LA VULNERABILIDAD EN EL MEDITERRÁNEO ANTIGUO

Espacios reales e imaginarios

Pedro David Conesa Navarro
Susana Reboreda Morillo
José Miguel Noguera Celdrán

Edizioni Quasar

El volumen se inserta en el proyecto VIPMA. Vulnerabilidad intrafamiliar y política del mundo antiguo (PID 2020-116349GB-100), financiado por el Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación del Gobierno de España

Esta investigación se ha llevado a cabo en el marco del contrato posdoctoral Ramón y Cajal (RYC2023-045876-I) que se está desarrollando en el área de Historia Antigua de la Universidad de Murcia.

El contenido de este volumen se ha sometido a revisión de pares ciegos (peer review)

El diseño de la cubierta es de Lidia González Estrada. Imagen de Mark Landon, Wikimedia Commons, CC BY 4.0, vía Wikimedia Commons. La imagen ha sido ligeramente modificada.

ISBN 978-88-5491-724-8

via Ajaccio 41-43, 00198 Roma (Italia)
www.edizioniquasar.it

Terminado de imprimir en febrero de 2026

La vulnerabilidad en el Mediterráneo Antiguo. Espacios reales e imaginarios

Pedro David Conesa Navarro, Susana Reboreda Morillo y
José Miguel Noguera Celdrán (Eds.)

Edizioni Quasar

Índice

Introducción. Una vulnerabilidad diversa en la Antigüedad

PEDRO DAVID CONESA NAVARRO[1]
Universidad de Murcia
pedrodavid.conesa@um.es

SUSANA REBOREDA MORILLO
Universidade de Vigo
rmorillo@uvigo.es

JOSÉ MIGUEL NOGUERA CELDRÁN
Universidad de Murcia
noguera@um.es

> Nuestras vidas se desarrollan en escenarios que nos transcienden y en circunstancias que no elegimos. Factores que van de lo más externo a lo más íntimo (nuestro entorno medioambiental, nuestro contexto social o nuestro universo emotivo-simbólico, por ejemplo), que afectan decisivamente a la biografía que vamos construyendo. Son circunstancias que influyen en nuestro estar en el mundo y que nos revelan la condición que hace posible todas nuestras experiencias: ser vulnerables (Seguró Mendlewicz 2021: 13)

Esta obra colectiva reúne una serie de contribuciones elaboradas en el marco del proyecto *VIPMA. Vulnerabilidad intrafamiliar y política del mundo antiguo* (PID 2020-116349GB-100), financiado por el Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación del Gobierno de España y dirigido por las doctoras Susana Reboreda Morillo y Rosa María Cid López, de las universidades de Vigo y Oviedo, respectivamente. En un trabajo reciente, Ana Iriarte (2025: 279-281) alude a la problemática que plantea la aplicación del concepto de vulnerabilidad para el período antiguo, una cuestión ampliamente debatida y reflexionada en el transcurso del citado proyecto. De origen indoeuropeo, a partir de la raíz *vul-* y pese a la existencia del adjetivo latino *vulnerabilis*, el significado actual del término "vulnerabilidad" no existía en el periodo grecolatino. El vocablo más cercano sería *vulnus*, cuyo sentido más estricto remite a la "herida" física o corporal y, por extensión, al instrumento con el que se inflige el daño. No obstante, gracias a la literatura y, en especial, a la poesía, es posible comprobar la evolución experimentada por el concepto, que se extenderá a una herida de carácter emocional (*vulnere amoris* o *vulnera vitae*)[2].

En el pensamiento filosófico la vulnerabilidad se ha abordado desde dos ópticas o postulados. Por un lado, tenemos la denominada "ontológica" o de perfil "antropológico", que sería la condición compartida por todos los seres humanos susceptibles de ser dañados y en última instancia de perder la vida, mientras que, la segunda opción, incide más en el aspecto "social" o "situacional". Esta última corriente sería aquella que presta especialmente atención a situaciones concretas que conducen a la exacerbación de la vulnerabilidad compartida u ontológica. En las sociedades antiguas, donde los Estados carecían de la conciencia social o de los mecanismos institucionales necesarios para mitigar este tipo de problemáticas, la pertenencia étnica, el género o la edad fueron factores que determinaron el "grado de vulnerabilidad" de distintos individuos, afectando especialmente a colectivos como mujeres, infantes o personas ancianas, que eran más propensas a vivir situaciones de exclusión social, precariedad y desamparo (Liedo 2021: 245-246; Fernández Prieto e Iriarte 2024: 19). No obstante, también pudieron darse situaciones concretas que también fueron determinantes que propiciaron momentos de sufrimiento, más allá de las circunstancias económicas o de género, como las crisis

1. Esta investigación se ha llevado a cabo en el marco del contrato posdoctoral Ramón y Cajal (RYC2023-045876-I) que se está desarrollando en el área de Historia Antigua de la Universidad de Murcia.

2. Sin duda, una de las mejores síntesis que aborda todas estas cuestiones y que se centra en el período antiguo en particular, cf. Moragno 2018.

alimentarias, enfermedades, guerras o pandemias[3]. La vulnerabilidad puede definirse como la propensión, a nivel individual o colectivo, a sufrir daños o amenazas, condicionadas por diversos factores sociales, económicos o ambientales provocando alteraciones muchas veces en los patrones de conducta con el fin de adaptarse a las nuevas realidades. No obstante, el verbo vulnerar, como señaló Seguró Mendlewicz (2021: 13), implica que todo individuo también puede causar situaciones de vulnerabilidad a otros individuos. De igual modo, ser vulnerable no significa necesariamente ser agredido o dañado. También se refiere a una persona que está expuesta a elementos amenazantes y que no dispone de las herramientas necesarias para protegerse o defenderse en caso de agresión (Liedo 2021: 244). En definitiva, podemos afirmar que la vulnerabilidad se entiende como un concepto estrechamente ligado con escenarios de riesgo, inseguridad o deterioro de las condiciones físicas y sociales que pueden afectar a las personas, colocándolas en contextos desfavorables como la pobreza, la carencia de alimentos, las guerras, además de la enfermedad o epidemias.

En los últimos años, proliferaron los análisis en torno a este concepto a consecuencia de la situación pandémica vivida con la COVID-19. Estos trabajos se han centrado especialmente en materias concretas como la filosofía, la antropología, la ética o el derecho, con el fin de debatir sobre ciertos elementos relacionados con la vulnerabilidad humana o con las políticas encaminadas a erradicar situaciones consideradas injustas. No obstante, desde otras parcelas científicas como la historia, no se ha abordado con demasiada asiduidad y, mucho menos, centrado en la Antigüedad[4]. Esta publicación cubre pues un importante vacío, aportando algunas reflexiones producidas en el marco del proyecto *VIPMA* (2021-2025).

Este volumen se estructura temáticamente en cuatro grandes bloques que pasamos a resumir brevemente a continuación. El primero se inicia con un capítulo de carácter eminentemente teórico, el único de esta naturaleza, firmado por Carla Rubiera Cancelas y Lidia González Estrada, titulado «¿A qué nos referimos cuando hablamos de vulnerabilidad? Interseccionalidad, agencia y estrategias de compensación en la Roma antigua». En él, las autoras realizan una revisión crítica del concepto de vulnerabilidad desde una perspectiva interdisciplinar, con el propósito de demostrar la utilidad analítica de esta categoría en el estudio histórico. Por este motivo, hemos optado por aislar este capítulo y situarlo como marco teórico del volumen. La incorporación del enfoque interseccional resulta fundamental para examinar cómo los factores sociales y jurídicos condicionan las experiencias de vulnerabilidad, una cuestión que se ilustra de manera concreta a través del ejemplo del parto.

El segundo bloque está compuesto por un total de seis trabajos referidos al ámbito religioso o mitológico. El primero de ellos, de Susana Reboreda Morillo, que lleva por título "El *oikos* ¿espacio invulnerable en la época homérica?, aborda el concepto del *oikos* homérico centrándose en las normas destinadas a su protección y en las transgresiones que lo transforman en un espacio amenazante. El capítulo ofrece una visión comparada de la *Ilíada* y la *Odisea* para comprender estas dinámicas en distintos contextos. Asimismo, se examina la posibilidad de contrarrestar dichas amenazas, atendiendo a los mecanismos de defensa existentes y a los resultados, tanto fallidos como exitosos, de su aplicación. El segundo trabajo de este bloque: "Etra en Escena: Eurípides, *Suplicantes* 1-364", de Ana Iriarte Goñi, como su título indica, está centrado en la figura femenina de Etra. En la tragedia de Eurípides se pone de relieve su complejo papel de mediadora entre Teseo y las madres de los guerreros argivos caídos cuando ellas acuden a Atenas para reclamar los cadáveres de sus hijos, retenidos por el tebano. Ante la negativa a entregarlos, interviene Etra, quien logra encauzar el conflicto. En esta actuación se destaca la relevancia y capacidad de actuación de las mujeres en el espacio público. El estudio de Sara Casamayor Mancisidor: "Espacios y vulnerabilidad en la historia de Baucis y Filemón (Ov. Met. 8.611-724)", se enfoca en el libro octavo de la *Metamorfosis* de Ovidio, donde se relata el mito de Baucis y Filemón,

3. A este respecto, pero centrado en los conflictos bélicos, interesante resulta el trabajo de Rubiera Cancelas y Guantes García 2024: 49-77. Desde una perspectiva más general en las que se abordan precisamente aspectos ligados con la vulnerabilidad y las categorías de género, sexo y edad, cf. Rubiera Cancelas 2018; Rubiera Cancelas, García-Ventura y Méndez Santiago 2023; Fernández Prieto e Iriarte 2024.

4. Algunas y recientes excepciones, son las monografías anteriormente citadas. Cf. Nota 2.

una pareja anciana cuya devoción y hospitalidad son premiadas por Júpiter y Mercurio. Tradicionalmente, este episodio, con amplia repercusión artística, se ha interpretado como símbolo del amor fiel, de la felicidad en la pobreza y de la lección moral sobre la ayuda al prójimo. El relato también permite reflexionar sobre la fragilidad de la existencia en la Antigüedad al examinar la vulnerabilidad a partir de los espacios descritos por Ovidio, especialmente la humilde vivienda de los ancianos y sus enseres, así como el paisaje natural y el templo en el que la choza se convierte al final del relato. En el capítulo de Dolors Molas i Font: "Espacios de libertad y vulnerabilidad en los relatos ovidianos sobre las ninfas", se examinan las ninfas en la obra del poeta de Sulmo. La amenaza a estos seres mitológicos que habitan en entornos forestales, apartadas de la sociedad, proviene de la presencia masculina que altera su tranquilidad. Las dos últimas contribuciones de este bloque son de Arturo Sánchez Sanz: "(Non)places of vulnerability. The mythical imaginary landscape as an educational anti-model" y de Iria Souto Castro: "La práctica de la religión doméstica en Deir el-Medina ante la vulnerabilidad en la gestación y la infancia". Ambos textos analizan la relación entre espacio y vulnerabilidad en contextos de la Antigüedad desde perspectivas complementarias. El primero estudia cómo en el imaginario colectivo de la mitología griega existían ciertos lugares simbólicos, como Temiscira, que servían para transmitir valores y normas sociales que reforzaban la idea de la vulnerabilidad femenina. El segundo, centrado en la ciudad egipcia de Deir el-Medina, pone de relieve la presencia de espacios domésticos con funciones rituales que, mediante prácticas de intimidad religiosa, actuaban como mecanismos de protección frente a situaciones de extrema fragilidad, especialmente relacionadas con mujeres y recién nacidos durante la gestación, el parto y la primera infancia.

El tercer bloque puede subdividirse en dos áreas temáticas. La primera reúne contribuciones dedicadas al análisis de espacios, tanto imaginarios como reales, en los que se ponen de relieve situaciones de vulnerabilidad vinculadas al sufrimiento y al dolor. La segunda, integrada por las dos últimas aportaciones, incluye trabajos con un marcado enfoque jurídico y político. Dentro de la primera área se inscriben los trabajos de Isabel Vinal Tenza: "Le *locus aomenus*, un espace de vulnérabilité dans les sources antiques"; de Almudena Domínguez Arranz: "Isla, cárcel y paraíso. La Arqueología como prueba de la *relegatio ad insulam* bajo la dinastía Julio-Claudia" y la conjunta de Carmen Delia Gregorio Navarro y Rosa María Marina Sáez: "Vulnerabilidad, edades y género en el imaginario romano de la muerte a través de la epigrafía funeraria de la Colonia Tarraco y la poesía epigramática latina". El capítulo de Vinal Tenza, a través del análisis literario del mito de Proserpina, muestra cómo el *locus amoenus* se puede transformar en un escenario de violencia. La contribución de Domínguez Arranz analiza cómo las villas marítimas del Lacio y la Campania, concebidas originalmente como espacios de ocio aristocrático, pasaron a convertirse en lugares de *relegatio*, tras la promulgación de la *Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis*. La autora presta especial atención a la isla de Ventotene como centro de confinamiento de las mujeres de la dinastía imperial, lo que permite poner de relieve una dimensión punitiva diferenciada por género en el programa moral y político impulsado por Augusto. Gregorio Navarro y Marina Sáez, centradas en la ciudad hispana de Tarraco, estudian las inscripciones funerarias y ciertos textos literarios con el propósito de visualizar cómo la sociedad romana concebía y ritualizaba la muerte en función del género, la edad y el estatus social. La segunda área temática está conformada por las aportaciones de David Espinosa Espinosa: "Violencia institucional, estatuto cívico y conflictividad sociopolítica y militar en Sicilia durante la propretura de C. Verres (73-71 a.C.): premisas iniciales para una reevaluación histórica" y la de Rafael González Fernández, "Vulnerabilidad y ciudadanía romana en Egipto: un camino complejo hacia la integración". El primero aborda, a partir del testimonio de Cicerón, el gobierno de C. Verres en Sicilia, caracterizado por un abuso extremo del poder provincial, que incluía violencia institucional y por lo tanto la vulneración de derechos. En este trabajo se evidencia el contexto de crisis de la República romana de los años 70 a.C., caracterizada por conflictos militares, sociales y políticos en diversos territorios. La última contribución se centra en la relación entre la ciudadanía romana y la población egipcia durante el periodo imperial. La persistencia de normas locales, pese a la aplicación restrictiva de la ciudadanía romana en Egipto, dio lugar a situaciones de exclusión cultural y a una marcada jerarquización social. Como consecuencia, la población egipcia quedó

relegada a una posición de inferioridad, lo que pone de manifiesto el fracaso de la política romana en lo relativo a la integración de los individuos.

El cuarto bloque agrupa cuatro capítulos dedicados a la familia, a las enfermedades y a las etapas vitales del ser humano. La contribución de Francesca Reduzzi Merola: "La famiglia come luogo della vulnerabilità", examina contextos de vulnerabilidad dentro de la familia romana, con especial atención a dos constituciones imperiales pertenecientes a momentos distintos y vinculadas por la cuestión del matrimonio entre una mujer *ingenua* y un liberto y por las repercusiones jurídicas tanto en los cónyuges como en su descendencia. El trabajo de Borja Méndez Santiago: "La violencia contra las personas mayores en la Antigüedad. Un acercamiento multidisciplinar", aborda la violencia ejercida contra las personas mayores percibidas como una carga familiar a partir del registro literario, epigráfico, iconográfico y arqueológico, abarcando un amplio marco cronológico y geográfico. El capítulo de María Secades Fonseca, "La ilusión de la invulnerabilidad. Poder, justicia y daño en las *Georgias* de Platón", interpreta la vulnerabilidad en *Gorgias* desde la perspectiva ontológica humana, distinguiendo entre daño físico y daño moral. Platón considera este último más grave al comprometer la integridad del alma, transformando al ser herido en un problema filosófico central. El capítulo de Gonzalo Matilla Séiquer: "La enfermedad como vulnerabilidad: el caso de los balnearios romanos", analiza el deseo del ser humano de curarse y enfrentarse a la enfermedad, a través de los balnearios gracias a las propiedades medicinales de sus aguas, revisando si este recurso estaba al alcance de todas las personas.

El último bloque de la monografía está compuesto por cinco aportaciones dedicadas a analizar las diferencias de vulnerabilidad entre las personas determinadas por su posición social y jurídica. Claudia Valeria Alonso Moreno: "Vulnerabilidad y dependencia en la Grecia del Bronce final: el trabajo femenino e infantil en los talleres textiles y el servicio doméstico en el Estado micénico de Pilo", se centra en el Bronce Final en el Estado palacial de Pilo, donde la mano de obra era un recurso fundamental controlado por la administración. Las mujeres trabajadoras y sus hijos, documentados en las series Aa y Ab, formaban parte de los sectores más vulnerables de la sociedad, aunque no fueran consideradas esclavas. Esta vulnerabilidad, fomentada por el propio Estado, aseguraba una fuerza de trabajo estable. También se indagan los mecanismos y espacios en los que se desarrollaba este tipo de actividades. Francesca Cenerini: "Le stanze del potere e la violenza letale sulle Augustae: da Poppea Sabina a Faustina Minore", analiza la vulnerabilidad de ciertas mujeres de la corte imperial romana, incluso en espacios que deberían ofrecerles protección. Estudia los casos de Poppea Sabina, Julia hija de Tito y Faustina la Menor, destacando una vulnerabilidad ligada al embarazo y al desgaste físico provocado por maternidades repetidas y constantes desplazamientos. Las tres últimas aportaciones son de Jacobo Rodríguez Garrido: "Lo que no se nombre no existe: la invisibilización de la prostitución masculina en la documentación legal romana"; Maria Vittoria Bramante: "*Qui in scaenam prodierit* nello spazio del diritto: dall'infamia al divieto di rappresentazione" y José Javier Martínez García: "Mujeres vulnerables durante los primeros siglos del cristianismo: el *ordo viduarum* y el *ordo virginum* y su reflejo en Oxirrinco (Egipto)". Rodríguez Garrido se centra en la prostitución a través del análisis de las fuentes jurídicas romanas, especialmente las referidas al componente servil. El empleo de un lenguaje "feminizado" parece que no da cabida a la prostitución masculina. No obstante, a partir de un recorrido diacrónico que abarca desde los primeros siglos de la Antigüedad hasta época tardía, se aprecia cómo los varones, al igual que las mujeres, también ejercieron la prostitución. Bramante estudia la situación legal de los actores en Roma, limitada hasta las reformas de Justiniano, y subraya que, pese a las restricciones jurídicas, eran muy valorados en la vida cotidiana y en los espectáculos. Martínez García se circunscribe al estudio de la ciudad egipcia de Oxirrinco y analiza las condiciones de vida de las viudas y las vírgenes en época tardía. Estas mujeres, a pesar de desempeñar funciones como guías espirituales y de ejercer una notable influencia social, veían su margen de actuación limitado por dinámicas de marginación y subordinación al clero masculino. No obstante, dichas restricciones no les impidieron optimizar los recursos disponibles para desarrollarse tanto en el ámbito social como en el religioso.

En definitiva, los capítulos de este volumen avalan la hipótesis de que la vulnerabilidad en la Antigüedad fue un fenómeno multidimensional, ligado a factores de género, edad, estatus social, condición jurídica, espacio y contextos culturales o religiosos. También se demuestra cómo mujeres, niños, ancianos y otros grupos

podían encontrarse en situaciones de fragilidad física, social o legal, incluso en entornos que deberían ofrecer protección, como la corte imperial, el hogar o los espacios religiosos. La vulnerabilidad se manifiesta tanto en la cotidiano (trabajo, familia, parto, enfermedad), como en lo simbólico o jurídico (leyes, relegaciones, marginalización social), y estaba condicionada por relaciones de poder, dependencia y control institucional. Asimismo, los estudios concluyen que, pese a estas limitaciones, existían estrategias de participación cívica y mecanismos de compensación que permitían cierta capacidad de acción y resistencia, revelando una tensión constante entre subordinación y autonomía en distintos contextos históricos.

Para finalizar queremos expresar nuestro agradecimiento a las instituciones que han hecho posible esta obra coral. En primer lugar, al Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación del Gobierno de España, a las universidades vinculadas a los editores (Universidad de Murcia y Universidade de Vigo), así como al Museo de Bellas Artes de Murcia y al Museo del Teatro Romano de Cartagena, espacios en los que disfrutamos de la oportunidad de presentar y discutir públicamente buena parte de nuestras reflexiones. De igual forma, no podemos olvidar la contribución de los grupos de investigación de los editores de esta monografía: *Antigüedad y Cristianismo* y *Arqueología y Patrimonio del Mediterráneo Occidental* de la Universidad de Murcia; *GEAAT. Grupo de Estudos de Arqueoloxía, Antigüidade e Territorio* de la Universidade de Vigo y *Deméter. Maternidad, Género y Familia* de la Universidad de Oviedo. Por último, queremos agradecer el trabajo del amplio elenco de especialistas que meticulosamente han revisado de forma anónima las contribuciones y que han sido de gran utilidad para enriquecer la calidad de la versión final de la obra.

Murcia y Trasalba, diciembre de 2025

Bibliografía

Fernández Prieto e Iriarte 2025 = A. Fernández Prieto y U. Iriarte, *Introducción*, en A. Fernández Prieto y U. Iriarte (eds.), *(In)visiblidad, vulnerabilidad y agencia. Visiones de las mujeres en la antigua Grecia*, Sevilla-Madrid, pp. 17-27.

Iriarte 2025 = A. Iriarte, *Vulnerabilidad y resistencia. A propósito de Antígona, Martha Nussbaum y Judith Butler*, en G. Puigvert y M. Oller (eds.), *Influencia, poder y liderazgo en la Antigüedad grecorromana*, Madrid 2025, pp. 279-294.

Liedo 2021 = B. Liedo, Vulnerabilidad, en Eunomía. *Revista en Cultura de la Legalidad* 20, 2021, pp. 242-257.

Moragno 2018 = G. Moragno, *Alle origini (terminologiche) della vulnerabilità:* vulnerabilis, vulnus, vulnerare, en O. Giolo y B. Pastore (eds.), *Vulnerabilità. Analisi multidisciplinare di un concetto*, Roma 2018, pp. 13-35.

Rubiera Cancelas 2018 = C. Rubiera Cancelas (ed.), *Las edades vulnerables. Infancia y vejez en la Antigüedad*, Gijón 2018.

Rubiera Cancelas, García-Ventura y Méndez Santiago 2023 = C. Rubiera Cancelas, A. García-Ventura y B. Méndez Santiago (eds.), *Cuerpos que envejecen. Vulnerabilidad, familias, dependencia y cuidados en la Antigüedad*, Madrid 2023.

Rubiera Cancelas y Guantes García 2024 = C. Rubiera Cancelas y J. Guantes García, *Atravesadas por la guerra. Esclavas y cautivas en la Antigüedad clásica*, en A. Fernández Prieto y U. Iriarte (eds.), *(In)visiblidad, vulnerabilidad y agencia. Visiones de las mujeres en la antigua Grecia*, Sevilla-Madrid 2024, pp. 49-77.

Seguró Mendlewicz 2021 = M. Seguró Mendlewicz, *Vulnerabilidad*, Barcelona 2021.

(Non)places of vulnerability. The mythical imaginary landscape as an educational anti-model

ARTURO SÁNCHEZ SANZ[1]
Universidad Internacional de La Rioja
arturo.sanchez@ui1.es

Abstract: Are there imaginary spaces linked to the concept of vulnerability? Greek myths are always related to places, sometimes real and sometimes imaginary, although many of the latter are often connected to physical spaces in order to increase the credibility of the events narrated. However, there are also places that we can consider real, installed in the collective imaginary, or rather (non-)places, if we follow the famous concept used by Augé in his definition of 'supermodernity'. One of the most important, because it has remained alive in our memory for millennia and is closely linked to the need to inculcate values and social rules that relegated the female sex as evidence of its vulnerability, is Themyscira, the capital city of the Amazons, a (non-)place whose physical existence has always been defended as an indispensable element for believing that there is some reality in Amazon myths. However, its origin is closely connected to the need to inculcate values and social norms that relegate the female sex as evidence of its vulnerability.

Key Words: Vulnerability, Amazons, Themyscira, (non)places, mythology.

1. Introduction

There are places in our imagination, in our memories or in our thoughts that are associated with real places, but also with imaginary places that have no less influenced our way of thinking and acting. The Amazons represented absolute otherness for the Greeks, the extreme representation of the 'Other' who opposed both their concept of civilisation and the patriarchal system that governed it, and whose mission was to act as a transgressive model of feminine behaviour (Sánchez Sanz 2025a: 12).

As being responsible for the Amazonic myths, the Greeks turned them into a barbarian community who inhabited a kingdom ruled exclusively by warrior women, an outrage in itself. Therefore, only the Greek heroes were able to defeat them in their best-known tales. It was inconceivable, and yet they had to exist. The Amazon tradition settles its roots in the political, social and religious beliefs of the Hellenistic world, although the image they created overpassed its limits until today. More specifically, in the alterity generated from the gender dichotomy and from a cultural model applied to the unknown, the unconnected, the 'Other', as a reversal of the accepted values and norms, supported by the strong belief in the dominant role that was granted to the masculine gender (Lefkowitz 2007: 5-12; Mercury 2009: 26; Diel 2004: 85).

The Amazons were created to represent their role, to embody everything that was contrary to the concept of patriarchal Greek civilisation, which in Hellenic society reflected the moral vulnerability of the female gender immersed in patriarchal social norms and values. Hence, their imaginary kingdom should be located beyond the known world, defining the *limes* of civilization, the limit of 'reality'. Thus, just heroes like Heracles and Theseus managed to reach it and return alive in the myth of the ninth labour. It had to become a place or, rather, a (non)place, whose capital would act as a true advocate of what defines them for Augé: 'It deals with every shapes of the other: the exotic other defined in relation to a 'we' presumably identical; the other of the others, the ethnic or cultural other, defined in relation to a supposedly identical 'They'; the other social, the other internal used as a reference for a system of differences that begins with the division of the sexes but also

1. Este trabajo se ha realizado dentro del Proyecto de I+D PID2023-146086NB-I00, "Mecanismos de construcción de la identidad y la etnicidad por oposición: más allá de la dicotomía griegos-persas en la Atenas de los siglos VI-IV a. C." financiado por el Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades para el período 2024-2027.

defines the political, economic and family situation of each one' (Augé 1995: 18-19). Therefore, we will try to show how (non)places also manifest themselves in our imagination and are perpetuated through the centuries thanks to tradition and their suggestive character.

2. Context

The Amazons were groups of barbarian women who were believed to inhabit the *limes* of the known world (Blake Tyrrell 2001: 114-115; Schefold 1966, 45; Sánchez Sanz 2024i: 174), whether that was next to the Sangario river[2], in Thrace (Arctinus in Procl. *Chr.* 2; Schol. Hom. *Il*, 24. 804), on the shores of the meridional[3] or septentrional[4] Pontus, in Colchis (Medea's homeland)[5], next to the Caspian[6], in West Africa (Dionysus of Mytilene *FHG*. 2. 9, 9; Diod. Sic. 3. 52) or many other places[7] that represented the border between civilization and wildness (*eschatia)*, the rational and the marvelous[8]. Beyond that limit, either in the East or the West (in the case of the Libyan Amazons), the Greeks located kingdoms of legend, mythical beings and other wonders such as Gorgons, Hyperboreans or Atlanteans. Therefore, Ephorus attributed the weakness of the Persians to 'geographical predestination' (Steph. Byz., *Ethnika*, *Amazons*) an affirmation closely related to the otherness associated with the Amazons since, as a consequence of it, men were 'soft' and women 'hard'. They constituted kingdoms governed by sovereigns (as opposed to the democratic system), where the masculine element was absent or relegated[9] as a sign of noticeable otherness. They were warriors[10] who practiced hunting, denied the marriage institution, and only joined men out of duty[11], with the unique purpose of perpetuating their lineage. They represented absolute otherness to the Greek society, and even further, in a conscious and consensual way[12].

The Hellenes attributed to them a feverish founding activity during the mythical Heroic Age, mainly based in Anatolia, where numerous *poleis* such as Ephesus, Smyrna, Myrina or Cime (Sakellariou 1958: 407-410; Devambez 1976: 267-276), theoretically owed their name to an Amazon who turned eponymic heroine (Gehrke 2023: 64). Most of these traditions have a local character, probably interested in sharing the prestige offered by such famous ancestors, who not only decorated streets and buildings with Amazonian

2. Hom. *Il*. 3. 184-189. Wilke and Hurt (2001: 127) locate their original home (considering it real) along the Ionian coast, where several cities in that region claimed their names from the Amazons who founded them.

3. Callim. *H*. 648; Plut. *Dem*. 19, *Thes*. 27, *Pomp*. 35; Ap. Rhod. 2. 373-377, 96-1000; Hellan. Fr. 172; Hecat. Fr. 203; Strab. 1. 3, 7; Diod. Sic. 2. 44-46; Prop. 3. 14, 12 y 7. 71; Iust. *Epit*. 2. 4; App. *Mith*. 1. 69; Ps. Apollod. *Epit*. 2. 9; Phil. *Her*. 23, 56-57; Arr. *An*. 7. 13, *FHG*. 3. 597, 58; Ps. Callist. 3. 25-27; Amm. Marc. 22. 8; A. *Pr*. 720-730; Hdt. 4. 110, 9. 27; Paus. 1. 2.

4. Ps. Plut. *Fluv*. 15; Diod. Sic. 2. 45-46; Eur. *Ion* 1140-1150; Str. 11. 5. 3; Plin. *NH*. 6. 35.

5. In Colchis (Aesch. *Pr*. 720-30; Diod. Sic. 17. 77. 1-3) and Ceraunia (north Caucasus, Metrodorus of Scepsis *FGH*. 3. 204. 4).

6. Along Caspian Sea (Plut. *Pomp*. 35), in so-called Caspian Gates (Str. 11. 5, 4, citing Clitarchus of Alexandria; Curtius. 6. 5, 24-32.) or Hyrcania (Diod. Sic. 17. 77, 1-3).

7. Along Sangarios river (Hom. *Il*. 3. 184) or between Ephesus, Magnesia and Priene (Democles of Pigela *FHG*. 2. 21).

8. Except those who placed it within the Hellenic territory (in Alope, Palaeph. *FGH*. 2. 339, 4).

9. Mimnermus. CURFRAG. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* -0255.18; Hp. *Art*. 53; Str. 11. 5. 1-3; Iust. *Epit*. 2. 4; Diod. Sic. 2. 44-46.

10. For Greeks, war belonged to the public sphere and was institutionalized by the State as one of the responsibilities that belong to men (Vernant 1990: 36).

11. As it happened with gargareans (Metrodorus of Scepsis FGH. 3. 204, 4; Str. 11. 5, 1-3; Iust. *Epit*. 2. 4).

12. Their stories don't belong to a memory of matriarchal myth, as it has been claimed (Eller 2011: 17), their origin comes from a patriarchal society that sought just the opposite.

images, but also used their portrayal for the utility of monetary pieces associated to each city's Tiqué that commemorated its origin for centuries.

Appian (*Mith*. 78) is the first known source that associates this process with the Amazonian capital in Asia itself, Themyscira, whose name, following the same logic, must be related to its own founder. Not surprisingly, the first known iconographic example of this trend corresponds to Greece itself, where the polis of Potidaea used the effigy of an Amazon to decorate the back of their coins already at the end of the VI century BC (Fig. 1). Certainly, it is a late source, but it probably followed a deeply rooted tradition, as Eustace of Thessaloniki shows it perpetuated until the Middle Ages:

> 'ἔστι δέ τις προπάροιθε πόλιος αἰπεῖα κολώνη,/ ἐν πεδίῳ ἀπάνευθε περίδρομος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,/ τὴν ἤτοι ἄνδρες Βατίειαν κικλήσκουσιν,/ ἀθάνατοι δέ τε σῆμα πολυσκάρθμοιο Μυρίνης' (Hom. *Il*, 2. 814).
>
> (v. 814) […] Ὥστε κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην τοῦ Γεωγράφου οὐκ αὐτὴ ἐκείνη ἡ Ἀμαζὼν Μύριννα διώνυμος ἀλλ' ὁ τύμβος αὐτῆς, οὗ δύο ὀνόματα, ἡ Βατίεια τοπικὸν καὶ ἡ Μύριννα ἐκ τῆς κειμένης Μυρίννης ἐν τῇ Βατιείᾳ. ὅτι δὲ τόποι πολλοὶ Ἀμαζόνων εἰσὶν ἐπώνυμοι, δεδήλωται καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Περιηγητοῦ. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ Θεμίσκυρα ἐπωνομάσθαι Ἀμαζόνι, οἰκητήριον καὶ αὐτὴ [1.550.25] Ἀμαζόνων γενομένη ποτέ, παρ' ᾗ καὶ εἰσέτι νῦν τόπος τις ταῖς Ἀμαζόσιν ἐπωνόμασται.' Eustachian of Thessaloniki (commentary on. Hom. *Il*, 2. 814).

A stunning, exotic city as belongs to the myths and, therefore, opposed in its essence to the traditional organization of the polis due to the inversion of gender roles. In ancient times, when Greek geographical knowledge was just starting to gather information about long distance places, classical authors located it in Southern Pontus, at the statuary of Thermodon River[13], where it flourished around the 2nd Millennium BC according to the mythical tradition. They were based on periplus of the first sailors who navigated the dangerous waters of the Black Sea, stories colored with fantasy about places that, by definition, belonged more to a myth than to reality. As the Greeks expanded their territories, the information about what were once considered legendary places became more and more accurate but, in spite of everything, the Amazonian capital never appeared (Sánchez Sanz 2024b: 7). Not even the slightest trace of it was found where the first storytellers placed her.

In the VII-VI centuries BC[14], the Greek colonies founded in Northern Pontus converged with a unique population of semi-nomadic warriors, the Scythians, whose customs turned strangely familiar (Sánchez Sanz 2025c: 3; 2024k: 194). Their women fought, as skilled in the art of war as men, which for the Hellenic idiosyncrasy could only mean one thing, the Amazons. From that moment onwards, there were many the classical authors who began binding together the two communities, mythical and real, as otherwise they could not accept the existence of women with such features, and hence began to affirm that Themyscira was indeed in the northern region of the Black Sea[15]. Still, no one found her there either[16].

There had to be an explanation for those who believed in its existence, until new legends arose in Alexander's period around the encounter of the Macedonian sovereign and the Amazon queen Talestris[17]. Alexander

13. Callim. *H*. 648; Plut. *Dem*. 19, *Thes*. 27, *Pomp*. 35; Ap. Rhod. 2. 373-377, 96-100; Hellan. Fr. 172; Hecat. Fr. 203; Strab. 1. 3, 7; Diod. Sic. 2. 44-46; Prop. 3. 14, 12 y 7. 71; Iust. *Epit*. 2. 4; App. *Mith*. 1. 69; Ps. Apollod. *Epit*. 2. 9; Phil. *Her*. 23, 56-57; Arr. *FHG*. 58 (cfr. Eustath. ad Dionys 828); Ps. Callist. 3. 25-7; Amm. Marc. 22. 8; A. Pr. 720-730; Hdt. 4. 110, 9. 27; Paus. 1. 2; Ephor. *FHG*. 103.

14. The contact between Greek settlers and Scythians began in VI BC in Northern Pontus (Koch and Börner 2010: 40; Sánchez Sanz 2023a: 8; 2021: 22).

15. Euripides (*Ion* 1140-50) is the earliest known example, although he probably followed an earlier unknown tradition. This line was preserved until the Roman period despite the progress of geographical knowledge about the region (Ps. Plut. *Fluv*. 15; Diod. Sic. 2. 45-46; Str. 11. 5. 3; Plin. *NH*. 6. 35).

16. In my PhD thesis (Sánchez Sanz 2019a), I have done a complete cataloging of all the known Amazonian pieces in Antiquity, and only one amphora from the 6th century B.C. represents Themyscira (Fig. 02).

17. Diod. Sic. 17. 77. 1-3. Along Caspian Sea (Plut. *Pomp*. 35) or in so-called Caspian Gates (Str. 11. 5, 4, citing Clitarchus of Alexandria; Curtius. 6. 5, 24-32.). See Sánchez Sanz 2024c: 321; 2024g: 14.

Fig. 1. Tetrobols from Potidaia. Rx: Amazon head facing right within thin square frame. (510-500 BC) Left. Boston MFA 04.691. Right. 04.690.

never visited Northern Pontus, so the sources decided to place that encounter in the distant region of Hyrcania. An evidence of their existence was never found there either, nor in any of the places where others located them, such as Colchis[18]. Nobody managed to do so as it was a place that was, simultaneously, everywhere and nowhere. It was a myth, a (non)place that, notwithstanding, inhabited the imagination of all Hellenes and those who shared their cultural values. For that reason, the descriptions always placed it far from the known world, on the threshold between the real and the imaginary, further away as geographical knowledge advanced and expanded[19]. Its existence relates to the dichotomy of place/(non)place, from the discussion created among those who believed it a myth or a reality. That was unimportant, since its legends recalled something much more significant, the male/female gender battle.

Centuries later, not even the Romans found it when Pompey the Great reached Southern Pontus in the I century BC. Just as the Amazons were created to grant prestige to the Hellenes through the victories of their heroes, Pompey longed for it for himself and for Rome. Hence, during the celebration of his triumph, he did not hesitate to create a march with a group of captive women who were holding banners that identified them as defeated Amazons (Plut. *Pomp*. 35 and 45). Their imaginary remained alive and still does today.

Place/(non)place, myth/reality, man/woman, patriarchy/matriarchy; the Amazons, their kingdom, their capital never required a physical space, but they became a powerful symbolic and conceptual image that still lives within us (Sánchez Sanz 2024f: 110; 2024h: 82; 2024j: 294). It helps us define and specify the limits between what is accepted and what is cut to pieces, civilization and barbarism, what we are and what we are not, what we should be and what we should avoid (Gehrke 2023: 25), the vulnerable and the invulnerable. These concepts are still valid, but their original meaning has changed dramatically. The Amazons, as a symbol of empowered woman, it does no longer act as an example to be dodged, but as a model to follow, a shifting model of a social paradigm that the Greeks attempted to discredit at any cost (Sánchez Sanz 2018: 235; 2024e: 434).

There are places that have settled in our minds, places in which we believe and live that do not need to necessarily exist to make sense of our world imaginary. They are places that are everywhere and nowhere at the same time, that have been within us for millenniums. Such is the impression they have made on us that they form an imperishable part of our being, since we need them to understand the world and society in which

18. In Colchis (A. *Pr.* 720-730) or in Ceraunia (north Caucasus, Metrodorus of Scepsis *FHG.* 4 cfr. Str. 11).

19. In the 1st century BC. Diodorus Siculus places them next to the Caucasus (17. 77. 1-3), Strabo (11. 5. 1) in Hyrcania, a territory that occupied the Southeastern coast of the Caspian, and Quintus Curtius Rufus (6. 5. 24-32) in the so-called Caspian Gates (between Caucasus and the Caspian Sea) for the 1st century BC. and 1st AD, Plutarch next to the Caspian (*Pomp*. 35.) between the I-II centuries AD.

we live in. As Legnaro expresses, '(non)places are new places that satisfy new needs' (Legnaro 2015: 54). Themyscira was there, but every time more distant and, at the same time, more present in our thoughts.

The places where we live or pass by are as ephemeral as are the moments we dedicate to interacting with them, but the imaginary places, better characterized by their features as (non)places, always remain, as paradigms to alter the way we feel, understand and interact with ourselves and the rest of the world. At the same time, they are presented as an example of the vulnerability associated with the ease with which it is possible to shape our thinking within a group by inculcating norms and values that are accepted through social pressure.

3. Amazon myths

Amazon stories constantly appear in classic works. Their authors remember, mainly and extensively, those best known that elaborated as epic poems, included all the key elements to act as didactic resources that trained to behave and act (Sánchez Sanz 2025b: 21), in short, to become frightened citizens of the divinities they worshiped, who accepted their culture and, above all, the role they had played in it. Nevertheless, beyond those stories, where heroes like Achilles, Theseus, Heracles or Bellerophon enhanced their own legend and with it the prestige of the Greek people too by becoming the only ones capable of defeating the Amazons, who mostly appeared in the classic texts to specifically remind the impact that their way of life and customs caused in the Hellenic mentality.

Our first written reference belongs to Homer himself already in the VIII century BC who didn't even need to remember that it was an Amazon when he revealed the place where Queen Mirina's remains presumably rest[20]. It was not necessary, everyone there knew her well, which places the origin of Amazonian myths in the past, where the impact of her image was already installed in the collective imagination of the Hellenes to never fall into oblivion, not even today. Her memory appears again and again in several authors until the IV century AD, where Quintus Smyrnaeus (1. 43-46), Orosius (3. 18. 5) or Ammianus Marcellinus (22. 8. 18) still evoke the power of such renowned warriors. More than a millennium of Amazonian stories that, despite everything, represent only a small fragment of those that have been lost.

Notwithstanding, between the 7th century BC and the IX century AD, more than 4.500 artistic works dedicated to Amazonian myths have been cataloged in many ways (vase painting, sculptures, reliefs, mosaics, engravings, mints, textiles, paintings…). When referring to vase painting themselves, they suppose approximately 1,56% of those cataloged in the Beazley Archive, although its database is not up to date, and the real number would be of approximately 3% (Sánchez Sanz, 2019a: 24). It may resemble a low number, but its outstanding role is even more visible if we compare it with the one showcased by relevant heroes such as Heracles (4.222 representations, 3,67%), Achilles (711, 0,62%) or Theseus (886, 0,77%), and divinities such as Athena (4.027, 3.49%), Dionysus (5.982, 5,2%) or Zeus himself (630, 0,55%).

Where could we start to clean the Augean stable? It is necessary to understand that the mythical Amazonian universe, as a result of the Hellenic tradition, embodies a huge complexity of the significant importance that its image had provoked in the collective imaginary. As envisaged, its influence run through the borders of the Hellenic world, reaching cultures such as the Roman, Etruscan[21], or even Scythian[22].

20. Hom. *Il*. 2. 814. Also mentioned by another contemporary epic poet such as Arctinus of Miletus, in Proclus (Chr. 2. Escol. Hom. *Il*. 24. 804).

21. It can be seen in the Amazonomachy that decorates the Etruscan sarcophagus from Tarquinia (4th BC). Florence, National Archaeological Museum.

22. Like the gold crown discovered in a Scythian tomb in Boliznitsa (Russia, 6th-4th BC) that represents several Amazons fighting with griffins. Hermitage, St Petersburg. Daumas (2009: 111) and Ivantchik (2001: 212) believes that the contacts between Greeks and Scythians were so close and constant as to affirm that they understood part of the meaning of Greek myths.

The myths, and the related rituals, such as traditional stories connected on an imaginary faraway past (Gehrke 2010: 16), were elaborated with an etiologic character as an instrument to interpret the world in cultural terms (Hobsbawm and Ranger 2002: 10-11), offering answers to political, religious and social (marriage, incest, etc.) questions as well as physical (death, disease) or emotional ones, based on thinking patterns with the aim of generating stability and cohesion in the community, transmitted through stories with a dramatic plot that awakened interest and symbolic values from which easily identifiable messages were taken. They had an educating purpose, as they were used to share instances and examples that were used as a guide for all decision-making and actions, generating known results (Díez de Velasco 2015: 567-568). The Greeks turned to myths to understand their lives, as rationalizations that were embraced to justify every aspect of their existence (Gehrke 2023: 17); in the same way that the meaning of imaginary-(non)places has sometimes been defined as those that 'tell us what to think and what not to think' (Coyne, Mcmeel and Parker 2005: 4).

Why otherwise would Plato have given Homer the title of 'Greece's educator'? (*Resp*. 10.606e) Not only the poets, but the historians themselves collaborated to rewrite the past through the so-called 'intentional history' (Gehrke 2023: 18). The Greeks constantly produced new versions of their legends and myths but, above all, of their own history, which in many cases differs enormously as their origin can be located both in more or less accurate personal interpretations, as well as in specific goals sought by characters or reference groups. In this process of *hypolepsis*, each story, initially transmitted only orally and later also in writing, was remade based on prototypes before being integrated into tradition (Assmann 2011: 257), so that the group members, those who formed the 'we', accepted them globally as historical descriptions of a past that belonged to them, to which they were actively connected and guaranteed stability from the glory obtained once upon a time. The group identity and the feeling of belonging are not exclusively centered on the relationship or proximity but, and above all, on the acceptance and internalizing of norms, traditions and shared values[23].

Something similar happens to us, perhaps not so much as passive recipients, but as inheritors of a tradition that we place at the origins of the Anglo-Saxon culture. Their stories continue to be remade to adapt them to current needs, which is why the Amazonian imaginery has radically reversed its meaning, up until the point of becoming a transgression model against the dominance of patriarchal culture.

Their stories kept a constant and original purpose (mytheme) related to the demand of a specific social model based on the gender dichotomy, where the feminine element was downgraded because of the negative values associated with its own nature. Downgraded yes, but still indispensable, hence it was needed to create the necessary environment to allow their integration into society, assuming a position of subordination. Such a claim needed to be based on something other than masculine pride, or perhaps fear[24], thus the Amazonian myths were designed to show that such system had a divine approval. This was acknowledged by the famous Lysistrata, who did not hesitate to warn Athenian men on the danger that their women's behavior could cause if they did not act to mend it, since they would end up imitating Artemisia I, the queen of Halicarnassus who fought in Salamis, or even the Amazons (Ar. *Lys*. 672). This group of warriors emerged not only as representatives of gender-related alterity against the dominance of patriarchy, but as a cultural model applied to the unknown, the external, the 'Other' as a reverse of accepted values and norms, sustained by the strong belief in the leading role that was assumed by the masculine gender.

Nevertheless, the richness of the mythical Amazonian imagery and the diverse range of episodes that shapes it, integrates a multitude of secondary messages associated with different levels of interpretation that arise as a consequence of those, and could have varied or been added based on new needs, as part of its *mytho-*

23. Hobsbawm (2002: 16), talks about three overlapping levels for imaginary traditions: a) those that establish or symbolize social cohesion or group membership; b) those that establish or legitimize institutions, status, or authority relationships, and c) those whose main objective is socialization, instilling beliefs, value systems, or conventions related to behavior.

24. Blok (1995: 112) thinks that Greeks feared women taking away their privileges; but Walcot (1984: 46) associates this masculine fear with women's sexuality, without explaining its origin.

poiesis. They come from the dynamic feature of the mythical tradition, its development capacity and the cultural environment to which they adapted (Buxton 2000: 29), allowing their doctrines to survive as of today. Thereby, they were created as a social construct originated from the specific needs of the culture to which they belonged (Hobsbawm and Ranger 2002: 10), until they acquired a multidimensional nature.

In this context, its capital assumed its corresponding role as main reference, connected to endemism in the Greek world, where the *polis* was understood to be decisive in determining many of the aspects that defined the culture to which it belonged. It placed it in the world, with all that it represented, and for the myths it also increased the possibility of believing in its real existence, beyond a simple idea, a meaningless delusion produced by a feverish mind. It was essential to connect them with a place capable of enhancing the features of otherness that they themselves represented, even though it is a (non)place, since it brings together all the main conceptual characteristics that define Augé (1995: 18-19)[25]. The exotic, cultural and social 'other', defined in connection with a shared 'us', which the Amazons embody not only from the antagonism associated with gender, but as an unusual culture, a perfect example of the legendary character associated with everything that was located beyond the known world, the Hellenistic civilized world. The 'other' of the others, as a unique society, without equivalent even among the other barbarians. The external 'other', as a reference to highlight the differences, not only at a cultural, economic, political or family level, but even gender. How could we say that it was not real, when it represented a decisive space in the collective imaginary? It was as much for those who believed in its existence as for those who denied it, even since they granted a place to this (non)place in their imaginary, and hence would remain there forever.

An imaginary (non)place that settles in the subconsciousness, but also consciously influences its recipients through the character that Augé defines as a 'universe of recognition… of which only a few have the key to, but whose existence everyone accepts' (Augé 1995: 33), through the symbolic transfer of tradition, of the culture that saw them born, created *ad libitum* with a purpose that connects what Greeks thought as defining themselves, sometimes inculcated as a means of control over a vulnerable section of the population.

They were carefully built, in this way, spaces to offer safety and to avoid any type of ambiguous reference or one that could be misconceived by the recipients, disrupting its fundamental mission aimed at influencing behavior, lifestyle and world view. Certainly, this was only possible if there was consent, which was granted by the community that accepted those who shared those teachings tagged as valid. The (non)places contribute to generate identity, supported by patterns that inspire a 'calming acquaintance' (Delalex 2002: 109), acting as common places for the members of a community. As Legnaro affirms: '(non)places are ruling places, they govern the definition of compliance, its edge with divergence and alienation, and serve as a means to adjust people to the standards of society, through an artificial reality, undoubtedly, but at the same time overwhelmingly real, which conquers all the senses.' (Legnaro 2015: 60-61).

The defense of the Hellenic patriarchal culture is the main goal of Amazonian myths, through the scope of action assigned to the genre and its accepted forms of interaction[26]. Its recurring defeat against Greeks (men) not only showcased the superiority of a social, political, economic model, etc., over any other possible structured organization and example of otherness, but of civilization against the 'barbarian' who embodied their figure by opposition (Pembroke 1967: 1-35; 1965: 217-247; Vidal-Naquet 1970: 63-80), contributing to form and reinforce his patriotic concept of 'State'[27], in connection with the ideology of Ionianism[28]. Thus, the patriarchal culture affirmed the need to establish controlling systems to perpetuate the lineage from the basic family core and, through this, from the *demos*, through institutions supervised by the male that regulat-

25. Nocker (2014: 6) believes that (non)places can also be defined as places.

26. Lefkowitz (2007: 5-12) thinks that the Amazonian society was always used as an example of what would happen if political and social power remained in the hands of warrior women.

27. Block 2009: 257-258; Isaac 2004: 114-124; Hornblower 2011: 132-135; Fragoulaki 2013: 210-128; Merck 1978: 96.

28. According to which, Athens should be considered as the mother polis of all Ionians (Zacharia 2017: 6).

ed their behavior, such as the *gamos*[29], and accepted principles such as the *ethos*, the *phronesis* and the *nomos*. Similarly, Amazonian myths were conceived as a reflection of the alterity that the 'Other' embraced (Gould 1980: 56-57), the alien by opposition to themselves as Greeks, males, civilized people and citizens (Vernant 2009: 16). Nevertheless, their existence was necessary to understand the essence of the Hellenistic world. As Augé (1995: 19) points out, a feature of a non-place is that it contributes to and complements individuality. They defended their own identity by contrast (Rodríguez Blanco 2011: 67) in order to build their own exalted imaginary.

They had to give them prestige as warriors to justify the need to appeal the most important Hellenic heroes in their fight. Otherwise, they could have never become admirable opponents for Heracles, Theseus, Achilles, Bellerophon (Sánchez Sanz 2019b: 39), or even divinities such as Dionysus (Plut. *Quaes. Gr.* 56; Sen. *Her. F.* 467 ss.; Tac. *Ann*. 3. 61). The first ones, in their paradigmatic heroic condition, supporters of Hellenic culture and civilizers, were the only ones who could stop them as representatives of Greek and masculine excellence, and their contest required obtaining in exchange the necessary praise and recognition for defeating these transitional characters, prototypical of the disparity that carries the threat of the irrational, the inherent feminine nature linked to the wild as a distortion of the established order (Mercury 2009: 26; Diel 2004: 85; Ortega Balanza 2017: 193). This feature extends to Dionysus himself as a god who represents order over chaos (Hernández de la Fuente 2008: 210), but carries in himself a concept of otherness that relates him to the Amazons.

The image of women in Greek mythology was multifaceted, at times oppositional, often reflecting the negative view of women as an example of the vulnerability associated with the female sex, as strange, mysterious and uncontrollable forces existing outside the civilising male universe. The victory over the Amazons legitimized the Greek autochthony[30], their culture superiority over the rest with order over chaos and men over women. Not by chance they understood that the very nature of women, as well as their *physis*, showcased their imperfect and less developed featured. Some authors even extended these differences to the soul, as they lacked the self-control (*sophrosyne*) and courage (*andreia*) known on men. Stories such as the death of Orpheus in the hands of Thracian women[31] or the Theban king Pentheus have been associated to the representation of male fear over women who lose control and can act ferociously, even in men presence.

In the Hellenic thought, defeating simple women did not bring glory but shame, and therefore the Amazons had to organize themselves as an alien and barbaric culture that was nedded to be defeated., as well as prestigious warriors whose features would distance themselves, at least partially, from their inherited feminine character. Thereby, the fight was justified, the defeat certain and the prestige earnt due to its winners. The Amazons were 'similar to men'[32] but they never stopped being female, as they could not. They acted as resemblance of the feminine features inherent in nature, raised to their supreme manifestation.

The Amazonian universe, designed from the external, dismisses home, the inside, as an exclusive dimension and voluntary denial of pre-established spaces. They did not care for their home or raise males, but only act as mothers to daughters who lived in their imaginary, and they also did not comply with the Greek rites of passage[33]. They had no place in the organized Hellenic world, but they 'existed' to find meaning.

---

29. Nevett 1999: 13. The Greeks believed that the sexuality of their wives could be controlled through marriage, considered naturally prone to lust, and ensured the paternity of their children, while the Amazons controlled their own sexuality, without thinking about the father's identity (Blake Tyrrel and Brown 1991: 180).

30. Athenians defended their 'purity' by affirming that they were born from the earth, not from a woman, thus they also felt free from the 'foreign' nature that they granted to women. (Hom. *Il*. 2. 547-548; A. *Eu*. 902-913).

31. *LIMC* VII (1994) s.v. Orpheus 84, nos. 7-15, 85, nos. 22-24 (M.-X. Garezou). See Sánchez Sanz 2024d: 4.

32. Homer (*Il*, 6. 185-86) describes the Amazons as Αντιάνειραι, and sometimes (Weimbaum 2000: 118) it has been translated that way.

33. Greeks considered women as *mergaité* before marriage, a *moteris* after maternity, and between both they lived in the liminal and indeterminate (and dangerous) condition of *marti*, where unrestrained sexuality is progressively domesticated through procreation (Diez de Velasco 1998: 117-118).

4. Themyscira

Herodotus (4. 110) refers to the Thermodon river for the first time as the Asian Amazons homeland in the V century BC. He does not really express where he was located in his creation of the earth, which denotes a much earlier date for the acknowledgement of this literary *topos* by then already well known and definitively adopted at an undetermined time in the past[34]. Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius reused that name for their capital in the III century BC (Callim. *H.* 648), locating the most powerful Amazon kingdom in Southern Pontus. Apollonius (2. 990-1000; Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 2. 9) himself states that Themyscira was a coastal city built in the Termodonte river (current Terme river), which joins the Pontus very close to the Çarşamba Obasi valley (which he mentions as the Deante valley), Northern Pontic mountain chain described as 'high Amazonian mountains' which, at that time, would belong to the Pontus region, east of Paphlagonia. His text actually narrates the adventure of the Argonauts, whom, according to his words, sailed along the Southern coast of Pontus from the Propontis to the east, in a past era when the Hellenes had no prior references to the lands located beyond the known world. In order to give credibility to this story, he refers to several important milestones that such explores passed through, such as the Halis river (currently known as Kizilirmak) and the Iris river (Yeşilirmak) shortly afterwards. Certainly, already in Apollonius' era, periplous such as Pseudo-Scylax's or the Hannonian periplous of the Pontus Euxinus provided an advanced knowledge of these passages, more outstanding than the information that the Greeks had on the interior regions.

Shortly afterward, he named 'headland of the Amazons' to the Eastern cape of the Çarşamba Obasi valley which allowed access to the port of Themyscira. In Homer's time, the Greeks asserted that the Amazons lived there only four or five centuries earlier, curiously the same statement as of Apollonius's contemporaries. Pliny (*NH*, 7. 201) placed the Amazon homeland in that same location[35], stating its destroy by the proconsul Lucullus in the era of Augustus, when in the reality this campaign took place much earlier (74-65 BC). Nevertheless, he does not refer there to the existence of any memory associated with the mythical warriors, not even to the fact that the female feature had high social recognition among themselves, perhaps to defend their credibility and stage the disappearance of the Amazon kingdom long time ago. Strabo acknowledges that there were several interpretations around its location, joining Theophanes of Mytilene (1st century BC), a historian who acted as an advisor and soldier to Gnaeus Pompey, who claimed that the Amazons lived in the mountains beyond Albania, a territory located between Iberia and the Caspian Sea, Southern Caucasus (Plut. *Pomp.* 35).

This is the main feature of imaginary (non)places, their change of location when trying to place them in the real world, although this evasive 'attitude' extended even to the iconography since, among all the pieces with Amazonian representations we only know an image of its capital (Fig. 2). The piece shows an Amazonomachy at the gates of Themyscira, which appears highly schematized, through a small battlemented wall defended by two Amazons, with the access closed in the lower area, as the Greeks considered it should be fortified[36].

Undoubtedly, Themyscyra assumes the idea of place as a reflection of the ethnological school that connects its meaning to a culture located in a time and space, but that goes beyond it, since the concept reaches a double meaning in it. As an essential element that grants credibility to the mythical Amazonian universe, it alludes to a town of warrior women recognized in itself as culturally unique, to which its defenders assign an origin chronologically similar to the very beginning of the Hellenic world, rooted in a distant place, so distant that surpassed the limit of the known, always distant despite the efforts made by the human being to reach it.

Nevertheless, Themyscyra conceals the true memory of its creators, the architects of an idea that became both a place and a non-place at the same time: the Hellenes themselves and their homeland, ancient Greece,

34. Hellanic (*Fr.* 172) and Hecateus (*Fr.* 203) already refered to it between the 6th-5th BC, but only through fragments that do not offer details.

35. According to Blok (1995: 91), the traditions that located the Amazons' reign near the Black Sea existed before. Some authors definitively located them in Themyscira. Since then, both possibilities competed until became a literary *topos*.

36. Ap. Rhod. 2. 378-390 and 990-1000; Diod. Sic. 2. 45; Agías of Troezen (cfr. Paus. 1. 2, 1).

Fig. 2. Athenian black-figure neck amphora, from Tarquinia (575-525 BC). attributed to Castellani Painter. Antikensammlung Berlin F1711 (Sánchez Sanz 2019a: 386).

which has a dual meaning in the collective imaginary. Therefore, it has no specific time or place; its time is that of the human race which treasures it in its memory, and its place is found within it, overcoming all spatial and temporal limitations.

It meets the three conditions that Augé lists for the (non)places. They are or are expected to be places' (Augé 1995: 36) of identity, relationships and history' as their myths were help in the identity building of the Hellenic people. Following imposed traditions they served to establish and strengthen the links between the Hellenes themselves as a community but also with other communities who shared their vision of the female gender. They areare part of History, originally from the Hellenic history by remembering their origin and tales of its founding heroes, but also ours, as inheritors of their culture that contributed to building our individual identity, hence leaving an eternal footprint.

The routes or paths that usually lead to a physical place become converging paths through which our perception of ourselves and of what we feel as culturally our own travels (as an extension of the external as well). In our case, they act as (non)places in which we share experiences, events, ways of thinking and acting socially recognized, in the same way as the Hellenes did themselves. The Amazonian capital represented the external, the different that at the same time, consolidates the own, creating meeting points which act as cultural references of identity accepted by the community[37]. It establishes the limit between both worlds by opposition, defining the qualities and flaws of each one; thus, the definition of the 'one self' is unfeasible apart from the mirror image or, in any case, it becomes much more difficult.

By this point, we must disobey Augé's opinion (1995: 77-78), since not only those that he calls 'supermodernity' can generate (non)anthropological places but can also act as 'places of memory', as it happens with imaginary, evocative places, and at the same time they share some of the characteristics that Baudelairean modernity assigns to its counterparts, as they consequently acquire a relational, historical feature linked to identity. As poles of the same axis, they not only share attributes by opposition, but it is also impossible to conceive

37. Contrary to Korstanje (2009: 103), according to which (non)places cause the decline of identity.

them separately. Amazonian myths were created with a multifaceted purpose, but the success associated with their internalizing and acceptance depended on them being able to show a real appearance for the doctrines of the myth to be accepted as part of the tradition that instilled values and social norms.

It is not possible to internalize such concepts by contradiction without associating these heroines with a kingdom ruled by a female sovereign who embodied the vision of the 'other'. The absolute discrepancy that meant to believe in the existence of women warriors, against their traditional absence on the battlefield, creators of a kingdom despite their absence in the Hellenic context, ruled by a queen even with the power in the hands of the *demos*. The greatness of the hero is that of their homeland, and vice versa, so the Amazons had to acquire enough prestige to face them, so their defeat would increase their legend, excluding the inconvenience of their female condition.

5. A (non)place nowhere and all over

The (non)places thus become an intermediary between us and the 'others', occupying a space in our minds that not only identifies the contrary, but also allows us to know ourselves and place ourselves in the world that surrounds us by giving us security, relating to those we consider our own and others (Legnaro 2015: 57) but, beyond spoken or written language as a means of interaction to which Augé refers, there are many others capable of creating our own kindship or discrepancy regarding the surrounding. Mythical places, as (non)places, were learned, perceived and assimilated until they occupied their space in the imaginary using all available means, including symbolic ones. The Amazons became one of the most common artistic themes in Greek art, as protagonists of pictorial works (whether they were vase painting, sculptural, mosaics, reliefs, etc.), created with an equally suggestive and instructive purpose (Sánchez Sanz 2024a: 77). They do not exist only to the degree that such means remember them, since actually their main mission consists in reaffirming the space that this (non)imaginary place already occupies in our mind, and they can there seem subjectively real for the individual (Gebauer, Nielsen, Schlosser and Sørensen 2015: 15).

Undoubtedly, as Belting affirms, we ourselves are the ones who give significant power to imaginaries (Belting 2007: 102); in such a way that any interaction of our own or of others is capable of reactivating that idea already inside of us, but its influence goes further because, to the extent that we accept it, it determines both consciously and unconsciously our way of behaving, relating, accepting our role in society and in the world[38]. There is no meaningless place nor (non)place, since all of them, real or imaginary, are characterized by the inspiring capacity that comes from their symbolic power (Korstanje 2009: 106). This can be positive or negative, utopian or dystopian, but in our case its meaning goes much further. The otherness from which the Amazonian myths are built and, by extension, the image of its capital as (non)place (Gall 1994: 171), acquires an imperative negative feature as an example of everything opposed to Greek culture. At the same time, it allows to structure and accept the positive values that are connected to it, thus acquiring a double meaning[39].

Themyscira acts as an imaginary (non)place, dystopian, since it speaks about the future although it refers to the past, a future linked to the domain of chaos if the lessons conveyed through the stories that made the Amazonian mythical universe were not listened. It represented the fear intrinsic in any social system under its possibility of disappearing, of losing control against chaos (Rudzik 2009: 19), reflected through its alterity.

Contrary to Derrida's opinion, we could only partially classify it as an aporetic place (Derrida 2002: 47), as far as that the reflection of this idea installed in the imaginary does not also suppose an insuperable logical difficulty, although it undoubtedly poses a paradox contrary to logic as an anti-model. In fact, it is necessary to go through it to understand it as a whole, to internalize the different levels of messages that contains and, at the

38. Augé (1995: 95) grants that role only to words, although he later recognizes that part of (non)places is made of imaginaries (1995: 117).

39. Far from Bosteels (2003: 136), according to which (non)places are 'spaces completely emptied of events'.

same time, to know ourselves. We do not need to create a logical itinerary, but this is predetermined by those who formed the Amazonian myths based on different milestones marked by that opposition, that otherness necessary to identify the values connected and accepted by their own culture, through a narrative associated with the feeling of the era and built for a specific audience (Legnaro 2015: 56-57).

Social identity is shaped in connection with the environment (Brogden 2019: 119). It is a narrative construction that expresses the individual perception of oneself in relation to others and depends on the response of the sociocultural group to its manifestations (Ryan 2011: 156)[40]. Tradition articulates the means to create teachings and learnings systems whose purpose is to transmit socially accepted values and behaviors. Both places and (non)places, whether real or imaginary, are conceived as a mean for the construction of ideological values (Serrano-Barquín, Nava-La Corte, Serrano-Barquín and Zarza Delgado 2021: 21-22), and act as spaces that generate connections whose meaning comes from the accumulation of collective knowledge. Community memory reflects the collective identity of the group[41]. Thereby, its influence is always present through memory, although its meaning may vary over time and according to the paradigm shifts associated with new cultural realities. This happens with the imaginary of Themyscira, since it acted as a symbol of absolute social, cultural and political alterity in ancient times; while, currently, the imaginary of warrior women has exceeded its original anti-model feature to become a paradigm of the role model to follow in order to achieve gender equality.

Hence, the (non)place brings the capacity to 'project fears and hopes, promote dreams and bury memories' (Highmore 2017: 91), whose meaning can change over time. The words, ideasor representations that evoke them also act as catalysts that reactivate the remembered spaces regardless of the value we assign to them (Hobsbawm and Ranger 2002: 12). Currently, characters like Wonder Woman have become paradigms of value, courage and capability; while for the Hellenes they meant everything negative and associated with chaos. It has been possible to overcome the stigma connected to them that remained in the accumulated collective memory of the communities. The city, the *polis*, was for the Hellenes a symbol of autochthony, but also a mirror of their achievements as a symbolic image of their culture (Sánchez Sanz 2014: 36), and the same happened with Themyscira at a much deeper level if we think on the diversity of meanings that it brought together.

Her interpretation could be understood as a counter-monument, commemorative of everything negative, installed as a (non)place in the imaginary; in such a way that it does not exist in the reality except through our own interaction with our memory (Gebauer, Nielsen, Schlosser and Sørensen 2015: 7), but its effects on our way of socially acting and behaving are reflected in the reality. In fact, it was necessary to overlap their stories with reality even more through tradition (Legnaro 2015: 58), reason why monuments were created and visited to remember the glory that the Hellenes obtained after defeating the Amazons[42] and, with it, the divine approval in terms of their way of living and organizing, through tombs that supposedly contained the remains of Amazons deceased in combat (Paus. 1. 2) or the name of the Areopagus in their honor (A. *Eum.* 685-690). Monuments, statues, reliefs, paintings… even the mental imaginary that was individually created in each of the Hellenes and, since then, in each one of those who interiorized the Amazonian stories are nothing more than visual illustrations of their myths, fated to conform and maintain the 'cultural memory' (Assmann 2011: 41; Gehrke 2010: 15), generating a relational system of (non)places directed to identify ourselves with the past, connect it with the present (Giuliani 2010: 49) and future, to structure and fix one idea or several of them in a directed, imperishable, capable of articulating the timeless 'we' against the 'other' as the foundation of well-being.

Following Relph, emotions attach themselves to places through the interaction with them, as a way of giving them meaning (Relph 1976: 143). The same happens with (non)places, they are settled in the memory with a preconceived meaning, but the task of assuming them and even extracting new signifiers from

40. The way we understand ourselves is in part a result of what others think about us (Losch 2003: 35).

41. Muszyńska 2019: 128. The Hellenic culture understood it as a group of people connected by a common past and related by descent, who shared a social model (Gehrke 2023: 12).

42. He not only remembered the past in the present, but also guaranteed its survival in the future as a testify that granted veracity for what they commemorated (Gehrke 2023: 33).

the inner dialogue is a personal task whose result we will accept or reject depending on its adaptation to the social norms imposed in the community to which we belong. It is not possible to know to which extent some Hellenic women could consider the Amazons more as models than anti-models already in ancient times, but that conclusion extracted from the meaning that the tradition attributed to their mythical tales would not be shared by most of their peers or, at least, by the majority of men by whom the social context was uttered.

From a cultural point of view, places acquire a significant character for people and communities associated with a system of traditions, knowledge, norms, values and behavioral rules thanks to which the group identity is determined and promotes the process of social integration (Muszyńska 2019: 127). Nevertheless, this perception can be applied in the same way to (non)places, which also acquire a much more ambivalent character by acting as a threshold, limit or border between two worlds, between the known and the unknown, between what we accept and what we do not (Rudzik 2009: 2; Coyne, Mcmeel and Parker 2005: 4). This is the case of Temiscira, as the greatest spatial exponent of the Amazonian myths. What establishes the perception and meaning of a place or (non)place is predominantly related to the accumulative emotional feelings from personal experiences and external ones, from the present or the past, related to the shared identity (Bradley 2012: 54) that builds a specific cultural context, which explains the current narrative paradigm shift regarding the Amazonian universe.

Certainly, memory and identity are mutually organic (Ryan 2011: 156), and in this symbiotic interrelationship, (non)places are able to create experiences away from reality (De Socio 2006: 12). In them, the community is experienced in solitude, inquiring into oneself, which does not mean that it is an alienating place that is also faced against the feeling of belonging from public spaces[43]. The essence of Themyscira, its meaning as an imaginary (non)place, is experienced both inside and outside, it is not 'only private, but public either' (De Cauter and Dehaene 2008: 3). It is shared at every level and that is how it was conceived, so that all the spoken, written or visual references that assaulted the Hellenes are intricately connected to the internal reflection that they provoke from the imaginary that has been placed in them.

The Greeks not only constructed their own past, they also established a complex system to run the present and influence the future. Nevertheless, even when they partially succeeded to the extent that, even several millennia later, anyone can describe the prototypical image of an Amazon, they would not have been able to accept that their 'intentional history' would undergo such profound change. The (non)places that were designed to legitimise a social system by encouraging widely recognised patterns of behaviour within an accepted value system continue to influence collective imaginery today. However, they have precisely confirmed what they were intended to avoid.

Themyscira became an imaginary non-place, permanently present as a counter-model. It was intended to servenot only as a reminder of the individual's vulnerability to tradition or accepted cultural norms within the group, but also as a reminder of the negative associated with the 'other', that is, as an example of what is expected of 'us', and at the same time as evidence of the female difficulty in preventing, resisting or escaping the effects of this idea in a context in which not only social pressure but also the 'bombardment' of images helped to determine its acceptance.

6. Conclusion

The word 'vulnerability' has not only physical but also psychological connotations. The fear of physical vulnerability is a conscious one, ultimately related to the fear of losing one's life to a higher power, and therefore impossible to avoid or control. Physical vulnerability keeps us alert to potential danger, but we do not have such an effective 'alarm system', or at least we do not show the same awareness of our moral vulnerability.

Somatic wounds can be superficial, serious or fatal. In the first case, their effects may be superfluous, so that they do not have a great impact on our being; the latter could be considered the most dangerous, but their

43. Contrary to Augé's (1995: 101) and others' (Ibelings 1998: 65) explanations to define the (non)places.

effects on us are extinguished by life itself. Serious wounds that have no moral effect on us and do not threaten our life may be much less decisive than the other way round, so that among all the possibilities of physical aggression, only a part of them causes permanent moral damage. However, psychosomatic injuries can also have a varying influence on our being, but the most dangerous ones have an unprecedented component among physical aggressions, one that affects us in a decisive way and conditions our way of acting or understanding the world, without us even being aware of it.

In antiquity, women, considered by nature to be fragile, impressionable and not only susceptible but necessarily manipulable, represented the most obvious potential psychosomatic vulnerability among those arising from aspects of identity. As opposed to other types of situational vulnerability related to aspects such as economic (poverty), class (slavery), xenophobia (the 'other'), etc. The consequences and actions provoked by these latter examples are visible at first sight and suffered at a conscious level, but the psychosomatic vulnerability resulting from a subordinate situation at source is often not overtly manifested. In the worst case, the effects are not even conscious, and in the best case, they are accepted with resignation, but they are permanent, at least as long as the power that produced them persists, and therefore the pain they produce can perhaps be considered much more important than any other.

Undoubtedly, vulnerability requires sovereignty (Hobbes 1651: 445), it requires a power relationship between two elements, the one that generates an imposition (whether obvious or not) and the one that suffers it (whether consciously or not). In Hellenic society, men based their moral and social ascendancy on the patriarchal tradition, which gave them the legitimacy to impose social norms that had to be accepted in order to be part of the group. This imposition was only possible if there was a psychosomatic vulnerability created by social pressure and the adaptation of traditions to the desired end.

Therefore, in most cases, it is likely that women have accepted a subordinate role in society, without even questioning the legitimacy of a way of thinking that has been ingrained in them, consciously or unconsciously, since childhood and that would indissolubly mark their way of acting, behaving and understanding the world in a directed way. In addition, social control is masked by the adoption of a form of imposed protection that assumes the vulnerability previously inculcated in the female gender and the disorientation it generates, offering a false security that demands compliance (Vantín 2019: 65).

In order to achieve this, all possible means were used to fix these ideas permanently in us, and this task corresponded not only to the myths, but also to the images or ideas that they generated and installed in the deepest part of our being. Themyscira became a clear example of this, a place that was really a non-place, whose image has remained alive in the collective imaginary as one more element among those destined to influence the collective female consciousness with a very specific purpose. An idea that has brought truth to a message, reminding us that vulnerability is not only physical but also psychological. It has become so powerful that we have not been able to forget it for millennia (Sánchez Sanz 2023b: 828), and it is only because we have managed to create a paradigm shift in relation to its essence that we are now able to give it a radically opposite meaning, moving away from vulnerability to become a beacon of empowerment. Only in this way have we been able to reverse its effects, for in one way or another it is now an inextricable part of our essence. A non-place that has always acted as a place within us.

But even if they were partially successful, not even the Oracle of Delphi would have been able to accept that their 'intended history' would undergo a profound change, that non-places designed to legitimise a social system would continue to influence collective identity to endorse what they had hoped to avoid.

7. Bibliography

Asmann 2011 = J. Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization. Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, Cambridge 2011.

Augé 1995 = M. Augé, *Nonplaces. Introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*, London 1995.

Augé 2012 = M. Augé and J.P. Colleyn, *¿Qué es la antropología?,* Madrid 2012.
Belting 2007 = H. Belting, *Anthropology of Image*, Buenos Aires 2007.
Block 1995 = J. Blok, *The Early Amazons. Modem and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth*, Leiden 1995.
Block 2009 = J. Blok, *Gentrifying Genealogy: On the Genesis of the Athenian Autochthony Myth*, in U. Dill and C. Walde (eds.), *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*, Berlin 2009, pp. 251-275.
Bosteels = B. Bosteels, *Nonplaces: An Anecdoted Topography of Contemporary French Theory*, in *Diacritics* 33(3/4), 2003, pp. 117-139.
Bradley 2012 = J. Bradley, *The Future of a Transnational Cultural History of the Non-Place*, in *Boletín del Instituto de Ciencias Humanas. Universidad de Toyo* 14, 2012, pp. 47-60.
Brogden 2019 = J. Brogden, *Photography and the Non-Place. The Cultural Erasure of the City*, Leeds 2019.
Buxton 2000 = R. Buxton, *El Imaginario griego: los contextos de la mitología*, Madrid 2000.
Coyne, Mcmeel and Parker 2005 = R. Coyne, D. Mcmeel and M. Parker, *Places to Think With Non-Place and Situated Mobile Working. Working Paper Architecture. School of Arts, Culture and Environment. University of Edinburgh*, 1-8, 2005.
Daumas 2009 = M. Daumas, *L´Or et le Pouvoir. Armement Scythe et Mythes Grecs*, Nanterre 2009.
De Cauter and Dehaene 2008 = L. de Cauter and M. Dehaene, *Heterotopia and the city: public space in a post-civil society*, London 2008.
De Socio 2006 = N. de Socio, *Assembling Non-Place Collage: Architecture of the Terminal*, Ottawa 2006.
Delalex 2002 = G. Delalex, *Non-places: The Everyday Experience of Flows*, in *disClosure: A Journal of Social Theory* 11(9), 2002, pp. 101-115.
Derrida 2002 = J. Derrida, *Religion*, London 2002.
Devambez 1976 = P. Devambez, *Les Amazones et l'Orient*, in *Revue Archéologique, Fasc. 2, Études sur les relations entre Grèce et Anatolie offertes à Pierre Demargne* 2, 1976, pp. 265-280.
Diel 2004 = P. Diel, *Le Symbolisme dans les Mythes*, Paris 2004.
Díez de Velasco 1998 = F. Diez de Velasco, *Lenguajes de la religión: mitos, símbolos e imágenes de la Grecia Antigua*, Madrid 1998.
Díez de Velasco 2015 = F. Diez de Velasco, *Los sentidos del epínetro: Imaginarios de lo femenino (y amazónico) en la Atenas Clásica*, in *Ianua Classicorum* 11, 2015, pp. 557-584.
Eller 2011 = C. Eller, *Gentlemen and Amazons: The Myth of Matriarchal Prehistory, 1861–1900*, Berkeley 2011.
Fragoulaki 2013 = M. Fragoulaki, *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*, Oxford 2013.
Gall 1994 = R. Gall, *Living On (Happily) Ever After: Derrida, Philosophy and the Comic*, in *Philosophy Today* 38, 1994, pp. 167-180.
Gebauer, Nielsen, Schlosser and Sørensen 2015 = M. Gebauer, H. Nielsen, J. Schlosser and B. Sørensen, *Non-Place. Representing Placelessness in Literature, Media and Culture*, Aalborg Universitetsforlag: Interdisciplinære kulturstudier, 7, Skjernvej 2015, pp. 51-67.
Gehrke 2010 = H.J. Gehrke, *Representations of the past in Greek culture*, in L. Foxhall, H.J. Gehrke and N. Luraghi (eds.), *Intentional History. Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, Stuttgart 2010, pp. 15-34.
Ghrke 2023 = H.J. Gehrke, *The Greeks and Their Histories. Myth, History, and Society*, Cambridge 2023.
Giuliani 2010 = L. Giuliani, *Myth as past? On the temporal aspect of Greek depictions of legend*, in L. Foxhall, H.J. Gehrke and N. Luraghi (eds.), *Intentional History. Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, Stuttgart 2010, pp. 35-56.
Gould 1980 = J. Gould, *Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens*, in *JHS* 100, 1980, pp. 38-59.
Harmatta 1950 = J. Harmatta, *Studies on the History of the Sarmatians*, Budapest 1950.
Hernández de la Fuente 2008 = D. Hernández De La Fuente, *Bakkhos Anax. Un estudio sobre Nono de Panópolis*, Madrid 2008.
Highmore 2017 = B. Highmore, *Cultural Feelings: Mood, Mediation and Cultural Politics*, London 2017.

Hobbes 1651 = T. Hobbes, *Leviathan or the Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civill*, London 1651.

Hobsbawm and Ranger 2002 = H.J. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger, *La invención de la tradición*, Barcelona 2002.

Hornblower 2011 = S. Hornblower, *The Greek World 479–323 BC*, London 2011.

Ibelings 1998 = H. Ibelings, *Supermodernism, Architecture in the Age of Globalization*, London 1998.

Isaac 2004 = B. Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*, Princeton 2004.

Ivantchik 2001 = A. Ivantchik, *La Légende Grecque sur l'Origine des Scythes (Hérodote 4. 8-10)*, in V. Fromentin and S. Gotteland (eds.), *Origines Gentium*, Ausonius – Publications, Etudes 7, Bordeaux 2001, pp. 207-220.

Kallistov 1949 = D. Kallistov, *Ocerki po istorii Severnogo Pricernomor' ja anticnoj epochi*, Leningrad 1949.

Koch and Börner 2010 = A. Koch and L. Börner, *Amazonen: Geheimnisvolle Kriegerinnen*, Speyer 2010.

Kotstanje 2009 = M. Korstanje, *Non-places and Tourism: Towards an understanding of travel*, in *Antrocom* 5(2), 2009, pp. 103-106.

Lefkowitz 2007 = M. Lefkowitz, *Women in Greek Myth*, London 2007.

Legnaro 2015 = A. Legnaro, *In search of place-ness: Non-places in late modernity*, in M. Gebauer, H. Nielsen, J. Schlosser and B. Sørensen (eds.), *Non-Place. Representing Placelessness in Literature, Media and Culture*, Aalborg 2015, pp. 51-67.

Losch 2003 = D. Losch, *Bad Memories, The Poetics of Memory and the Difference of Culture*, in J. Bennett and R. Kennedy (eds.), *World Memory: Personal Trajectories in Global Time*, London 2003, pp. 30-43.

Merck 1978 = M. Merck, *The City's Achievements*, in S. Lipshitz (ed.), *Tearing the Veil: Essays on Femininity*, London 1978, pp. 95-115.

Mercury 2009 = F. Mercury, *Figures de Femmes de la Mediterranée Ancienne*, Ajaccio 2009.

Muszyńska 2009 = J. Muszyńska, *Places and 'Non-Places': The Identity of a Place in the Perspective of Individual Memory and Social Forgetting*, in *Kultura i Edukacja* 4, 2009, pp. 125-137.

Nevett 1999 = L. Nevett, *House and Society in Ancient Greek World*, Cambridge 1999.

Nocker 2014 = C. Nocker, *Non Places and the Generic City*, 2014. Available in: http://www.clemensnocker.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Essay-Clemens-Nocker.pdf

Ortega Balanza 2017 = M. Ortega Balanza, L*a violencia como constructor de identidad en la gladiatura femenina*, in B. Antela-Bernárdez, C. Zaragozá Serrano and A. Guimerá Martínez (eds.), *Placer y dolor. Las mujeres en la Antigüedad*, Alcalá de Henares 2017, pp. 179-197.

Pembroke 1967 = S. Pembroke, *Women in Charge: the Function of Alternatives in Early Greek Tradition and the Ancient idea of Matriarchy*, in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30, 1967, pp. 1-35.

Relph 1976 = E.C. Relph, *Place and Placelessness*, London 1976.

Rodríguez Blanco 2011 = Mª.E. Rodriguez Blanco, *Mujeres monstruo y monstruos de mujer en la mitología griega*, in R. López and L. Unceta (eds.), *Ideas de mujer. Facetas de lo femenino en la Antigüedad*, Alicante 2011, pp. 65-92.

Rudzik 2009 = E. Rudzik, *Provocation of the Non-Place [A Place for Alienation]*, Ontario 2009.

Ryan 2011 = L. Ryan, *Memory, Power and Resistance: The Anatomy of a Tripartite Relationship*, in *Memory Studies* 4(2), 2011, pp. 154-169.

Sakellariou 1958 = M.B. Sakellariou, *La Migration Grecque en Ionie*, Athènes 1958.

Sánchez Sanz 2014 = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Aproximación al mito de las amazonas en la iconografía griega Arcaica y Clásica*, in *Historias del Orbis Terrarum* 12, 2014, pp. 14-42.

Sánchez Sanz 2018 = A. Sánchez Sanz, *El desarrollo teórico del matriarcado en el s. XIX y los primeros estudios sobre el mito amazónico*, in *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 38, 2018, pp. 221-237.

Sánchez Sanz 2019a = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Ars Amazonica. Estudio de fuentes y análisis comparativo*, Madrid 2019.

Sánchez Sanz 2019b = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Belerofonte y las amazonas*, in *Journal of Intercultural and Interdisciplinary Archaeology* 03, 2019, pp. 39-45.

Sánchez Sanz 2021 = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Cimerios, amazonas y el arte griego*, in *StHist* 39, 2021, pp. 5-26.

Sánchez Sanz 2023a = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Scythian Amazons. Female burials in northern Pontus*, in Erga-Logoi. *Rivista di storia, letteratura, diritto e culture dell'antichità* 11, 2023, pp. 7-27.

Sánchez Sanz 2023b = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Identidad y género en el Bronce Griego*, in P. Druille and L. Pérez (eds.), *Libertad, Opresión y Confinamiento. Del Mundo Antiguo a nuestros días*, Buenos Aires 2023, pp. 827-836.

Sánchez Sanz 2024a = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Gryphomachias. Amazons and Grypes in Ancient Art*, in *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 11(3), 2024, pp. 77-86.

Sánchez Sanz 2024b = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Periplus to the unknown. The Greek conquest of the Black Sea and the origin of the Amazon myths*, in *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica* 30(1), 2024, pp. 5-36.

Sánchez Sanz 2024c = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Mythical Eugenics. The Macedonian-Amazonian Royal Alliance in Classical Sources*, in *Cercetări Arheologice. Revistă a Muzeului Național de Istorie a României* 31(2), 2024, pp. 321-332.

Sánchez Sanz 2024d = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Enlightened Bodies. The Symbology of Tattooing in Ancient Thrace*, in *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 11(2), 2024, pp. 3-19.

Sánchez Sanz 2024e = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Rethinking the amazon image. Modern paradigms vs. inherited tradition*, in E. Marco Arocas and A. Faus Bartomeu (eds.), *Cuerpos en tránsito: explorando intersecciones emergentes y raíces culturales*, Madrid 2024, pp. 434-450.

Sánchez Sanz 2024f = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Dalí's amazons. The surrealism of the classical female body*, in L. Robledo Díaz and A. Grau I Muñoz (eds.). *Cuerpos en diálogo: tejiendo ecos de diversidad e identidad*, Madrid 2024, pp. 109-130.

Sánchez Sanz 2024g = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Alexander and Thalestris. A Midsummer Night's Dream in Hyrcania*, in *Actas del XI Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Iranología (SEI), 26 y 27 de octubre de 2023*, Santiago de Compostela 2024, pp. 13-42.

Sánchez Sanz 2024h = A. Sánchez Sanz, *El corazón de las amazonas. Reimaginando la mitología*, in C.A. Costa Campos and L.F. Bantim de Assumpção (eds.), *História em Quadrinhos na Perspectiva da Prática de Ensino*, Río de Janeiro 2024, pp. 81-133.

Sánchez Sanz 2024i = A. Sánchez Sanz, *La civilización y la barbarie*, in M. Valdés Guía and F. Notario (eds.), *La Antigua Grecia hoy: los límites de la ciudadanía y el «desarrollo sostenible»*, Madrid 2024, pp. 173-192.

Sánchez Sanz 2024j = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Zanzim's Amazons. Classical Mythology in 'Island of Women' Artbook as a Pedagogical Innovation Source*, in M. Rodríguez, C. Hernández and F. Sánchez (eds.), *Repensar, rehacer. Reflexiones y experiencias sobre innovación docente en Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades*, Madrid 2024, pp. 293-307.

Sánchez Sanz 2024k = A. Sánchez Sanz, *The 'first' Amazons. Development of genre in Eurasian bronze*, in *Actas del X Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Iranología (SEI), Tbilisi los días 20-21 de octubre de 2022*, Tbilisi 2024, pp. 173-203.

Sánchez Sanz 2025a = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Amazons in Digital Era. The reception of the warrior woman image*, London 2025.

Sánchez Sanz 2025b = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Destroy Your Enemy Becoming Your Friend: Priam and the Amazons in the Trojan War*, in *Clotho* 6(2), 2025, pp. 5-26.

Sánchez Sanz 2025c = A. Sánchez Sanz, *Nomad Vs sedentary. Gender, production and social evolution in the Eurasian steppe peoples of the East Eurasian region between Chalcolithic and Bronze Age*, in *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 11(4), 2025, pp. 3-12. In print.

Schefold 1966 = K. Schefold, *Myth and Legend in Eraly Greek Art*, London, 1966.

Serrano-Barquín, Nava-La Corte, Serrano-Barquín and Zarza Delgado 2021 = C. Serrano-Barquín, F. Nava-La Corte, H. Serrano-Barquín and P. Zarza Delgado, *Evanescent landscapes. Resignification of the notion of non-place*, in *Revista de Arquitectura* 24(1), 2021, pp. 16-23.

Tyrrell 1991 = W.B. Tyrrell and F. Brown, *Athenian Myths and Institutions*, New York 1991.

Tyrrell 2001 = W.B. Tyrrell, *Las amazonas: un estudio de los mitos atenienses*, México 2001.

Vantín 2019 = S. Vantín, *Vulnerabilità, morte e pietas. L'atto della sepoltura e le sue implicazioni giuridiche, Stato*, in *Chiese e Pluralismo Confessionale* 21, 2019, pp. 57-69.

Vernant 1990 = J.P. Vernant, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, New York 1990.

Vernant 2009 = J.P. Vernant, *La muerte en los ojos. Figuras del Otro en la Antigua Grecia*, Barcelona 2009.

Vidal Naquet 1970 = P. Vidal-Naquet, *Esclavage et Gynécocratie dans la Tradition, le Mythe, l'Utopie*, in *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'Antiquité classique; Colloque du CNRS, Caen 25-26 avril 1969*, Paris 1970, pp. 63-80.

Walcot 1984 = P. Walcot, *Greek Attitudes towards Women: The Mythological Evidence*, in *GaR* 31(1), 1984, pp. 37-47.

Weimbaum 2000 = B. Weimbaum, *Islands of Women and Amazons: Representations and Realities*, Austin 2000.

Wilke and Hurt 2001 = B. Wilke and J. Hurt, *Literature of the Western World, Vol. 1: The Ancient World Through the Renaissance*, New Jersey 2001.

Zacharia 2017 = K. Zacharia, *Converging Truths: Euripides' Ion and the Athenian Quest for Self-definition*, Leiden 2017.

8. Illustration list

Fig. 1. Tetrobols from Potidaia. Rx: Amazon head facing right within thin square frame. (510-500 BC) Left. Boston MFA 04.691. Right. 04.690.

Fig. 2. Athenian black-figure neck amphora, from Tarquinia (575-525 BC). attributed to Castellani Painter. Antikensammlung Berlin F1711 (Sánchez Sanz 2019a: 386).