry do seem similar or shared. Whether or not lament influenced the sophists, it can certainly be argued that lament was a carefully constructed form used by women who were well aware of the power of language not only to persuade but also to create community.

**Conclusion**

At the heart of this study, my goal has been to re-envision Athenian women not only as the objects of discourse, but also as its subjects. In other words, while investigating how rhetoric and male discourse acted upon women and defined their role in society, it has also tried to view women as producers of knowledge and symbolic discourse. While some recent scholarship has shown certain women (Aspasia and Diotema) to have taken an active role in society and meaning making, those women have been viewed as exceptions, as women who were lucky enough, due to their status as foreigners, to have existed outside structured Athenian society. For other women, especially Athenian women, their role as subjects has been ignored. Most scholarship, for example, has taken it for granted that these women were cloistered and without
opportunities for public speech. It has assumed, moreover, that even if these women had participated in public discourse, that their participation was too far erased to recover.

This study shows that both these assumptions are incorrect. While women were, of course, acted upon by the rhetoric and discourse of a male-dominated society, they were far from being entirely passive, cloistered, or silenced. During their laments, women could assume the roles of public speaker, symbol creator, and critic of the same male institutions which objectified them. Their voices, far from being unheard, inspired the playwrights to imitate them, the politicians to legislate against them, and the epitaphios logos to contain them. Moreover, while the actual laments of ancient Athens may have disappeared, their influence and tradition has left traces for us to follow. Often, and somewhat ironically, it is through the very same institutions which tried to silence women's voices, that we can hear them most clearly.

Understanding Athenian women as the subjects of discourse, however, requires far more than simply being able to spot traces of their voices in the dominant discourse. This kind of understanding, I believe, can only come when we begin to view women's discourse in terms of genre. While often ignored when History of Rhetoric scholars speak about women's discourse, genre is important for re-envisioning women as speaking subjects because it suggests its own discursive tradition and implies accepted rules for the construction of knowledge. Instead of simply trying to fit women into the canonical rhetorical tradition, genre allows us to view women's discourse in terms of its own tradition and as a competing system of symbol construction.
The value of being able to reconstruct women's lament as a genre is not only in describing an early form of women's discourse, but also in tracing all the places it connects and collides with our traditional notions of rhetoric. Some of these connections have allowed smaller, unexpected insights, such as illuminating Plato's critique of the sophists. Other insights have been more substantial. For example, this study has demonstrated that the *epitaphios logos* did not just serve a performative or educational function by relating timeless truths, but that it had an argumentative purpose and was part of a real and lasting conflict. By locating the genre of the *epitaphios* in terms of the genre of lament, we have been able to see that it, like all rhetoric, is infused with the social, the political, and the historical.

In a way, the relationship between the *epitaphios logos* and the lament can serve as a metaphor for the history of rhetoric. Like the *epitaphios*, the canonical rhetorical tradition has been a retelling of events from a single view which desires to transmit one, unified truth. In this history, other voices and other rhetorics have been contained and buried. Exhuming these other histories may mean that rhetoric does become muddied, riddled with contradictions, and infused with power relations. What once was clear and linear (imitating the rational discourse of Plato) begins to look more like the *dissoi logoi* of Empedocles or the antithesis of female mourners. In this new view, different histories must exist in tension, bouncing off one another, providing a space where all the dead can be heard.
APPENDIX 1

A Brief Chronology of Important Events

c. 632/624 BC  Kylon attempts to become tyrant of Athens--coup fails and many members of the Kylon clan are killed by members of the Alkmeonid clan despite promises of a trial.

620/621 BC  Drako passes his homicide laws. These laws are usually seen as a response to the KyloniAlkmaeonid blood feud. The laws are unsuccessful.

c. 595 BC  Solon passes his reforms. Funeral legislation is passed, an appeals court is formed, adopting heirs becomes law, and voting for archons is opened up based on economic standing instead of kinship groups,. Solon persuades the Alkmeonids to stand trial for religious pollution (they were free from the charge of murder because of a retroactive clause in the laws of Drako, but could stand trial because the killing took place on religious ground) 700 families go into exile.

c. 575 BC  There is a sudden appearance of Herakles and the Amazons on black vases.

524/524 BC.  The archon Kleisthenes passes a barrage of reforms limiting clan power. Clans are broken up into voting demes.

498 BC  Pindar begins his poetic career.

490 BC  Athenians and Plataeans defeat the Persians at the battle of Marathon.

480 BC  Athenians desert Athens which is burned by the Persians; however, the Athenians win a major sea battle at Salamis.

479 BC  Greeks win the battle of Plataea. Persians withdraw from Greece.

472 BC  Aeschylus stages The Persians.

468 BC  Sophocles wins his first victory in tragedy.

467 BC  Corax and Tisias "found" Rhetoric.

464 BC  Latest possible date for the formation of the epitaphios logos. It is generally held to have been formed earlier.
455 BC  Euripides puts on his first play.
c. 450 BC  Herodotus writes *History of the Persian Wars*.
431 BC  Pericles delivers his second Funeral oration.
431-404 BC  Peloponnesian War
431-404 BC  Thucydides composes his *History of the Peloponnesian War*.
427 BC  Tisias and Gorgias go to Athens on a diplomatic mission.
404 BC  Thirty Tyrants overthrow the democratic government. They are put to death after only ruling a short period.
399 BC  Socrates is executed.
c. 392 BC  Lysias delivers his funeral oration.
c. 390 BC  Isocrates founds his school of Rhetoric.
383 BC  Plato founds the Academy.
339 BC  Isocrates writes the *Panathenaicus*.
338 BC  Demosthenes delivers his funeral oration.
323 BC  Hyperides gives his funeral oration.
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