

# The Betrayal of Aeneas

*Giampiero Scafoglio*

EVERYONE KNOWS the story of Aeneas, who flees with his father on his shoulders and his son by the hand, away from a Troy set on fire by the Achaeans. This poignant scene occurs in the second book of the *Aeneid* (2.721–724);<sup>1</sup> hence it has permanently entered into our literary and artistic heritage, as a shining example of *pietas*, conceived especially as a loyalty to family ties and dedication to father and son.<sup>2</sup>

That scene has its origin in the Greek world, as attested by Attic vase painting beginning in the late sixth century B.C.;<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Here is that famous passage: *haec fatus latos umeros subiectaque colla / ueste super fuluque insternor pelle leonis, / succedoque oneri; dextrae se paruus Iulus / implicuit sequiturque patrem non passibus aequis*. Cf. N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 2. A Commentary* (Leiden/Boston 2008) 500 ff., esp. 508–510.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 1.378, 544–545; P. Boyancé, *La religion de Virgile* (Paris 1963) 58–82; C. J. Mackie, *The Characterisation of Aeneas* (Edinburgh 1988). On the concept of *pietas* and its role in the Augustan political program: K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* (Princeton 1996) 288–331. But an alternative and more problematic point of view is expressed by M. C. J. Putnam, *Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence* (Chapel Hill 1995) 134–151; Ch. Perkell, “*Aeneid* 1: An Epic Programme,” in *Reading Virgil's Aeneid. An Interpretive Guide* (Norman 1999) 29 ff., at 35–37.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. the Attic black-figure eye-cup from Vulci Louvre F.122 (530–520 B.C.) and the oinochoe Louvre F.118 (520–510), the storage jar at the Getty Museum, inv. 86.AE.82 (about 510), the neck amphora British Museum B.280 (490–480), the hydria Vivenzio at the National Archaeological Museum, Naples, inv. 81669 (ca. 480). Cf. F. Brommer, *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*<sup>3</sup> (Marburg 1973) 386–389; S. Woodford and M. Loudon, “Two Trojan Themes: The Iconography of Ajax Carrying the Body of Achilles and of Aeneas Carrying Anchises in Black Figure Vase Painting,” *AJA* 84 (1980) 25–40, esp. 30 ff.

there is also a trace in the decoration of the Parthenon.<sup>4</sup> As for literary evidence, we find that scene already in a fragment of the lost *Laocoon* of Sophocles,<sup>5</sup> and perhaps it was, even earlier, in the lost *Iliupersis* of Stesichorus (if we are to believe the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*).<sup>6</sup>

But Virgil presents Aeneas as *pius* even in the broadest sense, which consists in devotion to the gods and to the homeland, despite his escape on that fateful night: his loyalty to his country is realized, together with his religious devotion, in the mission which he is entrusted by Fate, as Hector tells him in a prophetic dream that very night (2.268–297, notably 288–295).<sup>7</sup> In the flight from Troy, indeed, he not only carries his

<sup>4</sup> Notably the north metope 27 (scil. 2<sup>nd</sup> half V cent.). Cf. C. Praschniker, *Parthenonstudien* (Vienna 1928) 107 ff. and fig. 78–79, pl. 8–9; G. Ferrari, “The Iliupersis in Athens,” *HSCP* 100 (2000) 119–150, esp. 137–138.

<sup>5</sup> Soph. fr.373 Radt (Dion. Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 1.48.2); R. Jebb, W. G. Headlam, and A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles II* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1917) 38 ff. and notably 44–45; H. Lloyd-Jones, *Sophocles: Fragments* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1996) 198–201; G. Scafoglio, “Le *Laocoon* de Sophocle,” *REG* 119 (2006) 406–420.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. A. Sadurska, *Les Tables Iliques* (Warsaw 1964) 24–70 and fig. 1 (on the *Tabula Capitolina*), particularly 29 (on the scene at issue); M. Davies, *Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta I* (Oxford 1991) 205; D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric III* (Cambridge [Mass.]/London 1991) 107. A dependency relationship between the poem of Stesichorus and the depictions on the bas-relief (as indicated by the inscription engraved on the latter) is claimed by A. Debiasi, *L’epica perduta. Eumelo, il Ciclo, l’occidente* (Rome 2004) 164–177, and G. Scafoglio, “Virgilio e Stesicoro. Una ricerca sulla *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*,” *RhM* 148 (2005) 113–127. *Contra*, C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1961) 103–106; G. K. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton 1969) 106–113; N. Horsfall, “Stesichorus at Bovillae?” *JHS* 99 (1979) 26–48, at 35–43 (summarized in *CQ* 29 [1979] 375–376), and *Virgil, Aeneid* 2 587–591.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. A. Thill, “Hector dans l’Énéide ou la succession homérique,” *BAssBudé* 39 (1980) 36–48; P. Kyriakou, “Aeneas’ Dream of Hector,” *Hermes* 127 (1999) 317–327; J. Bouquet, *Le songe dans l’épopée latine* (Brussels 2001) 23–26; G. Scafoglio, “L’apparizione onirica di Ettore nel libro II dell’Eneide: Intertestualità e mediazione filosofica,” *Philologus* 146 (2002) 299–308; E. Adler, *Virgil’s Empire. Political Thought in the Aeneid* (Lanham 2003) 263–269.

father and son, but also the Penates, who represent the soul of the nation (2.717, *tu, genitor, cape sacra manu patriosque Penatis*): he undertakes the task of bringing them away and establishing them in a new land, becoming the *pius* hero *par excellence*.<sup>8</sup>

But there is also another story, a marginal version of the legend, less known and less edifying as to Aeneas: the story of his betrayal, his secret agreement with the Achaeans, who after the conquest of Troy grant him safety and part of the booty in return for his help. The story seems to be known by some Latin writers in both the Republican and the Imperial age,<sup>9</sup> but comes to full light in Late Antiquity in the mysterious works of Dictys the Cretan (*Ephemerides Belli Troiani*, Books 4 and 5)<sup>10</sup> and Dares the Phrygian (*De excidio Troiae historia* 37–40).<sup>11</sup> However,

<sup>8</sup> Cf. F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge 1989) 29–32 and 71–77; J. D. Garrison, *Pietas from Vergil to Dryden* (University Park 1992) 22–32 and passim; M. Fernandelli, “*Sum pius Aeneas*. Eneide 1 e l’umanizzazione della pietas,” *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia, Linguistica e Tradizione Classica* (Torino 1999) 197–231.

<sup>9</sup> Lutatius Catulus fr.2 in U. Walter, *GFA* 12 (2009) 1–6, quoted in the *Origo gentis Romanae* (9.2): *at uero Lutatius non modo Antenorem, sed etiam ipsum Aeneam proditorem patriae fuisse tradit*; Sen. *Ben.* 6.36, *quis pius dicet Aenean, si patriam capi uoluerit, ut captiuitati patrem eripiat?*; also Tert. *Ad nat.* 2.9; Pomp. Porph. ad Hor. *Carm.saec.* 41 (182 Holder); Serv. ad Verg. *Aen.* 1.242.

<sup>10</sup> Text by W. Eisenhut, *Dictyis Cretensis ephemeridos belli Troiani libri* (Leipzig 1958); overview by O. Rossbach, “Diktys,” *RE* 5 (1905) 589–591; J.-P. Néraudau, “Néron et le nouveau chant de Troie,” *ANRW* II 32.3 (1985) 2032–2045, esp. 2039–2042.

<sup>11</sup> Text by F. Meister, *Daretis Phrygii de excidio Troiae historia* (Leipzig 1873); overview by Meister, *Ueber Dares von Phrygien, De excidio Troiae historia* (Leipzig 1871). Both works are translated by R. M. Frazer, *The Trojan War. The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian* (Bloomington 1966). See also S. Merkle, “The Truth and Nothing but the Truth: Dictys and Dares,” in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden 1996) 563–580; Merkle, “News from the Past: Dictys and Dares on the Trojan War,” in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Latin Fiction: The Latin Novel in Context* (London 1999) 155–166. All evidence about the legend of the betrayal of Aeneas from antiquity to the Middle Ages is collected and discussed by F. Chiappinelli, *Impius Aeneas* (Acireale/Rome 2007) (reviewed: G. Scafoglio, *GFA* 12 [2009] 1063–1067).

this tale dates back to Greek literature: Dionysius of Halicarnassus attributes it to a historian of the fourth century B.C., Menecrates of Xanthus.<sup>12</sup>

Μενεκράτης δὲ ὁ Ξάνθιος προδοῦναι τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνει τὴν πόλιν τῆς πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἔχθρας ἕνεκα, καὶ διὰ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν αὐτὴν Ἀχαιοὺς αὐτῷ συγχωρῆσαι διασώσασθαι τὸν οἶκον. σύγκειται δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος ἀρξαμένῳ ἀπὸ <τῆς> Ἀχιλλέως ταφῆς τὸν τρόπον τόνδε· “Ἀχαιοὺς δ’ ἀνίη εἶχε καὶ ἐδόκεον τῆς στρατιῆς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπηράχθαι. ὅμως δὲ τάφον αὐτῷ δαΐσαντες ἐπολέμεον βίη πάσῃ, ἄχρις Ἴλιος ἐάλω Αἰνείεω ἐνδόντος. Αἰνεΐης γὰρ ἄτιτος ἐὼν ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ἀπὸ γερῶν ἱερῶν ἐξειργόμενος ἀνέτρεψε Πρίαμον· ἐργασάμενος δὲ ταῦτα εἰς Ἀχαιῶν ἐγεγόνει.”

Menecrates of Xanthus says that he [Aeneas] betrayed the city to the Achaeans because of his enmity to Alexander, and that because of this benefaction the Achaeans allowed him to save his family. The account composed by him begins with the funeral of Achilles, as follows: “Distress held the Achaeans, and they thought the army had been deprived of its head. Nevertheless, after the funeral feast for him, they made war with all their might, until Ilium was taken, Aeneas permitting it. For Aeneas, who was unrecompensed by Alexander and excluded from sacrificial portions, brought down Priam and in doing this became one with the Achaeans.”

Menecrates is the most ancient author who relates this story. Nevertheless, it is almost certain that he did not invent it: he must have found it in an earlier source (as is typical of the working method of Greek historians, who only select and revise the information gathered in their research).<sup>13</sup> The aim of this

<sup>12</sup> *Ant. Rom.* 1.48.3 = *FGrHist* 769 F 3; Loeb transl., with revision.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. J. Marincola, *Greek Historians* (Cambridge 2001) 105–112 and *passim*; G. Schepens, “History and Historia. Inquiry in the Greek Historians,” in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford 2007) 39–55; M. Cuypers, “Historiography, Rhetoric, and Science: Rethinking a Few Assumptions on Hellenistic Prose,” in J. J. Clauss and M. Cuypers (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature* (Oxford 2010) 317 ff., at 318–323.

study is to demonstrate that the story of the betrayal of Aeneas was already in the pre-literary oral tradition, which provided the matter to the Homeric poems as well as the epic cycle.<sup>14</sup>

In the *Iliad* Aeneas is described as a warrior as strong and brave as he is pious to the gods and loyal to his people:<sup>15</sup> one may say that Virgil found right here the seed of the *pious Aeneas*. According to Homer, indeed, Aeneas is very close to Hector and often fights valiantly by his side: there is nothing to foreshadow his betrayal.<sup>16</sup>

It is true that, on closer examination, one may see some allusions to a dynastic rivalry between two families, the ruling dynasty of Priam and Hector and the cadet branch of Anchises and Aeneas. Achilles appears to refer to this when he is to face Aeneas in a duel, and mocks him thus (*Il.* 20.178–186):

Αἰνεΐα τί σὺ τόσσον ὀμίλου πολλὸν ἐπελθὼν  
ἔσταις; ἦ σέ γε θυμὸς ἐμοὶ μαχέσασθαι ἀνώγει  
ἐλπόμενον Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξειν ἵπποδάμοισι  
τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμου; ἀτὰρ εἴ κεν ἔμ' ἐξεναρτίξης,  
οὔ τοι τοῦνεκά γε Πρίαμος γέρας ἐν χειρὶ θήσει·  
εἰσὶν γάρ οἱ παῖδες, ὃ δ' ἔμπεδος οὐδ' ἀεσίφρων.  
ἦ νύ τί τοι Τρῶες τέμενος τάμον ἔξοχον ἄλλων  
καλὸν φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης, ὄφρα νέμῃαι  
αἴ κεν ἐμὲ κτείνης; χαλεπῶς δέ σ' ἔολπα τὸ ρέξειν.

Aeneas, why have you stood so far forth from the multitude against me? Does the desire in your heart drive you to combat in hope you will be lord of the Trojans, breakers of horses, and of

<sup>14</sup> On the mythological heritage, passed down orally at first, and then shared by the Homeric poems and the epic cycle, see J. S. Burgess, *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore 2001) 132–171.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the words of Poseidon at *Il.* 20.297–299; N. Horsfall, “The Aeneas Legend from Homer to Virgil,” in J. N. Bremmer and N. Horsfall (eds.), *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London 1987) 12–24, esp. 13–14.

<sup>16</sup> So for instance *Il.* 15.328–332; 16.536–537; 17.333–341, 483–490, 512–513, 752–754; Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* 3–61; N. Horsfall, “La leggenda di Enea,” *Enc. Virg.* 2 (1985) 221–229.

Priam's honour? And yet even if you were to kill me Priam would not because of that rest such honour on your hand. He has sons, and he himself is sound, not weakened. Or have the men of Troy promised you a piece of land, surpassing all others, fine ploughland and orchard for you to administer if you kill me? But I think that killing will not be easy (transl. Lattimore).

Achilles ironically asks Aeneas why he is preparing to take the risk of facing him in a duel: does he have, perhaps, the vain hope of succeeding Priam on the throne? But these words sound like a sarcastic challenge: hard to say if the hero (i.e. the poet) is aware of—and wants to refer to—a rivalry between the two families of Priam and Anchises. Achilles may have arbitrarily advanced this sarcasm for an aggressive and hateful purpose, without any reference to reality.

Moreover, the conduct of Aeneas, who advances out of the ranks and does not hesitate to face the strongest of the Achaeans, does not fit well with the presumed competition with Priam. On the contrary, the heroic attitude of Aeneas seems to exclude such a rivalry. His own response to Achilles is significant (20.200–202):

Πηλείδῃ μὴ δὴ ἐπέεσσὶ με νηπύτιον ὥς  
ἔλπεο δειδίξεσθαι, ἐπεὶ σάφα οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς  
ἡμὲν κερτομίας ἢ δ' αἴσυλα μυθήσασθαι.

Son of Peleus, never hope by words to frighten me as if I were a baby. I myself understand well enough how to speak in vituperation and how to make insults.

Aeneas does not take seriously the sarcasm of Achilles: he calls it an inconsequential insult, worthy of a child. Then (213 ff.) he recalls with pride his ancestors, from Dardanus onwards, indicating Erichthonius, Tros, and so on, up to the cousins Priam and Anchises; at line 240 both of them are enclosed with their children in a chiasmus, which seems to emphasize the unity of the family: αὐτὰρ ἔμ' Ἀγχίσης, Πρίαμος δ' ἔτεχ' Ἑκτορα δῖον. He claims to be proud “of such a race” (241), which contains

both branches of Priam and Anchises.<sup>17</sup> His speech ends by telling Achilles to stop talking “like children” and to take up the duel (244–258), confirming his resolution in battle.<sup>18</sup>

The fact that, after the conquest of Troy, the ruling family of Priam will die out and Aeneas will reign over the survivors, as the god Poseidon prophesies a little later (20.306–308),<sup>19</sup> does not necessarily imply a reference to such a rivalry between the families. Moreover, this prophecy seems to be a later addition to the poem.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup> This is in fact the final sentence of his narrative: ταύτης τοι γενεῆς τε καὶ αἵματος εὐχομαι εἶναι (241); and it sounds like his definitive answer about the alleged rivalry. Is it the answer of the poet too, in regard to another version of the legend?

<sup>18</sup> “But come, let us no longer stand here talking of these things like children, here in the space between the advancing armies. For there are harsh things enough that could be spoken against us both, a ship of a hundred locks could not carry the burden ... The sort of thing you say is the thing that will be said to you. But what have you and I to do with the need for squabbling and hurling insults at each other, as if we were two wives who when they have fallen upon a heart-perishing quarrel go out in the street and say abusive things to each other, much true, and much that is not, and it is their rage that drives them. You will not by talking turn me back from the strain of my warcraft, not till you have fought to my face with the bronze. Come on then and let us try each other's strength with the bronze of our spearheads.”

<sup>19</sup> ἤδη γὰρ Πριάμου γενεὴν ἔχθηρε Κρονίων· / νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνεΐαιο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει / καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται, “For Kronos' son has cursed the generation of Priam, and now the might of Aineias shall be lord over the Trojans, and his sons' sons, and those who are born of their seed hereafter.”

<sup>20</sup> Cf. K. Reinhardt, “Zum homerischen Aphrodite-Hymnus,” in H. Erbse (ed.), *Festschrift Bruno Snell* (Munich 1956) 1–14; A. Hoekstra, *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Formulaic Tradition. Studies in the Homeric Hymns to Apollo, to Aphrodite and to Demeter* (Amsterdam 1969) 39–40; F. Càssola, *Inni Omerici* (Milan 1975) 243–247; N. van der Ben, “De Homerische Aphrodite-hymne I: De Aeneas-passages in de Ilias,” *Lampas* 13 (1980) 40–77; P. Smith, “Aineidai as Patrons of *Iliad* XX and the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*,” *HSCP* 85 (1981) 17–58; M. W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary* V (Cambridge 1991) 299–301; A. Faulkner, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (Oxford/New

Nevertheless, in the *Iliad* there is a hint that could point (albeit subtly) to the treason of Aeneas or, at least, to his rivalry with Priam. This is in the narrative of the ‘battle by the ships’, when Deiphobus asks Aeneas for help to fight Idomeneus (13.458–461):<sup>21</sup>

ὦδε δέ οἱ φρονέοντι δοάσσατο κέρδιον εἶναι  
βῆναι ἐπ’ Αἰνεΐαν· τὸν δ’ ὕστατον εὗρεν ὀμίλου  
ἔσταότ’· αἰεὶ γὰρ Πριάμῳ ἐπεμήνιε δίῳ  
οὔνεκ’ ἄρ’ ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα μετ’ ἀνδράσιν οὔ τι τίεσκεν.

The poet (here I would not call him Homer) says that Deiphobus, after thinking over what to do, decides to seek help from Aeneas, but does not find him in the front row, “among the warriors,” fighting with full impulse (as befits one of the bravest warriors, according to the heroic attitude typical of the Homeric world).<sup>22</sup> Aeneas, on the contrary, is “still/motionless” (ἔσταότ’), “at the back of the army” (τὸν δ’ ὕστατον ... ὀμίλου). It is the poet himself who explains why: “because he was always angry with great Priam, since he did not honor him, although he stood out among the warriors.”

Apart from this reference, no other evidence in the poem suggests Aeneas’ grudge against Priam (a grudge that causes slothful behavior and almost an attitude of obstructionism in the hero). The hint, in fact, is all the more interesting and intriguing just because it is strangely isolated: the matter requires an explanation.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> York 2008) 3–7.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary IV* (Cambridge 1992) 105–106.

<sup>22</sup> Among others see H. van Wees, *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam 1992) 61–165; G. Zanker, *The Heart of Achilles: Characterization and Personal Ethics in the Iliad* (Ann Arbor 1994) 1–45; M. Clarke, “Manhood and Heroism,” in R. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge 2004) 74–90.

<sup>23</sup> In fact, G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaean* (Baltimore 1979, 1999<sup>2</sup>) 265 ff., argues that there may have been an epic tradition on Aeneas’ withdrawal and return analogous to that of Achilles, a tradition that no longer survives. However he develops a ‘speculative’ argument, so to say, based on Parry-



The inconsistency of this scene with the portrait of Aeneas and the narrative of his deeds in the rest of the *Iliad* can be a consequence of interpolation. But perhaps the concept of interpolation is not entirely suitable for the Homeric epics, which (at least in part) gradually grew with the progressive addition and integration of material coming from the oral tradition, especially in the phase of ‘aurality’, the coexistence of oral performance (based on memory) and written form.<sup>24</sup> Maybe that scene can be considered, so to say, an ‘infiltration’ coming from the oral tradition (as, indeed, there are others in the *Iliad*).<sup>25</sup> If so, it follows that the grudge of Aeneas against Priam was already present in the oral tradition.<sup>26</sup> But we must try to confirm it: confirmation might be found in (what remains of) the epic cycle. In fact, although it was later put into writing, in a longer and troubled process (late VIII to early VI centuries),<sup>27</sup> it draws its material from the same oral culture that feeds the

---

Lord methodology about formula and theme. I agree to some extent with his findings, but I will try to follow a different path, based on textual evidence, that will lead to more radical conclusions (Aeneas’ betrayal).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. M. S. Jensen, “In What Sense Can the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* Be Considered Oral Texts?” in L. E. Doherty (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Homer’s Odyssey* (Oxford 2009) 18–28; F. Montanari, “The Homeric Question Today,” in *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (Berlin/Boston 2012) 1–10; W. Kullmann, “Neoanalysis between Orality and Literacy,” in *Homeric Contexts* 13–26.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. 1.484–877; 6.237–502; Bk. 10; 14.315–328. Cf. G. S. Kirk, *Homer and the Oral Tradition* (Cambridge 1976) 1–18 and passim; G. Nagy, *Homer’s Text and Language* (Urbana 2004) 25–39 and passim.

<sup>26</sup> This can be assumed to be true, even if one prefers to believe in a single author for the *Iliad*, instead of the ‘stratified’ redaction of many contributions. In this case, one should only come back to the traditional concept of interpolation (a later poet wrote the passage about Aeneas’ anger, drawing it from the oral culture).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. M. Davies, “The Date of the Epic Cycle,” *Glotta* 67 (1989) 89–100, and *The Greek Epic Cycle<sup>2</sup>* (Bristol 2001) 2–5, 11–12; G. Nagy, *Poetry as Performance. Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge 1996) 109–111 and passim.

Homeric epics.<sup>28</sup>

At first glance, in the epic cycle there is not easily available evidence about the hostility of Aeneas against Priam: so it seems, at least, according to the summaries by Proclus, which remain our main source of documentation on those lost poems.<sup>29</sup> To judge by these summaries, and by the surviving fragments too, there was no hint of this version of the legend in the *Cypria*, which narrated the antecedents of the Trojan war.<sup>30</sup> Even in the poems on the events following the conquest of Troy, the *Iliupersis* of Arctinus<sup>31</sup> and the *Ilias parua* of Lesches,<sup>32</sup> there was no reference to the treason of Aeneas. In the former, in fact, Aeneas left Troy with his family and followers after the killing of Laocoon and one of his sons by the monstrous snakes which came from the sea (probably the same version as told by Sophocles in *Laocoon*).<sup>33</sup> Instead, in the *Ilias parua*, according to Tzetzes' commentary on Lycophron, "Andromache and

<sup>28</sup> Cf. M. L. West, "The Rise of the Greek Epic," *JHS* 108 (1988) 151–172; J. S. Burgess, "Performance and the Epic Cycle," *CJ* 100 (2004) 1–23; G. Scafoglio, "La questione ciclica," *RevPhil* 78 (2004) 289–310, esp. 290–296.

<sup>29</sup> For the text of these abstracts, with French translation, see A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus* IV (Paris 1963) 75–97. On the identity of Proclus and the features and limits of his working method: G. Scafoglio, "Proclo e il ciclo epico," *GFA* 7 (2004) 39–57, and *RevPhil* 78 (2004) 296–308.

<sup>30</sup> Fragments and evidence: A. Bernabé, *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta* I (Leipzig 1987) 36–64; M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988) 27–45; M. L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2003) 64–171 (with English translation). Cf. Davies, *Greek Epic Cycle* 32–50.

<sup>31</sup> Bernabé, *Poetarum epicorum* 86–92; Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum* 61–66; West, *Greek Epic Fragments* 142–153; Davies, *Greek Epic Cycle* 71–76; Debiasi, *L'epica perduta* 136–160.

<sup>32</sup> Bernabé, *Poetarum epicorum* 71–86; Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum* 49–61; West, *Greek Epic Fragments* 118–143; Davies, *Greek Epic Cycle* 60–70; Debiasi, *L'epica perduta* 179–227.

<sup>33</sup> Soph. fr.373 (Dion. Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 1.48.2); S. Radt, *TrGF* IV pp.330–334; Debiasi, *L'epica perduta* 136–146; Scafoglio, *REG* 119 (2006) 412–420.

Aeneas were captured and given to Achilles' son Neoptolemus, and taken away with him to Pharsalia, Achilles' homeland."<sup>34</sup> This might be confirmed, too, by a fragment preserved by Tzetzes himself, *Il.Paru.* 20 Davies = 21 Bernabé;<sup>35</sup> but its authorship is controversial, because the second part (lines 6–11) is attributed to the Hellenistic poet Simmias of Rhodes by a commentator on Euripides' *Andromache*.<sup>36</sup>

Nevertheless, it is worth reading another item in Tzetzes' commentary on Lycophron, on *Alex.* 1232 (352.26 Scheer):

ὕστερον δὲ τῆς Τροίας πορθουμένης ἐλευθερωθεὶς ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων  
ὁ αὐτὸς Αἰνείας, ἢ αἰχμάλωτος ἀχθεὶς ὑπὸ Νεοπολέμου, ὡς  
φησιν ὁ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα πεποιηκώς.

Later, Aeneas himself, released by the Greeks during the sack of Troy, or else taken away as a slave by Neoptolemos, as the author of the *Little Iliad* says.

This passage is overshadowed or even completely ignored by the main editors of the fragments of the epic cycle;<sup>37</sup> yet it is an important testimony, which adds something missing in the

<sup>34</sup> *Il.paru.* fr.21(I) Bernabé = schol. Lycophr. *Alex.* 1268 (360.4 Scheer); transl. West, *Greek Epic Fragments* 138–139.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. West, *Greek Epic Fragments* 140–141, who believes that Tzetzes quotes two passages that were not consecutive in the epic: “But great-hearted Achilles' glorious son led Hector's wife back to the hollow ships; her child he took from the bosom of his lovely-haired nurse and, holding him by the foot, flung him from the battlement, and crimson death and stern fate took him at his fall” (1–5). “He took from the spoils Andromache, Hector's fair-girt consort, whom the chiefs of all the Achaeans gave him as a welcome reward and mark of honor. And Aeneas himself, the famous son of Anchises the horse-tamer, he embarked on his seagoing ships, to take as a special prize for himself out of all the Danaans” (6–11).

<sup>36</sup> *Il.paru.* fr.21(V) Bernabé = schol. Eur. *Andr.* 14 (II 250–251 Schwartz), i.e. Simmias fr.3 *spur.* Fränkel = fr.6 Powell. Cf. G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London 1969) 199; Debiasi, *L'epica perduta* 180–185.

<sup>37</sup> It is absent in Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum*, and West, *Greek Epic Fragments*, while Bernabé, *Poetarum epicorum* 81, relegates it to a very marginal position, in the apparatus (IV, alongside *Il.paru.* fr.21).

other sources concerning the epic cycle. In fact, here Tzetzes refers to two different versions on the fate of Aeneas: released by the Achaeans, or taken away as a slave by Neoptolemos. The first version, the spontaneous release of Aeneas by the enemy, seems to imply his betrayal: why, otherwise, would they have released him? It is true that in other sources (not concerning the epic cycle) we find the same matter with a different explanation, namely that the Achaeans freed him out of admiration for his devotion to family, as they saw him fleeing with his father on his shoulders.<sup>38</sup> But such motivation could not be passed over in silence by Tzetzes; instead, he seems to summarily dismiss the version, almost with reluctance: it is possible (though not certain) that this has to do with the thorny issue of betrayal.

Actually it is not clear whether the clause ὅς φησιν ὁ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα πεποιηκώς concerns both versions or (more probably) only the latter, i.e. Aeneas' slavery, which is referred to the *Ilias parua* also by Tzetzes on *Alex.* 1268 and the fragment he quotes (20 Davies = 21 Bernabé). However, it could be conceived even that both versions were in the *Ilias Parua*, though this may seem paradoxical: indeed, it is not the only inconsistency that can be found in this poem, to judge by the fragments, which are full of contradictions.<sup>39</sup> Some scholars have even assumed that there were several works under the title *Ilias parua*.<sup>40</sup> Perhaps it is best to think of various drafts or

<sup>38</sup> The earliest evidence for this version seems to come from Xenophon, *Cyn.* 1.15: Αἰνείας δὲ σώσας μὲν τοὺς πατρώους καὶ μητρώους θεοὺς, σώσας δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν πατέρα, δόξαν εὐσεβείας ἐξηνέγκατο, ὥστε καὶ οἱ πολέμοι μόνῳ ἐκείνῳ ὧν ἐκράτησαν ἐν Τροίᾳ ἔδοσαν μὴ συληθῆναι, "Aeneas saved the gods of his father's and his mother's family, and withal his father himself; wherefore he bore away fame for his piety, so that to him alone among all the vanquished at Troy even the enemy granted not to be despoiled" (transl. Marchant).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. the emblematic case of the two alleged incipits of the poem, fr.1 Bernabé = 2 *dub.* Davies (from Plut. *Mor.* 154A) and fr.28 Bernabé = 1 Davies (from the *Vita Homeri Herodotea*, 202 Allen = 15 Wilamowitz).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. A. Bernabé, "¿Más de una Ilias parua?" *Eclás* 87 (1984) 141–150,

stages of the same poem (with progressive additions and changes), in a gradual or stratified process of composition, by several poets, over more than a century.<sup>41</sup>

Therefore, it is quite possible that Tzetzes found in his sources both versions of the legend (the spontaneous release of Aeneas by the Achaeans as well as his enslavement) equally attributed to the *Ilias parua*. It is also plausible, however, that Tzetzes attributes only the latter version to that poem, and does not know (or does not want to say) where the former comes from. In any case, the technique of the quotation shows that both legends date back to the same period and cultural context, if not the same poem. Indeed, the stories are closely juxtaposed to each other and nearly merged by Tzetzes: he does not usually work this way on heterogeneous material.<sup>42</sup>

Thus, it is almost certain that both versions date back to the epic cycle or, to be precise, to the conspicuous and confused mass of legends and poetic production that had been initially handed down orally, and then (from the late eighth century to the beginning of the sixth) was put into writing. This cultural

---

and *Poetarum epicorum* 84–85 (with the clear distinction: “alterius Iliadis paruae uel aliarum Iliadum paruuarum fragmenta”).

<sup>41</sup> Some scholars prefer to speak of oral poets composing in performance over several generations, and not ‘drafts’ of a stratified redaction (implying a written form and the ‘sameness’ of the poem): cf. notably J. S. Burgess, “The Epic Cycle and Fragments,” in J. M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic* (Oxford 2005) 344–352. This seems to me allowable for the Homeric poems (cf. n.26 above), but not for the epic cycle, which did not have in antiquity the same ‘editorial treatment’, as can be inferred by the many inconsistencies and contradictions coexisting in the evidence. For this view, with a striking instance of many-hands work (at least more than one hand) in the written composition of the *Ilias Parua*, see G. Scafoglio, “Two Fragments of the Epic Cycle,” *GRBS* 46 (2006) 5–11.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. F. Budelmann, “Classical Commentary in Byzantium: John Tzetzes on Ancient Greek Literature,” in R. K. Gibson and Chr. Shuttleworth Kraus (eds.), *The Classical Commentary: History, Practices, Theory* (Leiden 2002) 141–169, mainly 153–157. In general, on Tzetzes: K. Wendel, “Tzetzes,” *RE* 7A (1948) 1959–2010 (dated, but still useful).

context, ranging from orality to the (various drafts of the) poems of the epic cycle, through a long phase of aurality, is also the background of the Homeric epics.<sup>43</sup>

In this perspective, it is not surprising to find in the *Iliad* that isolated and inconsistent hint to Aeneas' resentment against Priam (13.458–461): it may come from the legend of Aeneas' betrayal and may have penetrated into the poem as an afterthought. This confirms the ancient origin of that story, which later fell into the shadows and was revived only in some isolated instances in Greek and Roman literature, to reemerge in Late Antiquity.<sup>44</sup>

*November, 2012*

Seconda Università di Napoli  
scafogli@unina.it

<sup>43</sup> Cf. West, *The Rise* 151–172; Burgess, *The Tradition* 132–171 and passim; Scafoglio, *RevPhil* 78 (2004) 290–296.

<sup>44</sup> I am sincerely grateful to Prof. Kent Rigsby and the anonymous referees of *GRBS* for their helpful suggestions.