Piety Versus Betrayal: The Portrayal of Aeneas in the Dictys Cretensis Ephemeris belli Troiani and the Daretis Phrygii de excidio Troiae historia

Taal, Arie Marinus

Master Thesis Classics and Ancient Civilizations: Classics

Leiden University, Faculty of Humanities

Piety Versus Betrayal

The Portrayal of Aeneas in the *Dictys Cretensis Ephemeris belli Troiani* and the *Daretis Phrygii de excidio Troiae historia*

Marijn Taal

Supervisor: Dr. J. Soerink

Second reader: Dr. T.A. van Berkel

Submission date: 31-10-2024

Table of contents

Introduction

Medieval Troy

Towards the end of his twelfth-century work on the Trojan War, the Old French *Roman de Troie*, Benoît de Sainte-Maure relates how, when it becomes clear that Troy will soon fall to the Greeks, the Trojans Antenor, Anchises and their respective sons Polidamas and Eneas advise King Priam to make peace with the Greeks. The king refuses their proposal however, and, concerned that they will betray him and the city to the Greeks, conspires to have them beheaded. Ironically, when the suspected four learn of the king's plot, they then indeed 'pledged and swore (to the Greeks) to betray the city, provided that their possessions, wealth and dwellings, including their allies and kin, would escape unmolested and immune from retaliation'.[1] They force the king to send Antenor to the Greeks and under the guise of negotiating a false peace, he actually negotiates the terms of their betrayal of Troy. As for Eneas' reward for betraying his city and king, the Greeks promise that he 'would keep all that he had rightfully inherited, as well as his possessions without sustaining any losses' and furthermore that 'when the overall booty had been divided up and distributed, he would receive such a donation and share that he would be very well provided for throughout the rest of his life, being wealthy, very satisfied and content'.[2] Next the four traitors convince the rest of the Trojans that a peace has been negotiated with the enemy. As part of the terms of the peace, the Greeks build a giant wooden horse and the Trojans knock down a part of their city wall to take it in. Finally, the Greeks feign their departure and the Trojans celebrate the end of the war. After they have tired themselves out, the Greeks return to Troy in the dead of night, enter through the gap in the city wall and begin their massacre. On their way to the citadel, they are guided through the city by 'Antenor, that good-for-nothing Judas, along with Anchises and Eneas, like the wicked, cruel and faithless scoundrels they were'.[3] After the Greeks have broken into the royal palace and King Priam has been slain, Queen Hecuba catches sight of the traitor Eneas and exclaims: 'Scoundrel, vile, shameful, and renegade Satanas, most disloyal of all traitors, how did you dare plot this? How could you let it happen that King Priam be cut to pieces right here before your very eyes? This deed does not appear to disturb or displease you. Thanks to you, Troy is today being devastated'.[4] After they have sacked the city, the Greeks give the Trojan traitors all that had been agreed upon. Although Eneas intended to stay at what is left of Troy, he is forced to leave the city by the Greeks for having hidden Priam's daughter Polixena during the sack. Eventually, he sets sail and arrives in Lombardy. There in the *Roman de Troie*, the story of Eneas ends.[5]

As the name suggests, this Trojan traitor Eneas is a medieval equivalent of the famous Aeneas of classical antiquity, best known today from the *Aeneid* of Vergil. To modern readers familiar with Vergil's now canonical story of *pius Aeneas* as a defender of burning Troy and blameless survivor of its fall, the presentation of the character of Eneas in the *Roman de Troie* as a traitor responsible for the death of his king and the fall of his city may come as a surprise. While

[1] Quotations are from the first full English translation of Benoît's *Roman de Troie* by Glyn S. Burgess and Douglas Kelly (2017), here 344.
[2] Burgess and Kelly (2017) 346.
[3] Burgess and Kelly (2017) 360.
[4] Burgess and Kelly (2017) 361.
[5] This full narrative is to be found in Burgess and Kelly (2017) 340-390.

Antenor is called a 'Judas' by the medieval Christian writer Benoît, he even has Queen Hecuba denouncing Eneas as a 'Satanas', meaning a devil or even Satan himself. Benoît's *Roman de Troie* with its traitorous Eneas was hugely popular during the Middle Ages, being translated into other vernacular languages and influencing many later works on the Trojan War. But it is not as if Vergil's *Aeneid* with its pious Aeneas was unknown or unpopular at the time Benoît wrote his *Roman de Troie*. Ever since antiquity, the *Aeneid* had been a canonical work. The Latin work was much read and commented on in twelfth-century monasteries. The story of pious Aeneas was translated and reworked into the Old French *Roman d'Enéas* for the aristocratic court, even dating from around the same decade as Benoît's *Roman de Troie*. Thus these two Old French romances with their very different depictions of Aeneas were being read at the same time. How then was it possible that Benoît's work became so popular when he portrayed Aeneas in such a different way than Vergil and the *Roman d'Enéas*? Did its alternative take on the fall of Troy and Aeneas' role in it have the appeal of shock value? That could have been the case if the twelfth-century Benoît had come up with this deviating narrative himself. In fact, the story of traitorous Aeneas as given above was far older.

Where then did Benoît find this narrative? As he gladly tells his readers, he found it in the two Latin sources that his *Roman de Troie* is a translation and adaptation of. In the twelfth century, these two works were seen as authoritative historical sources on the Trojan War, even more so than the poetic *Aeneid* of Vergil with its unrealistic supernatural events. In his prologue, Benoît describes the first of these two works as the history written by the Trojan Dares, a participant in the Trojan War whose 'deeds of prowess in assault and in open combat were numerous' and who was also 'a marvellous cleric, learned in the seven liberal arts, who decided to set down the deeds of the war in writing'.[6] Later on in his work, Benoît names his second source: the history of the Greek Dictys, 'a noble, shrewd and courtly knight, a wise and well-educated cleric and a learned man with a remarkable memory, who was present in the Greek host and put into writing as best he could the events as he knew them'.[7] These two writers Dares and Dictys, here presented as medieval knights and clerics, are actually the alleged authors of two ancient works on the Trojan War, at which we will have a closer look now.

First there is the history of Dictys, which is known today by the title *Dictys Cretensis Ephemeris belli Troiani* ('Dictys of Crete's Journal of the Trojan War'), from its most modern edition by Eisenhut (1958). For brevity, I will from here on out refer to this work as the *Ephemeris*. As we will shortly see, in a letter that prefaces the work, a certain Septimius claims that the extant *Ephemeris* is his Latin translation of an originally Greek text. Until the beginning of the twentieth century, scholars were not inclined to believe his words, and the most important scholarly discussion surrounding the *Ephemeris* was the so-called Diktys-Frage, the question whether a Greek original had truly existed. Between 1907 and 2009 however, four papyrus fragments of the Greek original were found, proving Septimius' words true.[8] To differentiate between the extant Latin text and the almost completely lost Greek original, I will from here on out refer to the original Greek work as the Greek *Ephemeris* and to the Latin translation by Septimius as the Latin *Ephemeris*. Furthermore, from a comparison between the papyrus fragments of the Greek *Ephemeris* and the Latin *Ephemeris*, it seems that Septimius was quite

[6] Burgess and Kelly (2017) 44.
[7] Burgess and Kelly (2017) 340.
[8] An edition of the first two can be found in Eisenhut (1958) 134-139. See also Gómez Peinado (2018) 53.

faithful in his translation.[9] The Greek *Ephemeris* presented itself as a report of the events leading up to, during and after the Trojan War, allegedly written by the participant and eye-witness Dictys of Crete.

Secondly, there is the work of Dares, most commonly known today by the title *Daretis Phrygii de excidio Troiae historia* ('Dares the Phrygian's History on the Destruction of Troy'), from its most recent edition by Meister (1873). [10] Again for brevity, I will simply refer to this work as the *Excidio*. In a similar way to the Latin *Ephemeris*, the *Excidio* proclaims itself to be the Latin translation of an earlier history of the events leading up to and during the Trojan War, written by another alleged participant and eye-witness of the war, Dares the Phrygian. In contrast with the Greek *Ephemeris* however, no trace of an original text behind the extant Latin *Excidio*, in Greek or any other language, has ever been found.

To fully understand the way both the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* present themselves as eye-witness accounts of the Trojan War, we need to look at the way the two works introduce their contents to its readers. First we will have a look at the more complicated case of the *Ephemeris*, before moving on to the slightly simpler case of the *Excidio*.

The Greek Ephemeris

In certain manuscripts, the Latin *Ephemeris* opens with a prologue. It is accepted among scholars that this is the original prologue of the Greek *Ephemeris*.[11] In translation, it relates the following:

'Dictys, by origin of Crete, from the city of Knossos, living in the same times, in which the sons of Atreus also lived, was skilled in the speech and the letters of the Phoenicians, which were brought to Achaia by Cadmus. He was a companion of Idomeneus, the son of Deucalion, and Meriones from Molus, who had come as commanders with the army against Ilium, by whom he was ordered, that he would draw up annals of the Trojan War. Thus on the whole war he arranged nine volumes on linden barks in Phoenician letters. After he had already returned to Crete as an older man, he instructed as he was dying that these had to be buried with him. And so, as he had ordered, they have put the mentioned linden barks, stored in a small box of stannum, with him in his burial mound. After times passed however, in the thirteenth year of the reign of Nero, there occurred movements of the earth in the city of Knossos that revealed many things, that then even threw open the tomb of Dictys in such a way, that the box could be seen by those that passed by. So that when shepherds, passing by, had seen this, they took it from the tomb, thinking it to be treasure. And when they had opened it they found linden barks written with letters unknown to themselves and they immediately brought them to their master, a certain someone by the name of Eupraxides. He perceived what the letters were and brought them before Rutilius Rufus, then the governor of that island. He despatched the writings brought before him to Nero with Eupraxides himself because he judged some secret things to be contained in them. When Nero thus had received these things and had noticed that it were Phoenician letters, he summoned people practised in these things to him. When they had come, everything was interpreted. And when Nero had understood that these were the records of an ancient man, who had been at Ilium, he ordered these to be translated in the language of the Greeks, from which events a more truthful text on the Trojan War became known to all. Then he sent Eupraxides back to his own with gifts and after he had given him Roman citizenship.

[9] Janssen (2003) 51-54; Spence (2010) 134; Gómez Peinado (2018) 68; Dowden (2022) 136.
[10] As Merkle (1994) 188 remarks, a new edition of the *Excidio* is needed.
[11] Dowden (2022) 137.

In the Greek library he received the annals however, inscribed under the name of Dictys, of which the text shows the series, that follows.[12]

With this prologue, the Greek *Ephemeris* proclaimed itself to be a report of the Trojan War by the participant and eye-witness, Dictys of Crete. The detailed narrative of the prologue and its biographical details served to make it seem probable that Dictys is the author of the work and to explain the survival of his writings from the time of the Trojan War into the first century CE of emperor Nero. Dictys is placed directly in the time of the heroes of the Trojan War, as a companion of the Cretan commanders Idomeneus and Meriones, who appear throughout the *Iliad* of Homer. They ordered him to draw up *annales belli Troiani*. The prologue thus describes the *Ephemeris* as 'annals of the Trojan War', which is fitting for a report of a war that lasted ten years. In order to convey the antiquity of the work, Dictys is described to have written it on linden barks in Phoenician letters. In chapter 17 of book V of the *Ephemeris*, the use of Phoenician letters is explained as realistic for the linguistic circumstances of the Greek camp before Troy, as we are assured that many different languages were spoken there.[13] To present Dictys as a reliable eye-witness and his work as a contemporary report of the war, the *Ephemeris* at various places (chapters I.13, V.17, VI.4, 5 and 10) has Dictys state in the first person that he recorded all events he was present at himself as precisely as possible from his memory and that he used others as his source who were present at events where he himself was not. Details on Dictys' life years after the fall of Troy are given to make his record seem even more believable. Finally, in order to maintain its credibility, the prologue does not make any mention of Homer and his *Iliad* at all, as he would not yet have been born when Dictys supposedly lived and wrote.

To explain the survival of his writings, Dictys is described to have requested the box (described as *stagneus*, 'made of stannum', either tin or an alloy of silver and lead) containing them to be put inside his burial mound in Knossos (another practice that would already have appeared ancient in the first century CE). There it lay for centuries until an earthquake uncovered it in the thirteenth year of the reign of Nero, so in either 66 or 67 CE. Next, three parts of a chain process are described to get the work to Nero himself, supposedly all to make the narrative seem more like a realistic history; first the nameless shepherds, then their master Eupraxides and finally the governor of Crete, Rutilius Rufus. When the work finally reaches the emperor, presumably in Rome, Nero, known for his philhellenism, understands it to be the records of a truly ancient man and has it translated into Greek. In this way, 'a more truthful text on the Trojan War became known to all'. This remark implied the Greek *Ephemeris* to be a more truthful report of the Trojan War than certain other texts relating the war, by which Homer's *Iliad* is implied most of all. Thus the prologue presented the Greek *Ephemeris* as the Greek translation of an original report of the Trojan War written in Phoenician letters by a Cretan named Dictys.

The idea of the authorship of an original Phoenician *Ephemeris* by a historical Dictys of Crete, who would have been present at the Trojan War, and later translated to Greek under Nero has been abandoned by scholars long ago.[14] Dictys has been revealed as a fictitious eye-witness chronicler invented by the author of the Greek *Ephemeris*, Pseudo-Diktys. The narrative of the

[12] Eisenhut (1958) 2-3. All translations of Ancient Greek and Latin are my own.
[13] The prologue relates that Cadmus had brought the speech and letters of the Phoenicians to Achaia, information for which Herodotus' *Histories* 5.58 seems to have been the source.
[14] As far as I am aware, of modern scholars only Gerard Janssen, in his Dutch translation of the *Ephemeris*, still seriously explored the possibility of the historical authenticity of an original Phoenician text written by a Dictys of Crete. See Janssen (2003) 8-59, 212-265.

chance discovery of a source as old as time in the grave of the person who supposedly wrote it and the later translation of that source by a secondary anonymous author, such as we find it in the prologue of the Greek *Ephemeris*, is not to be trusted. We find the same literary device in various other works from antiquity.[15] It has been called ancient fiction or pseudo-documentarism by modern scholars. With it the actual author of the work invites his readers to participate in his fiction by endeavouring to persuade them of the believability of his narrative.[16] The name Dictys itself is a clear indicator of his fictitiousness. The Latin *Dictys* would have been the Greek *Diktys* in the Greek *Ephemeris*, both coming from an adjective deriving from the name of Mount Dicte on Crete and thus meaning 'of Crete'.[17] Incidentally, the adjective *Dictaeus* appears twice in the *Aeneid* (3.171 and 4.73).[18] Perhaps the author of the Greek *Ephemeris* came across it there. According to Griffin, there were more alleged pre-Homeric authors that were given names denoting their country of origin. He also sees the allusion to an early script with Phoenician characters we find in the prologue as a characteristic feature of these alleged pre-Homeric documents.[19]

The Greek *Ephemeris* can be dated with some accuracy. The clear terminus post quem is the year 66 or 67 CE, the thirteenth year of the reign of Emperor Nero given in the prologue. The terminus ante quem is the year 200 CE, the approximate date of the oldest of the papyrus fragments of the Greek text. We can thus broadly date the Greek Ephemeris to the years between 66 and 200 CE, between the second half of the first century and the second century CE.[20] Within these years however, an early dating somewhere between 66 and 100 CE seems to be preferred, for two reasons. First of all, the Cretan governor Rutilius Rufus from the prologue seems to be a scribal error, by Septimius or an earlier scribe of the Greek text, for the name of Titus Atilius Rufus.[21] This historical Titus Atilius Rufus was governor of the Roman province of Crete and Cyrenaica, with his governorship even dated to the exact year 67 CE. He died in 85 CE.[22] The author of the Greek *Ephemeris* seems to have included the name of the actual Roman governor of Crete in the year he has set his prologue in to enhance its believability. After Titus Atilius Rufus' death, his name would have fast lost its significance for readers of the prologue. Secondly, the seismologic scholars Papadopoulos and Vassilopoulou report that it is not unlikely that there was a serious earthquake on Crete in 66 CE, as the prologue relates, or at least some years before, around the middle of the first century CE.[23] This seems to have gone unnoticed by Dictys scholars commenting on the earthquake in the prologue.[24] Again, the author of the Greek *Ephemeris* seems to have included a real life event on Crete to enhance the believability of his literary device. All in all, the Greek *Ephemeris* surely dates from between 66 and 200 CE, with an early date in the second half of the first century CE as the most likely.

---

[15] Griffin (1907) 14.
[16] Gudeman (1894) 141-142, 150; Griffin (1907) 14; Hägg (1983) 118-119, 146; Merkle (1994) 185; Clark (2020) 22-23.
[17] Griffin (1907) 1; Spence (2010) 134; Gómez Peinado (2018) 53.
[18] Williams (1962) 92.
[19] Griffin (1907) 1, 8.
[20] Gudeman (1894) 151-154; Hägg (1983) 146; Horsfall (1986) 16; Merkle (1994) 192-194; Janssen (2003) 22, 53-55, 362; Spence (2010) 134; Gómez Peinado (2018) 53; Dowden (2022) 135.
[21] Dowden (2009) 158.
[22] Eck (1972) 233, footnote 2, 246.
[23] Papadopoulos and Vassilopoulou (2001) 122.
[24] For example, Clark (2020) 22.

The Latin Ephemeris

In other manuscripts, the Latin *Ephemeris* does not have the prologue but a letter instead. When he translated the Greek *Ephemeris* into Latin, Septimius reworked the information of the original Greek prologue into a letter from him to one Q. Aradius Rufinus and replaced the prologue with this letter. Somewhere along the line of the works' transmission however, someone who was in the possession of both the original Greek *Ephemeris* with the prologue and the Latin *Ephemeris* with the letter decided to translate the prologue into Latin as well, making sure that both the prologue and the letter are extant in manuscripts today. Septimius' letter to Rufinus goes as follows:

'L. Septimius greets Q. Aradius Rufinus.

Dictys of Crete, who served in that army with Idomeneus, first drew up his journal of the Trojan War in Phoenician letters, that were in that time frequently used throughout Greece by the writers Cadmus and Agenor. Then, as his tomb near Knossos, once the seat of the king of Crete, had collapsed after many centuries because of old age, and when shepherds had come there, by chance they stumbled upon a small box amidst the rest of the ruin, ingeniously closed off with stannum, and they quickly opened it up, thinking it to be treasure. Not gold nor some other booty, but barks of linden they brought to light. But when their hope had been frustrated, they brought them to Praxis, the master of the place, who, after he had changed it to Attic letters, for it was the speech of Greece, presented them to the Roman emperor Nero, for which he was given very many rewards by him. When the booklets had by chance come in our hands, eager for the true history, the desire assailed me to treat them, as they are, into Latin, not so much out of confidence in our skill, than so that we could scatter the idleness of our unemployed mind. And so we have maintained the same number of the first five volumes, that are about the resulting war and the deeds, we have reduced the remaining volumes on the return of the Greeks to just one volume and sent it to you in this form. You, my Rufinus, must, as is suitable, be favourable to what we have undertaken and in reading Dictys …'[25]

Septimius' letter contains a simplified and otherwise altered version of the information from the prologue. He almost completely removed the explanation how Dictys' work came to rest in his tomb and lets the tomb collapse because of old age instead of an earthquake. Perhaps he was not familiar with earthquakes on Crete. Eupraxides becomes Praxis and goes from the shepherds' master to the owner of the terrain. In the prologue, Dictys' work is written in Phoenician letters and then translated into Greek. It is unclear whether it are just the letters or also the language that is Phoenician. Here, Septimius makes it clear that it was written in Phoenician letters but that the language was Greek. In the prologue, neither Eupraxides nor Rutilius Rufus could read the work. In the letter, it is Praxis who changes the Phoenician letters to Greek ones. Thus, there is no need any more for Nero's Phoenician experts. Praxis then directly presents the work to Nero, so that the intermediary role of the Cretan governor Rutilius Rufus is also omitted. While the prologue describes the Greek *Ephemeris* as annals, the letter calls it a journal (*Ephemeridem*). Septimius' description of the work as 'the true history' is probably his translation of the 'a more truthful text on the Trojan War' from the prologue. He follows the Greek *Ephemeris* in not making explicit reference to Homer and his *Iliad*. He relates how he maintained the number of the first five volumes of the Greek *Ephemeris* as books I-V of his translation but reduced the remaining volumes on the homeward journeys of the Greeks, which he apparently did not value as much as the volumes on the war itself, into the one book VI of his translation. Subsequently we are not sure of the number of these remaining volumes

[25] Eisenhut (1958) 1-2.

of the Greek *Ephemeris*.[26] Finally, Septimius' letter breaks off while he is exhorting his Rufinus to be favourable to his translation. As for the date of Septimius' Latin *Ephemeris*, it was certainly written much later in antiquity, but precise years elude us. Scholars have dated it somewhere between the second half of the third century and the fourth century CE, with most preferring a dating in the fourth century CE.[27]

The Excidio

As announced, the way in which the *Excidio* introduces its contents to its reader is less complicated than the *Ephemeris*' double case of the prologue and letter. The *Excidio* is only preceded by a letter of its translator to his dedicatee, similarly to Septimius' letter:

'Cornelius Nepos greets his Sallustius Crispus.

When I was occupied with many things out of curiosity in Athens, I found the history of Dares the Phrygian, written by his own hand, as the title indicates, that he put to writing from memory on the Greeks and the Trojans. I seized it with the greatest love and immediately translated it. I deemed it right neither adding to it nor diminishing it for the sake of reshaping the matter, otherwise it could be understood to be my own work. Thus I have guided in the best way so that it was written out verily and straightforwardly, so to turn it over in Latin to the word, so that those reading it would be able to understand it, how the things that were done were: whether they judge it to be more truthful, what Dares the Phrygian committed to memory, who lived and served during that same time, when the Greeks assaulted the Trojans, or to believe Homer, who was born many years after that war was fought. On which matter the judgement of the Athenians was, that he was held for insane, because he wrote that gods had waged war with people. But so much for this: now let us return to what was promised.'[28]

This letter is supposedly written by one Cornelius Nepos to a Sallustius Crispus. Of course, these are the names of two Roman historiographers from the first century BCE. The letter presents itself as the correspondence between these two famous authors. The extant *Excidio* however, has been dated to between the fifth century and the first half of the seventh century CE, when Isidore of Seville mentioned Dares in his *Origines* I.41, which dates from before 636 CE. Most scholars date it to the sixth century CE.[29] Thus, Cornelius Nepos cannot have been the work's translator or author. The actual author, Pseudo-Nepos, is trying to pass off his work as that of one first century BCE literary authority, Cornelius Nepos, a known philhellene, writing to another, Sallustius. By attributing his own work to Cornelius Nepos and presenting him as writing about it to Sallustius, Pseudo-Nepos heightened the *Excidio*'s chances at readership and survival, as well as giving his pseudo-historiographical work an air of true historiographical authority.[30] Unlike the clear case of the *Ephemeris*, the letter of the *Excidio* does not give us an indication of the year in which Cornelius Nepos supposedly found Dares' work in Athens. Like the case of the *Ephemeris* however, this letter presents the *Excidio* as the Latin translation of an original history of the Trojan War by another eye-witness and participant, Dares the Phrygian. It is not stated in which language Dares supposedly wrote his *historia*,

[26] There were four or five books. Griffin (1907) 8; Frazer (1966) Letter, note 6, and Preface, note 4; Janssen (2003) 10, 195, footnote a; Spence (2010) 134; Dowden (2022) 136.
[27] Gudeman (1894) 151-154; Griffin (1907) 3; Hägg (1983) 146; Horsfall (1986) 16; Merkle (1994) 192-194; Janssen (2003) 53; Spence (2010) 134.
[28] Meister (1873) 1.
[29] Gudeman (1894) 151-154; Griffin (1907) 3; Hägg (1983) 146; Horsfall (1986) 16; Janssen (2003) 17; Spence (2010) 134; Clark (2020) 43-45, 54-55.
[30] Clark (2020) 17, 59-63.

whether in Phoenician letters like Dictys, or in Greek. Pseudo-Nepos most likely wanted as least troublesome details in his fiction as possible. Unlike with Dictys, not much biographical information is given on Dares. Chapter 12 and chapter 44 do however try to establish his credibility as an eye-witness in the same way as the *Ephemeris* does for Dictys.[31] In chapter 44, Dares' writings are described as *acta diurna*, 'a journal'.[32]

Some scholars have suspected the existence of an older work behind the extant Latin *Excidio*.[33] An important reason for this is that Aelian, writing at the beginning of the third century CE, describes a 'Dares the Phrygian who wrote an Iliad and was said to have lived before Homer' in his *Varia Historia* (11.2). It is unclear if this was an exact Greek original to our extant Latin *Excidio*, making the latter work a translation like Septimius' Latin *Ephemeris*, or a different, perhaps poetical work which Pseudo-Nepos in some way imitated or epitomized. Nevertheless, this assumed Greek, original *Excidio* has been dated to between the first century and the first half of the second century CE.[34]

Of course, the authorship of the *Exidio* by a historical Dares as presented by Pseudo-Nepos is very similar to Dictys' supposed authorship of the *Ephemeris*. The narrative in Pseudo-Nepos' letter is another example of pseudo-documentarism. The survival of Dares' ancient text is explained along the same line, the main difference being that Pseudo-Nepos doesn't have Cornelius Nepos find the work in Dares' grave but in a library while studying in Athens. As for the survival of Dares' work into the time of Nepos, he is very brief: the reader just has to believe that Nepos finds the work written in Dares' own hand, centuries old but apparently undamaged. Like with Dictys, the name Dares is also an interesting choice for a fictitious writer. Trojans named Dares occur in both the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*. The *Iliad* mentions a Trojan priest of Hephaestus named Dares (5.9). In Vergil's *Aeneid*, a Dares appears twice. At *Aeneid* 5.369, we are introduced to a Trojan boxer named Dares. And at *Aeneid* 12.364, Turnus kills a Trojan called Dares. According to Tarrant, it is possible that Vergil is speaking of the same Dares here.[35] Dares seems to be a stock Trojan name, ideal for someone who needed to name a fictitious Trojan chronicler. Perhaps Pseudo-Nepos was inspired by one of these mentions. That he makes no connection between his Dares and those of Homer and Vergil can be explained as him maintaining his fiction that Dares wrote before them, as well as by his clear attitude towards the blind poet. Pseudo-Nepos ends his letter by stating that he translated Dares' history into Latin so that his readers can judge for themselves whether they find what Dares or what Homer wrote more truthful. Unlike Pseudo-Diktys and Septimius, Pseudo-Nepos makes direct mention of Homer, polemising with his *Iliad*.

Questions and answers

Now that we have taken a detailed look at the complicated manner in which Pseudo-Diktys, Septimius and Pseudo-Nepos present the contents of the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* to their reader, we have a better understanding of the two ancient sources Benoît de Sainte-Maure used to construct his *Roman de Troie* and which gave him their narratives of a traitorous Aeneas. But how did the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* portray Aeneas exactly and with what purpose? Before

[31] Clark (2020) 13-15.
[32] Meister (1873) 52.
[33] A recent example is Bradley (1991).
[34] Gudeman (1894) 151-154; Horsfall (1986) 16; Janssen (2003) 17.
[35] Tarrant (2012) 181.

we begin to analyse the two works in order to answer the former question there is another question that we need to answer first: does the concept of Aeneas as a traitor of Troy originate with the oldest of these works, with the Greek *Ephemeris*? Is Pseudo-Diktys to blame for the negative press Aeneas would later receive? Or does the concept predate him and his work? If so, then what was its origin? And what was its relation with the portrayal of pious Aeneas in Vergil's first century BCE *Aeneid* more familiar to us today. In other words, what was the tradition of Aeneas' relation to the fall of Troy? In my first chapter, I aim to give an answer to these questions. In the two chapters after that, we will analyse the exact portrayal of Aeneas in the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio*, first in the former, then in the latter. Is he portrayed as negatively as we have seen from the narrative of the *Roman de Troie*? Or do the ancient texts portray him differently? In a more neutral way, or perhaps even more positively? And how do the two works differ in their portrayal of him? Is there influence of earlier works describing Aeneas at the fall of Troy? Using the methods of text analysis and close reading I aim to discern the way Aeneas is portrayed and employed as a character in the narratives of the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio*. At the same time I will make use of the method of intertextual comparison to search for differences with the older tradition, most notably with Vergil's *Aeneid*. The results of these chapters will guide us in answering our main research question: why did the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* portray Aeneas as a traitor responsible for the fall of Troy in the way they do? In my final chapter I aim to use the approach of new historicism to search for possible explanations to this question from the background of the text's historical literary context.

Chapter 1: Aeneas and the fall of Troy between Homer and Vergil

When did the concept of Aeneas as a traitor responsible for the fall of Troy originate? To answer this question, we need to look at the relationship of the literary character Aeneas and his role in the fall of Troy as it developed in the literary works before the *Ephemeris*: between Aeneas' appearance in the *Iliad* and his portrayal as pious in Vergil's *Aeneid*. As we will see in this chapter, the tradition of Aeneas as a traitor to his city was not thought of first by Pseudo-Diktys but long predates him.

The Epic Cycle

The *Iliad*, the *Little Iliad*, the *Ilioupersis* and the *Odyssey*, the four parts of the Epic Cycle that describe the fall of Troy, all attribute it to the traditional Trojan Horse, filled with Greeks.[36] There is no Trojan betrayal from within. If there already existed a tradition of Aeneas as a traitor, then it was but one part of the pre-literary oral tradition that provided the matter for the poems of the Epic cycle. Nevertheless, the *Iliad* and the *Ilioupersis* do tell us something about the origin of the concept of Aeneas as a traitor. Aeneas' first appearance is in the *Iliad* of Homer, as a distant relative of King Priam and his sons through his father Anchises. Aeneas is said to be loved by the gods for his piety (20.334-347). In book twenty, Aeneas gets into a fight with Achilles (20.75-352). In the end, he is saved by Poseidon, who justifies his divine interference with the prediction that Zeus has started to hate Priam and his sons and that it is Aeneas and his descendants who will succeed to rule over the Trojans (20.300-308). This prediction was likely woven into the *Iliad* for historical rulers of the Troad, the area around Troy, who claimed descent from Aeneas.[37] The consequence of Poseidon's prediction was that Aeneas somehow had to survive the fall of Troy. This made him vulnerable to accusations of having betrayed Troy in order to survive. The *Iliad* ends before the fall of Troy and it does not tell us how its Aeneas survived in order to take up rule as Poseidon predicted. Historical rulers claiming descent from Aeneas would probably have preferred him to have survived the fall of Troy in a honourable way, similar to how Vergil later described in his *Aeneid*. However, the *Iliad* does give us the first hints of an Aeneas with some hostility to his king. First of all, Poseidon's prediction clearly sets Priam and his sons apart from Aeneas and his descendants. This can be read as an allusion to a tradition of dynastic rivalry between the two family lines, the ruling dynasty of Priam and the cadet branch of Aeneas. Secondly, in book thirteen of the *Iliad*, Aeneas seems to have resentment of Priam. He is described to stand at the back of the Trojan battle lines and has to be asked to help in the fight. It is said that he is angry with Priam for not giving him honour even though he is outstanding among the warriors (13.461). Thirdly, during their fight in book twenty, Achilles suggests there was even more to Aeneas' anger in book thirteen when he accuses him of wanting to hold Priam's honour and lordship among the Trojans. Achilles mockingly reminds his opponent that Priam's sons will succeed him, not Aeneas (20.178). Thus, the *Iliad* sets the lines of Aeneas and Priam apart and seems to be aware of a tradition of dynastic rivalry between them. If the idea of Aeneas betraying Priam and Troy was already a part of the pre-Homeric oral tradition, the *Iliad* is alluding to it in these three passages. And if it wasn't, then the epic seems to be playing with the idea here in reference with Aeneas' future

[36] Austin (1980) ix.
[37] The seventh-century BCE *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* also predicts future rule for Aeneas.

rule over the Trojans as predicted by Poseidon.[38] The latter case is more likely, as the *Ilioupersis* seems to give no hint of treason from Aeneas. This is the first work that gives us an explanation of Aeneas' survival of the fall of Troy. According to the excerpt by Proclus, Aeneas, together with his family and followers, left Troy after recognizing the deaths of Laocoon and his sons by snakes as a bad omen and went to Ida, before the city was sacked.[39]

The pious Aeneas

The *Iliad*'s description of Aeneas as being beloved by the gods because of his piety seems to have given rise to the tradition that Aeneas so impressed the Greeks with his piety during the fall of Troy that they spared him and allowed him to depart. For various reasons the Greeks allow him to choose what to rescue from Troy. In some versions he impresses them by trying to rescue certain sacred objects, in others by trying to rescue his aged father Anchises. Eventually the two options to rescue became linked. We find versions of the tradition of pious Aeneas surviving the fall of Troy in various texts: Sophocles' fifth-century BCE play *Laocoon*, the prologue of Xenophon's fourth century BCE *Cynegetica*, the *Alexandra* of Lycophron, of which the date is uncertain (between the fourth and the second century BCE), and Aelian's third century CE *Varia Historia*. In the *Troica* of Hellanicus (as related in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' first century BCE *Roman Antiquities* 1.46.2-4), Varro's lost *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* and in Diodorus Siculus' first century BCE *Bibliotheca historica* 7.4, Aeneas is given more of a fighting role in the same narrative.[40]

The hospitable Antenor

At the same time, a different tradition emerged for Antenor, another Trojan in need of an explanation for his survival of the fall of Troy. In the *Iliad*, Antenor is described as a wise counsellor, loyal to King Priam. He is said to have entertained Menelaus and Odysseus in Troy when they came to demand the return of Helen (3.207). According to later sources, Antenor saved the ambassadors when the Trojans, led by Antimachus, tried to kill them.[41] Agamemnon later refers to the attempt in his speech to the sons of Antimachus (11.122-142). In book seven, Antenor urges the Trojans to return Helen to the Greeks himself, in order to end the war (7.348). Antenor's friendly dealings with the Greeks as described in the *Iliad* were the reason why they spared him. We have various clues that this was how the works of the Epic Cycle relating the fall of Troy explained his survival. According to Strabo's first century CE *Geographia* 13.1.53, Sophocles' play *Antenoridae* related how the Greeks put a leopard-skin on Antenor's house as a sign not to attack it because he had saved Menelaus' life and later allowed him to depart from Troy with his family. The same story can be found in Pausanias' second century CE *Description of Greece* 10.26-27. Interestingly, in the *Iliad*, Menelaus is the only Greek who is described to wear a leopard-skin (10.29-30). Eventually, Aeneas and Antenor came to be associated together as survivors of the fall of Troy. In his first century BCE *Ab urbe condita*, Livy is the first to pair

[38] Horsfall (1986) 16; Horsfall (1987) 12-13; Casali (2010) 40-42; Scafoglio (2013) 5-8.
[39] Horsfall (1979) 372-374; Horsfall (1986) 16; Horsfall (1987) 12; Austin (1980) x; Horsfall (2008) 69; Casali (2010) 42; Scafoglio (2013) 10.
[40] Horsfall (1979) 384-385; Horsfall (1986) 8, 15-16; Horsfall (1987) 14, 23; Casali (2010) 42; Scafoglio (2013) 2, 10, 12.
[41] Scafoglio (2018) 258.

Aeneas with Antenor when he relates how the Greeks spared them both because of guest right and because they had urged to make peace by returning Helen (1.1.1).[42]

Aeneas and Antenor, traitors of Troy

The traditions that held that Aeneas and Antenor had been spared by the Greeks because of their piety and their friendly dealings with the Greeks respectively made it possible for them to be depicted as traitors who sold themselves out to the Greeks. It is uncertain when Antenor was first dubbed a traitor. In his first century BCE *Roman Antiquities* 1.46, Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes the treachery of the Antenoridae as one reason why Troy might have fallen, but his attribution of this treachery to the *Troica* of Hellanicus is disputed. The cryptic *Alexandra* of Lycophron describes a traitor to Troy, but it not certain whether Antenor is meant or Sinon. However, the story of the betrayal of Antenor does not seem to have been older than the third or the second century BCE. Of the two, it seems that Aeneas was presented as a traitor first. As far as we can see, it was Menecrates of Xanthus, writing in the fourth century BCE, who first gave mention of Aeneas betraying Troy (Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* 1.48). According to Menecrates, Aeneas betrayed (προδοῦναι) Troy out of hatred for Alexander, who did not recompense him enough, and was allowed to save his family. The story seems to have been developed from the mention of Aeneas' resentment of Priam in the *Iliad*. In his first century BCE *Geographia* 13.1.53, Strabo also mentions the tradition that Aeneas survived because of his enmity with Priam as mentioned in the *Iliad*.[43]

Traces of treachery in Vergil's Aeneid

Servius, writing in the late fourth and the early fifth century CE, shows his familiarity with the stories of traitorous Aeneas related above when he suggested at his commentary on *Aeneid* 1.647 that Vergil had been actively trying to hush up allegations of treason against Aeneas (*laborat hoc sermone probare ab Aenea non esse proditam patriam … cum Antenore Troiam prodidisse manifestum est*).[44] Of all the ancient works describing the role of Aeneas in the fall of Troy, the *Aeneid* with its narrative of pious Aeneas is probably the one readers today are most familiar with. But what does the *Aeneid* exactly tell us about Aeneas' role in his city's fall?

In Vergil's epic, Aeneas has been tasked by fate with the mission to bring the statues of the household gods of Troy to Latium and found a new Troy. In time, the city of Rome will spring from his efforts, as predicted by Jupiter in *Aeneid* 1.227-296. To fulfil this sacred mission it is necessary for Aeneas to survive the inevitable fall of Troy. Vergil achieves this by letting his hero escape from the city. Throughout the *Aeneid*, Vergil lets Aeneas express himself negatively about the Greeks who sacked his city and positively about Priam, his slain king. Already in the *Aeneid*'s proemium, Aeneas is described as having fled the city (1.2 *fato profugus*). Aeneas himself later describes his Trojans as having escaped from the Greeks (1.598). In *Aeneid* 3.5-12, Aeneas calls himself a exile and once again draws attention to the pious way he survived the fall of Troy. On the surface then, the Trojans that survived the sack of Troy in the *Aeneid*

[42] Austin (1971) 91-92; Horsfall (1979) 377, 383, 387; Horsfall (1986) 16; Horsfall (1987) 23; Casali (2010) 42-43; Scafoglio (2018) 257-260; Clark (2020) 72.
[43] Horsfall (1979) 384, 386-387; Horsfall (1987) 14, 23; Casali (2010) 42-43; Scafoglio (2013) 3-4; Scafoglio (2018) 260-264; Clark (2020) 69-72.
[44] Austin (1971) 92-93; Austin (1980) xiii, xv; Horsfall (1986) 16.

did so by means of escape. But what do we find when we dig into Vergil's account of the sack itself?

The fall of Troy is related in book 2 of the *Aeneid*. Vergil's narrative of the fall of Troy is the first full account that we have of the events that must have been told before him by the *Little Iliad* and the *Ilioupersis*.[45] The story of the way Troy falls in the *Aeneid* is Vergil's own creation, in the form of an eye-witness narrative by the survivor Aeneas. At the beginning of book 2, Aeneas, at the court of Queen Dido of Carthage, describes himself as a victim and witness of the destruction of Troy by the Greeks (2.5). He then begins to tell his listeners of the city's fall. Aeneas does not mention himself in the first part of his narrative, but it is clear from the text he was present at these events (as at 2.204). Aeneas relates how the Trojans found the wooden horse left by the Greeks and debated on what to do with it, whether they should destroy it or take it into the city. At 2.32, Aeneas wonders if the Trojan Thymoetes, who was the first who urged to drag the wooden horse inside their city walls, was devising a ruse. Is this a subtle nod by Vergil of the tradition of Trojans plotting treachery? Horsfall is of the opinion that Vergil must have been aware of the charges of treason laid against Aeneas.[46] Then the Greek Sinon appears and the famous story of the Trojan Horse is related (2.185-267). He tells the Trojans that the wooden horse was made too big to fit through the city gates on purpose, so that they would not receive the blessing of Pallas. If they destroy the horse however, disaster will befall Troy. Convinced by Sinon's tale, the Trojans break down part of their city wall and bring the horse into the city. It seems they rebuilt the section of the wall. At night, Sinon frees the Greeks hidden in the horse and at the city gates they kill the guards and open the gates for the Greek army that has sailed back in secret from Tenedos. Thus Troy falls to the treachery of the Greeks, not that of any Trojans, especially not Aeneas.[47]

Then Aeneas introduces himself into his own narrative. He is in the house of his father Anchises in Troy when the shade of Hector appears to him in his sleep and orders him to take flight and save himself from the flames of the burning city (2.289 *fuge et eripe*). Hector declares that enough has been done to defend Troy. If it could have been defended against the Greeks, he would have succeeded in that himself. The city can't be saved from destruction. Hector declares that Aeneas is now the protector of Troy's household gods and orders him to take them with him and found a city somewhere else (2.289-295). Vergil thus seems use the words of Hector, the heir to the throne, to absolve Aeneas of the duty of defending Troy to the end. It can also be pointed out however that it is Aeneas himself here, as the secondary narrator of *Aeneid* book 2, who puts these words in Hector's mouth. Is Vergil letting Aeneas defend himself from accusations of abandoning Troy in this way within the overall narrative of the whole *Aeneid*? Aeneas is the narrator of the whole fall of Troy in book 2. How much of what he tells of the event can the reader really trust?

In spite of Hector's order, Aeneas is resolved to die fighting (2.314-317). He and his men fight the Greeks for some time, with quite some success. Aeneas even swears by Troy itself that he would have defended the city to his death at this point (2.336-452). Is this forestalling of his own destiny by Aeneas the work of a Vergil who was intent on exonerating his protagonist from all accusations of betraying Troy? Horsfall does not see Aeneas' oath as 'an answer to the old

[45] Austin (1980) x.
[46] Horsfall (1986) 17.
[47] Austin (1980) xiv.

charge of treason, or collusion laid against Aeneas, but as a reply to any sense of doubt about how a warrior prince might survive such a night without an intolerable sense of guilt'.[48] But surely the line can act as an answer to both? Finally, when Aeneas is on the roof of the royal palace in order to defend it, he sees Priam being killed (2.453-567). Suddenly, he is overcome by the desire to defend his own family (2.559-563). When Venus appears to Aeneas to urge him to go to his family, she shows him that the gods themselves are taking part in the destruction of Troy and Aeneas at last can accept that the city can't be saved (2.588-633). Still, when Aeneas has returned home to his family the thought to fight and die for Troy overcomes him two more times (2.665-672). In the end, Aeneas listens to the orders of Hector, of his divine mother and later of the shade of his fallen wife and flees Troy with his father, son and followers (2.706-804). Thus, Vergil seems to be doing his best in *Aeneid* book 2 to let Aeneas defend Troy as long as possible while also giving him as many excuses as he can to eventually escape from the falling city. He completely justifies Aeneas' survival by flight, while he seems to give his reader slight hints to the tradition that Troy was betrayed by one of its own.[49]

Spread throughout the rest of the *Aeneid* however, there seem to be scattered references by Vergil to different versions of the Aeneas legend. Do they include references to Aeneas as a traitor? At 4.340-344, Aeneas declares that he would have tried to rebuild Troy if he had not been send on his way by the gods. According to Pease, Vergil, with his tendency to suggest at the conflicting traditions surrounding Aeneas at the time he wrote the *Aeneid*, could be hinting at the particular tradition that represented Aeneas as having stayed at Troy and restoring it here.[50] At *Aeneid* 4.599, Vergil has Dido questioning whether what she had heard about Aeneas and his deeds at the fall of Troy was actually true. In *Aeneid* 8.162, Euander tells Aeneas that he had met his father Anchises in the past and remembers seeing him elevate himself above all others, even above Priam. Could this be a refence by Vergil to the rivalry between the family branches of Anchises and Priam that we first found in the *Iliad*? Eden does not look for anything behind it however.[51] At *Aeneid* 11.484, Queen Amata calls Aeneas a *Phrygii praedonis*, a 'Phrygian thief, pirate or criminal'. According to McGill, 'the insult *praedo* ties Aeneas to Paris.' He remarks that Aeneas was earlier called a *praedo* by Amata at 7.361 and by Mezentius at 10.774.[52] Could these actually be hints at the allegations of treachery levelled against Aeneas? Finally, at *Aeneid* 12.15, Turnus calls Aeneas *desertorem Asiae*, 'a deserter of Asia'.[53] According to Tarrant, 'Turnus treats Aeneas' survival and departure from Troy as evidence of desertion, possibly alluding to accounts of Troy in which Aeneas saved his life by colluding with the Greeks'.[54] He notes that at *Aeneid* 2.431-434, where Aeneas was swearing by Troy itself that he would have defended the city to his death he is vehemently denying what is probably the same charge. What then does Vergil want his reader to think of these passages that seem to allude to a not so pious Aeneas? Is he merely showing off his knowledge of the Aeneas tradition? Or is he suggesting that his reader is not supposed to take his pious Aeneas at face value?

[48] Horsfall (2008) 337.
[49] Horsfall (1986) 16.
[50] Pease (1967) 304.
[51] Eden (1975) 68.
[52] McGill (2020) 182.
[53] noted by Horsfall (1986) 16.
[54] Tarrant (2012) 90.

Conclusion

As we have discovered in the course of this chapter, the origin of the concept of Aeneas as a traitor responsible for the fall of Troy ultimately lies in his description in the *Iliad* of Homer as a Trojan prince, beloved for his piety, that needs to survive the fall of Troy to rule over the Trojans as prophesized by Poseidon. A prince who's bloodline is set apart from that of his ruling king. As different narratives explaining Aeneas' survival by reason of his piety were written, he came to be associated with Antenor, another Trojan for whose survival explanations were being described. Once together, their interactions with the Greeks made them prime targets for alternative narratives attributing the fall of Troy to Trojan treachery. Later, there was an intellectual discussion on the precise role of Aeneas at the fall of Troy. Finally, we have seen how suggestions of this tradition of Aeneas as a traitor even seem to have been used by Vergil to write his story of the pious Aeneas in the *Aeneid*. Now we can turn to analyse the way in which the concept of traitorous Aeneas was used in the first of our two texts, the *Ephemeris*, written around the same time that Servius openly questioned Vergil. We need to ask ourselves: how does Pseudo-Diktys portray Aeneas exactly?

Chapter 2: Aeneas in the *Ephemeris*

In this chapter, I will analyse the portrayal of Aeneas in the six books of the *Ephemeris*.

Book I

Aeneas is mentioned only once in the first book of the *Ephemeris*. Importantly however, the book establishes the power dynamic among the Trojans in which he is later given his role. The only mention of Aeneas here is when we find him accompanying Alexander (Paris) to Sparta in chapter I.3. There, Alexander steals Helen along with other people and treasures:[55]

Per idem tempus Alexander Phrygius, Priami filius, Aenea aliisque ex consanguinitate comitibus, Spartae in domum Menelai hospitio receptus, indignissimum facinus perpetraverat.

At the same time the Phrygian Alexander, the son of Priam, had, with Aeneas and other companions from his kin, perpetrated a most unworthy crime at Sparta, in the house of Menelaus, where he had been received with hospitality.

When the Greeks send an embassy to Troy, King Priam defends his absent son from their complaints and proposes to await his arrival (chapter I.6). Antenor is already shown to be a sympathizer of the Greeks when he lets the embassy stay the night with him, as mentioned in the *Iliad*. It is with the arrival of Alexander that Pseudo-Diktys creates two Trojan factions within the city. The Trojan people are angry with Alexander's actions (chapter I.7). This worries Priam and he asks his sons for counsel. The Trojan princes counsel their father not to return Helen and the treasures to the Greeks. Next, the king calls the Trojan senate together to ask their counsel (chapter I.8). It is at this point that the princely faction comes to dominate the Trojan decision making. The princes storm into the meeting and threaten the senate to keep Helen in Troy. Next, together with Alexander they attack and kill the angry Trojan people, with Antenor leading the nobles from the senate against the people. Although the text does not mention it explicitly, Antenor and the nobles seem to be acting under pressure. In chapter 9 and 10 we learn that Priam and certain unnamed princes had indeed been willing to hand over Helen to the Greeks, but that Alexander and his brother Deiphobus are resolved to keep her at Troy. Thus there are different opinions among the Trojans on Alexander bringing Helen to Troy. The Trojan people are immediately outraged by the deed. The Trojan princes led by Alexander and Deiphobus are willing to use threats and violence to keep her at Troy, though at least some of these princes were apparently willing to hand her over. As we will see later, Antenor and the rest of the senate of Trojan nobles want to avoid war, but they are forced into it by the princes. This triangular relationship of the people, a royal or princely party and senators is quite similar to the power dynamic in Rome under the Principate, when Pseudo-Diktys was writing. But where does Aeneas stand among these factions? As said, he is not further mentioned, but him accompanying Alexander to Sparta where the latter abducts Helen seems to place him among his followers.[56] In the middle of all this strife, King Priam is presented as a good-natured but weak authority figure, who is willing to listen to all advice but lets himself be swayed by the desires of his own young sons in the end. This is quite reminiscent of the character of King Latinus in the *Aeneid*. As we will see, this dynamic among the Trojans continues throughout

[55] Eisenhut (1958) 4-5.
[56] As remarked as well by Janssen (2003) 105, footnote a.

the *Ephemeris* and eventually leads to the death of Priam, his sons, and the end of their rule. After Menelaus again demands Helen back in the Trojan assembly, Priam lets her decide for herself then and there. She wishes to remain with the Trojans and Menelaus declares war on Troy (chapter I.11). When the sons of Priam plan to ambush and kill the Greek embassy staying at Antenor's house, Antenor reveals the plot to the Greek ambassadors and safely guides them out of Troy, as he did in the Epic Cycle. Back in Sparta, the embassy expresses their appreciation for Antenor's honesty to the rest of the Greeks (chapter I.12). In the rest of book I, the Greeks prepare their invasion force.

Book II

In chapter 8 of book II, Pseudo-Diktys bluntly calls Alexander and other sons of Priam criminal councillors to their father. When the Greeks land at Troy, we find Aeneas fighting for the Trojan cause in the first battle and killing Protesilaus (chapter II.11). In chapter II.20, the Greeks send a second embassy to Troy to exchange Helen for the captured Trojan prince Polydorus. In the assembly, all the Trojan senators, except for an certain Antimachus, agree that Menelaus has been treated unjustly but declare that they do not have the power to return Helen (chapter II.23). As we have seen, the *Iliad* describes how this Antimachus allowed himself to be bribed by Alexander to oppose the return of Helen and how he tried to have Menelaus killed when he visited Troy as an envoy. When the Trojan princes arrive at the meeting, he threatens Menelaus (chapter II.24). Antenor keeps the situation under control and Antimachus is chased from the building. The Trojan Panthus begs Hector to return Helen to the Greeks, but the prince says he is unable to do so as Helen has received asylum from his family (chapter II.25). He offers to return the treasures and promises Menelaus a Trojan princess for a wife. Menelaus does not take this offer well (chapter II.26). Then Aeneas speaks for the first time in the *Ephemeris*:[57]

adversum quem Aeneas: „ac ne haec quidem, ait, concedentur contradicente ac resistente me reliquisque, qui adfines amicique Alexandro in rem eius consulimus. sunt enim atque erunt semper, qui domum regnumque Priami tueantur neque amisso Polydoro orbitas Priamum insequetur tot talibusque filiis superstitibus. an solis qui ex Graecia sunt raptus huiusmodi concederetur, quippe Cretae Europam quidem a Sidona, Ganymedem ex hisce finibus atque imperio rapere licuerit? quid Medeam? ignoratisne a Colchis in Iolcorum fines transvectam? et ne primum illud rapiendi initium praetermittam, Io ex Sidoniorum regione abducta Argos meavit. hactenus vobiscum verbis actum, at nisi mox cum omni classe ex hisce locis aufugeritis, iam iamque Troianam virtutem experiemini, domi quippe iuventus perita belli abunde nobis est, atque in dies auxiliorum crescit numerus."

To him (Menelaus) Aeneas said: ''And not even these things will be allowed by me and by others, who as kin and friends take care of Alexander in his case, because we speak against it and resist it. For there are and will always be those, who support the house and the reign of Priam and after losing Polydorus childlessness will not follow Priam since so many and such sons survive. Or was abduction of this kind allowed only to those who are from Greece, since Crete indeed was allowed to carry Europa off from Sidona and it was allowed to abduct Ganymedes from these bounds and this realm? What about Medea? You are not ignorant of the fact that she was borne from Colchis to the lands of Iolcus, right? And so that I will not overlook the first beginning of all this abducting, Io was abducted from the region of the Sidonians and passed to Argos. Until now there has been dealt with you with words, but if you will not soon have fled from this place with your whole fleet, then you will experience the Trojan courage, since we have an abundance of youths skilled in war at home, and the number of our auxiliaries grows by the day.

[57] Eisenhut (1958) 40.

As Janssen remarks, Pseudo-Diktys has given Aeneas a new role as a warmonger here.[58] Aeneas clearly presents himself as part of the kin and friends of Alexander and as a firm supporter of the house of Priam. He will let Polydorus, at this moment a prisoner of the Greeks, die before he sees Alexander forced to return Helen. According to Aeneas, Polydorus' death will not greatly harm Priam, who has many more sons. Then he lists the past abductions of the eastern women Europa, Medea and Io by the Greeks to justify the easterner Alexander's abduction of the Greek Helen. The author of the *Ephemeris* seems to have lifted this argument straight from Herodotus' *Histories* 1.1-3, where the abductions of the same three women are presented as the reason Alexander abducted Helen. Alongside these examples Aeneas mentions the abduction of the Trojan prince Ganymede, who was not stolen by Greeks but by Jupiter himself. Perhaps what he means here is that if the king of gods and men abducts people, mortals like Alexander are allowed to as well.[59] Finally, Aeneas threatens the Greeks with an imminent Trojan attack. Thus in chapter II.26 Aeneas is presented as still very much supportive of Alexander and the royal house. But as Janssen remarks, the role of Aeneas will change in the course of the *Ephemeris*.[60] In the rest of book II, the Trojans and the Greeks fight several battles and in one of these we find Aeneas among the wounded Trojan generals who are forced to leave the battlefield (chapter II.38).

Book III

After Achilles returns the body of the dead Hector to Priam in chapter 24 of book III, the Greeks and the Trojan visitors have diner together. In that setting, Priam tells his company of the birth of Alexander (chapter III.26):[61]

namque Hecubam foetu eo gravidam facem per quietem edidisse visam, cuius ignibus conflagravisse Idam ac mox continuante flamma deorum delubra concremari omnemque demum ad cineres conlapsam civitatem intactis inviolatisque Antenoris et Anchisae domibus.

For in a dream he had seen how Hecuba, pregnant with that fetus, had given birth to a torch, by the fires of which the Ida was burning and, when the flame went on, soon the temples of the gods were consumed by fire and eventually the whole city had fallen to ashes while the houses of Antenor and Anchises were untouched and unharmed.

Pseudo-Diktys clearly foreshadows the role of Antenor and Aeneas in the fall of Troy later on in his work. In the same chapter, Priam remarks how Antenor was the only one who resisted to the arrival of Helen at Troy. This detail on Antenor is new here. We did not find it in the narrative of Helen's arrival at Troy in book I.

Book IV

In chapters 10 and 11 of book IV, Achilles comes unarmed and unwary to the temple of Apollo to meet with the Trojans and arrange his marriage with Polyxena, with whom he has fallen in love. There he is tricked and killed by Alexander and Deiphobus. It is at this moment that Aeneas stops supporting Alexander. In chapter IV.17, we are told:[62]

[58] Janssen (2003) 39.
[59] As Janssen (2003) 105, footnote b also remarks.
[60] Janssen (2003) 105, footnote a.
[61] Eisenhut (1958) 79.
[62] Eisenhut (1958) 95.

tum primum Aeneas parato certamine intra muros manet execratus quippe Alexandri facinus commissum in Apollinem, cuius sacra is praecipue tuebatur.

Then Aeneas stayed inside the city walls for the first time, even though battle was being prepared, because he detested the crime Alexander committed against Apollo, whose holy places he especially cared for.

The text states that Alexander's ambush of Achilles in the temple of Apollo is an act of sacrilege against the god. Because of this, Aeneas is no longer willing to fight for Alexander. Aeneas' religious principle here is perhaps a reference by Pseudo-Diktys to the piety that so characterizes him in the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*.[63] In chapter IV.18, Helenus, one of Priam's sons, also shows his disgust for Alexander's misdeed. He surrenders himself to the Greeks and explains his motives to them:[64]

... multa prius locutus non metu, ait, se mortis patriam parentesque deserere, sed deorum coactum aversione, quorum delubra violari ab Alexandro neque se neque Aeneam quisse pati. qui metuens Graecorum iracundiam apud Antenorem agere senemque parentem. de cuius oraculo imminentia Troianis mala cum cognovisset, ultro supplicem ad eos decurrere. tunc nostris festinantibus secreta dinoscere, Chryses nutu uti silentium ageretur significat atque Helenum secum abducit. a quo doctus cuncta Graecis uti audierat refert, addit praeterea tempus Troiani excidii idque administris Aenea atque Antenore fore.

… after having spoken many things before it, he said that he had not deserted his country and his parents out of fear of death, but because he had been forced to by the aversion of the gods, as neither he nor Aeneas had been able to endure their shrines to be violated by Alexander. He said that Aeneas lived with Antenor and his old parent because he feared the wrath of the Greeks. When Helenus had learned of the imminent calamities for the Trojans from his oracle, he had of his own accord come running to them as a suppliant. When our men hurried to discern secrets from this, Chryses expressed with a nod that silence should be made and he took Helenus aside with him. He referred all what he had learned from him to the Greeks as he had heard it, and moreover he added the time of the destruction of Troy and that this would be with Aeneas and Antenor as helpers.

This passage has two difficulties. First of all, as Janssen remarks, it is left open here if 'his old parent' or 'father' (*senemque parentem*) is meant to be the father of Antenor or the father of Aeneas.[65] It seems more likely that Anchises is meant here, as he appears in multiple other places in the *Ephemeris*, whereas a father of Antenor appears nowhere else. Secondly, the placement of *de cuius oraculo* in the sentence implies that Helenus learned of the oracle from the *senemque parentem*, who is likely Anchises. Thus, Frazer attributes the oracle to Anchises in his translation.[66] Janssen disagrees with this interpretation and ascribes the oracle to Apollo, of whom Helenus was a priest.[67] The only thing that is certain is that the text is cryptic here. Nevertheless, in his opposition to Alexander and Priam, Aeneas has now sought refuge with Antenor and his own father Anchises. And it is the Greek ally Chryses, who first speaks of the possible role of Aeneas and Antenor in the fall of Troy.

In the last chapter (22) of book IV, the Trojan nobles have no further hope of defending the walls of Troy against the Greeks. Their army has been beaten and Alexander is dead. And so

[63] Scafoglio (2018) 272.
[64] Eisenhut (1958) 96.
[65] Janssen (2003) 166.
[66] Frazer (1966) chapter 21.
[67] Janssen (2003) 166.

they erect a sedition against King Priam and the remaining princes. Apparently, Aeneas was not yet present at this himself:[68]

denique accito Aenea filiisque Antenoris decernunt inter se, uti Helena cum his, quae ablata erant, ad Menelaum duceretur.

When Aeneas and the sons of Antenor were called for, they thereupon decide among one another, that Helen, together with those things that had been carried off, would be taken to Menelaus.

Aeneas must have arrived before Priam enters the scene:[69]

ceterum ingressus consilium Priamus, ubi multa ab Aenea contumeliosa ingesta sunt, ad postremum ex consilii sententia iubet ad Graecos cum mandatis belli deponendi ire Antenorem.

Moreover, when Priam had entered the council, where many abusive things are heaped up by Aeneas, on the opinion of the council he at last orders Antenor to go to the Greeks with mandates to give up the war.

Contumeliosa can be translated more negatively as 'insults', 'abusive things', or more neutral as 'reproaches'. Based on Aeneas' opinion of Priam earlier in the *Ephemeris*, I have chosen to translate it more negatively. And although the Latin leaves it open, it is therefore likely that Aeneas directs his insults directly at Priam here. Next, Antenor goes to the Greeks. There he is received kindly because of his past fidelity and benevolence to them. The Greeks encourage Antenor to betray Troy. He answers them with a long speech in which he denounces Priam and the princes. At the end, he shows to the Greeks how he and Aeneas are more closely related to each other than to Priam. Antenor seems to put in a good word for Aeneas here. Then he requests that the Greeks choose their own ambassadors so that they can negotiate a peace with them. Although it is not mentioned explicitly, this seems to be the point when both the Greeks and Antenor are of the same mind: he will betray Troy to them. It seems that Antenor already made up his mind to betray Priam before he arrived at the Greek camp. With four of the Greek leaders, Antenor arranges the betrayal in private. Both Antenor and the Greeks immediately want to include Aeneas in the betrayal:[70]

praeterea placet, uti Aeneae, si permanere in fide vellet, pars praedae et domus universa eius incolumis, ipsi autem Antenori dimidium bonorum Priami regnumque uni filiorum eius, quem elegisset, concederetur.

In addition it pleased them, that a part of the spoils would be conceded to Aeneas, if he wanted to remain in their trust, and that his house would be entirely undamaged, while half of the goods of Priam would be conceded to Antenor himself and the kingdom to one of his sons, whom he would have chosen.

From this and from his behaviour immediately hereafter it seems Aeneas was already partner to Antenor's plans of betrayal. It is the question of course, if the Greeks would have even consented to a real peace when Antenor and Aeneas really intended on it. When it seemed enough of the betrayal has been discussed, Antenor is sent back to Troy. There he will tell that the Greeks are supposedly prepared to negotiate peace. They will prepare a gift to Minerva and return to Greece once Helen is returned and they have received their payment in gold.

[68] Eisenhut (1958) 99.
[69] Eisenhut (1958) 99.
[70] Eisenhut (1958) 100-101.

Book V and VI

In chapter 1 of book V, the Trojan council convenes to listen to Antenor:[71]

at lucis principio, omnibus iam in consilio expectantibus audire, si quis modus tantis malis fieret, cum Talthybio ipse venit neque multo post Aeneas, dein Priamus cum residuis regulis.

But at first light, when everyone already at the council was expecting to hear, if an end had been made to such evils, he (Antenor) himself came with Talthybius and not much later came Aeneas, next Priam with the remaining kinglets.

Here we see Aeneas acting in concord with Antenor immediately after the latter has gotten back from planning their betrayal with the Greeks. Although it is not stated explicitly, the sequence of events seems to imply Aeneas was on board with the plan of betrayal before Antenor left for the Greek camp. Then Antenor holds another lengthy speech in which he condemns the war with the Greeks because of Helen. He rebukes Priam, his sons and Antimachus for their injustices towards the Greeks. He urges to sue for peace and pay them off (chapter V.2). Of course the reader knows Antenor's words are far from sincere. The Trojans however, are moved and beg Priam to give in to the demands. Seeing no other options, the king gives his blessing to the matter and charges Antenor with arranging it (chapter V.3). Antenor asks for Aeneas to be joined to him in the endeavour:[72]

tum separato rege placet, uti Antenor ad Graecos redeat exploratum voluntatem certam adiunctusque ei, uti voluerat, Aeneas.

Then, when the king had left, it pleased them that Antenor, and joined to him, Aeneas, as he had wanted, would return to the Greeks to investigate their determined will.

The next day the two make their way to the Greeks to tell them of the Trojans' wish for peace. Pseudo-Diktys remarks how they are now supposedly negotiating peace while they negotiated to betray Troy not long before. Then they return to Troy with ambassadors from the Greeks. After an assembly of the Trojan senate, the Greek leaders again spend the night at Antenor's house (chapter V.5). He tells them that the removal of the Palladium from the temple of Minerva would mean the end of Troy. At the Greeks' urging, Antenor promises to arrange its removal from the city. The next day, the Trojans and the Greek leaders negotiate the price of the city's ransom. The next night, Antenor secretly bribes Theano, the priestess of the temple of Minerva, to hand him the Palladium and he brings it to the Greeks. The next day, the Trojans and Greeks at last agree on the ransom price (chapter V.8). In chapter 9 Helenus comes up with the idea of a giant wooden horse as the Greeks' gift for Minerva. Its great size will mean the Trojans will have to break down their wall to let it in. And so the Greeks start building the horse. They then send ten of their leaders to Troy, where they swear oaths with the Trojans to confirm the peace treaty. Antenor and the Greeks swear a deliberately ambiguous oath of which the words apply to their arrangements of betrayal as well. While the Greeks continue building the horse, the traitors gather the ransom (chapter V.11):[73]

ceterum apud Troiam auri atque argenti praedictum pondus per Antenorem atque Aeneam summo studio in aedem Minervae portabatur.

[71] Eisenhut (1958) 101.
[72] Eisenhut (1958) 104.
[73] Eisenhut (1958) 111-112.

Furthermore at Troy the aforesaid weight of gold and of silver was carried with the greatest endeavour to the temple of Minerva by Antenor and Aeneas.

When the Greeks bring their wooden horse to the city walls, the Trojans try to take it through their gates but find it doesn't fit. They start breaking down a part of their wall to let it in. Before they are allowed to do so completely, the Greeks demand to be paid the ransom money. After they are paid, the Trojans break down the rest of the wall and take the horse into their city. Then in chapter 12, the fall of Troy finally begins. The Greeks feign their depart for Greece and await a signal to sail back to Troy. Their army enters Troy through the gap in the wall and they spread throughout the city. Thus, in the *Ephemeris*, the Trojan Horse is not filled with Greek soldiers as it is in the *Aeneid* but only serves to force the Trojans to make a gap in their wall and let the Greeks in. At last, the Greeks begin to massacre Trojans and set houses on fire. Aeneas and Antenor are looked after however:[74]

neque segnius per totam urbem incendiis gestum positis prius defensoribus ad domum Aeneae atque Antenoris.

And not less slowly throughout the whole city fires were started after defenders had first been placed at the houses of Aeneas and of Antenor.

After killing and burning all night, the Greeks start to plunder for days (chapter V.13). Finally, they divide the spoils. In chapter 16, Antenor, now apparently ruler of what remains of Troy and the Trojans, asks the Greeks to depart for Greece. It is at this point that the Greeks direct their attention to Aeneas:[75]

tunc Graeci Aeneae suadent, secum uti in Graeciam naviget, ibi namque ei simile cum ceteris ducibus ius regnique eandem potestatem fore.

Then the Greeks urged Aeneas, that he would sail with them to Greece, since there would be for him the right equal with the other leaders and he would have the same power of rule.

Aeneas chooses to stay at Troy, but the Greeks seem to have planted the desire for rule in his head (chapter V.17):[76]

qui post Graecorum profectionem cunctos ex Dardano atque ex proxima paene insula adit, orat, uti secum Antenorem regno exigerent. quae postquam praeverso de se nuntio Antenori cognita sunt, regrediens ad Troiam imperfecto negotio aditu prohibetur. ita coactus cum omni patrimonio ab Troia navigat devenitque ad mare Hadriaticum multas interim gentes barbaras praevectus. ibi cum his, qui secum navigaverant, civitatem condit appellatam Corcyram Melaenam.

After the departure of the Greeks he went to all the descendants of Dardanus and to the people from the closest peninsula, and entreated them, that they would drive out Antenor with him from the realm. After these things became known to Antenor from a message sent to him, and when Aeneas returned to Troy while his business was uncompleted, he was prohibited from entrance. Thus forced to he sailed away from Troy with his entire patrimony and while sailing past many barbarian peoples he arrived in the Adriatic Sea. There he founded, together with those people who had sailed with him, a city called Corcyra Melaena.

Thus Aeneas unsuccessfully turns against his former ally and fellow conspirator Antenor. Shut out from Troy, he at last sets sail to found a new city elsewhere, as is his traditional fate. Pseudo-

[74] Eisenhut (1958) 113.
[75] Eisenhut (1958) 117.
[76] Eisenhut (1958) 118-119.

Diktys places his new city along the coast of the Adriatic Sea and calls it Corcyra Meleana, 'Black Corcyra'. Janssen identifies this with the Greek colony on the modern-day Croatian island of Korčula.[77] Thus, book V of the *Ephemeris* ends with describing the fate of the Trojan traitors and survivors. In book VI, no more information on the fate of Aeneas or Antenor is given.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have taken a look at the portrayal of Aeneas in the *Ephemeris*. We can confirm that Pseudo-Diktys did indeed make use of the much older tradition of Aeneas, along with Antenor, as a traitor who betrayed Troy. The *Ephemeris* portrays Aeneas in a quite negative way. At first, he is shown as an adherent of the wicked Alexander, fighting for his cause and defending him in the Trojan assembly. Then, he seems to be presented more positively when he refuses to fight for Alexander's cause anymore when the latter commits a sacrilegious crime. Finally, when the evil cause of Alexander and the princes is lost, Aeneas is given the chance to negotiate a peace treaty between the Trojans and the Greeks. But instead of remaining loyal to his people and his king, he conspires with Antenor to betray them to the Greeks for his own personal interest. In the aftermath of the fall of Troy, Aeneas even turns on his fellow conspirator Antenor and is finally forced to depart from his fatherland. This is hardly a positive portrayal. The *Ephemeris* portrays Aeneas very negatively. This begs the question if the portrayal of the traitorous Aeneas in the *Excidio* is any better.

[77] Janssen (2003) 193.

Chapter 3: Aeneas in the *Excidio*

In this chapter I will analyse the portrayal of Aeneas in the *Excidio*. In the edition of Meister (1873) the work is divided into forty-four chapters.

The loyal Aeneas

In contrast with the narrative of the *Ephemeris*, that begins with the abduction of Helen by Alexander, the *Excidio* connects the history of the Argonauts and the abduction of Hesione with the history of the abduction of Helen and the Trojan War. The history of the Argonauts is shortly related in chapters 1-3, only to get to the abduction of Priam's sister Hesione by the Greeks.[78] Now that Priam has become king of Troy, he sends Antenor to Greece to demand Hesione back (chapter 4). All the Greeks dismiss him however and after his return in Troy Antenor urges Priam to avenge himself by waging war on the Greeks (chapter 5). We first meet Aeneas in the *Excidio* in chapter 6 as a friend of the king when Priam summons him and others to tell them he will send an army to Greece:[79]

Continuo Priamus filios vocari iubet et omnes amicos suos Antenorem Anchisen Aenean Ucalegonta Bucolionem Panthum Lamponem et omnes filios, qui ex concubinis nati erant.

Priam immediately ordered his sons to be called and all his friends – Antenor, Anchises, Aeneas, Ucalegon, Bucolion, Panthus and Lampus – and all his sons, who were born from his concubines.

For this purpose the Trojans build a fleet (chapters 7-8). In chapter 9, Aeneas is made part of the expedition force. Once in Greece however, the war is seemingly abandoned when Alexander meets Helen and decides to abduct her (chapter 10). After their return to Troy, Priam hopes to trade Helen for Hesione. When Helen's abduction becomes known, the Greeks gather an army to sail to Troy (chapter 11). In chapters 12 and 13, Pseudo-Nepos introduces Dares as the author of this history and physical descriptions are given of the Trojans and the Greeks, including Aeneas:[80]

Aeneam rufum quadratum facundum affabilem fortem cum consilio pium venustum oculis hilaribus et nigris.

Aeneas was red-haired, stocky, eloquent, courteous, strong with counsel, pious, charming, with lively, black eyes.

Interestingly, Pseudo-Nepos uses the word *pium*, among others, to describe Aeneas. Is this a reference by the author to Aeneas' famous quality in the *Aeneid*? After the Greeks arrive at the island of Tenedos, envoys are sent to Priam to demand Helen back (chapters 15-16). The Greeks promise to return home when she is returned to them. Strangely, Priam brings up the abduction of Hesione, but he does not propose to exchange her for Helen anymore.[81] Instead, he repudiates the Greek envoys as they had repudiated Antenor and declares that he will have war and not peace (chapter 17). While this is not a very logical development of the story, Pseudo-Nepos

[78] Pseudo-Nepos actually refers to a full work on the Argonauts (1. *argonautas*), probably meaning the *Argonautica* of Apollonios of Rhodes.
[79] Meister (1873) 8.
[80] Meister (1873) 15.
[81] As noted by Griffin (1907) 4.

probably did not want to prevent the Trojan War from happening by resolving the conflict here. In chapter 18, Aeneas again appears as a Trojan commander. The Greeks land at Troy and the first of the many battles described in the *Excidio* begins (chapter 19). To fill out the long ten years of the war, Pseudo-Nepos again and again lets the Trojans and the Greeks fight battles that last between a few days and eighty days until one of the sides is so weakened that they request a truce from the enemy. Between chapters 20 and 33 a total number of ten truces occur, ranging from twenty days to three whole years. During these years of war, Aeneas is mentioned six times, in chapters 20, 21 and 24, as one of the Trojan commanders, killing Greeks, and one time saving Alexander's life:[82]

quos ut vidit Hector instanter fratrem suum persequi, subpetias cum Aenea ei venit. quem Aeneas clipeo protexit, et de proelio ad civitatem secum adduxit.

When Hector instantly saw that they pursued his brother (Alexander), he came to his aid together with Aeneas. Aeneas protected him with his shield, and he led him with him from the battle to the city.

Aeneas the traitor

After the death of Hector and Alexander, the Greeks encircle Troy and things are looking grim for the Trojans (chapter 36). In chapter 37, Priam is asked by his own people to make peace:[83]

Hoc postquam Troiani viderunt, Antenor Polydamas Aeneas ad Priamum veniunt, agunt eum eo, ut consilium convocet et deliberet quid de fortunis suis futurum sit.

After the Trojans saw this, Antenor, Polydamas and Aeneas came to Priam, and they moved him to it, that he would call together the council and deliberate what the fates of his people would be.

Priam calls the council together and Antenor advises to make peace by returning Helen. Amphimachus, a son of Priam, curses Antenor and his associates and urges to fight to the death. As Frazer remarks, he is a clear adaption by Pseudo-Nepos of the character of Antimachus from the *Iliad* and the *Ephemeris*.[84] Next, Aeneas and Polydamas speak up (chapter 37):[85]

postquam is finem fecit, Aeneas exurgit lenibus mitibusque dictis Amphimacho repugnat, ab Argivis pacem petendam magnopere suadet: Polydamas eadem suadet.

After he had made an end, Aeneas rose up and fought against Amphimachus with gentle and soft words, and he earnestly urged for peace to be sought with the Argives: Polydamas urged the same.

Aeneas now forms the Trojan peace faction with Antenor and Polydamas. Priam, however, accuses Antenor and Aeneas of starting the war they are now urging to end. He is of the same opinion as Amphimachus, there will be no peace. He commands everyone to prepare to fight to the death on the morrow. After he has dismissed the council, Priam plots with Amphimachus to kill Antenor, Aeneas and Polydamas as he fears they will betray him and the city (chapter 38). At the same time, the peace faction convenes. It is here that the development of Aeneas, among others, from a loyal supporter of Priam to a traitor takes place in the *Excidio* (chapter 39):[86]

Eodemque die clam conveniunt Antenor Polydamas Ucalegon Dolon, dicunt se mirari regis pertinaciam, qui inclusus cum patria et comitibus perire malit quam pacem facere. Antenor ait se

[82] Meister (1873) 26.
[83] Meister (1873) 44.
[84] Frazer (1966) note 30.
[85] Meister (1873) 45.
[86] Meister (1873) 47.

invenisse quod sibi et illis in commune proficiat, quod quo pacto fieri possit dicturum, si sibi fides servaretur. Omnes se in fidem Antenori obstringunt. Antenor ut vidit se obstrictum, mittit ad Aenean, dicit patriam prodendam esse et sibi et suis esse cavendum…

That same day Antenor, Polydamas, Ucalegon, and Dolon come together in secret, and they said that they were amazed at the stubbornness of the king, who would rather perish together with his country and his companions than make peace when he was surrounded. Antenor said that he had devised something that would benefit himself and them in common, what could be made to be spoken out when fixed, if loyalty was kept to himself. They all bound themselves in loyalty to Antenor. When Antenor saw that they had bound themselves, he sent for Aeneas, and said that their country needed to be surrendered and they needed to look out for the interest of themselves and their people…

Pseudo-Nepos presents both Priam and the Trojan peace faction as guilty towards each other. On the one hand, Priam refuses to abandon the war and is prepared to sacrifice his own people instead of making peace. In order to avoid the opponents among his own people from betraying him he plots to have them killed. On the other hand, the Trojan peace faction, including Aeneas, is left unaware of their king's plot to kill them. Antenor fears that Priam will act against him but they are not sure of his plans. Still they are prepared to betray him to avoid their own deaths and those of their people. Bradley thinks the assassination plot of Priam, unheard of before the *Excidio*, may have been devised by Pseudo-Nepos to justify the older tradition of Antenor betraying Troy to the Greeks.[87] It is interesting that Antenor binds the other conspirators to him before calling in Aeneas. Is Aeneas really the last person to be brought into the conspiracy? Or were he and Antenor already on the same page before Antenor convinced the others, as in the *Ephemeris*? The first option would make Antenor the originator of the treason. Nevertheless, they send Polydamas to Agamemnon with their offer of betrayal. The Greeks decide to trust the Trojan traitors (chapter 40):[88]

tunc placitum est omnibus, ut fides daretur iureiurando confirmaretur, ut si oppidum proxima nocte tradidissent Antenori Ucalegonti Polydamanti Aeneae Doloni suisque omnibus parentibus fides servaretur nec non liberis coniugibus consanguineis amicis propinquis, qui una consenserant suaque omnia incolumia sibi habere liceat.

Then it was agreed upon by all, so that loyalty was given and confirmed by swearing, that if they had handed over the city the next night, good faith would be kept with Antenor, Ucalegon, Polydamas, Aeneas and Dolon and with all their parents and also with their children, wives, relatives, friends and relations, whom they had agreed upon together and that it would be allowed to have all their possessions unharmed for themselves.

Thus the terms of the betrayal are agreed upon. Next, Polydamas instructs the Greeks in the details of the betrayal. They will lead their army to the Scaean gate at night, on which the head of a horse is sculpted. This is of course a clear nod to the Trojan Horse. With this Pseudo-Nepos seems to imply that the legendary story of the wooden horse developed from a more believable historical detail. At the gate, Antenor and Anchises will have charge of the guard. They will unlock the gate and signal to the Greeks that they can enter the city (chapter 40). That night, all is done as said. But instead of Anchises, it is Aeneas who accompanies Antenor at the gate. Most likely, the previous mention of Anchises in chapter 40 is a mistake by the author. Indeed, in his translation, Frazer already mentions Aeneas instead of Anchises in chapter 40.[89] After

[87] Bradley (1991) 242.
[88] Meister (1873) 48.
[89] Frazer (1966) chapter 40.

they have let the Greeks in, Antenor leads them to the royal palace, where Priam is killed. Aeneas however, is given one last good act after his betrayal (chapter 41):[90]

Hecuba dum fugit cum Polyxena, Aeneas occurrit: Polyxena tradit se ei, quam Aeneas ad patrem Anchisen abscondit.

While Hecuba fled with Polyxena, Aeneas ran into them: she handed Polyxena over to him and Aeneas hid her at the house of his father Anchises.

This act can be seen as an homage by Pseudo-Nepos to the traditional piety of Aeneas.[91] The morning after the Greeks have plundered Troy, they honour their promises to the Trojan traitors (chapter 42). Eventually however, it is remembered that Polyxena had not been found and Agamemnon orders Antenor to find her. Antenor knows that Aeneas has hidden her and asks him to hand her over. Thus Aeneas is forced to give her up and she is killed on Achilles' burial mound. His last good deed has serious repercussions for Aeneas (chapter 43):[92]

Agamemnon iratus Aeneae quod Polyxenam absconderat eum cum suis protinus de patria excedere iubet. Aeneas cum suis omnibus proficiscitur.

Agamemnon was angry with Aeneas because he had hidden Polyxena and ordered him to depart his fatherland immediately with his people. Aeneas departed together with all his people.

And so Aeneas is forced by the Greeks to sail away from Troy. Unlike in the *Ephemeris*, where he is forced to depart after turning on his fellow conspirator Antenor, here Aeneas is punished by the Greeks for his last good deed towards the house of Priam. Very much near the end of the *Excidio*, we hear of Aeneas one last time (chapter 44):[93]

Aeneas navibus profectus est, in quibus Alexander in Graeciam ierat, numero viginti duabus: quem omnis aetas hominum secuta est in milibus tribus et quadringentis.

Aeneas has left with the ships, in which Alexander had gone to Greece, with the number of twenty-two: three thousand and four hundred people of all ages followed him.

Pseudo-Nepos doesn't tell us where Aeneas ends up with his ships and his people. Instead, the story of Aeneas ends as the *Excidio* ends.

Conclusion

So how is Aeneas portrayed in the *Excidio*? Like the *Ephemeris*, the *Excidio* makes use of the already centuries old tradition of Aeneas as a traitor, along with Antenor. Like in the *Ephemeris*, Aeneas begins as a firm supporter of his king, fighting for him and the cause of his son Alexander for the most part of the *Excidio*. Unlike in the *Ephemeris*, he even stays loyal to Priam until the Trojan cause is hopelessly lost. Thus, his portrayal up to that point is very positive. Then Aeneas is part of the group of Trojan nobles urging the king for peace with the Greeks. This is where Aeneas, as in the *Ephemeris*, shifts from loyal noble to traitor. The shift is not as negative as it is in the *Ephemeris* however. There Antenor and Aeneas did not need to betray Priam but did so for their own gain. In the *Excidio*, Antenor and Aeneas are part of a larger group of Trojan nobles urging for peace who end up being willing to betray Priam and

[90] Meister (1873) 49.
[91] Scafoglio (2018) 279.
[92] Meister (1873) 51.
[93] Meister (1873) 52.

their city to the Greeks. Their motivation is presented in a quite neutral way. Their king was actively trying to have them assassinated for their insistence on peace, giving them some justification in betraying him. However, they were not completely sure of his intentions and came to the thought that he would try to have them killed on their own, without any clear proof. And so their betrayal is not entirely justified. Finally, during the sack of Troy, Aeneas is shown in a positive light one last time when he rescues Polyxena by hiding her from the Greeks. However, he is forced to reveal her in the end and is punished for it with banishment. Thus, unlike in the *Ephemeris*, where Aeneas is forced to depart from Troy because he betrayed his fellow conspirator Antenor, in the *Excidio*, he is forced to sail away from Troy because of a good deed. All in all, Aeneas' portrayal in the *Excidio* is mixed. Certainly more positive than his portrayal in the *Ephemeris*, but still negative in the end.

Chapter 4: Choosing treacherous Aeneas

In the last two chapters we have analysed the exact way in which the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* portray Aeneas as a traitor responsible for the fall of Troy. We concluded that the *Ephemeris* portrays him very negatively, while in the *Excidio* he is still portrayed negatively but at the same time far better than in the *Ephemeris*. These results lead us back to our main research question: with what purpose did the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* negatively portray Aeneas as a traitor responsible for the fall of Troy? In this final chapter, I will examine the possible explanations for this question offered by scholars in the past. By using the approach of new historicism I aim to investigate the two works' historical literary contexts to determine their purpose with the characterisation of Aeneas in their texts as we have analysed them.

Homeric revisionism

Already since the time of Herodotus, writers have expressed their doubts on the authenticity of the account of the Trojan War in Homer's *Iliad*. There has been scholarship on the historical problems in Homer's works since Hellenistic times. This tradition is called Homeric criticism. Soon however, scholars went from criticizing to correcting and Homeric revisionism was born. In the Greek-speaking world, the works of Homer were seen to have the greatest literary authority, making them very attractive for revisionism. The modern term for these type of Homeric revisionist works is antihomerica ('against the works of Homer'). First, plausible reconstructions of the Trojan War were made to offer rationalistic explanations of the *Iliad*. But with the charges against Homer as an excuse, later writers began to write their own accounts of the war to dispute the accuracy of the *Iliad*'s narrative, ignoring the fact that the work was not really meant to be treated as a historical work. They aimed to show where Homer supposedly went wrong in his narrative of the Trojan War and to correct him by relating their own 'true' version of events. The history of the Trojan War was rewritten on the basis of supposedly newly discovered, more trustworthy sources. These were often in the form of eye-witness accounts, as these would have been written before Homer was even born, thereby making him the second-rate authority, and could theoretically not be factchecked. These fictitious accounts were the pretended solution for the problems historians had with the *Iliad*. The two most important examples are the *Trojan oration* of Dio Chrysostomus from the end of the first century CE and the *Heroicus* by Philostratus from around 220 CE. The *Ephemeris* and *Excidio* belong to this genre of antihomerica. However, they do their own thing. They are imaginings of what a real historical work that Homer writing the *Iliad* might have used would look like, complete with their revisionist take on the character of Aeneas. But for what purpose exactly?[94]

Vergilian revisionism

Pseudo-Diktys and Pseudo-Nepos wanted their narratives of the fall of Troy to differ from the traditional narrative of the Epic Cycle and of the *Aeneid*. As we have seen, Aeneas and Antenor had been the usual suspects of betraying Troy for the longest time. Thus, the two authors chose to play with the literary tradition of the traitorous Aeneas and Antenor. For their readers, the negative narrative of Aeneas as a traitor fitted into the genre of Homeric revisionism, in which the canonical story of the Trojan War was turned upside down. Treason from within would have

[94] Gudeman (1894) 140; Griffin (1907) 11-14; Merkle (1994) 183-184, 193; Scafoglio (2018) 266-; Clark (2020) 21-22; Dowden (2022) 134-139; Overduin (2023) 16-35.

read as more plausible than a giant wooden horse filled with men. But as it is Aeneas whose role in the fall of Troy they revised, we should also be speaking of Vergilian revisionism. The presentation of Aeneas as a traitor gave them the opportunity to contrast their narrative of the fall of Troy with that of Vergil in *Aeneid* book 2. But why exactly did they do this? We can think of two good reasons.

First, there is the reason of polemising with the *Aeneid*. As Scafoglio remarks, at the time of their compositions in late antiquity, the negative portrayal of Aeneas as a traitor in *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* would have pushed against the established narrative of pious Aeneas of Vergil's *Aeneid*.[95] I certainly agree with this, but was polemising with the *Aeneid* the works' main goal?

Secondly, there is the reason of entertainment. Pseudo-Diktys and Pseudo-Nepos must have known that the story of a very negative traitor Aeneas would offer their readers a very different view and experience of Aeneas than they were most likely familiar with. As Spence remarks, the two authors wrote a history of the Trojan War that is alternative to the events of the Trojan War as we are familiar with them from Homer's *Iliad* and Vergil's *Aeneid*.[96] This would certainly have been a refreshing and entertaining experience for educated readers familiar with the older and established works on the Trojan War. This seems to me to have been the prime reason for adopting the traitorous Aeneas tradition. As we have seen, the narratives on the fall of Troy in the two works is certainly very different than anything else seen before.

Thus, the choice of the authors of the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* of adopting the tradition of traitorous Aeneas, and Antenor, in their revisions of the narrative of the fall of Troy seems to me to have been primarily born out of a desire to subvert the expectations of their audience, to delight it with a dangerous new fully worked out narrative of war and betrayal, and to dazzle their readers with references to the rich literary tradition surrounding the Trojan War.

[95] Scafoglio 2018, 267.
[96] Spence (2010) 136.

Conclusion

We started this thesis with the research question how exactly the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* portrayed Aeneas as a traitor responsible for the fall of Troy and for what reason. In my introduction I have tried to bring order to the complicated literary webs of these two texts by taking a detailed look at the way the authors of these two works present their contents to their readers in the *Ephemeris*' prologue and letter, and the *Excidio*'s letter. After that I investigated the origin of the concept of Aeneas as a traitor responsible for the fall of Troy. We concluded that the origin of this narrative goes back to Aeneas' first appearances in ancient literary works and that traitorous Aeneas has known many versions and works. Next, we spend two chapters taking an exhaustive look into the precise way the *Ephemeris* and the *Excidio* present Aeneas in their narratives. We found the first to contain a much darker portrait of the traitor Aeneas than the second. With all that done, we turned back to our research question and attempted to answer the question why exactly these two works, with the most important being the *Ephemeris*, chose to incorporate the much older concept of Aeneas as a traitor into their versions of the history of the Trojan War. This was a difficult question to answer. I suspect the reason the works included their portrait of a treacherous Aeneas was to distance themselves as far as they could from the traditional and more established versions of the history of the Trojan War related in Homer's *Iliad* and Vergil's *Aeneid*, in which Aeneas is a pious survivor of the fall of Troy. This they could achieve by adopting the old story of Aeneas, and Antenor alongside him, as a Trojan who survived the fall of Troy by betraying his own city to its enemies.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Austin, R.G. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1971).

Austin, R.G. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1980).

Burgess, Glyn S. and Douglas Kelly (transl.), *The Roman de Troie by Benoît de Sainte-Maure*. Gallica Volume 41 (D.S. Brewer, Cambridge 2017).

Eden, P.T. (ed.), *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII* (E.J. Brill, Lugduni Batavorum 1975).

Eisenhut, Werner (ed.), *Dictys Cretensis. Ephemeridos Belli Troiani Libri a Lucio Septimio ex Graeco in Latinum Sermonem Translati. Accedit Papyrus Dictyis Graeci ab Tebtunim Inventa*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (B.G. Teubner, Leipzig 1958. Reprint by B.G. Teubner, Leipzig 1973. Reprint by De Gruyter, Berlin 1994 and 2013).

Frazer, R.M. (transl.), *The Trojan War. The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington 1966).

Horsfall, Nicolas (ed.), *Virgil, Aeneid 2. A Commentary*. Mnemosyne Supplements. Monographs on Greek and Roman Language and Literature. Volume 299 (Brill. Leiden – Boston 2008).

Janssen, Gerard (transl.), *Dictys Cretensis. Dagboek van de Trojaanse Oorlog* (Chaironeia, Leeuwarden 2003).

McGill, Scott (ed.) *Virgil. Aeneid Book XI* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).

Meister, Ferdinand (ed.), *Dares Phrygius. Daretis Phrygii de excidio Troiae historia*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (B.G. Teubner, Leipzig 1873. Reprint by B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart – Leipzig 1991).

Overduin, Floris (transl.), *Dio Chrysostomus. Troje is nooit veroverd! Trojaanse redevoering (Or. 11)* (Uitgeverij Damon, Eindhoven 2023).

Pease, Arthur Stanley (ed.) *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1967).

Tarrant, Richard (ed.), *Virgil. Aeneid Book XII* (Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Williams, R.D. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Tertius* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1962).

Secondary literature

Bradley, Dennis R., ‘Troy Revisited’, *Hermes* 119:2 (1991) 232-246.

Casali, Sergio, 'The Development of the Aeneas Legend', in: Joseph Farrell and Michael C.J. Putnam (eds.), *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World (Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester 2010) 37-51.

Clark, Frederic, *The First Pagan Historian: the Fortunes of a Fraud from Antiquity to the Enlightenment* (Oxford University Press, New York 2020).

Dowden, Ken, 'Antihomerica: Dares and Dictys', in: R. Scott Smith and Stephen M. Trzaskoma (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Mythography* (2022) 134-141.

Dowden, Ken, 'Reading Diktys: The Discrete Charm of Bogosity', in: Michael Paschalis, Stelios Panayotakis, Gareth Schmeling (eds.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel*. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 12 (Barkhuis Publishing and Groningen University Library, Groningen 2009) 155-168.

Eck, Werner, 'Über die prätorischen Prokonsulate in der Kaiserzeit. Eine quellenkritische Überlegung', *Zephyrus* 23 (1972) 233-260.

Gómez Peinado, Elisabet, 'The Greek *Ephemeris belli Troiani* by Dictys Cretensis and its Latin and Byzantine testimonies', in: Grasiana Brescia, Mario Lentano, Giampiero Scafoglio and Valentina Zanusso (eds.), *Revival and Revision of the Trojan Myth: Studies on Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius*. Spudasmata 177 (Hildesheim, Georg Olms Verlag 2018) 53-75.

Griffin, Nathaniel Edward, *Dares and Dictys. An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Versions of the Story of Troy*. Dissertation (J.H. Furst Company, Baltimore 1907).

Gudeman, Alfred, 'Literary Frauds among the Romans', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 25 (1894) 140-164.

Hägg, Tomas, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1983).

Horsfall, N.M., 'The Aeneas Legend from Homer to Virgil', in: J.N. Bremmer and N.M. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*. Bulletin Supplement 52 (University of London. Institute of Classical Studies). Oxford University Press (1987) 12-24.

Horsfall, Nicholas, 'The Aeneas-legend and the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius* 32 (1986) 8-17.

Horsfall, Nicholas, 'Some Problems in the Aeneas Legend', *The Classical Quarterly* 29:2 (1979) 372–390.

Merkle, Stefan, 'Telling the True Story of the Trojan War: The Eyewitness Account of Dictys of Crete', in: James Tatum (ed.) *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London 1994) 183-196.

Papadopoulos, G.A. and A. Vassilopoulou, 'Historical and Archaeological Evidence of Earthquakes and Tsunamis Felt in the Kythira Strait, Greece', in: G.T. Hebenstreit (ed.) *Tsunami Research at the End of a Critical Decade* (Kluwer Academic Publishers 2001) 119-138.

Scafoglio, Giampiero, 'Antenore, il traditore', in: Grasiana Brescia, Mario Lentano, Giampiero Scafoglio and Valentina Zanusso (eds.), *Revival and Revision of the Trojan Myth:*

Studies on Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius. Spudasmata 177 (Hildesheim, Georg Olms Verlag 2018) 257-286.

Scafoglio, Giampiero, 'The Betrayal of Aeneas', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013) 1–14.

Spence, Sarah, 'Felix Casus. The Dares and Dictys Legends of Aeneas', in: Joseph Farrell and Michael C.J. Putnam (eds.), *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World (Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester 2010) 133-146.

Images

Title page: miniature of Aeneas as a medieval knight in the capital A of the opening lines *arma virumque cano* of a manuscript containing the works of Vergil. Austria, Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, Codex Claustroneoburgensis 742, f.40r, second half of the twelfth century.