

Title	Abstract of Vol.12, Mar.1995
Author(s)	
Citation	西洋古典論集 (1995), 12: 75-82
Issue Date	1995-03-31
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2433/68629
Right	
Type	Departmental Bulletin Paper
Textversion	publisher

SUMMARIES

Sophocles' Oedipus Coloneus, 465-492

Yoshinao Sato

In Sophocles' Oedipus Coloneus, the Chorus tells Oedipus to make peace with Eumenides at Colonus by performing the rite of purification. (465-92) This part has been interpreted only within the first epeisodion, but it affects the whole play.

Being hieros not only as a supplicant, but also as a receiver of Apollon's oracle, Oedipus essentially belongs to a sanctuary. Though he does not want to pollute the place, he actually does pollute it and follows the warning of the chorus in retreating from there. We must note that when he enters the sanctuary, he is unaware that this is a sanctuary and that he himself is a supplicant. The play begins with "To what region have we come?" It is not until he hears that this is the sanctuary belonging to Eumenides that he realizes he is a supplicant.(44) Though he qualifies himself as a supplicant, the goddesses do not recognize him as one, because the disposition of the supplicant is most important in supplication. He must first purify the pollution he has brought to the sanctuary, so that he can be acknowledged as a supplicant and pray.

Since the purification is concerned with Oedipus, he ought to perform the rite himself. However, it is performed by Ismene instead of Oedipus. She can be his proxy because she has 'good will' (εὐνοίας 499) from the goddesses. Then, attention turns from the form of the rite to the heart of the prayer. Despite the change in prayers, which was greatest change in the rite, good will maintains the validity of the purification because the outer dimension must correspond to the inner dimension in purification and prayer. The importance of good will foreshadows the supplications of Creon and Polyneices to Oedipus. In both cases, their supplications are in vain because of the lack of good will. We may see the play as constructed in the contrast between a supplication which is to be granted and that which is not.

The prayer to accept Oedipus at Coronus is repeatedly expressed in combination with his heroization. Heroes do not equal the gods, since they are bound fast to where their graves are. Their efficacy does not reach beyond the limits of their home. Oedipus must be accepted unclear in order to become a Hero and put an effective curse on Creon and Polyneices. It is the purification and prayer that meets this requisite for heroization.

We may regard the kinship between Oedipus and Eumenides as one of the motives of the play. It results from their common character. Their influence is limited to a single locality. The goddesses give blessing as Eumenides lays a curse as Erinyes; Oedipus provides benefits for his host and ruins those who drive him away. It is necessary for Oedipus to restore his relationship with Eumenides in order to make their connection substantial. The rite of purification establishes the ground for that motif.

A Re-examination of Morality in Plautus' *Trinummus* :
Comic Effect of *fides* and *amicitia*

Kenji Kamimura

The *Trinummus* of Plautus contains considerable moralizing on virtue, and hence it is often considered as a boring play. This paper explores the uses of the traditional virtues, especially *fides* (faith, loyalty) and *amicitia* (friendship), are used for comic effect as well.

Stasimus, a slave of Charmides and Lesbonicus, doubts the honesty of Callicles, a friend of Charmides, and contrasts his own loyalty to his master with Callicles' supposed treachery to Charmides (600-1, 611-621). He drives Charmides to despair by informing him of the betrayal of Callicles (1077-93).

Thus, the misjudged *fides* and *amicitia* of Callicles (cf. 1110-3) provides humor. Therefore, it is likely that *fides* and *amicitia* are also related to some other comical scenes in the *Trinummus*.

The dialogue between Stasimus and Philto (516-59) is one of the most amusing scenes in the play. The young master Lesbonicus assents to give his sister to Philto's son in marriage, and insists that he should offer his farm as a dowry. Stasimus attempts to persuade Philto to reject the farm by audacious fictions. Lesbonicus' aside, in which he mentions Stasimus' loyalty (528 *mi infidelis non est*), is inserted for comic effect. Lesbonicus does not know that Stasimus is acting against his will.

However, Stasimus is really loyal to his master, since he tries to protect the property, the only remaining source of income (512-4, 561). However, the attempt here is irrelevant, because Philto has no mind to accept a dowry (499, 511). It is the pointless *fides* of Stasimus that provides amusement.

The dialogue between the swindler and Charmides (871-997) is generally recognized as the funniest scene in the play. The swindler, hired to bring Lesbonicus forged letters from Charmides, meets Charmides himself. He asserts that Charmides is his friend (895 *amicus*), without knowing that the man he is

talking to is Charmides. Moreover, he forgets the name of Charmides. He gets irritated, and abuses Charmides (923, 925, 926-7), who is supposed to be absent. Charmides tells him not to speak ill of a friend (924, 926 *amico*).

The point of the whole scene is that the swindler is mocked by an old man, but there is another twist. Charmides, unwilling to disclose his identity, cannot censure the swindler directly, and he is forced to speak in a roundabout way. The fictitious *amicitia* that the swindler claims arouses laughter.

The monologue of Stasimus about *mores* (1028-58) is a parody of serious observations on morality of other characters. A long lamentation over moral decay is comical from the mouth of a drunken slave, and it contains sheer nonsense (1039-40). Moreover, his motive for it is a betrayal of his friend (1050-6). *Fides* and *amicitia* are also related to this scene (1048 *fidem*, 1052, 1054, 1056 *amicum*).

To sum up, in the *Trinummus*, while the true *fides* and *amicitia* of Callicles is highly praised (1125-6), the pointless *fides* of Stasimus and the fictitious *amicitia* of the swindler are used for comic effect.

Peace and Janus in Book One of Ovid's *Fasti*

Hiroyuki Takahashi

This paper observes some incongruous expressions concerning Peace and Janus in the first book of the *Fasti*, which seem to reflect the characteristic narrative manner and arrangement of the work.

Put the last to the first. The entry of *ara Pacis* on Jan. 30(709-22) contains some features fitting to *sphragis*: a main theme highlighted at the end of the book, and *carmen deductum*, 'fine-woven poem', suggested by the juncture *carmen deduxit* in l.709. There are, however, other features pointing to the opposite: l.709 is an extremely heavy and awkward line, with four spondees in the first four feet and a diaeresis after the first foot, which has no caesura, and l.710 notes that this is the second-last day of the month, namely the wrong moment for a *sphragis* of the calendar poem. This incongruity seems to be concisely expressed by the phrase *carmen deduxit*, which, judging from the word order, does not really stand for *carmen deductum*, and to reflect the difficulty which the *Fasti* has to deal with : arrangement in calendrical order hinders coherent presentation.

The proem(1-26) proclaims the *Fasti* to be poetry of peace. Ovid is anxiously nervous about putting the grand and weighty themes of augustan Rome in the little and light verse of elegy(4-5, 16), but he hopes that his work will stand within the genre with its year going well as long as it is in peace and *doctus princeps*(19f.) accepts it with the peaceful look(3), on which its success depends (17-18).

This proem could have been aptly bridged to the Jan. 1 entry by the passage about Romulus' year of ten months(27-44): the error of the rude and unlearned king's year was corrected by Numa, a pious, erudite and peace-loving king, adding January and February, and at the beginning of the Jan. 1 entry Janus, the god of the month, takes over the role played by the prince, the dedicatee of the calendar poem, in the proem.

In fact, there is the explanation of the characters of day(45-62) interrupting

this smooth shift. It abruptly begins by saying: *Ne tamen ignores*(45)(also cf. *ne fallare cave*(58) in contrast to *recognosces*(7)), but why should a man so skilled in *civica arma*(23) as Germanicus be ignorant of those legal matters(45-53; note also *iura*(45), *officium*(46), *vindicat*(55), *tutela*(57))? Here we should pay attention to ll.61-2: *haec mihi dicta semel, totis haerentia fastis, / ne seriem rerum scindere cogar, erunt*. The right comment in the right place: this passage itself fully demonstrates the disrupting nature by cutting off the transition. This incoherence combined with the sudden change of topic appears to expose the difficulty in arranging materials day by day which applies to the whole poem .

On the first reading of the Jan. 1 entry, it seems that the interview with Janus (89-288) is its main body, and that the new consuls' inaugural rite(71-88) and the dedication of the temples for Aesculapius and Veiovis(289-94) are incidental, whereas they are the events marked on the calendar. In this respect the first line of the Aesculapius-Veiovis passage(*Quod tamen ex ipsis licuit mihi discere fastis* 289) is remarkably similar to that of the passage explaining the days(*Ne tamen ignores variorum iura dierum* 45). Someone may wonder if the teachings of Janus were not satisfactory(cf. *disce* 101,133; *percipe* 102,166; *multa didici* 228).

But we should note that the dialogue also begins with a similar phrase(*Quem tamen?* 89), suddenly shifting the topic. And we wonder why Ovid was so frightened at the appearance of Janus, the god of peace. It is probably because it occurred to the poet's mind that the presence of Janus meant the opening of his temple's doors, i.e. *Belli portae*(cf. *Verg.Aen.* 7.607): the god should hide in peace, reveal himself in war(277), then here would come a war, that might ruin the *Fasti*, a poem of peace!

Why, then, did the god appear now? Because he thought he was asked to do so by the poet, who prayed that he might open the doors(70) and teach the cause (91). Of course, this was not what Ovid had intended. By the temples(70) he probably meant the new year figuratively, or specifically *Iuppiter capitolinus* (*candida*(70) suggests the white robes of the inaugural rite(79-80)) and the two temples dedicated on Jan. 1(*patres*(290) echoes *patribus*(69)). In this calendar poem it would be reasonable to imagine that Ovid's original plan had only those

temples for Jan. 1. His expression, however, is so ambiguous (*resera nutu tuo* 70), that it is no wonder that Janus thought it was his own temple. Here is Ovid's first fault. His second is that he neglected the traditional form of invocation to the Muses when taking up a new theme (*haec ego cum sumptis agitare tabellis* 93; cf. Callim. *Aet.* fr.1.21-22). Perhaps Janus happily felt like revealing himself because the poet sidestepped the convention to call upon him.

Thus the dialogue between the god and the poet began by their miscommunication, product of sheer chance. At the start, the poet, hampered by the initial terror, looks very awkward: unable to say a word until the god's gentle eyes (*voltu* 145; cf. 3,18) encourage him to inquire (145-46), after the long section (101-44), giving time for recovery, as the passage associating the opening of the doors with Peace going out over the world (121-22) helps the poet to overcome his fear. For that Ovid naturally gives thanks (147), but his first question, with his eyes still downcast (148), is pointlessly lengthy (149-60), while the god's answer is concise (161-64). The second question is anticipated by the god before it is uttered (165-66).

In time, however, Ovid grows more and more at ease: the third question is launched immediately (*mox ego* 171) and the fourth (175-76) without any halt after the god's replies. Janus, on the other hand, now looks less cooperative as if he is looking for the right time to return to behind the doors (presumably because he cannot leave them open so long). After the poet's fourth question Janus makes a pause (177) for the first time. Twice he is said to have finished (*desierat Ianus* 183, *finierat monitus* 227), but each time Ovid finds the words to continue (183-84, 227-28). In his memories of the Golden Age (233-52) Janus associates a god hiding in Latium with the peaceful kingdom of his own (not of Saturn, who was just a *hospes* 240), presumably to suggest to Ovid that the god had better hide himself in time for peace. To conclude, exhibiting his key, Janus stresses his power to maintain peace (253-54), and shuts his mouth as if to close the gates (*presserat ora deus* 255).

But Ovid does not care, opening his mouth to call out the god (255-56). This is Ovid's third fault. As a result, the god brought forth a war (*rettulit arma* 260),

which broke out as the gates were unbarred(266, 269) and ceased when the path was closed(272), thanks to Janus.

Now the poet, as well as the god, realizes it is time. Ovid's last question is as short as a single line(277), as if to suggest that the god hide(*lates?*). After the last words of the god(279-82) there was peace(*pax erat* 285), probably because Janus was back on duty watching all over the world(283-84) from behind the gates.

With regard to the ineptitude of Ovid as *vates* seen above, the last line of his prayer to Janus(288) could be paraphrased as: take care lest the author abandon his work (by carelessly unbarring(*de-serat*) your doors).

In the Jan. 1 entry we see the defectiveness of calendrical arrangement being subtly balanced by the poet's incompetence. He promises to take up grand themes in calendrical order, but when he does so, the incoherent nature of the work is put into focus, while, when he fails, the results are successful: we can have a real feeling of peace through the humorous conversation between the timid, but careless and easy-going poet and the gentle, kind and generous god. The calendar looks like a book of complicated rules which enable a playful poet to enjoy the game better, rather than presenting the difficulties in making poetry.