CERES

Vol. II/1990

PAPERS
OF THE
THIRD ANNUAL
GRADUATE
STUDENTS'
CLASSICAL
CONFERENCE

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
MAY 4-5, 1990

CERES

Vol. II 1990

Journal of the Graduate Students' Classical Conference

Table of Contents

Preface

The Graduate Students' Classical Conference has now completed its third successive year. The intention of establishing such a conference was to provide graduate students with an opportunity to present their work to an audience of their peers outside of their own university. The creation of the journal CERES to publish that work was the next logical step. Because of the quality of scholarship consistently presented at the conference it is justifiably deserving that this work reach a wider audience still. Moreover, the experience of publication can only serve to benefit graduate students in their future careers.

As coordinator for 1990 I take pleasure in the success of the conference. I consider the time spent in the organization of the conference and in the compilation of CERES amply rewarded both by the experiences themselves and by the new acquaintances made during the course of the endeavour. Because of the positive response voiced by all participants in the two years that I have been involved with the G.S.C.C. I hope that the Graduate Students' Classical Conference will continue and prosper in the years to come.

Richard Levis
Editor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have contributed to the planning and execution of this year's conference. In particular, David Marko gave his time and energy both in preparation for the conference and the production of Ceres. His graphic designs were responsible for the notification posters and the cover of Ceres. Steve Robinson and Josée Sabourin are among the other people whose time and suggestions helped make this year's conference take place.

The Graduate Students' Classical Conference Committee would again like to express their gratitude for financial support from the School of Graduate Studies and Research at Queen's; the Ontario Classical Association; and, the Graduate Student Society at Queen's.

Above all generous thanks must be given to the students who took the time and made the effort to attend the Graduate Students' Classical Conference of 1990; the benefits of this effort the readers now have before them.

Richard Levis

Amores 3.12.11-12: A Couplet that Forges a Link between the Amores and the Ars Amatoria.

me lenone placet, duce me perductus amator,
ianua per nostras est adaperta manus.

These lines at Amores 3.12.11-12, in which Ovid, as poet-lover, now describes himself as the leno who has brought lovers to Corinna's door, are perhaps the defining link between the Amores and the Ars Amatoria. Here Ovid declares that it is because of his ability as a poet and through his own "little books" that Corinna has been made known and become available to others (7) just as earlier his verses had won her for himself (cum pulchrae dominae nostri placuere libelli [Am. 3.8.5]). This being so, Ovid utilizes what worked well in dealing with Corinna in the Amores and puts it to good use in the Ars in order to direct others who wish to play the same game of love. Recollections, therefore, of the Amores can be found throughout the Ars not only in thematic content, metre and style, but also in persona as Ovid takes on the role of leno behind the protective screen of praeceptor.

Ovid's experiences (whether real or not is of little importance) were for all to see in the love-elegies. Early in the Amores, Ovid begs the girl with whom he claims to have fallen in love, at least to allow herself to be loved by him so that she may be the fertile subject matter for his songs (Am.1.3.19); reading this, we understand that his experiences with her are to be put to good use. These love-elegies were then used as the foundation for his didactic work, the Ars Amatoria, of which he says at the beginning of the Ars: usus opus movet hoc (A.A.1.29).

That this was so, that the elegies in the Amores were a major factor in the Ars, is immediately apparent to the reader (in fact literally visible at first glance) by Ovid's use of the elegiac couplet for his didactic creation. This was the first time, so far as we know, that the elegiac metre was used in the didactic genre and consequently it must have had a significant purpose: its purpose was to emphasize the importance that the Amores had on the new work. What we see is Ovid making use of the elegiac couplet in the same way that an opponent may turn a rival's weapon around and use it against its original possessor -in other words, Ovid uses the elegiac metre to mock the elegiac genre. Ovid has already acknowledged this kind of verbal warfare in Amores 3.1.37f. in which Elegia taunts Tragedy with the irony that she, Tragedy, has had to deign to use the elegiac metre in order to urge Ovid to

begin writing a greater work, a work which automatically acknowledges the fact that it would definitely not be in elegiac couplets.

In this same poem (Am.3.1), Ovid explains how it was possible for himself, as a poet, to become a leno through the medium of his elegiac verses, and this he does by depicting the link that he alleges to exist between himself, Elegia, and the Amores. Ovid describes Elegia as the lena of Venus (44): Venus is Love, and it is because of Elegia's instruction that lovers have learned to deceive guards and to tear down the barriers that separate them from each other(43-58). Also, it is Elegia, the lena of Love, who teaches Ovid what he knows about love and deceit, and the ways in which he may win Corinna: at this point in his affair with Corinna, Ovid owes it to Elegia that the girl now seeks him (59-60). It is this knowledge which is contained in the Amores, and it is through this knowledge as well as his ability as a poet that he unwittingly becomes Corinna's leno. And so, just as Elegia once taught the mother of Amor the sophisticated pleasures of love now Ovid, at the beginning of the Ars, claims to be the teacher of Amor himself (A.A.1.17) - a play on words[1] which in the one instance provides Ovid with his references (as teacher of Amor) and in the other announces his new role in his new work, that of praeceptor amoris. This role we now see as not only that of praeceptor but also that of leno, but whereas he became Corinna's leno unwittingly in the Amores, in the Ars he is fully aware of what he is doing.

In the Ars when he declares that it is experience that moves his work, he is echoing the words that he put into the mouth of the lena in Amores 1.8. Here the old woman says that she learned what she now knows from long experience (..usu mihi cognita longo [105]). We are not surprised then when we find that Ovid re-uses in the Ars many of the precepts found in this elegy as they form a natural resource for him to use in his character as praeceptor or leno. But they form only a small part of the rules of conduct that Ovid delivers in these poems, and the greater proportion by far come from almost every area of the Amores.[2] In the Ars we can see that Ovid re-employs in some way nearly all the themes and situations, both large and small, that he used in the Amores. Although the books of the Ars can be read for their own sake as completely independent poetry, the enjoyment of them and the appreciation of their literary sophistication is increased if they are read with the Amores in mind, recognising how Ovid has transformed the pursuits and performances of the elegiac lover in the Amores into the precepts of the handbook. In the Ars version of

---

[1] Patricia Watson, *Studies in Ovid's Ars Amatoria* Diss. University of Toronto, 1979 63.

[2] I have discussed this topic in some detail in my thesis: *Ovid's Amores and Ars Amatoria: some shared themes*. University of Calgary, 1989.

the Circus theme in Book 1 (135-62), for example, Ovid quite obviously used for its base Amores 3.2 which was stripped down to its fundamental points of persuasion for him to use in his role as praeceptor. These components were then presented as helpful precepts for other men in similar circumstances to exploit for their own advantage. That Ovid used the poem in the Amores as the groundwork for the Ars version is evident from the number of similarities between them, and the re-use of this particular theme also indicates another point that must be noted in the Amores: that many of the elegies are in part - and on occasion almost entirely - didactic in tone and therefore eminently suitable for re-use in the Ars.

Ovid also refers to the Amores both directly and indirectly throughout the Ars. A direct reference is made to the Amores when, in Book 3 of the Ars, he advises women to improve themselves by reading and reciting good literature, naming his Amores in particular: deve tribus libris, titulo quos signat AMORUM, elige (343). This example is unique in that the Amores are specified and named. The next example is much more typical in that it requires the reader to remember, along with the poet, a situation that had been described earlier in the Amores. In Book 2 of the Ars Ovid looks back to a particular incident in Amores 1.7,[3] an elegy in which Ovid tells of an occasion when he was angry with his mistress and, in his rage, struck her and made her cry, but which in the Ars he recalls lightly claiming that as far as he remembers he had merely messed up her hair (me memini iratum dominae turbasse capillos [A.A.2.169]). In the Amores, the situation is described with elegiac fervour even though subject to Ovid's wry humour at the end, but in the Ars, in his role as praeceptor amoris, Ovid reflects upon the incident with cool detachment. He acknowledges, somewhat cynically, that Corinna had in fact taken advantage of him by allowing him to believe that he had torn her dress in anger, a fact that he considers to be most probably untrue but all part of this sexual pastime and for which he had to pay : nec puto nec sensi tunicam laniasse, sed ipsa/dixerat, et pretio est illa redempta meo (A.A.2.171-2).

Love is a game full of ritual in the Ars and Ovid as praeceptor - or leno - specifies the rules and manoeuvres. The tone in these poems is nearly always light, and wit and humour pervade the whole work. But these are not new elements in Ovid's love-poetry. In the Amores we see the origin of the idea that love is a game, and indeed in Amores 2.19 it is explicitly, and didactically, revealed as such. Here Ovid lays out the rules of the sport and the hurdles to be overcome in the playing of it, not only to the girl he has fallen in love with, but to her husband as well. An easy seduction, after all, offers no challenge, no

---

[3] For a discussion of this see also: H.Fraenkel, *Ovid. A Poet Between Two Worlds* (Berkely and Los Angeles, 1945) 53-4.

excitement and for Ovid this is unimaginative, tedious (3). On the other hand, success must be possible. Not for him the long fever of frustrated love as it was so often with the other elegists, Tibullus and Propertius. Ovid's game has a conclusion, a goal to be reached; the intricacies that surround the sexual diversion remain, for the most part, within his control and even when Ovid is vociferously lamenting his locked-out status as in Amores 1.4, the suggestion is that this is a temporary situation and that he will, after all, see the girl on his own terms the next day (70).[4]

Ovid, in fact, is often seen to be undercutting the rules of love-elegy, treating it largely as a literary, poetic amusement. Amores 2.19, as mentioned above, is an obvious example, an entire elegy written in an outrageous and humorous vein; but he frequently closes a poem with a couplet that undercuts the seriousness of all that has gone before, which then changes our original perception of the whole elegy. For example, the elegy on Corinna's hair (Amores 1.14): in this poem Ovid claims to be righteously angry at his mistress for senselessly ruining her beautiful hair which is now falling out and leaving her bald. In the last couplet, however, Ovid reveals that the matter is in actual fact of little importance: when he tells Corinna to stop crying and to pull herself together as her hair will soon grow back, we are forced to realize that we have been taken in by the exaggerated intensity of the poem; it is really nothing to worry about.

In the Amores, although we often see Ovid humorously undercutting the intensity of elegy, he still claims to be the ardent elegiac lover, a man who can be wounded or made angry by his mistress's infidelity or cruelty. In the Ars, however, he is in complete control of his emotions. He is cool and detached, somewhat cynical and amused. He is a man who has indulged his passions and in the process has learned something about the art of love-making and the psychology of women. He finds it diverting to inform others of what he has learned of love and intrigue so that they may take advantage of his experience and may also become skilled in the art of love and deceit.

Some discussion of chronology and possible dating has to be dealt with here because of the influence that the Amores had on the development of the Ars Amatoria. Dates can be postulated for the Amores from references and facts within the poems that extend from 21-20 B.C.[5] down to possibly 7B.C. Amores 3.9 must almost

---

[4] On *cras*, see J.C.McKeown, *Ovid: Amores*. Volume 2 (Leeds, 1989), 102.

[5] Ovid evidently began to read some of the *Amores* in public when he was a very young man (*Tr.* 4.10.57f.) and these poems may have been published within a first volume of the first edition that came out *ca* 21-20 B.C. This would have been after Propertius' third book was published if it is true that *Amores* 1.2,

certainly have been written in or just after 19 B.C. as it is concerned with the death of Tibullus. Amores 2.10, which is composed as a reply to Graecinus, who has apparently been offering his opinions on matters of love to Ovid, cannot have been written before 17 B.C. Graecinus was ten years younger than Ovid so it would in reality be more appropriate to date the poem considerably later.[6] In Amores 1.14 Ovid refers to Corinna wearing a wig made from hair taken from captive female Sygambrians. This was a German tribe that was finally defeated by the Romans in 8 B.C. The word triumphatae is used in line 46 and if this is to be read literally,[7] this poem would have been written around 7 B.C. when Tiberius celebrated his German triumph, or perhaps even later.

In Amores 2.18 there is evidently a reference to the Ars Amatoria: quod licet, aut artes teneri profitemur Amoris- / ei mihi, praeceptis urgeor ipse meis! (19-20). The tone of the lines suits an allusion to the Ars better than a reference to the Amores, firstly because Ovid refers to himself being driven on by his own precepts (experience, after all, inspires his work in the Ars [1.29]), and secondly because, as noted by Hollis, the word profitemur (19) points to a more sustained teaching role than that found in the Amores.[8] As it is very likely that Ovid was already writing - and reading to friends - parts of the Ars before the Amores were finished, he is therefore able to make a reference to the Ars within the Amores - the work was already under way.

Certain facts are also mentioned in the Ars Amatoria which allow for dating such as the mock sea-battle put on by the Emperor Augustus as part of the festivites that surrounded the dedication of a temple in 2 B.C.[9] (A.A. 1.171), and there is a reference to the young Gaius Caesar who is about to set out on his expedition to the East (A.A. 1.181) which took place in 1 B.C. But this does not mean that parts of the Ars could not have been written even earlier. In the Tristia, Ovid claims, in fact, that he wrote the Ars as a iuvenis (Tr. 2.543) which would fit in much better with an earlier start than 2 B.C.

1.1 and 1.3 are humorously exploiting Propertius 3.1., 3.3 and 3.2 respectively (see J.C.McKeown, Ovid: *Amores* Volume 1 [Leeds, 1987] 80).

6 For information regarding identity and age of Graecinus, see: J.C.McKeown, *ibid*, 80.

7 R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford,1978) 5. Syme notes that Ovid "like Tacitus, knew [that *triumphatae*] was a strong and solid word" and that "the only other places where [Ovid] employs [*triumphatus*] confirm."

8 A.S.Hollis, *Ovid. Ars Amatoria. Book 1* (Oxford, 1977) xii.

9 Cf. A.S.Hollis, *ibid*, 64.

The Ars was almost certainly issued in two editions and it does seem likely that A.A. 1 and 2 were written originally as a self-contained unit, and that there was a considerable gap between the writing of the original first two books of the Ars and Book 3[10]. When the third book of the Ars Amatoria came out, the first two books must have been published again as a second edition with no changes made except for adding the new couplet[11]. This second edition of the Ars, now including Ars 3, must, admittedly, have been published reasonably close to the year 8 A.D. for the Ars Amatoria to be used as a plausible excuse for Ovid's exile.

As the date for the first edition of the Amores is now determined to extend to around 7 B.C. at least, and the Ars can be dated to as early a time as 2 B.C. - and there is no reason to suppose that he could not have been writing some parts even earlier than that - it would seem possible, as already noted, that Ovid could well have started on the Ars before he had completely finished dealing with the Amores. The Amores had a profound influence on the Ars and this influence was undoubtedly reinforced not only while Ovid was writing the final poems of the Amores, but also while he was re-reading and re-evaluating that work before the publication of its second edition in three books.[12]

To sum up: in Amores 3.12, Ovid declares that he has become Corinna's leno, that because of his ability as a poet Corinna's fame has spread abroad so that she is now vendibilis, a thing for sale. In the Ars, Ovid officially takes on the role of praeceptor amoris along with its underlying character of leno, and, like the lena of Amores 1.8, he informs his audience that it is his experience that provides the foundation for this work; to prove this, themes and motifs from the Amores are re-used throughout the Ars - not by accident or through laziness but in order to prove what he has said.

Finally, but very importantly, in the Amores Ovid not only refers to himself as a leno but he also points out that Elegia claims to have been the lena of Venus; in the Ars he skillfully

---

[10] *quondam* (*A.A.*3.811), when used specifically to date an incident, refers to an occasion in the past, as in "once (upon a time)".

[11] Even though it was remarkably "gauche" of him to leave in the passage which predicted that Gaius would celebrate a triumph (*A.A*1.213ff.) since Gaius died in 4 A.D. Charles E.Murgia, "The date of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* 3." *AJPh* 107 (1987) 86. The ancient poets, however, did not always tidy up their poetry when history changed.

[12] Ovid makes no mention in the *Tristia* (4.10.61f.) of editing by means of replacement as well as excision. While this does not prove that no additions were made, it does mean that a very good case must be made for regarding any poem as an addition.

joins these two concepts together and writes as a leno in the lena of love's elegiac couplets. We can now see how the couplet in Amores 3.12.(11-12) can be viewed as the link that joins together the Amores and the Ars: Ovid's experiences in the world of elegy are put to work in the didactic genre and whereas he was a leno for one in the Amores he becomes the leno for many in the Ars Amatoria, advising both men and women on how to please and deceive.

University of Calgary Naomi Lacey

The Identification of Aeneas and Augustus, Turnus and Antonius

The identification which is often made between Aeneas and Augustus has determined, to a large extent, that any "political" interpretation of Book 12 must reconcile Aeneas' character with his killing of Turnus. In order to address the problem of whether the ending of the Aeneid may be a criticism of Augustus, the characters of Aeneas and Turnus must be analysed with regard to literary precedents. If it can be demonstrated that there are elements in the characters of Aeneas and Turnus which are not found in the epic tradition then a reader must consider whether the identification which is made between Aeneas and Augustus and Turnus and Antonius is valid and whether it is used by Vergil to express a condemnation of Augustus.

Some recent critics of the Aeneid have examined the problem of the extent to which the character of Aeneas may "reflect" Augustus himself. As a result, discussions of Aeneas' character, which have centred upon possible allusions to Augustus, seem to be cautious in the terms chosen to express the relationship between the two figures. Some scholars have argued that there is a direct correlation between the character of Aeneas and Augustus. Thus Bloom: "Though no Achilles, Aeneas pragmatically is quite frightening, and really as benign as the Emperor Augustus, his contemporary model" (1987, p. 5). Pomathios also argues that Augustus served as a model for Aeneas: "...Enee rassemble en lui bien des traits, reels ou idealises, du Prince" (1987, p. 243) a view shared by West, who considers Aeneas the "prototype" of Augustus (1974, p. 29). Gransden's view that the character of Aeneas is a "...prefiguration of Augustus at Actium" (1984, p. 206) seems to have been stated earlier by Quinn: "If the Aeneas of Book 4 suggested Julius Caesar or Mark Antony, the Aeneas of Book 12 points plainly to Augustus; and the portrait is hardly a flattering one" (1968, p. 54).

Another group of scholars also feels that there is some correlation between Aeneas and Augustus, but they express themselves with less certitude. Syme argues, "The poem is not an allegory: but no contemporary could fail to detect in Aeneas a foreshadowing of Augustus" (1932, pp. 462, 463). This view has been restated most recently by Cairns: "...the pair are only to be seen as analogues rather than equated. But any repeated attribute of Aeneas must to some extent have reflected on Augustus" (1989, p. 4). Camps has also suggested a parallel between certain elements

of their characters : "It may be, therefore, that in outline, the character of Aeneas in the Aeneid is in fact drawn from Virgil's conception of that of Octavian- Augustus" (1969, p. 143), a view shared by both Griffin, who calls Aeneas a "pattern" of Augustus (Oxford, 1984, p. 214), and Wistrand, who recognizes a "correspondence" between Aeneas and Augustus (1984, p. 195).

The association which is believed to exist between Turnus and Antonius seems to be based on two premises: firstly, since Aeneas is equated with Augustus, it follows that Turnus is to be equated with Antonius and, secondly, since Augustus was victorious at Actium, then the poem's ending must somehow allude to the elimination of Augustus' opponent (cf. Gransden, 1984, p. 206, and Otis, 1963, p. 317). Quinn has argued that the character of Turnus cannot be interpreted solely with reference to Antonius on the basis of perceived similarities between Aeneas and Augustus: "Any thoroughgoing equation between Aeneas and Augustus, or between the war through which Aeneas led his people and the civil war, is obviously impossible" (1968, p. 54). Farron, however, suggests that Vergil intended the death of Turnus to be an overt criticism of the role played by Augustus in defeating Antonius: "So Aeneas' last act is the killing of a defenceless Italian after the war is over. This would have reminded the readers of nothing more than the savagery displayed by Octavian during the civil wars, especially the proscription" (1981, p. 103). Farron's argument that Vergil attempted to make the poem's ending as brutal as possible through references to contemporary events cannot be accepted since he does not provide an adequate reason as to how the historical roles of Antonius and Augustus are reflected in Aeneas' killing of Turnus.

It is clear that there are in the Aeneid certain similarities between the figures of Aeneas and Augustus (cf. Wistrand, 1984, p. 195). Both have a divine parent, the life of both is projected as being devoted to the fulfilment of a divine mission, and both are destined to be gods in heaven (cf. Aen. 1.287 ff., and Georg. 1.24 ff.). Aeneas is the ancestor of the Julian race and the founder of the Roman nation; Augustus is the present descendant of Aeneas' line and as champion of the Roman state will issue in a new period of prosperity (cf. Aen. 6.792 ff., and Georg. 1.26 ff.). In addition to these similarities, there is also an epic layer to Aeneas' character, derived from Homer's Iliad and Odyssey. An examination of the epic features present in Aeneas' character must be made in order to discover traits not found in the Homeric heroes, but which may possibly allude to Augustus.

As an epic hero, Aeneas is modelled in the first half of the Aeneid, upon Homer's Odysseus and Apollonius' Jason, and upon Homer's Achilles in the second. The sea voyages of Odysseus, and the similar sea perils faced by the crew of the Argo in Apollonius Rhodius, find parallels in Aeneas' wanderings after Troy's destruction. Whereas the mythological features in Books 1-6 recall

the fantastic elements of the Odyssey, such as Aeolus (Aen. 1.50 ff; Od. 10.1 ff), Scylla (Aen. 1.200; Od. 12.85 ff.), the Cyclops (Aen. 1.201; Od. 9.106 ff.) and the Underworld (Aen. Book 6; Od. Book 11), the figure of Dido, in the romantic courtship scenes of Books 3 and 4, recalls Medea in Apollonius Rhodius (cf. most recently, Cairns, 1989, p. 134 ff.). The final six Books of the Aeneid, with Aeneas' arrival at Latium and the war which ensues, are modelled upon the battle scenes and episodes of military valour of Homer's Iliad. By placing the "Odyssey half" first and the "Iliad half" second, however, Vergil creates a narrative tension, through Aeneas' characterization, which may explain the perceived harshness of Turnus' death. When the reader approaches the battle scenes in the Aeneid, he/she is not ready to recall either the war scenes of the Iliad or Aeneas' warrior past in which he was described as the equal of Hector (Il. 6.77-79; 17.513; cf. Aen. 11.283-92) and second only to Achilles in military prowess (Il. 20.332-39), since in the first half of the poem Aeneas was portrayed as a man curisque ingentibus aeger (Aen. 1.208). In the words of Clausen, "...he seems to have become an efficient Homeric killer. We hardly recognize, in the fields of Latium, the man we knew, or thought we knew" (1987, p. 90). The literary parallels which a reader recognizes between the characters of Achilles and Aeneas are also evident between Achilles and Turnus. In Book 6, the Sybil warns Aeneas of the future menace of Turnus and refers to him as alius Latio iam partus Achilles (89). The equation of Turnus and Achilles is also made by Turnus himself: hic etiam inventum Priamo narrabis Achillem (9.742). It is only with Book 11, however, that the equation of Turnus and Hector is introduced and consistently sustained until the end of the poem (11.438). Also, from this point onwards, Achilles becomes ostensibly the model for Aeneas' characterization, a characterization which may also involve Augustus. In order to understand the significance of Vergil's borrowing from Homer in the episode of Turnus' death, it is necessary to undertake both an analysis of Aeneas' and Turnus' characters in light of Homeric precedents, and a discussion of the narrative parallels between Iliad, Book 22, in which Hector's death occurs, and Aeneid, Book 12.

In the Iliad, it is only after Patroclus' death that Achilles returns to the battlefield to avenge the death of his friend (Il. Book 19). After many acts of valour, Achilles finally confronts Hector in a duel and slays him (Il. Book 22). The mutilation of Hector's corpse and a scene of reconciliation between Achilles and Priam follow and the poem ends on a note of sadness for the suffering of man (Il. 24.529 ff.) (cf. Griffin, 1980, p. 39 ff.). Although he/she sympathizes with Hector, it never occurs to the reader to consider whether his death could have been avoided, or whether the poem could have ended any other way, as he/she does at the end of the Aeneid. Different aims are present in Vergil's narration of Turnus' death. In contrast to the touching reconciliation scene between Priam and Achilles, "There is [in the Aeneid] no humane aftermath of the killing, in which Aeneas can

come to terms, as Achilles does in the Iliad, with the survivors, the world, and himself" (Griffin, London, 1984, p. 124). On the one hand, the narrative demands that Aeneas pursue Turnus in order to avenge the death of Pallas and to follow the "heroic" example of Achilles; on the other, the narrative also demands that the reader accept Turnus' death with reluctance and see it as something as tragic as Hector's death (cf. Griffin, 1985, p. 195). After the killing of Turnus, there remains the feeling that his death "could" have been avoided and that he did not "deserve" to die. The ancient commentator Servius has stressed the ambiguous moral position of Aeneas as he is about to slay Turnus: "From pietas he wants to spare him, from pietas he has to kill him, and both enhance his glory."[1]

Modern opinion has been divided on the question of the "moral correctness" of Aeneas' actions. Before discussing various views it should be noted that the nature of each character's actions is presented in a morally ambiguous form, as Gordon Williams notes: "The moral dilemma on both sides is carefully presented in its most extreme form. Both men's acts are made perfectly understandable, but neither is morally unscathed...it is impossible to make a clear cut distinction between them" (1983, p. 92). For the sake of convenience, the various arguments may be divided into schools of thought. The "pro-Aeneas" school argues that the poem ends with Aeneas as a moral victor, and that his killing of Turnus is sanctioned by Heaven: "Aeneas never is a mere soldier who must stick to the code of honor, but he is also, as the destined courier of the fated mission that will lead to Augustus' fated rule, a human being qualified as a judge (and even executioner)" (Stahl, 1981, p. 169; cf. Lyne, 1983, p. 198). This school also sees Aeneas as a moral victor who was fulfilling an obligation to Evander in killing Turnus: "But Turnus cannot be spared, however moving his appeal, for there is the pressing emotional debt that Aeneas owes to Evander, a debt of gratitude originally, now become with Pallas' death a sacred obligation..." (Clausen, 1987, p. 100; cf. Gordon Williams, 1983, p. 223). Perhaps the clearest statement of the supposed moral superiority of Aeneas and moral deficiency of Turnus is that of Otis: "In one sense Aeneas is the 'good' opposite of the 'bad' Turnus: he is pietas and humanitas versus impietas and violentia" (1963, p. 392). This equation cannot, of course, be applied consistently to the actions of either character since it is too restrictive and seems to lóse precision by its very conciseness.

The "pro-Turnus" school condemns Aeneas' brutality and sympathizes with the unfortunate Turnus: "This is what years of suffering and painful training in self-discipline in the service of a great ideal have come to: the vengeful slaying of a fallen enemy" says Little (1970, p. 74); Farron claims that "Vergil contrived to make Aeneas' killing of Turnus as harsh as possible" (1981, p. 97); Sforza that "The hatred of Virgil towards the prime ancestor of the despot of the day is so intense that it is

practically impossible to find a passage, where Aeneas appears, that does not in some way indict him in dastardly, criminal or stupid actions" (1935, p. 106), and Griffin that "This death was necessary for the purposes of history, and it is a great heroic feat for Aeneas; but it also is a fearful waste, a noble Italian killed by Rome's founder when he could easily, it seems, have been spared" (London, 1984, p. 124). With regard to Griffin's statement, it is true that Vergil sympathizes with Turnus as he had sympathized with Dido (Aen. Book 4), Nisus and Euryalus (Aen. 9.446 ff.), and Pallas (Aen. 11.59 ff.), but as West points out: "Virgil evinces a pity for the victims of fate, but this does not mean that he disapproves of its instruments" (1974, p. 29, n. 3). The "pro-Turnus" school also claims that Pallas was responsible for his own death, not Turnus (cf. Little, 1970, p. 72), and opposes the view that Turnus deserved to die on account of the "impious sin" of despoiling the dead Pallas (cf. Camps, 1969, p. 39, and Little, 1970, p. 71), a view stated in its most extreme form by Clausen: "Turnus suffers, Virgil seems to imply, from a latent disposition to violence, a sickness of the soul" (1987, p. 90).

At this point, it should be made clear that Turnus does not die simply because he despoiled Pallas' corpse and took his baldric, as many scholars assume. Thus Lyne: "...here seems to be the centre of Turnus' offense" (1983, p. 193), and Otis, "...Turnus must pay for his past, for the violence that he has not even yet overcome (he still wears the belt of Pallas)..." (1963, p. 380).[2] Nor does Turnus die because he was a "bad king" (cf. Cairns, 1989, p. 67), consumed with love for Lavinia: "Thus, although a vice, Turnus' amor helps to soften his image near his end by aligning him with Dido, that other bad king who nevertheless was much less vicious than Turnus" (Cairns, 1989, p. 76). Gransden's assertion that Aeneas, through the death of Turnus, was avenging the death of Priam ("It transfers to the Latins the guilt of the Greeks on the last night of Troy" [1984, p. 201]) is patently unacceptable since nowhere in the poem does Vergil attribute a collective responsibility or guilt to the Latins for any crime committed by the Greeks. Turnus dies, rather, because he was wearing the baldric, which he had earned fairly, at the fatal moment when Aeneas was still grief-stricken over the death of Pallas and thus at a time when Aeneas was emotionally unprepared to forgive him (cf. Putnam, 1981, p. 154; Little, 1970, p. 71). This is not to say that Turnus' death was an accident but that Vergil arranged the order of events in Book 12 in a way that would ensure that the two characters met while Aeneas was still in an emotionally weak state. That Vergil did not present Turnus' death as a punishment for some crime or moral deficiency is evident in the portrayal of Aeneas' grief and the circumstances of their encounter. Turnus' admission, 'equidem merui; nec deprecor,' inquit/'utere sorte tua...' (12.931-2), is not a recognition that he is guilty of any sin or at fault for any wrong. He merely states that he has accepted a contest to the death and that he is prepared to abide by the consequences (cf. R.D. Williams, 1987, p.

127).

The equation of Turnus with a "vice" is the result of the association which has been made between Aeneas and stoic virtues. It is argued that after Aeneas' trip to the Underworld in Book 6, he underwent a psychological change which transformed him from a Homeric warrior to a civilized "reborn hero" (cf. Otis, 1963,p. 317). Thus Lyne argues that Aeneas exhibits stoic virtues in avenging the death of Pallas through his killing of Turnus: "He [Aeneas] and Turnus (he suggests rationally) should fight it out in a duel - the fairest, most expedient solution. Again, therefore, we have the stoic-imperial hero, with that added ingredient, a measured sympathy..." (1983, p. 193). It could be argued, of course, that Aeneas' character after Book 6 is not consistently "stoic". Aeneas' behaviour on the battlefield, while it of necessity must be aggressive, nevertheless falls short of the "stoic" ideals of clementia and restraint. For example, in Book 10, Aeneas' cruelty after he kills Tarquitus is expressed in his speech: istic nunc, metuende, iace. non te optima mater/ condet humi patrioque onerabit membra sepulchro./ altibus linquere feris aut gurgite mersum./ unda feret piscesque impasti volnera lambent (557-560). One could also argue that the fury to which he submits himself in avenging the death of Pallas is also contrary to "stoic" principles, illustrated by his intention of sacrificing the prisoners whom he had taken alive at Pallas' burial (10.517 ff.), and by his ruthless fighting: sic toto Aeneas desaevit in aequore victor,/ et semel intepuit mucro (10.569-570). According to Little: "The real acts of barbarism in the Aeneid are committed by Aeneas, not Turnus" (1970, p. 70), and this is illustrated by Aeneas' inhumane treatment of Magus after his supplication: galeam laeva tenet atque reflexa/ cervice orantis capulo tenus applicat ensem (Aen. 10.535-536).

It has been pointed out that Aeneas undergoes a change of character which is typified by violence and that he is not referred to as pius in the second half of Book 12 (cf. Farron, 1981, p. 97). Vergil uses instead the adjectives furens and violentus, words associated with the "destructive passions of the civil wars" (Camps, 1969, p. 40), which he had formerly used to describe Turnus:

> Indeed, Aeneas at the end of the Aeneid changes in the opposite direction from Achilles. At first he is inclined to compassion, but then becomes 'furiis accensus et ira terribilis'; and the last word to describe him is fervidus which is very emphatic at the beginning of a line and end of a sentence" (Farron, 1985, p. 26).

This association of pietas and ruthlessness (cf. Wistrand, 1984, p. 197) could perhaps have brought to the reader's mind Augustus' alleged cruelty at Perusia:

> Perusia capta in plurimos animadvertit, orare veniam vel excusare se conantibus una voce occurrens moriendum esse. scribunt quidam trecentos ex dediticiis electos utriusque ordinis ad aram Divo Iulio exstructam Idibus Martiis hostiarum more mactatos (Suet. Aug. 15.1).

This shift in Aeneas' character, from pius to furens, according to Farron, would imply that the true hero of Book 12, and consequently of the epic as a whole, is Turnus: "So Aeneas' last act is the killing of a defenceless Italian after the war is over. This would have reminded his readers of nothing more than the savagery displayed by Octavian during the civil wars, especially the proscription" (1981, p. 103). Stahl, however, interprets Aeneas' fury in Book 2 and elsewhere positively, as an instrument of justice:

> One should explain Aeneas' wrath along these lines - rather, I say, than declare him to be in his creator's eyes an underdeveloped and uncivilized "Homeric" fighter or even see him as comparable to Turnus and to the negative characteristics that Virgil ascribes to Turnus' frenzy. Aeneas' order will always serve the Trojan-Julian cause, not an individualistic goal like the wrath of Turnus or Achilles (1981, p. 166).

As for the argument that Aeneas' furor reflects negatively upon Augustus, one must also remember that furor is a word associated with Turnus and that this would then have to be seen as a slur on Antonius, if the characters are to be viewed as completely analogous. It has been argued that the political vocabulary of Cicero is reflected in Vergil's characterization of Turnus, an approach which has been taken most recently in Cairns's assessment of the relationship between Aeneas and Turnus: "Analogies with the propaganda of the Civil Wars and their aftermath abound" (1989, p. 123). Camps has argued that Vergil describes Turnus in language which is similar to that which Cicero had used against Antonius: "Not long before, Cicero had used repeatedly in his denunciation of Antony the same combination of terms that characterize Turnus in the Aeneid, violentus and furens, furor and violentia" (1969, p. 40). In the Aeneid, the following words are associated with Turnus: amens (7.460; 12.622, etc.), turbidus (9.57; 10.648; 12.10, 671), fervidus (9.72; 12.325), ardens (9.760; 12.3, 71, 101, 325, 732), furor, furens, etc. (9.691, 760; 11.486, 901; 12.680), and violentia, violentus (10.151; 11.354, 376; 12.9, 45). Furor is also used by Vergil to account for the military tactical mistakes made by Turnus (9.730 ff., 9.760 ff.; 11.901, 12.324 ff.). While it is true that these words are used to describe Antonius in Cicero's Philippics, it is not clear whether Vergil intended any political nuance in his application of them to Turnus or whether he even intended any identification of Antonius and Turnus. As the following

quotations illustrate, Cicero attempts to attribute a type of insanity to Antonius in order to weaken his prestige: ut es violentus et furens (2.68), homo vehemens et violentus (5.19), ille furens (5.23), homo amentissimus...eius furorem (5.37), furori M. Antoni (5.43), novi hominus furorem, novi effrenatam violentam (12.26), and inde se quo furore, quo ardore...ad urbem rapiebat (13.18). Vergil however, does not weaken Turnus' prestige but rather uses furor for plot development and characterization to evoke sympathy. This is best illustrated by Turnus' admission of the disaster which he has brought upon the Rutulians through his furor: ...neque me indecorem, germana, videbis/ amplius. hunc, oro, sine me furere ante furorem (12. 679-80).

Clausen, too, has suggested a correlation between Vergil's description of Turnus and Cicero's description of Antonius (cf. 1987, p. 84 ff.). Cicero had used audax as a political term to describe the audaces who were hostile to the boni, the audaces who would subvert the established order by violence, men like Catiline, Clodius, Antonius, and Caesar: oportere hominum audacium, euersorum rei publicae, sceleri legibus et iudiciis resistere (Pro Sest. 86). Clausen suggests that Vergil, in his own use of audax, intended Cicero's concept of the term to be understood by contemporary readers: "That Virgil was aware of the political connotation of audax...is indicated by a singular fact: the occurence of euersor, a word apparently invented by Cicero, in Aen. 12.545: Priami regnorum euersor Achilles" (1987, p. 85). This may be true, but Clausen's observation seems to overlook that Turnus is apparently described as audax only three times during the battle scenes and never in Book 12: audacis Rutuli ad muros (7.409), Irim de caelo misit Saturnia luno/audacem ad Turnum (9.2-3), and at non audaci Turno (9.126). It would also be easy to forget in discussions of Turnus' furor and audacia that he is pius (10.617) and insons (630-1) according to Juno and noted for courage and sincerity (7.531 ff; 10.75; 7.469). The dangers of interpreting a character in general terms on the basis of a single dominant trait must be kept in mind in analyses of the negative aspects of both Aeneas and Turnus.

The Homeric element in the characters of Turnus and Aeneas dominates the narrative in Book 12. Between Turnus and Hector there are many similarities of action and psychology. With respect to action, Turnus and Hector both lose their weapons (Aen. 12.731 ff.; Il. 22.293 ff.); both are chased (Aen. 12.742 ff.; Il. 22.188 ff.); abandoned by the gods (Aen. 12.809 ff.; Il. 22.213); and forced to confront the protagonist in a duel (Aen. 12.188 ff.; Il. 22.306 ff.).[3] After an acceptance of their fate (Aen. 12.931 ff.; Il. 22.296 ff.), death itself follows (Aen. 12.951-52; Il. 22.361 ff.). In the description of their deaths, the image of the "unwilling" or "indignant" fleeing of the soul is common to both:

Ὣς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψε,
ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἄϊδόσδε βεβήκει,
ὃν πότμον γοόωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην.

(22.361-363), and ast illi solvuntur frigore membra/vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras (12.951-952).

With regard to psychological similarities between the two characters, they both feel a sense of shame (Aen. 12.655 ff.; Il. 22.104 ff.), and share a feeling of abandonment after being deserted by the gods (Aen. 12.895; Il. 22.303). Cairns's view that Turnus and Hector should not be considered as "analogues" because of Turnus' "...alienisation and his incomprehension of destiny [which] weaken his heroic and moral status" (1989, p. 123) is incorrect since it is precisely the sense of abandonment and "incomprehension of destiny" which make their characters analogous and sympathetic, a view offered by Pöschl: "The closer Turnus is to the end, the more he grows in inner stature. The more he realizes that the gods are abandoning him, the stronger his resolution becomes to uphold his obligation to his glory to the end..." (1962, p. 111). Turnus and Hector also show an overriding disillusionment - a detachment from reality (Aen. 12.908 ff.; Il. 22.199 ff.). For example, Turnus is compared to a dream: ac velut in somnis,...nequiquam avidos extendere cursus/ velle videmur et in mediis conatibus aegri/ succidimus;...sic Turno... (Aen. 12.908-13), and recalls to the mind of the reader Achilles' pursuit of Hector:

ὡς δ' ἐν ὀνείρῳ οὐ δύναται φεύγοντα διώκειν·
οὔτ' ἄρ' ὁ τὸν δύναται ὑποφεύγειν οὔθ' ὁ διώκειν·
ὣς ὁ τὸν οὐ δύνατο μάρψαι ποσίν, οὐδ' ὃς ἀλύξαι.

(Il. 22.199-201).

There are, however, certain differences between the two characters. Vergil seems to show more sympathy for the antagonist than did Homer. Whereas Hector had fled from Achilles to avoid a confrontation (Il. 22.137 ff.), Turnus fled from Aeneas to find his own sword (Aen. 12.742 ff.). The weakness which the gods instilled in Turnus is used to tragic effect (cf. Pöschl, 1962, p. 135), so that when Turnus falls before Aeneas, pity is aroused in the reader and expressed in the narrative through the groan of the Rutulians which is echoed by the hills (Aen. 12.930 ff.). Unlike the Iliad, where the Greeks break into a paean upon the death of Hector (Il. 22.372 ff.), the Trojans in the Aeneid do not rejoice at the death of Turnus and at the grief of the Rutulians.

Vergil also presents the antagonist more sympathetically

through similes and references to passages in Homer which evoke pathos. The simile of the swan and eagle, which was used in Book 9 to depict the aggressiveness of Turnus (Aen. 9.563-566), is now reversed to elicit sympathy for him (12.247-256), and does so by contrasting his outstanding beauty (7.55; 7.650; 7.783; and 10.446), with the tragedy of his death. The analysis of this simile by S. Harrison is worthy of full citation:

> This change in the depiction of Turnus is accompanied by a commensurate switch of sympathy towards him as he approaches his inevitable end. The reversal of the swan/eagle image is surely an illustration of the tragic peripateia of Turnus, who moves from proud aggressor to frightened and finally noble victim, and an index of the general movement of the poem (1985, p. 103).

This reversal in the emotional presentation of a character is also evident in Vergil's description of the character and death of Mezentius (Aen. Book 10, 794 ff.).[4]

The sympathetic manner in which Vergil presents Turnus at the end of Book 12 is also achieved through reminiscences of Priam's speech to Achilles in Turnus' address to Aeneas. When, at the point of death, Turnus asks Aeneas to pity his aged father, ...miseri te si qua parentis, tangere cura potest oro (fuit et tibi talis Anchises genitor) Dauni miserere senectae... (Aen. 12.932-4),the narrative recalls the first words spoken by Priam to Achilles after the death of Hector:

> "μνῆσαι πατρὸς σοῖο, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
>
> (Il. 24.486-7).

Just as the negative aspects of Aeneas' character, such as his furor and violentia, suggest that Vergil is not equating Aeneas and Augustus, so too in the characterization of Turnus he is not equating Turnus and Antonius. The large extent to which Aeneas and Turnus are influenced by Homer's Achilles and Hector also makes less likely the view that they are representations of Augustus and Antonius respectively. It would be possible, however, to see a similarity of historical roles between Vergil's characters and Augustus and Antonius. As mentioned earlier, the life of both is projected as being devoted to the fulfilment of a divine mission, both are the victors of an Italian war, and both are destined to be gods in heaven. As Wistrand points out: "Aeneas and Augustus are the same type of heroes, but not to be equated. They have similar historical roles, but that does not entail that they have the same personal qualities" (1984, p. 195). Likewise, in the case of

Turnus and Antonius, both are the defeated parties of a civil war but their personalities are not similar. The sympathy with which Vergil presents the death of Turnus, and all those who died in the Aeneid: ...tanton placuit concurrere motu,/ Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras? (12.503-504), cannot be transferred to Antonius.

This examination of the controversy concerning the association which is believed to exist between Augustus and Aeneas has emphasized that the association is ambivalent and one which can not be maintained throughout the poem. Augustus and Aeneas share a similar historical role, but this does not necessarily mean that they should also share the same personality. With regard to the relationship which is believed to exist between Antonius and Turnus, it was found that the basis for the argument itself was usually a product of the perceived association between Augustus and Aeneas.

Mario Erasmo

University of Ottawa

NOTES

1 Servius, Servii grammatici in Vergilii Aeneidos Commentarius., on Book 12, lines 939 ff.

2 cf. The view of Camps: [The despoliation of Pallas]",...is not to be construed as brutal or arrogant" (1969, p. 39).

3 cf. R.D. Williams, 1987, pp. 19 ff.

4 cf. Basson, 1984, and Putnam, 1981: "Though Mezentius despises the gods, publicly abrogating an important form of pietas, he gains at the end a measure of our sympathy", p. 141.

EURIPIDES' HECUBA: POLYXENA RECONSIDERED

The sacrifice of a young person, usually a parthenos, is a favourite motif in the tragedies of Euripides, but nowhere is it more strikingly employed than in the Hecuba. Almost a disproportionate amount of Hecuba's tragedy, one might say - 600 lines - is devoted to her daughter and fellow-captive, Polyxena, who is sentenced to die as a propitiatory sacrifice to the shade of Achilles. The climax of the first half of the play is the death scene itself, vividly reported and without parallel in extant Greek tragedy. Polyxena consents to the sacrifice, finding death preferable to a life of slavery, and faces her death boldly. The usual interpretation of this action is that she alone of the debased characters that populate the play shows courage and nobility - that she alone is truly eleutheros.[1] There are, it is true, dissenters who detect a discordant note in Euripides' treatment of the episode, among them A. Burnett, for whom Polyxena's death, more a suicide than a sacrifice, "affirms nothing, but becomes a bitter, incidental, discoordinate event."[2] In a similar vein, A. Michelini speaks of "Euripidean sensationalism", "elements of incongruity", and "suggestion of the ludicrous".[3] But even these critics see in Polyxena a model of heroic behaviour, "both firm and maidenly"[4] and "noble, brave and

---

[1]So, most eloquently, K.J. Reckford (p. 118): "She died, she was permitted to die, a free and beautiful death. In her, nobility found such lasting expression as art confers on human beauty: thus she was compared to an agalma, a lovely image dedicated to a god. ("Concepts of Demoralization in the Hecuba" in Directions in Euripidean Criticism, ed. Peter Burian (Durham, 1985) pp.112-28). For similarly favourable appreciations, c.f. D.J. Conacher, Euripidean Drama (Toronto, 1967) pp.158-59; S.G. Daitz, "Concepts of Freedom and Slavery in Euripides' Hecuba" Hermes 99 (1971) pp.217-26 (p.220); G.H. Gellie, "Hecuba and Tragedy" Antichthon 14 (1980) pp. 30-44 (p. 32); D. Kovacs, The Heroic Muse (Baltimore, 1987) pp.96-97.

[2]Catastrophe Survived (Oxford, 1971), p.24.

[3]Euripides and the Tragic Tradition (Wisconsin,1987), pp. 161, 162,164.

[4]Burnett, ibid.

decorous".[5] This is the view with which I would like to take issue: how much of Polyxena's heroism are we to take at face value, and what significance does it have in the play?

Already in the preliminary scenes, before Polyxena is led away, there are hints that this question should be asked. It must be emphasized, first of all, that Polyxena does not freely choose her fate; she is a captive condemned to die, a situation of the direst anankê. Her advice to Hecuba is τοῖς κρατοῦσι μὴ μάχου (404) - words of submission more in the mode of an Ismene than an Antigone. She will not struggle against this necessity: τί γάρ με δεῖ ζῆν; (349); when unaccustomed misfortune strikes, it is better to be dead than alive (375-78).[6] Furthermore, Polyxena makes it clear that her decision represents a strictly private solution. It might be argued that such self-sufficiency is characteristic of a heroic nature, but unfortunately Polyxena then proceeds to rather undermine her case. It would be unseemly, she explains to Hecuba (who wants to sunthanein (396)), for her, Hecuba, to be pushed to the ground, her old body slashed and shamefully mistreated by a younger Greek aggressor (405 ff.). Polyxena decides, in effect, that what would in another case be disgraceful, shall in her own be noble - rather arbitrarily, it would appear.[7] A rather problematic "nobility" seems to be emerging. And there is one more oddity in this episode. In her last farewell, Polyxena reassures Hecuba that her brother Polydorus is alive and well, and will tend his old mother at her death (430). In fact, she has no reliable information to this effect, and she is of course wrong. We know from the prologue that Polydorus is already dead. We may well wonder then

---

[5]Michelini, p. 165.

[6]It is interesting to compare the situation in Troades, where Andromache reports to Hecuba Polyxena's death: ὄλωλεν ὡς ὄλωλεν. ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐμοῦ / ζώσης γ' ὄλωλεν εὐτυχεστέρῳ πότμῳ (630-31). No, objects the much-enduring Hecuba, while there's life, there's hope: οὐ ταὐτόν, ὦ παῖ, τῷ βλέπειν τὸ κατθανεῖν./ τὸ μὲν γὰρ οὐδέν, τῷ δ' ἔνεισιν ἐλπίδες. (632-33).

[7]Polyxena underlines the opposition between youth (the unnamed Greek's) and age (Hecuba's). Her advice would have some force if we accepted the view that Hecuba's age disqualifies her from any claim to aretê. C.f. Michelini, "...the old have already undergone the shame of losing youth and beauty. Being no longer kaloi, they are unlikely to have the pride required for courage and self-sacrifice." (p.169). For that matter, Adkins concludes, by similar reasoning, that Polyxena cannot aspire to aretê either, being a young woman and a slave ("Basic Greek Values in Euripides' Hecuba and Hercules Furens" CQ n.s. 16 (1966) pp.193-219; p.200). But dramatic situations allow such variety that such narrow discussions of eligibility are not very illuminating, and can be refuted by numerous counterexamples in extant tragedy.

why Euripides makes her voice this gratuitous sentiment. Is it not to further undermine her credibility, and to cast doubt upon her ability to set right what is wrong?

Among the things that are unequivocally wrong, is Polyxena's sacrifice. Greek ships are stranded, and a girl is sacrificed to speed the homeward journey. The obvious parallel to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia at Aulis, which inaugurated this expedition, immediately sets the present proceedings in a grim light. Hecuba offers some compelling arguments to reinforce it in her confrontation with Odysseus: one should not slaughter humans where animal sacrifice is more appropriate (261); rulers should not rule what is not right (οὐ τοὺς κρατοῦντας χρὴ κρατεῖν ἃ μὴ χρεών), nor presume that they will always have the upper hand (282-83); it moreover incurs phthonos to kill women who had earlier been pitied and spared as suppliants (288-90); furthermore the same rule applies to slaves and the free in the matter of shedding blood (291-292).[8] It is generally observed, moreover, that Polyxena's situation is very different from that of other Euripidean victims: the usual salutory purpose of benefitting one's city, or at least family, is absent. There is of course no alleviating the plight of the Trojan captives - and, for the moment, not of the Greek army either, it would appear, since Agamemnon will later observe that the winds remain unfavourable (900).[9] Polyxena's death thus seems to do no one any good. Furthermore, it is not the gods who demand the sacrifice, only the ghost of Achilles, who is, as usual, after his personal geras. It is true that in tragedy the dead can have legitimate claims over the living, but in this play the nature of such a claim is not explored; pure self-interest is all it seems to be. The issue is rather how will the the army respond to Achilles' demand, and here the possibility of sparing Polyxena is definitely held out (116-140). No divine necessity presides; ultimately only the insidious persuasion of Odysseus prevails over a divided assembly.

---

[8]Contrast Adkins (ibid.), who maintains that Polyxena's sacrifice is legitimate, and that Hecuba cannot persuade Odysseus because her arguments are fundamentally inadmissible. But while Odysseus may deny any personal obligations toward Hecuba, her remarks about the human condition have general validity and are not to be lightly dismissed. See also Michelini (pp.145-46) for doubts concerning the effectiveness of Hecuba's appeal. But this has no bearing on the sacrifice itself, which we may assume to be a reprehensible act.

[9]I am assuming that Achille's demand and the winds are connected, even though this is nowhere stated explicitly, and Agamemnon merely observes that "the god" is not sending favourable winds. The precedent of Aulis is suggestive - and how also would Achilles hold back the whole Greek army? Kovacs denies the connection (p.145 n.58), but his arguments are not convincing.

The killing of Polyxena is thus a cruel and unnecessary act, committed by the victorious against the defenceless and already-defeated. For this reason, there is something rather distasteful about Polyxena's ready acquiescence to her sacrifice.[10] It makes her uncomfortably like an accomplice in her own murder (which is something quite different from "suicide", as Burnett terms it). Like the consecrated animal victim that traditionally consents to be sacrificed, Polyxena facilitates the Greeks' task, and also exonerates them from the normal guilt that should attach to such an act of violence. Where one would expect an atmosphere of foreboding and intimations of retribution, there is instead an anomalous scene of relief and satisfaction. As Polyxena lies dead, her killers magnanimously praise her as περίσσ' εὐκάρδιος and ψυχὴν ἀρίστη (579-80) and enthusiastically try to outdo each other in showering the corpse with funeral offerings (571 ff.). They honour her as one of their own. But retribution will come. It is part of the myth, and in the closing lines of the play, Polymestor does not allow this to be forgotten. But for the moment it is suppressed, and it is my contention that Euripides is here depicting a real distortion of the proper order, occasioned by Polyxena's extraordinary action.

At this point, we should consider in greater detail the death scene itself, as reported in the messenger's speech (518-82). It is a memorable one not only because it is the most complete description of a human sacrifice that we have in Greek tragedy, but also because Polyxena's physical and verbal gestures make a powerful impression. Polyxena shows her independence by stage-managing her own death scene. She will not be restrained and repeats her insistence on dying "free" (547-551). The Greeks comply (554). She then tears her peplos, exposing her breasts, and kneels before Neoptolemus (557-561). He may strike her breast or throat as he wishes, she offers (563-565). Neoptolemus strikes, and in her final dying gesture, Polyxena takes care in falling to hide "what ought to be hidden from the eyes of men" (568-570).

The erotic implications of this scene have been recognized by not a few commentators.[11] If this seems an incongruous or distasteful element in Polyxena's death, it should be kept in mind that, in Greek tragedy, the death of women and their sexuality or

---

[10]Is there a note of impatience in Hecuba's response to Polyxena's renunciation of life, "καλῶς μὲν εἶπας, θύγατερ, ἀλλὰ τῶι καλῶι / λύπη πρόσεστιν..." (382-83)?

[11]For example, Michelini (p. 160ff.), who sees in this an example of the kind of "drama of sexual shock" that made Euripides notorious.

sexual initiation are regularly connected.[12] Tragic virgins typically become "brides of Hades." Polyxena had prospects of a splendid marriage (352-53), but now that she is anymphos (416), slavery makes her "long to die" (θανεῖν ἐρᾶν 358), and she will "join her body to Hades" (Ἀιδηι προστιθεῖσ' ἐμὸν δέμας. (368)). The erotic component of a virgin's death further manifests itself in the victim's regular desire to remain chaste and observe propriety.[13] Hence Polyxena's extreme and astonishing preoccupation with preserving her modesty in death, a preoccupation that is underscored by Hecuba, who on a number of occasions worries about the army having indecent designs on her daughter's corpse (515-17, 604-08).[14]

The depiction of Polyxena's sacrifice, then, draws on some common tragic motifs and pulls together some threads that run through the play. The combination of these elements imparts a remarkable quality to her death scene. Polyxena is active and in control throughout. Her kneeling and nudity constitute a classic pose of supplication, but here it is utterly devoid of suppliant content.[15] There had earlier been an opportunity to supplicate, and she had even then refused (345). The choice of where to strike that she offers to Neoptolemus sees her firmly in charge: she dispenses

---

[12]There has been considerable interest in this topic in recent scholarship. W. Burkert discusses the theme in a general ritual context in Homo Necans ("The Sexualization of Ritual Killing") (Berkeley, 1983). Recently, N. Loraux has explored the equivalence of marriage and death in Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman (Cambridge, 1987): "...the blood-stained death of parthenoi is considered as an anomalous and displaced way of transforming virginity into womanhood." (p.41). Cf. H. Foley's discussion in "Marriage and Sacrifice in Euripides' Iphigeneia in Aulis" Arethusa 15 (1982) pp. 159-80.

[13]Cf. Macaria in Hcld., who wants a guarantee that she will die in the hands of women, not men (565-66). Iphigeneia's (less explicit) request in IA that none of the Argives touch her (1559) may also reflect a similar concern.

[14]Not an implausible prospect. Greek literature affords famous precedents for erotic interest in lifeless objects, not to mention for abuse of slain corpses, and we recall too that Polyxena has anticipated such a thing happening to Hecuba.

[15]Cf. N. Loraux: "This bent knee is not to be taken as some barbarous oriental practice of prostration...Still less should one think in terms of some gesture of entreaty. Euripides' Polyxena, on her knees, is not begging...On the contrary, in that posture...one should see a serene acceptance of death, above all a refusal, expressed in action, to be treated as an inert body..." (p. 45). Also Michelini (p. 163).

the terms of her own death. She does not merely expose her breasts, she displays them - ἔδειξε (560) - but immediately erases the erotic import of this action by covering herself modestly as she dies. Polyxena thus demonstrates that she truly has the power to redefine her situation in a manner compatible with her gennaiotês, and to transform a pathetic death into a noble one. She embodies sexual vulnerability and heroic defiance, and explicitly acts out this paradox before her assembled executioners.[16] Critics commonly see therein a sensational device to enliven the drama.[17] However I would argue that Euripides deliberately set up these incongruities for a purpose of a rather different kind. Through her studied, self-conscious control, and through her exaggerated gestures, Polyxena achieves a highly artificial and alienating effect. She is literally an agalma (560), an object of inspection, and a spectacle before an audience of Greek sailors. She is on a kind of stage that is at one remove from the live audience, and she performs a play, "The Death of Polyxena". The artificiality of the scene distances her from us (which is the opposite effect of what messenger speeches usually achieve), and the effect of her heroic action, I suggest, is by this means adulterated and dissipated.[18]

Confirmation for this impression may be found in the elusive reactions of the other characters to Polyxena's death. The attitude of the messenger Talthybius is one of genuine pity and admiration, but he also says, with a suggestion of ambivalence, that her last words were a πάντων τλημονέστατος λόγος (562): was

---

[16]Cf. Michelini, who emphasizes a kalon/ aischron antithesis inherent in the scene: "...the combination of apparent innocence and purity with sexual appeal permits us...to ogle Polyxena even as we sympathize with her. The appeal to shameful pleasures is very satisfyingly blended with a high moral tone..." (p. 165).

[17]For example Gellie: "It is sexual innuendo used as an expedient for winning a little more audience attention. It is not the sort of thing that tragedy uses because the tragic charge can easily be dispelled by the distraction of short-term excitements. But in a play whose main interest lies in the narrative sequence, it may quite properly be used to boost the energy and impact of the story-telling." (p. 35). Also Michelini: "...the audience will be held fast, charmed by the combination of sexual titillation and idealism." (p. 165).

[18]Hecuba's subsequent plea to Agamemnon is interesting in this connection: ...ὡς γραφεύς τ' ἀποσταθεὶς/ ἰδοῦ με κἀνάθρησον οἷ' ἔχω κακά. (807-08) Consider also her reference to the arts of Daedalus giving her limbs the power to supplicate (836 ff.). At various other times, she also makes self-referential and self-critical remarks, which likewise require a degree of detached contemplation (603, 736 ff., 824-25). The notion of "stepping back" and beholding an object thus appears to be a recurring motif in this play.

she most steadfast or most wretched? Neoptolemus then comes to strike, and Talthybius makes a curious observation about how the death stroke fell: "ὁ δ' οὐ θέλων τε καὶ θέλων οἴκτωι κόρης/ τέμνει..." (566-67). Some kind of hesitation is suggested, but Neoptolemus is no Orestes. Talthybius' brisk remark "οὐ θέλων τε καὶ θέλων" conveys no image of a would-be executioner overwhelmed and immobilized by his victim's bearing. And despite what Talthybius says, it is not a normal manifestation of pity to be "unwilling and willing" ("not want and want") to kill someone. Neoptolemus' contradictory attitude, a simultaneous aversion and inclination toward his task, rather seems to suggest genuine confusion. Despite its approving tone, the messenger's account thus raises some questions about how to evaluate Polyxena's death.

But it is the reaction of Hecuba herself that is most telling. "I don't know which of my ills I should contemplate - there are so many" she says. "I cannot wipe from my mind your suffering so as not to lament. But you have deprived me of excessive grieving since you are reported to have died nobly" (585-592). She then proceeds in a much-discussed speech to ruminate about the nature of nobility and and its relation to physis and trophê. Whatever account of this speech one may give, its tone remains oddly bemused and detached. The explanation is usually sought in Hecuba's character and mental state - for example, as a momentary lapse from shock and grief.[19] However, a better place to look may be in the nature of what she is responding to. Such, I suggest, is the extraordinary quality of Polyxena's actions at the moment of her sacrifice, that there is no straightforward way to engage with her. She has resorted to a course of action that, to her dramatic as well as real-life audience, is at once impressive and pathetic, seductive and repellent, and in the end profoundly alienating.

It remains to consider the implications of such a reading for the meaning of the play as a whole. A major critical issue in discussions of the Hecuba is the problem of unity. In order to account for the double plot, Polyxena is with virtual unanimity interpreted as a foil and positive contrast to the old Hecuba: both are helpless victims of the worst fortune, but whereas Polyxena manages to confront her fate heroically and preserve her nobility, Hecuba is reduced by her suffering and hate to an abject and even

---

[19]For example, Conacher: "Hecuba is, for the moment, emotionally exhausted...Hecuba is kept paralyzed by grief; in her struggle to "blot out"...her daughter's agony, she seizes on the one saving aspect of it...Hecuba's mind, in spasm like protective muscles around an injured limb, quickly depersonalizes even this subject..." (p.159).

bestial state.[20] However, if my interpretation of Polyxena's death is correct, this contrast cannot be maintained so neatly. The Hecuba is an exploration of heroism under adverse, and in fact highly unheroic conditions, a favourite Euripidean theme. A distinctive characteristic of Euripidean tragedy is that suffering victims strive to assert themselves, and often succeed, but the success is limited, illusory or tainted in some way.[21] In this regard, Polyxena is an apt Euripidean heroine: she dies a "fine" death, but that's all she does.[22] Though her part be a substantial one, she exists in the play only to die. Her gestures exist only for their own sake and have a private value for her alone. We have seen that Hecuba is first excluded from sharing her fate, and then, like us, inhibited in responding to it. The Greeks, to be sure, are impressed by her, but there is a dubious quality to the homage paid after-the-fact by these perpetrators. Has it at least been worth it for the sake of lasting fame? Except for trivial references, she seems quite forgotten in the second half of the play.[23] The poet, in sum, has so undermined Polyxena's self-assertion that there is no general meaning, and certainly no comfort to be drawn from her example.

Something similar, I suggest, happens to Hecuba. She too strives to make a heroic statement by avenging a terrible wrong done to her, and she succeeds: she destroys Polymestor, her friend turned enemy. Contrary to many critics, I do not believe that

---

[20]For example, E.L. Abrahamson: "[Hecuba's] suffering has turned a pitiable human being into a ferocious animal." (p. 128) ("Euripides' Tragedy of Hecuba" TAPA 83 (1952) pp. 120-29); Conacher: "Polyxena preserves her dignity, her impregnable sense of freedom, and avoids, above all, subjection to the enemy. It is this paradigm of tragic aretê which shows up the essential nature of the fall of Hecuba: her self-abasement before the knees of one enemy in her passion for vengeance against another. (p. 165); Reckford: "What is really tragic is the inner death of the being who was called Hecuba. She suffers what Polyxena escapes, a kind of rape. (p. 119); Michelini: "Polyxena's role, nature, fate and character are...virtually the precise inversion of her mother's. It is the presence of Polyxena...that defines and clarifies the role of Hecuba...(p. 134).

[21]Consider the "tainted success" of, for example, Medea, Phaedra, Heracles, Orestes or Creousa.

[22]Michelini describes this as "the perversity of a heroism that asserts the self only by annihilating the self." (p. 180).

[23]Antigone is forgotten too, it may be argued, but Antigone is absent only from the concluding scenes, and her spirit pervades her play as Polyxena's doesn't. Contrast also the powerful "presence" of Ajax throughout the second portion of a double plot.

Hecuba's revenge is repellent in itself, for all its cruelty, nor that she is degraded by it. Polymestor, a liar and traitor, unrepentant even when exposed, is contemptible in every way. His punishment is commensurate with his crime, and I believe we are to feel satisfaction on Hecuba's behalf.[24] But if this satisfaction is nevertheless not entirely whole-hearted, the explanation, I believe, lies in a broader context. In the midst of immeasurable suffering, Hecuba has achieved one modest success: she has avenged the murder of her last and youngest son. But for the loss of Polyxena there is no compensation, partly because Hecuba has no power to take on the Greek army (not even Odysseus, who owes her a favour), and partly, as I have been arguing, because of the very way that Polyxena has gone to her problematic death. In an odd way, Polyxena has prepared Hecuba's defeat in this regard. Nor does it end there. In order to ensure the success of her subsequent intrigue, Hecuba is obliged to collude with the Greeks, her enemies - or at least one of them, Agamemnon. Not only then has Polyxena absolved them from guilt, but Hecuba now must also enlist their help in order to get what she wants.[25] The irony of the drama has blurred the distinctions between enemies and allies, and as a result, the integrity of Hecuba's revenge suffers. And finally there is the general appropriateness of her choice of target to consider. We are repeatedly in the course of the play reminded that the deaths of her two children are but the latest sorrows imposed on even greater sorrows: the destruction of all the other children, her husband, her pride, her status, and her city.[26] In such a world, and against such humiliation, one aggressive act is no remedy. In fact, it is difficult to see what remedy there could be other than the sorrowful endurance of the Hecuba of the Troades. Given the depth of her misfortune, the fury of Hecuba's attack on

---

[24]Polymestor killed one child and had nothing to do with Polyxena; yet in addition to his sight, he loses two innocent children. The logic of Hecuba's revenge may thus be found wanting, but this is still not sufficient grounds to denounce it. It should be remembered that tragic punishments often appear to exceed the injuries that they requite. Apart from divine punishments (which are a different matter), consider Oedipus at Colonus, Medea, Creousa, etc. As for the "vulgarity" of winning her revenge by appealing to the sexual relationship that Agamemnon enjoys with Cassandra, we should note that the issue of this relationship has come up before as a legitimate and significant factor in the proceedings (120-22). For other favourable assessments of Hecuba, cf. R. Meridor, "Hecuba's Revenge" AJP 99 (1978) pp. 28-35, and Kovacs (pp. 108-09).

[25]Cf. Conacher: "...Hecuba, overwhelmed by the loss of both son and daughter, avenges one child by betraying the other." (p. 165).

[26]55 ff.; 159 ff.; 284-85; 492 ff.; 581-82; 619 ff.; 658-660; 667-69; 721-22; 783; 785; 809 ff.; 821 ff.; 953-55.

Polymestor seems woefully misdirected and pitifully limited. Polyxena and Hecuba thus both fall short, each in her own way, of achieving a truly heroic response to their predicament. Mother and daughter, I suggest, are much more alike, and Euripides' treatment much more complex than has been suspected.

University of Toronto Michaela Milde

Uses and Functions of Early Cycladic Figurines

The marble figurines of the Early Cycladic period are considered outstanding works of art because of their simplicity of form and austerity of style. The production of figurines seems to have been limited to the Early Cycladic period, especially to the EC II (ca 2800/2700-2400/2300 B.C.). During the EC III period, their production was significantly reduced, and by the dawn of the Middle Cycladic (ca 2000 B.C.), it had virtually ceased altogether.[1] Indeed, the Early Cycladic culture is unique in character on account of its geographical situation and, above all, of its art. The people, who were of Mediterranean stock, had probably settled from neighboring islands. At first, they established small settlements, but by the end of the Early Cycladic period they built larger communities which were, in some cases, fortified.[2]

Of the many artifacts left behind, the marble figurines represent aspects of the material culture which conceal the nature of the people's values and religion. They are the concrete representing the abstract. However, virtually every statement made about their uses and functions is open to question. The provenance and context of most of the material now on exhibit is not known due to grave looting and to the sale of antiquities during the last century. Yet the figurines can be dated on account of stylistic features if compared to figurines which were found in an established context as a result of scientific excavations. However, the context is lost and, in this case, context means everything in determining the uses and functions of the figurines. Even today, archaeologists can only speculate.

The EC figurines are basically of two types, schematic and naturalistic. The schematic figurines are a more abstract representation of the human form, especially of the female. In most cases the arms are emphasized, and the neck is an elongated

---

1 C. Doumas. Thera, Pompeii of the Ancient Aegean. London: Thames and Hudson. 1983. p. 33.

2 C. Doumas. The N.P. Goulandris Collection of Early Cycladic Art. Athens: J. Makris. 1968. p. 13.

prong. This results in the rounding of the profile and in the lack of articulations of the limbs. If there is an indication of the head, there is, however, no details of facial features.[3]

Several varieties of the naturalistic folded-arm figurines (FAF) exist, but all share common characteristics. For example, the head is tilted upward with usually only the nose indiacted among the facial features. The ears are sometimes depicted in addition to the eyes. The majority of figurines represent naked females with the arms folded at the waist, nearly always right below left.[4] The two breasts are slightly indicated. The pubic triangle is revealed by incisions, and there is often a horizontal line at the waist. The legs are often slightly bent at the knees, so that the figurines seem to be standing on tiptoe. As previously mentioned, there is a marked lack of detail, but in some instances fingers and toes are indicated by incisions, and there are traces of paint. Details such as ankles, kneecaps, navel and ribs are not shown. However, hair can be depicted.[5] In some cases, the spine is incised; otherwise, the back is left very simple. All figurines, including the pregnant ones, are slim and graceful.[6]

The use of marble for the figurines can be explained by psychological and economical factors. Psychologically, the use of marble suggests the importance of the figurines, and thus may deal with their spiritual role. Economically, their production in marble may imply that only rich people possessed them. This would account for the absence of figurines in some of the tombs. However, this absence may be more "apparent" than "real"; it has been suggested that some figurines may have been made of wood and so deteriorated.[7]

Archaeologists have to deal with material that has been taken out of context, and with a class of artifacts representing females. The goal of this paper is to outline only a few of the many hypotheses concerning the interpretations on the uses and functions

---

3 C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. p. 83.

4 C. Doumas. Thera. p. 20; C. Renfrew. "The Development and Chronology of the Early Cycladic Figurines." AJA 73(1969) 17. This is a special feature of the Chalandriani variety.

5 J. Thimme. Art and Culture of the Cyclades in the Third Millenium B.C. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press. 1977. pp. 489-91. plates 240-241.

6 C. Renfrew. AJA. pp. 9-11.

7 R.L.N. Barber. "Early Cycladic Marble Figurines: Some Thoughts on Function." Cycladica. L.J. Fitton, ed. London: British Museum Publications Ltd. 1984. p. 11.

of the Early Cycladic figurines.

Magic and Religion in Early Cycladic Society

Prehistoric religions consisted mainly of superstition and magic. Religion is the belief in a supernatural being of force which is responsible for Man's existence and destiny. Magic, on the other hand, is to be found and expected whenever man comes to an unbridgeable gap in his life, and yet has to continue in his own pursuit. This realization comes about when his technology and knowledge fail him.[8] This is especially true in the case of birth and death.[9] If we consider the evidence concerning the functions of female idols from other contemporary or earlier cultures, we can see that the female image can relate to both birth and death. Birth, hence fertility, seemed to have been controlled by a force which was beyond human experience, and so men probably used the figurines both to create a concrete image of the supernatural as a mother-goddess or fertility goddess, and to use the idols in rituals as a means to worship and ask for favors or protection from the gods.

The figurines may be associated with death and burial practises as psychopompoi, that is, leaders of souls. This implies a belief in an after-life. This belief can be further illustrated by the fact that some figurines were found with traces of red paint representing blood, a symbol of life, thus of the after-life of the tomb occupant. Here, the figurines may combine the two roles and so represent the mother-goddess as the leader of the soul[10] If, however, they were used during the life of the person and had no specific function in burial rituals, blood may refer to fertility and birth. But it is natural to assume that the simple practice of enclosing grave goods, for any culture at any time, implies the belief that the soul is going on a journey, and that it needs to bring with it some of its possessions. Some scholars also believe that the figurines are like Egyptian ushabtis, and so were destined to fulfil the same purpose, that is to satisfy the needs of the dead in the next world.[11]

---

8 B. Malinowski. "The Role of Magic and Religion." Lessa, W.A. and E.Z. Vogt, eds. Reader in Comparative Religion. New York: Harper and Row. 1979. pp. 37-46.

9 C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. p. 91.

10 P. Getz-Preziosi. "Early Cycladic Marble Art." Archaeology 40(1987) 23.

11 C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. p. 88. Thus they may simply be servants to the deceased, but it was suggested that they may also fulfil their sexual needs.

The figurines can therefore be associated with probably the two most mysterious elements in Early Cycladic culture. But how can archaeologists explain the male figurines? As mentioned above,magic is an outgrowth of science. The richest domain of magic is health which relates to both the moral and physical pains of birth and death. Therefore, if the musicians and cup-bearers are portrayed as exercising a specific function, they can be interpreted as magicians who either summon or ward off supernatural powers by their music as part of a ritual. In doing so, they served as mediators between mortals and gods, and because of their power which was acquired through their music or other ritual acts, they were of great importance in the community.[12]

There are basically three possibilities as to the use of the figurines, both the schematic and the naturalistic; first, as votaries, second, as votives and third, as cult images. A votary is one who is "bound by vows to a religious life... or to some form of worship or religious observance."[13] In this case, the figure represents a man or woman dedicated to the service of the deity or supernatural which is the focus of the cult. A votive is a figure offered as a gift to the deity. In Early Cycladic culture, most of the figurines represent females, and if the person who gives is related to the idol by sex-association, this implies a matriarchal society, since the focus is directed on the female.[14] Finally, the cult image, or object of worship, is the concrete representation of the deity. In all cases, the context in which the idol was found is crucial for archaeologists, and is the main element which could provide the information necessary to determine the function.

In the case of folded-arm figurines as votaries or votives, the position of the arms may be indicative of awe or respect. If they are cult images, it may be interpreted as a gesture of epiphany. Therefore, one could argue that the male folded-arm figurines are deities.[15] This would weaken the argument that the Early Cycladic culture was a matriarchal society, if male figurines were found in a greater number. However, since the overwhelming majority is of female figurines, this still supports the theory of matriarchy. On the other hand, if the male warrior figurines were used as votaries, they can be interpreted as the representation of the warriors themselves and, as votives, as the means by which the warriors seek the deity for protection against death in war

---

[12] C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. p. 94.

[13] C. Renfrew. "Speculations on the Use of Early Cycladic Sculpture." Cycladica. L.J. Fitton, ed. London: British Museum Publications Ltd. 1984. p. 28.

[14] C. Renfrew. Cycladica. p. 28.

[15] C. Renfrew. Cycladica. p. 29.

endeavors. In this case it is an essential element of the magical ritual.

The Mother-Goddess

Because of the large amount of figurines found and their emphasis of sexual characteristics, they were thought, at first, to be the representation of a mother-goddess. In a society whose economy was primarily based upon agriculture, women occupied a unique and prominent position. Through them, life was created. Therefore, this puts them in danger during pregnancy and childbirth which then occupied a large part of their lives. This may also account for the large amount of pregnant figurines. The fact that men did not have the same need to place themselves under divine protection may explain the rarity of male figurines and, in this case, they may be interpreted votaries.[16]

Renfrew sees the origin of both the schematic and naturalistic figurines in the Neolithic period, and believes that the schematic idols are a little earlier on account of stylistic similarities with the Neolithic artifacts.[17] In a final Neolithic context at Kephala, however, a head of a figurine resembling an EC II naturalistic one was found. This may imply a possible origin in the Neolithic period, even though it featured some stylistic differences.[18] According to evidence for the functions of Neolithic idols, this could be applied to the EC figurines, that is their function as a mother-goddess, as a representation of fertility. However slim the Cycladic figurines are compared to figurines from other cultures, their sexual characteristics were emphasized, some are pregnant, and, on this account, they may be viewed as mother-goddesses.[19]

Uses in Graves

In addition to their association with fertility, Renfrew also believes that the figurines were an accompaniement of the dead, and that they may have been the personal property of the deceased. This suggests thet EC people believed that the simple ownership of the deceased's property could carry risks to the living who

---

16 C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. p. 93.

17 They were dated earlier than the FAFs, and reappeared with some stylistic differences in the LC period.

18 C. Renfrew. AJA. pp. 29-30.

19 R.L.N. Barber. Cycladica. p. 10.

retained it.[20] This does not only apply to the figurines, but to any other object. This implies that the figurines were used during the deceased's lifetime, since they were his/her possessions. Also, their position in graves did not always reflect an attitude of reverence; they were usually mixed with other objects and sometimes were crushed beneath them.[21] People believed that in death the deceased were not happy, but jealous of the living. This may explain the fact that the bodies and figurines were buried in narrow confined graves. This way, neither could haunt the living.[22] As votaries used during lifetime, the figures were a protection against dangers, sickness, childbirth, or were guardians during initiation rituals such as marriage or puberty rituals. When the person died, the figure was endowed with magical properties, and was considered dangerous since it represented the dead person itself. Thus it had to be buried as well.[23]

Renfrew also suggests their function as psychopompoi and ushabtis as previously mentioned, and explains the musicians as figures needed for the entertainment of the deceased in the after-life.[24] However, the lack of data provided by skeletal analysis prevents archaeologists from drawing conclusions about sex-associations between the figurines and the deceased. To do so without such evidence may result in the conclusion that the figurines were buried with females, and the bronze objects and daggers with males. This argument, however, was ruled out by evidence from Dokathismata, Amorgos, where two folded-arm figurines, a dagger and a spearhead were found in the same burial.[25]

Thimme believes that female idols were made specifically for use in graves, and that they represented the Great Mother in her role as a goddess and guardian of the dead.[26] Here, the mother-goddess is a giver of life as well as a receiver of life. Thimme bases his theory on the following facts:

---

[20] C. Renfrew. Cycladica. p. 25.

[21] To the exception of one group of figurines found standing in a conch shell. C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. p. 91.

[22] C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. p. 91

[23] C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. pp. 91-93.

[24] C. Renfrew. Cycladica. p. 25.

[25] Also, so many female figurines were uncovered that this would suggest an abnormal number of female deaths compared with that of males. C. Renfrew. Cycladica. p. 26.

[26] C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. pp. 89-90.

1) The idols are monumental. Doumas, however, states that it is possible that the existence of the larger idols is not so much related to their uses and functions as to an economic factor.

2) The existence of double idols may suggest a primitive worship of Demeter and Kore, or their prototypes. Doumas argues that the presence of two figurines or of double figurines occurs rarely, and that the discovery of two or more idols in the same grave, although possible, is infrequent. For example, two folded-arm figurines were found in grave 14 at Dokathismata, thirteen in grave 13 at Aplomata, and two in grave 307 at Chalandriani.[27] The schematic figurines seemed to appear in an even greater number. In grave 103 at Pyrgos, Paros, fourteen such figurines were uncovered, and at Kassadhes, Antiparos, thirteen from grave 117.

3) The pubic area is emphasized. This may simply represent an effort of the artist to eliminate any doubt as to the sex of the figurines, since in every other respect, male and female figurines are basically identical.

4) The position of the arms. Thimme believes that this portrays a gesture of epiphany, whereas Doumas suggests that the position may only be due to the limitations of the material.[28]

Davis proposes burial as a primary use of the marble figurines. But the presence of damaged figurines in the graves suggests that they were produced for non-funereal purposes. As mentioned above, some were found buried under other artifacts. This implies that burial was not their main function, but only part of the cult.[29] Doumas states that "one significant piece of evidence revealed in the excavation of Cycladic cemeteries is the fact that broken idols, fragmentary idols and idols which had been repaired... were not infrequently placed in the graves. This would seem to indicate that the figures had been used by the living before their interment with his corpse."[30] Therefore, Doumas denies that the use of figurines was restricted to burial, but that they served thair owners throughout their lives as genii, that is, representatives of the soul.[31]

---

27 C. Renfrew. Cycladica, p. 26.

28 C. Doumas. Goulandris Collection. pp. 88-89.

29 J.L. Davis. "A Cycladic Figure in Chicago and the Non-Funereal Use of Cycladic Marble Figurines." Cycladica. L.J. Fitton, ed. London: British Museum Publications Ltd. 1984. p. 16.

30 J.L. Davis. Cycladica. p. 16.

31 J.L. Davis. Cycladica. p. 16.

Originally, the figurines were believed to have been created for use in graves only since they were reported to have come from graves. Systematic exccavations now support the theory that the idols had a special value and importance since they were kept and buried with their owners even though they had been broken and, in some cases, even mended. This may indicate that the figurines were moved, kept in places of intense activity, or even broken to fit in the graves.[32] This would tie in with evidence presented by Dr Nanno Marinatos showing that the community's ordinary activities were closely linked with ritual observance.[33] Therefore, the breakage may suggest that the figures were used in temples or rituals, indicating a non-funereal function, and that they were used by the living and buried with them.[34]

There is no evidence yet for a shrine dating to the EC period such as those at Ayia Irini (MC) and Phylakopi (LC). A feature to be expected in such an EC shrine would be a concentration of artifacts relating to a cult in a defined area rather than in a domestic context. Some scholars believe that the numerous finds at Keros may indicate a sanctuary or, according to P. Getz-Preziosi, an exceedingly large cemetery if they came from graves.[35] Renfrew suggests that the finds are the indication of a ritual carried out at or near the place where they were found. Over 350 figurines and 150 stone vessels could not have been broken in the context of ordinary use. This may be indicative of a sanctuary or cult area. In this case, the figurines are related to magic and are used in rituals. More excavations need to be carried out on Keros in order to determine all aspects of the EC culture, but it is clear that rituals involved the offering of special cult goods.[36]

Renfrew proposes that the figurines are the indication of a relationship between the deceased and the cult. If broken figurines were used in burials, they were probably used during the lifetime of the deceased. If they were used in lifetime, they were indicative of a cult. This implies the status of the deceased as a priest or priestess of the deity. This may be another alternative to explain the fact that some graves do not have figurines, and it may also suggest the practise of household cults

---

[32] C. Renfrew. Cycladica. p. 26.

[33] Here in a LC context at Akrotiri.
R.L.N. Barber. Cycladica. p. 11.

[34] R.L.N. Barber. Cycladica. p. 13.

[35] P. Getz-Preziosi. "The Keros Hoard, Introduction to an Early Cycladic Enigma." Antidoron. D. Metzler, B. Otto, O. Muller-Wirth, eds. Karlsruhe: C.F. Muller. 1983. pp. 37-44.

[36] C. Renfrew. Cycladica. pp. 28-29.

since no architectural remains of EC shrine have yet been found.[37] The large sculptures, however, are enigmatic, since none have yet been found in the course of systematic excavations.[38] Due to their size, they may not have been placed within the graves. Renfrew suggests that they might have been used in a public cult, perhaps in a shrine.[39] These exceptionally large figures all belong to a distinct stylistic group, indicating that they were all produced within a certain period of time, perhaps by only one or two generations of sculptors. They may also be the mature work of artists who preferred to carve on an unusually large scale.[40] The provenance can not be established for any of the idols, but one is reported to have come from Keros.

Conclusion

There was a marked decline in the manufacture of figurines after the EC III period, and almost certainly the disappearance of the naturalistic types. This may have been due to the disruption of EC life by the Anatolian incursions of EC IIIA. Barber suggests two hypotheses as to the disappearance of figurines. First, if the idols had a secular function, and their presence in graves was only the sign of prosperity, their decline would be indicative of a political and economic disruption. If, on the other hand, they played an active role in Cycladic religion and rituals, archaeologists may postulate that a fundamental change in burial practises took place because of the invasions. It is worth noting that the introduction of rock-cut tombs is dated to this period, even though cists graves were still in use. Schematic figurines reappeared during the LC period, thus Barber raises the question: could their reappearance "represent the re-emergence of a native element in the population which had been subdued since EC IIIA?"[41] But the figurines themselves can not yet be used to elucidate this question.

The idols belong to a class of artifacts which focused on the fundamental role of women as a source of life. Burial was therefore only one aspect of the cult. Symbolic or ritualistic, for cult or prestige, as votaries, votives or cult images, they were, in some way, associated with the dead. Thimme states that there is "the possibility that religious or magical practises

---

37 C. Renfrew. Cycladica. p. 27.

38 P. Getz-Preziosi. Archaeology. p. 66.

39 C. Renfrew. "A New Cycladic Sculpture." Antiquity 60(1986): 133.

40 P. Getz-Preziosi. Archaeology. p. 66.

41 R.L.N. Barber. Cycladica. pp. 11-12.

unknown to us are connected with the breaking as well as with the burial of these pieces."[42] Only by further scientific excavations of undisturbed contexts can we hope to elucidate the nature of the Early Cycladic figurines.

Josée Sabourin
Queen's University

42 C. Renfrew. Cycladica. p. 28; J. Thimme. ACC p. 588.

Food in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis

The food of the Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius is a rather overlooked aspect of the banquet. Although scholars have discussed many other elements at great length, few have attempted any study of the food beyond its role as merely another example of Trimalchio's extravagance and vulgarity. This attitude towards food seems strange as it is an integral part of a banquet and in other Latin literary banquet depictions, is fully described. What separates the food of the Cena Trimalchionis from that served in other literary banquets is that the emphasis is less on the culinary aspects of food than on the elaborate tricks, deceptions and dramatic tableaux associated with it. Few courses are served by Trimalchio that do not contain some clever trick.

The purpose for such an abundance of disguised foods seems to be twofold. Firstly, these courses provide great amusement for the guests. Encolpius, the young narrator, unused to such displays, constantly expresses his surprise and amazement at each successive dish. Even veteran diners are awed at some of the spectacles which Trimalchio presents. The emphasis of this food, however, is entirely visual and nowhere in the proceedings does anyone note the taste of any dish. All descriptions are concerned entirely with the visual impact of these presentations.

Secondly, these entertainments distract the guests from the fact that the food and wine they are consuming are actually nondescript and commonplace.[1] Trimalchio serves no food that is not mentioned in other Latin culinary literature and all his fare is domestic. In fact, it is rumored at the banquet that Trimalchio grows most of his food on his own estates.[2] None of his fare is imported, particularly exotic or expensive and instead, he serves items such as olives, dormice, fowl, fish, pork and boar.[3] A banquet served by the Emperor Vitellius and described by Suetonius

---

[1] G. Schmeling, "Trimalchio's Menu and Wine List," Classical Philology 65 (1970): 248-251. See also J. Francis, Food and the Enigma of the Cena Trimalchionis, MA Thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1990.

[2] Petronius, 38.

[3] Olives and dormice are described in Petronius, 31.9-11; fowl and fish in 36.2; boar in 40.3-4; and pork in 49.

indicates the extravagant food which was available to a wealthy Roman. A comparison between Vitellius' food and Trimalchio's reveals the ordinary nature of the fare at the Cena Trimalchionis:

> Hanc quoque exsuperavit ipse dedicatione patinae, quam ob immensam magnitudinem clipeum Minervae poliouxou dictitabat. In hac scarorum iocinera, phasianarum et pavonum cerebella, linguas phoenicopterum, murenarum lactes a Parthia usque fretoque Hispanico per navarchos ac triremes petitarum commiscuit.[4]

Trimalchio is either financially unable or simply does not wish to serve such lavish food, but he still wishes to impress his guests with his wealth. In order to accomplish this, he resorts to trickery and deceptions in order to disguise the nondescript nature of what he serves. His guests are so impressed by these clever and elaborate presentations that fail entirely to notice that they are eating ordinary fare.

The first course, the gustatio, contains two tricks. Trimalchio serves sausages, damsons and pomegranate seeds, but not in an ordinary manner.[5] The sausages are placed on a silver grill beneath which lie the damsons and pomegranate seeds representing coals. Eggs are also handed out and are subject to a long explanation by Trimalchio on their possible half-hatched state.[6] This digression is necessary to draw the guests' attention to the fact that the eggs are actually made of pastry and when cracked, open to reveal figpeckers rolled in spiced egg yolk. Trimalchio's introduction of these eggs builds the suspense around the disclosure of the hidden trick and heightens the guests' enjoyment of the course. As well, this offers a novel manner in which to serve an otherwise ordinary food item.

The ferculum primum begins with elaborate fare, the zodiac dish consisting of foods representing every sign in the zodiac.[7] This dish, however, is wondrous only in its visual presentation and ingenuity, as the guests quickly note; its ingredients are ordinary and not great in quantity:

---

[4] Suetonius, Vitellius, XIII.2

[5] Petronius, 31.9-11.

[6] Petronius, 33.8.

[7] Petronius, 35.1.

> Laudationem ferculum est insecutum plane non pro expectione magnum.[8]

To the guests' relief, this dish proves to be nothing more than a visual amusement, and the real course is revealed on a plate underneath it: hare, fowl, sow bellies and fish swimming in a moat of garum sauce which is poured over them by four figures of Marsyas.[9] Such an arrangement is by no means unprecedented and a parallel appears in Horace's Cena Nasidieni:

> Adfertur squillas inter murena natantis
> in patina porrecta.[10]

This dish does not seem to be as elaborate as Trimalchio's, but the basic idea is the same.

This course also provides a disguised dish. A hare is served decorated with feathers to resemble Pegasus.[11] Hare itself is an ordinary enough food and this trick seems designed to distract the diners from this fact. Furthermore, it likely brought to mind the myth of Pegasus which constitutes a further diversion. Horace also seems to have provided a precedent for Trimalchio's hare:

> fecundae leporis sapiens sectabit armos.[12]

This winged hare from Horace may have provided Petronius with inspiration for the winged hare/Pegasus of Trimalchio's banquet.

The ferculum secundum contains only one item: a wild boar garnished with dates, grapes, and pastry suckling pigs to be taken away by the guests.[13] Trimalchio describes how this boar, which wears the pilleus, is a rejected course from a previous day's feast. Once it is cut open, however, thrushes fly out and are caught by servants with ready nets. Such a course does not seem suitable for consumption but the visual impact must have been

---

8 Petronius, 35.1

9 Petronius, 36.

10 Horace, Sermone 2.8:42-43.

11 Petronius, 36.2.

12 Horace, Sermone 2.4:44.

13 Petronius, 40.3-4.

great. This spectacle afforded the guests much amusement. Again, the food itself seems secondary to its elaborate presentation.

This boar stuffed with wild birds is only one example of a practice which seems to have been prevalent in Roman society. Macrobius defines this phenomenon in his description of a Pontifical banquet:

> nam Titus in suasione legis Fanniae obicit saeculo suo quod porcum Troianum mensis inferant, quem illi ideo sic vocabant, quasi aliis inclusis animalibus gravidum, ut ille Troianus equus gravidus armatis fuit.[14]

Macrobius describes the culinary practice of stuffing a pig with foods in much the same manner as the Greeks were shut up inside the Trojan Horse. He registers astonishment that this practice was eventually expanded to include stuffing hares and even snails. There seems to be little difference between the stuffing of Macrobius' pig and Trimalchio's boar. When the stuffing is revealed, the guests are not only entertained but their attention is diverted from the nondescript nature of the boar itself.

The next course, the ferculum tertium, consists of an elaborately arranged dramatic tableau involving Trimalchio and the cook. Trimalchio, after leading three live sows into the triclinium, asks his guests to choose which they would prefer for this course.[15] Eventually a sow appears at the table, and a pre-arranged scene erupts between Trimalchio and the cook over the allegedly uncleaned sow. When the animal is cut into, it reveals a stuffing of sausages and blood puddings in much the same way that the boar contained thrushes. It is another example of a "Trojan Pig". Trimalchio prolongs the serving of the course through a dramatic presentation and again, the guests are caught up in the scene and seem unaware of the nature of the food. They are eating only pork with sausages and blood puddings but do not notice.

As with the serving of the winged hare, the ferculum quartum brings to mind a mythological story.[16] Like the preceding course, it is part of an elaborate and intentional dramatic spectacle. The food itself receives very little attention except that it plays a part in the action surrounding it. The course is nothing more than a calf wearing a helmet and is sliced up by a slave masquerading as

---

[14] Macrobius, 3.13.13. J.P.V.D. Balsdon, Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome (London: The Bodley Head, 1969): 37, notes that the "Trojan Pig" goes back to the 2nd century B.C.

[15] Petronius, 49.

[16] Petronius, 59.7.

Ajax. This dish is more a prop to Trimalchio's recitation of the story of Ajax than an actual course.

The final course, the epideipnis, contains a variety of items. Thrushes are formed from fine meal and stuffed with raisins and nuts, quinces covered with thorns are disguised as sea urchins, and various geese, fish and birds, all made out of pork are offered.[17] Again, Trimalchio deceives his guests by disguising what he serves. He informs them that what has been placed before them is not necessarily what they think it to be; there is a trick of which they are unaware and they do not notice that these items are all made from pork. Although no parallels for such disguised foods appear in Latin culinary literature, a modern analogy may be found. In 1935, the death of a famous chef prompted a comparison between the chef's talents and Trimalchio's culinary deceptions, demonstrating that this practice has continued into modern cooking:

> a group of chefs were discussing the case of the renowned Vatel, who had committed suicide because the soles had not arrived in time for dinner. What, they asked M. Escoffier, would he have done if he had been in Vatel's place? The master turned his hand up in a gesture of carelessness:
>
> "I would have taken the white meat of chickens--very young chickens," he said, " and I would have made filet of sole with it. No one would ever have known the difference."[18]

This seems to be a direct parallel to Trimalchio's creation of fish and fowl out of pork.

The wine served by Trimalchio is also ordinary but contains a deception which seems intended to disguise this fact. The best wines available to a wealthy Roman were Setine, Caecuban or Chian but Trimalchio offers none of these wines to his guests.[19] Instead, he supplies Falernian. Although Falernian had once been much admired, by the time of Petronius, it was a second-rate wine.[20] Trimalchio, however, either through ignorance or in order to trick his guests deliberately, has labelled this wine:

---

[17] For thrushes made of meal, see Petronius, 69.6; for quinces, 69.7; and for pork shapes, 69.8.

[18] H.M. Poteat, "Chefs, Modern and Ancient," Classical Journal 30 (1935): 429, notes the parallel between this modern example and Trimalchio's pork shapes.

[19] C. Seltman, Wine in the Ancient World (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1957): 153.

[20] Seltman 153.

Falernum Opimianum annorum centum.[21]

Falernian, however, was fit for consumption only for twenty years, after which time it became undrinkable. If the Cena Trimalchionis takes place during the reign of Nero, then Trimalchio's Falernian wine would be approximately 170 years old and could not possibly be drunk. Trimalchio compares this wine to the inferior stuff he served the day before and encourages his guests to believe that he offers the very best quality wine possible, stating:

> verum Opimian praesto. hero non tam bonum posui, et multo honestiores cenabant.[22]

Since none of the guests register any surprise regarding the date of the wine, it seems that they believe Trimalchio's pronouncement. This wine is ordinary and it is only by a deception that it appears otherwise.

This disguise of the wine, unlike the tricks associated with the food, does not seem to have been designed to entertain, but only to impress. The wine so erroneously labelled was likely ordinary Falernian and Trimalchio seems to be attempting to impress his guests by serving a wine which he purports to be very old, and thus, of good quality. There is little difference between this disguise of wine and the "Trojan Pig"; both are elaborate deceptions conceived to show off the great wealth of the host.

This wealth, however, need not be excessive. Although it has been suggested that the proliferation of ordinary foods may indicate that Trimalchio's wealth was less than previously thought, the type of tricks which Trimalchio presents could have been concocted at very little cost to the host.[23] Since slaves would have arranged the food in its elaborate settings, the food itself would have been the only expense, and this was readily available and inexpensive. The only energy expended by Trimalchio for these displays is either in the conception of the tricks or carrying them out, neither of which would have put much of a strain on his purse. Trimalchio seems willing to display his affluence through other elements of his banquet, but does not consider food a suitable expenditure of wealth. Instead, he cuts costs by serving ordinary and common food. However, because it is so disguised, the guests' concentration is not on the food itself but on the spectacle which each course contains.

---

[21] Petronius, 34.

[22] Petronius, 34.7.

[23] Schmeling 248-251.

The common nature of the food coupled with the numerous tricks seems indicative of Trimalchio's attitude towards food. He is careful about the food he serves, and although the ordinary nature of it seems to suggest that it is not a primary concern for him, his careful manipulation of it reveals his understanding of its importance. He seems to be aware of its value as something with which he can impress his guests, but at the same time, realizes that it is perishable and cannot be kept for long. Thus, he does not seem willing to spend great sums of money on it when the effect of great wealth can be obtained by some simple and inexpensive illusions. These tricks indicate both Trimalchio's penchant for disguise and trickery as well as his miserly character. The guests, however, do not notice this due to the abundance of disguises and tricks which surround every course and, instead, express amazement and praise his cleverness. The overall effect is that of elaborate foods obtained at great expense, when in truth, the food itself seems to be less spectacular than that served at other literary banquets.[24]

Thus, Trimalchio's two purposes are realized through the abundance of tricks which hide the true nature of the food: the guests are both entertained and deceived by it. However, there is a third role which food plays in the Cena Trimalchionis and this goes far beyond mere entertainment or sly trickery. The food provides the underlying structure for the banquet and governs the pace and progression of the action. Each course, as it is brought in, breaks up the existing conversation or action since its arrival forces the narrator to abandon what he has been doing and acknowledge its presence. This is suitable behaviour for one of Encolpius' character, as he has never been to such a dinner party before and all that he sees and hears commands his wide-eyed curiosity. Each course interrupts the current activity and introduces a new character, conversation, anecdote or entertainment. In this way, the entire Cena is divided up into a series of shorter episodes which are governed by the serving or clearing away of a course of food. As Bacon notes:

> The courses are the frame and regulating principle of the action, and thus in a very basic way the dominant artistic device. They determine both the length and pace of the episodes.[25]

The entrance of each new dish is perfectly timed so that the scene does not change too quickly or before the last entertainment has

---

[24] For example, the food of Horace, Sermone 2.8; and Juvenal, Satire 5.

[25] H. Bacon, "The Sibyl in the Bottle," Virginia Quarterly Review 34 (1958): 274.

been completed. For example, the ferculum primum is not brought out until the play with the silver skeleton is over; one amusement does not interfere with another.[26] When a new course focuses upon an elaborately staged trick, the concentration on the food is prolonged. However, this attention usually relates more to the trick than to the actual food consumption.

The pace of each episode is determined by the speed with which the courses are delivered to the tables. At the beginning of the banquet, the dishes are brought out slowly, allowing the guests ample time between them to be entertained. As the meal progresses, however, the dishes seem to arrive with more frequency and less time is left between one course and the next. This is not to suggest that the food takes over the banquet since at no time does it become a dominant element, except when a trick related to a course is described. As time goes on and the guests consume more wine, the slaves seem to be either serving one course or cleaning up another. The number of courses which had to be served may have influenced the speed with which they came to the table as all had to be laid out before the meal ended. The climax of the meal comes with the end of this "flood of dishes," after which time all retire to the baths and a new meal is prepared.[27]

As well as setting the pace for each episode, the food also controls the momentum of the entire Cena. One way in which this is accomplished is by the type of description which Encolpius gives of each course. The dishes at the beginning of the dinner are described in minute detail and seem to evoke a greater response from the viewers. This changes as the dinner progresses and the courses seem to arrive at a faster pace and the descriptions of them are less elaborate. These descriptions, which become briefer and more hurried, increase the breathless and rushed air which the end of the Cena possesses. All events hurtle towards the end with progressive haste until the final climax.

The existence of so many tricks and deceptions in the courses also contributes to this general feeling that the events of the Cena surge to an inevitable ending. These intricately disguised dishes are, at the beginning of the banquet, of a relatively simple nature: the illusion of cooked eggs containing figpeckers.[28] As the action of the banquet progresses, the tricks become longer and more elaborate until Trimalchio cannot even serve fruit without disguising it as something else.[29] The excessive tricks of the

---

[26] Petronius, 34-35.

[27] Bacon 275.

[28] Petronius, 32.5-6.

[29] Petronius, 69.7.

courses which provide continual entertainment only heighten the increasingly wild nature of the guests' conversations and behaviour, the vulgarity of the entire proceedings, and the absurdity of Trimalchio's funeral preparations.

Thus, the food of the Cena Trimalchionis cannot be considered as merely another example of the host's extravagance and vulgarity. While the food itself is ordinary, the tricks and dramatic presentations associated with it turn the guests' attention from this fact while all the time providing great entertainment. This seems to be Trimalchio's purpose and one which he certainly achieves. His guests are suitably impressed by his wealth as displayed through his food. Petronius' purpose for such a depiction of food provides the third role that it plays in the Cena. Trimalchio's banquet is a digression in the Satyricon and does not contain the movement and excitement which the remainder of the work possesses. However, by the continual presentation of elaborately arranged courses, the action of the Cena progresses and the illusion of activity is heightened. Far from being merely a background element, the food is an important part of the Cena Trimalchionis.

University of New Brunswick Jane E. Francis