Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer

Georg Nicolaus Knauer

Often since Vergil's *Aeneid* was edited by Varius and Plotius Tucca immediately after the poet's death (18/17 B.C.) and Propertius wrote his (2.34.65f)

> cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai,
> nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade

> Make way, ye Roman authors, clear the street, O ye Greeks,
> For a much larger Iliad is in the course of construction
> <div align="right">(Ezra Pound, 1917)</div>

scholars, literary critics and poets have tried to define the relation between the *Aeneid* and the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

As one knows, the problem was not only the recovery of details and smaller or larger Homeric passages which Vergil had used as the poetical background of his poem. Men have also tried from the very beginning, as Propertius proves, to evaluate the literary qualities of the three respective poems: had Vergil merely stolen from Homer and all his other predecessors (unfortunately the *furta* of Perellius Faustus have not come down to us), is Vergil's opus a mere imitation of his greater forerunner, an imitation in the modern pejorative sense, or has Vergil's poetic, philosophical, even "theological" strength surpassed Homer's? Was he—not Homer—the *maximus poetarum, divinissimus Maro* (Cerda)? For a long time Vergil's *ars* was preferred to Homer's *natura*, which following Julius Caesar Scaliger one took to be chaotic, a *moles rudis et indigesta* (Cerda, following Ovid *Met.* 1.6f).

In Germany Vergil fell behind when the discovery of the originality of the Greek mind, the *Originalgenie*, led to an all too high esteem of Greek literature, a development started by men like Robert Wood (1717–1771) or Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–1768). It seems to me that throughout the nineteenth and part of the twentieth century Latinists took to the peculiarities and characteristic qualities of Latin literature only *ex officio*, by a sense of duty, rarely by real incli-

nation or genuine understanding. A distinguished Latin scholar has told me recently that he considered Vergil's greatest work to be Dante's *Divina Comedia*.

Yet Richard Heinze's (1867–1929) *Vergils epische Technik* and Eduard Norden's (1868–1941) commentary on the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, both published in 1903, proved a turning point. Though when it comes to Vergil's relation to Homer they contented themselves mainly with the investigation of comparable passages, similes, and groups of typical scenes.

It is odd to say, but this was the consequence of the analytical approach to Homer, because at least since Friedrich August Wolf (1759–1824) German Greek scholars—to mention only Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1848–1931)—could look at the Homeric epics only analytically, that is as the work of several poets. But a new generation of scholars could look afresh at these poems and could try to see them as a unity. In this context one has to mention Wolfgang Schadewaldt's (born 1900) *Iliasstudien* (1938) and Karl Reinhardt's (1886–1958) *Die Abenteuer der Odyssee* (1948).

After this change of perspective the question became still more urgent. Had Vergil taken over Homeric structures and if so, in which way and why? That means: can one compare the *Aeneid* as a whole with both of Homer's poems as a whole? Karl Büchner in his Pauly-Wissowa article on Vergil (1955/58) has at least sought for an answer to this question and he boldly states that the amount of Homeric "material" in the *Aeneid* could by now, after centuries of search, be looked at as firmly established (col. 1449).

We must now test this statement and ask where one can find that material, who has collected it and, most important of all, what is the actual value of the Homeric quotations in the Vergilian commentaries. One will agree that we can compare the three epics only if we can be certain of the quantity and quality of that material in detail.

When, a few years ago, I first asked these questions and started to compare some commentaries, I soon saw that in them one finds at a random passage of the *Aeneid* either a great many, very few or no Homeric passages at all (*e.g.* in J. W. Mackail's [1845–1945] edition of 1930). No commentator ever makes it clear what principles he follows when he annotates a given Vergilian verse. The commentators normally don't distinguish between genuine quotations of Homer by Vergil, transformed paraphrases, or notes meant merely to help the

modern reader in understanding Vergil's text. This means that the vital question, whether Vergil has really thought of a certain Homeric verse—and if he has, why—is asked only in very rare cases.

The prevalent chaos one can judge best by the number of parallels with which editors have annotated Vergilian similes. One will find six, seven or eight parallel Homeric similes, never all of them together, never the question: which simile is really the relevant one, and if one is, is it only that one, or others too? The same applies to Homeric repetitions as quoted in commentaries on the *Aeneid*. Another annoying habit is it to annotate *e.g. "Aeneid* 12.56ff" only with *"Iliad* 22. 82ff." The casual reader will never be able to find out that Vergil has here, in 12.56–63, imitated not so much the content of Hecabe's speech to Hector, *Iliad* 22.82–89, as the exact number of these Homeric verses. Amata's speech to Turnus is eight verses long, as is Hecabe's. Moreover, in the *Aeneid* Amata's speech occupies the same position as Hecabe's within this scene, which as a whole is shaped after the moving attempt of Hector's parents to save their son's life.

That these inconsistencies and this want of clarity in annotating have led to an intolerable situation is apparent from the fact that there are on the one hand many papers on Dido as a tragic character, the image of *pius* Aeneas, or the *Aeneid* as a symbol and so on, whereas on the other hand there are no means of establishing to what extent Vergil has really made use of Lucretius, Apollonius of Rhodes or Homer, to mention only his preserved "sources."

In other words, there is not a single Vergil edition with an *index fontium*, long since a matter of course for the Biblical quotations in Christian authors. If one considers, in addition to all that, the innumerable erroneous or tendentious parallels which—often for centuries —have been taken over unverified from one commentary to another, Büchner's statement about the definitive collection of the Homeric material proves utterly wrong.

In collecting Homeric quotations cited by earlier scholars I have collated some twenty commentaries on the entire *Aeneid*, commentaries on single books, and relevant monographs, from Servius and Macrobius down to the twentieth century. Every reference regardless of its real value was recorded. The commentary of John Conington (1825–1869) and Henry Nettleship (1839–1893) provided a useful basis. A study of this collection of several thousand alleged Homeric parallels leads to surprising conclusions.

1. The major part of all quotations observed hitherto has been contributed by Vergil commentators of the sixteenth century, more precisely between 1550 and 1620. Of these I mention only a few names, now almost wholly forgotten. The first study containing more material than the commentaries of Servius and Macrobius is the *Annotationes* of Johannes Hartung (1505–1579), a Greek scholar at Freiburg/Breisgau University. They are printed as a supplement to the fine Vergil edition of Georg Fabricius of Chemnitz (1516–1571), first published at Basle in 1551. Hartung's discoveries have been used and augmented by all his successors, namely J. C. Scaliger (1484–1558) in his *Poetics* (1561), the Vatican librarian Fulvius Ursinus (1529–1600) in his *Collatio* of 1568, and Germanus, who is Germain Vaillant de Guélis (1517–1587), bishop of Orléans, a friend of Ronsard and Jean Dorat, in his *Commentationes* of 1575. His is the first Vergil commentary which can be called a modern one. This first period ended with the monumental commentary in three volumes by the learned Spanish Jesuit Joannes Ludovicus de la Cerda (1558–1643), written between 1608 and 1617. Only with the commentary of Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812), published between 1767 and 1775, have these early achievements been surpassed. Today the basis for our work on Vergil is the commentary by Conington, first published between 1858 and 1871.

2. The survey of the whole material and the checking of each reference showed at once that many valuable discoveries of Renaissance scholars have been forgotten long ago. On the other hand it eventually became clear that large sections of the *Iliad,* and still more important, of the *Odyssey,* have so far never been recognized as being imitated in the *Aeneid,* even when the imitations are extended over hundreds of verses.

In this study I shall try to indicate how Vergil has in fact incorporated the whole *Iliad* and the whole *Odyssey* into the *Aeneid,* incomparably transforming the Homeric epics. I must start with a few methodological considerations. I shall then seek to explain the relation of some of the most important passages of the *Aeneid* to their Homeric counterparts. Finally I shall try to suggest how we ought to understand this grand poetical *agōn.*

I

If, without requiring the reasons, we assume that Vergil really wanted from the very beginning to incorporate both Greek epics in

his poem, it is obvious that he had to shorten them drastically. There are 27,803 verses in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; in the *Aeneid*, as it has come down to us, only 9896, *i.e.* little more than one third of Homer's poems. Such compression can be achieved by cutting down the extensive Homeric battle-scenes, *aristeiai*, assemblies of gods and men *etc.*, that is the so-called typical scenes. Very often Vergil has composed only a single one of such scenes, in which he condensed elements of all the relevant Homeric prototypes. Recall the sole *consilium deorum* at the beginning of the tenth book. In Homer we have ἀγοραὶ θεῶν at the beginnings of Books 4, 8, 20, *etc.*

Homer's chronology could also be abridged. So the one day in the *Aeneid*, starting 1.305 (*ut primum lux alma data est*, 306) with Aeneas en route to Carthage and ending 4.5 (*Dido*) *nec placidam membris dat cura quietem* after his narrative, corresponds to those two days of the *Odyssey* which Odysseus passes with the Phaeacians. At *Odyssey* 6.48 Nausikaa awakes, at the end of *Odyssey* 7 Odysseus' bed is prepared for the first night, in the evening of the second day (it's morning at 8.1) follows his narrative and not until *Odyssey* 13.17 does everyone go to sleep.

Again, the four books of Odysseus' narrative, Books 9–12, 2233 verses long, are cut down to two books in the *Aeneid*, the second and third, 1500 verses long. But in doing so Vergil has still preserved the proportion of his narrative to the whole of the poem: four books are one sixth of the twenty-four books of the *Odyssey* as two are the sixth part of the twelve books of the *Aeneid*.

Again, Vergil has mingled or contaminated large Homeric passages which contain parallel events. Thus the visits Telemachus pays to Nestor at Pylos as related in *Odyssey* 3 and to Menelaus at Sparta, the first part of which is related in Book 4, the second part not until Book 15—these the Roman poet has combined into Aeneas' single visit to Evander's Pallanteum in *Aeneid* 8. In spite of such necessary constrictions Vergil has retained almost the original length of some Homeric passages. Thus the games for Anchises in *Aeneid* 5 (42–603) are spread over 562 verses, those for Patroclus in *Iliad* 23 (226–897) over 672, or more obviously, the 666 verses of Aeneas' Katabasis (6.236–901) even surpass the number of verses in the Nekyia: *Odyssey* 11 has only 640 verses. Short scenes sometimes have the same length as their Homeric prototypes. Thus the Dido scene in *Aeneid* 6 equals with its

27 verses the corresponding Aias scene in the Nekyia (6.450–476: *Od.* 11.541–567).

Moreover Vergil has sometimes combined several Homeric characters into one. Three examples suffice: in Aeneas Odysseus, Telemachus, and Achilles are united; in Dido more—Arete, Alcinous, Circe, Calypso (and of course Medea); Lavinia must fulfil the functions of Helen and of Penelope. But the reverse too may occur. One Homeric character is split up into three: Elpenor falls drunken to his death at the end of *Odyssey* 10, he asks for his funeral in 11, and receives it from Odysseus at the beginning of 12. Even so, at the end of *Aeneid* 5, the sleepy Palinurus falls to his death, he asks Aeneas for his funeral in Book 6, but at the beginning of 7 the latter buries his nurse Caieta instead of Palinurus, whereas Vergil has already imitated, in the funeral of Misenus in Book 6, details of that of Elpenor. Elpenor thus has become Palinurus, Misenus, and Caieta.

One wonders further. What does Vergil do when he wants to transform a larger Homeric passage? I shall describe two procedures.

1. Vergil very often translates, that is, quotes one or several Homeric verses with such a degree of exactitude that his listeners would at once recognize the passage in the poet's mind. Such *Leitzitate* were meant to tell the listener that he was now in this or that larger Homeric context. It thus becomes clear for example, not only that the verses which describe Apollo of Soracte as partly consenting, partly disapproving Arruns' prayer in Book 11 (794–798) are an exact and immediately recognisable quotation of the similar partly consenting, partly disapproving reaction of Zeus of Dodona to Achilles' prayer in *Iliad* 16 (249–252), but also that the whole description of Camilla's death is shaped after that of the death of Patroclus. Vergil has in *Aeneid* 11.778–885 transformed *Iliad* 16.783–867.[1]

---

[1] The literal quotation of Zeus' reaction proves that one has to compare the preceding prayers too. Achilles prays to the Pelasgian Zeus of Dodona who is worshipped by the *Selloi, with unwashed feet* (*Il.* 16.233–235); Apollo of Soracte is worshipped by the *Hirpi*, who in his honor walk *with bare feet over* burning coal (*Aen.* 11.785–788). This is a typical Vergilian variation. Arruns will be content to return even as an *inglorius*, if only the god concedes him to kill Camilla (11.792f). Achilles prays for Patroclus' return to the camp (*Il.* 16.241, 246–248): Vergil has reversed the content of the prayer to its opposite. Camilla is blinded by her desire to kill the richly dressed priest of Cybele, Chloreus (11.774–782), because Patroclus was blinded by his success over the Trojans (*Il.* 16.784–789). This blindness makes it possible for Apollo, who approaches Patroclus unnoticed (*Il.* 16.789, οὐκ ἐνόησεν), to render him defenseless. Then Euphorbos wounds him badly and flees immediately (*Il.* 16.813, ὃ μὲν αὖτις ἀνέδραμε, μίκτο δ' ὁμίλῳ). Finally Hector kills Patroclus. Vergil has united these three,

2. But not only quoted details make the listener understand which larger Homeric passage Vergil had in mind. When, let us say, Aeneas and his followers sail from Sicily as *laeti* (1.34), Juno delivers her first angry monologue, and the storm drives the shipwrecked men to the Libyan shore, it is not by literal quotation but by the similarity of the situation that the listener thinks of Odysseus, who leaves Ogygie as γηθόσυνος (*Od.* 5.269) and sails unhindered for many days, till Poseidon sees him and, after an angry monologue, releases the storm in which Odysseus loses his raft and is swept to the Phaeacian shore. Here the structural correspondence provides the clue to the Homeric prototype, already adduced in antiquity. This correspondence was so obvious that it deterred readers from seeing that Vergil contaminated *Odyssey* 5 and 10 in *Aeneid* 1. I shall return later to this point.

In other words, we have to check in each case whether an obvious quotation of a detail is a *Leitmotiv*, the complete context of which Vergil has incorporated into the *Aeneid*, or whether, *vice versa*, the scenic imitation is so evident that detailed literal imitations could be neglected. Whether it is literal quotations or only faint reminiscences which hint at particular Homeric passages, or whether it is the number of verses of a speech, a simile, a scene or its structure, even its position in the course of the book—we shall have to consider all these phenomena, because they can possibly be traced to Homer. Their meaning and their function become clear only when one recognizes why Vergil transformed his model.

Apollo, Euphorbos, and Hector, in the one Arruns, who just like Euphorbos is mentioned only here in the whole epic. When Arruns kills Camilla *ex insidiis* (11.783), Camilla doesn't notice the sound of the weapon at all (11.801–804). Arruns flees immediately (11.806 *fugit ante omnis exterritus Arruns* and 815 *contentusque fuga mediis se immiscuit armis*). Camilla dies as Patroclus died: 11.831 *vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras* will be repeated when Vergil describes Turnus' death (12.952, closing line of the *Aeneid*); this line, the second literal quotation in this context, is a translation of the two lines describing Patroclus' death, which are repeated in the description of Hector's death (*Il.* 16.856f=22.362f). The reason for this well considered Vergilian repetition will be found again in Turnus' blind obsession that is comparable to Camilla's. Overwhelmed by his *violentia* (*cf.* 12.9 and 45) he is not able to see that victory is destined to Aeneas. So only in his last forlorn monologue do his ἀτασθαλίαι (*Il.* 22.104) dawn upon Hector, *i.e.* that he was blinded like Patroclus. The poetical *motivation* of Patroclus' death is the same as that of Hector's. Therefore Vergil connected Camilla's and Turnus' deaths in the way in which Homer indicates parallel events, namely by repeating verses. Hector's death as a result of that of Patroclus, and its *meaning* for the structure of both epics, will be discussed below (see pp. 79–81).

II

We must now attempt to outline these structural relationships, beginning with the first half of the *Aeneid*. Books 1–6 have rightly been called the "Vergilian Odyssey." But on closer inspection one will have to restrict this statement because, if action in the *Aeneid* (I leave the proem apart) starts at 1.34 with the departure of the Trojans from Sicily, this beginning corresponds not to *Odyssey* 1, but only to the middle of *Odyssey* 5. At 5.263 Odysseus on his raft leaves Ogygie, an island like Sicily. At the end of *Aeneid* 1 we have reached the same point as at the end of *Odyssey* 8. There Alcinous asks his still unknown guest his name and wants to hear his adventures. Odysseus' narrative follows in the four books 9–12. It starts with the departure from Troy and ends with the arrival at Calypso's island Ogygie. Dido on the other hand asks the already beloved guest to narrate the fall of Troy and the wanderings of the Trojans. Aeneas does so in Books 2 (Iliupersis) and 3. In this second book of his narrative he, like Odysseus, relates the events from his departure from Troy until the departure from Sicily and his arrival in Libya which has led to the encounter with Dido.

Thus in *Aeneid* 1 are condensed the events from the middle of *Odyssey* 5 to the end of Book 8, three and one-half books (5.263–8.586). The first-person narrative in *Aeneid* 2 and 3 as a whole corresponds to that of Odysseus from *Odyssey* 9 to 12. More exactly Vergil's third starts like Homer's ninth and ends like his twelfth; because we see at once that the end of Aeneas' narrative *hinc* (*i.e.* from Sicily) *me digressum vestris deus appulit oris* (3.715) looks back literally not only to the end of Odysseus' narrative (*Od.* 12.447f)

> . . . δεκάτῃ δέ με νυκτὶ
> νῆσον ἐς Ὠγυγίην πέλασαν θεοί, ἔνθα Καλυψὼ
> ναίει

but also to the beginning of the action of the *Aeneid* (1.34f):

> *vix e conspectu Siculae telluris in altum*
> *vela dabant laeti . . .*

In exactly the same way the end of Odysseus' narrative looks back to the proper beginning of the action of the *Odyssey*, his departure from Ogygie (5.263ff):

> 263   τῷ δ' ἄρα πέμπτῳ [SC. ἤματι] πέμπ' ἀπὸ νήσου διὰ Καλυψώ . . .
> 269   γηθόσυνος δ' οὔρῳ πέτασ' ἱστία δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.

Books 1–3 of the *Aeneid* thus follow the construction of *Odyssey* 5.263 to the end of *Odyssey* 12.

Moreover it is obvious that Vergil has removed Book 11, the Nekyia, from Odysseus' narrative and transformed it into a book of action, Book 6 of the *Aeneid*. We are not concerned here with Vergil's reasons for doing so. But I have already mentioned that the figure of Elpenor has been split into that of Palinurus at the end of *Aeneid* 5 and that of Caieta at the beginning of *Aeneid* 7. If, in addition, one now considers that Anchises appears to his dreaming son, one year after his death, and asks him to undertake the *katabasis*, the trip to the *Ditis . . . domūs* (5.731f), just as Circe at night reveals to Odysseus, who has stayed with her for one year, that he must go εἰς 'Αΐδαο δόμους (*Od.* 10.491), the following becomes evident: Vergil has not only imitated *Odyssey* 11 in his sixth book but has transformed the end of *Odyssey* 10 (469–574) into the end of his fifth (700–871). Moreover he has transformed the beginning of *Odyssey* 12 which follows the Nekyia into the beginning of his seventh book (*cf.* 7.1–20: *Od.* 12.1–15).

I cannot here attempt to demonstrate that Vergil has not only condensed the beginning of Odysseus' narrative in *Odyssey* 9 and its end in 12 but has in fact by a very clever reshaping condensed the whole content of these two books into *Aeneid* 3. In these Aeneas is represented throughout as a hero surpassing his Greek counterpart, Odysseus, who had passed through the same or similar situations shortly before him (in epic time). Odysseus, the victor, destroys Ismaros in Thrace; Aeneas, the exile (3.11), founds Ainos in the same region. On his way home to the πατρίς, Ithaca, west of the Peloponnesus, Odysseus is shipwrecked by a storm at Cape Maleia; Aeneas, in spite of a storm, successfully passes this cape (*cf.* 5.193) on his way to the west, where in the end he will find the promised *patria*, Hesperia. Here for the first time one begins to sense Vergil's purpose in following Homer.

At any rate we may say that Vergil has united *Odyssey* 9 and 12, *i.e.* the first and the last books of Odysseus' first-person narrative, into the second, the last book of Aeneas' first-person narrative. Furthermore he placed *Odyssey* 11, *i.e.* the third book of the narrative, together with the closing part of the tenth and the beginning of the twelfth as its natural components, as his sixth book at the end of the first half of the *Aeneid*. He connected the sixth book with the end of the fifth and the beginning of the seventh after the Homeric analogy. Finally he made the first book of action in the *Aeneid* correspond to

the action in the *Odyssey* from the middle of the fifth to the end of the eighth book. Having these structural alterations in mind, one must eventually ask where he may have used the two major remaining passages of this part of the *Odyssey*. First, there is the beginning of Book 5 (1–262), the second conversation between Athene and Zeus, which leads to Hermes' mission to Calypso. She is asked to release Odysseus, and she actually does so after a vain attempt to keep him with her. Next we must ask where he has put the greater part of Book 10 (1–468), the beginning of the second book of narrative, in which are related Odysseus' adventures from the encounter with Aiolos to his love affair with Circe. Both these passages Vergil has, for good reasons, placed elsewhere.

The beginning of *Odyssey* 5 he has shifted to his fourth book. Here it is Iarbas, the son of Jupiter Ammon, who asks his father to provide for the separation of Aeneas and Dido. Mercury communicates the god's order not to Dido but to Aeneas, who obeys, while Dido, exactly like Calypso, vainly implores him to marry her. For Calypso too, unlike Circe, had tried to win Odysseus as her husband. She had compared herself to Penelope, and only because of Penelope Odysseus had not yielded (*Od.* 5.203–224). Just the same thing happens in the *Aeneid*: Aeneas, and through him Dido, knows, that another wife is destined for him in Hesperia. That is why, although ruefully, he can withstand the temptation (*cf.* 4.198–407 with *Od.* 5.1–262, and especially the speeches *Od.* 5.203–213 and *Aen.* 4.305–330).

In the *Odyssey* it is the episode with Calypso which by its relation to Penelope points to the second half of the epic, to the death of the suitor. This relation to Penelope is completely missing in the episode with Circe. Vergil must have recognized—and this seems to me very important—the difference in the relationship of Circe and Calypso to Odysseus; otherwise he would scarcely have made of Dido another Calypso only in Book 4. Aeneas' renunciation makes the second half of the *Aeneid* possible. This means at the same time that the second half of the *Aeneid* must have been determined also from the *Odyssey* and that to Lavinia has been assigned the same function as to Penelope.

And the beginning of *Odyssey* 10? Aiolos, the loss of the whole fleet, the stag hunt and the consolation of the despairing companions in Circe's Aiaie lost and recovered companions, Circe's kind reception of Odysseus? To enumerate these elements already helps us to recognize the place where Vergil has intended them to stand: Juno hurries

to king Aeolus, in a storm Aeneas loses for the first time a major part of his fleet, after the landing in Libya follows the hunt in which seven stags are killed, he consoles his despairing companions who have survived, he finds the lost ones with Dido, who receives him kindly. In other words, in *Aeneid* 1 Vergil has contaminated two large portions of the Odyssey without changing the sequence of their single parts, 5.263–8.586 and 10.1–468.

Let us examine just one passage, the relation of which to the *Odyssey* has been as little recognized as the whole of this contamination. In *Odyssey* 10 when Circe vainly attempts to transform Odysseus, who has not told her his name, into a pig (310ff, esp. 320), she finally breaks out in utter astonishment:

325   τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; . . .

     θαῦμά μ᾽ ἔχει ὡς οὔ τι πιὼν τάδε φάρμακ᾽ ἐθέλχθης,
     nobody had ever achieved that (327–329),

330   ἢ σύ γ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς ἐσσι πολύτροπος, ὅν τέ μοι αἰεὶ
     φάσκεν ἐλεύσεσθαι χρυσόρραπις ἀργεϊφόντης,
     ἐκ Τροίης ἀνιόντα θοῇ σὺν νηὶ μελαίνῃ.
     ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε δή, κολεῷ μὲν ἄορ θέο, νῶϊ δ᾽ ἔπειτα
     εὐνῆς ἡμετέρης ἐπιβήομεν, ὄφρα μιγέντε

335   εὐνῇ καὶ φιλότητι πεποίθομεν ἀλλήλοισιν.

"Or art thou he? the man to come foretold/ By Hermes . . .,/ The man from Troy . . ./ The man for wisdom's various arts renown'd/ Ulisses?" in Pope's translation. Then follows the deliverance of the companions.

In the *Aeneid* Venus dissolves the protective cloud round Aeneas and Achates when it becomes clear that Dido is willing to give shelter to the shipwrecked Trojans (1.579ff). This finds its counterpart in *Odyssey* 7, where the protective cloud round Odysseus vanishes at the moment when he kneels before Arete, who alone can save him. But it is a trait not of the Phaiakis but of the Circe story, when the reunited Trojans greet each other most heartily. Then Vergil proceeds (*Aen.* 1.613–627):

     obstipuit primo aspectu Sidonia Dido,
     casu deinde viri tanto, et sic ore locuta est:
615 **quis** te, nate dea, per tanta pericula casus
       insequitur? . . .
     tune ille Aeneas, quem Dardanio Anchisae
     Alma Venus Phrygii genuit Simoentis ad undam?

And Dido continues:

> 619 *atque equidem Teucrum memini Sidona venire* . . .
> 623 ***tempore iam ex illo*** *casus* ***mihi*** *cognitus urbis*
>   ***Troianae*** *nomenque tuum regesque Pelasgi* . . .
> 627 *quare* ***agite*** *o tectis, iuvenes, succedite* ***nostris.***

"At her first sight of Aeneas Sidonian Dido was awestruck, thinking of the horrible fate which had been his. Then she spoke: Son of the Goddess, what is this fortune which has been pursuing you through such fearful perils? . . . Can you truly be that Aeneas whom Venus, the kind love-giver, bore to Dardan Anchises by the waters of Phrygian Simois? Now I myself remember Teucer coming to Sidon . . . Ever since that time I have known of the calamity which befell Troy, and known you, and the Greek princes, by name . . . Therefore, come, gallant friends, and proceed to my home." (Translation of W. F. J. Knight [Penguin 1958]).

Dido had heard long ago from Telamonian Teucer of Aeneas and the fall of Troy; she already knew his name before Ilioneus' report. Just so Circe had long known through the god Hermes of the man Odysseus, who would come one day from Troy. Certainly the love of the Vergilian Dido had to be of a different nature from that of Homer's Circe. It is all the more astonishing that Vergil has left unchanged the inner core of Homer's narration, out of which he could let the passion of this noble couple grow.

To form the Dido of *Aeneid* 1, Arete, Alcinous, and Circe are in fact combined. In Book 4 she becomes Calypso. I cannot deal here with the Medea of Apollonius and the Dido of Naevius, nor can I prove why Vergil has switched the places of the first part of *Odyssey* 5 and that of *Odyssey* 10. The reasons must be sought in the complicated structure of the *Odyssey*, which Vergil has simplified by transposing its various parts. For the moment we must be content to acknowledge that Vergil split *Odyssey* 5 and 10 into two parts.

Summarizing our first results, we now can say that it is possible to state with a greater degree of exactitude than hitherto that in his first six books Vergil has not transformed the whole of the *Odyssey* but only the eight books 5–12—only one third, but the essential third of the epic. Of this core no vital part has been left out.[2] On the other

---

[2] The games for Patroclus in *Iliad* 23 together with the Phaeacian games in honour of Odysseus (*Od.* 8) serve as the basis of the games for Anchises in Vergil's fifth book.

hand, Books 1–4, the Telemacheia, have not been incorporated into *Aeneid* 1–6, nor has the whole of the second half of the *Odyssey*, the twelve books 13–24.

Furthermore we can assume that Vergil clearly realized how Homer conceived the structure of the *Odyssey* and that Vergil therefore did not simply imitate sporadic Homeric verses or scenes. On the contrary he first analysed the plan of the *Odyssey*, then transformed it and made it the base of his own poem.

III

We now come to the difficult task of discovering the relations of the second half of the *Aeneid*, Books 7–12, to the *Iliad* and to those parts of the *Odyssey* which had not been adapted earlier. The *Iliad* is not only longer than the *Odyssey* but of an infinitely more complicated structure. This has made Vergil's task more difficult and ours as well.

Let us look first at the end. Richard Heinze (p. 180) rightly pointed out that, if Vergil wanted to close the *Aeneid* with Turnus' death, it was obvious to model it upon Hector's death in *Iliad* 22. We must ask ourselves now whether Vergil has not rather chosen this prototype for other more weighty reasons, reasons resulting from a penetrating analysis of the *Iliad*.

The memorable closing verse of the *Aeneid* runs (12.952= 11.831):

vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

This is a shortened translation of the two verses describing Hector's death (*Il.* 22.362f= 16.856f):

ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἀϊδόσδε βεβήκει,
ὃν πότμον γοόωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην.

For the present we may say that the end of the *Aeneid* is just as little in keeping with the end of the *Iliad* as its beginning with the beginning of the *Odyssey*. Since the end of the *Iliad* from Hector's death onward (*Il.* 22.364) could not be used for the closing of the *Aeneid*, Vergil was at liberty to use its various sections at other places in his poem. The description of the violation of Hector's body and the laments of the Trojans (to the end of *Il.* 22) has been used for the description of the violation of the bodies of Nisus and Euryalus and the laments of the latter's mother in *Aeneid* 9. The funeral of Patroclus in *Iliad* 23 supplied elements for that of Misenus in Book 6. The games he transferred to

Book 5. The ransom and the return of Hector's corpse in *Iliad* 24 furnished parts of the return of Pallas' body in *Aeneid* 11.

Still, a comparison of the end of the *Aeneid* with the end of the *Iliad* is possible. The hearer knows at the end of the *Iliad* that Troy is doomed by Hector's death. Just so the hearer knows at the end of the *Aeneid* that Rome will rise by Turnus' death. Now Jupiter's prophecies in Books 1 and 12, those of Anchises in Elysium in Book 6 can come true. Just so the pernicious prophecies of Troy's fall direct the action of the *Iliad*.

The beginning of the second half of the *Aeneid*, i.e. Book 7, is more difficult to understand than its end. In order to visualize the situation more clearly, we must turn back to the prophecy of the Sibyl at the beginning of *Aeneid* 6. The Cumaean Sibyl promises Aeneas, who has just survived many a danger on the sea, even greater ones on land (6.83f). She announces *bella, horrida bella* (6.86) and she sees a bloody Tiber which she identifies with the Trojan rivers Simois and Xanthus (6.87–89). Another Achilles, also son of a Goddess, has already arisen. Juno will pursue the *Teucri*, the Trojans, with her rage. Finally the cause of such evils will again be "a wife" (93f; 6.83–97):

> *causa mali tanti coniunx iterum hospita Teucris*
> *externique iterum thalami.*

The words of the Sibyl leave us in no doubt that Aeneas, who has already reënacted the adventures of Odysseus, will have to endure a second Trojan War, and for the same reasons. Lavinia, whose name is of course not mentioned here, will be the *causa mali tanti* exactly like Helen. ἥ τ' ἔπλετο νείκεος ἀρχή, said Hector in his final monologue (*Il.* 22.116). In addition to fulfilling the function of Penelope which resulted from her relation to Dido as a second Calypso, Lavinia takes up the part of Helen. Vergil seems to have regarded the functions of Helen and Penelope in the Homeric epics as comparable and parallel. He thus was able to weld them into one person.

The parallelism goes even further. Since Norden's investigations in Ennius and Vergil (1915), it has been well known that the great scene between Juno and Allecto in Book 7 has been shaped after the scene between Juno and Aeolus in Book 1 (*Aen.* 7.286–340). Now, after Latinus has promised the newcomers peace and the hand of his daughter Lavinia, Allecto is charged with stirring up war. Bellona will be *pronuba* for Lavinia (7.319). The wedding will be delayed by the war, and

here also a hint of Troy is not lacking. Aeneas, the son of Venus, will be a torch to set afire the new Troy, *iterum*, as Paris, the son of Hecabe, had once enkindled the old (7.321f):

> *quin idem Veneri partus suus et Paris alter*
> *funestaeque iterum recidiva in Pergama taedae.*

One knows how successful Allecto was. Forced by circumstance, Latinus declares war (7.601–622). The deployment of the Latin forces, the so-called catalogue of the Itali, follows, preceded by an invocation to the Muse (7.641–817), which of course corresponds to the catalogue of ships of the *Iliad* (2.484–779). Such is often said. But is it parallel only as a catalogue? Because a heroic epic is not complete without a catalogue?

We must therefore ask where in the action of the *Iliad* the catalogue of ships has its place. This consideration will help us to find the clue for the Vergilian reshaping of the structure of the *Iliad*. The commencement of the *Iliad*, the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles, Vergil could not use. *Iliad* 1 is absent from the *Aeneid*, but in the *Iliad* the quarrel prompts Zeus to restore Achilles' τιμή, because Thetis has asked him to do so. Zeus' intention is realized through the dream which he sends Agamemnon, advising him to lead the army towards Troy at once. This dream scene has in fact served as pattern for the dream scene with Allecto and Turnus. It also motivates in both epics the gathering of the armies. But Vergil has nevertheless taken another motif far more important, which in the *Iliad* is only a consequence of Agamemnon's order. Agamemnon first wants to test the army (*Il.* 2.73). Following his orders but against his expectations, the army joyfully retreats to the ships to embark for home (*Il.* 2.142–154). Now Hera acts. She asks Athene if all has been in vain. Will Helen, for whose sake so many Greeks and Trojans have lost their lives, be left to Priam and the Trojans (*Il.* 2.160–167)? Athene succeeds in stopping the army. After the resumed assembly, the deployment of the army and the catalogue of ships follow.

In other words, Zeus achieves his aims only by a detour, for the intervention of Hera, who dispatches Athene, makes her unwittingly a tool of the father of gods. This is quite the same in the *Aeneid*. We can now understand not only that the Juno-Allecto scene of Book 7 is a parallel to the Juno-Aeolus scene in Book 1—and indeed both stem from the Poseidon scene in *Odyssey* 5—but also that their structural

pattern is that of the Hera-Athene scene in *Iliad* 2.155–168. None of the goddesses—neither Hera in the *Iliad* nor Juno in the *Aeneid*—can alter the course of events (*Aen.* 7.314 *immota manet fatis Lavinia coniunx*). They are as ineffectual as Poseidon in *Odyssey* 5. At a point like this Vergil's genius for perceiving parallel developments in both Homeric epics and making use of them becomes most clear. Furthermore, both goddesses refer to the respective causes of war, Helen and Lavinia. Both send their aides, be it Athene or Allecto. In both cases the gathering of the respective forces follows. Thus for his seventh book Vergil has clearly chosen as a pattern the starting point of the Trojan War as it becomes evident in *Iliad* 2. He clearly has imitated the second book of the *Iliad* as a whole instead of merely picking out the catalogue as a conventional epic ingredient.

The hostile forces are now readied, but not Aeneas, the newcomer. That means that Vergil from now on could not follow the next events in the *Iliad*. Only in Book 12 was he able to do so again, where *Iliad* 3 and 4, the ὅρκια and the archery of Pandarus, are indeed united with the closing section of the Patrocleia, the first part of *Iliad* 22. In Book 8 Aeneas is—and this was a surprising discovery—in rather the same situation as the unarmed Odysseus in *Odyssey* 13, after the Phaeacians have dropped the sleeping hero in his homeland, Ithaca. Vergil has taken Odysseus' encounter with Athene and her taking counsel with him as to how they could subdue the suitors, as model for the dream-vision of the river god Tiber, who reveals to Aeneas his arrival in his predestined *patria* (*cf.* 8.39) and advises him to seek support at Pallanteum, the city of the Arcadians, for the forthcoming struggle with the Italic forces of his rival suitor Turnus. That the transformation of the *Odyssey* continues here in Book 8, a fact which has passed unnoticed hitherto, becomes easily understandable if we realize that Turnus in Book 7 has taken over the part of the suitors in the *Odyssey*. As the struggle for Lavinia corresponds to that for Penelope, Aeneas' situation, his lack of means compared to the mighty suitor Turnus, corresponds to that of Odysseus in *Odyssey* 13, but there is no comparable situation in the *Iliad*.

Thus Evander as an ally is not only a new Eumaios—for *Odyssey* 14 has also been laid under contribution to Book 8—he is, most important of all, a new Nestor in Pylos, contaminated with the Spartan Menelaus of *Odyssey* 4 and 15, both of whom Telemachus visits when he sets out to look for his father. A great many of Vergil's literal, detailed quota-

tions from this part of the *Odyssey* have been recognized long ago, but it has not yet been noted that Vergil follows in Book 7 and especially in Book 8, *Odyssey* 13 and 14, thus continuing in the second part of his epic the imitation of the second part of the *Odyssey*. He then passes over to his transformation of the Telemacheia (from the end of *Odyssey* 2 to that of 4).

If one considers that in Book 8 Aeneas' relation to his rival Turnus can be compared to that of Odysseus to the suitors, it becomes easier to understand why Vergil could also submit the Telemacheia to transformation. The so-called *signum Veneris* (*Aen.* 8.520–540) gives us the clue for this. For, when early in the morning Venus flies through the air with the clashing arms Vulcan had made the night before, nobody but Aeneas, her son, is able to explain this as a sign promising victory: *ego poscor Olympo* (8.533) . . . *quas poenas mihi, Turne, dabis* (8.538). This famous scene Vergil has developed from the parting scene in Sparta when Telemachus takes leave of Menelaus and Helen and the eagle portent occurs (*Od.* 15.160–181). There only Helen, the daughter of Zeus, is able to interpret the portent: Odysseus will return home and take his revenge, οἴκαδε νοστήσει καὶ τίσεται. The purpose of Telemachus' journey has been achieved. He now can return, full of new hope. Father and son will unite their efforts (*Od.* 16). The last act of the *Odyssey* begins.

Vergil has made one character out of the two here. Another Odysseus, Aeneas is also Telemachus, in that he obtains from his mother the hopeful portent that prepares the way for the last act of the *Aeneid*.

But the last books of the *Odyssey*, 16–24, defied transformation. Instead Vergil turns completely to the *Iliad*. Let us see what he has done. From 8.370 *at Venus . . . exterrita mater* (*Volcanum adloquitur*) onwards, he relates what happens while Aeneas is asleep at Evander's. At 369 *nox ruit et fuscis tellurem amplectitur alis* Vergil's imitation of the Telemacheia had reached the point which corresponds to *Odyssey* 3.403 and 4.305 respectively, when Nestor or Menelaus and their guest lie down to sleep. But in the *Odyssey* these nights are not described at either place, for already in the next verse, in 3.404 as well as in 4.306, the dawn, Eos, of the respective next morning appears. This corresponds perfectly to Vergil's *Euandrum ex humili tecto lux suscitat alma* (8.454). The following events also have their counterpart in this part of the *Odyssey*. But in the *Aeneid* Vergil inserts into these *Odyssey*-

nights the important events of one night in the *Iliad*. Exactly as Homer's Hephaistos fulfils the request of Achilles' mother Thetis for weapons for her son, so does Vergil's Vulcan fulfil Venus' request for her son (these scenes start *Iliad* 18.369 and *Aeneid* 8.370 respectively). The *signum Veneris*—the clatter of weapons in the air—thus represents a contamination of the τέρας Διός of the *Odyssey* and Thetis' delivery of the weapons at the beginning of *Iliad* 19. Now after the description of the shield (till the end of *Aeneid* 8) Aeneas is fortified by divine weapons and allies as Achilles is in *Iliad* 19 and Odysseus in *Odyssey* 16.

This amalgamation of both Homer's epics in *Aeneid* 8 and the transition from the imitation of the *Odyssey* into that of the *Iliad* at precisely *this* point may be explained by the fact that Vergil has obviously compared the situation of Achilles after Patroclus' death with that of Odysseus after his landing in Ithaca (that means, in the *Aeneid*, after Aeneas' landing in Latium). For Achilles, bereft of his divine weapons now in the hands of Hector (*Il.* 17), on whom Patroclus must be avenged, is therefore as defenceless as Odysseus after his disembarkation in *Ithaca*. Thetis' aid makes it possible for Achilles (as Athene's for Odysseus) to face his enemy fully armed. When Vergil makes Venus help Aeneas, he thus repeats once again the basic situation which had been prefigured in *both* Homeric epics.

Before entering upon Book 10, one should perhaps recall the fact that in the *Iliad* two actions are intertwined. First there is the action round Helen for whom the war is fought. This at first glance has nothing to do with Achilles. Next the Patroclus-action: Achilles fights again only after his ἔταιρος Patroclus has been slain and stripped by Hector in an unfair duel. This in its turn has little to do with Helen. We are not concerned here about the way in which these two strands have been entwined and eventually made to lead the action in the *Iliad* towards the ultimate aim, the fall of Troy. But we are now in a position to explain why Vergil has made *Iliad* 2 the foundation of Book 7, but *Iliad* 18 and the beginning of 19 the basis of Book 8. In *Iliad* 2 the Helen-action begins. In 18 Achilles is allowed to start his revenge, which will lead finally to the fall of Troy. We have reached the same situation at the end of *Aeneid* 8.

Book 9 may be left aside. Heinze has rightly said that it contains those parts of the *Iliad* in which battles without Achilles' participation are described, roughly Books 8 to 12. Of *Aeneid* 10 we shall deal only

with the death of Pallas, who is killed by Turnus. I suggest, only brief-
ly, that Pallas' death is a contamination of the death of Sarpedon with
that of Patroclus in *Iliad* 16. This book has served as the basis for
Aeneid 10 in structure as well as in details. Moreover Vergil has con-
taminated it with parts of the assembly of gods in *Iliad* 20 and the
Scamander battle in 21. Special attention may be called to only one
of the many so far unnoted relations between *Iliad* 16 and *Aeneid* 10.
It is a passage which has always been wrongly interpreted. For the
catalogue of the Etruscans is not an imitation of the catalogue of the
Trojans in *Iliad* 2 (816–877) but an exact and structurally determined
transformation of the catalogue of the Myrmidons in *Iliad* 16, a section
situated in *Aeneid* 10 at almost the same spot as in *Iliad* 16 (16.168–197:
Aen. 10.163–214).

Vergil had good reasons to shape *Aeneid* 10 after *Iliad* 16, because he
understood that here was the turning point of the Trojan war as
Homer saw it: the death of Patroclus will cause Achilles' decisive inter-
vention. In the same way by Aeneas' arrival when the battle for the
camp is raging and by Pallas' death the battle for Latium is brought to
a crisis in *Aeneid* 10. That is why Vergil made only this book start with
an assembly of gods (*Il.* 4 and 20), where Jupiter solemnly states that
hodie, today (*Aen.* 10.107, cf. *Il.* 20.127 σήμερον), both parties would have
the same chance—*rex Iuppiter omnibus idem* (10.112).

How does Turnus forfeit his chance? The Sibyl had predicted in
Book 6 that Aeneas would meet as opponent another Achilles, also
the son of a goddess. Turnus by descent and excellence is Aeneas'
equal. Both too, after the events of Books 7 and 8, are equals in allies
and weapons. But when Turnus has slain Pallas, the very young son of
Evander, and insolently stripped him of his *balteus*, Vergil reflects
upon the naïve shortsightedness of men that does not know how to
restrain itself—*nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae et servare
modum* (10.501f). Soon Turnus would curse the day on which he had
slain and stripped Pallas (503–505):

> *Turno tempus erit, magno cum optaverit emptum*
> *intactum Pallanta et cum spolia ista diemque*
> *oderit.*

For Pallas, as Vergil expressly describes, was not Turnus' equal,
either in age or strength. The encounter begins *viribus imparibus*

(10.459). Aeneas bewails the *miserandus puer* (11.42). Evander the father deplores the *immatura mors* (11.166f).

Through his excess Turnus forfeits the chance Jupiter had granted him. This guilt, the result of a victory without honor over young Pallas, who had been entrusted to Aeneas by Evander, is the reason for his own defeat at Aeneas' hand. When the Trojan sees Turnus wearing Pallas' *balteus*, he is enraged and kills Turnus as a sacrifice for Pallas. Turnus pays with his "criminal blood" the debt for Pallas' death (12.948f):

> ... *Pallas, te hoc volnere Pallas*
> *immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit.*

These are Aeneas' last words before he slays Turnus. They follow after Turnus had acknowledged Aeneas' victory and his claim for Lavinia: *vicisti ...; tua est Lavinia coniunx* (12.936f). Now it becomes clear that Vergil has in fact concluded the two elements of action in the *Aeneid*. Aeneas, suitor of Lavinia, has defeated his rival. This theme sets the tone for the whole second half of the epic and it refers back to Penelope of the *Odyssey* as well as to Helen of the *Iliad*. Further, Aeneas has taken revenge for Pallas' death. This second theme determines the structural patterns between Books 10 and 12.

Vergil again has developed the Pallas theme from his analysis of the Patroclus-action in the *Iliad*. Hector, in slaying Patroclus exactly as Turnus slays Pallas, does not kill an opponent who is his equal, but only the ἕταρος (*Il.* 16.240), the θεράπων (16.244) of Achilles. Hector's victory is also inglorious because he kills a rival already rendered defenceless by Apollo, and even worse: he strips him of the weapons, which in reality belong to Achilles (*Il.* 17.188–197). When Vergil, the poet, deplores the *nescia mens hominum* after Pallas' death, his reflection is modeled upon Zeus' sorrowful reaction to Hector's errors. Zeus reflects and observes (17.201f) that Hector's death is imminent because he did not act according to moral order, οὐ κατὰ κόσμον (205), when he stripped Patroclus of his armor.

When Vergil in Book 10 makes Turnus a villain by his murder of Pallas and at the end of Book 12 makes Aeneas kill Turnus as punishment for his guilt, it becomes evident that the poet here wanted to imitate the structure of the *Iliad*, *i.e.* the relation in composition which exists between *Iliad* 16 and 22. Because Hector has violated the code

of honor of the Homeric heroes[3] and because Achilles must therefore take revenge for the death of Patroclus, on another level the same must occur once more in the *Aeneid*.

The plan of Vergil's structural imitations of Homer may now have become at least partly clear: the four great units of action in Homer, the Helen-action and the Patroclus-action in the *Iliad* (not Book 1, the Menis), the Telemacheia and the wanderings of Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, must after a thorough study have seemed to him to be not only comparable but actual parallels between the Homeric epics. Remember only the wrath of the gods or the women as cause of war. Such apparent parallelism induced him to unite the two in a single poem, the *Aeneid*—to put it daringly, to treat the same matter a third time.

The complete structure of the Homeric epics, not simply occasional quotations, was no doubt the basis for Vergil's poem. I cannot explain these findings otherwise than by the suggestion that Vergil must have intensively studied the structure of the Homeric epics before he drafted in prose his famous first plan for the whole *Aeneid*. Propertius' *nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade* at about 26 B.C. is not against this view.

IV

What can we say of the significance of Vergil's transformation of Homer? At our present state of knowledge we can merely ask the questions which necessarily arise from these findings.

The simplest first. It seems clear that Aeneas, who excelled Odysseus in the first part of the *Aeneid*, now surpasses the Greeks who had been victorious in Troy. Diomedes in Arpi expressly confronts the *pietas* of Aeneas with the *scelus* of the Greeks (*Aen.* 11.258). The moral strength and piety of the "new Achilles," and indeed of the whole line of the *Aeneadae*, has its beginnings in the *Iliad* (20.307f, translated at *Aen.* 3.97f). The way in which he completes the divine mission to found a new Troy, that is Rome, elevates him morally far above the Greek heroes.

One next would have to ask to what extent Vergil made use of the various ancient interpretations of Homer. To what extent did they influence and enhance his own? There are indications in the *Aeneid*

[3] *Cf.* Samuel E. Bassett, "Hector's Fault in Honor," *TAPA* 54 (1923) 117–127.

that Vergil was well acquainted with the current expositions of Homer, especially the allegorical explanation of the Stoics.[4]

It is much more difficult to answer a third question. Had any of his Latin forerunners earlier imitated Homeric structure, if only in parts, or is this sort of analysis of Homer original with Vergil? The discussion about Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* is still in flux. I think it not impossible that Vergil could have found in Naevius a tendency toward it, in Ennius scarcely.

Next comes the question of the position of the *Aeneid* within the development of the Latin epic. Vergil's *Aeneid* is in fact a Latin epic in the tradition of the annalistic-historical epics of Naevius and Ennius. "Historical" in this sense means to take as the actual beginning of Roman history the end of the Trojan War, the flight of Aeneas, his wanderings and his landing in Latium.

But all this does not satisfy us entirely, indispensable as it may be for the understanding of the *Aeneid*. It does not explain why the *Aeneid* should have had such an astonishing impact through the centuries. Rather it is the decisive step Vergil has made towards an epic much nearer to Homer than the traditional Latin epic with its rough attempts at Homeric imitation.

It seems to me as if Vergil had understood the relation of his poem to Homer's epics in a way which can be compared to that of Christian exegesis in understanding the relation between the Old and the New Testament, namely by "typology." The Old Testament was understood as an account of real historic events which represent in an earlier stage the expectations of salvation which are fulfilled in the New Testament. The same event is repeated in the New Testament, only on another level, even by way of reversal.[5]

---

[4] One example only. In *Aen.* 1.740–746 the Carthaginian bard Iopas sings about nature, i.e. *de rerum natura*. In *Aen.* 1 he sings at a point that corresponds in a way to the situation of Demodokos' (second) song about Ares and Aphrodite (*Od.* 8.266–366). Both sing for the pleasure of the distinguished guests and in both epics follow the narrations of the Iliupersis (*Od.* 8.499–520 and *Aen.* 2) and the wanderings of the heroes (*Od.* 9–12 and *Aen.* 3). The song of Ares and Aphrodite had long been interpreted not only as an amusing story about love affairs on Olympus but as an allegorical poem about nature, περὶ φύσεως. The proem of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* proves that he too interpreted Venus and Ares allegorically. Vergil, who in the *Georgics* (4.346) let the nymph Clymene in Cyrene's palace sing *Vulcani Martisque dolos et dulcia furta*, in the *Aeneid* replaced the old story by its allegorical interpretation, namely a poem with a philosophical explanation of nature.

[5] Within the last ten years several scholars in Germany have tentatively ventured in this direction. For further information see my book (*infra* n.6) pp. 354ff.

This analogy may suggest the reason why Vergil made the Sibyl and Juno declare that the events of the Trojan war would be reënacted, *iterum*, that a new Troy, Rome, would rise—and also the reason why Vergil could found his own characters upon the Homeric. This is *not* an aesthetic or literary interpretation—rather a 'historical' one.

This view is confirmed by the observation that Vergil's *Aeneid* is marked by an eschatological interpretation of history, apparently a *sine qua non* of the typological method. Compare the relation between Old and New Testament. Contrary to usual Roman practise, the deeds of the ancestor of the *gens Iulia* do not just represent the beginning of Roman history, deeds to which simply are added those of all his successors. Aeneas instead unites in his person, in the epic acting in the *present*, the awful Trojan *past*—represented for instance in the reliefs of the temple of Juno in Carthage—as well as the glorious Roman *future* reaching to Augustus. Of course eschatology for a Roman of this period could not mean the same thing as for a Christian; but it could mean the hope that now, at this very moment, in Augustus' and Vergil's lifetime, the Golden Age of Saturnus might return. Here, too, history is understood as a repetition of things past. The Neo-Pythagorean flavour of this conception is, by the way, a distinctive element of the Roman epic.

This Vergilian yearning, already eloquently articulated in the *Fourth Eclogue*, is nowhere stated more grandly than in Anchises' prediction in Elysium (6.791–794):

> *hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,*
> *Augustus Caesar, Divi genus, aurea condet*
> *saecula, qui **rursus** Latio regnata per arva*
> *Saturno quondam . . .*

"And there in very truth is he whom you have often heard prophesied, Augustus Ceasar, son of the Deified, and founder of golden centuries once more in Latium, in those same lands where once Saturn reigned" (transl. Knight).

The *imperium sine fine* that Jupiter promises Venus will now be realised in the *aurea saecula* of Augustus' reign—all of that is but the repetition of what has come before. Is this mere fancy? No, for Vergil has enlarged this prophecy of Anchises from an Homeric original. It is the prophecy of Teiresias in the underworld that Odysseus eventually will die as a very old man amidst prosperous people—ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ ὄλβιοι

ἔσσονται (*Od.* 11.136f). The simple, natural death of the aged Odysseus, whose rule has made the tribes of Ithaca blessed, becomes in Vergil a grand vision, the vision of the return of the Golden Age under the rule of Augustus, of the *pax Romana*, which embraces the *orbis terrarum*, an *imperium* unlimited by time and space.

It was left for a Roman to achieve such a transfiguration of Homer, for a Roman whose historical insight had been sharpened by the blood and pain of civil war, who knew that the ancient, revered *res publica* was no longer enough. It was this Roman who transformed the "historicity" of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* into that of the *Aeneid* and linked his poem to the hopes of Augustus' reign. In such a context, one would do well to understand the epigram—perhaps even said by Vergil: *facilius est Herculi clavam quam Homero versum subripere.*[6]

FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN

May, 1964