

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Jovita Dikmonienė

POETICS OF FEELINGS IN SENECA'S TRAGEDIES

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Philology (04H)

Vilnius, 2011

The dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University, in 2005–2010.

Research Supervisor:

Assistant Professor Dr. Dalia Emilija Staškevičienė (Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

The Dissertation is defended at the Academic Council of Philology, Vilnius University:

Chairwoman:

Professor, Habilitated Doctor Eugenija Ulčinaitė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

Members:

Assistant Professor Dr. Nijolė Juchnevičienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

Assistant Professor Dr. Naglis Kardelis (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

Professor, Habilitated Doctor Jolanta Gelumbeckaitė (Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Institute of Comparative Linguistics, Philology – 04H).

Assistant Professor Dr. Aušra Martišiūtė (Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

Opponents:

Assistant Professor Dr. Audronė Kairienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

Professor Dr. Roma Bončkutė (Klaipėda University, Humanities, Philology – 04H).

The Dissertation will be defended at an open meeting of the Academic Council of Philology held at Vincas Krėve Auditorium, the Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University, at 3.00 p.m., 25 March 2011.

Address: Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513, Vilnius, telephone: 2687216, tel. / fax: 2687217.

The Dissertation summary was sent out on _ February 2011.

The Dissertation is also available at Vilnius University Library.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Jovita Dikmonienė

JAUSMŲ POETIKA SENEKOS TRAGEDIJOSE

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04H)

Vilnius, 2011

Disertacija rengta 2005–2010 metais Vilniaus universitete

Mokslinis vadovas:

doc. dr. Dalia Emilija Staškevičienė (Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H).

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkė:

prof. habil. dr. Eugenija Ulčinaitė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H).

Nariai:

doc. dr. Nijolė Juchnevičienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H).

doc. dr. Naglis Kardelis (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H).

prof. habil. dr. Jolanta Gelumbeckaitė (Frankfurto prie Maino Johanno Wolfgango Goethes universitetas, Lyginamosios kalbotyros institutas, filologija – 04H).

doc. dr. Aušra Martišiūtė (Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H).

Oponentai:

doc. dr. Audronė Kairienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H).

prof. dr. Roma Bončkutė (Klaipėdos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H).

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2011 m. kovo 25 d., 15 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakulteto Vinco Krėvės auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, LT–01513, Vilnius, telefonas 2687216, tel. / faks. 2687217.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2011 m. vasario _ d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

Introduction

Tragedy is inseparable from our perception of the being. Tragedies reflect on the themes of human pain, death, suffering, fate. Seneca's tragedies were written almost two thousands years ago, but they still have not lost their relevance – they are staged in contemporary theatres, literature theory studies are carried out on their form, characters' nature, expression of emotions and their reception in the renaissance drama. Contemporary researchers acknowledge that Seneca's tragedies are a significant psychological study on a suffering human being, which still amazes by its powerful insights, beauty and artistry.

In this dissertation, the term 'Poetics' is applied mostly in consideration of the wholeness of artistic, rhetoric and stylistic measures. In the Lithuanian language the words 'feeling' and 'emotion' are used as synonyms, thus while analyzing expression of the characters' feelings in Senecan tragedies, the dissertation author does not try to emphasize any differences in these two concepts.

2,500 years ago Plato (in his *Phaedrus*, *Philebus* and *Symposium*) and Aristotle (in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, *On Breath* and *Rhetoric*) explored the nature of feelings. Subsequently, the Stoics (Zeno of Sitium, Chrysippus), Cicero (in his *Questions Debated at Tusculum*), Seneca (*On Anger*) and Plutarchus (*Moralia*) also focused on the analysis of feelings. According to contemporary psychologists Cheshire Calhoun and Robert C. Solomon (1984), Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* developed an impressive modern theory of emotions, which up to the present day has been deflecting the criticism of many scholars and presenting a significant alternative to the presently dominating W. James's theory. Even Seneca's ideas on suppressing anger rather than its moderate 'wreaking out' have not lost their relevance today. As proven by the recent research of contemporary psychologists, aggressive actions and fantasies do not reduce aggression, and by pouring our anger out we cannot be relieved of it (B. J. Bushman, 2000).

Many contemporary theories analyze emotions in two aspects: the physiological and cognitive. Like Classic thinkers, modern philosophers mostly focus on the cognitive side of emotions, exploring the relationship between an emotion and conviction. For example, if a person is embarrassed, it means he believes that he has got into the inconvenient situation, or if a person is in love, he believes that his beloved is the kindest person. According to Ch. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon, attempts to find out a specific link between human emotions and convictions have become one of the central issues in contemporary discussions.

Another two important issues are closely related to the research of emotions. Although we often talk about emotions as being 'inside of us', the analysis of emotions cannot be restricted only by such 'inside' physiological and psychological aspects – senses, desires,

convictions. Nearly always emotions have ‘the outside’ aspect – an expression in human behavior. Usually we can recognize human emotions by watching how persons talk and act, therefore many philosophers and psychologists define emotions as specific behavioral pattern.

Finally, emotions are dependent on the cultural environment and circumstances. In other words, they can be ‘learned’, imitated following the others. Anthropologist Jean L. Briggs in his book *Never in Anger* states that some Inuit tribes never get angry. The scholar has discovered that Inuit people do not express their anger; they cannot feel it and even do not have any word for expressing it in their language. The word closest to ‘being angry’ in their language means ‘childish’. According D. G. Myers (2008), the ‘pouring out’ of anger is more characteristic to individualistic cultures, but it is rarely found in those cultures, where a person’s identity is more related to a group. People having a stronger feeling of their interrelationships consider anger as causing threat to the wellbeing of a group (Markus and Kitayama, 1991).

As there are plenty of human feelings and emotions, first of all, it has to be defined, what particular feelings have to be analyzed in this dissertation paper. Anger is one of the most important feelings in Seneca’s tragedies. It is described in all tragedies by this author; he has devoted three treatises to the analysis of this feeling. Shame and guilt are also the feelings inseparable from the Antique tragedy. Shame including a few different aspects of this feeling, and pride, anger and guilt in Ancient Greek tragedies, epos, lyrics, the works by Aristotle, Plato and Sophists have been researched by Douglas L. Cairns (*Aidōs. The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford, 1993). One of the most significant works before Cairns’ was *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 1951, by Dodds devoted to the analysis of shame and guilt in the Greek literature.

Seneca’s tragedies also often deal with fear, which is intensified by the poet picturing cosmic and earthly catastrophes, atrocities of the afterlife. In his philosophical works (*Moral Letters to Lucilius* and *Natural Questions*) Seneca focuses more on the biological fear of death rather than on the fear of the global catastrophe. A hundred years earlier, the fear of death was also analyzed in the poem *On the Nature of Things* by another famous Roman poet Lucretius. Seneca discloses the fear of death and its defeat in *Hercules Oetaeus*. In this work the poet presents a stoic example of peace at facing death. Fear of the global catastrophe or, the so-called disintegration fear, was first noticed and described in this tragedy by Denis Henry and Elisabeth Henry (*The Mask of Power: Seneca’s Tragedies and Imperial Rome*, Warminster, Chicago, 1985). The dissertation also touches upon the feelings of love and jealousy. Many Roman poets wrote love poems. In Senecan tragedies a huge influence of Lucretius, Vergil and Ovid can be felt.

It would be much more difficult to understand the feelings of Seneca's tragic characters without considering the Stoic concept of emotions, which forms a basis for Senecan theory of feelings. One of the most recent researches on the Stoic emotion theory is *Emotion and Peace of Mind* (2000) by Richard Sorabji and *Stoicism and Emotion* (2007) by Margaret Graver.

Early Stoics (Zeno, Cleanthes and Chrysippus) distinguished four basic feelings: rejoicing, sadness, desire and fear. Rejoicing is focused on perception of the present good, sadness – of the present evil, desire – on perception of the future good, and fear – of the future evil. Anger was considered a certain type of desire. In the 3rd century B.C. Stoics stated that a sage had not to be overwhelmed by his subconscious emotions. The theory of feelings in Stoicism was not aimed at mentoring a person on how to deal with feelings being able to suppress them, reduce emotions or make them actually conformed to a caused impression, but rather at teaching a person to recognize his feelings and be in possession of the positive ones – will (instead of passion), cautiousness (instead of fear) and joy (instead of rejoicing).

Although feelings are a social phenomenon and it is widely accepted that an onlooker can see better what the other person can feel (partially this idea forms a basis for Freud's psychoanalysis), feelings first of all are a human body's internal reaction, also depending on his convictions and cultural tradition, thus in recognizing and evaluating a feeling one needs great cautiousness. Dodds, Adkins and Cairns, who analyzed emotions of the characters in Ancient Greek tragedies, were often criticized by other scholars, especially for their incorrect identification of feelings. In the present dissertation, characters' feelings are recognized and defined as based on Seneca's tragedies, *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Editor in Chief Alan E. Kazdin, Vol. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, Oxford, 2000, and definitions of contemporary psychologists (David G. Myers, *Psichologija*, Kaunas, 2008; Antoni Kępiński, *Gyvenimo ritmas*, Vilnius, 2008), as well as definitions of feelings provided in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Cicero's *Questions Debated at Tusculum* and Seneca's *On Anger*.

Characters' feelings are especially emphasized in Seneca's tragedies. The personages continuously talk about their feelings, and emotions are described by the poet with the help of different rhetoric, poetic devices, so the author of this paper has selected the following subject for her dissertation: *Poetics of the Characters' Feelings in Seneca's Tragedies*.

Until now no more detailed research paper has been devoted to the analysis of characters' feelings in Senecan tragedies covering all basic, inherent to the characters emotions that drive forward the entire action in these dramas. Also no research has been made trying to answer the questions, what kind of the characters' feelings are pictured in different types of his tragedies, and what role feelings play in the them. Finally, no systemic research has ever been

made on how Seneca disclosed his characters' feelings and what literary, artistic devices he applied.

Subject Matter and Sources of the Research

The subject of the research is eight fully preserved tragedies by Seneca: *The Trojan Women*, *Hercules Furens*, *Medea*, *Phaedra*, *Oedipus*, *Agamemnon*, *Thyestes* and *Hercules Oetaeus*. The manuscripts of Senecan tragedies are divided into two groups of corpuses – A and E. *Octavia* is present only in the Corpus A. Other nine tragedies are found in both corpuses. The earliest preserved manuscript of Seneca's tragedies was found in the Etruscan Corpus (E) composed in about 1,100 A.D. and kept in the Laurentian Library, Florence. The group of A Corpuses (further distinguished into P, T, G (*Octavia* is found in these only) and C, S and V) is dated a little before 1,204 A.D. In Corpus E Seneca's tragedies are placed in the following order of sequence: *Hercules*, *Troades*, *Phoenissae*, *Medea*, *Phaedra*, *Oedipus*, *Agamemnon*, *Thyestes* and *Hercules*. In Corpus A the sequence and titles of tragedies slightly differs: *Hercules Furens*, *Thyestes*, *Thebais*, *Hippolytus*, *Oedipus*, *Troas*, *Medea*, *Agamemnon*, *Octavia* and *Hercules Oetaeus*.

Seneca's tragedies ascribed to the A Group Corpuses prevailed in medieval Europe. At Vilnius University (1579–1773) the poet's tragedies were recited also from the copies of A Group Corpuses. From 1614 to 1622 the following tragedies by Seneca were recited during studies of the Rhetoric Class at Vilnius University: *Medea*, *Hercules Furens*, *Thyestes et Thebais*, *Hyppolitus*, *Oedipus* and *Troas*. In 1711 – Seneca's *Medea*, *Thyestes et Thebais* and *Hyppolitus* (Ludwik Piechnik, *Rozkwit Akademii Wileńskiej w latach 1600–1655*, T. 2 in: *Dzieje Akademii Wileńskiej*, T.1–4. Rzym, 1983).

Vilnius University Library had in its possession one of the earliest publications, Seneca's tragedies in the Incunabula Collection: *Lucius Annaeus Seneca, Tragediae, cum commentario Gelli Bernardini Marmitae et Danielis Caietani. Venezia, Johannes Taminus, 1498*.

In this research work the Latin publication of *Seneca's Tragedies* prepared in 1986 by Otto Zwierlein after making comparisons between Group A and Group E Corpuses is used (*L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae, recognovit Otto Zwierlein, Oxford, 1986*); quotes used in this dissertation are taken from the aforementioned publication and translated into the Lithuanian language.

Forms of ancient Greek and Roman names were written by applying a presently popular principle: *Graeca graece, Latina latine*. In absence of the common opinion, the dissertation author finds such classification the best. Such usage is not a rarity in the Lithuanian language,

the textbook for university students by Dalia Dilytė *Antikinė literatūra (Classic Literature, Vilnius, 1998, 2005)* was written based on this transcription principle. Names of the characters in Seneca's tragedies are spelled in this dissertation on the basis of Latin pronunciation formed in the late Antiquity and Middle Ages, besides this principle is still applied in teaching students to read Latin at Vilnius University. In quoted translations the Classic names have been left unchanged, in the same shape as they were published.

Novelty and Relevance of the Subject

The subject selected for the dissertation is brand new in Lithuanian literature theory and teatrology studies. In the same studies abroad devoted to the Classical drama and theatre issues, Seneca's tragedies have been explored in various aspects, though they still lack a more consistent analysis of all dramas by Seneca with not just one specific feeling (e.g. anger), but rather the entire set of feelings (love, jealousy, anger, fear, shame, guilt) being distinguished as a factor generating the wholeness and meaning of a tragedy.

Usually contemporary scholars of literature analyze the characters' feelings without concentrating on their place in the tragedy, interconnections, significance to the general action of the tragedy and leaving behind the causes of feelings. Most often scientists just review the personages' feelings while solving other issues of literature theory, or analyze feelings by applying exclusively Freudian method of psychoanalysis, considering the characters' feelings only as their suppressed libido.

Thus Seneca's tragedies have not been fully explored; the selected subject is fairly new and original. The comprehensive analysis of expression of the characters' feelings in Senecan tragedies presented in this dissertation will contribute to better understanding of the meaning of Seneca's dramas, the purpose of their creation and place within the thinker's whole written heritage, be helpful in translating the tragedies into the Lithuanian language and finding out the reception of them in the Jesuit Theatre of Vilnius University to the Renaissance and Baroque literature researchers and, finally, may be valuable to Lithuanian theatre directors planning to stage Seneca's tragedies.

Background of the Research

Seneca's dramas have not been analyzed more comprehensively in Lithuania. Out of all ten survived tragedies by Seneca, three were translated into Lithuanian by Jonas Dumčius – *Phaedra, Hercules Furens* and *The Trojan Women*. Not a single monograph has been written on Seneca's tragedies in Lithuania. Just a few articles devoted to the drama works by Seneca were

published in the *Literatūra* scientific publication, 1996, volume 38 (3). In this publication Dalia Dilytė explored the authorship of Seneca's tragedy *Hercules Oetaeus*, Audronė Kudulytė–Kairienė presented a comparison between Helen's character in *the Trojan Woman* and Helen of the Greek mythology, and Izolda Gabrielė Geniušienė introduced T.S. Eliot's view on Seneca's drama works. Two articles by the author of this dissertation were devoted to the expression of feelings of Seneca's characters and the Roman Theatre particularity (*Literatūra* 50 (3), 2008, *Literatūra* 51 (3), 2009). Besides the aforementioned articles, in the *Literatūra* 38 (3) Nijolė Juchnevičienė compared Seneca's satire *Pumpkinification* and Stesimbrotos' political pamphlet, and Eugenija Ulčinaitė discussed how Seneca's works found their way to Lithuania in the 15th century and how two brightest Roman authors Cicero and Seneca influenced the formation of the style of European humanists in the 15th - 16th centuries.

D. Dilytė reviewed Seneca's tragedies in her textbook for university students, *Antikinė Literatūra* (1998, 2005). The review of the poet's tragedies was also given in Josif Tronskis' textbook *Antikinės literatūros istorija (the History of Ancient Greek and Roman Literature*, 1961) and biographic work *Seneka* (1998) by Pierre Grimal.

In Lithuania Seneca's tragedies were considered of especially great value in the 16th – 18th centuries. They made a tremendous influence on the Jesuit School Theatre of Vilnius University. One of the most artistic dramas staged in Vilnius, 1596, was *Filopatris (Philopater seu Pietas)*, the tragicomedy written by Vilnius University Professor Grigalijus Knapijus. A special reception of Seneca's dramas could be felt in this work: recitation of the text, rhetoric, abundance of maxims and a contraposition between the inevitability of human fate and man's strength facing it.

In Europe and the United State of America, Seneca's drama works have always been stirring scientists' attention. In the 18th and 19th centuries tragedies by Seneca were often compared to the 5th century B.C. Ancient Greek tragedies (Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides) and conclusion was made in favor of the latter, as Seneca's dramas were considered too elaborate, pompous and artificial, too rational and even unsuitable for a stage, and too rhetoric, fit only for school declamation. In some cases it was even deeply regretted that Seneca's rather than Greek tragedies had influenced Shakespeare, Marlowe and Ben Jonson's writings and become a benchmark to the Classicist French, Spanish and Italian tragedy. Just a few scholars of the 19th century – the first half of the 20th century recognized the poetic value, psychological nature of the characters and integrity of Seneca's tragedies (L. Ranke, 1888), a positive influence of rhetoric, application of the Stoic psychology and ethics in them (B. M. Marti, 1945).

By the mid 20th century the attitude towards Senecan tragedies radically changed. The former opinion that possibly they could have not been staged or at least written for the 1st century A.D. Roman theatre was denied, a positive outlook to the characters' long and emotional monologues, interrupted action and unanswered questions was developed. Presently scholars regard these stylistic devices as inducing the audience's critical thinking. Two especially favorable T.S. Eliot's essays written in 1927 and expansive Léon Herrmann's study devoted to the analysis of Seneca's drama characters and themes published in 1924 had had a great influence to such change of approach towards Senecan tragedies. Herrmann was one of the first 20th century scholars seeing the value of Seneca's tragedies. The author discussed general issues: dating of dramas, their possible staging and the influence of Greek drama. In 1930 a short, but really significant essay by German scholar Otto Regenbogen was published. It was especially valued and often quoted by later authors. Regenbogen explored the images of pain, suffering and death in Seneca's tragedies. He acknowledged their great power and impression. Since Regenbogen, more and more scientists had focused on the original, thrilling, expressive and even grotesque style of Senecan dramas. Actually, it was the rebirth of Seneca's dramas – they were started to play in modern theatres.

By the end of the 20th century a few trends in exploring Senecan tragedies had settled: 1) Seneca's tragedies within the historic – political context; 2) the relationship between Ancient Greek and Roman tragedies, 3) the influence of Roman poetry on Seneca's tragedies, 4) reflections of the Stoicism philosophy in Seneca's dramas, 5) elements of rhetoric in the tragedies, 6) the influence of Seneca's tragedies on the Renaissance Theatre, 7) psychology of the characters' feelings in Senecan dramas.

Although Seneca (4 B.C. – 65 A.D.) was one of the most outstanding persons in the Roman Empire, the information on his life preserved till our day in works by other Roman authors is very scarce. Available to us is mostly the data on how Seneca was related to Nero and his environment through the treatises by Tacitus, Suetonius and Cassius Dio. Quintilianus' notes on Seneca's style, and accounts by Martialis and Juvenalis on the philosopher also survived. Seneca's tragedies were not analyzed by any Classical author therefore in the Middle Ages it was believed that Seneca, the philosopher, and Seneca, the playwright, were two different persons. Even Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam doubted, whether Seneca could write tragedies, and if he could, what was the purpose of such writing. Erasmus also thought that actually two Senecas existed, the philosopher and playwright. It was by the end of the 16th century only when the philosophical works and dramas were first ascribed to Seneca as one and the same author.

One of the first significant article collections devoted to the influence of Senecan tragedies on the Renaissance Theatre, edited by Jean Jacquot, was published by French scholars in 1964. Within more than a decade, in 1978, an article (with bibliography material) on the influence of Senecan tragedies on the Renaissance drama and tragedy of the Elizabethan era was published in English by Frederick Kiefer. In 1985 Gordon Braden came back to this theme and wrote a detailed study in the English language stating that the Renaissance tragedy had accepted the principles of the 'Senecan tradition' to picture the main character in a play expressing himself through the anger and avenge. This author also distinguished the personages of Stoic restraint and endurance, in response to such avenging character retreating from his wrath to their own world. The theme was further researched by Australian scholar A. J. Boyle in 1997. He explored the declamatory style and reappearing themes in Seneca's dramas, paid a lot of attention to the Roman Theatre and its influence on the Renaissance playwrights, presented a long bibliography on Senecan research.

In 1985 Denis Henry and Elisabeth Henry published an interesting and original study on the artistic principles in Senecan dramas - *The Mask of Power*. They emphasized the power of Seneca's imagery, abundant use of rhetoric devices in creation of impressive, repeating pictures related to the characters' anger, violence, death and disintegration fear. C. J. Herington (1966) presented an especially positive account on Seneca's ability to create dramatic, thrilling images and emphasize appropriately the power of fate devastating a protagonist so that he/she is naturally blinded by the madness of his/her anger and wrath. Clarence W. Mendell also devoted an extensive study to Senecan tragedies (1941). He compared Seneca's dramas to the Greek tragedies focusing on the differences in their prologues, dialogues and choruses, emphasized the meaning of gods and ghosts in Seneca's tragedies and drew the readers' attention to *Oedipus* by Seneca.

In their book *Senecan Tragedy* (1986) Anna Lydia Motto and John R. Clark analyzed each Senecan tragedy separately, especially focusing on the artistry of the dramas. They distinguished repeating motives used by Seneca in creation of the form and characters of the drama; emphasized that Seneca pictured his personages non-heroic, furious, losing control and absolutely unlike the noble heroes of the Greek myths. They also presented a long and detailed bibliography list.

Pratt explored the feelings of Senecan characters in the context of Stoic ideas (1983). The scholar analyzed all tragedies by Seneca, although in a quite slanted way. A lot of hostility to Seneca could be felt in his study. The critic tended to devalue the dramas by the Roman poet. The dissertation author considers such attitude downgrading Pratt's research itself. In Seneca's

dramas the critic noticed only protagonists and antagonists, whom he interpreted as Stoic symbols of Virtue and Vice.

A few other significant articles on Senecan tragedies are worth being mentioned here. R. J. Tarrant (1978) paid attention to the structure and changes of form in Seneca's tragedies, showed how the Classical tragedy developed and what influence the Hellenistic Greek tragedies made on Senecan dramas. The critic also explored the influence by Euripides, New Greek comedy and Augustan writers (Asinius Pollio, Varius and Ovid) on the dramas by Seneca.

In 1986 Dana Ferrin Sutton wrote a study on Senecan tragedies' appropriateness for stage. She stated that the poet wrote his dramas for theatre and supported this idea by the drama extracts. The same subject was considered in the collection of articles (edited by George W. M. Harrison, 2000) also raising a question, whether Seneca wrote his tragedies for theatre or recitations. Twelve classical philology specialists explored the staging problems of Senecan tragedies, the poet's relationship with the Roman Theatre of the time, also the translation issues of his dramas related to contemporary staging of the tragedies by Seneca. In Cincinnati, Ohio, 1998, Harrison organized a conference devoted to Senecan tragedies. The International Conference on Seneca's dramas was organized in Switzerland, Geneva, the Hardt Foundation, by Margarethe Billerbeck and Ernst A. Schmidt. The presentations and discussions by scholars participating in this conference were published in 2004 by *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, Volume 50.

Victoria Tietze Larson (1994) focused on the meaning of descriptions in Senecan tragedies, Peter J. Davis (1993) explored the role of chorus in Senecan as well as other Roman dramas, and Gianni Guastella (2001) analyzed the characters' feelings of anger and rage.

In 1986 Charles Segal wrote the study devoted to psychology of the characters' feelings. He explored the relationship between Seneca's *Phaedra* and Euripides and Ovid's texts. In the collection of articles prepared and edited by Edith Hall and Rosie Wyles (*New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, 2008) two articles analyzed Senecan dramas. They distinguished three clear elements of pantomime present in Seneca's tragedies. The authors' maintained that dramas were written for a theatre stage rather than reciting.

In his book *The Passions in Play, Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama* (2003) Alessander Schiesar explored Atreus' anger and wrath as poetic inspiration, the character's charisma and genius mesmerizing the readers. Schiesar criticized the traditional political – historical reading of the tragedy, when Atreus is understood just as an example of bad tyrant. The critic based his study on Freudian ideas, also the thoughts by Francesco Orlando, the critic of Freudism. Schiesar denied the well-established opinion that Senecan tragedies were somehow

worse than his prose pieces. He also criticized the interpreters who maintained that Senecan tragedies were illustrations of the negative examples presented in the writer's philosophical works.

M. Nussbaum analyzed Senecan *Medea* emphasizing the importance of disastrous love (Nussbaum, Martha, 'Serpents in the Soul: a Reading of Seneca's *Medea*', *The Therapy of Desire, Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*, 1994). She noticed Seneca's special talent to picture passions in such a way that they may cause a shocking feeling in us towards excessive love and anger so that after experiencing such passions together with the characters and recognizing them in ourselves we would like to reject them.

Many similarities between Senecan tragedies and philosophical works were noticed by Harry M. Hine (2004), Norman T. Pratt (1983) and Thomas G. Rosenmeyer (1989). A revolutionary approach by the latter to understand Seneca's tragedies as 'the Stoic dramas' was met quite negatively by many subsequent researchers. Rosenmeyer looked upon Senecan tragedies as the continuation of his Stoic ideas in his prose works. Presently it is widely accepted that at least a few themes of Senecan tragedies are related to his philosophical views. According to E. Fantham and Ch. Gillo (2003), Seneca's interest in natural philosophy, ethics and psychology – first of all in the destructive impact of excessive feelings – plays a key role in the poet's tragedies.

In summary of the background of the research it is noteworthy that the analysis of Senecan characters' feelings in the aforementioned scientific works is incomplete, devoted to the separate tragedies only, without reviewing the entirety. In most cases, the dramas have been analyzed according to a narrow Freudian method or with formal understanding of the characters' feelings, as single-sided ideas of good and evil. Lithuania still lacks the research on Seneca's character feelings. On the whole, Senecan tragedies have not still been the subject of specialized studies in Lithuania; there is no methodology and problematic formed for such research; no reviews of the Roman tragedy and just a few translations can be found.

Objective and Tasks of the Research

The goal of the work is to explore what kind of the characters' feelings in Senecan tragedies serve as a driving force to the tragedy's action, determine its progress and create its emotional mood; to show what artistic devices help Seneca to reveal the very genesis of the character's feeling, its disclosure and existence inside the character; to find out, how all the aforementioned processes are reflected in the character's speech and behavior.

The following tasks are raised in the dissertation:

1. to analyze the characters' feelings, which induce the action in the tragedy;
2. to show through which mythological figures Seneca revealed anger, fear, guilt, shame, love, jealousy. Explore, whether any feeling is prevailing in Senecan tragedies, whether such feeling is typical to all Seneca's characters, or rather different personages have different feelings;
3. to analyze the stylistic and rhetoric devices applied by Seneca in picturing the characters' feelings;
4. to explore the genesis of the characters' most important feelings, disclose what kind of the personage's behavior is determined by one or another feeling, and what language pattern is characteristic to such emotional expression;
5. to find out whether the characters' feelings in Senecan tragedies are pictured chaotically, or whether they have a certain sequence;
6. to identify the purpose why Seneca pictures his characters experiencing extremely strong feelings and what is the probable impact of such feelings on the reader or spectator.

Methods of the Research

The *synthesis* is applied in the Introduction and the First Chapter; *analysis* in the Second Chapter. In consistent description of the characters' feelings, which drive the action in eight Senecan tragedies, the dissertation author applies the *phenomenological* method. The *comparative* method is also applied in making comparisons between Senecan tragedies and looking for any similarities/ differences in comparison to their Greek prototypes. The dissertation author uses the *interpretation/ hermeneutical* method while analyzing the artistic and rhetoric devices, with the help of which the characters' feelings are described, and explaining the meaning and significance of the emotional impact the characters' feelings have on the readers or spectators.

Structure of the Work

The dissertation consists of the Introduction, two main parts of narration, conclusions and list of literature. In the First Chapter the author presents a short overview on prototypes of Senecan dramas - the Ancient Greek and Roman tragedies written according to the Greek mythology plots. In more detail the survived Greek tragedies *Medea*, *Trojan Women*, *Hecuba*, *Andromache*, *Hercules*, *Hippolytus* by Euripides; *Oedipus the King* and *the Trachiniae* by Sophocles; and *Agamemnon* by Aeschylus are discussed comparing them to the Senecan tragedies *Medea*, *Trojan Women*, *Hercules Furens*, *Phaedra*, *Oedipus*, *Hercules Oetaeus* and

Agamemnon. The First Chapter also contains a description of the Roman Theatre in the 1st c. A.D. and popular at the time mime, which, according to some scientists, had major influence on Senecan tragedies and especially his pursuit of picturing the character's rage and madness. This part also deals with spectators/ readers emotions, to which back in the Antique times Gorgias and Aristotle first paid attention and which were none the less important to Seneca.

The Second Chapter is devoted to expression of characters' feelings in Senecan tragedies. This Chapter is divided into four subsections: 1) *Dominants of anger and aggression*; 2) *Dominants of fear, anger and aggression*; 3) *Dominants of fear, shame and guilt*; and 4) *Dominants of love and jealousy*.

The first and second subsections present the analyses of four Senecan tragedies: *Medea*, *Thyestes*, *Trojan Women* and *Agamemnon*. The driving force in these tragedies is the character's anger. This feeling is a keynote in opening, developing and finishing *Thyestes* and *Medea*. Therefore the dissertation author divides this feeling into three stages of development, identifies the artistic devices used by Seneca to disclose this emotion, and follows how he described the characters' behavior, speech, dialogue. Three tragedies analyzed in these subsections – *Thyestes*, *Trojan Women* and *Agamemnon* – are started with the appearance of a ghost of deceased father, who prompt the characters for avenge, strengthen and motivate their anger. This personage was not frequent in the Greek tragedies, although especially liked by Seneca. The dissertation author notices that *Trojan Women* and *Agamemnon* are the only Senecan tragedies with framework composition and long retardation of action therefore she has chosen to analyze them together. In them the action driven by the main characters' anger is suspended for a while with feelings of other characters being described, and only in the final scenes the playwright returns to the characters' anger and aggression themes.

The third and fourth subsections deal with analysis of four Senecan tragedies with the method of comparison being applied. In the research paper the tragedies are grouped by twos: *Hercules Furens* and *Oedipus*, and *Phaedra* and *Hercules Oetaeus*. In the first two tragedies the driving force of action is the characters' fear, and in the latter two – women's love and jealousy. After committing a crime, the character recognizes himself/ herself a criminal and feels shame and guilt. Some characters feel just shame (*Phaedra* and *Deianira*), others – shame and guilt (*Hercules* and *Oedipus*), this drives to their different reaction after recognition. Characters, who feel just shame, commit suicides, and those who feel shame and guilt – punish themselves by exile.

Theses Defended in the Dissertation:

1. The characters' anger, rage, aggression, shame, guilt, love and jealousy contribute to acceleration of the action, whereas fear, sadness and joy – the retardation of the action. More often than the Greek tragedy writers Seneca changes action and place in the internal world of the dramatic character. Strong feelings experienced by the Senecan characters force them travel in time and space, see the afterlife, watch the constellations during the day and talk to the deceased, gods and persons, who are not present nearby.

2. All main characters by Seneca feel and express anger. Shame and guilt are felt by Oedipus, Hercules and Theseus; shame – by Phaedra, Deianira and Jocasta; love – by Phaedra, Andromache and Hercules; jealousy – by Deianira; fear – by Oedipus, Andromache, Hecuba, Amphitryon, Megaira, Thyestes and Aegisthus.

3. Seneca describes the characters' feelings with the use of amplification, introvert dialogue, question and answer scheme, adynaton, anaphora, metaphor, repetition, comparison, irony, hyperbole and paradox.

4. The characters sufferings in Senecan tragedies are caused by strongly experienced anger, rage, guilt, shame, love, jealousy, fear, sadness. Seneca discloses that these feelings are induced by the personages' false convictions and opinions.

5. The characters' feelings in Senecan tragedies are pictured in the appropriate sequence. In tragedies, *where a character commits an unintentional crime and feels his/ her guilt*, first of all fear is described, and then, after the recognition – shame, anger and guilt protecting the character from suicide. In tragedies, *where a character commits an unintentional crime and can feel only shame*, first of all affection and jealousy are described, and after the recognition – anger and shame, which drives him/her to suicide. In tragedies, *where a character commits an intentional crime and can feel neither guilt nor shame*, the feelings of grievance, anger, desire for avenge, fury and complacency after committing the avenge are described.

6. Ideals of the Stoic philosophy had strongly influenced the creative principles of Senecan poetry. Most often the playwright pictured callous, violent and selfish personages in his tragedies with the purpose that we, readers and spectators, could reflect on huge and devastating power of false convictions and untamed feelings and passions arising out of them, rather than just feeling pity for such characters.

Summary of the Dissertation

I. Senecan Tragedies in the Context of Classical Drama and Roman Theatre

1. Mimesis: the Competition with Greek Dramas

In the 1st century A.D. the Roman Empire did no longer have such drama contests as were held by the Greeks in the 6th – 4th centuries B.C., but the spirit of competition and fight was still alive at the time of Seneca. Starting from the 3rd century B.C. Romans translated, contaminated and used as prototypes many Greek literary works seeking to have the lead among Romans with adaptation of Greek literary genres, and later, at the time of Seneca, they wanted to surpass not only the Greek literary works, but also the Roman Golden Age literature with their original style and thought. Longinus, whose creative period coincided with Seneca's, and whose ideas about style, in the dissertation author's opinion, were very close to Senecan tragedy style, wrote that the path leading to the sublime (τὰ ὑψηλὰ) was the imitation and outrival of great past writers and poets (μίμησις τε καὶ ζήλωσις). According to Longinus, poetry has a purpose to astonish, and astonishing is related to the feeling and movement (τό τε παθητικὸν καὶ τὸ συγκεκινημένον).

In his letters Seneca also urged his young friend Lucilius to compete with the great writings of former authors. Seneca stated that he never stopped reading, as he wanted to know what had been explored by others and think about what still could be discovered. According to Seneca, writers have to imitate (*imitaris*) the works of other authors to obtain one piece of writing out of the many, hiding anything what has helped them in the creative process and showing just what is made new.

Seneca provided a new form and original style to Ancient Greek tragedies, used as examples not only the Greek tragedies, but also the works by Vergil, Ovid and Lucretius. It is impossible to trace everything Seneca intercepted, imitated and adapted in his writings, as many Greek and Roman tragedies did not survive. Both *Medeas*, by Euripides and Seneca, are similar, but *Oedipus the King* by Sophocles and *Oedipus* by Seneca, *the Trachiniae* by Sophocles and *Hercules Oetaeus* by Seneca, *Agamemnon* by Aeschylus and Seneca differ a lot. In Senecan *Agamemnon* some motives were taken and recreated from Books I and II of Vergil's *Aeneid* (storm in the sea, description of wooden horse); in *Oedipus* by Seneca the views of a plague looked very similar to the plague descriptions present in Book VI by Titus Lucretius *On the Nature of Things* and Book III by Vergil's *Georgics*, and afterlife images – to the picture of Tartar present in Book VI of Vergil's *Aeneid*.

Besides, Senecan works might be influenced by the Greek and Roman tragedies that did not remain till nowadays. It is known that *Thyestes* was also written by Euripides, Agathon, Apollodorus of Tarsus, Carcinus the Younger, Chaeremon, Cleophon, Diogenes Oenomaus. The same myth was also used as a plot in *Atrous* by Sophocles, Lucius Accius and Publius Pomponius Secundus. Other *Thyestes* were known by the following Roman authors: Quintus Ennius, Varius Rufus, Gaius Cassius Parmensis, Curatius Maternus and Gracchus. Only Senecan *Thyestes* survived till nowadays.

Following the Medea myth the tragedies were written by these Antique authors: Neophron of Sicyon, Carcinus the Younger, Diogenes Oenomaus, Dicaeogenus, Ennius, Accius, Ovid, Curatius Maternus and Marcus Annaeus Lukanus. Only two *Medeas* survived up to the present day: by Euripides and Seneca. Seneca might have been influenced the Letter 12 in Ovid's *Heroides* (to Aeson by Medea), and also Book 7 by Ovid's *Metamorphoses* dedicated to Medea and Aeson.

Senecan *Troades* (*the Trojan Women*) is a contamination of two tragedies by Euripides - *Hecuba* and *Troades*. Before Seneca, other Roman Poet Accius had written *Hecuba* and *Troades*, Ennius - *Hecuba*. The prototype of Senecan *Agamemnon* most likely was the *Agamemnon* by Aeschylus. The plot had been already used before Seneca by Ion of Chios, Sophocles and Accius.

Besides the remaining *Oedipus the King* by Sophocles, eleven more Greek tragedies on Oedipus were written. Their authors were: Achaëus of Eretria, Aeschylus, Euripides, Xenocles the Elder, Nicomachus of Phrygia, Philocles the Elder, Meletus of Athenes, Carcinus the Younger, Diogenes Oenomaus, Theodectes of Phasalis and Lycophron of Chalcis. In Latin two tragedies on Oedipus appeared - by Julius Cesar and Seneca. Only two tragedies survived till nowadays - by Sophocles and Seneca.

The plot Senecan *Hercules Furens* is very similar to *Heracles* by Euripides. It is known that *Heracles* also was written by Sophocles, Timesitheus, Astydamus the Younger, Diogenes Oenomaus, and Lycophron of Chalcis.

Before Seneca, four tragedies on *Phaedra* and *Hippolytus* were written: *Phaedra* by Sophocles, two *Hippolytus* by Euripides and *Hippolytus* by Lycophron of Chalcis. *Hippolytus Veiled* by Euripides and *Phaedra* by Seneca preserved till nowadays. The Senecan *Phaedra* was the result of synthesis and contamination of *Hippolytus Veiled* by Euripides, *Phaedra* by Sophocles and *Heroides* by Ovid.

The prototype of Seneca's *Hercules Oetaeus* survived till nowadays Sophocles' tragedy *The Trachiniae* and unsurvived *Scorched Herakles* by Spintharus. The preserved Letter 9 of

Ovid's *Heroides* (Deianira to Hercules) and the death of Hercules described in Book 9 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, as well as Plato's dialogue *Phaedo* also had had certain influence on Seneca's *Hercules Oetaeus*.

Although the Greek plays were more adapted to the Classical Theatre, contained more extrovert dialogues, Seneca's approach to the Greek drama was quite critical and ironic. Seneca outrivalled Greek tragedies by his accurately incorporated philosophy of Stoicism, bright and hyperbolized examples of good and evil, and astonishing images of human spiritual pain, especially of anger and madness.

2. Influence of Pantomime

Since the 16th century till nowadays Senecan tragedies have been willingly staged in theatres and served as plot backgrounds to movies. His *Trojan Women* were staged in St. Trinity College, Cambridge, 1551 and 1552; *Phaedra* – in Sydney Opera House, 1987; *The Trojan Women* in Melbourne, Alexander Theatre, 1988; five unabridged Senecan tragedies - in the regional theatres of Paris 1995–1996. Director Adel Hakim staged *Thyestes*, *The Trojan Women* and *Agamemnon* in Ivry Theatre, 1995; Director Jean-Claude Fall – *Hercules Furens* and *Hercules Oetaeus* in Saint-Denis theater, 1996. Film Director Ovliakuli Khodzhakuli made a movie *Oedipus* in the Kirghiz language, 2004. In May 2005 Michael Rutenberg staged Senecan *Oedipus* in the Theatre of Haifa University, Israel. The same year *Oedipus* was also staged on Broadway by Ike Schambelan. In 2007 *Oedipus* by Seneca was staged at Michigan Grand Valley University according to Ted Hughes' translation and adaptation. In 2009 *Oedipus* was staged once again by the Theatre Department of Michigan University in cooperation with Moravian College Theatre Company (MCTC).

Some contemporary researchers of classical philology (Bernhard Zimmermann, Alessandra Zanobi) notice a great influence of a pantomime, a *fabula saltata*, on Senecan tragedies that have not been discerned by earlier critics. In his work *The Dance* Lucian said that pantomime and tragedy alike applied the same mythological plots. But in pantomime one actor played the roles of all characters changing the masks, coats and impressing the audience by his arm and body plastics. Such actor's dance was performed by the accompaniment of instrumental music and chorus telling the plot story of the tragedy. Senecan tragedies might contain some pantomime parts rather than presenting the entire story by such body movements. Three types of pantomime scenes were distinguished: the first, where a character's actions were described by chorus; the second, where a character's behavior was commented by another actor; and the third, so-called 'short commentary on pantomime', where the appearance of an actor on the

stage and retreat from it were shortly announced by the chorus or the second actor. If Seneca did not write his tragedies for pantomime performances, he was undoubtedly influenced by the new aesthetics. The most exciting scenes picturing the characters' rage in Senecan tragedies could be ascribed to pantomime.

Theatre was very popular during Seneca's lifetime. In 59 A.D. Emperor Nero introduced drama festivals in Rome, which were called the *Juvenalia*. Nero himself used to act and play the kithara under the applause of the crowd of his flatterers. About 60 A.D. following the example of the Greek competitions, Nero introduced the *Neronia*, the quinquennial festival of musical theatres and gymnastics. Romans had to compete in pantomime and tragedy singing competitions. In the last year of Seneca's life (65 A.D.) the Emperor held the *Neronia*, where he sang and played dramatic solo parts in *fabula cantata* tragedies: *Niobe*, *Orestes the Murderer of His Mother*, *Oedipus Blinded*, *Hercules Mad* and *Oedipus in Exile*. According to D. and E. Henry, Seneca wrote his tragedies for a stage, although probably they were not staged in the theatre, because the author was frightened by Nero, who did not tolerate any competition and demanded that the Emperor's writings and performance were appreciated as the best of all.

In the dissertation author's opinion, Seneca was greatly affected by theatre, pantomime and he wrote his tragedies for performance rather than recitation. Although no clear evidence exists to confirm or deny the fact of staging Senecan tragedies, nevertheless we can affirm that they were written for theatre performances, as in the 1st century A.D. many theatres existed in Rome, tragedies were very popular on their stages and, finally, even the texts of Senecan tragedies contained some references to the scenery, besides the descriptive commentaries to the personages' actions allowed to suppose the influence of pantomime, which was very popular at the time. Finally, the suitability of Senecan tragedies for stage is proven by many contemporary productions in various theaters all over the world.

3. Spectators' Emotions

In the 5th century B.C. Gorgias, the Sophist and rhetoric teacher, stated that the audience's emotions depended on whether a good or bad fate befell on the characters. He noticed the following effects by poetry to spectators: *thrilling fear*, *lachrymose pity* and *languishing sadness* (*φρίκη περίφοβος καὶ ἔλεος πολύδακρυς καὶ πόθος φιλοπενθήας*). In his *Poetics*, Aristotle said that a tragedy caused the greatest sympathy, fear and chill to the spectators, when suffering and hatred were set amongst close relatives, friends, beloved, when brother killed his brother, son – the father, when mother killed her son, and son killed or intended to kill his mother or committed other similar crime. The philosopher also stressed out

that identifications and peripeteia in tragedies induce the characters' love ($\phi\iota\lambda\iota\alpha$) and contempt ($\epsilon\chi\theta\rho\alpha$).

In his tragedies *The Trojan Women* and *Hercules Oetaeus* Seneca described the spectators' feelings watching a human death. Thanks to such descriptions now one can understand, what kind of emotions Seneca attempted to stir up in the audience. In the final scene of *The Trojan Women* the poet presented the offering of a young girl as a spectacle. He noticed that killing of the young girl caused horror (*terror*) to the audience; her beautiful appearance (*formae decus*), young age (*mollis aetas*), unstable development of events (*uagae rerum uices*), courage (*animus fortis*) and approaching death (*leto obuius*) excited (*mouet*) them. Watching a young, beautiful and brave woman killed the spectators experienced three emotions: fear, admiration and compassion (*mentes tremunt, mirantur, miserantur*). Seneca also noticed two emotions experienced by the characters: boldness (*audax, fortis animus*) and anger (*irato impetu*), which excited and got the audience 'caught up' (*omnium mentes ferit*). In *Hercules Oetaeus* Seneca stated that spectators were able of experiencing the same feelings as the characters, feeling the empathy. Horace in his *Ars Poetica* and Seneca in his work *On Anger* also talked about such empathy of tragedy spectators. According to Oliver Taplin, spectators of Antique tragedy should experience a lot of emotions at a time: pity, fear, horror, sadness, anxiety. Taplin concludes that emotions caused by a tragedy are complex and always variable.

Feelings were also a subject of the Stoicism philosophy. Treatises on emotions were usually ascribed to the sphere of ethics. The following philosophers were known for their works on passions: Zeno of Citium (the 4th – 3rd c. B.C.), Cleanthes of Assos (the 4th – 3rd c. B.C.), Herillus of Chalcedon (the 3rd c. B.C.), Sphaerus of Bosphorus (the 3rd c. B.C.) and Chrysippus of Soli (the 3rd c. B.C.). The early Stoics were also interested in passions viewed in tragedies. According to Diogenes Laertius, Chrysippus and Herillus of Chalcedon wrote books about Medea. *Medea* by Euripides was an excellent illustration of false convictions and passions to the early Stoics.

In his five-part treatise *Questions Debated at Tusculum*, Cicero also applied this Stoic teaching on passions. In the fourth book of the *Questions Debated at Tusculum* Cicero presented the definitions by Zeno and Chrysippus, classification and expanded the definitions of passion by quotes from Homer's *Iliad* and Roman poets - Lucilius, Ennius, Trabea, Caecilius, Turpilius and Terence. Cicero illustrated different passions by examples from the Greek mythology.

According to Stoics, mistakes ($\psi\epsilon\nu\delta\eta$) can distort thinking, thus stirring up many passions ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta$), which are the cause of spiritual imbalance. Passion, according to Zeno, is the irrational movement of the soul discordant to nature, or excessive stimulus. Writing about anger,

Seneca also states that anger is incongruous with human nature. According to Chrysippus, passion is caused due to erroneous conviction (*ὑπόληψις*). The same though can be found in the *Questions Debated at Tusculum* by Cicero, *On Anger* by Seneca and Epictetus *Discourses*.

In the *Questions Debated at Tusculum* Cicero mentions four types of passion (*perturbationum*) – two of them are related to seeking after assumed good and the other two - to averting assumed evil. Desire (*libido*) and rejoicing (*laetitia*) seek after the assumed good and fear (*metus*) and sadness (*aegritudo*) help to avert the assumed evil.

Feelings, which could be felt by spectators of Senecan tragedies, stir up confusion in a soul and distort the picture of reality. Therefore a question arises: does such stirring of emotions not contradict Seneca's Stoic principles? The answer to this question can be based on Senecan treatise *On Anger*. The philosopher states that although we are depressed looking at a mourning crowd and explode watching other persons fighting, this is not real anger (*ira*), like it is not true sadness (*tristitia*) forcing to touch bottom when we watch a shipwreck in mime performance and it is not true fear (*timor*) thrilling our souls (*animos*) when we read about Hannibal's siege of Rome after the battle at Cannae. These are movements of souls unwilling to be disturbed; these are not passions (*adfectus*), but rather the beginnings of inceptive passions (*principia proludentia affectibus*). After introducing such dualism of feelings, Seneca solves the problem of spectators' feelings, which, as it seems, should arise due to Seneca's Stoic views and teachings to abandon passion. Some feelings that control us in real life (*adfectus*) are caused by false convictions and induce us to behave badly. Whereas other feelings are short-termed soul movements (*motus animorum*) stirred up in spectators/ readers. These feelings last for the same time as the performance and then calm down. Emotions by tragedy spectators experienced during the performance are just temporary and do not encourage the audience to bad behavior, and so they do not contradict the Stoicism ideology. Picturing of true passions, revealing false convictions and decisions, illustration of affects by examples from Greek tragedies was the usual method applied by Stoics to disclose the destructiveness of passions and is in full compliance with Senecan Stoic world outlook.

II. Expression of the Characters' Feelings in Senecan Tragedies

1. Dominants of Anger and Aggression in Senecan Tragedies *Thyestes* and *Medea*

One of the strongest feelings experienced by the characters in Senecan tragedies *Thyestes* and *Medea* is anger (*ira*). In his treatise *On Anger* Seneca calls the passion of anger an onslaught (*impetus*), which occurs when a person not only accepts the appearance of a grievance (*speciem iniuriae*), but also approves (*adprobavit*) it and consciously wants to take revenge.

The feeling of anger is otherwise defined by contemporary psychologists (*Encyclopedia of Psychology*, 2000). What Seneca calls the passion of anger (attacking behavior of a person), psychologists name aggression, and anger – the feeling, which causes hostility, antipathy, directed to a person or phenomenon that has provoked this feeling. According to psychologists, anger may induce aggression, but in itself it is not an onslaught – psychological or physical harm towards the other.

Like Aristotle, contemporary psychologists do not refer to anger as a negative feeling, but a regular emotion of a human being having Ian's face. It can be very pleasant, giving strength to fight for justice, one's honor, energizing, increasing endurance, stimulating, encouraging overcome obstacles and supporting in one's fight for survival. Although intensely aroused anger may damage the cognitive, emotional and physiological functions of a human being. Strongly experienced anger reduces behavioral control, weakens the information processing ability, may induce aggression, willingness to harm others, thus it can also damage the person's social relationships. An angry person partially loses his/ her vigilance, clarity of thinking, empathy, wisdom and physical health.

Since ancient times till nowadays such positive and negative features of anger force scientists and artists express, understand and evaluate it. Early Greek Stoics had extremely negative attitude towards anger. They considered anger (*ὀργή*) a negative desire (*ἐπιθυμία*), which had to be refused by sages. Epictetus (*Enchiridion*) maintained that anger was determined by interpretation of events, false opinion (*δόγμα*). Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* states that usually people get angry when they are humiliated, their honor is scorned, and their anger is pointed to such people, whom they feel superior to. Most often the persons get angry, when they have a certain desire, but no possibilities to satisfy such a desire.

In Greek mythology anger and physical aggression are considered a just punitive response for a violation of some standards, a way to correct the suffered injustice. Aeschylus and especially Sophocles liked to exaggerate the expression of anger in their tragedies. Sophocles mitigates the guilt of offenders Oedipus, Ajax and Deianira, leaves the expression of their anger and aggression behind the stage, but rather places the suffering, repentance and goodwill of his characters on the foreground. The latter feelings arouse pity in the audience, help them to justify the criminal, forget about his/her aggression. In difference to Sophocles, Seneca brings the wrongdoer's anger and aggression to the foreground, shocks the audience with the personage's anger and aggression. In his philosophical writings and tragedies alike, Seneca does not legitimize anger and aggression.

Defining the nature of anger Seneca especially emphasized the feature of this feeling to reduce a cognitive function by the angering person. The philosopher pointed out a few development stages of anger, which were especially clearly disclosed in *Medea* and *Thyestes*. He writes that passion (*adfectus*) is born, grows and expands in the following way. The first movement is involuntary (*non voluntarius*) and it is like a preparation for the passion (*quasi praeparatio adfectus*). The second brings in itself a non-pertinacious wish, a thought 'it would be good to take revenge, because I have been insulted, or somebody has to be punished as he/she committed an offence'. The third movement is uncontrolled already; the person wants to take revenge not because it is right to do so, but because his anger has overcome his mind.

In *Medea* and *Thyestes* the picturing of expression of the characters' anger may be divided into three phases: 1) involuntary Medea's resent at Aeson, who has broken his love oath; in *Thyestes* – Atreus' resent at Thyestes, who has humiliated him; 2) the protagonists' controlled anger, their accusations to the wrongdoers (Creon, Aeson and Thyestes), deliberate willingness to revenge; 3) mad, uncontrollable anger and rage, when Medea and Atreus kills children not because they need to, but because their passion of anger has overcome their minds.

In his diatribes Seneca writes that the greatest indignation (*indignatio*) rises out of the conviction: 'I committed no sin'. Or 'I have done nothing bad'. Medea and Atreus have very high self-esteem, they take pride in themselves. Atreus considers himself above any law, shame, honor, justice, morals and fidelity. Seneca points out that Medea and Atreus' dissatisfaction is caused by too high self-esteem. William Anderson regards this to be the key important anger-inducing feature of human character distinguished by Seneca.

In the second phase of anger, characters are able to control their feelings, manipulate and deceive their opponents. Medea pretends to be good and humble. After having noticed his brother's weakness to power, Atreus is able to decoy his brother into a trap. Desire for power and inability to resist its temptation takes away peace and happiness from Thyestes, Aeson and Seneca in *Octavia*. Critics have noticed similarities between Thyestes and Seneca in *Octavia*. We can presume that Seneca looked ironically upon power, the value fostered by many Romans in the times of the Republic.

The poet expresses Atreus' anger to his brother by the rhetoric device – adynaton – presenting a comparison of this feeling to a natural catastrophe. The adynaton represents the never-to-be-changed status and feeling of the character: it is more likely the sea would flood over the Ursa Major constellation or breaking waves would cease at the Sicilian coast, the crops would spring up on the waves of Ionian Sea and night would enlighten the Earth, water and fire,

life and death, or seas and winds would mix together, rather than Atreus would come to like his brother.

In the third phase of anger Seneca shows his protagonists overcome by the passion of their anger. Seneca speaks about losing temperance and harmony, about how a person in anger cannot get satisfied even with the greatest revenge, any repayments seem too mild to him/her, because such angering person cannot realize the size of penalty by his/her mind, as he/she cannot reason. Atreus and Medea alike speak about their unquenchable, intemperate desire for avenge.

Senecan Medea personifies and almost idolizes her anger; she addresses it asking for even stronger obsession and courage. She is different from Euripides' Medea, who kills her children unconsciously possessed by her anger. Seneca discloses the poetics of Medea's feelings by introvert dialogue. Medea speaks of herself in the first and in the third person, personifies her own feelings and while talking to them develops an expressive and dynamic dialogue. In revenge to her husband for his infidelity, she stabs her sons to death in front of the audience and throws their bodies at him. In revenge to his brother for the seduction of his wife, Atreus kills his brothers' children, prepares a meal of them and treats his brother. Such vengeance and aggression scenes demonstrate the awfulness and madness of anger. In the dissertation author's opinion, Seneca aims to emphasize the latter. Neither Atreus nor Medea can evoke any compassion in us, because their violence is especially emphasized. Seneca does not legitimize anger. The poet also aims at disclosing Atreus and Medea's false conviction that by revenge one can get repayment for the grievance and cause grief to the wrongdoer, and that after revenge everything can remain the same as it has been before the grievance. In Book III of his work *On Anger* Seneca explains why he presents such horrible examples of manifested anger: to disclose the ugliness and brutality of anger, to show what a terrible being is a man in wrath at other person, how he strives to destroy himself and others by attacking what can be drowned only together with the person who does the drowning. The dissertation author believes that the characters' internal dialogues with their souls point out to the fact that persons overcome by their passions are unable to develop external, extrovert dialogue with an interlocutor.

The descriptive scenes characteristic to pantomime are present in *Medea* only. Seneca discloses the personages' feelings by introvert dialogue, irony, personification and adynaton. In *Medea*, *Thyestes* and also *On Anger* Seneca focuses mostly on depicting the results of anger. Therefore, we believe, the tragedies, like diatribes, had the same – curative and didactic – purpose.

2. Dominants of Fear, Anger and Aggression in Senecan Tragedies *The Trojan Women* and *Agamemnon*

In Senecan Tragedies *The Trojan Women* and *Agamemnon* the dissertation author can distinguish three clearest emotional dominants: the characters' fear, anger and aggression used as a leitmotif in these tragedies. Fear ($\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma$), according to Stoics, is the expectation of evil. Cicero, in his *Questions Debated at Tusculum*, affirms that cautiousness based on reason is a good feeling and helps to avert evil, but cautiousness without reason is fear (*metus*), which a sage should avoid. According to Cicero, the Stoics considered fear to occur due to the prejudice and false conviction. Cicero distinguishes a few types of fear: idleness (*pigritia*); horror (*terror*); fright (*timor*); trepidation (*pavor*); suffocation (*exanimatio*); embarrassment (*conturbatio*); and timidity (*formido*). In his *Questions Debated at Tusculum* Cicero says that poets and especially theatres continuously promote superstitions about the deceased and scare the audience with the pictures of deceased persons. According to Cicero, we have to remember just one thing: a dead body no longer has any senses, thus we do not have to believe in persons raised from the dead. In his *Rhetoric* Aristotle states that fear ($\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma$) is spiritual pain or anxiety arising out of the imaginable future evil, which can destroy us or cause some troubles to us. According to Aristotle, people are afraid only of those evil things, which can bring pain, sorrow or destruction, and only when the troubles do not seem too distant, but are so close that they look unavoidable.

According to contemporary psychologists, fear, like anger, has positive as well as negative features. As psychologist David G. Myers (*Psichologija*, 2008) puts it, fear may torture us, be a cause of our sleeping disorders and obsess our thoughts, but at the same time it is an alarm system preparing the body avoid danger. According to psychologists, our misfortunes, failures and traumas teach us to fear. We can also learn how to fear from our parents, friends, teachers and other persons, older and more powerful than we are.

In his *Letters to Lucilius*, *Marcia*, *Polybius* and his Mother Helvia in his *On Consolation* Seneca gives many advice how one should overcome the fear of death or pain, how to sooth and control one's passions. But in his poetry Seneca aims not at soothing the passions, but rather to stirring up strong emotions, such as fear, pity or sadness to his reader and spectators. Antique poetry, like nowadays, had to astonish, move and touch. What was called passions by Stoics and what helped to evoke passions – different opinions and superstitions – Seneca found it excellent material for his tragedy writing.

In Senecan tragedy *Agamemnon*, like in *Thyestes* and *Trojan Women*, a dead person's ghost scares the characters and invokes their anger and even aggression. Ghosts by the deceased

appear in Song XI of *Odyssey* by Homer, Song VI of *Aeneid* by Vergil and *the Persians* by Aeschylus. Odysseus meets his deceased mother, Aeneis – with his deceased father in the Kingdom of Hades. In *The Persians* the chorus summons the ghost of Darius. In difference from the Senecan deceased characters, these do not induce revenge. In Seneca's tragedies Pyrrhus and Aegisthus can see their dead fathers, Atreus – his deceased grandfather, and Creon – the Oedipus' deceased father rising from the kingdom of the dead at night, in darkness, with loud crash and demanding for vengeance. Seneca pictures the appearance of the deceased by words meaning suddenness, unexpectedness, describing the earthquake, eclipse, strong wind and fog, thus willing to strengthen the emotional effect on the audience. Following Seneca, the deceased father's character as scaring and action-driving device was used by Grigalijus Knapijus in his *Filopatri (Philopater seu Pietas, 1596)*, William Shakespeare in the *Hamlet* (1600) and Tirso de Molina in his *The Seducer of Seville* (1630). Shakespeare and Tirso de Molina intercepted the visual presentation of the scene, where the ghost by deceased father appears, from Seneca.

Like in *Thyestes* and *Medea*, in *The Trojan Women* and *Agamemnon* we can discern a few stages of the characters' anger: 1) the character's sense of grievance related to raising his own value and diminishing the opponent's, disclosure of some injustice; 2) the character's willingness to revenge the wrongdoer and 3) his aggression. In act 2 of the *Trojan Women* the poet uses anger as a driving force in Pyrrhus and Agamemnon's dispute. In act 3 he discloses fear and anger in Ulixes and Andromache's dispute. In *the Trojan Women* we can notice a few different stages of the rise of the characters' anger.

In *Agamemnon*, Seneca concentrates such rise of the characters' anger inducing revenge in two characters – Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. In their dialogue and Clytemnestra's talk to her nanny the poet reveals the inception of anger, the degradation and unrighteousness of opponent Agamemnon, Clytemnestra's noble background and desire for avenge. While talking to her nanny, Clytemnestra tells about her anger, grievance and desire to take revenge, although the real dialogue does not further develop. Clytemnestra's speech is an introvert dialogue with herself, decorated with the question and answer scheme. The poet shows that a person obsessed with anger can hardly communicate with others. Seneca also discloses the characters' feelings though a descriptive inserts typical to pantomime.

In *the Trojan Women* Seneca does not maintain a unified approach to death and afterlife: the chorus sings that there is nothing after death, and Talthibius tells about the appearance of the deceased Achilles and his demand to sacrifice a girl on the warrior's grave. *The Trojan Women* is a contamination of two tragedies; it has not a single main character, whose feeling

could drive the action of the entire tragedy. The third and fourth acts of the play are used by Seneca for retardation – when Ulixes takes a son from Andromache and throws him away from the Trojan tower. Then Seneca comes back to Pyrrhus and pictures the murder of Polyxena. In such a way, by inserting the sacrificing of Andromache's son into the main action, Seneca creates a perfect frame composition, which is more often used in epos and could be found in Homer's *Odyssey* and Vergil's *Aeneid*. In the retardation Seneca focuses on Andromache's fear that her son can be found and killed. The poet is very subtle in depicting her feelings. Her speech is characterized by the majestic style decorated by gradations. The Greeks are shown angry, impatient, their language – poor. Seneca decorates Andromache's farewell speech with her son by anaphora and gradation, intensifies the expression of her speech.

Seneca also applies the frame composition in *Agamemnon*, where his imitation of Vergil's *Aeneid* can be especially felt. The retardation in *Agamemnon* is continued in 450 verses, which means almost a half of the tragedy. In this central part of the tragedy Seneca depicts sea storm (like in Song I of Vergil's *Aeneid*), fall of Troy and Cassandra's pain after the loss of her relatives (similar to Songs II and III of Vergil's *Aeneid*, where Aeneas tells Dido about the fall of Troy and his wanderings before his arrival to Carthage). While painting the frightful picture of stormy sea, Seneca uses impressive metaphors (of moaning rocks, the wind denuding the sea), hyperboles (the sea washing the stars, the sea being mixed up with the skies, it seems to the sailors that gods fell down with the skies) and emphasizes suddenness, change, unexpectedness. By its suggestibility and expression, Senecan description of the storm parallels Homer and Vergil's poetry. *Agamemnon* by Seneca is distinguished by the realism of picturing fear and horror.

In the final scenes of *Agamemnon* and *the Trojan Women* Seneca stresses out Clytemnestra, Aegisthus, Pyrrhus and Ulixes' aggression. A typical feature of Senecan style is to describe the physiological details of a dead person: bones scattered around, mangled facial features, splattered brain, disintegrated body parts – what was typical to see in Roman amphitheatres of the time.

In these tragedies Seneca joined the Stoic theory about fate, vicious human passions, the Greek theatre traditions and the Roman theatre, in which violent scenes having strong effect on spectators' were especially popular. In the descriptive scenes characteristic to pantomime, the poet emphasized the personages' fear, anger and madness. Their feelings are disclosed by introvert dialogue, rhetoric questions, irony, personification, metaphor, hyperbole, adynaton, gradation and anaphora.

3. Dominants of Fear, Shame and Guilt in Senecan Tragedies *The Madness of Hercules and Oedipus*

According to A. Kępiński, a sudden appearance of unexpected phenomenon induces disintegration fear in a human being. The more extreme is the way how the situation changes, the greater is the fear stirred up. In his *Natural Questions* Seneca also states that the extraordinariness and unexpectedness of a situation is always frightening. C. J. Harington, D. and E. Henry wrote about depiction of the disintegration fear in Senecan tragedies. The disintegration fear is disclosed in *Hercules Furens* by Seneca himself: madness of Hercules, murder of the wife and children, in Oedipus – through plague and appearance of the deceased to the living characters. Following Vergil's *Aeneid* can be clearly felt in the third act of *Hercules Furens*. Hercules and his friend Theseus come back from the kingdom of the dead. Like Aeneas by Vergil, Theseus tells about the Tartarus. While describing the kingdom of the dead, Seneca continuously emphasizes darkness, dusk, night, fear, horror and sadness. The poet stresses out that human wickedness, selfishness and exploitation of others destroys this world. Like in Vergil's dramas, Senecan dead suffer, can speak, see, hear and sense pain, fear, anger, may feel sympathy or sadness, in the Elysian Fields – also joy.

In difference from *Oedipus the King* by Sophocles, in his tragedy *Oedipus* Seneca creates destruction not only on the external, but also in the internal Oedipus' world. At the beginning of the tragedy, Sophocles' Oedipus is calm, self-confident, does not feel any fear of guilt, and the Senecan character expresses his worrying about the unfavorable prophecy, his fear that he may murder his father and marry his mother. He feels the social fear. According to A. Kępiński, a human being's social fear is always related to his possible elimination of the social world. This expulsion equals to his biological death.

Seneca replaces Oedipus' fear of guilt by the disintegration fear describing the outcome of the terrible plague. In creation this plague picture in *Oedipus*, Seneca was mostly influenced by the plague descriptions in Vergil's *Georgics* and Lucretius' *On the Nature of Things*.

In *Hercules Furens* Seneca completes this picturing of the disintegration fear by the family murder scene, in Oedipus – by rising the deceased and afterlife scene. Suddenly Senecan characters recognize their crimes, feels guilt, and others try to calm them down saying that their crime is just an error (*error*).

A hero's tragic mistake (*hamartia*) was first explored by Aristotle. In his *Poetics* and *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle calls *hamartia* an unintentional, conscious crime, which is not related to the character's bad will. *Hamartia* does not signify the crime itself, but specifies the cause of such crime, that the crime has been related not to poor conditions minimizing the

character's responsibility and guilt, and even not to a vicious nature of the character, but rather to his erroneous conscious decision. Such emphasis on the wrong decision allows for transferring the whole responsibility for the crime to the criminal himself and pitying him, as he is not a typical criminal, but a good man who has unintentionally committed a bad crime.

Hamartia (error) in Senecan tragedies was explored by Roger A. Pack, who distinguished three tragedies by Seneca, in which the characters discuss the causes of unintentional crime and error of others: *Hercules Oetaeus*, *The Phoenician Women* and *Hercules Furens*.

Four out of nine Senecan tragedies could be classified as picturing the deliberate, conscious cases of murder (ἀδικήματα). These are: *Medea*, *Thyestes*, *The Trojan Woman* and *Agamemnon*. The remaining five – *Hercules Furens*, *Oedipus*, *The Phoenician Women*, *Hercules Oetaeus* and *Phaedra* could be classified as picturing the unintentional crimes depending on the offender's will (ἀμάρτημα). After recognizing their crime, the personages of the latter tragedies regret, feel shame and punish themselves. Following Aristotle, it could be possible to state that the tragic mistake in these Senecan tragedies is made, because the other person is harmed unintentionally, when the wrongdoer has in mind the other person, other measure, other purpose. While killing his wife and children, mad Hercules in Senecan tragedy believed he was murdering tyrant Licus and Juno; Oedipus was convinced he had killed the stranger at the crossroad, but not his father, he had married the other woman, not his mother; Jocasta believed she had married a man, not of her own blood, and definitely not her own son; when sending a soaked clothing, Deianira believed this could help her to return her husband's love, but not kill him; Phaedra accusing Hyppolitus of being dishonest was seeking just to humiliate and insult him, but did not want him to be killed; by sending his son to death Theseus believed he was punishing a vicious rather than innocent man.

In Senecan tragedies the guilty personage always discusses *hamartia* with a close relative or friend (Deianira with her son Hyllus and nanny, Oedipus with his daughter Antigone, Hercules with his father Amphytrion), who feels pity for the offender and always tries to persuade him/her that the crime has been committed due to a mistake, without his/her fault and thus there is no need for suicide. Relatives and the personage himself/ herself blame the fate. This dissertation author also thinks that fate is important to Seneca, though it the poet can show the relatives' compassion to the offender, their willingness to protect him/her against suicide, against unbearable burden of shame. If the characters' crimes were determined only by fate or some other external force, they could not feel shame and guilt, because they could believe the crime has been committed beyond their will and thus they are not responsible for it. But feeling

shame by the guilty characters is a proof they do not really believe in fate, and fell responsible for their crimes.

After recognizing their unintentional crime, Seneca's characters (like the characters in Euripides and Sophocles dramas) first of all feel torturing shame (*pudor*), which brings self despise and infringement of self identity. The guilt (*scelus*) is most often perceived by Senecan personages as their crime and responsibility for a crime.

Aristotle was the first to explore the feeling of shame in his *Rhetoric*. Stoics just shortly defined that shame (*αἰσχύνη*) was a fear for the inglorious. Aristotle, the Stoics and Cicero did not distinguish guilt from other feelings and did not analyze it. According to Aristotle, shame (*αἰσχύνη*) is suffering or embarrassment due to the present, former or future mischief, which, as it seems, brings disgrace. According to Aristotle, shameful are all actions made because of bad moral qualities, for example, to embezzle a deposit - this happens due to injustice (*ἀπὸ ἀδικίας*); coming together with inappropriate persons at an inappropriate place and at inappropriate time - this happens due to debauchery (*ἀπὸ ἀκολασίας*) etc. People usually are ashamed of what they do in public, while they are watched by others. Aristotle notices that this is where the saying 'shame is in the eye' derives from. This Aristotle's notice is very accurate, as the characters by Seneca, like the personages of the Greek tragedy, always speak about their eyes, when they feel shame. They cover their head, blind themselves, discuss whether after the crime they will dare look other people in the eye. In *Hercules Furens*, Seneca says that the shame covers its face.

In 1971 American psychologist Helen Block Lewis substantiated the differences between shame and guilt that have been widely accepted nowadays by the empirical research and presented the results in the book *Shame and Guilt in Neurosis*. According to her, persons feeling guilt consider their behavior as being bad, and persons feeling shame – being bad themselves. A person suffering shame emphasizes his own ego (*I committed this awful thing*), and suffering guilt – their behavior (*I committed this awful thing*). Shame induces a sense of low self-esteem and strong desire to escape from the shameful situation. Shame motivates the defense and revenging anger for the suffered spiritual pain. Guilt brings pressure, remorse, feeling sorry for the bad behavior. People often confuse shame and guilt; 35 years ago even in professional psychologists' reports shame and guilt were used as synonyms.

The author of the dissertation believes that Seneca like Sophocles in his *Oedipus the King* and Euripides in his *Hercules* emphasizes more the characters' shame rather than guilt, thus it could be just to state that Oedipus, Jocasta and Hercules are persons more prone to

shame, but not to guilt. According to the dissertation author, all Senecan characters have a tendency to feel shame and they belong to the shame rather than guilt culture. According to E. R. Dodds, the personages of the Greek tragedies may be partially ascribed to the guilt culture, though they still differ very little from Homer's characters belonging to the shame culture.

Seneca expresses Oedipus' shame by a hyperbole: Oedipus affirms he himself is the crime of the age (*saeculi crimen*). Senecan Oedipus and Jocasta solve the conflict in a destructive way hurting (Oedipus blinds himself) or even killing themselves (Jocasta stabs herself with a sword). After sensing the shame, Hercules pours his anger not to himself, but outside, he wants revenge, prepares to punish his weapons. Later he points his aggression to himself willing to kill himself, but after feeling sorry for his father he restrains from the suicide. Seneca expresses Hercules' shame and guilt with the help of hyperbole (even largest rivers flowing through his hands cannot wash Hercules' guilt) and personification (seeing his shame even stars have deflected). His characters' feelings of shame, anger and aggression Seneca reveals by introvert dialogue, question-answer scheme, personification, hyperbole. Scenes of the characters' madness have some elements typical to pantomime. In the final scenes Oedipus and Hercules feel guilt, which is manifested by their awareness of their debt to the town and relatives. After suffering shame and non-justifying himself, Hercules realizes that the cause of his crime underlie in his desire to be always the best and take revenge often forgetting the compassion and love to others.

4. Dominants of Love and Jealousy in Senecan Tragedies *Phaedra* and *Hercules Oetaeus*

Early Greek Stoics attributed love to the negative desires (*ἐπιθυμία*). Seneca in his *Letters to Lucilius* stated that romantic, passionate love was not needed by a person. According to the early Stoics, love (*ἔρως*) is one's striving for physical contact invoked by the sight of the other person's beauty. Chrysippus in his book *On Love* wrote that love is a part of friendship (*φιλία*). Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* states that to love means wishing something what you think is good for the other person, but not for our own self and attempting to supply this good in favor of the other person. According to Aristotle, types of love are: friendship, marriage relations, kinship and similar ones. More systemic research on love was started by contemporary psychologists in 1980. During the research Canadian scientist Beverly Fehr (1988) analyzed what people have in mind, when they say the word 'love'. According to Fehr, three aspects of love were found out: a) *intimacy* covering all key features of love, such as freedom while speaking, free selection of conversation topics, integrity, openness and understanding; b)

commitment covering interim features of love, such as devotion, protective, patronizing behavior, commitment, prioritizing other person rather than oneself, self-devotion; c) *passion* covering peripheral features of love, such as euphoria, excitement, intensified heart beating, attraction of sexual life, sexual desire. Psychologists Clyde and Susan Hendrick (1986) distinguished six types of love: *eros* (romantic, passionate love), *ludus* (game-playing, flirtatious love), *storge* (friendship love), *mania* (possessive, dependent love), *pragma* (pragmatic love), and *agape* (all-giving, selfless love).

In his *Letters to Lucilius* Seneca calls love passion ‘a disease’, stating that such an illness of medium severity could be neither healthy nor useful to a person, thus it is better not to fall in love. To the same opinion Seneca sticks while picturing love in his tragedy *Phaedra*. Love is depicted here as suffering, pain and madness. After falling in love, Phaedra gets ill and is not able to control herself. The image of love as madness, torturing passion driving a person to a suicide was created in the Roman literature – Vergil’s poems (especially Corydon’s picture in the IInd *Eclogue*, Damon’s picture in the VIIth *Eclogue*, Gallus picture in the X *Eclogue*, Dido’s picture in *Aeneida*), similar love sufferings are also described in Tibullus’ poems.

In his tragedy *Phaedra* Seneca describes love of Theseus’ wife by collecting various, contradicting actions by the character into one entity. The poet especially emphasizes Phaedra’s inconsistency, anxiety, flustering: she wants to work, but is not able to, wants to be virtuous, pious, but refuses to go worship the goddess. She wants to stay home, not to give away her feeling and wishes she could run in the forest after Hypolitus. Phaedra wants to be a hostess of her palace, but is not able to control herself. She feels love passion, though does not want to.

Based on Clyde and Susan Hendrick differentiation of love, it could be stated that Phaedra’s love (*amor*) is a mix of romantic love (*eros*) and possessive love (*mania*). Phaedra does not believe herself she will be able to restrain her wicked love to her stepson. She cannot see her guilt for this passionate love, which she calls madness (*furor*). Seneca compares Phaedra to a helpless sailor caught up by the storm at the sea. Phaedra understands that her love is possessive, so she feels shame, anger, aggression, wants to commit suicide. The descriptive scene of Phaedra’s madness shows it could have been written for pantomime performance.

The poet does not agree that the lady’s lust for a man who is not her husband cannot be controlled, even though this desire, according to Phaedra, is inherited, determined by fate (*fatale malum*). According to Cicero, even if human vices such as drunkenness, adultery or similar can occur due to inherited reasons, total abstinence from them, in such a way when the person, who has been obsessed with such vices, is totally freed from them, depends not on the natural reasons, but on our will, attempts, discipline (*voluntas, studium, disciplina*). In his *Letters to*

Lucilius Seneca writes that we love our vice and foster them, thus we are more prone to justify them rather than give them up. In *Phaedra* Seneca pays lots of attention to the guidance, how a person should live right, how he could reject what he really does not need, how could he tame his own passions, refuse excessive pleasures and lead moderate life. Seneca believed that a human being could minimize his problems by reducing his selfishness, pointing it to the appropriate moral direction.

Last but not least intensely expressed emotion in Senecan tragedies is jealousy. The Stoics ascribed envy and jealousy to the category of sad passions (*λύπη*). According to Stoics, envy (*φθόνος*) is sadness for the good which belongs to others; jealousy (*ζήλος*) – sadness because somebody has something what you crave for yourself. Seneca in his tragedies does not use the word “being jealous of” (*obtrectatio*), and expresses jealousy by the word *invidia*. Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* distinguished only one word – *φθόνος*. The philosopher states that envy is some sort of sadness, which we experience when we see wellbeing of persons similar to us, while they take pleasure in this wellbeing. The *Encyclopedia of Psychology* states that envy and jealousy are two different feelings, though they are often mixed up together. The main reason of such confusion – because envy and jealousy rise out of the threat to a person’s self-esteem. This threat is caused by inappropriate comparison of the self with others. Envy is stirred up when a competitor is more superior in the area important to the envying person’s self identification, and jealousy is stirred up when a partner’s attention is important to the jealous person’s self identification and this attention is transferred to some other persons. Being jealous requires the relationship of three persons: 1) the jealous person; 2) ‘the partner’, with whom the jealous person wishes to communicate and 3) ‘the rival’, who threatens to take the jealous person’s place in his relationship with the partner. Whereas in case envy, only two persons are involved – the envying and the subject of envy.

Jealousy could be found in the Greek mythology, especially in the relationships of Zeus, Hera and Zeus’ lovers. These love triangles are masterly depicted in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, where Jupiter takes by force or treachery his lover (Io, Callisto, Europe or Semele), and Juno is jealous, angry and takes revenge. In his tragedy *Hercules Oetaeus* Seneca discloses Deianira’s jealousy, in part following Ovid. Senecan Hercules brings home his new lover, Eurytus’ daughter Iola, from his last military campaign. As Deianira sees Iola, she is jealous, feels sad, compares the girl’s beauty with wonderful nature in spring, and her own appearance – to a gloomy, sleety winter, is angry at Hercules for being unloved and wants to take revenge.

Seneca depicts Deianira’s jealousy emphasizing her spiritual pain and fast changing feelings. The poet compares Deianira to flustering, god inspired maenad: Deianira runs and

suddenly stops, threatens and grieves, her cheeks get pale from fear and all of a sudden she flushes in anger. Seneca expresses Deianira's anger metaphorically, comparing this feeling as romantic love, to a flame (*flamma*). Deianira fears of losing her status thus she resolves to kill her husband, even if she could die herself. Deianira cannot live without Hercules' love. Therefore she wants to fight, to destroy her rival and get back her husband's love. Deianira is jealous of Iola's beauty, youth and compares her to a wonderful spring forest, when the first warmth clothes nude branches with leaves, and she calls her own beauty (*nostra forma*) ugliness, which looks like winter when hard wind tears the last leaves from the branches and the frost blast hair.

Deianira notifies her nanny that she is going to kill her husband with a sword, as the pain (*dolor*) caused by the beautiful slave induces her to revenge. She talks in paradoxes: she says that she loves her husband up to her medulla (*medullis*) and wants to kill him, desires to find such herbs and poison, which could break her husband's will and force him to love his wife.

By emphasizing Phaedra and Deianira's selfishness in his tragedies *Phaedra* and *Hercules Oetaeus*, Seneca strongly reduces our sympathy to these women. The spectator/ reader does not feel any compassion for them, when after committing the unintentional crimes Phaedra and Deianira recognize their guilt and feel ashamed, wants to commit suicide. In stressing out their wickedness and willingness forcibly to get their husbands' love, the author forces us to feel revulsion at them rather than pity. According to Aristotle, pity is a sorrow for the undeserved suffering. Seneca pictures the shame of these ladies as being deserved, like repayment for their mad and selfish love and jealousy.

Conclusions

1. The research results have shown the clear connections between Senecan dramas and his philosophical works. In his tragedies, similar to his philosophical treatises, Seneca deliberately emphasized and hyperbolized the characters' emotions.
2. Seneca used his characters' feelings of anger, rage, aggression, guilt, shame, love and jealousy to create an acceleration of action, whereas fear, sadness and joy – a retardation of action. In Senecan dramas, more often than in Ancient Greek tragedies, the place of action is changed within the internal world of the character. The characters' intensely experienced feelings force them travel through time and space, be able to see the afterlife, watch the remotest constellations during the day and talk to the deceased, gods and persons that are not present nearby.

3. All main characters by Seneca feel and express anger. Shame and guilt are felt by Oedipus, Hercules and Theseus; shame – by Phaedra, Deianira and Jocasta; love – by Phaedra, Andromache and Hercules; jealousy – by Deianira; fear – by Oedipus, Andromache, Hecuba, Amphitryon, Megaira, Thyestes and Aegistus. Usually, in one scene Seneca reveals just one feeling, which is like a mask, inherent to the character. Key feelings that cause an intentional or unintentional crime (*hamartia*) are spiritual pain, anger and aggression.
4. Seneca discloses the feelings of his characters (anger, aggression, rage, fear, jealousy, love, guilt and shame) with the use of the following poetic devices: repetition, comparison, metaphor, amplification, hyperbole, adynaton, irony, anaphora, paradox, introvert dialogue and question and answer scheme. In Senecan tragedies not the external dramatic dialogue persists (like in the Greek tragedies), but rather the diatribe monologue, a personage's talk on moral issues with an imaginary interlocutor or himself/herself. To picture his characters' feelings Seneca also used pantomime scenes.
5. Seneca provides the motives of the genesis of one or another feeling. When a person is angry, he/she falsely believes that he/she has been unjustly harmed and has to take revenge for such wrongdoing. When a person commits an unintentional crime (a case of *hamartia*), he/she feels shame, anger, in some cases - guilt. Those characters who feel fear believe they are going to experience some evil in the future. When a personage is jealous, he/she is convinced he/she is worse than some other person. A character feeling passionate affection is falsely convinced that his/her beloved is the most beautiful person. In his tragedies the author discloses persons' false convictions that give birth to their spiritual pain causing feelings. After elimination of such false conviction, the person may free himself/herself from the spiritual suffering. Only Hercules in Senecan tragedy *Hercules Oetaeus* is able to liberate himself from his physical and spiritual pain. He is the only personage having the stoically strong character, understands his mistakes and is able to free himself from the fear of death. In the tragedy *Hercules Furens* Hercules is able to endure shame and instead of valor (*virtus*) to choose love for his neighbor (*pietas*).
6. The characters' feelings in Senecan tragedies are pictured in a certain sequence. In tragedies, *where a character commits an unintentional crime and feels his guilt (Hercules Furens, Oedipus)* first of all fear is described, and then, after the recognition – shame, anger and guilt protecting the character from suicide. In tragedies, *where a character commits an unintentional crime and can feel only shame (Phaedra, Hercules*

Oetaeus), first of all affection and jealousy are described, and after the recognition – anger and shame, which drives him/her to suicide. In tragedies, *where a character commits an intentional crime and can feel neither guilt nor shame* (*Medea, Thyestes, Agamemnon, the Trojan Women*), the feelings of grievance, anger, desire for avenge, fury and complacency after taking the revenge are described.

7. After comparing the definitions of feelings by the Antique philosophers and contemporary psychologists, it could be stated that a modern man's understanding of anger, aggression, shame and guilt has changed. No unanimous approach on feelings existed in the Classical world. Although taken positively by Aristotle and Peripatetics, all feelings were considered vicious by the Stoics. Seneca did not agree to Aristotle's thought that temperate anger ('temperate madness') was a good feeling, necessary for maintenance and defense of a strong and individual spirit, fighting, distinguishing oneself and standing out of the crowd. Even mild anger was considered a negative and unnecessary feeling by Seneca, therefore in his tragedies anger is always transformed into intemperate rage, astonishing by its violence. Senecan personages feel destructive anger and aggression also due to their strong inclination to shame, belonging to the so-called 'culture of shame'. In his tragedies Seneca pictures the characters inclined to shame and anger as a negative illustration of Stoic ideals, as an example showing where destructive passions may bring to. The Classical world did not have a clear distinction of shame and guilt. Both, Antique poets and philosophers emphasized more the feeling of shame leaving guilt outside the discourse.
8. Seneca's exaggerated and exalted way of speaking astonishes readers and does not allow them to pity the characters, but rather invites to reflect on what a vast and destructive force are false convictions and uncontrolled feelings, as well as passions rising out of them. Senecan tragedies speak to us, the readers, like our consciousness, our own feeling of moral responsibility.

Ivadas

Žmogaus tragedija yra neatsiejama nuo mūsų būties suvokimo. Antikinėje tragedijoje permąstomos žmogaus skausmo, mirties, kančios, likimo temos. Senekos tragedijoms jau beveik du tūkstančiai metų ir jos vis dar nepraranda aktualumo: jas stato šiuolaikiniuose teatruose, literatūros mokslas tyrinėja tragedijų formą, herojų charakterius, jausmų raišką, recepciją Renesanso laikų dramose. Senekos tragedijos šiuolaikinių tyrinėtojų pripažįstamos kaip reikšminga, stebinanti savo jėga, grožiu ir meniškumu psichologinė studija apie žmogų, patiriantį kančią.

„Poetikos“ terminas šioje disertacijoje vartojamas, turint omenyje retorinių, stilistinių priemonių visumą. Lietuvių kalboje „jausmas“ ir „emocija“ yra sinonimai, todėl, tyrinėjant herojų jausmų raišką Senekos tragedijose, nesistengta išryškinti šių sąvokų skirtumų.

Jau prieš 2500 metų Platonas (*Faidre, Filebe, Puotoje*) ir Aristotelis (*Nikomacho etikoje, Apie sielą, Retorikoje*) tyrinėjo, kokia yra jausmų prigimtis. Vėliau jausmų analizei didelį dėmesį teikė stoikai (Zenonas, Chrisipas), Ciceronas (*Tuskulo pokalbiuose*), Seneka (*Apie pyktį*), Plutarchas (*Dorovės traktatuose*). Pasak šiuolaikinių psichologų Cheshire'os Calhoun ir Roberto C. Solomonio (1984), Aristotelis *Retorikoje* išplėtojo išpūdingai modernią emocijų teoriją, kuri iki šiol atremia daugelio mokslininkų kritiką ir teikia reikšmingą alternatyvą dabar dar vyraujančiai W. Jameso teorijai. Senekos idėjos apie pykčio suvaldymą, o ne saikingą „išliejimą“ į išorę taip pat nepaseno. Dabartiniai psichologai tyrimais įrodo, kad agresyvūs veiksmai ir fantazijos nesumažina agresijos, „išliedami“ pyktį neišsivaduojame nuo savo pykčio (B. J. Bushman, 2000).

Daugelis šiuolaikinių teorijų emocijas analizuoja dviem aspektais: fiziologiniu ir kognityviniu. Šiuolaikiniai, kaip ir Antikos filosofai, didžiausią dėmesį kreipia į emocijų kognityvinę pusę, tyrinėja, koks yra ryšys tarp emocijos ir įsitikinimo. Pavyzdžiui, jei žmogus sumišęs, vadinasi, jis įsitikinęs, kad situacija yra nepatogi, arba jei žmogus myli, tiki, kad jo mylimasis yra geriausias žmogus. Pasak Ch. Calhoun ir R. C. Solomonio, tikslaus ryšio tarp emocijų ir įsitikinimų nustatymas tapo vienu centrinių šiuolaikinių diskusijų klausimu.

Su emocijų tyrimu susiję dar du svarbūs klausimai. Nors dažnai kalbama apie emocijas, kaip apie žmogaus „viduje“ esantį reiškinį, tačiau emocijų analizė negali būti apribota tik „vidiniais“ fiziologiniais ir psichologiniais aspektais: pojūčiais, troškimas, įsitikinimais. Emocijos beveik visada turi „išorinį“ aspektą – išraišką elgsenoje. Dažniausiai atpažįstamos žmonių emocijos stebint, ką jie kalba ir daro, todėl daugelis filosofų ir psichologų apibrėžia emocijas kaip savitą elgesio modelį.

Galiausiai emocijos priklauso nuo kultūrinės aplinkos ir aplinkybių. Kitaip sakant, jos yra „išmokstamos“, nusižiūrimos nuo aplinkinių. Antropologas Jeanas L. Briggsas knygoje *Niekada nepykstantys (Never in Anger)* teigia, kad kai kurios eskimų gentys niekada nepyksta. Mokslininkas ištyrė, kad eskimai ne tik neišreiškia pykčio, bet net nejaučia jo ir neturi žodžio savo kalboje, kuris reikštų šį jausmą. Artimiausias pykčiui žodis jų kalboje reiškia „vaikiškas“ (*childish*). Pasak D. G. Myerso (2008), „pykčio išliejimas“ būdingas individualistinėms kultūroms, tačiau jis retai pasitaiko kultūrose, kuriose žmonių tapatumas yra labiau susijęs su grupe. Žmonės, kurie stipriau jaučia tarpusavio ryšius, mano, kad pyktis kelia grėsmę grupės darnai (Markus ir Kitayama, 1991).

Žmogaus jausmų ir emocijų yra labai daug, todėl apsibrėžta, kokie jausmai tyrinėtini šioje disertacijoje. Vienas svarbiausių Senekos tragedijose jausmų yra pyktis, kurio analizei filosofas skyrė tris traktatus ir visose savo tragedijose aprašo šį jausmą. Gėda ir kaltė taip pat yra neatsiejami jausmai nuo antikinės tragedijos. Gėdą ir šio jausmo įvairius aspektus, be to išdidumą, pyktį, kaltę graikų tragedijose, epe, lyrikoje, Aristotelio, Platono ir sofistų veikaluose tyrinėjo Douglas L. Cairnsas (*Aidōs. The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford, 1993). Vienas reikšmingesnių darbų, skirtas gėdos ir kaltės tyrimams graikų literatūroje, yra Doddso *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London 1951.

Senekos tragedijose dažnai aprašomas baimės jausmas, kurį poetas išryškina, vaizduodamas kosmoso ir Žemės katastrofas, pomirtinio pasaulio baisumus. Seneka savo filosofiniuose veikaluose (*Laiškai Lucilijui, Gamtos klausimai*) didesnę dėmesį kreipė ne į pasaulio katastrofos baimę, o į biologinę mirties baimę, kuri buvo tyrinėjama romėnų literatūroje jau šimtmečiu anksčiau rašiusio poeto Lukrecijaus poemoje *Apie daiktų prigimtį*. Mirties baimę ir jos nugalėjimą Seneka atskleidžia *Etos Herkulyje*. Čia poetas pateikia stojišką ramybės mirties akivaizdoje pavyzdį. Dezintegracinę baimę Senekos tragedijose pirmieji pastebėjo ir aprašė Denisas Henry ir Elisabeth Henry (*The Mask of Power: Seneca's Tragedies and Imperial Rome*, Warminster, Chicago, 1985). Disertacijoje tirtas meilės ir pavyduliavimo jausmas. Eiles apie meilę rašė daugelis romėnų poetų. Senekos tragedijose jaučiama didelė Lukrecijaus, Vergilijaus, Ovidijaus įtaka.

Senekos tragedijų herojų jausmus būtų daug sunkiau suprasti, neatsižvelgus į stoikų jausmų sampratą, kuria grindžiama Senekos jausmų teorija. Vieni naujausių stoikų jausmų teorijos tyrimų yra Richardo Sorabji *Emotion and Peace of Mind* (2000) ir Margaret Graver *Stoicism and Emotion* (2007).

Ankstyvieji stoikai (Zenonas, Kleantas, Chrisipas) įvardijo keturis pagrindinius jausmus: džiūgavimą, liūdesį, troškimą ir baimę. Džiūgavimas yra nukreiptas į dabar esančio gėrio suvokimą, liūdesys – į dabar esančio blogio suvokimą, troškimas – į ateityje būsimo gėrio suvokimą, baimė – į būsimo blogio suvokimą. Pyktis laikomas troškimo rūšimi. III a. pr. Kr. stoikai teigė, kad išminčius neturi būti nesąmoningai valdomas jausmų. Stoikų jausmų teorija turėjo tikslą išmokyti žmogų ne šiek tiek suvaldyti jausmus, sumažinti emocijas ar jas padaryti atitinkančias sukeltam įspūdžiui, bet išmokyti žmogų atpažinti savo jausmus ir turėti teigiamus: valią (vietoj aistros), atsargumą (vietoj baimės), džiaugsmą (vietoj džiūgavimo).

Nors jausmai yra socialinis fenomenas ir pripažįstama, kad iš šalies geriau matyti, ką jaučia kitas žmogus (šia idėja iš dalies grindžiama ir Freudo psichoanalizė), tačiau jausmai yra vidinė organizmo reakcija, be to, priklausanti nuo vidinių įsitikinimų ir kultūrinės tradicijos, todėl reikia didelio atsargumo atpažįstant ir vertinant jausmą. Personažų emocijas graikų tragedijose tyrinėję Doddsas, Adkinsas, Cairnsas mokslininkų buvo kritikuojami būtent dėl neteisingo jausmų nustatymo. Disertacijoje herojų jausmus atpažįstame ir apibrėžiame, remdamiesi Senekos tragedijomis, psichologijos enciklopedija (*Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Editor in Chief Alan E. Kazdin, Vol. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, Oxford, 2000) ir šiuolaikinių psichologų (David G. Myers, *Psichologija*, Kaunas, 2008; Antoni Kępiński, *Gyvenimo ritmas*, Vilnius, 2008) definicijomis, taip pat Aristotelio *Retorikoje*, Cicerono *Tuskulo pokalbiuose* ir Senekos traktate *Apie pyktį* pateiktais jausmų apibrėžimais.

Senekos tragedijose herojų jausmai yra nepaprastai išryškinti, apie savo jausmus herojai nuolat pasakoja ir jie poeto aprašomi, pasitelkus įvairias retorines, poetines priemones, todėl darbe pasirinkta tema: herojų jausmų poetika Senekos tragedijose.

Iki šiol nebuvo išsamaus tiriamojo darbo, skirto Senekos tragedijų personažų jausmų analizei, apžvelgiančio visus pagrindinius Senekos tragedijų herojų jausmus, kurie skatina dramos veiksmą. Taip pat nebuvo ištirta, kokie herojų jausmai kokių tipų tragedijoms būdingi, kokia jausmų vieta tragedijose. Galiausiai nebuvo atliktas sistemingas tyrimas, kaip ir kokiomis priemonėmis Seneka atskleidžia ir charakterizuoja herojų jausmus.

Tyrimo objektas ir šaltiniai

Tyrimo objektas yra Senekos aštuonios pilnai išlikusios tragedijos: *Trojietės*, *Pamišęs Herkulis*, *Medėja*, *Fedra*, *Edipas*, *Agamemnonas*, *Tiestas* ir *Etos Herkulis*. Senekos tragedijų rankraščiai yra skirstomi į dvi kodeksų grupės: A ir E. *Oktavija* yra tik A grupėje. Kitos devynios tragedijos yra abiejuose kodeksuose. Anksčiausiai išlikęs Senekos tragedijų rankraštis yra *Etruskų kodeksas* (E), parašytas apie 1100 metus po Kr., saugomas Florencijoje, Medičių

Laurencianos bibliotekoje. A kodeksų grupė (skirstoma į P, T, G (tik šiuose yra *Oktavia*) ir C, S, V) datuojama šiek tiek anksčiau nei 1204 metai po Kr. E kodekse Senekos tragedijos išdėstytos tokia tvarka: *Hercules, Troades, Phoenissae, Medea, Phaedra, Oedipus, Agamemnon, Thyestes, Hercules*. A kodekse tragedijų eiliškumas ir pavadinimai šiek tiek skiriasi: *Hercules Furens, Thyestes, Thebais, Hippolytus, Oedipus, Troas, Medea, Agamemnon, Octavia, Hercules Oetaeus*.

Viduramžiais visoje Europoje vyravo A grupės Senekos tragedijų kodeksai. Vilniaus universitete (1579–1773) Senekos tragedijos buvo skaitomos taip pat iš A grupės kodeksų nuorašų. Studijų metu Vilniaus universitete retorikos klasėje nuo 1614 iki 1622 metų kasmet buvo skaitomos lotyniškai Senekos tragedijos: *Medea, Hercules Furens, Thyestes et Thebais, Hyppolitus, Oedipus, Troas*, 1711 metais – Senekos *Medea, Thyestes et Thebais, Hyppolitus* (Ludwik Piechnik, *Rozkwit Akademii Wileńskiej w latach 1600–1655*, T. 2, in: *Dzieje Akademii Wileńskiej*, T. 1–4, Rzym, 1983).

Vilniaus universiteto biblioteka buvo įsigijusi vieną seniausių leidinių – Senekos tragedijas inkunabulų rinkinyje: *Lucius Annaeus Seneca, Tragediae, cum commentario Gelli Bernardini Marmitae et Danielis Caietani. Venezia, Johannes Taminus, 1498*.

Šiame darbe naudojamos ir citatos į lietuvių kalbą verčiamos iš lotyniško *Senekos Tragedijų* leidimo, kurį 1986 metais parengė Otto Zwierleinas, sugretinęs A ir E grupės kodeksus (*L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae, recognovit Otto Zwierlein, Oxford, 1986*).

Šioje disertacijoje antikinių vardų formas rašau dabar populiariu principu: *Graeca – graece, Latina – latine*. Nesant vieningos nuomonės, manau, kad toks skirstymas yra geriausias. Lietuvių kalboje tokia vartoseną nėra retenybė ir šiuo transkribavimo principu parašytas Dalios Dilytės aukštosioms mokykloms skirtas vadovėlis *Antikinė literatūra* (Vilnius, 1998, 2005). Šioje disertacijoje rašau Senekos tragedijų personažų vardus, remdamasi lotynišku tarimu, kuris susiformavo vėlyvoje Antikoje ir Viduramžiais, be to, iki šiol šiuo principu studentai mokomi skaityti lotyniškai Vilniaus universitete. Transkribuoju iš lotynų kalbos *Faedra* į Fedra, *Oedipus* į Edipas, o iš graikų kalbos *Φαίδρα* į Faidra, *Οιδίππος* į Oidipas *etc.* Cituojamuose vertimuose palieku antikinius tikrinius vardus tokius, kokie jie buvo publikuoti.

Temos naujumas ir aktualumas

Disertacijai pasirinkta tema Lietuvos literatūrologijos, teatrologijos moksle yra visai nauja. Kitų šalių literatūrologijoje, teatrologijoje, skirtoje Antikinių dramų ir teatro problemoms, Senekos tragedijos yra tyrinėtos įvairiais aspektais, tačiau nuoseklios visų Senekos dramų analizės, išskiriančios ne konkretų (pavyzdžiui, tik pykčio jausmą), bet viso komplekso –

meilės, pavyduliavimo, pykčio, baimės, gėdos, kaltės jausmus, kaip tragedijos visumą ir prasmę kuriančio veiksnio, nebuvo.

Šiuolaikiniai literatūrologai paprastai tyrinėja herojų jausmus, nesigilindami į jų vietą tragedijoje, tarpusavio ryšius, reikšmę visam tragedijos veiksmui, paliekamos nuošalyje ir jausmų atsiradimo priežastys. Herojų jausmus mokslininkai dažniausiai apžvelgia, nagrinėdami kitas literatūrologines problemas, arba analizuoja jausmus, taikydami išskirtinai froidišką psichoanalizės metodą, žvelgdami į herojų jausmus kaip į jų slopinamą lytinį potraukį.

Senekos tragedijos dar nėra pakankamai ištyrinėtos, pasirinkta tema yra nauja ir originali. Šiame darbe pateikiamas išsamus Senekos tragedijų herojų jausmų raiškos ištyrimas padės geriau suprasti Senekos dramų reikšmę, jų sukūrimo tikslą ir vietą Senekos kūrybos kontekste, pasitarnaus verčiant Senekos tragedijas į lietuvių kalbą, padės Renesanso, Baroko literatūros tyrinėtojams atpažinti Senekos dramų recepciją Vilniaus universiteto mokykliniame jėzuitų teatre, bus naudingas Lietuvos režisieriams, norintiems statyti Senekos tragedijas teatruose. Šio tyrimo rezultatus galima panaudoti kaip pagrindą ar lyginamąją medžiagą tolesniems graikų ir apskritai visų laikų dramų tyrimams.

Tyrimų apžvalga

Lietuvoje Senekos dramos išsamiai nėra nagrinėtos. Iš dešimties išlikusių tragedijų, susijusių su Senekos vardu, trys Jono Dumčiaus išverstos į lietuvių kalbą: *Fedra*, *Pamišęs Herkulis*, *Trojietės*. Lietuvoje iki šiol Senekos tragedijoms nėra skirtos nė vienos monografijos. Yra vos keletas Senekos dramaturgijai skirtų straipsnių, kurie yra publikuoti 1996 m. *Literatūros* 38 (3) numeryje. Čia Dalia Dilytė tyrinėja Senekos tragedijos *Etos Herkulis* autorystę, Audronė Kudulytė–Kairienė lygina Helenos personažą *Trojietėse* su Helenos charakteriu graikų mitologijoje, Izolda Gabrielė Geniušienė pristato poeto T. S. Elioto požiūrį į Senekos dramaturgiją. Senekos herojų jausmų raiškai ir romėnų teatro specifikai yra skirti ir du šios disertacijos autorės straipsniai (*Literatūra* 50 (3), 2008, *Literatūra* 51 (3), 2009). Be jau minėtų straipsnių, *Literatūros* 38 (3) numeryje Nijolė Juchnevičienė lygina Senekos satyrą *Sumoliūgėjimas* su Stesimbrotu politiniu pamfletu, Eugenija Ulčinaitytė aptaria, kaip Senekos kūryba XV amžiuje pateko į Lietuvą ir kaip du ryškiausi romėnų autoriai Ciceronas ir Seneka formavo XV–XVI amžiaus Europos humanistų stilių.

Senekos tragedijas apžvelgia D. Dilytė aukštosioms mokykloms skirtame vadovėlyje *Antikinė literatūra* (1998, 2005). Su poeto tragedijų apžvalga lietuvių kalba galima susipažinti Josifo Tronskio vadovėlyje *Antikinės literatūros istorija* (1961) bei Pierre'o Grimalio biografinio pobūdžio knygoje *Seneka* (1998).

Lietuvoje Senekos tragedijos buvo ypač vertinamos XVI–XVIII amžiuje. Senekos tragedijos padarė didžiulę įtaką Vilniaus universiteto mokykliniam jėzuitų teatrui. Viena meniškiausių dramų – Vilniaus universiteto profesoriaus Grigalijaus Knapijaus tragikomedija *Filopatris (Philopater seu Pietas)*, parašyta ir pastatyta Vilniuje 1596 metais. Šioje tragedijoje ypač juntama Senekos dramų recepcija: deklamacinis teksto pobūdis, retoriškumas, sentencijų gausa, likimo neišvengiamumo ir žmogaus stiprybės jo akivaizdoje priešprieša.

Europoje ir Jungtinėse Amerikos Valstijose Senekos dramaturgija sulaukė didžiulio mokslininkų susidomėjimo. XVIII, XIX amžiuje Senekos tragedijos dažniausiai buvo lyginamos su V a. pr. Kr. graikų (Aischilo, Sofoklio, Euripido) tragedijomis ir daroma išvada, kad Senekos dramos prastesnės nei graikų dėl išpūsto, įmantraus stiliaus ir dirbtinumo, per didelio racionalumo, nenatūralumo ir netinkamumo statyti scenoje, per didelio retoriškumo, tinkančio vien mokyklinei deklamacijai. Buvo apgailestaujama, kad ne graikų, o Senekos tragedijos paveikė Shakespeare'o, Marlowe, Beno Jonsono dramą, tapo klasicistinės prancūzų, ispanų, italų tragedijos pavyzdžiu. Tik nedaugelis XIX ir XX a. pirmos pusės mokslininkų pripažino Senekos tragedijų poetinę vertę, charakterių psichologiškumą, vientisumą (L. Ranke, 1888), teigiamą retorikos įtaką, stoikų psichologijos bei etikos pritaikymą tragedijose (B. M. Marti, 1945).

XX amžiaus viduryje pasikeitė mokslininkų požiūris į Senekos tragedijas. Paneigta nuomonė, kad jos negalėjo būti statomos, ar bent jau rašomos I amžiaus Romos teatro scenai, imta teigiamai žvelgti į herojų ilgus, emocingus monologus, veiksmo pertraukimą, neatsakytus klausimus. Dabar manoma, kad šios stilistinės priemonės skatina žiūrovų kritinį mąstymą. Didelę įtaką pakeisti neigiamą požiūrį į Senekos tragedijas turėjo dvi labai palankios T. S. Elioto esė, parašytos 1927 metais, ir didžiulė Léono Herrmanno studija, skirta Senekos dramų personažų, temų analizei, publikuota 1924 metais. Herrmannas buvo vienas pirmųjų, XX amžiuje teigiamai įvertinęs Senekos tragedijas. Autorius aptarė bendrus klausimus: dramų datavimą, jų galimą pastatymą, graikų dramų įtaką. 1930 metais buvo publikuota vokiečių mokslininko Otto Regenbogeno trumpa, bet labai reikšminga esė, vėlesnių autorių ypač vertinama ir dažnai cituojama. Regenbogenas tyrinėjo skausmo, kančios ir mirties vaizdus tragedijose. Jis pripažino Senekos dramų jėgą ir išpūdingumą. Nuo to laiko po truputį vis daugiau ir daugiau mokslininkų pradėjo teigiamai vertinti Senekos originalų, šiurpų, ekspresyvių, groteskišką dramų stilių. Senekos dramoms atgimė – buvo pradėtos statyti šiuolaikiniuose teatruose.

XX amžiaus pabaigoje nusistovėjo kelios Senekos tragedijų tyrinėjimo kryptys: 1) Senekos tragedijos istoriniame – politiniame kontekste, 2) graikų ir romėnų tragedijų santykis,

3) romėnų poezijos įtaka Senekos tragedijoms, 4) stoikų filosofijos atspindžiai Senekos dramose, 5) retorikos elementai tragedijose, 6) Senekos tragedijų įtaka Renesanso teatrui, 7) Senekos personažų jausmų psichologija.

Nors Seneka (4 pr. Kr. – 65 po Kr.) buvo vienas iš žinomiausių Romos imperijos žmonių, informacijos apie Seneką Antikos autorių kūriniuose iki mūsų dienų išliko labai mažai. Mus pasiekė daugiausia tik tos žinios apie Senekos gyvenimą Tacito, Svetonijaus, Diono Kasijaus veikaluose, kurios buvo susijusios su Neronu ir jo aplinka. Išliko Kvintiliano pastabos apie Senekos stilių, Marcialio, Juvenalio paliudijimai apie filosofą. Senekos tragedijų nenagrinėja nė vienas Antikos autorius, todėl Viduramžiais buvo manoma, kad Seneka – filosofas ir Seneka – tragikas yra du skirtingi asmenys. Dar Erazmas Roterdamielis abejojo, ar filosofas Seneka galėjo rašyti tragedijas, o jei galėjo, kodėl jas rašė. Erazmas manė, kad buvo du Senekos, filosofas ir tragikas. Tik XVI amžiaus pabaigoje imta laikyti filosofą ir dramaturgą vienu autoriumi.

Vieną pirmųjų reikšmingų rinkinių, skirtų Senekos tragedijų įtakai Renesanso teatrui, išleido prancūzų mokslininkai 1964 metais. Šio rinkinio redaktorius – Jeanas Jacquot. Praėjus daugiau nei dešimtmečiui, 1978 metais straipsnį su reikšminga bibliografija apie Senekos tragedijų įtaką Renesanso dramoms ir Elžbietos laikų tragedijai anglų kalba pateikė Frederickas Kieferis. 1985 metais prie šios temos grįžo ir išsamią studiją anglų kalba parašė Gordonas Bradenas, kuris teigė, kad Renesanso laikų tragedijos perėmė „senekiškos tradicijos“ nuostatas vaizduoti pagrindinį herojų, išreiškiantį save per pykčio jausmą ir kerštą. Atskirai išskyrė stojiško santūrumo ir ištvermės herojus, kurie atsako kerštaujančiam pasitraukimu nuo jo pykčio į savo pasaulį. 1997 metais šią temą toliau tęsė Australijos mokslininkas A. J. Boyle'as. Jis tyrė Senekos tragedijų deklamacinį stilių, pasikartojančias temas, daug dėmesio skyrė romėnų teatrui, jo įtakai Renesanso dramaturgams, pateikė didžiulę Senekos tyrimų bibliografiją.

Denisas Henry ir Elisabeth Henry 1985 metais išleido įdomią ir originalią studiją (*The Mask of Power*) apie Senekos dramų meninius principus. Jie pabrėžė Senekos vaizdingumo jėgą, gausų retorinių priemonių pavartojimą, kuriant išpūdingus, pasikartojančius paveikslus, susijusius su herojų pykčiu, prievarta, mirtimi ir dezintegracine baime. C. J. Heringtonas (1966) ypač teigiamai įvertino Senekos sugebėjimą kurti dramatiškus, šurpius vaizdus ir tinkamai išryškinti likimo galią, parbloškiančią protagonistą taip smarkiai, kad herojus natūraliai atsiduoda beprotiškam pykčiui ir įniršiui. Senekos tragedijoms didelę studiją yra skyręs Clarence'as W. Mendellis (1941). Jis lygina Senekos tragedijas su graikų dramomis, dėmesį kreipia į prologų, dialogų, chorų skirtumus, akcentuoja Senekos tragedijose dievų, šmėklų reikšmę, daug dėmesio skiria Senekos *Edipui*.

Anna Lydia Motto ir Johnas R. Clarkas knygoje *Senekos tragedijos* (1986) analizuoja kiekvieną Senekos dramą atskirai, ypatingą dėmesį skirdami dramų meniškumui išryškinti. Jie išskiria pasikartojančius motyvus, kuriuos Seneka vartojo, kurdamas dramos formą ir charakterius. Pabrėžia, kad Seneka vaizduoja personažus neherojiškus, įtūžusius, nesivaldančius, nepanašius į kilnius graikų mitų herojus. Čia pateiktas ilgas, išsamus bibliografijos sąrašas.

Prattas herojų jausmus tyrinėjo stojiškų idėjų kontekste (1983). Mokslininkas išanalizavo visas Senekos tragedijas, tačiau labai tendencingai. Jo tyrime reiškama daug priešiško Senekai. Kritikas nori nuvertinti romėnų poeto dramą. Šis požiūris, mano nuomone, Pratto tyrinėjimą sumenkina. Senekos dramose autorius pastebi tik teigiamus ir neigiamus personažus, kuriuos interpretuoja kaip stoikų Dorybės ir Ydos simbolius.

Dar galima paminėti keletą reikšmingų straipsnių, skirtų Senekos tragedijoms. R. J. Tarrantas (1978) atkreipė dėmesį į Senekos tragedijų struktūrą, formos pokyčius, parodė, kaip kito atikinė tragedija ir kokią įtaką Senekos dramoms turėjo helenistinė graikų tragedija. Kritikas taip pat tyrė Euripido, Naujosios graikų komedijos, Augusto laikų tragikų (Asinijaus Poliono, Varijaus ir Ovidijaus) kūriniių įtaką Senekos dramoms.

1986 metais Dana Ferrin Sutton parašė studiją apie Senekos tragedijų tinkamumą scenai. Ji teigė, kad Seneka dramą rašė teatrui, ir šią mintį parėmė pačiais dramų tekstais. Šiai temai taip pat yra skirtas straipsnių rinkinys (redaktorius George'as W. M. Harrisonas, 2000), kuriame keliami klausimai, ar Seneka rašė savo tragedijas teatrui, ar skaitymui (recitacijoms). Čia dvylika klasikinės filologijos specialistų tyrinėja Senekos tragedijų režisavimo problemas, poeto santykį su to meto romėnų teatru, jo dramų vertimo problemas, susijusias su šiuolaikiniais Senekos tragedijų pastatymais scenoje. 1998 metais Harrisonas surengė konferenciją, skirtą Senekos tragedijoms Cincinatyje, Ohajo valstijoje. Tarptautinę konferenciją Šveicarijoje 2003 metais, vykusią Hardto fonde Ženevoje, skirtą Senekos dramoms, surengė Margarethe Billerbeck ir Ernstas A. Schmidtas. Čia dalyvavusių aštuonių mokslininkų pranešimai ir diskusijos 2004 metais buvo išleisti 50–jame *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* tome.

Victoria Tietze Larson (1994), atkreipė dėmesį į aprašymų reikšmę Senekos tragedijose, Peter J. Davis (1993), tyrinėjo choro vaidmenį Senekos ir kitose romėnų dramose, Gianni Guastella (2001), analizavo herojų pykčio ir įniršio jausmus.

Charlesas Segalas 1986 m. parašė studiją, skirtą herojų jausmų psichologijai. Jis tyrinėjo Senekos *Fedros* santykį su Euripido ir Ovidijaus tekstais. Redaktorių Edith Hall ir Rosie Wyles (*New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, 2008) sudarytame straipsnių rinkinyje du straipsniai skirti Senekos dramoms. Čia išskiriami trys ryškūs pantomimos elementai, būdingi Senekos tragedijoms. Teigiama, kad dramoms buvo rašomos ne skaitymui, bet teatro scenai.

Alessandro Schiesaro knygoje *The Passions in Play*, „Thyestes“ and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama (2003) tyrinėjo Atrėjo pyktį ir keršto troškimą kaip poetinį įkvėpimą, kaip herojaus charizmą, genialumą, užburiantį skaitytojus. Schiesaras kritikuoja įprastą politinį – istorinį tragedijos perskaitymą, kai Atrėjas suvokiamas kaip blogo tirono pavyzdys. Schiesaras tyrime remiasi Freudu ir froidizmo kritiko Francesco Orlando idėjomis. Schiesaras neigia nusistovėjusią nuomonę, kad Senekos tragedijos prastesnės už prozos veikalus. Jis taip pat kritikuoja ir tuos interpretatorius, kurie įsitikinę, kad Senekos tragedijos yra filosofiniuose kūriniuose pateikiamų neigiamų pavyzdžių iliustracijos.

M. Nussbaum tyrinėja Senekos tragediją *Medėja*, kurioje išryškina pražūtingos meilės svarbą (Nussbaum, Martha, „Serpents in the Soul: a Reading of Seneca’s *Medea*“, *The Therapy of Desire, Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*, 1994). Ji pastebėjo ypatingą Senekos gebėjimą vaizduoti aistras taip, kad jos sukeltų pasibaisėjimą besaike meile ir pykčiu, kad, išgyvenę su herojais aistras ir atpažinę jas savyje, norėtume jų atsisakyti.

Daug tragedijų panašumų su filosofiniais veikalais pastebėjo Harry M. Hine (2004), Normanas T. Pratts (1983), Thomas G. Rosenmeyeris (1989). Pastarojo revoliucinis požiūris suvokti Senekos tragedijas kaip „stojiškas dramas“ daugelio vėlesnių tyrinėtojų buvo sutiktas gana priešiška. Rosenmeyeris žvelgia į Senekos tragedijas kaip į stojiškų idėjų prozos veikaluose tęsinį. Dabar plačiai manoma, kad bent jau keletas Senekos tragedijų temų yra susijusios su jo filosofinėmis pažiūromis. Pasak E. Fantham ir Ch. Gillo (2003), Senekos susidomėjimas gamtos filosofija, etika ir psichologija – pirmiausia destruktiviu besaikių jausmų poveikiu – vaidina žymų vaidmenį poeto tragedijose.

Apibendrinant tyrimų apžvalgą, reikia pasakyti, kad minėtuose mokslo darbuose Senekos personažų jausmų analizė nebuvo išsami, skirta tik atskiroms tragedijoms, neapžvelgianti visumos. Dramos dažniausiai tyrinėtos siauru froidišku metodu arba herojų jausmai suvokiami formaliai, vienpusiškai kaip gėrio ir blogio idėjos. Lietuvoje Senekos herojų jausmų raiškos tyrimų kol kas nėra. Apskritai Senekos tragedijos Lietuvoje dar netapo specialių studijų objektu, nėra suformuluota tokių tyrimų metodika ir problematika, nėra romėnų tragedijos žanro apžvalgų, nedaug tėra vertimų.

Darbo tikslas ir uždaviniai

Darbo tikslas – ištirti, kokie Senekos tragedijų personažų jausmai skatina tragedijos veiksmą, nulemia jo eigą ir sukuria emocinę tragedijos nuotaiką. Parodyti, kokiomis priemonėmis Seneka atskleidžia tragedijos herojaus jausmo atsiradimą, jo skleidimą ir

egzistavimą to herojaus vidiniame pasaulyje, nustatyti, kaip visi minėtieji procesai atsispindi personažo kalboje ir poelgiuose.

Disertacijoje keliami uždaviniai:

1. Išnagrinėti, kokie herojų jausmai skatina tragedijos veiksmą.
2. Parodyti, kokiomis mitologinėmis figūromis Seneka atskleidė pyktį, baimę, kalnę, gėdą, meilę, pavyduliavimą. Ištirti, ar Senekos tragedijose vyrauja koks nors vienas šių jausmų, ar jie visi būdingi visiems Senekos herojams, ar skirtingi personažai išgyvena skirtingus jausmus.
3. Išanalizuoti, kokiomis stilistinėmis, retorinėmis priemonėmis Seneka išsako jausmus.
4. Ištirti svarbiausių personažų jausmų genezę, parodyti, kokį herojų elgesį vienas ar kitas jausmas sąlygoja, kokia kalbinė išraiška yra jam būdinga.
5. Nustatyti, ar Senekos tragedijose herojų jausmai vaizduojami chaotiškai, ar tam tikra seka.
6. Nustatyti, koku tikslu Seneka pateikia itin stiprius jausmus išgyvenančius tragedijos herojus ir koks yra tikėtinas tų jausmų poveikis skaitytojui ar žiūrovui.

Metodai

Įvade ir pirmajame skyriuje taikoma *sintezė*, antrajame skyriuje – *analizė*. *Fenomenologiniu* metodu remiuosi aprašydama aštuonių Senekos tragedijų herojų jausmus, skatinančius dramos veiksmo eigą. Taip pat taikau *lyginamąjį* metodą, gretindama vieną Senekos tragediją su kita ir su graikišku jos prototipu. *Interpretaciniu (hermeneutiniu)* metodu remiuosi, tyrinėdama stilistines, retorines priemones, kuriomis aprašomi herojų jausmai, ir aiškindama, kokią prasmę ir reikšmę turi herojų jausmai žiūrovų emociniam poveikiui.

Darbo struktūra

Disertaciją sudaro įvadas, dvi pagrindinės dėstymo dalys, išvados ir literatūros sąrašas. **Pirmoje dalyje** glaustai apžvelgiami Senekos tragedijų prototipai – antikinės graikų ir romėnų tragedijos, parašytos, sekant graikų mitologiniais siužetais. Plačiau aptariamos išlikusios graikų tragedijos: Euripido *Medėja*, *Trojietės*, *Hekuba*, *Andromachė*, *Heraklis*, *Hipolitas*, Sofoklio *Oidipas karalius*, *Trachinietės* ir Aischilo *Agamemnonas*, lyginu jas su Senekos tragedijomis: *Medėja*, *Trojietėmis*, *Pamišusiu Herkuliu*, *Fedra*, *Edipu*, *Etos Herkuliu* ir *Agamemnonu*. Pirmoje dalyje aptariu, koks buvo romėnų teatras I amžiuje po Kr. ir tuo metu populiarus pantomima, kuri, mokslininkų teigimu, turėjo įtakos Senekos tragedijoms ir ypač jo pomėgiui vaizduoti herojų

aistras. Šioje dalyje taip pat analizuoju tragedijų žiūrovų ir skaitytojų emocijas, į kurias Antikoje vieni pirmųjų atkreipė dėmesį Gorgijas ir Aristotelis, ir kurios ne mažiau buvo svarbios Senekai.

Antroje dalyje nagrinėju Senekos tragedijų herojų jausmų raišką. Šią dalį skaidau į keturis poskyrius: 1) *pykčio ir agresijos dominantės*, 2) *baimės, pykčio ir agresijos dominantės*, 3) *baimės, gėdos ir kaltės dominantės*, 4) *meilės ir pavyduliavimo dominantės*.

Pirmajame ir antrame poskyryje analizuoju keturias Senekos tragedijas: *Medėją*, *Tiestą*, *Trojietes* ir *Agamemnoną*. Šiose tragedijose varomoji jėga yra herojų pyktis. Šis jausmas kaip leitmotyvas pradeda, plėtoja ir užbaigia *Tiesto* ir *Medėjos* tragedijas. Todėl išskiriu šį jausmą į tris jo raidos etapus, nustatau, kokiomis priemonėmis Seneka atskleidžia šią emociją, kaip aprašo herojų elgesį, kalbą, dialogą. Pastebėjau, kad *Trojietės* ir *Agamemnonas* – vienintelės Senekos tragedijos, turinčios rėminę kompoziciją ir ilgą veiksmo retardaciją, todėl jas analizuoju kartu. Čia veiksmas, kurį skatina herojų pyktis, yra laikinai nutraukiamas, aprašant kitų veikėjų jausmus, ir grįžtama prie pagrindinių herojų pykčio finalinėse scenose. Nustatau, kokie jausmai ir kaip aprašomi centrinėje tragedijų dalyje, kuri yra digresija ir veiksmo retardacija, kaip, lyginant su nepertraukiamo pykčio ir keršto tragedijomis (*Tiestu*, *Medėja*), keičiasi dramų, turinčių retardaciją, poveikis skaitytojui.

Trečiajame ir ketvirtajame poskyriuose nagrinėju lyginimo metodu keturias Senekos tragedijas, kurias sugrupavau po dvi: *Pamišusį Herkulį* su *Edipu*, o *Fedrą* su *Etos Herkuliu*. Pirmosiose tragedijose varomoji veiksmo jėga yra herojų baimė, antrosiose – moterų meilė ir pavyduliavimas. *Fedra* ir *Etos Herkulis* turi dvinarę kompoziciją. Šiose dramose padaręs nusikaltimą personažas atpažįsta save kaip nusikaltėlį, pajunta gėdą ir kaltę. Vieni personažai jaučia tik gėdą (*Fedra* ir *Dejanira*), kiti – gėdą ir kaltę (*Herkulis* ir *Edipas*), todėl skirtinga jų reakcija po atpažinimo. Herojai, jaučiantys tik gėdą, nusižudo, o jaučiantys gėdą ir kaltę, save baudžia tremtimi.

Disertacijoje ginami teiginiai

1. Personažų pyktis, įniršis, agresija, gėda, kaltė, meilė, pavyduliavimas sukuria veiksmo akceleraciją, baimė, liūdesys, džiaugsmas – veiksmo retardaciją. Seneka dažniau nei graikų tragikai keičia veiksmą ir vietą vidiniame dramatinio personažo pasaulyje. Stiprus jausmo išgyvenimas Senekos herojus verčia keliauti laiku ir erdve, regėti pomirtinį pasaulį, dienos metu stebėti žvaigždynus, kalbėtis su mirusiais, su dievais, su žmonėmis, kurių nėra šalia jų.

2. Visi Senekos pagrindiniai personažai jaučia ir išreiškia pyktį. Gėdą ir kaltę jaučia *Edipas*, *Herkulis*, *Tesėjas*, gėdą – *Fedra*, *Dejanira*, *Jokastė*, meilę – *Fedra*, *Andromachė*,

Herkulis, pavyduliavimą – Dejanira, baimę – Edipas, Andromachė, Hekuba, Amfitrionas, Megara, Tiestas, Egistas.

3. Herojų jausmus Seneka atskleidžia, vartodamas amplifikaciją, introvertišką kalbėseną, klausimo-atsakymo figūrą, adiną, anaforą, metaforą, pakartojimą, palyginimą, ironiją, hiperbolę, paradoksą.

4. Senekos tragedijose herojų kančios kyla dėl stipriai išgyvenamo pykčio, įniršio, gėdos, kaltės, meilės, pavyduliavimo, baimės, liūdesio. Seneka atskleidžia, kad šiuos jausmus kilti skatina klaidingi personažų įsitikinimai ir nuomonės.

5. Herojų jausmai Senekos tragedijose vaizduojami tam tikra seka. Tragedijose, *kuriose personažas padaro netyčinį nusikaltimą ir jaučia kaltę*, pirmiausia aprašoma baimė, po atpažinimo – gėda, pyktis, kaltė, apsauganti herojų nuo savižudybės. Tragedijose, *kuriose personažas padaro netyčinį nusikaltimą ir jaučia gėdą*, pirmiausia aprašoma meilė arba pavyduliavimas, po atpažinimo – pyktis ir gėda, skatinanti nusizudyti. Tragedijose, *kuriose personažas padaro tyčinį nusikaltimą ir nejaučia kaltės bei gėdos*, aprašomas skriaudos pojūtis, pyktis, keršto troškimas, įniršis ir nusiramimas, įvykdžius kerštą.

6. Stoicizmo filosofijos idealai buvo paveikę Senekos poezijos kūrybos principus. Rašytojas beširdžius, žiaurius, egoistiškus tragedijų personažus dažniausiai pateikia tam, kad mes, skaitytojai ir žiūrovai, ne galėtume herojų, o susimąstytume, kokia didžiulė, griauanti jėga yra klaidingi įsitikinimai ir iš jų kylantys nevaldomi jausmai ir aistros.

Išvados

1. Tyrimo rezultatai atskleidė ryškias Senekos dramų ir jo filosofinių veikalų sąsajas. Tragedijose, kaip ir filosofiniuose traktatuose, Seneka sąmoningai išryškino ir hiperbolizavo herojų išgyvenimus.
2. Personažų jausmus (pyktį, įniršį, agresiją, gėdą, kaltę, meilę, pavyduliavimą) Seneka pasitelkė veiksmo akceleracijai, o baimę, liūdesį, džiaugsmą – veiksmo retardacijai sukurti. Seneka dažniau nei graikų tragikai keitė veiksmą ir vietą vidiniame dramatinio personažo pasaulyje. Stiprus jausmo išgyvenimas Senekos herojus verčia keliauti laiku ir erdve, regėti pomirtinį pasaulį, dienos metu stebėti žvaigždynus, kalbėtis su mirusiais, su dievais, su žmonėmis, kurių nėra šalia jų.
3. Visi Senekos pagrindiniai personažai jaučia ir išreiškia pyktį. Gėdą ir kaltės jausmą jaučia Edipas, Herkulis, Tesėjas, gėdą – Fedra, Dejanira, Jokastė, meilę – Fedra, Andromachė, Herkulis, pavyduliavimą – Dejanira, baimę – Edipas, Andromachė, Hekuba, Amfitrionas, Megara, Tiestas, Egistas. Seneka vienoje scenoje dažniausiai

išryškina tik vieną jausmą, kuris yra tarsi tik tam veikėjui būdinga kaukė. Pagrindiniai jausmai, dėl kurių įvyksta tyčinis arba netyčinis nusikaltimas (hamartija), yra dvasinis skausmas, pyktis ir agresija.

4. Herojų jausmus (pyktį, agresiją, įniršį, baimę, pavyduliavimą, meilę, kaltę, gėdą) Seneka atskleidė, vartodamas pakartojimą, palyginimą, metaforą, amplifikaciją, hiperbolę, ironiją, adiną, anaforą, paradoksa, introvertiško pobūdžio kalbėseną, klausimo-atsakymo figūrą. Senekos tragedijose vyrauja ne į išorę nukreiptas dramatis dialogas, o diatribės formos personažo pokalbis moralės temomis su įsivaizduojamuoju pašnekovu arba pačiu savimi. Jausmams atskleisti Seneka pasitelkdavo ir pantomimai būdingas scenas.
5. Seneka pateikia vienokių ar kitokių jausmų genezės motyvus. Jei žmogus pyksta, tai jis yra klaidingai įsitikinęs, kad yra neteisingai nuskriaustas ir už skriaudą turi atkeršyti. Jei žmogus netyčia įvykdo nusikaltimą (hamartijos atvejis), tai jaučia gėdą, pyktį, rečiau – kaltę. Personažai, jaučiantys baimę, yra įsitikinę, kad ateityje patirs blogį. Jei personažas pavyduliauja, tai įsitikinęs, kad yra prastesnis už kitą. Meilės aistrą jaučiantis herojus yra klaidingai įsitikinęs, kad mylimasis yra gražiausias žmogus. Autorius atskleidžia klaidingus žmonių įsitikinimus, kurie pagimdo dvasinį skausmą sukeliančius jausmus. Pašalinęs klaidingą įsitikinimą, žmogus gali išsilaisvinti nuo kančios. Tik Herkulis tragedijoje *Etos Herkulis* sugeba išsivaduoti nuo fizinio ir dvasinio skausmo. Šis personažas vienintelis turi stoikui būdingą tvirtą charakterį, jis suvokia savo klaidas, sugeba nugalėti mirties baimę. Tragedijoje *Pamišęs Herkulis* Herkulis geba iškęsti gėdą ir vietoj šaunumo (*virtus*) pasirinkti nesavanaudišką artimo meilę (*pietas*).
6. Herojų jausmai Senekos tragedijose vaizduojami tam tikra seka. Tragedijose, *kuriose personažas padaro netyčinį nusikaltimą ir jaučia kaltę* (*Pamišęs Herkulis, Edipas*), pirmiausia aprašoma baimė, po atpažinimo – gėda, pyktis, kaltė, apsauganti herojų nuo savižudybės. Tragedijose, *kuriose personažas padaro netyčinį nusikaltimą ir jaučia gėdą* (*Fedra, Etos Herkulis*), pirmiausia aprašoma meilė arba pavyduliavimas, po atpažinimo – pyktis ir gėda, skatinanti nusižudyti. Tragedijose, *kuriose personažas padaro tyčinį nusikaltimą ir nejaučia kaltės bei gėdos* (*Medėja, Tiestas, Agamemnonas, Trojietės*), aprašomas skriaudos pojūtis, pyktis, keršto troškimas, įniršis ir nusiraminimas, įvykdžius kerštą.
7. Palyginus Antikos filosofų ir šiuolaikinių psichologų jausmų apibūdinimus, galima teigti, kad pakito šiuolaikinio žmogaus pykčio bei agresijos ir gėdos bei kaltės jausmų supratimas. Antikoje jausmų atžvilgiu nebuvo vieningos nuomonės. Aristotelis ir

peripatetikai teigiamai vertino visus jausmus, o stoikai juos visus laikė ydomis. Seneka nepritarė Aristotelio minčiai, kad saikingas pyktis („saikinga beprotybė“) yra geras jausmas, reikalingas stipriai ir individualiai dvasiai palaikyti, apsiginti, kovoti, išsiskirti ir nesutapti su minia. Seneka net silpną pyktį laikė neigiamu, nereikalingu žmogui jausmu, Todėl pyktis Senekos tragedijose visada virsta nesaikingu, savo žiaurumu stulbinančiu įniršiu. Destruktyvų pyktį ir agresiją Senekos personažai jaučia ir dėl stipraus polinkio į gėdą, priklausymo vadinamajai „gėdos kultūrai“. Seneka personažus, turinčius polinkį į gėdą ir pyktį, parodo kaip neigiamą stoiškų idealų iliustraciją, kaip pavyzdį, parodantį, kurlink veda pražūtingos aistros. Antikoje nebuvo aiškaus gėdos ir kaltės skyrimo. Ir Antikos poetai, ir filosofai labiau akcentavo gėdos jausmą, kaltę palikdami diskurso užribyje.

8. Senekos išdidintas ir pakilus kalbėjimo būdas stulbina skaitytojus ir verčia ne gailėtis herojų, o susimąstyti, kokia didžiulė, griaunanti jėga yra klaidingi įsitikinimai ir iš jų kylantys nevaldomi jausmai ir aistros. Senekos tragedijos prabyla į mus tarsi sąžinė, mūsų pačių dorovinio atsakingumo jausmas.

Works Published on the Subject of the Dissertation:

1. „Atpažinimas Aristotelio *Poetikoje*“ (Recognition in Aristotle’s Poetics), *Gimtasis žodis*, Nr. 8, Vilnius: Gimtasis žodis, 1998, 34–38.
2. „Herojaus charakteris Homero epe ir Sofoklio tragedijoje“ (A Hero’s Character in Homer’s Epos and Sophocles’ Tragedy), *Literatūra*, 44 (3), Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2002, 15–23.
3. „Vis dar gyvos antikinės tragedijos: Oidipas – šiuolaikinio valdovo paveikslas“ (Still Alive Antique Tragedies: Oedipus as a Picture of Contemporary Ruler), *Gimtasis žodis*, Nr. 6, Vilnius: Gimtasis žodis, 2003, 16–21.
4. „Antikinių dramų pastatymai Lietuvoje“ (Staging Antique Dramas in Lithuania), *Literatūra*, 46 (3), Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2004, 119–132.
5. „Charleso Martindale’io recepcijos teorija ir antikinė literatūra“ (Charles Martindale’s Reception Theory and Antique Literature), *Literatūra*, 49 (3), Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2007, 8–21.
6. „Senekos dramų herojų jausmų raiška ir poveikis žiūrovams“ (Expression of the Characters’ Feelings and Impact on Spectators of Senecan Dramas), *Literatūra*, 50 (3), Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2008, 36–54.
7. „La fortuna del teatro classico in Lituania“ (The Fortunes of The Classic Theatre in Lithuania) (transl. Manuela Anelli), *Il Lessico della classicità nella letteratura europea moderna*, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana Fondata da Giovanni Treccani, 2009, 901–906.
8. „Romėnų teatras ir Senekos tragedijos *Pamišęs Herkulis, Edipas*“ (The Roman Theatre and Seneca’s Tragedies *Hercules Furens, Oedipus*), *Literatūra*, 51 (3), Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2009, 47–65.

Jovita Dikmonienė (g. 1972.09.01.) 1994–2000 m. studijavo klasikinę filologiją Vilniaus universitete. 1998 m. baigė klasikinės filologijos bakalauro studijų programą, apgynusi bakalauro darbą *Atpažinimo motyvas graikų tragedijoje*, kuris buvo teigiamai įvertintas Lietuvos Mokslų akademijos studentų darbų konkurse. 2000 m. baigė klasikinės filologijos magistro studijų programą, apgynusi magistro darbą *Atpažinimas antikinėje komedijoje*. Nuo 2000 m. birželio 16 d. iki 2002 vasario 28 d. dirbo Vilniaus universitete Filologijos fakultete Klasikinės filologijos katedros reikalų tvarkytoja. Nuo 2000 m. rugsėjo 1 d. iki dabar dirba Klasikinės filologijos katedros asistente, dėsto lotynų kalbą, antikinę literatūrą ir romėnų literatūrą. 2005 m. spalio 1 d. įstojo į Vilniaus universiteto doktorantūrą, disertacijos tema parengė keletą straipsnių.

Jovita Dikmonienė (born on 1 September 1972) studied classical philology at Vilnius University in 1994–2000. In 1998 she completed the Bachelor Degree study program in classical philology and defended the Bachelor's work *Recognition Motive in the Greek Tragedy*, which received positive evaluation by the Lithuanian Academy of Science in the contest of the students' works. In 2000 she finished the Master Degree study program and defended the Master's work *Recognition in the Antique Comedy*. From 16 June 2000 to 28 February 2002 Jovita worked as an office keeper in the Classical Philology Department, the Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University. Since 1 September 2000 till now she works as an assistant in the Classical Philology Department, also teaches the Latin language, Antique Literature and Roman Literature. On 1 October 2005 Jovita Dikmonienė started her postgraduate PhD studies at Vilnius University, prepared a few articles on the subject of her dissertation.