


On Arcs, Arrows, and Eating with One's Hands as if There's No Tomorrow: Some Notes on Bonnie Honig's *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*¹

Liesbeth Schoonheim

Humboldt University of Berlin ✉ 

<https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/rpub.92177>

Abstract. In this essay, I explore some key notions in Bonnie Honig's *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*. Juxtaposing her speculative reading of Euripides' *Bacchae* to Ursula K. Le Guin's essay on the 'Carrier Bag Theory of Storytelling,' I argue that the women in the tragedy can be considered neither as imitating masculine, violent hunter-heroes, nor as surreptitiously embodying feminine, caring gatherer-mothers. Following their refusal to care and to think about tomorrow, I conclude by suggesting that a critical fabulation of the women's acts of refusal should steer clear from expecting them to inspire us, as contemporary feminists.

Keywords: Bonnie Honig; Refusal; Speculative Fabulation; Care; Violence; Storytelling; Ursula Le Guin (1929-2018)

[ES] De Arcos, Flechas, y del Comer con las manos como si no hubiera un mañana: Apuntes sobre *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*, de Bonnie Honig

Resumen. En este ensayo exploro algunas nociones clave de *A Feminist Theory of Refusal* (Una teoría feminista del rechazo), de Bonnie Honig. Yuxtaponiendo su lectura especulativa de *Las bacantes* de Eurípides al ensayo de Ursula K. Le Guin sobre la "Teoría de la narración en tanto 'bolsa de transporte'", sostengo que las mujeres de la tragedia no pueden ser consideradas ni como imitadoras de los violentos héroes cazadores masculinos, ni como encarnación subrepticia de las cuidadosas madres recolectoras femeninas. Acatando su negativa a preocuparse y a pensar en el mañana, concluyo sugiriendo que una fabulación crítica de los actos de rechazo de las mujeres debería evitar esperar que nos inspiren, como feministas contemporáneas.

Palabras clave: Bonnie Honig; rechazo; fabulación especulativa; cuidado; violencia; narración; Ursula Le Guin (1929-2018)

Sumario. 1. Critical Fabulation beyond Binaries. 2. Storylines beyond an Endpoint. Bibliography.

Cómo citar: Schoonheim, L. (2024). On Arcs, Arrows, and Eating with One's Hands as if There's No Tomorrow: Some Notes on Bonnie Honig's *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*. *Revista Anales del Seminario de Historia de la Filosofía*, 27(1), 5-10.

There is an intellectual joy in reading Bonnie Honig's *A Feminist Theory of Refusal* (2021) that is highly infectious. The text has a formal, and even geometrical quality: it juxtaposes ideas and authors in a semi-repetitive pattern, and out of this juxtaposition emerge new lines. It is "a formal

adventure"² that leaves the reader both mesmerized with the pattern and wanting to play themselves. A serious playfulness for sure; one that is not trivial but that instead moves around the authors and ideas, to see and wait how new and often unexpected lines appear.

¹ I would like to thank the editors, Viktoria Huegel and Luke Edmeads, as well as two anonymous reviewers, for their insightful comments. This essay is much indebted to conversations I had before and during the one-day workshop "Thirty Years of *Political Theory and the Displacement of Politics*: A Symposium with Bonnie Honig" in January 2023: I am grateful to Bonnie Honig for her intellectual generosity, and to leva Motuzait, my co-organizer, and Viktoria, one of the invited speakers, for their agonistic sorority.

² This is a description by director Erin Courtney of her play *A Map of Virtue* that Honig approvingly quotes. Bonnie Honig, *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2021, p. 116.

Honig's book is structured around three chapters, each introducing one concept of refusal that is ameliorated by another concept: Agamben's inoperativity by Butler's public assembly; Cavarero's inclination by Ahmed's disorientation, and Hartman's fabulation by Arendt on the city as a community of remembrance. Each concept of refusal informs a reading of the *Bacchae*, followed by two readings that are in turn informed by the *Bacchae*, of which one engages with a movie or a theatre play. Each refusal-concept instantiates one stop on the long arc of refusal, with the final stop (fabulation) occupying a privileged position: it illustrates Honig's key argument that politics is a worldly affair that is directed towards improving the shared conditions under which we live (as opposed to, for instance, fugitive politics). It is also methodologically crucial, because the construction of the arc of refusal is itself the product of critical fabulation. This exercise in fabulation pertains first and foremost to Honig's reading of Euripides' *Bacchae*.

The *Bacchae* shows the events leading up to and shortly after the death of Thebes' young and arrogant king, Pentheus. The classic reading of Euripides' play focuses on Pentheus' refusal to acknowledge his cousin, the god Dionysus. The divinity of wine takes revenge by driving the women of Thebes mad, including the king's own mother, Agave. They leave the city to go to Cithaeron, where they linger around, eat the riches spontaneously provided by the earth, and live in harmony with wild beasts. Pentheus is curious to see the women, and persuaded by a stranger, who is Dionysus in disguise, he dresses like a woman and spies on them from the top of a tree. But Dionysus exposes him to the women, who tear down Pentheus' tree, and mistaking him for a lion, tear his body apart—Agave being the fiercest of them. The play ends with Agave's return to the city, proudly showing her bloody bounty to her father, only to be called back to her senses and recognizing the filicide that she committed. So the classic reading goes; readers familiar with Honig's previous work on tragedy won't be surprised that her interpretation substantively diverges from it. The central element for her is the women's refusal: the refusal to be in the city and perform their domestic chores, and later on, upon their return, to submit to the subordinate role of wife, mother, and daughter, and instead claim a position of their own as proud hunters. As a consequence, the central conflict no longer unfolds between Pentheus and Dionysus, but between Agave and her father Cadmus, when the latter appeals to his daughter to recognize her crime and, as Honig shows in a breathtaking reading, interpellates her as a woman in the patriarchal order. I would go even further, and not only shift the focus from one conflict to another (that is, from the one between the two young male protagonists to that between father and daughter), but also suggest that this conflict is only one element in what constitutes the arc of refusal—and for that matter, not even a central one.

Honig's *Bacchae* is a thread or, more correctly, a web that connects different authors and ideas, and it makes one want to play, and weave in

other elements. What would emerge, for instance, if we read Agamben's *Glorious Body* (ch.1) alongside Ahmed, focusing on her discussion of "use"?³ Ahmed's validation of use shares the same impulse as Honig's, namely to acknowledge the instrumental logic that has objectified gendered and racialized bodies, and to counter it by pursuing a *different* use. This kind of use entails life-sustaining powers,⁴ and it enacts modes of dependency—one that celebrates a wide variety of affects such as erotic pleasure, anger, and joy, which remain somewhat undertheorized in Butler's reflections on assembly. Turning to the second chapter, we can ask what would emerge when we use Cavarero, for instance, for a *Bacchae*-reading of Chantal Akerman's film *No Home Movie* (2015)? The film documents the filmmaker's mother in the last period of her life: scenes in which they eat, cook, and share stories about the family (Akerman's mother was the family's sole survivor of the Shoah) alternate with footage of Akerman on work trips abroad.⁵ It is very much un-Bacchic in that nothing happens; but while the confinement to and looming emptiness of the apartment makes one feel deeply uneasy, it also depicts a heterotopia in which the traditional relations of care in the maternal scene are reversed, or rather, multiplied (her mom still cares for her, but so does Akerman for her mother) without necessarily achieving the political equality configured in agonistic sorority. Or, to give a final example of such reshuffling, what would have happened if chapter 3 had focused on Hartman's *Lose Your Mother* (2006)? It might have invited us to reread Wole Soyinka's 1974 rendering of Euripides' play, in which the enslaved men join the chorus of Asiatic Bacchantes to worship Dionysus and proclaim their freedom.⁶ They are *in* the city without being *of* the city. Hence, when at the very end of the play, the officer reports Pentheus' death, they respond "Your master not mine. I have another home, another life. Nor will the fear of the dungeons stop me manifesting my joy."⁷ Would they want to come back to the city? And if so, what does this return mean for the kinship relations that structure it? Without a mother, what home do they have to return to? This kind of fugitivity is very different from the arc of refusal that is prefigured in Honig's reading of the *Bacchae*.⁸

³ Sara Ahmed, *What's the Use? On the Uses of Use*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2019.

⁴ Particularly important for Ahmed is the work by Audre Lorde. For the various powers that can be used for survival, see especially "Uses of the Erotic: 'the Erotic of Power'" and "The Uses of Anger: Women Responding to Racism," both in Audre Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, London, Penguin UK, 2019.

⁵ Akerman is mostly known for her monumental "Jeanne Dielman" (1975), a groundbreaking work in feminist *Nouvelle Vague* cinema, that shares with her final film the focus on domestic scenes. For a Beauvoir-inspired reading of "Jeanne Dielman", see Lori Jo Marso, *Politics with Beauvoir: Freedom in the Encounter*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2017.

⁶ Wole Soyinka, *The Bacchae of Euripides: A Communion Rite*, New York/London, Norton, 1974, p. 15.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 83. In the original version, it is the chorus of Asian Bacchantes who make a similar comment.

⁸ Fugitivity being a core concept of Black feminism and Afro pessimism. See Akwugo Emejulu, *Fugitive Feminism*, London, Silver Press, 2022.

1. Critical Fabulation beyond Binaries

In this essay, I do not wish to pursue such shape-shifting, but stay with the arc. I want to celebrate how Honig's Bacchantes form a queer group of storytellers and heroines, and make them even stranger than Honig might sometimes be willing to. Honig's reading of the *Bacchae* is speculative or, put differently, offers a critical fabulation. Like her other readings of tragedy, it looks for agonistic sorority where none had been seen before: it retells a story that we thought we knew in a manner that brings out thoughts, feelings, and actions that are written out of the classic interpretation. Notice that there is nothing inherently critical about fabulation. We only have to think of the fabulations that have been enlisted to maintain the patriarchal order, such as the ones promulgated in innocuous works of pop psychology that suggest that women come from Venus and men from Mars. But speculations have also been used against the patriarchy. Reading Honig, I was reminded of Ursula Le Guin, that great thinker and writer of speculative fiction, and her essay on the carrier bag theory of storytelling (1988). Taking us back to the dawn of human culture, Le Guin offers an alternative story of its emergence. What if, she asks, culture did not start with a stick-like tool, meant to wound and kill? Weapons serve to hunt for meat and, as Beauvoir reminds us (in her critical fabulation of the origin of gender divisions), hunting was a violent, life-risking activity monopolized by the male members of early human societies.⁹ In risking their life, the men got to be the heroes whose feats are talked about. Even more so, by willfully seeking out this risk they show the hubris of wanting to be in control of the story, making its plot revolve around their premature death.¹⁰ Yet weapons were not the first human inventions. These were the containers in which the seeds, grains and berries that formed the staple of our early ancestors' diet were collected. This fact, narrated to us by archeologists and anthropologists, sets Le Guin off on a tangent, a speculative history (like all histories arguably are) of storytelling. Containers and the stuff they gather, she conjures, are the very requirements for storytelling as they free up time to sit around and share tales. The hunters clamoring «Look at me! I am the greatest!»¹¹ had little to contribute to the community's survival, and their bragging was a pastime for the hours freed up by the foraging of their so-called less-heroic companions. Their tales require, in our contemporary language, the care work of others who are not accorded a role in these tales. But while we have become accustomed to the "killer story,"¹² which is structured around a so-called courageous hero and his overcoming of conflict and ordeals, Le Guin discerns another mode of narration. The "life

story"¹³ has conflict and violence, if at all, only as one of its many elements. It's a bag that collects disparate elements; or a net that weaves wildly diverging things into one object.¹⁴ What holds the story together is "[a] leaf a shell a net a bag a sling a sack a bottle a pot a box a container. A holder. A recipient."¹⁵

If Le Guin (like Beauvoir and, in spite of herself, Arendt) provide two modes of being in the world that are gendered masculine and feminine, Honig's Bacchantes embody a third option. They defy the categorization of hunters and gatherers. They hunt, surely, but without weapons; and they gather but not to take anything back home.

To argue that the Bacchantes do not belong to the hunters seems odd. After all, the text is replete with allusions to them capturing and killing animals. They explicitly claim to emulate their male counterparts, and thus, one could object, they imitate the masculine violence that is much criticized by Le Guin. Furthermore, by committing what Honig refers to as the extended arc of their regicide, they could be criticized for mimicking the sovereign violence that they defy. This mimicry, so the objection continues, is particularly clear in the gruesome scene in which Pentheus is torn apart; an unwieldy imitation of the meticulous suffering inflicted on bodies by the sovereign. That violence deploys, as Foucault reminds us, an "anatomy of pain," which is scrupulously and with horror-inducing tools applied to the body of the convict.¹⁶ In antiquity, such a case of sovereign violence can be seen in the scene in the *Iliad* where Achilles ties the corpse of Hector behind his chariot. Achilles fails because of divine intervention, but his aim is clear enough: scattering his opponent's body outside the walls of Troy—visible for all, untouchable to none. Achilles is the paradigmatic hero in this "killer story," fighting his foe to death in a man-to-man sword fight, and then trying to dismember him by dragging him around.

We can almost hear Agave scold Achilles, for the vanity of "their weapons forged by the makers of iron."¹⁷ She prides herself on her bare-handed killing. Towards the end of the play, she demands recognition from her father: "No more for me the shuttle or the loom. I have achieved a greater glory. For I can hunt the creatures of the wild with my bare hands."¹⁸ What distinguishes killing with one's bare hands (as opposed to with a weapon) is the sensory experience of touching and being touched; it activates the potential of wounding always already present in a primordial engagement with (inclination to) others. This ambiguity is played out in a dialogue between Dionysus and Pentheus:

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 33.

¹⁴ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, *op. cit.*, p. 184; Donna J. Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2016.

¹⁵ Ursula Le Guin, *The Carrier Bag Theory of Fiction*, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

¹⁶ Foucault refers to torturers carrying out public executions as "anatomist of pain," who maximize the intolerable sufferings on a body before it collapses. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, London, Penguin Books, 1991, p. 11.

¹⁷ Euripides, *The Bacchae*, trans. Nicholas Rudall, Chicago, Ivan R. Dee, 1996, p. 52.

¹⁸ Euripides, *Ibidem*, p. 53.

⁹ Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, trans. Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevalier, New York, Vintage Books, 2011, pp. 71–75.

¹⁰ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1998 [1958], p. 194; Hannah Arendt, *Denktagebuch*, ed. Ursula Ludz, München, Piper, 2003, pp. 525–26.

¹¹ Hanna Pitkin, "Justice: On Relating Private and Public," *Political Theory*, 9(3), 1981, p. 338.

¹² Ursula Le Guin, *The Carrier Bag Theory of Fiction*, n.p., Ignota, 2019, p. 33.

Stranger: Follow me now. I will take you there. Someone else will bring you back.

Pentheus: My mother--

Stranger: For all to see.

Pentheus: That is why I go.

Stranger: You will be carried back--

Pentheus: Ah, you are going to pamper me.

Stranger: In the hands of your mother.¹⁹

The double-speech of Pentheus' question is that Agave does bring her son home, but of course in a very different manner than he had expected. Could it also be that she carried him home, knowing it was her son, thus enacting posthumously the wish that Pentheus had voiced and Dionysus granted him? Throughout the play, Agave is the only one who touches her (male) family members; the men are all averse to touch. Typically voiced as a fear of pollution, their aversity to touch underscores their struggles for sovereign control. So Pentheus tells his grandfather Cadmus: "Take your hand off me! Do not wipe your filth and folly off on me!"²⁰ And likewise, Dionysus (not much better than his cousin in this regard) tells Pentheus "I give a careful warning to the careless: touch me not."²¹ The Bacchantes are hunters indeed, but their touch both kills and caresses; they cannot fully extract themselves from the sovereign violence they oppose, but they do not imitate it.

When the Bacchantes are not quite the control-seeking, weapon-wielding heroes criticized by Le Guin, could they then be foragers? Again, that claim seems quite intuitive at first. What sets the gatherers apart from the hunters is the unpretentious activity of nourishing the young. Importantly, this activity is marked by establishing bonds between heterogeneous people and things. The Bacchae suckle the wild animals, and as such, one might argue, they extend the range of creatures with whom we can enter into kinship relations. They haven't fully given up on their maternal role, it seems, and as such they testify of their drive to establish relations of care. Rather than refusing to be a mother, they mimic it in new ways, showing the ludicrous limits imposed by biological parentage on care. However, this reading does not quite hold. Do the women suckle the wild animals out of care for the animals or because "you know, the breast can get painful with milk!"²² The first reading reproduces the idea that a woman's body is maternal, inherently caring and a source of nutrition. The second, by starting from the physical discomfort of full breasts, acknowledges the body's capacity to provide nourishment without reducing it to it. As such, it recuperates the female body from its patriarchal representation as *alma mater*. This reading can also be applied to the earth, which is described as that which "spurred streams of water" and out of which "white milk flowed."²³ Could it be that this is not a Gaia in-

tent on feeding its critters, but indifferently and out of self-concern excretes its nourishing substances?²⁴ The scenes of feeding and nursing in the *Bacchae* do not display concern with the ones who are fed and, by extension, their future growth and wellbeing. The kind of care and nourishment enacted at Cithaeron is hence distinct from the one described by Le Guin. The use of a carrier bag presupposes that today's task will return the next day: to carry food home and store it only makes sense when you presume that you need it in the future. The Bacchae, on the other hand, eat where they lie, with no worry about tomorrow; they do not stow it away for a later moment but eat with their hands until they are saturated.

The women are thus deeply ambiguous figures: hunters, whose touch both kills and caresses; and gatherers, who nourish without caring for tomorrow. They thus complicate standard notions of relationality, which I take to be the most important contribution of Honig's theory of feminist refusal. Feminist ethics, in its various versions, proposes a relational account of selfhood.²⁵ This is typically taken to mean that we should embrace our dependency on others. But patriarchy, as noted in the introduction, is imbricated "in everything we love as well as in the structures and powers we resist."²⁶ To fight it, we might have to sever the bonds with those we hold dear, and be a "feminist killjoy."²⁷ The killing of Pentheus stands for this wider, more diffuse severing of bonds that relay patriarchal power relationships, and that separation had already started with the Bacchae's retreat to Cithaeron. But the ambiguity of the Bacchae points beyond a binary of being in a relation /breaking off a relation: it multiplies the kind of relations we can be in, and their ethical status. As a web of relationships, the *Bacchae* shows how some strings are marked by conflict and violence, while others are defined by solidarity and sororal agonism: yet all, in one way or another, are shaped by the patriarchal expectation of women's filial loyalty.

2. Storylines beyond an Endpoint

Agave's return to Thebes concludes the "arc" of the Bacchae's refusal, suggesting (in literary terms) a linear narrative with an open end or (in political terms) a practice that is important both in its own right and in pursuing the amelioration of the objective conditions of collective life. The notion of 'arc' suggests continuity, and this continuity resides primarily in the ongoing refusal by the women of the sovereign, patriarchal order. From the moment they left the city to Agave's re-entry, they engage in a regicide. The interpretative

¹⁹ Euripides, *Ibidem*, p. 44.

²⁰ Euripides, *Ibidem*, p. 22.

²¹ Euripides, *Ibidem*, p. 27.

²² Wole Soyinka, *The Bacchae of Euripides: A Communion Rite*, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

²³ Euripides, *The Bacchae*, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

²⁴ For this notion of Gaia, see Isabelle Stengers, *In Catastrophic Times: Resisting the Coming Barbarism*, trans. Andrew Goffey, n.p., Open Humanities Press, 2015.

²⁵ See, for instance, Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1993; Virginia Held, *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006; Adriana Cavarero, *Inclinations: A Critique of Rectitude*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 2016. For the influence by Care Ethics on Le Guin, see her essay "The Fisherwoman's Daughter," in *Space Crone*, London, Silver Press, 2023, p. 89.

²⁶ Bonnie Honig, *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

²⁷ Sara Ahmed, *Living a Feminist Life*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2016.

advantage of this reading is that it decenters the killing of Pentheus.²⁸ The focus on the visceral violence of the women “occludes the affirmative dimensions of their refusal, which are broad and deep, and neglects the regicidal nature of their refusal’s long arc.”²⁹ Their regicide, in other words, started long before Pentheus was murdered: when they refused to take up their loom and repaired to Cithaeron. Agave’s entry in the city aims to solidify this regicide, an attempt which flounders on the persistent patriarchal structures. How can we exactly understand this failure? One reading would suggest that the arc of refusal very much describes the path of an arrow—albeit one that misses its goal. In Le Guin’s typology, to fabulate this refusal as an arrow’s arc obeys the imperative of the ‘killer story’ that “the proper shape of the narrative is that of the arrow or spear, starting *here* and going straight *there* and THOK! hitting its mark (which drops dead).”³⁰ This imperative also decrees that “the central concern of narrative (...) is conflict.”³¹ This reading stresses the continuity between Cithaeron and Thebes, presenting the former as a mere preparatory stage for changing the latter. It would also stress that the conflict between Agave and Cadmus is central to the story, and present Agave’s dialogue with Cadmus as the heroic test of the main protagonist.

Now surely, there is some textual basis for presenting Honig’s text in this way³²; but we can also offer another reading, one that is arguably closer to what Le Guin had in mind when advocating for the “life story”, a story as a bag full with life-sustaining nourishment and random interesting things that inspire and are fun to play with. “One relationship among elements [in this story] may well be that of conflict, but the reduction of narrative to conflict is absurd.”³³ What are the elements in the sack that is Honig’s *Bacchae*? First and foremost, we find an alternative notion of instrumentality: Cithaeron is important in itself, regardless of Agave’s success (or lack thereof) in transforming Thebes. Another is her conflict with Cadmus. But now it is one of the many things gathered in the story, it loses its central role: rather than a test, it embodies one of the many relations implicated with patriarchal power. The moment of anagnorisis is a thing and a string: a scene in the plot that has now become dislodged from a linear narrative, and a bond of filial duty that pulls Agave away from her sisters and back into the nuclear family until it snaps.

This kind of life story is, I think, aimed for by Honig. By coming back to the city, the women hope to change it into a place fit for living for them too. Agave wants to change the city’s collective memory by adding their story; and this is not a mere addition but, because it is theirs, challenges the function and hegemony of

the male-biased archive. The final move that Honig describes in Agave’s return to the city and that she enacts in her reading of the *Bacchae*, serves to undo what earlier feminist phenomenologists referred to as “cultural oppression”.³⁴ To demand one’s place in the archive is to refuse the anonymity imposed by a life in the domestic sphere, as well as planting a seed of inspiration for their future daughters.

But then again, Honig’s *Bacchae* might not be quite a bag, carried home to feed the kids. It might not be quite a “killer story” with a central hero, but neither is it a “life story” that serves to nourish later generations. For Honig, the return to the city exemplifies a desire to be remembered. Yet, when we stress the discontinuity between Cithaeron and Thebes, we might ask if this is so. For while Agave does claim her share of immortal fame, showing her bounty for all to see, the same cannot be said of the women’s retreat to Cithaeron. Importantly, and as Honig observes herself too, the women do not want to be observed during their stay outside of the city. The stories we have of their whereabouts are relayed to us through male testimonies. And neither, in fact, do the women relate what they did out there in the hills. When Agave starts to speak, she carefully manages her self-presentation: she utters no word of their languishing on the slopes of Cithaeron. We, her feminist posterity, might have liked to hear more about that queer place outside of the city. But to expect the *Bacchae* to care about us, and provide us with examples of refusal that feed our own acts of resistance—wouldn’t that ascribe them a maternal role, which is exactly what they would have objected to? To suggest that some people might want to be forgotten, or have episodes of their life erased out of the common story book that is human history might sound wild to us. But it might also be the very kind of refusal of filial bonds that the women of Thebes, in their wildest and most inspiring moments of agonistic sorority, pursued.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, S., *Living a Feminist Life*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2016.
- , *What’s the Use? On the Uses of Use*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2019.
- Arendt, H., *Denktagebuch*, 2 vols. (ed. Ursula Ludz), München, Piper, 2003.
- , *The Human Condition*, 2nd ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1998 [1958].
- Bartky, S. L., *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*, New York, Routledge, 1990.
- Beauvoir, S. de, *The Second Sex* (trans. Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevalier), New York, Vintage Books, 2011.
- Cavarero, A., *Inclinations: A Critique of Rectitude*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 2016.

²⁸ And don’t we still witness this fascination with violent women and in particular violent mothers in tabloids and other news outlets—a fascination that is fed by the romanticization of women as supposedly inherently peaceful? See Jacqueline Rose, *Mothers: An Essay on Love and Cruelty*, London, Faber & Faber, 2018.

²⁹ Bonnie Honig, *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*, op. cit., p. 21.

³⁰ Ursula Le Guin, *The Carrier Bag Theory*, op. cit., p. 34.

³¹ *Ibidem*, p. 34.

³² See, for instance, Bonnie Honig, *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*, op. cit., pp. 4–5.

³³ Ursula Le Guin, *The Carrier Bag Theory of Fiction*, op. cit., pp. 34–35.

³⁴ Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, op. cit., ; María C. Lugones et al., “Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for ‘the Woman’s Voice,’” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 6, no. 6, 1983, p. 577, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(83\)90019-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(83)90019-5); Sandra Lee Bartky, *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*, New York, Routledge, 1990, p. 25; Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton University Press, 2011, p. 58ff.

- Emejulu, A., *Fugitive Feminism*, London, Silver Press, 2022.
- Euripides, *The Bacchae* (trans. Nicholas Rudall), Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996.
- Foucault, M., *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison* (trans. Alan Sheridan), London, Penguin Books, 1991.
- Gilligan, C., *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Haraway, D. J., *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2016.
- Held, V., *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, USA, 2006.
- Honig, B., *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2021.
- Le Guin, U., "The Fisherwoman's Daughter," in *Space Crone*, London, Silver Press, 2023, pp. 61–96.
- , *The Carrier Bag Theory of Fiction*, n.p., Ignota, 2019.
- Lorde, A., *Sister Outsider*, London, Penguin UK, 2019.
- Lugones, M. C., and Spelman, E. V., "Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for 'the Woman's Voice'", *Women's Studies International Forum* 6, no. 6, 1983, pp. 573–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(83\)90019-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(83)90019-5).
- Marso, L. J., *Politics with Beauvoir: Freedom in the Encounter*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2017.
- Pitkin, H., "Justice: On Relating Private and Public", *Political Theory* 9, no. 3, 1981, pp. 327–52.
- Rose, J., *Mothers: An Essay on Love and Cruelty*, London, Faber & Faber, 2018.
- Soyinka, W., *The Bacchae of Euripides: A Communion Rite*, London, Norton, 1974.
- Stengers, Isabelle, *In Catastrophic Times: Resisting the Coming Barbarism* (trans. Andrew Goffey), n.p., Open Humanities Press, 2015.
- Young, I. M., *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton/Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2011 [1990]. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/rpub.91552>