



BRILL

Ritual Appropriateness in "Seven against Thebes." Civic Religion in a Time of War

Author(s): Manuela Giordano-Zecharya

Source: *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 59, Fasc. 1 (2006), pp. 53-74

Published by: Brill

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4433710>

Accessed: 27-06-2017 13:41 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Brill is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Mnemosyne*

RITUAL APPROPRIATENESS IN *SEVEN AGAINST THEBES*. CIVIC RELIGION IN A TIME OF WAR*

BY

MANUELA GIORDANO-ZECHARYA

אסור לי לבכות ומותר לי למוח
“I’m allowed to die but not to cry”

Aviv Gefen (Israeli rock singer)

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the themes and tensions of the first part of the *Seven Against Thebes*, against the background of Athenian civic religion. The confrontation between Eteocles and the Chorus can be seen as an opposition between two gender-related religious attitudes. Eteocles describes his religious behaviour as ritually appropriate whereas he rebukes that of the women as inappropriate and disruptive. Thus, sacrifice and *euchē*-prayer stand against supplication and lamenting prayer (*litē*). In partial opposition to other interpretations, this paper views Eteocles as more concerned about the religious *behaviour* of the Chorus—what they do and how they pray—than with their religious *views*; in other words he castigates them for their heteropraxy, not their heterodoxy. In the background it is possible to make out the needs of a society of soldier-citizens to contain the ritual and emotional expression of fear and lament in order to avoid demoralizing the troops.

As it is well known, ancient Greek culture did not produce sacred texts or other documents that attest to beliefs or religious doctrines, as we think of them. Precisely because Greek religiosity does not seem to match our own contemporary notions, reconstructing the normative attitude of the ancient Greeks towards the gods remains an important *desideratum*. Tragedy as an integral part of Athenian

* I delivered an early version of this paper at Tel Aviv University in May 2001, and I wish to thank Margalit Finkelberg and all the participants of the seminar for their remarks. I am grateful to Giovanni Cerri, Andrea Ercolani, Chris Faraone and Gabriel Herman for their important suggestions on this paper. A special thanks to my students Rosaria Colantonio, Luca Pucci and Giuseppe Rubino, whose intelligent and lively discussions have much improved this study.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2006
Also available online – www.brill.nl

Mnemosyne, Vol. LIX, Fasc. 1

political and cultural life provides us with revealing and authoritative information about the working of Athenian religiosity. By this statement I submit that religiosity is one of the interconnected dynamics of Athenian civic life and that, in this respect, “the separation of ‘religion’ as a discrete aspect of polis life is quite misleading”, as Goldhill (1999, 20) has expressed. To be sure, we cannot take a dramatic text as an historical document, nor does a tragedy provide us with a straightforward reflection of Athenian reality, rather with a slanted one. With its dramatic devices, tragedy nonetheless plays a central role in Athenian *religious debate*, not only as a representation, however partial, of religious practice but even more as questioning and ‘normative engagement’ of religious issues.¹⁾ Tragedy joins and replaces to a certain extent epic poetry in its educational function, readapting heroic narratives to the specific reality of the Athenian *polis*.²⁾

This is abundantly clear in Aeschylus’ *Seven Against Thebes*, where, as I will point out, many of the ritual procedures and religious elements hinted at find such a confirmation in other sources as to reasonably suppose that the poet’s exploration of religious tensions may allow us to understand and reconstruct some perceptions and features of Athenian attitudes towards the gods.³⁾ I wish to offer, in particular, a close reading of the opposition between Eteocles and the Chorus of Theban women⁴⁾ in the first part⁵⁾ of the *Seven Against Thebes* by framing it in the semantic context of *polis* religion of fifth-century Athens. The dialectic confrontation of the scene hinges primarily on a cultic question, i.e. the best way to address the gods

1) A commendable investigation of this assumption is now to be found in Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, where the scholar views tragedy as a “locus of religious exploration”, integral to *polis* discourse. The book appeared after the completion of this paper, therefore I could not make use of it, despite the numerous convergences of approach.

2) Still largely unexplored is the issue of functional transformations of epic themes into tragic plots. See Goldhill 1986, 138-67, Havelock 1985, Cerri 1992, 312-9.

3) The centrality of this theme is already suggested by the fact that the words *polis* and *theoi* are repeated with a high frequency in the first part of the drama.

4) Whether the Chorus represents maidens or women is disputable. See Lupaş & Petre 1981, 56. I refer to them as women, as a more general term.

5) In this paper, by ‘first part’ I mean: prologue, parodos and first episode. Among the many controversial points of the tragedy, this scene is perhaps that of sharpest disagreement among scholars, see Winnington-Ingram 1983, 27.

in a moment of danger and two key themes: (1) Hoplitic civic religiosity embodied in Eteocles and manifested in the ritual acts of sacrifice and prayer, described in terms of reciprocity. (2) The religiosity of the Chorus, based upon a supplicatory attitude, is tentatively described by Eteocles as negative and socially disruptive. The women's position is represented in acts of supplication (*hiketeia*), wailing lament, and in supplicatory prayers (*litai*).⁶

1. *The Tragedy and Its Interpretations*

The *Seven Against Thebes*, staged in 467, is the third of a trilogy concerned with the curse of the *genos* of the Labdacidae, of which the death of the two brothers Eteocles and Polynices represents the final accomplishment. It has been pointed out that the character of Eteocles is split into two different figures, separating the tragedy in two:⁷ in the first part of the tragedy he is a responsible military commander and *polis* leader, and in the second he is the accursed son of Oedipus, linked to the doom of his *genos* and blind to the needs of the community.⁸ This composite dual thematic structure is also connected to the role and significance of the curse,⁹ and the double identity represents one of the antinomic elements of the play

6) As Zeitlin (1990b, 104) has argued, in Aeschylean drama, the playwright uses the opposition between male and female to encompass *polis*-related issues larger than politics of gender, and that "he presents the differing patterns of power relations between the sexes and invokes the qualities symbolically associated with each". On women and tragedy see Foley 2001.

7) Corresponding to the split of line 652. See on this point Cameron 1971, 17-29 and Pepe 1998, 182.

8) The majority of studies have addressed problems regarding the unity of the play, the composite dual thematic structure and the role and significance of the curse. See Hutchinson 1985, xvii-liii. Most efforts to make sense of the play have been geared towards 'salvaging' the unity of the scene by showing at different levels the consistency of the argument, or conversely denying outright any unitarian view, see Dawe 1963. Problems of unity and structure have also been addressed with regard to the first scene. As far as structure is concerned, the dialogue opposing Eteocles and the Chorus in particular is characterized by the oddity of its independent character, standing as it is amidst the opening part and the shield scene, with no apparent necessary connection between the two. See Jackson 1988 and Brown 1977, on which the remarks of Jackson (1988, 287) .

9) Zeitlin (1990, 106) remarks on this point that "*polis* and *genos* are shown to be fundamentally incompatible in Thebes", and we may add that this is a peculiar Athenian dilemma.

that will not be reconciled:¹⁰⁾ the fratricide is Eteocles' defeat as a member of the *genos*, but not as the king of the *polis*, since Thebes will be saved after the king's death, not despite but thanks to Eteocles.¹¹⁾

Some scholars have seen the prologue as dominated by a martial atmosphere and the *parodos* by female feelings; the first episode with the *stichomythia* brings the male and the female into direct and open opposition.¹²⁾ If some studies have not failed to notice the peculiar religious content of this scene, most interpretations have rested on a generic evaluation, relying on anachronistic 'theological' connotations or psychological remarks.¹³⁾ Eteocles has been seen as absolvable or condemnable for his morality and religiosity, whether pious or impious:¹⁴⁾ moral and religious evaluations of a tragic character, however, are very rarely the tragedian's concern.¹⁵⁾ Eteocles himself for that matter is presented as a stalwart paradigm of the hoplite virtue in the first part of the tragedy only to fall apart in the end under the effects of the family curse. For our present concern the main context of understanding for the first part of the tragedy shall be that of civic religion.¹⁶⁾

10) Pepe 1998, 182. As for the representation of Thebes as 'anti-*polis*', elaborated by Zeitlin (1990a), I agree with the (re)formulation proposed by Cerri (2000, 259-63), who views Thebes as the tragic projection of Athens rather than as the anti- or the non-*polis*. See also Aloni 2003, for an interesting analysis of the 'Athenian' and 'anti-Athenian' elements of the play.

11) The structural problems of the play are beyond the paper's scope. I will recall only those points which are relevant to our discussion. For a good critical assessment of the controversies see Vidal-Naquet 1988.

12) Gagarin 1976, 120 ff., Hutchinson 1985, xxxvii, Caldwell 1973. For a good treatment of the male-female opposition in the tragedy see Bruit-Zaidman 1991, who however does not touch upon ritual issues.

13) Jackson (1988) sees in this scene the contrast between the divine and the human power and the balance between them; Golden (1964) comments on the struggle between martial ethics and the demands of the Chorus' religious emotions.

14) See for example Podlecki 1964, 295, who, in the concluding analysis of Eteocles' character, remarks "the world of such a man is without gods; he has no time for prayer".

15) Many tragic characters in fact reveal two opposing sides in the course of the dramatic action, and the playwright's purpose seems more to highlight the duality implicit in human action rather than giving any stronger preference to one model of behaviour over another. The very question of 'character' as a psychological unity may not be instructive in tragedy; see most notably Vernant 1982, 6-27.

16) A basic assumption of this paper is that the tensions and oppositions of this

2. *Prologue: Polis, Civic Gods and Altars*

In the prologue Eteocles acts as a figure wholly engrossed in civic concerns: the king Eteocles who feels his responsibility for the destiny of the community. Enveloped in this role he opens the tragedy with his introductory *rhexis* (1-38).

From this first speech we should note three elements: Eteocles' identification with the *polis*' interests, the centrality of appropriate utterances for the destiny of the city,¹⁷⁾ and that the king is addressing the citizens of Thebes in a quasi-real oration.¹⁸⁾ The formal rhetorical character gives the sense and the importance of a public occasion to his words. Furthermore, in the first few lines he presents himself as the representative of the *polis*, introducing the traditional imagery of the ship, symbolizing the state, of which he proclaims himself steersman and leader. The second element is epitomized by a motto expressing the task of a *polis* leader and of every community member in a moment of utter danger: λέγειν τὰ καίρια, 'to say what is appropriate and useful for the *polis*'. In many respects this is a keynote of the play, as Cameron (1971) has it, not only for the importance of avoiding words of ill omen or for the centrality of the powerful word of curse, but especially for the ritual appropriateness of certain types of utterances, as we shall see.

After stating his task and establishing his role, Eteocles exhorts the men of the city to their duty in a Tyrtaeian mode, and while reminding the male citizens to protect the community he traces a symbolic map of the *polis* (14-6):

πόλει τ' ἀρήγειν καὶ θεῶν ἐγχωρίων
βωμοῖσι, τιμὰς μὴ ἕξειφθῆναί ποτε·
τέκνοις τε, Γῆ τε μητρὶ, φιλιτάτη τροφῶ·

tragedy must be set in the context of Athenian *civic* religion. This is a *polis*-centred religious system where "the *polis* was the institutional authority that structured the universe and the divine world in a religious system and articulated a pantheon with certain particular configurations of divine personalities, and established a system of cults, particular rituals and sanctuaries, and a sacred calendar", as expressed by Sourvinou-Inwood (1990, 302) in her valuable contribution on this subject. On *polis* religion, see also Sourvinou-Inwood 1988; Cole 1995; Burkert 1995; Yunis 1988.

17) On these lines see Thalman 1978.

18) Taplin 1977, 129; Hutchinson 1985, 42.

‘[Tis for you] to succour the
 city and the altars of your country’s gods that their
 worship may never be blotted out; to succour your
 children too, and Mother Earth, your nurse most dear.’¹⁹⁾

Lines 14-6 establish an order of importance among the various components of the *polis*: first the *polis* itself, then the altars of the local gods, then the inhabitants and in the end mother earth, the land signifying both territory and the matrix of the community.²⁰⁾ As remarked by Dawson (1970, 32), the word order in lines 14-5 is significant. Among the prescribed actions, the *polis* is mentioned in the first place, in the second the altars of the gods, so that their honour will never be erased. This passage elucidates two features of civic religion, namely the interconnectedness of the gods to their *polis* and the pre-eminence of cult in the relationship with the gods.

Significantly enough, Eteocles mentions the θεοὶ ἐγγώριοι (14), i.e. civic gods embedded in the *polis* ground, and further on we find the πολιισσοῦχοι or πολιόχοι θεοί.²¹⁾ These gods are to be understood, in my opinion, as all the gods worshipped in the city, ‘physically’ present in the territory by statues and temples, inhabiting the same landscape as men, and echoed on the stage by the statues that the women will soon address. They form an integral and immanent part of the *polis* fabric, in a way that the *polis*, as common ground of gods and men, appears foremost.

At line 15 the altars represent both places of cult and the territorial intersection between πολιῖται men and πολιισσοῦχοι gods.²²⁾ This association moreover clarifies the sense in which religion is the cult of the gods, expressed first and foremost in sacrifice.

Eteocles’ mention of ancestral or native gods and altars in the prologue is customary in speeches of exhortation: it appears both

19) All translations are by H.W. Smyth.

20) The symbol of Mother Earth is particularly significant for Thebans, descendants of the Earth-born *Spartoi*.

21) See also ll. 69 (*infra*), 109, 185, 253, 271, 312, 822. On the frequency of the expression see Lupaş & Petre 1981, 16-7, 37.

22) The altars stand out in this passage as the religious symbol of group identity and an eminent civic institution: the reaction to the destruction of the sanctuaries by Xerxes can be viewed as an example thereof. Cf. also A. *Pers.* 805-29, A. 338-48, 381-84, *Eu.* 539; E. *Tr.*, prologue.

in historians and in tragedy and can be therefore considered as typical and representative of civic religiosity.²³⁾

3. *Reactions to Fear: the εὐχή of Eteocles vs. the λιτή of the Chorus*

After Eteocles' opening speech, the scout enters bringing dreadful news from the battlefield (39-68). He describes in vivid, frightening images the seven heroes ready to fight. With brief, vivid touches he depicts the ritual of oath performed with the blood of a sacrificed bull, the commitment to win or die, and the fierce, almost demonic appearance and courage of the seven heroes. Eteocles and the Chorus react in parallel and divergent ways: both interact with the gods, but Eteocles utters an εὐχή while the Chorus performs acts of supplication.

Eteocles responds to the news with an address to the gods following a three-part structure: invocation, where the relevant gods are named together with their epithets; argument, where the petitioner states why the god or gods should grant his request; and petition, where the actual object of the prayer is expressed (69-77):²⁴⁾

ὦ Ζεῦ τε καὶ Γῆ καὶ πολιτισσοῦχοι θεοί,
 Ἄρα τ' Ἐρινὺς πατρὸς ἡ μεγασθενής,
 μή μοι πόλιν γε πρυμνόθεν πανάλεθρον
 ἐκθαμνίσητε δηάλωτον, Ἑλλάδος
 φθόγγον χέουσαν, καὶ δόμους ἐφεστίους·
 ἐλευθέραν δὲ γῆν τε καὶ Κάδμου πόλιν
 ζυγοῖσι δουλίοισι μήποτε σχεθεῖν·
 γένεσθε δ' ἀλκή· ξυνὰ δ' ἐλπίζω λέγειν·
 πόλις γὰρ εὖ πράσσουσα δαίμονας τίει.

‘O Zeus and Earth, and ye gods that guard our city, and Curse, the potent spirit of vengeance of my sire, do not, I entreat ye, extirpate in ruin utter and complete, with ravage by the foe, a city that speaks the speech of Hellas, and our hearths and home. O may they never constrain in slavery’s

23) Th. 7.69.2; A. *Pers.* 402 ff.; E. *Heracl.* 826 f.

24) For the terminology see Bremer 1981, 196. On the three-part structure see Aubriot-Sevin 1992, 218-40.

yoke a land of freedom and the town of Cadmus!
 But show yourselves our strengths. Methinks it is
 our common cause I urge. For a State that
 prospers pays honours to its gods.'

Eteocles' prayer is structured as follows:

- (1) The *invocation* is addressed to Zeus, Gê, the gods of the city and to the Curse and Erinys of the father (69-70). We should note the presence of the local civic gods at line 69, the *πολισσοῦχοι θεοί*, which parallel the land gods, the *ἐγγώριοι θεοί* of line 14. These gods are invoked by Eteocles the king, one half of his double identity. Interestingly, he alludes to the other half by invoking the curse and the Erinys of the father.²⁵⁾
- (2) The *argument* brought forward to persuade the gods to comply with his request, lines 76-7, is that the destiny of the *polis* is also the destiny of the gods (*ξυνὰ λέγειν*): the gods have a vested interest in protecting the city, because without *polis* they would have no cult, honour nor 'existence'.
- (3) The *request* (lines 71-5) is to avert evil, to protect the city from slavery.²⁶⁾

The description of the gods as *πολισσοῦχοι* is, in my opinion, the key of the prayer. Their embeddedness brings to light the reason for the interrelated relationship between civic society and the gods. Eteocles' response therefore stresses the theme of reciprocity in the context of a prayer uttered in a moment of utmost danger.²⁷⁾ Salvation in a time of war is primarily in the hands of men, in their capacity to act as hoplites should, with order and control against the attack of the disorderly enemy, backed by the support of the gods as allies.

Pulleyn has recently interpreted Greek prayer, and particularly Homeric prayers of the εἴ ποτε type, as a request to the gods artic-

25) On this point see Vidal-Naquet 1988, 280.

26) As for πόλις γε of line 71, I see it as 'at least save the city', where again the theme of *polis* over family and *genos* is to be seen. Cf. Winnington-Ingram 1983, 26.

27) There is, to be sure, much ambiguity in Eteocles' words, particularly in the mention of the Curse and of his father, but this echo does not affect our point. See Lupaş & Petre 1981, 35 f.

ulated as a give-and-take transaction between gods and men.²⁸⁾ Indeed, the argument of Eteocles' prayer is understandable only in terms of reciprocity.²⁹⁾ As in the prayer of lines 216-8, here too he stresses the argument of the mutual interest for gods and men in saving the city, because without the city there would be no cult. Much emphasis in this respect should be given to the word *λόγος* of line 218, 'it is said', emphasizing the traditional form of the argument.³⁰⁾ The gods are linked to Thebes' destiny as an integral part of the *polis* universe. Aubriot-Sevin observes, in her thorough examination of tripartite prayers, that they are relatively rare in tragedy and almost absent in Aeschylus, which makes this prayer all the more significant.³¹⁾

The Chorus' reaction is markedly different, and shows what we can define as a supplicatory attitude. The Chorus of Theban women rushes onto the stage and reacts with uncontrolled cries and expressions of despair to the news. It invokes gods and goddesses in stages mixing the invocation with expressions of helplessness, and sheer panic (79-98). From the outset the women's reaction contradicts Eteocles' clear orders, who after his *parainesis* ordered the men of Thebes to 'stand firm courageously' because 'invading hordes must not cause panic' (34-5). In the quoted passages and throughout the *parodos* the women react to noises of war, to the shouts of an attacking party and the thunder of horse-hooves.³²⁾ From the performative viewpoint, the reaction of the Chorus, together with the actual noises offstage, would probably have had a strong impact on the audience, who, in their passive position, might have shared the fear of the Chorus. It might be useful to keep in mind therefore that

28) See also Giordano 2001, particularly for some reservations on his elaboration of reciprocity, and Calame 1999.

29) On reciprocity in the ancient Greek social and political fabric see Herman 1996, Gill 1998; on reciprocity and religion see Grottanelli 1989-90, with special emphasis on the theory of gift and sacrifice, Parker 1998, Bremer 1998, and Scheid-Tissinier 2001.

30) Valakas (1993, 62) suggests that *logos* might refer to the myth of the abandonment of the city by the gods with their *xoana*, recalled in the Sch. 304a; see also Bona 1997, 132.

31) Aubriot-Sevin (1992, 224) however does not recognize in 69-77 a three-part prayer, probably since the argument here is found at the end, while normally it comes second.

32) On the overwhelming presence of noise see Edmunds 2002.

Eteocles' endeavour to reprimand and channel their fear into a manageable ritual form would have found a second, implicit, recipient in the audience itself.

For the women of the Chorus, salvation can only come from the gods and not from men. At lines 93-4 they wonder which god or goddess has the power to save them from destruction and nowhere is there a reference to human resources able to counter the enemy's attack. The Chorus, as Jackson has well analyzed, relies totally on the gods' power in a way that completely negates a human role.³³⁾

This attitude to the gods seems to express the passive position of the Athenian woman, barred from carrying arms; this position is embodied in a form of cultic action divisible into: ritual action, *ἱκετεία* (supplication) and ritual speech, *λιτή* (lamenting prayer). They approach the statues of the local gods, fall at their feet, clinging or embracing them (lines 94-9), using gestures which the Greek audience would have immediately understood as *hiketeia*.³⁴⁾ The Chorus defines its action as a collective supplication, calling itself *ἱκέσιος λόχος* (111), a 'company of suppliants'.³⁵⁾

Supplication to the gods was not in fact a customary practice, as *hiketeia* is usually addressed to another human being and not to a god.³⁶⁾ There were, to be sure, cases of *hiketeia* where the gods were involved, but upon closer examination, in many of these cases the gods acted as protectors of the suppliants, through the inviolability of their sanctuaries (*hierosylia*), and as intermediaries between the suppliant and the addressee, who is another human being often representing the *polis*.³⁷⁾ The cases of the Cilonians and of Pausanias stand for a famous illustration of this point.³⁸⁾

33) Jackson 1988, 289-91; see also Zeitlin 1990b, 110.

34) On supplication see Gould 1973 and Giordano 1999.

35) For other terms related to supplication see also ll. 94, 185, 211, 241, 258.

36) Cf. Giordano 1999, 161-91.

37) As it is the case of the *Suppliants*.

38) Cilonians: Hdt. 5.70-1; Th. 1.126.3-12; Plu. *Sol.* 12; Pausanias: Th. 1.128.1, 133.5. *Hiketeia*, moreover, was also (or especially) a type of address to the Assembly in fifth- and fourth-century Athens, where the chairmen of the Council assigned a session of the Assembly, as Aristotle informs us, to the supplications of any citizen or stranger who wished to bring his case to discussion. In this form, *hiketeia* is entirely a civic institution operating at the human level. Cf. Arist. *Ath.* 43.6, see Zelnick-Abramovitz 1998 and Giordano 1999, 186-8.

Cases of collective supplication to gods are to be found in cases of defeat, when there is no more recourse to human intervention, as in the case of the Athenian plague.³⁹⁾ The Chorus itself justifies its action as one dictated by panic and terror (214), when Eteocles' words oppose their purportedly eccentric behaviour with the 'correct' way of addressing the gods.⁴⁰⁾ A passage of the *Prometheus Bound* suggests that the supplicatory attitude is a feature associated with women, probably because they had little access to the 'reciprocal' prayer, associated as it was to the performing of a sacrifice.⁴¹⁾ Recalling this element, we can better understand why the very performance of this act could, as Eteocles fears, induce panic in the soldier-citizens.

The *hiketeia* is accompanied by λιταὶ θεόκλυτοι.⁴²⁾ The difference between λιτή and other forms of εὐχή seems to lie not in the invocation to the gods, or in the requests, but in the lack of reciprocity, which we have defined above in the Homeric form of prayer

39) Th. 2.47.

40) Goff (1995, 360) argues that the Chorus "are well within their rights, as women of the city, to perform these actions". The scholar, complying with the idea of Thebes as the anti-*polis*, holds that in Athenian tragedy Theban women are prevented from fulfilling their ritual function on behalf of the *polis*; if this is arguable for other tragedies, the *Seven Against Thebes* seems to show a rather different picture. Cf. *Il.* 6.287-311 for a comparable cultic action performed by Trojan women, consisting of procession to Athena's sanctuary, prayer for the city's salvation and dedication of a gown. In the Iliadic scene, however, no gesture of supplication is performed. Bruit-Zaidman (1991, 46) remarks that whereas the Trojan women act on Hector's recommendation, the Theban women act on their own initiative. I do not agree however that the intervention of the Theban women is 'traditional', despite the difference with the Iliadic scene. See also Lupaş & Petre 1981, 72 and Ieranò 2002.

41) A. *Pr.* 1002-3: 'Do not think I will turn womanish for fear of Zeus' decision, and I'll imitate women supplicating with upturned hands, which I most hate'. On women and prayer see Aubriot-Sevin 1992, 78-87. On women and sacrifice see Dillon 2002, 236-46. The scholar also highlights the connection between women and kneeling before a god or clinging statues, concluding that "like kneeling to a god, clinging to a statue was appropriate behaviour for women, but also indicates their passivity and helplessness, particularly in the face of sexual violence" (2002, 261).

42) Cf. 171 χειροτόνοι λιταί, a clear indication of the gesture of lifting up the hands, the χεῖρα ἀνατείνειν, 320 ὄξυγόοι λιταί. The Chorus addresses several gods asking for protection, particularly Ares (104, 135), Zeus (116), Pallas Athena (129, 161), Poseidon (131), Cypris (140), Apollo (145, 159), Artemis (147, 154), Hera (151), and Pallas Onca (163). For the relevance of these gods for the construction of this scene see Bernardete 1967 and Thalman 1978, 88.

as the argument, and in being uttered with a lamenting tone. In other words, λιτή may describe a petition to the gods where on the formal level the argument and the *do ut des* form are missing. It is important to remember that the word λιτή together with λίσσομαι usually designates an urgent appeal to another human being and not to a god. The verb is connected to a supplicatory, persuasive approach, and is never to be found in votive or tripartite prayers, and “implies the presence and proximity of the supplicated person”.⁴³⁾ In the words of the Chorus λίσσομαι is strictly associated with the acts of supplication they are performing at the statues of the gods. The word λιτή moreover, is very often associated with supplication. In the *Seven Against Thebes* λιτή seems in conclusion to be a type of *lamenting prayer* whose peculiarity consists in being supplicatory and performed with a particular wailing tone.

It is, in fact, this supplicatory modality—defined by the specific word λιτή—that Eteocles opposes, defining it as damaging and inappropriate. He explicitly counters the λιτή with an εὐχή and replaces their supplicatory attitude with his own attitude of reciprocity. In their address to the gods the women use interjections which are close to lament, such as ἰὼ ἰὼ (86-7) or φεῦ φεῦ.⁴⁴⁾ The attitude of the Chorus has often been interpreted as expressing a “desperate and unquestioning faith”, or “genuine, intuitive and irrational” feelings,⁴⁵⁾ as if expressing a truer or simply more pious religious feeling. E. Jackson has rightly remarked that the Chorus has “benefited” in modern criticism from the thought-habits of Christianity and that “to regard passive self-abandonment to the gods as a virtue is much more typical of Christian religious thought than Greek”.⁴⁶⁾ One might call reciprocal this attitude too, reciprocity being a very wide encompassing conceptual category, representing different patterns of

43) Corlu 1966, 298-314. The scholar points out that in the rare cases where the verb is addressed to a god, it expresses a situation of distress and extreme danger and a request to obtain pity. On the use of the verb in connection to supplication see Giordano 1999, 211-9.

44) West (1990, 106) suggests that φεῦ φεῦ at line 136 has no place in the middle of a prayer, but following my interpretation this seems to confirm the eccentric character of this address.

45) Brown 1977, 303.

46) Jackson 1988, 291.

behaviour.⁴⁷⁾ However, the Chorus expresses a type of reciprocity where the unequal status of the partners (gods and men), is not bridged by a common ground of interest or by the direct offering of a gift.⁴⁸⁾

4. *Eteocles vs. the Chorus: a Confrontation of Religious Attitudes*

Let us now turn to the next scene: the dialogue between Eteocles and the Chorus. It has been noted that the length of this dialogue seems disproportionate to the play. In my opinion this dialogue defines by way of opposition two different religious attitudes, one positive, “virile and civic”,⁴⁹⁾ and the other dangerous, negative and marginal.⁵⁰⁾

Aeschylus emphasizes the contrast between Eteocles and the women of the Chorus by creating a series of oppositions in terms of religiosity, as we have stated at the beginning, which take on their value against the background of civic Athenian religion. I will list some of these opposing pairs:

Table 1: Oppositions between male and female in the *Seven Against Thebes*

opposition	male	female	lines
religiosity	normative	marginal	183-4, 187-90, 193-5, 200-1
relation to gods	reciprocity	supplication	216-7, 230-2
ritual form	prayer εὐχή + sacrifice	supplication + λιτή	185-6, 230-2, 258, 265-80
effect on <i>polis</i>	courage	fear	250, 252, 262
domain	public (outside)	private (inside)	200-1, 232
relation to fear	control	expression	236-8, 250, 270
response to danger	exhortation	lament	242-4

47) For an informing outline of the difficulty implicit in the concept of reciprocity see van Wees 1998, 15-20.

48) Cfr. ll. 176-80, where the women recall past sacrifices, but in a context where the omnipotence of the gods is expressed in a supplicatory tone.

49) Vernant 1982, 16.

50) The attitudes are thus represented by Eteocles, the masculine side, who, interestingly, is the only defining voice in the passages under examination; the feminine actor, the Chorus, defines Eteocles' attitude by way of dissonance. It may be assumed that in Athenian reality, taken as an all encompassing system, the two forms of religiosity coexisted; still we have already seen some consonance between Eteocles and the Athenian point of view.

We will examine two passages that elucidate particularly well the second and third points, namely, the relation to the gods and the ritual forms characterizing the male and female religiosities. At ll. 216-8 Eteocles counters the *λιταὶ μακάρων* of the Chorus (214) with an exhortation to pray, *εὐχομαι*, the gods that the bulwarks resist the attack:

πύργον στέγειν εὐχεσθε πολέμιον δόρυ.
οὐκοῦν τάδ' ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν· ἀλλ' οὖν θεοὺς
τοὺς τῆς ἀλούσης πόλεος ἐκλείπειν λόγος.

'That our bulwarks stand fast against the onset of the foe—be that your prayer. Aye, this will be as the gods grant—but then, 'tis said, a captured city is forsaken by its gods.'

In this passage, the element of reciprocity stands out with particular connection to prayer. On the ritual level we find an opposition between supplication and prayer, i.e. between the *λιταὶ μακάρων* of the Chorus and the *εὐχή* suggested by Eteocles (216). Although from the semantic point of view *εὐχή* and *εὐχομαι* are used to describe any address to a god as well as certain types of addresses to other human beings, and although its semantic status is still controversial, in this passage it seems to be a *vox propria* insofar as the ritual utterance that Eteocles prompts the Chorus to perform is similar to the prayer he uttered at ll. 69-77. Both are composed of invocation (summarized in the verb *εὐχομαι*), argument and petition, where the argument is that gods leave a captured city that can no longer pay honour to them.

At lines 226-33 Eteocles opposes a conception of 'divine providence' by stressing the agency of men in saving the *polis* through ritual action:

Xo. ἔστι· θεοῦ δ' ἔτ' ἰσχύς καθυπερτέρα
πολλάκι δ' ἐν κακοῖσι τὸν ἀμάχανον
κάκ χαλεπᾶς δύας ὑπερθ' ὀμμάτων
κρημναμενᾶν νεφελᾶν ὄρθοι.
'Ετ. ἀνδρῶν τάδ' ἔστι, σφάγια καὶ χρηστήρια
θεοῖσιν ἔρδειν πολεμίων πειρωμένους.
σὸν δ' αὖ τὸ σιγᾶν καὶ μένειν εἴσω δόμων.

Ch. Even so, yet the might of Heaven is above all;
and ofttimes in the midst of his distress, it uplifteth
the helpless, even from cruel woes when clouds are
lowering over his eyes.

Et. 'Tis for men to offer victims and sacrifices unto
the gods when they make trial of the foe; but thy
task is to hold thy peace and bide within the house.

Whereas Eteocles stresses the importance of human resources, both in themselves and in dealing with the gods, the Chorus declares here the powerlessness of human beings *vis-à-vis* divine power.

Eteocles states in normative terms how one should ritually behave towards the gods when there is a need to turn to them, in this case before a battle. In doing so, he tries to put back in order what had been subverted and disrupted by the women's invasion of the public scene and by the performance of anomalous ritual actions.

In his ongoing struggle for control Eteocles needs to divide the religious territory according to the opposing categories of outside-inside and male-female: dealing with and propitiating the gods is men's task, whose appropriate ritual action consists of sacrifices and divination. The opposition between the inside and outside space takes on a further connotation in this passage. The outside of the *polis* represents the enemy, the barbaric face of disorder (73, 170) and the danger confronting the citizen hoplite force, but it also represents the public sphere, dominated by the men, who deal both with the enemy and with gods as allies, while the women must remain inside the home. Opposing the women, Eteocles seems more prompted by the interest of the *polis* than by his idiosyncratic misogyny, for what matters is λέγειν τὰ καίρια, so that the city's defenders won't be discouraged by the spreading of panic, and this is why he asks the women whether their attitude will bring safety to the *polis* (182).

Consultation of omens (230) was customary before committing one's forces to battle and furthermore the association of omens or divination with sacrifice is a traditional one.⁵¹) Their performance thus marks the proper way of practicing the civic cult in general and before war in particular.

51) Hutchinson interprets χρηστήρια as synonym of σφάγια: χρηστήρια however indicates here divinatory practices, clearly different from σφάγια, which means sacrifice; a redundancy is furthermore not easily understandable in a context where very precise ritual actions are indicated. Furthermore, as Lupaş & Petre (1981, 20 f.) have pointed out, divinatory technique in particular is represented in this tragedy in most of its forms. The mantic resources to be addressed before a battle were manifold, and χρηστήρια may have consisted of oracle response, extispicy or empyroscopy. In his introductory speech (ll. 24-9), Eteocles reported the crucial intervention of

5. *Eteocles' Final Instructions: Sacrifice, Omen, εὐχή and the Strategy of Containment*

At this point the Chorus has finally agreed to restrain its wailings (258-63) and Eteocles gives the final directions before uttering his own prayer, in order to create the appropriate liturgical and ritual context to support the men's verbal and ritual actions in preparing to battle. His first command interrupts the women's contact with the statues and ends the formal supplication (264-6):

τοῦτ' ἀντ' ἐκείνων τοῦπος αἰροῦμαι σέθεν.
καὶ πρὸς γε τούτοις, ἐκτὸς οὐσ' ἀγαλμάτων,
εὐχου τὰ κρείσσω, ξυμμάχους εἶναι θεούς·

'This utterance likes me better than thy words that went before. Aye, and more than this—quit thy place about the images and make the better prayer: "May the gods fight on our side!"'

Line 265 probably indicates a stage direction, whereby the Chorus distances itself from the statues: after verbal silence has been obtained Eteocles also reduces them to gestural silence. He then asks them to pray τὰ κρείσσω, which would be better rendered as 'the most appropriate way' rather than 'for the best', and for him 'appropriate' means asking the gods to be partners in battle. This kind of address is of course a customary element of prayers before duels, battles or difficult enterprises,⁵²) but its occurrence here takes on a clearer meaning because of the opposition to the women's utterances and is highlighted by the opposition between reciprocity and supplication. The women in fact have already asked for intervention from the gods (130-1, 145, 214, 255), but in a manner of supplication and submission. Eteocles on the other hand, asks the gods to be engaged in the battle as allies, more powerful than men, but still together with them, consistent with his human-centred approach to salvation (267-81):

a seer, probably Tiresias, who prophesized an enemy attack for the coming night. At line 26 the seer's operation is described as an observation of χρηστήριοι δρνιθεσ, and it is clearly specified that the *mantis*' prophecy is carried out 'without fire's help' (l. 25), namely without sacrifice, thus opposing ornithoscopy to empyrosopy, the drawing of omens from the observation of the flames during the burning of offerings at the altar.

52) Mikalson 1991, 51-3.

κάμῶν ἀκούσας' εὐγμάτων, ἔπειτα σύ
 ὄλολυγμὸν ἱερὸν εὐμενῆ καιώνισον,
 Ἑλληνικὸν νόμισμα θυστάδος βοῆς, 270
 θάρσος φίλοις, λύουσα πολέμιον φόβον.
 ἐγὼ δὲ χάρας τοῖς πολιτισσοῦχοις θεοῖς,
 πεδιονόμοις τε κάγορᾶς ἐπισκόποις,
 Δίρκης τε πηγαῖς, ὕδατί τ' Ἴσμηνοῦ λέγω
 εὖ ζυντυχόντων καὶ πόλεως σεσωμένης, 275
 μήλοισιν αἰμάσσοντας ἐστίας θεῶν,
 ταυροκτονοῦντας θεοῖσιν, ᾧδ' ἐπέυχομαι
 θύσειν τροπαῖα, δαίων δ' ἐσθήματα,
 στέψω λάφυρα δουρίπληθ' ἀγνοῖς δόμοις.
 στέψω πρὸ ναῶν, πολεμίων δ' ἐσθήματα.
 τοιαῦτ' ἐπέυχου μὴ φιλοστόνωσ θεοῖς, 280
 μηδ' ἐν ματαίοις κἀγρίοις ποιφύγμασιν.

'And now first hear my vow, and then ring out the loud
 and solemn cry of jubilation, our Grecian wont of
 sacrificial shout heartening to our friends, and remove
 the terror of battle.

And now "To the guardian gods of our country, whether they haunt
 the plain or keep watch over the market-place, to
 Dirces's springs, and to Ismenus' stream, I make my
 vow that, if all go well and the city with its burghers
 be preserved, they shall stain with blood of sheep
 the hearths of the gods and offer trophies, while I
 will bedeck their hallowed abodes with the spoil of
 the spear-smitten vestments of the foe".

Such be the tenour of thy prayers unto the gods,
 indulging not in lamentations nor in vain and frantic
 shrieks.'

Its several difficulties notwithstanding,⁵³⁾ this passage can be viewed
 as a positive 'rulebook' of the customary Greek ways to interact
 with the gods in civic religion, particularly during wartime where
 we can identify many of the elements discussed in this paper. First
 of all, vow-prayer and sacrifice are mentioned and understood as
 a complementary pair, verbal and material offerings to the gods
 that continually renew a two-way relationship;⁵⁴⁾ solemn prayers and

53) Lupaş & Petre 1981, 96 f.

54) The term *eugmata* had a specific use for promissory vows. See Corlu 1966, 194 f.

sacrifices were a part of warfare, uttered before going into battle.⁵⁵) After the victory in battle it was also customary to erect a trophy 'at the doors of temples' with the spoil of the enemy.⁵⁶)

The duty of men is therefore defined as their almost exclusive leadership in wartime rituals, and the role of women is contained in the controlled and positive emotional expression of their shrill ritual cry, the ὀλολυγμός, at line 268, coupled with the paeon.⁵⁷) Lupaş and Petre see in Eteocles' invitation a dangerous reversal of customary ritual because the *ololygmos* "does not accompany the vows but rather the sacrifice".⁵⁸) In fact, Greek practice uses the *ololygmos* or *ololygê* in many functions (such as greeting, free prayer, expression of joy),⁵⁹) even if its most relevant use is as a high-pitched accompaniment to the sacrifice.⁶⁰)

In pointing out the opposition between the order of the citizen's behaviour against the impious and unmeasured attitude of the enemies, Petre remarks that "the piety of the assieged is entirely on the side of order".⁶¹) Still, according to our interpretation, the piety expressed by Theban women can be viewed as siding more with the barbaric than with the civic, particularly regarding the conno-

55) Cf. Th. 6.32, where there is mention of customary prayers accompanied by libations and a hymn to Apollo before the departure of the naval expedition to Sicily in 415 BCE. See for all these aspects Lonis 1979, 95-107 on sacrifices before battle, and Mikalson 1983, 18-21.

56) On the usage and forms of trophy, see Lonis 1979, 129-51 and Hutchinson 1985, xxxvi on the final 'inversion' of the triumph. Vidal-Naquet (1988, 281) suggests that the mention of the sacrifice is to be interpreted as human sacrifice, that is, the imminent fratricide, but I think that the semantic context clearly contradicts this interpretation, as in this passage *polis* traditional practices are countered with marginal ones and furthermore if there were a question of impious acts such as human sacrifice, there would have been no mention of ἑλληνικὸν νόμισμα.

57) Rose (1957, 183) interprets paeon here as "any kind of joyful noise", but it can be interpreted as a reference to the 'paeon of attack' sung before the battle, see Lonis 1979, 117 f.

58) Lupaş & Petre 1981, 194.

59) On *ololygmos* see Gernet 1983, 247-57, Pulleyn 1997, 180, Collins 1999.

60) In Homer it is uttered at the exact moment of slaughter of the sacrificial animal, but also before the utterance of a vow, expressed by *euchomai* (Il. 6.301). In Euripides' fragment the cry is associated with prayer, and in Call. *Law. Pall.* 139, the ὀλολυγαί are specifically associated with εὐγµατα, like in our passage, in the acclamations of the girls to Athena; cf. fr. 351 N2, where women are invited to address their cry to Athena, so she may come to their help.

61) Petre 1971, 19.

tation of disorder and vocal distortion.⁶²) The former emotions of disorderly cries are converted into the order of a customary expression.⁶³) While at the beginning the women uttered savage sounds, ἄγρια ποιφύγματα (280), and threatened by this token to spread panic among the population, their newfound vocal expression in the *ololygmos* can provide positive reinforcement to the fighters. With this in mind we can also see the ritual process prompted by Eteocles as a passage from the barbaric to the civic.⁶⁴)

After a short hesitation, the Chorus gives in to Eteocles' orders and slowly transforms its laments into invocations to the gods in more reciprocal terms and with customary ritual addresses including curses against the enemy and wishes *in bonam partem* for Eteocles and the Theban army. Eteocles has therefore eventually succeeded in 'taming' the dangerous voices of the women, reducing them once again to devout supporters of men folk: if fear is not entirely subsided, they cease to resort to supplication and supplicatory addresses.

Conclusions

The conflict between Eteocles and the Chorus, when seen as a larger tension between two types of religiosity in *polis* religion, allows a number of points to emerge. The interplay between *euchê* and *litê*, sacrifice and supplication, order and disorder, control and expression of emotions create the dissonance of the *parodos* and the first episode.

I have shown how the *Seven* brings to the fore two contrasting attitudes towards the gods, expressed in different ritual actions

62) In this picture we have seen women performing extreme acts and it is important to remind ourselves that as Foley (2001, 54) has remarked, "tragedy permits male choruses and actors not only to imitate female behavior but to imitate female behavior forbidden to contemporary women in a public context". On this point see also Easterling 1987, 25. See also the aspects connected with *heterophonos* as related to sound rather than language, as first remarked by Judet de la Combe (1988); see also Pepe 1998, 190.

63) Cf. αἶψιν and λακάζειν, 'yelling and shrieking', 186, and ἑλληνικὸν νόμισμα, 269, even if the custom is not only Greek. Cf. Hdt. 4.189.3, see Gernet 1983 and Rose 1957, 183.

64) I can here but hint at the fact that the representation of women's behaviour has essential features in common with that of the seven Argive heroes: in particular the semantic clusters of fear, noise, non-articulated voice and the pole civic-barbaric.

through the male-female opposition, where the dominant one (the male) constructs the other as inappropriate or deviating.

The expression of painful emotions and fear and the foreboding of slavery, defeat and death contained in the supplication to the gods and in lamenting prayers have the effect of ‘demoralizing the troops’ by making visible the risks and consequences of warfare. The danger embodied in the action of the women is therefore not only that of ill omen, but they may also stir in the hoplitic body exactly those dangerous emotions their morale contrives to master. From the viewpoint of Eteocles’ masculine religiosity, the feminine element must be evicted from the public domain and confined to the closed, internal space of the household, unless properly restrained by a ‘strategy of containment’,⁶⁵ or converted into controllable ritual forms. The dramatic conversion of the Chorus into the speech-regime of the citizen corresponds to the constriction of their emotional voices into recognizable and mastered ritual forms.

The tragedy does not nevertheless provide “a solution which could eliminate the conflicts either by reconciling them or by stepping beyond the oppositions”.⁶⁶ Eteocles’ victory is only temporary and illusory: the master of control will soon become victim of forces beyond his grip. Eteocles’ struggle for control eventually ends with his death, and the end of the play shows the re-emergence of the women’s lamenting, emotional voices.

Manuela_Giordano@hotmail.com

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aloni, A. 2002. *La colpa di Eteocle. Immedesimazione e straniamento. La fruizione dei Sette a Tebe*, in: Aloni *et al.* 2002, 93-103
- Aloni, A., Berardi, E., Besso, G., Cecchin, S. (eds.) 2002. *I Setti a Tebe. Dal mito alla letteratura* (Bologna)
- Aubriot-Sevin, D. 1992. *Prière et conceptions religieuses en Grèce ancienne* (Lyon)

65) MacClure (1999, 7) analyses the male strategy of containment towards the women in a number of plays that show “how women’s uncontrolled speech disrupts the male-governed household and city unless it is suppressed or transmuted into a ritual form”.

66) Vernant 1982, 13.

- Bernardete, S. 1967. *Two Notes on Aeschylus Septem*, I. *The Parodos and the Stasimon*, WS n.s. 1, 22-30
- Bona, G. 1997. *La polis, la religione, le donne nel teatro attico del V secolo I. I Sette a Tebe di Eschilo*, Lexis 15, 123-42
- Bremer, J.M. 1981. *Greek Hymns*, in: Versnel, H.S. (ed.) *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World* (Leiden), 193-215
- . 1998. *The Reciprocity of Giving and Thanksgiving in Greek Worship*, in: Gill 1998, 127-37
- Brown, A.L. 1977. *Eteocles and the Chorus in the Seven against Thebes*, Phoenix 31, 300-18
- Bruit-Zaidman, L. 1991. *La voix des femmes: les femmes et la guerre dans Les Sept contre Thèbes*, in: Fick, N., Carrière, J.C. *Mélanges Etienne Bernand* (Paris), 43-54
- Burkert, W. 1995. *Greek Poleis and Civic Cults: Some Further Thoughts*, in: Hansen, M.H., Raafaub, K. (eds.) *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart), 201-10
- Calame, C. 1999. Review of S. Pulleyn, 'Prayer in Greek Religion' (Oxford 1997), *BMCRC* 1999.090.15
- Caldwell, R.S. 1973. *The Misogyny of Eteocles*, *Arethusa* 6, 197-231
- Cameron, H.D. 1971. *Studies on the Seven Against Thebes of Aeschylus* (The Hague)
- Cerri, G. 2000. *L'etica di Simonide nell' Eracle di Euripide*, in: Angeli Bernardini, P. (ed.), *Presenza e funzione della città di Tebe nella cultura greca* (Pisa/Roma), 233-63
- . 1992. *La tragedia*, in: Cambiano, G., Canfora, L., Lanza, D. (eds.) *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, I.1 (Salerno), 301-34
- Cole, S.G. 1995. *Civic Cult and Civic Identity*, in: Hansen, M.H. (ed.) *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State* (Copenhagen), 292-325
- Collins, J. 1999. *Greek ololyzo and Hittite palwai: Exultation in the Ritual Slaughter of Animals*, *GRBS* 36, 319-25
- Corlu, A. 1966. *Recherches sur les mots relatifs à l'idée de prière, d'Homère aux tragiques* (Paris)
- Dawe, R.D. 1963. *Inconsistency of Plot and Character in Aeschylus*, *PCPS* 189, 31-42
- Dawson, C.M. 1970. *The Seven Against Thebes by Aeschylus* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ)
- Dillon, M. 2002. *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion* (London/New York)
- Easterling, P.E. 1987. *Women in Tragic Space*, *BICS* 34, 15-26
- Edmunds, L. 2002. *Sounds off Stage and on Stage in Aeschylus*, *Seven Against Thebes*, in: Aloni, A. et al. 2002, 105-15
- Foley, H. 2001. *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton/Oxford)
- Gagarin, M. 1976. *Aeschylean Drama* (Berkeley/Los Angeles)
- Gernet, L. 1983. *Les Grecs sans miracle* (Paris)
- Gill, Ch., Postlethwaite, N., Seaford, R. 1998. *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford)
- Giordano, M. 1999. *La supplica. Rituale, istituzione sociale e tema epico* (Naples)
- . 2001. Review of S. Pulleyn, 'Prayer in Greek Religion' (Oxford 1997), *SCI* 20, 267-72
- Goff, B. 1996. *The Women of Thebes*, *CJ* 90, 353-63
- Golden, L. 1964. *The Character of Eteocles and the Meaning of the Septem*, *CPh* 59, 79-89
- Goldhill, S. 1986. *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge)
- . 1999. *Programme Notes*, in: Goldhill, S., Osborne, R. *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge), 1-29
- Gould, J. 1973. *Hiketia*, *JHS* 93, 74-103
- Grottanelli, C. 1989-90. *Do ut des?*, *Scienze dell'Antichità* 3-4, 45-54
- Havelock, E.A. 1985. *The Oral Composition of Greek Drama*, in: Gentili, B., Paioni, G. (eds.) *Oralità: cultura, letteratura, discorso* (Pisa/Roma), 713-65

- Herman, G. 1996. *Reciprocity*, in: *OCD*
- Hutchinson, G.O. 1985. *Aeschylus: Septem contra Thebas* (Oxford)
- Ieranò, G. 2002. *La città delle donne. Il sesto dell' Iliade e i Sette contro Tebe di Eschilo*, in: Aloni, A. et al. 2002, 73-92
- Jackson, E. 1988. *The Argument of Septem contra Thebas*, *Phoenix* 42, 287-303
- Judet de la Combe, P. 1988. *La langue de Thèbes* (Les Sept contre Thèbes, 72 sqq. et 170), *Métis* 3, 179-206
- Lonis, R. 1979. *Guerre et religion en Grèce à l'époque classique. Recherches sur les rites, les dieux, l'idéologie de la victoire* (Paris)
- Lupaş, L., Petre, Z. 1981. *Commentaire aux Sept contre Thèbes d'Eschyle* (Paris)
- MacClure, L. 1999. *Spoken Like a Woman. Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama* (Princeton)
- Mikalson, J.D. 1983. *Athenian Popular Religion* (The University of North Carolina)
- . 1991. *Honor Thy Gods. Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy* (The University of North Carolina)
- Parker, R. 1998. *Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion*, in: Gill 1998, 106-25
- Pepe, L. 1998. *Dinamica dello spazio nella guerra dei Sette contro Tebe*, *Acme* 51, 181-96
- Petre, Z. 1971. *Thèmes dominants et attitudes politiques dans les Sept contre Thèbes d'Eschyle*, *Stud. Clas.* 13, 15-28
- Podlecki, A.J. 1964. *The Character of Eteocles in Aeschylus' Septem*, *TAPhA* 95, 287-99
- Pulleyn, S. 1997. *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford)
- Rose, H.J. 1957. *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus* (Amsterdam)
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1990. *What is Polis Religion?*, in: Murray, O., Price, S. (eds.) *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander* (Oxford), 295-322
- . 1988. *Further Aspects of Polis Religion*, *AION* 10, 259-74
- . 2003. *Tragedy and Athenian Religion* (Lanham/Boulder/New York/Oxford)
- Taplin, O. 1977. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford)
- Thalman, W. 1978. *Dramatic Art in Aeschylus's Seven Against Thebes* (New Haven/London)
- Valakas, K. 1993. *The First Stasimon and the Chorus in Aeschylus' Seven against Thebes*, *SIFC* 86, 55-86
- Vernant, J.P., Vidal-Naquet, P. 1982. *Tragedy and Myth in Ancient Greece* (Sussex, NJ)
- Vidal-Naquet, P. 1988. *The Shields of the Heroes: Essay on the Central Scene of the Seven Against Thebes*, in: Vernant, J.P., Vidal-Naquet P. *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (New York), 273-301
- van Wees, H. 1998. *The Law of Gratitude: Reciprocity in Anthropological Theory*, in: Gill 1998, 13-50
- West, M.L. 1990. *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart)
- Winnington-Ingram, R.P. 1983. *Studies in Aeschylus* (Cambridge)
- Yunis, H. 1998. *A New Creed: Fundamental Religious Beliefs in the Athenian Polis and Euripidean Drama* (Göttingen)
- Zeitlin, F. 1990a. *Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama*, in: Winkler, J.J., Zeitlin, F. *Nothing to Do with Dionysus? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context* (Princeton), 130-67
- . 1990b. *Patterns of Gender in Aeschylean Drama: Seven Against Thebes and the Danaid Trilogy*, in: Griffith, M., Mastronarde, D.F. (eds.) *Cabinet of the Muses* (Atlanta), 103-15
- Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. 1998. *Supplication and Request: Application by Foreigners to the Athenian Polis*, *Mnemosyne* 51, 554-73