CONTENTS

Introduction

THE GREAT ITALIAN WRITER and storyteller Italo Calvino once explained: "A classic is a book that has never finished saying what it has to say."[1] If that is true of any book, I believe it is true of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and of Vergil's *Aeneid*. By the same token, conversations among such books are never really finished, either. I am sure most critics and readers have always realized this, even if we sometimes write as if it were possible to sum up such a conversation once and for all. The urge is strong to feel that we have come to terms at last with the stories that matter to us, that we can make sense of the conversations taking place between them, and that we ourselves have something to contribute to the continuing discussions about them. Many of us also feel an urge to make decisions about the issues involved and to persuade others that our decisions are the right ones. Those efforts, no matter how successful, inevitably remain so for only a short time as measured against the lifespans of the works to which they pay tribute. If we are very fortunate, our contributions may add to the general appreciation of those works—not merely in the sense of what everyone knows or agrees to be true about them, but also of what it is possible to say about them, about the depth, magnitude, and seriousness of the conversations that they inspire. If we take issue with the opinions of our predecessors or our contemporaries, that is not in the least to disparage their contributions. It is to celebrate the nature of a true dialogue that aims to increase understanding. For there to be such a thing, we must disagree with one another. If we did not, then all the conversations that mean anything really would come to an end.

Why Juno?

I will have more to say about dialogue, but before I do, I think I should say something about my title. This is not a book about Juno in the *Aeneid,* or not exactly. It is not like Antonie Wlosok's important study of Venus in the *Aeneid*,

1. Calvino 1981/1986, 128.

or like John Miller's panoptic survey of Apollo in Augustan poetry, or Julia Dyson Hejduk's about Jupiter.[2] Like most studies of this divinity since Denis Feeney's landmark discussion of gods in epic poetry, it addresses the relationship of Juno in literature to the Juno of history and of cult, but only occasionally and, for the most part, generally.[3] Similarly, it conjures with the allegorical Juno of Michael Murrin and Philip Hardie, but it does not consistently put physical allegory at center stage.[4] Above all, it regards Juno as a character in this poem and in relation to characters in other poems who in some sense share her identity. These aspects are hardly unfamiliar, and I do not claim to reveal very much that is new about Hera or Juno in earlier literature or about relationships among her various avatars. I do believe that my approach to Juno is of some value if only because it is a bit unusual—even though, like most of what I have to say, it is not altogether unprecedented.

The main point is that I explore Juno's familiar role as an oppositional and a transgressive character, and do so to a deliberately exaggerated degree. By "exaggerated" I do not mean that I am overstating this aspect of her role. I mean that I put much more emphasis on it than is usually done because I want to do justice to the poem's own extreme emphasis on Juno's opposition. So extreme is this emphasis that, no matter how vigorously I pursue it, I find that I risk understating its importance. Consider: The first thing that Juno does upon entering the *Aeneid* is to declare her unhappiness with the fact that the Trojan War did not finish off all of the Trojans to the very last one, and she then takes immediate steps to make that happen. She thus reveals herself to be the divine antagonist of this poem's hero. This is a conventional role in epic poetry and one that Juno is extraordinarily well qualified to play. Her previous appearances as Hera in Greek literature, her cultic identity as Tanit in the Punic religion, and her own historical role in supporting the opponents of Roman expansion through the 2nd century BCE, all combine to make Juno not just well qualified, but overqualified for the role of Aeneas' divine antagonist. Her suitability, we might say, is overdetermined. As will happen in cases of overdetermination, an abundance of factors may contribute to one result while not agreeing with one another in important respects.

It is pedantic to point this out, but necessary, because it is no trivial matter that aspects of Juno's role as Aeneas' divine antagonist do not comport with other elements of the poem's design. For instance, and very simply, it has been common since antiquity to consider the first six books of the *Aeneid* as a kind

2. Wlosok 1967; Miller 2009; Hejduk 2020.

3. Feeney 1991.

4. Murrin 1980; P. R. Hardie 1986.

of Odyssey. If it is one, then it is ironic that Juno, not Neptune, tries to destroy Aeneas in a storm at sea, as the Homeric Poseidon tries to destroy Odysseus. It is a further irony when Neptune saves the hero from this same storm. One need not make much of these ironies, but on the other hand, if one pays some attention to them, they quickly prove impossible to ignore. Another elementary point is that is that the *Aeneid* is indebted not only to Homer but also to other models. Very prominent among them is the *Argonautica* by Apollonius of Rhodes. This much has been known since antiquity, but demonstration that Apollonian influence is as pervasive as that of Homer, and similar in general character, is a fairly recent achievement, and one with which critics have still not fully come to terms.[5] For instance, Hera, Juno's Greek counterpart, is a more important character in the *Argonautica* than in any other poem that survives from antiquity—with the possible exception of the *Aeneid*. Unlike the Vergilian Juno, however, the Apollonian Hera is not the hero's divine antagonist, but his principal patron. Not only that, but Zeus plays such a minor role in the *Argonautica* that the reader might well regard Hera and not him as the most important deity in that poetic universe.[6] Again, it is possible to treat these antecedents in a way that does not disturb one's sense of Juno's conventional role in the *Aeneid*. That involves treating them in the way that critics used to treat similes in epic poetry, not as overqualified or overdetermined but as overadequate to their specific purpose. One approach to this overadequacy is to say that the reader merely has to identify a "third point of comparison" between the tenor and the vehicle of the simile. One might then enjoy other details from an aesthetic point of view, but in cognitive terms one could disregard them as excess.[7] It is perfectly possible to treat Juno in that same way. Her role in the *Aeneid* is extremely simple: to the point of obsession, she just wants to destroy Aeneas, excluding all other considerations. On the other hand, because this obsessive simplicity arises from a multiplication of overdetermining factors, including those I have just named and many others, Juno's oppositional role takes on a degree of complexity beyond what is found in any of her previous literary, cultic, and historical appearances. This complexity, in my view, is in very large measure what makes the *Aeneid* the poem that it is.

5. I refer to Nelis 2001, which I discuss immediately below and in the section of chapter 2 entitled "A Second Argo: the *Aeneid* and Apollonius."

6. Feeney 1991, 62–69, 81–95; Hunter 1993, 78–80, 87–88, 96–100.

7. The ancient critic Servius in his *Commentary on Vergil's Aeneid* 1.497 states the principle that one cannot expect all aspects of the vehicle to be appropriate to the tenor of any simile. The interpretation of "multiple correspondence similes" was put on a new footing by D. A. West 1969. For the particular simile that attracted Servius' comment see chapter 1 note 192.

I should also be clear that although Juno gives me a useful way into these issues, my interest is less in her than in the *Aeneid* itself; it is less in the maker than in the poem that she makes. With this I come to my subtitle, of which there are actually two. For most of the time I was writing this book it had the working title "Juno's *Aeneid*: Narrative, Metapoetics, Dissent."[8] As you know, the subtitle is now "A Battle for Heroic Identity." Both subtitles mean the same thing to me, but the more important question is what they mean to you; so let me next try to help you with that.

Form, Content, Context

My working methods are grounded in literary formalism. I do not insist that this is the best or only way to study literature, and I have learned a lot from those who have actively disparaged formalist criticism. At the same time, I have never been persuaded by most denunciations of formalism as such. The reason is simple. Literature is a form of communication. Writers cannot communicate by telepathy, by direct emotional sympathy, by purely conceptual means. At a minimum, they need things like an alphabet, words, sentences, and some story to tell. These are all formal devices. It is certainly possible to fetishize them as such and to produce quite arid scholarship in the process; but no method in itself can save you from that.

Forms are the means by which writers communicate. Attending to them is a matter of coming to terms not just with the medium of communication but with whatever content may be found within it as well as with the context that surrounds it. It is sometimes hard to tell the difference. Whatever content or context is involved may seem trivial or profound; it may speak to the concerns of our own time or seem totally beside the point. It may speak to you but not to me. With luck, we will both agree—whatever else we may think—that it offers us a way into a discussion that is worth our time.

My choice to focus on "narrative" and "metapoetics" in the original subtitle arose directly from this perspective. Very simply put, the idea behind this book is that the central issues that animate the *Aeneid* are intimately linked to the form of the story that it tells. In Homeric terms, that story is complex. It involves two very different poems that offer different possibilities, specifically in the realm of ethics. In the *Aeneid*, these different possibilities are promoted and contested by forces within the poem that behave as if they were autonomous and could hope to bend the plot in one direction or another, possibly even substituting one plot for another. The different forces stand to some

8. Or a variation thereof.

degree outside the plot, but not entirely; they are also functions of it. Specifically, the ones I have in mind are constitutive elements of the epic genre, either indispensable (the epic narrator) or very common (the hero's divine antagonist, whom I have already mentioned). The difference between their respective intentions accounts for the third part of the older subtitle.

In the situation I envision, one of these characters, who is by definition supposed to tell the story, tries to do so but is immediately challenged by another character, Juno, whose role is supposed to be confined within that story; but she does not accept her confinement, expressing her disapproval of the story she believes that narrator has set out to tell. So, transgressive figure that she is, Juno steps across whatever boundary separates characters inside the plot from the narrator who stands outside it. She tries to take control of the poem and make it tell a different story from the one she thinks the narrator wants to tell. Because there is, or it seems there ought to be, some sort of hierarchy by which the narrator is superior to any other character, at least in terms of controlling the plot, I understand Juno to be in dissent with regard to this dispensation. There is more to say about all of this, and I will get to it; but I hope it will be useful for me to have said this much at the beginning, and for the reader to know that the book actually took shape under the triple rubric "narrative, metapoetics, dissent."

How the original subtitle morphed into "a battle for heroic identity" is also easily explained. I have mentioned a relationship between different stories and different ethical possibilities, and it was always clear to me that the formal issues involved are inextricably tied to ethics. This is one of a few areas in which my argument reacts quite specifically to earlier scholarship. Francis Cairns was the first to consider the *Aeneid* in the light of ancient "kingship theory," a branch of ethical philosophy concerned with paradigms of leadership and citizenship, not just in monarchies but in all constitutional forms.[9] This diverse tradition includes a number of works entitled "On Kingship" or something similar, whether they were given that title by their authors or acquired it as a subtitle or second title in virtue of their perceived relevance to the subject.[10] The heroes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* loom large in this tradition, and none larger than Achilles and Odysseus themselves.[11] At the turn of the 5th to the 4th century BCE the versatile Odysseus became the preferred paradigm of the "good king" while the intransigent Achilles came to be seen mainly as typifying behaviors to avoid. This preference endured well into the imperial period,

9. Cairns 1989, 1–84.

10. Murray 2008, 14–15.

11. Montiglio 2011; see also Richardson 1975 and 1992.

and it is outstandingly exemplified by works emblematic of the Second Sophistic.[12] There is no doubt, however, as Silvia Montiglio has made clear, that it was already the dominant attitude towards Achilles and Odysseus among ethical philosophers during the late Classical and Hellenistic periods of Greek culture, and its impact was felt in Rome well before the *Aeneid* began to be written.[13] In retrospect, the only surprise is that no one thought to interpret the *Aeneid* in light of this tradition before Cairns did so.

A possible explanation is that pejorative representations of Odysseus in Greek tragedy and other "elevated" genres are more familiar to literary scholars than are the philosophical sources of kingship theory.[14] Another is that an essay by the Epicurean philosopher Philodemus of Gadara entitled "On the Good King according to Homer," although it was first published in 1844, was not well understood or even widely read before the mid-1960s.[15] Even then it did not begin to have much impact on students of Latin poetry before the discovery of a treatise by the same author on another ethical subject that is addressed to Vergil and other members of his literary sodality.[16] Cairns, whose book was published the same year as that discovery, was ahead of the curve in grasping that Philodemus' ideas on Homer as a school of ethical heroism must have been familiar to the author of the *Aeneid*.

That said, there is no reason to believe it was through Philodemus alone that Roman intellectuals became acquainted with this branch of ethical philosophy for the first time. "On the Good King" is an elegant tribute to Philodemus' patron, Lucius Calpurnius Piso, probably on the occasion of his assuming some important position in the Roman governmental apparatus, and it would no doubt have made enjoyable and edifying reading for many others. It is very unlikely, however, that it was a revelation to anyone, and very much more likely that it was received as an intriguing effort to reconcile Epicurean ethics with traditional Roman attitudes of service and political engagement, rather than as an introduction to Homeric kingship theory in general.

12. Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse* 52, "On Homer" in Crosby 1946, 355–70; "Plutarch," *On the Life and Poetry of Homer* 2.4 ("It is clear from this that in the *Iliad* he is presenting physical prowess, in the *Odyssey* the nobility of the soul"); cf. 2.141–42 in Keaney and Lamberton 1997, 68–69 and 222–25.

13. Rawson 1985, 59, 95, 101; Perutelli 2006, 17–29.

14. Stanford 1954, 102–17.

15. Murray 1965 marked a great turning point; see also the edition of Dorandi 1982 with Murray 1984 and Fowler 1986. A new edition by Jeffrey Fish is awaited; see Fish 2002, 187.

16. Gigante and Capasso 1989; Gigante 2001/2004.

What is clear is that virtually this entire tradition regarded Odysseus as the more admirable and useful of Homer's ethical paradigms.[17] It is therefore not surprising that Cairns interprets the *Aeneid* as promoting an Odyssean model of ethical heroism. Like many others, he starts from the premise that the poem is informed by a strong panegyrical impulse. If such a poem were to propose Achilles as a model of good kingship, it would be swimming against a very strong philosophical tide. As the reader will find, I agree with Cairns and others that the reception of Hellenistic kingship theory looms large on the horizon of expectations that ancient readers will have brought to the *Aeneid*. On the other hand, I do not share the assumption that such factors actually determine what it is possible for the poem to mean; at least, not in any simple way. That is to say, I am more willing than I believe Cairns is to allow that the *Aeneid* might offer an unorthodox or contrarian answer to any given question.

To come back to forms, I am also intrigued by an argument that Cairns offers in support of his argument about kingship—namely, that the Homeric program of the *Aeneid* does not treat the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* even-handedly, but takes the latter poem as its primary model and the former as a distinctly secondary influence. One easily sees how this serves Cairns' argument that Aeneas is to be understood as a "good king" of the Odyssean type, and not as a negative exemplum, like Achilles. But what is it that justifies treating the poem as primarily an Odyssey, and only secondarily as an Iliad? For Cairns there are two main aspects. I defer one of these for the moment to focus on the primary one, which will serve to introduce a brief survey of relevant critical opinion.[18]

Homer's *Aeneid*

The protagonists of my survey, in addition to Cairns, will be G. N. Knauer, Alessandro Barchiesi, Edan Dekel, and Damien Nelis.[19] I discuss their contributions in chronological order except for that of Nelis, which focuses not on

17. Asmis 1991, 39; 1995, 31; Montiglio 2011, passim. Aristotle may be the major exception: see Richardson 1992, 36–40, who also contrasts Aristotle's general approach to Homer with that of critics interested mainly in ethics.

18. In the next section I attempt to account, as briefly as possible, for only the most essential background of my approach to the Homeric *Aeneid*. For the larger context, I refer anyone who may be interested to Farrell 1991, 3–25; 1997; 2005; and 2019.

19. David Quint's contributions, Quint 1993 and 2018, would make him another convincing protagonist, not only as an exemplary exponent of formalist criticism in the service of important ideas—his more recent reading of the *Aenied* being based on the rhetorical figure of

Homer but Apollonius. That said, it is no less important than any of the others for understanding the Homeric *Aeneid*, as we shall see.

The Systematic Intertext

The germ of the idea that the *Aeneid* is more an Odyssey than an Iliad can be traced back to Knauer's 1964 study *Die Aeneis und Homer*, which is still a standard point of reference and seems likely to remain so.[20] This is true even for those who do not agree with any of Knauer's basic assumptions or conclusions. That is because fully one-third of his book, by page count, is comprised of lists documenting practically all of the passages in the *Aeneid* that had been identified as parallel to one or more passages of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, or both, in Knauer's investigation of about seventy-five commentaries and special studies written or published between about 400 and 1962 CE. Of these Knauer collated the twenty-five or so that seemed to him the most informative. These lists are so useful that the book remains a fixture in bibliographies and is widely used, as I say, even by those who profess strong disagreement with almost every other aspect of it. Indeed, I suspect that dissenters are in the majority of those who profit from it in this way.

Let me add that I write these words as someone who was Nico Knauer's departmental colleague from 1984 until his retirement in 1988 and remained his friend until his death in 2018. We did not agree about everything, by any means. I suspect that it was easier for him than it might once have been to befriend a younger colleague who did not share all of his ideas about the *Aeneid*, to name only that, after he moved from Berlin to Philadelphia and had become somewhat acclimated to American academic culture. This was also after his research had largely left classical literature behind to focus on its

---

chiasmus—but also for his pithy observations on the importance of the modern reader's political position and on the recent history of *Aeneid* criticism: see Quint 2018, x–xi and compare the section of this introduction entitled "Modern Perspectives." Because Quint does not fashion himself as an interlocutor in the specific discussion that concerns me here, and also because his own approach to the Homeric problem of the *Aeneid* is altogether so distinctive, it seemed best not to try to describe his position vis-à-vis the others—a project that would be well worth the effort, but would also require a good deal of space—but instead simply to cite his work at opportune moments in the course of my argument.

20. Knauer 1964, 329 remarks that Abrahamson 1963, a posthumous publication that appeared after Knauer had submitted an earlier version of *Die Aeneis und Homer* as his Habilitationsschrift in 1961 (see his foreword), was the only other scholar to that date who had recognized the *Odyssey* as the structural model of the *Aeneid* as a whole.

reception during the early modern period.[21] We did, however, strongly agree about one thing in particular, which is that Vergilian intertextuality (as I call it; I don't believe that Nico ever used that word) is very profitably considered not as an occasional phenomenon, but one with pervasive, systematic, even totalizing tendencies. He is certainly not the first to have had such an idea. The late-antique grammarian and commentator Servius hints at it when he notes that the *Aeneid* consists of Odyssean and Iliadic halves in that order.[22] Elsewhere Servius endorses an even more ancient opinion that describes the poem as "a varied and complex theme; the equivalent, as it were, of both Homeric poems."[23] So the idea of the *Aeneid* as a totalizing imitation of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* has deep roots. It was always very obvious as well that books 1–6 do not contain the entire *Odyssey* in any literal sense any more than 7–12 contain the whole *Iliad*. Scholars have also long been aware that each half of the poem includes material borrowed from other poems, including the "wrong" Homeric model.[24] A systematic understanding of the entire Homeric program, however, was something new. It was because of Knauer's work that I began to look at Vergil's poetry in this way; and the book you are reading now, even without the additional impetus of Cairns' ideas about kingship theory, might have been much the same, simply as a reaction to Knauer's work and subsequent responses to it.

Knauer approaches his study of this seemingly intractable topic with a disarming simplicity. In an English summary of the book, which he published simultaneously with it, he writes: "If, without requiring the reasons, we assume

21. The interest was already evident in Knauer 1964, 31–106, especially 62–106 on the rediscovery of Homer through commentary on the *Aeneid* during the Renaissance (briefly summarized in Knauer 1964a, 61–64). By the time he arrived at Penn he had begun research for the article on Homer for the *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, a massive undertaking left unfinished, but far advanced at the time of his death. Publication is not imminent, but is anticipated.

22. Servius, *Commentary on Vergil's Aeneid* 1.1; I discuss this passage more fully in the section of chapter 1 entitled "In Medias Res."

23. *argumentum varium ac multiplex et quasi amborum Homeri carminum instar*: I quote David Wilson-Okamura's translation of a passage in Servius' preface to his *Commentary on Vergil's Aeneid*. This preface derives, via the biography of Vergil ascribed to Servius' teacher, Aelius Donatus, from Suetonius Tranquillus, the influential scholar who served as secretary to the emperors Trajan and Hadrian; see Ziolkowski and Putnam 2008, 191.

24. Servius considers *Aeneid* 4 to be an imitation of Apollonius, *Argonautica* 3 and *Aeneid* 5 an imitation of *Iliad* 23. Neither Servius nor anyone else to my knowledge comments on the presence of Odyssean elements in books 7–12 before the 17th-century commentator Juan Luis de la Cerda, whose perspective I discuss in the section of chapter 1 entitled "In Medias Res."

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."[25] As someone who lived through years of debate as to whether and how one ought to use words like "imitation," "allusion," "reference," and "intertextuality," I am stunned when I reflect on the untroubled directness of this statement. So much have critical perspectives changed that it now seems almost unbelievably naïve; and yet it does take Knauer right into the heart of his problem and lead to immediate results. As his initial focus on the seemingly mechanical, and in a sense trivial problem of shortening seems to suggest, Knauer eventually has to admit that the *Aeneid* does not literally contain the whole *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The reason, however, is not simply that there was no room. He is very effective in showing how instances of the most common features of archaic epic—formulaic language, typical scenes, and the like—could be combined. There was no need for the *Aeneid* to incorporate multiple episodes of arrival, feasting, or arming for battle: combining many Homeric instances into one or a few would both suffice and, not incidentally, comport well with the classicizing aesthetic of the *Aeneid*.[26] However, the truth is—and Knauer is frank about this—that some elements of the Homeric poems simply "defied transformation."[27] Precisely why they did so is not in fact clear, and the idea that they did so becomes all the more remarkable when one considers that this statement applies to the last nine books of the *Odyssey* (16–24)—which is to say, nearly a quarter of the poem—in their entirety.

In spite of this, there is little doubt that Knauer understands the *Aeneid* as incorporating or transforming virtually or essentially the entire *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Here is how, after about twelve pages of detailed discussion, he summarizes his findings:

> 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

25. Knauer 1964a.

26. Shortening and condensation are not the unbending rule, however. Knauer 1964, 227 note 1 records the observation of Ernst Zinn, Knauer's thesis advisor, that *Aeneid* 1–6 contains exactly one invocation of the Muse, at the beginning of the poem (1.8), just like the entire *Odyssey* (1.1), while *Aeneid* 7–12 contains five, the same number as in the *Iliad.* See also the index entry under "Vergils Homerumformung: Längungen homer. Abschnitte" (Knauer 1964, 542).

27. Knauer 1964a, 77.

> 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.

Then Knauer immediately opens a new paragraph.

> The complete structure of the Homeric epics, not simply occasional quotations, was no doubt the basis for Vergil's poem.[28]

If I may rephrase this: Knauer sees the *Aeneid* as a thoroughgoing combination of the entire *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, from a structural point of view, but one that leaves out the events that set in motion the plot of the former (the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1) and conclude that of the latter (the punishment of the suitors and the reunion of Odysseus and Penelope in *Odyssey* 16–24). How can both of these statements be true?

There is a great deal that could be said in answer to this question, but I will be brief. First, it is obvious that Knauer did in fact consider the *Aeneid* successful in combining the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in their entirety, no matter how much of either it actually left out. Second, and no less remarkably, he believed that the two poems tell essentially the same story, one of heroic deeds undertaken to recover a woman who had been stolen or was under threat of being stolen. Third, there is a certain asymmetry in the Homeric program of the *Aeneid* as Knauer sees it. He insists, and correctly so, that *Aeneid* 1 does not begin with *Odyssey* 1 but with *Odyssey* 5, when the hero is on his way home to Ithaca but is diverted to Scheria, the land of the Phaeacians—just as the *Aeneid* begins with the hero on his way "home" to Italy but diverted to Carthage. The story that Aeneas tells his hosts in books 2–3 about his prior adventures resembles the story that Odysseus tells his own hosts in *Odyssey* 9–12. Some of Odysseus' tales inspire episodes in the *Aeneid* that are not part of Aeneas' own narrative, but are part of the main narrative. For instance, Odysseus' journey to the land of the dead in book 11 (the "Nekyia"), about which he himself tells the Phaeacians, becomes Aeneas' journey to the underworld in book 6, which is told by the epic narrator. The first half of the *Aeneid* is thus not a complete Odyssey, but it is convincing as a reworking of the "Phaeacis" (*Odyssey* 5–12). This means that even if the *Aeneid* does not start at the beginning of the *Odyssey*, by the end of its first half it has just about "caught up" with its model. Then, although the poem signals with some fanfare what seem to be Iliadic intentions for its second half, it does not suddenly embark on this project, but instead continues on an Odyssean trajectory for two additional books. Aeneas' arrival in Latium in book 7 and his embassy in book 8 to Pallanteum, a Greek city

28. Knauer 1964a, 81.

built on the site of what would be Rome, correspond to Odysseus' arrival on Ithaca and his cautious approach to his own property in *Odyssey* 13–15. With only four books to go, the *Aeneid* is looking like it might be a kind of Odyssey almost from start to finish.[29]

At the same time, however, the catalogue of Italian forces that concludes *Aeneid* 7 corresponds to the catalogue of Greek and Trojan forces that concludes *Iliad* 2.[30] Each catalogue precedes the onset of active combat in its respective poem. Further, in *Aeneid* 8 and 9, the hero is absent while his people are under attack, a situation that corresponds to *Iliad* 3–19, when Achilles stays in his tent while the Greeks are (for the most part) being drubbed by the Trojans. In *Aeneid* 8 and *Iliad* 18 Aeneas and Achilles both receive from their mothers a gift of divine armor, and in books 10 and 20 they both return to battle wearing it and are victorious. Eventually, each slays the greatest hero of the opposing side, Turnus in *Aeneid* 12 and Hector in *Iliad* 22. Knauer thus finds *almost* a complete Iliad within *Aeneid* 7–12, most of it in the last four books. Crucially, however, he also finds that this Iliad is congruent with the second half of the *Odyssey*—that is, with Odysseus' struggle to re-establish himself in Ithaca and overcome Penelope's suitors. On this basis, he infers that in the last books of the *Aeneid* an Iliadic story consisting of Iliadic material *takes the place of* homologous Odyssean elements, but within an Odyssean structure that informs the entire *Aeneid*.

It is obviously possible to take issue with this conception of the Homeric *Aeneid* in whole or in part, but that is in some sense beside the point. What I would like to emphasize is that Knauer presents this conception in quite definite terms, and that he offers it not as his own interpretation of Vergil but as reflecting Vergil's own interpretation of Homer. That is fair enough, of course, but it is worth noting that he regards Vergil's interpretation as quite fixed and definite, not unlike Knauer's own. Looking back on this situation from the perspective of more than fifty years, one can see how it could be done differently. The rigid account that Knauer gives is self-contradictory (a totalizing imitation that leaves out crucial elements of both Homeric poems) in ways that might now seem not merely to undermine his

29. See Knauer 1964, 265, 328–29, 343 and Knauer 1964a, 65, 68–73, 76–77.

30. Strictly speaking, the Italian catalogue corresponds to the catalogue of Greek ships, which ends at *Iliad* 2.760 and is followed by the additional 117 lines cataloguing the Trojans and their allies, which conclude book 2. Homer's Trojan catalogue is "transferred" to the catalogue of Aeneas' Etruscan allies in book 10, which also draws on the brief catalogue of Myrmidons at *Iliad* 16.168–97: see Harrison 1991, 106–11, especially 107, on *Aeneid* 10.163–214; Knauer 1964, 297. This is a clear example of how Aeneas' war with Turnus is an intertextual battle for Greek identity, as I discuss in the section of chapter 3 entitled "Becoming Achilles."

conclusions, but rather to open them up to further exploration. One of these might be to imagine the Homeric program of the *Aeneid* not as a fixed structure with a definite meaning, but as something more flexible and provisional. That critical turn has in fact occurred; but before I get to it, let me return for a moment to Cairns.

The early reception of Knauer's work tended to emphasize its rigidity, sometimes approvingly, but not always. Most of those who disapproved did not go on to show how the whole system might be opened up but instead were skeptical of taking such an ambitiously systematic approach in the first place.[31] The bipartite model had survived since antiquity; it obviously wasn't true in every detail, but perhaps that just proved that one should not expect algebraic exactitude from poetry. Some did strongly approve, however.[32] Cairns, who was one of them, took the idea of "The *Aeneid* as Odyssey," the title of chapter 8 of his 1989 book, much, much farther. Although Knauer believed that the *Odyssey* provided the actual scaffolding that supported the entire Homeric *Aeneid*, it was clearly important to him conceptually that the *Aeneid* be, to recall the ancient phrase, "the equivalent, as it were, of both Homeric poems."[33] That is not how Cairns describes it. Building on Knauer's perception of continued Odyssean structural relevance in *Aeneid* 7–12, Cairns argues that the poem is an Odyssey from start to finish and not an organic Iliad, at all. Here is how he puts it:

> The *Odyssey* retains the structural and thematic importance that it had in Books 1–6 well into, and indeed throughout, the "iliadic" Books 7–12, while iliadic or quasi-iliadic episodes surface also in the "odyssean" *Aeneid* 1–6. This makes the *Aeneid*, not a bipartite work divided by subject matter (i.e. voyages or battles), but a unitary *Odyssey* with significant iliadic episodes.[34]

That is really a quite different way of putting it. Nor is that everything. Having conceded the existence of "significant iliadic episodes" throughout *Aeneid,* including books 1–6, Cairns goes on to devote an entire chapter to "The Memorial Games of Anchises" in *Aeneid* 5. Servius begins his commentary on book 5 by stating, "everything the poet mentions here is on display around the tomb of Patroclus [in *Iliad* 23], except there is a chariot race there and a boat race

31. See Buchheit 1967 and 1970; Pöschl 1967, 17–19; Wigodsky 1972, 8–12.

32. See, for example, Clarke 1965; C. Hardie 1967; Williams 1967; Wlosok 1973, 130, 139–40.

33. Again I quote David Wilson-Okamura's translation of the preface to Servius' commentary (see note 23 above).

34. Cairns 1989, 178

here."[35] About a century ago Richard Heinze built his masterly analysis of the episode on this assumption. At the same time, Heinze acknowledges, with many others, that Iliadic games are "out of place" in the "Odyssean *Aeneid*."[36] This is an obvious point, which Knauer explains by arguing that the episode was "transferred" from the end of the *Aeneid*, where (he says) it would have been inappropriate, to a location approximating that of some games that take place among the Phaeacians in *Odyssey* 8.[37] There is nothing in this that is the least objectionable or out of line with Knauer's usual methods.[38] Cairns, however, goes much farther by insisting that the Odyssean games are actually the more important model in every respect.[39] One would have thought, after reading the passage of Servius quoted above, that the "Games" of *Aeneid* 5 are a significant Iliadic episode if anything is; but after reading Cairns' chapter on them, one would have been told that they are hardly Iliadic at all.

In case it isn't obvious, I am not really persuaded by this argument. That said, I take Cairns' characterization of the *Odyssey* as dominant in the Homeric program of the *Aeneid* as an important and welcome provocation. I have spoken already of things that are overqualified, overadequate, and overdetermined; now I come to the most important over-compound of all, which is "overreading." One of the things I admire about Cairns is his overreading of both Knauer and the *Aeneid*. Knauer's perspective on the *Aeneid* is rigid, but it contains, if only in spite of itself, the germ of a more dynamic approach. He sees Aeneas as reliving the combined experiences of the angriest, most violent, and most stubborn hero who fought at Troy and also of the wiliest, most

35. The two races are the first and, in terms of narration, the longest events in their respective poems. Comparative analysis of the two "Games" episodes, in whole or in part, is a frequent scholarly exercise: see for instance Heinze 1917/1993, 121–41; Otis 1964, 41–62; Willcock 1988. Nelis 2001, 1–21 considers the "Games" of the *Aeneid* in the light of a wider array of models; Lovatt 2005 considers the tradition of epic games episodes from the perspective of Statius, one of Vergil's most important "epic successors" in the phrase coined by P. R. Hardie 1993.

36. Heinze 1917/1993, 121–41.

37. Knauer 1964, 156; 1964a, 65, 72 note 2, 73–74.

38. For a discussion of an important instance, and in my view a programmatic one, see the section of chapter 1 below entitled "Aeolus." Knauer also sees Andromache's mournful greeting of Aeneas in book 3 as "transferred" to the hero's quasi-Odyssean narrative of his "Wanderings" from Andromache's own lamentation for Hector in *Iliad* 22 (Knauer 1964, 276 note 2; 336). Similarly, the heroic funeral given Misenus in *Aeneid* 6 parallels Elpenor's burial in *Odyssey* 11, but it more closely resembles Patroclus' funeral in *Iliad* 23 (Knauer 1964, 136, 220). In general, see Knauer 1964, 330 and 332–45, especially 333–36..

39. Cairns 1989, 215–48.

circumspect, and most versatile. Cairns, instead of seeing the *Aeneid* as drawing more or less equally on two Homeric models, sees one as clearly dominant, and really does not discuss the importance of the other except to downplay or even deny it. Moreover, in contrast to Knauer, he recognizes and even stresses that the two Homeric poems, and especially their heroes, are quite different, specifically in ethical terms, making it clear that he regards Aeneas as an Odyssean "good king." This is, to repeat, not only a quite rigid interpretive structure, but one that moves to shut down any dynamic element that may be have been lying dormant in Knauer's approach. But an important reaction to the rigidity of Knauer's systematic approach, couched explicitly in terms of dynamism, was already in motion.

The Dynamic Intertext

A topic that Cairns treats in a rather gingerly way is the idea that the *Iliad* has often been considered the earlier and the greater of Homer's epic masterpieces. It is an idea that could be found already in ancient commentaries on Homer, as Cairns observes, supporting the observation with a long footnote.[40] Among the modern scholars who discuss this subject Cairns cites Alessandro Barchiesi, whose remarkable monograph *La traccia del modello* appeared five years before Cairns' book on the *Aeneid*. I believe this is Cairns' only citation of *La traccia*, and it is a tribute to his eye for detail and his scholarship; for Barchiesi's main subject is not the Odyssean *Aeneid* at all. Rather, he traces the reception in the most Iliadic portion of the *Aeneid*, and especially, in *Aeneid* 10 and 12, of the Homeric "Patrocleia"—the sequence of the *Iliad* that begins when Achilles' friend Patroclus goes into battle in Achilles' place and is killed by Hector, and ends when Achilles slays Hector in revenge.

Even after more than a quarter-century, and without considering that it was his first book, Barchiesi's project remains amazingly rich and rewarding, full of implications that go well beyond the relationship between these particular texts, and it has been widely influential in at least two ways. To suggest how this is so, perhaps I will be forgiven if I invoke Barchiesi's own famous distinction between Homer as the "genre model" (*modello genere*) and the "example model" (*modello esemplare*) of the *Aeneid*. Under the former aspect, Homer is the master text that showed not only Vergil but all Greek and Latin writers what epic poetry is, as he has continued to show writers and critics ever since. Under the latter aspect, Homer is the author of a particular text or segment of text, or of some treatment of a theme, motif, or idea to which a specific passage

40. Cairns 1989, 180 note 15.

of the *Aeneid*, or more than one, may respond. The response can take many forms, whether by repeating the original as precisely as possible, contradicting it, or even omitting it, but most often, on Barchiesi's reading, by modifying or re-imagining it. Such transformations frequently take place under the influence of Homer's reception by readers and critics during the eight centuries or so that separate the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* from the *Aeneid*. One could say that many of Barchiesi's contemporaries and a generation of younger scholars have looked to his work as a kind of genre model of how to study Latin poetry, especially epic and closely related genres, but certainly not the *Aeneid* alone. Here I am especially interested in Barchiesi's intervention as an example model, and will focus mainly on his specific contribution to the Homeric problem of the *Aeneid*. In that regard, it is worth quoting the opening sentence of his book:

> Twenty years have passed since Knauer published his comprehensive collection of comparisons between the *Aeneid* and Homer: one glimpses in this monumental work the closure—and the definitive balance sheet—of a scholarly activity stretching from ancient inquiries into *furta Vergili* [the poet's "thefts," especially from Homer] right down to the great commentaries of the modern period. But one can also see in this inventory of comparative materials an opening for new research. Space remains, I think, for one who wants to investigate the functions the Homeric model assumes in the composition of the Vergilian text.[41]

It is clear that the young Barchiesi fully grasped Knauer's desire to continue to the fullest extent possible the work of predecessors, even to the inclusion of the competing and indeed contradictory imperatives that any such project must contain. In some sense, much as Knauer conceived of the *Aeneid* as a faithful translation of the Homeric poems, he conceived of his own project as a faithful representation of that relationship assembled from the many individual discernments of it, more or less accurate and much more limited in scope, that he found in earlier commentators. In contrast, Barchiesi declares that Knauer closed the book on that entire tradition. Further, he hints in his sly reference to ancient collections of *furta*, things in the *Aeneid* that were "stolen" from Homer, how much the motivation of those who took part in this tradition changed over time. What some ancient scholars regarded as culpable thefts, many later ones have praised as one of the highest expressions of Vergil's literary genius. In terms of comparison, as we have seen, Knauer's Vergil regarded the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as telling, in essence, the same story; similar

41. Barchiesi 1984/2015, xv.

elements in the two poems, he wrote, are "not only comparable," but functionally the same. Again in contrast, when Barchiesi speaks of *Die Aeneis und Homer* as an "inventory of comparative materials," he is probably not responding directly to Knauer's phrase, but he might as well be. His language does not suggest that things that can be compared are necessarily similar but that they are interesting precisely in that they are dissimilar. Finally, Barchiesi's focus on "functions" (plural) suggests a dynamism within the Homeric *Aeneid* that is quite alien to Knauer's conception of a poem that "treat[s] the same matter a third time."

For all of these differences (and there are many more), it is odd to say, but there are certain similarities between the methods of both these scholars. I do not say continuities, because they tend to treat similar issues in different ways. For instance, Knauer follows earlier scholars in supposing that Vergil made use of ancient Homeric exegesis to assist his research.[42] Barchiesi goes much farther than anyone before him in using ancient scholarship to establish the horizon of expectations that Vergil and his readers will have brought to their experience of Homer.[43] Notably, he shows that these expectations are, precisely, *not* identical with those that are based solely on a close acquaintance with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* themselves: they involve ideas that had grown up around those texts over centuries of reception history. This is one of the ways in which we may regard Homer's meaning itself as not static but dynamic; and in the collisions of meaning that take place between Homer's text and its interpretation by ancient critics, between Greek cultural realities and those of Roman readers, in the intertextual jostling of one Homeric allusion against another within the *Aeneid*, one gets the impression of something very different from Knauer's fixed intertextuality, a pronounced sense that the relationships involved might be and even must be negotiated in different ways.

That said, I would be misrepresenting Barchiesi's work if I suggested that this openness was limitless. A very important part of the way in which he presents interpretive possibilities is that he shows them to the reader, and then often moves on without endorsing them, or else explicitly retreats from doing so. This is perhaps only to be expected in view of the ethical interests of the book. These are not a central concern, but Barchiesi does examine closely the ethical topic of practicing moderation in success (*servare modum*) as a generally recognizable principle that clashes with the behavior of individual Homeric heroes at particular moments and, in the *Aeneid,* with that of Turnus as

42. Knauer 1964, 56 note 2; 69 note 1; 356 note 1.

43. Barchiesi 1984/2015, 1–34.

he slays Aeneas' young protégé, Pallas, and strips the armor from his body as a prize of war. Again I quote:

> Vergil is therefore able to cite in summary form, through the simple opposition between *res secundae* [success] and *servare modum* [practicing moderation], a universally recognized and accepted cultural model: from this an ongoing commentary is cast that allows the reader to ideologize according to his own value system the poem's "Iliadic" content and participate in foreseeing its developments. Thus commented upon, the action takes on a plausible realism. The narrative produces its own *post hoc ergo propter hoc* by construing itself in reading as a necessary concatenation. But this commentary must remain completely incorporated in the narration if it is not to "kill" (as will happen, for example, in Lucan) the free unfolding of epic events by superimposing itself on them. So the Vergilian text cannot help but permit a host of "voices" to coexist within it (voices linking up in various way[s] with the Homeric texts, of which they represent diverse readings and transformations): it accepts the risk of being multivocal and even exploits, for precise communicative ends, the polyphony of its own cultural codes. Perhaps this was the only way to remake Homer without ignoring the distance that inevitably separated it from the complex, civilized world in which the poet lived. Yet this distance is less insurmountable if, once again, we do not consider the Homeric text as a fixed and immutable object but as a layering of historically diverse readings.[44]

This seems as if it could not be more different from Knauer's conception, in which the Homeric text is indeed a fixed and immutable object, even to the extent of denying any important difference between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* themselves, let alone between those texts as they were understood at different points in their long history of reception. No further comment is required to see how Barchiesi opens up interpretation of the Homeric *Aeneid* to multiple possibilities. And yet, I am not sure in the end precisely how open it remains. A pair of phrases that interest me above are in the description of the Vergilian text: "it *accepts the risk* of being multivocal and even exploits, *for precise communicative ends*, the polyphony of its own cultural codes." What is the nature of this risk, and what are the ends the poem is trying to achieve by taking it? Is the risk simply that of being misunderstood? Multiple voices are often in conflict, as are the welter of voices that modern students of the *Aeneid* have long debated. Ever since Adam Parry first articulated the concept of "two voices," one public and one private, many different readers have attempted to

44. Barchiesi 1984/2015, 31.

adumbrate the poem's precise communicative ends with reference to the matter of voices.[45] On the other hand, the risk could be that readers will fail to grasp a multivocality that evokes conflicting responses as a precise communicative end; but that does not seem to be what Barchiesi means. I am not even sure that the multivocality he has in mind resides properly, as it were, within the *Aeneid* itself. Is it rather something that infiltrates the poem along with Homer and the complex history of Homeric interpretation?

We may find at least one answer to this question in Barchiesi's famous paper on "The Lament of Juturna," originally part of the same thesis that became *La traccia*, which was then published separately and is now "reunited with its siblings," the chapters of the original book, in the 2015 translation. The paper addresses a monologue by Turnus' sister, whom Jupiter has raped and "compensated" by granting her divinity and immortality. The monologue speaks to her grief at the impending death of her beloved brother. I quote once more:

> The motif of unhappy immortality, born on the ground of philosophical criticism of Homer, thus inserts itself, thanks to the narrow gap in the epic narrative made possible by the monologic structure that we have examined, in a text that wants to situate itself as a direct continuation of the Homeric tradition: scholars who study (with good reason) the *Aeneid* as an open work, characterized by ideological tensions, in the context of "the crisis of the ancient world," will find this contradiction significant.

And then:

> The undeniable evocation of tragedy that deeply marks Vergil's work establishes, in scenes such as this one, a style that makes an immediate gesture of pathos; but we must note, at the same time, that this expressive register (the aspect of Vergilian style where we can identify and study philologically credible borrowings from tragedy) exhausts and consumes the impulse towards the tragic. From tragedy Vergil carries over a certain violent immediacy that imposes the ego of the characters as a total perspective on the world. But on these originally irreducible personalities the tragic form knows how to enact a principle of synthetic recomposition: the character "learns" from action, changing and being changed by others. All this does not seem possible in the *Aeneid*. . . . Not that the poem lacks potentially tragic material or the required maturity of a dramatic style: its limitation

45. Parry 1963; followed by Barchiesi's "'host' of voices" (see note 44 above; actually "una serie di 'voci,'"1984, 51); the "further voices" of Lyne 1987; the skeptical "too many voices" of Traina 1990; and, most recently, the "furthest voices" of Schiesaro 2008, on which see chapter 1, "Enigmas of Arrival," with note 141.

> should be located rather in the form of the content, which does not take up the task of recomposing the various worldviews by making them dialectical, but instead brusquely superimposes a dominant perspective—that of Fate.[46]

Here the openness of the *Aeneid*, together with multivocality, looks distinctly illusory and rather like a stratagem. Of course it is more than that, but perhaps some of the risk that Barchiesi has in mind relates to William Empson's throwaway observation, which he attributes to Alexander Pope, that "even the *Aeneid* was a 'political puff'; its dreamy, impersonal, universal melancholy was a calibrated expression of support for Augustus."[47] J. D. Reed in his 2007 book, *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*, cited Empson, but expressed himself with greater nuance when he wrote this:

> Roman origins in the *Aeneid* are an unstable combination of different elements, represented on the narrative level by the contested viewpoints and ambiguity that so often contribute to "Virgilian melancholy." There is certainly enough melancholy in the passages on "ancient cities," but we would do well to remember that the tender feelings of loss that readers often detect in Virgil's account of the cost of Aeneas' mission can be as much an aesthetic channeling of true indignation as they are an acknowledgement of ambivalence about the triumph of Rome.[48]

Ten years later, Reed would complain that different readers reacted to his book as anti-determinist and denying all meaning to Roman identity, on the one hand, but also as upholding the "traditional imperialist" school of interpretation, on the other—with both of these reactions being based on perceptions that Reed is opposed to a notional pessimistic orthodoxy deriving from Parry's "two voices" perspective.[49] Can it be that critics of the *Aeneid*, whether they openly embrace multivocality and polyphony or do not embrace it enough, either way run the same kind of risk as the poem does by permitting so many voices to coexist within it?

46. Barchiesi 1978/2015, 111–12.

47. Empson 1935, 1. If Pope actually left this in writing I have not been able to find where. I am grateful to Christine Perkell for first calling my attention to Empson, however, and for a penetrating discussion of this perspective many years ago at a time when I was just beginning to work towards this project, some five years before she published Perkell 1997 as a response to Barchiesi 1978/2015.

48. Reed 2007, 141, quoting Empson. See also Habinek 1998, 164: "Through its central movement of lamentation, [the *Aeneid*] distances the author and reader from their responsibility in the losses generated by imperialism while foreclosing the possibility of resistance on the part of the defeated."

49. Reed 2017.

Barchiesi gives the reader a glimpse of the poem that the *Aeneid* might have been, one engaged in a dialogue with tragedy that is open, and not one-sided or unbalanced; one in which voices of lamentation represent a perspective that the reader need not reject. I have often felt bemused that no one has done as much to convince me of the poem's essentially tragic nature, only to deny the validity of that response. Or, if not to deny its validity, then to encourage a dialogical response, but one that must finally be recognized, not without regret, as an evanescent possibility, a dream version of a poem that ultimately speaks with a single voice. Must that be the last word?

The Dialogic Intertext

Because *La traccia* is devoted to the Iliadic "Patrocleia," one might have inferred that Barchiesi's focus was at odds with Knauer's thinking about the continuing structural relevance of the *Odyssey* in *Aeneid* 7–12; but that would be mistaken. Barchiesi too accepts the idea of an imbalance in favor of the *Odyssey* within the poem's Homeric program. He writes, "The complex texture of relations that bind the *Aeneid* to the two Homeric poems seems analogous to what binds the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*."[50] This observation, which Barchiesi supports with a page or so of details concerning plot and narration, some of them deriving from ancient scholarship, differs mainly in terms of metaphor from the perspective that Edan Dekel works out in his 2012 book *Virgil's Homeric Lens*. Dekel's central idea is this: "Imitating Homer means first and foremost emulating the Greek poet's own habits. For Virgil, this means first and foremost modeling his intertextual epic on the very first intertextual epic, the *Odyssey*."[51]

In this intriguing conception there are continuities with and departures from the chief insights and contributions of Knauer, Cairns, and Barchiesi. Like Knauer, Dekel regards the second half of the *Odyssey* as congruent in structure and theme with the *Iliad*, but he does not focus, as Knauer does, mainly the mechanical challenge of combining both of the massive Homeric poems. Like Cairns, he sees the *Odyssey* "as a master text for the *Aeneid*," but not merely as the poem's "primary structural or conceptual model."[52] Neither is Dekel concerned to argue that Aeneas is more an Odysseus than a new

50. Barchiesi 1984/2015, 71.

51. Dekel 2015, 19.

52. Dekel 2015, 20, where he notes that Cairns also invokes an optical metaphor to argue for "a possible reading of the *Odyssey* as *imitatio cum variatione* [imitation with variation] of the *Iliad* that would have allowed Virgil to look through the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*" (Cairns 1989, 202).

Achilles, and therefore a "good king."[53] Like Barchiesi, Dekel explores intertextual dynamics and invokes the metaphor of a Homeric "trace" that is, to quote Stephen Hinds' well-known discussion, "also a Homeric 'track' or a 'trail,' which, once encountered in Virgilian territory, has the potential to lead readers in directions determined no less by Homer than by Virgil."[54] As we have seen, the intertextual dynamics that exist between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* lie mostly outside the limits that Barchiesi set himself, but these dynamics are absolutely central to Dekel's project of reading the *Aeneid* as a reading of the *Iliad* through an Odyssean "lens."

Alluding through one poem to another is a very familiar intertextual procedure to which Richard Thomas has given the felicitous name "window reference."[55] Dekel acknowledges the power of this concept but offers a critique of its limitations.[56] His objections mainly involve what he sees as a tendency to regard the "window," the more proximate model through which one alludes to the more distant one, as hermeneutically inert, more or less. He apparently regards most of those who speak of "window reference" as imagining the ideal window as one that is barely there, or at least as one that does not distort, refract, color, or otherwise alter whatever there may be on the other side. There is something to this, although I think most would acknowledge that even a window with no glass in it frames what one sees and alters it in that way, at least. In any case, it is fair to say that the concept of "window reference" has been understood in new ways since Thomas coined the term, including different ways that the metaphor itself has provoked into existence. Dekel's own optical metaphors of "lenses," "mirrors," and so forth are but the latest instance. (Or so I believe, as of this writing; it is sometimes hard to keep up!)

Dekel also mentions Hinds' influential counter-coinage, "two-tier allusion," which I believe was a product of the debate over basic terminology that I mentioned before (reference, allusion, intertext . . .). That is also what Damien Nelis calls it in his 2001 book, *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius.* Dekel mentions Nelis' study in his discussion of "window reference," but he does not devote much attention to it. In a way that is fair enough. Dekel's focus is on Homer and Nelis' is on Apollonius. In fact, though, Nelis' work is essential to understanding the Homeric as well as the Apollonian *Aeneid*, and in ways that speak directly to Dekel's concerns. For instance, when

53. Dekel 2015, 108–9 argues on other grounds that Aeneas in book 3 presents himself as improving upon Odyssean leadership. This position contrasts with my own in a number of ways, as will become evident in the section of chapter 3 entitled "Wanderings."

54. Hinds 1998, 101, citing Fowler 1991a, 90.

55. Thomas 1986, 188–89.

56. Dekel 2015, 20–21.

Dekel refers to Hinds' argument "that it is actually impossible to read two texts against one another without privileging one or the other at any given moment of interpretation," he notes,

> While there is a great deal of truth in this formulation, the situation is a bit more complex when we are dealing with three texts. If the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* are already engaged in an intertextual dialogue, and Virgil composes his *Aeneid* so that it engages that dialogue in yet another dialogue, then we actually have a pair of nested bidirectional relationships. It is possible to read the internal Homeric relationship from the perspective of the *Aeneid,* and the *Aeneid* itself in relation to the Homeric poems.[57]

That is quite correct. And the complexity only increases, I suppose, when four poems are involved. This is the situation that Nelis reckons with. His materials are the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, the *Argonautica*, and the *Aeneid*; and "two-tier allusion" or "window reference" is the essential intertextual trope in his conceptual tool kit. Crucially, on Nelis' reading, the Apollonian window is anything but transparent. It is a veritable multicolor, prismatic composition of complex design worthy of Chartres Cathedral; or so Nelis would have it, because the argument of his book is not that the *Aeneid* alludes through a largely inert *Argonautica* to its real, Homeric model, nor that it "corrects" (*à la* Thomas) Apollonius' treatment of Homer in the process.[58] On the contrary, Nelis argues that Apollonius' program largely *determined* that of the *Aeneid*: that the Homeric program of the *Aeneid* amounts to imitating Apollonius imitating Homer.

Nelis expresses himself very clearly about this key point, but I have to confess that I failed to understand it for some time. To describe my difficulty, let me quote James O'Hara's very perceptive, highly appreciative review of Nelis' book. After stressing that Nelis demonstrates persuasively that the Argonautic program extends throughout the *Aeneid,* just as Knauer had argued about the *Aeneid* and Homer, O'Hara writes:

> Many Virgilians will read this book with the disturbing sense that after having gotten used to the dominance of Homer and the choice contributions of Callimachus and Apollonius, we have to change the way we view the poem. The scholar is almost like a sailor or fisherman who has carefully learned the tides, only to look up and see a second moon in the sky (perhaps one that we can only see dimly, through the clouds) exerting its pull on

57. Dekel 2015, 23; see Hinds 1998, 102 note 3.

58. In keeping with another allusive technique described by Thomas 1986, 185 as "perhaps the quintessentially Alexandrian type of reference."

> the world's waters. This would mean, of course, that everything has changed.[59]

O'Hara's prediction that the book might prove disturbing has been borne out, but in my view the effect of this disturbance has been that very few have actually faced the challenge of calculating the effect of a second moon on those familiar tides. That may be partly because the "two moons" conceit can itself be read in two ways. Perhaps the more obvious way is that the gravitational pull of the second moon is likely to conflict with that of the first, at least some of the time. That way of thinking dominated my initial reaction to Nelis' book. One can see this clearly in something I wrote not long after it appeared, in one of a series of what I have come to think of as interim reports on Vergilian intertexuality.[60] At the time I was used to reckoning with the *Aeneid* in terms that proceeded from Knauer's totalizing perspective on Homer, in which (to pursue the metaphor) the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are treated as two moons that are never in conflict—or really, as O'Hara's conceit suggests, are together just a single moon. Even if one were to follow Knauer in this, it seemed inevitable that adding Apollonius to the mix as a much more powerful influence than had ever before been suspected would indeed disturb one's sense of order. More than that, it also seemed to me that if this were true of Apollonius, and we simply hadn't realized it, then one had to be prepared, at least in theory, for yet another moon to appear one day, and another and another. In the aforementioned paper I tried to grapple with what such a proliferation of satellites could possibly mean; and it was at this point that I began to surrender any residual allegiance I may have had to the concept of authorial intention in the study of poetic design, and especially in matters of allusion. Frankly, the idea of managing to coordinate separate, but totalizing allusive programs involving two, or really three different poems at once seemed incompatible with the idea that all of the effects that a reader might notice could have been foreseen, even by the most brilliant poet in the world. To admit this was a liberating step, and one result of it is that the reader of the present book, after getting clear of this intro, will notice only one reference to Vergil's intentions (besides this one) in the rest of it, and very few references to Vergil himself, at least in my own "voice." If that had been my only reaction to Nelis' book, I would already have been very much in his debt.

There is, however, an additional, and possibly larger debt, as well. In regard to Nelis' conception of how the Homeric and Apollonian programs work together in the *Aeneid*, I was at first seriously mistaken, assuming that the two

59. O'Hara 2004, 376.

60. Farrell 2005; see note 18 above.

moons of O'Hara's image would generally pull in different directions. I did not reckon with the possibility that, if they were aligned, their force would be multiplied. Eventually I understood that the latter possibility agrees much more closely with what Nelis has in mind. His application of "two-tier allusion" to the problem of the Argonautic *Aeneid* is indispensable to his critical method and amounts to a crucial update of Knauer's hermeneutics. One could easily imagine a poet as fashioning any individual passage in such a way as to allude quite clearly to a passage in Apollonius and one in Homer. The passages in both of the Greek poets might have absolutely nothing to do with one another, until the third poet alluded to them simultaneously. That is what I would call "combinatory allusion," which one encounters all the time.[61] It is also the foundation of Knauer's approach to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the *Aeneid*, although he characteristically prefers to use the word "contamination," which he borrows from the critical vocabulary of Roman comedy. As I have explained, Knauer regards combination or contamination not as an act of debatable interpretation, but as reflecting Vergil's accurate detection of real homologies—intended by Homer!—between the plots of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Such an assumption obviously elides many interpretive possibilities. Still, it was only a short, though crucial step from that assumption to Barchiesi's understanding of the *Odyssey* as occupying a position between the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*, and then to Dekel's conception of the *Aeneid* as imitating the *Odyssey* imitating the *Iliad*. Both lead towards the notion that the *Odyssey* in some sense guides allusion to, and interpretation of, the *Iliad* in the *Aeneid*. But that is exactly what Nelis says about the *Argonautica*—that Apollonius' imitation of Homer largely determines how the *Aeneid* imitates Homer, as well.

There is an important difference, however, between Nelis and Dekel; possibly Barchiesi, as well, since he adumbrates a general understanding of the relationship between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the Homeric *Aeneid*, though it is not his purpose to analyze the relationship in detail. Dekel does this, and in the process he describes a dialogical relationship between the two Homeric poems that reduces any sense of conceptual hierarchy between them. The impression thereby created is somewhat at odds with the notion of the *Odyssey* as the "lens" though which the *Aeneid* views the *Iliad.* To my mind, this is all to the good. Nelis differs from Dekel, and from Barchiesi, in that he does not

61. Thomas 1986, 193 calls this "conflation" or "multiple reference" and considers it "the most complex type of reference." As a friendly amendment to this, I would suggest that complexity is where one finds it, but I would certainly agree that most types of reference are interesting in proportion to their complexity. Knauer might agree with this to an extent, but when he speaks of complexity in allusion he is usually referring to formal and not hermeneutic challenges.

posit any a priori hierarchical relationship between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, whether on the basis of narrative chronology, supposed compositional priority, or any other factor. He does not say that the alluding poet must approach one poem through the other. He does say, however—as large numbers of Apollonian critics also do—that the *Argonautica* represents itself as an Odyssey in a much more pronounced sense than it fashions itself on the model of the *Iliad*. For this reason, he believes, Apollonius' imitation of the *Odyssey* becomes the basis of almost the entire Homeric program of the *Aeneid*. This position is not quite the same as Cairns'—that the *Aeneid* is really "a unitary *Odyssey* with significant Iliadic episodes"—but it is not incompatible with it. Above all, Nelis believes that the Odyssean character of the *Argonautica* is clearly reflected in the Homeric program of the *Aeneid*. A very significant difference between Nelis and Cairns, however, is that the latter regards "Virgil's ready acceptance of additional influence on his characters, motifs, and emotional tone from Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*" as "external confirmation" of his thesis regarding "the *Aeneid* as *Odyssey*." [62] That is similar to my own initial response to Nelis' work as the revelation of an extensive Apollonian program *added to a conceptually prior* Homeric one. In fact, what Nelis argues, clearly and convincingly, is that the Apollonian program is at least *conceptually parallel* to the Homeric program, and it is difficult not to conclude that it is *conceptually prior* to it. That, it seems to me, is why O'Hara's image is so apt, no matter what may be the direction in which his two moons are pulling. We have been used to thinking of Homer as unique. Nelis shows that Homer is not only not unique, but in at least one important sense he is not even primary.

Among the works that I have been discussing there are some obvious differences as well as some diachronic continuities and discontinuities. All of them, however, have at least one thing in common. Here I quote Dekel: "There is a massive body of literature on local parallels or allusions, and some serious work on the alleged Odyssean or Iliadic 'half,' but there are almost no comprehensive studies of the systematic relationship between the two poets."[63] That is quite true. These studies are the main examples. Again, I do not say this is the only way to approach Vergil's *Aeneid*, or his *Eclogues* or his *Georgics*, for

62. Cairns 1989, 179 cites Apollonian influence as "external confirmation" that the *Aeneid* is primarily an Odyssey. The *Argonautica*, he writes, is a "hyper-odyssean epic," and to the extent that the *Aeneid* easily accepts contributions from such a source (one that involves heroic seafaring, that is highly episodic, full of colorful ethnographic elements, and so on), it must be the kind of poem into which such features would readily fit. I will return to this point in the section of chapter 2 entitled "The *Aeneid* as Argosy."

63. Dekel 2012, 14.

that matter, or that it is the best way, or that anyone who neglects it is a miscreant doomed to hermeneutic perdition. I do say that a susceptibility to systematic analysis is highly characteristic of these poems, perhaps to an unusual extent. I would even admit that this may make them a poor model for the study of intertextual effects in other poems.[64] In fact, if I were to amend what I have just written, I might say that the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid* are unusual in the extent to which they *seem to invite* systematic analysis and to offer the promise of a great reward to anyone who, by virtue of ingenuity or sheer dint of scholarly labor, might be able to encompass the elaborate intertextual vistas that these extraordinary poems *appear* to offer. I also recognize that, to many, this invitation is not enticing at all and that the promised rewards are not in the least tempting, but better avoided as chimerical. These many are not confined to critics who are skeptical of literary formalism *tout court*. After quite a few years of familiarizing myself with the possibilities and the frustrations of such work, I am more convinced than ever that the effort is well worth it, but also more convinced than ever that the skeptic's role is as indispensable as that of the true believer. All of that said, whatever differences I may have with Knauer, Barchiesi, Cairns, Nelis, and Dekel, I share with them a preference for taking a systematic approach.

At the same time, all of the works that I have been discussing share among themselves, to varying extents, the idea that a systematic approach to the Homeric *Aeneid* must be biased, to some degree, towards the *Odyssey*. Of this I admit that I am skeptical, for reasons that will become clear in due course. I am also reluctant to make such an assumption the starting point of my inquiry, rather than accepting it only if that is where my own investigation leads. Further, I am somewhat wary of the various ways in which systematic approaches to the problem tend to become ever more complex, in one way or another. Cairns is something of an exception to this, but he is also in many ways the most forthright and insistent about the dominance of the *Odyssey*. So, in what follows, I will propose a different model that begins, or at least tries to begin, with no bias for or against either of Homer's masterpieces. I will take their differences into account, but will not assign primacy to either of them. I refer to the familiar concept of a two-part Homeric program, and I agree very much with Barchiesi that it is far from irrelevant and should not be discarded. However, like all those whose work I have been discussing, I invoke it only to reiterate that this conception does not tell the whole story. I would go a bit farther to say that precisely because it is far from irrelevant and yet does not tell the whole story, this durable concept paradoxically underlines the contingency of

64. See, for instance, Farrell 1997, 222–23 and 228.

all analytical constructs. With that in mind, I have tried to describe fairly the work of five similar but very different accounts of the Homeric *Aeneid*, and I hope I have conveyed my appreciation of what they all have to offer. I also hope it is clear that I think that it would be a mistake to identify any of them with The Truth. Naturally, the same caveat applies to my humble efforts.

The Ethical *Aeneid*

Before I say more about those efforts, there is a bit more to say about ethics. Since Cairns is so explicit about ethical concerns, I return to his idea that the *Aeneid* is primarily an Odyssey and that its hero is an avatar of Odysseus the "good king." On that basis, Cairns concludes that the poem reflects well on the hero's notional descendant, Augustus. This interesting proposal invites the question: if the *Aeneid* were found instead to be primarily an Iliad, would it be necessary to infer that its hero is an avatar of Achilles the "bad king," and that the poem thus reflects poorly on Augustus? I am aware that to pose the question in such bald terms will repel some readers, and I should just say now that if you are one of those, you may just want to stop reading, because I will be posing such questions repeatedly in the coming pages. If you are willing to grant me some leeway, however, I will explain why I do this. It is not my purpose to argue that the *Aeneid* is or is not an Odyssey or an Iliad, or that it combines those poems in some specific proportion, or that it offers a smorgasbord of reflective opportunities for the erudite reader to make of what they will. Instead, I am interested in the heuristic possibilities offered by Cairns' clear-cut approach and am curious to see where they would lead if turned in some other direction. In the case of the Homeric program of the *Aeneid*, there is really only one other principal direction, so I propose to evaluate the alternatives, both of which mean something in terms of ancient and modern ethical assumptions.

Ancient Perspectives

A point very much in favor of Cairns' approach is that ethical criticism was one of the most common modes of discussing and evaluating literature in antiquity. It is overwhelmingly likely that ancient readers were reflexively attuned to the ethics of virtually any story that they read or heard. Certainly they had learned in school to regard Homer as an ethical teacher. It would be rather extraordinary if readers with this background approached a poem like the *Aeneid*, which engages in such a committed way with both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, as if that engagement lacked an ethical dimension or its concern with ethics lacked a Homeric dimension. That much is elementary and obvious, but there will be more to say on the subject very shortly.

Modern Perspectives

A second advantage of focusing on ethics, and specifically on the ancient reception of Homeric ethics, is that it opens a door to discussing possibilities that have been underrepresented in the criticism of epic poetry, and of Roman poetry in general, for some time. This is not the place to attempt a thoroughgoing account of developments in the post–New Critical, post–Harvard School environment of the last three decades or so.[65] It has been and continues to be a period in which an enormous number of new ideas have entered the field as the quantity and variety of texts and subjects that are frequently read and studied by so many classicists has greatly expanded. These developments are obviously altogether positive. At the same time, in my view at least, some of the avenues that it was once possible to explore have surprisingly become much less accessible than was once the case. This is certainly true of the *Aeneid*. New Critical readers with Harvard School leanings once found it possible to find that the poem raises urgent questions about the ethics of power and the means used to procure it. Readers today are more likely to frame their assessment of what the poem might mean by emphasizing that it was written in active engagement with the norms of the epic genre by a poet who enjoyed the friendship and patronage—whatever precisely those words mean—of a person closely associated with the de facto ruler of Rome and its empire. Readers had always been fully aware of these facts, but nevertheless conceived of the poem as speaking to the issues of its moment with reference to broader concerns that transcended that moment. In contrast, many readers now tend to emphasize the limits that immediate political and social realities placed on what any writer could safely say or would even want to say. Comparative studies involving other media play an important role here. In a visual environment saturated with imagery flattering to the Augustan regime, how could mere poetry—particularly poetry that in large part shares an imagistic and conceptual vocabulary with contemporary visual arts—manage to convey a significantly different message?[66] In purely literary terms, as well, generic protocols can be

65. The reflections of Giusti 2016, with specific reference to Kennedy 1992, are very pertinent here, as are many of the contributions to Hejduk 2017, of which Reed 2017 (cited above, note 49) is one.

66. In modern times this approach originated with Syme 1939, 459–75 (chapter 30, "The Organization of Opinion"), which was written with direct reference to political propaganda in contemporary authoritarian states. Zanker 1987/1988 represents an updating of this model on the basis of exoteric forms of post-Marxist cultural critique that pervaded the academy in the late 20th century. In my own view, the replacement of "propaganda" with "ideology" in the standard critical lexicon did not really change much. In any case Zanker, like Syme, takes

seen as preventing certain ideas from being expressed or from meaning what they might in some other context. For my own project, these tendencies raise the question of how the *Aeneid* could entertain, even obliquely, the possibility that Augustus' ancestor might be found to be a "bad king" when judged by the standards of philosophical heroism. Cairns does not frame the question in such explicit terms, but the case he presents is consistent with those unstated premises. And yet, to speak directly to those concerns, it is undeniably true that ancient ethical critics of Homer found the *Iliad* to be full of negative exempla. That is to say, the horizon of expectations that surrounded the *Iliad* in particular from the late Classical period onwards both regarded the poem as in some sense the greatest ever written and, in another sense, viewed it as a tragic meditation on human failings. I simply want to ask: Is it not possible that the *Aeneid* was written to challenge the greatest poem ever written on the very same terms? And: Is it possible for the *Aeneid* to engage with the *Odyssey* in ethical terms, and to engage simultaneously with the *Iliad* while *avoiding* analogous ethical issues?

By posing that question I am getting ahead of myself, and I risk forgetting that there is yet another dimension to these ethical questions. When "pessimistic" approaches to the *Aeneid* were still relatively new, one of the most common objections to reading the poem as a critique of its own times and a melancholy meditation on the human condition more generally, asserted that critics who did so were inattentive to the contextual environment that produced the poem and were inappropriately influenced by the times in which they themselves lived.[67] With the proliferation of activity in the field of reception studies during the intervening years, I think I can say that most would now be a bit less likely to make such a charge in such simplistic terms. When was anyone's response to the political or ethical climate of Augustan Rome not conditioned by their own times?

---

virtually no account of how poetry might function differently from architecture or other forms, or of the extent to which the message of any work of art might differ at different points of reception. Elsner 1991 addresses the latter issue from a historical and theoretical perspective that he develops more fully in Elsner 1995 and 2007; see also Hölscher 1987/2004; Rutledge 2012. With regard to the *Aeneid* see Bell 1999; Seider 2013; Schiesaro 2015; Freudenburg 2017. For more general perspectives see Henderson 1998; Fowler 2000, 193–217; Pandey 2018.

67. The interpretation of Putnam 1965, 151–201, that Aeneas wins a "tragic victory" by killing Turnus, which of course was and continues to be hugely influential, provoked a strong reaction that has also been sustained: see von Albrecht 1966, a review of Putnam's book, and 1999, 120, a one-sided review of the controversy to that point. Otis 1976, 27, describes the Aeneas of Putnam and A. J. Boyle as "a product of the Vietnam war and the New Left," but he goes on to admit, "and yet they point, in a curious way, to an actual feature of the *Aeneid*."

(continued...)

GENERAL INDEX