

## **Helen of Troy: Tracing the Shift from a Speculative Figure of Antiquity to Mythical Archetype**

Kumar, Ravinder<sup>1</sup> and Tomar, Parnit<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professor, Dept. of English, C.C.S. University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

<sup>2</sup>Asst. Professor, Dept. of English, G.V.N Degree College, Ramala, Baghpat, U.P

### **Abstract**

Helen of Troy, famously immortalized as “the face that launched a thousand ships,” sits at the threshold between history and myth, straddling fact and cultural imagination. While there may have been a real woman at the heart of the ancient narratives, Helen has become far more than a historical figure. Through centuries of retellings by poets, playwrights, and philosophers, Helen is transformed into a mythic archetype — a symbol of beauty, desire, conflict, and feminine agency. This paper explores the processes by which Helen becomes a myth: through symbolic elevation, narrative multiplicity, cultural function, and her distance from history. Drawing on theories of mythology, archetypes, and feminist literary analysis, this study reveals how Helen’s identity is constructed, deconstructed, and reimagined over time, reflecting evolving social values and gender politics. Her presence in works from Homer to Euripides and beyond shows how narrative layers accumulate to both glorify and scrutinize her image, turning her into a mirror for society’s conflicting ideals about womanhood. In this way, Helen’s story serves as a powerful example of how mythic figures are not fixed relics of the past but living symbols that adapt to cultural shifts, embodying the tensions between freedom and constraint, agency and objectification. Contemporary retellings like Margaret George’s *Helen of Troy* push this dynamic further by giving Helen her own narrative voice, imagining her thoughts, doubts, and choices, and reclaiming her as a speaking subject rather than a mute emblem of blame or desire. Such modern interpretations invite readers to reconsider the myth not as a static tale of ancient betrayal but as an enduring conversation about identity, memory, and the power of storytelling itself.

**Keywords:** Archetype, Mythologies, Narrative Multiplicity, Ideologies, Agency, Constructed Identity

## Introduction

“Myths are original revelations of the pre-conscious psyche, involuntary statements about unconscious psychic happenings.” (Carl Jung, *Man and His Symbols*)

Myths have long acted as a lens for the human condition, capturing collective hopes, anxieties, moral dilemmas, and archetypal conflicts in narrative form. They transcend time and culture, communicating truths not as historical facts but through metaphor and symbolic resonance. Through gods, queens, and larger-than-life heroes, they tell us not only what society believes but what it questions, fears, and dreams of. Among such mythic figures, Helen of Troy stands out as a singular symbol. Hailed as the most beautiful woman in the world, “the fairest of her sex” (*The Iliad*, Book 3), Helen’s image has come to signify far more than the story of an ancient queen. Her legend illustrates how beauty, blame, agency, and conflict entwine within cultural storytelling. In Homer’s *Iliad*, Helen appears as the woman whose departure from Paris sparks the Trojan War — a conflict involving gods, warriors, and kings.

Yet she is not depicted merely as a passive catalyst; she is portrayed as introspective, burdened by her role, and painfully conscious of the ruin that follows her name. Even in the oldest epic traditions, Helen exists at the edge of agency and objectification, myth and memory.

Over the centuries, Helen’s image has evolved into a potent mythic archetype. Her historical reality, if any, is overshadowed by the power of her story, which has been shaped and reshaped by each culture that inherits it. Myths thrive on such ambiguity — they grow stronger when untethered from clear facts. Euripides’ Helen famously upends Homer’s version by suggesting that Helen never went to Troy at all; instead, a phantom likeness took her place while she remained hidden in Egypt. This twist reframes her from Temptress to Victim, complicating the moral blame often placed on her shoulders. Across Roman poetry, medieval romances, Renaissance drama, and modern feminist fiction, Helen’s role transforms with each new retelling. These

variations reveal that Helen is less a single character than a cultural mirror, absorbing shifting ideas about femininity, sexuality, guilt, and power. She provokes age-old questions: Does her beauty doom her? Is she a willing actor or a pawn of fate and male ambition? Is she to be scorned or defended? Every version test new answer, reflecting the anxieties and moral codes of its time.

Helen's identity has journeyed from a possible historical figure to an enduring mythic construct, shaped by narrative adaptation, symbolic elevation, and the archetypal imagination that keeps her alive as a figure of fascination and debate. It examines how narrative adaptation, symbolic elevation, and archetypal imagination keep her alive as a figure of fascination and discussion. By drawing on literary analysis and myth theory, this study shows how Helen's story endures because it remains fluid — a mutable myth that reveals how cultures both fetishize and fear female beauty and agency. As myths do, Helen's tale reminds us that legends are not static relics; they are living frameworks adapted by each generation to test old questions in new forms. Whether Helen was once flesh and blood or purely the invention of poets, her story

endures because it reflects humanity's enduring tensions between desire and blame, freedom and fate, voice and silence. Myths like Helen's remain potent precisely because they invite us to look again — and see not only an ancient queen but the timeless truths societies embed in the figures they create.

### **Myth: From Reality to Representation**

At its core, a myth is not just a story but a vessel of meaning. Myths explain the origins of the world, reinforce societal norms, and offer psychological truths through symbolic language. They are collective expressions of belief systems and social values carried forward through ritual, performance, and storytelling. According to structuralist thinkers like Claude Lévi-Strauss, myths do not merely entertain; they “provide a logical model capable of overcoming a contradiction” (Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* Ch.11). In other words, myths give cultures a framework to navigate conflicts and oppositions that would otherwise remain unresolved or threatening to social order. Lévi-Strauss argues that “mythical thought always progresses from the awareness of oppositions toward their resolution” (ch.11). These oppositions — what he calls binary structures — are

embedded in the fabric of myths: life and death, male and female, civilization and wilderness, loyalty and betrayal. Through these binaries, a culture's deepest anxieties and ideals are staged and symbolically reconciled.

Within this interpretive frame, Helen of Troy is not only a legendary figure blamed for the Trojan War but also an archetype shaped by centuries of storytelling. Her identity is built upon layers of cultural fantasy, embodying tensions between power and passivity, choice and captivity. Her beauty turns her into both an agent and an excuse—someone whose body becomes a battleground for male rivalries and political ambitions. Helen's mythic identity lives in the space between the binaries Lévi-Strauss describes: freedom and confinement, desire and destruction. Each version of Helen revives and reshapes these roles, keeping the myth alive while reflecting changing social attitudes toward gender and blame. Contemporary novelists, such as Margaret George in *Helen of Troy*, push back against older versions by giving Helen a conscious voice, private fears, and self-reflection. These reimagining invites readers to see Helen not only as a symbol of beauty and betrayal but also as a complicated human

being caught in the tensions of love, politics, and survival. Ultimately, the myth endures because each generation reopens the questions it raises—about choice, agency, and the cost of being turned into a symbol.

### **Historical Helen: The Possible Woman behind the Legend**

Was Helen a real person? Some historians speculate that there may have been a Mycenaean queen or noblewoman whose life inspired early oral traditions. Ancient ruins in Troy and Mycenae hint at historical kernels beneath the epic grandeur. But if she did exist, the real woman has been lost beneath layers of storytelling and symbolic meaning. There is little historical evidence to definitively prove that Helen of Troy ever existed as an actual historical figure. Archaeological findings at Hisarlik—the site traditionally identified as Troy—confirm that a great city was destroyed by war and fire, but the details remain speculative. Many historians argue that if there was any truth behind the legend, the so-called Trojan War was likely a cluster of regional skirmishes or trade disputes over control of crucial sea routes, later woven together into the grand epic tapestry known to us through Homer's *Iliad*. In this context, if there was a "Helen,"

she may have been a Mycenaean queen or noblewoman whose real political or marital alliances were transformed through generations of oral tradition into the tale of a woman whose beauty could summon a thousand ships. Even in the *Iliad* itself, however, Helen is not simply portrayed as an ordinary woman. From her first appearance, she stands at the heart of the conflict yet remains strangely peripheral, caught between her agency and the designs of gods and men. She expresses sorrow, shame, and self-awareness, yet the epic never fully grants her the authority to direct her fate. “Her in the palace, at her loom she found; The golden web her own sad story crown’d, The Trojan wars she weaved (herself the prize)”. (Homer, *Iliad*, Book 3). This is where her transformation from human character to enduring symbol truly begins. She becomes an embodiment of the desire that men fight and die for, an archetype of the dangerous beauty whose allure can unmake kingdoms. Her lamentations and regrets in Homer do not free her from the role assigned by the narrative: she is at once blamed for ruin and pitied for her own lack of power. Over centuries, poets and artists built on this duality, solidifying Helen as more than an

individual — she becomes mythic shorthand for the complex intersections of beauty, blame, and destiny that transcend her possible historical reality.

## The Mythic Construction of Helen

### 1. Symbolic Elevation

Helen is transformed into a myth when her beauty is no longer just a human trait but a cosmic force with the power to shape the fate of kingdoms. Christopher Marlowe’s haunting question — “Was this the face that launched a thousand ships?” (Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, Act V, Scene I)—significantly captures this transformation. In that single line, Helen’s body becomes inseparable from the destruction of Troy; her existence is not her own but a spark for epic ruin. She is no longer merely a queen or a wife but a symbol — the embodiment of desire so intense it sets nations ablaze. This symbolic status is what secures Helen’s place in myth, moving her beyond the constraints of historical reality and into the realm of enduring cultural imagination. What is striking is how little detail we are given about Helen’s physicality in ancient texts. Homer, for instance, does not spend lines describing every feature of her face or body. Instead, her

beauty is mediated through the words of others: she is praised, blamed, or mourned over but never truly seen in her own right. Her beauty exists more as an aura or legend — talked about by men, fought over by armies, lamented by the elders of Troy. It is this indirectness that gives her mythic power. Helen's allure is less about concrete physical traits and more about what she represents — an ideal so potent that it defies exact form.

In this sense, her beauty becomes a narrative device, an abstract principle around which male glory and ruin revolve. Helen herself acknowledges this in Homer's *Iliad* when she refers to herself as "evil-intriguing" (*Iliad* 6.344, trans. Fagles). She is painfully aware that her body has become a battlefield for others' ambitions and moral codes. Later authors magnify this dynamic: poets, dramatists, and painters alike use Helen's myth to ask troubling questions about blame and agency. Is she a victim of forces larger than herself, or is she complicit in the chaos that follows her? In becoming a myth, Helen also becomes unknowable. The real woman — if there ever was one — disappears under layers of story, poetry, and art. What remains is an archetype: the woman whose beauty bends the will of heroes and gods alike, the

spark for an epic conflict that still fascinates us millennia later.

## 2. Narrative Multiplicity and Literary Layers

Helen's story has endured precisely because it is not static but endlessly adaptable, reshaped to serve the cultural anxieties and artistic visions of each new age. In Homer's *Iliad*, Helen is portrayed as a deeply self-aware figure, weighed down by guilt and regret for the devastation her flight to Troy has brought. She sees herself through the eyes of those around her, acknowledging her role in the war yet lamenting her powerlessness to change its course. This version of Helen is both tragic and complex — not merely a passive prize but a woman haunted by her own choices and by how others define her. In Euripides' *Helen*, written centuries later, her myth undergoes a striking revision. Here, Helen never actually goes to Troy at all; instead, the gods create an illusion, a phantom of Helen — while the real queen waits faithfully in Egypt. She exclaims, "I did not go to Troy; that was a phantom" (Euripides, *Helen*, lines 580-588). By replacing the flesh-and-blood woman with an ethereal double, Euripides questions the very foundation of the epic blame placed on her. This version strips

Helen of the moral stain of adultery and treachery, turning her into a pawn in divine games and exposing how fragile the so-called truths of myth can be when examined from a different angle. Modern retellings continue this pattern of reinvention. Authors and filmmakers reinterpret Helen in various ways, portraying her as a seductress who knowingly wields her beauty, a helpless victim swept up by political forces, or a calculating strategist who uses her allure to secure her survival in a male-dominated world. Each portrayal reflects contemporary concerns — about agency, gender, power, and historical memory. These shifting images remind us that myths are never final or singular: they remain alive precisely because they invite new readings, transforming with each storyteller who dares to imagine Helen beyond the “face that launched a thousand ships.”

### **3. Cultural Function and Gender Politics**

Helen of Troy has long functioned as a mirror through which cultures examine their most profound contradictions about femininity, sexuality, and moral responsibility. In ancient epics and tragedies, Helen is cast in a paradoxical light: she is an object of desire so compelling that armies will perish to possess

her, yet she is also scorned as the ultimate cause of a devastating war. This tension makes her one of literature’s enduring femme fatales — the beautiful woman whose allure is linked with danger and downfall. But unlike other figures who simply seduce and destroy, Helen’s story keeps asking whether she is truly to blame for the violence carried out in her name. Throughout different versions of her myth, Helen oscillates between Victim and agent, scapegoat and conspirator. Her role raises several uncomfortable questions: did she willingly leave with Paris, or was she taken by force? Was her beauty a tool she wielded or a trap that ensnared her? In Homer, she seems painfully aware of her part in the war yet powerless to alter its course, embodying a woman whose choices are circumscribed by the ambitions of men and the whims of the gods. Her bitter retort to Aphrodite— “Then is it still thy pleasure to deceive?? And woman’s frailty always to believe! For whom must Helen break her second vow” (Iliad, Book III)— reveals a sharp self-awareness and frustration at being a pawn in a divine game. Yet even this resistance is futile; ultimately, she yields, reinforcing how her agency is only an illusion within a world



ruled by male power and divine will. In later interpretations like Euripides' Helen, the phantom double suggests that she may have been innocent all along — a mere pretext for male violence dressed up as heroism. Because of this moral ambiguity, Helen becomes more than just a legendary figure; she becomes a touchstone for debates about the consequences of female power and desire. Her story has been revisited by poets, playwrights, and contemporary authors precisely because it probes how societies navigate the boundaries between agency and victimhood. Each retelling exposes how cultures both fear and fetishize women's autonomy, projecting onto Helen the burden of beauty that destroys — and the possibility that her myth, in fact, exposes the folly of blaming women for the ambitions and conflicts of men. As Judith Butler argues, "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being." (Gender Trouble, p.43-44). In this light, Helen's shifting identity across versions shows how femininity itself is repeatedly performed and redefined — making her both a reflection and a challenge

to the myths that would fix her as static blame or passive prize.

### **Archetypal Lens: Helen as the Eternal Feminine**

Helen also exemplifies what Carl Jung called an archetype — a universal symbol that recurs across time and culture. As the "eternal feminine," Helen becomes an embodiment of beauty that both empowers and imperils. She is the archetypal Temptress and the mournful queen, the spark of war and the emblem of unattainable perfection. As a mythic figure, she speaks not to one culture but to a shared human imagination that is fascinated — and often troubled — by the interplay between appearance and consequence, desire and destruction. Moreover, Helen's mythic status is reinforced by the distance from history that surrounds her. With no definitive records or archaeological proof of her existence, she becomes untethered from the constraints of factual biography. This gap is not a weakness but a feature of myth itself: as the historical Helen fades into obscurity, the mythical Helen rises to prominence. She becomes not a woman but a symbol — shaped by narrative, magnified by imagination, and sustained by cultural need.



Carl Jung's concept of archetypes helps illuminate why Helen of Troy remains so enduring and adaptable across cultures and centuries. For Jung, archetypes are not just literary motifs but deep-seated psychic patterns embedded in what he called the collective unconscious—an inherited layer of the human mind that holds the shared images and symbols of humanity's experiences (The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious). Helen aligns with several of these timeless figures that recur across stories and epochs.

First is the archetype of the Temptress: the woman whose allure is so overpowering that it leads men to abandon duty, loyalty, and reason. Helen's beauty in the Iliad is legendary precisely because it is uncontrollable and transformative — her face launches a thousand ships not by force but by the pull of desire. In this role, Helen becomes an externalized projection of male longing and fear, symbolizing the perceived threat of female sexuality to social order.

At the same time, Helen fits the archetype of the Victim. Paris steals her away — or perhaps she is manipulated by the gods — and then blamed for a decade of brutal war. Her laments in Homer show a woman haunted by regret, aware of her role as a

scapegoat for others' ambitions. She bears the sorrow of knowing her name is synonymous with ruin, yet she cannot fully control how her story is told. Lastly, Helen also touches on the archetype of the Goddess or Divine Feminine — a figure both worshipped and feared. Her beauty is described in near-supernatural terms; poets rarely describe her specific features but instead speak of her radiance and the awe she inspires. This elevates Helen out of the realm of ordinary mortals into a symbolic space where she embodies both cosmic desire and destruction simultaneously.

Across cultures, this trinity of Temptress, Victim, and goddess echoes in other mythic and historical women — Cleopatra using her charisma to sway empires, Guinevere's affair bringing Camelot to ruin, or modern celebrities turned into objects of both adoration and scandal. Each figure mirrors Helen's central paradox: that beauty can be power, but power, for a woman, often comes bound up with punishment. As an archetype, Helen outlives any single historical context, reminding us how myths endure by crystallizing deep human anxieties and dreams about love, betrayal, and the dangerous freedom of female allure.

## Distance from History: Helen as Pure Myth

Over time, any trace of historical fact that might have anchored Helen's existence slips further into the shadows, overtaken by centuries of poetic invention and mythic layering. What endures is not a flesh-and-blood queen but an idea — a symbol that absorbs and reflects the anxieties and fascinations of each generation that reimagines her. Helen becomes, in this sense, a cultural phantom: she is Helen the Ideal, a vision of beauty so perfect it demands worship; Helen the Scapegoat, blamed for a war that countless men chose to fight; Helen the Mirror, reflecting society's conflicted views about female sexuality and responsibility.

This transformation reveals a paradox at the heart of Helen's mythic legacy. Her power over the story is immense and yet curiously hollow. She is pivotal to the action — whole fleets are launched in her name — yet her voice is startlingly absent in the narratives that immortalize her. In Homer's *Iliad*, we hear Helen's regret and shame in brief moments of dialogue, for instance, when she wails, "O had I perish'd, ere that form divine/ Seduced this soft, this easy heart of mine"

(The *Iliad* of Homer, Book XXIV) but these rare glimpses are overshadowed by the speeches of heroes and the strategies of kings. Her words, when they appear, are reminders that her story is not her own but belongs to the poets, historians, and playwrights who reshape her as they please.

One of the enduring ironies of Helen's myth is that she is spoken about endlessly but allowed so little speech herself. Her silence is filled by the chorus of male voices who argue about her beauty, her blame, and her meaning. She becomes the ultimate rhetorical figure — an absent presence used to stage questions about power, desire, and war. It is only in contemporary retellings, like Margaret George's *Helen of Troy*, that writers strive to recover the lost dimensions of her interiority. Here, Helen narrates her own life, offers her confessions, and reclaims her place not just as a symbol but as a fully imagined subject with thoughts, contradictions, and desires. In doing so, modern storytellers attempt to give back to Helen what the centuries of myth-making had so effectively stripped away: her voice.

## Conclusion

Helen of Troy illustrates perfectly how myths are not static fossils from a distant past, but living frameworks that societies continually adapt to express their deepest fears, hopes, and contradictions. Her legend shows how repetition, symbolic layering, and cultural projection can lift a historical figure — or even just the possibility of one — into the timeless realm of myth. Whether or not there was ever a real queen whose beauty ignited a war, Helen persists precisely because she is not bound to a single historical truth. Instead, she remains endlessly fluid, able to reflect the anxieties of patriarchy, the allure and danger of beauty, and the precarious power assigned to women whose bodies become battlegrounds for male conflict. Helen's metamorphosis from potential mortal to mythic archetype reveals how the narrative itself has the power to transform individual experience into collective symbolism. In this sense, her story is more than a tale of a beautiful woman caught between powerful men; it is a testament to the human instinct to explain our world through shared images and archetypes. As Carl Jung would argue, these archetypes — the Temptress, the Victim, the Goddess — are not mere inventions but psychic truths drawn from the collective

unconscious, resurfacing whenever we need to grapple with enduring questions about power, blame, and desire.

Through centuries of retelling — from Homer and Euripides to modern writers like Margaret George — Helen's myth shows how stories evolve to meet the shifting values of their audience. Each new version tweaks her agency, her culpability, and her voice, turning her from scapegoat to survivor, from passive captive to self-aware narrator. In doing so, these retellings prove that myths are never inert. They breathe with us, asking us to examine what we fear, what we idolize, and how we project cultural conflict onto the bodies and voices of legendary figures. Helen's continued relevance is a reminder that myths are not simply echoes of the past but ever-adapting scripts for how we imagine gender, power, and human fallibility in every age.

### Works Cited

1. Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
2. Euripides, (1998). Helen. In J. Morwood (Ed.), *Translated by E.P* (pp. 119–119). Oxford University Press.

- <https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00185905>. Coleridge, revised by Helene Emeriaud, Claudia Filos, Janet M. Oszolak, Sarah Scott, and Jack Vaughan, The Helen Heroization Team, Kosmos Society, Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard University
3. C, S., & B, M. (2024). Classifying Student Performance: An In-Depth analysis using Machine learning algorithms. *Shodh Sari-An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, 03(04), 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.59231/sari7751>
  4. Homer, & the Iliad. (1998) R. Fagles (Translated by). Penguin Classics.
  5. Homer, & The Iliad of Homer. (September 2006) A. Pope (Translated by), notes by Rev. Theodore Alois Buckley, illustrated by John Flaxman. Project Gutenberg.
  6. Jung, C. (1981). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious* R. F. C. Hull (Translated by). Princeton University Press.
  7. Sharma, G., & Kumar, R. (2024). English Language Teaching (ELT): Analysing Strategies and Challenges from the Indian Perspective. *Shodh Sari-An International Multidisciplinary*

*Journal*, 03(04), 242–250.

<https://doi.org/10.59231/sari7759>

8. Levi Strauss, & Claude. (1963). *Structural anthropology* C. Jacobson & B. G. Schoepf (Translated by), 2. Basic Books.
9. Marlowe, C., & Faustus, D. (Eds.). (1968). *John Barry Steane, Penguin Classics*. Penguin Books.

Received on May 20, 2025

Accepted on June 15, 2025

Published on July 01, 2025

*Helen of Troy: Tracing the Shift from a Speculative Figure of Antiquity to Mythical Archetype* © 2025 by Ravinder Kumar and Parnit Tomar is licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0