

# SUMMARIES

## A Study on the Helen-legend

Yoshiko TSUDA

This paper consists of four chapters, dealing with (1) Helen as a goddess and the rise of the legends of her seducement. (2) The legend of the seduction by Theseus. (3) The legend of the abduction by Paris. (4) Another legend of the abduction by Paris.

The first chapter explains the background to the rise of these legends. Archaeological data (the result of the excavation of "Menelaion" which is regarded as Helen's shrine in Therapne in accordance with Herodotus) and the etymology of the name Helen show that she was once a Laconian vegetation goddess who was connected with tree-worship. The relationship between Helen as a vegetation goddess and the legends of her abduction is explored with the help of explanations by G. Murray and M. P. Nilsson. The main purpose of the next three chapters is to investigate the historical background to these legends and to discuss some problems implicit in their study.

In the second chapter, there will be a discussion of whether the legend of Theseus' seducement of Helen was known to the poet of the *Iliad*. An examination of the descriptive passages in the poem reveals an affirmative. Then the present writer deals with the role of the Dioscuri in the legend. Although their part in the story is an important one, it is doubtful whether they were an essential element from the first. I think they were added later to eradicate some inconsistencies to the similar

legend of the abduction of Helen by Paris.

The third chapter deals with the legend that Paris (or Alexandros) abducted Helen from Sparta to Troy. It is quite clear that the legend was well known to epic poets, but they adopted it as a legend in which Helen played a passive role. This may be ascertained by examining the descriptions of Helen in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. And then the problem to be analysed in this legend is the significance of Aphrodite's intervention. Though the *Kypria* seems to have described Aphrodite's part in the abduction in detail, it is uncertain whether the poet of the *Iliad* knew of the divine assistance theme. But analysis of the descriptions in the epic makes it clear that the *Iliad* is based upon the same type of legend as the *Kypria*. Homer did not describe the existence of Aphrodite's help directly but made it implicit in the nature of her particular protectiveness towards Paris and Helen. Many commentators have supposed that the special relationship of the three characters derives from the judgment of Paris. Therefore the themes of the judgment and that of the abduction of Helen by Paris with the help of Aphrodite's divine intervention were known to Homer as a series of legends.

In the fourth chapter, the central discussion concentrates on the *Palinode* of Stesichorus. It is said that the poem is the first work that dealt with another version of the abduction of Helen by Paris—what he took away was not Helen but her phantom, while the real Helen stayed in Egypt under the protection of Proteus during the Trojan war. Since the poem was transmitted in only one fragment and the contents of the *Palinode* are almost unknown, an investigation must be made to ascertain whether the poem really contained this legend. The recently discovered Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2506 has added important new data to the discussion, emphasizing the innovation of the lyric poet. The new material consists of Helen's phantom and her stay in Egypt. I would like to

investigate what is called Stesichorus' invention only on the former point. From the typology of the phantom motif the use of which is found in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, his innovation is limited to the adaptation of the motif to Helen. The diversion of the concept to Helen is perhaps connected with Sparta which was the centre where Helen was worshiped as a goddess.

## On the Relation between the Scenes on Cithaeron and the Stage Actions in Euripides' *Bacchae*

Tadatoshi KUBOTA

In Euripides' *Bacchae* there are two entirely different groups of Bacchae, the Asian Bacchae, who form the Chorus, and the Bacchae of Thebes, including the daughters of Cadmos, who as divine punishment have been driven into madness by the god Dionysus and live a wild life on Mt. Cithaeron. It is conceivable that without the existence of the latter the effect of the play would be greatly diminished.

In this paper I will try to show the relationship between the actions of the Theban Bacchae and those of the characters, and the songs of the Chorus, especially that in the parodos.

It may be argued that Cithaeron is not introduced simply as a place where the terrible death of Pentheus is to be carried out, but also established from the beginning of the play as an invisible stage where the possessed women can act freely and reveal what they really are. This is clearly shown in the prolog where Dionysus states that the women are camped in their mountain fastness mad but peaceful.

... Their presence is not revealed to the audience or the characters until the first messenger's speech which changes the atmosphere of the play from light to dark. That their exposure is delayed until the middle of the drama has two significant functions: 1) the joyful world of Dionysus which the Chorus sings of seems superficially attractive and real to everybody except Pentheus, who appears to be an obstinate opponent of the cult; 2) Pentheus and other characters are given no chance to see the situation and find out the true facts about the cult. Pentheus imagines pruriently that the women are drunken and indulging in promiscuity. An idea which arises from his ambivalent feeling towards the female sex, which he has oppressed as an over-conscientious ruler. Much of his prejudice may be attributed to the fact that he is young and inexperienced in sexual matters.

According to the first messenger's speech, the Theban Bacchae have two entirely different aspects: one is peaceful and joyful, and the other violent, which is analogous to the hidden aspects of Dionysus himself—the destructive power underneath the smile. The scenes on the invisible stage show, however, that they live a wild but spiritually exalted life as suggested in the Chorus' song. Possessed by madness they exercise inconceivable abilities beyond human limitation. With this power they kill the herd of cattle and plunder the villages, which excites Pentheus' rage towards them. The sparagmos of the cattle reveals the savagery latent in the cult, which together with the disastrous fate of Actaeon, hinted at by Cadmos, foretells how Pentheus is to meet with a tragic death. Their quietness after their violent actions is ominous, hinting at more violence to come.

... Dionysus dresses Pentheus in women's robes and indulges his prurient imagination at Pentheus' expense. Like Agave who, in her delirium, thinks her deeds to be worthy of praise and feels blessed, Pentheus feels liberated from oppression and happy during his madness, though he pays the price of having to abandon his self-consciousness. When the two of

them enter Cithaeron; the two streams of action which have been running parallel to each other, one on the visible stage and the other on the invisible, converge for the first time on the latter.

The second messenger reports the gruesome scene of Pentheus' death so vividly that we can visualize it easily. The sparagmos of Pentheus, which had been anticipated in the destruction of the cattle, symbolizes the ultimate destructive power of Dionysus, manifested in the Theban Bacchae. The poet does not seem to share the supreme joy the women feel while tearing him asunder and throwing his flesh about like a ball. Euripides describes it in all its macabre detail without sympathy. As Winnington-Ingram points out, the scenes on Cithaeron are a microcosm of the drama as a whole.

The last words of the play before the formulaic close are Agave's: "Let me go away / where bloody Cithaeron will not see me, / where I can not see Cithaeron, where nothing / will make me think of a thyrsus again. / Other women can now be the Bacchae." (1383-87) (translation by R. Lattimore). The mountain that has been the invisible stage looms up at last, destroying every illusion that the world of Dionysus is a joyful one.

### Archaeologia Vergiliana

— La légende d'Enée et le culte de la déesse —

Masahiro OGAWA

Si, dans la tradition littéraire d'Homère à Virgile, le guerrier troyen Enée a été mis sous la protection maternelle d'Aphrodite ou Vénus,

c'est que, dans le domaine religieux, la légende de ce héros a toujours eu des relations étroites avec le culte de la déesse, depuis sa genèse en Grèce jusqu'à son dernier développement au temps d'Auguste. Dans la présente étude, l'auteur s'est proposé de suivre l'évolution de ces rapports, pour montrer en particulier comment les Romains ont assimilé et plus tard utilisé cette association mythique d'origine étrangère.

Voici d'abord les trois principales étapes que l'on peut remarquer de l'origine jusqu'à l'introduction à Rome :

1) La première liaison, qui se forma sans doute dans le pays natal des Troyens, semble refléter par sa nature le culte asiatique d'Aphrodite : on apprend par le récit d'Homère (*Il.*, 20, 300sqq.; etc.) et l'*Hymne homérique à Aphrodite* qu'il existait en Troade une race se prétendant descendante d'Enée (Aineadai) et que la divinité qui avait enfanté leur ancêtre fabuleux avait les traits caractéristiques de la Grande Mère de l'Asie Mineure ; aussi peut-on supposer que la figure mystérieuse d'Enée, telle qu'elle est dépeinte dans l'*Iliade*, a été créée dans ces circonstances religieuses comme un double d'Attis, compagnon de Cybèle.

2) Propagée ensuite en Sicile, la légende troyenne se rattacha au culte de l'Erycine, déesse assimilée à l'Aphrodite grecque en sa qualité de divinité de la mer, et lui donna le titre "Aineias" (cf. Denys d'Hal., *A.R.*, 1,50,4; 1,53,1). Ici, la modification des attributions d'Aphrodite (déesse de la fécondité devenue celle de la navigation) s'accorde avec le changement de situation de son enfant parti sur mer en quête d'une demeure fixe.

3) Pour s'acclimater enfin en terre italienne, le mythe et la religion durent subir, l'un et l'autre, des transformations essentielles : tandis que le héros était romanisé et devenait l'incarnation de la "pietas" (vertu cardinale pour le Romain), la déesse s'identifiait à la Vénus romaine dont la fonction religieuse consistait à donner aux hommes les faveurs

des dieux (*venia deum*). En adoptant Enée comme fondateur de leur cité, les Romains des premiers siècles pouvaient déjà non seulement reconnaître en lui leur "pietas", mais encore compter légitimement sur l'action propitiatoire de leur divinité protectrice.

A partir de cette assimilation, œuvre incontestablement originale, le groupe Enée-Vénus n'a cessé d'incarner la religiosité du peuple romain: par lui s'explique en effet, pendant la période républicaine, la fête annuelle des Vinalia, dont le mythe étologique montrait la déesse assumant le rôle de médiatrice entre Enée et Jupiter et assurant ainsi la victoire de la "pietas" des Romains-Enéades.

A la fin de la République, c'est essentiellement à partir de l'utilisation politique du culte vénusien que la légende a pris son dernier essor: s'efforçant de chercher des appuis divins à leur propre imperium, les grands ambitieux de cette époque ont de plus en plus revalorisé la puissance de la déesse et en même temps le mythe de l'ascendance troyenne qui leur permettaient de se prévaloir de la faveur exceptionnelle des dieux. Parmi ces hommes d'Etat, Jules César a occupé une place avantageuse grâce à sa généalogie mythique (il a appartenu à une famille "troyenne"), et, héritant de la tradition culturelle de son père adoptif, Octave-Auguste a su stabiliser le culte de "Venus Genetrix" dans la religion officielle restaurée. Ainsi, au début de l'empire romain, la déesse a-t-elle reçu le plus juste hommage de sa "postérité", pour avoir permis l'accomplissement de l'ancienne promesse faite à son fils par les Dieux olympiens (cf. *Il.*, 20, 307-308; *Aen.*, 1, 257-296).

## *Exempla maiorum* in Juvenal

Eiichiro TANI

Reading Juvenal's satires we are deeply impressed by his use of picturesque examples. He refers to good examples chiefly from the *maiores* or the ancestors of Rome. Although it can be said that some of them are reduced to commonplaces, generally speaking Juvenal uses them to serve the purpose of each satire. In the invective Satires I, II and VI he uses them to accuse the degenerate nobility and to demonstrate that their behaviour is shameful and a disgrace to their ancestors. In the plaintive Satires III, V and VI, he uses *maiores* to express a kind of "chronological primitivism", in the form of a longing for the Golden Age. In the persuasive Satires VIII, XI and XIV the poet invokes *exempla maiorum* as a guiding principle of conduct.

In addition Juvenal sometimes refers to renowned philosophers. His attitude to them does not remain unchanged throughout the satires. In Satires II and III he scorns hypocrite philosophers. Seneca is praised in Satires V and VIII, not because he was a philosopher, but because he was very generous to his less fortunate friends. In Satire X two Greek philosophers, Heraclitus and Democritus are placed above Roman ancestors. By examining how Juvenal deals with philosophers, we can deduce that the philosophers he approves of are those who despise luxury and live a simple life and whose teachings agree with his own experience and conceptions.



## Lessing und Aristoteles

— um die Deutung von „Poetik“ (6 1449b 27) —

Yasuo TAKENAKA

G. E. Lessing hat „Phobos“ und „Eleos“ im „Tragödiensatz“ von Aristoteles „Poetik“ (6 1449b 27) durch „Furcht“ und „Mitleid“ übersetzt.

Mit „Furcht“ meint er keine Furcht oder vielmehr kein Entsetzen, das auf etwas im Augenblick auf der Bühne Geschehendes bezogen ist, sondern das bange Voraussehen eines Schicksals, das der Zuschauer über die Personen des Dramas verhängt sieht; allgemeiner gesagt, heißt „Furcht“ hier die Furcht vor der Unberechenbarkeit des menschlichen Daseins, davor, daß niemand vor seinem Schicksal sicher ist. In diesem Sinn ist sein Furchtbegriff bis zur Tiefe „einer reflektierten Idee“ verinnerlicht.

Andererseits ist das „Mitleid“ ein sehr umfassendes und vieldeutiges Wort. Lessing versteht nämlich darunter alle Gefühlsregungen angesichts der dramatischen Illusion. „Mitleid“ enthält natürlich das Mitleid im „moralischen“ Sinn, aber es läßt sich dadurch nicht erschöpfend erklären. Es hat weiter zu tun mit den „mitgeteilten Leidenschaften“ der dramatischen Personen (Furcht, Schrecken, Zorn usw.) und darüberhinaus auch die Gefühlsregung des Zuschauers, wenn er das Leiden des Helden auf der Bühne voraussieht. Diese Gefühlsregung kann man nie „mitgeteilte Leidenschaft“ nennen; andererseits darf man jene „mitgeteilten Leidenschaften“ als das „Fühlen des Fühlens“ auf seiten des Zuschauers bezeichnen. Ohne Zweifel kann man für eine dramatische Person bloß deswegen fürchten, weil man sie von außen her sieht und über sie mehr weiß, als sie selbst über sich weiß. Dies alles versteht

Lessing unter „Mitleid“, wenn er „Furcht“ in das folgende Verhältnis zu „Mitleid“ setzt:

diese Furcht ist das auf uns selbst bezogene Mitleid.

(Hamb. Dram. St. 75)

Er sagt, die „Furcht“ sei die Bedingung des tragischen „Mitleids“.

Aber Lessings Auffassung entspricht kaum dem von Aristoteles mit „Phobos und Eleos“ Gemeinten. Aristoteles gebraucht diese Bezeichnung meist im Sinn von „Phobos und Eleos erregende Geschehnisse“. Dabei faßt er wohl solche Szenen ins Auge, wo etwa Elektra die Aschenurne ihres Bruders umfaßt, Philoktet von Schmerzen gefoltert wird, und besonders die, in der sich Oidipus entsetzt, als sich ihm das große Geheimnis plötzlich offenbart. Auch an anderen Stellen in der „Poetik“ werden ähnliche Redewendungen benutzt, die schließlich auf dasselbe hinauswollen.

Lessing hat diesen Satz mißverstanden oder zumindest umgedeutet. Um seine eigene Deutung zu stützen, zieht er die Definition von Phobos aus der „Rhetorik“ heran. Dort steht zwar „Phobos“ in Verbindung mit der Zukunft, wird aber als Schmerz oder (Seelen-)verwirrung aufgefaßt. Bei all seiner glänzenden Formulierung hat dieser Gedanke einen Widerspruch in sich. Es ist *eine* Sache, daß ein Übel zu geschehen droht. Diese Möglichkeit zu bemerken, ist eine ganz *andere* Sache. Das hat nichts mit Leidenschaft zu tun.

Für Lessing ist „Furcht“ die Bedingung des „Mitleids“, die die dramatische Illusion überhaupt erst ermöglicht. Hier steht Schadewaldt in unerwarteter Nähe zu Lessing. Denn nach ihm soll die Tragödie nicht „Furcht“ im verwässerten noch „Mitleid“ im humanitär-philanthropischen Sinn dem Zuschauer zeigen, sondern das Ungeheure, das Erschütternde.

Wo die „Furcht“ am größten ist, wird auch das „Mitleid“ am stärksten. Das ist der Fall im bürgerlichen Trauerspiel. Lessing sagt dazu ausdrücklich:

Das Unglück derjenigen, deren Umstände den unsrigen am nächsten kommen, muß natürlicherweise am tiefsten in unsere Seele dringen.

Lessings Aristoteles-Deutung hat also diesem Typ des Trauerspiels als theoretische Stütze gedient.

Ohne diese seine Auffassung wären wahrscheinlich so bedeutsame tragische Figuren wie die gefangene Jole, der wahnsinnige Ajas, der gefesselte Prometheus aus dem Gesichtskreis der Dramentheorie verschwunden. Wenn für die Dramatiker, die griechischen nicht ausgenommen, die „Furcht“ des Zuschauers der Kern ihrer Dramentechnik ist, so trifft die Auffassung Lessings ins Schwarze, obwohl er das von Aristoteles Gemeinte verfehlt. Dürfen wir nicht behaupten, daß die Dramentheorie dadurch an Weite und Tiefe gewonnen hat?