

Different Cultures Nurture Different Heroes : A Comparative Study of Prince Ch'ung Erh and Aeneas

Hsiung-Fei Tang*

Abstract

We Chinese define a hero as a man who should devote himself wholeheartedly to the nation and the mass of the people; besides, he should also honor the ruler and repel the barbarians. We venerate such ancient heroes (or leaders) as Pan Ku, Yu Ch'ao, Sui Jen, Fu Hsi, Shen Lung as well as the Yellow Emperor, but we never look upon them as gods, so is Prince Ch'ung Erh (later known as Duke Wen of Chin). *Aeneas* is the founder of the Roman Empire and the leading figure in *Aeneid*, an epic by Virgil. Though a literary work, in Europe, *Aeneid* has been admired and imitated and even studied as a standard textbook in all schools throughout thousands of years. In Europe people never regard Aeneas as just a mythical figure, but a national hero. Both Prince Ch'ung Erh and Aeneas were reluctant slaves, forced to be exiled in strange lands, finally became rulers. According to history books, we know that it was in accordance with the natural tendency that Prince Ch'ung Erh became the ruler of Chin. As for Aeneas, his success lies in a duel, in which he killed his opponent for nothing but winning Lavinia, a beautiful woman. It seems to be a child play that such an important matter as the rise and fall of a race was decided upon the duel of two warriors, but, anyway, this is the Westerner's idea of defining a national hero.

* Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Chung-Hsing University

Introduction

It is definitely indisputable that different cultures nurture different heroes. In this treatise, I try to compare some features of two culture heroes of dim antiquity in the West and China and then analyze the reasons that caused them to do so. The one is Aeneas, survivor of the Trojan War and founder of a new nation, destined to be Rome; the other is Prince Ch'ung Erh (公子重耳), known after his accession as Duke Wen of Chin (晉文公), reigning from 636-628 B.C., as the second hegemon¹ of the Spring and Autumn Period (春秋時代, 722-484 B.C.). We all know that Aeneas is a legendary hero, created by Publius Vergilius Maro (70-19 B.C.) in his epic *Aeneid*. An epic is a long narrative poem about the deeds of a traditional or historical hero or heroes of high station.² It is a literary form which we do not have in our literature. In our country there is historiography, a narrative art which fulfills the cultural function of epic poetry in the West and is the most formal vehicle for the transmission of culturally vital materials. As to Prince Ch'ung Erh, he was a real figure, whose deeds are detailedly recorded in such official history books as *Historical Records* (《史記》), *Kuo Yu* (《國語》), *Tso Chuang* (《左傳》) and many others.

The depiction of a cultural heritage and its values inevitably focuses upon the human actors who occupy the center of the narrative. In epic or historiography, the figures are emblems of cultural concerns, whether for good or evil,³ epic heroes in Western traditions tend to be based on mythological archetypes, and reveal their essential qualities through action. In a sense, what such a hero does is more important than what he is, because what he does reveals what he is. The heroes of our early historiography tend to be conceived in terms of abstractions of aspects of ritual completeness; that is, those aspects of social conduct which they exemplified in their careers. Following our propensity for emphasizing ritual rather than action

is the issue, and therefore quality determines action.⁴ In spite of these different emphases--so different indeed as perhaps to seem entirely contradictory--both allow for well-rounded, sympathetic characterizations of figures who otherwise would be in danger of being represented as cyphers of heroic action or ritual awareness.

These two heroes are of comparable stature in the history and legends of their respective traditions, and have some astonishing parables in their careers. The similarities which are most striking may seem at first to be coincidental, but where there is no possibility of intercultural influence, such similarities may reveal concerns which transcend cultural boundaries. Aeneas and Prince Ch'ung Erh were both marital and culture heroes. Their titles or epithets emphasize the civil side of their natures: Aeneas is habitually described as "pius" (pious) for his ability to integrate his awareness of duty toward the gods into the actions of daily life, while Ch'ung Erh's ducial title "wen" (文, meaning culture or literature) emphasizes civil over military achievement. Both heroes were charismatic leaders of groups of exiles, and at crucial points in their careers faced choices between following their destinies with their inevitable rigors and personal comfort and love. Both were forced into exile by violence, Aeneas fleeing the pyre of a ruined civilization, whereas Ch'ung Erh was escaping a court broken by intrigue. Both were obliged to endure years of wandering in strange and uncouth lands before gaining or, in the case of Ch'ung Erh, regaining their rightful kingdoms. Most important in this study, both loved and were loved by noble women, from whom they were forced to part with a view to fulfilling their duties to their own people. On the human level, both were obliged by their sense of duty to put aside personal considerations for the sake of a kingdom not quite of their own choosing, and both took up their tasks in the most human way possible--unwillingly.

For all these similarities, there still exist many differences in their full-

filment of their duties. And these differences are caused by the different cultures to which they belonged. To give these differences a satisfactory clarification, I have to describe detailedly their respective vicissitudes before explaining the differences between these two heroes.

I、The Vicissitudes of Aeneas and Ch'ung Erh

Aeneas and his followers were, according to Virgil, after the sack of Troy by a wooden horse, forced to leave that city to wander the earth for many years, driven by the hatred of Juno, queen of the gods, until they safely reached Libya, where they were gladly welcomed by the people of Carthage. Because Carthage was the favorite city of Juno, Venus, Aeneas' mother, could not but have Cupid take form of Ascanius, son of Aeneas, so that the young god of love might warm the heart of proud Dido, queen and ruler of Carthage, and Aeneas came to no harm in her mind.

It was after Juno and Venus had conferred and agreed that a union between Aeneas and Dido would be desirable, during a royal hunt, Juno caused a sudden thunderstorm. The members of the hunting party scattered, seeking shelter from the downpour. Aeneas and Dido hid in a large and secluded cavern. While alone there, the couple, under the influence of the goddesses, consummated their love.⁵

But when Jupiter, king of the gods, learned what had happened, he sent Mercury to order Aeneas to sail for Hesperia (the ancient name for Italy), where he would be the ancestor of a new nation, powerful and strong enough to conquer Greece and all the world.

When they reached Italy, they were welcomed by Latinus, ruler of Latium. Latinus had been warned by an oracle not to give his daughter Lavinia in marriage to any native man, but to wait for an alien, who would come to establish a great country. A Latin hero, Turnus, became jealous of the favor Latinus showed to Aeneas, and stirred up a revolt among the

people. Juno, hating Aeneas, aided Turnus. Aeneas could not but make preparations for battle with the Latins under Turnus. In a dream Aeneas was advised to seek the help of Evander, whose kingdom on the Seven Hills would become the site of mighty Rome. Aeneas thus paid Evander a visit and the latter agreed to join forces with the former against the armies of Turnus and to enlist troops from nearby territories as well. After a long period of fighting, Turnus declared that the husband of Lavinia would be selected in a duel between himself and Aeneas. Undauntedly, Aeneas accepted the challenge and killed Turnus. No longer opposed by Turnus, Aeneas was then free to marry Lavinia and established his long-promised new nation.

Before talking about Prince Ch'ung Erh, I feel it necessary to give a brief sketch of the situation of Chin (晉) at that time. It was in the fifth year of Duke Hsien of Chin (晉獻公, around the 7th century B.C.), Ch'ung Erh's father, when Chin defeated Li Jung (驪戎), a barbarian tribe to the west of China, the duke captured Li Chi (驪姬) and took her as one of his royal concubines. After a period of time Li Chi gave birth to a son, named Hsi Ch'i (奚齊), the duke had the intention of redesignating of Hsi Ch'i as the crown prince by deposing the original one, Shen Sheng (申生, Ch'ung Erh's elder brother). On learning this, Li Chi said pretentiously to the duke in tears, "All the feudal lords know that Shen Sheng is the crown prince of Chin; besides, he has led troops to start on campaigns, that's why people love him. How can you, because of me, set aside the elder and redesignate the younger? If you really mean it, I can do nothing but commit suicide."....In the twenty-first year, Li Chi said to crown prince Shen Sheng, "A few days ago His Majesty dreamed of your mother (who had already been dead), you'd better hurry with Ch'u Wo (曲沃) to offer sacrifices and then bring the sacrificial meat back to present to His Majesty." The crown prince did as he had been told. But unluckily the duke had gone hunt-

ing, the crown prince put the meat in the palace, Li Chi thus secretly sent a servant to dip the meat in poison. Two days later when Duke Hsien came back from hunting and the royal cook presented him the meat, Li Chi said at this juncture, "The meat was brought here from afar, Your Majesty had better try it before eating." Thereupon she gave a piece to a dog, which died immediately after swallowing it. Then she gave another piece to a servant, who also died soon after he had eaten it. Li Chi thus calumniated the crown prince before the duke, who was really infuriated and sent men to arrest his son. On hearing this, the crown prince committed suicide. Li Chi also told the duke that Ch'ung Erh was an accomplice, Ch'ung Erh could not but take to his heels.

Duke Wen of Chin, Ch'ung Erh, was the second son of Duke Hsien of Chin. He liked to associate himself with men of virtue and talent when young. When he was only seventeen years old, it is said, there were five virtuous and talented men accompanying him wherever he went. They were Chao Shuai (趙衰), Hu Yen (狐偃), Chia T'o (賈佗), Hsien Chen (先軫), and Wei Wu-tzu (魏武子). In the year when Duke Hsien, his father, acceded to the throne, he was twenty-one years old; in other words, he had already been a grown-up when his father still served as the crown prince. In the thirteenth year of Duke Hsien of Chin, because of Li Chi, Ch'ung Erh was sent to P'u Yih (蒲邑) to defend the troops of Ch'in (秦軍). In the twenty-first year, because of crown prince Shen Sheng's being forced to commit suicide and Li Chi's calumination, he fled back to P'u Yih without saying good-bye to his father. In the twenty-second year when his father sent Lu Ti (履鞮), a eunuch, to kill him, he could not but jump over the wall and run away. But the killer still chased after him and cut off one of his sleeves. Finally he escaped to Ti (狄, name of a barbarous country to the north of ancient China), the place where his mother came from. He was forty-three years old then; except those five friends, there were still several

tens of followers escaping with him.

When Ch'ung Erh was in Ti, the troops of Ti defeated Chiu Ju (咎如, a barbarous tribe) and captured two princesses, of whom the king of Ti betrothed to Ch'ung Erh the elder one who gave birth to two sons, Po T'iao (伯嚭) and Shu Liu (叔劉), and to Chao Shuai the younger one who later became the mother of Chao Tun (趙盾), a famous minister of Chin. Duke Hsien died after Ch'ung Erh had lived in Ti for five years. At this time Li K'e (里克), a powerful courtier of Chin, killed Hsi Ch'i, together with his brother Tao Tau (悼子), and asked Ch'ung Erh to hurry back to Chin to succeed to the throne. But Ch'ung Erh was afraid of being killed and dared not to return to his mother state. Li K'e then asked Yi Wu (夷吾), younger brother of Ch'ung Erh, to return to Chin, who became Duke Hui of Chin (晉惠公). Duke Hui was afraid that Ch'ung Erh might come back some day and order him to abdicate, he thus, at the seventh year, sent Lu Ti, together with several brave warriors, to assassinate Ch'ung Erh. On hearing this, Ch'ung Erh discussed with his followers and said, "It is not that for succeeding to the throne I escaped to Ti but that Ti is adjacent to P'u Yih and I want to have a temporal relaxation here. Now that having rested here for quite a long time, I intend to move to a big feudal state. I hear that Duke Huan of Ch'i (齊桓公, ?-643 B.C.) is now trying to execute good administration; besides, Kuan Chung (管仲, ?-644 B.C.) and Hsi P'eng (隰朋) have died, His Majesty must be very anxious about looking for talented assistants. Why not let's try our chances in Ch'i?" Then he turned to his wife, "Please wait for me for twenty-five years. If I cannot come back then, you may re-marry anyone of your own choice," then they started eastward for Ch'i. Ch'ung Erh lived in Ti for twelve years.

When they were passing through Wey (衛), Duke Wen of Wey (衛文公) didn't treat them with courtesy. They could not but travel on eastward via Wu Lu (五鹿). They felt bitterly suffering cold and hunger on the road

and begged a rustic for food. Unexpectedly, that rustic put a handful of soil in the bowl and gave it to Ch'ung Erh, that made the prince in distress and felt very angry. At this time Chao Shuai said, "Soil symbolizes territory. Your Highness had better accept it with thanks."

When they finally arrived in Ch'i, Duke Huan of Ch'i received them with high respect and betrothed his daughter Chiang (姜) to Ch'ung Erh. He lived in Ch'i for five years. Because of loving his wife dearly he didn't want to leave Ch'i. One day when Chao Chuai, Chiu Fan (咎犯) and several other were scheming under a mulberry tree, a maid of Ch'ung Erh's wife was gathering mulberry leaves nearby who eavesdropped their plan and hurriedly confided it to her mistress. For fear that the secret might be divulged, the mistress killed her maid as soon as possible. But, unexpectedly, Ch'ung Erh said, "Living in this world, man should enjoy himself whenever he can. As for the future, it's as illusory as a mirage. I have made up my mind to live in Ch'i till my death." His wife could not but make him drunk before sending him to another state in a carriage. Having travelled quite a long distance when Ch'ung Erh recovered his senses, he felt greatly infuriated and intended to kill Chiu Fan, the driver. After the latter's explanation, Ch'ung Erh left Ch'i reluctantly.

While passing through Ts'ao (曹), a small feudal state, Duke Kung of Ts'ao (曹共公) didn't receive him. Li Fu-chi (釐負羈), a minister of Ts'ao, helped him by giving him many pieces of jade, hidden under food, Ch'ung Erh accepted the food but refused the jade.

When he was passing by Sung (宋), another small feudal state, Sung had just been attacked by Ch'u (楚) and Duke Hsiang of Sung (宋襄公) was wounded. Duke Hsiang received him as if he had been a feudal lord, but general Kung-sun Ku (公孫固) said to him, "Sung is but a small feudal state and we were besieged by our enemy troops not long ago. We are indeed incapable of helping Your Highness return to Ch'in. Your Highness'd

better seek for help from a powerful state." Ch'ung Erh could not but leave Sung.

When he was passing by Cheng (鄭), also a small feudal state, Duke Wen of Cheng (鄭文公) didn't treat him with courtesy; besides, Cheng Shu-chan (鄭叔瞻), a courtier of Cheng, even advised Duke Wen to kill Ch'ung Erh, but the duke didn't accept this memorial.

When Ch'ung Erh arrived in Ch'u, King Ch'eng of Ch'u (楚成王) welcomed him with great respect. After Ch'ung Erh had lived in Ch'u for several months, Prince Yu (公子圍) of Chin escaped to Ch'u from Ch'in (秦). The people of Ch'in hated Prince Yu; when they heard that Ch'ung Erh was then in Ch'u, they invited him to Ch'in. King Ch'eng of Ch'u said at this time, "Because Ch'u is far from your mother state; if you intend to go back, you have to travel through many states before reaching Chin. Ch'in is adjacent to Chin; what's more, the King of Ch'in is virtuous and talented, you'd better go there."

When he arrived in Ch'in, Duke Mu of Ch'in (秦穆公) betrothed him five girls, who were of the same clan with Duke Mu. Among those girls, one had been the wife of Prince Yu. In the fourteenth year of Duke Hui of Chin, the Duke died in autumn and his son, Prince Yu, acceded to the throne. Having heard that Ch'ung Erh was in Ch'in, such ministers of Chin as Luan (欒) and Hsi (郤) advised Ch'ung Erh, together with his entourage, to come back to Chin. Thus Duke Mu of Ch'in ordered a troop to escort him back to his mother state. Having lived in exile for nineteen years, Ch'ung Erh was finally received by Chin and acceded to the throne. This is Duke Wen of Chin, who was then sixty-two years of age.⁶

II. The Fulfillment of Duties to People

To save space, I leave out such differences between these two cultures, such as in geography, topography, mythology, legend, tradition, social

notions, feminine ideal as well as loyalty and national spirit and jump to the discussion of a hero's duties to people.

In the fulfillment of duties to people, both Ch'ung Erh and Aeneas were strongly desirous of letting their people have a country, which would be powerful and prosperous enough to safeguard them to live and work in peace and content. But, unluckily, both were ill-fated and destined to be exiled and travel for many years in distant lands. As I have clarified in the *Introduction*, there exist so many similarities between these two heroes. But, having known the vicissitudes of these two heroes, we may clearly see that Ch'ung Erh was factually the legitimate heir to the throne of Chin, but wrongly exiled by a usurper. Thus what he tried to do during those nineteen years when he was wandering from one feudal state to another was to reinstate himself to the throne of Chin which had to be his (for his only elder brother, crown prince Shen Sheng, had already committed suicide). This is by no means aggression, nor Ch'ung Erh an aggressor. On the other hand, Aeneas' being exiled and forced to travel to a distant land where he was, after many years of hottest fightings and struggling, to found a new country is evidently aggression.

It is true that why Aeneas did so is not of his own will, but provided by Jupiter, the king of all gods and goddesses. As to this, we should not blame too much of him, for in Virgil's mind, "all human affairs were controlled by superhuman forces."⁷ But for what should Jupiter arrange so? Why shouldn't *He* let Aeneas re-establish for his people a country on the ruins of Troy? Having defeated Troy, in fact, the Greek didn't occupy the city but soon sailed back to their respective city states. To answer this question, we should, beforehand, know *The Aeneid* is an authorized account of the beginning of the Roman Empire, and this beginning entitles the Roman nation to regard itself as the equal of Greece in antiquity, nobility, and authority. Virgil tried to establish it as a literary model to rival *The Iliad*

and *The Odyssey* of Homer, and did his best to make it a Roman epic, whose claim to artistic merit equaled Rome's political aspirations. Thus *The Aeneid* can never be looked upon as a personal epic about Aeneas, but a national epic, a glorification and exaltation of Rome and the destiny of Roman people. This is clearly stated in *The Aeneid* :

He (Jupiter) lightly kissed
his daughter's lips; these were his words to Venus:
"My Cytherea, that's enough of fear;
your children's fate is firm; you'll surely see
the walls I promised you, Lavinium's city;
and you shall carry your great-hearted son,
Aeneas, high as heaven's stars. My will
is still the same; I have not changed. Your son
(I now speak out--I know this anxiousness
is gnawing at you; I unroll the secret
scroll of the Fates, awake its distant pages)
shall wage tremendous war in Italy
and crush ferocious nations and establish
a way of life and walls for his own people--
until the time of his third summer as
the king of Latium, until he has passed
three winters since he overcame the latins.
But then the boy Ascanius, who now
is carrying Iulus as his surname (while
the state of Ilium held fast, he still
was known as Ilus), with his rule shall fill
the wheeling months of thirty mighty years.
He shall remove his kingdom from Lavinium
and, powerful, build Alba Longa's walls.

For full three hundred years, the capital
and rule of Hector's race shall be at Alba,
until a royal priestess, Ilia,
with child by Mars, has brought to birth twin sons.
And then, rejoicing in the tawny hide
of his nursemaid, the she-wolf, Romulus
shall take the rulership and build the walls
of Mars' own city. Romulus shall call
that people 'Romans', after his own name.
I set no limits to their fortunes and
no time; I give them empire without end.
Then even bitter Juno shall be changed;
for she, who now harasses lands and heavens
with terror, then shall hold the Romans dear
together with me, cherishing the masters
of all things, and the race that wears the toga.
This is what I decree. And age shall come
along the way of gliding lustra when
the house born of Assaracus shall hold
both Phthia and illustrious Mycenae
and rule defeated Argos. Then a Trojan
Caesar shall rise out of that spendid line.
His empire's boundary shall be the Ocean;
the only border to his fame, the stars.
His name shall be derived from great Iulus,
and shall be Julius. In time to come,
no longer troubled, you shall welcome him
to heaven, weighted with the Orient's wealth;
he, too, shall be invoked with prayers. With battle

fortotten, savage generations shall
grow generous. And aged Faith and Vesta,
together with the brothers, Romulus
and Remus, shall make laws. The gruesome gates
of war, with tightly welded iron plates,
shall be shut fast. Within, unholy Rage
shall sit on his ferocious weapons, bound
behind his back by a hundred knots of brass;
he shall groan horribly with bloody lips.

(Book I, 357-417)⁸

From the above we know that *The Aeneid* is more than just a story, a myth, or a long poem; it had been studied, admired, imitated and used as a standard textbook in all the schools.⁹ Every new generation of students was exposed to Virgil's poem, and *The Aeneid* developed an unselfish dedication to the Roman ideal. Thus, in addition to being a literary masterpiece, *The Aeneid* has served as, perhaps, the strongest intellectual bulwark of the Roman Empire.

The fact being so, Virgil could not but begin from where Homer had ended his epic. As to why should Virgil select Aeneas from among all the nobles in Troy to be the founder of the Roman Empire? My explanation is that Aeneas was the son of Venus, a noble goddess. This is the result of ethnocentrism. It is definitely true that every nation always conceit that they are the descendants of a god or a goddess, and by doing so can they exalt themselves to being members of a noble nation and, meanwhile, disdain other races. This is a common phenomenon, about which we need not feel strange.¹⁰ Since Virgil had to begin his epic from where Homer had ended on the one hand and select a descendant of a famous god or goddess on the other, Aeneas' being forced to travel to a distant land becomes inevitable.

In carrying out what they should do, both Aeneas and Ch'ung Erh were

explicitly depicted in situations in which they clearly considered themselves to be the reluctant slave of duty. Aeneas in Carthage and Ch'ung Erh in Ch'i showed apparently the action in a manner precisely contrary to the demands of their causes and personal glory. They were finally set on clearly marked and morally correct paths not by their own choice, but by forces beyond their control. Aeneas was subjugated to a chastising visit from Mercury, Jupiter's messenger, and listened in mortification to Jupiter's instructions:

And Mercury attacks at once, "Are you now laying the foundation of high Carthage, as servant to a woman, building her a splendid city here? Are you forgetful of what is your own kingdom, your own fate? The very god of gods, whose power sways both earth and heaven, sends me down to you from bright Olympus. He himself has asked me to carry these commands through the swift air: What are you pondering or hoping for while squandering your ease in Libyan land? For it the brightness of such deeds is not enough to kindle you--if you can not attempt the task for your own fame--remember Ascanius growing up, the hopes you hold for Iulus, your own heir, to whom are owed the realm of Italy and land of Rome".

(Book IV, 353-369)

As for Ch'ung Erh, he also defied the better judgment of his counsellors and his high-spirited wife, Lady Chiang of Ch'i (齊姜氏). When Lady

Chiang urged him to resume his rightful place on the throne of Chin, Ch'ung Erh responded that he could not leave Ch'i because of his great love for her, to which she reacted in a manner that would bring credit to any Confucian statesman:

Chiang said, "You should not act like this! *The Odes of Chou* say, 'All of the many travelers on long journeys and military campaigns think constantly of their goals and only fear that they may not be able to realize their desires.' Morning and evening they march on, not worrying about what they have left behind, but dreading the possibility of failure. Certainly they do not succumb to the flesh and give in to their desire to seek comfort, how could they ever think of that? If a man does not actively seek his goal, will he be able to achieve it? Time does not wait, so who can waste it in idleness? *The Odes of Chou* go on saying, 'Comfort and ease are truly detrimental to great work.'...The minister Kuan Chung used (these arguments) in administering the state of Ch'i, and he supported the rule of the primary prince (my father), who became hegemon. You, sir, say you would reject all this, but does this undercut your arguments? The government of Ch'i is disintegrating, and the kingdom of Chin has been without a ruler for a long time. The plans of your followers are loyal! Your opportunity has come, and you are practically the duke! If a prince of a state is able to help his people and yet he passes them by, then he is no longer a man. You cannot allow this degenerate state of affairs to continue. This moment cannot be lost, the loyalty (of your followers) cannot be rejected, and you cannot follow your own inclinations. You must leave here at once."¹¹

Ch'ung Erh refused to listen to the laws of duty, so Lady Chiang took matters into her own hands. She plotted with Ch'ung Erh's chief follower, Chiu Fan, to stupefy him with liquor, packed him into a cart while he was unconscious, and carried him away from Ch'i before anyone knew what had happened. When Ch'ung Erh finally awoke and realized that he was far from the palace, he went berserk with rage. Seizing his spear, he charged at Chiu Fan, threatening to kill him and eat him if the enterprise should have failed. Chiu Fan walked calmly toward the spear and said,

"If this matter does not succeed, who knows where I will have already met my death? Will Your Highness contend with the wolves for my carcass?"¹²

So did Aeneas who told Dido, queen of Carthage: "It is not / my own free will that leads to Italy." (Book IV, 491-492). The difference between the two is that: Ch'ung Erh was forced to leave Ch'i by his followers and wife who had a firm grasp of what was right and wrong and put aside their personal losses and gains; whereas Aeneas didn't have such wise and far-sighted followers and wife, Virgil could not but let Mercury do what a wife should do in China.

In the process of struggling to achieve their goals, Aeneas bore with more monolithic solitude than Ch'ung Erh. Those Aeneas loved most had nothing to do with his mission, nor could they help him in his agony. Dido, doomed by her guilty conscience, was swept away by passion. Anchises, the revered father, only appeared to him as a shade. Ascanius, his son, was nothing but a cheerful child. Aeneas was alone, without equal companion, until he met king Evander in Latium. Even "faithful Achates," his companion through all his experiences, had not the power of direct discourse and

admonition of Ch'ung Erh's redoubtable Chiu Fan. I sympathize heartily with Aeneas.

In our country, it is not so. On the human level, Ch'ung Erh need not be a lonely figure to prove his quality. A Confucian statesman always seeks a worthy lord to follow and advise.¹³ Those loyal retainers who followed Ch'ung Erh through nineteen years in exile shared in his glory. Loyalty to the lord was their destiny, not because they were compelled by divine messages or hoped to achieve personal fame, but because they were irresistibly attracted by his exemplary qualities. To those retainers, if the lord was worthy in himself, his external success or failure was of little importance. Their duty was to the principles embodied in the man, and their heroism was in sticking by him. It was not the business of divine beings to admonish a delinquent or a misguided leader; that was the duty of virtuous men.

III 、 The Differences in Identifying Heroic Conduct

Having acceded to the throne, Duke Wen of Chin implemented good administration in the interests of giving favors to people. What's more, he also bestowed and created talented scholars and those who had followed him when he was in exile. At that time Prince Tai (公子帶), younger brother of Emperor Hsiang of the Chou Dynasty (周襄王), rose in revolt, the Emperor was forced to take refuge in Cheng (鄭) and sent an envoy to Chin to ask for relief. At this juncture what with newly accession to the throne and what with his suppressing a rebellion not long ago, though he intended to send troops to relieve the Emperor, Duke Wen could not help delaying taking any military action. In the spring of the following year (635 B.C.) when Ch'in (秦) sent troops to Ho Shang (河上), a city in Chin, intending to escort the Emperor back to Loyang (洛陽), Chao Shuai memorialized to the duke:

National Chung Hsing University

If Your Majesty intends to assume the hegemony among feudal lords, there is nothing more important than venerating the House of Chou and escorting the Emperor back to Loyang. Your Majesty should know that the Emperor of the House of Chou and the royal family of Chin bear the same family name. If we do not escort His Majesty back to Loyang but let Ch'in do what we should, then how can we give orders to all feudal states under the heaven? The heavy responsibility of venerating the Emperor suggests a good opportunity for us to establish our hegemony.¹⁴

Duke Wen thus sent troops to escort the Emperor back to the capital city in the third month of that year and killed Prince Tai in the fourth month. Thus Emperor Hsiang felt very thankful and bestowed the duke with a region, in which such big cities as Ho Nei (河內) and Yang Fan (陽樊) were included.

In the fourth year after Duke Wen's succession when King Ch'eng of Ch'u (楚成王), by uniting with Ts'ao (曹), Wey (衛), and Cheng (鄭) (all were small and weak feudal states), sent troops to besiege Sung (宋), the king of Sung ordered Kung-sun Ku (公孫圉) to Chin to ask for help, the duke sent troops to lift the siege. What's more, Duke Wen marched his troops forward to attack Ts'ao, Ch'u, and Cheng and forced Tzu Yu (子玉), the famous commander-in-chief of Ch'u, to commit suicide. In the past when the duke was living in exile in Ch'u, King Ch'eng of Ch'u had treated him with courtesy, and he had promised that in case there should be any war breaking out between Ch'u and Chin, the troops of Chin would beat a retreat for ninety li (退避三舍) as a repayment of King Ch'eng's kindness. When a war did break out between Ch'u and Chin, Duke Wen kept his promise and ordered his troops to retreat ninety li and King Ch'eng of Ch'u

agreed to negotiate peace. Unexpectedly, General Tzu Yu insisted on resorting to military force. In the end Ch'u was defeated and Tzu Yu committed suicide, for he felt too ashamed to go back to face King Ch'eng of Ch'u.

Duke Wen held the reins of the government of Chin for nine years; during which period, for maintaining the unification of Cathay, he helped those states that were weak and in danger and delivered those that were in distress. He also fought against those that were powerful and firmly kept his promise. All these suggest the true quality of being a standard Chinese hero.

In *The Aeneid*, Virgil didn't mention anything after the duel between Aeneas and Turnus, king of Rutulians; in other words, *The Aeneid* ends with the death of Turnus. We only know the subsequent development in Italy from what Juno had asked of Jupiter:

I beg of you, for Latium, for your
own father's greatness, for the race of Saturn:
when with their happy wedding rites they reach
a peace--so be it--when they both unite
in laws and treaties, do not let the native-
born Latins lose their ancient name, become
Trojans, or be called Teucrians; do not
make such men change their language or their dress.

Let Latium still be, let Alban kings
still rule for ages; let the sons of Rome
be powerful in their Italian courage.

Troy now is fallen; let her name fall, too. (Book XII, 1989-1100)

Jupiter accepted what his wife had asked of him and pacified her by saying:

For the Ausonians (Italians) will keep
their homeland's words and ways; their name will stay;

the body of the Teucrians will merge
 with Latins, and their name will fall away.
 But I shall add their rituals and customs
 to the Ausonians', and make them all--
 and with one language--Latin. You will see
 a race arise from this that, mingled with
 the blood of the Ausonians, will be
 past men, even past gods, in piety;
 no other nation will pay you such honor.

(Book XII, 1107-1117)

Since this is Jupiter's will, Aeneas could not but, I think, put what the god of gods and men had said into practice. From this we know that what Aeneas tried to complete is nothing but Trojans' naturalization. The outcome is that Aeneas abandoned the "hated" name of Trojan, and the ancient customs and rituals of Troy were not permitted to flourish in Italy.

The Westerner's idea of being a hero, especially a national hero, is definitely different from that of ours. In our mind, a national hero must do or invent something useful to bless the country and benefit the people, and struggle with Nature to deliver people from calamities. In the Western world, for what should Aeneas and Turnus fight the duel? Virgil clarifies it through Turnus' mouth:

I go to meet him. Father, have the holy
 rites readied, draw the treaty: either I
 send down this Dardan, Asia's renegade,
 to hell with my right hand--while Latins
 sit and watch--and by my single sword blot out
 the slur that stains us all; or we are beaten
 and held by him, he takes Lavinia

(Book XII, 16-22)

The above implies that they fought for nothing but a woman, Lavinia. When the duel came to an end and Turnus was fatally wounded, he said to Aeneas:

For you have won, and the Ausonians
have seen me, beaten, stretch my hands; Lavinia
is yours; then do not press your hatred further.

(Book XII, 1249-1251)

In our country, our ancestors would never let such a thing happen to our national heroes, because, in their mind, woman served as nothing but an accessory of men. What's more, the duel between Aeneas and Turnus symbolizes, in fact, the most important turning point of the rise and fall between two peoples. How can such a serious and important problem be decided upon the duel of two heroes who fought for nothing but seeking the hand of a woman?! Does this seem to be a child's play? Strange to say, there were none who opposed this duel which did have something to do with the rise and fall of a race. During the duel, what these two heroes thought of, I think, must have been that: I have to do my best to beat my opponent, otherwise I can never be able to take Lavinia for wife. To them, at that juncture, the rise and fall of their peoples and nations appeared so trivial as compared with Lavinia. Such a hero may well be comparable to Wu San-kuei (吳三桂)¹⁵ who has been extremely despised in our country even until today.

Finally Aeneas won in the duel, Turnus could not but accept his defeat, but he asked the victor to allow his family to give him a decent burial. The prince of Troy was sympathetic to this last request and ready to spare his opponent: "Aeneas stood, ferocious in his armor;/ his eyes were restless and he stayed his hand."(Book XII, 1252-1253) Had he been a Chinese, Aeneas would have spared Turnus, because we have been taught since childhood that it brings no honor to the victor if he still slays his opponent when he has already knocked him down. But, alas, Aeneas was a Trojan, so:

--until

high on the Latin's shoulder he made out
 the luekless belt of Pallas, of the boy
 whom Tunus had defeated, wounded, stretched
 upon the battlefield, from whom he took
 this fatal sign to wear upon his back,
 this girdle glittering with familiar studs.
 And when his eyes drank in this plunder, this
 memorial of brutal grief.

(Book XII, 1256-1263)

Subsequently he

cried: "How can you who wear the spoils of my
 dear comrade now escape me? It is Pallas
 who strikes, who sacrifices you, who takes
 this payment from your shameless blood.

(Book XII, 1265-1268)

Finally "Relentless, he sinks his sword in the chest of Turnus" (Book XII, 1269). To us Chinese, this can never be looked upon as a heroic conduct but sentimental impulse, which is by no means worth praising.

Conclusion

Generally speaking, Western culture is extrovert, while that of ours is introvert. In other words, what Westerners feel important is exterior grandeur and magnificence, which is shown in its material appearance. The merit of this type of culture lies in that it stands forever there and gives people a concrete impression; yet its demerit is that, once it has formed into

a fixed appearance, it can never be changed. Consequently, instead of going on existing, it tends to ruin. Take the Egyptian pyramid for example, it serves as the best example of this type of material-externalized culture. If we pay a visit to Egypt today, when facing those huge monuments, we shall naturally have a sense of self-infinitesimalness. Living in this modern age of highly developed science and technology, we still feel incompetent to build them. We may say that when it developed into being able to build a pyramid, the Egyptian culture had reached its zenith, from which the Egyptians could never have made any progress. What happened subsequently would be the decline and fall of the ancient Egyptian culture. Although the ancient Egyptian culture had declined and fallen long ago, those tremendous pyramids still stand forever there for people to admire. They have, it seems at least to me, become independent and irrelevant to the ancient Egyptian culture. Aeneas stands for a Roman pyramid. Though the Roman Empire had already declined and fallen hundreds years ago, Aeneas goes on serving as a monument in man's heart. This is why Westerners worship those who have been praised as heroes. The consequence of this type of material-externalized culture is that once when it is ruined, it will never restore to its original grandeur and magnificence.

In our culture, we never look upon one as a hero who is brutally courageous, emanating from his emotional outbursts. In China there was a widespread myth about the beginning of the world. It is recorded in an ancient book about the first national hero P'an Ku (盤古氏), who chiselled the universe out of chaos. He was the offspring of the original dual powers of Nature, the *yin* (陰) and the *yang* (陽). In his right hand he held a hammer and in his left a chisel, the only implements he used in carrying out his great task which lasted for eighteen thousand years. During such a long period of time, he increased in stature day by day, being daily one *chang* (丈, a unit in ancient Chinese measurement, slightly longer than ten

feet) taller than the day before. When his labor came to an end, he had grown to be an extreme giant. Strange as it may sound, after his death, his left eyeball became the sun, the right one the moon, his head the mountains, his breath the wind and clouds, his voice the thunder, his limbs the four quarters of the earth, his blood the rivers, his flesh the soil, his beard and hair trees and grass, his teeth and marrow the metals, rocks, and precious stones, his sweat the rain, and the insects creeping over his body metamorphosed into human beings.¹⁶

After P'an Ku there was Nu Wa (女媧, 2953-2838 B.C.), a great heroine. But toward the end of her reign there was among the feudatory princes Kung Kung (共工), whose functions were the administration of punishment. Violent and ambitious, he became a rebel, and sought by the influence of water to overcome that of wood. He did battle with Chu Jung (祝融, the god of fire), but was defeated. Whereupon he struck his head against the Imperfect Mountain (不周山) and brought it down. The pillars of the heaven were thus broken and the corners of the earth gave way.¹⁷ Nu Wa smelted stones of five colors to repair the heaven and cut off the feet of the tortoise to set upright the four extremities of the earth.¹⁸

In addition to the above two sage rulers, we still have Yu Ch'ao (有巢氏) who taught people to build tree houses for protection against wild beasts; Sui Jen (燧人氏) who was said to be the first one to discover fire, since then people began to eat cooked food; Fu Hei (伏羲氏, 2858-2738 B.C.) who invented *pa kua* (or the eight trigrams, 八卦) and was credited with the introduction of farming, fishing, and animal husbandry; and Shen Nung (神農氏, around 2838 B.C.) who introduced agriculture and herbal medicine. Why all these mythological figures have been so loved and so supported by people is that they could utilize and conquer Nature and invent many useful things with which people solved many problems in their livelihood, they have thus been honored as national heroes and heroines.

The above is my personal point of view which, of course, is far from being perfect and circumspect. Any direction and instruction will surely be heartily appreciated.

Notes

1. This is a term derived from Greek, denoting a leader among all feudal lords, elected by his peers to act as the arbiter and first authority during that period; from 684-591 B.C., all the feudal lords of that period voluntarily acknowledged an elected "hegemon" as their leader, complementing the titular and ritual functions of the *Emperor* of the Chou Dynasty.
2. See *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary*, 2nd edition, p. 611.
3. C. H. Wang discusses the comparative functions of epic and historiography in *Towards Defining a Chinese Heroism*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 95, no. 1, 1975, pp. 25-55. Also see Jaroslave Prusek, *History and Epic in China and the West*, in *Chinese History and Literature*, a Collection of Essays (Dordrecht, Holland, 1970).
4. Derk Bodde, *Mythology in Ancient China* in Samuel Noah Kramer, ed., *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, Garden City, 1961, pp. 367-406. For a discussion of the characteristics of ancient Chinese narrative and comparison to Western forms, see Anerew H. Plaks, *Archetype and Allegory in the Dream of Red Chamber*, Princeton, 1975.
5. See Robert J. Milch, *The Aeneid*, Notes (Cliff's Notes, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1963, 台北：書林，rpt.) p. 21
6. See 《史記》晉世家第八。
7. See Robert J. Milch, *The Aeneid* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1966, 台北：書林，rpt.) p. 17.

8. See Allen Mandelbaum (tr.), *The Aeneid of Virgil* (a verse translation), A bantom Book new edition. Oct. 1971, 台北：書林，rpt.
9. See Robert J. Milch, *The Aeneid*, p. 10.
10. So did we Chinese. In *The Etymological Dictionary* (《說文解字》) of our country, we find: In referring to the southerners, the character "蠻" was coined by deriving from the radical "蟲" (an insect or worm); to the northerners, "狄" (a dog); to the easterners, "貉" (a reptile); and to the westerners, "羌" (a goat). It is evident that our ancestors looked down upon our neighboring races as beasts and insects.
11. See Kuo Yu (《國語》)(台北：里仁書局，民國七十年，) p.342: The original text is：齊姜曰：「不然。周詩曰：『莘莘征夫，每懷靡及。』夙夜征行，不遑啓處，猶恐無及。況順身縱欲懷安，將何及矣！人不求及，其能及乎？日月不處，人誰能安？西方之書有言曰：『懷與安，實疚大事。』.... 此大夫管仲之所以紀綱齊國，裨補先君成霸者也。子而棄之，不亦難乎？齊國之政敗矣，晉國之無道久矣，從者之謀忠矣，時日及矣，公子幾矣。君國可以濟百濟，而釋之者，非人也。敗無可處，時不可久，忠不可棄，懷不可從，子必速行。」 The English translation is mine.
12. Ibid., p.344, The original text is：若無所濟，余未知死所，誰能與豺狼爭食？ The English translation is mine.
13. See 《左傳》哀十三章，良禽擇木而棲，賢士擇主而事。 The English translation is mine.
14. See 《史記》晉世家第九。 The original text is：求霸莫如入王尊周。周晉同姓，晉不先入王，後秦入之，毋以令于天下。於今尊王，晉之資也。 The English translation is mine.
15. He was the commander-in-chief of the Ming Dynasty, garrisoning troops in Shan Hai Pass (山海關) when bandit troops, led by Li Tzu-ch'eng

(李自成), captured his beloved concubine Ch'en Yuan-yuan (陳圓圓). In great wrath, he thus asked for military assistance from the Ch'ing troops (清軍) to fight the bandits.

16. See 《藝文類聚》卷一引《三五曆記》(宋刻本。台北：新興書局，五十八年，頁33)：「天地渾屯如雞子，盤古生其中，萬八千歲，天地開闢。.....天日高一丈，地日厚一丈，盤古日長一丈。如此萬八千歲...」又《釋史》卷一引《五運曆年紀》(台北：商務印書館，頁二)：「首生盤古，垂死化身。氣成風雲，聲爲雷霆，左眼爲日，右眼爲月，四肢五體爲四極五嶽，血液爲江河，筋脈爲地里，肌肉爲田土，髮髭爲星辰，皮毛爲草木，齒骨爲金石，精髓爲珠玉，汗流爲雨澤，身之諸虫，化爲黎甦。 The English translation is mine.
17. See 二十五史《史記》(二)，司馬貞《補史記三皇本紀》(台北：藝文)p.1365, 「當爲(女媧)末年也，諸侯有共工氏，任智以強，霸而不王，以水乘木，乃與祝融戰，不勝而怒，乃頭觸不周山崩，天柱折，地維缺。」 The English translation is mine.
18. See 《淮南子，覽冥》(京都：中文出版社，1982, p.1732)：「於是女媧鍊五色石以補天，斷鼈足以立四極。」 The English translation is mine.

不同的文化孕育出不同的英雄

— 伊利亞斯與晉文公之比較研究 —

湯 雄 飛 *

摘 要

國人認為民族英雄（或領袖）總俱有為國為民，尊王攘夷的精神，如我國的盤古氏，伏羲氏，黃帝等，皆為國人心目中的偉人，但卻絕不奉之為神，晉文公亦復如此。伊利亞斯為羅馬帝國之開國始祖，出自拉丁大詩人維吉爾的史詩〈伊利亞得〉中。伊氏雖為一神話性人物，但是兩千多年來，維氏之作早已成為歐洲人學拉丁文之範本，其深入人心可以想見。二人均因故跋涉長途，在萬分不情願的情況下復國與建國，晉文公是水到渠成的回到晉國為王，其登基後的所做所為亦合於國人對民族英雄的期許，伊氏則以打敗對手贏得美人而建國，兩個民族的生死竟決定於兩個戰士的單打獨鬥，國人也許認為兒戲，這是西方人士對英雄的看法所使然。

關鍵詞：晉文公（或公子重耳）

伊利亞斯

伊利亞得

維吉爾

國立中興大學 

* 國立中興大學外文系副教授 | Chung Hsing University