A LITERARY HISTORY OF THE TROJAN WAR FROM ANTIQUITY TO THE MIDDLE AGES

by

ADAM J. GOLDWYN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Comparative Literature in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2010

©2010
Adam J. Goldwyn
All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Comparative Literature is satisfaction of the
Dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

William Coleman

Date	Chair of Examining Committee
Date	Executive Officer

William Coleman

Tamara Green

Andre Aciman

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

A LITERARY HISTORY OF THE TROJAN WAR FROM ANTIQUITY TO THE MIDDLE AGES

by

Adam J. Goldwyn

Adviser: William Coleman

"A Literary History of the Trojan War from Antiquity to the Middle Ages" analyzes the various renditions of the mythical and historical accounts of the Trojan War from Homer to Shakespeare. It contains a discussion of the stylistic, literary and generic changes these stories underwent as authors over time and across Europe translated and adapted their sources to make them relevant to contemporary audiences. The work also examines two important political and historical themes: the use of a Trojan genealogy to justify claims of political legitimacy and the use of Troy to critique and comment on the author's age. Both are present in *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*; they also play an important role in Pindar's odes, wherein athletic competition is often compared to martial combat, and in Attic tragedy, wherein the sack of Troy serves as a cautionary exemplum for Athens during the Peloponnesian War.

These two themes are then examined in Virgil and Ovid's poetic retellings of the Trojan War. Although scholars disagree whether their works glorify the Roman Empire and whether their heroes, particularly Aeneas, be positive exempla, it is agreed that such questions are central to any understanding of them. The next significant rendition analyzed are the first extended prose accounts by the late antiquity chroniclers Dares and Dictys; drawing on the historiographical tradition of Herodotus and Thucydides, these authors excised the role of the gods and presented the war in rational, not supernatural, terms.

The second part of the dissertation focuses on the transmission of Trojan War stories in the Middle Ages, when rulers sought to legitimize their power the same way as the Romans: by claiming descent from Trojans. Modeled after *The Aeneid* but using the literary conventions of Dares's and Dictys's chronicles, medieval authors such as Snorri Sturlusson and Geoffrey of Monmouth invented genealogies for their royal patrons which traced their ancestry back to Trojan exiles and characterized their heroes according to the ideals of their own societies. The final two chapters discuss Trojan romances and Trojan tragedies, analyzing these two genres for the paradigmatic significance of the War itself and the individuals fighting in it.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge my friends and colleagues James Nikopoulos for his help with Boccaccio's Italian and Eirikur Kristjansson for his help with all things Icelandic; my two readers, Andre Aciman and Tamara Green; and, above all, my supervisor, William Coleman for his guidance, support, patience and insight. The dissertation is immeasurably better for his input. All mistakes remain my own.

Table of Contents

Introduction: The Uses of the Past in the *Iliad*: "The Past-as-Paradigm Motif" and "The Genealogical Justification" 1

- I. The Past-as-Paradigm Motif 4
- II. The Genealogical Justification 10

Chapter 1: The Trojan War in Classical Greek Literature 15

- I. The Past-as-Paradigm Motif in Pindar's Trojan Odes 16
- II. The Genealogical Justification in Pindar's Trojan Odes 24
- III. Pindar's Trojan War 28
- IV. The Past-as-Paradigm Motif in Attic Tragedy 39

Chapter 2: The Trojan War in Classical Latin Literature 49

- I. The Past-as-Paradigm in Classical Latin Literature 49
- II. The Genealogical Justification in the *Aeneid* 55
- III. Ovid's Trojan War 62

Chapter 3: The Trojan War in Late Antiquity 76

- I. Dares, Dictys, and the Greek Historiographical Tradition 79
- II. Dictys and Homer 85
- III. Dares's Trojan War 97
- IV. Dares, Dictys and Virgil 103
- V. Dictys and the Greek Tragedians 107

Chapter 4: Trojan Genealogical Histories in the Middle Ages 112

Chapter 5: Medieval Trojan Romances 139

Chapter 6: Trojan Tragedies in the Middle Ages 170

Conclusion: The Trojan War Beyond the Middle Ages 197

Bibliography 206

Introduction: The Uses of the Past in the *Iliad*: "The Past-as-Paradigm Motif" and "The Genealogical Justification"

Some two and a half millennia after the first written accounts of the Trojan War, and some three millennia after the war is alleged to have happened, literary accounts, as well as those in other media, continue to retell the events, keeping the story alive for a new generation. Whether in traditional literary genres, such as Nobel Laureate Derek Walcott's post-colonial epic *Omeros* and Margaret Atwood's feminist reinterpretation of *The Odyssey* in her novel *The Penelopiad*, or in new media such as blockbuster films (Wolfgang Peterson's 2004 film *Troy* starring Brad Pitt), comic books and graphic novels (Marvel Comics published versions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in 1977 and again in 2008), the Trojan War remains an extremely fruitful source of contemporary artistic production. Indeed, more accounts of the Trojan War are being produced today, and in more different genres, than at any time in history. These contemporary works are merely the latest contributions to a long tradition of Trojan War literature that began in Classical Greece, and, over the course of twenty-five hundred years, have spread across the rest of the world, a process which continues even to this day. The present dissertation, then, describes the first part of this tradition, from its beginnings in Homeric epic to its culmination in Shakespearean tragedy, identifying the political and literary forces that shaped the production of these works across Europe.

Because of the enduring popularity of these works and their centrality to the Western literary canon, a variety of academic books discuss many aspects of Trojan War literature. Such works, however, are often limited to an analysis of one period and one location, and thus rarely attempt a broader reading in terms of both chronology and geography. They tend to neglect the long-term stylistic transformation from, for example, Homeric epic to medieval romance, the question of transmission across linguistic and national boundaries, or the varied political uses to which Trojan history has been put. On Trojan War stories in England, for example, C. David Benson's *The History of Troy in Middle English Literature* (1980) offers a detailed analysis of the stylistic, structural and thematic differences, a literary approach that is supplemented by the political and ideological reading offered by Sylvia Federico in *New Troy* (2003). Federico describes Richard II's attempt to identify his dynasty, the Lancastrians, with the Trojans and his capital city, London, with Troy, thus legitimizing his own reign. These two works, then, with their rather narrow scope, together offer a rounded portrait of English Trojan literature. Similarly, *Fantasies of Troy: Classical Tales and the Social Imaginary in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Alan Shepard and Stephen Powell (2004), focuses on the political and cultural context of the production of Trojan War literature in a particular time and place, without accounting for the connection between those works and their ancient sources.

This dissertation differs from these works because it analyzes Trojan War stories across time and geography and in a variety of languages, describing the way each work is indebted to its sources, adapted to suit its own political, cultural and literary context, and finally how it, in turn, then influenced ensuing accounts of the Trojan War. It also analyzes the generic evolution of works about the Trojan War from epic and tragedy in ancient Greece and Rome to the medieval forms of chronicle, history and romance. Finally, it contains a literary analysis of the aesthetic and stylistic elements of each author's depiction of the events of the war.

Such research has implications for scholars in various fields. For the political scientist, the dissertation offers insight into the appropriation and manipulation of the powerful symbols that can confer political legitimacy; to the historian, it offers insight into the relationship between literature and historical events in the formation of European national identity in Greece, Roman and medieval Europe. Most important, the philologist and literary critic will find in it a detailed analysis of generic and literary evolution, as well as a discussion of the artistic merits and inventiveness of works by some of the most distinguished authors of antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and others who, though perhaps less famous, may be equally important. Because of the period that the work covers, it would be of interest to classicists and medievalists, Homerists, Chaucerians and Shakespeareans; moreover, because the analysis crosses national and linguistic borders, it will be of interest to critics working on literature in Greek, Latin, French, Icelandic and English and more.

Above all, however, this work tells a story of European political and literary evolution through the prism of one of its most identifiable myths. Specifically, it will trace the development of two important political and historical uses of these stories: (1) the use of "the genealogical justification," that is, the claim of Trojan descent by ancient and medieval rulers to justify claims of political legitimacy and (2) "the past-as-paradigm motif," which uses Troy as a mirror of various contemporary societies and a locus for an oblique criticism of the author's age.

I. The Past-as-Paradigm Motif

In Book 14 of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus has landed at Ithaka and, wearing nothing but rags, arrives at the hut of the swineherd Eumaios. When a storm comes on and he is drenched, he finds himself in a delicate situation: he is cold and wet, but also a guest, and because Eumaios is his host and therefore his social superior according to the rules of hospitality, Odysseus cannot simply ask for warm, dry clothes. Ever resourceful, Odysseus turns to the past for assistance: he tells a tale about his days at Troy. Pretending to be a Cretan, he reminisces about when he, Menelaus and Odysseus lay in ambush there: he had forgotten his cloak and was cold, but Odysseus devised a ruse to induce one of the men to return to camp, leaving his cloak behind. The Cretan Odysseus then went to bed in the other man's cloak.

Eumaios listens to this tale and recognizes in it Odysseus's oblique criticism of his failure of hospitality:

> Old sir, that was a blameless fable (αἶνος) the way you told it;
> And you have made no unprofitable speech, nor one that
> Missed the point, so you shall not lack for clothes. (14.508) [1]

Had Odysseus asked directly for warmer and drier clothes, he would have been forced to criticize Eumaios's hospitality, an insult amounting to a violation of social etiquette. In using the αἶνος about his time at Troy, he is able to convey his desire for clothes to his host without insult or violating any rules of hospitality. Maureen Alden, in *Homer Beside Himself* (2000), writes of this episode: "At *Od*.14.508, Eumaeus uses [αἶνος] in the sense of ‘cunning story’ to refer to the tale just told by Odysseus (*Od*.462-506). Odysseus’s ‘cunning story’ of how by a trick he obtained the cloak of another man to sleep at in Troy is a veiled hint to Eumaios that Odysseus would like to be provided with another cloak now (*Od*.14.504)” (Alden 31). Eumaios’s response, along with the fact that he subsequently provides Odysseus with a better cloak, proves that Eumaios has understood the meaning of his guest’s αἶνος: a story about the past which clarifies a complicated social situation in the present.

---

[1] ὦ γέρον, αἶνος μέν τοι ἀμύμων, ὃν κατέλεξας,
οὐδέ τί πω παρὰ μοῖραν ἔπος νηκερδὲς ἔειπες·
τῶ οὔτ’ ἐσθῆτος δευήσεαι (14.508).
All translations from *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* are from Lattimore.

The word αἶνος is used again, and with the same meaning, at *Il*.23.652. In this passage, Menelaus and Antilochus begin to quarrel over second place in the chariot race at Patroclus’s funeral games. Nestor, hoping to defuse the rising tension between the two heroes, tells a story about the past to instruct his contemporary audience in appropriate behavior. His αἶνος is about a chariot race that he lost in his youth. Alden observes that

> in the games for Patroclus, Menelaus lost the second place in the chariot race to the unfair tactics of Antilochus. Menelaus went on to make an issue of the unfair tactics. … Nestor’s story describes how in the chariot race at Bouprasion, he lost the first place to the Molione, who had some kind of unfair advantage. …Unlike Menelaus, Nestor did not make an issue of the unfair tactics by which he was defeated: he simply took no notice of the whole thing. Nestor is hinting to Menelaus that his querulous reaction to defeat is inappropriate. (32)

This αἶνος shares many similarities with the αἶνος in the *Odyssey*. In each instance, one character wishes to criticize another, but, because of the rules of social decorum, is unable to do so directly; instead, he draws on a story from the past, trusting that the parallel between past and present will be clear and instructive. The Homeric heroes are all too aware of the past that they have inherited: a past of heroes whom they believe to be greater and more heroic then they. This knowledge allows analogous stories from the past to carry moral authority in the present.

To Homeric heroes, the past is no mere store of events unrelated to their own lives, but a wellspring of events to guide behavior. In “Mythical Paradeigma in the *Iliad*” (1964), Malcolm Willcock calls such a use of the past a “paradigm,” a term which he defines as “a myth introduced for exhortation or consolation. ‘You must do this, because X, who was in more or less the same position as you, and a more significant person, did it’” (142). The analogous relationship between events in the past and present circumstances is the source of the past’s unique authority, not only in Homeric accounts of the Trojan War, but in the ensuing tradition of Trojan War literature and in history and literature in general. The past provides models for behavior, either to be emulated or avoided, and these models reflect the constantly evolving cultural construction of what a hero is and how he behaves. The *Iliad* and subsequent literature about the Trojan War are the stories of heroes: larger than life characters from the past who offer those in the present a model of heroic behavior. As a result, the importance of Willcock’s notion of the paradigm is not only that its power is seen as coming from its use of the past, but that past heroes were, in some sense, “more significant” than those for whom the is being cited as a model. That the heroes of the past were greater than the heroes of the present is a potent theme in Homer:

> Tydeus’s son in his hand caught
> up a stone, a huge thing, which no two men could carry
> such as men are now, but by himself he lightly hefted it. (*Il.*5.302)[2]

Even to Homer and his heroes, the exemplary heroic past was already a potent source of rhetorical authority. In it, and it seems, always, heroes struggle to match their fathers’ achievements in war and council, political power, physical prowess and moral fortitude. The use of the past-as-paradigm offers them a means to equal or even surpass their fathers in these ways.

---

[2] ὃ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ
Τυδεΐδης μέγα ἔργον ὃ οὐ δύο γ’ ἄνδρε φέροιεν,
οἷοι νῦν βροτοί εἰσ’· ὃ δέ μιν ῥέα πάλλε καὶ οἶος. (*Il.*5.303)

The αἶνος is but one type of this "past-as-paradigm motif." The purpose of the αἶνος is to counsel obliquely so as not to give offense. In other social situations, however, the past-as-paradigm motif is used in a more direct fashion; its purpose is not to avoid giving offense, but to increase the persuasive force of a piece of advice.

Willcock begins his article with a discussion of the Niobe paradigm at *Il*.24.602. Consistent with Willcock's definition, Achilles uses a story from the past to persuade his current audience to behave in like manner. Priam has come to Achilles's tent in order to retrieve Hector's body, and Achilles remarks:

> Now you and I must remember our supper.
> For even Niobe, she of the lovely tresses, remembered
> to eat, whose twelve children were destroyed in her palace. …
> Come then, we also, aged magnificent sir, must remember
> to eat. (*Il*.24.602)[3]

Willcock elucidates the significance of the paradigm: "Niobe's situation as described is clearly very like Priam's, only more so. Priam has lost one son: Niobe lost all twelve; yet Niobe ate food. *A fortiori* Priam should eat" (141). As with Odysseus's and Nestor's paradigms, Achilles also uses a story from the past as a guide to how to behave in the present. By referencing the behavior of someone from the past (who lived, almost by definition, life on a grander scale), Achilles increases the persuasive force of his argument.

---

[3] νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα δόρπου.
καὶ γάρ τ' ἠΰκομος Νιόβη ἐμνήσατο σίτου,
τῇ περ δώδεκα παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ὄλοντο
ἓξ μὲν θυγατέρες, ἓξ δ' υἱέες ἡβώοντες …
ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῶϊ μεδώμεθα δῖε γεραιὲ σίτου· (*Il*.24.602)

Of all Homer's characters, Nestor uses this rhetorical technique most often. Alden notes that the way Nestor is introduced in the poem "draws the attention of the audience both to the sweetness of [his] rhetoric and his authority, which derives from his longevity" (75). His authority, however, is derived not simply from his age, but what his age signifies: unlike other characters in the poem, he has fought alongside and against the great heroes of old.

He is, moreover, introduced at a critical time, that of the cataclysmic conflict between Agamemnon and Achilles. He enters as a peacemaker, a role which he, because of the prestige his status as the oldest of the Achaeans, is uniquely suited to play. No one in the army possesses Agamemnon's status as supreme commander, nor does anyone else possess Achilles's status as supreme warrior; only Nestor, as the oldest, enjoys comparable prestige. As Alden suggests, his introduction in the *Iliad* points to this role:

> … Nestor
> the fair-spoken rose up, the lucid speaker of Pylos,
> from whose lips the streams of words ran sweeter than honey.
> In his time two generations of mortal men had perished,
> those who had grown up with him and they who had been born to
> these in sacred Pylos, and he was king in the third age (*Il.*1.247).[4]

---

[4] … Νέστωρ
ἡδυεπὴς ἀνόρουσε λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής,
τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή·
τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
ἐφθίαθ', οἵ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ' ἐγένοντο
ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσεν· (*Il.*1.247)

Because of his age, Nestor has clearer authority to claim the past, and indeed, the speech he gives immediately following his introduction reflects this; his appeal that Achilles and Agamemnon heed him is based on his authority as elder statesmen:

> Yet be persuaded. Both of you are younger than I am.
> Yes, and in my time I have dealt with better men than
> you are, and never once did they disregard me …
> men like Perithoös, and Dryas, shepherd of the people,
> Kaineus and Exadios, godlike Polyphemos, or Theseus …
> And also these listened to the counsels I gave and heeded my bidding.
> Do you also obey, since to be persuaded is better. (*Il.*1.259)[5]

Nestor's rhetorical strategy is based on the authority of paradigms from the past. He begins by telling them of his greater age, thereby establishing his superior access to the past, then tells them the story of past men – "better men than you are" – concluding that, since they listened to him, Achilles and Agamemnon ought to do so too. In *The Iliad: A Commentary* (1990), GS Kirk rightly notes that "the message of the *exemplum* is that strong fighters follow Nestor's advice and obey him" (81).[6] Nestor is criticizing the quarrelsome behavior of Achilles and Agamemnon and he wishes to condemn their behavior. The past-as-paradigm motif gives him the rhetorical authority to do so, despite the fact that they are his social superiors. It is his claim to equality with them: Agamemnon may rule more men, Achilles may be best in combat, but Nestor has most experience among the best of warriors. This type of prestige makes him their equal in social status, thereby allowing him to criticize their behavior.

---

[5] ἀλλὰ πίθεσθ’· ἄμφω δὲ νεωτέρω ἐστὸν ἐμεῖο·
ἤδη γάρ ποτ’ ἐγὼ καὶ ἀρείοσιν ἠέ περ ὑμῖν
ἀνδράσιν ὡμίλησα, καὶ οὔ ποτέ μ’ οἵ γ’ ἀθέριζον …
καὶ μέν μευ βουλέων ξύνιεν πείθοντό τε μύθῳ·
ἀλλὰ πίθεσθε καὶ ὔμμες, ἐπεὶ πείθεσθαι ἄμεινον· (*Il.*1.259)

[6] "Exemplum" and "paradigm" are synonymous terms: the former is the Latin cognate of the Greek.

The heroes of the Trojan War were well aware that their actions would serve as paradigms for future generations; indeed, this becomes the impetus for Hector’s fateful (and fatal) decision to turn and fight Achilles rather than continue to run away in fear and shame:

> But now death is upon me.
> Let me at least not die without a struggle, inglorious,
> But do some big thing first, that men to come shall know of it. (*Il*.22.303)[7]

Hector seems to set himself up to be a paradigm for future generations. He wants to leave a legacy as a laudable paradigm by achieving a glorious death in battle, not a contemptible paradigm by dying while fleeing from his enemy. The heroes who fought at Troy looked to the heroes of previous generations to understand their place in the world and how to act in it, yet, as Hector’s words at *Il*.22.305 show, they were also well aware that their own deeds might serve as paradigms for future generations.[8]

II. The Genealogical Justification

In Book 2 of the *Iliad*, Agamemnon calls a council of the Achaeans:

> Powerful Agamemnon
> stood up, holding the sceptre Hephaistos had wrought him carefully.
> Hephaistos gave it to Zeus the king, the son of Kronos,
> and Zeus in turn gave it to the courier Argeiphontes,
> and lord Hermes gave it to Pelops, driver of horses,
> and Pelops again gave it to Atreus, the shepherd of the people.
> Atreus dying left it to Thyestes of the rich flocks,
> and Thyestes left it in turn to Agamemnon to carry
> and to be lord of many islands and over all Argos. (*Il*.2.100)[9]

---

[7] νῦν αὖτέ με μοῖρα κιχάνει.
μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην,
ἀλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι. (*Il.*22.303)

[8] Cf. also *Il*.7.89 for another example of Hector’s awareness of what men in the future will say about them.

[9] ἀνὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

The scepter referred to here is the physical manifestation of Agamemnon’s power and the genealogy provided is that power’s justification: Agamemnon is “lord of many islands and over all Argos” because his great-grandfather received the scepter and with it the right to rule, from the gods and passed it down to his descendants. The same scepter that Achilles hurls to the ground in anger at *Il.*1.245, thereby symbolically rejecting Agamemnon’s authority over him, is the scepter to which Nestor refers in the first exposition of divine right in the Homeric corpus, when he advises Achilles not to

> think to match your strength with
> the king, since never equal with the rest is the portion of honour
> to the sceptred king to whom Zeus gives magnificence (*Il.*1.277).[10]

Though this example of what may be termed the genealogical justification for political power is here provided in a passage of description, it is more often the case in the ancient Greek epics that the characters themselves make the case for their right to rule. For example, Idomeneus tells Deiphobos of his lineage:

> Strange man. Do you rather come yourself and stand up against me
> so you can see what I am like, Zeus’s seed, come here to face you.
> Since Zeus first got by Krete Minos, who cared for his people,
> and to Minos in turn was born a blameless son, Deukalion,
> and Deukalion sired me to be lord over many people
> in wide Krete. (*Il.*13.448)[11]

ἔστη σκῆπτρον ἔχων τὸ μὲν Ἥφαιστος κάμε τεύχων.
Ἥφαιστος μὲν δῶκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι,
αὐτὰρ ἄρα Ζεὺς δῶκε διακτόρῳ ἀργεϊφόντῃ·
Ἑρμείας δὲ ἄναξ δῶκεν Πέλοπι πληξίππῳ,
αὐτὰρ ὃ αὖτε Πέλοψ δῶκ’ Ἀτρέϊ ποιμένι λαῶν,
Ἀτρεὺς δὲ θνῄσκων ἔλιπεν πολύαρνι Θυέστῃ,
αὐτὰρ ὃ αὖτε Θυέστ’ Ἀγαμέμνονι λεῖπε φορῆναι,
πολλῇσιν νήσοισι καὶ Ἄργεϊ παντὶ ἀνάσσειν. (*Il.*2.100)

[10] θελ’ ἐριζέμεναι βασιλῆϊ
ἀντιβίην, ἐπεὶ οὔ ποθ’ ὁμοίης ἔμμορε τιμῆς
σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεύς, ᾧ τε Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν. (*Il.*1.277)

Unlike the example of the scepter, here the assertion of the right to rule is proclaimed in direct speech by the hero himself: Idomeneus's claim to the rule of Crete, like Agamemnon's rule of Argos, comes from his patrilineal descent from Zeus. Idomeneus claims the right to rule Crete because he is the son of its previous ruler, who was, in turn, a son of Zeus.

This same genealogical justification for the right to rule holds sway even in the divine realm. At *Il*.15.185, Iris comes to Poseidon to tell him to yield to Zeus. Poseidon refuses, on the that he, Zeus and Hades are equal, since they are both descendants of the same father:

> No, no. Great though he is, this that he has said is too much,
> if he will force me against my will, me, who am his equal
> in rank. Since we are three brothers born by Rheia to Kronos,
> Zeus, and I, and the third is Hades, lord of the dead men.
> All was divided among us three ways, each given his domain.
> I when the lots were shaken drew the grey sea to live in
> forever; Hades drew the lot of the mists and the darkness,
> and Zeus was allotted the wide sky.[12]

Both Poseidon's claim to parity with Zeus and his right to rule the seas are based in a genealogical justification: as a descendant of Kronos, they are his by birthright. To

---

[11] δαιμόνι’ ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐναντίον ἵστασ’ ἐμεῖο,
ὄφρα ἴδῃ οἶος Ζηνὸς γόνος ἐνθάδ’ ἱκάνω,
ὃς πρῶτον Μίνωα τέκε Κρήτῃ ἐπίουρον·
Μίνως δ’ αὖ τέκεθ’ υἱὸν ἀμύμονα Δευκαλίωνα,
Δευκαλίων δ’ ἐμὲ τίκτε πολέσσ’ ἄνδρεσσιν ἄνακτα
Κρήτῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ. (*Il*.13.448)

[12] ὢ πόποι ἦ ῥ’ ἀγαθός περ ἐὼν ὑπέροπλον ἔειπεν
εἴ μ’ ὁμότιμον ἐόντα βίῃ ἀέκοντα καθέξει.
τρεῖς γάρ τ’ ἐκ Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφεοὶ οὓς τέκετο Ῥέα
Ζεὺς καὶ ἐγώ, τρίτατος δ’ Ἀΐδης ἐνέροισιν ἀνάσσων.
τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται, ἕκαστος δ’ ἔμμορε τιμῆς·
ἤτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολιὴν ἅλα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ
παλλομένων, Ἀΐδης δ’ ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα,
Ζεὺς δ’ ἔλαχ’ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσι· (*Il*.15.185)

Poseidon, none of the “three brothers born by Rheia to Kronos” has any more authority than the others.

Even more to the point perhaps is that divine sanction of genealogical authority is clearly to be seen at *Il*.20.302, in which Poseidon tells Athena and Hera that

> it is destined that [Aeneas] shall be the survivor,
> that the generation of Dardanos shall not die, without seed
> obliterated, since Dardanos was dearest to Kronides
> of all his sons that have been born to him from mortal women.
> For Kronos’s son has cursed the generation of Priam,
> and now the might of Aeneas shall be lord over the Trojans,
> and his sons’ sons, and those who are born of his seed hereafter.[13]

Aeneas’s legitimacy is thus understood as divine favor because of his descent from Zeus. Furthermore, because of divine sanction, not only does Aeneas possess the divine authority to rule, but also his descendants. This is the passage, it will be remembered, that justified Virgil’s belief in Aeneas as the founder of Rome. Aeneas’s wanderings on his way to found Rome in *The Aeneid* are modeled on Odysseus’s wanderings on his way towards Ithaka; indeed, many of the adventures Aeneas faces are identical to those of Odysseus. Whereas Odysseus is trying to reach his old home and re-establish his authority among his own family and subjects, Aeneas’s mission is something altogether different. Unlike Odysseus, who comes to his familiar home in Ithaka alone and in disguise, Aeneas comes to an unknown land bringing with him all the refugees he has led. The long years of wandering before arriving home is also one of the great themes of

---

[13] μόριμον δέ οἵ ἐστ’ ἀλέασθαι,
ὄφρα μὴ ἄσπερμος γενεὴ καὶ ἄφαντος ὄληται
Δαρδάνου, ὃν Κρονίδης περὶ πάντων φίλατο παίδων
οἳ ἕθεν ἐξεγένοντο γυναικῶν τε θνητάων.
ἤδη γὰρ Πριάμου γενεὴν ἔχθηρε Κρονίων·
νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει
καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται. (*Il*.20.302)

Trojan War literature. The pattern of wandering before city founding and of descent from a Trojan War hero to legitimize political rule is strongly presented in Aeneas's favor in Homer. Because they traced their genealogy back to Aeneas, this would also become the touchstone of the Roman use of the genealogical justification and, eventually, one of the primary reasons for medieval monarchs' attraction to the story of the Trojan War.

The past-as-paradigm motif, wherein heroes from past generations become idealized examples of how to behave, and the genealogical justification, wherein rulers may claim political legitimacy based on a patrilineal connection to past rulers, thus form the two most significant ways in which the past in the Homeric corpus informs the present. These uses of the past were incorporated into Classical Greek and Roman as well as medieval literature about the Trojan War, as various actual rulers, seeking to mold cultural ideals and to secure their political legitimacy, sponsored authors who would write versions of the Trojan War that supported their claim

Chapter 1: The Trojan War in Classical Greek Literature

In *Pindar and Aeschylus* (1955), John Finley identifies the Classical Greek inheritance of Homer as a way of thinking which was "concerned with poetic symbolism" and which "saw, in Pindar and Aeschylus, as well as in Homer, minds for whom reality was chiefly comprehensible through heroic figures and situations, not through ideas" (21). In this reading, every character serves as an exemplum, whether explicitly, as in the case of Niobe in *Il.*24, or implicitly, as is, for example, illustrated by Finley's reading of Odysseus's trip to the underworld: "Odysseus sees among the dead exemplars of social and family life" (Finley 17) or, similarly, in the *Iliad*: "Thetis as a mother, Briseis as a disappointed girl, ignoble Thersites, laboring and somewhat limited Ajax, managerial Odysseus" (Finley 18). For Finley, every character in the Homeric corpus is meant to be understood as an exemplum of a particular role in society. This use of exempla, then, if it is to be accepted, is one of the primary methods of thinking which Classical Greek authors adopted from the Homeric corpus.

In Pindar, the exempla are generally positive. He either praises his patrons, usually victors in athletic competitions, for acting in sports in the same praiseworthy fashion as might a famous ancestor have done in war or he exhorts a patron to act in the same praiseworthy fashion as had a famous ancestor, but in the future.

In the hands of the classical tragedians, however, and those of Euripides in particular, exempla came to serve an opposite purpose. Rather than appealing to the glory of the Homeric heroes, the tragedians show the horrors of war. By depicting a defeated Troy in a manner reminiscent of Athens, Euripides warns his fellow Athenians that, as Polymestor says in *Hecuba*,

> Nothing's secure. A good name may be lost.
> Things may go well today and not tomorrow.
> The gods are always shuffling our affairs,
> Through fear of the unknown. (956-60)[1]

This programmatic statement about the nature of the world may be particularly applicable to the Athenians, who, at the time of the performance of Euripides's play, enjoyed the height of their imperial power. From a literary perspective, this amounts to foreshadowing, for it anticipates the destiny of Polymestor in the play, but from an ideological perspective, the warning is directed much more generally, not at the defeated Trojans, but at the Athenians in the audience.

I. The Past-as-Paradigm Motif in Pindar's Trojan Odes

The use of myth as exemplum in Pindar has formed a topic of discussion among Pindaric scholars. The most detailed work here remains David Young's *Pindar Isthmian 7, Myth and Exempla* (1971), in which the author asserts that "most scholars have argued that many myths … function as paradigms or exempla to illustrate some contemporary subject, usually, but not necessarily, pertaining to the victor" (35). In Young's view, Pindaric myth serves as both positive and negative exemplum (38).

---

[1] οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν πιστόν, οὔτ' εὐδοξία
οὔτ' αὖ καλῶς πράσσοντα μὴ πράξειν κακῶς.
φύρουσι δ' αὐτὰ θεοὶ πάλιν τε καὶ πρόσω
ταραγμὸν ἐντιθέντες, ὡς ἀγνωσίαι
σέβωμεν αὐτούς.

Although the presence of exempla in Pindar is broadly acknowledged, and although many works, such in fact as Young's, discuss certain aspects of the Pindaric exemplum, he himself notes that "a comprehensive study of Pindaric paradigm has yet to be written" (36). What follows constitutes no such study; instead, the focus will be limited only to those paradigms drawn from the story of the Trojan War, so as to establish a thematic link to Homer by showing how Pindar has incorporated and deployed the Homeric past-as-paradigm motif; and, second, to show how Pindar uses this technique to adapt the Homeric version of the Trojan War to suit his own historical and political interests.

Young's test-case for the relationship of myth to exemplum in Pindar is *Isthmian 7*: "Pindar … apostrophizes the fallen Strepsiades, and compares him to Meleager, Hector, and Amphiarus. Scholars have vainly sought the common element, other than a military death, that links these famous warriors, but Meleager will not suit the theory that all died fighting a losing cause; nor did Amphiarus die defending his country" (21). The common element between these deaths, according to Young, is that "Pindar … connects the three famous warriors because they all fell valiantly in the front line of battle; they knew not the flight of shame" (22).

The example of the fallen Strepsiades, the uncle and namesake of the victor to whom the poem is dedicated, serves as a positive exemplum, reinforced by its Homeric antecedents: "Pindar… represents Strepsiades's patriotic self-sacrifice as a kind of absolute heroism that is always of the same quality – whether in Pindar's day… or in the heroic age of Hector, Meleager, and Amphiaraus, who exemplify it in myth" (Young 25). Young makes the example of the elder Strepsiades, itself an example of the Homeric heroism, into an example for the younger Strepsiades: like the elder Strepsiades and the three mythical heroes in war, the younger Strepsiades should strive even unto death for the glorification in athletics of his homeland.

For Pindar, then, the Homeric heroes become a source of paradigms for how to glorify the homeland. Just as the Homeric heroes find in their past paradigms of glorious and noble behavior, and, as in the case of Hector, looked ahead to see how their lives could have paradigmatic value to future generations, so did the Classical Greeks look for paradigms among those who fought in the Trojan War. Indeed, Pindar praises Strepsiades for his emulation of the Homeric heroes:

> For let him know well, whoever in that cloud of war
> defends his dear country from the hailstorm of blood
> by turning the onslaught against the opposing army,
> that he fosters the greatest glory for his townsmen's race,
> both while he lives and after he is dead.
> And you, son of Diodotos, … you emulated the warrior
> Meleagros and emulated Hektor
> And Amphiaros. (*Isth.*7.27).[2]

This passage suggests that, in following the example of the Homeric hero, one might attain some portion of their κλέος, or fame, the most sought after of all attributes, both in the world of the Homeric hero and in Classical Greece (see, for example, *Hdt.*1.1). The passage instructs young men in how to achieve κλέος, that is, by acting like the Homeric heroes, and exhorts them to do so. In this it follows Willcock's definition of a paradigm. In essence, Pindar is saying that Strepsiades must fight even unto death for his homeland because Hector, Meleager and Amphiarus, who were both more significant people and in more or less the same situation as he, did so.

---

[2] ἴστω γὰρ σαφὲς ὅστις ἐν ταύτᾳ νεφέλᾳ χάλα-
ζαν αἵματος πρὸ φίλας πάτρας ἀμύνεται,
λοιγὸν ἀμύνων ἐναντίῳ στρατῷ,
ἀστῶν γενεᾷ μέγιστον κλέος αὔξων
ζώων τ' ἀπὸ καὶ θανών.
τὺ δέ, Διοδότοιο παῖ, μαχατάν
αἰνέων Μελέαγρον, αἰνέων δὲ καὶ Ἕκτορα
Ἀμφιάραόν τε.
All translations from *Pindar* by John Sandys.

Pythian 3 also features a connection between the use of the Homeric exemplum and the attainment of Homeric κλέος. The ode expresses Pindar's wish that his patron, Hieron, who has fallen ill will soon recover. Pindar encourages Hieron to bear his illness serenely, since the course of one's life is constantly changing, first from health to sickness and then back to health. The exemplum that Pindar uses to prove this point is Peleus's sorrow after Paris kills his son Achilles,[3] which, in Pindar's ode, becomes an example of the transitory nature of human happiness and, by analogy, an exhortation to Hieron not to be too upset on account of his current illness: "If you can understand the true point of sayings, you know the lesson of former poets: the immortals apportion to humans a pair of evils for every good" (*Pyth.*3.80).[4]

As an example of the lesson he has just described, Pindar cites the case of Peleus and Kadmos:

---

[3] This event, though not reported in either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, is alluded to in Hector's last words:
I might be made into the gods's curse upon you, on the day when Paris and Phoibos Apollo destroy you in the Skaian gates, for all your valour
φράζεο νῦν, μή τοί τι θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι
ἤματι τῷ ὅτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
ἐσθλὸν ἐόντ' ὀλέσωσιν ἐνὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσιν.
(*Il.*22.358).

[4] εἰ δὲ λόγων συνέμεν κορυφάν, Ἱέρων,
ὀρθὰν ἐπίστᾳ, μανθάνων οἶσθα προτέρων
ἓν παρ' ἐσλὸν πήματα σύνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖς
ἀθάνατοι.

> But an untroubled life did not abide with Aiakos’s son Peleus or with godlike Kadmos; yet they are said to have attained the highest happiness of any men. … But [Peleus’s] son, the only child immortal Thetis bore him in Phthia, lost his life to an arrow in war, and as [Achilles] was consumed by the fire, he raised a lament from the Danaans (*Pyth.*3.86).[5]

Pindar concludes his description of this paradigm by restating its moral:

> If any mortal understands the way of truth, he must be happy with what good the blessed gods allot him. Now here, now there blow the gusts of the high-flying winds. Men’s happiness does not come for long unimpaired, when it accompanies them, descending with full weight (102).[6]

Unlike the hortative Homeric paradigm, the Pindaric paradigm is instructive; Pindar points out that the “previous poets” themselves were teaching this lesson, which Pindar reiterates, using an example from the past. Pindar attempts to explain to Hieron why he is ill and to comfort him, but does not exhort from him any particular behavior, while the Meleager and Niobe paradigms in Homer exhort their listeners to eat and fight. Pindar, therefore, has taken the past-as-paradigm motif from Homer and adapted it for his own literary and historical purposes: to comfort and instruct his patrons. Homer’s paradigms were entirely literary: fictional characters used the example of other fictional characters to convince still other fictional characters to act or behave a certain way. Pindar’s paradigms, however, are directed at real people, his patrons, to offer them lessons on how to live their lives.

---

[5] αἰὼν δ’ ἀσφαλής
οὐκ ἔγεντ’ οὔτ’ Αἰακίδᾳ παρὰ Πηλεῖ
οὔτε παρ’ ἀντιθέῳ Κάδμῳ· λέγονται γε μὰν βροτῶν
ὄλβον ὑπέρτατον οἳ σχεῖν …
τοῦ δὲ παῖς, ὅνπερ μόνον ἀθανάτα
τίκτεν ἐν Φθίᾳ Θέτις, ἐν πολέμῳ τό-
ξοις ἀπὸ ψυχὰν λιπών
ὦρσεν πυρὶ καιόμενος
ἐκ Δαναῶν γόον. (*Pyth.*3.86)

[6] εἰ δὲ νόῳ τις ἔχει
θνατῶν ἀλαθείας ὁδόν, χρὴ πρὸς μακάρων
τυγχάνοντ’ εὖ πασχέμεν. ἄλλοτε δ’ ἀλλοῖαι πνοαί
ὑψιπετᾶν ἀνέμων.
ὄλβος δ’ οὐκ ἐς μακρὸν ἀνδρῶν ἔρχεται
σάος, πολὺς εὖτ’ ἂν ἐπιβρίσαις ἕπηται.

Pythian 3 concludes with a hope that ties together the theme of the lesson taught by the previous poet and illustrated within the previous work:

> If a god should grant me luxurious wealth, I hope that I may win lofty fame (κλέος) hereafter. We know of Nestor and Lykian Sarpedon, still the talk of men, from such echoing verses as wise craftsmen constructed (110).[7]

Pindar, in the first person, makes the connection between emulation of the paradigmatic hero and κλέος.

Much has been written about the paradigmatic function of the Meleager story in the *Iliad*, but none to this point compared it to Pindar’s use of the same story in *Pythian 3*. In Homer, the Meleager story is a negative paradigm: Phoinix has encouraged Achilles not to do as Meleager did, that is, not to abstain from battle until it was too late. Pindar’s Meleager paradigm, however, serves by contrast a positive purpose: act like Meleager and die fighting in the frontline for your fatherland.

There is, however, a substantive difference between the uses of paradigms by both authors: the Homeric paradigm is hortatory, the Pindaric is didactic. Willcock defines the Homeric paradigm as “a myth introduced for exhortation or consolation. ‘You must do this, because X, who was in more or less the same situation as you, did it’” (142). The

---

[7] εἰ δέ μοι πλοῦτον θεὸς ἁβρὸν ὀρέξαι,
ἐλπίδ’ ἔχω κλέος εὑρέσθαι κεν ὑψηλὸν πρόσω.
Νέστορα καὶ Λύκιον Σαρπηδόν’, ἀνθρώπων φάτῑς,
ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν, τέκτονες οἷα σοφοί
ἅρμοσαν, γινώσκομεν·

Pindaric paradigm, however, appears not to follow this model. It is often preceded by a gnomic reflection, proved true by a mythical example. Thus, a definition of the Pindaric paradigm might be that the gnomic statement is true because it describes the situation of a Homeric hero who was in more or less the same situation as Pindar's patron and the patron should be praised for learning from his example.

Pythian 6 follows this model. In praising Thrasyboulos for his filial devotion, Pindar begins with a gnomic reflection before moving on to the analogous situation:

> Truly by keeping [your father] at your right hand, you uphold the precept, whose words of advice they say Philyra's son once gave to the mighty son of Peleus in the mountains, when he was away from his parents: above all gods to revere Kronos's son, loud-voiced lord of lightning and thunder, and never to deprive of like honor one's parents during their allotted lifetime. (19)[8]

The gnomic reflection here suggests that one should honor Zeus above the other gods as well as one's parents. The story that follows is a paradigm illustrating the benefits of such behavior:

> In the past as well, mighty Antilochus bore such thoughts in mind, who died to save his father by standing up to the man-slaughtering general of the Ethiopians, Memnon. For Nestor's chariot had become entangled when his horse was struck by Paris's arrows, and he was brandishing his powerful spear. In panic the mind of the old man from Messene shouted to his son, nor indeed did he hurl forth a word that fell to the ground: that godlike man took a stand right there and bought his father's rescue with his own death, and, for doing that awesome deed, he was deemed by the

---

[8] σύ τοι σχεθών νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός, ὀρθὰν
ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν,
τά ποτ' ἐν οὔρεσι φαντὶ μεγαλοσθενεῖ
Φιλύρας υἱὸν ὀρφανιζομένῳ
Πηλεΐδᾳ παραινεῖν· μάλιστα μὲν Κρονίδαν,
βαρύοπα στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε πρύτανιν,
θεῶν σέβεσθαι· ταύτας δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶς
ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον.

> young men of that ancient generation to be foremost in virtuous behavior toward parents. (28)[9]

Pindar’s example of filial piety is Antilochus, who loses his own life that he might save his father’s. Because he found himself in a situation similar to that of the mythical hero Antilochus and because Pindar’s patron Thrasyboulos learned and applied the lesson of the paradigmatic situation, the latter now receives the poet’s praise: “Those things are past: but of men now, Thrasyboulos has come closest to the standard of filial devotion” (43).[10]

This same pattern of gnomic reflection with Trojan paradigm to prove it and praise for the patron who enacts it in Pindar’s own time can be seen in *Isthmian 7* and *Pythian 3*. In *Isthmian 7*.27, cited above, the first sentence is the poet’s gnomic statement, while the second is his praise of the dead Strepsiades for having learned the lesson and acted upon it.

---

[9] ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον Ἀντίλοχος βιατὰς
νόημα τοῦτο φέρων,
ὃς ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός, ἐναρίμβροτον
ἀναμείναις στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων
Μέμνονα. Νεστόρειον γὰρ ἵππος ἅρμ’ ἐπέδα
Πάριος ἐκ βελέων δαϊχθείς· ὁ δ’ ἔφεπεν
κραταιὸν ἔγχος· Μεσσανίου δὲ γέροντος
δονηθεῖσα φρὴν βόασε παῖδα ὅν,
Εχαμαιπετὲς δ’ ἄρ’ ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριψεν· αὐτοῦ
μένων δ’ ὁ θεῖος ἀνήρ
πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός,
ἐδόκησέν τε τῶν πάλαι γενεᾷ
ὁπλοτέροισιν ἔργον πελώριον τελέσαις
ὕπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν.

[10] τὰ μὲν παρίκει· τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος
πατρῴαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα,
πάτρῳ τ’ ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαΐαν ἔδειξεν ἅπασαν.

In *Pythian 3*, Pindar’s gnomic statement: “Truly if great destiny looks with favor upon any man, it is upon a people-guiding ruler” (85)[11] is followed by a paradigmatic example drawn from the store of Trojan War literature: “But an untroubled life did not abide with Aiakos’s son Peleus” (86).[12] The paradigm is followed by a reiteration of its didactic purpose: “If any mortal understands the way of truth, he must be happy with what good the blessed gods allot him” (102).[13]

Pindar’s patrons paid him to write poems praising them for their victories in athletics, which he did by equating their achievements in athletics to the military exploits of the heroes of the Trojan War. This equivalency was created through the application of paradigms: a great hero of the past is said to have behaved in an admirable way, whether through filial devotion, military prowess or moral fortitude and Pindar’s contemporary patron is praised for having learned the lesson the lesson of the paradigm and emulating it through his actions. An athletic victory, therefore, becomes, in Pindar’s hands, the equivalent of the highest heroism ever displayed by Greeks in arms: their exploits at Troy.

II. The Genealogical Justification in Pindar’s Trojan Odes

In addition to providing models of exemplary behavior, the heroes who fought at Troy become, in Pindar’s odes, a legitimizing force for the political power of current ruling families. The Aiakidai, the rulers of the island of Aegina, employed Pindar to write epinikian poetry to justify their rule there. In doing so, they become the first in a literary tradition stretching through to the Middle Ages to justify their right to rule based on descent from Trojan heroes. In *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages* (1987), Katherine Callen King suggests that “heroes, who are always of divine descent, are particularly important to Pindar’s message because they illustrate his firm belief that excellence is something in one’s blood, not something learned” (56). By pointing out the valor of the old heroes in battle, Pindar not only casts their reflected glory on their descendents, but also seems to renew that glory through the parallel action of athletic victory in the present. Since virtue is inherited, the current heroes, because they are related to the ancient heroes, must also be virtuous, and so justified in continuing their rule.

---

[11] λαγέταν γάρ τοι τύραννον δέρκεται,
εἴ τιν’ ἀνθρώπων, ὁ μέγας πότμος.

[12] αἰὼν δ’ ἀσφαλής
οὐκ ἔγεντ’ οὔτ’ Αἰακίδᾳ παρὰ Πηλεῖ

[13] εἰ δὲ νόῳ τις ἔχει
θνατῶν ἀλαθείας ὁδόν, χρὴ πρὸς μακάρων
τυγχάνοντ’ εὖ πασχέμεν.

Nemean 3, for example, begins by tracing the ancestry of Aegina’s current rulers back to the heroes of the Trojan War:

> To Aiakos and his race I bid you bring the Muse …
> In achievements of long ago
> lord Peleus took delight …
> and captured the sea nymph Thetis
> with great effort … and fostered her matchless offspring …
> so that, when sent by the blasts of the winds at sea
> to the foot of Troy, [Achilles] would withstand the spear-clashing.
> (*Nem.*3.28)[14]

---

[14] Αἰακῷ σε φαμὶ γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν …
παλαιαῖσι δ’ ἐν ἀρεταῖς
γέγαθε Πηλεὺς ἄναξ …
καὶ ποντίαν Θέτιν κατέμαρψεν
ἐγκονητί …
γόνον τέ ος φέρτατον …
ὄφρα θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι πεμφθείς
ὑπὸ Τροΐαν δορίκτυπον

With the divine help of the Muse, Pindar traces the descent of the current rulers of Aegina, the Aiakidai (whose very name suggests the connection to mythical Trojan genealogy), from Peleus and Achilles to the current rulers. He asserts an unbroken line of patrilineal from the rulers of the island during the Trojan War to the contemporary rulers of the island's contemporary rulers. Having established a genealogy, Pindar then asserts the divinely sanctioned right of the Aiakidai to rule Aegina:

> The far-shining light of the Aiakidai is fixed from here.
> Zeus, yours is the blood (*Nem*.3.64).[15]

The rule of the Aiakidai is fixed because of their descent through the Trojan heroes back to Zeus.

Nemean 4 follows a similar pattern; Pindar begins with a list of lands over which the Aiakidai rule:

> Quickly now, sweet lyre, weave out this song too
> in Lydian harmony, one beloved
> by Oinona and Cyprus, where Teukros rules in exile,
> the son of Telamon, but
> Aias holds the paternal home of Salamis;
> and in the Euxine Sea Achilles holds the shining
> island. Thetis rules
> over Phthia, Neoptolemos over the far-reaching mainland
> where cattle-grazing forelands descend,
> beginning with Dodona, to the Ionian Sea. (*Nem*.4.44)[16]

---

[15] τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν·
Ζεῦ, τεὸν γὰρ αἷμα.

[16] Λυδίᾳ σὺν ἁρμονίᾳ μέλος πεφιλημένον
Οἰνώνᾳ τε καὶ Κύπρῳ̆, ἔνθα Τεῦκρος ἀπάρχει
ὁ Τελαμωνιάδας· ἀτάρ
Αἴας Σαλαμῖν' ἔχει πατρῴαν·
Ζ ἐν δ' Εὐξείνῳ πελάγει φαεννὰν Ἀχιλεύς
νᾶσον· Θέτις δὲ κρατεῖ
Φθίᾳ· Νεοπτόλεμος δ' ἀπείρῳ διαπρυσίᾳ,
βουβόται τόθι πρῶνες ἔξοχοι κατάκεινται
Δωδώναθεν ἀρχόμενοι πρὸς Ἰόνιον πόρον.

Having established the lands over which the Aiakidai rule, he then affirms their right to do so:

> [Peleus] beheld the fine circle of seats
> on which the lords of the sky and sea sat
> and revealed to him their gifts and his race's power. (*Nem*.4.66)[17]

The kingship passes to the current rulers based on their mythological familial relation to the Aiakidai, who were, in turn, given the right to rule by Zeus.

The past-as-paradigm motif is strengthened by the genealogical connection between the victors Pindar is praising and the ancient heroes to whom he links them; the exhortation to behave like the heroes of the past becomes even more potent when those ancient heroes are one's own relatives. In *Olympian 8*, Apollo tells Aiakos: "Pergamos is to be captured … not without your children; but it will begin with the first ones and also with the fourth" (*Ol*.8.42).[18]

Pindar's Apollo foretells the heroism of the Aiakidai, which will result in Troy being sacked twice. The glory of this double-sack of Troy is reflected in the behavior of the current Aiakidai:

> I must awaken memory to announce the foremost victories won by the hands of Blepsiadai, whose sixth garland now wreathes them (*Ol*.8.74).[19]

---

[17] εἶδεν δ' εὔκυκλον ἕδραν,
τὰν οὐρανοῦ βασιλῆες πόντου τ' ἐφεζόμενοι
δῶρα καὶ κράτος ἐξέφαναν ἐγγενὲς αὐτῷ.

[18] Πέργαμος ἀμφὶ τεαῖς,
ἥρως, χερὸς ἐργασίαις ἁλίσκεται·
ὣς ἐμοὶ φάσμα λέγει Κρονίδα
πεμφθὲν βαρυγδούπου Διός·
οὐκ ἄτερ παίδων σέθεν, ἀλλ' ἅμα πρώτοις ἄρξεται
καὶ τερτάτοις.

[19] ἀλλ' ἐμὲ χρὴ μναμοσύναν ἀνεγείροντα φράσαι
χειρῶν ἄωτον Βλεψιάδαις ἐπίνικον,
ἕκτος οἷς ἤδη στέφανος περίκειται
φυλλοφόρων ἀπ' ἀγώνων.

In this ode, as in *Isthmian 7*, the glory of athletics is made equivalent to the glory of war, and Pindar praises his victorious patrons for acting in such a way as befits their illustrious ancestry.

This pattern of praising an ancestor who fought in the Trojan War, then praising the patron for equally glorious behavior in athletics appears in odes for other ruling families. In *Olympian* 13, for example, Pindar praises the rulers of Corinth for their victory and connects the glory of this victory back to the glory of one of their ancestors: "The Danaans trembled before Glaukos who came from Lykia. And to them he boasted that in the city of Peirene were the kingship and rich inheritance and the palace of his father" (*Ol.*13.60).[20] Pindar seems to say that the ancestors of the Oligaithidai ruled Corinth and behaved heroically; the current rulers should maintain their rule because they continually equal the glory of their ancestors' military prowess in athletic competition.

III. Pindar's Trojan War

Are Pindar and Homer writing about the same Trojan War? At first glance, it would seem so: both Pindar and Homer tell the deeds of the same characters in the same setting and under similar conditions. But the events Pindar chooses to describe are very different from the events presented in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

---

[20] ἐκ Λυκίας δὲ Γλαῦκον ἐλ-
θόντα τρόμεον Δαναοί. τοῖσι μέν
ἐξεύχετ᾽ ἐν ἄστεϊ Πει-
ράνας σφετέρου πατρὸς ἀρχάν
καὶ βαθὺν κλᾶρον ἔμμεν καὶ μέγαρον·

The earlier history of conflict between the Greeks and Trojans, for example, is alluded to only once in Homer, when Tlepolemos uses his father Herakles as a paradigm: since Herakles sacked Troy, so too will he, as Tlepolemos says to Sarpedon:

> You fall far short in truth of the others who were begotten of Zeus in the generations before us: such men as, they say, was the great strength of Herkales, my own father … came here on a time for the sake of Laomedon's horses, with six vessels only and the few men needed to man them, and widowed the streets of Ilion and sacked the city. (*Il*.5.638)[21]

Yet this first sack of Troy and other actions preceding the invasion described in the *Iliad* appear in several of Pindar's odes. In *Nem*.3, Pindar reports that "Telamon, fighting beside Iolaos, destroyed Laomedon and once joined him in pursuit of the brave Amazons" (*Nem*.3.36).[22]

Homer never reports that Aias's father had also sacked Troy. Homer is not concerned with the first sack of Troy by his heroes' fathers, and, it seems, equally unconcerned with the life of his heroes before they arrive in Troy. For example, in *Nemean 3*, Pindar describes Achilles's early life:

> Achilles, while living in Philyra's home, even as a child at play would… deal death in battle to wild lions and kill boars. He would bring their grasping bodies to the Centaur, Kronos's son, first when he was six, then in later years. (*Nem*.3.43)[23]

---

[21] ἀλλ' οἷόν τινά φασι βίην Ἡρακληείην
εἶναι, ἐμὸν πατέρα θρασυμέμνονα θυμολέοντα·
ὅς ποτε δεῦρ' ἐλθὼν ἕνεχ' ἵππων Λαομέδοντος
ἓξ οἴῃς σὺν νηυσὶ καὶ ἀνδράσι παυροτέροισιν
Ἰλίου ἐξαλάπαξε πόλιν, χήρωσε δ' ἀγυιάς·
[22] Λαομέδοντα δ' εὐρυσθενής
Τελαμὼν Ἰόλᾳ παραστάτας ἐὼν ἔπερσεν
καί ποτε χαλκότοξον Ἀμαζόνων μετ' ἀλκάν
ἕπετό οἱ.
[23] ξανθὸς δ' Ἀχιλεὺς τὰ μὲν μένων Φιλύρας ἐν δόμοις,
παῖς ἐὼν ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα· χερσὶ θαμινά
βραχυσίδαρον ἄκοντα πάλλων ἶσα τ' ἀνέμοις,
ἐν μάχᾳ λεόντεσσιν ἀγροτέροις ἔπρασσεν φόνον.

Of Achilles's precocious youth, we hear nothing in the Homeric corpus, though this would become a staple of subsequent literature about Achilles, such as Statius *Achilleid* and the anonymous fifteenth-century *Byzantine Achilleid*.

Pindar's poems often provide information not given in the Homeric epics. *Isthmian* 6, for example, provides information on the portentous birth of a Homeric hero. The poem describes how Herakles prayed for Telamon's wife to give birth to a noble son, at which point an eagle appeared, dispatched from Zeus and portending the birth of Aias. Though Aias is a prominent hero in the Homeric epics, this particular piece of information is never reported. Pindar's political aim was to praise his patrons, and the fantastic story of their ancestor's birth no doubt was pleasing. Though Homer certainly praises many of his heroes, it need not be limited to a single family or individual.

Another of Pindar's odes, *Nemean 7*, differs from Homer in the opposite way: while *Ishtmian 6* provides information about the pre-Trojan War lives of its heroes, *Nemean 7* recounts the post-Trojan War lives of its heroes, specifically, the death of Neoptolemos after his return. Similarly, in *Pythian 11*, Pindar recounts the story of Agamemnon's homecoming, his death at the hands of Clytemnaestra and Orestes's revenge on her.

Several of Pindar's odes differ from Homer's account of events even when they present similar events. Although Pindar's accounts at these points are never irreconcilably contradictory, they certainly have different foci. When, in the *Iliad*, Poseidon recounts the building of the walls of Troy, he complains to Apollo:

> Can you not even
> now remember all the evils we endured here by Ilion,
> you and I alone of the gods, when to proud Laomedon

> we came down from Zeus and for a year were his servants
> for a stated hire, and he told us what to do, and to do it?
> Then I built a wall for the Trojans about their city,
> wide and very splendid, so none could break into their city,
> but you, Phoibos, herded his shambling horn-curved cattle
> along the spurs of Ida with all her folds and forests.
> But when the changing seasons brought on the time for our labour
> to be paid, then headstrong Laomedon violated and made
> void all our hire, and sent us away, and sent threats after us. (*Il.*21.441)[24]

While Homer's focus is on the injustice done them by Laomedon, Pindar's version of the building of the walls of Troy makes no mention of this conflict. Instead, his account focuses on the human contribution and its prophetic importance: Poseidon and Apollo have summoned Aiakos to build the walls of Troy and when they are finished,

> Three blue-gray snakes tried to jump upon the rampart: two fell down and, stricken by terror, gave up their lives on the spot, but one leapt in with a shout of triumph. Apollo considered the adverse omen and immediately said: "Pergamos is to be captured, hero, at the site of your handiwork … not without your children; but it will begin with the first ones and also with the fourth." (*Ol.*8.37)[25]

---

[24] οὐδέ νυ τῶν περ
μέμνηαι ὅσα δὴ πάθομεν κακὰ Ἴλιον ἀμφὶ
μοῦνοι νῶϊ θεῶν, ὅτ' ἀγήνορι Λαομέδοντι
πὰρ Διὸς ἐλθόντες θητεύσαμεν εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
μισθῷ ἔπι ῥητῷ· ὃ δὲ σημαίνων ἐπέτελλεν.
ἤτοι ἐγὼ Τρώεσσι πόλιν πέρι τεῖχος ἔδειμα
εὐρύ τε καὶ μάλα καλόν, ἵν' ἄρρηκτος πόλις εἴη·
Φοῖβε σὺ δ' εἰλίποδας ἕλικας βοῦς βουκολέεσκες
Ἴδης ἐν κνημοῖσι πολυπτύχου ὑληέσσης.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μισθοῖο τέλος πολυγηθέες ὧραι
ἐξέφερον, τότε νῶϊ βιήσατο μισθὸν ἅπαντα
Λαομέδων ἔκπαγλος, ἀπειλήσας δ' ἀπέπεμπε.

[25] γλαυκοὶ δὲ δράκοντες, ἐπεὶ κτίσθη νέον,
πύργον ἐσαλλόμενοι τρεῖς, οἱ δύο μὲν κάπετον,
αὖθι δ' ἀτυζόμενοι ψυχὰς βάλον,
εἷς δ' ἐνόρουσε βοάσαις.
ἔννεπε δ' ἀντίον ὁρμαίνων τέρας εὐθὺς Ἀπόλλων·

Homer's account makes no mention of Aiakos having helped in building the walls of Troy and Pindar's account makes no mention of Laomedon have cheated Apollo and Poseidon, so the two accounts are not necessarily contradictory. The reason for the differences seems to lie in Pindar's extra-literary purpose. Pindar works under the patronage of the Aiakidai; he is paid to glorify them, and his strategy for doing so is to glorify the heroes from whom they claim descent. Homer, who has no apparent vested interest in glorifying the Aiakidai, omits the glorifying details. Homer's account of the building of Troy's walls, moreover, is relevant only as an explanation for the wrath of Poseidon against Troy; therefore his focus is on the offense Laomedon committed against him. Pindar's account, however, is meant to praise the Aiakidai; his account thus focuses not only on Aiakos's achievement in building the wall, but also on the glorious achievement of his descendants in twice conquering the city – and all this in order to cast reflected glory upon the current rulers of Aegina.

This conflict between Homer's authoritative-seeming account, which does not always glorify the Aiakidai, and Pindar's revisions, which must glorify them, can best be seen in the several odes in which Pindar treats the conflict between Aias and Odysseus over Achilles's arms. Bound by the plot of the myth, Pindar cannot alter the story so that Aias, an Aiakidai, will win the weapons. He must, therefore, find some way to maintain Aias's glory while at the same time staying faithful to Aias's defeat in the contest and his subsequent suicide.

In treating this scene in Book 11 of the *Odyssey*, Homer focalizes the scene through Odysseus; that is, the event is not described by the omniscient, objective narrator, but by Odysseus himself. Odysseus, moreover, is not telling the story in a disinterested fashion: he is at the court of Alkinoos, having arrived as a beggar, and is attempting to persuade Alkinoos to give him gifts and a journey home. It is to his advantage to make himself sound as heroic, admirable and glorious as possible, even if he has to lie. Indeed, it is Odysseus's practice to lie in order to secure what he needs for his own survival, a trait for which Athena highly praises him:

> It would be a sharp one, and a stealthy one, who would ever get past you
> in any contriving; even if it were a god against you.
> You wretch, so devious, never weary of tricks, then you would not
> even in your own country give over your ways of deceiving
> and your thievish tales. They are near to you in your very nature.
> (*Od.*13.291)[26]

Odysseus's deceit, cunning and, when necessary, self-aggrandizement are the key to his survival; his description of his own adventures, including the Aias story, cannot, therefore, be trusted as objective – a fact borne out by his rhetorical strategy. He begins his account of their meeting by marking Aias as the only one of the dead who still bore him a grudge:

> Only the soul of Telamonian Aias stood off
> at a distance from me, angry still over that decision
> I won against him, when beside the ships we disputed
> our cases for the arms of Achilleus. (*Od.*11.543)[27]

Odysseus then downplays his own responsibility for the competition:

> His queenly mother
> set them as prize, and the sons of the Trojan, with Pallas Athene,

---

[26] κερδαλέος κ' εἴη καὶ ἐπίκλοπος, ὅς σε παρέλθοι
ἐν πάντεσσι δόλοισι, καὶ εἰ θεὸς ἀντιάσειε.
σχέτλιε, ποικιλομῆτα, δόλων ἄατ', οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες,
οὐδ' ἐν σῇ περ ἐὼν γαίῃ, λήξειν ἀπατάων
μύθων τε κλοπίων, οἵ τοι πεδόθεν φίλοι εἰσίν.
[27] οἴη δ' Αἴαντος ψυχὴ Τελαμωνιάδαο
νόσφιν ἀφεστήκει, κεχολωμένη εἵνεκα νίκης,
τήν μιν ἐγὼ νίκησα δικαζόμενος παρὰ νηυσὶ
τεύχεσιν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆος·

> judged. (*Od.*11.547)[28]

Then he goes even further, expressing his own regret, combined with praise for the hero he defeated:

> I wish I had never won a contest like this,
> so high a head has gone under the ground for the sake of that armor,
> Aias, who for beauty and for achievement surpassed
> all the Danaans next to the stately son of Peleus. (*Od.*11.548)[29]

Before he has even spoken to Aias, he has already prepared his listeners for a version of the events wherein he is the more sympathetic and magnanimous of the two. This self-presentation continues in the speech he purports to have addressed to Aias, in which he again presents himself as the better of the two men, this time seeking forgiveness from the obstinate Aias and ultimately blaming Zeus for the entire undertaking. In Odysseus's version of the events, then, everyone from Athena, Thetis, Zeus and the mortals who decided on the victor bears some responsibility for Aias's suicide – but Odysseus, none at all.

This theme of Homer's unjust treatment of Aias recurs in several of Pindar's odes. In *Nemean* 7, Pindar writes:

> I believe that Odysseus's story
> has become greater than his actual suffering
> because of Homer's sweet verse,
> for upon his fictions and soaring craft
> rests great majesty, and his skill
> deceives with misleading tales. (*Nem.*7.20)[30]

---

[28] ἔθηκε δὲ πότνια μήτηρ,
παῖδες δὲ Τρώων δίκασαν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.

[29] ὡς δὴ μὴ ὄφελον νικᾶν τοιῷδ' ἐπ' ἀέθλῳ·
τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ἕνεκ' αὐτῶν γαῖα κατέσχεν,
Αἴανθ', ὃς περὶ μὲν εἶδος, περὶ δ' ἔργα τέτυκτο
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα.

[30] ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι
λόγον Ὀδυσσέος ἢ πάθαν

Because Pindar’s patrons consider Aias an ancestor, Homer’s inglorious account of Aias’s actions must be corrected. Rather than dispute the facts surrounding the story, which were viewed as having a historical veracity, Pindar takes issue with the way in which the events are narrated, blaming the beauty of Homer’s poetry for glorifying Odysseus over Aias. Then Pindar blames the Achaeans themselves for not judging properly which of the two heroes is most worthy:

> The great majority
> of men have a blind heart, for if they could have seen
> the truth, mighty Aias, in anger over the arms,
> would not have planted in his chest
> the smooth sword. (*Nem.*7.23)[31]

Pindar places the blame for Aias’s suicide, then, first on Homer and then on the men who unjustly decided against him. Where Homer had blamed everyone but his hero Odysseus, Pindar blames everyone but Aias. That Pindar was paid to glorify the Aiakidai, who claim Aias as their ancestor, may explain his attacks on the Homeric account of that hero’s behavior as well as his own attempts to correct the historical record on that count. Indeed, Pindar makes the same complaint about the treatment of Aias in *Nem. 8*. He writes:

> Words are dessert
> to the envious, and envy fastens
> always on the good, but has no quarrel with lesser men.

διὰ τὸν ἁδυεπῆ γενέσθ’ Ὅμηρον·
ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσί οἱ ποτανᾷ <τε> μαχανᾷ
σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι· σοφία
δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις.

[31] τυφλὸν δ’ ἔχει
ἦτορ ὅμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος. εἰ γὰρ ἦν
ἒ τὰν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὔ κεν ὅπλων χολωθείς
ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν
λευρὸν ξίφος·

> It was that which feasted on the son of Telamon
> when it rolled him onto his sword. (*Nem*.8.22)[32]

Again, Pindar, while not changing the basic fact of Aias's suicide nor directly contradicting Homer, nevertheless attributes to it different reasons than does Homer. As in *Nemean* 7, Pindar relieves Aias of agency in his own suicide, instead making "it" (envy) the subject and "the son of Telamon" (Aias) the object.

By arguing that envy "feasted on the son of Telamon" and "it rolled him onto his sword," Pindar transforms Aias's suicide into a murder, with "envy" as the active agent. Pindar even makes this into a virtue by asserting that envy always "fastens on the good." The scene, therefore, is treated as one in which a good man is murdered by his own virtuousness.

Further, *Nemean* 8 offers Odysseus as a negative exemplum, that is, as a person whose actions and behavior are not to be emulated, but condemned. Pindar is forced to explain to his patrons why, though Odysseus has won Achilles's armor and was therefore deemed more worthy than Aias, he was not, in fact, more deserving of it. *Nemean* 8 again emphasizes following Trojan War paradigms as a means of earning κλέος while at the same time revising Homer's version of events to justify bestowing that κλέος on Aias. Pindar also contradicts the Homeric judgment of the comparison between Odysseus and Aias:

> In truth, unequal indeed were the wounds they tore
> in the warm flesh of their foes
> with succouring spears when they were hard pressed,

---

[32] ὄψον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν,
ἅπτεται δ’ ἐσλῶν ἀεί, χειρόνεσσι δ’ οὐκ ἐρίζει.
κεῖνος καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἱόν,
φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις.

> both in fighting over Achilles newly slain
> and in the murderous days of their other
> labors. Yes, hateful deception existed long ago,
> the companion of flattering tales,
> guileful contriver, evil-working disgrace,
> which represses what is illustrious,
> but holds up for obscure men a glory that is rotten. (*Nem*.8.28)[33]

Pindar argues that Aias's deeds were greater than Odysseus's, but that Odysseus was the more convincing speaker and that he used guile and deceit – two charges regularly leveled at Odysseus – to achieve his ends. Pindar then contrasts the glory of Aias, that which is "illustrious," with that which Odysseus received, "a glory that is rotten." Homer's account pits two types of prowess against one another: the physical prowess of Aias and the mental prowess of Odysseus. Odysseus's winning of the armor can be read as the emergence of a new kind of hero: the smart, cunning and resourceful hero, replacing the old Aias-type hero whose only attribute is his physical power. Pindar reverses this analysis, suggesting that the straightforward and honorable Aias was cheated by the deceptive liar Odysseus. Aias, therefore, is the truly honorable and praiseworthy one.

Switching to the first person, Pindar then offers up Odysseus and Aias as opposing exempla:

> May I never have such a disposition,

---

[33] ἦ μὰν ἀνόμοιά γε δᾴοισιν ἐν θερμῷ χροῒ
ἕλκεα ῥῆξαν πελεμιζόμενοι
ὑπ’ ἀλεξιμβρότῳ
λόγχᾳ, τὰ μὲν ἀμφ’ Ἀχιλεῖ νεοκτόνῳ,
ἄλλων τε μόχθων ἐν πολυφθόροις.
ἀμέραις. ἐχθρὰ δ’ ἄρα πάρφασις ἦν καὶ πάλαι,
αἱμύλων μύθων ὁμόφοι-
τος, δολοφραδής, κακοποιὸν ὄνειδος·
ἃ τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν βιᾶται,
τῶν δ’ ἀφάντων κῦδος ἀντείνει σαθρόν.

> father Zeus, but let me travel
> the straightforward paths of life,
> so that when I die I may nay leave my children
> with no such disreputable fame. (*Nem*.8.34)[34]

Pindar prays to Zeus that he not be like Odysseus, but that he be straightforward like Aias. Then Pindar makes the connection between the Homeric paradigm and the earning of κλέος, for if one behaves like Odysseus, one will leave a disreputable fame. Thus, in this rendering, Odysseus is a negative paradigm to be avoided, for the κλέος that comes with emulating him is disreputable.

The use of Trojan heroes as paradigms for heroic behavior and the genealogical connection to these heroes as justification for political legitimacy are intertwined in Pindar's odes. They find their union in the great heroes of the past. These great heroes were often claimed as ancestors by Pindar's patrons: athletic victors from the ruling families of Greece. In the case of Aegina, the ruling family, the Aiakidai, claimed as ancestors heroes who fought at Troy, such as Aias and Achilles. In comparing their victories in athletic competition to the deeds of their ancestors in war, Pindar praises his patrons for acting like their glorious ancestors. In doing so, Pindar praises his patrons, strengthens their genealogical link to the heroes of Troy and, since those heroes also ruled in Aegina, strengthens the political legitimacy of their rule. The Trojan War is, therefore, a crucial element in the justification of the exercise of political power by Pindar's patrons.

---

[34] εἴη μή ποτέ μοι τοιοῦτον ἦθος,
Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἀλλὰ κελεύθοις
ἁπλόαις ζωᾶς ἐφαπτοίμαν, θανὼν ὡς παισὶ κλέος
μὴ τὸ δύσφαμον προσάψω.

To create this political legitimacy for his patrons, Pindar draws on episodes from the Trojan War, many of which were already narrated in the Homeric corpus. Since Pindar's aims were often at odds with Homer's, he often altered his presentation of an event narrated in Homer to support his own political and literary aims. Homer, however, had a great deal of historical authority and Pindar was therefore unable to contradict him explicitly on such matters. While not contradicting the events themselves, he corrected what he saw as errors in Homer's presentations of them. In one important respect, however, Homer and Pindar are in perfect agreement: that the Trojan War was a locus for winning great glory, κλέος, and that its heroes should be emulated. These three trends, then – using Homeric heroes as a paradigm for current behavior, using Homer to support claims of political legitimacy, and altering certain Homeric elements which conflict with the author's literary purpose – are all present in Pindar. The rest of the dissertation will demonstrate their continuing importance to the reception of Homer and other Trojan War literature in later Antiquity, the Middle Ages and beyond.

IV. The Past-as-Paradigm Motif in Attic Tragedy

For the tragedians, as with Pindar, the Trojan War was also a source of models of how to live. The primary difference between the Pindaric paradigm and the tragic paradigm can be seen in the intended audience of the two genres. Pindar's audience was his patron: the man to whom the ode was addressed. The tragic audience, however, consisted of the entire citizen-body of Athens. As a result, where Pindar's paradigms focused on how an individual should conduct himself, the tragic paradigm focused on how the city-state should conduct itself.

Tragedy's engagement with contemporary issues and the hortatory function of such works can be seen in the Athenians' reaction to the staging of Phrynichus's play *The Capture of Miletus.* Performed in 511 BCE, this play dramatized the real sack of that city some years earlier. According to Herodotus

> The Athenians … showed their profound distress at the capture of Miletus in a number of ways, and in particular, when Phrynichus produced his play, *The Capture of Miletus*, the audience in the theatre burst into tears. The author was fined a thousand drachmas for reminding them of their own evils, and they forbade anybody ever to put the play on the stage again. (Hdt.6.21)[35]

Phrynichus's selection of a contemporary event was meant to have immediate political ramifications. In "Greek Drama as Education," (1970) Peter Arnott argues: "It is more than possible that Phrynicus was acting as spokesman for the pro-war party, and that his work was intended to foment anti-Persian feeling. His subsequent connection with Themistocles would lend support to this theory" (37). In the earliest stages of Attic Tragedy, the playwright felt no need to look to the past for paradigms to exhort his fellow citizens towards a particular position. Instead, he drew directly from contemoirary events to persuade them as to what actions they should take.

Phrynichus, however, was censured for producing this play. Having learned from Phrynichus's example, later tragedians refrained from direct criticism or commentary on Athenian politics in favor of a safer, oblique form of criticism. The only other tragedy based on historical events, *The Persians*, is also the oldest extant tragedy, which suggests that tragedians did not completely and immediately abandon contemporary events as the subject matter for tragedy for several more years. Yet, even though this play ostensibly deals with recent events, Simon Goldhill points out in "Battle Narratives in Aeschylus' *Persae*" (1988) that "there are elements that make 'history play' a misleading term to apply. It is, like most other tragedies, set in and largely concerned with a place that is not Athens" (189). But even this play, like *The Capture of Miletus* before it, serves a paradigmatic function. Goldhill continues: "The Persians provide for the Athenian audience an *exemplum,* so critics have argued, of the need to avoid *hubris*. As often in Athenian culture, the East constitutes a privileged locus of what is different from Athenian society, which is used to articulate concerns and positive values about the Athenians' own selves – the logic of the negative exemplum" ("Battle Narratives" 189).

---

[35] Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν γὰρ δῆλον ἐποίησαν ὑπεραχθεσθέντες τῇ Μιλήτου ἁλώσι τῇ τε ἄλλῃ πολλαχῇ καὶ δὴ καὶ ποιήσαντι Φρυνίχῳ δρᾶμα Μιλήτου ἅλωσιν καὶ διδάξαντι ἐς δάκρυά τε ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον καὶ ἐζημίωσάν μιν ὡς ἀναμνήσαντα οἰκήια κακὰ χιλίῃσι δραχμῇσι, καὶ ἐπέταξαν μηκέτι μηδένα χρᾶσθαι τούτῳ τῷ δράματι.

The example of Phrynichus, the fact that the only other historical play is also the oldest and the series of lawsuits directed at Aristophanes for criticism of contemporary politicians, suggests that playwrights moved away from direct criticism of Athens in favor of an oblique approach in order to avoid arousing public anger. That is to say, the tragedians realized that they were better off depicting the fall of Troy rather than the fall of Miletus if they wanted to address such issues. The paradigmatic function of tragedy was, therefore, removed to the distant and mythical past.

An early twentieth century proponent of this approach was Gilbert Murray, who attempted, in *Euripides and His Age* (1918), to relate each of Euripides's works to some historical event upon which they acted as commentary. In Murray's reading, for example, the *Trojan Women* becomes oblique criticism of the Athenian razing of Melos:

> Euripides must have been brooding on the crime of Melos during the autumn and winter. In the spring, when the great fleet was still getting ready to sail [for the disastrous Sicilian Expedition] he produced [*The Trojan Women*]. … At the very beginning we see gods brooding over the wreck of Troy; as they might be brooding over that wrecked island in the Aegean [Melos], whose walls were as ancient as Troy's own. ... Such is the handiwork of Athena. (65)

In this reading of Euripides, Melos represents Troy and the Athenians represent both their eponymous deity Athena and the Achaeans. But Murray presses the past-as-paradigm motif further, comparing the Achaean homecoming to the Sicilian Expedition: "[Athena] is no sooner mentioned than she appears. But she is changed. Her favourites have gone too far; they have committed *Hubris*, insulted the altars of the gods and defiled virgins in holy places. Athena herself is now turned against her people. Their great fleet, flushed with conquest and stained with sin, is just about to set sail" (65). A storm destroys the homecoming Achaean fleet, just as the Sicilian Expedition will be destroyed only a few years later, leading Murray to call the *Trojan Women* "the work rather of a prophet than a mere artist" (65).

The tragedian, then, uses the past as a paradigm, condemning the Athenian action in Melos through a depiction of a story from the past made parallel to the situation present in Euripides's own time. Applying Murray's historical/dramatic allegorical theory of oblique criticism, Arnott notes several other instances in which tragedy was used in this way: "In Sophocles, the Spartans tend to be cast as heavies: thus Menelaus in *Ajax*. In *Hecuba*, Euripides can create a vicious and morally irresponsible incumbent of the Thracian throne who possessed the same qualities to a marked degree" (37).

Murray's and Arnott's analyses attempt to locate a particular moment of historical circumstance, either in the dramatist's personal life or in the life of his city, which serves as the impetus for a given play. Such a close pairing of historical event and tragedy, however, has been contested by other scholars. A. Maria van Erp Taalman Kip, for example, takes issue with Murray's reading. In *Euripides and Melos* (1987), she argues that (what she approximates as) the three and a half months between the sack of Melos and the Great Dionysia would not have been enough time for Euripides to write the tragedy and train the chorus. But even she is forced to admit that much of her evidence is speculative. Since her argument is based so strictly in chronology, the strength of her conclusion is limited by the fact that she does not know how long the siege of Melos lasted: "It seems a fair guess that all this must have taken, at the very least, some forty days" (van Erp Taalman Kip 415). As for the length of time required to train a chorus, she argues that there is no scholarly consensus, nor is there any ancient evidence, yet she still asserts that "[i]f the training lasted three and a half to four months, it seems virtually impossible that both the writing and the production of the play were completed between the massacre at Melos and the Dionysia" (415). The premise of her refutation of Murray's position (which had become the dominant one) is based entirely on chronology. The fact that her timeline is based on assumption makes it less than conclusive.

But perhaps due to problems like the ones van Erp Taalman Kip identified, more recent critics have sought to loosen the relationship between a specific tragedy and a specific historical event even while retaining the overall conviction that tragedy was a vehicle of social criticism. Simon Goldhill, for example, argues in "Civic Ideology and the Problem of Difference," his contribution to *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?* (1990), that "the tragedies themselves, for all that they are enacted at the scene of 'the other' – distant places, former times, alien figures – and for all that they are great poetry and concerned with general matters in a generalizing manner, reveal a constant concern with contemporary political discourse" (35).[36] Rather than trying for a one-to-one relationship between historical events and Attic tragedies, Goldhill seems to be arguing for a broader reading of Greek tragedy not necessarily engaging with the specific moment, but with "contemporary political discourse" (35). Contemporary political discourse is something more theoretical and less time-specific than Murray's approach, and thus less subject to the kind of criticism that Murray's work engendered.

In another article from *Nothing to Do with Dionysos*, Froma Zeitlin sets out just such a model for a more discursive and less episodic understanding of the paradigmatic function of tragedy. In "Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama" she argues that the Thebes which appears in Attic Tragedy serves as the location for oblique criticism and commentary on contemporary Athens. Tragedies about Thebes, she writes, "can also illuminate the ideological uses of Athenian theater as it portrays a city onstage that is meant to be dramatically other than itself. Thebes, I will argue, provides the negative model to Athens's manifest image of itself with regard to its notions of the proper management of city, society and self" (131). Thebes becomes a negative paradigm for Athens, a city ruled by an incestuous monarchy where powerless citizens suffer because of the unjust actions of the few. Seeing such a city on stage would reinforce the Athenians' own faith in the justice and moderation of their democracy. Without criticizing Athens directly, the tragedians were nevertheless able to comment on oligarchic and monarchic impulses within the city. Zeitlin, therefore, presents a model in which the cities where the tragedies take place serve as exempla for Athenians to learn about how to govern their own domestic affairs.

---

[36] For a rebuttal to Goldhill, cf. Jasper Griffin (1998) who argues that Athenian tragedy was purely for aesthetic pleasure and had no democratic or civic function in the polis. For rebuttals to Griffin, cf. Seaford (2000) and Gregory (2002).

But Zeitlin's schema, accurate though it may be in describing the relationships between these cities on the Athenian stage, makes no mention of the other great locus for Attic tragedy, Troy. By applying Zeitlin's model of civic identity to tragedies which draw their mythical material from the Trojan Cycle, a portrait of just what type of paradigm Troy offered contemporary Athenians comes into view: if Thebes is an exemplum for an alternate version of Athenian domestic politics, Troy may be viewed as a locus for oblique criticism of Athenian foreign policy. Specifically, Troy becomes the locus for the sympathetic treatment of the defeated, thus serving as a constant indictment against the conquerors. In his reading of *The Trojan Women*, Murray notes how this sympathy for the defeated undermines the glory of war and becomes, inescapably, though obliquely, critical of the Athenian imperial enterprise:

> [*The Trojan Women*] tells of the proudest conquest wrought by Greek arms in legend, the taking of Troy by the armies of Agamemnon. But it tells the old legend in a peculiar way. Slowly, reflectively, with little stir of the blood, we are made to look at the great glory, until we see not glory at all but shame and blindness and a world swallowed up at night. At the very beginning we see the gods brooding over the wreck of Troy; as they might be brooding over that wrecked island in the Aegean. (65)

As Murray's reading of *The Trojan Women* suggests, in Euripidean tragedy in particular Troy serves as a cautionary exemplum for Athens. An example of this can be seen in *The Trojan Women*: although the close association of the massacre at Melos and the production of the tragedy has been called into question, the basic premise of Murray's analysis – the play's anti-war message – remained a feature of subsequent scholarship.

This anti-war message is laid out in the dialogue between Athena and Poseidon at the play's opening. Poseidon says:

> Fool, that in sack of towns lays temples waster, and tombs, the sanctuaries of the dead! He, sowing desolation, reaps destruction. (Tr*oj.Wom.*95)[37]

This line has traditionally been read suggest an anti-war message based on reciprocity: he who sacks cities will ultimately be destroyed.[38]

This introductory discussion between Poseidon and Athena is also the starting place for Philip Vellacott's *Ironic Drama: A Study of Euripides's Method and Meaning* (1975). Vellacott argues that Euripidean tagedy places responsibility for war solely on the individuals making the decisions and not on any divine causes (163). In particular, he argues that the Athenians in the audience, so soon after the massacre at Melos, would be able to see the relationship between their own behavior in war and the behavior they see on the stage:

> Talthybius refers twice to the sentence on Astyanax, in terms regularly used for decisions of the Athenian *ecclesia, edoxe* (713), 'it was decided,' and 'psephos ekranthe (785), a vote was taken and ratified.'… If there was one man in the theatre at the Great Dionysia in 415 B.C. who had used his sword, under orders, in the mass killing in Melos some nine months earlier, Talthybius spoke for him; for it is unlikely that he had forgotten the occasion (Vellacott 165).

He concludes that Euripides's "characters by word and act hold up a mirror to contemporary patters of behaviour on which he tacitly invites his audience to venture their judgments" (7). Euripides uses the Achaeans as a cautionary paradigm for the Athenians themselves. In the mouths of Athena and Poseidon, he warns against *hubris* in the form of imperial over-reaching at the opening of the play. Later, by using the official language of the Athenian democratic pocess to describe the death sentence of an infant, he shows how every citizen in a democracy has a share in the often senseless violence and brutality of war. Euripides uses a tragic representation of Troy to obliquely criticize current Athenian politics.

---

[37] μῶρος δὲ θνητῶν ὅστις ἐκπορθεῖ πόλεις
ναούς τε τύμβους θ', ἱερὰ τῶν κεκμηκότων·
ἐρημίαι δούς σφ' αὐτὸς ὤλεθ' ὕστερον.
All translations of Euripides from *Children of Hercules, Hippolytus, Andromache, Hecuba.* Trans. Kovacs, David and *Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles*. Trans. Kovacs, David.

[38] Cf. Kovacs, pg. 336 for a discussion of previous criticism on this line and for his own take on the issue.

NT Croally's reading of the play also relies upon Troy as a mirror for Athens. In *Euripidean Polemic: The* Trojan Women *and the Function of Tragedy* (1994), he argues that "Euripides's Troy is not only a rewriting of the city inherited from Homer; it also shows marked similarity to the space of Athens. And, for an Athenian audience experiencing the increasing brutality of war, the sight of space so catastrophically disrupted may have been disturbing" (205). The basis for Croally's argument is the plays focus on the razing of the walls of Troy, which Croally contrasts with Pericles's strategy of bringing all the Athenians inside the walls of the city. The walls of Troy, however, prove over the course of the play not to be as impenetrable as the Trojans thought. The last action for which the walls were used before being destroyed was to throw the infant Astyanax from them to his death. Once again, Troy becomes a cautionary exemplum for Athens, whose own walls protected her against Spartan invasion. In this, too, Euripides would prove correct, for though the Spartans did not raze the city entirely, they did demand the Athenians tear down the long walls connecting the city to the port of Piraeus.

When Polymestor speaks the line with which this section opened (*Hec.* 956-60), he is offering the Athenians a cautionary exemplum. Arnott quotes his speech as an example of Thracian heresy, but, applying Goldhill and Zeitlin's model, it is just as likely that this is a cautionary tale about *hubris* that could be equally applied to the Athenians: though today they are in a position of power and can perjure their oaths towards friends and allies, someday, they, too, might end up in the reverse situation. From a literary perspective, this is foreshadowing, for this is exactly what happens to Polymestor in the play. From a broader ideological perspective, however, the warning is directed much more generally, not towards a specific Thracian king or specific moment in time, but as part of a broader "contemporary political discourse." The tragedians placed the locus for their critique of contemporary society in a distant and mythical past, allowing the past to serve as a cautionary paradigm for their own times.

Chapter 2: The Trojan War in Classical Latin Literature

I. The Past-as-Paradigm in Classical Latin Literature

Virgil, ever the dutiful student of Homer, was well aware of the rhetorical force of the Homeric paradigm; indeed, Aeneas's first appearance in *The Aeneid* is a speech in which he uses a paradigm from the Trojan War. As a storm descends on his fleet:

> Aeneas on the instant felt his knees
> Go numb and slack, and stretched both hands to heaven,
> Groaning out:
> Triply lucky, all you men
> To whom death came before your fathers' eyes
> Below the wall at Troy! Bravest Danaan,
> Diomedes, why could I not go down
> When you had wounded me, and lose my life
> On Ilium's battlefield? Our Hector lies there,
> Torn by Achilles's weapon; there Sarpedon,
> Our giant fighter, lies; and there the river
> Simois washes down so many shields
> And helmets, with strong bodies taken under! (1.131)[1]

To Aeneas, the deaths of these men, Sarpedon and Hector, the great heroes of the Trojans, stand as paradigms of noble death; Aeneas, seeking to understand the quality of his own impending death, compares it to their example, and finds his wanting.

---

[1] Extemplo Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra:
ingemit, et duplicis tendens ad sidera palmas
talia voce refert: 'O terque quaterque beati,
quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis
contigit oppetere! O Danaum fortissime gentis
Tydide! Mene Iliacis occumbere campis
non potuisse, tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra,
saevus ubi Aeacidae telo iacet Hector, ubi ingens
Sarpedon, ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis
scuta virum galeasque et fortia corpora volvit?' (1.92)
All translations from *The Aeneid* are by Fitzgerald.

The most important use of the past-as-paradigm motif in the *Aeneid* is not to be found in what Aeneas says, but rather in the character of Aeneas himself. The Roman audience of the poem read Aeneas paradigmatically, though they disagreed about whether he was a paradigm to be imitated or avoided. In "Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal" (1933), CM Bowra, an early twentieth century advocate of Aeneas as positive paradigm, argues that several important Romans authors, including Horace, Tibullus, Ovid, Statius, Juvenal and others "believed in Aeneas as an ideal man. Virgil's contemporaries and successors reiterated with wearisome devotion praises of Aeneas" (9).

The paradigmatic significance of the *Aeneid* lies not simply in the character of Aeneas, however. *The Aeneid*, much like Pindar's odes and Euripides's tragedies, is not, like the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, simply an inherited though influential text, but rather a work commissioned by a specific person with a specific political and ideological stake in the message of the work. In the case of Pindar's odes, the athletic victors who served as Pindar's patrons paid the poet to produce odes which glorified both themselves and their ancestors. In the case of Euripides's tragedies, the playwright used his medium to obliquely comment and critique contemporary Athenian politics. For the poet of the *Aeneid*, the political context of the work was the ascendance of Augustus, the end of the Roman civil war, his violent retribution against Julius Caesar's assassins and Rome's relation to her great rival, Carthage.

Simultaneous, however, with the works of those who praised Aeneas as the ideal Roman, a parallel tradition was emerged in which Aeneas served as a cautionary exemplum. In Carvilius Pictor's *Aeneomastix*, Aeneas is "accused of having deserved the hostility of Juno, of having deserted, if not betrayed, his country of Troy, of sleeping when the attack was made, of not carrying the Penates himself, of losing Creusa, of not restoring Troy, and of deserting his comrades in Sicily" (Bowra 10). Early Christian writers, too, saw Aeneas as a cautionary exemplum to be avoided.[2]

A similar debate has emerged in modern scholarship. According to Hans-Peter Stahl in "Aeneas – An 'Unheroic' Hero?" (1981),

> Traditional interpretations of the *Aeneid* tend to draw on programmatic passages… to lend special support to Augustus by showing that his rule, equivalent to the return of the Golden Age, was fate-ordained all along. The Julians' ancestor, Aeneas, acts in agreement with Jove and Fate. … Let us add that moral innocence and suffering without guilt are reserved for the Trojan (Julian) party. (157)

Because of Stahl's view that anti-Imperialist tendencies were in the academy in the 1960s, a new school of thought emerged in which scholars found "an anti-imperial Virgil who undercuts his own programmatic passages" (157).[3] Michael Putnam is one such scholar, and in his *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (1989) he argues that not only is Aeneas as a character a negative exemplum, but the *Aeneid* as a work of literature stands as an oblique criticism of Augustan political ideology: "The tragedy of the destruction of Turnus and his world does much to negate any romantic notion of the *Aeneid* as an ideal vision of the greatness of Augustan Rome … only the most superficial reading of the

---

[2] Bowra makes a special point of noting the hostility Virgil aroused in the early Church writers, to whom pagan literature was "one of the greatest obstacles the Church had to overcome…. Tertullian sneers at Aeneas for escaping from Troy only to fall into the arms of 'the Carthaginian woman' [*ad Nat. 2.9*]. Augustine takes him as typical of Stoic hardness of heart in his treatment of Dido [*Civ. Dei. 9.4*]; Lactantius bitterly compares his promises of goodwill and peace to the Latin ambassadors with his actual behaviour after the death of Pallas [*Inst.5.10.5*]" (10).

[3] The two points of view are the so-called "Imperial" or "Optimistic" school, which viewed Virgil as a glorifier and apologist for Roman imperial expansion under Augustus, and the "Harvard" or "Pessimistic" school, which argued that Virgil undermined the imperial program he was ostensibly supporting. For a synthesis of the two positions, cf. Parry.

Aeneid can find in its hero a model for Augustus or, more unfortunate still, a glorification of the accomplishments of Rome" (193).

Though he wrote some fifty years before Putnam, Bowra has nevertheless pre-empted this line of reasoning. Putnam's argument for Aeneas's failure is his inability to restrain his vengeful anger at the death of Pallas. Bowra argues that, though many critics, both ancient and modern, have found Aeneas wanting as an ideal hero, their readings misunderstand the theoretical ideal of which Aeneas is the embodiment (8). He agrees with Aeneas's fiercest critics that the hero fails at many of his tasks, but he believes this failure is because the ideal – the "Stoic Ideal" of Bowra's title – requires an *exercite*, a test. This word had a special significance in Stoic philosophy: "Whom the gods loved, they tested. They loved Aeneas, there was no question, and therefore they tested him. Without such testing, virtue was impossible." (15). With this theory, Bowra is able, then, to explain how, despite his many failures, Aeneas is still a paradigm to be emulated: "To the Stoics it was ultimately unimportant that in the courses of his moral development he should fail. The past would count for nothing provided that in the end he found virtue" (15). For Aeneas to be a model of this type, then, he has to fail at some moments in order to achieve the ideal Stoic virtue that can only come through divine tests.

This still leaves Bowra, however, with the problem of reconciling his Aeneas as a paradigm of Stoic virtue with the decidedly un-Stoic rage in the killing of Turnus at the conclusion of the poem. His solution is to take into account the patron of the poem. He argues that Virgil shapes his character in the mold of his patron, and that how the patron behaves (particularly when that patron is the Emperor) becomes *de facto* a laudable paradigm:

> It seems that in these angry scenes Virgil must have had Augustus himself in mind. … After Philippi Augustus was said to have behaved much as Aeneas behaved after the death of Pallas. Both had deaths to avenge and both were merciless in exacting vengeance. Aeneas refuses burial to Tarquitus, telling him that he would be left to the birds and the fishes would lick his wounds. It was told of Augustus that in answer to a man who begged humbly for burial, he said that the birds would soon settle that question [Suetonius, *Vit. Aug. 13*]. Aeneas is so angry that no appeal to the names of Anchises and Ascanius move him to spare Magus or Lucagus: it was told of Augustus that he made sons play ‘mora’ with their fathers to decide which should live, and then looked on while both died [Suetonius, *Vit. Aug. 13*]. Aeneas sacrificed the sons of Sulmo at Pallas’s pyre: Augustus was said to have sacrificed three hundred prisoners of war after Perusia on the Ides of March at the altar of Julius [Suetonius, *Vit. Aug. 15*]. (18)

In a clever bit of circular logic, Virgil gives Aeneas an Augustan rage and Aeneas, as the ideal Roman, becomes the justification for the very rage on which his own was modeled.

Virgil and Augustus also find support for this sort of vengeful rage in the *Iliad*, which begins with the wrath of Achilles:

> Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus’s son Achilleus
> and its devastation, which put pains thousandfold upon the Achaians,
> hurled in their multitudes to the house of Hades strong souls
> of heroes, but gave their bodies to be the delicate feasting
> of dogs, of all birds. (*Il.*1.1)[4]

The idea of leaving bodies unburied for birds is, at the very outset of the poem, attributed to Achilles’s wrath. Further, the phrase is repeated at the moment when Achilles has just given Hektor his mortal wound. Hektor begs for proper burial, to which Achilles replies: “ἀλλὰ κύνες τε καὶ οἰωνοὶ κατὰ πάντα δάσονται,” “Dogs and birds will have you all for their feasting" (22.354). Both Virgil and Augustus would have been well aware of these moments in the *Iliad*, and it is no surprise that these themes appear in the *Aeneid*.

---

[4] Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί’ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε’ ἔθηκε,
πολλὰς δ’ ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν
ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν
οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι,

Additionally, Achilles, having killed Lykaon, hurls his body into the river, saying:

> Lie there now among the fish, who will lick the blood away
> from your wound, and care nothing for you. (*Il*.21.122)[5]

These are almost the exact words with which Suetonius describes Augustus's wrath. There is also a clear *Iliadic* parallel for Aeneas's and Augustus's offer of human sacrifices at the tomb of the dead: at *Il*.23.175-182, Achilles sacrifices twelve noble Trojan youths whom he has captured at Patroklos's funeral pyre.

Virgil uses Achilles as a paradigm for Aeneas, who in turn justified Augustus's actions and rage at Caesar's death: Augustus's was a performative rage and revenge modeled on a paradigm from the Trojan War, that of Achilles at the death of Patroklos. Virgil's depiction of Aeneas's rage and revenge, too, was modeled, like so much else in the *Aeneid,* after Homer.

Aeneas embodies all those attributes which Augustus found best and, as the paradigmatic Roman, becomes a positive exemplum; Dido and Turnus, however, as the paradigmatic Carthaginian and barbarian, Rome's historic enemies, become negative exempla: where Aeneas is unimpassioned (except in revenge) Dido and Turnus are overcome by their emotions, Turnus by his love for Lavinia and Dido by her love for Aeneas. Where Aeneas puts his people first, Dido lets Carthage languish while she pines for Aeneas and Turnus fights not for the good of his land and people, but for himself. The main players in the poem, Turnus, Dido and Aeneas most of all, are paradigmatic, and the virtues and vices which they display are those which Virgil's patron, Augustus, either displayed or wanted to emulate.

---

[5] ἐνταυθοῖ νῦν κεῖσο μετ' ἰχθύσιν, οἵ σ' ὠτειλὴν
αἷμ' ἀπολιχμήσονται ἀκηδέες·

II. The Genealogical Justification in the *Aeneid*

In *Aen.*8.129, Aeneas comes to Evander, seeking allies in his war against the Rutulians, and his rhetorical strategy for securing such aid relies on their genealogical connection, a point Aeneas makes early on in his address:

> I have not feared you as Arcadian
> Or captain of Danaans, or blood-kin
> Of the Atridae. No, my own manhood
> And heaven's holy words, our ancestry
> In common, and your fame through all the world,
> Have brought me here by destiny, and gladly,
> To join my strength with yours. The Greeks maintain
> Electra bore the founding father of Troy,
> Old Dardanus, who sailed to the Teucrians.
> Electra was the child of that prodigious
> Atlas who upholds the heavenly sphere
> On a snowy shoulder. Father of your line
> Was Mercury, whom snow-white Maia bore
> On the cold summit of Cyllene – Maia,
> Father, if we can trust these tales,
> By that same Atlas, pillar of starry sky.
> So both our lines are branches of one blood. (8.181)[6]

---

[6] Non equidem extimui Danaum quod ductor et Arcas
quodque a stirpe fores geminis coniunctus Atridis;
sed mea me uirtus et sancta oracula diuum
cognatique patres, tua terris didita fama,
coniunxere tibi et fatis egere uolentem.
Dardanus, Iliacae primus pater urbis et auctor,
Electra, ut Grai perhibent, Atlantide cretus,
aduehitur Teucros; Electram maximus Atlase
didit, aetherios umero qui sustinet orbis.
uobis Mercurius pater est, quem candida Maia
Cyllenae gelido conceptum uertice fudit;
at Maiam, auditis si quicquam credimus, Atlas,
idem Atlas generat caeli qui sidera tollit.
sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno.

This is, however, not Aeneas's only persuasive strategy, for immediately after stressing the genealogical tie, Aeneas pushes for an alliance based on a far more practical and immediate concern:

> If they defeat and rout us,
> nothing, so they believe, stands in the way
> of their subduing all Hesperia,
> Ruling the seas that bathe her, north and south. (*Aen*.8.197)[7]

Aeneas suggests to them that if they do not help him, they will be, at least, attacked by them and possibly conquered. Aeneas's speech lays out two reasons for Evander and the Arcadians to come to his aid, one based on a tenuous genealogical connection, the other based on mutual self-interest. In his reply, Evander agrees to join forces with the Trojans, but his response only addresses one of the reasons Aeneas had put forth:

> Most gallant Teucrian,
> How happily I welcome you and know you;
> How you remind me of your father's speech,
> The voice of great Anchises, and his look!
> For I remember how Prince Priam, son
> Of old Laomedon, Salamis-bound
> To the kingdom of Hesione, his sister,
> Visited the cold Arcadian land. (*Aen*.8.208)[8]

Evander's response suggests that he is swayed exclusively by the genealogical connection. This is all the more surprising given that their genealogical connection is not only distant but also possibly not even true as implied by Aeneas's "if we can trust these tales." Moreover, the mutual self-interest involved in such an alliance never even enters Evander's speech, evidence that it is of no concern to him. As Virgil was aware of Homer's use of the past-as-paradigm motif, so too is he aware of the power of genealogical connections.

---

[7] Nos si pellant nihil afore credunt
quin omnem Hesperiam penitus sua sub iuga mittant,
et mare quod supra teneant quodque adluit infra. (*Aen*.8.147)

[8] Ut te, fortissime Teucrum,
accipio agnoscoque libens! ut uerba parentis
et uocem Anchisae magni uultumque recordor!
nam memini Hesionae uisentem regna sororis
Laomedontiaden Priamum Salamina petentem
protinus Arcadiae gelidos inuisere finis. (*Aen*.8.154)

The most important use of the past-as-paradigm motif was not when the characters themselves referenced it, but rather how the idea deployed in the text held sway in the political and historical context outside the work itself. The significance of genealogies similarly does not lie in Aeneas's use of them in this literary context, but, rather, in Virgil's use of them in a political and historical context. The notion of the Trojan wanderer founding a new city was not Virgil's own invention. A variety of Classical Greek sources such as Strabo, Pausanias, Thucydides and Herodotus attribute the foundation of Greek cities to Trojan refugees.[9] Virgil, however, took this theme from his Classical sources and elaborated and expanded upon it, adapting it to the needs of his Roman context. The Greek writers who discussed the motif of the Trojan refugee as city founder mainly offer this widely accepted information as historical information about civic origins. Virgil used it to establish and justify Roman political legitimacy in Italy and in its ever expanding empire. Aeneas becomes one of many refugees who founded cities, but by tying this conventional story of refugees founding cities to a genealogical justification, Virgil justifies his patron's political legitimacy: Augustus claimed descent from Aeneas, thus Virgil gives Aeneas divine right to rule and, by extension, his descendant Augustus. This divine right is bestowed early in the poem, with Jupiter's prophecy at 1.350:

---

[9] In "Cretan and Trojan Émigrés" (1933), S. Casson argues that "Certain Greeks were τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἀποσκεδασθέντον [Hdt.8.91]; these had escaped from Troy with Amphilochos and Calchas. Of others who escaped with Aeneas some were blown as far afield as Sardinia [Paus.10.17.6]. Others with Antenor founded what was later to become Cyrene [Pindar, *Pyth*.5.82]. Trojan prisoners of war were found at Tenea [Paus.2.5.4] in the Peloponnese. The Elymoi of Sicily, who lived at Segesta and Eryx, were, according to Thucydides [6.2], Trojan refugees who 'after the capture of Tory dodged the Aechaeans and reached Sicily in their ships.' And so on: for the list of refugees and their destination is a large one" (52).

> In Italy [Aeneas] will fight a massive war,
> Beat down fierce armies, the for the people there
> Establish city wall and a way of life. …
> Three full centuries
> That kingdom will be ruled by Hector's race,
> Until the queen and priestess, Ilia,
> Pregnant by Mars, will bear twin sons to him.
> Afterward, happy in the tawny pelt
> His nurse, the she-wolf, wears, young Romulus
> Will take the leadership, build walls of Mars,
> And call by his own name his people Romans.
> For these I set no limits, world or time,
> But make the gift of empire without end.[10]

Virgil's strategy relies on the poet's temporal relationship to his material. To Virgil, the events he describes are, if not "historical" in the technical sense of the word, at least events that have already happened, that is, events from the past. But from the temporal perspective of the *Aeneid*, that is, of Jupiter and Aeneas, they are yet to happen; thus to them Jupiter's words are prophecy. Virgil uses this same juxtaposition between temporal perspectives in the other section that justifies Roman political rule: the ekphrasis on Aeneas's shield:

---

[10] Bellum ingens geret Italia, populosque feroces
contundet, moresque viris et moenia ponet …
Hic iam ter centum totos regnabitur annos
gente sub Hectorea, donec regina sacerdos,
Marte gravis, geminam partu dabit Ilia prolem.
Inde lupae fulvo nutricis tegmine laetus
Romulus excipiet gentem, et Mavortia condet
moenia, Romanosque suo de nomine dicet.
His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono;
imperium sine fine dedi (1.263).

> There the Lord of Fire,
> Knowing the prophets, knowing the age to come,
> Had wrought the future story of Italy,
> The triumphs of the Romans. (8.848)[11]

From this point, Virgil narrates several scenes, all of which, again, are in the past relative to Virgil and his readers' perspective, but in the future relative to Aeneas; thus, Vulcan is able to prophecy with perfect accuracy. The trajectory of the shield, then, with its long depiction of Roman history from Ascanius to Caesar, cements the legitimacy of Augustus's rule and, along with Zeus's earlier "gift of empire without end," creates a strong foundation for justifying not only Augustus's political legitimacy but also his imperialist foreign policy. According to Francis Ingledew, prophecy, whether from Jupiter's lips or on Vulcan's shield, is Virgil's most powerful rhetorical technique for justifying his patron's political legitimacy; Francis Ingledew, in "The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*" (1994), argues that "[i]n Virgil's work it is the interpretive intervention of prophecy that permits the discovery of divine purpose in human political affairs and so history's and the empire's special meaning. And it is the mode of prophecy that produces a narrative in which divine pronouncements are everywhere embedded, so that human action appears to make history" (Ingledew 670). Prophecy, according to Ingledew, is the most effective means of creating a genealogical connection between

---

[11] Illic res Italas Romanorumque triumphos
haud uatum ignarus uenturique inscius aeui
fecerat ignipotens (8.627)

Aeneas, who, as divinely guided founder, has the clearest claim to rule Rome, and Augustus. Because Aeneas lived in the distant past, what to him appears as prophecy appeared to Virgil's readers as history, creating a sense of inevitability about his descendant Augustus's rule: Virgil "confer[s] heroic value on the origins of Rome in the fall of Troy and in the figure of Aeneas" and positions Augustus in relation to those events as "the fulfillment of a long and patient historical design guaranteed by Jupiter" (670), as sure a guarantee of political legitimacy as ever was imagined.

Augustus, like Julius before him, claimed descent from Ascanius, and indeed, their family name, the Iulii, came from Ascanius's other name, Iulus. But the story of the Trojan founding of Rome lent many other patrician Roman families legitimacy as well. In "Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome" (1974), TP Wiseman notes that "Gyas and Clonus were among Aeneas's followers, and founded the Geganii and the Cloelii, two of the Alban families supposedly admitted to the patriciate by Tullus Hostilius. The patrician Sergii descended from the Trojan Sergestus, and the Nautii from Nautes" (153). Wiseman's evidence suggests that it was not only Augustus and the Iulii who sought to claim political legitimacy by claiming descent from Trojan heroes, but other Roman patrician clans as well. A Trojan lineage, even from secondary heroes such as Gyas and Clonus, conferred on Augustan Roman families the prestige of an ancient and noble pedigree.

The foundation story and the genealogical justification found in the *Aeneid* are merely the most famous examples of a practice common in among many elite families in the Roman world: "The works *de familiis Troianis* of Varro and Hyginus attest the interest aroused by the question of Trojan descent in the late Republic and the triumviral period. Indeed, the fact that Hyginus wrote on the same subject so soon after Varro suggests a demand for a revised version from families whom Varro had left out" (Wiseman 157). Many other families claimed descent from both Trojans and Greeks alike, and many even grafted their family trees onto characters from the *Aeneid* because, as Wiseman notes, "By that time, the imperial house had given Trojan descent a prestige far greater than any other" (157).

Indeed, the performance contexts for such genealogies are very similar to those with which Pindar and his patrons would have been familiar:

> We shall get closest to the spirit of the legendary genealogies if we try to imagine the audiences at which they were aimed – the dinner guests at a great house, listening to the *anagnostes* read from a not too rigorous work of history; the loungers in the exedra of the baths, as the poet recited his pangyrical epic; the Forum crowd, enjoying the splendour of a society funeral and listening to the orator declaim on the greatness of the deceased and of his family. (Wiseman 159).

For all his other possible failings, Aeneas is ultimately successful in fulfilling Jupiter's prophecy, which was also the original mission for which he set out: to found Rome and the Roman people. By claiming descent from Aeneas, Augustus is able to bask in the reflected glory of his famous ancestor's glorious achievements, to claim political authority because his ancestor ruled, and also to claim, through historical analogy, that the peace which resulted after the internecine war between Trojans and Rutulians is synonymous with the peace which will result with the ascendancy of the Trojans' descendant after the civil war that gripped Rome.

III. Ovid's Trojan War

Although Virgil's epic was the most influential version of the Trojan War written during the Augustan era, it was not the only one. His younger contemporary Ovid also included in his *Metamorphoses* an account of the Trojan War and the wanderings of Aeneas. Though the relationship between Virgil and Ovid and their respective accounts of the Trojan War have been discussed at length,[12] there remain several important points to be made, particularly as they bear upon the evolution of the Trojan stories from Antiquity to the Middle Ages.

As even the casual reader of both the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses* must observe, the purposes of both authors are radically different. Virgil's epic is concerned almost exclusively with the founding of Rome and with connecting that founding, through the insertion of divine prophecy, with Augustus and the current eminence of Rome. Ovid's purpose is to tell a universal history from creation to his own present day through the prism of the physical transformations undergone by significant figures from the mythic past, some of whom happened to live during the time of the founding of Rome. Scholars have noted the many differences between Virgil and Ovid's accounts of the Trojan War and the wanderings of Aeneas afterwards.[13] Nevertheless, Virgil's version of the events of the Trojan War had become canonical by the time Ovid undertook his own version in the *Metamorphoses*. Because of this, Ovid was bound by his audience's historical credulity to abide by the Virgilian plot. He could, however, attribute different motives to his characters and, where Virgil was silent, Ovid could tell his own version of the events. The result, according to Joel Solodow in *The World of*

---

[12] For which, cf. Horsfall, pp. 257-84.

[13] For which, cf. Solodow, 110-156

Ovid's Metamorphoses (1988), is that "again and again he frustrates attempts to attach Virgilian meanings to the story Virgil had told; he transforms it from a national into a personal history, that is, into a subjective rendering of the history of individuals" (136).

Ovid's and Virgil's differing treatments of the fall of Troy reflect the different foci of their works and the differences in their styles and literary purposes. In the *Aeneid*, for example, Aeneas narrates the events of the fall of Troy analeptically, restricting the focus to his own perceptions of it. The fall of Troy leads in directly to Aeneas's wanderings. The focus of the poem remains firmly on him. Ovid, however, uses the fall of Troy as a means for fulfilling his literary goal: describing the physical metamorphoses of mythical characters. Digressions from the description of the fall of Troy lead to the metamorphoses of Hecuba into a dog and Memnon into a flock of birds. Because his interest is in the metamorphoses that occurred during the time of the Trojan War, not in the Trojan War itself, he provides much less detail about the war than Virgil or the Greek tragedians. For example, the concluding events of the war are described quickly and in broad strokes:

> Victorious Ulysses now set sail
> For Lemnos, land of Queen Hypsipyle
> And glorious Thoas, island infamous
> For husbands murdered in the days of old.
> He sailed to fetch the shafts of Hercules
> And when he'd brought their master with them, at long last
> The final stroke was given to that great war.
> Troy fell and Priam too. (*Met.*13.99)[14]

---

[14] Victor ad Hypsipyles patriam clarique Thoantis
et veterum terras infames caede virorum
vela dat, ut referat Tirynthia tela, sagittas.
Quae postquam ad Graios, domino comitante, revexit,
imposita estque fero tandem manus ultima bello,
Troia simul Priamusque cadunt!
All translations from the *Metamorphoses* from Melville, AD.

Ovid makes no mention of the horse, the principal feature of Virgil's narration of the fall of Troy. Similarly, Ovid does not re-tell scenes staged in Greek tragedy. He narrates only briefly Odysseus's trip to Lemnos, thus eliding the events of Sophocles's *Philoctetes*. Similarly, though he does narrate the contest between Ajax and Ulysses, his focus is upon their debate, not on its aftermath. Thus, he also elides the events of Sophocles's *Ajax*. The death of Priam, one of the scenes of highest drama and pathos in the *Aeneid*, is also mentioned without detail.

The reasons for this have to do with the author's aims, expressed in the opening lines of the poem:

> Of bodies changed to other forms I tell;
> You Gods, who have yourselves wrought every change,
> Inspire my enterprise and lead my lay
> In one continuous song from nature's first
> Remote beginnings to our modern times. (*Met.*1.1)[15]

His interest is not exclusively in the tragic elements of his stories; rather, he uses the fall of Troy and the events traditionally associated with it, as a catalyst for addressing his primary focus: describing physical metamorphoses. He narrates the events of the *Trojan Women*, but only insofar as it bears upon Hecuba's physical transformation into a dog.

After narrating these events, Ovid comes to the wanderings of Aeneas. Solodow writes: "The destruction of the city has scarcely any relation to Aeneas. … Ovid severs all except the slenderest connection between the man and the loss of his homeland, which Virgil had made so significant an event in the hero's life" (137). In Virgil's account, the loss of his homeland and the drive to found a new one are Aeneas's principle motivations, as seems natural in a work about the foundation of a city. Ovid's account, however, is not concerned with city founding, so this aspect of Aeneas's story omitted.

---

[15] In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas
corpora; di, coeptis (nam vos mutastis et illas)
adspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi
ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen.

Another difference is between the time spans their works cover, a difference that can be explained by the authors' literary purposes. *The Aeneid* contains only a small portion of the time frame of the *Metamorphoses*. Because of this difference, both works deal with the ascendance of Augustus and the legitimacy of his rule in different ways. Because of the unique temporal distance between his character and actual history, Virgil employs prophecy to create a link between the gods, their offspring Aeneas, and his descendant Augustus to create a genealogical justification for the latter's rule and the expansion of his empire.

Ovid uses a technique closer to teleological history, beginning with creation and moving forward chronologically. The apotheosis of the founder of Rome and its greatest early hero, Aeneas, foreshadows the teleogical culmination of history in the apotheoses of the greatest of Rome's contemporary heroes, Julius Caesar and, ultimately, Augustus. Ovid's history ends with these two greatest metamorphoses, and, as the apotheosis of Aeneas is the mark of his political legitimacy in founding and ruling Rome, so too do the apotheoses of his descendants mark them:

> But Caesar is a god
> In his own city here. He was supreme
> In war and peace; though not his great campaigns
> Triumphantly concluded, nor his feats
> Achieved at home, his glory gained so fast,
> Made him a star, a comet new in heaven,
> Rather his son. (15.744)[16]

---

[16] Caesar in urbe sua deus est; quem Marte togaque
praecipuum non bella magis finita triumphis

Having established a genealogical link between Julius and Augustus, Ovid then describes the events in heaven, where Venus, referred to here with a maternal epithet in order to strengthen the genealogical connection, “Aeneas’s golden mother” (aurea … Aeneae genetrix) (15.761) recounts her suffering:

> See the treachery
> That seeks the only life that’s left to me
> Of Trojan Iulus’s stock. Shall I alone
> Be always torn with troubles all too real?
> I, wounded by the lance of Diomede,
> Confounded when great Troy’s defences failed,
> Who saw my dear son forced to roam so far. (*Met.*15.765)[17]

Stressing again the genealogical connection, she refers to Augustus as “of Trojan Iulus’s stock,” and, in order to cast him as her true heir and repudiate any false claimants to the genealogical claim, calls him the “only life that’s left to me” in that family line. She also recalls her own suffering in the Trojan War before appealing to Jupiter. To appease her, Jupiter grants Augustus revenge for the death of Julius Caesar (15.823), mastery in war (15.825), great advances in political justice (15.837) and, finally, an apotheosis greater than his uncle’s (18.837).

Ovid concludes the poem with a prayer that emphasizes the genealogical connection between Aeneas and Augustus. The divine favor which aided Aeneas in

---

resque domi gestae properataque gloria rerum
in sidus vertere novum stellamque comantem,
quam sua progenies. (*Met.*15.746)

[17] “adspice,” dicebat “quanta mihi mole parentur
insidiae, quantaque caput cum fraude petatur,
quod de Dardanio solum mihi restat Iulo.
Solane semper ero iustis exercita curis,
quam modo Tydidae Calydonia vulneret hasta,
nunc male defensae confundant moenia Troiae,
quae videam natum longis erroribus actum” (*Met.*15.765).

times past and Augustus in the present justifies Augustus's right to rule the city his ancestor Aeneas founded on both the human level of patrilineal descent and the divine level of the gods' support:

> Jove rules
> The citadels of heaven and the realms
> Of all the immense three-natured universe;
> The earth Augustus governs, each of them
> Father and Leader. Hear my prayer, ye Gods
> Who led Aeneas safe through fire and sword. …
> Grant the day dawn far off, a time beyond
> Our generation when Augustus's soul,
> Leaving the world he rules, to heaven repairs. (15.855)[18]

Ovid also deals with the Trojan War in another work, the *Heroides*, a series of epistolary poems from heartbroken legendary women to the lovers who have rejected them. As in the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid is careful never to alter the fundamental context in which his lovers write their letters, a process that would put his account in conflict with the more canonical versions of Homer and Virgil. Rather, he picks up on un-narrated moments in these canonical versions and expands where they are silent. Ovid's methodology in this regard is outlined by Peter Knox in his introduction the *Heroides* (1995):

> Each of the heroines' epistles refers self-consciously to a specific source in earlier literature; they represent episodes set in the interstices of the literary tradition. The reader finds himself in book 19 of the *Odyssey*: Penelope cannot sleep after her interview with the stranger who speaks

---

[18] Iupiter arces
temperas aetherias et mundi regna triformis,
terrra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque.
di, precor, Aenea comites, quibus ensis et ignis
cesserunt…
tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aevo,
qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto
accedat caelo faveatque precantibus absens! (*Met.*15.858)

> with such assurance of her absent husband. How did she fill the hours till morning? [Ovid] knows: she wrote the letter that is *Heroides* I. In the anxious moments as dawn breaks over Libya, Dido knows that Aeneas and the Trojan fleet are putting to sea. She considers using force to stop him, but rejects it; instead, she writes our seventh epistle. (18)

In contrast to the *Metamorphoses*, wherein the Trojan War is one small but significant part of a much longer whole, the epistles in the *Heroides* crystallize the single moment when the aggrieved woman writes to her lover. This is not to say, however, that the letters lack breadth; rather, his narrators often encapsulate the events of the entire war in their letters. Each letter often provides one person's view of the war, so that the corpus of letters provides a comprehensive view of the war from the perspective of many of those who suffer along its margins.

Additionally, in these poems, Ovid abandons the objectivity and grandiosity of the epic style for the subjective and intimate style more common to elegy. These two innovations provide views of the Trojan War from several different perspectives, not just that of an omniscient narrator and, in the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*, the eponymous heroes themselves. Ovid also rejects the epic narrative position in favor of the tragic. Rather than viewing the events of the war from the perspective of its male heroes, he narrates them from the perspective of its unwilling victims: those who suffer indirectly because of it and those who are denied a voice in the traditional epic renderings. Like Euripides, Ovid sympathizes with the women, a fact that puts him at odds with Virgil: "The *Heroides* … in its deheroization of the mythic material and in its rejection of the male viewpoint, [is] a denial of the Augustan (and Virgilian, at least as envisioned in the *Aeneid*) ideal" (Jacobson 7).

In *Heroides* 1, for example, Penelope writes a letter to Odysseus in which she recounts the entire ten-year war and the ten years of Odysseus's wanderings. Her focus is on her own subjective response to the war, as well as her over-riding sense of powerlessness in the face of such massive events. She is writing the letter during the end of Odysseus's journey, her point of greatest despair about his return, and, in a long analepsis which recaps the events of the Trojan War, describes her helplessness, fear and sorrow:

> These words your Penelope sends to you, O Ulysses, slow of return that you are; writing back is pointless: come yourself! Troy, to be sure, is fallen, hated of the daughters of Greece; but scarcely were Priam and all Troy worth the price to me. O would that then, when his ship was on the way to Lacedaemon, the adulterous lover had been overwhelmed by raging waters! Then had I not lain cold in my deserted bed nor would now be left alone complaining of slowly passing the days; now would the hanging web be wearying now my widowed hands as I seek to beguile the hours of spacious night. (11)[19]

In these opening lines of the first letter in the *Heroides*, Ovid's first rhetorical move is to have Penelope explicitly deny the male voice the opportunity to speak for himself: "Writing back is pointless." This is a marked departure from Homer's rhetorical strategy in the *Odyssey*, in which Odysseus's own first person narration comprises much of the poem. Moreover, albeit in reverse order, the entire Trojan War, from the abduction of

---

[19] Haec tua Penelope lento tibi mittit, Ulixe,
Nil mihi rescribas attinet: ipse ueni.
Troia iacet certe, Danais inuisa puellis;
Uix Priamus tanti totaque Troia fuit.
o utinam tum, cum Lacedaemona classe petebat,
obrutus insanis esset adulter aquis!
Non ego deserto iacuissem frigida lecto,
nec quererer tardos ire relicta dies,
nec mihi quaerenti spatiosam fallere noctem
lassaret uiduas pendula tela manus. (1.1)
All translations from the *Heroides* are from Showerman.

Helen to the fall of Troy, is described in this first section. The focus of the narration, however, is not on the events themselves, but rather on how these events affect her personally: she tells of her loneliness in her cold bed, a decidedly intimate and personal response. The events of the war are viewed through the eyes of the suffering wife: her fears, her imaginings, her sorrows. The deaths of several of the major heroes are not narrated, as in the *Iliad*, for the glory they bring to the dying hero, but rather for the emotional toll they take on Penelope: "In short, whoever it was in the Argive camp that was pierced and fell, colder than ice grew the heart of her who loves you" (13).[20] Penelope is indifferent to the greater political and military repercussions of the war. Her concern is only for the way these events affect her personally. The sack of Troy illustrates this point. This event is narrated in the form of a rhetorical question which places the fall of the city in terms of its personal benefit to her: "But of what avail to me that Ilion has been scattered in ruin by your arms, and that what once was wall is now level ground – if I am still to remain such as I was while Troy endured, and must love to all time bereft of my lord?" (15)[21] Her question crystallizes Ovid's method and purpose: an all-encompassing narrative of the Trojan War written by a marginalized woman whose focus is on the effects the external events of the war have on the interior life of the letter writer.

This same method is evident in the letter of Briseis to Achilles. Her letter begins: "From stolen Briseis is the writing you read, scarce characterized in Greek by her barbarian hand. Whatever blots you shall see, her tears have been made; but tears, too, have none the less the weight of words" (33). Ovid draws attention to Briseis's voice: it is the voice of a captive woman, a foreigner and, finally, a voice broken by tears. In neither Homer nor Virgil is there any linguistic distinction between peoples: not only do Greeks and Trojans understand each other perfectly, but Rutullians, Lotus-Eaters, Tyrians and Cyclopses speak to and understand each other without any difficulty. In tragedy, the only person who makes mention of her inability to be understood because she speaks another language is another captive Trojan slave-girl, Cassandra, when she enters Argos in the *Agamemnon*. In *Heroides 3*, Briseis's opening emphasis on the problem of language and her status as a captive foreground her powerlessness and marginalization.

---

[20] denique, quisquis erat castris iugulatis Achivis,
frigidius glacie pectus amantis erat. (1.21)

[21] Ilios et, murus quod fuit, esse solum,
si maneo, qualis Troia durante manebam,
uirque mihi dempto fine carendus abest? (1.48)

Like Penelope, Briseis begins by narrating the events of the Trojan War, and also like Penelope, her focus is not on the exterior events themselves, but, rather, on the emotional impact they have on her. Describing Achilles's silence in the face of the heralds Talthybius and Eurybates' demand that he give her to them to take to Agamemnon, she reproaches him for his passivity: "My going might have been deferred; a stay of my pain would have eased my heart. Ah me! I had to go, and with no farewell kiss; but tears without end I shed, and rent my hair – miserable me, I seemed a second time to suffer the captive's fate" (33).[22] Briseis describes her thoughts and emotions as the events of the war unfold: that she cried and rent her clothes, that she would have welcomed a "delay in pain," and how she felt "as though she had been captured again." By contrast, Homer shows almost no interest in this aspect of female psychology:

---

[22] ei mihi! discedens oscula nulla dedi;
at lacrimas sine fine dedi rupique caillos –
infelix iterum sum mihi visa capi!

> He led forth from the hut Briseis of the fair cheeks and gave her
> to be taken away; and they walked back beside the ships of the Achaians,
> and the woman all unwilling went with them. (*Il*.1.346)[23]

The only insight into Briseis's state of mind is the single word "ἀέκουσ" (unwilling) which, unlike the emotions Ovid describes, is perceptible by Achilles and the heralds and therefore requires no access to her thoughts. Immediately thereafter, the narrative's focus returns to Achilles's weeping, and no more is heard about Briseis's reaction. Given Homer's silence about Briseis's interior life, Ovid has plenty of room for invention without having to contradict Homer's authoritative account.

Virgil, too, does not offer his reader as much insight into the interiority of his female characters as Ovid. His descriptions of them rely primarily on observable external changes that may reveal their internal thoughts. The description of Camilla's death, for example, offers no psychological insight:

> Dying, Camilla tugged at the javelin,
> But the steel point between the ribs held fast
> In the deep wound. She drooped from loss of blood,
> Her eyelids drooped, chill with approaching death,
> And the fresh glow of youth drained from her cheeks. (*Aen*.11.1110)

This description is entirely externalized: her wound is described, her physical reaction in terms of her loss of blood and her drooping eyelids, but not her psychology. The reader may assume her pain and suffering from the description of the wound and its effects on her, but there is no insight into her thoughts at that moment.

---

[23] ἐκ δ’ ἄγαγε κλισίης Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρῃον,
δῶκε δ’ ἄγειν· τὼ δ’ αὖτις ἴτην παρὰ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν·
ἣ δ’ ἀέκουσ’ ἅμα τοῖσι γυνὴ κίεν·

There is a similar lack of psychology in the character of Lavinia. For example, after Amata begs Turnus not to go into battle, Lavinia's response is recorded not in words or interior monologue, but by outward sign:

> Lavinia, listening to her mother, streamed
> With tears on burning cheeks; a deepening blush
> Brought out a fiery glow on her hot face. (*Aen.*12.64)

Again, this description of Lavinia at a moment of high drama is entirely physical. Virgil narrates Lavinia's blush and this physical description serves in lieu of any direct insight into Lavinia's interiority. Indeed, this is typical of Virgil's method throughout the *Aeneid*. R.O.A.N. Lyne begins his article "Lavinia's Blush" (1983) by writing: "In the *Aeneid* actions are consistent with character and psychology, indeed indicative of character and psychology" (55). That is, psychology is only visible through its external manifestations – in this case, the blush.

Even Dido does not get any interiority. The moment before her suicide is described in terms of her physical, not her mental, state:

> Dido's heart
> Beat wildly at the enormous thing afoot.
> She rolled her bloodshot eyes, her quivering cheeks
> Were flecked with red as her sick pallor grew
> Before her coming death. (*Aen*.4.891)

As with Lavinia's blush, Dido's interior is revealed by its external manifestations: her bloodshot eyes, her quivering cheeks, her spotted complexion. But then Virgil records Dido's last words, which reflect a deep insight into her own life, her accomplishments and disappointments, and the emotional and psychological factors that motivated her:

> I lived my life out to the very end
> And passed the stages Fortune had appointed.

> Now my tall shade goes to the underworld.
> I built a famous town, saw my great walls,
> Avenged my husband, made my hostile brother
> Pay for his crim. Happy, alas, too happy,
> If only the Dardanian keels had never
> Beached on our coast. (*Aen.*4.907)

Dido's critical self-awareness and the willingness on the part of the poet to narrate it are unique among women in the *Aeneid*.[24] Dido's emotions and mental state, however, are revealed not through access to her mind, but still through the observable means of speech.

Ovid's Dido must directly confront Virgil's, which has led inevitably to many scholarly comparisons between the two versions. Though some think Ovid's depiction at least equal,[25] most find him seriously wanting. Walter Jacobson's opinion, from his *Ovid's* Heroides (1974), is representatively uncharitable: "Lest one be seduced by the thought that Ovid's poem could not but pale before Vergil's masterpiece, and that we would view it in a much more favorable light did it not, standing in the shadow of *Aeneid* Four, suffer invidious comparison, let us be quick to admit that this letter is a failure in its own right and would be so judged whether the *Aeneid* existed or not" (Jacobson 76). Such a judgment, however, misses Ovid's objective, which is to let these women speak for themselves. In the *Aeneid*, Dido's curse, though emotionally and psychologically potent, does not allow her to reflect on her own life; and her final words, quoted above, while offering some self-awareness and psychological insight, lack the detail of Ovid's version. Moreover, the most extensive section narrating Dido's back-story is not spoken by the woman herself, but rather by Venus. In Book 1, Venus tells Aeneas Dido's story – "let *me* tell," she says – in contrast to the male protagonist, Aeneas, who gets to tell his own story in Books 2 and 3 (as did his models, Achilles in *Il.*1.365 and Odysseus during the feast at Phaiakia in the *Odyssey*). Thus, Ovid allows Dido, as he does the other silenced, marginalized and spited women in his *Heroides*, the chance to tell their stories themselves: "Not because I hope you may be moved by a prayer of mine do I address you – for with God's will adverse I have begun the words you read" (83).[26] Dido's introduction makes clear that she is the speaker, the teller of her own story, and her narration of the events is not in the omniscient narrative voice of the epic poets, but in a deeply subjective and personal voice.[27]

---

[24] Compare Dido's last words, for example, with Camilla's:

> Until now, sister, I was able.
> Now this wound galls me and finished me.
> Everything around is growing dark.
> Make you escape and take my last command
> To Turnus: that he join the battle here
> To keep the Trojans from the town. Farewell. (*Aen.*11.1119)

Camilla's last words give no insight into her psychological state; they simply describe her wound and her physical response to it, followed by a final military command. Her speech suggests no reflective self-awareness of interior life.

[25] For a discussion of the difference between the two versions, cf. Jacobson n.2 and pg. 76ff.

Like Euripides before him, Ovid takes familiar moments from Trojan War literature and, careful not to contradict those previous accounts, dilates the unnarrated moments implicit in the more canonical versions. Also like Euripdies, Ovid's sympathy lies entirely with the marginalized women who most suffer the unintended consequences of a war over which they have no power.

---

[26] Nec quia te nostra sperem prece posse moveri,
adloquor – adverso movimus ista deo. (7.3)

[27] Her description of her life's story, for example, is told almost exclusively with first person verbs which keep the narrative's focus trained on her: "On a perilous route I fly, and my enemies pursues. Upon these shores I land; escaped from my brother and the sea, I purchase the strand that I gave, perfidious man, to you. I establish a city, and lay about it the foundations of wide-reaching walls that stir the jealousy of neighbouring realms" (93).

Chapter 3: The Trojan War in Late Antiquity

"In the thirteenth year of Nero's reign an earthquake struck at Cnossos and, in the course of its devastation, laid open the tomb of Dictys in such a way that people, as they passed, could see a little box" (20).[1] The box contained the diary of Dictys of Crete, who had followed Idomoneus to Troy. Some shepherds brought it to a certain Eupraxides, who, in turn, gave it to Rutlilius Rufus, and the two of them presented it to Nero. Around the same time, Cornelius Nepos, studying in Athens, came across the diary of Dares the Phrygian, who had fought on the Trojan side in the Trojan War. Cornelius Nepos translated this text into Latin, "neither adding nor omitting anything" (133).[2]

These chance discoveries revealed to the readers of late antiquity the two works which would have the greatest influence on the medieval understanding of the Trojan War: Dares the Phrygian's *De Excidio Troia Historia* and Dictys the Cretan's *Ephemeris de Historia Belli Troiani*. These discovery stories, however, along with the chronicles they introduce, are now universally acknowledged as literary conventions with no historical validity; scholars now date the originals to the first century of the common era, though the extant version of Dares is generally dated to the early sixth century CE.[3] Further, the purported authors of these accounts of the Trojan War, Dares and Dictys, are now understood to be the invented literary personae of two anonymous Greek authors, even if the Greek originals, with the exception of a Greek fragment of Dictys, are lost and survive only in Latin translations.

---

[1] Tertiodecimo anno Neronis imperii, in Gnoso civitate terraemotus facti, cum multa, tum etiam sepulcrum Dictys ita patefecerunt, ut a transeuntibus arcula viseretur (16). Latin from Valpy; English translation by Frazer.

[2] Nihil adiciendum vel diminuendum rei (1). All Latin from Meister; English translation by Frazer.

[3] Benson 3

Critical opinion of the literary merits of these two works has not been kind. The English translator of the poems, R.M. Frazer, writes in the introduction to *The Trojan War: The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian* (1966): "Dictys's Latin prose is simple and fairly good. Dares's, on the other hand, is very bad; it is, as Gilbert Highet says, 'of extreme simplicity, verging on stupidity'" (14). Dennis Bradley (1991) opens his article "Troy Revisited" by quoting the views of other scholars on Dares: "The author has been dismissed as 'abject,' and the work described as 'an ill-assorted aggregation of meager details, written in … barbarous Latin.'" (232). In a footnote, he cites others who call it "dull and tasteless" and "a crude summary" (233 n. 3).

Perhaps because of the low estimation of their literary merit, coupled with their discredited claims to historical authenticity and factual accuracy, these works have been largely ignored, except insofar as they bear on the medieval tradition that drew so heavily from them. A close analysis of these two works reveals that, while they drew heavily for their source material from previous versions of the Trojan War, they also broke radically with them in several important ways. The first change is to be found at the level of style: though previous accounts of the Trojan War had been written in many different genres – epic, lyric and tragedy – all had been high verse genres. By contrast, both Dares and Dictys wrote chronicles, at once a low genre and in prose.

The decision to write in prose complements the two most significant methodological revisions of previous Trojan War literature. Cornelius Nepos writes that he has produced his translation that

> thus my readers can know exactly what happened according to this account and judge for themselves whether Dares the Phrygian or Homer wrote the more truthfully – Dares, who lived and fought at the time the Greeks stormed Troy, or Homer, who was born long after the war was

> over. When the Athenians judged the matter, they found Homer insane for describing the gods battling with mortals. (133)[4]

In Cornelius Nepos's reading, the Athenians valued Dares over Homer because the latter, who was born after the events he narrates and relies on the epic Muse for his knowledge of the events, Dares was an eyewitness to them. Writers in Late Antiquity had a different standard for historical truth than did those who lived in Homeric Greece. After Herodotus and, particularly, Thucydides, historiography looked for the human causes of events, a method whose truth claim was legitimized by the kind of direct observation and analysis claimed by Dares and Dictys rather than any divine inspiration.

This tension between the literary superiority of the poets and the greater historical accuracy (at least by the standards of Late Antique historiography) of the chroniclers lasted from Late Antiquity, when Cornelius Nepos first "found" Dares's diary through to the Renaissance, when Sir Philip Sydney, echoing Cornelius Nepos's sentiment, wrote his *Defense of Poetry*. In it, Sydney claims that "if the question were whether it were better to have a particular act truly or falsely set down, there is no doubt which is to be chosen. … But if the question be (for your own use and learning) whether it be better to have it set down as it should be or as it was, then certainly is more doctrineable… the feigned Aeneas in Virgil than the right Aeneas in Dares Phrygius" (19). Sydney argues that if one is searching for truth, one should go to Dares, but if one is looking for artistic merit, Virgil is better. In their attempt at being historically accurate, they also moved away from the high poetry of epic and tragedy, which is, ultimately, the reason why

---

[4] Utrum magis vera existiment, quae Dares Phrygius memoriae commendavit, qui per id tempus vixit et militavit, quo Graeci Trojanos oppugnarent; an Homero credendum, qui post multos annos natus est, quam bellum hoc gestum fuissent: de qua re Athenis judicum fuit, cum pro insane Homerus haberetur, quod Deos cum hominibus belligerasse descripsit (1).

Sydney prefers Virgil. This chapter will explore the ways in which Dares's and Dictys' decision to write historical chronicles rather than poetry affected their literary styles and the themes, events and narratives they tell. Though interesting works of literature in their own right, they are best seen as transitional works bridging the worldviews of the ancient Greek and Roman world and the emerging monarchies of Western Europe.

I. Dares, Dictys, and the Greek Historiographical Tradition

The decision to write in prose recalls the Classical historiographical tradition of Herodotus and Thucydides, whose methodological statements suggest their rejection of the Muse and their reliance on direct observation. Thucydides sets forth his historical method in the opening of his work: "And with regard to the factual reporting of the events of the war I have made it a principle not to write down the first story that came my way, and not even to be guided by my own general impressions; either I was present myself at the events which I have described or else I heard of them from eye – witnesses whose reports I have checked with as much thoroughness as possible" (1.22).[5] Thucydides relies either on his own observations or on the authority of eye-witness accounts. Unlike Homer, there is no Muse to inspire him with information which he has not seen or heard himself; also unlike Homer, who reports whatever the Muse inspires, Thucydides sifts through his evidence to find what he believes to be the most accurate account.

---

[5] τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος ἠξίωσα γράφειν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἑκάστου ἐπεξελθών. ἐπιπόνως δὲ ηὑρίσκετο, διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς ἔργοις ἑκάστοις οὐ ταὐτὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑκατέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι (*Th.*1.22). Greek from Jones and Powell; English translation by Warner.

Dictys's methodological statement closely follows Thucydides's: "I followed along with [Idomeneus and the Cretans]. As to what happened earlier at Troy, I have tried to make my report as accurate as possible, Ulysses being my source. The account that follows, based as it is on my own observations, will meet, I hope, the highest critical standards" (30).[6] Like Thucydides, Dictys also relies on eye-witness accounts, either his own or, in those cases when was not present, those of Ulysses and others. Dictys's follows Thucydides's method and accepts his standards for accurate reporting.[7]

Throughout his work, Dictys continues to bolster his claims to historical accuracy by repeating his methodological statement at crucial moments. Immediately after the fall of Troy, for example, he writes: "Everything I have written about the war between the Greeks and the barbarians, in which I took a very active part, is based on first-hand knowledge. What I have told about Antenor and his kingdom was learned on inquiry from others" (118).[8] Later, Dictys notes that "Neoptolemus told me everything which I have written about him, when I attended his marriage to Hermione, the daughter of Menelaus. I also learned from him about the burial of Memnon's remains" (126).[9]

---

[6] Dein haud multo post Idomeneus et Meriones, summa inter se juncti Concordia. Eorum ego secutus comitatum, ea quidem quae antea apud Trojam gesta sun tab Ulysse cognita quam diligentissime retuli: et reliqua quae deinceps insecuta sunt, quoniam ipse interfui, quam verissime potero exponam. Igitur post eos, quos supra memoravimus (109).

[7] It is worth noting that these standards do not necessarily result in a work that is more historically accurate in terms of relating what actually happened in the past than Homer; the important point here is that Dictys and, presumably, his audience, *believed* that this method would produce a more accurate version, much in the same way that our modern methods cannot be proven to provide a more historically accurate account than Homer, and yet we still believe our methods do just that.

[8] Igitur ea quae in bello evernere Graecis ac Barbaris, cuncta sciens, perpessusque magna ex parte, memoriae tradidi. De Antenore ejusque regno quae audieram retuli (263).

[99] Haec ego cuncta a Neoptolemo cognita mihi memoriae mandavi, accitus ab eo qua tempestate Herminam Menelai in matrimonium susceperat. Ab eo etiam de reliquiis Memnonis cognitum mihi (281).

Again, Dictys's method, with its focus on "inquiry," "learning" and "first-hand knowledge" follows the Thucydidean model by making use of interviews when he himself was not present.

Dares's methodology also emulates Thucydides's. He legitimizes his authorial and historical credibility by introducing his catalog of ships as follows: "Dares the Phrygian, who wrote this history, says that he did military service until the capture of Troy and saw the people listed below either during times of truce or while he was fighting" (142).[10] He then names all the people who fought on either side. Dares makes clear that the names he lists are people he saw with his own eyes. This contrasts with Homer, whose catalog of ships is inspired by the Muse; Homer himself says:

> Tell me now, you Muses who have your homes on Olympos. For you, who are goddesses, are there. And you know all things, and we have heard only the rumour of it and know nothing. Who then of those were the chief men and the lords of the Danaans? I could not tell over the multitude of them nor name them, not if I had ten tongues in ten mouths, not if I had a voice never to be broken and a heart of bronze within me, not unless the Muses of Olympia, daughters of Zeus of the aegis, remembered all those who came beneath Ilion. (*Il*.2.484)[11]

As clearly as Dares states he saw the combatants, Homer claims he did not. He explicitly says he has "heard only rumour of it and knows nothing." Dares implicitly contrasts his own authority with Homer. He announces that he knows about the catalog of ships not because of any Muse, but because he saw them himself, and unlike Homer, is able to list them with no divine aid. Direct observation, however, does not necessarily provide a better or more historically accurate account. Their principles of selection for what material to include and exclude show a strong bias for their own side and an only thinly-veiled revulsion for the other. Their audiences believed that these methodological differences made them more trustworthy than Homer.

---

[10] Dares Phrygius, qui hanc historiam scripsit, ait se militasse usque dum Troia capta est, hos se vidisse, cum indutiae esse, partim proelio interfuisse (14).

[11] Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι·
ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε ἴστέ τε πάντα,
ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν·
οἵ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν·
πληθὺν δ’ οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ’ ὀνομήνω,
οὐδ’ εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ’ εἶεν,
φωνὴ δ’ ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,
εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
θυγατέρες μνησαίαθ’ ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον· *(Il.2.484)*

That Dares and Dictys position themselves as contemporary writers about the Trojan War, not as Muse-inspired poets living after it, has another important result. The first two chapters sought to demonstrate how, despite the fact that Homer's account remained the canonical version, subsequent authors writing about it often sought to present variant accounts of it. In the case of Pindar, chapter 1 showed how, because his patrons claimed descent from Ajax, a hero who suffers shamefully in Homer's account, he sought to take issue not with the facts of the narrative but with how they were reported. Pindar argued that Homer's account was biased in favor of Ajax's nemesis Odysseus. In this way, Pindar was able to present an account of the war which remained faithful to the accepted version of events, while at the same time pleasing to his patrons, for whom the accepted version of events was a blight on the family's honor.

The first two chapters also argued that while some authors may have disagreed with Homer's account, they were not at liberty simply to alter the accepted version of the events, lest their accounts lose the claim to historical truth. This, for example, is why Pindar could not more directly contradict the Homeric account of Ajax's death. Dares and Dictys, however, position themselves as having lived before Homer and as relying on superior epistemological footing – direct observation, not the Muse. As a result, they can differ from Homer, sometimes radically, without sacrificing the authority and legitimacy of their accounts, as would have been the case had Pindar or Virgil done so.

The most fundamental revision of the canonical account of the Trojan War is in their different approach to the role of the gods. Frazer writes that Dares and Dictys "use none of the divine machinery typical of epic poetry, and they tend to describe supernatural occurrences in rationalistic terms" (6). This was not the case in Homer, where the gods play a crucial and direct role in everything from large events such as setting the Trojan War in motion to small things such as causing a spear to miss its mark.

The influence of the Classical historiographical tradition can also be seen in Dares's and Dictys's choices of where to start their account of the war. Previous authors writing about the Trojan War chose a circumscribed period from the much larger Trojan Cycle: the *Iliad*, for example, describes the short period from Achilles's quarrel with Agamemnon to the death of Hector; the *Aeneid* from the fall of Troy to the death of Turnus, and Euripides's *Rhesus* from Rhesus's arrival to his death. Dares and Dictys, following Ovid's somewhat more expansive model, relate the events of the entire war: in Dictys's case, from the abduction of Helen to the death of Ulysses, and in Dares's case, from the theft of the Golden Fleece in the generation before the Trojan War to the fall of Troy.

Dares's decision to begin his Trojan War with the Medea episode evokes the opening of Herodotus's *Histories*, in which Herodotus recounts the origins of the Persian Wars, beginning with the snatching of Io:

> This, according to the Persian account (the Greeks have a different story), was how Io came to Egypt; and this was the first in a series of unjust acts.

> Later on, some Greeks ... put into the Phoenician port city of Tyre and carried off the king’s daughter Europa. ... For the next outrage it was the Greeks again who were responsible ... they abducted the king’s daughter Medea. ... The accounts go on to say that some forty or fifty years afterwards Paris, the son of Priam, was inspired by these stories to steal a wife from himself out of Greece ... and that was how he came to carry off Helen. ... So much for what the Persians and Phoenicians say. (1.1)[12]

The Greek author of *The Fall of Troy*, since he adopted as his narrative persona the Phrygian Dares, an Easterner, would naturally follow the story which Herodotus attributes to Persians and Phoenicians: that it was the Greeks who committed the first wrong. It is natural, therefore, for him to begin with the abduction of Medea.

Dictys, too, has Priam, another Easterner, follow the Herodotean account. One of the major stylistic components of Dares’s and Dictys’s works is the extremely rare use of direct discourse, which is a hallmark not only of Homeric style but of Classical Greek literature in general.[13] In one of the rare moments of direct discourse in *The Fall of Troy,* Dictys, who, as a Cretan, tells the story from the Greek perspective, puts Herodotus’s opening words into Priam’s mouth. Responding to the Greek demand for the return of Helen, Priam says:

---

[12] Οὕτω μὲν Ἰοῦν ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἀπικέσθαι λέγουσι Πέρσαι, οὐκ ὡς Ἕλληνες, καὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων πρῶτον τοῦτο ἄρξαι· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἑλλήνων τινάς … τῆς Φοινίκης ἐς Τύρον προσσχόντας ἁρπάσαι τοῦ βασιλέος τὴν θυγατέρα Εὐρώπην … μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἕλληνας αἰτίους τῆς δευτέρης ἀδικίης γενέσθαι … ἁρπάσαι τοῦ βασιλέος τὴν θυγατέρα Μηδείην. … Δευτέρῃ δὲ λέγουσι γενεῇ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Πριάμου ἀκηκοότα ταῦτα ἐθελῆσαί οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος δι’ ἁρπαγῆς γενέσθαι γυναῖκα, ἐπιστάμενον πάντως ὅτι οὐ δώσει δίκας· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκείνους διδόναι. Οὕτω δὴ ἁρπάσαντος αὐτοῦ Ἑλένην. … Ταῦτα μέν νυν Πέρσαι τε καὶ Φοίνικες λέγουσι (Hdt.1.1). All Greek from Legrand; translation by Godley.

[13] The Homeric epics, for example, consist of about thirty percent dialogue. Similarly, several other ancient Greek genres consist exclusively of direct discourse, most notably Greek tragedy and comedy and Platonic dialogues. Even the Greek historians, Herodotus and Thucydides, include many important debates in direct discourse, such as Herodotus’s famous constitutional debate and Thucydides’s Melian dialogue.

> Do you think that abductions, like that of Helen, should be allowed only to those who hail from Greece? The Greeks of Crete, as you know, successfully abducted Europa from Sidon and Ganymede from our kingdom. Medea is another example. She, as surely you know, was abducted from Colchis and carried off to Iolchus. And finally, not to omit your very first abduction, Io was stolen from Sidon and taken to Argos. (53)[14]

It is fitting that Dares would give Priam a speech which echoes Herodotus's Eastern account of the origins of the war.

By means of prolepsis and analepsis, such as the example of Aeneas's shield in the *Aeneid* and Odysseus's stories to Alkinoos in the *Odyssey*, the poets are able to tell us about events that lie outside the direct temporal scope of their work. Dares and Dictys, however, never use these techniques, preferring instead a strictly chronological narrative. Like their models in history writing, they are as concerned with the origins of their war as they are with the war itself; their accounts of the war, therefore, cover more time than their predecessors do.

II. Dictys and Homer

Dictys's version of the events of the Trojan War told in the *Iliad* begin at verse 28 with the arrival of Chryses, who seeks the return of his captured daughter. Before this, however, Dictys describes two other events: first, it is related how Polymestor betrayed Priam and gave Polydorus to the Greeks (52). Because the Trojans refuse to give up Helen, the Greeks

---

[14] An solis qui e Graecia sunt raptus hujumodi concedentur? Quippe Cretae Europam quidem a Sidone, Ganymedem ex hisce finibus atque imperio rapere licuerit? Quid Medeam ignoratisne a Colchis in Iolcorum fines transvectam? Et ne primum illud rapiendi initium praetermittam, Io ex Sidoniorum regione abducta, Argos meavit (156).

> determined to kill Polydorus within view of the wall where all the Trojans could easily see what was done. Delaying no further, we led him into the center and stoned him to death in payment for his brother's impiety, while most of the enemy watched from the walls. Then we sent a herald to tell the Trojans to come and get the body for burial. Idaeus came and, with the help of some slaves of the king, took Polydorus, mangled and torn by the stones, back to his mother, to Hecuba. (53)[15]

This account deserves comparison with Euripides's *Hecuba*. The first point to notice is that in Dictys's account, Polydorus's death occurs before the Greeks and Trojans have exchanged a single blow, much less, as in Euripides's version, after Troy has fallen. Further, in Euripides's version, Polymestor kills Polydorus, whose corpse happens to wash up on the shore where the Trojan captives are being held. In Dictys's account, he is brought by Polymestor to the Greeks still living and is only then put to death. The meaning of his death, therefore, is transformed. In Euripides's account, his death is yet another example of the miseries of war, the powerlessness of war's victims and an opportunity to emphasize both Polymestor's violation of the laws of hospitality and Hecuba's revenge. His death, therefore, serves to foreshadow the horrors facing the Trojans in the long war that is about to begin and exemplifies both Greek ruthlessness and Trojan obstinacy. Dictys's account demonstrates none of the sympathy for women that characterizes *Hecuba*; in keeping with his reticence to use direct discourse, Hecuba makes no lament, nor does she get her revenge on Polymestor, as she does in Euripides's play.

[1515] Itaque decernitur, uti Polydorum in conspecta omnium, atque ante ipsos muros necarent. Neque ulterius dilatum facinus: quipped productus in medium, visentibus ex muris plerisque hostium, lapidibus ictus, fraternae impietatis poenas luit. Ac mox unus ex praeconibus nuntiatum Iliensibus mittitur, uti Polydorum sepeliendum peterent. Missusque ad eam rem Idaeus, cum servis regiis, foedatum ac dilaniatum lapidibus Polydorum matri ejus Hecubae refert (157).

The other event immediately preceding those described in *The Iliad* is Ajax's raid on other cities around the Troad. Dictys describes how Ajax sacked two cities in the Troad, Pitya and Zelia, "notoriously wealthy cities, and, not being content with these, laid waste Gargarum, Arisba, Gergitha, Scepsis, and Larissa with marvelous swiftness" (54).[16] Similar events are alluded to analeptically in Homer, such as when Lykaon describes his previous encounter with Achilles (*Il*.21.70). But the reason for the prominence given to these raids has to do again with the influence of Thucydides on Dictys's account. In his description of the Trojan War, Thucydides writes that the Greeks needed ten years to sack Troy because they never "brought the whole of their force into action; instead they cultivated the soil of the Chersonese and went on plundering expeditions because of the shortage of supplies." (*Th*.1.11).[17] Dictys recounts several such foraging invasions by Ajax and Achilles in other areas of the Troad because he is adopting Thucydides's economically historicized view of history rather than Homer's account, which does not dwell on the real-world needs of armies.

In Dictys's account, moreover, such moments have real effects on the war, which would seem to bear out Thucydides's assertion that the Trojan War took longer because the Greeks could not concentrate their forces. He recounts that on one foraging expedition, both Ajax and Achilles were away from the Greek camp when the Trojans launched a surprise attack, burning two ships before Ajax returned. Upon finding Hector, he strikes him with a stone and thus drives off the Trojan attack. In Homer's account, this moment appears in Book 16 of the *Iliad*, where Hector's burning of the ships is the high water mark of the Trojan War effort, the closest they will come to victory. Hector's success at this moment in *The Iliad* is part of Zeus's plan to grant glory to Achilles, who at this point is sitting out the war; Ajax alone is unable to stop Hector's advance. Dictys, however, given his opposition to divine intervention, must find a different reason for Hector's advance. He finds it in Ajax's absence on a foraging raid. This alternative serves two purposes: to find a legitimate explanation for Hector's success and to justify the Thucydidean interpretation of why the Greeks took so long to conquer Troy.

---

[16] Divitiis nobiles, capit. Neque contentus his, Gargarum, Arisbam, Gergitham, Scepsim, Larissam, admiranda celeritate depopulatur (157).

[17] ἀλλὰ πρὸς γεωργίαν τῆς Χερσονήσου τραπόμενοι καὶ λῃστείαν τῆς τροφῆς ἀπορίᾳ (*Th*.1.11).

At verse 28, Dictys picks up the Homeric account and follows it fairly faithfully: Chryses comes for his daughter; he is rejected by Agamemnon; a plague strikes; Achilles convinces Agamemnon to return the girl, which Agamemnon does, though he takes Achilles's slave girl instead. These early scenes offer clear comparisons between Homer's and Dictys's thematic concerns. Dictys recounts how the plague "attacked first the cattle, and then, as it gradually gained momentum, spread among men" (55).[18] His narration closely follows Homer's quite closely: "First [Apollo] went after the mules and the circling hounds, then let go a tearing arrow against the men themselves" (*Il.*1.50).[19] While both accounts describe the same progression of the plague from the animals to the humans, a close reading reveals important differences between their treatments of this event. Homer's account emphasizes the role of the god: Apollo himself is the killer; the plague is merely the effect his arrows have on the gathered Achaeans. Dictys, however, excises the role of the god, substituting Homer's divine intervention with a rational explanation; in Dictys's account, the plague is simply a plague: "Whether this [plague] was due to the wrath of Apollo, as everyone thought, or to some other cause, was uncertain" (55).[20] In Dictys's account, people may believe that the gods are directly involved in the lives of men, but this is just a belief not sanctioned with religious certainty. In Homer's account, which is more favorable to divine intervention, Apollo's intervention is presented as an indisputable fact.

---

[18] Principio grassandi facto a pecoribus: dein malo paulatim magis magisque ingravescente, per homines dispergitur (160).

[19] οὐρῆας μὲν πρῶτον ἐπῴχετο καὶ κύνας ἀργούς,
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' αὐτοῖσι βέλος ἐχεπευκὲς ἐφιεὶς (*Il.*1.50).

Dictys's plot continues to follow Homer's, again with the same thematic alterations which characterize the difference between their styles, such as the excision of divine interference. One such moment occurs at verse 40. Paris and Menelaus are dueling, as they do in Book 3 of the *Iliad*. In the *Iliad*, however, at the moment Menelaus is about to kill Paris, Aphrodite swoops in, scoops Paris up and delivers him to safety. Then Athena comes down to Pandaros and encourages him to break the truce by shooting Menelaus. At *Il.*5.280, Diomedes and Pandaros engage in combat and Homer records Pandaros's death:

> Pallas Athene guided the weapon to the nose next to the eye, and it cut on through the white teeth and the bronze weariless shore all the way thorough the tongue's base so that the spearhead came out under the jawbone. He dropped then from the chariot and his armour clattered upon him, dazzling armour and shining, while those fast – running horses shied away, and there his life and his strength were ended. (*Il.*5.290)[21]

Dictys records this same event, and his description shares the same stylistic and thematic differences with Homer as in the earlier example centering on the plague:

---

[20] incertum alione casu, an, uti omnibus videbatur, ira Apollinis (160).

[21] Ὣς φάμενος προέηκε· βέλος δ' ἴθυνεν Ἀθήνη
ῥῖνα παρ' ὀφθαλμόν, λευκοὺς δ' ἐπέρησεν ὀδόντας.
τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ μὲν γλῶσσαν πρυμνὴν τάμε χαλκὸς ἀτειρής,
αἰχμὴ δ' ἐξελύθη παρὰ νείατον ἀνθερεῶνα·
ἤριπε δ' ἐξ ὀχέων, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ
αἰόλα παμφανόωντα, παρέτρεσσαν δέ οἱ ἵπποι
ὠκύποδες· τοῦ δ' αὖθι λύθη ψυχή τε μένος τε (*Il.*5.290).

> Alexander fell, wounded in the thigh; and Menelaus, hoping to take complete vengeance and win greatest glory, rushed forward to kill him. But Pandarus, committing an act of the blackest treachery by shooting his bow from a hidden spot, wounded Menelaus and caused him to halt. … During this general confusion, a group of barbarians rushed in and saved Alexander from danger. … [Pandarus] continued his slaughtering until Diomedes, stirred by this barbarous action, advanced upon him and cut him down at close quarters. Thus Pandarus, who had killed many men in violation of the treaty… paid with his life for his heinous method of fighting (62).

Dictys's account reveals the same absence of divine interference: Pandarus decides to shoot Menelaus without Athena's instigation while "a group of barbarians," not Aphrodite, saves Paris from Menelaus. Further, the dialogue between the characters, so prevalent in Homer, is excised, replaced with a description of events alone. One other significant difference remains: Dictys's record of Pandarus's death is followed by a moralizing statement condemning Pandarus for his behavior, whereas Homer reports his death without a moralizing comment. This is not so much a reflection of Homer's even-handedness or lack of bias as much as it is an example of Dictys, a Cretan, reacting as a Greek would when watching his comrades suffer harm from Trojan treachery.

The most significant difference between Homer and Dictys appears in the embassy to Achilles. In the *Iliad*, Phoenix and Ulysses's emotional and rational appeals to Achilles set the stage for Achilles's speech, the longest and greatest in the *Iliad*. In it, Achilles rejects his friends' appeal for his return to battle and in so doing rejects the heroic code and all that goes along with it: glory, material wealth, status in the community. In Dictys's account, characteristically, the speeches are cast in free indirect discourse, thus sapping them of their pathos and grandeur. More startling than that, however, is the outcome of the embassy: in Dictys, they are able to persuade Achilles to return to battle. Not only does this conflict with Homer at the level of plot, but it also undermines the thematic thrust of the *Iliad*: Achilles’s separation from and eventual reintegration into society.

In the *Iliad*, Achilles’s absence from battle leads to disaster for the Greeks: Hector’s burning of the ships. This leads Patroclus to return to battle wearing Achilles’s armor and his death at the hands of Hector. That Dictys allows Achilles to return to battle poses a problem, then, for how he is to move forward with this crucial plot element after having altered the scene which logically precedes it. He solves this problem by having Achilles receive a wound in battle, which forces him to the sidelines again, an event which, given Achilles’s overwhelming physical prowess in the *Iliad*, would be inconceivable in the Homeric account.

Patroclus’s death also exemplifies the differences between the two authors: gone are the speeches between the two heroes and the direct intervention of the gods. In the *Iliad*, Apollo comes against Patroclus and “struck his back and his broad shoulders with a flat stroke of the hand so that his eyes spun. Phoibos Apollo now struck away from his head the helmet four-horned and hollow-eyed” (16.793).[22] Only at that point does Euphorbus strike him with a javelin before Hector finally kills him. In Dictys’s account, stripped as it is of divine intervention, this scene is much briefer and less emotionally fraught: “[Patroclus] entered the fray and attacked the enemy fiercely, more fiercely than anyone ever. Euphorbus, however, found him with a javelin. And soon Hector rushed up and, straddling the fallen body, dealt it many piercing thrusts and then tried to drag it from the battle" (76).[23]

---

[22] … πλῆξεν δὲ μετάφρενον εὐρέε τ’ ὤμω
χειρὶ καταπρηνεῖ, στρεφεδίνηθεν δέ οἱ ὄσσε.
τοῦ δ’ ἀπὸ μὲν κρατὸς κυνέην βάλε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων·
ἣ δὲ κυλινδομένη καναχὴν ἔχε ποσσὶν ὑφ’ ἵππων
αὐλῶπις τρυφάλεια,

Achilles's revenge on Hector is also cast in a cursory and unemotional way: "Achilles chose a few faithful comrades and hastened to lay an ambush for the Trojans. He caught them off guard – they were trying to cross a river – and surrounded and slew them before they knew what had hit them. Hector and all those who were with him were killed" (79).[24] Again, there is no dialogue, nor is there any divine intervention, as in the *Iliad,* in which Athena tricks Hector and convinces him to fight. All the pathos and drama which lead up to this climactic moment in the *Iliad* are absent in the chronicle tradition, where this is just one of many encounters between heroes.

Dictys also changes the scene of Priam's embassy to Achilles: "At daybreak Priam came to Achilles – a wretched sight. … With him came Andromache, no less wretched than himself, her features marred in every way. To aid the king in his request, she brought her sons. … And Polyxena came also, supporting her father" (81).[25] The difference between this scene and the parallel scene in the *Iliad* is obvious from this passage's opening words: "At daybreak." In the *Iliad*, Priam's nocturnal visit to Achilles is extremely risky; Priam's own safety is by no means assured. Indeed, when Hermes comes upon Priam on his way, the god says:

---

[23] Patroclus fortunam belli vincere aggressus, dum hortatur suos simul atque instat hostibus, promitior quam bellandi mos est, telo Euphorbi ictus ruit: statimque Hector advolans eum opprimit, ac desuper vulneribus multis fodit: moxque nititur abstahere praelio (194).

[24] Igitur Achilles, paucis fidis adjunctis secum, insidiatum propere pergit, atque hostem securum sui praevortit. Tum ingredi flumen occipientem circumvenit: ita eumque, et omnes qui, comites regulo, dolum hujusmodi ignoraverant, ex improvisero interficit (199).

[25] At lucis principio, Priamus lugubri veste miserabile tectus, cui dolor, … quo cum Andromacha, non minor equam in Priamo miseratio: ea quippe deformata multplicio modo … parvulos admodum filios, prae se habens, regi adjumentum deprecandi aderat, qui moeroribus senioque decrepitus filiae Polyxenae humeris inniterbaur (204).

> Where, my father, are you thus guiding your mules and horses
> Through the immortal night while other mortals are sleeping?
> Have you no fear of the Achaians whose wind is fury,
> Who hate you, who are your enemies, and are near? (24.362)[26]

In Dictys's version, however, Priam, unafraid, makes a daytime entrance and, in contrast to the *Iliad*, in which he comes alone, he brings his grandsons, daughter and daughter-in-law with him. Though Dictys's story follows his usual pattern of excising the divine element – the undertaking is not ventured through the will of Zeus, nor does Hermes act as guide – Dictys does include a rare moment of direct discourse, reporting Priam's speech to Achilles. In the *Iliad*, the meeting between the two is a furtive affair undertaken in secret under cover of darkness; in Dictys's account, Priam is brought before the entire council of Greek kings. The speech he gives combines elements of both Priam and Achilles's speeches to one another in the *Iliad*.

Dictys's Priam begins: "You are not to blame for my misfortunes. It is one of the gods who, instead of pitying me, has brought the end of my life to ruin. Now I am overwhelmed and worn out with grief for my sons" (82).[27] This is paralleled in the *Iliad*, but it is rather Achilles who expresses this sentiment by drawing upon the famous urns of fate:

> There are two urns that stand on the door-sill of Zeus. They are

---

[26] πῇ πάτερ ὧδ' ἵππους τε καὶ ἡμιόνους ἰθύνεις
νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην, ὅτε θ' εὕδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι;
οὐδὲ σύ γ' ἔδεισας μένεα πνείοντας Ἀχαιούς,
οἵ τοι δυσμενέες καὶ ἀνάρσιοι ἐγγὺς ἔασι; (*Il.*24.362)

[27] 'Non tu mihi,' inquit, 'causa husjusce fortunae, sed Deorum quispiam, qui postremam aetatem meam cum miserari deberet, in hasce aerumnas deduxit, confectam jam, ac defatigatam tanti luctibus filiorum' (205).

> unlike
> for the gifts that they bestow: an urn of evils, an urn of blessings.
> If Zeus who delights in thunder mingles these and bestows them
> On man, he shifts, and moves now in evil, again in good fortune.
> But when Zeus bestows from the urn of sorrows, he makes
> a failure of a man. (*Il.*24.527)[28]

This, Achilles claims, is the cause of Priam's sad fate. In Homer's worldview, the gods apportion happiness and sadness as they see fit, and the course of men's lives are subject to their arbitrary and inscrutable whims. Dictys, with his usual disregard for mythological material and for the specific means by which the divine operates in ancient Greek religion, dispenses with the urns, but maintains the basic sentiment Achilles expressed, namely that Priam was once happy and is now brought low by the gods. Priam continues his speech by offering himself for sacrifice, if that should satisfy the Greeks. In doing so, Priam acknowledges, in a way he never does in previous versions of the Trojan War, that the fault for the war's outbreak lies with the Trojans, and his sons in particular:

> They, confident in their youth and the resources of their kingdom, and always desiring to fulfill the desire of their hearts, have devised, contrary to their expectations, destruction for both themselves and for me. It is their maxim that old age should be despised by youth. Nevertheless, if my death will prevent those of my sons who are left from committing other crimes of this sort, I also offer myself, if thus it is pleasing, for capital punishment. (Dictys 82)[29]

---

[28] δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει
δώρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων·
ᾧ μέν κ’ ἀμμίξας δώῃ Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος,
ἄλλοτε μέν τε κακῷ ὅ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ’ ἐσθλῷ·
ᾧ δέ κε τῶν λυγρῶν δώῃ, λωβητὸν ἔθηκε,
καί ἑ κακὴ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα δῖαν ἐλαύνει,
φοιτᾷ δ’ οὔτε θεοῖσι τετιμένος οὔτε βροτοῖσιν. (*Il.*24.527)

[29] Quippe hi fisi regno per juventutem, cum simper cupiditates animi quoquo modo explore gestiunt, ultro sibi, mihique perniciem machinati sunt; neque dubium cuiquam, quin contemtui sit adolescentiae senectae aetas. Quod si interitu meo reliqui hujuscemodi facinoribus temperabunt, me quoque, si videtur, exhibeo poenae mortis (205).

In this passage, Priam focuses on the political situation; his goal here seems to be ending the war and expiating his sons' guilt. Priam's speech in the *Iliad* demonstrates no larger concern than regaining Hector's body; Priam does not offer of his own life nor does he apologize for his sons' actions. He concludes, however, by appealing, as in the *Iliad*, to Achilles's fondness for his own father: "Remember your own father who is spending all of his waking hours thinking of you, wondering if you are safe" (83). In the *Iliad*, he says: "Honour the gods, Achilleus, and take pity upon me/ remembering your own father" (*Il.*24.503).[30]

This, in the *Iliad*, is enough to persuade Achilles. In Dictys's account, however, Achilles gives a much different response, reproaching Priam because of his children's greed for others' wealth and women (83).

For the second time in this scene, the characters cast blame on Priam's children for the war. Moreover, it is only after this initial condemnation that Achilles brings up the Iliadic reason for his cruel treatment of Hector's corpse, that is, as revenge for Patroclus. Dictys's Achilles says:

> Until now, the Greeks had obeyed civilized rules of war and returned the bodies of their enemies for burial. But Hector had acted contrary to the laws of human nature when he dragged the body of Patroclus from the battle, with the evident of abusing and defiling it. Now the Trojans must bear their punishments in expiation of this crime. Thus, in future time, the Greeks and other peoples, remembering what had happened in this case, would keep the natural law. (83)[31]

---

[30] ἀλλ' αἰδεῖο θεοὺς Ἀχιλεῦ, αὐτόν τ' ἐλέησον
μνησάμενος σοῦ πατρός· (*Il.*24.503).

[31] Namque ad id tempus Graecos secutos morem in bellis optimum, quoscumque hostium pugna conficeret, resituere sepultrae solitos Contra Hectorem supergressum humanitatis modum, Patroclum eripere praelio ausum, scilicet ad ludendum, ac foedandum cadaver ejus: quod exemplum poenis ac suppliciis eorum eluendum, ut Graeci ac reliquae posthac gentes memores ultionis ejus, moremque humanae conditionis tuerentur (207).

No mention is made of any particular intensity of feeling between Patroclus and Achilles; rather, Achilles presents his claim as objective moral instruction. The personal element, which is the defining feature of Achilles's treatment of Hector in the *Iliad*, is entirely absent, substituted instead for impersonal justice; the Trojans are being punished for improper treatment of the dead. Yet, this seems an odd lesson for Achilles to draw, since, as Dictys reports Patroclus's death, Hector's attempt to drag off Patroclos's body was unsuccessful. Further, his intended treatment of the body is entirely based on the narrator's speculation: "No doubt, in keeping with his people's total lack of human decency, Hector wanted to mock and mangle this victim in every way" (76).[32] There is no actual evidence that Hector even wanted this; it is mere supposition on the part of a Greek warrior primed to assume the worst about the Trojans.

Dictys's pro-Greek partisanship defines his treatment of this and other scenes, particularly in situations where they differ from the Homer's more neutral account. Thus, he assumes the worst of the Trojans and the best of the Greeks: Hector must have been trying to mangle the corpse; Achilles must not have been, but rather teaching a lesson. Similarly, Dictys's report of Priam's embassy to Achilles focuses on his admission of his sons guilt, a recurring theme in the *Journal*, as it puts the Greeks in a more just light relative to the Trojans.

---

[32] Scilicet insolentia gentis suae illudere cupiens per universa genera dehonestamenti (194).

III. Dares's Trojan War

Dares's account, as has already been discussed, begins earlier than Dictys's account; it is the earliest extant narration of the first Trojan War, fought by the fathers of the heroes fighting in the Homeric epics. This war, alluded to obliquely in scattered lines of Homer and Pindar, becomes a prominent part of Dares's version. Further, since Medieval European monarchs claimed descent from the Trojans, they favored Dares's account, since he, like them, was a Trojan. As a result, this first war becomes even more prominent in medieval accounts of the Trojan War. Dictys writes that at the end of the war, "They all joined in, and tore down their walls, those walls which had stood for centuries unharmed, and which, as tradition told, were the masterwork of Neptune and Apollo" (112).[33] In this, he agrees with Homer and Pindar, both of whom cite the divine construction of the walls (though Dictys notes not that this is true, but only that it is "as tradition told").

Dares, however, tells a somewhat different story. After returning from stealing the Golden Fleece with Jason, Hercules leads a group against Troy, which at this time is ruled by Priam's father, Laomedon. After Hercules sacks it, Priam "saw to the maximum fortification of the city, built stronger walls, and stationed a greater number of soldiers nearby. Troy must not fall again, as it had under his father" (136).[34] Thus, the walls torn down at the end of Dictys's narrative are not the same walls torn down at the end of

---

[33] Ita inviolatum multis tempestatibus murorum opus, Neptunique, ut perhibebatur, atque Apollinis, maxima monumenta, nullo dilectu civium minibus dissolvuntur (252).

[34] ampliora moenia extruxit, civitatem munitissimam reddidit et militum multitudinem ibi esse fecit, ne per ignorantiem opprimeretu, ita ut Laomedon pater eius oppressus est (6).

Dares's: Dares's walls were less than a generation old while Dictys's walls had stood for centuries.

Dares also differs from both Homer and Dictys in his description of the participants of the War. Dictys gives no physical descriptions along with his list of those involved in the war: "Nestor came to Argos, accompanied by Antilochus and Thrasymedes, his sons by Anaxibia. Then Peneleus came with his cousins Clonius and Arcesilaus" (30).[35] Dictys simply lists the names of the participants. Homer is somewhat more expansive. In this scene's analogue in the *Iliad*, the teichoscopia in Book 3, Helen, standing on top of the walls of Troy, points out to Priam the Greek leaders in the plain far below. Homer structures these introductions in a question and answer format, such as when Priam asks: "So you could tell me the name of this man who is so tremendous; who is this Achaian man of power and stature? Though in truth there are others taller by a head than he is, yet these eyes have never yet looked on a man so splendid nor so lordly as this: such a man might well be royal" (3.166).[36] Helen identifies him as Agamemnon. Again, Priam asks: "Tell me of this one also, dear child; what man can he be, shorter in truth by a head than Atreus's son Agamemnon, but broader, it would seem in the chest and across the shoulders" (3.191).[37] Helen responds that this is Odysseus.

[3535] Nestor cum Antilocho et Thrasymede, quos ex Anaxibia susceperat, supervenit. Eos Peneleus insecutus, cum Clonio et Arcesilao consanguineis (109).

[36] ὥς μοι καὶ τόνδ' ἄνδρα πελώριον ἐξονομήνῃς
ὅς τις ὅδ' ἐστὶν Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ ἠΰς τε μέγας τε.
ἤτοι μὲν κεφαλῇ καὶ μείζονες ἄλλοι ἔασι,
καλὸν δ' οὕτω ἐγὼν οὔ πω ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν,
οὐδ' οὕτω γεραρόν· βασιλῆϊ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικε (*Il.*3.166).

[37] εἴπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε φίλον τέκος ὅς τις ὅδ' ἐστί·
μείων μὲν κεφαλῇ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο,
εὐρύτερος δ' ὤμοισιν ἰδὲ στέρνοισιν ἰδέσθαι (*Il.3.192*).

Homer's physical descriptions are all relative and general: that Agamemnon is not the tallest of the Aecheans, but is taller than Odysseus, but that Odysseus is broader shouldered. These descriptions offer some insight into each character's physique, but not enough to allow them to be recognizable outside the context of the teichoscopia. Where Dictys does away with these physical descriptions entirely, Dares takes an opposite approach, fleshing them out in specific and concrete terms: "Hector spoke with a slight lisp. His complexion was fair, his hair curly. His eyes would blink attractively. His movements were swift. His face, with its beard, was noble. … Alexander was fair, tall, and brave. His eyes were very beautiful, his hair soft and blond. … Aeneas was auburn – haired, stocky, eloquent, courteous, prudent, pious and charming. His eyes were black and twinkling" (143).[38]

Dares's account even describes the physical appearances of women: "Hecuba was beautiful, her figure large, her complexion dark" (143).[39] Dares even records that Briseis had a unibrow (144). This level of detail delineates the physical characteristics of the heroes in a way that no previous writer had, a level of detail that surpasses not only Homer and Dictys, but Virgil as well. As Mark Griffith points out in "What Does Aeneas Look Like" (1985), "We are not told whether [Aeneas] is dark or fair, youthful or grizzled, bearded or clean – shaven, long – or short – haired, burly or slim" (309). For Griffith, however, this is a mark of Virgil's literary greatness: "The inner man is fixed, if not assertive, of character and purpose; the outer man is no more than he has to be, the sum of the perceptions of others. He has no distinctive quirks or scars, no special mannerisms, no unique quality to his beauty" (316). If Virgil's man is all interior, then Dares's characters are all exterior; indeed, particularly given the lack of monologue and dialogue, such integral parts of the epic and tragic traditions, his characters betray no depth at all. This holds equally true, however, for Dictys, who nevertheless demonstrates neither interiority nor exteriority for his characters. The works of the chroniclers is driven by plot and action, not by psychology and dialogue.

---

[38] Hectorem blaesum caudidum crispum strabum pernicibus membris vultu venerabili barbatum. … Alexanrum candidum longum fortum. … Aeneam rufum quadratum facundum affabilem fortem cum consilio pium venustum oculis hilaribus et nigris (15).

[39] Hecubam magnam aquiline corpora pulchram mente virili piam iustam (15).

Dares alters the Homeric plot of the Trojan War much more than Dictys or any other previous known author. Most of the elements from the Homeric version are present, if in slightly altered form, in Dares, but the ordering of events and their causal relations to one another is different. Thus, for example, in the second battle between Greeks and Trojans, Dares reports that

> Hector met and slew Protesilaus . ... On the next day Hector led forth his army out of the city ready for battle. … Hector slew Patroclus. … Hector though wounded, slew a great number of the enemy and would have successfully turned the Greek forces to flight had Ajax the son of Telamon not stood in his way. Immediately upon meeting Ajax, Hector remembered that they were related: Ajax' mother was Priam's sister Hesione. Therefore, he commanded the Trojans to stop setting fire to the ships. And the two men gave gifts to each other and departed. On the next day the Greeks obtained a truce. Achilles mourned for Patroclus, and the Greeks for their dead. Agamemnon held a magnificent funeral for Protesilaus and saw to the proper burial of the others. And Achilles held funeral games in honor of Patroclus. (149)[40]

---

[40] Hector oviam venit et eum [Protesilaus] interfecit … postera die Hector exercitum ex urbe educit et instruit. … Hector Patroclum occidit … [Hector] saucius quoque multa milia occidit et perseverasset Achivos in fugam mittere, nisi obvius illi Aiax Telamonius fuisset. cum quo cum congrederetur, cognovits eum esse de sanguine suo, erat enim de Hesiona sorore Priami natus. quo pacto Hector a navibus ignem removeri iussit et utrique se invicem remuneraverunt, et amici discesserunt. Postera die Graiugenae indutias petunt. Achilles Patroclum plangit, Graiguenae suos. Agamemnon Protesilaum magnifico funere effert ceterosque sepeliendos curat. Achilles Patroclo ludos funebres facit (24).

This passage, which covers two battles on two consecutive days, contains elements from a variety of scenes scattered throughout the *Iliad*. Protesilaus's death occurs before the *Iliad* begins, and is narrated analeptically at *Il*.2.698. The next event Dares narrates, Patroclus's death at the hands of Hector, occurs, in his account, the next day, whereas in Homer it occurs some ten years later. While Dares passes over this incident in a sentence, moreover, the death of Patroclus is the pivotal moment in the *Iliad*, setting in motion a chain of events which will lead to the deaths of Hector and Achilles and, ultimately, the fall of Troy. It has no such significance in Dares; it is merely one of many deaths he reports.

The next moment Dares describes, the confrontation between Hector and Ajax, is a conflation of two separate encounters between the two. The meeting between Ajax and Hector recalls the individual combat between the two in the *Iliad*. At *Il*.7.22, Athena and Apollo decide to end the death on both sides by stirring up in Hector the desire to challenge the Greeks to individual combat. The Greeks hesitate before ultimately choosing lots and sending Ajax. The combat rages until night comes on, forcing the heroes into a face-saving gift exchange. This scene, comprising some three-hundred lines of dialogue, divine intervention and description of combat, is reduced to a sentence of bare narrative exposition in Dares. Moreover, the gift exchange has nothing to do with any recognizable genealogical connection between the two heroes.

The other scene with which Dares conflates this one is the burning of the ships in the fifteenth book of the *Iliad*. In this scene, Hector attempts to burn the ships while Ajax, the last of the great Greek heroes still actively involved in the combat, wards him off. In the *Iliad*, it is not Ajax who drives the Trojans off, but rather Patroclus, dressed in

Achilles's armor; Ajax is otherwise occupied fighting a last ditch defensive action to preserve the ships from the fire. Dares, of course, cannot have Patroclus save the ships, since, in his account, Patroclus is already dead; thus, he joins two scenes, thematically linked because they feature combat between Ajax and Hector, in order to retain the vague plot outline inherited from Homer: Hector begins to burn the ships but is ultimately stayed.

Another moment exemplifying the different foci of Homer and Dares is the way they describe the death of Hector. This moment, one of the most dramatic in the Homeric corpus, is treated almost identically as the other deaths Dares describes:

> Achilles, seeing these leaders fall and wanting to prevent other Greeks from meeting a similar fate, determined to go against Hector and slay him. But by the time he caught up with Hector, the battle continuing to rage, the latter had already killed Olypoetes, the bravest of leaders, and was trying to strip off the armor. The fight that arose was terrific, as was the clamor from the city and armies. Hector wounded Achilles's leg. But Achilles, though pained, pressed on all the harder and kept pressing on until he had won. Hector's death caused the Trojans to turn and flee for their gates. (153)[41]

The combat between Achilles and Hector, the central conflict in *The Iliad*, is told in Dares's account without even mentioning the death of Patroclus. Consistent with his style, there is no divine intervention, as when in *The Iliad* Athena disguises herself as Deiphobus to encourage Hector to fight, nor are there any words exchanged between the two heroes.

---

[41] Achilles ut respexit multos duces eins dextera cecidisse, animum in eum dirigebat, ut illi obvius fieret. Considerabat enim Achilles nisi Hectorem occideret plures de Graecorum numero eius dextera perituros. Proelium interea conliditur. Hector Polypoetem ducem fortissimum occidit dumque eum spoliare coepit, Achilles supervenit. Fit pugna maior, clamor ab oppido et a toto exercita surgit. Hector Achillis femur sauciavit. Achilles dolore accepto magis eum persequi coepit nec destitit, nisi eum occideret. Quo interempto Troianos in fugam vertit et maxima caede laesos usque ad portas persequitur (30).

Equally surprising is what follows in Dares's account: Memnon, now in command, leads the Trojans on the offensive, while Agamemnon requests a two-month truce to bury the dead. During this truce, "Priam, following the custom of his people, buried Hector in front of the gates and held funeral games in his honor" (153).[42] Again, Dares drastically alters the traditional Homeric storyline. In Dares's account, it is Agamemnon, the Greek king, who sends envoys to seek a truce after the death of Hector, whereas the Trojans march forth to battle. In "Troy Revisited," Dennis Bradley calls this scene a "serious flaw in narrative technique" because "in spite of the death of the Trojans' foremost champion and their consequent rout … the Greeks are made to sue for a truce instead of seeking to press home their advantage over a demoralized enemy" (235). Bradley rightly notes, however, that this seeming discrepancy is most likely "a reflection of the pro-Trojan bias of the account" (235, n. 30). In the *Iliad*, Priam, with the aid of Zeus and Hermes, comes to beg for Hector's body and the exchange between him and Achilles is one of the most emotionally fraught, poignant and psychologically profound moments in the poem. In Dares' account, not only does this embassy not occur, but there is absolutely no emotional charge to the narration Hector's burial, which is, after all, the concluding episode in the *Iliad*.

IV. Dares, Dictys and Virgil

The major difference between Dictys and Virgil is at the levels of plot and characterization, particularly the treatment of Virgil's protagonist, Aeneas. In Antiquity and the Renaissance, Aeneas was a character to be emulated, a sentiment most elegantly expressed by Sir Philip Sidney: “Who reads Aeneas carrying old Anchises on his back, that wishes not it were his fortune to perform so excellent an act?” (25).

---

[42] Priamus Hectorem suorum more ante portas sepelivit ludosque funebres fecit (31).

The depiction of Aeneas in the chronicles of both Dares and Dictys, however, is radically different. In both accounts, Aeneas becomes a negative exemplum: indeed, along with Antenor, he becomes the paradigmatic traitor.[43] In Dares’s account, Aeneas plays an active role in the downfall of Troy. He conspired with the Greeks to the end that they should come to the “Scaean gate – the one carved with a horse’s head. Antenor and Aeneas would be in charge of the guard at this point, and they would open the bold and raise a torch as the sign for the attack” (165).[44] In this version, the Trojan horse has been re-imagined as a carving above the gate through which the Greeks enter. Aeneas betrays Troy, opening the gate so the Greeks can conquer Troy. This is a far different version of events from that which Aeneas tells Dido in the *Aeneid*:

> Many a combat, hand to hand, we fought
> In the black night, and many a Greek we sent
> To Orcus. (*Aen*.2.526)[45]

Rather than fighting on behalf of the doomed Trojans, the Aeneas presented by Dares and Dictys is the agent for their destruction. Similarly, in the *Aeneid*, Aeneas heeds his divine mother’s advice and flees, taking with him the last remnant of the Trojans. In contrast, Dares and Dictys treat this episode quite differently. Because they programmatically deny divine intervention in human affairs and because Aeneas, as a conspirator with the

---

[43] For this and also for Aeneas’s reputation in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, cf. Bradley 103ff.

[44] Ad portam Scaeam adducant, ubi extrinsecus caput equi sculptum est, ibi praesidia habere noctu Antenorem et Anchisen, exercitui Argivorum portam reseraturos eisque lumen prolaturos, id signum eruptionis fore (49).

[45] Multaque per caecam congressi proelia noctem
conserimus, multos Danaum demittimus Orco. (*Aen*.2.397)

Greeks, is in no danger from their victory, they suggest different reasons for his flight from Troy. Dares writes that Aeneas hid Polyxena from the Greeks, who wanted to sacrifice her, and as a result, "Agamemnon was angry with Aeneas for hiding Polyxena and ordered him and his followers to depart from their country immediately. Thus Aeneas and all of his followers departed" (167).[46] This last sentence is the entirety of Dares's treatment of the main events recounted in the *Aeneid*. Dictys tells a somewhat different tale: Aeneas attempts a coup against Antenor, whom the Greeks have appointed to rule Troy, but is unsuccessful, "And so, Aeneas was forced to set sail. Taking all of his patrimony, he departed from Troy and eventually arrived in the Adriatic Sea, after passing many barbarous peoples. Here he and those who were with him founded a city, which they called Corcyra Melina (Black Corcyra)" (117).[47] Dictys, too, condenses the main action of the *Aeneid* into one sentence.

These differences have two possible causes, one literary, the other historical. From a literary perspective, Aeneas's much more admirable behavior in the *Aeneid* relative to the chronicles of Dares and Dictys can be explained by the fact that it is Aeneas himself telling his story, and of course, given that he is the teller, it is natural that he would want to paint himself in the best light. Tellingly, however, in his description of his own action during the fall of Troy, there are several moments which leave open the possibility that Aeneas is, in fact, telling a not wholly reliable version of events. Indeed, Aeneas plays a decidedly passive role at some of the crucial moments of the sack of

---

[46] Agamemnon iratus Aenae quod Polyxenam absconderat eum cum suis omnibus profiscitur (51).

[47] Ita coactus cum omni patrimonio ob Troja navigat, devenitque ad mare Adriaticum, multas interim gentes barbaras praetervectus: ibique constituit his qui secum navigaverant civitatem, appellatam Corcyram Melaenam (262).

Troy, first as he watches helplessly as Cassandra is dragged away (*Aen*.2.535) and, more significantly, when Priam is killed by Neoptolemos. Aeneas describes the scene, mentioning that he saw it with his own eyes (*Aen*.2.649). At no point, however, does he make any attempt to intervene, either by protecting Priam or killing Neoptolemos. Nor, for that matter, does he give any reason for not doing so; in the incident with Cassandra, he at least proffers an excuse as to why they were prevented from pursuing Cassandra and her captor:

> We all went after him, our swords at play,
> But here, here first, from the temple gable's height,
> We met a hail of missiles from our friends,
> Pitiful execution, by their error,
> Who us Greek from our Greek plumes and shields. (*Aen*.2.540)[48]

In the scene with Priam, he offers no reason whatsoever. He never even expresses any desire to avenge himself on Neoptolemos at all. Rather, his thoughts immediately turn to Helen, whom he sees cowering at an altar:

> Now fires blazed up in my own spirit –
> A passion to avenge my fallen town
> And punish Helen's whorishness. (*Aen*.2.754)[49]

The only character he expresses a desire to kill is Helen, an adopted Trojan; he never expresses such rage towards, Neoptolemus, whom he has just seen kill Priam. These contradictions in Aeneas's narration of the events puts him more in line with the characterization presented by Dares and Dictys: a traitor ultimately concerned with self-preservation, indifferent to the sufferings of the mass of Trojans, and gratified at the death of the Trojan ruling class. This discrepancy in characterization can also be explained from a historical perspective. Virgil and Ovid were both patronized by Augustus, who claimed descent from Aeneas, thus their Aeneas cannot be committing treason. Dares and Dictys, with no patron to gratify, can write whatever they please.

---

[48] Consequimur cuncti, et densis incurrimus armis.
Hic primum ex alto delubri culmine telis
nostrorum obruimur, oriturque miserrima caedes
armorum facie et Graiarum errore iubarum (*Aen.*2.409).

[49] Exarsere ignes animo; subit ira cadentem
Ulcisci patriam et sceleratas sumere poenas (*Aen*.2.575).

V. Dictys and the Greek Tragedians

Dictys's work covers not only the portion of the Trojan War narrated by Homer, but also the immediate aftermath and homecoming of the Greek heroes. In this, he draws on much the same mythological material as the tragedians (if not drawing from them directly) and on Euripides in particular. But, as with Homer, the way in which he treats this material is significantly different at the levels of plot and style. These differences can be seen in Dictys's treatment of the scenes depicted in Euripides's *Trojan Women* and *Andromache* and Sophocles's *Ajax*. As with the comparison between Dictys and Homer, the major differences are the absence of divine intervention and the omission of direct discourse. The effect of this latter distinction distinguishes the chronicle from the epic style insofar as Homer's interest is at least as much plot narration as dialogue and psychology. In drama, however, there is only dialogue; whatever plot does exist is moved forward by this medium. Thus, drama is even more diametrically opposed to the chronicle tradition than epic. To illustrate, Dictys narrates the entire action of the *Trojan Women* in a single paragraph:

> When we were sated with Trojan blood, and the city was burned to the ground, we divided the booty, in payment of military service, beginning with the captive women and children. First of all, Helen was freely given to Menelaus; then Polyxena, at the request of Ulysses, was given to Neoptolemus, to sacrifice to Achilles; Cassandra was given to Agamemnon (he had been so moved by her beauty that, in spite of

> himself, he had openly said that he loved her); and Aethra and Clymene were given to Demophoon and Acamas. The other women were apportioned by lot, and thus Andromache fell to Neoptolemos (to honor whose greatness, we further allowed Andromache's sons to accompany her); and Hecuba fell to Ulysses. After enslaving the women of royal birth, we allotted booty and captives to the rest of our men in proportion as they deserved. (114)[50]

At the level of plot, this more or less follows the *Trojan Women*. Each of the female Trojans is given to the same Greek as in Euripides's account. What is missing is anything other than the mere repetition of the facts, which, though the same as in Euripides, are secondary to the emotional pathos of the work. Euripides's focus is on the repercussions of slavery, how various royal women, once free, accept their impending life of bondage. Dictys's concern is limited to the economy and division of slaves and property. The only alteration of factual detail between the two is the inclusion of Andromache's sons in the exchange. In Euripides, the death of Andromache's son Astyanax forms a dramatic highpoint, which Euripides exploits to elucidate his themes of the cruelty of victors and his emotional sympathy with the plight of women. Dictys has no such interest, and the death of Andromache's sons would provide a moment of heightened emotion which he has no interest in narrating.

Drawing from Ovid, Dictys narrates the story of Hecuba's death, writing that she, "preferring death to enslavement, called down many curses and evil omens upon us, and we, being terribly provoked, stoned her to death. Her tomb, which was raised at Abydos, was called Cynossema (The Tomb of the Bitch) because of her mad and shameless barking" (116).[51] Dictys means this metaphorically; he, unlike Ovid, has no interest in physical metamorphoses. Whereas Ovid takes the metaphorical and makes it literal, that is, she yelled like a dog at the Greeks to the extent that she became a dog, Dictys leaves his description at the metaphorical level.

---

[50] Igitur ubi saties Trojani sanguinis tenuit, et urbs incendiis complanata est, initium solvendae per praedem militia capiunt, primo a captivis foeminis, puerisque adhuc imbellibus. Itaque ex his prima omnium Helena sine sorte Menelao conceditur: dein Polyxena, suadente Ulysse, per Neoptolemum Achilli inferias missa: Agamemnoni Cassandra datur, postquam forma ejus captus, quin Palam desiderium fateretur, dissimulare nequiverat: Aethram et Clymenam Demophoon atque Athamas habuere: reliquarum sors agi coepta, atque ita Neoptolemo Andromacha, adjunctis postquam id evenerat filiis ejus in honorem tanti ducis, Ulyssi Hecuba obvenere. Alii, ut quemque sors contigerat praedam, aut ex captivis, quantam pro merito distribuebatur, habuere (256).

After narrating the events of the *Trojan Women*, Dictys narrates the events of Sophocles *Ajax*. Again, the distinction at the level of plot is somewhat minor, but is illustrative of the larger differences between the two authors' methods. In Sophocles's version of the events, Ajax and Ulysses are competing over Achilles's armor, a prize which, being of divine fabrication, is worth fighting over. Dictys, who consistently rationalizes and diminishes the role of the gods, has no such place for a divine suit of armor. Thus, he substitutes a religious artifact, the Palladium, the statue that prevented the destruction of Troy as long as it stayed within the walls.

He then uses this religious artifact as the prize around which the conflict between Ajax and Ulysses is organized: "Heated contention arose at this time as to which of our leaders should have the Palladium. Ajax the son of Telamon demanded it in payment for the booty his courage and zeal had brought us all. … But not so Ulysses, who contended, with all of his force, that he should have it" (114).[52]

---

[51] Hecuba, que servitium morte solveret, multa ingerere maledicta, imprecarique infausta omina in exercitum: quare motus miles lapidibus obrutam necat, sepulcrumque apud Abydum statuitur, appellaturque Cynossema, ob lingue proterviam impudentemque petulantiam (259).

[52] Interim super Palladio ingens certamen inter se ducibus exortum, Ajace Telamonis expostulante in munus sibi, pro his quae in singulos universosque virtute atque industria

This conflict between Ajax and Ulysses in Sophocles is set in motion by Athena. Unseen by Ajax, the goddess leads him away from Odysseus and into the madness which results in his slaughter of the cattle. When Odysseus asks her why Ajax slaughtered the cattle, she replies that she deluded him into thinking that they were the Greek captains he hated (*Aj*.51). In contrast, Dictys never even mentions the slaughter of the cattle. At most, he implies it when he writes that "Ajax was so angry that he lost control of himself and openly swore to kill those who had thwarted his claim" (115).[53] This is as close as he comes to mentioning the cattle. He continues by writing: "At daybreak we found Ajax, out in the open, dead; upon closer investigation, we discovered the he had been killed with a sword" (115).[54] This account reveals only the most minor similarity with the Sophoclean and Pindaric narrations of Ajax's death. In their versions, Ajax's death is clearly and unambiguously a suicide; not so in Dictys's account, where the implication is treachery and murder: "A great tumult arose among our leaders and men, and soon a full-grown rebellion was under way. We felt that just as Palamedes, our wisest counselor in war and peace, had been treacherously slain, so now Ajax, our most distinguished commander, had met a similar end" (116).[55] Sophocles is concerned with the conflict between divine and mortal forms of justice; Dictys is concerned solely with the historical and political ramifications of action.

---

sua contulerat. … Igitur Ulysses cum Ajace summa vi contendere inter se, atque invicem industriae meritis expostulare (257).

[53] Interim Ajax indignatus, et ob id victus dolore animi, palam atque in ore omnium vindictam se sanguine eorum a quibus impugnatus esset exacturum denuntiat (258).

[54] At lucis principio, Ajacem in medio ex animem offendunt: perquirentesque mortis genus, animadvertere ferro interfectum (258).

[55] Inde ortus per duces atque exercitum tumultus ingens, ac dein seditio brevi adulta, cum ante jam Palamedum virum domi belloque prudentissimum, nunc Ajacem inclytum tot egregiis pugnis, atque utrosque insidiis eorum circumventos ingemiscerent (259).

Dares's *De Excidio Trojae* and Dictys's *Ephemeridos Belli Trojani* are both retellings of the Trojan War which revise the epic and tragic poets' visions in light of contemporary historigraphical theory. Though Dares writes from the Phrygian pro-Trojan perspective while Dictys, as a Cretan, is pro-Greek, both authors share a similar conception of historical writing and authorial legitimacy. In opposition to Homer, they stress that they were eye-witnesses to the events they recount and they replace divine causation with human action. On the level of style, they excise almost all of the passages of great pathos from the previous versions as well as the great speeches which comprise so much of the earlier tradition. In the skeletal outlines that remain when these elements are removed, they offer what they consider to be the most historically accurate account of the Trojan War. Though they could not have predicted it, the skeletal form of their works would provide their medieval translators and adaptors with a version that was uniquely suited to medieval ideas about historiography, romance-writing and epic. Because of this, their accounts would become the most influential in the Middle Ages. This influence is described in Chapter 5. The reason, however, that medieval audiences retained an interest in the Trojan War has to do with another familiar theme: medieval rulers rested the legitimacy of their political power on their Trojan lineage. This genealogical component of the Trojan War in the Middle Ages is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 4: Trojan Genealogical Histories in the Middle Ages

In his 1970 Presidential Address to the Royal Historical Society, R.W. Southern wrote that

> … in the tenth century several new peoples – Saxons and Normans in the first place, but also Poles and Hungarians – were beginning to achieve political importance and respectability. With this there came the conviction, or perhaps only the hope, that they were no longer barbarians, but belonged to the civilized peoples of Europe. This in turn bred a desire for a past, and a sense of awe at the providential steps which had brought them out of barbarism. In these circumstances the obvious source for a national history lies in the legends and myths of the people. (Southern 189)

The people they ruled had formerly been part of the Roman Empire and this new class of political elites saw in ancient Roman (and through Roman, Greek) myth much the same thing as had their ancient counterparts: "There were two aspects of Roman history which they found especially useful[:] it showed them how people in a distant and heroic past might be expected to speak and behave, and it provided a fixed point for the beginnings of the civilized people of Europe" (Southern 189). That is to say, they saw the past as a paradigm, and they saw genealogy as a justification of their rule.

Their justification for ruling part of the Roman Empire – and the imperialist desire to control more of it – led to the widespread belief that "they had come as conquerors to take over the Roman Empire and carry on the Roman tradition. But where had they come from and whence had they drawn the strength for so great an enterprise? What was more likely than that they had come from the same root as the Romans themselves from Troy?" (Southern 189).

In a sense, Rome itself was a paradigm: a highly successful, wealthy and militarily powerful society ruled (in theory, if not always in a practice) by dynastic succession. Because medieval rulers sought to inherit Rome's glory, they positioned themselves as its cultural and imperial descendants. In *The Past as Text* (1997), Gabrielle Spiegel notes that burgeoning medieval dynasties attempted to justify their links to Rome through Troy. Not coincidentally,

> Genealogy intrudes into historical narrative at precisely the time when noble families in France were beginning to organize themselves into vertical structures based on agnatic consanguinity, to take the form, in other words, of *lignages*. Genealogy … was able to create this consciousness and to impose it on members of the lineage group. Written above all to exalt a line and legitimize power, a medieval genealogy displays a family's intention to affirm and extend its place in political life. (Spiegel 104)

While the authors of these genealogical histories were more concerned with the succession of their patrons' immediate predecessors, they also sought to anchor their contemporary succession in the remote past and, lacking the prestige of a Roman pedigree, began to fuse their medieval genealogies to the Trojan ancestors of Rome: "The return of Troy as a stimulus to writing coincided with an age of genealogy that began earlier but flourished in the twelfth century as kings, aristocrats and the protonational communities that aristocrats did so much to define increasingly claimed or buttressed power over land by appeal to their relationship to time" (Ingledew 668). In a way both comprehensible and acceptable to the medieval mind, these rulers simply enacted the laws of primogeniture on an imperial scale: as an individual ruler passed his power to his son or, lacking a son, his nearest male relative, so did Priam and the Trojans pass their power on to Aeneas and other Trojan refugees from whom medieval rulers claimed descent, such as Brutus among the Britains and Franco among the Franks. This *translatio* *imperii* provided both an ideological legitimacy and a historical precedent to justify their often recently established rule.

These medieval families had established themselves in one of two ways: as invading foreign conquerors from elsewhere, as was the case with the Normans in France and England, or by establishing their preeminence among many squabbling local clans, as in the case of the German and Swedish monarchies. These means of gaining and maintaining power, however, had none of the prestige, antiquity or credibility that a Roman pedigree, with its long and glorious history as a military and imperial power and as the seat of Christian power, could offer. Their interest in Trojan literature, therefore, was two-fold: to grant legitimacy to their dynastic rule based on genealogical descent from the Trojans, and to learn how the civilized heroes of the past behaved, so they could emulate them. This chapter will look at these two aspects of medieval genealogical histories.

Though the tradition of Frankish descent from Trojans was claimed as early as the seventh century,[1] the early eleventh century saw the most forceful and influential assertion of the genealogical connection between Troy and medieval Europe's ruling elite in Dudo of St. Quentin's *History of the Normans*. Dudo's work became the model for other dynastic houses seeking to use genealogical histories to support their political legitimacy, both in the continuing tradition of Norman historiography by authors such as William of Jumieges, Robert of Torigni and Ordericus Vitalis, and those further afield, such as Snorri Sturluson's *Prose Edda*, which claims Trojan descent for the ruling families of Scandinavia and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*, which claimed Trojan descent for the British.

---

[1] Ingledew 676

At the end of the tenth century, Dudo's patron, Richard II, third duke of Normandy, commissioned him "to write something about 'customs, deeds, and right's established in the Norman land'" (Dudo xi). Richard II's grandfather, Rollo, first duke of Normandy, having been driven from Scandinavia, had seized his territory in France through conquest and secured it through treaty with the French King Charles III. Rollo's legitimacy was based primarily upon his *de facto* military superiority as a foreign conqueror. His grandson, more firmly established on his throne, sought to provide some other, *de jure*, justification for his rule. Dudo's task, then, was to provide a history which justified the political power of the new dynasty, a task to which medieval ideas about historiography were well suited: Spiegel argues that "the 'truth' of the past that underwrote the utility of historiography to medieval rulers and political actors, whose institutions, to be sure, lay not in recuperating an account of 'what actually happened,' but in the legitimation of their propagandistic and political goals" (xii). The Normans' goal was to justify their power over land which they had ruled by conquest for only two generations and for which they had no justification other than their military superiority. Elaborating on a tradition that the Franks had used since the seventh century, they claimed descent from the Trojans and, as Troy's imperial grandchildren, their right to rule a portion of the land ruled by Troy's Roman heirs.

Dudo creates this genealogical and dynastic connection to Troy and, through Troy, Rome, in two ways. First, early on in the work, he makes explicit a genealogical connection: "The *Daci* call themselves *Danai*, or Danes, and boast that they are descended from Antenor; who, when in former times the lands of Troy were laid waste, ‘slipped away through the middle of the Greeks’ and ‘penetrated’ the confines ‘of Illyria’ with his own men” (Dudo 17).[2] The Dacians, who would later come to be inhabitants of Normandy, had traced their descent from the Trojans, and this genealogical connection to Trojans, and through them, Romans, provided Richard II with just such a justification for his ruling part of the former Roman Empire. Their homeland, Dacia, was also imbued with a royal origin: Dudo’s world is divided into three continents, Asia, Europe and Africa, of which Europe is, according to him, the best; within Europe “the most spacious and affluent of all”[3] the provinces is Germany, of which “Dacia stands in the middle, looking like a crown, or resembling a city fortified by the Alps” (15).[4] In Dudo’s conception of geography, Dacia is the king of lands: it is richest, it is in the center and, metaphorically, it wears a crown. The king of earthly lands produced the rightful rulers of the land: first the Trojans, then their descendants, the Romans, and, in Dudo’s own day, their descendants, the Normans.

Second, Dudo supports this explicit genealogical connection by modeling his account of the life of Rollo, the founder of the Norman dynasty, on Virgil’s Aeneas, transposing the events of the Trojan hero’s life and the sack of his city to contemporary medieval life and substituting the role of Roman religion with Christianity. That is, he shaped the account of Rollo’s exploits to fit what Ingledew calls a “Virgilian scheme”:

---

[2] Igitur Daci nuncupantura suis Danai, vel Dani, gloriantique se ex Antenore progenitos; qui, quondam Trojae finibus depopulatis, mediis elapses Achivis, Illyricos fines penetravit cum suis” (130). All translations from Christiansen; Latin from Lair.

[3] Quarum Europa quam plurimus fluminum alveis interrivata, variisque provinciis denominata (129).

[4] Quarum Dacia exstat medioxima, in modum coronae, instarque civitatis, praemagnis Alpibus emnita (129).

> While this new textual production of Troy must bear the marks of the Christian cultural history that succeeded the pagan Roman Empire, it represents in an effectual manner a return of Virgil: in it reappear several defining elements of the Virgilian philosophy of history, namely, the genealogical, the prophetic, and the erotic. These conceptual instruments combine to construct temporality itself. They allow Virgil to define the grounds of Rome's imperial status not through a comprehensive appropriation of time (genealogy) understood as system (prophecy). … When the medieval Book of Troy quite distinctively reawakens the issues of genealogy, prophecy, and eros, it thus opens up the question of history, and it does so according to a broadly Virgilian scheme (Ingledew 666).[5]

Virgil's conception of genealogical history became the most influential for a variety of reasons. Homer's account of the Trojan War was lost to Western Europe during the Middle Ages and those who were aware of it believed Homer to be biased against the Trojans, whose descendants the medieval chronicles were meant to glorify. Though Dares and Dictys were the primary source for factual knowledge about the Trojan War, and though their works did indeed describe many of the Trojans' wanderings, their works lacked the element of prophecy that would give the otherwise secular founding of new cities political legitimacy through presumed divine sanction. The pattern of exile, wandering, prophecy and city founding that Ingledew finds in *The Aeneid* makes that work the literary model for several medieval genealogical histories, including Dudo's.

Rollo's story begins with a war against an enemy king, which ends with Rollo's defeat in a way similar to the Trojan defeat at the hands of the Greeks: "Conflict between the king and Rollo continued for the space of five years, and then the king sent him words of peace, such as these, in trickery" (Dudo 27).[6] As with Aeneas and the Trojans, Rollo believes the long war to be over, only to be defeated by treachery in the form of a false peace; his city is sacked and many of his men are killed; he flees, like Aeneas, with a small band of followers by ship.

---

[5] The "erotic" element of Ingledew's view of Virgil's historiographical method seems more relevant to the non-Trojan sections of these medieval genealogical histories, and is therefore omitted here.

[6] Unius vero lustri spatio preservante inter regem et Rollonem duello, inisit rex pacificis verbis ad eum hujusmodi in dolo (143.)

The account of Rollo's defeat and flight, written in prose, is then interrupted by a prophecy in hexameter verse, the epic meter, which is reminiscent of the *Aeneid*'s prophecies of the founding of the new homeland in Italy:

> Wealth will be showered on Rollo, affluence on him be conferred;
> Francia, you will be fruitful in your fortunate offspring
> Formed of the seed commingled of noble Christian believers
> Once there is peace between Francia's sons and the Dacians,
> Then will she breed and give birth, and pregnant, bring forth
> Kings and archbishops, dukes also and counts, nobles of high rank:
> Under whose rule, Christ-led, all the world will rejoice & prevail,
> And by whom churches will everywhere be increased in number,
> And they will rejoice in new and continuing progeny. (28)[7]

The prophecy promises Rollo a new homeland, great success, and that, much like Aeneas, after years of hardship and war he will found an enduring empire ruled by his descendants. Indeed, Dudo uses the same temporal disjunction used by Virgil: from the perspective of the writer and the audience, that which is predicted had already come to pass; from the perspective of the characters, a prophecy yet to be fulfilled. As Ingledew suggests, however, Dudo replaces the pagan elements of the *Aeneid*'s prophecies with

---

[7] Suggeret omne bonum isti prospera divite censu,
Illum ditabit, locupletans munificabit;
Francia deque tuis genitis fecunda beatis,
Spermate nobelium concretis christocolarum,
Dacigenis cum Francigenis jam pacificatis,
Gignet producens, expurget, proferet ingens
Reges, pontificesque, duces, comites, proceresque:
Sub quibus orbis ovans pollebit, principe Christo,
Et quibus ecclesiae fecundabuntur unbique,
Atque novo quorum, gaudebunt, perpete foete (143).

Christian ones more consonant with medieval theology and ideology: Rollo becomes a church-builder in his new land.

Ensuing prophecies in Rollo's story also contain strong Christian elements. In the prose section which follows the verse prophecy, Rollo falls asleep, and in a dream, "a divine voice spoke to him and said: 'Rollo, rise up with speed and make haste to sail across the sea and go to the English. There you will hear how you will return to your own country as a saviour, and will there enjoy perpetual peace, free from harm'" (28).[8] When Rollo recounts his dream, his wise Christian advisor interprets it for him: "In due course, you will be purified by holy baptism, and you will become a most worthy Christian: and one day you will reach the Angles, that is, the angels, through wandering the uncertain world; and with them you will enjoy the peace of everlasting glory" (28).[9] Again, as with the prophecy Aeneas receives, Rollo's dream is interpreted to prophesy a long and difficult period of wandering before he is able to establish a dynasty which rules an empire at peace. Dudo, however, gives a Christian twist to the prophecy by adding that Rollo and his descendants will become church builders. In the conversation with his advisor, moreover, England is construed to have its etymology with the word angels, suggesting that Rollo's success depends on his being a good Christian.

Dudo asserts the Norman right to rule in two ways. First, by connecting their genealogy to the Trojans, themselves the ancestors of the Romans, he offers the example of *translatio imperii* as imperial primogeniture. This justification, however, lacks the divine sanction so crucial to the medieval understanding of the divine right of medieval kings. This secular justification is, therefore, incomplete, so Dudo, like Virgil, uses prophecy to imbue it with religious legitimacy as well. In *The Aeneid*, Venus, Jupiter and Vulcan, the pagan gods of Roman religion, all use prophecy to guide Aeneas to Rome and ensure its founding and imperial success, a chain of events made possible by Poseidon's prophecy at *Il*.20.302 that Aeneas was destined not to die at Troy, but to carry on the Trojan line. Dudo also employs prophecy to grant his ruler divine sanction, but unlike the pagan gods who prophecy Aeneas's success, Rollo's rule is sanctioned by the Christian God. All genres have a set of literary conventions that they all employ, and genealogical histories are no exception. In the world of the conventional genealogical history, no king who receives a prophecy of success ever dies with this prophecy unrealized. The prophecy, therefore, is more than simply divine sanction; in the world of genealogical histories, prophecy is never wrong: it is a guarantee of success.

---

[8] Vox divina illi sonuit, dicens: "Rollo, velociter surge, pontum festinanter navigio transmeans, ad Anglos perge: ubi audies quod ad patriam sospes reverteris, perpetuaque pace in ea sine detriment frueris" (144).

[9] Tu, vergente venture temporis cursu, sacrosanct baptismate purificaberis, praedignusque christicola efficieris: et ab errore fluctuantis saeculi Anglos, scilicet Angelos, usque olim pervenies, pacemque perennis gloriae cum illis habebis (145).

The infusion of Dudo's history with Christian ideology is significant in other ways as well, for as in the Augustan era, in which Aeneas became the paradigm of ideal Roman, so too did Dudo's medieval audience look to past heroes for their paradigmatic heroes; divine right may have provided the justification for political power, but " … consecration established only the legitimacy of rulership; it provided medieval kings with few guides to action and little in the way of explicit programs and political policy. These were drawn, instead from the records of the past. … History, the record of political tradition, determined the parameters of political activity" and appropriate behavior (Spiegel 85). These parameters, however, were not fixed, and history-writing became a locus wherein visions of the present, projected onto the past, could be debated the past-as-paradigm in its medieval context: "What made history writing important in the Middle Ages … was exactly its ability to address contemporary political life via a displacement to the past, and to embed both prescription and polemic in an apparently "factual," because realistic, account of the historical legacy that the past had bequeathed" (xii). In Dudo's hands, Rollo, the latter-day Aeneas, became the model of the ideal Norman.

Dudo's history crafts the Norman paradigm through the implicit comparison of the first two protagonists: Hasting, the principal character of the first book, and Rollo, the principal character of the second. In action and motivation, the two characters are opposites; Hasting's villainy emphasizes Rollo's heroism : "the first book constructs a kind of 'false *Aeneid*,' an account of exiled Danish warriors whose depredations of Francia under a precursor figure, Hasting, culminate in an attempt to conquer Rome" (Ingledew 682). Like Aeneas, Hasting is an exile who tries to find a home for himself. Hasting "becomes a negative pole by applying to him text from the *Aeneid* that is applied to the Greeks or to Turnus and by assigning to him an act of perfidy modeled on the Trojan horse against the city of Luna" (Ingledew 682). Like the Greeks, Hasting uses deceitful words to enter the city and catch the city's defenders off guard. He does not, however, use the pagan religious symbolism of the Trojan horse, a sacrifice to Athena, but rather holds out the promise of baptism: the Trojan horse becomes Hasting himself, who pretends to be dead so that his followers ask to be let in the walls that he may have convert and have a proper Christian burial inside the city (19).

Dudo's description of the fall of Luna, in fact, cites Virgil: "The raging pagans massacre the unarmed Christians. All those discovered by the infuriated foe are handed over to be killed. They rage within the precinct of the sanctuary 'like wolves inside a sheepfold'. 'The women utter groans from the heart', and shed useless tears. … The people in charge of the ships 'are at hand, at the gates that are open wide'" (20).[10] Book 1 of Dudo's history, with Hasting the treacherous, blasphemous, pagan, negative exemplum in a "false *Aeneid*," is preparation for "a 'true *Aeneid*' based on Rollo as a founder figure assimilated to Aeneas. He is the Danes' 'pious' leader, a virtuous pagan to whom divine visions assign a mission to found a people, settle a land, and build a capital" (Ingledew 683).

Hasting, as the perpetrator of treachery, contrasts with Rollo, who is exiled after a defeat in war as the victim of treachery; Hasting's false baptism and his slaughter of Christians and the bishop and the unarmed priests who had taken refuge in the church (20) stand in contrast to Rollo's sincere baptism and his role as church-builder. Further, Hasting's failure in his attempt to conquer Rome signals the illegitimacy of his imperial aspirations as the inheritor of the Roman Empire; Rollo's successful founding of his own capital at Rouen, on the other hand, marks him as Rome's true inheritor. Hasting and Rollo's stories, along with the third book, comprise "less than nine tenths of the fourth book, which concerns the reign of count Richard I of Normandy" (Dudo xiii), yet, despite this brevity, these two characters set the standards against which all ensuing Norman counts are to be compared; subsequent kings are either positive or negative exempla, depending on whether they act more like Rollo or more like Hasting.

This use of the past-as-paradigm, however, represents not historical fact but literary invention. Christiansen notes that "Hasting was not a uniquely ferocious Viking invader, nor did he sail to Italy or capture Luna. … He, rather than Rollo, appears to have made peace with king Alfred of Wessex" (xv). As the historical Hasting was not the negative exemplum he becomes in Dudo's literary work, so too was the historical Rollo not the idealized model of Christian nobility that Dudo makes him. Christiansen notes that neither of the two paradigmatic events of his life, his conversion to Christianity and his founding of Rouen, are historically accurate: "his baptism was imposed on him after defeat" and "he was given Rouen and Upper Normandy to defend, but not as duke, or marquess, or count, or even as the most prominent Viking chief" (xvi). Dudo's purpose was not to write an accurate account of historical events, but to justify Norman rule and offer those rulers historical examples for them either to emulate or avoid emulating. Whether Hasting acted treacherously is irrelevant. What is relevant is that current rulers avoid treachery. Whether Rollo converted freely is also irrelevant. What is relevant is that current rulers be devout Christians.

---

[10] Tunc paganorum rabies trucidat christianos inermes. Traduntur omnes neci, quos furor reperit hostis. Saeviunt infra delubri septa, ut lupi infra ovium caulas. Corde premunt gemitum mulieres, lacrymasque effundunt inanges. … Gens quae praeerat navibus adest, portis bipatentibus (134).

Dudo's historiographical method became the literary model for later medieval historians. Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain* uses this same mix of Trojan wanderings, prophecy and genealogy to create a national identity for Britons, to justify the political legitimacy of its ruling class and to provide models for those rulers to emulate. J.S.P. Tatlock argued in "Geoffrey of Monmouth's Motives for Writing his 'Historia'" (1938) that Geoffrey wrote his history for several reasons, the most important of which is "racial patriotism" (697), namely, that the Continental dynasties all had court historians, while the English had none: "The lack of accounts of British history was notorious among historians of this time" (699). Second, Tatlock writes that Geoffrey was motivated by, in Tatlock's formulation, "what I shall crudely call political propaganda"

(701). Geoffrey's *History* was written during the 1130s, during the English Civil War between the Empress Matilda, whom Henry I had declared his heir on January 1, 1127, and King Stephen, who contested her claim to the throne. His *History* can thus be viewed as criticism of civil war in general and in support of Matilda in particular, especially in light of the fact that "her greatest supporter was Geoffrey's chief patron, the strong and generous Robert of Gloucester" (702). Finally, Geoffrey argues for what Tatlock calls "still more crudely, imperialist propaganda" (702). The English sought to justify their long-dreamt of conquests in Ireland as well as the Continent by citing, through their genealogical connection to Troy, a historical claim to the land – both Britain, where Brutus ruled, and the rest of Europe, where the Romans did:

> That the Norman dynasty was addicted to extending its dominions needs no proof. … Nor is proof needed that Geoffrey again and again exalts his Britons by showing them again and again as European if not world conquerors. … I do not believe that Geoffrey was unaware that his showing the ruler of England as lord also of all the British Isles, all Scandinavia and most of France, and as victorious over the Roman Empire, would be highly gratifying to the Norman dynasty and its supporters. (703)

Geoffrey's work, like Dudo's, encompasses several centuries, and, as with Dudo, the Trojan section comprises only the introductory part of his history. Nevertheless, their early sections contain the major themes of the rest of their respective works. Geoffrey begins by sketching out the physical dimensions of the land over which he wishes to justify English rule: "Britain, the best of islands, is situated in the Western Ocean, between France and Ireland. It stretches for eight hundred miles in length and two hundred in breadth" (54).[11] After describing the land itself, he writes that "Britain is inhabited by five races of people, the Norman-French, the Britons, the Saxons, the Picts and the Scots. Of these the Britons once occupied the land from sea to sea, before the others came. Then the vengeance of God overtook them because of their arrogance and they submitted to the Picts and the Saxons" (54).[12] Having described the land, Geoffrey then describes how the Britons once ruled it before the Norman conquest. Implicit in his discussion is their right to rule it again, while the rest of his history is an argument for the justness of British rule based on their primacy.

Indeed, Geoffrey's very next sentence returns to the origins of secular history, the Trojan War, to describe the events leading up to the founding of Britain: "After the Trojan War, Aeneas fled from the ruined city with his son Ascanius and came by boat to Italy" (Geoffrey 54).[13] The events of the *Aeneid* are briefly reiterated, followed by Geoffrey's making explicit a genealogical link to Rome, Ascanius's election as king and his founding of "the town of Alba on the bank of the Tiber" (Geoffrey 54).[14] Having made explicit the genealogical links to Troy and Rome, Geoffrey recasts Dudo's model to describe the founding of Britain. Like Dudo, Geoffrey stresses the importance of prophecy in this case, thereby granting a divine sanction to the events that he describes: Ascanius marries Lavinia, for instance, and impregnates her, after which "the soothsayers said that she would give birth to a boy, who would cause the death of both his father and mother; and that after he had wandered in exile through many lands, this boy would eventually rise to the highest honour" (Geoffrey 54).[15]

---

[11] Britannia, insularum optima, quondam Albion nuncupata, in occidentalia Oceano inter Gallia<m> et Hibernia sita est. Quae octigenta miliaria in longum, ducenta vero in latum continens (23). All translations from Thorpe; Latin from Hammer.

[12] Postremo quinque inhabitatur populis, Normannis videlicet atque Britannis, Sxonibus, Pictis et Scotis. Ex quibus Britones olim a mari usque ad mare annis pluribus insiderunt, donec ultione divina, propter ipsorum superbia <m>, supervenientibus Pictis et Saxonibus cesserunt (23).

[13] Aeneas, post Troianum bellum et excidium urbis cum Ascanio, filio suo fugiens, Italio navigio devenit (24).

[14] Super Tiberim Albam Longam condidit (24).

Like Aeneas (and Rollo) before him, Brutus is expelled from Italy, fleeing over the sea until he meets a group of Trojan refugees whom he discovers in Greece. In a long battle scene, Brutus, like Aeneas, fights a new Trojan War in which the Trojans are victorious. The Greek king Pandrasus holds as slaves the Trojan refugees whom Brutus meets during his exile. Brutus becomes the leader of these Trojan slaves and fights several inconclusive battles against Pandrasus. Eventually, Pandrasus is captured and Brutus uses treachery to defeat the remaining Greeks, thus reversing the Trojan defeat by Greek treachery at Troy. Finally – and just as the *Aeneid* itself suggests the union of Trojan and Italian through the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia – Geoffrey recasts the Trojan War's end with Brutus's marriage to Pandrasus's daughter Ignoge. At the wedding, Pandrasus, the Trojans' enemy, readily acknowledges the legitimacy of Brutus's descent: "I take some comfort in the knowledge that I am about to give my daughter to a young man of such great prowess. The nobility which flourishes in him, and his family, which is well known to us, show him to be of the true race of Priam and Anchises" (Geoffrey 63).[16] Pandrasus confirms Brutus's lineage in terms of his descent from the Trojans through Priam and the Romans through Anchises. The defeat of the Greeks by the Trojans reverses the historical ignominy of the Trojan War, thereby removing the stigma of defeat from Brutus's British descendants, Geoffrey's patrons. The kings of England are now seen to be on the side of the winners, not the losers.

---

[15] Dixerunt autem magi ipsam gravidam esse puero qui et patrem et matrem interficeret pluribusque terries in exilium peragratis ad summum tandem culmen honoris perveniret (25).

[16] Solacium tamen habeo, quia copulo eam probo et nobili, quem ex genere Priami et Anchisae creatum fama declarat (32).

Soon thereafter, Brutus and the Trojans set sail and, during their journey, come across a temple of Diana, where "there was a statue of the goddess which gave answers if by chance it was questioned by anyone" (64).[17] Drawing on the prophetic mode of both Virgil and Dudo and breaking from the narrative prose, Brutus asks the goddess in verse to "tell me which lands you wish us to inhabit. Tell me of a safe dwelling-place where I am to where I am to worship you down the ages, and where, to the chanting of maidens, I shall dedicate temples to you" (65).[18] Brutus falls asleep and Diana comes to him in a dream:

> It seemed to him that the goddess stood before him and spoke these words to him: "Brutus, beyond the setting of the sun, past the realms of Gaul, there lies an island in the sea, one occupied by giants. Now it is empty and ready for your folk. Down the years this will prove an abode suited to you and to your people; and for your descendants it will be a second Troy. A race of kings will be born there from your stock and the round circle of the whole earth will be subject to them." (65).[19]

The prophecy articulates the genealogical justification for the rule of Britain – "a race of kings will be born there from your stock" – as well as the justification for British military expansion onto the Continent – "the round circle of the whole earth will be subject to them." The use of prophecy in this context gives divine (albeit pagan) sanction to Geoffrey's assertions.

---

[17] Ubi imago eiusdem deae response quaerentibus dabat (33).

[18] Et dic quas terras nos habitare veils.
Dic certam sedem, qua te venerabor in aevum,
  Qua tibi virgineis templa dicabo choris (33).

[19] Tunc visum est illi deam astare ante eum et sese sic affair:
    Brute, sub occasu solis, trans Gaillicia regna,
      insula in Oceano est, undique clausa mari;
    insula in Oceano est habitat gigantibus olim,
      nunc deserta quidem, gentibus apta tuis.
    Hanc pete: namque tibi sedes erit illa perennis:
      haec fiet natis alter Troia tuis,
    hic de prole tua reges nascentur et illis
      totius mundi subditus orbis erit (34).

Like Dudo, Geoffrey switches from prose when recounting this prophecy. This divine sanction for dominion over the world is also significant insofar as it bears upon England's conflict with the French. Sailing from Diana's temple, Brutus joins with another band of Trojan refugees led by Corineus, who would later become the eponymous founder of Cornwall, just as Brutus would for Britain. Their combined armies land in Aquitaine and defeat the Gauls in battle. As Tatlock suggests, this passage creates a historical precedent for British rule in France. Geoffrey even asserts that Brutus "came to the place which is now called Tours, the city which, as Homer testifies, he himself afterwards founded" (69).[20] Geoffrey, who had no access to Homer, could not have known that Homer, in fact, wrote no such thing. Yet by attributing this to Homer, who, because of his age, was held to be a reliable source, Geoffrey seeks to endow the claim with a particularly strong overlay of truth.

He provides further evidence for the primacy of British rule in France later, when he claims that after the death of Brutus' nephew, "[t]he city of Tours … took its name from Turnus, who was buried there" (71).[21] Places named after Trojan heroes, such as Britain and Cornwall, are one of Geoffrey's methods for asserting political legitimacy over the land to which names refer. Geoffrey here seems to employs this strategy to claim a portion of France for the British.

---

[20] Brutus autem … venit ad locum ubi nunc est civitas Touronorum, quam, ut Homerus testator, ipse prior construxit (37).

[21] De nomine itaque ipsius civitas Turonis vocabulum sumpsit, quia ibidem sepultus est Turnus (38).

According to Geoffrey, following this battle Brutus settles in Britain, where he "[comes] at length to the River Thames, walk[s] up and down its banks and so [chooses] a site suited to his purpose. There he build[s] his city and call[s] it Troia Nova" (73).[22] After siring three sons, each of whom gives his name to a third of the island, Brutus dies and is buried in Troy. Geoffrey completes his genealogical justification for British rule with this final act of naming: named after Brutus and his companions and his children, the land becomes the titular property of their descendants.

Giving political legitimacy to Britain's rulers was only part of Geoffrey's purpose in writing the *History*; he is equally concerned to offer a criticism of contemporary society and in particular the behavior of its ruling elites. Geoffrey, a partisan of Matilda in the civil war of the 1130s, had argued for the justness of Matilda's claim and urged his readership, through implicit criticism of the consequences of civil war, to avoid further conflict between Matilda and King Stephen; Paul Dalton argues in "The Topical Concerns of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Brittaniae*" (2005) that "Geoffrey of Monmouth's book was an intensely topical work, which sought to use history and prophecy to promote peace by warning the Anglo-Norman aristocracy of the dangers of civil war" (689).

Geoffrey warns of the dangers of civil war throughout the work, but one of the early indicators of the importance of this is to be found in the story of the generations which immediately follows that of Brutus. A dispute erupts between Corineus and one of Brutus's sons, Locrinus, who has decided to marry a captive barbarian instead of

---

[22] Ad Tamensem fluvium locumque nactus est proposito suo perspicuum. Condidit itaque ibidem civitatem eamque Novam Troiam vocavit, quae postmodum per corruptionem vocabuli Trinovantum est" (40).

Corineus's daughter. Corineus forces Locrinus to marry his daughter Gwendolen, but on his death, Locrinus abandons her in favor of the barbarian girl. This story mirrors the historical events of Geoffrey's own time: Stephen and the other nobles have promised Henry to pass the crown to his daughter Matilda, but on his death, take it for himself. Gwendolen then goes to her home in Cornwall, where she raises an army and attacks Locrinus. In the ensuing battle, he is killed and she takes the throne. This series of events reflects what Geoffrey hopes will be the outcome of the English civil war; Matilda, as the rightful heir dispossessed of her kingdom, will regain it in battle.

Geoffrey also characterizes Gwendolen as a paradigm for proper female authority: she rules justly for fifteen years until her son comes of age, at which point she relinquishes power to him. In a world as rigidly patriarchal as that of twelfth-century England, the notion of a female ruler was in and of itself unsettling; Geoffrey's moderate and wise Gwendolen serves as a reassurance to his aristocratic male audience that a woman might also rule, and rule justly, but it goes without saying that she ought to relinquish power to any male progeny as soon as possible.

The stability of Gwendolen's rule and that of her son, Maddan, however, is brought to an end by the internecine strife of Maddan's children. Maddan "ruled his kingdom in peace and frugality for forty years. When he died, a quarrel over the kingship arose between the sons whom I have mentioned, for each of the two was eager to possess the whole island" (78). In another situation similar to the civil war between Stephen and Mathilda, Geoffrey cautions against this type of conflict, which leads to an extremely bleak period in Britain's history during which Mempiricus rules like a tyrant and puts to death many people, including his own family (78).

Geoffrey's *History* alternates between periods of legitimate and uncontested succession that bring with them peace, tranquility and prosperity, and contested successions which result in civil war. The eventual winners of these civil wars, however, lack any political legitimacy, rule badly and oppress the people.

This pattern continues, for example, into the conflict between the Britains under Cassivelaunus and the Romans under Julius Caesar. So long as the Britains remained united, they were able to resist Caesar's invasion; when they were divided against themselves, however, they were defeated. The pattern persists in ever wider swings of the pendulum, culminating in the unprecedented national unity created by Arthur, who, because of this unity, was in legend able to conquer all of Europe, and the strife among later kings, who bring the kingdom to ruin. In this way, the work served as implicit criticism of the civil war between Matilda and Stephen, as well as offering Brutus and Arthur as paradigms for other rulers to follow: strong kings at the head of a united nation are unconquerable; division leads to conquest and destruction.

Like the *Aeneid* and the *Historia*, "Geoffrey of Monmouth's book was an intensely topical work, which sought to use history and prophecy to promote peace by warning the Anglo-Norman aristocracy of the dangers of civil war" (Dalton 689). The prophecies of Merlin and the ensuing career of Arthur are the most significant portion of the work dealing with these contemporary concerns. However, the introductory narrative of Brutus and the settling of the nation lay the foundation by introducing the themes of national unity, prophecy and political legitimacy which feature so prominently in the Arthurian section.

It stands to reason that, as claimants to Rome's inheritance, the French and the English would seek to forge a common genealogical tie to Rome through Troy, but the Trojan War was used as a means to legitimize political authority even in places never under Rome rule. In Iceland, versions of the Trojan War were introduced "before the thirteenth century, creating the mischief it had so often done before. Troy once more had to stand father to a nation looking for a respectable pedigree" (Frank 147). The text which most forcefully makes the connection between the dynasties of Scandinavia is Snorri Sturluson's *Edda*, written around 1220. The *Edda* begins with the Biblical creation story, from Adam and Eve to Noah and the Flood, before linking it to the Trojan legend and, ultimately, through Trojan genealogy, to the line of Scandinavian kings. In "The Center of the World and the Origins of Life" (2001), Bruce Lincoln observes that, in connecting the Trojan legend with the Biblical account of history and other legendary sources, Snorri follows the historiographic method of his predecessors:

> His text is an absolute tour de force, combining numerous discourses, allusions, topoi, and subtexts. Among these, one can recognize the Virgilian theme of Trojan origins and migration … conjoined with a euhemerist explanation of the pagan deities. … Toward this end he constituted the Norse gods' names as vestigial indices of their native land. Thus, 'Thor' became Trór, a son of Priam named for Troy; his wife 'Sif' was the Sibyl. (321)

Like his predecessors in the historiographical tradition of the Trojan diaspora, Snorri grafts the story of the Trojan diaspora onto the existing tradition of heroic literature and, like Geoffrey, uses the false but plausible etymologies derived from phonetic similarity between place names and Trojan heroes to join the two traditions.

Like Dudo, Snorri begins by describing Troy's central position in world geography: "Near the centre of the world where what we call Turkey lies, was built the most famous of all palaces and halls – Troy by name. That town was built on a much larger scale than others then in existence and in many ways with greater skill, so lavishly was it built" (25).[23] Snorri then describes the process of expansion, conquest and colonization by which Trojans spread out and conquer the world: "One of the kings was called Múnón or Memnón. He married a daughter of the chief king Priam who was called Tróán, and they had a son name Trór – we call him Thor" (25).[24] Snorri melds the indigenous mythological heroes of Scandinavia, such as Thor, with the imported heroic tradition of Trojan heroes. At the age of twelve, Thor "took possession of the realm of Thrace – we call that Trudheim" (Snorri 25).[25] This is the first of many conquests by the Trojans as they colonize the rest of the world.

As with Virgil, Geoffrey and Dudo, Snorri's hero benefits from having received a prophecy assuring him of the eventual success of his journey. Each of these heroes, moreover, is assured that his children will rule under the same divine favor as he does. In *The Prose Edda*, Thor, after defeating in battle many warriors, giants and dragons, "married a prophetess called Sibyl" (Snorri 26).[26] Their descendant, "Odin, and also his wife, had the gift of prophecy, and by means of this magic art he discovered that his name would be famous in the northern part of the world and honoured above that of all kings. For this reason he decided to set out on a journey from Turkey" (Snorri 26).[27]

---

[23] Nær miðri veröldinni var gert þat hús ok herbergi, er ágætast hefir verit, er kallat Trjóa, þar sem vér köllum Tyrkland. Þessi staðr var miklu meiri gerr en aðrir ok með meira hagleik á marga lund með kostnaði ok föngum, en þar váru til. All Icelandic from Jónsson; translation from Young.

[24] Einn konungr í Trjóu er nefndr Múnón eða Mennón. Hann átti dóttur höfuðkonungsins Príamí. Sú hét Tróan. Þau áttu son. Hann hét Trór, er vér köllum Þór.

[25] … eignaði sér ríkit Trakíá. Þat köllum vér Þrúðheim.

[26] Í norðrhálfu heims fann hann spákonu þá, er Síbíl hét, er vér köllum Sif, ok fekk hennar.

From this point on, the story leaves Troy, never to return. The literary elements of Snorri's work and those of his predecessors are the same—a Trojan exile, guided by prophecy, becomes progenitor of a European dynasty. But Snorri's version omits a significant element of the traditional story: the Trojan War itself. Like Brutus's and Rollo's flights from Troy, Odin's was the result of fratricide and internecine conflict. Unlike the other two heroes, however, Odin's flight occurs while Priam is still king in Troy; there is no mention of the Greeks or their war against the Trojans. This omission removes the historical stigma of defeat which features prominently in Virgil's and Geoffrey's accounts of Trojan history.

The omission also emphasizes the limited importance in the *Edda* of Troy itself: Snorri's concern is not with Troy or its history; it lies in justifying the political rule of the Yingling and the other Northern European dynasties and to set them on equal footing with their Trojan-descended Southern European royal peers. Indeed, Snorri's account is by far the most detailed description of territorial conquest and the establishment of monarchies by the scions of Troy.

After reporting the divine sanction for Odin's journey, Snorri then describes Odin and his children's settlements in Northern Europe: Odin and his followers arrive and divide the lands up among them. One son, Vegdeg, becomes king of East Germany, another rules over Westphalia and a third over France. Other sons rule Jutland, Denmark and Scandinavia (27). Having colonized for his children much of Northern Europe, Odin himself sets out for Sweden, where, like Brutus and Aeneas before him, he becomes the founder of a New Troy. The urgency of this mission, however, is diminished by the fact that in Snorri's account of history the original Troy still stands. Nor is Odin a fugitive like his father, Aeneas, Rollo, or Brutus. Rather, his "travels were attended by such prosperity that, wherever they stayed in a country, that region enjoyed good harvests and peace" (Snorri 27).[28]

---

[27] Óðinn hafði spádóm ok svá kona hans, ok af þeim vísendum fann hann þat, at nafn hans myndi uppi vera haft í norðrhálfu heims ok tignat um fram alla konunga. Fyrir þá sök fýstist hann at byrja ferð sína af Tyrklandi.

Odin founds his New Troy on the same plan as the original city: "He appointed chieftains after the pattern of Troy, establishing twelve rulers to administer the laws of the land, and he drew up a code of law like that which had held in Troy and to which the Trojans had been accustomed" (Snorri 27).[29] Finally, Odin "placed his son over the kingdom now called Norway. Their son was called Sæming and, as it says in the *Háleygjatal*, together with the earls and other rulers the kings of Norway trace their genealogies back to him. Odin kept by him the son called Yngvi, who was king of Sweden after him, and from him have come the families known as the Ynglingar" (Snorri 27).[30] Thus are the Trojan origins for most of the dynasties in Northern Europe and Scandinavia set at the outset of Snorri's history.

---

[28] ... sá tími fylgði ferð þeira (it's actually "*their* travels, not *his*"), at hvar sem þeir dvölðust í löndum, þá var þar ár ok friðr.

[29] Skipaði hann þar höfðingjum ok í þá líking, sem verit hafði í Trója, setti tólf höfuðmenn í staðinum at dæma landslög, ok svá skipaði hann réttum öllum sem fyrr hafði verit í Trója ok Tyrkir váru vanir.

[30] setti þar son sinn til þess ríkis, er nú heitir Nóregr. Sá er Sæmingr kallaðr, ok telja þar Nóregskonungar sínar ættir til hans ok svá jarlar ok aðrir ríkismenn, svá sem segir í Háleygjatali. En Óðinn hafði með sér þann son sinn, er Yngvi er nefndr, er konungr var í Svíþjóðu eftir hann, ok eru frá honum komnar þær ættir, er Ynglingar eru kallaðir.

Like Dudo, Geoffrey and Snorri, the authors of chronicles about the Trojan founding of Venice use their legendary genealogy both to justify the right of the conquerors to possess the land and to use the Trojans as examples of the ideal citizen. Unlike much of the medieval world and the Western European dynasties who claimed Trojan descent, Venice was not a monarchy, but a republic. As a result, the values embodied by the Trojans in the Venetian foundation story were different from those embodied by those commissioned by European monarchs. Dudo, Geoffrey and Snorri conceive of history as being shaped by the agency of one hero whose embodiment of that society's values enables him to lead his people to safety and prosperity. Although the Republic of Venice was certainly an oligarchy, it was also a communal undertaking opposed to dynastic monarchies. As a result, one chronicler who wrote about Venice's Trojan foundation, known simply as Marco, who composed his *Codex Marco* in 1292, imbued his work with the communal values his society idealized.

The Trojans in Marco's account, for example, do not come to Venice led by a single hero-founder, but rather as a group. According to Sheila Days in *Fantasies of Troy* (2004), by refusing to acknowledge a single hero-founder, Marco "steps out from the earlier medieval tradition when he credits a band of unnamed Trojans with having founded Venice. Other chroniclers, notably da Canal and Giovanni Decano, attest to Antenor as the city's legendary founder. Marco does not ignore this tradition but his Antenor enters the scene once the location has been found, the city built" (*Fantasies of Troy* 101). Venice's political structure is a collective one, and so it imagines its Trojan founders to have had, like them, a collective structure. This point is made more strikingly when Antenor, whom Marco presents as an elected king, decides to leave the city. Days interprets this as a rejection of the idealized hero, founder and king of other genealogical histories: Antenor's departure "suggests that even though the Trojans had chosen him to be their king, the conditions were already set, that is the abundance of free and various peoples, did not leave the space required for the proper monarchical authority" (101).

This idealization of group cooperation results in another revision of the traditional conventions of the Trojan foundation myth. Venice, in opposition to Rome, rejects not only the hero-king, but also the guarantee of divine prophecy and empire. Marco's creation of Venetian ideology is a rejection of Rome. The rejection of Antenor is also a rejection of Aeneas-type city founders. Marco gives the Venetians neither a founder "nor does he award them divinely ordained freedom" (*Fantasies of Troy* 101). There is no guarantee of prosperity and empire because there is no one family line whose rule the Venetians must ensure. Rather, Macro's chronicle again stresses communal responsibility. Venice's security rests upon the cooperation of its citizens, not aid from the gods. Though he drew his account from the same source material and understood the conventions of the Trojan exile as city-founder legend, Marco adapts this type of legend to suit the specific political culture of Venice:

> … the medieval configuration of the Trojan foundation of Venice was a specifically anti-monarchical, anti-imperialist and anti-Roman myth. Instead of echoing Aeneas's foundation of Rome, it challenged it, and so too Rome's authority. … Venice ranked itself superior to imperialist qualities by eschewing the single-hero founder model of Trojan origins. Constructing a specifically Venetian version of Trojan nobility in that pluralistic, consensual and civil manner in which the city was founded, Marco espoused the Trojan values of liberty and peace.

Drawing on Virgil's example in the *Aeneid*, Dudo, Geoffrey and Snorri create Trojan exiles who, with divine aid, colonize vast expanses of Europe, both those formerly under Roman control and those, like Scandinavia, which were not. The act of colonization and foundation was realized by one man with divine aid. This man – Aeneas, Rollo. Brutus or Odin – would become the founder of a dynasty and the divine favor cast upon the founder would carry over to his descendants, guaranteeing peace and prosperity. The Venetian myth of Trojan foundation used these same tropes, but altered them to suit the differing ideology of the Venetian Republic. Rejecting the single-hero founder and the divine guarantee, Marco created a Trojan society where cooperation and shared responsibility are the only guarantees of success and prosperity. In this communal view, there is room neither for the individual hero nor for the ideology he represents.

Though the stories of Trojan origins are not the main focus of these works, their position at the beginnings of these accounts suggests their importance as the point of origin for secular dynastic histories and for establishing the legitimacy of the rulers whose exploits and lives comprise the remainder of the works. These genealogical histories, however, were composed at the beginning of the medieval tradition of writing about the Trojan War. Their establishment of a genealogical connection between Trojans and contemporary medieval rulers led, in subsequent generations, to an increased interest on the part of these rulers in finding out more about this ancient aspect of their imaginary bloodline.

Chapter 5: Medieval Trojan Romances

The twelfth century saw the rise of genealogical histories which created a dynastic link between the Trojans, the Romans and the medieval ruling class. For the first time, these rulers had an impeccable pedigree that they could trace to the beginning of (secular, historical) time. Though these works began with their patrons' dynastic origins in Troy, their plots were primarily devoted to events closer to the authors' own times. As the Trojan pedigree became more firmly entrenched as an idea, however, the rulers who claimed their descent from these Trojans became interested in finding out about this most ancient aspect of their family line. As their predecessors had commissioned works about their lineage, so too did later medieval rulers commission works about their earliest ancestors, the Trojans.

Because Dares and Dictys were eyewitnesses to the events they describe and because they dramatically reduced the role of the pagan gods in human events (two themes outlined in Chapter 3), the medieval poets working in the tradition of Trojan literature viewed their chronicles as the most authoritative and reliable accounts. Because of this, their works served as the source for the medieval versions of the Trojan story. These translations, however, were not simply faithful word for word re-renderings of Dares and Dictys; they were not simply translations across language, but across culture and literary traditions as well. Their overriding principle of translation seems to be the same as that of Homer's successors: they could not contradict their source, but where their source was silent, they could elaborate however they wanted. Drawing on the skeletal outlines of the story left them by Dares and Dictys, these medieval authors, while remaining true to the plots of their sources, amplified them with detail at every opportunity. For example, they added dialogue and set speeches, ekphrases, elaborate descriptions of costumes and weaponry and detailed accounts of battles which their sources never describe.

Moreover, while people in the Middle Ages had a sense of historical time, that is, a sense that events occurred in chronological order from the past to the present, they did not have a sense of historical difference, that is, a sense that life was lived differently, with different modes of dress, speech, attitudes and cultural norms, in the past than in their own time. Because of this, medieval accounts of the Trojan War graft the conventions of the contemporary medieval world onto the ancient one: Greek and Trojans wear medieval dress, speak according to the rules of medieval rhetoric, fight using medieval weapons, and live according to medieval rules of conduct, such as the code of chivalry.

This conception of the past had another important effect on medieval accounts of the Trojan War. Like their predecessors working in this tradition, medieval poets created heroic characters to serve as paradigms of idealized behavior. The events of the Trojan War became, moreover, source of stories which, analogous to their present, could instruct society at large and their patrons in particular. These paradigms had persuasive force for three reasons.   First, because their audience claimed descent from the Trojan heroes, the example of their ancestors was more credible. Second, the works themselves had an aura of antiquity, and older was almost always better in the eyes of the medieval reader. Third, because the ancient characters who appear in these works were depicted in the idiom of contemporary medieval society, the analogous relationship between the past and the present could be drawn more closely. This made the paradigmatic value of the past more powerful in the present.

Previous scholarship has addressed these issues in medieval Trojan War literature. These works, however, tend to look at individual works or at several works in one language group. They lay the groundwork for understanding the pan-European nature of the medieval Trojan War tradition without actually discussing it themselves. This chapter builds upon these works by combining their insights to show how the production and translation of Trojan romances were not confined to any one place or time, but were part of a larger pan-European trend which occurred in many different languages and countries. The chapter, then, looks at the transmission of Dares's and Dictys's accounts of the Trojan War across Europe in the Middle Ages, with attention to the way in which their basic plot was transformed to suit the cultural and literary conventions of the language into which they were translated. As in the case of previous Trojan War literature, the Trojan romances were not produced purely for their literary and aesthetic merit. They were also an important part of larger competing ideological and political narratives which played a significant part in medieval self-understanding. Often produced at the request of royal patrons, these Trojan romances had a paradigmatic function for modeling idealized behavior to its aristocratic audience.[1]

The first medieval vernacular translation of Dares and Dictys, the Irish *Togail Troi*, composed in the tenth or eleventh century, serves as a useful illustration of the themes that will be addressed in this chapter. *The Togail Troi* is a medieval romance in which the events of Dares's and Dictys's Trojan War are described using the language, conventions and tropes of medieval Irish literature. As such, an analysis of the transformations Dares's and Dictys's accounts underwent at the hands of their Irish translator will serve as the template for viewing their subsequent transformation into other literary traditions as well.

---

[1] For which, cf. Benson's review of Wolfram Keller's *Selves and Nations*: Keller argues that Trojan War literature in the Middle Ages helped medieval communities imagine themselves in terms of distinct nations.

The main characters of the story of the Trojan War are described in the language of Irish folk stories. Accordign to Leslie Diane Myrick (1993), "Medea, for instance, is transformed from a Colchian witch to an Irish *bandriu*, whose repertoire of *druidecht* includes flying snakes and magic balls of thread" (91).

This translation of Greeks and Trojans into heroes more familiar to an Irish audience can be seen in the physical description of Hector. The Trojan prince, according to Myrick, "displays all the standard beauty features of the typical Irish hero: he has blonde curly hair, evenly-matched blue eyes, a curly beard reaching to his navel, and skin whiter than the snow of a single night. He is clothed in typical Iron age Irish garb: a purple cloak with elaborate borders and fringes, a gold brooch, and mantle which covers a silken tunic" (145). In the Irish account, Hector is no longer a Homeric hero clad in bronze. Instead, he is imagined as an Irishman with contemporary medieval Irish clothes. In a different redaction of *The Togail Troi*, Hector is written as a Cúchulainn archetype: his exploits are described using the same diction applied to Cúchulainn, his weapons bare a similarity to Cúchulainn's and his *riastrad* (the Irish term cognate with the Greek *aristeia*) shares several similar elements to the Irish hero's (Myrick 157).

Myrick argues that redactions of *The Togail Troi* "were not merely translations across languages, but across cultures … onto the substratum of Greco-Roman epic they have applied a layering of elements from native Irish saga, and a final overlay of medieval Christian socio-religious influence" (1).

The same combination of Greek and Roman epic overlaid with elements of medieval romance and Christian morality which Myrick identifies in her discussion of *The Togail Troi* is evident in subsequent translations of Dares's and Dictys's works in the Middle Ages. Benoît de Sainte-Maure would apply a similar form of cross-cultural adaptation and translation in his *Roman de Troie*, though he altered his source material to suit the literary aesthetic and cultural mores of twelfth-century France rather than tenth- or eleventh-century Ireland. Like the translator of *The Togail Troi,* Benoît follows Dares and Dictys because they had stripped away almost all of the elements that troubled medieval readers about the Homeric account (though, unlike Dares and Dictys, they themselves had not read Homer). Indeed, in his preamble, Benoît praises Dares and Dictys over and above Homer for their superior accuracy:

> Homer, who was a wondrous clerk and wise and learned, wrote of the destruction, of the great siege, and of the cause whereby Troy was laid waste, so that it was nevermore the abode of men. But his book does not tell the truth, for we know well, beyond any doubt, that he was born a hundred years after the great hosts met in battle. No wonder if he errs since he never was there and saw nothing thereof. When he had made his book and brought it to Athens, there was accordingly exceeding great debate. They wished to condemn him because he had made the gods fight with mortal men. That was accounted folly and wondrous folly in him that he made the gods fight like human beings against the Trojans, and likewise made the goddesses fight with the people. And when they read his book, many rejected it for that reason. (Gordon 3)[2]

---

[2] Omers, qui fu clers merveillos
E sages e esciëntos,
Escrist de la destruction,
Del grant siege e de l'acheison
Por quei Troie fu desertee,
Que onc puis ne fu rabitee.
Mais ne dist pas sis livres veir,

This rejection of Homer is followed in Benoît's account by the story of how Cornelius Nepos found Dares's diary in Athens. Benoît accepts Dares's account because it does not share these Homeric flaws: "Each day he wrote it thus, as he beheld it with his eyes. Everything they did in the day, either in battle or combat, that night this Dares wrote it all, as I tell you. … We must believe him and hold his story true far rather than the one who was born a hundred years after or more later, who knew nothing, except by hearsay" (Gordon 3). Thus, Benoît rejects the Homeric account in favor of Dares's version.

Next, Benoît offers the principles of his translation, though even a cursory comparison of the original with the translation shows that this was more rhetorical posturing than scholarly principle. He writes:

> [The story] had not yet been related till Benoît de Sainte-Maure came upon it and made it and told it and wrote the words with his own hand, so fashioned and wrought, so set down, so arranged, that none of them, greater or lesser, is out of place. I shall begin the story here. I shall follow the Latin closely, I shall put in nothing but as I find it written. Nor do I

Quar bien savons senz nul espier
Qu'il ne fu puis de cent anz nez
Que li granz oz fu assemblez:
N'est merveille s'il i faillit,
Quar onc n'i fu ne rien n'en vit.
Quant il en ot son livre fait
E a Athenes l'ot retrait
Si ot estrange contençon:
Dampner le voustrent par reason,
Por ço qu'ot fait les damedeus
Combatre o les homes charneus.
Tenu li fu a desverie
E a merveillose folie
Que les dues come homes humains
Faiseit combater as Troïains,
E les deuesses ensement
Faiseit combater avuec la gent;
Plusor por ço le refuserent (4).
Old French is from the Joly edition.

> say or add any good word, even had I the skill, but I shall follow the matter closely. (Gordon 4)[3]

As is evident from the work itself, this simply cannot be true; the skeletal forms of Dares's and Dictys's chronicles were the perfect vehicles for Benoît's project: while they offered a chronological plot outline and a variety of facts and incidents, they rarely expand upon those incidents in any meaningfully detailed way. Benoît, therefore, could stay true to the historical events recounted in his sources even as he elaborated on them and adapted them from a late antique Latin idiom to an early medieval French one. The lack of direct discourse in Dares and Dictys, for example, became for Benoît an opportunity to provide elaborate oratorical set pieces and the lack of detail about costumes and battle strategies became an opportunity for Benoît to modernize the dress and mannerisms of the heroes he found in his sources.

Benoît's elaboration of his source material can be seen in the poem's opening action: Jason's adventure in winning the Golden Fleece. Dares narrates: "King Pelias, who ruled the Peloponnese, was the brother of Aeson, and Aeson was the father of Jason.

---

[3] Ceste estoire n'est pas use,
N'en guaires lieus nen est trovee:
Ja retraite ne fust ancore,
Mais Beneeiz de Sainte More
L'a contrive e fait e dit
E o sa main les moz escrit,
Ensi tailliez, ensi curez,
Ensi asis, ensi posez,
Que plus ne meins n'i a mestier.
Ci vueil l'estoire comencier:
Le latin sivrai e la letre,
Nule autre rien n'I voudrai metre,
S'ensi non com jol truis escrit.
Ne di mie qu'aucun bon dit
N'i mete, se faire le sai,
Mais la matire en ensivrai (8).

Jason was known for his courage and goodness. He treated everyone in the realm as his personal friend, and therefore everyone loved him" (133).

In Benoît, this becomes a much longer description, and it typifies the burgeoning Medieval French literary aesthetic:

> Peleus was a rich king,
> Very brave, very wise, very courteous. (715)[4]

Already, Benoît has provided information about Peleus's character that is nowhere to be found in Dares, though, importantly, it does not contradict him in any way. Interestingly, however, this description of Peleus seems to be at odds with Peleus's behavior in the story, in which he tries to send his nephew to certain death so he will not take the throne from him. A similar description accompanies Jason:

> Eson had a son
> Who was called Jason,
> Of great beauty and of great value
> And of great intelligence, as I have found.
> He had great strength and great virtue,
> He was known by many kings;
> He was very courteous and noble and brave
> And he was much loved by everyone;
> He demonstrated often his great nobility
> And much he loved glory and largesse. (727)[5]

---

[4] Peleus fu un riches reis,
Mout proz, mout sages, mout corteis.
All translations from *Le Roman de Troie* are mine except where noted.

[5] Icist Eson un fil aveit
Qui Jason apelez esteir,
De grant beaute e de grant pris
E de grant sen, si com jo truis.
Grant force aveit e grant vertu,
Par maint regne fu coneu;
Mout fu courteis e genz e proz
E mout esteit amez de toz;
Mout por demenot grant noblece
E mout amot gloire e largece

This effusive style is typical of Old French romances. Chrétien de Troyes's description of King Arthur at the beginning of *Le Chevalier de la Charette* bears a strong similarity to Benoît's description of Peleus. Arthur is

> Arthur, the good king of Britain, whose valor teaches us that we too should be courteous and brave, was holding court in all kinglike splendor (257).[6]

Arthur, Jason and Peleus are described in the diction of medieval French romance; they are rich, courteous, brave and intelligent. Indeed, the largesse which Jason is said to love is the quintessential Arthurian trait: many Arthurian romances begin with Arthur holding a feast for his knights at which he grants them whatever they should wish. These words signify that the audience has entered the world of medieval romance and of chivalric heroism.

Le Roman de Troie is very much a work which follows the literary conventions of contemporary medieval French romance, and, as such, it is more than just a translation from the Latin language to the French language; it is also a translation from a Latin literary aesthetic to a French one. No longer working in the chronicle tradition of his sources, Benoît is faithful to (what he believed to be) the historical facts of his source while at the same time rendering them into the romance literary tradition of twelfth-century France. He takes the bare facts of Jason's departure and describes them in a way uses the conventions of medieval French romance. For example, whereas Dares does not specify the time of Jason's departure, Benoît writes:

---

[6] Li boens rois de Bretaingne
La cui proesce nos enseigne
Que nos soiens preu et cortois,
Tint cort si riche (Chrétien 339).
All translations from Chrétien de Troyes, *The Complete Romances*.

> When came the new time,
> When the birds sing sweetly,
> When the flowers are in bloom and white and beautiful
> And the grass is green, fresh and new;
> When the foliage is in full flower
> And their leaves grow again
> And the sweet breath of wind came;
> That is when Jason set his boat
> Upon the sea, tarrying no longer. (939)[7]

This language echoes a somewhat later romance, *Le Roman de la Rose*. The same three elements that appear in Benoît's *Roman*: the changing of the seasons, the blossoming of flowers and grass and the sound of birds also appear in *Le Roman de la Rose.*[8]

The most important stylistic change between previous accounts of the Trojan War and the romance account, however, is the introduction of courtly love among the various Greeks and Trojans. In Dares's account, the adventure of the Golden Fleece is not important in and of itself; rather, its importance lies in Dares's search for the causes of the Trojan War. Jason's voyage results in Laomedon's lack of hospitality, which in turn rouses Hercules's anger, leading to the first sack of Troy, the abduction of Priam's sister Hesione, and Paris's abduction of Helen as revenge. Dares skips over Jason's adventures except where it bears upon the relation of these events to the Trojan War. Indeed, he refers readers interested in Jason's adventures to "read the *Argonautica*" (134), while his own account of the events is simply:

---

[7] Quant vint contre le tens novel,
Que doucement chantent oisel,
Que la flor pert e blanche e bele,
E l'erbe est vert, fresche e novele;
Quant li vergier sont gent flor
E de lor fueilles revesti,
L'aure douce vente soef,
Lors fist Jason traire sa nef
Dedenz la mer, ne tarja plus.

[8] Cf. ln. 45ff.

> Thus, reembarking, they departed from Phrygia.
> And set out for Colchis.
> And stole the fleece.
> And returned to their homeland" (135).[9]

Benoît, however, uses this incident to elaborate a miniature romance of Jason and Medea, complete with all of the conventional demonstrations of courtly love. In Andreas Capellanus's *Art of Courtly Love,* a twelfth-century book outlining the rules, regulations and signs of courtly love, defines it as "a certain inborn suffering derived from the sight and of excessive meditation upon the beauty of the opposite sex, which causes each one to wish above all things the embraces of the other" (28).

This is evidently the case in other works of Arthurian romance, such as Chrétien's *Knight with the Lion*, where Yvain, "through the window … watched the beautiful lady as she spoke…. [He] could barely stop himself from running out to … her" (272). As he begins to meditate upon the pains her love has inflicted upon him, Chrétien writes that "Love had avenged the death [of the lady's first husband] by attacking Yvain so gently, striking his heart through his eyes" (273). This same motif also occurs in *The Knight of the Cart*: "From the window, the knight [Lancelot], recognized the queen [Guinevere]. He did not cease to gaze on her most attentively, happy to do this as long as possible. When he could not see her, he wished to hurl himself out onto the ground below" (177).

Benoît's description of Medea's love for Jason follows the same pattern described by Andreas and put into practice by Chrétien:

> When she [Medea] was certain
> That this was Jason, she was even more pleased by him:
> The more she spoke to him
> And the more she spoke to him

---

[9] navin conscenderunt et a terra recesserunt, Colchos profecti sunt, pellem abstulerunt, domum reversi sunt (4).

> The more she loved him in her heart;
> She could do nothing
> But keep her eyes on him;
> His face seemed so handsome. (1257)[10]

Medea's love for Jason also accords with Andreas's notion of love as suffering, that "this inborn suffering comes … from seeing and meditating" (Andreas 29). The lover, moreover, looks upon every brief hour as a very long year" (Andreas 29). Benoît's description of Medea's suffering from love of Jason follows these rules:

> The longer she looked at his face,
> The more she looked into his eyes,
> Sweet, sincere and simple, without pride,
> The more she found sweet solace.
> Her heart was full of true love. (1275)[11]

The words translated here as "true love," moreover, are "fine amors" in this original. Fine amors is the traditional term for the type of romantic chivalric love which the knights and damsels of French medieval romance seek out as the true goal of life. Medea's love is so great and the pains she endures for it so profound that

> Greatly she desired marriage.
> She suffered such great pains
> All the eight days of the week
> That she could find no easy rest. (1291)[12]

---

[10] Quant ele [Medea] certainement sot
Que c'ert Jason, mout par li plot:
Mout en aveit oï parler
E mout l'aveit oï loër.
Mout l'aama enz en son cuer:
Ne poëit pas a nesun fuer
Tenir ses ieuz se a lui non;
Mout li ert de gente façon.

[11] Mout le reguarede en mi la chiere.
Mout i a Medea ses ieuz
Douz, frans e simples, senz orguieuz;
Mout le remire doucement:
Sis cuers de fine amors esprent.

[12] Mout le desire a marriage.

Medea's love for Jason increases as she gazes upon him, and as she gazes upon him, her love is born and grows; her thoughts turn to marriage. Yet, as Andreas suggests, love is suffering, and Medea suffers during his absence: Andreas writes that the lover "looks upon a brief hour as a very long year;" this is how Medea feels as "she suffers a very great pain all the eight days of the week." Andreas also writes of the other great fear of the lover:

> But even after both are in love the fears that arise are just as great, for each of the lovers fears that what he has acquired with so much effort may be lost through the effort of someone else, which is certainly much worse for the man than if, having no hope, he sees that his efforts are accomplishing nothing, for it is worse to lost the things you are seeking than to be deprived of a gain you merely hoped for. (29)

This is, of course, the devastating results of many of the great love affairs in *Le Roman de Troie*: Jason and Medea and Troilus and Briseida (as well as of Chaucer's and Boccaccio's versions of the Troilus story).

Benoît's work, then, is an account of the Trojan War written according to the literary tastes of a medieval French audience. As such, it represents, stylistically and generically, if not at the level of plot, a significant departure from its sources. This generic evolution can also be seen in another, slightly earlier, French romance about the Trojan War, *Le Roman d'Eneas*. In the introduction to his translation of the *Eneas* (1974), John Yunck writes that, in this work, the elements of medieval romance can be seen in their nascent form: "The feudal battles, single combats, councils of barons – these essentials of the *chanson de geste*" retain their importance for the new genre,

---

Ensi sofri a mout grant peine:
Tos les uit jours de la semaine
N'ot bien ne repos ne solaz.

though they are secondary to “the passionate and sentimental love between the sexes [that] makes its appearance as the supreme moving force in the hearts of the characters” (1). These elements, so crucial to medieval romance as a genre, help delineate the distinction between the sources with which these medieval authors were working and the tastes and expectations of their audiences. In addition to supplementing his tale with contemporary flair, he, like other Christian writers working with originally pagan material, “is clearly embarrassed by Vergil’s gods” (Yunck, 10), which “causes him to discard almost all divine interference and apparitions, all encounters of gods with gods or with men, and similar supernatural occurrences unnecessary to the narrative frame” (Yunck, 11). In this, his practice is in accordance not only with Dares and Dictys, but also with almost all other medieval writers working in the tradition of Trojan War literature.

Where these divine elements are indispensable to the narrative, the narrator of the *Roman d’Eneas* “suppresses as much detail as he can” or “ascrib[es] them to sorcery” (Yunck 13). A third strategy for dealing with the paganism of his source material was to transform pagan rituals into Christian ones. For example, when Eneas describes a sacrifice conducted by Calchas, he says: “Then Calchas – a prophet highly honored – was sought out and given the duty. He took his cross and stole and made a sacrifice to the gods” (Yunck 76).[13] The author gives the pagan priest conducting the pagan sacrifice the trappings of a Christian priest: the cross and the stole, thereby Christianizing his pagan world, and bringing it more into accord with the expectations of medieval society in general and medieval romance in particular. The "overlay of medieval Christian socio-religious influence" onto the "substratum of Greco-Roman epic" on medieval romance that Myrick identified in her analysis of *The Togail Troi* is equally applicable to the French *Eneas,* and not just in the obvious example of a cross and a stole at a human sacrifice (1).

---

[13] A tant fu Calchas demandez,
Uns profites molt onorez;
Sor lui fu mise la parole.
Il enprist sa croce et s’sestole,
As des fist un grant sacrefise (1003).

In his *One Heart One Mind: The Rebirth of Virgil's Hero in Medieval French Romance* (1973), Raymond Cormier analyzes the way in which Virgil's Aeneas is transformed from the idealized Roman citizen to the idealized hero of medieval romance, or, in his words, how "the *Roman d'Eneas* seems to synthesize … the Christian monotheistic and the Stoic views" (157). The medieval Eneas is "a somewhat more steadfast her who not only accepts frequent, unwelcome catastrophes, but endeavors to justify their disciplining function" (156). To prove his claim, Cormier cites a passage from Boethius which argues that the vicissitudes of human life, though incomprehensible to humans, is in fact part of a larger divine scheme: "Even though things may seem confused and discordant to you, because you cannot discern the order that governs them, nevertheless everything is governed by its own proper order directing all things towards the good."[14]

Cormier also interprets the *Eneas* poet's excursus on Fortune as a crucial moment in understanding how Christian elements work their way into a poem about a pagan hero:

> No man should despair if he has to endure evil, and in turn he should not rejoice too much if he has all his desire; he should be neither too much dismayed by great or evil, and in turn he should not rejoice too much if he has all his desire. …

---

[14] Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy,* tr. R. Green. Indianapolis and New York: 1962, p. 92, as reproduced in Cormier 156.

> Fortune changes in a very short time, and he who weeps in the evening laughs the next morning: in the evening Fortune is ugly, in the morning beautiful, as she turns her wheel. (Yunck 69)[15]

The Aeneid is the story of the eponymous hero's trials and tribulations, his successes and his failures, as his journey works to its inevitable conclusion: the founding of Rome, its expansion and growth and its supremacy under Augustus. The *Eneas* poet, however, is not "interested in Vergil's grand imperial: the divine mission of Roman rule, the praise of Roman glories to come, the concern with Roman and Italian antiquities and topography, the flattery of the Augustan family" (Yunck 15). The *Eneas* poet, however, overlays the medieval Christian template of the Wheel of Fortune and the religious pilgrimage onto the heroic wanderings of his Virgilian character.

Benoît's account was written just as the emerging genre of the medieval romance became popular, and over the course of centuries, he would have many translators, most notably Boccaccio. But not everyone found Benoît's exotic, erotic style appropriate to the weightiness of the subject matter with which he was dealing. In 1287, a Sicilian judge, Guido delle Colonne, perhaps reacting to the introduction of the amoral and highly eroticized Trojan world created by Benoît, translated his source from Benoît's vernacular

---

[15] Por ce ne desit oem desperer,
se li estuet mal endurer,
et se il a tot son plaisir,
donc ne se deit trop esjoïr, …
Fortune torne en molt poi d'ore,
tels rit al main ki al seir plore;
al seir est laie, al matin bele,
ai com el torne sa roele;
cui el met a l'un jor desus,
a l'altre le retorne jus:
de tant com el l'a mis plus halt,
tant prant is aval graignor salt. (674-92)

French back into Latin. At the same time, he stripped away many of Benoît's rhetorical and romantic flourishes while at the same time imbuing his story with a traditional Christian morality which suppressed the celebration of passion which he found in his source.

Guido claims to be writing his account of the Trojan War because "certain past events happened a long time ago which are so worthy of memory on account of their enduring greatness that age does not succeed in destroying them by imperceptible corrosion … as long as the tale of what is past is handed down to posterity" (1)[16]. In an almost Herodotean fashion, Guido asserts that the reason that he is writing is to preserve the great events of the past from the forgetfulness of time. As importantly, however, Guido is concerned about the accuracy of the accounts he has read. In particular, he rails against Homer for the same reasons as Benoît and others did: for representing pagan gods who fought with mortal men and for sacrificing truth in favor of poetic invention (1). Ovid and Vergil, too, are accused of following Homer and spreading his mistakes (2).

Significantly, the one name not mentioned on this list (or anywhere else for in the *Historia*, for that matter) is also the most important source for Guido: Benoît de Sainte-Maure. Guido, writing in the high authoritative language of Latin, and, moreover, writing in prose, rejects the vernacular verse of Benoît as beneath the dignity of his subject matter. Indeed, Guido's adaptation of Benoît suggests that he excised the most poetical elements of Benoît's work. In his descriptions of battle scenes, for example,

---

[16] Nonnulla tamen iam dudum uetera precesserunt que sicm sui magnitudine uiuaci sunt digna memoria ut nec ea cecis morisbus uetustas ablore preuleat nec exacti temporis antique curricula sopita taciturnitate concludant. Vigent enim in illis pro gestorum magnitudine continuata recordia dum preteritorum in posteros sermo dirigitur (3). All English translations of Guido from Meek; Latin from Griffin.

"Guido omits most of Benoît's colorful touches … hauberks refurbished, horns sounding, banners waving, helmets laced on, bright swords, and the like. Sometimes there are exotic touches such as Pavian helmets, Castilian or Arabian war-horses, and Turkish bows, but only the last of these appears in Guido" (Guido xxi). Rejecting everyone who preceded them, Guido embraces Dares and Dictys as the most accurate reporters of the Trojan War. Though he claims that he will follow them faithfully, he does not, but rather follows Benoît. He writes his account, he says, "so that [future readers] may know how to separate the true from the false among the things which were written of the said history in Latin books, those things which [were related] by Dictys the Greek and Dares the Phrygian, who were at the time of the Trojan War continually present in their armies and were the most trustworthy reporters of those things which they saw" (2).[17] Again, it is the claim to first-hand observation of the events reported on that gives these two authors their historical veracity in Guido's eyes.

As with other accounts of the Trojan War, Guido was not only writing to retell a significant portion of ancient history in a truer and more accurate manner; rather, his view of history was inextricably linked to the moral, theological and philosophical lessons he believed such histories could teach. Scholars writing about Guido's *Historia* have debated what lessons Guido attempted to infuse into his work, but none question the underlying principle that Guido saw history writing as an enterprise whose purpose was to offer lessons to those in the present by presenting them with examples from the past.

---

[17] … ut separare sciant uerum a falso de his que de dicta ystoria in libris gramaticalibus sunt descripta, ea que per Dytem Grecum et Frigium Daretem, qui tempore Troyani belli continue in eorum exercitibus fuere presents et horum que uiderunt fuerunt fidelissimi relatores (4).

Walter Wigginton argues that Guido's work is "a traditional quasi-allegorical moral history" and that the Trojan War is "horrible, but ultimately under the hand of God: it is 'the working out, through men, of some divine purpose'" (Benson 24). C. David Benson, however, argues that there is no divine purpose, that rather, the Trojans, and their kings Laomedon and Priam in particular, "are caught by fate rather than models of conscious evil," as Wigginton reads them. (24)

Benson's counters that Guido's work is not a theological work explicating the hidden hand of God in human affairs, but rather a philosophical work explaining the role of the fates (25). A number of authorial interjections support such a reading. At such moments, Guido breaks from his usual omniscient objective mode of narration to lament the cruel future which he knows his characters face but which they are, nevertheless, unable to see and powerless to stop. These moralizing sentiments – against war in general, against rash decision making, against action taken without appropriate forethought – form the crux of the moral paradigm of Guido's *Historia*, which is, ultimately, that, in war, everyone loses. Nowhere is this lesson more pronounced than in Guido's digression at the moment of Troy's fall: "For the envious course of the fates, enemies of happiness, always prevents the highest things from remaining on the heights for very long, and in order to bring the condition of men more easily to ruin, it attacks the mighty, through unperceived and obscure snares, and leads them to misfortune" (Benson 25). Using the same concept of the Wheel of Fortune as other medieval writers, Guido describes the way in which fate traps and ruins even good men.

Like Euripides long before him, the Trojan War, in Guido's hands, becomes an indictment of war itself and a cautionary tale to those who would engage in it. It is in this critique of contemporary society through the prism of the ancient world that Benson sums up Guido's attitude towards his subject: "The history of Troy does not celebrate glory or heroism, but records with horror the destruction and futility of war" (29).

Perhaps Guido's most important moral point, however, lies in his attitude towards women. The love stories which are such a crucial element of the chivalric milieu of Benoît's *Roman* are transformed in Guido's *Historia* into cautionary paradigms about the destructive power of love and its devastating effects in the political and military realms. In the introduction to her translation of Guido's *History* (1974), Mary Elizabeth Meek notes that "Gone is Benoît's amused but sympathetic treatment of the lover's feelings and in its place we find much heavy moralizing" (xxiii). While Meek's statement is true, it does not quite go far enough in attempting to understand Guido's inclusion, and, in some cases, expansion of the love affairs he found in Benoît.

For Guido, the passionate love of the kind between Jason and Medea, Helen and Paris and other lovers was a potent, perhaps the most potent, motivator of historical causation. In this, he is resolutely in and of the world of medieval romance, in which, above all else, the heroes are spurred to action by passionate, courtly love, and this passionate love, with its correlative abdication of reason, is the source of political turmoil. Such, for example, is the plot of Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan*, wherein Tristan, the heir to the throne, and Isolde, the king's wife, are forced to choose between their own passionate love or their loyalty to stability of the political institutions. A similar decision falls to Lancelot and Guinevere in the Arthurian legend. In each of these instances, and any of several others, the choice the lovers make is between political stability and their own passionate love; in a tradition which stretches as far back as the

Dido episode in *The Aeneid,* the one precludes the other. For Guido, then, passionate love is the cause of all political instability.

He therefore dwells at such length on the love stories because they are the vehicles of historical change. Guido laments two things: the inconstancy and fickleness of women and the weakness of male resistance, both of which cause the downfall of political stability in the Trojan War as well as in medieval romances. For the writers of romance, however, this conflict between passionate love and political stability is the stuff of tragedy precisely because, though the lovers are aware of the damage they will cause, the authors still side with them, as partisans of passionate love over political stability.

Chrétien begins his *Chevalier au Lion,* for example, by describing how "at that time Love's order was still fine and flourishing. Now, alas, there are very few disciples; nearly all have deserted him so that Love is held in disrepute. In olden days Love's disciples were known for courtesy and bravery, generosity and honor" (Chrétien *Complete Romances* 257). Chrétien sides with the lovers: for him, passionate love is a force for good. But the most forceful advocate of the transformative and positive powers of love is Andreas Capellanus, who writes: "Love causes a rough and uncouth man to be distinguished for his handsomeness; it can endow a man even of the humblest birth with nobility of character; it blesses the proud with humility; and the man in love becomes accustomed to performing many services gracefully for everyone" (31).

For Chrétien and Andreas, as for most other authors writing in the romance tradition, passionate love is an important force in shaping history regardless of whether it moves history for better or worse.

Even Gottfried von Strasburg, an author who acknowledges the inherent misery of love and the devastation it causes, still sides with the lovers; he will present the story of Tristan and Isolde because his readers "will find it very good reading. … It will make love lovable, ennoble the mind, fortify constancy, and enrich their lives." (43). Despite the destruction that Tristan and Isolde's love will cause for Mark and Cornwall, Gottfried unequivocally sides with his lovers, and holds their love, adulterous as it is, in the highest esteem.

Guido's text, with its over-riding pessimism, inverts the usual trope of the romance genre, siding with political stability over love, in two ways: first, in showing, in the grim and bleak results of the wars they cause, as described by Yunck and Benson, and second, through the specific moralizing passages which condemn the behavior of courtly lovers. Whereas Gottfried praises the adulterous affair of Tristan and Isolde, arguing that their love should serve as an example of steadfastness and loyalty, Guido often chastises both men and women for their inability to resist passionate love. For instance, when Medea, at her father's insistence, sits next to Jason, Guido interrupts his narrative to interject: "Is it wise to trust to feminine constancy or the female sex, which has never been able, through all the ages, to remain constant? ... Just as it is known that matter proceeds from form to form, so the dissolute desire of women proceeds from man to man, so that it may be believed without limit" (Guido 15).[18] Guido's lament here is strangely out of place: it is not, ultimately, Medea, who proves fickle, but Jason. Nor, for that matter, did Medea have any say in where she sat; her father Aeëtes instructed her to do so. Medea's love for Jason causes the downfall of Aeëtes's kingdom, and Guido laments this. Finding their characters in similar situations, however, both Chrétien and Gottfried laud their choice of passionate love over political propriety.

---

[18] Numquid est sapientis se credere constancie puellari aut sexui muliebri, qui nullis annorum circulis nouit captare constantiam? … Set sicut de forma ad formam precedere materie notum est, sic mulieris conscupentia dissolute procedure de viro ad virum, uti esse creditor sine fine (17).

Guido again chastises Telamon for starting the war by stealing Hesione: "Oh, the marvelous ingratitude of the victor if the palm of victory joined Hesione to you! Noble gratitude ought to have joined her to you in the union of the marriage torch … and you would not have wrongly dishonored her on account of the shameful passion of lust when you made her your concubine" (41).[19] In this instance, too, passionate love overrides reason, with disastrous consequences: "From this Hesione proceeded the whole substance of the raging madness from which afterward the greatest causes of war proceeded" (41).[20]

Guido's conservative morality also reveals itself in his attitude towards the pagan and magical elements of his story. As discussed previously, all of the Christian authors writing accounts of the Trojan War had a problem with the paganism of their ancient sources. Most of them, however, simply elided pagan events or explained the supernatural in naturalistic terms. Guido, however, makes a point of explicitly renouncing these elements, and encouraging his audience to do so as well. After describing Medea as a witch, necromancer and astrologer, he writes that "the pagans of antiquity were willing to believe that she could very often force the great planets, that is, the sun and moon, to go into eclipse against the order of nature" (14).[21] Guido makes a point of calling the veracity of this statement into question by prefacing it with the doubt-inducing statement "the pagans of antiquity were willing to believe;" more importantly than this, however, is his explicit rejection of her alleged skill a bit later. Of her skill in causing eclipses, he writes: "It is not fitting that Catholics faithful to Christ should believe," because

---

[19] Sed O mirabilis ingratitude uictoris, si tibi palma uictorie sociauit Exionam! Hanc tibi sociare debuit nobilis gratitude ut tam nobilissimam virginem tante pulcritudinis forma decoram, tam nobilissimis moribus informatam, martialis tede tibi copula sociasses, non ut ignominiose libidinis uoluptate eam improbe deturpasses, ut eam, que tibi uix cedere poterat coniugo sociata, indignam tibi meretricali contubernio statuisti (42).

[20] Ex hac enim Exiona processit estuantis tota material rabiei, de qua postmodum maxima scandal processurent, longis nutrita temporibus, et de qua dampna postmodum irrearabilia sunt secuta (42).

> the high and eternal God, Who in His Wisdom, that is, in the Son, created all things, placed the heavenly bodies of the planets according to His law, and placing them, He imposed on them for all eternity an injunction that they will not disregard. For this reason we read that an eclipse of the sun never took place contrary to the laws of nature except when the Incarnate Son of God Himself humbly gave Himself up to suffering for us. (14)[22]

In contrast, Guido's source, Benoît, treats this scene quite differently, and their differing treatment of this scene shows the difference in their purpose and methods. Guido takes the time to explain why this cannot be true, and resorts to Christian dogma to explain himself, pointing out how true believers cannot believe in the power of humans to cause a phenomenon which can only be caused by God. Benoît, however, makes no such defense, either in Christian terms or in any other. Benoît's Medea is also highly skilled in magic:

> Astronomy and necromancy
> Which she had learned since her childhood
> She knew the arts of sorcery,
> How to make a clear night dark (1221).[23]

---

[21] Hanc credere uoluit antique gentilitas luminaria magna, scilicet solem et lunam, sepius coegisse contra naturalium ordinem eclipsari (16).

[22] Nam ille summus et eternus Deus, qui in sapientia, id est in Filio, cuncta creauit, celstia corpora planetarum propria sub lege disposuit, et ea statuens in eternum preceptum imposuit eis quod non preteribunt. Hinc est quod solis eclipsis contra naturalium institute numquam legitur accidise nisi cum incarnates Dei Filius seipsum pro nobis humiliter exposuit passioni (16).

[23] Astronomie e nigromance

In contrast with Guido, whose description of the eclipse is followed by a Christian indictment of his source material, Benoît continues with something quite different: he describes the richness, exoticism and luxury of Medea's clothes with a detailed description of her attire. He seems not to be bothered at all by either the realism of Medea's magical powers nor the theological ramifications of pagan witchcraft. As a writer of romance, his focus is on the trappings of an idealized imaginary courtly life. He has no need to explain or defend the behavior of his characters as Guido, a more moralizing writer, does. Guido only returns to Medea's clothing after his religious disclaimer.

Despite their differing foci, Guido's work is neither a theological work, as Wigginton claims, nor a philosophical one, as Benson claims. In Guido's historical ideology, the course of historical events provides their own lessons. History follows a Christian logic because it is the story of a fallen and sinful humanity. There is no distinction between history and theology. His conservative Christian morality against sinful lust and passion as well as the potent and politically devastating charms of women suggest that Guido had no need for high-minded theology or philosophy. His method, rather, is straightforward: he presents the story of the Trojan War in as austere a fashion as he can, commenting frequently on the events to elucidate the conservative moral and cultural values he found in those events. Such a narrative demonstrates that humans cannot know the consequences of their actions and that moral weakness, represented by

---

Sot tote par cuer dès enfance;
D'arz saveit tant e de conjure,
De cler jor feïst nuit oscure"

passionate love, leads to the abandonment of reason, with catastrophic consequences for all involved.

Guido’s account became the most widely translated of all medieval accounts of the Trojan War, and was, “during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries … translated several times in French, German and English. There are also versions in Spanish, Flemish, and Bohemian; one German version appeared as early as 1392, and an Italian one as late as 1665” (Meek xi).

Though many authors (such as Boccaccio, Chaucer, and, of course, Guido) knew Old French, every educated medieval writer knew Latin; Guido’s translation, therefore, made possible the transmission of Trojan War literature into these and other languages: Guido’s *Historia Destructionis Troiae* made vernacular translations of the Trojan War a truly pan-European phenomenon. Guido, moreover, acknowledged the politically legitimizing claims of a variety of medieval rulers claiming Trojan descent. In addition to Aeneas founding Rome, he mentions not only the widely accepted settlement of England by Brutus and France by Francus, but also less common foundation stories, such as the founding of Venice by Antenor, Sicily and Tuscany by King Sicanus. Even the Greeks become city-founders: Diomedes, for example, founds Calabria (Guido 10). Because of his assertion of genealogical descent from Trojan heroes for much of Europe, Guido’s work lent itself to translation by a variety of different royal patrons, all of whom seeking to capitalize on their connection to the political legitimacy which came from being the descendant of a Trojan exile.

As widely translated as Guido was, and as widely as his work disseminated, nowhere did it find as fertile soil as England, where Guido was known both in his own

Latin and in several English translations. *The Seege or Battayle of Troye, The Laud Troy Book*, John Lydgate's *Troy Book, The Geste Hystoriale the Destruction of Troy* all tell the story of the Trojan War, and all use Guido as their primary authority. But, as with all writers of Trojan War literature, they all adapted the works to suit their own era and culture, their own literary and political aims, performance contexts and interests.

One of the most obvious ways this cross-cultural adaptation can be seen is in the presence of anachronisms. As Guido himself struggled with reconciling his pagan heroes with his Christian worldview, so too did the medieval English authors who succeeded him. In *New Troy: Fantasies of Empire in the Late Middle Ages* (2003), Sylvia Federico identifies two types of anachronisms in *The Destruction of Troy*. The first category consists of anachronisms which are the result of a lack of understanding of the differences between past and present. Federico writes, for example, that the poet "has no feeling for the way in which pagan culture differs from his own and only a vague hostility towards its practices. Instead, he appeals to a contemporary audience by making the world of Troy seem familiar" (54). As examples of this type of anachronism, she writes: "Within a few lines … Priam refer[s] to 'Our goddes' (2113) and also to 'God' (2115)" (54). The poet's inability to maintain a consistent representation of the Trojans' religion as either polytheistic, as they would have been, or as monotheistic, as the poet's contemporary understanding of religion would make them are one type of anachronism.

The second class of anachronisms represents the opposite situation. In these cases, the poet is aware of the difference between his culture and the culture about which he is writing but fears his audience will not. With this second class of deliberate anachronisms, the poet follows the same method as the author of *The Togail Troi, Le*

Roman de Troie and other works in which Greeks and Trojans are described in the terms of the author's own era. To illustrate this point, Federico shows how the list of tradesmen responsible for the construction of Troy represent medieval English crafts, many of which had not yet been discovered by Bronze Age people in the Aegean. Among the many professions listed,[24] the most anachronistic must be bookbinders, which would be familiar to a medieval poet, though not a Trojan one.

This second type of anachronism is also used by the poet of the *Laud Troy Book*, who describes Troy as having "parliaments (e.g., 3221, 3391, 3733, 11546, and 11590), sheriffs, and a mayor (18376)" and nobles who "go & hunt with her grehoundes,/ with hauke, brache, & with kenetes' (13572)" (Federico 79). These were the institutions and trappings of medieval England, not ancient Troy. Because of the choices the author made in his translation, he has removed the Trojan War from the realm of ancient history and made out of it a contemporary sounding event whose language and culture contemporary English readers could understand and to which they could relate.

---

[24] Goldsmythes, Glouers, Girillers noble;
Sadlers, souters, Semestris fyn;
Tailours, Telers, Turners of vesselles;
Wrightes, websters, walkers of clothe;
Armurers, arowsmythis with Axes of were;
Belmakers, bokebynders, brasiers fyn;
Marchandes, Monymakers, Mongers of fyche;
Parnters, painters, pynners also;
Bochers, bladsmythis, baxters amonge;
Ffererers, flecchours, fele men of Crafte;
Tauerners, tapsters, all the toune ouer;
Sporiors, Spicers, Spynners of cloth;
Cokes, condlers, coriours of ledur;
Carpentours, cotelers, coucheours fyn;
With barburs bigget in bourders off the stretes. (1584-98) (Federico 54).

Anachronisms appear frequently in other accounts of the Trojan War as well. In *The Seege or Battayle of Troye,* the military technology employed by Greeks and Trojans alike are those familiar to the period of the poem's composition: "The akedouns (1457), 'hawberks of mayles' (2007), breast and shoulder-plates, apparently of the plastrons-de-fer order (1472) point to the end of the reinforced chain-mail period, 1250-1325" (Barnicle xxxi). These anachronisms, like those in other medieval accounts of the Trojan War, made these ostensibly ancient events seem more immediate and relevant to their contemporary audiences. As a result, they had greater paradigmatic force. The English used Trojan paradigms for two purposes: first, to provide paradigms of idealized behavior to be emulated and, second, as a critique of contemporary society.

The most influential of Guido's translators was John Lydgate, whose *Troy Book*, written between 1412 and 1420 at the behest of Henry, then Prince of Wales and later Henry V, reiterates Guido's desire to preserve historical truth while simultaneously shaping his work to support Lancastrian dynastic claims and to model exemplary heroes for his royal patron to emulate. The past-as-paradigm motif and the genealogical justification meet in *The Troy Book* and in the person of Henry V himself, who "is at once a living instance of its exempla and a personification of its political claims" (Meyer-Lee 46). Henry, descended from the Trojan heroes, and therefore legitimized in his political rule, also embodies the heroic paradigms in Lydgate's work: he is the greatest of the great Trojan heroes. Lydgate's *Troy Book*, in praising the Trojans, praises Henry as a warrior and as a king. Further, in asserting the Trojan foundation of England, Lydgate justifies Henry's rule.

Like Guido, Lydgate sees the events of history as naturally imbued with moral significance: human decision making, for better or worse, is the agent of historically causation. In this world, moral leadership is crucial, since it is the morality of the decision maker, the king, which will result in prosperity or destruction for himself and his people. History in general and, for a descendant of the Trojans, the history of the Trojan War and the heroic paradigms of its characters are the guides by which Henry is to learn proper moral leadership. In *History as Moral Instruction: John Lydgate's Record of Troie Toun* (1970), John Studer argues that Lydgate "has *moralized* the story of Troy" by presenting his characters "as historical models of good and bad behavior… sometimes nearly abstracted into 'types'" (5). Studer emphasizes, however, that the moral dimension of a character finds its greatest expression in

> … Lydgate's continual emphasis upon the consequences of certain behaviors. He narrates the actions that have led to a character's downfall, then digresses to discuss the general consequences of such behavior, and finally returns to warn the reader to heed the character's fate, or he points out that the misfortunes are an example of, perhaps, the consequences of hasty, impulsive judgments. (5)

This is not a new insight by Lydgate; he has simply adopted this practice from his source, Guido. But Lydgate's case is more complex because he is writing for a specific audience: the future Henry V, before he had assumed the throne. His eventual succession all but certain, but no king yet, Henry could still be taught the lessons of history and the value of moral kingship. Unlike Guido, whose work was moralizing and didactic without a clear audience, Lydgate tailored his moralizing message to this all important audience of one. In his prologue, he states this as his very purpose:

> By-cause he [Henry] hath Ioye and gret deynte
> To rede in bokys of antiquite,
> To fyn only, vertu for to swe

> Be example of hem, and also for to eschewe
> The cursyd vice of slouthe and ydelnesse. (Prologue 79)

Henry wants to be a good king, and he wants to learn from the exempla of past kings. Lydgate was commissioned to find such examples for him and to tell their story. Because his father had overthrown the last king and usurped the throne, his family’s claim to the throne lacked the legitimacy of dynastic succession. That Lydgate's praise of Henry was included in a book which praised his ancestors and helped secure Lancastrian legitimacy was an added bonus. Lydgate’s *Troy Book*, therefore, is the clearest example of the rhetorical power that the genealogical justification and the past-as-paradigm motif have, not only in isolation, but also when combined both to idealize the king and to justify his political legitimacy.

Chapter 6: Trojan Tragedies in the Middle Ages

Benoît's *Roman de Troie* is the fountain from which the medieval tradition of Trojan War literature flowed. Translations of *Le Roman de Troie* appeared in almost every European vernacular, spreading the nascent genre of the medieval romance across the Continent. Subsequent generations of authors, however, did not only follow this romance tradition; Benoît was also the source of a number of medieval and Renaissance tragedies, many of which written by some of the greatest authors of European letters: Giovanni Boccaccio, Geoffrey Chaucer[1], Robert Henryson and William Shakespeare.

Unlike the writers in the romance tradition, who generally described the events of the war from beginning to end by translating the entirety of their source, Boccaccio drew from Benoît only those sections having to do with the love triangle between Priam's youngest son, Troilus; Cressida, the daughter of the Trojan prophet Calchas; and the Greek hero Diomedes. In *The Story of Troilus* (1978), R.K. Gordon notes that, whereas previously this love triangle had been "a mere episode in a vast Troy-book," it became, in Boccaccio's hands, "a poem to itself" (xiv). Boccaccio's adaptation of *Le Roman de Troie* and Guido delle Colonne's *Historia Desctructionis Troiae,* entitled *Il Filostrato,* inaugurated the medieval tradition of Trojan tragedy.

It is difficult to trace the literary history of Troilus's tragedy before *Le Roman de Troie*. There is evidence of a lost Sophoclean tragedy named after him, though the plot of this tragedy is unknown; it cannot even be determined whether it follows the basic outline of the medieval and Renaissance accounts of his life. Troilus, however, consistently appears in ancient and medieval literary works.[2] While the quantity of his appearances in various literary works is striking, the quality of these appearances requires some note. Troilus appears only once in Homer and once in Virgil. In neither instance, moreover, does he do or say anything significant. In fact, during the seventeen hundred years between Sophocles and Boccaccio, there is no evidence of any work of literature exclusively or primarily about Troilus. It is tempting to think that Boccaccio, who was so instrumental in reviving interest in Classical Greek during his lifetime, found and adapted Sophocles's lost play; sadly, however, there is no evidence to suggest that his *Filostrato* had any source earlier than Benoît de Sainte-Maure and Guido delle Collonne. Boccaccio's own Greek, moreover, would have been insufficient to read Sophocles without the aid of a more skilled translator.

---

[1] The romance tradition did, indeed, precede the tragic tradition insofar as Benoît preceded Boccaccio, but these traditions were contemporaneous in the later Middle Ages, when Chaucer's *Troilus and Cressida* inspired many of the Trojan romances discussed in the previous chapter.

Indeed all the essential elements of the love triangle in *Il Filostrato* are present in Benoît's *Roman de Troie*: Troilus's love of Briseida (later Criseida), Calchas's desertion to the Greeks, Briseida's transfer to Greek control in a prisoner exchange, and her ultimate betrayal of Troilus by falling in love with Diomede. With respect to the plot, Boccaccio's contribution was in selecting the disjointed threads of the pre-existing story and weaving them into a unified whole that had tragic power. To do this, Boccaccio did much more than simply retell Benoît's story. He altered and adapted it in numerous radical and inventive ways.

---

[2] In *The European Tragedy of Troilus* (1989), Piero Boitani lists some of the many authors who have mentioned Troilus over the past seventeen centuries: "From the epic cycles collected in the *Kypria* to Homer, from Sophocles to Lycophron, from Callimachus to Apollodorus, from Cicero to Virgil, Horace, Hyginus, and Seneca, down to Quintus Smyrnaeus, Ausonius, and Servius between the third and fourth centuries AD, to the Latin versions of Dictys and Dares between the fourth and the sixth, and to Joseph of Exeter in the twelfth and Albert von Stade in the thirteenth, to the *Ovide Moralisé*, the *De Casibus*, the *Genealogie* and the *Espsizioni* on the *Divine Comedy*" (2).

In *Le Roman de Troie*, Troilus's story resembles a miniature version of Achilles's. Troilus's, moreover, precedes Achilles's, allowing the audience to see on a small scale and with limited emotional power what they will later see in full force. In "The Birth of Criseyde – An Exemplary Triangle" (1989) Roberto Antonelli calls Achilles and Troilus "the *exempla* of the knightly virtues destroyed by the power of Love" (36). In Antonelli's reading, Briseis (like Polyxena later in the work) becomes the exemplum of the feckless woman. Her portrayal is, at first, sympathetic and Benoît describes at length the sorrows she suffers as she leaves Troilus. As the story continues, however, Benoît offers more and more insight into Briseis's thoughts and her mind begins to change. This change is made in a long section of interior monologue. She begins by berating herself for being "false and inconstant," saying: "I have done shame most horrible to damsels and rich maidens. My treachery and my ill deeds will always be told to them. Needs must that be grievous unto me, and so it is. Very changeable and faithless is my heart; for I had the best lover to whomever a maiden might give her love" (Gordon 20). Within the space of a few lines, however, her mind begins to change and she wavers between the two: "Often I am content; often I am distressed; often it is well with me, and greatly do I wish it to be so often my eyes are filled again with tears" (Gordon 20). In the next line, however, her mind is fixed on her new love: "God be gracious unto Troilus! Now that I cannot have him, nor he me, I give and surrender myself to Diomede. Dearly would I like to have this boon – that I should not remember what I have done in the past" (Gordon 20). All this happens in the space of one paragraph. After this, as Antonelli notes, “Briseis disappears from the story as soon as she gives up her role as a mysterious, contradictory character and dramatically takes on the role, in social and cultural terms, of negative *exemplum*” (43).

As the faithless woman, Briseis stands as a counterpoint to the steadfast and chivalrous nobility of her first suitor, Troilus. It is fitting that Boccaccio’s other source, Guido delle Colonne, whose work adopted a tone of didactic moralizing, should use the opportunity to moralize on the fickleness of women in general:

> But oh, Troilus, what youthful credulity forced you to be so mistaken that you trusted Briseida’s tears and her deceiving caresses? It is clearly implanted in all women by nature not to have any steady constancy; if one of their eyes weeps, the other smiles out of the corner, and their fickleness and changeableness always lead them to deceive men. When they show signs of greater love to men, they at once at the solicitation of another suddenly change and vary their inconstant declaration of love. If perchance no seducer appears to them, they seek him themselves. (157)[3]

Boccaccio’s *Filostrato*, however, has none of this didactic moralizing, nor, for that matter, does it retain the overt misogyny of its sources. The reasons for such a change have to do with the cultural and literary milieu in which Boccaccio was writing and the reason behind his re-telling of this particular story. Writing in the Dantean/Petrarchan tradition of lovers who idealize the beloved, Boccaccio positions himself in the role of Troilus. He uses the example of Troilus’s tragic love as an exemplum for his own love. In his proem, he tells his absent beloved how much he loves and misses her. He also says that he is writing his poem in order to show “that when one has beheld happiness one understands much better how great and of what nature is misery which afterwards befalls. And yet this happiness is like my fortunes, in so far as I drew no less pleasure from your eyes than Troilus found in the happy love which fortune granted him with Criseida" (Gordon 29).[4]

---

[3] Sed, O Troile, que te tam iuuenilis coegit errare credulitas ut Briseyde lacrimis crederes et eius blanditiis deceptiuis? Sane omnibus mulieribus est insitum a natura ut in eis non sit aliqua firma constancia, quarum si vnus oculus lacrimatur, ridet alius ex transuerso, quarum mutabilitas et uarietas eas ad illudenos uiros simper adducit, et cum magis amoris sui demonstranciam instabilem repente uariant et commmutant. Et si forte nullus solicitator earum appareat, ipsum ipse, dum incedunt (164).

In the proem, he establishes the love of Troilus and Criseida as a cautionary exemplum for him and his beloved: "As often as you find Troilus weeping and lamenting the departure of Criseida, you will be able to understand and know my very words, tears, sighs, and agonies; and whenever you find portrayed the beauty of Criseida, her manners, and any other excellent quality in a woman, you can understand that it is spoken of you" (Gordon 29).[5] Like Guido before him, the narrator casts his story as an exemplum. Unlike his source, however, the narrator does not berate women in general (and the men who fall in love with them). Rather, he hopes that his beloved will see in his story an example of how not to behave. Reading of the sorrows of Troilus upon Criseida's departure, the narrator hopes his beloved "will thus be able to understand from these things how great and of what sort my desires are, what is their goal, and what beyond all else they crave, or if they deserve any pity. Now I know not if these rhymes will so prevail as to touch your chaste mind with compassion as you read them, but I pray Love to give them this power" (Gordon 29).[6]

---

[4] Perché la felicità veduta d'alcuno, molto meglio si comprende quanta e quale sia la miseria sopravvenuta. La qual felicità nondimeno, in tanto è alli miei fatti conforme, in quanto non meno di piacere io dagli occhi vostri traeva, che Troiolo prendesse dall'amoroso frutto che di Crideida gli concedea la Fortuna. (Proem 30-31)

[5] Nelle quali se avviene che leggiate, quante volte Troiolo piangere e dolersi della partita di Criseida troverete, tante apertamente potrete conoscere le mie medesime voci, le lagrime e' sospiri e l'angosce; e quante volte la bellezza e' costumi, e qualunque altra cosa laudevole in donna, di Criseida scritta troverete, tante di voi esser parlato potrete intendere. (Proem 34)

In order to help his beloved understand her current situation, Boccaccio turns to the Trojan War and, finding an analogous situation to his own current state, hopes to convince his beloved to behave in a certain way:

> I beg you as humbly as I can that you take thought touching your return, so that my life, which is hanging by a most slender thread and barely sustained by hope, may at sight of you be happily restored to its former surety. And if this, perchance, cannot come about as soon as I should desire, at least with some sigh or kindly prayer intercede with Love for me that He may give some peace to my troubles and sorrows to my hapless life. (Gordon 30)[7]

In Boccaccio's hands, the story of Troilus and Criseida is a warning to his beloved that if she follows the example set by Criseida, Boccaccio will have the same fate as Troilus. At the conclusion of the opening stanza of the penultimate book, wherein Troilus dies at Achilles's hands, Boccaccio introduces the conventional moralizing statement on the inconstancy of women, and does so in a way which paints both Troilus and Criseida as negative exempla:

> O youths, in whom amorous desire springs up as your age increases, I pray you in the name of God check your eager steps towards the evil passion and see yourselves imaged in the love of Troilus, which my verse has set

---

[6] E se cosí seite avveduta come vi tengo, da esse potrete comprendere quanti e quali siano i miei disii, dove terminino e che cosa piú ch'altro dimandino e se alcuna pietà meritino. Ora io non so se esse fieno di tanta efficacia che a voi, leggendole voi con alcuna compassione, possano toccare la casta mente, ma Amore ne priego che questa forza lor presti. (Proem 35)

[7] Il che se avviene, quanto piú umilmente posso, priego voi che all vostra tornata mettiate sollicitudine, tale che la vita mia, la quale ad un sottilissimo filo pendente è da speranza con fatica tenuta in forse, possa, vedendovi io, lieta nella prima certezza di sé ritornare; e se ciò non può forse cosí tosto com'io disidererei avvenire, almeno con alcun sospiro o pietoso priego per me ad Amore, fate che alle mie noie presti alcuna pace, e lei smarrita riconfortiate. (Proem 37)

> forth. For, if you read with right feeling, you will not easily put your trust in all women. A young woman is inconstant and desirous of many lovers" (Gordon 124).[8]

After listing the myriad evil qualities of inconstant, snobbish women, he concludes by exhorting the young men as follows: "Avoid these [ladies] and deem them vile, for they are beasts, not noble ladies (Gordon 124).[9]

Directly addressing the youths, Boccaccio's narrator urges them to see in Troilus a cautionary exemplum: a man who fell in love with an inconstant woman and suffered for it. Guido, and to a lesser extent Benoît, condemn passionate love as leading to the type of sorrow and, ultimately, death, which is fated for Achilles and Troilus. But the narrator is himself a lover and wants to account for the possibility of success in love and he counsels the youths to be wiser than Troilus: "The lady of true nobility has a keener desire to be loved and finds delight in loving; she discerns and notes what is to be shunned; she rejects and chooses; she is foreseeing and forgets not her promises. Devote yourselves to these ladies" (Gordon 124).[10] Boccaccio leaves open the possibility for success in love and his message to the youths is not to avoid love altogether but to choose wisely.

---

[8] O giovinetti, ne' quai con l'etate
surgendo vien l'amoroso disio,
per Dio vi priego che voi raffreniate
i pronto passi all'appetito rio,
e nell'amor di Troiol vi specchiate,
il qual dimostra suso il verso mio;
per che, se ben col cuor gli leggerete
non di leggieri a tutte crederete.
 Giovane donna, e mobile e vogliosa
è negli amanti molti (8.29-30).

[9] Queste schifate ed abbiatele a vili, / ché bestie son, non son donne gentili (8.31).

[10] Perfetta donna ha piú fermo desire
d'essere amata, e d'amar si diletta;
discerne e vede ciò ch'è da fuggire,
lascia ed elegge provvida, ed aspetta
le promission; queste son da seguire. (8.37)

From the paradigm of the Troilus-Criseida-Diomede love triangle, the youths are supposed to draw one lesson. To the narrator's beloved, however, this paradigm has an altogether different meaning. The narrator hopes that she will see what power she has over him — the power to kill, as Troilus's story indicates — and that she will behave more truly and faithfully to him. The narrator, therefore, accomplishes two things with these negative exempla: first, to encourage his lady not to follow in the footsteps of Criseida, which would result in his death, but rather to be faithful and come home to him. Second, for the youths, the narrator encourages them not to be like Troilus, but to be wiser in choosing a lover, lest they suffer the same heartache as the narrator professes to have.

Boccaccio's interest is different from that of other medieval authors: they were writing to tell the history of Troy in as accurate and true a manner as possible; they were interested in Troy in and of itself. Boccaccio, on the other hand, was not primarily interested in telling the story of the Trojan War. He was interested in finding a story from the past—it seems not to have mattered where—which was analogous to the situation in which the narrator of the work finds himself in the proem. The narrator hopes that the story of Troilus would help explain his own situation to his audience, as he himself says: "in the person of somebody stricken with love as I was and am, I should tell my sufferings in song" (Gordon 28).[11] He then begins to

---

[11] di dovere ub oersiba d'alcuno passionate sí come io era e sono, cantando narrare li miei martiri. (Proemio 26-27)

> [turn] over the old stories in my mind and to find one which I could fitly use as a cloak for the secret grief of my love. For inasmuch as his life, if any faith may be put in old stories, was saddened by love and by his lady being far from him after Criseida, so dearly loved, was restored to his father Calchas, my life after your going hence has been much like unto it. And therefore in his person and his fortunes I found most happily a frame for my idea… I set down his sorrows and my own as well. (Gordon 29)[12]

Boccaccio's narrator was looking to use the past as a paradigm for understanding and explaining his current situation; it just so happened that of all the stories from antiquity, the story of Troilus fit most closely. Boccaccio's claims here cannot be taken uncritically, insofar as there was, essentially, no extant story of Troilus before Boccaccio created one. There was, to be sure, a skeletal outline of a story scattered throughout his sources, but it was left to Boccaccio to put these fragments together. His frequent additions to the story, moreover, give life to the events beyond what he found in his stories: the deep access to the interior suffering of the protagonists, for example, and the addition of vivid and lively characters such as Pandarus. Boccaccio's goal, however, was not to be a historian, much less a historian of the Trojan War. C. David Benson writes that "Boccaccio's Troy is not very convincing as an ancient locale and is used primarily as a transparent disguise under which he can write about his personal affairs" (136).

Boccaccio's ahistorical interest in the Trojan War stands in sharp contrast to his English translator and adapter, Geoffrey Chaucer: "Again and again Chaucer insists that his is an old and true story and that, like the Middle English historians of Troy, he is inventing nothing but is instead scrupulously reproducing an ancient, authoritative author" (Benson 136). Despite his fidelity to what he believed to be historical truth, Chaucer was not writing a historical work. Rather, as he himself claims, he is writing a tragedy, a word which he introduces to the English language when he refers to *Troilus and Criseyde* as "litel book … litel myn tregedie" (Gordon 345).

---

[12] Meco adunque sollicita cura cominciai a rivolgere l'antiche storie per trovare cui io potessi fare scudo verisimilmente del mio segreto e amoroso dolore. Né altro piú atto nella mente mi venne a tale bisogno, che il valoroso giovane Troiolo, figliuolo di Priamo nobilissimo re di Troia, alla cui vita, in quanto per amore e per lontananza della sua donna fu dolorosa, se fede alcuna alle antiche lettere si può dare, poi che Criseida da lui sommamente amata fu al suo padre Calcàs renduta, è stata la mia similissima dopo la vostra partita. Per che della persona di lui e de' suoi accidenti ottimamente presi forma alla mia intenzione…li suoi e li miei dolori parimente compuosi;" (Proemio. 28-29).

Like Boccaccio, Chaucer's interest in the Trojan War as a historical event is secondary to his interest in the literary power of the story he is telling. Though the war "remains in the background and does not overwhelm the principal story, the war permeates the *Troilus*, as it does not the *Filostrato*, even during the height of the love affair" (Benson 137). To the writers in the historical and romance traditions of the Trojan War — even to Chaucer's devotee and follower Lydgate — the supposed historical facts of the Trojan War were the most important element of the story. To Chaucer, however, the tragic pathos of Troilus is the primary objective, and the war is or is not a prominent feature of the work depending on Chaucer's literary needs, a point which Benson emphasizes in his analysis of the poem: "Chaucer's use of the history of Troy goes beyond mere setting or authenticizing detail [as in the *Filostrato*]: it helps to create the mood and moral of his poem. … When the love story prospers, references to the war are positive or fade out altogether, according to McCall, but as fate catches up with Troilus and Criseyde we are again reminded of the unhappy destiny of the city" (Benson 137). In *The Monk's Tale*, Chaucer defines tragedy as follows:

> Tragedie is to seyn a certeyn storie,
> As olde bookes maken us memorie,
> Of hym that stood in greet prosperitee,
> And is yfallen out of high degree

> Into myserie, and endeth wretchedly (Chaucer 241).

By this definition, Troilus's story is indeed a tragedy, for it tells, as the proem suggests, "the double sorwe of Troilus … |that was king Priamus son of Troye … |how his aventures fallen fro wo to wele, and after out of joye" (Gordon 131). Troilus's tragedy, however, is two-fold. In addition to"[t]he private political emotional tragedy" of Troilus the lover, there is also "the outward political tragedy of a ruler's downfall," that is, of Prince Troilus, whose very name suggests, as his fate parallels, that of his eponymous city. Troilus as a person falls from high to low, as does his city.

Though the tragedy of Troilus was a literary subject as early as Classical Athens, Benoît invented the story of Troilus and Briseida/Cressida as known to the medieval audience, telling it as a series of related episodes interspersed throughout his history of the much larger Trojan War. Boccaccio took those episodes and created out of them a single narrative. His interest, however, was not in the Trojan War at all and his work, therefore, divorced the story of Troilus and Cressida from the larger war. In a sense, then, Chaucer's work is a synthesis of Benoît's and Boccaccio's: Chaucer places the story of Troilus and Criseyde back into its Trojan War context, overlaying Boccaccio's story of the lovers back onto Benoît's story of the war. In doing so, Chaucer creates not only the individual tragedy, the subject of *Il Filostrato*, nor the political tragedy, the subject of *Le Roman de Troie*. Rather, he analogizes the personal fate of Troilus and the political fate of Troy.

The analogous relationship between the fall of Troilus and the fall of Troy is the insight that the conclusion of the poem offers: as Troilus, now slain by Achilles, rises through the spheres of the heavens,

And doun from thennes faste he gan avyse
This litel spot of erthe, that with the see
Embracced is, and fully gan despyse
This wrecched world…

And in him-self he lough right at the wo
Of hem that wepten for his deeth so fast;
And dampned al our were that folweth so
The blinde lust, the which may not laste. (Gordon 346)

From above, Troilus sees the earth and Troy and all his fellow Trojans mourning him. They cry for Prince Troilus, the political man, the defender of the city and his death is, to an audience familiar with the story of the Trojan War, symbolic of the city's inevitable fall. But Troilus, looking down, also laughs at his own adventures in love. This is the private tragedy of Troilus the lover. This conclusion, then, joins together in one work the tragic elements of Troy's fall in *Le Roman de Troie* and the tragic elements of Troilus's fall in *Il Filostrato*.

As Chaucer, the greatest fourteenth century writer in English, wrote an account of the tragedy of Troilus and Criseyde, so too did Robert Henryson, widely considered the greatest of fifteenth-century writers in English. Henryson's *Testament of Cressida* elaborates on the conclusion of Chaucer's poem. Chaucer describes Troilus's heartbreak and his final lament in some detail before his story gives way to generalized statements of how much the Greeks suffered at his hands before his own death at the hands of Achilles. Of Criseyde, however, no more is heard. Henryson's *Testament* fills in this empty space, telling what happened to Criseyde after Chaucer's account of her life ends. In treating Chaucer's account in this way, Henryson's rules of adaptation follow those of other adapters of Trojan War material: he rarely contradicts his source, but he expands upon certain episodes about which his source is either silent or non-specific.

Henryson's debt to Chaucer is more than simply the inspiration for the story; at the opening of the poem, Henryson places his story in the same generic tradition as Chaucer and, like him, refers to his work as a tragedy:

> Ane doolie sessoun to ane cairfull dyte
> Suld correspond, and be equivalent.
> Richt sa it wes quhen I began to wryte
> This tragedie, the wedder richt fervent. (19)

A little further on in the introduction, he mentions Chaucer by name. Describing his preparations for the composition of his own work, he writes:

> I mend the fyre and beikit me about,
> Than tuik ane drink my spreitis to comfort,
> And armit me weill fra the cauld thairout:
> To cut the winter nicht and mak it schort,
> I tuik an Quair, and left all uther sport,
> Writin by worthie Chaucer glorious,
> Of fair Creisseid and Troylus. (20).

After warming himself by the fire and having some drinks, Henryson opens his volume of Chaucer to read *Troilus and Criseyde*. After summarizing the events of Chaucer's story for his readers, however, Henryson writes that he opened another book, "In quhilk I fand the fatall destenie| Of fair Cresseid, that endit wretchitlie" (21). In the next stanza, he asks:

> Quha wait gif all that Chauceir wrait was trew?
> Nor I wait nocht gif this narratioun
> Be authoriest, or fenyeit of the new
> Be sum Poeit, throw his Inventioun,
> Maid to report the Lamentatoioun
> And wofull end of this lustie Creisseid,
> And quhat distres scho thoillit, and quhat deid. (21).

All of the authors working in the medieval tradition of Trojan War literature discussed the sources they were using and pointed out that their sources were of the highest authority and accuracy and that they were following their sources to the letter. Though

Chaucer invented at least one source (the mysterious Lollius), had probably never read the sources he does cite (Dares and Dictys) and does not mention his true sources (Benoît and Boccaccio) at all, his authorial reliability comes from his claims to be following reputable sources.[13] Henryson, on the other hand, calls into question the very reliability of his source, acknowledging that poets are not "always to be completely believed because his work may be 'fenyeit of the new' or come merely from his 'inuention.' Chaucer, still firmly in the medieval tradition, feels obliged to insist that he is accurately following ancient authority on the subject of Troy, despite the complex effects he creates with the role of historian" (144). Benson's assertion perhaps overstates the significance of Henryson's question; early medieval historians such as Benoît had always made the distinction between Homer, who, as a poet, was unreliable, and Dares and Dictys, who, as eye-witness historians, were.

Henryson's questioning of Chaucer increases the credibility of the other unnamed book that describes the death of Cresseid, much in the same way that Geoffrey of Monmouth had invented a very old book to lend authority to his own inventions and Chaucer had invented Lollius to lend credibility to his. Henryson's account then picks up some time after the main events of Chaucer's work but before Troilus's death. Diomedes, grown tired of Creisseid, leaves her for another woman and shuns Creisseid altogether. In a fit of rage, Creisseid curses Venus and Cupid for her beauty and they in turn afflict her with leprosy for her blaspheming. The emotional climax of the poem takes place when Troilus, flush with a recent victory over the Greeks, passes by the hospital where Creisseid is staying and, seeing her, does not recognize her because of her deformity. The vague resemblance he sees, however, reminds him of her and, in a moment of sympathy for his lost love, he gives her alms. After he leaves, she has a monologue punctuated by the thrice-repeated "O fals Cresseid and trew Knicht Troylus" (Henryson 39).

---

[13] It should be noted that Chaucer had an ambivalent relationship with Lollius. Perhaps the unreliability of Chaucer's Lollius was the inspiration for Henryson's self-professed ambivalence towards his own sources.

Henryson's own assertion in the final stanza of the poem suggests that his work, like so much of Trojan War literature, was intended to have a moral, and that the protagonist of Henryson's work was meant to serve as an exemplum to the readers of the poem:

> Now, worthie Wemen, in this Ballet schort,
> Made for your worschip and Instructioun,
> Of Cheritie, I monische and exhort,
> Ming not your lufe with fals deceptioun.
> Beir in your mynd this schort conclusioun
> Of fair Cresseid, as I have said befoir.
> Sen scho is deid, I speik of hir no moir. (42)

In Henryson as in Boccaccio and Chaucer, Cresseid's conduct serves to caution young ladies against inconstancy. Boccaccio and Chaucer, however, urge their female audience not to follow their heroine's example lest they end up breaking the hearts of their male lovers. In Henryson's hands, however, Cresseid's behavior is condemned not for its effect on her male lovers (Diomedes, although deplorable in his own way, is unaffected by Cresseid's plight and Troilus, the one time he appears in the poem, is celebrating a happy victory over the Greeks), but because of its effects on her. Because of her rejection of the "trew knicht Troylus," she is cast out from society, disfigured, and dies in penury and loneliness. Troilus and Diomedes, however, seem unaffected one way or the other.

Like Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, Henryson's *Testament* explores the role of the medieval Wheel of Fortune. The tragic genre, which tells the story of a fall from high to low, requires a meditation on fortune in everyday life. In *Troilus and Criseyde,* this meditation appears at the end, where Troilus assesses life on earth and his own sad fate as he rises through the heavenly spheres. Henryson discusses this at the beginning of the poem, wherein he addresses Cresseid directly:

> O fair Creisseid, the flour and A per se
> Of Troy and Grece, how was thou fortunait!
> To change in filth all they Feminitie,
> And be with fleschlie lust sa maculait,
> And go amang the Greikis air and lait
> Sa giglotlike, takand they foull plesance!
> I have pitie thou suld fall six mischance. (22)

Though Cresseid suffers the consequences of her actions and, ultimately, repents of them, she is as much a victim of fate as she is an agent in her own downfall, a point stressed by Benson in his analysis of her character: "[N]o two readers of the *Testament of Cresseid* agree in their judgments of the heroine (the degree of her guilt or innocence, the justice of the punishment she receives from the gods, or the extent to which her suffering leads to self-knowledge)" (144). On Troilus, however, a more unanimous opinion is rendered: "a true and admirable chivalric lover. Cresseid's own view has not been challenged: 'O fals Cresseid and trew knicht Troylus'" (Benson 144).[14]

Benson himself, however, challenges this view, arguing that, in Henryson's Christian outlook, it is the penitent Cresseid whose humbled redemption makes her more admirable than the arrogant, if magnanimous, Troylus. The historical background of the Trojan War features even less prominently in *The Testament of Cresseid* than in any of the other medieval tragedies, yet it looms large in the background, forcing a re-interpretation of Troilus's actions. Benson argues that Troilus's "heroic entrance is deceptive. If Troilus is now chieftain of the city, Hector must be already dead and Troilus's own end fast approaching. The victory over the Greeks from which Troilus is here returning is but a temporary stay of Troy's fall. Troilus's military success will soon suffer a cruel and complete reversal" (145). Previous scholars saw Henryson as a misogynist and a moralizer, Cresseid's leprosy as a physical mark of her shame and Troilus's magnanimity as a mark of his virtue. Benson inverts this reading, offering up instead a tragic equivalence in the fates of the two characters. Cresseid's tragedy is her fall from Trojan princess to leprous beggar. For Troilus, however, Henryson has something far more tragic. Blind to his own fate, Troilus marches triumphantly into Troy, and the dramatic irony of his inevitable fall, known to the audience but not to him, heightens the tragedy of his inevitable death. Unlike Benoît's, Boccaccio's and Chaucer's narrator, the narrator of the work is not a later author recalling past events. Rather, it is Cresseid herself writing her own life.

---

[14] For similar judgments in praise of Troilus, cf. Benson (144)

Cresseid's tragedy is her own knowledge and realization of her fate, emphasized by the refrain of "fals Cresseid, O trew Knicht Troilus;" Troilus's tragedy is his lack of knowledge of his fate. Henryson need not narrate his death; the audience already knows of its approach. Rather, Henryson, for the first time, describes her death and funerary rites, which from the time of Homer's description of the funerals of Patroclus and Hector, had been reserved for dead warriors.

The Trojan War was also an important motif in several of the works of William Shakespeare. Though there are many references to the Trojan War in the Shakespearean corpus, only one play, *Troilus and Cressida*[15]*,* is set during the Trojan War itself. This play addresses many of the major themes of previous Trojan War literature: Shakespeare's Trojans and Greeks serve as both positive and negative exempla for their contemporary English audience and his treatment of the Trojan material also criticizes the English monarchy's claim to political legitimacy based on Trojan descent and their reimagining of London as Troynovant, New Troy.

From a literary perspective, moreover, Shakespeare's play marks the end of the medieval tradition of Trojan War literature. It was also during Shakespeare's lifetime that the Homeric epics were rediscovered and translated into English, marking an end to the medieval authority of the tradition of Dares and Dictys. The first installment of Chapman's Homer was published in 1598, four or five years before the generally accepted date of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida.* Chapman's complete translation of Homer – the first in English – was published in the year of Shakespeare's death, 1616. Shakespeare's literary life, then, spanned the era of Homeric revival in English.[16] His work incorporates elements of the medieval Dares/Dictys/Benoît tradition as well as the Homeric elements. Shakespeare brings the medieval theme into the Renaissance and prepares for its continuing transimission into Early Modern and Modern literature.

---

[15] For a summary of other views and approaches to the play from the early twentieth century, see Kimbrough (1964) pgs. 1-6.

[16] Kimbrough also provides a list of other Trojan themed drama and literature contemporary with Shakespeare: "In the summer of 1596 the Admiral's Men gave fiver performances of a play called 'troyless & creseda'; and the fragment of the Admiral's plot of a play about Troy and the lovers must be dated from 1598-1602. Whether or not this plot is 'troye' reworked, the Chettle-Dekker play, or a third one, Henslowe from 1596-1602 was careful to have ready a play on Troy. Furthermore, in 1599 the Admiral's Men played the anonymous *Agamemnon, Troy's Revenge, Orestes' Furies*, and a two part play on Brutus, son of Ascanius" (26).

In his introduction to *Troilus and Cressida*, Kenneth Palmer notes that in *Romeo and Juliet*, “the proportion to the whole play of those scenes in which one lover (or both) appears is roughly 9:10 (91 per cent), and in that play Romeo or Juliet are seen primarily as lovers, and have no other effectual function” (Shakespeare 39). In contrast, Troilus and Cressida are on stage only 58% of the play. Their roles, moreover, are more varied than those of Romeo and Juliet: “To count those scenes from the whole play in which Troilus and Cressida appear *as lovers* would change the proportion radically: the ‘love’ plot occupies exactly 33 per cent of the play, whether counting by lines or scenes” (Shakespeare 39). Palmer’s analysis suggests that there is much more to this play than simply the tragic love story Troilus and Cressida.

The play begins as though to follow in the medieval tradition of Troilus tragedies, with Troilus declaring his love for Cressid to Pandarus and lamenting her refusal of the suit. The love story, however, is interrupted by a loud alarm and Aeneas enters to chastise Troilus for not being outside the walls and in the fight. Nowhere in Boccaccio, Chaucer or Henryson do the necessities of war interrupt so jarringly the courtship between the lovers. Just as quickly as the war breaks in upon the lovers, however, does the love story break in again upon the description of the war: Cressida and Alexander’s discussion of Hector and Ajax’s combat is broken in upon by Pandarus, who returns to the love story by attempting to persuade Cressida of Troilus’s prowess and virtue.

As Act I, Scene III opens, Shakespeare again returns to the larger Trojan War by shifting the focus of the play away from the Trojans entirely and to the Greek council, where the Greeks discuss strategy and Achilles’s absence from the war. Thus are the two plots of the play interwoven: the love story of Troilus and Cressida, drawing from the tragic tradition of Chaucer, and the story of the war between Greeks and Trojans, drawing from the romance tradition of Lydgate and the newly revived epic tradition of Homer.[17]

In combining these different traditions of Trojan War literature (ancient with medieval; tragic with romantic, epic and historical) Shakespeare, along with Chapman and other writers of their generation, instigated a broad shift away from the medieval tradition towards a new Renaissance understanding of the past. In creating something new out of the old stories and in updating them for a contemporary audience, Shakespeare is, in essence, following in the spirit of his predecessors. This shift, moreover, is seen not only in the literary qualities of Shakespeare's play, but also in its ideological ones.

The notion of *translatio imperii*, the transfer of imperial authority from ancient Rome to the medieval European monarchies, has a long standing literary pedigree in the tales of Trojan wanderers like Aeneas and, in the case of England, Brutus. Also following the literary tradition of the Trojan War, Shakespeare uses stories, images and motifs from the Trojan War to criticize contemporary society and, in particular, it's ruling political elite. Because he lived under an absolute monarchy and, as a playwright working in the public theaters, was subject to censorship and other, more severe, forms of punishment, Shakespeare uses analogous situations from the Trojan War to obliquely criticize both Queen Elizabeth and the Tudor monarchy. In *Shakespeare's Troy* (1997), Heather James's account of the influence of Trojan material not just on *Troilus and Cressida* but also on the larger Shakespearean corpus, James argues that Shakespeare continually undermines the symbols of the Tudor monarchy and its claim to Trojan and Roman roots in particular. In doing so, Shakespeare follows in a long tradition of artists using themes from the Trojan War to obliquely criticize existing political structures. James further proposes that Shakespeare's play was meant as a critique of contemporary politics: "There is little prospect that Shakespeare praises Elizabeth as a restorer of the golden age, considering *Titus Andronicus'* sustained abuse of classical models favored by the Tudors. His critique of Elizabethan political iconography begins with the figure of Lavinia and ends with Tamra, who parodies the guises that Queen Elizabeth appropriated from Vergil—Dido, Astraea, and the *Venus armata*" (48).

---

[17] In debating about which versions of Homer Shakespeare may have used, Palmer notes in his introduction to Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* (1982) that "Shakespeare might have used any of eight translations of the whole or part of the poem (five giving Latin verse, or Latin prose, or literal Latin with the Greek; either of two in French; and Arthur Hall's translation from the French of Books I-X)" (Shakespeare 33). In supporting Shakespeare's use of Chapman in particular, he writes that "those who for the use of Chapman's Books corresponds to what we find in the play in Acts I-IV (the Greek council, Hector's challenge, Ajax as Hector's opponent), and that what Chapman omits (the duel of Paris and Menelaus, Pandarus's breaking the truce, Diomede's fight with the Gods, Hector consoling Andromache and frightening his son) is also omitted by Shakespeare" (Shakespeare 330). For a more thorough review of Shakespeare's possible sources, cf. Shakespeare pgs. 22-34.

The rape, mutilation and murder of Lavinia in the play, moreover, graphically underscore the rejection of Virgilian history and its claims to legitimacy. In *The Aeneid*, although Lavinia is caught between her betrothal to Turnus and her destiny as Aeneas's wife and mother of the Roman dynasty, she remains separate and unaffected by the action of the poem, a passive figure awaiting her fate. *Titus Andronicus*, however, offers a very different picture of her. As in Virgil, a squabble erupts over which man is to have Lavinia, though in this case, she is already married and the argument is between her husband's two murderers about which one gets to rape her. After her rape, she is brutally disfigured: her tongue and hands are cut off in order to silence her. At the conclusion of the play, she is killed by her former father-in-law, the new Aeneas, Titus Andronicus.[18]

This method of social critique through analogy extends to other aspects of the play as well. The ten years' duration of the war against the Goths from which Titus has just returned, for example, forms a parallel with the Trojan War, while "Titus's military acts against the Goths and their Queen recall Rome's ancient wars with Carthage, then enemy civilization founded by another queen, Vergil's Dido" (James 51). The play, therefore, begins by creating the parallel between Shakespeare and Virgil's eponymous heroes; this parallel, however, quickly unravels, as Titus becomes ensnared by the political maneuverings required for the imperial succession. His decision to reject his brother's offer to become emperor in favor of the dead emperor's first son leads to the play's tragic action, which traces Titus's transformation from an Aeneas figure into an anti-Aeneas. Indeed, he even goes so far as to "commi[t] the act unthinkable in the *Aeneid*": he kills his son Mutius (James 53), inverting the image of Aeneas fleeing Troy "clasping his son's hand and carrying his father on his back in hopes that he may bring to Rome his most prized value, the love between father and son" (James 53). Titus not only continues primogeniture in imperial succession to an unworthy ruler, but also kills his own son, thus revealing the corruption at the heart of the practice.

---

[18] James argues that the physical and verbal violence done to Lavinia, the female progenitor of Rome—and therefore England— "do[es] nothing less than perform a critique of imperial Rome on the eve of its collapse and, in doing so, glance[s] proleptically at Elizabethan England as an emergent nation" (42). James further proposes that Shakespeare's play was meant as a critique of contemporary politics: "There is little prospect that Shakespeare praises Elizabeth as a restorer of the golden age, considering *Titus Andronicus's* sustained abuse of classical models favored by the Tudors. His critique of Elizabethan political iconography begins with the figure of Lavinia and ends with Tamra, who parodies the guises that Queen Elizabeth appropriated from Vergil—Dido, Astraea, and the *Venus armata*" (48).

Implicit in this critique of primogeniture is the long-standing struggle between Parliament and the monarchy. The catastrophic consequences of Titus's rejection of the republicanism of Parliamentary rule and his embrace of primogeniture coupled with the dismantling of the Roman legacy in Britain suggest that Shakespeare was a product of the growing discontent with the British royalist government which would break out in armed civil war in the generation after Shakespeare. Indeed, it was during the period between *Titus Andronicus* and *Troilus and Cressida* that Oliver Cromwell, the parliamentary leader who would overthrow the monarchy and institute republican government in England some forty years later, was born. In *Titus Andronicus,* this oblique criticism is leveled through the inversion of the tropes of Virgilian modes of authority: Titus becomes the son-slaying anti-Aeneas and the Trojan paradigm of Rome's founding and governance become emblematic not of Virgil's enduring peace and empire without end, but of internecine strife, civil war and despotic governance.[19]

---

[19] James finds a similarly oblique criticism running through *The Tempest* and Shakespearean theater writ large. As the conflict between Parliament and the monarchy escalated under King James in the last thirteen years of Shakespeare's life, his plays become all the more critical of the monarchy, culminating in the anti-monarchical themes of *The Tempest*. James argues that Shakespeare's critique of the monarchy in this play is based on an analogy between the Virgilian Aeneas and the Shakespearean Prospero as wanderers and civilization founders, as well as the plays many allusions to *The Aeneid* (James 196). James concludes that "Shakespeare's firmly and, to some, noxiously humble stand delicately proposes an answer to royal authority and popular audiences. Emphatically not seditious in its themes, the play nonetheless aligns the theater with constitutional theory that derives the royal authority from the people, who technically have the right to withdraw their consent and leave the prince stranded on a desert island" (221). For a similarly anti-Augustan (and thus anti-Aenean and anti-Elizabethan) reading of *Antony and Cleopatra*, cf. James 119-150.

From the earliest accounts of the Trojan War, Greeks and Trojans have been characterized in ways that emphasize their paradigmatic function as examples to be emulated or avoided, and Shakespeare's account of the Trojan War is no different. As with his oblique criticism of Tudor England by undermining its Trojan iconography in *Titus Andronicus*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *The Tempest*, so too in *Troilus and Cressida*, the only Shakespearean play set in Troy itself, James argues that Shakespeare's "aberrant reproductions of classical icons should be recognized as calculated assaults on the political program invested in transporting imperial authority from Rome to Elizabethan England" by way of their shared Trojan origin (85).

In *Troilus and Cressida*, however, Shakespeare's criticism is leveled not at the larger level of Roman and Trojan society, but at the individual exempla drawn from the Trojan War which sustained and shaped ideas of heroism in Elizabethan England as they had in previous generations. The warriors whose descendants had founded Britain in Geoffrey of Monmouth's work and who had been the ideal of knightly valor, chivalry and wisdom in John Lydgate's become, in Shakespeare's hands, so exaggerated as to become caricatures of themselves.

In Act I scene III, the audience gets a first glimpse of the Greeks on stage, with three of the traditionally greatest heroes, Agamemnon, Nestor and Ulysses, sitting in council, and the subject is how to get Achilles to return to the fight. In the Homeric tradition, Achilles is in his tent with Patroclus singing the praises of the great men of the past, that is, creating exempla out of other warriors. Shakespeare's Achilles, however, is doing the exact opposite, as Ulysses says:

> The great Achilles, whom opinion crowns
> The sinew and the forehand of our host,

> Having his ear full of airy fame,
> Grows dainty of his worth, and in his tent
> Lies mocking our designs: with him Patroclus
> Upon a lazy bed the livelong day
> Breaks scurril jests,
> And with ridiculous and awkward action,
> Which, slanderer, he imitation calls,
> He pageants us. (Shakespeare 133).

Ulysses goes on to describe how he mocks each of them in turn and each is mocked for their traditionally heroic virtues: for Agamemnon, "he acts thy greatness in;" for Nestor, "hem and stroke thy beard, as he being dress'd to some oration" (Shakespeare 135). Achilles and Patroclus caricature Agamemnon, the supreme commander, as being pompous and aggrandizing and Nestor, known for his age and sweet speech, is mocked as rambling and senile. Achilles, therefore, undermines the traditional exemplary value of these characters.

In a sense, however, Shakespeare is doing the same thing on the stage as Achilles is doing in his tent: in *Troilus and Cressida*, Agamemnon *is* pompous and self-aggrandizing; Nestor *is* rambling and senile. But Shakespeare doesn't leave his critique there. Rather, he extends it to virtually every other character, and Achilles himself is no exception. Like the other characters in *Troilus and Cressida*, Achilles is mocked and caricatured for the very attributes that had, in previous accounts of the Trojan War, made him the greatest and most admirable of warriors. The Achilles of previous accounts of the Trojan War, and *The Iliad* in particular, is torn among several competing desires, most significantly the conflict between his own slighted honor and passions in the matter of his love interest being taken (Briseis in the ancient accounts, Polyxena in the medieval) and his duty towards his comrades in arms fighting and dying against the Trojans. In Shakespeare, there is no conflict, and Achilles, rather than crying in his tent as in *The Iliad*, laughs and mocks and seems to be enjoying himself. The plot of *Troilus and Cressida* follows the general outline of the ancient and medieval accounts of the war—the Greeks still send an embassy to a recalcitrant Achilles, but the motives, behavior and attitudes of the participants have evolved.

Shakespeare alters two other significant elements of the traditional characterization of Achilles, both of which strip him of exemplary power by making weaknesses out of what, traditionally, have been his strengths: his passion as a lover and his prowess as a warrior. Toying with the homoerotic poetics of the closet (in this case, the tent) into which Achilles and Patroclus have found seclusion, Shakespeare once again raises the specter of Achilles's homosexuality: as Achilles and Ulysses argue over Achilles withdrawal from combat, Ulysses says, "And better would it fit Achilles much/ to throw down Hector than Polyxena" (218). Playing on the two meanings of throw down, the first for combat, the second for sex, Ulysses suggests that it would be better for Achilles to make war not love, but also suggests that he is more interested in making love to Hector than Polyxena. This sexual conflation undermines Achilles's warrior status.

Achilles's most characteristic feature is, of course, his position as the greatest warrior to have fought in the war. In every account of the Trojan War from antiquity to the Middle Ages, this has remained a constant feature. Shakespeare, however, treats Achilles's military power in a radically different way, with the effect not of glorifying him, but of diminishing him. First, rather than meet him in the open, Achilles lays an ambush for him. Second, rather than have the two face each other in one-on-one combat, Achilles brings all of his men with him. Hector, coming across the ambush and realizing himself trapped, tells Achilles: “I am unarm’d: forego this vantage, Greek,” an offer which would have allowed Achilles the opportunity to gain his glory in a fair fight (298).

Achilles’s diminished heroic stature is further revealed in his next line; not even addressing Hector, a conversation that, in *The Iliad*, contains some of the most epic and heroic language in the poem, he instead orders his men to kill Hector: “Strike, fellows, strike: this is the man I seek” (Shakespeare 298). In *The Iliad*, Achilles specifically warns the Greeks that none but he is to kill Hector; in *Troilus and Cressida*, his order is the opposite. Achilles’s heroic debasement is compete when he orders his men to give him the credit for the kill: “On, Myrmidons, and cry you all amain/ ‘Achilles hath the mighty Hector slain’” (Shakespeare 298).

The epic stature of the poem is diminished as the epic hero’s greatest feat is readapted in the most un-epic of ways. If the poem is not epic, however, neither is it tragedy; it neither tells of the death of Troilus as in Boccaccio and Chaucer, nor the death of Cressida, as does Henryson. Instead, these characters are left in an indeterminate state. The conventions of genre that distinguished previous accounts of the Trojan War have been eviscerated along with the exemplarity of the heroes themselves.

Conclusion: The Trojan War Beyond the Middle Ages

The decline of the Middle Ages did not result in a decline in interest in the Trojan War. The Trojan War remained an important literary subject and almost every subsequent period of literary history produced several important works set during the Trojan War. The Trojan War remained an important literary subject from Antiquity to the Middle Ages because unlike, for example, The Bible, there was no fixed, authoritative account of this ancient story. Ancient and medieval literary taste did not value originality of plot, but originality of presentation. The Trojan War allowed authors to invent, elaborate and alter significant elements of their source material without altering the plot. Writers could, therefore, recast their story into a variety of different genres and registers, from the high epic and tragedy of the ancients and the educational Latin genealogical histories of Geoffrey of Monmouth and Dudo of San Quentin to the lower forms of vernacular medieval romance and even, in the words of one critic, “medieval burlesque” (*Fantasies* 117).

The Trojan War did not retain its importance simply because of its literary merits. Nearly every work of Trojan War literature had some political or social resonance in its own time. For the rulers of ancient Rome and medieval Europe, this meant tracing their descent and, in a society which valued primogeniture, their political legitimacy, to Trojan refugees who they imagined had first settled their capital cities. The flexibility of the presentation of the Trojan War and the variability of the characterization, attitudes and behaviors of the combatants meant that authors working in the tradition of Trojan War literature could continually present their characters in contemporary terms: Greeks and

Trojans were representatives of the culture about which the author was writing. Greeks and Trojan, therefore, were used as exempla or paradigms of idealized behavior, either positive or negative. And just as the individual Greek or Trojan served as an exemplum, so too did the larger Trojan War. Authors seeking to criticize the taking of bad counsel, civil war or a variety of other social and political ills often saw in Trojan War literature a means of social criticism.

Generic experimentation, exemplarity, social criticism and political legitimacy did not disappear as topics of literary interest with the end of the Middle Ages, nor did the role of the Trojan War as a setting for literary works addressing these and other issues. Rather, the story of the Trojan War remained central to Western literary development, both in Europe and in the new colonies and, later, in independent nations across the Atlantic. Indeed, if the invention of the printing press was one of the most significant developments that catalyzed the transition from the medieval to the early modern world, then the fact that, in 1475, the first book that William Caxton published in English was his *Recuyel of the Histoires of Troye* suggests the continuing centrality of Trojan War literature in the Western Canon.

In addition to literary works set during the Trojan War that were written during the Renaissance, this period played another important role in the development of Trojan War literature. The rediscovery of Classical Greek texts, the process which gave the Renaissance its name, provided authors with new sources for their works. The revival of Classical learning gave Renaissance and later authors a new literary tradition from which to draw besides the medieval tradition that stemmed from Dares and Dictys. In England between 1598 and 1616, for example, George Chapman published his translations of *The*

Iliad and *The Odyssey*, making Homer available for the first time to an English speaking audience. Homer's epic tradition now stood alongside the many English Trojan romances. Chapman's influence was immediate and pervasive. In 1602, William Shakespeare published his *Troilus and Cressida*, which addressed the romance tradition through its depiction of the tragic love of the title characters and also the epic tradition of Achilles's withdrawal and the Greek commanders' attempts to get him to return to battle. In 1679, John Dryden wrote his own *Troilus and Cressida*, adding another name to the list of important English authors writing about the Trojan War.

Trojan War literature thrived in France as well. The rediscovery of Greek tragedy and Greek poetics also deeply influenced the Neoclassical French playwrights of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1570, Ludovico Castalvetro's *Art of Poetry* re-introduced Classical literary theory to the late Renaissance world. From Aristotle's *Poetics*, Castalvetro distilled the three unities of the Classical stage: unity of action, place and time. Pierre Corneille reiterated this theory in *Trois discours sur la poème dramatique* (1660). A successful playwright in the preceding decades, Corneille had published several plays which took place during the Trojan War, such as *Le Medée* (1635), *Le toison d'or* (1660) and *Andromède* (1650). The Trojan War was also a source for Corneille's younger contemporary Jean Racine, who published *Andromaque* (1667) and *Iphigénie* (1674). Though these examples represent but a few of the many works published by only two of the many playwrights writing in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, they suggest both the continuing importance of the Trojan War as a literary subject and the influence of Greek literary genres on Neoclassical authors.

With the reintroduction of Greek learning during the Renaissance and the Neoclassical period came the rise of Classical philology, a field which would have an important influence on the literary tradition of the Trojan War. Since the early Middle Ages, Dares's and Dictys's chronicles had been deemed the most reliable source of knowledge about the Trojan War. In *Dares and Dictys* (1907), Nathaniel Griffin writes: "Faith in the authenticity of records that had … achieved permanent embodiment in the Middle ages was not lightly abandoned in the period that followed. The sixteenth century remains, for the most part, firm in its allegiance to Dares and Dictys. … So too in the seventeenth century, in spite of a growing scepticism, critics are not wanting who still believe in the pre-Homeric antiquity of these records" (16).

The ultimate rejection of Dares's and Dictys's chronicles as legitimate sources of historical knowledge, Griffin writes, was not established "until the opening of the eighteenth century," when "pretensions so long maintained at last met thoroughgoing repudiation at the hands of Perizonius who, in his dissertation prefixed to the 1702 edition of the Delphin classics, by proofs to definitive to admit further hesitation, removed for all time the last vestiges of this peculiar veneration" (17). Subsequently, almost all accounts of the Trojan War have used the Classical tradition of Homer and the tragedians as their source, and Dares and Dictys have all but disappeared.

This rise of philology and humanist learning that the rediscovery of Greek texts sparked resulted in another important change. New histories began to emerge that challenged, undermined and, ultimately, led to the rejection of claims of Trojan ancestry by the royal houses of Europe. In Venice, for example, the story of the foundation of the city by Trojan refugees fell out of favor as early as the fourteenth century, when "the ennobling but pagan association with Troy fell to the wayside, while the Christian myths gained favour. Instead of recounting the arrival of original settlers, now chroniclers started the tale with the Hunnic invasion of Italy, which identified the *Veneti* as good Christians escaping the pagan threat" (*Fantasies of Troy* 103).

In France and Germany, the justification of political power through Trojan ancestry endured longer than in Venice, but it, too, eventually was rejected. In "The Trojan Origins of the French and the Brothers Jean du Tillet" (1998), Elizabeth Brown describes "the part [the two brothers] played before their deaths in 1570 in persuading their compatriots of the folly and irrationality of claiming Trojan descent" (351). Brown points out that the de Tillet brothers did not

> make any significantly original contribution to the rejection of the Trojan myth. Rather … they drew their inspiration and many of the facts they presented from the writings of a group of creative German humanists. These scholars (and most notably Heinrich Bebel [1472-1518], Count Hermann of Neuenar [1492-1530], and Beatus Rhenanus [1485-1547]), refused to follow their fellow Germans (particularly Trithemius [1462-1516] and his invented chroniclers Hunibald and Megenfrid) in catering to the whims of the ambitious Maximilain I, eager to establish his Trojan origins. (351)

In previous centuries, there had been very little debate over the veracity of the claim to Trojan origin on the part of European kings. As late as the middle of the sixteenth century, however, German kings were still trying to establish just such a genealogy they commissioned historians to document these origins. Now, however, these claims were being challenged as never before by rigorous scholarship: "The younger brother was an avid seeker after manuscripts, and a thoughtful, punctilious, and principled editor of texts patristic and legal. The older brother was a pioneer in inventorying and utilizing documents and registers housed in royal administrative repositories. In these respects both made original contributions towards advancing critical investigation of the past" (Brown 353).

Analyzing a variety of medieval sources, they determined that the French were in fact descendants of Germanic Celts, not Trojans. Brown writes that "thanks in no small part to the brothers Du Tillet, by 1570 (the year of their death), it had become unfashionable among the learned, Orthodox Catholic élite to continue espousing the popular myth that, not long before, King Louis XII had cherished" (353).

Though Europeans no longer looked to Trojans ancestors to justify their own political legitimacy, they continued to look to the heroes of the Trojan War for exempla of idealized behavior and, just as in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, the heroism they found was a reflection of their own society's ideals. This use of the Trojan War continued not only in Europe, but also in the former European colonies in the New World. In *The Founders and the Classics* (1994), for example, Carl Richard discusses the influence of classical literature on the American political class during the founding of the United States. In chapters entitled "Models" and "Antimodels," Richard describes how

> … the founders used classical symbols to create implicit analogies, identifying themselves and their causes with the ancients, they also formulated explicit analogies and contrasts between ancient and contemporary individuals, societies, and governments. … Ancient history provided the founders with important, if imprecise, models of personal behavior, social practice, and government form. (53).

As with others who looked to the past for models to emulate, the founders also looked to the past for "antimodels," which Richard defines as "those ancient individuals, societies, and government forms whose vices they wished to avoid" (85). As other Western thinkers and writers had, the founders of America looked to the past to understand their contemporary situation. More often than not, the founders looked to Greek and Roman history more than the Trojan War for their models. The Revolution was, to them, analogous to either the Persian War, the Peloponnesian War or the Roman Civil Wars. George Washington was compared variously to Cincinatus and Epaminondas of Thebes; Benjamin Franklin to Solon and Prometheus.

Trojan analogies did, however, feature in American political discourse as well: "Thomas Jefferson dubbed Samuel Adams 'the Palinurus of the American Revolution,' after Virgil's mythical hero, who, having piloted the Trojan ships to Italy past many dangers, fell overboard and drowned. … Charles Thomson compared Patrick Henry with Aeneas, claiming that Congress listened to him with as rapt attention as Aeneas's audience in Dido's palace" (Richard 55). This sort of exemplarity also found its way into the founders' private discourse:

> In 1782 [Abigail Adams] wrote to her husband, then negotiating a Dutch alliance for his infant country: "Eight years have already past since you could call yourself an Inhabitant of this State. I shall assume the Signature of Penelope, for my dear Ulysses [Odysseus] has already been a wanderer from me near half the term of years that Hero was encountering Neptune, Calipso, the Circes and Sirens." (Richard 67).

The use of Trojan War exempla continues even to the present day. The Nobel Laureate Derek Walcott's *Omeros*, for example, is an epic poem modeled on *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*. In this poem, Walcott adapts his Homeric source material to suit his own contemporary context as a black Caribbean islander writing allegorically about a variety of contemporary problems and the heroism of the Caribbean islanders overcoming the traumatizing experience of colonialism. No longer in a recognizably classical or medieval Troy, Achilles, Hector and the other characters of the Trojan War fish, dance and sail like contemporary Caribbean islanders.

To create his exempla, Walcott reimagines the heroes of the Trojan War in new ways, imbuing the old characters with new meanings. The Greek archer Philoctetes, for example, becomes, in the words of Jahan Zamarani (1997), “the emblematic black descendant of slaves” (493). This newly imagined Philoctetes becomes the paradigmatic representation of the postcolonial Caribbean islander, and it is through this character that, according to Zamarani, “Walcott not only gives voice to the suffering of African Caribbean peoples under European colonialism and slavery, he fuses other literary prototypes of North and South, Old World and New in an astonishing hybridity that exemplifies the cross-cultural fabric of postcolonial poetry” (405). Walcott reimagines Philoctetes’s identifying feature, the wound in his ankle, as an allegory of the colonial experience which Philoctetes has overcome. In Zamarani’s reading, “Walcott turns the wound into a resonant site of interethnic conflict within *Omeros*, vivifying the black Caribbean inheritance of colonial injury and at the same time deconstructing the uniqueness of suffering” (405). Philoctetes becomes the paradigm of the suffering black Caribbean, and his struggles and his heroism in overcoming them become the model for other black Caribbean islanders. Indeed, the cause of the wound itself is reinvented to suit Walcott’s contemporary Caribbean setting:

> He believed the swelling came from the chained ankles
> of his grandfathers. Or else why was there no cure?
> That the cross he carried was not only the anchor’s
>
> but that of his race, for a village black and poor
> as the pigs that rotted in its burning garbage,
> then were hooked on the anchors of the abattoir. (19)

As the first stanza suggests, in Walcott’s Trojan War, Philoctetes’s wound is caused by the traumatizing experience of the Trans-Atlantic slave trade. The wound, however, means more than just this. The last line of the first stanza and the second line of the first stanza suggest Philoctetes's role as the paradigmatic slave and descendant of slaves.

For two and a half millennia, the Trojan War has maintained this type of literary flexibility, allowing readers and writers to see in this ancient tale a continually contemporary message. No political elites still justify their rule based on political descent from the Trojans and the debate still rages as to whether the Trojan War, as described in the literary sources, is a real historical event. It seems, however, that for as long as there are societies at war to criticize and heroic behavior to idealize, for just as long will the Trojan War remain a central subject for Western literature.

Bibliography

Aeschylus. *Suppliant Maidens, Persians, Prometheus, Seven Against Thebes.* 2 vols. Trans. Herbert Weir Smyth. Vol. 1. Ed. E.H. Warmington, et al. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann and Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1973.

-----. *Agamemnon, Libation Bearers, Eumenides, Fragments*. 2 vols. Trans. Herbert Weir Smyth. Ed. E. Capps, et al. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 2. London: Heinemann and Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1926.

Agapitos, P.A. *Narrative Structure in the Byzantine Vernacular Romances*. Munich: Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, 1991.

Alden, Maureen. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the* Iliad. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Andreas Capellanus. *The Art of Courtly Love*. Trans. John Jay Parry. New York: Columbia UP, 1990.

Antonelli, Robert. "The Birth of Criseyde – an Exemplary Triangle: 'Classical' Troilus and the Question of Love at the Anglo-Norman Court." *The European Tragedy of Troilus*. Ed. Boitani, Piero. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. 21-48.

Arnott, Peter. "Greek Drama as Education." *Educational Theatre Journal* 22.1 (Mar., 1970): 35- 42.

Aucassin and Nicolette. Ed. Mario Roques. Paris: H. Champion, 1965.

Auerbach, Erich. *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1965.

Baswell, Christopher. "*Troy Book*: How Lydgate Translates Chaucer into Latin."

Translation Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages. Ed. Jeanette Beer. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 1997.

-----. *Virgil in Medieval England*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Battles, Dominique. *The Medieval Tradition of Thebes*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Beaton, Roderick. *The Medieval Greek Romance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Benoît de Sainte-Maure. *Le Roman de Troie*. Ed. Constans Joly. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1904.

Benson, C. David. *The History of Troy in Middle English Literature*. Bury St. Edmunds: Rowman and Middlefield, 1980.

-----. Rev. of *Selves and Nations: The Troy Story from Sicily to England in the Middle Ages*, by Wolfram Keller. *Speculum* 85.1 (Jan., 2010): 154-55.

Blumsfeld-Kosinsk, Renate. Rev. of *La legende de Troie en France au moyen age: Analyse des versions francaises et bibliographie raisonnee des manuscripts*, by Marc-Rene Jung.*Speculum* 73.1 (Jan., 1998): 201-203.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Il Filostrato.* Trans. Gordon, R.K. *The Story of Troilus*. Ed. RK Gordon. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1978. 25-126.

-----. *Opere*. Ed. Cesare Segre. Milano: U Mursia P, 1980.

Boitani, Piero. “Antiquity and Beyond: The Death of Troilus.” *The European Tragedy of Troilus*. Ed. Boitani, Piero. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. 1-20.

Bowra, CM. “Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal.” *Greece and Rome* 3.7 (Oct., 1933): 8-21.

Breillat, Pierre. “La table ronde en orient: le poeme grec du vieux chevalier.” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 55 (1938): 308-40.

Brown, Elizabeth. “The Trojan Origins of the French and the Brothers Jean du Tillet.”

After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History. Ed. Alexander Callander Murray. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1998. 348-84.

Browning, Robert. "A Fourteenth-Century Prose Version of the 'Odyssey.'" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46 (1992): 27-36.

Bradley, Dennis. "Troy Revisited." *Hermes* 119.2 (1991): 232-46.

Byzantine Achilleid. Ed. Ole Smith. Wien: Verlag, 1999.

Byzantine Iliad. Ed. Lars Norgaard. Copenhagen: Musuem-Tusculanum, 1975.

Casson, S. "Cretan and Trojan Émigrés. *The Classical Review* 44.2 (May, 1930): 52-55.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Riverside Chaucer*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1987.

Chrétien de Troyes. *The Complete Romances of Chrétien de Troyes.* Trans. David Staines. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.

-----. *Oeuvres Complètes*. Ed. Daniel Poiron et al. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1994.

Clark, John. "Trinovantum: The Evolution of a Legend." *Journal of Medieval History* 7.2 (June, 1981): 135-51.

Colville, K.N. "The Tale of Troy." *Greece and Rome* 10.28 (Oct., 1940): 1-11.

Cormier, Raymond. *One Heart One Mind: The Rebirth of Virgil's Hero in Medieval French Romance*. Mississippi: U of Mississippi P, 1973.

La Coronica Troyana. Trans. Frank Pelletier Norris, II. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1970.

Croally, N.T. *Euripidean Polemic: The* Trojan Women *and the Function of Tragedy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Dalton, Paul. "The Topical Concerns of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*: History, Prophecy, Peacemaking, and English Identity in the Twelfth

Century." *Journal of British Studies* 33 (Oct., 2005): 688-712.

Daretis Phrygii. *De Excidio Troiae Historia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1873.

Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius. *De Bello Trojano.* London: A.J. Valpy, 1825.

Dudo of St. Quentin. *History of the Normans.* Trans. Eric Christiansen. Rochester, NY: U of Rochester P / Boydell, 1998.

-----. *Historia Normanorum*. Ed. Jules Lair. Caen: Le Blanc-Hardel, 1865.

Eneas. Trans. John Yunck. New York: Columbia UP, 1974.

Erhart, Margaret. *The Judgment of the Trojan Prince Paris in Medieval Literature*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1987.

Erp Taalman Kip, A. Maria van. "Euripides and Melos." *Mnemosyne* 40.3/4 (1987): 414-19.

Euripides. *Children of Hercules, Hippolytus, Andromache, Hecuba.* 6 vols.Trans. David Kovacs. Vol. 2. Ed. G.P. Goold et al. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP,1995.

-----. *Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles*. 6 vols. Trans. David Kovacs. Ed. G.P. Goold et al. Vol. 3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1998.

Federico, Sylvia. *New Troy: Fantasies of Empire in the Late Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2003.

Finlayson, John. "Guido del Columnis's *Historia destructionis Troiae,* the *Gest Hystorial of the Destruction of Troy*, and Lydgate's *Troy Book*: Translation and the Design of History." *Anglia* 113 (1995): 141 – 62.

Finley, John. *Pindar and Aeschylus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1955.

Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar. Ed. J.M. Wallace-Hadrill. London: Nelson, 1960.

Frank, Tenney. “Classical Scholarship in Medieval Iceland.” *The American Journal of Philology* 30.2 (1909): 139-52.

Gaunt, Simon. “From Epic to Romance: Gender Sexuality in the *Roman d’Eneas*.” *Romantic Review* 83 (1992): 1-27.

Geoffrey of Monmouth. *History of the Kings of Britain*. Trans. Lewis Thorpe. New York: Penguin, 1966.

-----. *Historia Regum Britanniae*. Ed. Jacob Hammer. Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1951.

Gest Hystoriale of the Destruction of Troy. Ed. Geoffrey Panton, and David Donaldson. London: Oxford UP, 1968.

Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni. Ed. Elisabeth Van Houts. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

Goldhill, Simon. “Battle Narrative in Aeschylus’s Persae.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108 (1988): 189-93.

-----. “The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology.” *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?* Ed. John Winkler and Froma Zeitlin. Princeon: Princeton UP, 1992. 97-129.

Gottfried von Strassburg. *Tristan*. Trans. A.T. Hatto. London: Penguin, 1960.

Gregory, Justina. “Euripides as Social Critic.” *Greece and Rome* 49.2 (Oct., 2002): 145-52.

Griffin, Jasper. “The Social Function of Attic Tragedy.” *The Classical Quarterly* 48 (1998): 39-61.

Griffin, Nathaniel. *Dares and Dictys: An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Versions of the Story of Troy*. J.H. Baltimore: Furst, 1907.

Griffith, Mark. “What Does Aeneas Look Like?” *Classical Philology* 80.4 (Oct., 1985): 309-19.

Guido delle Colonne. *Historia Destructionis Troiae*. Trans. Mary Elizabeth Meek. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1974.

-----. *Historia Destructionis Troiae*. Ed. Nathaniel Edward Griffin. Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1936.

Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun. *Le Roman de la Rose*. Trans. Arand Strubel. Paris: Lettres Gothique, 1992.

-----. *The Romance of the Rose*. Trans. Harry Robbins. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1962.

Hanly, Michael. *Boccaccio, Beauvau, Chaucer.* Norman, Oklahoma: Oklahoma UP, 1990.

Hay, Denys. *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1957.

Henry of Huntingdon. *Chronicle*. Trans. Thomas Forester. New York: AMS, 1968.

Henryson, Robert. *The Testament of Cresseid and Other Poems*. New York: Penguin, 1973.

Herodotus. *The Histories*. 4 vols. Trans. A.D. Godley. Ed. T.E. Page et al. London: William Heineman,1928.

-----. *Histoires*. Ed. Ph.-E. Legrand. Paris: Les Belles Lettres,1932. 9 vols.

Les Histoires troyanes *de Guiu de Colupnes*. Ed. R. Miquel y Planas: R. Barcelona: Biblioteca Catalana, 1916.

Homer. *Iliad*. Trans. Richmond Lattimore. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1956.

-----. *Odyssey*. Trans. Richmond Lattimore. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

-----. *Opera*. Ed. Monroe, David and TW Allen. Oxford: Oxford UP: 1920. 4 vols.

Ho Polemos Tes Troados/The War of Troy. Ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys and M. Papathomopoulou. Athens: Morphōtiko Hidryma Ethnikēs Trapezēs, 1996.

Horsfall, Nicholas. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2000.

Howorth, Henry. "The Early History of Sweden." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Association* 9 (1881): 174-215.

Huppert, Goerge. "The Trojan Franks and their Critics." *Studies in the Renaissance* 12 (1965): 227-41.

The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. 4. Ed. G.S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Ingledew, Francis. "The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouths *Historia regum Britanniae*." *Speculum* 69.3 (Jul., 1994): 665-704.

The Irish Aeneid. Ed./Trans. George Calder. Dublin: D. Nutt, 1907.

Jacobson, Walter. *Ovid's* Heroides. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974.

James, Heather. *Shakespeare's Troy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Jeffreys, Elizabeth. "The Comnenian Background to the romans d'antiquité." *Byzantion* 10 (1980): 455-86.

-----. "The Judgement of Paris in later Byzantine Literature." *Byzantion* 48 (1983): 112-31.

-----. "The Manuscripts and Sources of the War of Troy." *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines* (1971): 91-94.

Jeffreys, Elizabeth and Michael. "The Oral Background of Byzantine Popular Poetry." *Oral Tradition* (1986): 504 -47.

Jeffreys, Michael. “The Literary Emergence of Vernacular Greek.” *Mosaic* 8 (1974): 171-93.

DE Jong, Irene. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

-----. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam: B.R. Gruner, 1987.

Jung, Marc-Rene. *La legende de Troie en France*. Basel: Francke, 1996.

Kimbrough, Robert. *Shakespeare’s* Troilus and Cressida *and Its Setting*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1964.

King, Katherine Callen. *Achilles*: *Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1987.

Kovacs, David. “Euripides, *Troades* 95-7: Is Sacking Cities Really Foolish?” *The Classical Quarterly* 33.2 (1983): 334-38.

Laud Troy Book. 2 vols. Ed. J. Ernst Wülfing. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & co., 1902-03.

Lincoln, Bruce. “The Center of the World and the Origins of Life.” *History of Religions* 40.4 (May, 2001): 311-26.

Lydgate, John. *Troy Book*. 4 vols. Ed. Henry Bergen. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1906.

Lyne, R.O.A.N. “Lavinia’s Blush: Vergil, ‘Aeneid’ 12.64-70.” *Greece and Rome* 30.1 (Apr. 1983): 55-64.

Meier, Christian. *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*. Trans. Andrew Webber. Cambridge: Polity Press: 1992.

Murray, Gilbert. *Euripides and His Age*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1918.

Myrick, Leslie Diane. *From the* De Excidio Troiae Historia *to the* Togail Troi*: Literary Cultural Synthesis in a Medieval Irish Adaptation of Dares'* Troy Tale. Heidelberg: C. Winters, 1993.

Ordericus Vitalis. *The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy*. 4 vols. Trans. Thomas Forester. London: H.G. Bohn, 1853.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans. A.D. Melville. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.

-----. *Ovid: Heroides*. Trans. Peter Knox. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge UP, 1995.

-----. *Metamorphoses*. 2 vols. Trans. Frank Justus Miller. Vol. 2. Ed. G.P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984.

-----. *Heroides and Amores*. Trans. Showerman, Grant. Vol. 1. Ed. G.P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1977.

Parry, Adam. "The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Arion* 2 no. 4 (Winter, 1963): 66-80.

Pidal, R. Menendez, and E. Varón Vallejo. *Historia troyana en prosa y verso*. Madrid: S. Aguire, 1934.

Pindar. *The Odes of Pindar.* Trans. John. Sandys. Ed. G.P. Goold, et al. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP,1978.

Poe, Joe Park. *Genre and Meaning in Sophocles'* Ajax. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1986.

Putnam, Michael. *The Poetry of the Aeneid*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989.

Pryce, Huw. "British or Welsh? National Identity in Twelfth -Century Wales." *The English Historical Review* 116.468 (Sep., 2001): 775-801.

Quint, David. *Epic and Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1993.

Reinhold, Meyer. “The Unhero Aeneas.” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966): 195-207.

Richard, Carl. *The Founders and the Classics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1994.

Le Roman d’Eneas. Ed./Trans. Schöler-Beinhauer. München: Fink, 1972.

Meyer-Lee, Robert. “Lydgate’s Laureate Prose.” *John Lydgate: Poetry, Culture and Lancastrian England*. Ed. Larry Scanlon and James Simpson. Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 2006. 36-60.

Schleiner, Winifred. “Aeneas’s Flight from Troy.” *Comparative Literature* 27.2 (Spring, 1975): 97-112.

Seaford, Richard. “The Social Function of Attic Tragedy: a Response to Jasper Griffin.” *The Classical Quarterly* 50 (2000): 30-44.

Seege or Batayle of Troye. Ed. Mary Elizabeth Barnicle. New York: Kraus, 1971.

Shakespeare, William. *Troilus and Cressida*. Ed. Kenneth Palmer. London: Routledge, 1982.

Shepard, Alan, and Stephen Powell, eds. *Fantasies of Troy: Classical Tales and the Social Imaginary in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 2004.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *Sidney’s Defense of Poesy*. Ed. Lewis Soens. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1970.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Trans. James Winny. Lewiston: Broadview Literary Texts, 1992.

Sklar, Elizabeth. “Guido, the Middle English Troy Books, and Chaucer: The English Connection.” *Neophilologus* 76 (1992): 616-28.

Smith, Peter. “Aineidai as Patrons of *Iliad* XX and the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*.”

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 85 (1981): 17-58.

Solodow, Joseph. *The World of Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina P, 1988.

Sophocles. *Antigone, Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus as Colonnus*. 3 vols. Trans. Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Ed. G.P. Goold, et al. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1994.

-----. *Ajax, Electra, Oedipus Tyrannus*. Trans. Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Ed. G.P. Goold, et al. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1994.

Southern, R.W. "Presidential Address: Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 1. The Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 20 (1971): 173-96.

Spencer, Terence. "Turks and Trojans in the Renaissance." *The Modern Language Review* 47.3 (Jul., 1952): 330-33.

Spiegel, Gabrielle. *The Past as Text*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1997.

Stahl, Hans-Peter. "Aeneas—An 'Unheroic' Hero?" *Arethusa* 14.1, (Spring, 1981): 155-77.

Stevens, PT. *Euripides' Andromache*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Strohm, Paul. "Storie, Spelle, Gest, Romaunce, Tragedie: Generic Distinctions in the Middle English Troy Narratives." *Speculum* 46 (1971): 348-59.

Studer, John. "History as Moral Instruction in Lydgate's Record of Troie Toun." *Emporia State Research Studies* 19.1 (1970): 5-13.

Sturluson, Snorri. *The Prose Edda*. Trans. Jean Young. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1966.

-----. *Heimskringla*. Trans. Trans. Guðni Jónsson. 7 March 2010. http://www.heimskringla.no/wiki/Prologus

Tanner, Marie. *The Last Descendant of Aeneas*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1993.

Tatlock, J.S.P. “Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Motives for Writing his ‘Historia.’” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 79.4 (Nov., 1938): 695-703.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Trans. Rex Warner. New York: Penguin, 1954.

-----. *Thucydidis historiae*. Ed. H.S. Jones and J.E. Powell, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942. 2 vols.

Three Medieval Greek Romances. Trans. Gavin Betts. New York: Garland, 1993.

The Trojan War: The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian. Trans. R.M. Frazer. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1966.

Vellacott, Philip. *Ironic Drama: A Study of Euripides’s Method and Meaning.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975.

Venutti, Lawrence. “The Destruction of Troy: Translation and Royalist Cultural Politics in the Interregnum.” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993): 197-219.

Virgil. *Aeneid*. Trans. Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Random House, 1990.

-----. *Virgil*. 2 vols. Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978.

Willcock, Malcolm. “Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*.” *The Classical Quarterly* 14.2 (Nov., 1964): 141-54.

Winkler, John, and Froma Zeitlin, eds. *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1990.

Wiseman, T.P. “Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome.” *Greece and Rome* 32.2 (Oct., 1974): 153-64.

Young, David. *Pindar’s Isthmian 7: Myth and Exempla*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Zamarani, Jahan. “The Wound of History: Walcott’s *Omeros* and the Postcolonial Poetics of Affliction.” *PMLA* 112.3 (May, 1997): 405-17.

Zeitlin, Froma. “Thebes: Theater of Society and Self in Athenian Drama.” *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?* Ed. John Winkler and Zeitlin, Froma. Princeon: Princeton UP, 1992. 130-67.