The symmetrical pattern was a conscious aspect of the act of composition. By this I do not mean to suggest that all the elaborate examples of this pattern which scholars find in the Greek and Latin poets are also conscious — certainly some of them are the result of subconscious artistic instinct, probably some of them are more in the mind of the critic than they were in the mind of the poet (though I, for one, would be surprised if some of the symmetrical structures of Vergil and Horace were not quite intentional). And I would not wish to deny, of course, that there is a vast gulf between the background, cultural milieu, and artistic canons of an ancient poet (especially an oral poet) and a modern composer. Nonetheless, the fact is that modern composers do construct elaborate geometric patterns for their music and that they apparently consider these patterns significant factors in the organization and understanding of their music; it is a fact which may give some pause to those who find it hard to imagine that any poet would consciously work with such seemingly artificial patterns.

Finally, a word on why it is that this same pattern appears in two such diverse areas. I am next to certain that the parallel is not to be explained by any conscious emulation of antiquity on the part of our modern composers. These composers are clearly at times imitating each other, and ring-composition seems to be in vogue with them right now much as it is with classicists; but I see no evidence that they are imitating the classical poets. When Gunther Schuller, the distinguished American composer, spoke at Carleton in 1969, he gave a particularly explicit demonstration that the third movement of his Second String Quartet was consciously structured according to a complex and precise concentric pattern. When I confronted him afterwards with the similarity between this pattern and the geometric structures which critics were finding in so many classical poets, he was delighted to learn of the resemblance but denied any prior knowledge of it. Such, I expect, is the case with those other composers who have used ring-composition: they have embraced it not out of any desire to emulate ancient models but primarily because to them, as to those classical poets who used it also, it was in one way or another artistically useful and effective. And indeed, what is at least as remarkable as the ubiquity of ring-composition is its extraordinary adaptability and range of expression, qualities which have rendered it significant and productive to a great variety of artists working in many different times, places, and media. Those critics who feel that the complexities of ring-composition are too mechanical to have appealed to ancient poets must reckon with the fact that modern composers have consciously and enthusiastically responded to the lure of the same symmetries.

**EURIPIDES’ TROJAN WOMEN: ALL IS VANITY**

The purpose of this analysis of Euripides’ *Trojan Women* is to show that this play, although unorthodox in form, having no hero and hardly a plot (that is, it does not follow the canon which we, as post-Aristotelians have come to expect from Greek drama), is more than simply a moving series of events which dramatizes the sufferings of the defeated in war. The theme of the *Trojan Women* is the vanity of victory in war. It is a play in which the dramaturgy and the theme are inseparable, for its panoramic view intends to show all the unhappy effects of war, direct and indirect, both for the victor and victim.

Euripides’ *Trojan Women* has long been considered one of the greatest pieces of anti-war propaganda ever written. Even in the twentieth century, recent productions of the play have proven that it still affects its audience with the pity and horror of war, although it was written for an age long past, and contains distinct references to fifth century Athenian activities. Euripides, as every historical dramatist must do, wrote what was relevant to his time and his society, but he was a great enough poet to make even his propaganda universal. He makes the Trojan War part of a cycle, a pattern which his audiences, both then and now, have seen repeated in their own times; that is, he has made the Trojan War stand for every war. It is a pattern of war and the excesses which accompany it. For war is society’s great tragedy: victory is an illusion. Euripides brings in the gods to comment on the action, to show that the affront to civilization and to humanity does not pass unnoticed by the forces that have power in the universe. And to emphasize his theme, Euripides extends his play back in time and projects it into the future.

By extending the play back to the time when Troy was prosperous, through the words of Hecabe and the other Trojan slaves, and back to the cause of the war, through the words of Helen and Menelaus, Euripides shows the utter waste and folly of war. Of even more importance is the extension to the future, through the gods’ conversation and prophecy in the prologue, and...
through Cassandra's prophecies later in the play.¹ The knowledge of the coming destruction of the Greeks shows that there can be no real victory in war. Victory itself caused the excesses which the Greeks committed. The Greeks will suffer what they have wrought: violent and disgraceful death (Ajax and Agamemnon), loneliness and loss (Odysseus).

The play must be seen entirely through the prophecy made in the prologue. Each excess the Greeks commit, each that is reported will be revenged. Cassandra's prophecy confirms and extends that made by Poseidon and Athene. Euripides, more fully than any other writer on the Trojan War, insists on this cause and effect relationship — that the Greeks' excessive reaction to victory is the cause of their subsequent destruction.

It was a favorite practice of Euripides to equate the oppressed and the oppressor in one way or another. He did it in the Hecabe and in the Heraclidae through a lust for power and violence on the part of the sufferer. In the Heraclides, he made the hero the victim of his own heroism. In the Trojan Women the emphasis is different: the victim and victor are here equated through failure, death, loss. Euripides draws us into the drama, forces us to see the excessive suffering of the defeated, and through it to see the excessive arrogance of the conquerors. The pity of it all is matched by the folly of it all. Poseidon closes the prologue with three lines beginning moros de thneidon (fool of mortals, 95), after his and Athene's prophecy of the destruction of the Greek ships by fire. Near the end of the play, after we have seen all the suffering of the women and all the brutality of the Greeks, after the dead Astyanax is brought to her for burial, now that there can be no new woe, only the remembrance of the old, Hecabe repeats the sentiment, echoing the words of Poseidon, thneidon de moros (of mortals, fool, 1203).

The play opens after the war has been lost and won, after the sacrilege has been committed. All that is left is to inflict more suffering on the sufferers, to destroy the city already destroyed. The brutality and further sacrilege of the Greeks is purely gratuitous: their fate has already been

sealed (by the gods in the prologue). It is, however, proof that their fate is justified, that the rape of the priestess was not a unique act, but part of the pattern of the Greeks in victory, a pattern of arrogance and insensitivity in their dealings with gods and men.²

The victims, too, have already suffered as much and more than they can bear. Their city has been taken and plundered; their men have been killed; they are waiting to be taken into slavery. Further suffering is almost meaningless: the murder of Polyxena, the forced “marriage” of Cassandra, the brutal and senseless death of the child, the firing of the city built by the gods, reduced to ashes by the Greeks. All this is part of the pattern of the Greeks in victory, a pattern of arrogance and insensitivity in their dealings with gods and men.³

Victory brings with it arrogance, and arrogance brings death, degradation, ultimate defeat. Such, too, is the fate of Odysseus, the most evil of the Greeks, the master of deceit (283-87). He is the man who persuades the Greeks to kill the infant Astyanax, a senselessly brutal act, as even the Greek herald bears witness (713, 717, 721, 723). It is not the act of a hero to fear an innocent child. And again (as when they did not prevent Aias’ hybris), all the Greeks are involved; all were persuaded by Odysseus (721). But Odysseus will learn what fear is (431-33). He will expiate his ten years of violence at Troy by ten years of wandering (433-34). For the desolation he has left behind him, his reward will be to come alone to his fatherland (434); he will lose everything. So much will he suffer, that the sufferings of the Trojans will seem like gold to him (432-33). To crown it all, he will descend alive into Hades, and return to find ten thousand ills at home (442-43). This is the reward for the man of deceit, a bitter and deceitful wandering and a return to a home in chaos. Hecabe’s cry of woe at learning the name of her master (278) is the introduction to this prophecy, but (as was the case with the prophecy of the gods) we learn later how justified his fate really is to be. After the announcement that the child must die, there is no more for the chorus to worry and wonder about their destination as slaves (197-234, 292-93). It is painful, but a respite from worse pain.

The Greeks will suffer. Their ships will burn from Zeus’ fire wielded by Athene, as they have set fire to Troy (80-81). Aias will suffer shipwreck and all the Greeks a stormy voyage home (77-94), for their violence and sacrilege in the temple of Athene. Furthermore, to “hunt Helen” and wage war on the Trojans, they left their own homes in disorder (368-69). First, Agamemnon killed his daughter for his brother’s bad wife (370-71). They came to Troy and died (375), and did not see their children again (377); they left their wives as widows and their parents childless (379-81), all for one woman, one love (368-69). Thus, during the war the Greeks suffered as much as the Trojans, and they left their families to lives of emptiness. Besides Agamemnon, Neoptolemus is mentioned specifically as having troubles at home; his grandfather Peleus has been driven out by a usurper (1126-28). But there is much more. Agamemnon, for his arrogant behavior, will suffer a degrading death at the hands of his wife. His taking of Cassandra is made the specific cause of his own downfall and the ruin of his house (357-60). Aeschylus, in his Agamemnon, had built up a case damning to Agamemnon, in which the “marriage” to Cassandra was only one of a series of crimes leading to his death. Euripides, through Cassandra’s prophecy, makes her the cause of the whole series of events from his death (359) to the matricide (363). He will die as he has lived, this general of the Greeks, who thought that he was doing a mighty deed (446-47, kakos kakōs taphēsei, an evil man, you will be evilly buried). For all his accomplishments at Troy, his reward will be a secret burial at night. The end of the great man will be that he will lie in darkness; his deeds are not worthy of the daylight (446): oh fool of mortals. No honor goes to the great king of men — such is the futility of war.

²See O’Neill, op. cit. 320, on victory as the corruptor of the Greeks.
³See O’Neill, op. cit. 320, on victory as the corruptor of the Greeks.
mache had voiced the opinion that death is preferable to a life without hope (630-31, 634ff.): death at least is a release from the degradation and endless sorrow she knows she must suffer as Neoptolemus' wife. But to Hecabe, Astyanax represents a glimmer of hope, not hope for revenge, but hope that the city might one day be rebuilt again. For his sake, Hecabe urged Andromache to bear her agony (701-05). It was the Greeks who feared revenge at his hands. The Greek herald appears (709), in answer to Hecabe's words, to dash this small hope. Then it is only to gain burial for the child that Andromache must endure. The Greeks will suffer. Revenge will come, but not from the Trojans; it comes from the gods and from themselves. There is some justice in the scheme of things: a policy of violence is ultimately self-destructive.

Menelaus, more than any other Greek, symbolizes the emptiness and folly of the war. He enters exulting that this is the day he will get his hands on Helen (860-63). Ten years of fighting and toil, and this is the prize. He cannot even decide why the war was fought; he claims that it was not for the sake of the woman, but against the man who stole her, in spite of what people think (864-66). He is obviously on the defensive; there seems to be little difference between these two causes. Nor can he decide what is to be done with her; to slay her or to take her back. Whichever it is to be, there can be little doubt that the expedition was futile. The debate over Helen is the center of the play. The suffering has reached its climax with the taking of the child from Andromache; all that is left is to bury the child, gather the women for the voyage home, and set fire to the city that is no more (ouketi Troia, 99), so that the Greeks will leave nothing behind them, except the bodies of the slain on either side. This debate takes us back to the causes of all the present unhappiness, and it considers the question of justice. Justice is at the heart of the play, a kind of justice at least: that men will pay for their crimes, because they will always go a step too far. To understand this, it is necessary that we know what is to become of the Greeks (as we do know from the prologue). The question of Helen, however, is left unresolved, which in itself makes us feel most strongly the emptiness of the victory. What justice can there be for Helen? How could the death of one woman pay for the lives of the many who have died (cf. 879)? Hecabe warns Menelaus to beware of falling into the trap of her beauty (891), and his mixed feelings show that he is still very susceptible. The expectation of her entrance into the play and her guilt have been built up from the beginning. Witnesses of her guilt are Poseidon (35), Cassandra (368-69), Andromache (764-73) -- each adding to the case against her by his own suffering or loss. Andromache calls her the daughter of the Fury (768). Helen is the second avenging fury; Cassandra called herself one of three (457). Finally, Menelaus comes to condemn her, with the support of the entire Greek army. And Hecabe speaks for the prosecution. But Helen feels no guilt. She thrusts the cause of the war upon the gods, speaking almost as if she had invented the story of the judgment of Paris to free herself from guilt. She blames Menelaus and the Trojans, but never herself. We know that she is wrong: the gods have already condemned her. The glory that she claims to have brought to the Greeks will be turned to ashes and nothing. On the human and rational level, Hecabe proves Helen's guilt. Helen has been stored with the Trojan slaves (endikōs, justly, says Poseidon, 35). But she is no suffering slave. If we are to credit Hecabe's words, she comes before her captor only after taking careful attention with her looks, so as to make a fair entrance (1022-28); not as a suppliant slave, but as a beautiful woman, confident in her beauty and guiltlessness. What good would it do to kill such a woman, who feels no remorse, who alone suffers nothing? Menelaus will put her into another ship, though somewhat reluctantly (1052-54). His questioning (1050) shows either that he does not realize his danger or that he does not want to be parted from her; most probably the latter, to judge from Hecabe's remark (1051).

Helen takes us back to the cause of the war, and back to the time before the war when all was well. Hecabe's remembrance of things past makes the present suffering more poignant. Throughout, the pathos is heightened by reminiscence of the former glory and prosperity of the Trojans, and by the hopes they had in their children. Equally pathetic and ironic is the attitude of the Greeks — their desire to sail home to their wives and children. We know what they do not know: that all is not well at home, that the fair voyage they are all waiting for is not to be granted.

Though the gods are questioned, again it is

---

4For the theme of hope and the loss of hope, see D. J. Conacher, Euripidean Drama (Toronto 1967) 139, 142, 145.

5Otherwise, Conacher, op. cit. 136: "Clearly viewed, there is little justice in this play or in its prologue."
ironic: for we know the plan of the gods from the prologue. Cassandra may question her god, but we know that her prophecies are true. Hecabe may question the usefulness of prayer, but we know that their will be revenge. Poseidon never deserted Troy until there was nothing left, and then it is with sadness and the sense of loss that pervades the whole play, that he leaves behind the city he built and loved. Nor is it Poseidon who seeks revenge, but the very gods who supported the Greek effort; for it is the Greeks who bring about their own destruction. Not even their own gods can support them any longer. Athene is the last of the three avenging furies to accompany the Greeks homeward (cf. 457).

All hope is gone for both sides. The Trojans at least have the glory of having fought and died bravely to defend their homes, their wives and children (386-87). The Greeks have nothing. Just as, at the end of the play, they have left nothing behind them at Troy, so they have nothing ahead of them but suffering and death. So works justice. So do the excessive reaction to victory, the gratuitous violence and the insensitivity to human suffering, contain the seeds of self-destruction.

That Euripides intended to win the favor of his audience, by his references to Athens as the best place for slavery, I find extremely difficult to believe. Rather, he brings the play closer to the audience by involving Athens; but the reference is surely ironic (205-209, 218-19). Euripides is forcing his audience to join in the drama, not as the sufferer, but as the tormenter. He is forcing them to look at their own behavior; indeed, Athens practices this policy of murder and enslavement. It is hard not to think of the incident at Melos of the preceding year (416 B.C.), as reported by Thucydides (5.84-117), and of the excessive behavior, of the cruelty, the injustice, the suffering, the enslavement of women and children, and the slaughtering of the men—all the atrocities that accompany a war of aggression. It is hard not to think of the opening of Thucydides' next book, which shows where the policy of excess leads. No doubt Euripides loved his city; but he deplored her policy of excess, a policy which, as he saw it, could lead only to more violence and bloodshed, and ultimate self-destruction. For violence is always self-destructive (a theme which Euripides treats in the Medea and in the Heracles). In the Trojan Woman, Euripides showed the folly of war and the emptiness of victory, and he made a prediction to his own people, which history confirmed. The play is universal, and because of its universality, it is always timely.

Syracuse, Italy

C. A. E. Luschnig

THE RHETORICAL TYRANT IN ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY: SALLUST, Livy and Tacitus

I

It is a well-known fact that the stock tyrant of the declamations lies in the background of many a portrait of a Roman tyrant in Roman historiography of the late Republic and early Empire, e.g. Tacitus' Tiberius. However, there exists no study which clearly defines in detail what elements in these portraits can be directly traced to the rhetorical tyrant. It is the purpose of this article to examine this problem primarily from the point of view of verbal influence and also to note other elements which can be shown to have the rhetorical tyrant as their source. The method employed in this study will be first to trace the development of the rhetorical tyrant as a popular stereotype, then to establish the existence of a vocabulary of terms descriptive of the tyrant's characteristic behavior and originating in the rhetorical schools, and finally to examine the use of these terms by Sallust, Livy and Tacitus in describing tyrannical behavior. Thus this study, by demonstrating the almost formulaic use of this vocabulary of terms by these three historians, will hopefully reveal what elements they have derived from the common source of the rhetorical tyrant.

II

The tyrant as a stock character first became well-known at Rome through the agency, not of the rhetorical schools but of the theater. Undoubtedly the dramatic tyrant represented Rome's first extensive contact with the type of the Greek

6 For opposing views, see Conacher op. cit. 135, 137, 139-140, 142; T. B. L. Webster, The Tragedies of Euripides (London 1967) 180.

7 But, for the opposite opinion, see H. D. Westlake, "Euripides, Troades 205-229," Mnemosyne 6 (1953) 190.

8 On the contemporary references, both to the Melian incident and to the Sicilian campaign, see Conacher, op. cit. 137, n. 17; Pertusi, op. cit. 253; Westlake, op. cit. 181.

9 See B. Walker, The Annals of Tacitus (Manchester 1952) 204.