THE POETIC DARKNESS OF APHRODITE

AND ITS RECEPTION IN VERGIL'S *AENEID*.

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Natasha Marta Binek

December 2018

THE POETIC DARKNESS OF APHRODITE AND ITS RECEPTION IN VERGIL'S *AENEID*.

Natasha Marta Binek, Ph.D.

Cornell University 2018

This dissertation examines the figuring of Aphrodite in the Greek poetic tradition and its reception in Vergil's *Aeneid*. In particular, it considers the unflattering depictions of the goddess of love, along with her powers and complements, that, on the one hand, conceptualize her as a chaotic elemental force at odds with civilized existence, and, on the other, repeatedly subject her to humiliating disempowerment. Drawing on J. Mira Seo's reading of characters as "nodes of intertextuality" (2013: 4) and extending to divine figures the insights of recent scholarship on the interpretative value of the dynamics of *fama*, I contend that the dark *fama* of the goddess of love is an intertextual presence in the *Aeneid* that shapes and dramatizes the process of the characterization of its Venus to an extent that has not been previously appreciated. In Vergil's poem, we find fragments of Venus' dark poetic past embedded within new narratives and reconfigured to new, often oppositional, effects. In turn, this composite make-up undermines the stability of her character, as past and present voices compete in a dialectical process that ultimately denies a fixed identity to this profoundly referential figure.

I also posit that Vergil dramatizes the doubleness inherent in his Venus by "relocating" some of the dark elements that typify the poetic articulation of the goddess of love into the articulation of his Juno. In turn, this resonance of Juno's characterization with Venus' *fama* destabilizes the oppositional relationship between the *Aeneid*'s divine antagonists, whose conflict in many ways

shapes the poem. Finally, I show that the deep affinity between Juno and Venus is both dramatized in the seamless merging of their influence within Dido's experience of an "*odi et amo*" passion and amplified by the parallel erotic coloring that marks their preoccupation with Aeneas. In blurring the distinctness of the goddesses' identities, Vergil invites critical reflection on poetic apprehensions of divine individuality and on other oppositional configurations, both within the world of his poem and within the historical realities with which it is engaged.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Natasha M. Binek received both her B.A. and her M.A. from the University of Toronto. During her time as a graduate student at Cornell, Natasha presented her research at a number of international conferences. She also published an article on the controversial last segment of the Dipylon Oinochoe graffito. Currently, she holds the position of Classics Fellow at Marlboro College in Vermont.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank the chair of my advisory committee, Hayden Pelliccia. With brilliant insight, thoughtfulness, and much-needed humor, he has guided my – sometimes storm-tossed – journey from Aphrodite of the *Fifth Homeric Hymn* all the way to Vergil's Venus. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Caitlin Barrett for her unfailing encouragement, generosity, and kindness, and to Dave Makin, Verity Platt, and Joseph Reed for their invaluable comments, suggestions, and overall assistance. Warm thanks are likewise due to the Classics Department at Cornell for facilitating my academic growth in a constructive and caring environment. In particular, I would like to thank Eric Rebillard for his advice and unwavering support.

Finally, I must acknowledge how much I owe to my husband Jeff, who left his comfortable life in Toronto to start from scratch in a small city in upstate New York. Eternally patient and positive, he has faithfully accompanied me on my academic adventures while keeping me grounded in the "real" world. Of course, this dissertation is dedicated to him!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

As the divine mother of the poem's eponymous hero, Venus has a vital and sustained role in the *Aeneid*. Her assiduous involvement in the storyline frames the narrative: she intervenes on behalf of her son on three occasions in both the first and last book. In fact, the poem's very title underscores her importance, for according to the longer *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite,* Aeneas' name reifies the goddess' terrible pain, αἰνὸν ἄχος (198-199) at having conceived a child in the bed of a mortal.[1] At a certain level, then, the *Aeneid* is actually the story of Venus's suffering, rooted in her ongoing participation in the mortal condition via her son and his descendants.

Along with Jupiter and Juno, Venus is also a principal agent of the *Aeneid*'s divine machinery, one of the formal features through which the Roman work signals its generic identity and close alignment with the Homeric tradition and in so doing activates Venus' epic heritage. In fact, through her identity as a major Olympian goddess Vergil's Venus also attracts sources beyond the epic genre. It is with a view of the complex ways in which the *Aeneid*'s negotiates the extensive literary past of its Venus that this study considers the goddess of love in the Greek poetic tradition and her characterization in the *Aeneid*.

Interpretations of Vergil's Venus: the good, the bad, and the (un)sexy

Like the *Aeneid* itself, the character of Vergil's Venus has generated a wide range of interpretations. To begin with, it is a long-standing point of disagreement whether she constitutes a continuation of the Greek goddess of love in her function of embodied sexuality. Thus, in the middle of the 20th century, Anderson felt compelled to counter the judgements presenting Venus

[1] For the strong likelihood of Vergil's familiarity with this text, see Sec. 1.5, note 128 and Sec. 3.3, pp. 171-172.

as "a colorless paragon of matronly respectability,"[2] by pointing to "traces of the old, capricious Aphrodite" (whom he terms a "disturbing lady of easy virtue") in Venus' encounter with her son in Book 1.[3] A comparison of scholarly views on what happens at the conclusion of this encounter vividly illustrates this interpretative disparity. Before she departs, Venus reveals herself to Aeneas as his mother through a change in form; her divine loveliness becomes apparent and *pedes vestis defluxit ad imos* (1.404). Harrison argues that the downward flow of her dress works to minimize the initial sensuality of her divine splendor and lends the goddess "a matronly gravity."[4] The same scene, however, has also inspired Reckford to propose that Venus' clothes slide *off* her body to foreground her "overwhelming erotic appeal."[5] Scholars like Wlosok and Paschalis contend – on Harrison's side – that Vergil very much downplays the goddess' traditional nature, while Gutting, for instance, argues that the poet presents her as a relentless champion of the erotic.[6]

A lack of scholarly consensus also attends two intersecting aspects of Vergil's Venus: her role as mother and her ideological significance. In terms of the first, some stress Venus' devotion to Aeneas, while others view her as sorely-lacking in her maternal function. The former group stresses her ardent concern and unrelenting assistance to her son throughout the poem; the latter focuses on her encounter with Aeneas in Book 1, seemingly adopting the emotional vantage point of the Trojan at the moment of her divine transformation: he accuses his mother of cruelty in her deceptions (1.407-409). Detractors of Venus see a deficiency of affection in the mother-son relationship and contrast this emotional distance with the warm interactions between Thetis

---

[2] Anderson 1955: 233, citing Cartault (1926: 88) and Bailey (1935: 314).
[3] Anderson 1955: 237 & 233.
[4] Harrison 1972-73: 12-13.
[5] Reckford 1995-96: 3.
[6] Wlosok 1967: 108 *et passim*; Paschalis: 1984; Gutting 2006: 11 *et passim*.

and Achilles in the *Iliad*.[7] As for the ideological assessments of Vergil's goddess, the divide in opinions is well illustrated by the stances of Wlosok and Lyne. The former writes of Venus in overwhelmingly positive terms,[8] seeing her as the advocate of peace and tranquility, who nevertheless – in her role as *Aeneadenmutter* and patron of what is beautiful – champions her people as they are called to fight "im Namen der göttlichen Ordnung und des Rechts zur Ahndung von Gewalt und Frevel."[9] Lyne – to use his own words – takes "a very different view of Vergil's Venus."[10] In keeping with his anti-imperialist approach, Lyne sees Vergil's portrayal of Augustus' reputed ancestress as predominately negative: "One might expect Rome's great epic to defer to her and assign to her dignity, benevolence, magnificence. In fact ... this is not the case. The explicit action (the epic voice) as well as further insinuating voices present her in roles that are traditional but hardly flattering... . Vergil is not fond of this goddess."[11] Other scholars

---

[7] Thus, e.g., Griffin (1986: 82) proclaims that this "programmatic" scene shows that "Aeneas is the son of a goddess, but she is not a real mother to him, as Thetis is to Achilles; she does not allow him even the companionship that Odysseus gets from Athena." Segal (1981: 73) argues that "[d]elusion by Venus' 'false images' counterbalances help by Venus' supernatural intervention." Henize (2003: 221) furnishes a contrasting view: he sees Venus as a prime example of maternal love, as a mother who is "tireless in her concern for Aeneas, as Thetis is for Achilles in the *Iliad*, but more passionate and tender." Moreover, Aeneas' reproachful outburst recalls the emotional complaints that Odysseus directs against Athena at *Od.*13.318-321 (after she has toyed with him with her deceptions, which include her change of Ithaca's appearance). As the portrayal of Venus' face-to-face interaction with Aeneas must also fit within the overall design and nature of Vergil's poem (and should be evaluated within this artistic framework), it would in fact be incongruent and jarring for their relationship to mirror that of Thetis and Achilles. In comparison with the Homeric epics, the *Aeneid* appears deficient in genuinely conversational exchanges and contains few displays of emotional and physical tenderness. For a discussion of the comparative brevity of verbal exchanges in the *Aeneid*, see Heinze 315-318. Cf. Lyne 1987: 145ff.; Johnson 1976: 107. Leach also makes the very good point that Thetis' "sentimental tenderness" toward Achilles is strongly implicated in her awareness of his short life (356, 364). In stark contrast, Venus knows that in due course Aeneas will achieve immortality (1.259-260). For more on Venus' devotion to her son, see Appendix 1.

[8] For instance, she declares (1967: 115) that Venus is "auf römischer Seite die Erscheinungsform der göttlichen Gnade, die Manifestation der Gunst der Himmlischen, ist die hilfreiche Gegenwart des Göttlichen... ."

[9] Wlosok 1967: 127 ("das Schöne und Blühende"), 125. Wlosok's understanding of Venus fits within the nationalistic orientation of her reading of the *Aeneid*. Thus, she contends that the successes of Rome evoked by Aeneas' shield may be understood "als die von der Stammutter vermittelten diesseitigen Gnadenerweise der Götter verstehen, als die Belohnung, die sie der vorbildlichen Rechtsgesinnung, der pie et iuste geleisteten Kriegsführung ihrer erwählten Bannerträger zuteil werden ließen" (131).

[10] Lyne 1987: 35 n. 73.

[11] Lyne 1987: 35. Lyne speaks of the "viciousness" of her involvement with Dido, the immorality of her dealings with Vulcan, and her "insidious" contribution to Aeneas' resolve to strike at the Latin city during the final battle (27, 18-35-44, 70-71). In his 1989 article, Greenwood, who holds a positive opinion of Venus, is defensive about his "downright unorthodox untraditional view of the goddess" and voices his perplexity about "the persistent readiness

appreciate her initially constructive presence, but deplore the subsequent "development" of her role. Thus, after remarking on the positive influence she exerts over Aeneas in recalling him from his frenzied rage during the sack of Troy,[12] Putnam pronounces that Venus' role changes "as the poem progresses from one who counsels against violence in Book II, to the purveyor – one might with justice say begetter – of arms in VIII; to the fighting goddess," who, in inspiring her son to attack Latinus' city in Book 12, promotes "needless destruction" and abets his final moral "downfall."[13]

In general, the assessments and interpretations of Venus pay only limited attention, if any, to the ways in which the reception of the goddess' poetic heritage shapes her characterization.[14] In her monograph on Venus in the *Aeneid*, Wlosok largely dismisses the significance of Aphrodite:

> Bei dem Überblick über die Verwendung der Venus als Liebesgöttin machten wir die überraschende Feststellung, daß Vergil diese, wie man denken möchte, konstitutive Erscheinungsform der Göttin in der Aeneis völlig zurücktreten läßt. Die Möglichkeit, daß er für seine Venus die Aphrodite Homers oder der griechischen Religion ... zum maßgeblichen Vorbild gewählt hat, scheidet damit von vornherein aus."[15]

---

of scholars over the years to refuse to present a fair, well-balanced picture" of this Vergilian character (132, n. 1). Remarking on the responses to Venus in scholarship, including those of Wlosok and Lyne, Leach (1997: 352) observes that while "the ideological construction placed upon Venus' actions is scarcely a determinant of any reader's approach to the poem in its entirety, it is a reliable index of the direction of sympathies represented by that interpretation."

[12] Putnam 1965: 29. Identifying her appearance in Book 2 with salutary light amidst the darkness of death, Putnam states that through her wisdom "as she recalls to him the manifold attraction of love and fate which must now impel him to create, not to demolish, Aeneas makes the transition from deep involvement in useless violence to commitment to family and future."

[13] Putnam 1965: 174. On the first "stage" of her transformation in Book 8, see 136-139. Similarly, although she acknowledges Venus' "saving function in Book 2," Skinner qualifies "Venus' battlefield activities in the *Aeneid*" as "sinister" (2013: 43). Skinner argues that by involving herself in warfare in Italy thorough the procurement of Aeneas' armor and thereby channeling the cult identity of *Venus Victrix*, the goddess activates her historical connection with the bloodshed of the civil conflict between Pompey and Caesar (42). Following Fratantuono (2007: 381-382), Skinner further contends that Venus encourages Aeneas to attack the Latin city because, driven by a compulsive desire to refound Troy, she wants to clear the new site of its native inhabitants (45-46).

[14] The studies – particularly those of Harrison – that do focus on these mechanics of reception are limited to particular episodes and so fail to appreciate the broader implications.

[15] Wlosok 1967: 108.

It is only in passing that Wlosok speaks of a "correction" of a Homeric portrayal and remarks that in his presentation of the goddess' proper sphere ("Bereich der Venus") as a joyous, carefree existence in a pastoral paradise, Vergil channels Sappho's description of Aphrodite's delightful grove.[16] But for Sappho, Aphrodite was not all sweetness and light; the poet also portrays her fundamental power as a troubling force, likening its effect to that of the wind shaking a mountain tree (Fr. 47). Wlosok acknowledges that Vergil's Venus participates in a literary legacy that goes all the way back to archaic Greek poetry, but she largely ignores the elements of this legacy that do not fit her interpretation of the goddess as a champion of a peaceful, dreamy world of leisure.[17]

Fama and characterization

"[T]racking the pieces as they fit together, and teas[ing] apart the elements of composition," Seo reads characterization as a "mode of communication, a process of becoming over the course of the work."[18] She draws attention to the densely allusive nature of the characters fashioned by Roman poets and proposes that we "read them as nodes of intertextuality."[19] Seo also interprets

[16] Wlosok 1967: 140, n. 6, also 139-146 *et passim*. Sappho Fr. 2. In connection with Venus' epiphany before Aeneas in Book 1, Wlosok (1967: 99, n. 108) mentions in passing that in his description of the goddess' departure back to Paphos, Vergil is deliberately referencing *Odyssey* 8.362ff, "das heißt aber auch, daß er die Vorlage demonstrativ umgestaltet und geradezu korrigiert hat, gemäß dem erhabeneren und bedeutungsvolleren Bild, das er von der römischen Göttin geben will."
[17] Putnam (1965: 138) similarly writes of the "shining beauty of the goddess of love and with it all the usual associations of water, pastoral, and motherhood."
[18] Seo 2013: 2.
[19] Seo 2013: 4.

the accumulated texts of literary tradition as a mechanism of *fama*[20] and, in turn, posits that Vergil establishes *fama* as "dynamically constitutive of epic character."[21]

In her study of the *Aeneid*, she looks at the mechanics operative in the characterization of Aeneas, whose *fama* encompasses what is said of him, both by the voices within the poem's narrative – including his own – and by those beyond.[22] At times, these multiple internal and external voices, articulating multiple narratives and traditions, compete with each other as they produce conflicting versions of Aeneas. For instance, the very first time we meet Aeneas, the poem draws our attention to a less than flattering aspect of his intertextual history. As he faces destruction from the violence of Juno's storm, Aeneas remembers the Trojan War and its battles. He begins with the recollection of his confrontation with Diomedes (1.94-101):

... o terque quaterque beati,

quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis

contigit oppetere! o Danaum fortissime gentis

Tydide! mene Iliacis occumbere campis

non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra,

saevus ubi Aeacidae telo iacet Hector, ubi ingens

Sarpedon, ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis

---

[20] Throughout this study, I follow Seo's use of the Latin word. Its untranslatable semantic range – involving denotations of fame *and* infamy, connotations of authority *and* unreliability – has considerable interpretative value, particularly for the study of the *Aeneid*, whose "narrative structure," as Syson (2013: 33) observes, "never lets it appear a coincidence that the word *fama* can refer to an ordinary report – a report that may be accurate, mistaken, or deceptive, neutral, positive or scandalous – as well as to the crafting of transcendent fame. … Just as *fama* stands both for transience and unlimited longevity, so *fama* serves equally well as grounds either for believing or disbelieving something." For more on the duplicities inherent in *fama*, see Hardie (2012: 3-11), who also employs the Latin word "as a shorthand for the cluster of concepts" (2) with which his study of rumor and renown is concerned.

[21] Seo 2013: 33.

[22] Seo (2013: 40) notes that in the *Aeneid* people talk about Aeneas and he talks about himself; speech and reports are modes "through which his character [is] defined."

scuta virum galeasque et fortia corpora voluit!

... Greater by three, even four times, the blessing
Chance gave those with the fortune to die beneath Troy's mighty ramparts
Under their fathers' gaze! O Tydeus' son, Diomedes,
Bravest Danaan of all, why could I not have fallen on Ilium's
Plains, spilled forth my soul under *your* right hand? That's where savage
Hector was killed by Achilles' spear, where the mighty Sarpedon
Died, where the Simois snatched up and rolled in the swirl of its waters
So many warriors' shields, men's helmets, and valiant bodies![23]

His words establish an intertext with Diomedes' *aristeia* in *Iliad* 5, in the context of which the Trojan suffers a dismal defeat and escapes death only because of the timely interventions of his mother and Apollo (297ff.). Homer's account of his failing on the battlefield, however, clashes with the vehement praise of the Trojan's battle-presence that comes from the mouth of Diomedes himself in *Aeneid* 11 (282-293). Similarly, within the confines of the *Aeneid*, the version of Aeneas described by his comrade strikes a note of discord when compared with the figure depicted by his enemy. Speaking to Dido shortly after Juno's storm, the Trojan Ilioneus characterizes his leader as *quo iustior alter / nec pietate fuit, nec bello maior et armis* (1.544-545). Iarabas, Dido's spurned African suitor, however, paints a very different picture of the Trojan hero (4.215-214):

.... ille Paris cum semiviro comitatu,
Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem
subnexus, rapto potitur. ...

[23] Trans. F. Ahl, here and elsewhere for block quotes from the *Aeneid*.

.... this latter—day Paris,

Chin kept in place by Maeonian bows, and his hair by conditioning

Perfumes, controls what he's raped. ...

Iarabas' words mark the growth and progression of the personified *Fama*, the monstrous goddess with countless tongues and mouths who embodies the rumors sparked by the union of Dido and Aeneas (4.173ff.). More than just an element of the tragic love story, however, *Fama* is "a demonic version of the aims and working methods of the epic poet, performing a poetics of intertextuality and of the sublime," says Hardie.[24] In proclaiming both facts and fictions (*pariter facta atque infecta canebat*, 4.190), the goddess recalls Hesiod's Muses, who know how to say false and true things and act as the divine sources of epic poetry (*Theog*. 27-80).[25] This fundamental affinity of *Fama* as rumor and *fama* as the accumulated poetic articulation of (essentially, a poetic "talking about") a figure foregrounds the latter *fama*'s potential dubiousness and unreliability, which, as we saw, is also suggested by the dissonances among intertextual and intratextual voices. All this has a notable effect on Vergil's Aeneas; the process of his creation within the poem does not, as Seo puts it, "culminate in a single, fixed character, ... for the unstable multiplicity of sources and the explicitly unreliable nature of poetic fiction also generates competing figures within the text."[26]

Although Seo's study predominantly focuses on human figures,[27] if we understand *fama* as the accumulation of things said about a character throughout the historical course of said character's poetic articulation, then her interpretative framework can also fruitfully contribute to the understanding of the literary depictions of gods. After all, on a key level, the gods in the

[24] Hardie 2009a: 103.
[25] Hardie (2009b: 73) remarks that *Fama* "might indeed be described as the goddess of epic."
[26] Seo 2013: 33.
[27] Seo (2013: 22-31) does, however, explore the intertextually rich characterization of Thetis in Apollonius.

Aeneid are characters, sometimes vividly anthropomorphic ones at that.[28] This is especially true of Juno and Venus, the two goddesses whose markedly human passions – vengeful anger and maternal devotion[29] – are crucial to the peripetian progression of the plot. Encouragement for the application of *fama* to divine characters can be found within the *Aeneid* itself. In Book 4, Iarbas speaks of the earthly *fama* of Jupiter, questioning the veracity of its substance.[30] In Book 7, Juno is concerned about damage to her *fama* if she allows herself to be defeated by Aeneas.[31] Correspondingly, the multiplicity of voices operative in the articulation of Venus is a function of her intratextual *fama*: as in the case of Aeneas, individuals talk about the goddess throughout the poem,[32] sometimes activating voices from her literary past and contributing to the emergence of dissonant narratives on both the intertextual and the intratextual levels.[33]

It is with the role that her *fama* plays in the process of Venus' characterization that Chapter 1 concerns itself. I begin by tracing the mechanics of misalignment and alignment with her inherited *fama* that underpin Venus' first two scenes in the poem: her meeting with her father on

---

[28] Johnson observes that deities such as Cupid and Allecto, although they "become states of mind for those whose minds and volitions they have perverted ... nevertheless remain realities that exist in the space and time of the poem which they inhabit together with the human figures" (1976: 146). Drawing on Johnson, Feeney (1991: 172) adds that in "the poem's terms, ... Allecto and Juno are characters as much as Aeneas and Turnus." Cf. Hardie's remark that "Jupiter is no less a part of the fiction of the *Aeneid* – the product of epic fama – than is any other character, human or divine" (2009b: 73).

[29] For an overview of Venus' devotion to her son, see Appendix 1.

[30] Given that the god has shown no response to Dido's rejection of his son while she takes up with Aeneas, Iarbas doubts the *fama* of Jupiter's frightful power and so the validity of his worship (*nos munera templis / quippe tuis ferimus famamque fovemus inanem*, 217-218). As Hardie (2012: 88) observes, Iarbas wonders "if Jupiter's control of the literal thunderbolt is anything more than idle talk, what people say ... . Thunderbolts, so far from striking the guilty, may be just *inania murmura* 'empty rumbles,' leading to 'baseless rumours' (another possible translation of *inania murmura*) about a supreme and provident divinity."

[31] Upon seeing the Trojans beginning to settle in Italy, Juno asks the fury Allecto to help her save her reputation: *ne noster honos **infracta**ve cedat / **fama** loco* (7.332-333). Syson (2013: 18) comments that Juno "instructs the Fury to unleash to the full her creative powers. The poem connects Juno's personal *fama*, her status among the gods and mortals, with the power of its own storytelling – its successful generation of epic *fama*." Cf. Hardie's remark that, in order to protect Juno's honor and reputation, "Juno and Allecto will present themselves as rivals of the epic poet, attempting to script their own epic, one which will trumpet the fame of Juno's defeat of the Trojans" (2012: 391).

[32] Aeneas speaks of Venus at 1.382, 2.589-633, 8.534-536; Achates at 1.585, Dido at 1.617-618; Helenus at 3.475; Jupiter at 4.227-228; Juno at 9.81-95; Turnus at 12.52-53, etc.

[33] Cf. Hardie's comment that in "Book 4 the emergence of competing versions of events is allegorized in the personification of *Fama*" (2012: 143).

Olympus and then with her son on earth. In particular, I focus on the striking moment of her divine revelation that concludes her encounter with Aeneas, exploring how Vergil uses this *anagnorisis* as an opportunity to subtly acknowledge the presence of the dark *fama* that the goddess of love attracts into his text from Greek poetry. I then proceed to thematically survey the substance of this dark *fama*, namely the sizeable body of interconnected elements – both large and small – within the Greek poetic tradition that collectively amount to a characterization of Aphrodite as a destructive and hateful figure, regularly subjected to forceful and humiliating disempowerments. It is with an appreciation of the intertextual "weight" of this assemblage of vividly unflattering things said about the goddess of love that I consider Vergil's responses. I show that the poet insinuates the unreliability of (poetic) tradition by hinting at its affinity with rumor and that his engagement with Venus' *fama*-as-tradition in some ways corresponds to the workings of *fama*-as-rumor, personified in the figure of the monstrous *Fama* of Book 4. I posit that Vergil foregrounds the mutability of Aphrodite's poetic characterizations by using it as material that he fragments, mixes, and reconfigures to create new and often oppositional articulations of the goddess of love. In turn, the dissonance between the collective voice of the inherited fragments and the voice of the new constructions – within which these fragments are embedded – produces a palpable doubleness through the course of Venus' characterization and helps to explain the polarity of opinion that marks her reception.

Chapter 2 considers another way in which the *Aeneid* engages with Venus' dark *fama*. I contend that Vergil has dramatized the doubleness inherent in his Venus by "relocating" some of the dark elements that typify the poetic articulation of the goddess of love into the characterization of his Juno. A transference on the intratextual level, whereby the mechanics of divine influence first associated with Venus are in the course of the poem coopted by Juno, has

parallels on the intertextual level. The recurrent affiliation of Juno with treacherous elemental energies resonates with the vast assemblage of instances in Greek poetry where Aphrodite (along with her powers and divine complements) is closely aligned with dangerous natural forces. Moreover, at many points in the poem, Juno's characterization incorporates elements that also characterize the dark poetic past of the goddess of love. In turn, the elucidation of Juno's participation in Venus' *fama* destabilizes the oppositional relationship between these divine antagonists.

This underlying affinity between Juno and Venus is further explored in the Chapter 3, where I investigate how it is underscored within the characterization of Dido, whose experience of ardent love and ardent hate not only illustrates the influence of both Venus and Juno but also resists a simple polarizing paradigm. I posit that this interplay of an "*odi et amo*" fervor can be viewed as the manifestation of developments along a continuous spectrum of passion, at either end of which can be positioned what Juno and Venus each feels for Aeneas, inasmuch as the text imbues their sentiments with a surprisingly erotic coloring. This emotional connectedness, in turn, further destabilizes the oppositional distinctness between the goddesses and implicitly questions the vital role that this opposition plays in the story of Rome's beginnings.

CHAPTER 1: Reconfiguring a Shabby Greek *Fama* into a New Roman Goddess: The Multivocal Composition of Venus

1.1. The anagnorisis of Aphrodite

In the first book of the *Aeneid*, Venus, disguised as a local huntress, asks Aeneas about his identity. He gives her a quick overview of his background, declaring, among other things, that his *fama* makes him known beyond the heavens (*fama super aethera notus,* 1.379) and that he is making his way to Italy with his mother's guidance (*matre dea monstrante viam*, 1.382). Venus is part of her son's *fama* and his declaration of her regular assistance harmonizes with the figure Vergil has shown her to be thus far. When we first meet the goddess, she advocates for her son before Jupiter, pleading for the fulfillment of all that the divine king had promised for Aeneas and for the recognition of the Trojan's *pietas* (1.253). She comes across as a devoted mother and a beloved daughter – Jupiter comforts her both with his words, which delineate the glory of her progeny, and with his tender gestures (a smile and kiss, 1.254-256). Venus' subsequent appearance in the poem, when she meets Aeneas during his reconnaissance of the Libyan coast, thus constitutes a continuation of her maternal assistance. She proceeds to give him all the information he needs to orient himself in the strange land to which Juno's storm has driven him, and she alleviates his anxiety about his lost ships. In both her advocacy before Jupiter and in the manner of her initial appearance before Aeneas – she presents herself as a Carthaginian girl – Venus most patently echoes Athena, specifically, as she pleads for Odysseus before Zeus in *Odyssey* 1 and guides the hero in Scheria in the form of a Phaikian maiden in *Odyssey* 6. Curiously, Vergil's Venus does not much resemble the literary character she is positioned as

continuing, that is, the goddess of love that we find in the Greek poetic tradition: she does not quite align with her own poetic past.[1]

This novel characterization, however, takes a dramatic turn back toward that very past at the moment his mother reveals herself to Aeneas. When she sheds her disguise, it is not only Aeneas who experiences a recognition (*agnovit,* 406); the reader too recognizes a familiar articulation of the goddess of love (1.402-404, 415-117):

> *... avertens rosea cervice refulsit,*
>
> *ambrosiaeque comae divinum vertice odorem*
>
> *spiravere ...*
>
> .....
>
> *... Paphum sublimis abit sedesque revisit*
>
> *laeta suas, ubi templum illi, centumque Sabaeo*
>
> *ture calent arae sertisque recentibus halant*.
>
> ... she turned on her heels. And her neck gleamed brightly as roses;
>
> Down from her head, her ambrosial hair breathed heavenly perfumes
>
> Gods breathe forth ...
>
> .....
>
> She, then, soars through the air off to Paphos, delighted to visit
>
> Her own home with its temple and hundred altars all breathing
>
> Perfume of fresh-cut blossoms and hot with the incense of Sheba.

[1] Burbidge (2010: 76-77) offers a survey of the intertexts informing the meeting between Venus and her son and notes the disconcerting effect that the association of Venus with figures in conflict with the goddess' identity, such as the preeminent virgins Athena and Artemis, might have on the reader.

The description of Venus' epiphanic appearance duly celebrates her emblematic attractiveness.[2] Moreover, her return to Paphos evokes the depiction of Aphrodite's visit to her favorite city at the end of the tale of her adultery in *Odyssey* 8 (362-364) and its close echo in the longer *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (henceforth *HHA*), where it introduces the narrative of her tryst with Anchises:[3]

> ἐς Κύπρον δ' ἐλθοῦσα θυώδεα νηὸν ἔδυνεν
> ἐς Πάφον· ἔνθα δέ οἱ τέμενος βωμός τε θυώδης·
> ἔνθ' ἥ γ' εἰσελθοῦσα θύρας ἐπέθηκε φαεινάς.
> ἔνθα δέ μιν Χάριτες λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ
> ἀμβρότῳ, οἷα θεοὺς ἐπενήνοθεν αἰὲν ἐόντας,
> ἀμβροσίῳ ἑδανῷ, τό ῥά οἱ τεθυωμένον ἦεν. (58-63)
> To Cyprus she went and entered her fragrant temple
> at Paphos where her sacred precinct was and her fragrant altar
> There she went inside and shut the gleaming doors.
> And the Graces bathed her and anointed her
> with ambrosial olive oil, such as is poured over the gods who are forever,
> divinely sweet, which was made fragrant for her.

When we next encounter Venus in Book 1, she is in the company of Aphrodite's familiar complement: Cupid/Eros, conventionally styled as the only power capable of subduing the Olympian king himself (*solus, ... / patris summi qui tela Typhoea temnis*, 1.664-665). She is also occupied with work emblematic of the goddess of love: the incitement of erotic passion. What is

---

[2] Cf. Helen's recognition of Aphrodite's attractive form, not entirely obscured by her mortal disguise (*Il.* 3.396-398): ἐνόησε θεᾶς περικαλλέα δειρὴν /στήθεά θ' ἱμερόεντα καὶ ὄμματα μαρμαίροντα.

[3] Zeus engineers the union to humiliate Aphrodite. He achieves his goal: filled with post-coital anguish, the goddess herself declares that it will be a source of her perpetual shame (198-199, 247-255).

more, the troubling nature of the love that she inflicts on Dido reflects models outside the generic confines of epic poetry. Through its extensive representation of Dido's passion as a burning, a disease, a wounding, and a madness, the *Aeneid* links the queen's experience with experiences of Aphrodite's power articulated by a vast and diverse body of Greek poetry stretching all the way back to the lyric voices of Archilochus, Sappho, and Ibycus. As the continuation of the traditional character of the love goddess, Venus is "inherently and broadly referential and, therefore, attracts multiple sources."[4]

In particular, Aeneas' reaction at the moment of his *anagnorisis* directs the spotlight at a specific area of Venus' poetic heritage. Heartbroken at his mother's deception and departure, he decries her cruelty and her wanton games, and this denunciation, in turn, resonates with intertexts that evoke not only a more familiar version of the love goddess, but a markedly darker one as well. The moment of recognition taps into Venus' unsettling *fama*. And it is this poetic darkness of the goddess that I will now consider. Specifically, I will look at two aspects that can be roughly categorized as (1) Aphrodite's characterization as an aggressive threat to the ordered structures of civilized existence, and (2) the recurrent expression of hostility toward the goddess (along with her powers and complements), often articulated through her degrading disempowerment.

While the distinction between these two categories facilitates their overview and examination, it is an artificial one: as networks of thematically and intertextually resonant elements, they are intimately connected, informing and reinforcing one another. To foreground this interconnectedness, I have organized the survey thematically, paying only limited attention to the

[4] Seo 2013: 54. Although Seo uses the words I have quoted to speak of the figure of Paris, her qualification is equally, if not more so, applicable to Venus. The *Aeneid*'s extensive engagement with the Greek literary tradition at large is well known. Quinn, for example, observes that Vergil "does not limit himself to Homer's data, but borrows freely from every department of Greek literature" (1969: 278).

specificity of genre and chronology, as well as the dynamics of development. I aim to exhibit Venus' poetic heritage not from a diachronic perspective, but as it appeared to Vergil, namely, in the synchronic state of its collective presence at the time that the poet received it. In that vein, I also do not shy away from detailed listings, acknowledging variations and giving account of repetitions. Although such inventories are currently somewhat unfashionable, they most vividly convey the cumulative "weight" of particular elements, that is, the degree to which they were embraced by Greek poets, and as such provide crucial insight into the dynamics of the intertextual attraction between Vergil's Venus and her poetic *fama*, a complex two-directional phenomenon with variable potency. Some parts of the *Aeneid* – through allusive mechanisms – forcefully attract specific elements from Venus' literary past, while, from the opposite direction, certain elements of the goddess' poetic *fama* "force themselves" into Vergil's text, so to speak, inasmuch as they are liable to be more readily recalled by the reader. This latter, "inward bound" potency is a measure not only of the status (for instance, Homeric pedigree) or the quality of an episode, *topos,* motif, and the like, but also of the frequency with which any of these appear (whether on independent or allusive terms) across the poetic tradition – with the weight of numbers generating a stronger potential for recollection.

1.2. Aphrodite: a threat to civilized existence

Greek texts frequently present love as a force that stands at odds with the integrity of ordered, civilized existence – on the micro and the macro level, on the human and the divine plane. If we consider the circumstances of Aphrodite's origin in Hesiod, we find a scenario at tension with the stability of a social order structured by a hierarchy of power defined by sex, age, and familial identity. Emerging from the castration and overthrow of Ouranos by Kronos, with his wife Gaia

supplying the weapon and masterminding the ambush (*Theog*. 170 ff.), Aphrodite is the unsettling product of the violent toppling of a ruling patriarch, of the son attacking the father, of the male overcome by the sexually tinged treachery of the female. Furthermore, since she is not "born" within the context of anything resembling a traditional familial configuration, the goddess is not only free of the subordinating control of parental authority, but – as Skinner observes – her "placement outside the genealogical scheme of the *Theogony* indicates that she is not altogether subject to the same rules as the Olympians."[5] Another archaic poet, the author of the *HHA*, envisions Aphrodite's activity as a threat to the stability of a universal order that the Greeks understood to be deeply connected with the cosmic rule of Zeus over a hierarchical system characterized by differential relations. By sexually uniting immortals with mortals, Aphrodite blurs the boundary of the hierarchical division between the human and the divine.[6] Bergren points out that the goddess produces "an 'illicit mixture' of categories, recalling the fact that sexual intercourse is denoted in Greek by the verb μειγνύναι, 'to mix.' The ἔργα Ἀφροδίτης produce a cosmos of 'mixture' that challenges the distinctions that make for cosmic meaning."[7] Bergren further observes that in "the cosmos of Aphrodite, the hierarchical order dependent upon the pre-eminence of Zeus collapses, as he joins the other gods, men, and animals whom the goddess can interbreed."[8]

---

[5] Skinner 2005: 24.

[6] Pelliccia (1990: 190) observes that the "shame and sorrow felt by gods in regard to these conjunctions and the mongrel offspring produced by them is well known from Thetis' laments in the *Iliad*, especially that addressed to Hephaestus in 18.429-441."

[7] Bergren 1989: 4. Bergren explains that studies "informed by the methods of structural anthropology have shown that in early Greek thought the entities of the universe are constituted by virtue of their differential relations. Thus, the human condition is defined by its difference from that of divinity, on the one hand, and bestiality, on the other. This differential relation is hierarchical and proportional, with mortals positioned below gods but above beasts" (3). Paralleling the *HHA*'s concern with illicit mixings, the "eugenicist" passage (183-192) of Theognis laments the corrupting effects of the sexual intermingling of social classes. As Pelliccia (1990: 189) has noted, Theognis identifies "social order with correct breeding practices; order is maintained by preserving class distinctions."

[8] Bergren 1989: 6.

Zeus' pre-eminence is also challenged by the sheer extent of the control Aphrodite and EROS exert over the world: the pair is repeatedly credited with universal power.[9] The chorus of Sophocles' *Thrachiniae* (497, 500-502) considers the goddess unbeatable (ἐκφέρεται νίκας ἀεί) and conveys the enormous scale of her potency (σθένος) by pointing to her sway over the three principal male gods of the universe: Hades, Poseidon, and Zeus.[10] In the *Hippolytus* (360, 530-531), the nurse exclaims that Aphrodite is something greater than a god, while the chorus declares that not even Zeus' defining weapon of ultimate power – the lightning bolt (πυρὸς βέλος) – is superior (ὑπέρτερον) to the missile hurled by EROS.[11] Correspondingly, Moschus asserts that Aphrodite is unique in having the ability to subdue Zeus: ἡ μούνη δύναται καὶ Ζῆνα δαμάσσαι.[12] Indeed, the notion that love alone can overcome the ruler of the universe develops into a cliché. Already in Homer, we find Zeus, under the enchantment of Aphrodite's κεστός (borrowed from the goddess by Hera), admitting that he has succumbed to the force of EROS (μ' ... ΄ΕΡΟΣ ... θυμὸν ἐδάμασσεν, 14.315-316). The *HHA* develops the idea of Zeus' erotic vulnerability even further. It reports that although he is the greatest (μέγιστός τ' ἐστί, 37), Aphrodite gets him to do her bidding – mix with mortal women – easily (ῥηϊδίως, 39) and

[9] Henceforth, I write the singular Greek noun that denotes both erotic passion and the its divine personification in capitals. I do this to preserve the potential for both meanings, especially in contexts where the boundary – always quite porous – between the passion and the god is not clearly demarcated. Let us remember that this ambiguity was always present for ancient writers and readers, who did not use lower and upper cases.

[10] Euripides' Frag. 898 tells us that the immense magnitude of Aphrodite's power surpasses articulation or measurement (2-3):

> ἣν οὐδ' ἂν εἴποις οὐδὲ μετρήσειας ἂν
> ὅση πέφυκε κἀφ' ὅσον διέρχεται.
> You could neither tell nor measure how great she is, and how far her power extends.
> (Trans. C. Collard and M. Cropp)

[11] In a similar vein, the anonymous epigram *A.P.* 5.168 claims that even Zeus' lightening cannot consume a man overpowered by love (΄ΕΡΟΤΙ δαμέντα). In Frag. 269 of Euripides' *Auge*, the second – albeit uncertain (omitted by Athenaeus) – line characterizes EROS as τῶν ἁπάντων δαιμόνων ὑπέρτατος, and in the last he is μέγιστος ἀνθρώποις θεός.

[12] *Europa* 76.

whenever she wishes (εὖτε θέλοι, 38).[13] Sophocles highlights the paradox: the all-powerful Zeus' does not have the strength to drive EROS away (Frag. 684.4-5):

> τόνδ' ἀπείργειν οὐδ' ὁ παγκρατὴς σθένει
>
> Ζεύς, ἀλλ' ὑπείκει καὶ θέλων ἐγκλίνεται.
>
> And not even the all-powerful Zeus has the power to drive him off, but he too yields and willingly gives way.[14]

In another fragment by the same playwright (Frag. 941), the speaker judges it proper (θέμις) to articulate this truth (τἀληθῆ, 14): Aphrodite rules the "heart" of Zeus (Διὸς τυραννεῖ πλευμόνων, 15). By the Hellenistic period, the lover in an epigram by Asclepiades (*A.P.* 5.64) – without the need for identification – can simply speak to Zeus of being compelled by the same god who rules him as well: ὁ κρατῶν καὶ σοῦ θεός.[15]

Bergren has perceived that in the *HHA*'s "use of the verb δαμνάω, a traditional term for the workings of the goddess, there is a suggestion that a cosmos ruled by Aphrodite runs counter to the regular order of things."[16] Bergren also shows that the hymn is structured as an "antagonism between Aphrodite's cosmos of mixtures and the hierarchical order of Zeus."[17] In addition to endangering the cosmic order thorough her illicit mixtures, the goddess constitutes a grave threat to the integrity of civilized life through her effect on its foundational core: the mind (as the seat of rational thought) and those of its constructs that underpin social values, regulatory structures, and the like. Greek texts show that when sexual passion comes in contact with rational or

---

[13] Strauss-Clay (2006: 163) observes that this situation "threatens to undermine the entire Olympian hierarchical system in which Zeus alone distributes and confirms divine *timai*."
[14] Trans. H. Loyd-Jones, modified.
[15] Zeitland (1999: 65) remarks that Zeus' "susceptibility to erotic desire offers a challenge to this authority and his claims to dominance."
[16] Bergren 1989: 3.
[17] Bergren 1989: 30.

culturally conditioned thought processes, it can overwhelm them utterly.[18] Indeed, the language, particularly the verbs, used to describe this effect reveals a marked degree of aggression on the part of the Aphrodite and her divine complements. For instance, in the *Theogony,* Hesiod says that EROS subdues (δάμναται) the mind and prudent intent (νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν) of all men and gods (122). Homer tells us that Aphrodite's κεστός robs of their minds even those who think prudently / intelligently (τ'ἔκλεψε νόον πύκα περ φρονεόντων, *Il.* 14.217), and this gnomic statement becomes particularized as we witness what happens to Zeus when he falls under its power in the *Dios Apate* episode: EROS muffles (ἀμφεκάλυψεν) even his πυκινὰς φρένας (14.294).[19] Janko notes that the expansion of φρένας with the epithet πυκινὰς "aptly stresses the intelligence that is overcome."[20] Correspondingly, the *HHA* proclaims that Aphrodite has repeatedly led astray the mind of Zeus (παρὲκ Ζηνὸς νόον ἤγαγε, 36), tricking (ἐξαπαφοῦσα) his πυκινὰς φρένας.[21] In Theocritus 30.30, EROS is described as a god who trips up (ἔσφαλε) even the great mind of Zeus (μέγαν νόον). *A.P.* 12.99 characterizes the mind (νοῦς) of the speaker who is caught by EROS as cast into fire (ἐν πυρὶ βέβληται),[22] while Apollonius speaks of the

---

[18] Thornton (1997: 38) says that the Greeks viewed EROS as "a violent force of nature inimical to the mind's order."

[19] For Zeitland (1999: 66), the famous scene of Zeus' deception and seduction by Hera demonstrates "the subversive potential of Aphrodite's irresistible power to challenge assumptions of masculine preeminence and to undermine the order of hierarchical status in the universe."

[20] Janko 1992: 198. Janko points to a parallel at *Il.* 3.442, where Paris stresses the intensity of his desire to sleep with Helen: οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὧδέ γ' ἜΡΟΣ φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν. It is noteworthy that he makes this declaration with Aphrodite potentially present in the room – after the goddess fetches a chair for Helen at 3.424-426, there is no indication of her departure.

[21] 36. Cf. *Theognidea* 1388, where Aphrodite is credited with this prerogative as an honor from Zeus: δαμνᾶις δ' ἀνθρώπων πυκινὰς φρένας.

[22] Calame (1999: 19) argues that EROS "first strikes one of the specific organs that the ancient Greeks considered to be the seat of emotions" and "seems regularly to be kept separate from the organs of the intellect that, in the archaic view, constituted the seat of knowledge and will," namely "the *noo*s (mind) and the *boulê* (will)." As the above quotations illustrate, however, love appears to affect both the organs of emotion as well as the physiological representations of the intellect, especially in light of Janko's comment that the addition of πυκνός to φρήν points to intellectual capacities (an observation confirmed in our examples by the close association of νόος with this pairing). Thus, the distinction seems to be that although EROS assails the seats of both the intellect and the emotions, he is not envisioned as actually residing in the former, whereas he can "lodge" himself in the latter, as, for example, happens in Frag. 191 of Archilochus, where love is stationed under the speaker's heart (Ἔρος ὑπὸ καρδίην ἐλυσθεὶς), echoed in turn in *Arg.* 3.296 (ὑπὸ κραδίῃ εἰλυμένος).

"torpor" of Medea's mind (ἀκηδείῃσι νόοιο)[23] at the moment she is struck with EROS' arrow (*Arg*. 3.298). In Sophocles' Frag. 941, we find the assertion that Aphrodite cuts short all the plans conceived by both men and gods: πάντα τοι συντέμνεται / Κύπρις τὰ θνητῶν καὶ θεῶν βουλεύματα (16-17).[24]

Thus, in opposition to Zeus' cosmos, Aphrodite appears to marshal a rival regime, which not only collapses hierarchical differentiation, but, by undermining the rational mind, imperils the integrity of civilized life and its regulatory laws.[25] Moreover, unlike Zeus, whose rule is, more or less, informed by a concern for justice – however slippery that notion may be – and by a responsibility for the preservation of the grand order of the cosmos,[26] Aphrodite seems to do what she regularly does simply because it is in her nature to do so, that is, she acts like an irrational and capricious elemental force.[27] This characterization is underscored by her regular association with games.[28] Thus, we find it in juxtaposition with the principles of an ordered cosmos in Sophocles' *Antigone* – a work devoted to the exploration of the tension between

---

[23] For this interpretation of ἀκηδείῃσι see Hunter 1989: 131.

[24] The antagonism between the workings of EROS and those of the mind is also conveyed by three epigrams in the *Greek Anthology* that set EROS in opposition to λογισμός (12.117, 12.120), λόγος (12.117), and σοφία (12.117, 12.150). Likewise, in the *Hippolytus*, Phaedra counters her irrational passion (τὴν ἄνοιαν, 398) with a highly rational approach (391ff.) – as noted by Segal (1965: 128).

[25] Bergen (1989: 7) argues that the *HHA* attempts "to resolve the tension between a cosmos controlled by Aphrodite and a cosmos controlled by Zeus."

[26] Already in Homer, we see Zeus' willingness to forsake his beloved son Sarpedon in order to uphold the ordinances of μοῖρα (*Il*. 16.433ff.) and hear his declaration that mortals suffer due punishment for their ἀτασθᾰλία (*Od.* 1.32ff.). The latter concern of the god is articulated in his common epithet: *dikaios*. For more on this dimension of the Olympian king, see Loyd-Jones' 1971 monograph: *The Justice of Zeus*.

[27] At most, we are given to understand that after mixing gods with mortals, she enjoyed boasting and laughing over her victims (*HHA* 48-52). Segal (1965: 118) remarks that "Aphrodite, born from the sea, has all its irrational elementality."

[28] For instance, Alcman 58, Anacreon 346, 357, 358, 396, Sophocles Frag. 941.13, *Arg*. 3.117ff., Theocritus 1.97, *A.P.* 12.46. Calame (1999: 15) remarks that in Anacreaon 398 "Eros' knucklebones represent his mad whims and refer us to the chaotic conflicts in which he involves his victims." It is significant that in Apollonius, EROS appears to win his game of knucklebones by cheating, something his mother says he does regularly (μιν αὔτως ἤπαφες οὐδὲ δίκῃ περιέπλεο, 3.129-130). The games of love are not regulated by rules. Indeed, Moschus calls them savage (ἄγρια παίσδων, *Eros Drapetes* 11). This "lawlessness" of love finds expression in the notorious emptiness of lovers' oaths – a commonplace in Greek literature, beginning with Hesiod Fr. 124 OCT and drawn on repeatedly in Bk. 5 of the *Greek Anthology*: 6, 7, 8, 52, 133, 150, 175, 184. For more on the proverbial Ἀφροδίσιος ὅρκος, see Gow & Page 1965: 165.

irreconcilable constraints. There, at the closing of their ode to EROS, the chorus proclaims that desire sits in power beside the great laws, for Aphrodite, the irresistible god, plays her game (796-800):

> ἵμερος ...
>
> ... τῶν μεγάλων
>
> πάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς θεσ-
>
> μῶν ἄμαχος γὰρ ἐμπαί-
>
> ζει θεὸς Ἀφροδίτα.
>
> desire ... sits in power beside great laws; for the goddess Aphrodite is irresistible as she plays.

In other words, the chaotic force of the goddess exerts its sway alongside weighty laws, the regulatory forces within civilized society. That this is not a harmonious coexistence is brought out just a few lines earlier: EROS forces the minds of even just – law/custom-abiding – men to become unjust and leads to their disgrace: Σὺ καὶ δικαίων ἀδίκους φρένας παρασπᾷς ἐπὶ λώβᾳ, (791-793).[29] Emblematic of this dark influence is Aphrodite' effect on Paris: driven by his desire for Helen, he dishonors his host (Menelaus) and so violates *xenia*, of which Zeus himself is the guardian.[30] Indeed, underscoring the tension between the two gods, impassioned lovers challenge the supreme god directly. In an anonymous epigram of the *Greek Anthology*, the speaker – drunk with madness and armed with thoughtlessness (ἄκρητον μανίην ἔπιον ... ὅπλισμαι ... ἀφροσύναν) – proclaims himself invulnerable to Zeus' missiles because he carries the

[29] EROS is a force of φύσις, which, as Euripides puts it (*Auge*, Frag. 265 = 920 N), cares nothing for customs / laws: ᾗ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει. Pavlock (1990: 1) observes that the erotic in epic generally takes the form of "an irrational force that acts against the prevailing values of the world in which the hero operates."

[30] For this misconduct, Alcaeus calls Paris ξ[εν]ναπάτα (Frag. 283.5). The *Cypria* seems to have endowed Aphrodite with a direct role in the abduction of Helen – crediting the goddess with the instigation of shipbuilding for Paris' journey from Troy to Sparta and the actual joining of Helen and Paris (Procl. *Chrest.* 1-2.).

invulnerable shield of EROS (τὸν ΄ΕΡΩΘ' ὅπλον ἄτρωτον ἔχων),[31] while in Aslepiades' 5.64 epigram the lover's taunting of Zeus echoes Prometheus' defiance in *Prometheus Bound* (1043).[32]

Relatedly, the goddess threatens the regulatory deterrent of shame (αἰδῶς). For instance, in the *Odyssey,* Hermes professes himself willing to experience extreme humiliation just to lie beside her (8.339-42). In the mortal world, the affair she orchestrates between Paris and Helen leads the latter to repeatedly identify herself with a bitch (κυνὸς, *Il*. 6.344 & 356; κυνώπιδος, *Il*. 3.180 & *Od*. 4.145) – a creature epitomizing shamelessness for the Greeks.[33] In *Iliad 3*, we get the opportunity to witness the process of the violation of Helen's culturally ingrained sense of shame under the goddess' compulsion. When Aphrodite enjoins Helen to go to join Paris in his bed after his confrontation with Menelaus, she initially refuses. She does not want to sleep with the man who had just been bested in a duel with her Greek husband because she finds it shameful (νεμεσσητὸν, 3.410), that is, liable to criticism from other women (Τρῳαὶ δέ μ' ὀπίσσω πᾶσαι μωμήσονται, 3.411-412). Her resolve breaks down only in the face of Aphrodite's menacing power – the goddess threatens her with the dire consequences of her divine anger (3.414-417). The episode showcases the opposition and struggle that often arises against an erotic impulse that pushes against culturally prescribed boundaries of behavior – resistance that testifies to the aggressive and invasive nature of the goddess.[34] This struggle against erotic compulsion is perhaps most vividly illustrated by Euripides' Phaedra and the inner struggle of Apollonius'

---

[31] *A.P.*12.115

[32] The allusion to *PV* is noted by Gow & Page (1965: 124). Lovers also challenge Zeus in *A.P.* 12.69 and 12.70.

[33] For a thorough exploration of the dog figure in Greek culture, see Franco's 2014 monograph: *Shameless: The Canine and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*. A lack of αἰδῶς also characterizes the Iliadic Paris (Pavlock 1990: 57), who is closely connected with Aphrodite (3.63-64, 3.373-425, 4.10-11). In this shamelessness, Paris is the antithesis of Hector, the conspicuous upholder of social values at the cost of personal yearnings – Redfield (1975: 119) calls the latter "a hero of *aidōs*." For the contrast between the two figures, see Redfield 1975: 113-115.

[34] Thus, Anacreon's speaker boxes against EROS in 346[2]C and 396C.

Medea,[35] but even a notorious character like Clytemnestra, as we are told in the *Odyssey*, initially balked against the shameful act of adultery (ἦ τοι τὸ πρὶν μὲν ἀναίνετο ἔργον ἀεικές, *Od*. 3.265).

Curiously, Aphrodite's own hymn devotes a large number of its verses to the goddesses who have successfully resisted her attacks. We are told that she had attempted to penetrate their hearts (φρένας, 7) thorough persuasion and deception. Athena did not find her works pleasing (οὐ γάρ οἱ εὔαδεν ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης, 9), Artemis resisted her effort to subdue her (οὐδέ ποτ' Ἀρτέμιδα... δάμναται, 16-17), and Hestia vehemently rejected her (ἡ δὲ μάλ' οὐκ ἔθελεν ἀλλὰ στερεῶς ἀπέειπεν, 25). These "three are behind the defining institutions and primary benefits of human society; furthermore, it follows that if these goddesses are opposed to Aphrodite, then on the human plane she must be an impediment to the worthy carrying-out of the important activities they patronize," says Brown.[36] In short, all that the hymn has these goddesses represent – which includes military and hunting technology, weaving, music, ritual dance, cities of law-abiding men (δικαίων ἀνδρῶν, 20), the hearth, and temples of the gods (19-31) – is threatened by the aggressive Aphrodite.[37] Particularly under threat is the domain of Hestia, since the poet allocates the greatest number of verses to this goddess, elevates her position with a list of honors, and – in relating that she even swore an oath to safeguard her virginity (26) – qualifies her

---

[35] Medea tells Jason (4.360-362):

> ...ἐγὼ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἀναιδήτῳ ἰότητι
> πάτρην τε κλέα τε μεγάρων αὐτούς τε τοκῆας
> νοσφισάμην...
> ... contrary to decency and with shameless resolve, I abandoned my country, the glory of my home, and my very parents... (Trans. W. H. Race)

Cf. Pavlock's observation that Medea's vacillation in Book 3 "shows *aidōs* in conflict with desire" (1990: 57). Pavlock argues that throughout the epic, "Apollonius relates love in complex ways to irrationality and the dissolution of social values, such as *aidōs* and *eusbeia*" (1990: 63).

[36] Brown 1997: 35.

[37] Sappho 102 offers a neat illustration of Aphrodite's influence interfering with one of Athena's prerogatives:

> γλύκηα μᾶτερ, οὔτοι δύναμαι κρέκην τὸν ἴστον
> πόθωι δάμεισα παῖδος βραδίναν δι' Ἀφροδίταν
> Truly, sweet mother, I cannot weave my web, for I am overcome with desire for a boy because of slender Aphrodite. (Trans. D. A. Campbell)

rejection of Aphrodite as the most vehement. Now, Hestia is not only closely linked with the *oikos* but also with her brother Zeus. We are told that her ability to remain an eternal virgin is an expression of his will (βουλῇ Διὸς, 23) and that her position in the center of the *oikos* as well as all her other honors are due to his beneficence. Moreover, the goddess expressly subordinates herself to Zeus – the cosmic patriarch (πατρὸς Διὸς, 27) – in vowing to remain a virgin by his authority. Faulkner points out that "the language with which Hestia is said to swear an oath by touching or grasping Zeus' head (κεφαλῆς, 27) has similarities with that of supplication."[38] As Smith observes, when the poet highlights Zeus' role in authorizing Hestia's perpetual virginity he is, in effect, stressing his "ruling position … as head of the world's government, the maintainer of order, the giver and protector of rights and honors."[39] Therefore, in assailing Hestia, Aphrodite threatens not only the *oikos*, but also the element of male ascendancy, which on the small scale dominates the *oikos* and on the large scale directs the state and maintains order at all levels of society, human and divine.

Both Homer and Hesiod illustrate this dangerous dimension of Aphrodite and her works (τὰ ἔργα Ἀφροδίτης), which, says Faulkner, "should be understood to carry both a literal sense 'the works performed by Aphrodite' and a wider one 'sexual love.'"[40] If we again consider the conditions of the goddess' origin in the *Theogony*, we can see that erotic desire plays a pivotal role in the first attack on patriarchal power. Kronos is able to ambush his father only when Ouranos he outstretches himself over Gaia, driven by desire for sex (ἱμείρων φιλότητος, 177). Proleptically, ἔργα Ἀφροδίτης make the primordial patriarch vulnerable to attack and the results are dire: castration and downfall. In the *Odyssey*, Aphrodite's affair with Ares destabilizes her

[38] Faulkner 2008: 113.
[39] Smith 1981: 36-7.
[40] Faulkner 2008: 73.

husband's control of his *oikos* and brings shame to her father, whom Hephaistos designates as the father of a κυνῶπις κόρη (8.319). It also leads to the dissolution of a legitimate marriage, since Hephaestus' demand of the return of the bride-price (ἔεδνα, 8.318) appears tantamount to a declaration of divorce.[41] Furthermore, as we are told in her hymn, by instigating Zeus' infidelities, by making the god forget his lawful wife (Ἥρης ἐκλελαθοῦσα κασιγνήτης ἀλόχου τε, 40), Aphrodite threatens the integrity of the cosmic patriarch's marriage and *oikos* (39-40).[42]

On the mortal plane, Aphrodite and her works play a pivotal role in numerous myths involving the destabilization or destruction of marriages, patriarchal authority, and/or familial cohesion, that is, of vital mechanisms and structures of the *oikos*. Perhaps most spectacular is the murder of her husband by the adulterous Clytemnestra,[43] whose betrayal of their father, in turn, leads to her estrangement from her children and eventually to her death at the hands of her own son. In the *Trachiniae*, Heracles' adulterous passion for Iole (ἐντεθέρμανται πόθῳ, 368) leads to the death of his wife (Deianira) and his dramatic departure from his earthly family. We have already looked at Aphrodite's role in Helen's abandonment of her *oikos.* Aphrodite is also behind Medea's treacherous abandonment of her parents (κακὸν ἔργον, *Arg*. 3.1162; ἀεικελίοισιν ἔργοις, *Arg*. 4.411) and her fatal betrayal of her brother. This latter transgression occasions Apollonius' reproachful apostrophe to EROS, wherein the poet denounces the god for inflicting such abominable madness (Μηδείῃ στυγερὴν φρεσὶν ἔμβαλες ἄτην, *Arg*. 4.449). Euripides' love-sick Phaedra hangs herself, prompting a conflict between Theseus and his son, which, in turn,

---

[41] For this interpretation and the meaning of ἔεδνα, see Lacey 1966: 58 and Brown 1989: 283.

[42] Notably, the poet gives Aphrodite and her primal power no part in the formation of this union. Bypassing any romantic or sexual motives, he focuses on the functions of the mind as the underlying basis for the marriage: Ζεὺς δ' ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδὼς /αἰδοίην ἄλοχον ποιήσατο κέδν' εἰδυῖαν (43-4). Zeitland (1999: 67) comments that Aphrodite's promotion of adultery is presented in the hymn as "a source of moral opprobrium that arouses the same indignation in the society of the gods that it would in the human world."

[43] Of course, the myth involves a double motivation: in the tragedians (Aes. *Ag*. 1404ff, S. *Elect*. 525ff., Eur. *Elect.* 1000ff.), Clytemnestra's crime is also an act of revenge for Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia. For an examination of the significant part sex plays in the story, see Thornton 1997: 24, 90-91, 234, n. 59.

precipitates Hippolytus' death.[44] In the *Antigone*, the chorus blames EROS for stirring up the quarrel between Creon and his son, which ultimately leads to the death of both Haemon and his mother (781, 793-794): Ἔρος ... σὺ ... τόδε νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον ἔχεις ταράξας. The list could go on.

The pernicious influence of Aphrodite and her powers on the integrity of the mind leads not only to the destruction of individuals and damage to the *oikos*, but at times ignites conflict on a larger, bloodier scale – the Trojan War is the most famous but not the only illustration of this effect of the goddess of love. The chorus of the *Medea* (639-641) begs Aphrodite not to cause unceasing conflict (ἀκόρεστά νείκη) by inciting adulterous passion.[45] In the *Trachiniae*, we are told that EROS alone caused Heracles to attack and ultimately destroy Iole's city (Ἔρος δέ νιν μόνος θεῶν θέλξειεν αἰχμάσαι τάδε, 354-55), while the chorus of the *Hippolytus* sings of Aphrodite's giving away Iole σὺν αἵματι, σὺν καπνῶι, φονίοισι νυμφείοις (551-553).[46] Apollonius relates that on Lemnos the goddess effectively destroys the integrity of an entire community: she compels Lemnian men to reject their lawful wives (κουριδίας γυναῖκας, 1.611) and indulge a raw passion (τρηχὺν Ἔρον, 1.613) for their Thracian captives, an erotic betrayal which, in turn, stirs the Lemnian women to the appalling murder of all the men on the island. Quite striking is the indictment which opens Book 2 of the *Theognidea* (1231-34):

> Σχέτλι' Ἔρος, μανίαι σε τιθηνήσαντο λαβοῦσαι·
>
> ἐκ σέθεν ὤλετο μὲν Ἰλίου ἀκρόπολις,

---

[44] Even before these deaths take place, the nurse exclaims that Aphrodite δόμους ἀπώλεσεν (361).

[45] As Brown (1989: 287-288) notes, "adultery was not simply a private, domestic issue. It was an act that undermined the integrity of the household, which, in turn, threatened the stability of the community."

[46] Segal (1965: 131) observes that in the Euripidean ode to which this quote belongs there is an overarching characterization of EROS as "a destroyer of civilizations, approaching like an army (see ἐπιστρατεύσηι, 527) with dreadful weapons (530), a sacker of cities (πέρθοντα, 541) bringing fire, smoke, blood (545ff). Both the fire and the military imagery ... converge destructively upon human order as embodied in the city wall and the city springs," namely the wall of Thebes and the spring Dirce of vv. 555-556.

ὥλετο δ' Αἰγείδης Θησεὺς μέγας, ὥλετο δ' Αἴας

ἐσθλὸς Ὀιλιάδης σῆισιν ἀτασθαλίαις

Cruel EROS, the spirits of Madness took you up and nursed you. Because of you Troy's acropolis was destroyed, and great Theseus, Ageus' son, and noble Ajax, Oïleus' son, through your acts of recklessness.[47]

The inclusion of Theseus among EROS' victims likely references the hero's trip to and consequent imprisonment in Hades as companion to Pirithous, inflamed with the desire for an impious union with Persephone.[48] In Lycophron's *Alexandra,* Cassandra utters this prophecy concerning her own impious rape by Ajax and its aftermath (403-407):

τὴν Καστνίαν δὲ καὶ Μελιναίαν θεὸν

λυπρὸς παρ' Ἄιδην δεννάσει κακορροθῶν,

ἥ μιν παλεύσει δυσλύτοις οἴστρου βρόχοις,

ἔρωτας οὐκ ἔρωτας ἀλλ' Ἐρινύων

πικρὰν ἀποψήλασα κηρουλκὸν πάγην.

And in grievous Hades he will abuse with revilements the goddess of Castion and Melina [i.e. Aphrodite], who will entrap him in the indissoluble meshes of the gadfly stings [of desire], springing for him love that is no love but the bitter destructive snare of the furies.

In arousing Athena's wrath against the Greek side, Ajax's rape of Cassandra not only destroys the man himself, but creates much trouble for his comrades as they make their way home from Troy. For bringing death to the Greeks within the framework of the Trojan War, Euripides' Helen calls Aphrodite "much-murdering" (ἁ πολυκτόνος Κύπρις Δαναΐδαις ἄγουσα θάνατον, *Helen* 238-

[47] Trans. D. E. Gerber.
[48] Hudson-Williams 1910: 245-246. For the mythic tradition of Theseus' imprisonment in Hades, see Gantz 1993: 291-293.

329) and decries the goddess' gifts (τὰ ἐμὰ δῶρα Κύπριδος, *Helen* 364) as producing much blood and suffering for both sides, including the terrible grief of women mourning their kin. Indeed, the ruinous, destructive dimension of Aphrodite and EROS is generally acknowledged by Greek poets.[49] In the *Hippolytus*, the chorus speaks of EROS as a tyrant of men (538), destroying them and casting them into every misfortune when he comes (πέρθοντα καὶ διὰ πάσας ἰέντα συμφορᾶς / θνατοὺς ὅταν ἔλθηι, 541-542). Both Apollonius and Moschus qualify EROS as οὖλος (*Arg*. 3.297 & 3.1078, Mos. Frag. 4.1). Indeed, Apollonius goes on to address the god as a great calamity for men (μέγα πῆμα ... ἀνθρώποισιν, 4.445), adding

> ἐκ σέθεν οὐλόμεναί τ' ἔριδες στοναχαί τε γόοι τε,
>
> ἄλγεά τ' ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν ἀπείρονα τετρήχασιν.
>
> from you come deadly quarrels and groans and laments, and countless other pains beside these are stirred up.[50]

In both Meleager's *A.P.* 5.180 and Dioscorides' *A.P.* 12.37, the god is termed βροτολοιγὸς, a plague for men.[51]

This dark characterization underpins a marked kinship between the goddess of love and death. As we saw, she is repeatedly implicated in the collateral death toll precipitated by her works, but she also drives individuals to their deaths in a more direct manner. Among those who perish from ill-fated love, we might note Euripides' lovesick Phaedra or Daphnis, the oxherd who wastes away in Theocritus' first idyll.[52] As Calame observes, the Greeks perceived affinities

---

[49] See Thornton 1997: 46, for a consideration of this subject, and 230 n. 75, for a list of texts that characterize EROS as destructive, injurious, oppressive, and the like.
[50] Trans. W. H. Race.
[51] For an examination of how EROS effects the dissolution of a lover's body through the language and imagery of melting and disease, see Cyrino 1995, Thornton 1997: 21, 33-35, and Carson 1986: 39-40.
[52] In the pseudo-Theocritean *Idyll* 23 and Hermesianax (Fr. 2.5 and 9 Lightfoot), unrequited passion leads men to suicide. The speaker of the *Theognidea* 1295-98 begs his beloved to not allow his love for the boy to carry him (the speaker) off to the abode of Persephone. Intimating the deadly potential of erotic passion, in the *HHA* Anchises declares that he is willing to sacrifice his life to gratify his lust (149-154).

"between the states of love and death."[53] The speaker of Archilochus' Frag. 193 declares that he is lifeless (ἄψυχος) as he lies (entangled) in desire (ἔγκειμαι πόθωι). At the sight of her beloved, Sappho' narrator experiences physical symptoms that make her feel that she is close to dying: τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύης φαίνομ' ἔμ' αὔται (31.15). One of these is the loss of vision (31.11), the darkening of the eyes, which is often linked with oncoming death. When we find this erotic symptom in Archilochus 191, where EROS pours a thick mist over the eyes (πολλὴν κατ' ἀχλὺν ὀμμάτων ἔχευεν), the poet's language, notes Thornton, echoes the Homeric "formula describing the experience of death for a warrior – when the obscure Meriones kills Acmas, Homer says 'over his eyes the mist was shed'" (κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλύς, *Il*. 16.344).[54] Like death, Aphrodite and EROS loosen the limbs of their victims. This is the effect Penelope – whose beauty Athena enhances with a cosmetic linked to Aphrodite (*Od.* 18.192-194) – has on the suitors when she appears before them and beguiles them into gift-giving: τῶν δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατ', Ἔρωι δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἔθελχθεν (*Od*. 8.212).[55] In fact, Aphrodite, EROS, and Pothos are all designated as λυσιμελής.[56] Furthermore, Sophocles emphasizes this deadly dimension of the goddess when, in a proclamation of her multivalence, he first identifies her with Hades: ἔστιν μὲν Ἅιδης (Frag. 941.2).

Given all this, it is little wonder that Alcaeus labels EROS δεινότατος θέων (Frag. 327). In the words of Thornton, like "fire and storm, disease and death, the Greeks' EROS is a force of nature, indiscriminate, chaotic, relentlessly attacking civilization and its orders – the mind and its

---

[53] Calame 1999: 149, 36. Cf. Thornton 1997: 26-27.
[54] Thornton 1997: 26. In *Arg*. 3.962-3, the eyes of the besotted Medea also grow misty (ἤχλυσαν) at the sight of Jason.
[55] Thornton (1997: 26-27) points out that Homer makes this connection between erotic passion and death explicit when Eumaeus "says that the beautiful Helen 'loosened the knees of many men' [πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπὸ γούνατ' ἔλυσε, *Od*. 14.96]. Indeed she did: first when all the great Greek heroes desired to possess her, and then when the Greeks and Trojans died at Troy for her adultery."
[56] For instance, Aphrodite in Hedylus*, A.P.* 11.414; EROS in Hesiod, *Theog*. 121, 911 and Sappho 130; *Pothos* in Archilochus 196 and Alcman 3.61.

projections onto the world, the political and social structures that clear the space for human identity."[57]

1.3. Aphrodite: hateful and disempowered

The previous section presented a selection of materials that together constitute a sizable portion of Venus' literary heritage. Of course, this heritage also encompasses other, less unsettling characterizations. Greek poets did acknowledge the lighter, sweeter side of the goddess of love. Hesiod designates τέρψίς γλυκερά, φιλότης, and μειλιχία as part of her defining τιμή (*Theog*. 206); in his *Alcestis*, Euripides has Heracles call Aphrodite ἡ πλεῖστον ἡδίστη θεῶν βροτοῖσιν (791-792); and Mimnermus asks famously: τίς δὲ βίος, τί δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης; (Frag. 1.1). More significantly, the Greeks understood that τὰ ἔργα Ἀφροδίτης are indispensable for the maintenance of animal and human existence;[58] while the goddess of love threatens civilization, she is also necessary for its continuation. And since Greek society – like all societies – could not keep itself far removed from Aphrodite's ambivalent forces, it endeavored to control and order them: the goddess was to be barred from where she wrought havoc and her power limited to well-defined parameters. Various cultural mechanisms, including the sanction of marriage and the determent of shame, were in place to either encourage or discourage particular types of sexual activity. As a cultural mechanism, literature certainly participated in this regulatory process.[59] Thus, not only does an anxiety about their pernicious potential animate depictions of Aphrodite and EROS in the Greek tradition, but so does an impulse to limit their

[57] Thornton 1997: 120. Cf. Skinner: "To civilized harmony ... the power of Eros posed an unruly threat" (2005: 28).
[58] Hesiod laments the necessity of sexual reproduction, and therefore of women, in the *Theogony* 590-612. The sentiment is echoed by misogynistic figures in later authors. Cf., e.g., the wish of Euripides' Hippolytus in *Hippolytus* 614-663.
[59] It also reflected the attendant push-backs.

power. This desire to curb and regulate the two gods manifests itself in a variety of poetic, narrative, and story-line devices and maneuvers, and it contributes to negative portrayals which range from mildly unflattering to downright degrading.

The poetic practice of limiting, overpowering, and disempowering Aphrodite begins with the *Iliad*, where, like no other god, she is ordered to keep permanently away from a sphere in which most deities freely interfere: an admonishment to stay away from warfare is directed at her by both Zeus and the mortal Diomedes, who actually forces the goddess out of battle with a physical attack (5.311ff.).[60] In his reprimand, Zeus also endeavors to restrict Aphrodite to the narrow confines of a matrimonial bed (5.429). [61] As we have already seen, by emphatically dwelling on the τιμαί of Athena, Artemis, and Hestia, that is, the goddesses who have successfully rejected Aphrodite, the poet of the *HHA* attempts to hedge-in the extent of her influence. Bergren notes that "what we have here are three rival 'mini-hymns' that delimit the power of the Hymn's subject."[62] But the hymn takes things a step further as it conveys not only the areas out of Aphrodite's reach but the actual diminishing of her initial activity. In communicating the purpose of Zeus' plan for the goddess – observes Bergren – the poet positions her boasts of producing divine-human mixings within a negative purpose clause (ὄφρα μηδ' ... ἐπευξαμένη εἴπῃ, 46-48)

---

[60] Zeus' heavy-handed command in *Iliad* 8 (5-27) that the all the gods and goddesses keep away from the battlefield of Troy is not only temporary but proves that this is a sphere normally open to them all.

[61] This attempt by Zeus "to limit Aphrodite's domain of influence" has been noted by Jackson (2010: 156).

[62] Bergren 1989: 5. Turkeltaub (2003) challenges this view by arguing that "the very realms in which these goddesses' virginity delights become also the means by which Aphrodite's erotic seduction successfully operates" (114). Aside from the strange claim that it is the goddesses' *virginity* which delights in the τιμαί specified by the poet (this reasoning implies that their other aspects delight in other τιμαί), Turkeltaub's thesis sometimes relies on vague assertions (e.g., "the clothes that [Aphrodite] '*borrows*' from Athena," 113) or problematic arguments. For instance, he argues that Hestia's sphere does not delimit Aphrodite's activity because she is traditionally and intimately associated with Hermes (though not in the *HHA*), whose sexual exploits are emphasized in the hymn. This emphasis, he posits, "casts an ironic suspicion on both the precise nature of Hermes' and Hestia's association and on the association that the hymn initially posits between Hestia's field of action and virginity" (113). However, Turkeltaub's arguments lack compelling force, as – among other issues – he fails to take full stock of the nature of the relationship between Hestia and Hermes, which, as Vernant has elucidated, is grounded in their complementary *opposition* (2006: 157-196).

"that unsays them. ... Her speech and the cosmos it represents are here subordinated by the grammar of the Hymnic voice."[63] In her address to Anchises, Aphrodite herself confirms her diminishment (247-255):

> ...ἐμοὶ μέγ' ὄνειδος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν
> ἔσσεται ἤματα πάντα διαμπερὲς εἵνεκα σεῖο,
> οἳ πρὶν ἐμοὺς ὀάρους καὶ μήτιας, αἷς ποτε πάντας
> ἀθανάτους συνέμιξα καταθνητῇσι γυναιξί,
> τάρβεσκον· πάντας γὰρ ἐμὸν δάμνασκε νόημα.
> νῦν δὲ δὴ οὐκέτι μοι στόμα χείσεται ἐξονομῆναι
> τοῦτο μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν, ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὸν ἀάσθην
> σχέτλιον οὐκ ὀνοταστόν, ἀπεπλάγχθην δὲ νόοιο,
> παῖδα δ' ὑπὸ ζώνῃ ἐθέμην βροτῷ εὐνηθεῖσα.
>
> For me there will be a great reproach amongst the gods, for all time because of you; [the gods] who before feared my whisperings and clever plans, with which at some point I mixed all the gods with mortal women; for my purpose tamed them all. But now my mouth will no longer open to mention this amongst the immortals, since I have been greatly led astray, terribly, unspeakably, and gone out of my mind, and have a child under my girdle having slept with a mortal man.[64]

When the goddess speaks of her past (πρὶν ... ποτε, 249) schemes of divine-human mixings, these accomplishments lose their vigor under the shadow cast by her initial declaration, that in the future and perpetually (ἔσσεται ἤματα πάντα διαμπερὲς) there will be a great ὄνειδος (247) – a "shaming reproach" – for her among the gods. Her words mark a distinct break between the

[63] Bergren 1989: 7.
[64] Trans. A. Faulkner.

future and the past: the gods used to fear (πρὶν τάρβεσκον, 249-251) the words and plans (ὀάρους καὶ μήτιας) by which she used to mix them with mortals, but this will no longer be the case. She then confesses: νῦν δὲ δὴ οὐκέτι μοι στόμα χείσεται ἐξονομῆναι τοῦτο μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν (252-253).[65]

Scholars have wondered what Aphrodite means by this admission, especially whether she means that she will stop mixing mortals with immortals (by putting a stop to the words that used to bring about this mixing) or that will she just stop boasting about doing so. Different answers have generated diverse readings of the larger significance of the poem.[66] But should we be asking and answering these questions and thus dispelling what appears to be a deliberate ambiguity?[67] Prior to her controversial admission, Aphrodite make quite clear the consequences of Zeus' scheme: she will be shamed by the gods, and they will no longer fear her. Zeus thus diminishes the goddess' status within the divine community; he "tames" her through a public reprisal. Aphrodite's ambiguous statement – in light of her previous words – intimates a disempowerment that extends further than this, but the hymnist had chosen to abandon specificity at his point. He could do so because Aphrodite's domination by Zeus has already been vividly delineated and any additional details would be superfluous. The goddess is limited in her problematic effect on the gods. In fact, she suffers a humiliating reversal; from one who inspires fear, she becomes transformed into the object of scorn. And all this fulfills Zeus' purpose, which

[65] στόμα χείσεται is a conjectural reading by Martin (1605) of the incomprehensible στοναχήσεται transmitted by all the MSS. For an overview of other suggested readings and the concomitant issues see Faulkner 2008: 282.
[66] Pelliccia (1985: 152), van der Ben (1986), and Strauss Clay (1989) argue that the hymn documents the very last divine-human mixing and so marks the end of an era, since Aphrodite will never again incite such unions. For issues with this interpretation see Bergren (1989: 37), who thinks that ultimately the text does not provide an unequivocal answer, and Zeitland (1999: 68) along with Faulkner (2008: 10-18), who argue against it.
[67] We have no evidence of any efforts made by ancient readers to "decipher" the meaning of Aphrodite's words. Indeed, if any of them had felt that the poem communicates a shift of such cosmic import as the end of divine-human sexual relations, one would expect some trace of this reception to survive in the work of ancient mythographers or the like.

constitutes the impetus for the hymnic plot: in the proem to the *narratio*, we are told that the Olympian king instills a desire for a mortal into the goddess' *thumos*

> ...ὄφρα τάχιστα
> μηδ' αὐτὴ βροτέης εὐνῆς ἀποεργμένη εἴη
> καί ποτ' ἐπευξαμένη εἴπῃ μετὰ πᾶσι θεοῖσιν
> ἡδὺ γελοιήσασα φιλομμειδὴς Ἀφροδίτη
> ὥς ῥα θεοὺς συνέμιξε καταθνητῇσι γυναιξὶ
> καί τε καταθνητοὺς υἱεῖς τέκον ἀθανάτοισιν,
> ὥς τε θεὰς ἀνέμιξε καταθνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις. (46-52)
> so that soon not even she would be kept from the bed of a mortal and so one day, boasting among all the gods, laughing sweetly, laughter-loving Aphrodite would not speak how she had mated gods to mortal women, and they had borne mortal sons to the immortals, and how she had mated goddesses to mortal men.[68]

Indeed, Zeus accomplishes his purpose by directing this problematic aspect of Aphrodite's power against her. Her power to mix immortals with mortals is problematic not only because it undermines the boundary between two ontologically distinct modes of existence and so threatens the order of differential relations, but also because it is responsible for the domination of something divine by something mortal: the mixings produce mortal offspring (50-51). In other words, through her illicit mixings, Aphrodite effects the dissolution of divine essence within the mortal realm: she degrades immortality. In the hymn, Zeus implicates her in this degradation.[69] Significantly, he and he alone can accomplish the reverse, that is, elevate the mortal into the

[68] Trans. S. C. Shelmerdine, modified.
[69] Smith (1981: 92) remarks that through her contact with Anchises, Aphrodite "has compromised her nature as a goddess and acquired a trace of mortality in the form of pain and grief."

immortal realm.[70] As Aphrodite herself admits, only Zeus can ameliorate her distressing situation through the deification of Anchises. By dwelling on the examples of Ganymede and Tithonos (202-238), she makes clear that this power is unique to the Olympian king and so implicitly acknowledges her own inferiority and subordination.[71] Bergren observes that by "voicing no active resistance, by expressing but then simply suppressing her desire for Anchises' eternal youth and announcing his inevitable death, Aphrodite proves she accepts Zeus' will as ineluctable."[72]

A call for the subordination of Aphrodite also underpins Zeus' aforementioned directive that she keep away from battle in the *Iliad* 5. Zeus' words are delivered with the smile that follows the mockery of the love goddess by Athena:

> ... μείδησεν δὲ πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε,
> καί ῥα καλεσσάμενος προσέφη χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην·
> οὔ τοι τέκνον ἐμὸν δέδοται πολεμήϊα ἔργα,
> ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἱμερόεντα μετέρχεο ἔργα γάμοιο,
> ταῦτα δ' Ἄρηϊ θοῷ καὶ Ἀθήνῃ πάντα μελήσει. (428-430)
> ... and the father of gods and men smiled on her
> and spoke to Aphrodite the golden, calling her to him:
> "No, my child, not for you are the works of warfare. Rather
> concern yourself only with the lovely works of marriage,

[70] As the apotheosis of Heracles illustrates, Zeus has the power to directly reverse the "degradation" of his divine seed brought about by Aphrodite's mixings.
[71] The hymn effectively shows that Zeus can effect movement across the mortal-immortal boundary in both directions: he can cause Aphrodite to bear a mortal child and, as she admits, he can make a mortal man divine.
[72] Bergren 1989: 35. The poet further diminishes Aphrodite in her own hymn by devoting a sizable number of its verses to the praise of other goddesses (Athena, Artemis, Hestia, and Hera), speaking in particularly superlative terms about Hestia and Hera, all the while withholding any patent praise from Aphrodite. What is more, he credits Hera with beauty that surpasses that of any other goddess (41) and thus deprives Aphrodite of her traditional honor. Cf. Faulkner 2008: 127.

while all this shall be left to Athene and swift Ares."[73]

The injunction is reinforced by indications of Zeus' authority: on the one hand as the patriarchal chief of the universe and her own father, on the other, as the apportioner and enforcer of divine τιμαί. In buttressing what is essentially an echo of Diomedes' impudent injunction and chastisement, the Olympian scene continues Aphrodite's earthly humiliation. Indeed, Zeus takes no account of his daughter's suffering at the hands of the irreverent mortal,[74] nor does he pay any attention to the reason for her foray into the battlefield. Although he addresses Aphrodite as her parent, he ignores her own role of a parent trying to save her son.[75] Homer provides an even more dramatic portrayal of the limiting and domination of Aphrodite in the *Odyssey*. In the song of Demodocus (8.266ff.), the goddess becomes the wife of – and so subordinate to – Hephaistos (the least attractive of the Olympians) who, we might recall, has a different wife in the *Iliad*.[76]

---

[73] Trans. R. Lattimore, modified.

[74] Hawkins remarks: "Zeus, with no sympathy, scolds her and tells her to stick to the arts of love" (2004: 80). His heavy-handed insensitivity becomes more apparent if we consider his words and overall behavior toward another one of his daughters. When Artemis turns to him after receiving a beating from Hera, Zeus pulls her close, uses the much warmer designation of φίλον τέκος (*Il*. 21.509), asks about her injuries, and declares their infliction a reckless act (μαψιδίως, *Il*. 21.510).

[75] Zeus uses τέκνον ἐμὸν only other time in the poem. He addresses Athena in this way when her rebukes her for having forgotten about Achilles and orders her to go and infuse the fasting warrior with divine nourishment (19.342-348). Thus, the vocatives occur in a parallel context of parental chastisement and directive, but, in stark contrast to our passage, here Zeus' words highlight his closeness with this particular daughter: his concerns are aligned with hers since, despite his gruff rhetoric, his words amount to permission for Athena to do what she herself desires (Ὣς εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε πάρος μεμαυῖαν Ἀθήνην, 19.349). Of course, the *Iliad* also depicts conflict between Zeus and Athena. Most notably, he threats her quite harshly in 8.402-406. Even this scenario, however, cannot compare with his treatment of Aphrodite, for Athena incites her father's rebuke by violating his very recent and stern injunction against any divine interference at Troy.

[76] She is Χάρις λιπαροκρήδεμνος καλή, τὴν ὤπυιε περικλυτὸς ἀμφιγυήεις (18.382-383). Brown (1989: 283, n.2) observes that, since the marriage of Hephaistos and Aphrodite is not well attested outside the Odyssean narrative and the texts influenced by it, "it may well be an *ad hoc* invention by the poet." In light of Aphrodite's predilection for strikingly attractive individuals (Anchises, Ares, Paris, and even Helen), this saddling of the goddess with a famously ugly husband would constitute yet another poetic attempt to impose checks on her nature. Hephaistos' words confirm that their marriage goes against the goddess' inclinations (8.308-311):

> ... ἐμὲ χωλὸν ἐόντα Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη
> αἰὲν ἀτιμάζει, φιλέει δ' ἀΐδηλον Ἄρηα,
> οὕνεχ' ὁ μὲν καλός τε καὶ ἀρτίπος, αὐτὰρ ἐγώ γε
> ἠπεδανὸς γενόμην ...
> ... Aphrodite, daughter of Zeus, forever
> holds me in little favor, but she loves ruinous Ares
> because he is handsome, and goes sound on his feet, while I am

When Aphrodite strays beyond the confines of her marriage (by engaging in her emblematic activity with the handsome Ares), Hephaistos, the embodiment of craft and technology, subdues her in a richly symbolic manner. The wild, unruly, elemental goddess is brought under control by an ingenious device that, as a product of her husband's brainpower and skill, evokes the advancements of civilization and its control over nature. The goddess who embodies energy that resists containment and boundaries is immovably fixed in place and suffers dramatically humiliating disempowerment. She is only freed through the intervention of Poseidon, who, interestingly enough, also happens to be a fellow elemental deity. Finally, there is the intimation that she has been defeated by Persephone in Bion's *Epitaph on Adonis*. Lamenting the dying Adonis, she declares that she fears Persephone, who turns out to be the more powerful goddess (ἐσσὶ γὰρ αὐτά /πολλὸν ἐμεῦ κρέσσων, 54-55; σε φοβεῦμαι, 57). This acknowledgment of inferiority ties into the tradition of a dispute between the two over Adonis and marks Aphrodite as the loser.[77]

Underscoring Aphrodite's disempowerment and domination is the recurrent use of her own powers against the goddess. In Homer's *Dios Apate* episode (*Il.* 14.153 ff.), she is tricked by Hera's false pretense into giving up control of her κεστός – an object externalizing her power, which Hera then employs to ultimately aid the side Aphrodite opposes in the Trojan War.[78] Correspondingly, Zeus achieves Aphrodite's subordination in the *HHA* by availing himself of her divine prerogatives. Mirroring the goddess' characteristic *modus operandi*, he casts desire in her heart (ἵμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ, 45 & 53)[79] and has her experience a loss of mental integrity

---

weakly from birth ... (Trans. R. Lattimore, modified)

[77] Hyginus, *De Astronomia* 2.7.3; Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Bibliotheke* 3.14.4; possibly some images from as early as the 5th cent. B.C., noted by Gantz 1993: 730-731.

[78] Jackson (2010: 156-157) notes this removal of Aphrodite's power from her control "as her own tools are used against her."

[79] The goddess herself Ἀγχίσεω ἵμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ at v. 143. The repetition (within the scope of less than ten verses) lends emphasis to Zeus' mastery of Aphrodite's power.

(ἀπεπλάγχθην δὲ νόοιο, 254). In helping to actualize his scheme, Aphrodite's divine powers of seduction – which she employs to achieve her union with Anchises – also become effectively subordinated to Zeus' purpose.[80]

This trope of turning the tables on Aphrodite contributes to some of the most striking degradations and humiliations of the goddess in the Greek tradition and reveals a level of hostility to an Olympian perhaps matched only by certain depictions of Ares.[81] The *Iliad* features a particularly demeaning scenario: Helen's directive for what Aphrodite herself ought to be doing to gratify Paris. Indignant at being treated like a plaything, Helen articulates a vision wherein – by enjoining the goddess to forever abandon Olympus and the way of the gods and spend her days suffering for Paris (αἰεὶ περὶ κεῖνον ὀΐζυε, 3.408) – she essentially strips Aphrodite of her divinity. She then develops the degradation into an even more dramatic humiliation: she envisions Aphrodite as not only subject to a mortal way of life but as becoming inferior to herself on the human plane; she envisions the goddess as a mere slave (δούλη, 3.409).[82] Notably, on the level of its storyline, the *HHA* features numerous points of correspondence with Helen's humiliating tirade, thereby transforming elements of her wishful thinking into mythic "reality." Indignant that he and other gods constitute Aphrodite's playthings, Zeus turns the tables on the goddess and makes her succumb to the desire for a (Trojan) mortal, so that she leaves her divine comforts, fashions herself into a mortal woman, serves his bed, and becomes afflicted with great pain (αἰνὸν ἄχος, 198-199), forever (ἤματα πάντα διαμπερὲς, 248) humiliated and significantly diminished in her power.[83]

---

[80] Bergren 1989: 2.
[81] As, for instance, when Zeus declares that, as far he is concerned, Ares is the most hateful of the gods who hold Olympus (*Il.* 5.890): ἔχθιστος δέ μοί ἐσσι θεῶν οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν.
[82] In articulating the vision of Aphrodite as a slave to her lover, Helen's words tie into the later conceit of erotic enslavement, on which see Thornton 1997: 44-45 & 230, n. 72.
[83] Both also stress the deceitfulness of Aphrodite. Moreover, they each feature Phygrai as the place to or from which a divinity is said to carry a woman intended for a mortal man.

The myth of Adonis, especially as treated by Bion, continues this theme of Aphrodite's degradation. Not only is she the devastated lover of a dying mortal, the goddess herself appears in very human terms.[84] Running through the woods with disheveled hair, barefoot and bloody from thorns and from self-inflicted lacerations (*Ep. Adon*. 20-27), she is a far cry from her typical – adorned and pampered – poetic incarnations.[85] Her immense suffering defines Bion's poem, which declares, moreover, that she has lost her beauty (καλὸν εἶδος, 30-31), her divine appearance (ἱερὸν εἶδος, 29), and her divine erotic power (κεστὸς, 60).[86] Of course, the song of Demodocus also features a terrible degradation of the Aphrodite as she is publicly exposed not only in her nakedness but also in the expression of her sexuality.[87] And likewise there is the humiliating wounding by Diomedes, who makes her drop her injured son and chases her away with contemptuous insults (*Il.* 5.311ff.). And these tactics of degradation are not restricted to Aphrodite. We also find them applied to EROS, especially in Hellenistic poetry. In the anonymous *A.P.* 12.112 and Meleager's *A.P.* 12.113 the tables are turned on the god as he himself is subjected to the conquering force of passion: in the first epigram, he is bound (δήσας) and led along by the triumphant Arcesilaus[88]; in the second, likewise bound, the god is vanquished, having been caught (δέσμιος ἥλω, ἀγρευθεὶς) by the eyes of another boy. A much more violent degradation is envisioned in a fragment (11) by Aristophon, where EROS is not only banished from Olympus but even has his wings chopped off to prevent any attempt at a

---

[84] Reed (1997: 24-25, 211) comments that her blood (22), the "death" of her beauty (31), and her μέλαν εἶμα (25) – normally worn by mourning mortals – draw "the goddess closer to mortality." Reed also observes that in the poem Aphrodite becomes assimilated to her mortal lover.

[85] *Od.* 8.364-366, echoed by *HHA* 61-65, *Cypria* 6.1-12, *Homeric Hymn* 6.5-18, etc. For an overview of Aphrodite's adornment, see Cyrino 2010: 57-67.

[86] Bion references the Iliadic κεστὸς ἱμάς (14.214).

[87] Hephaistos directs the gods to look ἵνα τώ γε καθεύδετον ἐν φιλότητι (8.313). Cf. Hera's declaration in the *Iliad* that if anyone should catch sight of her sleeping with Zeus, her lawful husband no less, and make it public, this would be νεμεσσητὸν (14.336).

[88] Citing parallels in Ar. *Pl.* 757 and Aesch. *Eum.* 1035, 1037, Gow & Page (1965: 567) show that the epigram's first words, Εὐφαμεῖτε, νέοι, are a call for triumphant cheering.

return.[89] That this kind of violence is not just the product of comedic license[90] is evidenced by another of Meleager's epigrams in which the speaker swears that he will burn EROS' weapons, cut off his wings, and put fetters on his feet.[91] Meleager also stations EROS in a slave market, where he is to be sold like a slave (*A.P.* 5.178), and – emulating Moschus' *Eros Drapetes* – the poet makes the god the subject of a proclamation that amounts to a public announcement of an escaped felon or a run-away slave (*A.P.* 5.177).

Similar in its effects and often implicated in a degradation, though not identical with it, is the regular shaming of Aphrodite. A particularly resonant example of this attack on her divine dignity can be found in Theocritus' first idyll, specifically in the encounter between the goddess and the lovesick oxherd Daphnis. He hails the goddess as νεμεσσατά, "causing indignation" (101). As Zimmerman has shown, this characterization alludes to Helen's rebuke of the goddess in *Iliad* 3 for pushing her towards sexual activity she deems νεμεσσητὸν, that is, liable to shaming censure.[92] Daphnis continues to disgrace Aphrodite by bringing up her trysts with the herdsmen Anchises and Adonis, implying their unseemliness through a remark about Adonis' ripeness (ὡραῖος, 108) and the aposiopesis of what Anchises had done to her: οὐ λέγεται τὰν Κύπριν ὁ βουκόλος; (105). The oxherd also references Aphrodite's confrontation with Diomedes

[89] The gods exact this punishment because EROS ἐτάραττε κἀκείνους γὰρ ἐμβάλλων στάσεις (3). They give his wings to Nike as "spoils from the enemies" (σκῦλον ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων, 9). These final words of the fragment intimate EROS' death since, as Papachrysostomou observes (2008: 137), σκῦλον, and not λάφυρον, had been chosen. Papachrysostomou explains that the "latter term denotes spoils taken from living enemies, the former spoils taken from the dead." Correspondingly, the speaker of Leonidas' *A.P.* 5.188, declares that he will avenge himself (τίσομαι) on EROS, the transgressor (ἀλιτρὸν) who torments him with his arrows. Moreover, in his characterization as θνητὸς ὁ δαίμων, there is likewise a suggestion that the god is stripped of his immortality. For a discussion of the emendations of the problematic ἐσώκει, which precedes this characterization, see Gow & Page 2965: 390 and Stadtmüller's edition.

[90] The speaker of this fragment reckons that the gods acted δικαίως and εἰκότως in their treatment of EROS. He is perhaps parodying Pythagorean beliefs concerning sex, since the fragment belongs to the comedy *Pythagoristes*, a satire of the school of the Pythagoreans (Papachrysostomou 2008: 136).

[91] He does subsequently admit that this would be an empty victory over the god, as having him chained close by is dangerous. Ultimately, he bids EROS to go and harass others.

[92] Zimmerman 1994: 377-378.

(112-113), directing us to the *Iliad,* where the hero scoffs at the goddess for corrupting the morals of feeble women – alluding to her role in Helen's adultery – (5.349), and his scorn is, in turn, echoed by the degrading mockery of Athena, who parodies the goddess as a notorious panderer of illicit sex, driven by an excessive love of Trojan men (τοὺς νῦν ἔκπαγλα φίλησε, 5.423) – a shaming reference to both her influence over Helen and her tryst with Anchises. [93] To this category also belongs the ignominy suffered by the goddess within Demodocus' song in *Odyssey* 8. Literally caught in her adultery and labelled κυνῶπις (319) by her husband, Aphrodite becomes fodder for boundless laughter (ἄσβεστος γέλως, 326; γέλως, 343). Citing parallels for the use of γέλως in public shaming, Brown persuasively argues that rather than expressing lighthearted, inconsequential hilarity, this public laughter is a manifestation of shame, a means by which Hephaistos exacts his revenge.[94] The disgraceful nature of her predicament is underscored by the information that a sense of shame keeps the goddesses away from the spectacle (8.324). Finally, we have the shaming of the goddess through her own hymn. On a narrative level, Aphrodite speaks of the never-ending μέγ' ὄνειδος, "great reproach / disgrace," that she will be subject to among the gods because of her union with Anchises (247-248).[95] On the level of its poetic function, in revealing her ignominious union with a mortal – as Bergren observes – the hymn is itself an ὄνειδος, a continuation of the ὄνειδος engineered by Zeus.[96]

Related to shaming is the use of the language of censure, language that not only communicates the threatening or destructive qualities of erotic energy, but also – through its

---

[93] Thornton (1997: 154) remarks that "the laughter and mockery Aphrodite endures serve to circumscribe her power, for those who suffer the mockery of others do so because they are powerless to stop it."
[94] Brown 1989: 287-289. Likewise, Faulkner 2008: 17-18 and Thornton 1997: 155.
[95] Faulkner (2008: 17) notes that concentrated attention is given to Aphrodite's shame in vv. 252-5 through emphasis produced "by expanding across two lines on the theme of her folly (vv. 253-4 ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὸν ἀάσθην / σχέτλιον οὐκ ὀνοταστόν, ἀπεπλάγχθην δὲ νόοιο), which is 'unutterable' (οὐκ ὀνοταστόν). Zeus has in the end been successful, and the laughing, boasting Aphrodite presented in the lines immediately preceding the narrative has been humbled and shamed."
[96] Bergren 1989: 2.

implicit moral evaluation – dramatizes its subject's undesirability and so amounts to a form of rejection. For instance, we see this mechanism at work whenever the adjective κακός is applied to Aphrodite, as it is by Euripides' Helen, who calls the goddess ἄπληστος κακῶν (*Helen* 1102), and by his Hippolytus, who (according to Aphrodite herself) declares her κακίστην δαιμόνων πεφυκέναι (*Hippolytus* 13).[97] In fact, denouncing EROS in this manner has the ring of a poetic convention: in Euripides he is κακὸν μέγα (*Medea* 330), in Apollonius ἄφατον κακὸν (*Arg*. 3.129), in Bion κακόν θηρίον (Frag. 13.13) as well as ταλίκον πάντεσσι κακὸν (Frag. 14.4), and Moschus endows him with κακαὶ φρένες (*Eros Drapetes* 8). Leonidas' designation of EROS as ἀλιτρός, "wicked," (*A.P.* 12.57) and Meleager's use of the hapax legomenon τριπανοῦργον, "triple-villain," (*A.P.* 5.188) work in an analogous manner. We also find thoroughly explicit rejections of EROS and Aphrodite. As we saw earlier, Apollonius addresses EROS as a great object of hate (μέγα στύγος ἀνθρώποισιν, 4.445), while Meleager declares that he is abhorred everywhere and by everyone (πάντῃ γὰρ καὶ πᾶσιν ἀπέχθεται). An epigram stresses the universality of this odium by declaring the unwillingness of air, earth, or sea to admit to fathering the creature (*A.P.* 5.177).[98] Theocritus' Daphnis, in turn, characterizes Aphrodite as θνατοῖσιν ἀπεχθής, "hated by mortals" (1.101).[99]

[97] Hippolytus also asserts that in women, particularly the clever ones, Aphrodite τὸ κακοῦργον ἐντίκτει (642). In the song of Demodocus, the gods call Aphrodite's adulterous activity κακὰ ἔργα (*Il.* 8.329).
[98] Hopkinson 1988: 262.
[99] Like Daphnis, Hippolytus persists in his vehement hate of the goddess right up to his tragic death. In fact, in his final moments he expresses an ardent – though futile – wish to curse his divine destroyer (1415).

1.4. A window into Venus' dark *fama*

Clearly, Aeneas' denouncement of his mother in *Aeneid* 1 participates in the tradition of invective against Aphrodite. Indeed, this participation is more profound and complex than is readily apparent. Let us take a closer look at Aeneas' reproachful words (1.407-408):

> *quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis*
> *ludis imaginibus? cur dextrae iungere dextram*
> *non datur ac veras audire et reddere voces*?
> 'You're cruel too! Why do you so often toy with your son,
> crafting your illusions! Why are we not allowed to link our right hands,
> and to engage in an exchange of genuine voices?'[100]

The invective *crudelis tu quoque* (1.407) is an echo of Vergil's words – emphasized through close repetition – in *Eclogue* 8 (*crudelis tu quoque*, *mater*, 48, 50). There, the words form part of an invective against *Amor*, within which the god is characterized as having taught a mother to stain her hands with her children's blood. The cruelty of *Amor* (*ille puer improbus*, 49-50) is weighed against the cruelty of the mother.[101] An impassioned reflection on the dark savagery of the love god constitutes the larger context, which, in turn, fits within the framework of a melancholy song of a lovesick goatherd. This piece exhibits many points of correspondence with the song of Daphnis, the lovesick cowherd of Theocritus' *Idyll* 1. They include the Vergilian song's pastoral setting, its punctuation by a refrain, its dramatization of the dark, destructive dimension of erotic love, the watery manner of the goatherd's suicide, and the reversal of nature (*adynaton*) that immediately follows the invective echoed in the *Aeneid*.[102] In effect, Aeneas'

---

[100] I have modified F. Ahl's translation.
[101] For the potential identification of *mater* with Venus, see Coleman *ad* 48.
[102] The refrain *incipe/desine Maenalios mecum, mea tibia, versus* is analogous to Theocritus' ἄρχετε/λήγετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι, πάλιν ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς. Daphnis drowns in the eddy of a stream (140-141), while Vergil's

denunciation of the goddess of love at the moment of her full epiphany activates a window reference, whereby the eclogue, functioning as an intermediate model, leads the reader back to its source in Theocritus, which also contains an invective directed by a mortal against the goddess of love upon her epiphany.[103] Addressing her as Κύπρι βαρεῖα, /Κύπρι νεμεσσατά, Κύπρι θνατοῖσιν ἀπεχθής (100-101), Daphnis abuses Aphrodite by citing her literary past (105-107, 109-110, 112-113):

> οὐ **λέγεται** τὰν Κύπριν ὁ βουκόλος; ἔρπε ποτ' Ἴδαν,
>
> ἔρπε ποτ' Ἀγχίσαν· τηνεὶ δρύες ἠδὲ κύπειρος,
>
> αἱ δὲ καλὸν βομβεῦντι ποτὶ σμάνεσσι μέλισσαι.
>
> .....
>
> ὡραῖος χὤδωνις, ἐπεὶ καὶ μῆλα νομεύει
>
> καὶ πτῶκας βάλλει καὶ θηρία πάντα διώκει.
>
> .....
>
> αὖτις ὅπως στασῇ Διομήδεος ἅσσον ἰοῖσα,
>
> καὶ λέγε "τὸν βούταν νικῶ Δάφνιν, ἀλλὰ μάχευ μοι."
>
> Is it not said that the cowherd and Cypris . . . but away with you
>
> To your Anchises—go to Ida where oaks and galingale grow,
>
> And the bees hum melodiously about their hives.
>
> .....
>
> And Adonis too is in his prime, pasturing his sheep,

---

goatherd jumps from a crag into the waves (59-60). For more correspondences, see Otis 1964:109-110. The goatherd's song is the first of two in the eclogue. While it echoes Theocritus' first idyll, the second song is modelled on the Greek poet's second idyll. Interestingly, the latter Vergilian piece features Daphnis, now positioned as the object of desire.

[103] For a definition of the "window reference," see Thomas 1999: 130. Cf. Pelliccia's use of the concept in his analysis of the meeting of Aeneas and Dido in the Underworld (2010: 201ff.). The interrogative form of Aeneas' four-line reproach corresponds to the three-line long question that begins Daphnis' address.

Killing hares, and hunting every kind of wild beast.

.....

Or go and confront Diomedes and say: "I've beaten

The cowherd Daphnis, so come on, now *you* fight with me."[104]

Through an aposiopesis, Daphnis' song underlines the disgraceful nature of Aphrodite's tryst with Anchises and invites recollection of her humiliation in the *HHA*. The sordid coloring bleeds into the evocation of the goddess' love affair with the young Adonis. Together, these elements of Aphrodite's *fama* not only suggests her unsavory notoriety but also remind us of her suffering as, in the *HHA*, she is bested by Zeus and, in the case of Adonis, by Persephone and Artemis - the latter goddess is traditionally credited with sending the boar that kills Aphrodite's beloved. The final allusion to Aphrodite's troubles continues the theme of disempowerment and shaming. Daphnis' words expressly direct the reader to Aphrodite's Homeric confrontation with Diomedes and her humiliating defeat by the mortal, who also shames her with his derisive abuse. But that is not all. As we have already noted,[105] the passage also features an intertext with an Iliadic scene in which, after rescuing Paris from Menelaus, Aphrodite bids Helen to join Paris in bed (3.383-436). In this scene, Helen likewise abuses the goddess and calls her suggestion νεμεσσητὸν (410) – paralleled by Daphnis' designation of the goddess as νεμεσσατά. Both Helen and Daphnis exhort Aphrodite to go off and tend to her own desires, and just as Helen scornfully challenges Paris to fight Menelaus, so Daphnis mockingly challenges Aphrodite to fight Diomedes.[106]

The window reference thus opens upon a rich intertextual nexus pulling together different strands of Aphrodite's *fama* of abuse and disempowerment. Vergil draws in additional strand of

[104] Trans. A. Verity.
[105] See p. 41.
[106] Zimmerman 1994: 378.

notoriety when he references the Odyssean song of Demodocus in his depiction of Venus' departure. Ovid calls this tale of Aphrodite's adultery and shaming punishment the most notorious tale in all of heaven (*fabula ... toto notissima caelo*, *Ars* 2.561).[107] To a certain extent, the enduring ill-repute of the love goddess resembles the στυγερή ἀοιδή and χαλεπὴ φῆμις that, in the last book of the *Odyssey*, Agamemnon attributes to Clytemnestra: a dark counterpart to the eternal κλέος earned by the chaste Penelope (*Od*. 24.194-202).

And yet, while the Theocritean allusion acknowledges the dark *fama* that Venus – in her function as a powerful node of intertextuality – attracts into the *Aeneid*, it simultaneously manages to suggest that very *fama*'s instability. Daphnis' intertextually potent narrative of Aphrodite's disgraceful history is prefaced and thus qualified by the questioning οὐ λέγεται (105). In addition to the destabilizing effect of an interrogative introduction, λέγεται is a charged term that foregrounds the issue of the (un)reliability of what is said about the goddess. Although it belongs to the stock expressions that invoke tradition for their authority, the anonymous λέγεται also draws attention to the foundational vagueness and mutability of collective talk, as it suggests the contestability of rumor – a meaning encompassed by the Latin *fama*.[108]

Indeed, throughout its course, the *Aeneid* casts doubt upon the reliability of what is said about Venus. For, as people talk about the love goddess, incongruities emerge that undermine the stability of her characterization. We have already noted that her own son articulates conflicting versions of his mother. When he meets her in the Libyan woods, his initial remark about her constant assistance (*matre dea monstrante viam,* 1.382) is dramatically undermined by his final

---

[107] The "adultery of Ares and Aphrodite," says Hardie (2012: 362), "is a prize specimen of the art of the epic bard that is at the same time the original elegiac *fabula*."

[108] Syson (2013) remarks that expressions like *dicitur* (the Latin equivalent of λέγεται) belong to "the vocabulary of *fama*" (34), whose discourse "draws attention to the fallibility of human knowledge and memory, even as it celebrates poetry's power both to transmit knowledge and to establish new memories" (36). As an "Alexandrian footnote," λέγεται – in the words of Hardie – "draws attention to the disputed, and possibly unfounded, nature of a particular tradition" (2012: 100). On the "Alexandrian footnote" see, e.g., Hinds 1998: 1-5.

reproach.[109] Moreover, in casting her behavior as habitual (*totiens*), Aeneas' denunciation of her cruelty clashes both with her present intervention and with her continuous assistance throughout the poem.

While this characterization of Venus as a bad mother is a jarring development, it does, however, align with her poetic *fama*: traditionally, the goddess of love is indeed a problematic mother. In the *HHA*, she not only views the conception of Aeneas as part of a disastrous mistake and the source of eternal shame, she also discloses her intention to abandon the child to the nymphs upon his birth and to hide her identity as his mother from the mortal world (247-258, 273, 281-290). Although she does display a warmer maternal stance in the *Iliad* when she swoops in at a critical moment to save Aeneas from being slayed by Diomedes, her assistance is extremely short-lived. As we have noted, when Diomedes nicks her hand, she drops the Trojan and in so doing exposes him to fatal attacks (5.343-346); it is Apollo, *not* his mother, who ultimately brings Aeneas to safety and ensures his recovery.[110] Thus, Aeneas' conflicting words about his mother dramatize the dissonance between the mother of Aeneas in the Greek poetic tradition and Venus' more effective performance as his dutiful protector, advocate, and all-around assistant in the Vergil's epic.[111]

The talk of other characters contributes additional dissonances. Near the beginning of Book 12, as he prepares for his imminent confrontation with Aeneas, Turnus makes the following declaration: *longe illi dea mater erit, quae nube fugacem / feminea tegat et vanis sese occulat umbris* (12.52-3). His words evoke Aphrodite' rescue of her son during his confrontation with

[109] It is also at odds with his narrative to Dido, which gives no indication of Venus' guidance after his departure from Troy.
[110] This lackluster track record with her mortal son harmonizes with – and perhaps prompted – Apollonius' account of her troubled relationship with her divine son Eros, which yet again illustrates the goddess' ineffectuality.
[111] For an overview of Venus' maternal assistance through the course of the *Aeneid,* see Appendix 1.

Diomedes, but they also challenge this epic history, since the Homeric goddess uses her arms and robe to shield the incapacitated Aeneas from missiles (*Il*. 5.314-316) and the Greek epic gives no indication of concealment through either cloud or shadow. A portion of Juno's rehashing of Venus' past at the council of the gods (*tu potes Aenean manibus subducere Graium / proque viro nebulam et ventos obtendere inanis,* 10.81-2) similarly contests the Iliadic model. Both Turnus and Juno amalgamate disparate Homeric elements: Aphrodite's rescue of *Paris* involves his concealment (ἐκάλυψε δ' ἄρ' ἠέρι πολλῇ, 3.381), and when Apollo takes up the rescue of Aeneas in *Iliad* 5, *he* both wraps the Trojan in a cloud (νεφέλῃ, 345) and fashions a phantom decoy to take his place (449-453). Juno even challenges the *Aeneid*'s narrative (9.76-122), attributing to Venus the transformation of the Trojan ships (which had been accomplished by Cybele and Jupiter in Book 9).[112] Significantly, in mixing truth and fiction, Juno replicates the *modus operandi* of the personified *Fama* of Book 4, who *pariter facta atque infecta canebat* (4.190).

1.5. The reconfigurations

A consideration of Vergil's *Fama*, the monstrous divinization of rumor, can illuminate one of the ways in which the poet negotiates the intertextual presence of Venus' own dark *fama* in his poem. Like Juno's aforementioned mixing of what Venus had *not* done with what did in fact happen, *Fama* fractures an original narrative in order to propagate versions that mix true elements with fictive ones. Her tales are believable because the false is anchored in the true, the new in the old.[113] Hardie has observed that a mixing of varied elements can also be found in

[112] She tells Venus *potes in totidem classem convertere nymphas* (10.83).
[113] In the view of Syson (2013: 165), the "*Aeneid* emphasizes how new beliefs are anchored in what people think they already know."

Vergil's description of *Fama*'s genealogy and physiognomy. Related to and endowed with features from various creatures of Greco-Roman myth, she is a bricolage "of preexisting materials ... put together to make something that never was."[114] Hardie also remarks that although in the immediate narrative context of her dramatic emergence in Book 4 *Fama* "operates in the manner of *Fama*-as-unfounded-rumour," the many "traditional features that go into the construction" of her person can suggest the identity of "*Fama*-as-tradition."[115]

I posit that some of Venus' characterization is likewise a bricolage of preexisting elements, combined with elements of Vergil's invention. Specifically, many of these preexisting fragments can be traced back to the tradition of poetic narratives – themselves amplified by their resonance with other texts – that together constitute a sizable portion of Venus' dark literary past. The unflattering and disparaging things that had been said about the goddess of love served as material that Vergil fragmented, reconfigured, and mixed with other elements to produce new narratives to new effects. In short, the poet's response to Venus' ineluctable dark *fama* not only involves his intimations of its rumor-like nature, but at times exhibits certain parallels with his own creation: *Fama*, the master of narrative plasticity.[116] Let us now take a close look at these and related maneuvers that reveal the significant role that her notorious Greek heritage plays in Venus' characterization, and in the poem at large.

[114] Hardie 2012: 99, 110.
[115] Hardie 2012: 110.
[116] It is noteworthy that Vergil's *Fama* emerges to propagate a tale centered around an erotic relationship and thus illustrates the susceptibility of τὰ ἔργα Ἀφροδίτης both to wide-spread talk and to negative distortion. For instance, she sings of Dido and Aeneas as *turpi... cupidine captos* (4.194). For the relationship between *Fama* and *elegaic fabula,* see Hardie 2012: 353-354, 360-361.

Iliad 5 and the *HHA*

Surely, the piece of Venus' *fama* most strongly attracted into the *Aeneid* is Aphrodite's botched rescue of Aeneas in *Iliad* 5 (311ff.). Not only are Vergil's Aeneas and Venus positioned as continuations of their Greek counterparts, we have here the only scene in Homer wherein these two characters interact. What is more, as far as Homeric battle episodes go, this can be counted among the more memorable ones. In consequence, the very presence of Venus' character draws Aphrodite's dramatic failure into Vergil's poem – no allusive nodding needed. Yet the poet does nod, encouraging the recollection of Aphrodite's intervention along with its attendant humiliations: her wounding by Diomedes, the verbal disparagements and mockery directed at her both by the impudent Greek hero and by the gods she faces on Olympus. In fact, not only does Vergil allude to this part of Diomedes' *aristeia* on multiple occasions,[117] he evokes what happens to Aphrodite through the words of Venus herself. Before Jupiter and the other Olympians, the goddess of love declares that what she has suffered during her Iliadic past is happening again in her Vergilian present (10.28-30):

> *atque iterum in Teucros Aetolis surgit ab Arpis*
> *Tydides. equidem credo, mea vulnera restant*
> *et tua progenies mortalia demoror arma.*
> Tydeus' son, Diomedes, sets out from Aetolian Arpi,
> Rushes the Teucrians again. More wounds, I suppose, yet await me—
> I, your own child, now delay, by my absence, those spear-thrusts from mortals.

We are expressly invited to recall the depth of the Aphrodite's disempowering humiliation. And yet, the manner and context of Venus' dramatic presentation of her epic heritage, in conjunction

[117] 1.94-98, 1.752, 8.9ff., 11.275ff., 12.52-3.

with a number of other references in the course of the poem, all function to color and destabilize the Homeric portrayal.

Venus' complaint in *Aeneid* 10 is reminiscent of Aphrodite's outburst on Olympus: the Homeric goddess declares her concern for her son and laments that the Trojan war now involves mortals attacking gods (*Il.* 5.376-381). She receives comfort from Dione – a vague deity appearing in Homer only here and likely styled as Aphrodite's mother for this very occasion;[118] but the other gods (whose presence Homer discloses) add insult to her injury. As we have noted in Section 1.3, Athena and Hera mock her, while Zeus callously puts her in her place.[119] Vergil channels the Diomedes incident and the dramatically plaintive tone of the beaten Aphrodite into his own Olympian scene, but here Venus does not merely *report* her indignity; she uses it as a rhetorical asset. She appropriates her Homeric *fama* to gain sympathy and to stress the grand injustice of Juno's machinations.[120] And although Jupiter does not actually chastise his wife and side with Venus, his stern words at the beginning and conclusion of the council are occasioned by Juno's transgressive involvement, while his sympathy for Venus and her cause is evident in his displeasure at the rise of the war. In fact, in so far as the Olympian scene in *Aeneid* 10 recalls the Olympian scene in *Iliad* 5, it underscores the tremendous shift in relationship dynamics between the king of the gods and the love goddess. The contrast is amplified by an intratextual correspondence: Venus' plaintive words bring to mind her interaction with her father in *Aeneid*

[118] Kirk 1990: 99.
[119] See pp. 32, 36-37.
[120] For an analysis of the rhetorical features, strategies, etc. of Venus' speech and of Juno's response, see Highet 1972: 65-121.

1,[121] where her distress is met with his sympathetic tenderness.[122] Jupiter not only kisses and soothes his crying daughter, he gladly grants her what she desires, just as the Homeric Zeus repeatedly does for Athena.[123]

One of the issues which moves Venus to plaintive pleading with her father concerns his promise of the deification of her progeny.[124] In this desire for the celestial immortality of (a) beloved mortal(s), she resembles Aphrodite of the *HHA*. As we saw, Aphrodite's desire and its unattainability is central to her humiliation by the supreme god; her disempowering shame (ὄνειδος, 247) follows from her inability to do for Anchises what only Zeus can bring about: to elevate the ontological status of a mortal.[125] In stark contrast, Vergil has Jupiter emphatically assure his pained daughter that both her human son and a future descendant will dwell among the gods.[126] Indeed, he specifies her agency in Aeneas' apotheosis.[127] These deifications also frame the narration of the progress toward great power and glory that she can expect from her bloodline. Whereas in the *HHA* the conception of Aeneas will lead to the goddess' ignominy among the gods, Vergil reformulates the consequence of Venus' union with Anchises as leading to glory that reaches the celestial realm (*astris*, 1.287). Is Vergil responding here to the *HHA* or

---

[121] *Aen*. 1.227ff. Gransden (1984: 132) notes the parallels: "When in book I Venus watched the Trojans, storm-tossed and far from the goal of their *nostos*, she had addressed Jupiter in a speech similar in its tone of plaintive reproach, a speech likewise starting with an appeal to Jupiter's omnipotence, *o qui res hominumque deumque aeternis regis imperiis* [229-230] ... and affecting to be resigned to a reversal of the irreversible course of history."

[122] This tenderness toward his daughter is reminiscent of Zeus' comforting of Artemis – who, like Venus, suffers from his wife's hostility – in *Iliad* 21.505-513. See note 74, above.

[123] The parallel is especially close in the case of Zeus' indulgence of Athena's pleas for Odysseus at the outset of the *Odyssey*, since in both cases the Olympian king proceeds to dispatch Hermes/Mercury for the benefit of his daughter's earthly protégé. As Austin (1971: *ad loc.*) has observed, Jupiter's smiling at Venus at *Aeneid* 1. 254 echoes Zeus' kindly attitude toward Athena at *Il*. 8.38.

[124] *nos, tua progenies, caeli quibus adnuis arcem* (1.250). Vergil does not make it clear whether she means only Aeneas or her mortal line in general.

[125] For this would diminish the shameful ontological disparity of their union. See Sec. 1.3, pp. 35-36.

[126] Some scholars argue that this descendant is Julius Caesar, others that it is Augustus. For a brief overview of the prominent scholarship in support of each view, see Ganiban *ad* 1.286-96.

[127] *sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli / magnanimum Aenean* (1.259-160).

works that take up its dark coloring of Aeneas' conception?[128] He very well could be, especially because recognition of this intertextual engagement elucidates his words at two other points in Jupiter's speech about Venus' bloodline.

The last descendant in Jupiter's survey is introduced with the following statement: *nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar* (1.286). The line is noteworthy because it does not expressly communicate anything more substantial than Caesar's introduction within the framework of an otherwise terse account loaded with historical information. Heyne interprets *pulchra Troianus origine* as simply conveying that Caesar's *origo* is *clara*; Conigton seems inclined to thinks that the words specify that Caesar comes from a *Trojan* line of high nobility; while Austin comments: "Caesar is to be of Trojan ancestry, and because his ancestry is Trojan it is therefore noble." In effect, such readings suggest that Vergil had composed an uncharacteristically banal verse. Conway finds the epithet "curious … in a pedigree," though he agrees with Servius in interpreting *pulchra* as a reference to Venus.[129] I think that *pulchra* does indeed refer to the goddess but that the word also functions beyond merely drawing on her emblematic beauty as it points to her role of progenitor. In fact, in combination with *Troianus*, it brings us back to the very beginning of the lineage of the Aeneadae, to the sexual union of Aphrodite and her Trojan lover, and, challenging its tawdry coloring in the Greek tradition, recasts it as something more noble. As the Olympian king unrolls the great stretch of destiny (expanding both generationally

---

[128] Vergil engages with the *HHA* in the context of Aphrodite's epiphany in *Aeneid* 1. For more on this, see Sec. 3.3, p. 172. Seo has detected engagement with the *HHA* in Dido's remark about Aeneas' parentage: *tune ille Aeneas quem Dardanio Anchisae / alma Venus Phrygii genuit Simoentis ad undam*? (1.618-619). Seo observes that "line 618 contains a critical reference to the hymn as the textual source of Dido's knowledge. *Dardanius*, used only twice of Anchises in the *Aeneid*, is applied to Anchises only once in the hymn at a critical moment of revelation. ... This single occurrence of the genealogical epithet appropriately introduces Aphrodite's speech revealing herself as a goddess and announcing the child she will bear as a result of their encounter. The queen's use of *Dardanius* thus refers to the precise section of the hymn in which Aeneas' birth and upbringing is described." As we have seen (Sec. 1.3 p. 41), in Theocritus' *Idyll* 1 Daphnis shames Aphrodite with his aposiopesis of her sexual intercourse with Anchises.

[129] Heyne 1797: *ad loc.*; Connington 1876: *ad loc.*; Austin 1971: *ad loc.*

and geographically as it progresses from a Trojan prince all the way to Caesar), he redefines his role in the conception of Aeneas: behind the mere resentment of the goddess' antics, there must have been a grander impetus to occasion the fateful union. The gleam of Rome's destiny dispels Greek shadows and highlights the affair's generative function: Venus' identity as the divine matriarch of an august bloodline and future empire casts its transformational brightness on her dark past as a lascivious seductress.

The *Aeneid* reinforces this reconfiguration of the Greek tradition by a maneuver remarked on by Paschalis, namely the careful avoidance of "portraying a meeting between Venus and her ex-lover."[130] Venus comes closest to Anchises when she leads Aeneas back to his father during the mayhem of Book 2. Significantly, in this context Vergil uses the words *ducente deo* (2.632), rather than the expected feminine form;[131] she is effectively de-sexed as she gets physically near her former lover.[132] More intimate collocations of Venus and Anchises are strictly verbal. One occurs within Dido's initial address to Aeneas: *tune ille Aeneas quem Dardanio* ***Anchisae / alma Venus*** *Phrygii genuit Simoentis ad undam?* (1.617-618). Even here, Vergil effects a separation by positioning Anchises and Venus in different lines. He also has *alma* intervene between the names of the lovers, marking their relationship as one of procreation, thereby dampening its erotic charge. Moreover, as Paschalis observes, by placing Aeneas' birth by the river Simois, rather than on Mt. Ida, Vergil completely disassociates it "from the embarrassing story of the love affair of Venus and Anchises on Mount Ida."[133] The names of Aeneas' parents occur in

---

[130] Paschalis 1984: 29. He thinks that in this avoidance Vergil diverges from the treatment of Anchises and Venus in Ennius and Naevius. We should note, however, the reluctance of Greek literature to portray gods in the presence of the mortals with whom they have children. (I am grateful to H. Pelliccia for this observation.)

[131] For how this unusual phrasing fits in with Vergil's engagement with *Iliad* 3, see pp. 69-70.

[132] In keeping with this sexual neutralization, at 2.596 Venus calls Anchises *parentem*: a genderless designation. Paschalis (1984: 30) remarks that to Venus "Anchises is only the *fessum aetate parentem* of Aeneas (596), and not the man she once seduced in the mountains of Phrygia."

[133] Paschalis 1984: 33. He notes that the *Aeneid* presents only one aspect of Mt. Ida, namely its status as a religious site.

close proximity only one other time. We find them side by side in Helenus' address to Anchises: *coniugio, Anchisa, Veneris dignate superbo, / cura deum, bis Pergarneis erepte ruinis* (3.475-6.). Paschalis comments that in this scenario Vergil

> places Anchises' union with Venus in a most favorable context, elevates it to a marriage (*coniugium*) and views it as a sign of divine goodwill. The Virgilian version of the story corrects the tradition that Aphrodite met with Anchises either because Zeus caused her to, in order to prevent her having the laugh over all other deities, or δι' ἐρωτικὴν ἐπιθυμίαν. The marriage version certainly befitted the dignity of Venus and Anchises in the *Aeneid* and the dignity of their descendants -- from Aeneas and Ascanius to Augustus.[134]

Vergil's engagement with the *HHA* also unlocks the pointed significance of Jupiter's designation of Venus as *secura* (1.290) at the moment she welcomes in the heavens her final descendant, the man who culminates the succession of mortal life that had begun inside her on Mt. Ida. Because of its mortal nature, this beginning is a source of great pain for the goddess in the *HHA*. This pain, in turn, becomes part of the identity of her *progenies*, the Aeneadae, who carry on the name of Aeneas, a name that preserves the anguish of her degradation: Αἰνείας ὄνομ' ἔσσεται οὕνεκά μ' αἰνὸν / ἔσχεν ἄχος ἕνεκα βροτοῦ ἀνέρος ἔμπεσον εὐνῇ (198-199). In her hymn, the Aphrodite implies that this distress will be perpetual, since the troubling effect of her union with a mortal, the μέγ' ὄνειδος (247), will never end: ἔσσεται ἤματα πάντα διαμπερὲς (248).[135] Vergil, however, puts an end to this humiliation. The succession of mortal life that originated from her body because of the goddess' degradation, adulterating her divine essence,

---

[134] Paschalis 1984: 28-29. Paschalis also shows that when the words of Anchises' refusal to leave Troy (2.647-649) evoke a memorable feature of his traditional story, namely that he had been blasted by Zeus for boasting of his tryst with Aphrodite, Vergil "handles the story of the thunderbolt stroke in such a way as to turn the traditional picture of it as a sign of divine displeasure and disfavor into its opposite" (31).

[135] During her wounding by Diomedes in *Iliad* 5, Venus "experiences in a direct physical way the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*'s etymology of Aeneas from *ainon achos,*" says Gutting (2009: 53).

"returns" to her through a glorious ascent to her level (*caelo*, 1.289) in the person of Caesar.[136] She receives (*accipies*, 1.290) him as a fellow god (1.290), and Jupiter's pronouncement that she will do so *secura* effectively counters the distress Zeus had engineered for her in the *HHA*. Moreover, in line with these oppositional reconfigurations of the hymn, in which her father used Aphrodite's own power against her, in the *Aeneid* we find that Venus herself utilizes Jupiter's emblematic power: her *signum* to Aeneas in Book 8 is introduced by a flash of lightning.[137] In general, far from limiting her or frustrating her agenda, Jupiter acts as a guarantor of the fulfillment of Venus' wishes. This power dynamic between the Olympian patriarch and the goddess of love reverses much of the Greek tradition.

Let us now return to the *Aeneid*'s engagement with *Iliad* 5. Vergil recalibrates the significance of Venus' Homeric humiliation by balancing the episode with Diomedes' consequent punishment. As in the case of his evocation of Aphrodite's humiliation in the *HHA*, Vergil invites the recollection of the event and then "zooms out," so to speak, enlarging the scope of our perspective so that what had happened to Aphrodite in the Greek text appears as merely a part of a bigger picture, a larger narrative. In the case of Diomedes, his momentary act of audacious violence and derision is counter-balanced by years of suffering, by the subsequent progression of losses: his marriage, his city, his comrades.[138] From an impressive feat of mortal daring that exposes the vulnerability of an Olympian, Vergil transforms the Homeric episode into a cautionary tale against mortal impiety. Harrison observes that Vergil redresses the balance with two additional maneuvers, one of which entails his referencing of Homer but doing "so in a quite

[136] Although she brings Aeneas to the heavens, her mortal line – including her beloved Ascanius – continues down below. Jupiter's prophecy presents the apotheosis of Caesar as the spectacular conclusion of that line.
[137] It is noteworthy that less than 200 lines earlier, the erotic fire her warm embrace transmits to Vulcan (*ille… accepit … flammam*, 8. 388-389) is likened to thunder and lightning (8.391-392).
[138] He is harried by divine hostility (11.269-270, 272).

un-Homeric manner…. Thus … Diomede recalls his wounding of the goddess, but instead of abusing her (cf. *Iliad* 5,348ff.) he now castigates himself for his sacrilegious behavior (11,275ff.)."[139] Furthermore, other engagements with Diomedes' confrontation with Aphrodite reconfigure her intervention to save Aeneas to appear as though it had never in fact been derailed. Jupiter speaks simply of Venus' saving her son from Greek arms (*Graiumque ideo bis vindicat armis*, 4.228),[140] while other references seem to not only take her complete success for granted but also conflate her activity both with her effective rescue of Paris in *Iliad* 3 and with the timely involvement of Apollo. As we already noted, at the council of the gods, Juno tells Venus *tu potes Aenean manibus subducere Graium / proque viro nebulam et ventos obtendere inanis* (10.81-2). Meanwhile, as he looks forward to his duel with Aeneas, Turnus tells Latinus *longe illi dea mater erit, quae nube fugacem / feminea tegat et vanis sese occulat umbris* (12.52-3). Their words fragment Aphrodite's botched rescue of Aeneas and mix it with her Homeric use of mist to easily (ῥεῖα, 3.381) whisk Paris out of mortal danger and into safety (*Iliad* 3.380-2):

> .... τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξ' Ἀφροδίτη
> ῥεῖα μάλ' ὥς τε θεός, ἐκάλυψε δ' ἄρ' ἠέρι πολλῇ,
> κὰδ δ' εἶσ' ἐν θαλάμῳ εὐώδεϊ κηώεντι.
> ... But Aphrodite caught him up
> easily, since she was divine, and wrapped him in a thick mist
> and set him down again in his own perfumed chamber.[141]

They also invite thought of Homer's depiction of the timely and decisive intervention of Apollo, the god who finally brings Aeneas out of danger and even puts Diomedes in his place: καὶ τὸν

[139] Harrison 1981: 223.
[140] The second instance presumably refers to her role in *Aeneid* 2.
[141] Trans. R. Lattimore, modified.

μὲν μετὰ χερσὶν ἐρύσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων / κυανέῃ νεφέλῃ (5.344-5).[142] This mixing of traditional fragments, through which Vergil effectively grafts onto Aphrodite's attempt the successful completion of the rescue by Apollo, also appears in the allusive subtext of Venus' intervention in *Aeneid* 1. Harrison has noticed that Venus' concern for Aeneas' safety, which motivates her to take action on earth, parallels her attitude and behavior in *Iliad* 5. The Homeric intertext operates within the framework of Venus' protective tactics involving the removal of Ascanius and his replacement by Cupid to take his place (meant to "neutralize" the potential danger posed by the Carthaginian Dido). Not only does Venus carry off her grandson – supernaturally incapacitated through sleep – as Aphrodite had Aeneas, but in her revelation of her plan to Cupid, she calls the boy *mea maxima cura* (1.678), an echo of Aphrodite's designation of Aeneas as ἐμοὶ πάντων πολὺ φίλτατός (5.378). At the same time, the episode mixes in elements that in the *Iliad* characterize the role of Apollo. The substitution motif echoes the god's use of a phantom as a deceptive replacement for Aeneas on the battlefield, while Venus' deposition of Ascanius within the haven of one of her temples recalls Apollo's transfer of Aeneas into one of his own temples (*Il.* 5.445-6).[143] The mixing of these Homeric fragments into the goddess' execution of her plan for Dido consequently transfers Apollo's success, which in the original context functioned to offset Aphrodite's ineffectuality, to Vergil's Venus.

The process of fragmentation and reconfiguration of elements from *Iliad* 5 can be also detected in the characterization of Venus at other points in the *Aeneid*. Homer's Athena imparts to Diomedes the power to perceive the presence of deities on the battlefield, and this power, in

[142] Knauer (1964a: 318 n. 1) and Lyne (1987: 133, n. 58) note these conflations. We might also think of how Poseidon uses mist to successfully rescue Aeneas during the Trojan's duel with Achilles, albeit in this case the mist is used to obscure Achilles' sight (*Il.* 20.321): αὐτίκα τῷ μὲν ἔπειτα κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν χέεν ἀχλὺν. The resonance of Turnus' words with this Homeric scenario is invigorated by the (superficial) resemblance of *occulat* to *oculus* (eye) and the absence of Aphrodite in this time of her son's need.
[143] Harrison 1982: 127.

turn, enables him to wound Aphrodite and force her to drop Aeneas. Harrison notes that in *Aeneid* 2, the setting is likewise Troy and the chaos of battle, "but now the arrangement is totally transformed, with Venus providing the special privilege, and Aeneas the beneficiary (2,604ff.),"[144] who is prompted by the supernatural insight to finally let go of his futile commitment to save Troy. Another reconfiguration of the dynamics of divine power within *Iliad* 5 occurs in *Aeneid* 12. Harrison has observed that what follows Aeneas' wounding – Iapyx' failed attempt to heal him, Venus' involvement, etc. – raises a number of questions:

> Why, for example, does Vergil choose to introduce at this critical point a surgeon of such monumental incompetence? Moreover, why is he so insistent on the man's Apolline connections, if all he can do is tug away so fruitlessly at the arrow lodged in Aeneas' side? Why indeed does Vergil repeatedly echo the god's name throughout his account of how this expert failed (cf. 391; 393; 401; 402; 405), ending with the words *nihil auctor / Apollo subvenit* (405f.)? On the other hand, why does Venus suddenly arrive on the scene, and proceed to display expertise in an area which, however familiar she may be with dittany, is no real concern of hers? (…) Commentators … refer us to *Iliad* l6,527ff., where Apollo, like Venus in *Aeneid* 12, produces a magical cure for Glaucus, when he, like Aeneas, is afflicted with an arrow-wound. But in fact such a reference only makes matters worse. For if Apollo could succeed in Homer's poem, where medicine was not yet within his province, why does he fail in Vergil's, where it was?[145]

---

[144] Harrison 1981: 222-223.

[145] 1981: 221-222. Skinner (2007: 90) likewise finds it puzzling that in presenting Apollo's inaction "Vergil disregards Homeric precedent, for in the *Iliad* Apollo had obligingly healed Glaucus when invoked (16.513-529). Moreover, the god has already been depicted as a significant Trojan benefactor, providing oracular guidance to Aeneas in Books 3 and 6 and defending the fleet of Augustus, Aeneas' descendant, on the Shield in Book 8. That he does not minister to Aeneas now seems odd." Tarrant (2012: *ad* 391-397) is perplexed by the prominence given to Iapyx, "since his medical intervention is futile and he is therefore superfluous to the narrative."

He concludes that all the unexpected features of this episode suggest that "Vergil was concerned here with achieving some artistic aim that went beyond, and could even distract from, the mere telling of a convincing story."[146] This aim appears to be the recalibration of Aphrodite's portrayal in *Iliad* 5:

> In the *Iliad* it was Aeneas' divine mother who tried in vain to rescue her son when his life was threatened, and Apollo who intervened to save him; now that Homeric situation is reversed. ... What we have in *Aeneid* 12, then, is a kind of reply κατ'αντίφρασιν of the rescue of Aeneas in *Iliad* 5…, [where] the Apolline side of the exercise had been so utterly competent that it had only made Aphrodite's bungled effort seem all the more inept. Now the bungling is all on the Apolline side, and it is Venus who emerges as the deity who is so opportunely competent.[147]

Vergil locates Venus' competence in an area that by his day had become the purview of Apollo, who had come to be identified with Paieon, the divine doctor that we find in Homer.[148] In a manner that echoes Paieon's healing of Hades' arrow wound and Ares' gash in the *Iliad* (5.401-402, 899-901), Venus heals her son's injury through the sprinkling of painkilling drugs (12.411-424).[149] That she is operating within Apollo's divine sphere is underscored by the resonance of the account of Apollo's gift of healing to Iapyx (*scire potestates herbarum usumque medendi*,

---

[146] Harrison 1981: 222

[147] Harrison 1981: 223. Harrison also notes that "once again Venus *Genetrix* regains some of the pride which, in the Homeric poems, Aphrodite had so conspicuously lacked." See also Harrison 1982: 128. Tarrant (2012: *ad* 403) remarks that repetition (*nequiquam ... nequiquam*, 403; *hoc ... hoc* 416-417; *omnis ... omnis*, 421-422; *maior ... maiora*, 429) emphasizes Iapyx' failure and, conversely, Venus' success.

[148] Over time, Paieon develops into the epiclesis of the healer Apollo, and this healing aspect of the god was especially embraced by the Romans. Macrobius tells us that the Vestals invoked him as *Apollo Medicus, Apollo Paean* (*Sat*. 1.17,.15), while Livy relates that during an epidemic at Rome in 431 B.C. a temple was vowed to Apollo *pro ualetudine populi* (4.25.3).

[149] *spargit* at 12.418

12.396)[150] with Venus' medicating (*medicans*, 12.418) of the water for Aeneas' wound with a special herb she had plucked for this purpose.[151] Furthermore, her intervention's restorative effect on Aeneas (*novae rediere in pristina vires*, 12.424),[152] who quickly returns to battle, recalls Apollo's effect on the Homeric Aeneas: once his injuries from Diomedes are supernaturally healed, the god endows him with renewed vigor and sends him back into battle.[153] Indeed, Vergil's description of Iapyx's relationship with Apollo amplifies the reversal of divine potency. The god endowed Iapyx with the power to heal because he had been overcome by the piercing power of love: *acri captus amore* (12.392). Thus, the *Aeneid* intimates that through erotic compulsion, that is, the emblematic power of Venus, Apollo had been "wounded" in his encounter with a mortal.[154] In other word, Vergil has constructed a scenario that structurally resonates with the literal wounding of Aphrodite by Diomedes. This revisonary empowerment of the love goddess is vividly articulated by Iapyx's reaction to Aeneas' sudden recovery, which comes about despite the failure of Apollo's *ars*: *maior agit deus* (12.429).

The recognition of Vergil's engagement with Venus' Homeric *fama* accounts for the puzzling elements within the narrative of Aeneas' healing.[155] The reconfiguration of the *Iliad* 5 episode in the final book of the *Aeneid* also amplifies the subtler fragmentation and manipulation of the

---

[150] Jacobson (2001: 308-309) thinks that Vergil's Roman audience would have associated Iapyx' name with the common word *pyxis*, "routinely used for a medicine-box … Thus, Iapyx is a name that signifies the healer together with his drugs."

[151] Venus' role as healer is quite unexpected (see, e.g., Quinn 1969: 258). Hawkins (2004: 78-80) observes that it marks a reversal of Aphrodite's Homeric ineffectuality as care-giver and her common literary role as wounder. She adds: "Vergil strategically departs from the Homeric model of healing and he rewrites the *topos* of the wounded hero in order to create a new role for Venus Genetrix – the fount of the Julian line – as a powerful healer and a symbol of Augustan control over Greek *technai* and *paideia*" (78).

[152] Greenwood (1989: 134) comments that Aeneas is not only healed by his mother but "is given a new lease of life, a new strength, and emerges refreshed, thirsty for the bounty and conquests of war."

[153] ἐν στήθεσσι μένος βάλε (12.513) … μένος ἐσθλὸν ἔχοντα (12.516)

[154] That Apollo's wounding belongs to Venus' domain is subtly confirmed by the correspondence of the phrasing of Iapyx' introduction (*Phoebo ante alios dilectus*, 12.391) with the description of a star linked with Venus: *quem Venus ante alios astrorum diligit ignis* (8.590). This correspondence is noted by Tarrant (2012: *ad* 12.391).

[155] Harrison 1981: 222.

Homeric material operating in *Aeneid* 1. Harrison has observed that "both at the beginning and at the end of the *Aeneid* Virgil can be said to have echoed that passage in such a way as to transform the Homeric tradition, and allow Venus to shake off the association with failure that clings to the Homeric Aphrodite as far as provision for her son's safety was concerned."[156] Moreover, this framing of the poem with the reworking of Venus' *fama* as a problematic mother resonates with her recurrent role as protector of her son in a martial setting throughout the course of the poem's narrative. Thus, in Book 2 she facilitates his passage from Priam's palace back to his own house amid flames and enemy missiles.[157] Her steadfastness and ultimate success in delivering her to safety is emphasized by her words: *nusquam abero et tutum patrio te limine sistam* (2.620). Jupiter appears to confirm the crucial importance and effectiveness of this intervention when he brings up what the goddess had done for her son in his address to Mercury: *illum… Graium … bis uindicat armis* (4.227-8). In Book 10, we find Venus effectively shielding Aeneas from hostile missiles (10.330-2):

> *… partim galea clipeoque resultant*
> *inrita, deflexit partim stringentia corpus*
> *alma Venus. ...*
> ... Some ricocheted off Aeneas's shield and his helmet,
> Harmlessly, some even grazed him, but slightly, deflected by kindly
> Venus. ...

Her active protection is complemented by the defense furnished by Aeneas' armour, that is, by the divine gear whose genesis she had occasioned and whose delivery she had personally

---

[156] Harrison 1982: 128.
[157] Through repetition, Vergil emphasizes that Venus successfully neutralizes the dangers of warfare: *flammam inter et hostis / expedior: dant tela locum flammaeque recedunt* (263-4); *me per tela, per ignis / eripis* (2.664-5). For the tradition of Venus' involvement in Aeneas' escape from Troy, see Heinze 2003: 32.

enacted. Her support is also influential in Aeneas' final combat. The shield she had procured for him not only saves him from the impact of Turnus' sword, but actually disarms his opponent – the mortal blade shatters against the divine surface (12.728ff.). More significantly, she undermines Juturna's final act of assistance to her brother and restores to Aeneas the instrument by which he at last subdues his Rutulian rival: angry at Turnus' sister for retrieving his original sword, Venus plucks Aeneas' spear out of the olive stump where Faunus' influence is preventing its release (12.786-787). In so doing she effectively proves her dominance over both Latin deities.

Venus' overall ascendency in the sphere of divine assistance becomes strikingly apparent if we consider how the other characters with divine patronage fare in the epic. In the first half of the *Aeneid*, the only helpful assistance that Juno lends to a mortal protégé entails the shortening of the agony that Dido suffers at her death. In the second half of the epic, she proves unable to bestow more than a temporary postponement of destruction upon her beloved Turnus. We saw that Iapyx is failed by Apollo (*nihil auctor Apollo / subvenit*, 12.405-6). It matters not that he is *dilectus Phoebo ante alios* (12.391). Camilla is similarly *cara ante alias* (11.537) to Diana, but the goddess seems unable to do more than avenge her death. Caeculus, the son of Vulcan, appears no better off for having the god as his parent (7.678ff., 10.543), and there is no indication that Neptune ever aids his son Messapus (7.690). Both men ultimately yield to the son of Venus.

We should also note that Venus' involvement on the battlefield is not only defensive, as it had been in the *Iliad*, but offensive as well. In Book 12, when the battle rages undecided, and Turnus – with Juturna's help – is able to elude Aeneas, Venus inspires her son with an aggressive tactic

that ultimately turns the course of the war in his favor. She moves him to attack the walls of Latinus' city (12.554-560):

Hic mentem Aeneae genetrix pulcherrima misit
iret ut ad muros urbique adverteret agmen
ocius et subita turbaret clade Latinos.
ille ut vestigans diversa per agmina Turnum
huc atque huc acies circumtulit, aspicit urbem
immunem tanti belli atque impune quietam.
continuo pugnae accendit maioris imago.

Now's when his mother, supreme in her beauty, inspired in Aeneas
Thoughts of approaching the walls, of making the city his army's
Target, surprising the Latins with threats of immediate disaster.
While hot on Turnus' tracks through the different contingents, Aeneas
Kept realigning his view of the fight. He observed how the city
Rested securely, unarmed and unharmed, in the havoc of warfare.
Instantly, visions of fighting a larger-scale battle are kindled.

Lyne notes the dissonance produced by Vergil's application of the epithet *pulcherrima* in the context of her participation in a plan that is "shrewd and effective but not particularly pleasant."[158] He thinks that in this instance Vergil, who "chooses major figures' epithets with great care," is being ironic.[159] In a sense he is, but the dissonance reaches deeper and is more

[158] Leach (1997: 363) notes that Venus' "aggressive interventions" on the battlefield mark a drastic shift from "Homer's protective Aphrodite who snatches her son out of combat." Putnam (1965: 174) sees Venus' inspiration of the attack as culminating the process of her transformation through the course of the poem, from "one who counsels against violence in Book II" to "the fighting goddess" who impels Aeneas to attack a defenseless city. Cf. Skinner 2013: 42ff.

[159] Lyne 1987: 71. For Lyne, the irony lies in the tension between Venus' insidious role and the meaning of *pulcherrima*: "honourable, excellent: the word has ramifying implications." As Leach points out (1997: 363 n. 27),

specific than Lyne realizes: it challenges a particular moment in Venus' poetic past, toward which the reader's attention is directed by a process of subtle intra- and intertextual nodding. Firstly, in constituting a dramatic reversal of the Trojans' past, their offensive against Latinus' city invites a recollection of the Trojan war.[160] This general recollection, in turn, gains specificity through the intratextual nod toward the only other passage in the *Aeneid* that features Venus' designation as *genetrix pulcherrima*: Jupiter' speech to Mercury, in which he observes that Aeneas' *genetrix pulcherrima* had twice saved him from Greek weapons (4.227-8). In engaging with Aphrodite' failure to protect her son on the battlefield, his words also invite thought of his Homeric counterpart's reaction to this bungled rescue, namely, Zeus' injunction for Aphrodite to keep away from the business of warfare and limit her sphere of activity to the lovely works of marriage (5.428-429). Dissonance arises because Vergil's phrasing evokes this Homeric attempt to disempower the love goddess at the very moment that we see her operating in the mode of Homeric Hera or Athena, nudging Aeneas toward an aggressive (and effective) military maneuver.[161] In Vergil's characterization, the lovely goddess is emphatically not limited to the lovely works of marriage.[162]

Iliad 3

Aphrodite enters the Greek literary stage in *Iliad* 3, suddenly intervening in the duel fought by Paris and Menelaus over the possession of Helen, a confrontation meant to put an end to the

---

this "is an intervention that most scholars would like to repudiate." Putnam (1965: 174), for instance, views it as Venus' abetting Aeneas' "downfall," namely his progression toward "irrational violence."

[160] Exploring the resonance of *imago* (12.560) with *imago* at 3.560 and 10.824, Berlin (1998: 14-20) proposes that Aeneas himself participates in this recollection of the Trojan War.

[161] As noted by Knauer (1964: 429), the manner in which Venus inspires Aeneas (*mentem misit*) echoes the way in which Hera inspires Achilles in the *Iliad* (τῷ … ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε, 1.55) and Athena inspires Penelope in the *Odyssey* (τῇ … ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε, 18.158).

[162] Wlosok (1967: 131) contends that the military victories of the Aeneadae evoked by Vulcan's shield "sollen als „Geben" der Venus gelten."

interminably bloody war. The goddess delivers Paris from death, and once she has deposited him into the safety of his bedroom, she makes her way to Helen (3.383-386):

αὐτὴ δ' αὖ Ἑλένην καλέουσ' ἴε· τὴν δὲ κίχανε
πύργῳ ἐφ' ὑψηλῷ, **περὶ δὲ Τρῳαὶ ἅλις ἦσαν**·
χειρὶ δὲ νεκταρέου ἑανοῦ ἐτίναξε **λαβοῦσα**,
γρηῒ δέ μιν ἐϊκυῖα παλαιγενέϊ προσέειπεν.
She then went away to summon Helen, and found her
on the high tower, with a cluster of Trojan women about her.
She laid her hand upon the robe immortal, and shook it,
and spoke to her, likening herself to an aged woman.[163]

Aphrodite tells her to join Paris at their home, but Helen recognizes the goddess behind her mortal semblance and, after a mocking invective, vehemently refuses to do as she is told (3.410-420):

κεῖσε δ' ἐγὼν οὐκ εἶμι· **νεμεσσητὸν** δέ κεν εἴη·
κείνου πορσανέουσα λέχος· Τρῳαὶ δέ μ' ὀπίσσω
πᾶσαι μωμήσονται· ἔχω δ' **ἄχε' ἄκριτα** θυμῷ.
Τὴν δὲ **χολωσαμένη** προσεφώνεε δῖ' Ἀφροδίτη·
μή μ' **ἔρεθε** σχετλίη, μὴ **χωσαμένη** σε μεθείω,
τὼς δέ σ' **ἀπεχθήρω** ὡς νῦν ἔκπαγλ' ἐφίλησα,
μέσσῳ δ' **ἀμφοτέρων** μητίσομαι **ἔχθεα λυγρὰ**
Τρώων καὶ Δαναῶν, σὺ δέ κεν κακὸν οἶτον ὄληαι.
Ὣς ἔφατ', **ἔδεισεν** δ' Ἑλένη Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,

[163] Trans. R. Lattimore.

βῆ δὲ **κατασχομένη** ἐανῷ ἀργῆτι φαεινῷ

σιγῇ, πάσας δὲ Τρῳὰς λάθεν· ἦρχε δὲ δαίμων.

Not I. I am not going to him. It would be too shameful.

I will not serve his bed, since the Trojan women hereafter would

laugh at me, all, and my heart even now is confused with sorrows."

Then in anger Aphrodite the shining spoke to her:

"Wretched girl, do not tease me lest in anger I forsake you

and grow to hate you as much as I now terribly love you,

lest I encompass you in hard hate, caught between both sides,

Danaäns and Trojans alike, and you wretchedly perish."

So she spoke, and Helen daughter of Zeus was frightened

and went, shrouding herself about in the luminous spun robe,

silent, unseen by the Trojan women, and led by the goddess.[164]

Inasmuch as the duel and Aphrodite's involvement are symbolic of the original violation of Helen's and Menelaus' marriage,[165] they highlight the goddess' responsibility for the devastating consequences of that earlier enactment of her dark influence. Moreover, her rescue of her beloved mortal is in the long run a futile and destructive gesture, since it contributes to the continuation of a devastating war that will ultimately lead to Paris' death and the return of Helen to Menelaus. We have already considered how Aphrodite's encounter with Helen contributes to the love goddess' dark *fama*.[166]

---

[164] Trans. R. Lattimore.

[165] Her union with Menelaus is legitimized not only by the sanction of her family, but also by the child – Hermione – that it produces. As such, it is unlike her barren union with Paris – characterized by Vergil as *inconcessi hymenaei* (1.651).

[166] Sec. 1.2, p. 23 and 1.3, p. 39.

What has come to be known in the *Aeneid* as the Helen Episode (2.567-588)[167] along with its immediate context engages with this Homeric material, which has been fragmented and reconfigured to a new effect.[168] Within this sequence, which belongs to Aeneas' narrative of the sack of Troy, the Trojan hero spies Helen from atop a rooftop. Raging to exact vengeance for the destruction of his city and its people, he is at last brought to his senses by the epiphany of his mother, who gets him to return home and look after his family. The Greek and Latin narratives are both set in Troy, and in both texts, the goddess' epiphany is marked by a divine light: μαρμαίροντα (397), *luce refulsit* (590). In Homer, she delivers Paris from death in combat and returns him to his house; in Vergil, she orchestrates Aeneas's safe return to his house amid the dangers of a Greek attack. In both the Greek and Latin texts, she has to persuade a mortal protégé to go home. When the Homeric Helen obeys her – as does Aeneas – and, miraculously unseen by others, leaves the high tower where she had encountered the goddess (πύργῳ ἐφ' ὑψηλῷ, 384), Aphrodite's guidance is conveyed by the words ἦρχε δὲ δαίμων (420). I believe that this Homeric scenario provides the model for *Aeneid* 2.632-3:

> *descendo ac ducente deo flammam inter et hostis*
>
> *expedior: dant tela locum flammaeque recedunt.*
>
> On my descent, I set out between foeman and flame with the goddess
>
> Guiding me. Weapons withdraw from my path, flames back off before me.

Aeneas, like Helen, meets his mother in a lofty location overlooking the city and so *descendo* echoes the implicit idea of Helen's descent from the high tower, while Aeneas' marvelous ability to escape attention and harm resonates with Helen's invisible passage through a crowd of

[167] I accept these lines as a genuine part of the *Aeneid*. For a survey of the arguments for and against their authenticity, as well as my own contribution to the debate, see Appendix 3, which also supplies the text and translation of the episode.

[168] Save for one (see note 172, below), as far as I can tell, these correspondences have so far gone unnoticed.

attendants (περὶ δὲ Τρῳαὶ ἅλις ἦσαν, 384). While Homer had earlier utilized θέα (396) in his account of Aphrodite's divine loveliness, which does not escape Helen, here he calls her a δαίμων, a unique usage for a female deity.[169] Correspondingly, while Vergil had also employed *dea* (591) in the account of Venus's divine splendor before her son's gaze, he now switches to *deus,* utilizing the word's ungendered sense of divinity akin to *numen* and the Greek δαίμων.[170] The recognition of the Homeric model explains what is otherwise a perplexing usage, given that Virgil does not elsewhere use *deus* in reference to a goddess.[171]

Both texts portray Helen as liable to be reclaimed by a victorious Menelaus (*Il.* 403-4, *Aen.* 577-79). In the *Iliad,* she is surrounded by a throng of Trojan women (περὶ δὲ Τρῳαὶ ἅλις ἦσαν, 384); Aeneas imagines her with the same entourage: *Iliadum turba … comitata* (580). In the Homeric scene, Helen makes her way unnoticed and in silence (σιγῇ, πάσας δὲ Τρῳὰς λάθεν); in the HE, she also escapes notice as she hides in silence (*tacitam secreta … latentem*, 568).[172] Motifs of anger and hatred color the Homeric episode (χολωσαμένη, 413, χωσαμένη, 414, ἔρεθε, 414; στυγερὴν, 404, ἀπεχθήρω, 415, ἔχθεα, 416) and constitute an important theme of the HE. The description of Helen's angry indignation at Aphrodite's prodding to engage in what she views as reproachful behavior (τῇ δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ὄρινε, 395, νεμεσσητὸν, 410) resonates with Aeneas's reaction at the sight of the reproach-worthy Helen (*exarsere ignes animo; subit ira … sceleratas sumere poenas*, 575-6). Each text presents Helen as the fearful

---

[169] Leaf 1900: *ad loc*.
[170] Austin 1961: 196 notes this possible general sense of *deus*.
[171] Goold 1970: 115. Previous efforts to explain this odd usage include seeing it as evidence of Vergil's process of composition *particulatim*, whereby already existing elements had to be altered to fit the introduction of new material (Henry 1879: *ad* 2.632-33, Korte 1916: 145-50, Goold 1970: 156-58). Harrison (1970: 322) suggests that *deo* refers to Jupiter, who will soon show his involvement through the subsequent crises. However, Venus's very recent promise to be by her son's side and secure his safe arrival home (*nusquam abero et tutum patrio te limine sistam*, 620) undermines this suggestion.
[172] This particular correspondence has been perceived by Ricottilli 1990: 9. It is worth noting that λάθεν and *latentem* are cognate words.

target of hostility from both the Greek and the Trojan side: ἀμφοτέρων ... ἔχθεα λυγρὰ Τρώων καὶ Δαναῶν … ἔδεισεν (416-8), *illa sibi infestos …Teucros et Danaum poenam … praemetuens* (571-2). When Aphrodite appears to her protégé, the goddess seizes her with her hand and ultimately restrains her (χειρὶ … λαβοῦσα, 385, κατασχομένη, 419). Similarly, Venus uses her hand to take hold of Aeneas and likewise proceeds to restrain him (*dextraque prehensum … continuit*, 592-3). Both episodes have their mortal characters consider public opinion in connection with their potential activity (*Il.* 411-2, *Aen.* 583ff.). Helen feels great pain, as does Aeneas (ἄχε' ἄκριτα, 412, *tantus dolor*, 594).

The Latin sequence is preceded by one of the most pitiful scenes in Aeneas' description of Troy's ruin: the slaughter of Polites and Priam by Pyrrhus. This scene, in turn, invites comparison with one of the most pitiful scenes of the *Iliad*, the killing of another of Priam's sons by Pyrrus' father. I refer to Achilles' slaying of Hector before the walls of Troy, from which his parents witness his death just as they witness the death of Polites. Hecuba steers us toward this recollection as she reminds Priam of Hector, who is no longer around to protect them (2.522). In short, Aeneas perceives the terrible disintegration of Troy's principal family, symbolic of the disintegration of the city at large. In response, the hero imagines his own father, wife, son, and familial home perishing (2.560-3). As though subject to a spreading fire, family after family is overcome by disaster. The destruction marks the continuation of a process that – on the human level – had began with the family of Helen and Menelaus: it had begun when Paris, the burning torch of Hecuba's dream, arrived in Sparta under the tutelage of Aphrodite.[173] The fire spread from Menelaus' family to the family of his brother in Mycenae (entailing the sacrifice of

[173] A Scholia at *Iliad* 3.325. This motif possibly formed part of Sophocles' and Euripides' Alexandros plays (Gantz 1993: 562) and might be referenced in *Troiades* 922. In Pindar's *Paian* 8a, Hecuba dreams of giving birth to a fire-breathing Hundred-Hander.

Iphigenia and the infidelity of his wife), to the families of the men who left their homes to follow the Atreidai, and finally to Trojan families, eventually consuming their chief patriarch, whose headless body Aeneas imagines lying on the shore. Key words in the initial lines of Aeneas' monologue make manifest this spread of the dark conflagration: *Spartam … Mycenas … ministris…. Priamus … Troia … litus* (2.577-582).

Aeneas' depiction of Helen as hiding in the temple of Vesta, lit up by the flames devouring Troy, manages to articulate both the origin and culmination of the grand conflict between the Greeks and the Trojans.[174] Given the conventional identification of erotic passion with fire, the image evokes Helen's initial passion and marks its most dramatic consequence. It also brings to mind Helen's desertion of the hearth that she was expected to tend in Sparta and so foregrounds the opposition between constructive and destructive fire: the flame that nourishes the core of family and city versus the blaze of illicit desire, sparking violent reprisals and devouring countless homes. Yet, Helen's turning to Vesta's flame also intimates her return to her original home and to her role of legitimate wife and thus signals a reversal of the chain-reaction set into motion by Aphrodite's initial intervention in her life. Aeneas sees this reversal at 2.578: *coniugiumque domumque patris natosque videbit*. However, as part of the chain-reaction of lust and rage, his fiery anger (*exarsere ignes animo,* 2.575) opposes this dramatic shift, and he resolves to prevent it.[175] It is at this pivotal moment that Venus steps in and halts her son; not only does she prevent problematic bloodshed,[176] she, effectively, ensures Helen's restoration to her family, something that Aphrodite actively hinders in the *Iliad*. Nevertheless, although Venus

---

[174] Harrison (1970: 331-332) describes Helen as "the true source of the conflagration that is now consuming Troy," while Thornton (1997: 32) says that "Helen and Paris's passion isn't just *like* a fire: It *is* the fire that burns the towers of Troy."

[175] *non ita* (2.583)

[176] Quinn (1969: 18) remarks that "Helen, like Cassandra, had sought sanctuary in a holy place; if Aeneas kills her, he must defile the altar of the gods with an act even more openly sinful than the killing of Priam, which he has just witnessed. His mother Venus holds him back in time."

protects Helen, Aeneas' narrative also distances the goddess from her notorious sister and earthly counterpart. Within the episode, Helen is called neither Jupiter's daughter nor ever referred to by her actual name; rather, her designations stress her mortal connections. Furthermore, as she hides, fearful of hostility from both sides, Helen finds herself in the very predicament that the Iliadic Aphrodite had threatened would follow if she ever distanced herself from her impudent protégé (3.414-417). In line with this separation, Venus attempts to absolve herself of blame for Troy's destruction as she assigns the responsibility to *divum inclementia* (2.602). Her subsequent revelation of the truth behind appearances, as she allows Aeneas to perceive the monstrous violence of Troy's divine enemies lends a certain amount of credibility to her declaration. And, as the fire of Vesta contrasts with the bloody flames of war, so Venus' epiphany, checking Aeneas' violent rage, stands in opposition to the image of gods ripping Troy to pieces. Their *dirae facies* (2.622) underscore the loveliness of her true form, marked by a rosy mouth and pure light (*pura luce*, 2.590). It is noteworthy that his mother's intervention also marks the end of the bloodshed between Greeks and Trojans that permeates Aeneas' account. In a sense, she begins a process of restoration, one family at time. While the Greek Aphrodite compels Helen to forget her spouse, child, and parents, Vergil's Venus compels Aeneas to remember his.[177] In short, through a subtle manipulation of Homeric elements and evocative imagery, Vergil softens some of the darkness that colors the love goddess' role in the Trojan War.

[177] Sappho speaks of how Helen had been led astray to leave her husband and to not remember her child and parents: Ἐλένα [τὸ]ν ἄνδρα ... ̣καλλ[ίποι]σ' ... κωὐδ[ὲ πα]ῖδος οὐδὲ φίλων το[κ]ήων ̣πά[μπαν] ἐμνάσθη, ἀλλὰ παράγαγ' ̣αὔταν (16.7-11). Cf. Alcaeus 283.7-8.

***Odyssey* 8 and *Iliad* 14**

By bringing Venus together with Vulcan in the eighth book of the *Aeneid*, Vergil strongly encourages a reminiscence of the eighth book of the *Odyssey*, which contains Demodocus' narrative of Aphrodite's adultery and the punishment meted against her by Hephaistos. The line that introduces Vulcan's presence also locates the married couple in the setting of the Homeric incident: Vulcan's bedroom (*thalamus aureus,* 373). The wording not only echoes θάλαμον at *Odyssey* 8.277, but also resonates with Hermes' desire to lie παρὰ χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ (337 & 342).[178] Within this intertextually charged setting, Venus pleads with Vulcan to make arms for Aeneas. When she is done speaking,

> *... niveis hinc atque hinc diva lacertis*
>
> ***cunctantem*** *amplexu molli fovet. ille repente*
>
> *accepit solitam flammam, notusque medullas*
>
> *intravit calor et labefacta per ossa cucurrit,*
>
> *non secus atque olim tonitru cum rupta corusco*
>
> *ignea rima micans percurrit lumine nimbos;*
>
> *sensit laeta* ***dolis*** *et formae conscia coniunx.* (8.387-393)
>
> ... The goddess's hands began moving,
>
> Fondling him this way and that in her pliant embrace. In an instant,
>
> He felt the same old flame flare up, the familiar hotness
>
> Surged through his bones' very marrow and raced through his loosened
>
> Joints, just as sometimes a dazzling fracture of fire spurts brightness
>
> Clear through a cloud when it bursts from a brilliant explosion of thunder.

[178] Schmidt (1973: 352) remarks that "l'adjectif aureus est caractéristique de Vénus. La chambre de Vulcain ne devient doré que par la suite de la présence dans la pièce de l'épouse de ce dernier."

She, well aware of her beauty, could feel her ruse work and was happy.

Our first glimpse of Vulcan's reaction to Venus presents him as *cunctantem* (388), a qualification that resonates with the repeated qualification of Hephaistos as βραδὺς (329 & 330), a trait in spite of which he manages to catch swift Ares. He is able to do so thanks to his craft: δόλον (276, 282), δόλος (317), δολόεντα (281), τέχνῃσι (332). The Aeneid features the corresponding *dolis* (393).[179] These *doli* are commonly taken to refer to the wiles of Venus, but Vergil's imprecise phrasing invites a wider scope of interpretation and generates the possibility of yet another reading, one that brings the text even closer to its Homeric model: [180] Venus understands Vulcan's behavior as the expression of *his* cunning, that is, she sees in his slowness to respond to her words a sly tactic to elicit a physical gesture – his desire for this physical coaxing stimulated by her beauty (*formae*) and the effect of her power (*divinum amorem*, 373).[181] The most pointed allusion to *Odyssey* 8, however, belongs to Vergil's description of Vulcan as *aeterno devinctus amore* (394), prompting a recollection of Aphrodite's ensnarement in Hephaistos' bonds. The simultaneous allusion to the embraces between Venus and Mars in Lucretius, who writes of the latter as *aeterno devictus vulnere amoris* (1.34), serves to strengthen this connection with the *Odyssey*.[182]

---

[179] The correspondence to τέχνῃσι – the explicit reason given by the gods for Hephaistos' advantage over Ares – is strengthened by the identical form and position of both words within their respective lines.

[180] Most take *dolis* as causal with *laeta*. Conington (1883: *ad loc.*), however, feels that *dolis*, along with *formae*, supplies the object of *sensit*. Servius Auctus reports the inclination of some to attach it to *conscia*. Most importantly, Vergil does not make it clear that Venus is the producer of the *doli*. Heyne (1797: *ad loc.*) points to the parallel at 4.128: *risitque dolis Cytherea repertis*. Significantly, in this earlier line, *dolis* does not refer to Venus' craftiness but to Juno's. Page (1931: *ad loc.*) thinks that it is "used quite absolutely," nevertheless supplying "result" and "conquest" as the object.

[181] *Sensit* needs an object, and this, I believe, is supplied by the narrator's description of what happens to Vulcan after Venus' address: a situation that involves *doli* and the effects of Venus' beauty. These effects of her beauty please the goddess (*laeta*), since she is happy to humor her husband's ruse for the initiation of their lovemaking, as her reaction to his embrace illustrates: *optatos dedit amplexu* (405).

[182] Di Cesare 1974: 152.

What makes Vergil's use of the allusive *devinctus* so delightful for readers is the brilliantly executed reversal. As Lyne comments, when "Vulcan discovered the affair of Venus and Mars, he engineered it so that they were caught in shackles. Here Venus shackles him."[183] At the same time that it evokes the Homeric episode, Vergil's text also flips the original power dynamic through dramatic as well as subtle maneuvers. If we acknowledge the polysemy that animates much of Vergil's work, a reading that construes Venus as perceiving the *doli* of Vulcan – in correspondence with Hephaistos' discovery of Aphrodite's mischief – can also accommodate Venus' perception of the effects of her own *doli*, which involve the supernatural potency of her words: *dictis divinum aspirat amorem* (373). As in the *Odyssey*, the two gods attempt to "trick" one another, but now the goddess of love gains the upper hand. She sees through the situation and in indulging Vulcan, as Hephaistos accommodates Aphrodite by leaving his house, she effectively ensnares him. The *amplexus mollis* (388), which Venus "pours" around Vulcan,[184] renders him *devinctus* and suggests the paradoxical power of Hephaistos' delicate yet invincible bonds, ἠΰτ' ἀράχνια λεπτά (280), which he pours all around Aphrodite and Ares (ἐξεκέχυντο, 279; χεῦεν, 282; ἔχυντο, 297). The intimation of the immobilization of Vulcan's limbs by sleep as he droops on Venus' lap (*petivit / coniugis infusus gremio per* ***membra*** *soporem*, 405-6) not only encapsulates, in an image of vulnerability and weakness, his subjugation by his wife's erotic potency, but on an intertextual level, also appropriates and reconfigures elements of Aphrodite's subjugation and Hephaistos' control of her body. Immobilized in her limbs (μελέων, 298), the Homeric goddess of love is overpowered in a setting (the sexually charged bed) that, although properly a fixture of her divine sphere, Hephaistos co-opts with his unique powers, suffusing it

[183] Lyne 1987: 41.
[184] The specification that the *amplexus* was achieved with her snowy white arms (*niveis hinc atque hinc diva lacertis*, 387) brings to mind Aphrodite' *pouring* of her white arms around Aeneas in *Iliad* 5: ἀμφὶ δ' ἑὸν φίλον υἱὸν **ἐχεύατο πήχεε λευκώ** (315).

with his *techne* by pouring about it his δολόεντα. Now Vulcan lies on Venus' sexually charged body, the emblematic setting of her power, which, in a sense, has absorbed his *techne*, evoked by Vergil's employment of the word *infusus* echoing as it does Hephaistos' "pouring" of his trap in the *Odyssey*. Just as Hephaistos had managed to overtake Ares – the fastest of the gods – with his craft,[185] so Venus overcomes with her special brand of flame the god who is the very embodiment of fire.[186]

Vergil extends this role-reversal to the level of gender dynamics. Lyne has observed the implicit sexual role-reversal in Vulcan's response to Venus' plea: "Venus the female and wife does not in his view have to 'precari'; therefore, she can, as would more naturally suit the husband and male, command. And to Venus the female he attributes the 'vires', a 'strength' or 'power', which is very masculine in its connotations."[187] Lyne sees this reading confirmed by the subsequent lines that "describe Vulcan getting up to do his wife's bidding" and assimilate him to a woman through a simile that echoes a simile Apollonius had applied to Medea, and as such "further confirms the sex-reversal – and reminds one of Vulcan's humbled erotic condition."[188]

---

[185] … κιχάνει τοι βραδὺς ὠκύν,
ὡς καὶ νῦν Ἥφαιστος ἐὼν βραδὺς εἶλεν Ἄρηα,
ὠκύτατόν περ ἐόντα θεῶν, οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσι,
χωλὸς ἐών, τέχνῃσι … (8.330-332)
... the slow one has overtaken
the swift, as now slow Hephaistos has overtaken
Ares, swiftest of all the gods on Olympus, by artifice,
though he was lame. (Trans. R. Lattimore)

[186] 8.388-92. Lada-Richards (2006: 69 n. 47) takes note of the delightful nature of this poetic maneuver presenting "the god who melts all metals in his fire" and whose epithet Mulciber (which appears at *Aeneid* 8.724) was linked with *mollire* by ancient etymologists, "as himself melting and therefore softening in the fire of love."

[187] See also Lada-Richards 2006: 40 and 69 n. 51. She comments that "by refusing to accept the necessity of Venus' role as a suppliant, Vulcan implicitly confirms her superior position in the hierarchy of power." Schmidt (1973: 355) observes that although the supplication is modelled on the *Iliad* 18, where Thetis entreats Hephaistos, Vergil makes a modification that comparatively elevates the dignity of Venus: line 8.383 (*ergo eadem supplex venio*) echoes *Il.* 18.457 (τοὔνεκα νῦν τὰ σὰ γούναθ' ἱκάνομαι); however, Vergil does not adopt the motif of the embracing of the knees and instead uses a more neutral expression. Schmidt points out that we do find suppliants embracing the knees elsewhere in the *Aeneid* (3.607 & 10.523), where the gesture conveys a position of marked inferiority.

[188] Lyne 1987: 42-3. Schmidt (1973: 359) nots the remarkable reverence implicit in Vulcan's utilization of the qualification *diva* (8.396) when he addresses his wife. Schmidt points out that nowhere else in the *Aeneid* is this adjective used in an exchange among deities; it normally occurs only when a mortal address a god.

An intertextual gender reversal also informs Vulcan's initial, non-verbal response to Venus. As commentators have observed, the scene is modeled on Hera's seduction of Zeus in *Iliad* 14, and if we consider the particulars of how this model maps onto Vergil's episode, we find that in his initial hesitation, Vulcan acts the part of Hera, who coyly delays Zeus' urgent plea with strategic excuses. Hera's reluctance is eventually dissipated by Zeus' embrace (ἀγκὰς ἔμαρπτε, 14.345), just as Venus overwhelms Vulcan by taking him in her arms. This mapping of the wily Hera on to Vulcan also lends further support to the reading of the aforementioned *doli* as referring (at least in part) to Vulcan' sly tactic of delay, especially since the delaying Hera is characterized as δολοφρονέουσα (14.300 & 329).

In turn, Venus' awareness of the *doli* at work not only reverses her disastrous ignorance in the *Odyssey*, but, through an intra- and intertextual network, contributes to a revision of Aphrodite' ignorance of Hera's *doli* in the *Iliad*. The words *sensit laeta dolis* recall *risitque dolis Cytherea repertis* at 4.128, which signal Venus' advantage at the conclusion of her meeting with Juno (at which the latter solicits her assistance in uniting Dido with Aeneas).[189] The connection is confirmed by the engagement of both contexts with Hera's mischief in *Iliad* 14. As we have seen, Hera manages to use Aphrodite's power against her by tricking her into giving up control of her κεστός.[190] Harrison observes that the scene exposes Aphrodite's gullibility, highlighted through the irony of her reply that she cannot refuse the one who sleeps in the arms of great Zeus (Ζηνὸς γὰρ τοῦ ἀρίστου ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσιν ἰαύεις, 213). Moreover, immediately after the clueless Aphrodite unwittingly articulates the very goal that the δολοφρονέουσα Hera is pursuing and hands over her κεστός, the poet "take[s] the smile that usually plays on the face of 'laughter-loving Aphrodite' and let[s] it play on Hera's face instead (222f.). For this smile is surely … one of

[189] As noted by Heyne, for which, see note 180, above.
[190] Sec. 1.3, p. 38.

triumph which even the crafty Hera at this point finds impossible to check."[191] Harrison argues that in the conversation between the two goddesses in *Aeneid* 4, Vergil has produced a scene that accomplishes "the reversal of the Homeric passage... . For the goddess of love, who at the end of that passage had surrendered her smile to a triumphant adversary, now not only gets it back at the expense of that same adversary, but also proves to have seen through her Homeric guile as well."[192] Thus, the unwitting victim of the Homeric *doli* of both Hera and Hephaistos is endowed in the *Aeneid* with awareness of "being manipulated" by each god. Indeed, in the case of Vulcan, she Venus turns this manipulation to her own advantage.

Underscoring the reversals of the power dynamics between their Homeric models, the Vergilian scenes of Venus in a tête-à-tête with Juno (in Book 4) and with Vulcan (in Book 8) work together to foreground the new empowerment of the goddess of love. In addition to Venus' implicit appropriation of male privilege noted by Lyne, a comparison of the two scenes highlights the goddess' pronounced effectiveness. Book 4 exposes Juno's inability to enact a proper marriage (between Dido and Aeneas), work that belongs to the core of her divine sphere no less, or to influence her husband, even with recourse to entreaty (*precando*, 4.113). This ineffectuality forces the Olympian queen to approach Venus, and, in turn, offsets the latter's effectiveness within her own sphere as she easily sways her husband by fortifying her entreaty (*precando*, 8.403) with erotic charms. The allusion to Venus' erotic subjection of Mars in Lucretius functions to amplify the goddess' irresistible power, as does the motif of fire, which punctuates the Vulcan episode. It first appears in Venus' lament over Troy, where fire facilitates the downfall of the city's structures: *casuras ... inimicis ignibus arces* (8.375). Her words look back to Aeneas' narrative of the blazes that engulfed the city, which begins with the account of a

[191] 14.197; Harrison 1981: 219-20
[192] Harrison 1981: 221.

house falling under the force of Vulcan: *dedit ampla ruinam / Volcano superante domus* (2.310-11). Vergil's identification of Vulcan with the fire ravaging Troy alludes to the god's activity in the *Iliad*, where he not only supports the Greeks and arms Achilles, but defeats the river Xanthus, a divine supporter of the Trojans, by the force of the element he embodies (21.342ff.). Therefore, this initial appearance of fire in the *Aeneid* 8 episode intimates Vulcan's antagonism toward his wife's beloved Trojans in the grand conflict that saw his side emerge triumphant. The next time we encounter the motif, however, is as the flame that overwhelms and shackles Vulcan.[193] Thereafter, the god pledges the power of his flames to Venus' cause (*quantum ignes ... valent*, 8.403). In consequence, his fire becomes the means by which her son gains his armor,[194] including the shield that bears the first depiction of the *arces* of Rome (8.652, 657), which – in contrast to the *casuras arces* of Troy – are fated to rise. In a sense, Vergil has Vulcan atone for his destruction of Troy by his construction of Rome and its triumphs on Aeneas' armor.[195]

Not only does the Vulcan episode rework some of the power dynamics informing Venus' troubled past, it also reconfigures the goddess of love in other respects. In contrast to Aphrodite's role in Demodocus' song, Vergil casts his Venus in a far more domestic light.[196] While in the *Odyssey*, the love goddess never speaks to her husband, the interlude with the two gods in the *Aeneid* begins with her address. Gutting remarks that she "addresses Vulcan in standard conjugal

---

[193] The *flamma* of 8.389. The fire imagery is extended in the following simile: *non secus atque olim tonitru cum rupta corusco / ignea rima micans percurrit lumine nimbos* (8.391-2).

[194] Vergil stresses the importance of fire in the making of Aeneas' armor with a simile that compares Vulcan's rising to get started on his task to a woman stirring up sleeping fires, with the repeated qualification of the god as *ignipotens* (8.414 & 423), and with the recurring presence of fire and associated imagery in the description of his workshop (8.417, 421,427, 430, 432).

[195] Vulcan's shield also showcases the ultimate domination of the world, which implicitly includes Greece and thus the race he used to support against the Trojans, by Aeneas' descendants (*Aeneadae*, 8.648).

[196] Schmidt (1973) argues that Vergil elevates the dignity of both Venus and Vulcan in accordance with the elevated conception of divinity elsewhere in the poem. For instance, he notes the ways in which Vergil establishes an atmosphere of conjugal respect and propriety throughout the episode.

language as *carissime coniunx* (8.377)" and observes that overall her speech is "that of a good wife."[197] Vergil also endows the marriage with the sexual vivacity that it sorely lacks in the *Odyssey*.[198] There, Aphrodite's sexual energy appears directed away from her marriage; in the *Aeneid*, the love goddess' sexuality thrives within it.[199] The text lets us know that the physical closeness we witness in the *thalamo coniugis aureo* (8.372) is a regular occurrence: when Venus embraces her husband, *ille repente / accepit solitam flammam, notusque medullas / intravit calor* (8.389-390). Not just one modifier, but two (*solitam, notus*) convey that Vulcan's response to his wife's touch follows its customary course. Furthermore, while the intertext with *Odyssey* 8 draws in Aphrodite's relationship with Ares, the more emphatic allusion to Thetis' request for arms in *Iliad* 18 brings to mind Hephaistos' union with a goddess other than Venus: when Thetis visits the divine smith at his home, he is married to the goddess Charis (382-383).[200] This Iliadic past

---

[197] Gutting 2006: 273. For instance, he points out that Venus "casts the exempla she chooses, Thetis and Aurora, in the most domestic light possible. Thetis is *filia Nerei*, which avoids mentioning her unsuccessful marriage to Peleus, while Eos is mentioned not by name, but as a wife—*Tithonia coniunx.*" Gutting thinks that the "only note of dissonance in Venus' carefully conjugal speech is that it is so formally rhetorical that it lacks the domestic familiarity one might expect between husband and wife". But, as he admits, the delicate nature of the favor she seeks requires this intensification in the persuasive force of her words (274). Cf. Highet (1972: 125), who finds Venus' conjugal address "particularly graceful." Moreover, elements of Venus' address (*supplex uenio et sanctum mihi numen / arma rogo,* 8.382-383) recall her speech to Cupid (*ad te confugio et supplex tua numina posco*, 1.666) and so suggest that the patently familial familiarity between Venus and her divine son extends to her dialogue with Vulcan. Although Gutting highlights the "conjugal nature of Venus' words" (274), he also argues that this domestic quality is undercut by the goddess' erotic actions in the scene. Seeing "a variety of positions that polarize marriage and erotic love" in "the mosaic of Roman social attitudes" and noting that "some Romans had a tendency to exclude sexual passion from marriage" (264), Gutting contends that the expression of Venus' sexuality problematizes her role as wife and constitutes "a thorough subordination of the conjugal to the erotic" (277). But, not only is there evidence of the compatibility of marriage and passion in the Roman world (Treggiari 1991: 247, 258-259; Griffin 1985: 119-120, 140), it is possible that Vergil was responding more attentively to his Homeric models than to the intricacies of various contemporary views. After all, directing Venus' sexual force toward her marriage engages (subversively) with Aphrodite's portrayal in the *Odyssey* while it simultaneously channels the manifestation of erotic passion within the marriage of Hera and Zeus that we find in the *Iliad*.

[198] Hephaistos complains that while his wife constantly disdains him because of his deformity, she is attracted to the handsome Ares (8.308-311). Indeed, she is happy to sleep with Ares: τῇ δ' ἀσπαστὸν ἐείσατο κοιμηθῆναι (8.295).

[199] Schmidt (1973: 367) thinks that Vergil's modification of the Lucretian *devictus* into the *devinctus,* which conveys the hold Venus has over Vulcan, draws in that word's association with the ties of marriage elsewhere in the poem (for instance, at 4.16 and 4.59).

[200] Not only is "Venus's visit to Vulcan … structurally and functionally analogous to the Homeric Thetis's visit to Hephaestus," as Lada-Richards (2006: 35) observes, Venus herself makes the parallel explicit in her speech (8.383-384).

intimates that Vulcan's marriage to Venus could be his second divine union – after all, as Hesiod tells us, Zeus had other wives before Hera – and, consequently, "carves out" a stretch of mythical time when the goddess of love was not yet his wife.[201] This, in turn, nicely accommodates the earlier designation of her union with Anchises as a marriage (3.475) and complements Leach's observation that "the action of the poem begins after the death of Anchises when Venus is acting in the position of widowed mother to further the enterprises of her son."[202] Furthermore, balancing Aphrodite's offspring from other men with Vulcan's offspring from other women, Book 8 (which features the Venus-Vulcan scene) as well as Book 7, each introduce a son fathered by Vulcan outside his marriage to Venus: Cacus and Caeculus (the founder of Praeneste).[203] The importance of their paternity is underscored by the fact that they are the only two earthly characters in the *Aeneid* to be fathered by the same god.[204]

Vergil's subtle mapping of the awkward grouping of Venus, Vulcan, and Aeneas onto more culturally acceptable configurations has Vulcan play the part of the helpful stepfather. The god's paternal position within his family comes across in his and Venus' designations: before the goddess speaks to her husband, she is called *mater* (8.370); just before he responds to her words about her child, he is labeled *pater* (8.394). And like a good stepfather, he promptly sets about the task of providing protection for Aeneas in accordance with his mother's wishes. In the simile

[201] Of course, one of the key characteristics of myth is its accommodation of variability, allowing even conflicting versions to coexist. The incongruous multiplicity, however, is liable to encounter some resistance in the context of a narrative – such as the *Aeneid* – that selects and manipulates the mythical tradition in a manner that caters to a reader's desire for logical sequence and cohesion. Thus, when an allusion introduces elements that threaten this order, the reader is particularly susceptible to entertaining rationalizations that can fit these dissonant elements into a plausible harmonizing structure. A poet like Vergil could purposefully set out to inspire such rationalizations.
[202] Leach 1997: 362.
[203] 8.198; 7.678-681. Schmidt (1973: 353 n.1) has perceived that Evander's story about a son of Vulcan undercuts the awkwardness of Venus' mentioning her "l'enfant de la faute."
[204] The balance is quite precise, as the *Aeneid* endows each deity with two earthly sons – Vergilian Venus is not only the mother of Aeneas but also of Eryx (5.23-24).

that introduces the forging of Aeneas' armor, Vulcan is compared to a woman who wakes up before the night is over to set to herself and her servants to work. Putnam comments:

> In putting his slaves to the forging of Aeneas' armor, Vulcan, god of fire at his work of creation, is essentially doing the same thing, on a far grander scale, as the good wife weaving her web. At this point, however, the simile might have run its course, but a further reason is added for the woman's nocturnal occupation, namely, that she can live her life chastely and bring up her small children. The mention of her husband's bed refers the reader back forthwith to Vulcan's nuptial chamber (*thalamo coniugis aureo*) and to the frequent mention of either Venus or Vulcan as *coniux* in the subsequent episode. In this case the small children mentioned in the simile become Venus' descendants – Aeneas and his children – whom it is now Vulcan's purpose not only to defend but, almost literally, to create, as he molds for Aeneas on the shield the fame and fortune of his heirs (*famam et fata nepotum*).[205]

The union of Hera and Zeus in *Iliad* 14 generates lush life upon the earth (346-349); correspondingly, the union of Venus and Vulcan creates the copious offspring of Aeneas' line on

[205] Putnam 1988: 139-140; similarly, Paschalis 1984: 27. Putnam (1998: 172) also reads the simile as implicitly communicating "that Vulcan is the faithful spouse, who cares for her and her husband's children while her mate is absent, unchaste, careless . . . It is Vulcan who adheres to the Roman rules of marriage, remaining, as it were, *univira* while her consort is elsewhere, and it is Venus … whose actions as Vergil chooses to portray them, come under suspicion for their ethical dubiety according to Roman standards." This reading is weakened by Vergil's introduction (in significant proximity to our scene) of Vulcan' extramarital children and his pointed allusion to a Homeric model in which the god has a different wife. If the antecedent tradition casts a shadow on Venus' sexual past so that the simile shows her up as no *univira*, it also, along with Vergil's own text, shows Vulcan to be himself far removed from such chastity. Moreover, while there is no indication of Vulcan's involvement to protect his children, Cacus and Caeculus, when they are imperiled (he is, in effect, "elsewhere"), all that Venus' does in the *Aeneid* is directed at providing support and aid to her son (See Appendix 1). In fact, the very scene that occasions the simile in question is motivated by her care for his safety.

his shield.[206] As Putnam puts it, in his creativity Vulcan is "siring the destiny of Rome."[207] Indeed, inasmuch as he is intimately involved in the physical development of the shield until it reaches its finished form, Vulcan is more than a "sire." On a symbolic level, he nurtures it within the "womb" of his cavernous workshop and labors until it is ready to be brought out into the world. Hence, his figurative alignment with a mother is quite apt. In some sense, he becomes an additional progenitor of Aeneas' line, and Vergil appears to encourage this notion of the god when he relates that Aeneas marveled at *talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis* (8.729). As Putnam notes, because "*dona* is a synecdoche in apposition to *clipeum*, the reader expects the parallelism to continue on in *Volcani* and *parentis*, that is, to have the two genitives refer to the same person."[208] Of course, strictly speaking, Venus is the *parens*, but the polysemous quality of Vergil's language also invites the consideration of Vulcan's parental qualities. To sum up, in Book 8 the poet reconfigures some of the dysfunction of Venus' inherited relationships into something that, at least from a distance, resembles an ordered *oikos*.

Apollonius' *Argonautica*

In addition to his fragmentations, reconfigurations, and revisions of Venus' Homeric *fama*, Vergil also engages with the depictions of a disempowered Aphrodite that we find in Hellenistic authors. It has been noted that the scene in which Venus directs Cupid to enflame Dido with

---

[206] *illic genus omne futurae / stirpis ab Ascanio* (8.628-629). The Homeric intertext is reinforced by the simile that links Vulcan's sexual burning with the celestial blaze of lightning (the fiery force proper to Zeus): *non secus atque olim tonitru cum rupta corusco / ignea rima micans percurrit lumine nimbos* (8.391-392). More particularly, the *nimbi* evoke the νεφέλη (350) within which Zeus and Hera make love, while the glittering (*micans*) of the *rima* echoes the glittering (στιλπναὶ, 14.351) of the dew shed by the Homeric cloud. What is more, while Hera and Zeus have sex within a golden (χρυσείην, 14.350) cloud, Venus and Vulcan do so within a golden (*aureo*, 8.372) chamber.

[207] Putnam 1998: 175. It is worth noting that Vulcan's portrayal of Rome's destiny parallels the previous revelations by Jupiter and Anchises, each of whom makes these revelations from a paternal position.

[208] Putnam 1998: 175. He offers a very different reading of this verbal arrangement, seeing *parens* as a remainder of the illegitimacy of Aeneas' conception.

passion for the newly arrived Aeneas is modelled on the opening of Book 3 of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, where Aphrodite asks Eros to afflict Medea with desire for Jason.[209] In the Apollonius episode, Hera and Athena approach the goddess of love to secure her assistance for their mortal protégé, but at her home they, and the reader, find a remarkably powerless figure. Against the backdrop of her husband's amazing skill and achievements, her activity appears trivialized. Apollonius relates that Hephaistos had built their great house (μέγα δῶμα, 3.36) and that he is currently in his workshop, where by the blast of fire he forges all his ingenious creations (3.42-43): πάντα δαίδαλα χάλκευεν ῥιπῇ πυρός. Conversely, just before he presents Aphrodite sitting all alone, combing her hair, he informs us that the goddess of love makes Hephaistos' bed. Confronted with Hera's purpose to help Jason, although she stresses her willingness for action, Aphrodite confesses the weakness of her hands (3.81-82).[210] Seemingly aware of her ineffectuality, Hera is not actually interested in the love goddess' direct assistance: she is interested in the erotic power that belongs to her son. Aphrodite is approached as a mere intermediary and not a very good one at that, grumbling as she does that the goddesses would fare better asking Eros themselves. For the first time in the extant literature, we find the god of love positioned at odds with the goddess he traditionally attends.[211] Unrestrained by her parental authority, the unruly youngster shows no respect for his divine mother: οὐκ ὄθεται, μάλα δ' αἰὲν ἐριδμαίνων ἀθερίζει (3.94). He even goes so far as to threaten her when she tries to curb his mischief. Moreover, to get the boy to do her bidding, she must cajole and bribe him with a toy

[209] E.g., Nelis 2001: 93-96.
[210] Regarding this confession, Campbell (1994: 80) writes: "This is not the familiar formidable overseer of the erotic sphere whose ἔργα are celebrated in *HyAphr*, and who possesses σθένος in good measure, but the ἄναλκις θεά of *Il.* 5.331, wounded by Diomedes."
[211] Hesiod, *Theog*. 201. Campbell 1994: 85.

belonging to her father.[212] In short, the goddess is overshadowed by and dependent upon her male kin, her customary divine force entirely obscured by her pathetic position.[213]

Vergil echoes the transference of Aphrodite's quintessential power to her divine son. He also has her entreat him to accomplish her will (1.664-6):[214]

> *nate, meae vires, mea magna potentia solus*
>
> *nate patris summi qui tela Typhoëa temnis.*
>
> *ad te confugio et supplex tua numina posco.*
>
> Son, you're my strength, you alone are the principal source of my power.
>
> Thunderbolts mighty Jupiter launched at Typhoeus don't worry
>
> You. So it's you that I run to and kneel to, whose grace I'm beseeching.

However, as Leach has observed, although she calls "herself *supplex* (1.666) in addressing Cupid as the executive embodiment of her powers, still the efficacy of her *auctoritas* resting on the maternal tie is never called into question."[215] The god agrees to Venus' request without the need for any bargaining on her part, and there is not a hint of tension between them. His immediate and complete submission to her will is not only shown through his activity, which follows precisely the course prescribed by Venus, but is both explicitly spelled out and emphasized through repetition: *paret Amor dictis carae genetricis* (1.689), *dicto parens* (1.695). That Cupid not only obeys her but is happy to do so is also underscored through repetition: *gaudens* 1.690, *laetus* 1.696. This harmonious alignment of Venus and the personification of her power, which restores to the goddess of love the control over her divine potency that she had lost in the

---

[212] Pavlock (1990: 44) observes that the "awesome goddess of the *Iliad*, who forces her human protegé Helen to love even though she may want to resist" is reduced by Apollonius "to a humanlike parent who can barely make her own child do as she says but must rely on bribery."
[213] Campbell (1994: 50) calls the goddess a "lonely, insecure," and "pathetic character."
[214] Interestingly, neither EROS nor Cupid ever speak directly in either text.
[215] Leach 1997: 360.

Argonautica episode,[216] receives confirmation when she observes their emotional closeness: she remarks that Cupid has often shared her pain concerning Aeneas (*nostro doluisti saepe dolore*, 1.669).

Bion's *Epitath on Adonis*

The Hellenistic poet Bion of Smyrna made Adonis and Aphrodite the subject of his *Epitath on Adonis*, which – as Reed observes – was likely known to "Latin poets by the time of Catullus and thereafter became a standard text for cultivated Romans."[217] Bion dramatizes the goddess' terrible suffering upon finding her lover fatally wounded in a hunt. [218] We are told that a boar had gored Adonis' white thigh and that blood pours over his snowy flesh (8-10, 60-61). With a wounded heart, Aphrodite runs through the woods grieving and searching, and her white skin turns bloody, lacerated by thorns and her own hands (17, 21-22, 26-27). She loses her beauty (29-31) and her sexual power (60). After attempting to catch Adonis' dying breath (ἀποψύξῃς, 47), she declares that Persephone is by much the stronger and that she herself stands in fear of her power (ἐσσὶ γὰρ αὐτά /πολλὸν ἐμεῦ κρέσσων, 54-55; σε φοβεῦμαι, 57). This acknowledgment of defeat by Persephone, in turn, prompts thought of the tradition of a dispute between the two over Adonis.[219] His death can also be linked to Aphrodite's conflict with Artemis: it could be read as payback for Aphrodite's role in the death of Hippolytus, for such a payback is implied in Artemis' threat in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (1420-22).[220] And so, once again

[216] When Aphrodite and EROS appear together in antecedent texts, EROS is her intimate accomplice and partner; however, a sense of his ultimate subordination prevails. Over time, this subordination becomes translated into Aphrodite's position as EROS' parent (Cyrino 2010: 44).
[217] Reed 1997: 61.
[218] Sec. 1.3, p. 40.
[219] Hyginus, *De Astronomia* [1st cent. BC] 2.7.3; Apollodoros, *Bibliotheke* [1st cent. AD] 3.14.4; possibly some images from as early as the 5th cent. B.C. (Gantz 1993: 730-731).
[220] It is, in fact, related by pseudo-Apollodoros *Bibliotheke* 3.14.4.

we find an uncomplimentary figuring of Aphrodite as Bion sets before us a bleeding, defeated, disempowered, and rather pathetic figure, whose terrible suffering over the loss of a favorite mortal permeates and defines the poem.[221]

I suggest that in *Aeneid* 1, Vergil carefully evokes and destabilizes Bion's characterization through a process of subtle fragmenting and reconfiguration. This process begins when Venus descends to earth to meet her son (1.314ff.). Vergil echoes Bion in presenting the goddess of love alone in the woods, ostensibly wandering in search of someone dear to her (*errantem*, 1.322 echoes ἀλάληται, 20) who, as she declares, might be hunting a wild boar (1.324). There is some overlap in the goddess' appearance: the disheveled Aphrodite sports free-flowing locks (λυσαμένα πλοκαμῖδας, νήπλεκτος 20-21); Venus appears in casual hunting garb, with loose, uncoiffed hair (*dederat comam diffundere ventis*, 1.319).[222] However, at the same time that these parallels invite a reminiscence of Bion's Aphrodite, they simultaneously revise her depiction through synthesis with elements that undercut her despairing helplessness. We now see the goddess of love as a fierce huntress, actively warding off possible danger from her beloved son. Aphrodite's unsandalled feet, perhaps red from the blood-drawing thorns, morph into Venus' purple boots. Instead of losing her divine beauty, Vergil's goddess regains it at the moment she sheds her mortal disguise. Her emblematic potency in this area is underscored by her subsequent enhancement of Aeneas' beauty (1.588ff.). Her son's exceptional beauty, in turn, links him with Adonis, whose great beauty is a central motif in Bion's poem.[223] Furthermore, whereas in Bion's work, the Paphian one (ἁ Παφία, 64) returns home to cry over her beloved as he lies dead in her

[221] Κύπριν ἀνιῇ, 8-9; ἄγριον ἄγριον ἕλκος ἔχει κατὰ μηρὸν Ἄδωνις, / μεῖζον δ' ἁ Κυθέρεια φέρει ποτικάρδιον ἕλκος, 16-17; πενθαλέα 21, ὀξὺ δὲ κωκύοισα, 23, ἔχω δ' ἀκόρεστον ἀνίαν, 56, etc.
[222] According to Ahrens' reading of line 25 (ἀμφὶ δέ νιν μέλαν εἶμα παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ᾠρεῖτο), Aphrodite's clothing hangs carelessly at her waist in bunched tatters. For more on this reading, see Reed 1997: *ad loc*.
[223] Interestingly, Bion's characterization of Aphrodite's painful love for Adonis as Κύπριδος αἰνὸν ἔρωτα (39) suggests the αἰνὸν ἄχος she suffers because of her love for Anchises in the *HHA* (198-199) and, in effect, links Adonis with Aeneas, whose name commemorates this pain.

bed, strewn with garlands (στεφάνοισι, 75), Vergil has the goddess return to her abode in Paphos, a place fragrant with flowers (*sertis*, 1.417), in a joyful manner (*laeta*, 1.416) presumably because she has just managed to impart protective assistance to her beloved Aeneas, who remains alive despite her enemy's great efforts to destroy him.

Reed notes that "Bion takes every opportunity to assimilate the grieving Aphrodite to her mortal beloved: the wound in her heart answers his savage wound (lines 16–17); she is so cut by thorns and disfigured by the violence of her own grief that her beauty suffers death along with him (29–30); as his blood gives miraculous birth to a rose, so her equally profuse tears become the anemone (64–66)."[224] We see a similar symmetry between Venus and her son: as her divine beauty flashes forth (*refulsit*, 1.402) at the end of their meeting, so his god-like (*deo similis*, 1.589) beauty shines (*refulsit*, 1.588) before Dido's eyes upon their meeting; within a brief span of the plot, both Venus and Aeneas appear as hunters in Carthaginian woods. Thus, instead of a degradation, from god to mortal, an elevation, from mortal to god, is intimated.

The *Aeneid*'s engagement with Bion's poem also includes more surprising reconfigurations of Aphrodite's role, as in the course of the episode Venus proceeds to slip into the position of the desired but unattainable beloved, while Aeneas becomes assimilated to the mourning goddess (1.405-9):

> *... ille* ***ubi*** *matrem*
>
> ***agnovit*** *tali* ***fugientem*** *est voce secutus:*
>
> *'quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis*
>
> *ludis* ***imaginibus****? cur* ***dextrae iungere dextram***
>
> ***non datur ac veras audire et reddere voces****?'*

[224] Reed 2007: 68.

> When he recognized his mother, he spoke to her thus as she fled away:
> 'You're cruel too! Why do you so often toy with your son,
> crafting your illusions! Why are we not allowed to link our right hands
> and to engage in an exchange of genuine voices?'[225]

Vergil's lines bear correspondence with Aphrodite's recognition of Adonis' actual (dying)state (ὡς ἴδεν, ὡς ἐνόησεν, 40), her figurative chase (likewise with her voice) of her "fleeing" lover (μεῖνον, ...μεῖνον, 42-43; σύ με ...φεύγεις. φεύγεις, 50-51), and her desire for contact: ὥς σε περιπτύξω καὶ χείλεα χείλεσι μίξω (also at line end, 44). Aeneas' remonstrative questions are also structurally analogous to those of Aphrodite (τί γάρ, τολμηρέ, κυνάγεις; / καλὸς ἐὼν τί τοσοῦτον ἐμήναο θηρὶ παλαίειν; 60-61). An *intra*textual connection amplifies these intertextual parallels. *dextrae iungere dextrae* / *non datur ac veras audire et reddere voces* is closely echoed by the words of the weeping Anchises when he first catches sight of his son in the underworld: *datur ... notas audire et reddere voces* (6.689). The echo continues in Aeneas's reply: *da iungere dextras* (6.697). In the underworld, Venus' son also speaks of an *imago* (6.695) with implicit falseness, namely of the image of Anchises that had repeatedly (*saepius*, 6.696) visited him on earth. Both parents impart important information to their son. Most significantly, both encounters are informed by an ontological divide,[226] and in each of them Aeneas is frustrated in his desire for an intimate connection: although – recalling Odysseus' attempt to grasp his mother's shade – the hero repeatedly tries to embrace his father, his living flesh cannot connect with the fleeting

[225] I have modified F. Ahl's translation.
[226] Reckford (1995-1996: 40, n. 42) remarks that inasmuch as Aeneas' last words to his mother are paralleled by what the deceased Anchises tells him in the underworld, the "separation of goddess and mortal resembles that of dead and living."

semblance of his father's body (***effugit*** *imago*, 6.701). This indissoluble divide between the living and the dead is precisely what separates Bion's Aphrodite from Adonis.[227]

The fragmentation and reconfiguration of the Adonis myth continues in *Aeneid* 1 as Venus, apprehensive about the precarious state of Aeneas' safety, concocts a plan to make Dido fall for her son. When she turns to the winged Cupid for assistance (*aligerum adfatur Amorem*, 1.663), she remarks – as we have noted – that he has often shared her anguish (*nostro doluisti saepe dolore*, 1.669). Her words, in turn, resonate with the pain her winged assistants (πτερύγεσσιν, 85) share with Aphrodite in Bion's poem (e.g. ὣδ' ὀλοφύρατο Κύπρις· ἐπαιάζουσιν Ἔρωτες, 62, and *passim*). Moreover, in a number of ways, the young Ascanius, whom Cupid is told to impersonate, also corresponds to Adonis. Venus calls him her *maxima cura* (1.678). In turn, this sentiment echoed by his designation as *Veneris iustissima cura* in Book 10,[228] where it is followed by a six-line long celebration of the boy's beauty. There, Ascanius is compared to a jewel in a gold setting, and the whiteness of his flesh is emphasized with comparisons to milk and ivory. Adonis, effectively Aphrodite's *maxima cura* in Bion, is also a beautiful boy with white flesh,[229] who – inert but still beautiful – is placed within the setting of her golden bed (παγχρυσέῳ κλιντῆρι, 74). Aphrodite throws her arms around her dying lover and longs for one last embrace before his body is laid in their bedroom,[230] which we might reasonably imagine to be situated on Cyprus, the traditional seat of the goddess.[231] Adonis is likened to someone sleeping and is laid down on soft (μαλακοῖς, 72) sheets; he lies among flowers and perfume. [232]

---

[227] Underscoring her divine potency, Venus enables Aeneas to cross both ontological boundaries: he enters the underworld carrying the golden branch he had located through her guidance, and ultimately, as Jupiter reveals, she will carry him into the divine sphere (1.259-260).
[228] 10.132.
[229] καλὸς, *passim*; παῖδα, 18, 24; λευκὸν, 8; χιονέας ... σαρκός, 10.
[230] πάχεας ἀμπετάσασα, 42; περιπτύξω, 44.
[231] Through his father, Adonis is also associated with the island (Reed 2007: 195).
[232] οἷα καθεύδων, 71; 65-66, 75, 77.

Correspondingly, in *Aeneid* 1, Ascanius is embraced by the goddess while senseless in the depths of supernatural sleep.[233] He is transferred to one of Venus' precincts on Cyprus and, once there, enveloped by soft (*mollis*, 1.693), fragrant flowers and *umbra* (1.694), a word with strong ties to death.[234] The flowers are blooms of marjoram (*amaracus*, 1.693),[235] a plant producing very light, almost white blossoms, opening from purple buds. Its presence resonates with the pervasive blood and white flesh imagery that we find in Bion.[236]

While establishing a connection with Bion's poem, the Ascanius and Venus scene also subverts a number of the tragic elements of the Adonis story. Venus' beloved boy is not subdued by the stronger power of a hostile goddess: it is Venus herself who – through her divine ability – temporarily enervates his body as part of her larger plan to secure her family's safety. While Aphrodite tragically tries to catch Adonis' final exhalation, attempting to have his final breath pour into her (ἀποψύχῃς ἐς ἐμὸν στόμα, κεἰς ἐμὸν ἦπαρ / πνεῦμα τεὸν ῥεύσῃ, 47-8), Venus pours gentle sleep into Ascanius (*inrigat*, 1.692) and flowers breathe forth (*aspirans*, 1.694) their sweet fragrance for the boy as he lies safe and sound in her sacred garden. Indeed, the description of Venus' embrace of Ascanius (*fotum gremio,* 1.692) hints at the nurturing warmth of life. Far

---

[233] *fotum gremio*, 1.692; *sopitum somno*, 1.680; *placidam per membra quietem* 1.691.

[234] Vergil's description of how Venus handles Ascanius (*Venus Ascanio placidam per membra quietem / inrigat, et fotum gremio dea tollit*, 1.691-2) is colored by a subtle eroticism as well as subtextual intimations of death, that is, by elements thematized by the Adonis story. Intratextually, the phrasing echoes the depiction of Nisus' death (*placidaque ibi demum morte quievit*, 9.445) as well as Vulcan's lovemaking and its aftermath (*placidum… petivit /coniugis infusus gremio per membra soporem*, 8.405-6). Moroever, both *gremium* and *fovere* have a secure connection with Latin amatory discourse. Khan (2002: 201-202) provides a detailed overview of the use of these words in amatory and sexual contexts. Noting a number of correspondences between Venus' grandson and Ganymede, "the paradigmatic *puer delicatus*," Seo (2013: 63) observes the eroticism operative in Venus' abduction of Ascanius, who "fulfills his requisite youthful stint on an eroticized 'Ida,' albeit on the suggestively named Cypriot Idalia." Cf. Hardie 2002: 339. This mapping of Ascanius onto Ganymede intimates Venus' access to the power requisite for the elevation of human to divine, which in the *HHA* the humbled Aphrodite acknowledges is the sole prerogative of Zeus.

[235] As noted by R. D. Williams (1972: *ad locum*), Catullus employs the *amaracus* in an address to Hymenaeus at the beginning of *Poem* 61, where he urges the nuptial god to wreathe his temples with its flowers (6-7). Interestingly, at the conclusion of Bion's poem, Hymenaeus tears up nuptial garlands (87-88).

[236] Hawkins (2004: 93) remarks on the connection between Ascanius and Adonis: "Venus steals Ascanius away from Carthage—surely evoking her relationship with Adonis." Hawkins does not, however, provide any reasons for her observation, nor does she reference Bion's work.

from being a barren lover who dies prematurely and leaves behind nothing but pain, the boy represents the continuation of Venus' earthly offspring: the human form of immortality. Moreover, as we already noted, his bloodline will ultimately culminate in Caesar, whom Venus will eventually receive in the heavens as she herself becomes free from distress (*secura*, 1.290).[237]

We might also observe that Venus carries off Ascanius so that a mortal favorite of her enemy (Dido) might suffer from the wound of love. Instead of being brought down by the pain of erotic passion, as Aphrodite is in the myth of Adonis, the goddess is now the huntress who figuratively strikes her victim; the force of her power is showcased through Dido's erotic suffering. Commenting that "Dido combines the wounds of the slain youth and the mourning lover," Reed argues that Dido's tragic love-affair is marked by allusions to the story of Adonis and Aphrodite.[238] In this way, Vergil responds to Aphrodite's tragic love-affair by transferring it to a woman whose father (Belus) had laid waste to her sacred island of Cyprus (*vastabat Cyprum*, 1.620),[239] who in her commitment to her dead husband has in effect disavowed the goddess, who is closely linked with a hostile deity (Juno), and who inspires Venus with fear (*domum timet ambiguam Tyriosque bilinguis*, 1.661).[240]

Reed also connects Bion's *Epitath on Adonis* with Vergil's narrative of the death of Camilla. Remarking that "Virgil has almost translated his precursor," Reed points out the close correspondence between the death of Adonis at 10-11 (ὑπ' ὀφρύσι δ' ὄμματα ναρκῇ / καὶ τὸ

---

[237] See pp. 56-57. In the context of his apotheosis, Caesar is described as *spoliis Orientis onustum* (1. 289). This element can perhaps be linked to Adonis, who is characterized by Bion as sprinkled with Syrian unguents and perfumes (traditionally coming from the East) (76-7).
[238] Reed 2007: 79. Reed also remarks that in Greek mythology Adonis regularly derives from Phoenicia and that an Adonis-type figure, the Phoenician deity Pumai, has been attested at Carthage (42, 77).
[239] Foster (1973-4: 30-31) argues that this is no idle detail but rather "the *aition* of the tragedy of the house of Belus," justifying in dramatic terms – in line with the tragic qualities of the Dido episode – Venus' antagonism towards the Belids and her eventual punishment of Dido.
[240] Cf. Aphrodite's fear of Persephone in Bion.

ῥόδον φεύγει τῶ χείλεος) and that of Camilla at 11.818–19 (*abitur exsanguis, labuntur frigida leto / lumina, purpureus quondam color ora reliquit*).[241] If we extend our perspective to encompass the broader setting of this intertext, we can see that in view of her intense feelings for Camilla (*cara mihi ante alias*, 11.537), Diana maps onto Bion's Aphrodite, as does her surrogate, Opis. Perhaps this parallel is behind Opis' somewhat incongruous designation as *dea pulcherrima* (11.852), a designation that might be considered the entitlement of Venus alone.[242] This alignment of Aphrodite's loss with the loss suffered by Diana, in turn, contributes to the corrective empowerment of the goddess of love in Vergil, since – as we have noted – Adonis' death was traditionally attributed to the hostility of Artemis. At the conclusion of the *Hippolytus*, Artemis declares that she will strike down the mortal most dear to Aphrodite (1420-22):

> ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἄλλον ἐξ ἐμῆς χερὸς
> ὃς ἂν μάλιστα φίλτατος κυρῆι βροτῶν
> τόξοις ἀφύκτοις τοῖσδε τιμωρήσομαι.
> for I will take vengeance on another by my hand, one of hers, whoever is actually her very dearest of mortals, with these inescapable arrows.[243]

In Camilla's death, Artemis' threat is, in a sense, turned against her. Diana's mortal favorite is struck down by a divinely guided missile – the result of Apollo's (partial) acquiescence to the prayer of her killer, Arruns (11.785ff.). Indeed, the implication of her divine twin in Camilla's death makes Diana's loss all the more tragic.

---

[241] Reed 2007: 34.
[242] Venus is called *genetrix pulcherrima* at 4.227 and 12.554-555. No other goddess is qualified as most beautiful in an absolute sense. Juno designates one of her nymphs as *forma pulcherrima* (1.72), but in this scenario she is voicing an evaluation of the nymph's beauty in relation to her fourteen attractive companions.
[243] Trans. M. R. Halleran.

The final allusion to the to the death of Adonis that I would like to consider belongs to the last book of the *Aeneid* and intratextually looks back to the assimilation of Aeneas to Aphrodite's beautiful lover in Book 1. Hawkins notes the parallel between Aeneas' injury in Book 12 and the story of Adonis, observing that both males are wounded in the thigh[244] and that inasmuch as Aphrodite was involved in the raising of Adonis according to Apollodoros' account, "at the fateful moment of Adonis' boar wound, [she] grieves not only as a lover, but also as a mother, as Venus does for Aeneas when he is wounded."[245] Reed likewise perceives a connection of the Vergilian episode to Bion's treatment of the myth: "When at 413–14 the dittany that Venus adds to Iapyx' brew is said to produce a 'crimson flower' (*flore purpureo*), with a phrase that can be a periphrasis for the hyacinth (and thus has associations with a dying god), we recall the prominence of crimson flowers in Bion's *Epitaph on Adonis*."[246] And yet a fundamental difference separates both scenes, that between death and life. By curing Aeneas, Venus thwarts the implicit "pull" of Persephone's divine prerogative. In fact, her ability to save her beloved mortal contrasts with the inability of other goddesses to achieve as much: to their great distress, Juno, Diana, and Juturna, all lose their human protégés. In effect, these (explicit or implicit) foes of the goddess of love become aligned with the bereaved Aphrodite in the Adonis myth. In short, in his engagement with Bion's articulation of the goddess – an overwhelmingly ineffectual,

---

[244] His injury forces him to support his alternate step with his spear, 12.385-6.

[245] Hawkins: 2004: 89-90. Hyginus and Apollodorus relate that as a child, Adonis was nurtured by both Aphrodite and Persephone (see note 15). This parallel is underscored by the evocative quality of Vergil's depiction of the wounded Aeneas as *cruentum ... nitentem* (12.385-6): since in its form, the participle of *nitor* (Aeneas is supporting his steps with his spear) is identical with the participle of *niteo* the word can function to suggest the thematic contrast of bright whiteness and rich red, of snowy flesh and blood that characterizes Bion's depiction of Adonis' death.

[246] Reed 2007: 193-4. Reed also comments "that the Adoniac subtext of the *Aeneid* activates a powerful analogy between Venus as mourner of Adonis and Venus as mother of Aeneas, and of Rome. Our Adonis-scenes superimpose her keening over her dead beloved onto her care for Rome—Venus the lover of Adonis (and of Anchises for that matter) onto Venus *genetrix*, the mother of the Roman race and in particular of the Julian line."

suffering, and pathetic figure – Vergil reconfigures her in complex ways, often repurposing elements from his predecessor's poem to effect a dramatic *oppositio*.

1.6. Concluding remarks

In the very first book of the *Aeneid*, in a moment of anagnorisis for both Aeneas and the reader, Vergil allusively spotlights Venus' dark *fama*, the sizable body of less than flattering words that have been spoken concerning her by his poetic predecessors within the Greek tradition, a tradition within which he referentially situates his own work. In other words, the Roman poet artfully acknowledges the inevitable presence of Venus' unsettling literary past within a sophisticated reader's experience of his poem: since Venus is patently positioned as a continuation of the Aphrodite articulated by Greek poets, from her very first appearance in the *Aeneid* she attracts Aphrodite's dark poetic *fama*. In this chapter, I have attempted to show that the dynamic process of Venus' characterization – along with other features of his narrative – can be viewed as the product of the Roman poet's engagement with the negative characterizations of Aphrodite.

In line with this engagement, Vergil suggests the unreliability and mutability of the talk that collects around an individual, both in the course of the *Aeneid* and within the poetic tradition at large. He draws attention to this instability of *fama* through his reconfiguration of Venus' dark heritage to different effects. Fragmenting and mixing inherited material, like his personified *Fama*, he combines old elements with new ones in the dynamic process of constructing a novel poetic articulation of the goddess of love. At the same time the intertexts embedded in the fabric of this new construction oppose the achievement of a stable new version of this powerfully

referential figure.[247] An attentive reader can perceive competing characterizations: an ongoing dialectic between new and old configurations, "between good and bad *fama*."[248] In consequence, a persistent doubleness animates the characterization of Vergil's Venus, as competing voices ultimately frustrate a firm grasp of the goddess.[249]

[247] The collective voice of these intertexts is amplified by the suggestive traces of Venus' dark *fama* scattered throughout the *Aeneid*, most prominently in Books 1, 4, and 6. For instance, Book 6 opens with the ecphrasis of the decorative doors of Apollo's temple at Cumae, and when the poet directs our attention to the depiction of Pasiphae's union with the Cretan bull and its issue (the Minotaur), he terms the hybrid monster *Veneris monimenta nefandae* (6.26). As in the *HHA*, the love goddess' transgressive mixing threatens fundamental boundaries – here the distinction between man and animal. About half way through that same book, we come across the *Lugentes Campi*, the underworld's region for wretches *quos durus amor crudeli tabe perdidit* (6.442). Here, in addition to getting another glimpse of Pasiphae, we also encounter her daughter Phaedra, who – as we know from Euripides – was compelled by Aphrodite to desire yet another transgressive mixing.

[248] I borrow Hardie's phrasing from his discussion of the *Aeneid's* reception (2012: 104).

[249] In this inherent dissonance, Vergil's Venus recalls her protege Helen, whom Suzuki has shown to be an "emblem of doubleness" (1989: 16, 43). Worman (1997: 166) remarks that Aphrodite is a "goddess whose nature is similarly ambiguous, her lineage similarly double."

CHAPTER 2 Juno and the Goddess of Love: The Enemy Within

2.1. When the dark self is someone else

The persistent doubleness that animates Venus' characterization – the result of Vergil's engagement with the goddess' dark heritage – bears some correspondence with the doubleness that informs the characterization of her son. As we have already noted, dissonant voices – internal and external – articulate competing versions of Aeneas and deny a culmination in a "single, fixed character."[1] In particular, Seo has identified a dissonance that effectively produces the distinct presence of an unflattering eastern figure behind the honorable (proto)Roman character. This darker side of the hero's hereditary proclivities is first articulated by *Fama* in Book 4, where she spreads the news that Aeneas has not only become Dido's Trojan consort, but has spent the winter indulging in a lifestyle reminiscent of an elegiac lover.[2] Reacting to *Fama*'s slanders, Iarbas develops and amplifies this suggestion of unheroic softness and dissipation.[3] In particular, he connects Aeneas' self-indulgence with the eastern effeminacy and erotic decadence of his notorious cousin: he calls the hero *ille Paris* (4.215).[4] This identification with Paris is echoed in the course of the poem by other, mostly hostile, voices,[5] It is facilitated not only by their consanguinity, but also by various points of mythic correspondence that align one man with the other. Most obviously, both are beautiful Trojans closely connected with Aphrodite/Venus

---

[1] Seo 2013: 33; Introduction, p. 6.
[2] Seo 2013: 48-49, 59. *Fama* sings that the pair *hiemem inter se luxu, quam longa fovere / regnorum immemores turpique cupidine captos* (193-194).
[3] See Introduction, pp. 7-8.
[4] Seo (2013: 50) observes that Iarbas's designation "points to a trading outside the poem" and "indicates a conventional image, a stereotyped figure."
[5] These voices include that of the Sybil at 6.93, of Juno at 7.319-322, of Amata at 7.361-364, and of Turnus at 9.136-139. See Seo (2013:57-58) on the link between Aeneas and Paris in Juno's version of Venus' rescue of Aeneas during the Trojan War at *Aeneid* 10.81-82.

and violently abhorred by Hera/Juno.[6] As Seo has noted, both have strong links with Mt. Ida, including its role in their respective voyages from Troy: in building his fleet on Phrygian Ida, Aeneas emulates the commencement of Paris' expedition to Sparta.[7] Indeed, this analogous origin introduces other parallels between their journeys: both Trojans sail to foreign lands where they acquire a wife at the cost of a bloody conflict. While Helen is abducted from her first husband, Aeneas faces Turnus' long-standing claim on Lavinia. Moreover, Aeneas' sojourn at Carthage maps onto the dynamics of seduction and large-scale destruction underlying the Trojan War. Both Aeneas and Paris prompt royal women to violate their loyalties to their husbands – Menelaus, Sychaeus – and so set in motion a course of events that culminates in lengthy wars between civilizations. Seo has shown that the language of "Juno's two-line summary of Venus' culpability for the Trojan War (10.92-93) ... insistently recalls the earlier narrative" of Dido's illicitly colored seduction. In short, "Aeneas, like Paris, has a bad relationship history."[8] Though herself unaware, Amata brings this out during her assimilation of Aeneas to Paris: she terms the former *perfidus ... praedo* (7.362) and thus echoes Dido's recurrent designation of Aeneas as *perfidus* (4.305, 366).[9] Finally, *Fama*'s and Iarbas' representations of Aeneas' emasculating life of luxury in his role as Dido's lover gains some confirmation in what Mercury finds upon his arrival in Carthage. The god sees the Trojan hero decked out in Tyrian opulence and engaged in work on Dido's city (4.260-264). The emasculation inherent in Aeneas' new role finds vivid expression in Mercury's qualification of the hero as *uxorius* (4.266).

Seo posits that the recurrent identifications of Aeneas with the Paris coalesce into "his darkling twin. The barbarous Phrygian, tendentiously formed from a distillation of the literary

[6] For more on this connection, see Seo 2013: 56-58.
[7] Seo 2013: 61, citing Proclus *Chr.* 1, Eur. *Hec*. 631-5, Lycophr. *Alex*. 24, *et al*.
[8] Seo 2013: 58-59.
[9] Seo (2013: 59) remarks that this is the only term for Aeneas that Dido uses more than once.

tradition that also informs Aeneas' identity, is the shadowy double."[10] In effect, the poem engages in a subtle displacement of Aeneas' problematic *fama* to a different figure, whose presence, while not crystalized within the story-line, can be felt "hovering" at the narrative periphery. A comparable process of relocation does take place within the story, namely the transference of certain elements characterizing Aeneas' defeats in the *Iliad* to the Trojan hero's chief opponent in the *Aeneid*. Thus, in *Aeneid* 10 we find that Turnus' martial inferiority necessitates his rescue by Juno. She fashions a phantom to lead Turnus out of battle and prevent his defeat in a face-off with Aeneas (613ff.). Her involvement resonates both with Poseidon's removal of Aeneas from the battlefield in *Iliad* 20 (performed to save him from death at the hands of Achilles) and with Apollo's rescue of the Trojan from Diomedes in *Iliad* 5 – the god both removes Aeneas from battle and fashions a deceptive phantom in his likeness.[11] Furthermore, Aeneas' futile gesture of last-resort against Achilles (which is followed by Poseidon's intervention) is replicated in Turnus' last desperate move against Aeneas: the Trojan lifts a great stone against the Greek hero, while the Rutulian throws a boulder against Aeneas during their climactic stand-off in *Aeneid* 12.[12] More obviously, we see the Italians' absorbing the earlier defeats of the Trojans as the second half of the *Aeneid* progressively reconfigures significant elements of the Trojan War.[13]

In this chapter, I argue that a parallel process of relocation occurs in Vergil's negotiation of Venus' dark *fama*: the poet transfers numerous elements of the unflattering poetic inheritance of Aeneas' mother to Juno, the chief antagonist of his Roman epic. In effect, an account of the

---

[10] Seo 2013: 64. Cf. 19 & 50-56.
[11] 20.318-339, 5.344-346, 5.432-453. The parallel between Juno's fashioning of the simulacrum and Apollo's phantom Aeneas has been noted by Hayne (*ad* 633) *et al*.
[12] *Aen*. 12.896-907 & *Il*. 20.285-287. In both texts the boulder is characterized as too heavy to pick up for any man of present day; in both scenarios, we are told that the toss either proves or would prove to be ineffectual.
[13] For an account of how, in the last six books, the roles of the Trojans and their opponents proceed to reflect a reversal of the situation at Troy, see Anderson 1957 ("Vergil's Second *Iliad*").

Aeneid's reception of the love goddess' *fama* requires the examination not only of Vergil's Venus, but of his Juno as well.

2.2. Mechanics of influence: from Venus to Juno

Before we look at how Vergil implicates Juno in the dark *fama* that Venus attracts into his poem on the intertextual level, it is important to note that we can clearly perceive his decision to transfer to Juno the dark elements previously aligned with the goddess of love on the *intra*textual level. Let us begin by considering the moment the *Aeneid*'s final book assimilates Turnus, the victim of Juno's influence, to a hunted deer (749-754). This figure looks back to the fourth book of the poem, where Vergil assimilates Dido to that same animal while he illustrates the effects of Venus' involvement in Dido's life (12.749-755, 4.69-73).[14] Moreover, as Pöschl observes, the wound suffered by Dido, both as the figurative deer and, more directly, within the characterization of her state at the outset of Book 4 (*gravi saucia cura*, 4.1), is echoed by the figurative wound of Turnus at the outset of Book 12, where he is likened to a lion whose breast had been pierced by a missile (*saucius gravi volnere*, 12.5).[15] And just as Dido is poisoned and enflamed from the venomous *pestis* of Cupid (1.688, 1.712, 4.8) so Turnus burns and turns sick after Allecto fixes her torch in his breast.[16] His *furor*, which arises from Juno's intervention, draws on and subsumes his feelings for Lavinia, that is, his love is coopted into the dynamics of Juno's influence.[17]

---

[14] A suggestive element in the description of the hunt, the *punicae pennae* (750), strengthens the connection to Dido.
[15] Pöschl 1962: 110. Again, the link with Dido is intensified by a suggestive detail, here, the simile's setting: *Poenorum ... in arvis* (4). This significant correspondence between Dido and Turnus has also received the attention of Putnam 1965: 154-155; Di Cesare 1974: 213; Gransden 1984: 71, 191, among others.
[16] *fixit sub pectore taedas* (8.457); *aegrescit* (12.46).
[17] Putnam (1965: 226, n.6) notes the verbal parallels between the description of the enamored Dido at 4.4 (*haerent infixi pectore vultus*) and the description of Turnus at 12.70 (*figitque in virgine vultus*), tormented by a love (*amor*) that has been coopted by Juno to serve her purpose. For additional parallels between Dido and Turnus, see Pöschl 1962: 111, 113-114 and Hunt 1973: 89-96.

Juno's appropriation of the mechanics of influence previously aligned with the workings of Venus also extends beyond the appropriation of a patently established erotic inclination. Although some scholars see an erotic subtext in the narrative of Amata's fondness for Turnus, on the explicit level of the storyline, Allecto's supernatural assault on Amata does not draw on her sexual inclinations.[18] All the same, this divine attack and the *furor* it produces are an extensive reflection of what happens to Dido under the distinct control of Venus.[19] We see that both Cupid and the snake that Allecto hurls at Amata deceive (*fallas*, 1.688; *fallit*, 7.350) their victims with false appearances as they come in close proximity to their bodies: Cupid cuddles with Dido in the form of Ascanius, while Allecto's snake embraces Amata's neck in the form of her necklace and intertwines in her hair in the guise of her ribbons (7.351-2). The *furor* that both creatures inspire[20] – it is supernaturally breathed into the two queens (*inspires*, 1.688; *inspirans*, 7.51) – is imaged as poison (*veneno*, 1.388 & 7.354), as disease,[21] and most especially as fire.[22] It enters and hides itself deep in their bodies. It is in their chests (*pectore,* 4.67 & 7.356), reaching their very bones (1.166 *atque ossibus implicet ignem*, 7.355 *atque ossibus implicat ignem*). It causes the unfortunate women to rage through the cities (*infelix ... urbe furens*, 4.68-9; *infelix... furit per urbem*, 7.376-7). Dido is figured as a wounded dear wandering through the woods in flight (*silvas*, 4.72), while Amata flees into the woods (*silvas*, 7.385) to keep Lavinia from Aeneas.

---

[18] Lyne, for instance, (1987: 15ff.) sees Amata as a Phaedra figure. Cf. Mankin (1995: *ad Epd.* 16.31). Others, including Cairns (1989: 68-69) and Horsfall (2000: 83-84), see nothing "improper" in the vehemence of the queen's feelings concerning the man she intends for her daughter's husband, who also happens to be a relative (7.366). We should also note the similarity between the queen's feelings and the affection Latinus likewise feels for Turnus. By his own admission, the king violated a divine injunction in promising his daughter to Turnus *because* he had been overcome by love for the young man: *victus amore tui* (12.29). But Latinus is a man and so reacts to Aeneas' arrival in a manner different from that of his wife, who boils with *feminea curae iraeque* (7.345).

[19] That is, once Venus decides to target the Carthaginian queen and before Juno herself interferes.

[20] 1.659, 4.69; 7.348, 7.377.

[21] 1.712; 7.354.

[22] 1.600, 1.671, 1.688, 4.2, 4.66, 4.68; 7.355-356. Hershkowitz (1998: 114 n. 141) takes note of Venus' "[f]ury-like deployment of Cupid, connected to the sort of terms later associated with *Allecto: quam simul ac tali persensit peste teneri /cara Iovis coniunx nec famam obstare furori*" (4.90-1).

Lyne observes that Allecto "recalls Venus, in action and imagery. Her plan and actions as regards Amata are a kind of perverse replay of Venus' plan and actions as regards Dido."[23] This marked affinity between the workings of the Fury and those of the goddess of love is intensified by subtle intertextual nodding. Lyne notes that line 356 (*necdum animus toto percepit pectore flammam*) echoes Ariadne's erotic passion in Catullus 64.92, while the simile which likens Amata's frenzy to a spinning top likely alludes to Tibullus 1.5.3ff., where a spinning top illustrates the ardent longing of a lover. Lyne argues that through the invention of the Latin queen's suggestive name and its introduction within the context of Allecto's besieging her threshold (*obsedit limen Amatae,* 7.343), Vergil draws in the conceit of *militia amoris* – part of the figurative repertoire of amatory poetry.[24]

Finally, in Book 5, we find an infection by Juno's *furor* that overwhelms its victims in a manner that not only evokes the workings of Aphrodite/Venus but also does this without tapping into either a preexisting romantic scenario or erotic subtext. While the Trojan men are occupied with their games, Juno has Iris descend among the Trojan women and stir them into such destructive frenzy (*furor*, 5.659) that they set fire to their ships. The episode makes clear that we should view the activity of Juno's principal agents as an extension of her own workings, for, when the women finally come to their senses and break free from Iris' supernatural grip, we are told that the deity they shake out of their breasts is not, as we might expect, Iris, but Juno herself: *excussaque pectore Iuno est* (5.679).[25] It is noteworthy that this "shaking-out" of Juno bears a

---

[23] Lyne 1987: 18.

[24] Lyne 1987: 14-16. Lyne makes these points in support of his reading of Amata's feelings for Turnus as sexual in nature (see note 18, above). He does acknowledge, however, that Vergil's handling of the conventional erotic image of a lover's besetting his beloved's door does not quite work in this context, since it casts Allecto in the role of a lover attempting to sleep with the queen. All and all, it is somewhat less problematic to interpret the erotic coloring connected with Amata as an element signaling Juno's appropriation of Venus' *modus operandi*, rather than as evidence of the queen's sexual passion for Turnus.

[25] Numerous correspondences between the two winged goddesses encourage the extension of this perspective to Allecto. Putnam (1965: 89-90) notes, for instance, the significant parallels between Iris' activity among the Trojan

striking correspondence to Lucretius' portrayal of the emblematic workings of the goddess of love. In his prologue, he portrays Venus as "shaking-in" *amor* into the breasts of her targets (1.19): *omnibus incutiens blandum per pectora amorem*. Vergil thus endows Juno with an intertextual appropriation of Aphrodite/Venus' traditional *modus operandi*, the infiltration of the *pectus* or its Greek correspondents.[26] Furthermore, the recognition of the disguised Iris as a goddess features parallels with Helen's recognition of Aphrodite in *Iliad* 3.383-397. Like the goddess of love, Iris likens herself to an old woman; however, her divine beauty (with three of its visual attributes enumerated), which the mortal facade does not completely conceal, gives her away. Aphrodite's ὄμματα μαρμαίροντα (3.397) correspond to Iris' *ardentes oculi* (5.648). Additionally, in appearing among Trojan women and in compelling them, despite their reluctance, to do something that will bring them shame and regret,[27] Iris recalls Aphrodite's epiphany before Helen, surrounded by Trojan women, and her enjoinment that Helen should act in a manner liable to shaming reproaches.[28] A subtle *intra*textual parallel reinforces this *inter*textual affinity between the two goddesses: as Servius has noted, Iris' revealing gait recalls the divine gait revealed by Venus at the end her encounter with Aeneas in Book 1.[29]

Putnam, moreover, notes parallels between the erotic fire that overwhelms Dido and the fire that consumes the Trojan ships, which Vergil endows with human characteristics (5.680-683):

---

women and the way in which Allecto affects Amata and Turnus; both scenarios feature fire and torches, as well as the use of *conicit*. He suggests that we can view Iris as not only throwing a torch at the ships but as also implanting "the torch of Juno's madness" in the women's breasts, just as Allecto does with Turnus. Cf. Coleman 1982: 151.

[26] For an overview of these as the targets of love's invasion, see Calame 1999: 19.

[27] 5.654-656, 5.676-678.

[28] *Il.* 3.384: περὶ δὲ Τρῳαὶ ἅλις ἦσαν. Conington and others have connected the recognition of Iris with Achilles' recognition of Athena in *Iliad* 1, particularly in view of vv.199-200: αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω / Παλλάδ' Ἀθηναίην· δεινὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν. And yet, Helen's recognition of Aphrodite furnishes more numerous and closer correspondences.

[29] 5.649, 1.405. It is worth mentioning that Servius, reading Iris' *spiritus* (5.648) as *odor*, sees another correspondence with an element of Venus' disclosure of her divinity: *divinum vertice odorem* / *spiravere* (1.403-4). Citing examples for this usage in other authors, most modern commentators (Conington, Page, Williams, Farrell, etc.), however, take *spiritus* as denoting Iris' spirited bearing.

> Like the flame of love which consumes Dido, imparting a silent wound which lives beneath her breast (*vivit sub pectore*: IV, 67), the fire lives deep in the sodden wood (*udo sub robore vivit*). Furthermore, the flame, in the form of a *pestis*, creeps into the whole body (*toto corpore*, line 683) of the ship as if it were a person, again like Dido, also the victim of a disease (I, 712).[30]

Putnam also observes that "the madness of the women is transferred to the roaring fire which with loosened reins (*immissis habenis*), like a horse run wild, rages through the burning fleet."[31] This particular figuring of Juno's fiery *furor*, in turn, resonates with the motif of uncontrollable equine energy that vividly punctuates Vergil's excursus on the destructive nature of sexual passion in *Georgics* 3.[32]

2.3. Aphrodite: a force of nature

The movement to Juno (and to her agents, Iris and Allecto) of the modes of influence initially characteristic of Venus (and of her agent Cupid) illustrates the central place of *fire* in poetic conceptualizations of the workings of erotic passion. By Vergil's time the conceit of erotic burning had become a commonplace in the figurative apparatus of Latin amatory discourse. It has its roots in the Greek poetic tradition, where the employment of the terminology of fire constitutes one of the ways in which the quintessential power of Aphrodite is conceptualized as a dangerous elemental energy. Greek poets, especially in the archaic and classical periods, also frequently align Aphrodite and EROS with sea waves and windy storms, along with a number of

[30] Putnam 1965: 90.
[31] 5.662; Putnam 1965: 90.
[32] See Appendix 2, p. 192.

elements metonymically related to these natural phenomena.[33] These alignments of the goddess of love (along with her powers and complements) with elemental energies, liable to entail or actively producing some form of destruction, are so prevalent that they amount to a defining characteristic of her poetic articulation. They also constitute a significant component of her dark *fama*, for, they are closely implicated in those aspects of Venus' heritage that we have already surveyed. The tension between Aphrodite and the ordered structures of civilized existence (that we considered in Section 1.2) stems from her elemental nature. The goddess belongs to the realm of volatile, chaotic, irrational forces that are both indispensable to human life and potentially destructive, and as such (as we observed in Section 1.3) necessitate strict control by man's various cultural technologies.[34]

Hesiod's narrative of Aphrodite's origin implicitly positions the goddess in an antithesis to the mechanisms of social order. It also conveys her elemental primordiality. In the *Theogony*, Aphrodite comes into existence *before* the Olympians, who constitute the divine counterpart to the structures of ordered life on earth – indeed, from the Greek perspective, they also anchor these structures. Aphrodite is thus older than Zeus and all the gods associated with the various aspects of (Greek) civilization.[35] Emerging after the fall of Ouranos' genitals into (the masculine)

---

[33] The figure of fire did not initially hold a central place in the poetic articulation of erotic passion. It seems to be rooted in the development of the conceptual associations of preexisting conventional figures, namely (1) the metonymic affinity of storms with lightning, and (2) the allocation of a heat source for the trope of erotic melting.

[34] "Eros," writes Thornton (1997: 38), "is out there in the wild but also in the heart of the home and city itself, as well as in the center of the human soul." He echoes Segal's observation (1965: 119) that Aphrodite's "terrible ambiguity lies in the fact that she is not only a power of the natural world, but is in a sense also within man: she is that part of him which responds instinctively to the elemental forces in nature and obeys, spontaneously, the same impulses as the animals, as earth and sky."

[35] For instance, Hera (marriage), Demeter (agriculture), Hestia (*oikos*), Apollo (poetry), Athena (cities, craft), Hephaestus (metal-working), Hermes (commerce), etc. Thornton (1997: 54) observes that these "younger anthropomorphic culture gods ... supersede the monstrous, more nature-oriented pre-Olympians" and "have subordinated their natural forces to a cultural function." It must be noted, however, that Poseidon, though technically an Olympian, does not quite fit this paradigm in so far as he embodies the elemental energy of the sea and of horses. Athena, in contrast, is credited with the invention of the human tools that harness this energy: the ship and the bridle and bit (Burkert 1985: 139).

πόντος (189), she does not fit within anything resembling a human family unit – as we have already noted. Not only is she "born" from the elemental sky and sea, the growth of vegetation as she first steps on land (194-5) links her with the fertility of primordial Earth (whom Hesiod designates as second in existence after Χάος, 114). This affinity is underscored through Aphrodite's immediate accompaniment by the primordial EROS, who follows only Χάος, Earth, and Tartarus in Hesiod's list of the most ancient of entities (120, 201). Furthermore, this genealogical account of Aphrodite and EROS as primordial deities resonates with the conceptualizations of their potency and workings that we find in other poets, namely the recurrent assimilations of these gods and their sphere of influence to natural phenomena, assimilations wherein the boundary between the figurative and the supernatural is often quite porous.[36]

Since these poetic articulations constitute a vital part of Venus' Greek heritage, attracted into the *Aeneid* through the goddess' singular intertextual potency, they warrant a careful overview. As with the surveys of Venus' *fama* in the previous chapter, I have ordered the following material thematically in order to foreground the interconnectedness and collective reinforcement of certain elements. I will begin by considering the assimilations of Aphrodite, EROS, and their sphere of influence to weather phenomena.

Love makes the speaker of an epigram by Meleager (*A.P.* 12.159) experience the variation in his beloved's gaze as a change in seasons, alternately bringing on spring or winter. In another epigram by the same author (*A.P.* 12.132A), EROS assails the lover's ψυχή with snow.[37] After

[36] Skinner (2005: 28) observes that within Greek culture raw sexuality was "deemed a phenomenon belonging to the sphere of nature, *physis.*"
[37] In Theocritus' *Idyll* 7, the lovesick Daphnis wastes away like snow (χιὼν ὥς τις κατετάκετο, 76), while in *Idyll* 2 love renders Simaetha colder than snow (πᾶσα ... ἐψύχθην χιόνος πλέον, 105).

recounting examples of the devastation of Aphrodite's influence,[38] the chorus of the *Hippolytus* declares that the terrible goddess blows on everything (δεινὰ γὰρ τὰ πάντ' ἐπιπνεῖ, 562).[39] Sappho assimilates love's onslaught to the force of wind upon a tree (Ἔρος δ' ἐτίναξέ μοι φρένας, ὠς ἄνεμος κὰτ ὄρος δρύσιν ἐμπέτων, Frag. 47),[40] while Apollonius characterizes the dialogue of the clandestine rendezvous between Medea and Jason as occurring ὑπὸ πνοιῇσιν Ἔρωτος (3.970). The meteorological conceit becomes implicated in mythical genealogy when Alcaeus declares that EROS comes from the mixing of the west wind and the rainbow: τὸν γένναt' εὐπέδιλλος Ἶρις / χρυσοκόμαι Ζεφύρωι μίγεισα (Frag. 327).

With identical phrasing, in both *A.P.* 12.157 and 12.167, Meleager speaks of the storm of oppressive windy desire blowing upon the lover: χειμαίνει δὲ βαρὺς πνεύσας πόθος,[41] and in *A.P.* 5.190, he suggests that love is like a sea storm, wherein EROS' waves are blown by sleepless jealousies: κῦμα τὸ πικρὸν Ἔρωτος ἀκοίμητοί τε πνέοντες / ζῆλοι. Cercidas envisions EROS as capable of rousing hurricanes or whirlwinds of desire (λαίλαπας ἢ λαμυρὰς πόθων ἀέλλας, 5.10) and of causing an unceasingly stormy passage over the sea (of love) (κυματίας διόλου ὁ πορθμός, 5.11). Thornton notes the implicit correlation of erotic passion and storm in the *Hippolytus*, where, referring to her love-sickness, Phaedra declares herself "storm-driven" into another fate (ἄλληι δ' ἐν τύχηι χειμάζομαι, 315).[42] The anonymous *A.P.* 12.88 and *A.P.* 12.156 also associate love with storms.[43] In the first, loves consume the speaker rushing upon him as

---

[38] They sing of the misfortunes suffered by Iole and Semele as objects of the desire of Heracles and Zeus, respectively.

[39] Envisioning a more beneficent manifestation, the chorus of the *Medea* portrays Aphrodite as blowing gentle breezes upon the land (χώρας καταπνεῦσαι μετρίας / ἀνέμων ἡδυπνόους αὔρας, 839-840), while Cercidas (Frag. 5) portrays EROS as blowing differently from each cheek, mildly from the right, but with tempestuous force from the left.

[40] Similarly, the lover in Theocritus' *Idyll* 30 feels himself to be like a leaf easily carried by love's breeze (αὔρα, 32).

[41] The first verse of 12.167 also associates EROS with a stormy wind (χειμέριον πνεῦμα).

[42] Thornton 1997: 36.

[43] Here and elsewhere I engage with anonymous *A. P.* epigrams that have been classified as Hellenistic – albeit with some reservation – by Gow and Page (1965 vol. 2: 559-561).

tempests (με τρύχουσι καταιγίζοντες ἔρωτες); in the second, the narrator declares that his love for Diodorus can make the boy appear as a heavy rain (πολὺν ὑετόν), compares his passion with a storm (χειμῶνι), and then develops the initial simile into a metaphor that envisions him as a shipwrecked man whirled by a great storm over a turbulent sea:

> τυφλὰ δ', ὅπως ναυηγὸς ἐν οἴδματι, κύματα μετρῶν
>
> δινεῦμαι, μεγάλῳ χείματι πλαζόμενος.
>
> And I, like a shipwrecked man in the surge, count the blind waves as I am whirled hither and thither at the mercy of the mighty storm.[44]

Ibycus emphasizes the fearsome quality of EROS, likened to a wind rushing from the side of Aphrodite, by figuratively endowing him with the burning power of lightning (Frag. 286): ὑπὸ στεροπᾶς φλέγων Θρηίκιος Βορέας ἀίσσων παρὰ Κύπριδος.[45] In the same vein, Meleager (*A.P.* 12.110) depicts the young Myiscus as having eyes that cast flames at those enamored with his beauty (φλόγας ὄμμασι βάλλει), equating these missiles with lightning and thunder.[46] His Diodorus and Aristagoras also cast fire through their loveliness (φλόγα βάλλων, *A.P.* 12.109; βάλλει φλόγα, *A.P.* 12.122). In fact, Meleager compares the latter to Zeus in his capacity to fling his thunderbolts (κεραυνοβολεῖν).[47] Correspondingly, Asclepiades presents Aphrodite herself as striking a lover with a missile of fire: Κύπρις, ἀνιηρὸν δ' ἐκ πυρὸς ἧκε βέλος (*A.P.* 5.189).[48]

---

[44] Trans. W. R. Paton.

[45] Trans. D. A. Campbell. Thornton (1997: 36) remarks that Ibycus' designation of Boreas as "Thracian" intensifies the wild quality of ἔρος, as the Thracians were notorious for their savagery. The association of love with storm and rain is picked up by Asclepiades, who declares that lovers have stormy eyes (κάτομβρα γὰρ ὄμματ' ἐρώντων, *A.P.* 5.145), and Philodemus, who calls Aphrodite the mother of storm-footed desires (πόθων μῆτερ ἀελλοπόδων, *A.P.* 10.21).

[46] He speaks of the boy's beauty as flashing lightening (ἤστραψε) and of the boy as κεραυνομάχαν by the workings of EROS.

[47] The anonymous epigram 12.140 imagines the beloved as Zeus in disguise, casting thunderbolts at the lover.

[48] Ion of Chios describes *Erotes* as βαρύγδουποι, an epithet attached by Pindar to winds and to Zeus – relating to his capacity to thunder (*Pi.* 4.210, *O.* 8.44).

The element of fire and its effects dominate the figurative language of amatory poetry in Hellenistic texts. The motif does make the occasional appearance in earlier poets. Sappho, for instance, speaks of a subtle fire coursing under her skin at the sight of her beloved (λέπτον / δ' αὔτικα χρῶι πῦρ ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν, 31.9-10) and describes herself as burning with desire: καιομέναν πόθωι. (Frag. 48).[49] It is in Hellenistic poetry, however, that the conceit of erotic fire and burning is embraced most fully and "elaborated on to almost baroque lengths."[50] Thus, we have a famous simile of Apollonius that likens the onset of Medea's passion for Jason, precipitated by EROS' arrows, to the consuming power of a growing flame (3.291-297).[51] In Callimachus, we find Apollo burning with love for Admetus (ἔρωτι κεκαυμένος Ἀδμήτοιο, *Hymn to Apollo* 49) and EROS instructing Aconius, who is kindled (ᾔθετο, *Aetia* 67.2) by the lovely Cydippe. Theocritus connects EROS with fire in a number of his idylls, most prominently, in Idyll 2. This poem's chief character, a young woman named Simaetha, confesses that her θυμὸς had been assailed with fire (πυρὶ, 82) at the moment she first set eyes on her lover Delphis, and, correspondingly, Delphis speaks of his own consumption by love's flame (πυρὸς, 131). He goes on to declare that love kindles a fire more blazing than that of Hephaestus on Lipari (133-

---

[49] Similarly, in Pindar's fourth *Pythian Ode* Aphrodite gives Jason instruction in love spells so that Medea might be driven by persuasion while she burns (ἐν φρασὶ καιομέναν, 219) and longs for Hellas. Forging a subtler connection, in the *HHA* the gleam of Aphrodite's *peplos* is compared to the brightness of fire (πυρὸς αὐγῆς, 86). More directly, vv. 1359-60 of the *Theognidea* compare the toil required of pederast lovers to the placing of a hand in the explosive fire of vine-twigs:

> χρὴ γάρ τοι περὶ παῖδα πονούμενον εἰς φιλότητα
> ὥσπερ κληματίνωι χεῖρα πυρὶ προσάγειν.
> For one who toils to win the love of a boy must, as it were, place his hand in a fire of vine-twigs.
> (Trans. D. E. Gerber)

With his thighs, Ganymede inflames (ὑπαίθων) the royal might of Zeus, as Sophocles seems to tell us (fr 345). For a list of the sexual terms connected with fire and burning that we find in comedy, see Henderson 1991: 177-78.

[50] Thornton 1997: 32. For Thornton's brief overview of the conceit of amatory heat and burning in Greek literature (which he supplements with multiple references to modernity), see 31-33. For examples of the figure of erotic fire in Greek and Latin authors, see Pease 1935: *ad* 4.2 (*igni*).

[51] Apollonius also assimilates erotic love to a flame (φλόγα) at 3.1018 and employs the conceit of erotic smoldering at 3.446 and 3.762.

134): Ἔρως δ' ἄρα καὶ Λιπαραίω / πολλάκις Ἀφαίστοιο σέλας φλογερώτερον αἴθει.[52] Moschus has Aphrodite proclaim that of all of EROS' savage (ἄγρια) weapons, his torch is the worst and can set the sun itself ablaze (*Eros Drapetes* 22-23). Similarly, in one of his epigrams Meleager refers to love as a hard-to-bear ἄγριος δαίμων who throws torches into a lover's breast: βαλὼν δ' ἐπ' ἐμὴν φρένα πυρσούς (*A.P.* 12.48).[53] Indeed, it is within the generic context of the amatory epigram that love's association with fire is most prominently and vigorously embraced by Vergil's Greek predecessors. Within the *Greek Anthology*, the motif occurs in sixteen of the Hellenistic epigrams of Book 5 and in forty-one of Book 12.[54] At times, it permeates entire poems;[55] the clever elaborations, moreover, suggest that it had become very much commonplace. Among the plays upon the conceit of erotic burning, we might note Dioscorides' *A.P.* 5.138, which presents a lover who, after listening to a girl recounting the tale of the Trojan War, professes to have burned and perished along with the Trojans in the flames devouring their city. Meleager, in turn, speaks of Heraclitus, whose eyes threaten to set Zeus' thunderbolts aflame (*A.P.* 12.63) and of the fire-casting Diodorus, who is himself set ablaze by the eyes of another, that is, of fire burning fire (*A.P.* 12.109): φλέγεται πῦρ πυρὶ καιόμενον. In another epigram by the same author, the speaker, suffering under δεινός Ἔρως, voices his amazement that Aphrodite, who hails from the sea, can generate fire out of moisture:

---

[52] There is more amatory fire at 2.40 and 2.131. In his other idylls, Theocritus speaks of erotic burning at 3.17, 7.55-56, 7.102, 11.52, and 14.26. The pseudo-Theocritean Idyll 23 refers to love's fires (7) and the burning of an enamoured heart (34). In Hermesianax, we find Mimnermus kindled (καίετο, 37) for Nanno and Aphrodite warming Socrates with the force of fire (πυρὸς μένει, *Leontion* 3.91). Moschus links love and fire in *Eros Drapetes 22-23,* 7, and 29, as well as in Frag. 2.3-4 and 4.1.

[53] Moschus likewise depicts the torch-bearing EROS in Frag. 4.1, and the torch is involved (explicitly or implicitly) in the amatory context of *A.P.* 12.17, 12.63, 12.82, 12.83, 12.110, 12.116.

[54] In Bk. 5: 6, 10, 57, 96, 123, 124, 131, 138, 139, 176, 180, 188, 189, 209-211; in Bk. 12: 17, 41, 46, 48, 49, 63, 72, 76, 79, 80-83, 85-87, 89-93, 98, 99, 109, 110, 116, 119, 121, 122, 124, 127, 130, 132, 132B, 134, 139, 140, 143, 144, 151, 166.

[55] For instance, fire or closely related terminology occur in three of the four lines of *A.P.* 5.131 as well as 12.79; in 12.83, the motif can be found in five of the epigram's six lines.

θαῦμα δέ μοι, πῶς ἆρα διὰ γλαυκοῖο φανεῖσα

κύματος ἐξ ὑγροῦ, Κύπρι, σὺ πῦρ τέτοκας

It amazes me, Cypris, how you, who rose from a blue-grey wave, brought forth fire from water.[56]

This sentiment highlights Aphrodite's close connection with yet another element – water.

The association of love and desire with liquidity dates back to the *Iliad*, where Zeus speaks of EROS as having poured all around his heart (περιπροχυθεὶς, 14.316). Hesiod's Graces drip EROS (εἴβετο, *Theog*. 910) from their eyes, and his Aphrodite is instructed to pour desire around Pandora's head (πόθον ἀμφιχέαι, *Op*. 65-66). Alkman describes EROS as dripping down (κατείβων, Frag. 59a.);[57] Sappho says it pours (κέχυται, Frag. 112.4). Cyrino observes that Anacreon enriches the blacksmith simile of Frag. 413 with a "distinct notion of love's elemental surge of power" by having the love god douse his speaker in a wintery torrent:[58]

μεγάλῳ δηῦτέ μ' Ἔρος ἔκοψεν ὥστε χαλκεὺς

πελέκει, χειμερίῃ δ' ἔλουσεν ἐν χαράδρῃ.

Once again Love has struck me like a smith with a great hammer and dipped me in the wintry torrent.[59]

The chorus of the *Hippolytus* sings of EROS as a god who sheds desire drop by drop onto one's eyes (ὁ κατ' ὀμμάτων / στάζων πόθον, 525-26), while the nurse tells Phaedra that Aphrodite cannot be withstood when she is in full flow (Κύπρις γὰρ οὐ φορητὸν ἦν πολλὴ ῥυῆι, 443).[60] The goddess and her sphere of influence are most especially linked with the sea, the setting of her

---

[56] Translation by W. R. Paton, slightly modified. A parallel sentiment appears in *A.P.* 5.209.
[57] For a brief discussion of the verb in the context, see Davies: 1983.
[58] Cyrino 1995: 117. She also notes the elemental, natural quality of love's force in Sappho 47 and Ibycus 286 (101-2, 106).
[59] Trans. D. A. Campbell.
[60] The instances, noted above, where love is linked with rain reinforce this association with liquidity.

genesis, according to Hesiod (*Theog*. 188ff).[61] In his article "The Sea of Love," Murgatroyd provides a fairly comprehensive analysis of the extensive "nautical metaphors, similes, parallels, allusions, and analogies applied to love and sex" in Greek (and Latin) literature. [62] For instance, he points out that Pindar speaks of being tossed on waves by desire (πόθῳ κυμαίνεται, Frag. 123) and surveys the various ways in which the language and imagery connected with sea vessels is appropriated within erotic contexts, particularly in the case of comedy and Hellenistic epigrams. Murgatroyd further observes that "the Alexandrians did much to enliven and elaborate the figure" of the sea of love, "exhibiting a high degree of inventiveness, ingenuity, dexterity and sophistication, and in the process demonstrating that this kind of imagery was by now so accepted that confusion was unlikely to result from original and bold treatment."[63] To illustrate his point, he brings up Frag. 5 of Cercidas and thirteen epigrams from the *Greek Anthology*,[64] among which Philodemus' 10.21 and Meleager's 12.167 and 12.84 are notable for referring to the sea or to waves as elements under Aphrodite's dominion. Since Murgatroyd's survey highlights the connection between erotic love and the sea primarily in terms of nautical conceits, it can be supplemented with a few instances of more strictly marine connections.[65] We might mention that Dioscorides positions the object of desire within the sea: his speaker advises the admirer of a boy not to go fishing (ἁλιεύῃ) for him by placing in a wave (κύματι) a line without a hook (*A.P.* 12.42).[66] Intoxication with love causes the speaker of Anacreon 376 to – once again – dive into

---

[61] The *Sixth Homeric Hymn* also locates her origin in the sea (3-5). Bion alludes to the conflict between the Hesiodic genealogy and her parentage in Homer by calling the goddess Διὸς τέκος ἠὲ θαλάσσας (14.1).
[62] Murgatroyd 1995: 9. The "sea of love" metaphor and image also receives attention in Kahlmeyer 1934: 22-26, Lesky 1947: 277-83, Tarant 1979: 109-112 (in Hellenistic epigrams), Gutzwiller 1992: 199-202, among others.
[63] Murgatroyd 1995: 14.
[64] 5.54, 5.55, 5.156, 5.161, 5.190, 5.204, 5.209, 9.143, 10.21, 12.84, 12.100, 12.156, 12.157, and 12.167.
[65] Though in his introduction Murgatroyd promises to survey nautical *and marine* amatory figures, he largely concentrates on the former.
[66] Furnishing a somewhat subtler connection, Philodemus' speaker stresses a (former) lover's deafness to his words by linking her with the sea (*A.P.* 5.107). Related is Lykidas' combination of "propemptic material with a sophisticated exploitation of the idea of 'the stormy sea' of love" in Theocritus' seventh idyll, noted by Hunter (1999:

the grey wave (ἐς πολιὸν κῦμα κολυμβῶ μεθύων ἔρωτι).[67] Conveying a similar equation of troubled passion with tumbling into water, the nurse in Euripides' *Hippolytus* questions how Phaedra might *swim* out of the τύχη into which she has fallen (ἐς δὲ τὴν τύχην πεσοῦσ' ὅσην σύ, πῶς ἂν ἐκνεῦσαι δοκεῖς; 469-470) and which the chorus earlier links with Aphrodite (371-372): τύχα Κύπριδος. The nurse's words, in turn, complement Phaedra's earlier description of her situation: ἄλλῃ δ' ἐν τύχῃ χειμάζομαι (315). Collectively, these subtle metaphors assimilate Phaedra's erotic suffering to an immersion in a sea-storm.[68]

In keeping with the associations of Aphrodite and EROS with elemental phenomena, Greek texts stress their presence within the natural world. The nurse of the *Hippolytus* states simply that Aphrodite – titled δέσποινα ποντία a little earlier (415) – *is* in the sea wave (*ἔστι* δ' ἐν θαλασσίωι κλύδωνι Κύπρις, 448-9).[69] The *HHA* opens with a narration of the goddess' sweeping influence over everything that lives in the heavens, the air, the land, and the sea. We are told that she has overcome οἰωνούς ... διιπετέας καὶ θηρία πάντα, / ἠμὲν ὅσ' ἤπειρος πολλὰ τρέφει ἠδ' ὅσα πόντος (4-5).[70] Invoking the Aphrodite along with EROS, the chorus of the *Hippolytus* likewise delineates their primal quality (1272-1279):

---

167), who explains that in the goatherd's song the "calming of the sea will reflect the soothing of Lykidas' [erotic] torment: if Ageanax reaches Mytilene safely, then both he and Lykidas will be saved from 'shipwreck.'"

[67] Anacreon 403 (ἀσήμων ὑπὲρ ἑρμάτων φορέομαι) perhaps also comes from an amatory context.

[68] Cf. Segal 1965, who thoroughly analyzes the figurative correspondences between the sea and Aphrodite in the tragedy, Gutzwiller 1992: 201, Thornton 1997: 36.

[69] Highlighting this marine aspect of the goddess, *A.P.* 16.160 (ascribed to Plato) features Aphrodite's coming to Knidos through the swell (δι' οἴδματος); Meleager invokes the goddess as one who swam in the blue-grey billows (τὰν νηξαμέναν χαροποῖς ἐνὶ κύμασι Κύπριν) (*A.P.* 5.154) and blames her emergence from the roaring, wind-lashed sea (μάτηρ ἀνέμων μάστιξι Θάλασσα / τραχὺ βοᾷ) for EROS' predilection for raging like the waves (κύμασι δ' ὀργὰν /στέρξεν ἴσαν) (*A.P.* 5.180). Aphrodite's cultic association with the sea features in such texts as Callimachus' Epigram 5 Pf. = 14. G.-P., on which see Gutzwiller 1992, and Posidippus' Epigram 12 G.-P.

[70] Correspondingly, Soph. Frag. 941.9-11 proclaims the presence of Aphrodite within the creatures of sea, land, and air:

> εἰσέρχεται μὲν ἰχθύων πλωτῷ γένει,
> ἔνεστι δ' ἐν χέρσου τετρασκελεῖ γονῇ,
> νωμᾷ δ' ἐν οἰωνοῖσι τοὐκείνης πτερόν.
> She enters into the swimming race of fishes, she is within the four-legged brood upon dry land, and her wing ranges among birds. (Trans. H. Lloyd-Jones)

ποτᾶται δὲ γαῖαν εὐάχητόν θ'

ἁλμυρὸν ἐπὶ πόντον,

θέλγει δ' Ἔρως ᾧι μαινομέναι κραδίαι

πτανὸς ἐφορμάσηι χρυσοφαής,

φύσιν ὀρεσκόων σκύμνων πελαγίων θ'

ὅσα τε γᾶ τρέφει

τά τ' αἰθόμενος ἅλιος δέρκεται

ἄνδρας τε· συμπάντων βασιληίδα τι-

μάν, Κύπρι, τῶνδε μόνα κρατύνεις.

Over the earth he flies and the loud-echoing salt-sea. He bewitches the race of the mountain-hunting lions and beasts of the sea, and all the creatures that earth feeds, and the blazing sun sees – and man, too. Over all you hold kingly power, Cyprian one; you are only ruler over all these.[71]

The chorus of Sophocles' *Antigone* articulates a similar sentiment as it sings to EROS of his roamings over the sea and among the homes of the those who dwell in the wild: φοιτᾷς δ' ὑπερπόντιος ἔν τ' / ἀγρονόμοις αὐλαῖς (784-5). Not only is EROS positioned within wilderness, the god himself is frequently characterized as *wild*. He is repeatedly termed ἄγριος.[72] In

[71] Translation by D. Grene, slightly modified. For the presence of Aphrodite and EROS in the sky/air and sea, see Soph. Frag. 684 and Eur. *Hipp.* 447-9. Apollonius' description of EROS' flight in the *Arognautica* resonates with these poetic antecedents as it intimates the extent of the god's power (3.164-166):

> νειόθι δ' ἄλλοτε γαῖα φερέσβιος ἄστεά τ' ἀνδρῶν
> φαίνετο καὶ ποταμῶν ἱεροὶ ῥόοι, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
> ἄκριες, ἀμφὶ δὲ πόντος, ἀν' αἰθέρα πολλὸν ἰόντι.
> And beneath him at times appeared life-sustaining earth and cities of men and divine streams of rivers, and then at other times mountain peaks, while all around was the sea as he traveled through the vast sky. (Trans. W. H. Race)

[72] For the use of this adjective in *Eros Drapetes* 22, *A.P.* 12.48, and *Antigone* 785 see pp. 111 and 115. Echoing *Eros Drapetes* 22, *A.P.* 144 likewise designates the god's weapons as savage (ἄγρια). Other instances of the adjective's qualification of EROS or his activity include Bion Frag. 9.1, *A.P.* 5.177 and 5.178, Euripides' Frag 897.8 (ἀγρίων τρόπων) and *Eros Drapetes* 11 (ἄγρια παίσδων).

Theocritus' *Idyll* 3, the suffering lover asserts that cruel EROS was not only born in the wild and but has been suckled by a lioness (15-16): βαρὺς θεός· ἦ ῥα λεαίνας / μαζὸν ἐθήλαζεν, δρυμῷ τέ νιν ἔτραφε μάτηρ. Apollonius plays on the wild quality of the god by depicting him as an unruly child who, unrestrained by the regulatory force of cultural mechanisms, disrespects and attacks his mother (3.94): οὐκ ὄθεται, μάλα δ' αἰὲν ἐριδμαίνων ἀθερίζει.[73] In line with his animal-like characterization, although he appears in scenes peopled with Ganymede, Aphrodite, and a number of mortal characters, EROS never utters a single word to any of them. The only sound we ever get from the creature is a malicious cackle (καγχαλόωντι, 3.124; καγχαλόων, 3.286) when he unfairly beats Ganymede at their game of knucklebones and as he darts up after striking Medea with his flame-like arrow. Fittingly, Apollonius likens his arrival at Aeetes' house to the attack of a gadfly (οἶστρος, 3.276). In this, the poet avails himself of a conventional conceit (found as early as a fragment of Simonides): the erotic gadfly.[74] In Theocritus, we find the identification of EROS with another blood-sucking parasite: the love-sick Simaetha compares the god to a leech (2.55-6):

> αἰαῖ Ἔρως ἀνιαρέ, τί μευ μέλαν ἐκ χροὸς αἷμα
> ἐμφὺς ὡς λιμνᾶτις ἅπαν ἐκ βδέλλα πέπωκας;
> Ah, cruel Love, why like a leech from the marsh, have you fastened on me and drunk all the black blood from my body?[75]

Moreover, we find intimations of EROS' snake-like nature in Sappho and Archilochus, with the latter echoed in Apollonius: they speak of EROS as something that creeps (ὄρπετον, Sap. 130C)

---

[73] As such, for the first time, EROS is positioned at odds with Aphrodite (Campbell 1994: 85). In *A.P.* 5.178, Meleager explicitly connects EROS' brattiness toward Aphrodite with his wildness: ἄγριον, οὐδ' αὐτᾷ ματρὶ φίλᾳ τιθασόν.

[74] The gadfly of Aphrodite (οἶστρος Ἀφροδίτ[ας, 541.10) compels a man against his will. Euripides also exploits this figure in the *Hippolytus*: Artemis calls Phaedra's erotic passion a gadfly (οἶστρον, 1300) and remarks that she fell in love because she had been stung by the sting (δηχθεῖσα κέντροις ... ἠράσθη, 1303) of Aphrodite.

[75] Trans. N. Hopkinson.

or coils under the heart (ἔρως ὑπὸ καρδίην ἐλυσθεὶς, Arch. 191; ὑπὸ κραδίῃ εἰλυμένος, *Arg*. 3.296).[76] In the *Theognidea*, the beloved boy with a θυμός μάργος (1301), who is "reminiscent of Eros, the *magros* child of Alcm. frag. 58,"[77] has the cruel nature of a kite (ἰκτίνου σχέτλιον ἦθος, 1302). Bion (Frag. 13.4), meanwhile, directly identifies EROS with a dangerous bird (ὄρνεον, 4 & 12) – a κακόν θηρίον (13) that everyone should flee. In her hymn, it is at the sight of predators – bears, leopards, wolves, and lions[78] – that Aphrodite's heart rejoices as she descends on Mt. Ida on her way to seduce of Anchises. In turn, the animals fawn around the goddess and then pair off and mate, in accordance with her wishes. Cyrino observes that this depiction of Aphrodite as "'mistress of beasts' highlights her close affinity for the untamed mountain milieu," especially significant since Mt. Ida is called the "mother of wild things" (μητέρα θηρῶν, 68).[79]

2.4. Juno: a force of nature

Within the extant body of Greek poetry, no deity is affiliated, in both figurative and literal terms, with dangerous natural phenomena as often and as broadly as Aphrodite.[80] In the *Aeneid*, however, this facet of the poetic articulation unique to the goddess of love resonates with the characterization of Juno. We have already noted Juno's domination, within the course of the *Aeneid*, of the motif of fire that had initially characterized Venus' mode of influence.[81] In fact, Vergil links Juno with figurative burning at the very outset of the *Aeneid*. At line 29, she is

---

[76] In Meleager's *A.P.* 5.177, the narrator finds EROS in his φωλεός, a word for the den of animals – Nicander uses it for the lair of snakes (*Theriaca* 32, 125, etc.). Meleager also terms EROS a complete τέρας (*A.P.* 5.178), a designation also applied to a serpent (*Il.* 12.209, *h.Ap*.302), the snaky Gorgon's head (*Il.* 5.742), and the serpent-bearing Cerberus (S.*Tr*.1098).
[77] Calame 1999: 24 n. 25.
[78] In Meleager's *A.P.* 5.179, EROS is figuratively assimilated to the predatory lynx.
[79] *HHA* 56-74; Cyrino 2010: 119.
[80] As noted earlier (Sec. 2.3 p. 107), because we are dealing with supernatural entities and powers, the boundary between the figurative and the literal in a supernatural sense is often quite porous.
[81] Sec. 2.2.

characterized as *accensa* by her grudges against the Trojans; at 50, her heart is in flames (*flammato corde*). Her flames become literal in Book 4: when she gives her signal for the union between Dido and Aeneas, fires flash out in the ether (*Juno / dant signum: fulsere ignes*, 4.166-7). Within the span of about hundred lines, these supernatural fires of Juno's intervention overwhelm – intensifying and imbuing with *ira* – the fire that had been initially kindled by Cupid. As the queen hears of Aeneas' decision to depart – news which she interprets as a betrayal by a perfidious husband – her burning passion assimilates her to her divine patron, the characteristically *saeva* Juno: *saevit... incensa* (4.300).[82] Eventually Dido's *ira* becomes the great flaring heat, the surging motion that agitates her darkening love: *saevit amor magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu* (4.532).[83] In keeping with this movement in her characterization toward an alignment with Juno, Dido contemplates the modes of destruction she could have inflicted on the Trojans.[84] The last option she considers involves the burning of their ships (4.605) and prefigures Juno's efforts on two subsequent occasions: the setting ablaze of Trojan ships in Sicily and the attempt to burn down the fleet in Italy.[85]

It is revealing that on her pyre Dido places *Iliacas vestes* (4.648), *arma viri thalamo quae fixa reliquit* (4.495), and what she terms the *lectus iugalis* (4.496). I think that Lyne rightly supposes that in encountering the *Iliacas vestes,* the reader is invited to recall the *palla* and *velamen* that

---

[82] For more on the close alignment of Dido and Juno at this point in the narrative, see Sec. 3.1, p. 164.

[83] *Aestus* conveys here both of its possible meanings: the immediate context accommodates its signification of the undulating motion of waves, while the connection of *saevit* with the metrically identical *saevit* in 4.300 (where Dido rages *accensa*) draws out its more common denotation of heat. The former meaning, with undertones of the burning fervor associated with great rage, appears to also operate in Mercury's depiction of Dido as he warns Aeneas of danger (4.563-4): *illa dolos dirumque nefas in pectore versat /certa mori, variosque irarum concitat aestus*. This impression is confirmed when Mercury goes on to envision an external manifestation of Dido's internal *aestus* (4.563-4): *iam mare turbari trabibus saevasque videbis / conlucere faces, iam fervere litora flammis*. The imagery blends the savage heat of fire with the seething motion of the troubled sea. Mercury's words contribute to Dido's alignment with Juno, particularly as the goddess appears in Jupiter's characterization at 12.831: *irarum tantos voluis sub pectore fluctus*.

[84] She herself perceives this transformative shift: she asks *quae mentem insania mutat*? (4.595).

[85] Both occasions involve the divine influence of Iris, who is explicitly dispatched to earth by Juno (5.605-608, 8.1-3).

Dido receives from Aeneas in Book 1,[86] emphasized through repetition (1.648-9, 1.711), particularly since the context suggests that Dido pauses for a final reminiscence of the course of their relationship.[87] These gifts are closely connected with Venus: they had belonged to Helen, the goddess' earthly counterpart, they were transferred in Troy on account of her protégé Paris (1.650-2), and their delivery to Dido involves her divine son Cupid. During the welcoming banquet of Book 1, the lovely love-god and the lovely gifts exert an equal effect on the queen (*Phoenissa, et pariter puero donisque movetur*, 714) and mark the moment when she begins to burn: *expleri mentem nequit ardescitque tuendo* (713).[88] On the other hand, the *arma* clearly belong to the period after Juno's enactment of the stormy wedding and signal the workings of her divine influence over the course of the queen's passion. We are told the *arma* were mounted in the *thalamus*, that is, Dido's and Aeneas' *marital* bedroom.[89] Wagner has noted the correspondence of this description to Euripides' *Hecuba*, where the queen speaks of her (conjugal) bedroom as a place in which her husband hung up his spear (919- 920): πόσις ἐν θαλάμοις ἔκειτο, ξυστὸν δ' ἐπὶ πασσάλωι.[90] Furthermore, the appearance of the word *thalamus* on three occasions in Book 4 (133, 392, 495) has prompted Gillis to observe that the occurrences "encompass with remarkable skill the entire affair with Aeneas – from the day of the hunt and

---

[86] Lyne 1987: 22, after Heyne, *ad loc*., followed by Krevans 2002-3: 177-178.

[87] That this reminiscence would involve the course of her love for Aeneas – from its very beginning all the way to its destructive end, symbolized by Aeneas' sword (646-654) – is suggested by a closely proximate indication of her contemplation of the *course* of her life (*quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi*, 4.653).

[88] At the very outset of her plan, Venus intends Cupid to inflame Dido both by imbuing her with his fire and through the gifts he will bestow as Ascanius (*donis ... furentem / incendat reginam atque ossibus implicet ignem*, 1.659-660). Krevans (2002-3: 180-182) argues that Helen's *velamen*, which along with her *palla* he reads as the meaning of *Iliacas vestes*, is a reworking of the *peplos* that Jason receives from Hypsipyle in the *Argonautica* (4.423-434). If he is indeed correct, this evocation of the Lemnian queen, as Dido is about to commit suicide atop her *lectus iugalis* (4.650), would emphasize that without Juno's meddling Dido's love could have taken a different, less destructive course (cf. Krevans 2002-3: 182).

[89] OLD (2); cf. Conington *ad loc*.

[90] Quinn (1969:148 & 346) thinks that the sword that Dido positions on the pyre is the gift from the queen we see Aeneas wearing at 4.261-3 "as one of the symbols of consortship." His role as the queen's spouse is brought out by Mercury's designation of Aeneas as *uxorius* (4.266).

seduction, to her collapse, to her removal of his *arma* to her pyre."[91] More specifically, the occurrences encompass the extent of Dido's and Aeneas' relationship from the day Juno steps in to mold its course, with *thalamus* appropriately marking her domain. Finally, there is the *lectus iugalis* (4.496), the only object the three distinct accounts of the toppings of Dido's pyre have in common.[92] By Dido's own declaration it is the reason for her doom: *quo perii* (4.497). It is also, in its name and emblematic function, the point at which the divine spheres of Venus and Juno most clearly overlap. As the "marriage" bed of Dido and Aeneas, it symbolizes the domination of Dido's hidden, internal erotic fire by Juno. Her direct involvement – henceforth the goddess will use her agents to spread her "flame" – in their wild, fiery union works to externalize, both supernaturally and symbolically, Dido's invisible erotic burning and eventually leads to the very literal, mortal blaze of the queen's pyre.[93] The inevitability of this final conflagration becomes apparent when we recognize that whenever Juno infects mortal hearts with her figurative or supernatural fire, pernicious earthly fire follows: the Trojan women burn their ships; [94] Amata raises a torch for Lavinia's wedding with Turnus;[95] the latter directs torches to burn the Trojan ships (9.71ff.).[96] In fact, Dido's burning pyre, with its flame blazing toward the sky, high enough for Aeneas to see from his ship, looks back to the sinister "wedding" Juno had created for her, at which (4.168-9)

---

[91] Gillis 1983: 44.
[92] 4.496, 507, 648.
[93] 4.172-3: *nec iam furtivum Dido meditatur amorem: coniugium vocat*.
[94] See Putnam's comment in note 25, above.
[95] *flagrantem fervida pinum / sustinet ac natae Turnique canit hymenaeos* (7.397-8). Cf. the look of Amata's eyes during the revel: *sanguineam torquens aciem* (7.399); it is a clear echo of Dido, likewise in a frenzy after Juno's intervention: *sanguineam voluens aciem* (4.643).
[96] Syson (2013: 146) comments that when "Turnus is frustrated in his desire to engage with the Trojans by their resolution to not leave the defenses of their camp, the poem presents his recourse to fire as the direct enactment of his flaming passion. ... The attack takes on a cosmic dimension as the Rutulians become human embodiments of the forces of hell unleashed by the Fury Allecto in Book 7, when she thrusts a torch smoking with black light in Turnus' breast."

... fulsere ignes et conscius aether

conubiis summoque ululatunt vertice Nymphae.

... The torches are lightning, the shrewd sky's brilliance is witness,

Hymns for the wedding are howling moans of the nymphs upon high peaks.

Reinforcing the connection, the reaction to Dido's death activates a tragic resonance (4.667-8):

lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu

tecta fremunt, resonat magnis plangoribus aether.[97]

Homes are a chaos of noises: laments, groans, keening of women.

Skies far above re-echo the breast-drumming, grief-stricken sobbing.

To sum up, I posit that Juno' domination of the various manifestations of fire in the *Aeneid* includes the figurative, supernatural, and earthly burning associated with Dido from the moment of her "nuptial" union with Aeneas, which had been prompted by and enacted within Juno's fiery storm.

Juno's characterization further resonates with the poetic articulation of Aphrodite through the sustained alignment of the Olympian queen in Vergil's poem with other ambivalent natural phenomena. To begin with, Juno's profound connection with the sea permeates the entire epic. We find it strikingly and tersely expressed in Book 7: when Juno perceives that the Trojan ships have at last reached their destination and the men are establishing themselves on Italian soil, she implicitly connects herself with the open waters of their journey by calling the landed men *securi pelagi atque mei* (7.304). Early in the poem, she is linked with the destructive force of the winds

[97] Austin (1955: *ad loc.*) remarks that *ululatu* "cannot but recall another cry, that of the Nymphs in 168." Cf. Suzuki 1989: 113. The aether is also affected in both scenes – each time positioned at the end of the line – while a loud noise issues from atop. Lines 4.667-8 are immediately followed by a image of flames (within a simile depicting the sack of Carthage or Tyros). Moreover, both Dido's "wedding" and her death are promptly followed by the introduction of rumor: *it Fama per urbes* (4.174), *bacchatur Fama per urbem* (4.666).

in Aeolus' keeping. On a level of the storyline, she procures their extraordinary release, and the havoc they wreak over the sea fulfils her intention. On the level of narrative poetics, the goddess' emblematic hatred "blends" into their elemental rage.[98] The importance of Juno's *ira* is underscored by the word's triple appearance within the first thirty-one lines of the poem (at 1.4, 1.11, and 1.25). In the last two instances, *ira* is associated with *animus* (1.4, 1.26), and when we next see these two words together, less than thirty lines later, they are used to describe the tremendous fury of the winds, which Aeolus must keep in check: *mollitque animos et temperat iras* (1.57). The lexical connection is reinforced by a number of conceptual correspondences between Juno's characteristic hateful energy and the destructive power of the winds.

Even before her employment of Aeolus' captives, Juno's effect on Aeneas and his band of Trojans is suggestive of wave-inciting winds. We are told that because of her anger, Aeneas has been much tossed (*ob iram ... iactatus* 1.3-4) over deep waters and that, in her fury, she keeps the Trojans, tossed (*accensa ... iactatos*, 1.29) over the sea and away from Latium. Correspondingly, at the close of the poem, Jupiter speaks of her anger as a great billowing (12.83)1: *irarum tantos voluis sub pectore fluctus*. In Book 1, Juno is indignant not only because of the slights against her honor but also because she feels herself restrained from wreaking utter destruction upon those she holds accountable. Significantly, when she brings up what Athena had done to Ajax as an example of what she herself is hindered from doing, she not only challenges the version of Ajax's end in the *Odyssey* (4.500-511) – where Poseidon drives the man against the Gyrean rock and personally causes his drowning with the use of his trident[99] – by speaking of only the goddess' involvement, but also makes the whole episode fit tightly within the structure of a fierce

[98] Anderson (1969: 27) remarks that Juno's "irrational fury erupts in the storm, which Vergil presents in a symbolic concatenation that is fundamental to the entire *Aeneid*." Similarly, Putnam (1965: 11): "the emotional fury of Juno finds tangible outlet in Aeolus and his forces."

[99] μιν ... Ποσειδάων ἐπέλασσε πέτρῃσιν ... τρίαιναν ἑλὼν χερσὶ στιβαρῇσιν ἤλασε ... πέτρην.

sea-storm. In Juno's version, Athena uses lightning to scatter Ajax's ships and winds (*ventis,* 1. 43) to churn the waters, while Ajax's final destruction is accomplished through a whirlwind (*turbine*, 1.45). Thus, Juno's words suggest that Fate checks her from doing essentially what Aeolus' savage winds might do if left unchecked. And like her, they are indignant at their situation, grumbling against their disempowerment: *illi indignantes magno cum murmure montis / circum claustra fremunt* (1.55-56). Moreover, they are held in the depths of a cavern under high mountains (*montis altos*, 1.61) in a manner reminiscent of the *causae irarum saevique dolores* (1.25) held in the depths of Juno's mind (*alta mente repostum*, 1.26).

Certain elements in the episode subtly intimate that this characterization of the *Aeneid*'s chief antagonist looks to the antecedent poetic articulations of the ambivalent, elemental nature of the goddess of love. We are told that Juno approaches Aeolus *corde flammato* (1.50), a metaphor that strongly resonates with the language of erotic passion. Furthermore, this characterization leads directly to the description of the elemental, chaotic energies that Aeolus will soon release under Juno's directive. This power of the imprisoned winds is difficult to control and liable to throw the world into confusion (1.58-59) and, as such, echoes the qualities that we have seen the Greek tradition attribute to *erotic* energies. What is more, throughout their depiction, the unruly winds are metaphorically assimilated to horses,[100] whose wild energy, as we have also noted, is emblematic of the dangerous nature of erotic frenzy in Vergil's excursus on love in *Georgics* 3.[101]

---

[100] Offering a close examination of this conceit, Putnam (1965: 9, 11-12) observes that Vergil "seizes upon the metaphor of horses, which he gradually develops as the scene unfolds."

[101] Sec. 2.2, p. 105 & Appendix 2, p. 192. This connection is underscored by the manner in which Vergil envisions the release of the winds and its effects in *Aeneid* 1.81-89. The vocabulary of these lines substantially reflects the wave simile at *Georgics* 3.237-241 (See Appendix 2, p. 186-187): the words *terras, fluctus,* and *ponto* are found in both passages, while variations of the *Aeneid*'s *montem (in)cubuere, imis,* and *volvunt* feature in the *Georgics* simile.

Neptune's response (*saepe furores / compressi et rabiem tantam caelique marisque*, 5.801-802) when Venus complains to him of Juno's relentless anger and its manifestation as the storm *Libycis in undis* (5.789), along with Juno's own declaration of having harassed the Trojans over the entire sea (*per undas / ausa sequi et profugis toto me opponere ponto*, 7.299-300), suggests that his divine nemesis had incited other sea storms against Aeneas at an earlier stage of his journey, including, perhaps, the terrible one he recalls at 3.192-204.[102] She certainly does go on to cause yet another storm before Aeneas reaches Italy: the storm in Carthage that leads Dido and Aeneas to become separated from their people and find shelter in the same cave.[103] It is at this point that Juno stages a ceremony that has the semblance of a wedding but is not one. Among other things, it occurs in a wild setting beyond civilized space, lacks the participation of a human community, and features a problematic bride still bound to her first husband.[104] As such, it resonates with the problematic "wedding" Aphrodite orchestrates for Helen and Paris and with the love goddess' own pseudo-bridal role in – as well as orchestration of – her union with Anchises on Mt. Ida in the *HHA*.[105]

As a consequence of her divine patron's storms and in alignment with her wishes for the Trojans not reach Italy, Dido persistently implores Aeneas not to leave Carthage once he decides to do so following Mercury's admonition. In her first speech, the queen invokes their "marriage" as a pivotal point of support for her appeals: *data dextra* (307); *per dextram tuam* (314); *per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos*, (316).[106] Her words make clear that the change in the

---

[102] R. D. Williams 1972: *ad* 5.801; Putnam 1965: 116; Block 1981: 133; Feeney 1991: 184.
[103] Otis (1964: 234) sees the storm of Book 1 as a proleptic symbol of this one.
[104] Dido permanently binds herself to Sychaeus at 1.24-29, and there is no indication that she is ever released from her oath. There is also the issue of Aeneas' role in and understanding of the event. After all, shortly before his departure, he denies that had ever married Dido (*nec coniugis umquam / praetendi taedas aut haec in foedera veni*, 4.338-339).
[105] *Il*. 4.445. For the pseudo-bridal scene in the *HHA*, see Bergren 1989: 22-24.
[106] For Dido's understanding of the pledge enacted with the right hand as a pledge of marriage, see Henry 1873-92: 393; Conington 1883: *ad* 307; Mackail 1930: *ad* 4.307, Austin 1955: *ad* 4.307; R. D. Williams 1972: *ad* 4.307.

nature of their relationship at the moment of their union under Juno's auspices has a fundamental role in how Dido perceives and thus reacts to the Trojan's departure. Thus, before considering her imprecations any further, we need to fully appreciate Juno's role in the transmutation of Dido's hidden erotic enchantment into a public union the queen considers a marriage.

Although Dido reveals her desires to Anna at the beginning of Book 4 and allows her sister to persuade her to move on from Sychaeus and hope (*spem dedit*, 4.55) for a marriage with Aeneas, for which, notably, she prays to Juno in particular (4.59), it is not a given that her hope must be realized. The range of possible developments is intimated by Dido's intertextual correspondence to figures in comparable situations. For instance, in her welcoming of Aeneas, she echoes both Apollonius' Hypsipyle and Homer's Nausicaa. Krevans lists the most salient points of correspondence between the Carthaginian queen and her Lemnian counterpart, including their sole rule, their offer to a foreign leader of "a share of royal power to strengthen their kingdom" in accordance with the advice of a female confidante, and their temporary diversion of "the hero from his fated goal."[107] It is significant that Aphrodite is closely involved in Hypsipyle's warm reception of Jason: not only is the goddess behind the Lemnian women's murder of their men, a circumstance that in turn makes the Argonauts appear particularly desirable, she also directly inspires erotic passion for the arrivals (Κύπρις...ἐπὶ γλυκὺν ἵμερον ὦρσεν, 1.850).[108] In conjunction with Dido's correspondence to Nausicaa, this strong Apollonian intertext intimates trajectories that the relationship between Dido and Aeneas could have taken before Juno stepped

---

Austin points to a parallel in Euripides (*Med.* 21) and Henry to one in Apollonius (*Arg*. 4.99). For more on this issue see O'Hara 2012: *ad* 4.307. When she first reproaches Aeneas' betrayal, the queen does invoke *amor* (4.307) before appealing to their "marriage"; in 4.412, Vergil apostrophizes *Amor* as the compelling force behind Dido's desperate entreaties. Would Dido, however, have felt what she does or voiced her feelings in this fashion if the two had never been joined under Juno's patronage? It is telling that in her invocation of *amor,* Dido qualifies it as *noster* and in so doing implicitly assigns its origin to Juno's storm. For the connection of 4.412 with Juno, see n. 651, below.

[107] Krevans 2002-3: 175-6.

[108] The goddess also features – in her forceful power (1.742-3) – on Jason's cloak and so contributes to the hero's shining beauty (φαεινῷ ἀστέρι ἶσος, 1.774), which awes the women and their queen.

in to orchestrate the supernatural "wedding": like the smitten Nausicaa, Dido might never have entered into a physical relationship with Aeneas, or, echoing Hypsipyle, she might have viewed their physical union as non-conjugal and thus, however reluctantly, accepted the man's departure. The very first words that follow the narrative of her union with Aeneas, brought about and framed as a wedding by the goddess in her role as *pronuba* (4.166), emphatically link the accomplishment of Juno's scheme (4.115-127) with the transformation of Dido's passion into something darker and more destructive: *ille dies primus leti primusque malorum / causa fuit* (4.169-170). And it is fundamentally on the basis of what Juno has occasioned that Dido directs her imprecations toward the departing Aeneas. With this in mind, we can appreciate the subtle dynamics of resonance with the love goddess' poetic heritage when the effects of Juno's involvement are likened by Vergil to the assault of Boreas upon a tree (4.441-446) in a simile suggestive of Ibycus' Boreas rushing from the side of Aphrodite and Sappho's image of herself as a tree shaken by the blasts of love.[109]

Juno's stormy influence continues in Book 5 as she sends Iris down to Sicily with blowing gusts of wind: *ventos ... aspirat eunti* (5.607). In Book 10, during her descent from the heavens to save Turnus, the goddess drives a wintry tempest toward the earth: *agens hiemem nimbo succincta per auras* (10.634). Vergil's similes also assimilate the effects of the workings of Juno's instrument Allecto to the force of a turbulent sea. One vivifies the gathering of armed men that has been prompted by Allecto's involvement in the killing of Sylvia's deer and, more directly, by the hellish signal of her horn: it likens the troops to the surging sea,[110] a comparison which links Juno with the wave simile we find in *Georgics* 3.237-241.[111] The allusion is clearly

[109] Sec. 2.3 pp. 108-109.
[110] Pöschl (1962: 31) remarks that the simile "embodies the strong pressure and excitement of Juno's presence."
[111] See Appendix 2, p. 186-187 and note 101, above.

established by the very first line of the simile, *fluctus uti primo coepit cum albescere ponto* (7.528),[112] a virtual quote of *Georgics* 3.237: *fluctus uti medio coepit cum albescere ponto*. The connection is reinforced by the correspondence of what follows: the rising magnitude of billows, whose extent stretches from the depths below to great heights above.[113] The second simile aligns the consequences of Allecto's activity with the violent force of waves buffeting a rock out in the depths of a stormy sea. It applies to Latinus as he is besieged by the passionate demands for war that fulfill Juno's plan: *eunt res saevae nutu Iunonis* (7.592).[114] Notably, once Latinus is driven to exclaim *frangimur heu fatis ... ferimurque procella*!, the passage recalls the reactions of Phaedra and her nurse to the fulfillment of Aphrodite's plan.[115] They likewise, as we have seen, attribute their calamity to fate, figured as stormy sea. Phaedra is metaphorically stuck in its deep waters, linked with Aphrodite both causally and through the recurrent associations of the goddess with the sea.[116] Finally, the scene's conclusion – *Latinus rerumque reliquit habenas* (7.600) – invites a comparison with the excursus on love in *Georgics* 3, where – as we have already noted – Vergil presents the impossibility of controlling horses under the sway of erotic passion.[117] Indeed, Juno's implication in the primal forces that Vergil connects with Venus in *Georgics* 3 gains confirmation in the final book of the *Aeneid*. There we find Turnus, under the sway of Juno's fiery furor,[118] compared to a bull preparing for a fight (12.104-106):

---

[112] In reading *ponto*, rather than *vento*, I am following R. D. Williams, *et al.* As Williams observes "*ponto* has much better MSS authority," and, if we take *primo ... ponto* to mean "on the sea's surface," we see that this reading is supported by the symmetrical antithesis with "*imo ... fundo*, the final stage" of the simile (1973: *ad loc.*).

[113] In the *Georgics*, the wave is like a mountain; in the *Aeneid*, it rises to the aether. The last two lines of both similes share the words *altus*, *unda*, and *imus*.

[114] Anderson (1969: 74, 77) notes the link between this figurative storm and the actual storm of Book 1: "The war can be compared to the effects of a storm (586ff.), just as Juno's storm in Book One contained overtones of warfare."

[115] Aphrodite, like Juno, is willing to destroy a mortal she favors for the sake of persecuting one who has inspired her hostility.

[116] Sec. 2.3 p. 114.

[117] See p. 105 and 123, and Appendix 2 p. 192.

[118] The fiery nature of Turnus' fury is made emphatically explicit by the lines that directly precede the simile: *his agitur furiis, totoque ardentis ab ore / scintillae absistunt, oculis micat acribus ignis* (12.101-2). The manner in

... irasci in cornua temptat

arboris obnixus trunco, ventosque lacessit

ictibus aut sparsa ad pugnam proludit harena.

... he tries to concentrate all of his anger

Into his horn-tips, charges at a tree-trunk and lunges at the breezes,

Paws at and scatters the sand as he works himself up for the conflict.[119]

Remarkably, with a very minor change of order in the first line, these words are a direct quote from *Georgics* 3.232-234, where they refer to erotic rivalry among cattle and illustrate the overwhelming force Venus exerts over the natural world.[120]

To sum up, like the goddess of love in the Greek poetic tradition, Vergil's Juno is repeatedly linked with the tumultuous and destructive energy of fire, sea, winds, and storms. Like the power of Aphrodite, Juno's potency appears rooted in the realm of dangerous elemental forces. Hence, we find Williams remarking that Juno portrays "in some sense the permanent forces of hostile nature," while Feeney calls her an "agent of natural chaos."[121] In contrast, Vergil largely limits the expression of the dangerous elementality of Venus' traditional power to the trope of erotic

---

which they leave unclear the boundary between the physical and the figurative suggests a supernatural quality – Quinn (1969: 315) sees a "note of magic" – and links his madness with its supernaturally fiery inception, accomplished at Juno's behest. I agree with Feeney (1991: 136-7) in seeing Vergil's gods as fictive characters in their own right, on equal narrative footing with Aeneas, Dido, Turnus, etc. Cf. Johnson (1976: 146, 161-163, n. 41) for general support of this perspective and an overview of the categories of divine action. Thus, I do not see the episodes where they exert their supernatural influence upon mortals as an allegory of "realistic" psychological and emotional processes and motivations, as does, e.g., Quinn, for whom they are "a plastic embodiment of instinct, impulse, character, and the indefinable something that makes people what they are and renders what they do impossible to account for rationally" (1969: 56). Feeney provides an overview of this approach (the "naturalistic reading"), which argues for a parallelism in divine and human motivation, as well as an insightful exposition of its flaws (168-175). I do believe, however, that a god *often* "works with" a pre-existing attitude or emotion, for more on which see Lyne 1987: 13, 66-71.

[119] I have modified F. Ahl's translation.

[120] It is noteworthy that just as the passionate pleas of Dido buffet Aeneas like the North wind, so Turnus is also compared to Boreas as presses upon the Trojans and their allies on the battlefield (12.365- 369).

[121] Williams 1965-66: 16; Feeney 1991: 134. Comparably, Pöschl (1962: 32) comments that in Book 7 the effects of her agent's intervention, namely "Amata's orgiastic frenzy, the surge of boiling water, the whirling black steam of Turnus' cauldron, and the developing hurricane of the war host," are emphatically symbolic "of uncontrollable elementary forces."

burning. And while he does allude to the goddess' longstanding affinity with the sea by way of Poseidon's remark that she originates from his kingdom (*meis ... regnis / unde genus ducis*, 5.800-801), he fails to develop this connection in her characterization.

Juno's alignment with Aphrodite's dark elementality is facilitated by Juno's own Greek heritage. For one, the allegorical tradition saw in Hera the symbol of elemental air,[122] and Vergil's engagement with this tradition could explain why Juno's connection with atmospheric phenomena is less figurative than what we find in the case of Aphrodite. On its own, this exegetical tradition cannot, however, adequately account for either the darkness inherent in Juno's elemental characterization nor its broad extent, encompassing not only atmospheric energies but also the violence of the sea and the all-consuming power of fire. Juno's poetic heritage, especially her *fama* as Homeric Hera, does furnish a few precedents for the destructive elementality of Vergil's character. For instance, the *Iliad* links the goddess with two destructive sea storms: one that she had incited against Heracles (14.249-56, 15.26-28), another that she plans to stir against the Trojan army (21.334-337). Hera declares that this latter storm will burn the Trojans with its evil flame (φλέγμα κακὸν φορέουσα, 21.337). A more oblique connection between Hera and the pernicious power of winds and fire appears in the Stesichoros (Frag. 239 PMG) and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (305-55), where she is credited with the birth of the serpentine Typhaon – a consequence of her ire against Zeus. Although Typhaon is not expressly related to winds in these texts, popular etymology associates this creature with whirlwinds,[123] while the Hesiodic Typhoeus/Typhaon is portrayed as both the father of baneful sea winds and a

[122] For an overview of this tradition in relation to Hera, see Murrin 1980: 3-9. For the allegorical dimension of Vergil's Juno as *aer*, see Heinze 2003: 238-239, Thornton 1976: 48-49, Feeney 1991: 132, and, especially, Murrin 1980: 11-25.
[123] West 1966: 381. West himself doubts an actual etymological connection.

monster who flashes fire from his multiple heads (*Theog*. 826ff.).[124] More directly, Hera is linked to the force of fire via her son Hephaistos, whom in *Iliad* 21 she enjoins to fight against the river Xanthos with his quintessential flames (330-341). Yet, all in all, the poetic alignments of Hera with ambivalent natural forces are few and far between, and their paucity is underscored by a comparison with the wealth of poetic material that we find in connection with Aphrodite. In short, even in combination with the allegorical tradition, Juno's poetic past cannot fully account for the marked resonance between her dark elementality in the *Aeneid* and the poetic *fama* that characterizes the goddess of love.

Finally, in view of our preceding surveys of Venus' poetic heritage and of Vergil's portrayal of the goddess' workings in his own poem, we are in a good position to take stock of the remarkable affinities between Juno's agents and the chief agent of the goddess of love: EROS/Cupid/Amor. For one, Iris' and Allecto's involvement with torches closely aligns them with the EROS of Hellenistic poetry.[125] As we have seen, not only do numerous texts convey this villainous god's affinity for torches, Moschus terms his torch the worst of his savage weapons.[126] Exceptionally striking is the parallel between the winged Allecto, the *saeva dea* (7.511) who casts her torch into the breast of Turnus (*facem ... coniecit ... sub pectore*, 7.456-7), and EROS, the winged ἄγριος δαίμων, imaged as casting his torches into the breast of his erotic victim in Meleager's epigram: βαλὼν δ' ἐπ' ἐμὴν φρένα πυρσούς.[127] Another parallel involves Turnus, who

---

[124] Drawing on her connection with Typhaon, O'Brien (1993: 94-111) examines Hera's treatment in Homer and Hesiod and proceeds to detect traces of her earlier identity as a fearsome earth goddess with elemental power. Though illuminating, O'Brien's observations have little bearing on Vergil's reception of the *Iliadic* Hera, since, as O'Brien herself points out, Homer has transformed this earlier version of the goddess into a member of the Olympian family without her previous potency (110-111).

[125] Although Iris does not directly encourage Turnus to cast torches at the Trojan ships in Bk. 9, her epiphany before him, which prompts his general attack, recalls her influence over the Trojan women in Bk. 2 through the repetition of the lines which frame her appearance in that episode: all of 5.606 and 5.658 at 9.2 and 9.15; most of 5.657 at 9.14.

[126] Sec. 2.3 p. 111.

[127] *A.P.* 12.48. See Sec. 2.3 p. 111.

in acting under the sway of both Allecto and Iris illustrates their malevolent disposition as he circles the Trojan camp looking for a way to inflict destruction.[128] He is likened to a wolf that *improbus ira saevit* (9.63). Amor is likewise termed *improbus* at 4.412, but we also find a closer correspondence in Vergil's *Eclogue* 8, where in view of his wild and harsh nature, the god is denied anthropomorphic qualities and designated as both *improbus* and *saevus* (47, 49-50).[129] Allecto and Iris further align with EROS/Cupid in their serpentine aspects.[130] Putnam points out the link between Iris and the snake that slithers up from Anchises' tomb: at 5.88-89 the animal's bright scales are compared to a rainbow in a simile that integrates descriptions of Iris at 4.701, 5.658, and 9.15.[131] Allecto memorably teems with serpents, one of which infects Amata with its poison, just as Cupid infects Dido with his venom (*veneno*, 1.688).[132] Lastly, both Iris and Allecto share with EROS a certain kinship with death.[133] The Fury, of course, comes from the abode of the dead and foments fatal destruction as her *raison d'être*. More subtly, Iris is linked to death through her visual affinity with the snake at Anchises' tomb. There is, however, a more vivid connection at the conclusion of Book 4: the goddess cuts off Dido's lock as an offering to Dis, thus bringing on the queen's death, and in so doing herself becomes, like EROS the λυσιμελής, a loosener of limbs (*resolveret artus*, 4.695). These agents of Juno also evoke EROS/Cupid on the individual level. When Allecto orchestrates the shooting and wounding of Sylvia' deer, she recalls the role of Cupid in the wounding of Dido (*saucia...vulnus*, 4.1-2),

---

[128] Vergil describes Iris as *haud ignara nocendi* (5.618).
[129] Vergil makes clear that Medea's savage cruelty reflects the cruelty of Amor, who taught her to kill her own children: *saevus Amor docuit natorum sanguine matrem / commaculare manus* (*Ec*. 8.47-8). For more on this, see Appendix 2, p. 193.
[130] See Sec. 2.3, p. 116-117.
[131] Putnam 1965: 212, n.11.
[132] Otis (1963: 328) says that "Allecto sums up the tonality of all that is serpentine, fiery, bloody, tragic, dark and irrational." To a significant extent this description also fits the dark side of EROS that we examined in Sections 1.2 and 2.3.
[133] See Sec. 1.2, pp. 29-30.

whom Virgil also figures as a deer (4.69-73). Furthermore, Allecto's guidance of Ascanius' arrow,[134] the cause of suffering that reverberates far beyond its target, brings to mind EROS' notorious arrows, the emblematic instruments implicated in far-ranging pain.[135] Iris, meanwhile, evokes EROS in her very appearance. Not only is she winged and beautiful like the god, but the emergence of variegated colors as she flies suggests Euripides' description of the flying EROS as ποικιλόπτερος (*Hipp*.1269-1270).[136]

2.5. Juno: a threat to civilized existence

Along with co-opting Venus' mechanics of influence and echoing Aphrodite's defining affiliation with dangerous natural energies, in a broad sense, Vergil's Juno seems to have absorbed Aphrodite's traditional role as the goddess of mixing. While in Greek poetry the goddess of love is closely connected with the verb μειγνύναι, often used to signal the sexual mingling she embodies, in the *Aeneid* the Latin equivalent and cognate *miscere* is repeatedly implicated in Juno's activity or the consequences of her involvement. And like the dangerous works of Aphrodite, Juno's mixing threatens to destabilize the established order of things. Thus, through the sea storm of Book 1, perceived by Neptune as a mixing of sea with the rumbling of thunder (*interea magno* ***misceri*** *murmure pontum* / *... sensit*, 1.124-5), Juno commingles sky and earth (*caelum terramque ...* ***/ miscere***, 1.133-4), sea and sky (*maria omnia caelo* ***/ miscuit,*** 5.790-1). She unleashes, in the words of Otis, "a perversion and confusion of the normal, moral order

[134] I take *deus* in lines 7.497-8 (*Ascanius curvo derexit spicula cornu; / nec dextrae erranti deus afuit*) as referring to Allecto, thus following the readings of Servius, Page, Williams, etc. Cf. *ducente deo* at 2.632 for Venus. For a brief overview of the debate see Horsfall *ad loc*.

[135] Lyne (1987: 18) observes that in her workings regarding Amata, Allecto not only recalls the role of Venus but also that of Cupid.

[136] Her appearance also links her with Venus. The two are the only characters described as speaking *roseo ore* (2.593, 9.5). We might also recall (Sec. 2.3, p. 108) that Alcaeus makes Ἶρις the mother of EROS (Frag. 327).

of nature."[137] Shortly before Aeolus releases his winds in response to Juno's petition, Vergil indicates the great danger the goddess poses for the boundaries that define the hierarchically structured cosmos by giving us a preview of what the imprisoned winds could do if released from their restraints. This preview – framed as Jupiter's fear (*hoc metuens*, 1.61) – entails the potential mingling of earth and sky and thus the effective breakdown of the defining difference between those below and those above: *maria ac terras caelumque profundum / quippe ferant rapidi secum verrantque per auras* (1.58-9).[138] Putnam observes that the "winds reify irrationality, in this particular instance, the madness of Juno, and their domination is as crucial for a civilized existence as their release is an augury of destructiveness."[139]

Juno is also behind Aeolus' transgression into Neptune's sphere of influence (1.138-41),[140] and the potential of what she has set in motion to escalate into ever increasing disorder is intimated by the simile that likens the elemental chaos to the incipient chaos of a social upheaval (1.148-150).[141] By imaging the effect of her influence as the fury of savage mob (*saevit...furor*, 1.149-50), Vergil intimates its inherent antagonism toward established structures of civilized order. The poet further underscores this dangerous antagonism by a maneuver that is rather remarkable in terms of the role it assigns to Neptune. As the god of the sea and the Roman counterpart to the Greek Poseidon, Neptune is the divine embodiment of an elemental force

---

[137] Otis 1963: 229. Similarly, Feeney (1991: 134) views the storm as "a sign of a fundamental dislocation in the providential natural order." Cf. Highet's remark that within "the orderly system of the moral and physical universe, [Juno] is the chief source of storm and strife" (1972: 70).

[138] Cf. the fear that Aphrodite's mixing inspires in the *HHA* and the danger that this mixing constitutes for the stability of cosmic order (Sec. 1.2, pp. 17-21, 33). In the words of Hardie (1986: 93), Vergil "imagines potential cosmic catastrophe in violation of a providential world-order."

[139] Putnam 1998: 164.

[140] In her conversation with Neptune, Venus attributes this transgression of established boundaries to Juno: *in regnis hoc ausa tuis* (5.792).

[141] As Hardie (1986: 93) observes, intimations "of cosmic disaster are found also at the end of the storm scene... . *Caeli ruina* at line 129 suggests the final disaster, and gains point if we remember that *caelum ruere* was a proverbial expression for an impossibility; here it threatens to become a literal possibility."

resistant to human control and regulation.[142] Yet through his simile, Vergil aligns this elemental and notoriously volatile god with an embodiment of well-ordered culture: an upright citizen who tames violent passions through nothing more than the use of his words and his *gravitas*. This surprising alignment, in turn, amplifies Juno's dark characterization: in making Neptune appear as an exemplar of civilized control when set against Juno's fury, the poet emphasizes the elemental chaos and disorder inherent in his articulation of the Olympian queen.

In inciting the storm that derails Aeneas from his fated goal, Juno occasions the Trojan's mixing with the Carthaginians, a process that begins as soon as Aeneas enters Carthage (***miscet*** *viris*, 1.440) and which the goddess plans to intensify and extend to all the Trojans and Carthaginians (***misceri*** ... *populos*, 4.112).[143] She facilitates this illicit mixing by prompting – through yet another one of her storms – the leaders of both peoples to "commingle" erotically.[144] The storm's purpose – to mix – is reflected in the language of its depiction: ***commixta*** *grandine nimbum* (4.120, 4.161), *interea magno* ***misceri*** *murmure caelum / incipit* (4.160-1).[145] The latter phrasing closely echoes the description of Juno's first storm and so aligns it with that storm's transgressive nature, with its illicit mixing of heaven and earth, of up and down.[146] Juno again confounds these fundamental categories in the second half of the *Aeneid* when she sends Allecto

---

[142] Consequently, more than once he is pitted against Athena, the ultra-civilizing deity: "He sires the horse and rules the sea, but it is Athena who invents bridle and bit and who builds the first ship..." (Burkert 1985: 139). See note 35, above.

[143] Gillis (1983: 40) observes that "the verbs *misceo* and *commisceo* assume a virtuoso ambivalence" once we become aware of the plan to unite Dido and Aeneas sexually.

[144] This mixing of peoples goes against the decrees of fate and Jupiter's will, as Venus intimates at 4.110-112.

[145] Estevez (1978-79: 102) comments: "We may speak of several kinds of coming together: nature's elements are mixed in the storm; the union of Dido and Aeneas is meant to effect a political union between Trojans; the joint recreational venture of the hunt anticipates all three: cosmic, sexual, political. The storm, avowedly chaotic and destructive, occasions the union of lovers, ostensibly an act of ordering, but in the end no less productive of chaos and destruction than the storm, which, before bringing the pair to the same cave, scatters the others." Anderson (1969: 49) also notes the symbolic fracturing of the ordered hunt. Cf. Gransden's remark that "Juno is the bringer-together of opposing forces, not in order to produce harmony out of discord but to engender further bloodshed" (1984: 76).

[146] Neptune perceives the upheaval in his kingdom as a turbulent mixing: *interea magno misceri murmure pontum / emissaque himemem sensit* (1.124-125).

from the realm of Dis into the upper world (*superis immissa*, 10.40), effectively mixing the underworld with the world above. She herself observes the transgressive nature of her extension of the Fury's presence beyond the boundaries of her proper sphere (7.557-8):

te super aetherias errare licentius auras

haud pater ille velit, summi regnator Olympi.

But having you freely licensed to wander through air's upper brightness,

Would not be what the Great Father would wish, Lord of highest Olympus.

Juno's predilection for nefarious mixing and the subversion of order also comes across in Jupiter's description of her accomplishments in Italy (12.804-5): *potuisti, infandum accendere bellum, / deformare domum et luctu* ***miscere*** *hymenaeos*.[147] Indeed, his words resonate with Allecto's casting of her serpent at Amata, *quo furibunda domum monstro* ***permisceat*** *omnem* (7.348), as well as with her infection of Turnus, which ultimately precipitates his state of confusion during the final battle in Italy: he is overwhelmed by the mixture of conflicting sentiments and passions (12.666-8):

... aestuat ingens

uno in corde pudor ***mixto****que insania luctu*

furiis agitatus amor et conscia virtus.

... In this one heart, a maelstrom

Seethed: huge eddies of shame, cross-currents of grief and of madness,

Love and courageous awareness of self set boiling by fury.

Juno's transgression of boundaries and confounding of categories – an activity which stands at odds with, and threatens to imperil, universal stability – recalls the transgressive mixings of

[147] Tarrant (2012: *ad* 805) suggests that *miscere* is an "echo of the fall of Troy, cf. 2.487-8 *domus interior* (Priam's palace) *gemitu miseroque tumultu / miscetur*."

Aphrodite, especially as they appear in the *HHA*. Moreover, in threatening to undermine the defining systems of the ordered universe, Juno, like Aphrodite, threatens its ultimate guardian, Jupiter himself. We have already noted that in engineering the release of the winds from their prison, she threatens to bring to pass what Jupiter himself fears, but Vergil's words invite further consideration. He tells us that, fearing the chaos the winds could inflict upon the world,

> *... pater omnipotens speluncis abdidit atris*
>
> *... molemque et montis insuper altos*
>
> *imposuit, regemque dedit qui foedere certo*
>
> *et premere et laxas sciret dare iussus habenas*. (1.60-3)
>
> ... the Almighty Father confined them
>
> Deep within caves, then superimposed high mountainous masses,
>
> Gave them a ruler who'd understand, from a well-defined contract,
>
> How to restrain and, upon his command, give rein to their movements.

There are parallels, noted by Buchheit, between Vergil's description of the imprisoned winds and Hesiod's account of the primeval Titans imprisoned by Zeus during the progress toward Olympian ascendency.[148] Vergil not only intimates that in her employment of destructive elemental force, to which she is to some extent assimilated, Juno undermines civilized control over dark irrational energies,[149] he also suggests that she challenges Jupiter's status as the all-powerful cosmic ruler.[150] It is through his status as *pater omnipotens* (1.60) that Jupiter is able to

---

[148] *Theog*. 729ff.; Buchheit 1963: 66, n. 252; Hardie 1986: 91-92, who also points out a correspondence with "the Hesiodic description of the discontent of the Hundred-handers" (*Theog*. 621-3) and cites scholia that interprets the creatures as storm winds (96).

[149] In assimilating Aeolus' management of the winds to the manner in which a charioteer (with the use of *habena*) controls his horses, Vergil's metaphor emphasizes the civilizing quality of this control. Aeolus' fealty (*foedere certo*) to a higher ruler, whose directives he follows, reinforces this impression.

[150] Hershkowitz (1998: 101) remarks that in procuring the violation of Aeolus' treaty with Jupiter "Juno usurps not only Jupiter's role of sky- and stormgod in the physical structure of the universe, but also his role of ensurer of cosmic order in the political structure of the universe, replacing his order with the chaos of madness."

keep the winds' dangerous force in check: in Vergil's narrative, the designation introduces the steps that the god takes to control of the winds, steps which require power great enough to move mountains and bestow divine kingship. Jupiter has this power *because* he is *pater omnipotens*; conversely, the fact that he *does* restrain the winds – that he does not allow his fears about them to materialize – proves that he is indeed *pater omnipotens*. And yet, through Juno's intervention, the winds escape their restraints. They escape their cave, their mountain, and the king who is supposed to deal with them according to Jupiter's commands. And so, by means of a dangerous elemental power that Jupiter ultimately fails to control, Juno, like Aphrodite, implicitly challenges the Olympian king's omnipotence.[151] Vergil seems to confirm this bold incursion into Jupiter's defining prerogative[152] by terming Juno *omnipotens* near the end of Book 4 and having Allecto describe her as *omnipotens Saturnia* in Book 7.[153] Of course, as most commentators point out, these qualifications are undermined by their very context: in Book 4, Juno is witnessing the death of Dido as Aeneas resumes his mission; in Book 7, she turns to Allecto because she has failed in everything else she has tried thus far. But have we not seen comparable dynamics of subversion at work in the *HHA*, where the initial account of Aphrodite's overwhelming power is undermined by its narrative context? Let us recall that the hymn narrates

---

[151] Lyne (1987: 79) shows that Juno's incitement of the war between Italians and Trojans, a conflict Jupiter had forbidden (*abnueram bello Italiam concurrere Teucris. / quae contra vetitum discordia?*, 10.8-9), likewise undermines his supreme power: "If what Jupiter forbids happens, it means (simply) that Fateful Jupiter, Jupiter 'omnipotens,' has in fact incomplete power over the other gods, in particular Juno, even in such a grave matter as peace and war." For more on the "imperfections" of Vergil's Jupiter, see Lyne 1987: 78-79.

[152] The description of Jupiter as *omnipotens* goes back to Ennius (*Ann*. 458). Its equivalent παγκρατὴς, as an epithet of Zeus, is most common in Aeschylus (*Eum*. 918, *Sept*. 255, *Supp*. 816, *PV* 389 – of Zeus' throne) and Sophocles (*Phil*. 679, Frag. 684.4). We have considered the Sophoclean fragment in Section 1.2 (p. 19), noting the paradox that the all-powerful Zeus' lacks strength against EROS. In the context of our current examination, which traces the correspondences between the Greek portrayal of the powers of love and the forces of Juno in the *Aeneid*, it becomes significant that this Sophoclean fragment describes EROS as stirring/troubling (ταράσσει – used of the stirring of the sea by Poseidon in *Od*. 5.291) the gods and moving over the sea (κἀπὶ πόντον ἔρχεται) and that it concludes with Zeus' willing submission (ὑπείκει καὶ θέλων ἐγκλίνεται), which parallels Jupiter's final declaration of submission to Juno: *me uictusque uolensque remitto* (12.833).

[153] 4.663 & 7.428. This designation had caused Amerasinghe (1953: 63) to exclaim "*Omnipotens* of Iuno? Surely that is Iuppiter's monopoly! No other god is ever called *omnipotens* by Virgil."

the fulfillment of the Olympian king's will and a goddess' incapacity to resist it. Indeed, it dwells on her inability to achieve what she desires: to keep age and death from her mortal beloved and to exercise her divine privilege unhindered. As such, at many points, Aphrodite's story aligns with the tale of Juno, who cannot keep her beloved Turnus from death and who laments her divine impotence.[154] A similar minimization of a goddess' problematic power operates in both texts and strengths the correspondence between the goddess of love and her Virgilian nemesis.[155]

And the correspondence becomes stronger still if we also recall that Greek poetry characterizes Aphrodite as an irrational force, confounding order simply because it is in her nature to do so.[156] Vergil likewise characterizes Juno as a force of chaos and destruction that is unregulated by rational control;[157] for, in the *Aeneid* she fosters devastation and ruin indiscriminately. It is true that we are given the reasons for her hatred of the Trojans, we are told about her love for Carthage, and we can clearly perceive her fondness for the Latins. In view of all of this she does appear to operate under the dictates of comprehensible – albeit heavily emotional – motivations. There is, however, a marked disconnection between her sympathies and the effects of her involvement. *All* the mortals in her path suffer some type of devastation: Trojans as well as the Carthaginians and the Latins.[158] Jupiter designates the great *fluctus irarum* (12.831) under her breast proof of her lofty pedigree; this seething sea of blind passion is in her

---

[154] 1.37-49; 7.297-310.
[155] For the likelihood of Vergil's familiarity with the *HHA*, see Sec. 1.5, p. 54 note 128 and Sec. 3.3, p. 172.
[156] Sec. 1.2, pp. 21-22.
[157] Cf. Highet's observation concerning her speech at the council of the gods in Bk. 10: "the fury of Iuno and the destructive ferocity of her speech and actions suggest that she is almost insane. Within the orderly system of the moral and physical universe, she is the chief source of storm and strife. She exults in evil" (1972: 70).
[158] Aeolus and Juturna also do not fare very well (Highet 1972: 127). Coleman (1982: 150) observes that "devotion to the goddess brings no greater reward to her favourites than to her foes. Both Dido and Turnus are doomed to violent deaths, Carthage is left in disarray, the Italian opposition to Aeneas crushed." Camps (1969: 38) remarks that she not only dooms Turnus but "shames him ... by her efforts to delay the end for which she is responsible."

nature, and, like the irrational elemental force of an actual stormy sea, it cannot differentiate between friend or foe. It overwhelms all.[159]

As a force fostering chaos, Juno unsurprisingly draws to herself the type of tension we find between Aphrodite and the laws that order existence at various levels. At the highest level, Juno opposes the ordinances of Fate and therefore the will of Jupiter, the regulating force of the universe.[160] As Aphrodite's influence drives Paris to violate *xenia,* which falls under Zeus' patronage, so Juno's influence, principally through the incitement of Turnus' passion for war (7.460-74), likewise leads to "a flagrant breach of hospitality."[161] To some extent, Turnus also parallels the impassioned lovers of the *Greek Anthology* who challenge the supreme god.[162] We see his brazen defiance of Jupiter's will near the beginning of Book 9, when the Rutuli, Messapus (along with his horses), and even the god Tiber are stopped in their tracks at the sight of the transformation – with attendant omens – of the Trojan ships into sea deities (9.123-5). The men who had attempted to burn the ships are stupefied and terrified by this supernatural frustration of their attack – the fulfillment of Jupiter's promise to Cybele. Turnus, however, whom Vergil tellingly qualifies as *audax* (9.126) at this juncture, challenges the obvious significance of the divine intervention. Although he acknowledges that Jupiter himself is behind the marvelous event, he shouts that this sudden deification of the ships, which occurs at the very moment they

---

[159] Cf. Johnson's remark that reality, which is "a massive, incomprehensible impersonality," "manifests itself in the will of Juno" (1976: 75).

[160] Pöschl (1962: 28-31) emphatically views the conflict between Juno and Jupiter, as one between the divine symbol of the force of disorder inherent in nature and the embodiment of order and the regulatory potency of the mind. Similarly, Anderson (1969: 14): Juno "represents the forces of Disorder in the *Aeneid*, he the ordering forces. On her side Vergil places anger and other passions, irrational thinking and action, destructivity of others and self … and such symbolic occurrences as storms on land and sea, fire, war." The identification of Fate with Jupiter's will is firmly grounded in Virgilian scholarship. See, e.g., Heinze (2003: 236-237) for a survey of the textual support. For the "slippage" of the alignment, see, e.g., Hershkowitz (1998: 97-100), who also offers references to a variety of scholarly perspectives (n. 91).

[161] Otis 1963: 321.

[162] Sec. 1.2, pp. 22-23.

were about to be destroyed, is in fact Jupiter's way of removing their *auxilium* from the Trojans (9.128-30). His claim is not only irrational but also goes against Cybele's proclamation, which had manifestly presented the metamorphosis as a divine defense against their burning. Perhaps to stress the senselessness of Turnus' words, Vergil makes very clear that Cybele's voice had been heard by both sides (9.113-7). This railing against Jupiter's will, which underpins Turnus' perverse interpretation of the god's omen, is brought out by his blatant disregard for the *responsa deorum* (9.134) that guide the Trojans.[163] Finally, Turnus becomes patently assimilated to his patron, the *audax*,[164] Jupiter-defying Juno, when he declares *sunt et mea contra / fata mihi* (9.136-7), a sentiment that echoes the goddess' words at 7.293-4: *fatis contraria nostris / fata Phrygum*.[165] Hence, through Allecto and Iris, Juno turns Turnus into an enemy of Jupiter,[166] something Turnus himself acknowledges near the poem's conclusion, when he accepts the manifest significance of the god's final intervention (which frustrates his efforts to harm Aeneas). Although he concedes that Jupiter disapproves of what he is doing, Turnus nevertheless persists in his bold opposition. After uttering the words *Jupiter hostis* (12.895), with a giant rock he mounts one last attack against Aeneas.[167]

In Turnus we also find the kind of moral conflict that we have seen operating in those who are subject to Aphrodite's influence.[168] As we have already noted, in the course of the final battle the

---

[163] His vaunt *nil me fatalia terrent* (9.133) contrasts with Messapus' reasonable fear: *conterritus ipse Messapus* (9.123-4). Likewise, there is no indication that Turnus is at all frightened by Latinus' words of warning that the war he seeks is *nefas* (7.595-7).
[164] Cf. 7.300.
[165] This correspondence has been noted by R. D. Williams 1973: *ad loc*.
[166] Cf. Pöschl 1962: 95.
[167] Hershkowitz (1998: 108) notes that from the Roman perspective, since the rock is a boundry stone, Turnus is committing "both a civic and a religious offence" in moving it from its place. She adds that "Turnus' violation of the ancient boundary stone demonstrates that not only is Jupiter Turnus' enemy (as Turnus declares at 12. 895), but that Turnus, pumped up with Juno-ordered furor, is an enemy of Jupiter. It is cosmically – and metapoetically – wrong for Turnus to alter the position of the boundary stone."
[168] The moral dilemma of Dido at the beginning of Book 4 naturally fits into this category.

Rutulian experiences a conflicting mixture of emotions upon hearing of Amata's suicide (12.665-71):

obstipuit varia confusus imagine rerum
Turnus et obtutu tacito stetit; aestuat ingens
uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu
et furiis agitatus amor et conscia virtus.
ut primum discussae umbrae et lux reddita menti,
ardentis oculorum orbis ad moenia torsit
turbidus eque rotis magnam respexit ad urbem.

Shocked stock-still and confused by the mixture of images conjured,
Turnus just stood there in silence and stared. In this one heart, a maelstrom
Seethed: huge eddies of shame, cross-currents of grief and of madness,
Love and courageous awareness of self set boiling by fury.
Then his mind shook off the shadows, its daylight restored. He refocused
Eyesight's blazing orbs on the walls, and disturbed by his anguish,
Gazed, past the spin of his wheels, at the great city back there, behind him.

Vergil's words recall the confusion and conflict of sentiments that trouble the heart of Apollonius' love-stricken Medea, especially her turmoil during her sleepless night after the Argonauts' arrival.[169] Like Medea, Turnus is subject to a supernaturally effected force of passion

[169] *Arg*. 3.744-824. Medea is torn in different directions: distressed about neglecting her duty to her people if she helps Jason, while simultaneously suffering from a burning passion for the Argonaut. At one point, as she moves toward suicide, like Turnus, she becomes stupefied (ἔσχετο δ' ἀμφασίῃ, 3.811) and, in reverse symmetry with Turnus' submission to death and literal turning toward the city, she chooses life and figuratively turns her back on her city. The turmoil of both figures ends with an actual or a figurative dispelling of darkness and the return of light. The reader is prompted to think of Medea through Turnus' affinity of with Dido, who manifestly recalls the Colchian princess in the experience of her love-sickness. In a table of the correspondences between Vergil and Apollonius, Nelis (2001: 481) notes a connection between *Aen*. 12.665-71 and *Arg*. 3.616-824, though he does not

that opposes his sense of shame and moral integrity (*pudor ... virtus*). In activating a reminiscence of this Apollonian model, Turnus's predicament also resonates with the experience of the Trojan women in Book 5, when Juno – through Iris – incites them to behave in a way that will bring them shame and regret.[170] Like Medea, the women are torn (*ancipites ... ambiguae*, 5.654-5) between their passion (*amorem*, 5.655) and their obligation to their community, which expects them to follow the dictates of Fate.[171] Pyrgo's denouncement of Iris as impostor marks their effort at resisting her incendiary lead, but Juno's power prevails, and the women proceed to vehemently transgress the boundaries of proper behavior.[172] We have also already observed the similarity of their experience to that of Helen, whom Aphrodite forces to breach her sense of shame. This correspondence is reinforced by Venus' complaint to Neptune concerning Juno's perversion of the women (*per scelus ecce etiam Troianis matribus actis*, 5.793), since her words form an inexact, but still perceptible, parallel with Diomedes' rebuking Aphrodite for her corruption of women (*Il.* 5.349): ἦ οὐχ ἅλις ὅττι γυναῖκας ἀνάλκιδας ἠπεροπεύεις;

The voice of Ascanius, who calls them *miserae cives* (5.671), is able to recall the Trojan *matres* (5.622, 646, 654) to their place within their community, to their obligations as mothers and wives. But, strikingly, before their return to these roles, they must shake none other than Juno, the goddess of marriage, out of their breasts.[173] Although Vergil acknowledges Juno's traditional patronage (*cui vincla iugalia curae,* 4.59), her involvement with marriage in the *Aeneid* resembles the ambivalent and often destructive influence of Aphrodite in Greek poetry.

---

indicate its particulars. For more on the correspondence of Turnus to Apollonius' Medea, see Nelis 2001: 375-376, 380-381.

[170] 5.654-656, 5.676-678.

[171] Confronted with Iris' gesture of destruction as she hurls her torch at the ships, the women, like Medea and Turnus, also become stupefied: *stupefactaque corda / Iliadum* (5.653-4).

[172] In Pyrgo's account of how she knows Iris is not who she appears, she speaks of the real Beroe's (frustrated) desire to duly honor Anchises. As such, this part of her account stands in implicit opposition to Iris' subversive pressures.

[173] In exclaiming *en, ego uester / Ascanius!* (5.672-3), the boy also appeals to their maternal qualities.

We first come across this effect during Juno's visit with Aeolus, which evokes the *Dios Apate* episode in *Iliad* 14, and in particular Hera's encounter with Hypnos, to whom she offers as wife one of the Graces (230ff.). The Homeric scene is marked by a tension between Hera's role as a sponsor of marriage and the goal of her mission, which endangers the integrity of her own union. Not only is this tension channeled by Vergil's story-line, it is amplified by his poetics. Juno pledges to join Aeolus with the nymph Deiopea (1.73-75):

> *conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo,*
>
> *omnis ut tecum* ***meritis pro talibus*** *annos*
>
> *exigat et pulchra faciat te prole parentem.*
>
> I'll designate her as yours, join you both in a durable marriage.
>
> Thus she can spend all time with you, in return for your service
>
> Rendered, and make you the father, as well, of some beautiful children.

While, on the one hand, Juno's pledge emphasizes the legitimacy and wholesomeness of the union she promises to enact and thus highlights her traditional identify as patron of lawful marriages, on the other hand, this central aspect of the goddess is subtly undercut by a phrase in a poetically significant position. At the center of her description of a model marriage,[174] we find the words *meritis pro talibus*. They convey the task she imposes upon Aeolus, a task that signals the destabilization of Juno's own marriage inasmuch as it challenges Jupiter's will and entails a usurpation of his sovereign authority. Moreover, by having Juno repeat her words from 1.73 (*conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo*) at 4.126, during her conversation with Venus, Vergil also intratextually aligns the union the goddess promises to Aeolus with the problematic union she plans for Aeneas and Dido. In the latter case, the poem makes clear that Juno's

[174] It is marked by stability, legitimacy, longevity, and fruitfulness.

declaration does not produce an unequivocally legitimate and stable marriage. Indeed, the new context of her declaration suggests that the goddess of marriage does not actually have the power to enact a marriage, as her words are preceded by a condition: the sanction of Venus (*tua si mihi certa voluntas*, 4.125).[175]

Not only does the Aeolus episode allude to Hera's activity in *Iliad* 14, it also subtly evokes one of the reasons for the *ira* motivating Juno's visit: the judgment of Paris. Whereas in Homer the bribe proffered by Hera to motivate Hypnos to choose to assist her against Zeus entails the gift of one of the younger Graces (Χαρίτων μίαν ὁπλοτεράων, 14.278), in the *Aeneid* Juno proffers the most beautiful (*forma pulcherrima*, 1.72) of her nymphs,[176] an arrangement that resonates with Aphrodite's offer of Helen, the loveliest of women, to secure Paris' favor.[177] And like the union between Paris and Helen, the union between Aeolus and Deiopea leads to the unleashing of forces of disorder and destruction. It sets in motion a chain of events that ultimately leads to the death of the ruler of a great city and foreshadows its eventual sack and destruction.[178]

---

[175] In keeping with his undermining of Juno's traditional patronage over legitimate marriage, Vergil makes the significant choice not to include her indignation at Paris' violation of the lawful union between Helen and Menelaus in his introductory listing of the various reasons behind Juno's anger toward the Trojans. The absence of this "most natural and obvious cause of offence for the goddess of marriage" has been noted by Lyne (1987: 18-33, 94-5), who also points out that it does appear in Horace's *Ode* 3.3, in which poem Juno brings up Helen's adultery in the exposition of her anger toward the Trojans. Vergil does present his Juno as incensed by *genus invisum et rapti Ganymedis honores* (1.28), words that intimate the adulterous violations of her own marriage and so link her with the mythical tradition of Hera, ever raging at Zeus' infidelities. However, the allusion to her husband's infidelity in his fathering of Dardanus (Servius *ad loc*., *et al.*) is significantly understated and, in the case of Ganymede, the focus of Juno's anger is manifestly directed at his *honores* rather than on the sexually suggestive element of *rapti*. Moreover, the suggestion of Juno's indignation at those who have slept with her husband is undermined by the subsequent expression of her warm feelings for Juturna (*animo gratissima nostro*, 12.142), concerning whose sexual experience Vergil is far more direct: *Iuppiter erepta pro virginitate* (12.141).

[176] The use of *forma* looks back to the use of the word less than 50 lines earlier, where it explicitly relates to Paris' judgment: *iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae* (1.27).

[177] Helen proved an irresistible bribe for Paris because of her superlative beauty – there is no tradition that the Trojan had any special interest in her prior to the judgement. This also seems to be the case with Deiopea and Aeolus. In contrast, Hypnos is willing to side with Hera over Zeus because of his longstanding love for Pasithea: ἧς τ' αὐτὸς ἐέλδομαι ἤματα πάντα (14. 276)

[178] Austin (*ad. loc.*) comments: "Dido's death means the death of her own Carthage, and it foreshadows the ultimate destruction of the city; and the sack of Troy is an ever-present memory."

In a certain sense, Dido herself is a Helen-like figure.[179] Recalling *forma pulcherrima Deiopeia* (1.72), she makes her grand entrance as *forma pulcherrima Dido* (1.496).[180] And just as in the *Odyssey* Helen's entrance is marked by a comparison with Artemis, so too is Dido's appearance linked with the same goddess. Both queens are accompanied by their retinue and both proceed to their seats with a degree of ceremony.[181] Bringing to mind Aphrodite's use of Helen at the Judgment of Paris, Juno offers Dido as an incentive for the Trojan Aeneas (and his mother) to choose a future that gratifies her ambitions.[182] And like Aphrodite, Juno effects an ambiguous and unfruitful union: a marriage that is not a marriage, and which ultimately leads to a death and a return to a former – legitimate – spouse.[183] The transfer of Helen's *palla* and *velamen* to the Carthaginian queen (1.648-652) foreshadows this mapping of Helen's *inconcessi hymenaei* (1.651) onto Dido's union with Aeneas. As Pöschl observes, through Dido and Aeneas "the fatal union of Paris and Helen will be repeated, and rulers and nations will suffer the consequences."[184] As we have already noted,[185] the "wedding" that Juno orchestrates – marked by storm, fire, and wailing – will by echoed by the description of the aftermath of Dido's suicide, particularly by lines 4.667-668:

lamentis ***gemitu****que et* ***femineo ululatu***

---

[179] Jacobson (1987: 167) observes a number of parallels between Dido and the titular Helen of Euripides' tragedy. He suggests that "in certain ways and to some degree Euripides' *Helen* was an influence on Vergil's narrative." Complementing Dido's identification with Helen, Estevez (1978-9: 108-109) points out the validity of Iarbas' identification of Aeneas with Paris (4.215-17): "Aeneas, an outsider and a Trojan, has come and taken up with Dido, on whom Iarbas had an at least defensible prior claim."

[180] Both phrases conclude their verses. We find *pulcherrima Dido* again at 4.60; Venus is the only other figure twice described as *pulcherrima* (4.227, 12.554). While Helen is traditionally credited with possessing the mortal equivalent of Aphrodite's superlative beauty, in the *Aeneid* Dido seems to implicitly hold this honor.

[181] This correspondence between the scene at *Od*. 4.120-136 and *Aen*. 494-508 has been noted by Hayne.

[182] Juno's words concerning Dido's future role (*liceat Phrygio servire marito,* 4.103) perceptibly parallel Helen's injunction to Aphrodite to take on the role of catering to Paris at *Il.* 3.408-9. See Sec. 1.3, p. 39.

[183] Their doomed unions lead both Paris and Dido to their death. Dido's return to Sychaeus takes place in the underworld: *coniunx ubi pristinus illi / respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem* (6.473-4).

[184] Pöschl 1962: 149.

[185] Sec. 2.4, pp. 120-121.

tecta *fremunt, resonat magnis* ***plangoribus*** *aether.*

Homes are a chaos of noises: laments, groans, keening of women.

Skies far above re-echo the breast-drumming, grief-stricken sobbing.

These lines, in turn, develop into a simile that foreshadows the historical sack of Carthage. In their phrasing, they also strongly reference a particularly vivid scene of the human suffering that we find in Book 2's depiction of the destruction of Troy (2.486-9):

at domus interior ***gemitu*** *miseroque tumultu*

miscetur, penitusque cauae ***plangoribus*** *aedes*

femineis ululant*; ferit aurea sidera clamor.*

tum pauidae ***tectis*** *matres ingentibus errant.*

'Screaming chaos reigns in the heart of the palace. The hollow

Hallways howl with the keening of women's laments and the rhythmic

Beating of breasts: vast sound drums glistening stars in its uproar.

Terrified mothers roam aimlessly through huge chambers.

And so, Vergil manages to link the "wedding" at which Juno functions as *pronuba* (4.166) with the eventual death of its "bride" and the destruction of two great cities, one of the past and one of the future.[186]

Dido's wild "wedding," at which *fulsere ignes et conscius aether / conubiis summoque ululârunt vertice Nymphae* (4.168-9), is also paralleled by the "celebration" of yet another ambiguous "wedding" that Juno, via Allecto, instigates. To this scene belongs the only other occurrence of *aether* close to *ululatus/ululare*, and the episode is likewise marked by a wild

[186] Clausen (1987: 24-25) notes this dark correspondence between the description of Dido's nuptials and the wailing of "the women of Troy when Priam's innermost palace was violated" as he connects the Vergilian depiction of the uncanny wedding with the melancholy darkness that marks Apollonius' presentation of the wedding of Jason and Medea (*Arg*. 4.1165-1169).

setting, chaotic disorder, and the perversion of ritual. I refer to the revel of the inflamed (*accensas ...ardor*, 7.392-3) Latin women in Book 7, who abandon their homes, loosen their hair, and *ululatibus aethera complent* (7.395). It is in their midst that Amata

> *... flagrantem fervida pinum*
>
> *sustinet ac natae Turnique canit hymenaeos*
>
> *sanguineam torquens aciem...* (7.397-9).[187]
>
> ... brandishes burning
>
> Pitch-pine and keens her nuptial hymn for her daughter and Turnus,
>
> Whirling the bloodied edge of her glance.

This perverse, sinister ceremony aims at a marriage that can never be, at the *inconcessi hymenaei* that Juno fails to (proleptically) legitimize.[188] And yet, although she cannot actually effect the marriage between Lavinia and Turnus, its very idea – intratextually implicated in a nexus of destructive pseudo marriages – manages to foster destruction on a scale that suggests the devastation suffered by Troy. Moreover, like the dark consequences of the ambiguous marriage of Helen and Paris, the effects of the "union" of Lavinia and Turnus are intimately linked to a legitimate union, one that – in a stark reversal of her Homeric role – Juno tries desperately to sabotage and violate.[189]

In terms of the structures that civilize and order the universe in the *Aeneid*, the union between Lavinia and Aeneas is emphatically legitimate.[190] Not only is it sanctioned by fathers, patriarchs,

---

[187] It is noteworthy that while the narration of Dido's "wedding" gives way to the description of the progress of *Fama* (4.170ff.), in an instance of reverse symmetry, Lavinia's "wedding" is preceded by the mention of *Fama*'s flight (7.392).

[188] Turnus speaks of Lavinia as his *coniunx praerepta* (9.138).

[189] Turnus' correspondence to Paris is underscored when Vergil's likens him to a spirited horse as he runs down from the citadel of Latinus armed for battle (11.492ff.) in a manner that recalls the simile used in the *Iliad* to describe Paris setting out from the Trojan citadel toward the battlefield (6.506ff.). This intertext has been remarked on by Hayne: *ad loc.*, Conington: *ad loc.*, *et al*.

[190] Otis (1963: 322) views it as a "predestined and almost effected union."

and kings, mortal and divine, (Latinus and Jupiter), it even has the approval of Aeneas' first (legitimate) wife (2.783-4). It fits within the fabric of Fate and the stability of the cosmos; its endangerment threatens chaos. Yet, in the first six books of the *Aeneid*, Juno seeks to (proleptically) annihilate it, and when – in Book 7 – she finally does accept its inevitability (*immota manet fatis Lavinia coniunx*, 7.314), she resolves to call up a force of hell to make the marriage as bloody, destructive, and divisive as possible (7.317-22):

> *hac gener atque socer coeant mercede suorum:*
> *sanguine Troiano et Rutulo dotabere, uirgo,*
> *et Bellona manet te pronuba. nec face tantum*
> *Cisseis praegnas ignis enixa iugalis;*
> *quin idem Veneri partus suus et Paris alter,*
> *funestaeque iterum recidiva in Pergama taedae.*
>
> Son-in-law, father-in-law, let them consummate union at this price
> Paid by their peoples. Young bride, you'll receive both Rutulian and Trojan
> Dowries of blood. And Bellona awaits you as matron of honour.
> Hecuba wasn't alone when her womb birthed torches of marriage,
> Pregnant by funeral fire. For the same's true of this second Paris,
> Venus' son; again marriage brings death to a Troy resurrected.

Highet comments that although Juno "is the deity presiding over marriage, she distorts the words appropriate to a wedding so as to give them a sinister meaning: '*gener atque socer*' (which, as in 6.830-831, would remind Roman readers of the civil war), '*dotabere, virgo*,' '*pronuba*,' '*iugalis*,'

'*taedae*.'"[191] She seems to justify her baleful perversion by designating Aeneas the Paris to Lavinia's Helen and thus recasting herself in her previous role of opposition to Aphrodite' sensual, home-wreaking protégé.[192] But her tendentious configuration of how the past maps onto the present cracks under the weight of the realities we find in the *Aeneid*.[193] Beyond the resounding legitimacy of Lavinia's and Aeneas' marriage and the multitude of incongruities that belie the identification of Aeneas' quest for Lavinia with Paris' theft of Helen,[194] Juno's use of the matrimonial and conjugal language reminds us that, in the scope of the Vergil's poem, the goddess' work within this sphere has not shown her actually capable of producing a *proper* marriage, and it is precisely such a lawful bond between Lavinia and Turnus that is required for her configuration to be valid. Aeneas really must violate a legitimate union in order to function as another Paris, the *Dardanius adulter* as Juno calls him (10.92). In effect, in her relation to the "love" triangle of the second half of the *Aeneid*, Juno recalls Aphrodite far more than she does Hera,[195] and it is essentially as a patron of the *inconcessi hymenaei* of Lavinia and Turnus that she dowers the bride with bloody destruction, evoking Aeschylus' description of Helen: ἄγουσά

---

[191] Highet 1972: 162. Cf. Jupiter's words to Juno in Book 12: *potuisti ... luctu miscere hymenaeos* (12.804-5). Juno's dark influence is particularly striking in the context of a narrative that Paschalis (1984: 25-26) shows to be otherwise marked by sustained respect for marriage among both immortals and mortals.

[192] Cf. her words regarding the cause of the Trojan War at 10.90-4:

> *quae causa fuit consurgere in arma*
> *Europamque Asiamque et foedera solvere furto?*
> *me duce Dardanius Spartam expugnavit adulter,*
> *aut ego tela dedi fovive Cupidine bella?*
> What caused all this war, what made all Europe and Asia
> Rise up in arms, cast treaties adrift through treacherous thievery?
> When the adulterous Dardan prince took Sparta, was Juno
> Leading the way? Did I arm him, did I use Cupid as war's nurse?

[193] Anderson (1957: 23, 20 n. 5) observes that this "illegitimate parallel" is a symptom of Juno's "propensity to draw false analogies," which is evidenced by her false analogies with Athena at 1.39ff and Mars and Diana at 7.304ff. Anderson also notes that Vergil underscores the irrationality that underpins Juno's comparison by having the emotional Amata, already inflamed by Allecto, attempt to impress this configuration onto Latinus, an effort marked by patent fabrication and warping (21). For more on the fallacy of the comparison, see Anderson 1969: 75.

[194] Anderson furnishes a thorough analysis of these (1957: 20, 22-29).

[195] The points of correspondence between Turnus and Paris have received the attention of multiple scholars. See, for instance, Anderson (1957: 27-29), Putnam (1965: 225 n. 4), Gransden (1984: 181-183).

τ' ἀντίφερνον Ἰλίῳ φθοράν (*Ag*. 406).[196] Her baleful proclamation further likens her to Aphrodite, for it suggests Euripides' description of the wedding that goddess had orchestrated for Iole (*Hipp.* 545-554):[197]

> τὰν μὲν Οἰχαλίαι
> πῶλον ἄζυγα λέκτρων,
> ἄνανδρον τὸ πρὶν καὶ ἄνυμφον, οἴκων
> ζεύξασ' ἀπ' Εὐρυτίων
> δρομάδα ναΐδ' ὅπως τε βάκ-
> χαν σὺν αἵματι, σὺν καπνῶι,
> φονίοισι νυμφείοις
> Ἀλκμήνας τόκωι Κύπρις ἐξέδωκεν· ὦ
> τλάμων ὑμεναίων.
>
> The filly in Occhalia, unyoked in marriage, with no man and no wedding previously, Cypris yoked her away from Eurytus' house, like a running Naiad or a Bacchant, with blood, with smoke, in a bloody wedding, and gave her away in marriage to Alcmene's son. Oh wretched in your wedding![198]

Intensifying the dark and destructive nature of Juno's connection with marriage, an intriguing subtext adumbrates something transgressive about her love for Turnus. Near the close of the poem, when Jupiter confronts his wife – perched on a cloud – about all she has done in pursuit of her agenda and orders her to go no farther (*ulterius temptare veto*, 12.806), she responds that she has indeed already yielded to his will by abandoning Turnus and the earth (12.808-11):

---

[196] This intertext with Aeschylus has been noted by Conington, *et al*.
[197] See Sec. 1.2, p. 27. Having attacked her city, Heracles had fought with Iole's father and brothers. As far as I can tell, this correspondence has not been previously noted.
[198] Trans. M. R. Halleran.

ista quidem quia nota mihi tua, magne, voluntas,

Iuppiter, et Turnum et terras invita reliqui;

nec tu me aëria solam nunc sede videres

digna indigna pati ...

Jupiter, I, though reluctant, abandoned both Turnus and solid

Earth, since I know it's your will, great lord: What you wanted.

Otherwise you wouldn't see me alone in this aerial setting

Now, taking good with the bad.

Intratextually, the phrase *Turnum ... invita reliqui* echoes Aeneas' declaration to Dido in the underworld (*invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*, 6.460). This, in turn, as Pelliccia has demonstrated, is a "window reference" through Catullus' translation of Callimachus' *Coma Berenices* to a scene in Euripides' *Protesilaus*, featuring the brief return of the title-character from Hades to reunite with his wife Laodamia, who commits suicide upon his final departure.[199] Pelliccia explains that the

> encounter of Dido and Aeneas in the *lugentes campi* seems to be configured as an inverted by-form of that scene: this time the man is alive and the woman dead. In [the story of Protesilaus and Laodamia] the dead lover visits the living one in the upper world, whereas here the living lover visits the dead one in the lower. But if on the surface Dido is dead and Aeneas living, from another perspective Dido is a mortal who happens to have died, and Aeneas, and those he represents, is a future immortal.[200]

Just as an ontological gulf divides (the dead) Protesilaus and (the living) Laodamia, as well as (the living, future immortal) Aeneas and (the mortal, dead) Dido, so one likewise separates (the

[199] Pelliccia 2010: 149.
[200] Pelliccia 2010: 201-202.

immortal) Juno and (mortal) Turnus.[201] In the last case, "the mandate of heaven, which drove Aeneas both away from Carthage and down to Hades, and Dido likewise, forces Turnus' other-worldly ally ... to abandon both him and earth for the upper-world; he is dead in 150 lines."[202] The parallel between Aeneas and Dido, on the one hand, and Juno and Turnus, on the other, is reinforced by an episode in Book 10 that forms a counterpart to Juno's dramatic confession of her unwilling departure: her swooping descent to earth, where she endeavors to extend Turnus' life (10.633-634). Her involvement leads Turnus to a futile chase after a phantom he takes to be Aeneas.[203] And when he realizes that in his delusion he has failed his comrades, abandoning them amidst the dangers of the battlefield, he feels such shame at this loss of honor that he repeatedly attempts to take his life (10.668ff.). Just as Aeneas pities (*miseratur*, 6.476) the tragically deceased Dido, so Juno pities (*miserata*, 10.686) Turnus in his desperation to die. And this subtle implicating of the bond between Juno and Turnus within the richly allusive dynamics of the last encounter between Aeneas and Dido, this mapping of Juno onto the roles of Aeneas and Protesilaus, has the significant effect of subtextually casting the goddess in the role of the departed lover.

Another subtextual voice amplifies the suggestion of an erotic connection between Juno and Turnus, and it comes from the characterization of Juturna. She seems to be Vergil's appropriation of a Roman water-nymph,[204] to whom – likely prompted by her name – he has imparted kinship with Turnus.[205] Although Vergil informs us that Juturna is a former lover of Jupiter, she is rather

---

[201] Pelliccia (2010: 186) considers the separation by an ontological gulf a distinctive feature of the Protesilaus/Laodamia theme.
[202] Pelliccia 2010: 206.
[203] We may think of Dido's desperate "chase" after that same man and of the effigy that she places on her pyre (4.508). As Pease has noted (*ad locum*), this effigy resonates with Laodamia's simulacrum of Protesilaus.
[204] Harrison (*ad* 10.439) relates that she was originally connected with Lavinium and was "well known at Rome through the Lacus Juturnae in the Forum Romanum."
[205] Servius and Varro etymologize the first syllable of her name as deriving from *iuvare*, and D. Servius remarks on the aptness of this etymology for her role in the *Aeneid*: *bene ergo Vergilius Turno fingit sororem, quae laborantes*

anomalous in this role: unlike the great majority of his mortal female conquests, she gains immortality as a reward for the affair and, perhaps most unusually, she is not credited with bearing his child. She is also ardently favored by Jupiter's wife![206] Her unusually close connection with Juno actually operates in Juturna's name. In line with Grandsen, I think that Vergil chose this name because it plays on the names of both Juno and Turnus,[207] between whom Juturna is the last and most devoted intermediary. We might say that, in a way, she symbolizes the relationship between the two, and from this perspective it becomes significant that she is embraced by Juno in the context of her extramarital activity (12.142-5). Furthermore, if we shift our perspective just a little, Juturna also appears as Juno's avatar and takes her place for a good part of Book 12.[208] This viewpoint, in turn, unlocks a new level of significance within the narrative of Juturna's leave-taking of Turnus at 12.869ff. Her frustration at her inability to accompany Turnus into the underworld and deprecation of her divine immortality, as commentators have long observed, parallels Aphrodite's bewailing the fact that as a goddess she cannot follow her dead lover Adonis into Hades – particularly in the form this lament receives in

---

iuvare consuevit (*ad* 12.139; *L. L.* 5.71). Vergil was likely aware of this aptness, although a consideration of whether Juturna actually helps Turnus (on which, for instance, see Lyne 1987: 139-44) puts this etymology into doubt.

[206] The strangeness of Juno's warmth toward Juturna is underscored by the image on her brother's shield: Io, the famous victim of Juno's jealous wrath (7.789-92). Thus, Quinn (1969: 258) remarks that "the reader is apt to be puzzled by the spectacle of the embarrassed efforts of the queen of the gods to enlist the aid for her own ends of her husband's former mistress." Highet (1972: 266) comments that in "her final intrigue, encouraging Juturna to aid Turnus (*Aen*. 12.142-153), Juno speaks like Hera to Thetis in Apollonius's *Argon*. 4.783-832 – except that her bitter reference to Jupiter's many Latin mistresses is the reverse of what Hera says to Thetis in *Argon*. 4.790-797, and is a distant echo of the catalogue of conquests which the Homeric Zeus deploys in *Il*. 14.315-328."

[207] Gransden 1984: 195.

[208] Juturna's love for Turnus parallels Juno's own affection. The "replacement" of Juno by Juturna has been noted by Otis (1963: 378).

Bion' *Epitath on Adonis*.[209] In effect, through Juturna, Juno becomes assimilated to Aphrodite, specifically to the downtrodden Aphrodite mourning her doomed, beautiful, mortal lover. [210]

Finally, before concluding this section, let us take a closer look at how – in keeping with the intimations of an extramarital entanglement – Juno echoes Aphrodite vis-à-vis the most basic and fundamental element of social organization, the family unit. We saw that in the Greek tradition Aphrodite's pernicious effects on legitimate marriage often translate into a destabilization of the integrity of the *oikos* and beyond. Similarly, in the *Aeneid* Juno undermines the stability of the royal marriage of Latinus and Amata, and this disturbance, in turn, fractures familial and social cohesion of the state at large. Through the Fury, she exacerbates Amata's disagreement with her husband concerning their daughter's marriage into a mad opposition that quickly develops into Amata's frenzied abandonment of the home.[211] The patriarch's will, along with his entire household, is overwhelmed: *consilium... omnemque domum vertisse Latini* (7.407). In turn, Amata's madness inflames other matrons (*accensas*, 7.392), who likewise desert their homes (*deseruere domos*, 7.394). Both his kin and his people turn against the king.[212] Finally, the royal house is shattered by Amata's suicide. Jupiter vividly sums up Juno's effect: *potuisti... deformare domum* (12.804-5). Like an uncontrollable fire, disorder spreads from the nucleus of the family to the community at large.

---

[209] Heyne: *ad* 12.878, *et al*. For an in-depth analysis of the parallel and its numerous points of contact, see Reed (2007: 49-53, 68-69). To these points we might add the correspondence between Aphrodite's and Juturna's fear (σε φοβεῦμαι, 57; *ne me terrete timentem*, 12.875) of the infernal power that takes their beloved young men away from them. In turn, Juturna's fear of Jupiter's omen (12.854), which conveys his *iussa superba* (12.877), is an intratextual echo of Juno's fear of Jupiter's orders (*tua tristia dicta timentem*, 10.612). Reed devotes an entire chapter to the insightful interpretation of Turnus as an Adonis figure (44-72).

[210] Adonis' beauty is a central motif in Bion's poem; correspondingly, Turnus is introduced as *pulcherrimus* (7.55; Reed 2007: 61).

[211] Quinn (1969: 181) describes Amata's behavior as a "flagrant disregard of her duty as wife and queen."

[212] In opposing Latinus, Turnus turns against his own kin, for Amata speaks to Latinus of his pledge to *consanguineus Turnus* (7.366), and the king himself tells Turnus that he promised him Lavinia because he had been won over by his *cognatus sanguis* (12.29).

Juno incites all this disorder by eliciting from Allecto her *proprium laborem* (7.331), which includes devastation of families and homes (7.335-8):

> *tu potes unanimos armare in proelia fratres*[213]
>
> *atque odiis versare domos, tu verbera tectis*
>
> *funereasque inferre faces, tibi nomina mille,*[214]
>
> *mille nocendi artes. ...*
>
> You can get brothers, harmonious souls, to don armour for battle,
>
> Overturn households with hate, you can introduce floggings and death-fires
>
> Into men's homes. You have names by the thousand, a thousand artistic
>
> Methods of hurting the world.

Allecto's torch also incites a mad desire for war in Turnus (*amor ferri*, 7.461), and his love for Lavinia blazes up as bloody violence that ultimately engulfs both the inhabitants of Italy and the newly arrived Trojans.[215] Juno has it wrong: it is Turnus, not Aeneas, who is the second Paris, who echoes the torch that burned Troy (7.319-322). The assessment of her role that Jupiter imparts to Juno toward the end of the *Aeneid* could just as well be applied to Aphrodite's role in the Trojan War: *potuisti infandum accendere bellum, / deformare domum et luctu miscere hymenaeos* (12.804-5). Moreover, although he is addressing the situation in Italy, his words also reflect Juno's involvement in Carthage. In the words of Feeney, "by producing a marriage that is not a marriage" and "causing hostility between Aeneas and Dido" Juno has made "inevitable the eventual destruction of Carthage which she is fighting to prevent."[216] As we have seen, Vergil's

---

[213] Cf. *Antigone* 781, 793-794 (Ἔρως ... σὺ ... τόδε νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον ἔχεις ταράξας), featured in the survey of Aphrodite's devastating influence on the *oikos* in Sec. 1.2, pp. 26-27.
[214] Cf. Sophocles' Frag. 941.2-3, where Aphrodite is credited with a multitude of names, including Hades (Sec. 1.2, p. 30).
[215] For the connection between Turnus' violence and his love for Lavinia, particularly as it is brought out by Vergil's description of Lavinia's blush at 12.64ff., see Putnam 1965: 158-9.
[216] Feeney 1991: 146.

depiction of the wedding that Juno orchestrates for Dido is marked by intimations of chaos and destruction, which are, in turn, amplified by intratextual correspondences with the scene of city-wide devastation that follows her death, itself foreshadowing the far greater destruction that will ensue in the course of the historical conflict between the people of Rome and Carthage.

2.6. Juno: hateful and disempowered.

In line with the treatment of Aphrodite within the Greek tradition, Juno appears limited, overpowered, and disempowered within the course of the *Aeneid*.[217] Right at the outset of the poem, we encounter a situation that bears a number of correspondences to what Aphrodite experiences in *Iliad* 5.[218] In orchestrating a sea storm against problematic mortals, Juno does nothing that many a god has not done before: divine manipulation of sea winds is a commonplace in myth. She herself cites an example of this practice in her description of the storm produced by Minerva against Ajax (1.39-45). Therefore, like Aphrodite' venture into the battlefield in Homer, Juno's incitement of the storm against the Trojans falls within the range of shared divine prerogatives. And yet, as in the case of Aphrodite, her activity is framed as utterly inappropriate and transgressive. Though Neptune does not reprimand Juno directly, as Zeus does Aphrodite, his chastisement of Juno' agent invites a comparison. Zeus tells Aphrodite (5.428-30):

> οὔ τοι τέκνον ἐμὸν δέδοται πολεμήϊα ἔργα,
>
> ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἱμερόεντα μετέρχεο ἔργα γάμοιο,
>
> ταῦτα δ' Ἄρηϊ θοῷ καὶ Ἀθήνῃ πάντα μελήσει.
>
> No, my child, not for you are the works of warfare. Rather

[217] Spence (1988: 29) remarks that while the *Aeneid*'s pantheon "gives Neptune and Jupiter clear power and duties," it "leaves Juno with nothing that is rightfully hers."
[218] See Sec. 1.3, pp. 31, 36-37.

concern yourself only with the lovely works of marriage,

while all this shall be left to Athene and swift Ares.[219]

Correspondingly, aware of the actual instigator of the storm (*nec latuere doli fratrem Iunonis et irae*, 1.130), Neptune instructs the east wind to deliver the following message to Aeolus (1.138-41):

non illi imperium pelagi saevumque tridentem,

sed mihi sorte datum. tenet ille immania saxa,

vestras, Eure, domos; illa se iactet in aula

Aeolus et clauso ventorum carcere regnet.

Ocean's High Command and the savage Trident of Office

Weren't allotted to him but to me. His province is large rocks,

Homes, east wind, for your kind. That's the right court for Aeolus' bluster,

Playing at king. But the winds must be kept in their cells with the doors locked!

Through their respective speeches, both Zeus and Neptune tell their addressees that the sphere of activity into which they have ventured has not been granted to them – but to others – and that they should limit themselves to their own (narrow) domains.[220]

What is more, Neptune proceeds to work against his sister's goal so that, inasmuch as Aphrodite had not been able to properly rescue Aeneas on the battlefield, Juno cannot properly destroy him. The winds yield to Neptune's authority. Likewise, Juno's other instruments must yield to Jupiter's power. The Olympian king uses her trusty sidekick Iris against her when he

[219] Trans. R. Lattimore, modified.

[220] In a more subtle resonance with *Iliad* 5, Venus' criticism of Juno's disgraceful behavior before Neptune parallels Athena's mockery of Aphrodite's defeat before Zeus (*Il.* 5.422-425): Venus complains about Juno's corruption of Trojan women (*per scelus ...actis*, 5.793) and thus echoes Athena's derision of Aphrodite as the corruptor of Greek women.

employs the winged goddess to stop Juno from supporting Turnus in Book 9.[221] Juturna departs from Turnus in recognition of Jupiter's commands (*nec fallunt iussa superba / magnanimi Iovis*, 12.877-8). Juno herself orders Allecto to leave earth before the Fury can further advance her cause because she anticipates Jupiter's displeasure at the creature's transgression into the upper world (7.545ff.). In Book 12, Jupiter directly and emphatically limits Juno's influence in Italy: *ulterius temptare veto* (12.806). His prohibition leads to the defeat of her side in war and to her loss of Turnus. Furthermore, this final humiliation of Juno is, in a way, accomplished with her instrument turned against her yet again. While the goddess, as her last recourse (7.311), had turned to a Fury and used her as her most destructive weapon, Jupiter likewise employs a Fury as his final, crushing gesture of opposition to Juno's machinations. Recalling Allecto, this Fury also overwhelms Turnus with her supernatural malevolence and in so doing precipitates his death. Thus, somewhat like Aphrodite in the *HHA*, Juno is defeated at her own game, and like Aphrodite, she cannot save her beloved human from his mortal destiny. Again echoing Aphrodite, she acknowledges that the Olympian king has the power (*qui potes*, 10.632) to do what she cannot. And in view of this, it becomes significant that Jupiter had in fact previously saved a member of Turnus' own family from death: he made his sister immortal. From this perspective, Juturna corresponds to Ganymede in the *HHA* and becomes a symbol of Jupiter's supreme power, to which Juno must subordinate herself. Indeed, in Book 10 the goddess is *summissa* (611) as she asks Jupiter to allow her to lead Turnus away from the fighting.

At this point in the story, Juno manages to rescue Turnus from destruction at the hands of a man who happens to be the superior warrior and has the legitimate claim to Lavinia. In so doing, the goddess again suggests Aphrodite, the rescuer of Paris from Menelaus. Moreover, Juno's

[221] Through Iris, he issues the stern command: *nec contra vires audet Saturnia Iuno sufiicere* (9.802).

creation of a phantom Aeneas to mislead Turnus recalls Apollo's creation of a phantom Aeneas to mislead Diomedes at *Iliad* 5.449-50 and invites a recollection of the Homeric context:[222] Aphrodite takes notice of her imperiled son and rushes into the battlefield, saving him from immediate death (5.311-7); she takes him out of the fighting (ὑπεξέφερεν πολέμοιο, 5.318) but is ultimately frustrated in her efforts by Diomedes, who pierces her with his sharp (ὀξέϊ, 5.336) spear, inflicting intense pain (ἀλύουσ[α] ... τείρετο δ' αἰνῶ ... ἀχθομένην ὀδύνῃσι, 5.352, 354) and forcing her to abandon Aeneas; Apollo steps in just in time, while the goddess departs back to Olympus, where she laments that she has been bested by a mortal (5.361-362, 376-380). Aphrodite's experience features multiple points of contact with that of Juno. We might think of Juno's removal of Turnus from battle (*pugnae subducere,* 10.615) and the fact that her rescue saves the man only from the destruction at hand. Like Diomedes, Aeneas ultimately gets the best of the goddess, as she is forced to depart and leave Turnus behind.[223] Additional parallels become apparent if we move beyond the literal and widen our scope. In Book 7, as Juno takes notice that Aeneas is beginning to settle in Italy and is thus laying waste to all her plans, she is stopped in her tracks *acri fixa dolore* (291): she is stopped by a figurative piercing that resonates with her figurative wound (*vulnus* 1.36) at the outset of the poem. Finally, she laments that she has been defeated by Aeneas (*uincor ab Aenea*, 7.310), the mortal who brings harm to her earthly protégés. All in all, the Olympian queen strongly resonates with the wounded, ineffectual Aphrodite and channels her undignified weakness.

---

[222] Noted by Hayne: *ad* 633, *et al*. The correspondence is strengthened by the description of Juno's creation as fitted with arms like those on the original (10.638-9), since Apollo's phantom is also made to resemble Aeneas in his armor (τεύχεσι τοῖον, 5.450).

[223] The quality conveyed by *indigna* in Juno's asyndetic expression of how she feels at 12.811 (*digna indigna pati*) fits in with the indignity of Aphrodite's injury.

In the previous section, we have observed that Juno's powerlessness, which stands in striking contrast to her characterization as *omnipotens* at 4.663 and 7.428*,* also likens her to Aphrodite, particularly as she appears in the *HHA*. I would now like to return to this paradoxical component of Juno's characterization and consider it in greater detail. Juno is first called *omnipotens* as Dido suffers a drawn-out and painful death. Like Aphrodite in the *Hippolytus*, Juno has sacrificed the queen to get the better of a detested mortal.[224] But her handing-over of the ruler of her favorite city to serve Aeneas (*liceat Phrygio servire marito*, 4.103) fails to accomplish its purpose. Aeneas sails to Italy while Dido dies, and Carthage suffers the tragic loss of its founder. The designation of Juno as *omnipotens* serves to ironically highlight her ineffectuality: none of the goddess' goals have been accomplished and, sadly, she appears most successful in facilitating the acceleration of Dido's death. In fact, even this "accomplishment" intimates her failings. Phillips has shown that Juno's role in helping release Dido from her final agony evokes her cultic function as Juno Lucina, called upon by women for a release from the agonies of childbirth. This subtext, in turn, brings out her inability – particularly embarrassing for the divine patron of marriage – to enact for Dido a *conubium stabile* (cf. 4.126), in which reproductive fruitfulness plays an integral part (cf. 1.73-5).[225] The second occurrence of Juno's qualification as *omnipotens* is similarly ironic. Vergil puts it in the mouth of Allecto, to whom – as we have already noted – Juno turns only because she has failed elsewhere. And although Allecto does accomplish for Juno the delay of Lavinia's wedding and the concomitant devastation that she seeks, the war that the Fury unleashes also showcases Juno's powerlessness to save her beloved Turnus. Overall, as

[224] It is particularly ironic that both Phaedra and Dido are destroyed by a goddess to whom each had erected a temple (*Hip*. 30-1).
[225] Phillips 1977: *passim*.

Johnson has observed, much of Vergil's "poem is directed to showing that *omnipotens* is one thing that [Juno] is precisely not."[226]

As a final point, we should note that the alignment of Juno's characterization with the "dark" characterizations of the goddess of love and her power extends even to the language of censure and rejection. While this language is not applied directly to Juno, we find it in connection with her agents, whom, as we saw, the text encourages us to view as extensions of the goddess.[227] In terms of implicit censure, we find Iris qualified as *haud ignara nocendi* (5.618) as she is about to incite the Trojan women into a state of destructive and disgraceful frenzy. A more explicit sense of moral condemnation and rejection operates in the characterization of the infernal monster Allecto, a *pestis aspera* (7.505). We are told that she delights in such evils as *tristia bella* and *crimina noxia* (7.325-6); her own family hates her: *odit et ipse pater Pluton, odere sorores / Tartareae monstrum* (7.327-8); and, recalling EROS, the universally hated κακὸν, she is termed an *invisum numen* (7.571).

2.7. Concluding remarks

In the previous chapter, we observed that a persistent doubleness animates the process of Venus' characterization as divergent voices articulate competing versions of Aeneas' divine mother. In this chapter, we have found that this duality is further negotiated through the "absorption" of some of the love goddess' dark *fama* by her divine adversary Juno. This process of displacement is dramatized *intra*textually as the nefarious modes of influence that initially define the workings of Venus are, over the course of the poem, embraced by Juno and her agents. *Inter*textually, Juno's characterization features imagistic, narrative, and structural elements that echo the Greek

[226] Johnson 1976: 68.
[227] Sec. 2.2, p. 103.

articulation of Aphrodite. Surprisingly, although she is ostensibly the deity who embodies the cultural construction of marriage, that is, the regulatory mechanism that aims to limit and contain the primal energy of Aphrodite/Venus, Vergil's Juno appears more transgressively elemental than the *Aeneid*'s goddess of love.[228] In effect, at a certain level, Juno functions as Venus' problematic alter ego, fundamentally related to the love goddess in her methods and in her participation in Aphrodite' poetic makeup. Thus, although the storyline radically distances the two goddesses and defines their relationship as one of antagonistic polarity, this explicit divergence is implicitly destabilized by the deep affinities that underpin their individual characterizations.

[228] Hera's patronage of marriage extends to its discontents: in her poetic articulations, she often embodies the wrath elicited by marital infidelity.

CHAPTER 3 Loving or Hating Aeneas: "Same Difference"

3.1. Dido: *odi et amo*

If we remark that over the course of Book 4, Dido's passionate love (*amor*) turns into hateful anger (*ira*), it appears that we are stating the obvious. Remarks such as "the fires of hatred … replace the fires of love" have the ring of platitude.[1] But we need to be cautious about such seemingly self-evident and commonplace observations because they can bring with them implicit assumptions that are, upon closer consideration, problematic. Firstly, this type of perspective suggests that the emergence of Dido's hate entails the disappearance of her love: if love transforms *into* hate, then it itself ceases to exist; secondly, it implicitly fixes love and hate in the configuration of a sharply oppositional dichotomy. But is this what Vergil shows us? In fact, he presents the two emotions in remarkably similar terms. Dido's love inflames her and drives her into frenzy;[2] her hateful indignation is marked by a corresponding burning and madness.[3] If we consider the presentation of each passion on the level of Vergil's poetics, no patent difference sets them apart. The poet writes of Dido's *amor*, as he writes of Dido's *ira*; the former seamlessly blends into the latter.[4] Going back to the first assumption, might we then say that this pronounced alignment in the experience of love and hate facilitates the process of transformation by way of which *ira* essentially replaces *amor*? Even here we need to be careful so as to allow for the "messy" complexity of Dido's emotional journey. For Vergil tells us that Dido's hateful rage – even after she loses hope, sees the ruin of her life, and resolves to die – exists alongside

---

[1] Newton 1957: 43.
[2] *ardescit* 1.713; *incensum animum*, 4.54; *furentem*, 4.65; *furens*, 4.69; *furorem*, 4.101, *furentem* 4.548, etc.
[3] *furenti,* 4.298*; incensa,* 4.300; *furias*, 4.474; *furiis incensa,* 4.376; *furores*, 4.501; *furibunda,* 4.646, etc.
[4] Commenting on "the ease with which Dido's erotic passion converts to … violence," Oliensis (1997: 307) writes that "the two fires burn with a single heat."

her love: *ingeminant curae rursusque resurgens / saevit amor magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu* (4.531-2). The initial words intimate both the fundamental affinity and the distinctness of the passions that trouble Dido's heart: *ingeminant curae*. Quinn notes the "*odi et amo*" mood to which she is subject.[5] Her hatred and love are not the same, but they are intimately connected; the love animates the anger. Even after she contemplates a gruesome retribution and utters a hate-filled curse against Aeneas, even in the final moments of her life, Dido is still moved by the sweet relics of love.[6] As Lyne observes, although her closing words suggest her continuing hate, her very last gesture reveals her continuing love: "she kisses the bed she lies on, that is to say, the 'marriage-bed'" – *os impressa toro*.[7]

We have already noted that in the throes of her angry passion Dido begins to resemble Juno.[8] At this point, I would like to draw attention to the remarkable closeness of this alignment. It begins within the narrative of the pain Dido experiences while she looks down on the sea shore, where the Trojans are readying themselves for departure: ***arce*** *ex summa*, ***totum****que* ***videres / misceri*** *ante oculos tantis* ***clamoribus aequor*** (4.410-411). The words subtly resonate with the first account of Juno's intervention, likewise prompted by the sight of the Trojans setting sail toward Italy: the goddess approaches Aeolus, who is seated *celsa* ***arce*** (1.56); the great storm he unleashes for her disturbs (***misceri,*** 1.124) the sea and elicits a loud reaction from the overwhelmed Trojans (***clamor***, 1.87); it causes Neptune to see Aeneas' fleet scattered over the

---

[5] Quinn 1969: 146.
[6] 4.648ff. Perceiving the complexity of Dido's disposition towards Aeneas even in view of her marked hostility, Gillis (1983: 52) remarks that to "cross the fine line between love and hate is not to escape love."
[7] Lyne 1987: 47. Lyne sees this ambivalence operating even in Dido' final sentence (*hauriat hunc oculis ignem crudelis ab alto / Dardanus, et nostrae secum ferat omina mortis,* 4.661-2) and remarks that she resembles Evadne in the manner of her death (47-49). Quinn (1969: 170) argues that Dido's love for Aeneas persists even in the underworld "with that turmoil of love mixed with hate (the *odi et amo* complex)" she felt while alive. Similarly, Gillis (1983: 52) interprets Dido's characterization as *ardens* while she hears Aeneas' pleading words in Book 6 as signifying "with loving anger and angry love."
[8] Sec. 2.4, p. 118.

entire sea (***toto videt aequore***, 1.128). Points of correspondence are also furnished by Juno's meeting with Jupiter in Book 12, in which we find the verbal alignment of Dido' suffering with the pain of her divine patron (*tantum dolorem*, 4.419; *tantus dolor*, 12.801). Moreover, the manner in which Juno humbles herself before Jupiter (*summissa,* 10.611) as she pleads for Turnus is reminiscent of the desperate entreaties *(summittere,* 4.414) Dido directs at Aeneas.[9] Indeed, the broad context within which the characteristically *infelix* Dido spies (*prospiceres*, 4.410) the preparations of the happy (*laeti*, 4.418) Trojans features a number of close parallels with a scene in Book 7 in which Juno, likewise from high above, spies (*prospexit* 7.289) the happy (*laetum*, 7.288) Aeneas and his Trojans as they undertake their settlement in Italy. Both queens are *infelix* (4.450; 7.309); both implore and both fail to persuade;[10] both declare themselves vanquished by Aeneas (*victam*, 4.434; *vincor*, 7.310). Amor compels Dido not to leave anything untried (*ne quid inexpertum ... relinquat*, 4.415), just as Juno, driven by her passionate hatred, admits that she could not leave anything unattempted (*nil linquere inausum*, 7.308). In the end, both Dido and Juno turn from the light and toward death's domain. The language and imagery of horror (*horrendum*, 4.454; *horrenda*, 7.323) follow this pivotal shift in Book 4 and Book 7. If we turn to the account of the terrible omens and visions that torment Dido at 4.452-473 and compare it with lines 7.313-340 (which narrate the horrors Juno envisions for Lavinia' nuptials along with the procurement of Allecto to help bring these about), we notice that both passages feature words denoting or related to night, darkness, arming, blood, death, savagery, snakes, furies, and torches. Dido is experiencing the dreadfulness of a marriage

[9] Tarrant (2012: *ad* 12.800) observes that "it is unusual for a god to direct *preces* to another god." He also remarks that *preces* are a standard ploy of the elegiac lover.
[10] Juno admits her inability to persuade the upper powers: *implorare ... flectere ... nequeo superos* (7.311-2).

fashioned by Juno; in Book 7, Juno sets about refashioning the inevitable marriage between Aeneas and Lavinia by infusing it with the dreadfulness of war and death.

3.2. Juno's erotic hate

The more saturated with hate that her love becomes, the more Dido becomes assimilated to her divine patron. Much of this intratextual alignment, however, comes into force in the second half of the poem and thus prompts a first-time reader to recall Dido while reading about Juno. In effect, the sequential directionality of these later correspondences positions Dido as the model that Juno herself echoes. In effect, the connection between the two queens involves a complex multidirectional process of alignment: Dido becomes more like Juno in the course of her story, and correspondingly, in the course of the poem's narrative Juno is progressively revealed to be like Dido. Does this dynamic affinity between the two characters inform not only the nature of Dido's passion but also the makeup of Juno's feelings? What do we make of the fact that a comparable fervor drives both the woman and the goddess to obsessively fixate on one and the same man? Engagement with these questions reveals an intriguing possibility: the seething tide of Juno's hatred toward Aeneas is complicated by an erotic undercurrent. Indeed, at many points in the epic, Vergil's poetics intimate as much.

Juno enters the *Aeneid* with her eyes fixed on Aeneas and his men; her very first words along with the description that precedes them are dense with inter- and intratextual resonances that suggest an erotic preoccupation: *aeternum servans sub pectore vulnus / haec secum: 'mene incepto desistere victam* (1.36-37).[11] The location of Juno's figurative wound maps onto the erotic afflictions we find – likewise at line-end – in Theocritus and Bion: shot by Aphrodite,

[11] McCallum (2012: 162-163) shows that throughout "the opening description of Juno, the language and motifs of erotic elegy underscore the amatory nature of her grievances and symbolic *uulnus*."

Theocritus' love-sick Poylphemus is depicted as ἔχων ὑποκάρδιον ἕλκος, while Bion's Aphrodite φέρει ποτικάρδιον ἕλκος.[12] An *intra*textual parallel confirms the erotic subtext: in Book 4, we find a verse that again ends with *sub pectore vulnus,* and here the phrase is clearly depicting an erotic wounding: ***est*** *mollis flamma medullas / interea et* ***tacitum*** *vivit* ***sub pectore vulnus / uritur infelix*** *Dido (*4.67-69).[13] This parallel, moreover, fits within a network of correspondences that, over the course of the poem, align Juno's passion with Dido's erotic fervor. The burning of the mortal queen echoes the burning of the goddess: ***urit*** *atrox Iuno* (1.662).[14] In Book 12, repeating the conceit of a silent emotional consumption, Jupiter speaks of the pain that silently eats away at Juno (*te tantus* ***edit tacitam dolor***, 801). The erotic coloring of Juno's *dolor* can also be glimpsed in Book 7; it appears in her reaction as she spies Aeneas and his men on the Italian coast. Thinking that they no longer care about her *(securi mei*, 7.304),[15] the goddess is stricken with pain as though with a sharp arrow: *stetit acri fixa dolore* (7.291). And this metaphor links her *aeternum vulnus* more closely with the erotic wound of Dido, figuratively struck with the arrow of a shepherd who stands for both Cupid and Aeneas (4.69-73).[16] Hershkowitz observes that the passage presents Juno "as an abandoned woman, with

---

[12] *Idyll* 11.15 and *Epitath on Adonis* 17, respectively. Reed (1997: *ad locum*) notes that Bion seems to have used Theocritus as his model.

[13] Gransden (1984: 71), Hershkowitz (1998: 97 n.87), and Keith (2000: 113) remark on the parallel between the wounds suffered by Juno and Dido. Keith comments: "The reminiscence of Juno's injured godhead in the description of Dido's wound links the Carthaginian queen closely to her divine patroness and invites us to see in the fate of Dido a displacement of the motif introduced in connection with Juno. Indeed, Juno's pity for Dido's suffering at the close of the book may be in some sense motivated by recognition of the displacement of the deadly effect of her own eternal wound on her protégé."

[14] Both forms of *uro* begin their respective lines.

[15] Incidentally, there are only four other instances of the adjective *securus* in the *Aeneid* (1.290, 1.350, 6.715, 10.326), and only twice does it also appear with a complementary genitive. On both of these occasions, it is linked with erotic love: *securus amorum* (1.350, 10.326).

[16] This nexus of correspondences between Juno and Dido has been perceived by Putnam (1985: 10), who also remarks that the "grief and suffering of Dido, Juno's emotional pawn, can in part be traced back ultimately to the suffering of the goddess herself" (1965: 70). On the metaphor of a *telum* of pain, see Lyne (1987: 56). In his discussion of the figurative use of *figo* in Latin literature, he notes "the frequent image represented by, e.g., Plaut. *Pers*. 25, '*saggita Cupido cor meum transfixit*.'" *acri* also appears in Apollo's subjugation by his love for Iapyx: *acri quondam ... captus amore* (12.392). Moreover, when Vergil elucidates Juno's motivation for sending Iris to Sicily

Aeneas placed in the role of the lover/deserter; the whole scene plays like a perversion of the typical female lament."[17] These erotic undertones, in turn, encourage a closer look at the presentation of Juno's *vulnus* at the at the outset of the poem's narrative.

The depiction of her wounded heart immediately precedes and contextualizes Juno's first words in the *Aeneid* (1.36-37): ***aeternum*** *servans sub pectore* ***vulnus /*** *haec secum: 'mene incepto* ***de****sistere* ***victam***. They commence a monologue with a counterpart in Juno's monologue in Book 7, where once again the goddess decries her defeat as she notices that the Trojans have made progress in the achievement of their destiny. This second monologue directly identifies the agent of Juno's conquest: *vincor ab Aenea* (7.310).[18] The elaboration becomes significant if we note that Vergil has unmistakably reworked at the beginning of his poem an element from the opening of another work: Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*. The latter poet's introduction features Venus in a tender moment with Mars, who is rendered vulnerable by his love for the goddess (***aeterno devictus vulnere*** *amoris*, 1.34). This intertext, in turn, directs us to its counterpart in *Aeneid* 8, the characterization of Vulcan as ***aeterno*** . . . ***devinctus*** *amore* (8.394), which in its clever play on Lucretius' *devictus* prompts thought of the god's Odyssean model. The text thus accomplishes an allusive alignment of Juno's feelings with those of the Homeric Hephaistos, who is spurned by his beautiful wife in favor of the better-looking Ares and so progresses from love to vengeful hate. This alignment is facilitated by the fact that the goddess' hatred of Aeneas is rooted in her experience of a similar rebuff: *iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae*

---

with the words *necdum antiquum* ***saturata dolorem*** (5.608), his phrasing imparts a subtle eroticism to Juno's *dolor* inasmuch as it suggests a reminisce of Catullus 68B.83: *noctibus in longis avidum* ***saturasset amorem***.

[17] Hershkowitz 1998: 97 n. 87. She links Juno with Catullus' Ariadne: like Ariadne, Juno "sees (*prospicere*) the unexpected sight of Aeneas and his fleet (7. 289, Catull. 64. 52, 61-2); both pour out their heartfelt words *(effundit pectore*, 7. 292; *fudisse e pectore*, Catull. 64. 125); both lament that they followed their men unsuccessfully (7. 299-300, Catull. 64. 180-1); Ariadne complains that Theseus abandons her *neglecto numine divum* ('with the divinity of the gods neglected', Catull. 64-134) and Juno complains that her *numen* is not powerful enough to hold back Aeneas (7. 297, 3 10-11)."

[18] Hershkowitz (1998: 97 n. 87) notes the sexual coloring of Juno's words.

(1.127). Indeed, we can observe that, inasmuch as it targets her sexual attractiveness, involves the preferment of another female, and is enacted by an exceptionally handsome young man (the perfect candidate for a deity's human lover), the rejection Juno experiences from by Paris is essentially an erotic affront.[19] In a sense, Juno, like Dido, is a "woman scorned,"[20] and the identification of Aeneas with Paris, which recurs throughout the *Aeneid*, gains in significance, most especially when it is articulated by Juno herself.[21] In Book 7, she calls Venus' son *Paris alter* (321). In viewing Aeneas as just another version of the man who rebuffed her sexual appeal, she implicates him in the erotic underpinnings of her passionate hate.

3.3. The erotic mother

Our examination of the obsessions that haunt Dido and Juno in Vergil's poem reveals that love and hate do not neatly fit into a binary paradigm, but rather tend to coexist in a messy, complicated fusion. We might think of them as occurring along a spectrum, one that encompasses the permutations of an ardent passion fixated on a particular person in connection with whom both sensory experience and internal reflection can entail great joy or great pain. This passion overwhelms its subjects and can drive them to behave in extreme ways and with extraordinary persistence. Interestingly, our definition suggests another boundless passion within the poem. Though it cannot be classified as erotic love or hate, it closely fits the above parameters. I speak of Venus' vehement love for her son.[22]

---

[19] Lyne (1987: 95) remarks that Juno's anger is not the expression of moral outrage but of the offence she takes at personal affronts, including a slight to her sexuality.

[20] I borrow Lyne's (1987: 46) characterization of the Carthaginian queen. Reinforcing Juno's participation in this gendered "category," Book 7 also aligns her with its most notorious representative, for, as Highet (1972: 268) observes, "forecasting disaster for the betrothal of Aeneas and Lavinia (317-322), she echoes the oath of Medea discarded and humiliated (Eur. *Med.* 395-400). As Medea, after determining to kill her victims, says 'ειέν' (*Med.* 385-386), so Juno (313) says '*esto*.'"

[21] See Sec. 2.1, p. 98.

[22] For a consideration of Venus' immense devotion to her son, see Appendix 1.

Like Dido and Juno, Venus suffers because of Aeneas. She is likewise driven to demeaningly lower herself on his account: she feels forced *preces descendere in omnis* (5.782),[23] a declaration instantiated within the poem by her tearful pleading before Jupiter (*lacrimis* 1.238) and her stance as *supplex* before both Cupid (1.666) and Vulcan (8.382).[24] In a number of ways, her experience parallels that of Dido, similarly compelled: *ire iterum in* ***lacrimas****, iterum temptare* ***precando /*** *cogitur et* ***supplex*** *animos summittere amori* (4.413-414). In fact, in her words to Cupid concerning her plans for the queen, Venus herself draws attention to the correspondence of her love with the love she plans for Dido; she feels that Dido must begin to love Aeneas as much as she herself does: *magno Aeneae mecum teneatur amore* (1.674-675).[25] Through this desire for Dido to love Aeneas as she herself does, a desire that is itself an expression of her maternal love, Venus seems to imbue Dido's passion with a dose of maternal "flavor." She has Cupid take on the guise of little Ascanius so that he can kindle an erotic fire by way of awaking the queen's maternal instincts: *cum te gremio accipiet laetissima Dido … cum dabit amplexus atque oscula dulcia figet* (1.685, 687).[26] Thus, the maternal *cura* (1.663) that had prompted Venus' plan resonates with and, in a sense, re-emerges in Dido's erotic affliction at the outset of Book 4: *regina gravi iamdudum saucia* ***cura*** (4.1). Indeed, we soon learn that a symptom of Dido's lovesickness entails a mixing of her erotic and maternal inclinations: *gremio Ascanium genitoris imagine capta / detinet, infandum si fallere possit amorem* (4.84-85).[27] She endeavors to assuage her erotic yearning through recourse to maternal behavior. We witness this blending

---

[23] Cf. Juno's self-exhortation: *dubitem haud equiden implorare quod usquam est* (7.311). In Juno's case, the lowering becomes literal as she descends from the heavens to earth (7.292-293, 323) to seek aid from the depths of the underworld.

[24] Vulcan tells her *absiste precando* (8.403). As noted above (Sec. 3.1, note 9), the use of *preces* between gods is unusual.

[25] For this reading of *mecum* see, e.g., Heyne, Conington, Austin, *ad loc*.

[26] Cupid carries out his mother's instruction: *reginam petit. haec oculis, haec pectore toto / haeret et interdum gremio fovet inscia Dido* (1.716-717).

[27] Dido's affinity with Euripides' Phaedra complements this mixing. For this affinity see, e.g., Hardie 1997: 322.

of mother and lover for the last time as the queen tells Aeneas that she could bear his departure if their union had produced a child that would echo his face for her (4.328-329). [28] But as Dido's passion progresses toward hateful rage, the maternal coloring fades. In fact, as we near the end of her story, we can detect a reversal: she contemplates a dreadful killing of little Aeneas (4.601-602), and, as Oliensis has observed, the "theme of the murderous mother" marks her dreams the night before she dies.[29]

Numerous correspondences linking Dido with Venus in her guise of a Carthaginian maiden contribute to the alignment of the goddess' motherly devotion with the erotic fervor of the queen. At first sight, Venus resembles Diana; Dido is likened to Diana when we first meet her. While Dido has a sister, Venus pretends to have one. In styling herself as huntress roaming the woods, she anticipates Dido's hunting expedition in Book 4. Moreover, as Oliensis observes, the goddess and the queen both echo Nausicaa, the enticingly marriageable Homeric maiden.[30] In short, during her meeting with Aeneas in Book1, Venus prefigures her son's Carthaginian lover.[31] But that is not all. Through sustained intertextual resonances the episode also maps mother and son onto other erotic partnerships. Oliensis writes that the "incestuous undertones" – generated by Venus' loveliness, her evocation of Nausicaa, and her foreshadowing of Dido – are "amplified by the echoes of another famous encounter involving the disguised goddess of love and an

---

[28] Oliensis (1997: 305) takes note of Dido's "oddly maternal passion," remarking that she "blends the features of mother and bride." Gillis (1983: 39-42) also observes the important role of maternal instincts in Dido's passion.
[29] Oliensis (1997: 305-306). Oliensis explains that this coloring occurs in a "curiously inverted form … Dido is not the pursuer but the pursued; in flight from a savage Aeneas, she wanders dazed and alone – like the crazed Pentheus and fury-ridden Orestes of Greek tragedy … (*Aen*. 4.465-73). Let us recall that Pentheus was torn to pieces by his Bacchant-mother, and that Orestes risked the same fate at the jaws of his mother's Furies. Although Dido is identified with the victimized sons here, she is also akin to their maddened mothers. In the event Dido will play both roles – she dreams these dreams the night before she commits suicide."
[30] Oliensis 1997: 306. We might also recall that Venus and Dido are the only characters to receive the designation of *pulcherrima* on two separate occasion: Dido at 1.496 and 4.60; Venus at 4.227 and 12.554.
[31] Lada-Richards 2006: 59. Similarly, Oliensis (1997: 306) remarks that in her disguise Venus offers Aeneas "a kind of preview of Dido." Otis (1963: 237) feels that Venus is "a curious blend of maternal anxiety and erotic impulse: the main point of the episode, however, is that it at once brings the resurgent Aeneas ... under the spell of love and Dido, that it determines the point of view he is to take toward the new city and toward Dido herself."

awestruck mortal: the meeting of Aphrodite with her future lover Anchises … in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*."[32] Frequent points of contact with the hymn map Aeneas onto the amatory role played his father and sexualize elements of the narrative.[33] For instance, since Aphrodite's adoption of the (incongruous) semblance of a virgin constitutes an integral part of her mischievous seduction of Anchises, Venus' choice of a similar disguise becomes tinged with a playful eroticism. Moreover, since Aphrodite's charade ultimately leads to an erotic unveiling (162-166),[34] the intertextual resonance amplifies the erotic undertones already present in the sensuality of Venus' epiphanic unveiling.[35]

Finally, as we have already noted, Vergil's narrative of the encounter between Aeneas and Venus resonates with Bion's portrayal of Aphrodite and Adonis and so maps elements of this erotic relationship onto the dynamics between mother and son.[36] In a number of ways, including the guise she adopts and the setting of her earthly visit, Venus recalls Bion's Aphrodite; Aeneas' dazzling beauty, in turn, connects him with Adonis. However, the individuals of each pair also become assimilated to one another, as elements characterizing Adonis and Venus reappear in the depiction of Aphrodite and Aeneas, respectively. This intertextual intimation of an erotic bond

---

[32] Oliensis 1997: 306. She argues that like Dido, "Venus appears before Aeneas at once as a mother and as a potential erotic partner."

[33] For an overview of these correspondences see Reckford 1995: 16-22 and Gutting 2008: 50, with references to additional scholarship. The alignment of Aeneas with Anchises is reinforced in the course of the poem by the close alignment of their words: much of Aeneas' exclamation at 1.409, *non datur ac veras audire et reddere voces*, remerges in Anchises' statement at 6.688-9: *datur ... notas audire et reddere voces*. For the significance of this *intra*textual connection in Vergil's engagement with Bion's Epitaph on Adonis, see Sec. 1.4, pp. 90-91.

[34] The hymn carefully recounts the undressing of the goddess by Anchises.

[35] Reckford (1995-1996: 3ff.) posits an even closer correspondence to the hymn by arguing that 1.404 (*pedes vestis defluxit ad imos*) can be read as Venus' clothes sliding off her body, thus recalling Aphrodite's undressing by Anchises. He also believes that a "second figurative seduction of Aeneas by his beautiful mother" takes place in *Aeneid* 8 as Venus presents her son with Vulcan's weapons (30). For this assessment, he draws on the Putnam (1998: 172-173), who detects sexual undertones in Vergil's description of Venus' presenting herself to Aeneas in a sequestered valley (*se … obtulit ultro*, 8.611) and seeking his embrace (*amplexus nati Cytherea petivit*, 8.615); he connects the phrasing to similar language used by Vergil in amatory contexts: *Eclogue* 3 (*sese offert ultro*, 66) and the union of Vulcan and Venus earlier in Book 8 (*optatos dedit amplexus*, 405).

[36] Sec. 1.5, pp. 87-91.

between Venus and Aeneas persists all the way to the end of their meeting in the Libyan woods: during their last moments together, Venus goes on evoke Adonis as he departs from life, while Aeneas recalls the plaintive Aphrodite.[37]

3.4. Concluding remarks

We have previously examined Juno's characterization against the background of the articulations of Venus/Aphrodite that we find in the *Aeneid* and in the Greek poetic tradition at large; our study has revealed a fundamental affinity between the Olympian queen and her divine opponent. In this chapter, we have considered how this affinity is underscored by subtextual connections focalized around two central human characters, Dido and Aeneas. Dido's characterization features the seamless convergence of the influence of both Venus and Juno and thus challenges the apparent polarity of the passions they symbolize; within the Carthaginian queen, the love inspired by Venus and the hatred that aligns her with Juno coexist and merge into a single blazing passion. Inasmuch as her love-hate passion is directed toward Aeneas, Dido both combines and mediates what Venus and Juno each feel toward the Trojan. Venus loves Aeneas as vehemently as Juno hates him, and their passionate preoccupation with the hero is united by a common erotic undertone.

The multifaceted and deep-rooted affinity underpinning the characterizations of the *Aeneid*'s chief divine antagonists has implications for how we understand the nature of their opposition, an opposition that drives the plot and maps onto hostile configurations both within the epic story and beyond it. Once Venus and Juno are shown to be so profoundly alike, the earthly cost of

[37] A parallel between Bion's Aphrodite and Vergil's Aeneas seems to also exist on the level of sound. Khan (2003: 262) posits that the "doleful quality of the introductory lines of Aeneas' complaint is enhanced by the long *o*-sounds in 373-374"; citing Gow (1958: 153f.), Khan connects this onomatopoeic effect with the "use of the lugubrious long *o* in (Bion's) lament on the death of Adonis, lines 1-2, and the refrain."

their conflict appears ever more problematic and a clear distinction between the sides each one represents becomes more difficult to delineate. In effect, their divine conflict, despite its affiliations with diverse nations, becomes implicated in the tragedy of civil bloodshed.

CONCLUSION

In her study of characterization in Latin poetry, Seo has shown that the *Aeneid* "dramatizes the process of creating 'Aeneas' out of multiple traditions and narratives."[1] I have argued that in an analogous manner the poem dramatizes the process of constructing Venus out of the vast fabric of her literary inheritance. Vergil's articulation of the Greco-Roman goddess of love is to a significant extent a complex reconfiguration of what has already been said about her in the Greek tradition, in particular, of the myriad of unflattering characterizations. In the *Aeneid*, we find fragments of Venus' dark poetic past embedded within new narratives and repurposed to new effects, and this composite make-up with discernible seams between elements of diverse origin underpins the constructedness of the character. The goddess of love emerges as a literary figure susceptible to endless kaleidoscopic rearrangements. Her instability is underscored by the dissonances between voices of past and present narratives, by discordant articulations competing for the truth of her divine identity. As Vergil's narrative challenges Venus' poetic past, it is itself in turn challenged by it. Moreover, the affinity between the workings of the poet and the workings of *fama*, the notorious mixer of truth and fiction, intimates the dubiousness of her both traditional and new poetic articulations. In fact, as *fama*'s multiplicity of voices finds correspondence in the polyphony inherent in Venus' characterization, we are encouraged to question the reliability of the poetic tradition and to recognize the elusiveness of truth in its multivocality. Thus, at the same time that the *Aeneid* depicts various immortals, it also casts doubt on the stability and reliability of poetic articulations of divinity, a fundamental uncertainty suggested by the poem's introductory question: *tantae animis caelestibus irae*?

[1] Seo 2013: 33.

Vergil also invites critical reflection on poetic apprehensions of divine individuality. In the *Aeneid*, we see Venus playing the traditional roles of other gods, including those of Athena, Thetis, and Apollo, while Juno's characterization comprises elements that define antecedent depictions of Aphrodite. The ease with which a divine character can absorb elements characteristic of the literary *famae* of other deities foregrounds the porous nature of the boundaries separating the poetic individuality of one god from that of another. In turn, this narrative interchangeability of divine actors challenges traditional dichotomies, in particular, the opposition between Juno and Venus. In positioning the goddesses as the chief divine antagonists within his poem's narrative, Vergil continues the paradigmatic hostility established in the *Iliad*, where Hera and Aphrodite champion opposing sides in the Trojan War. And yet, whereas in Homer's narrative Hera pushes for the destruction of Troy in accordance with its ultimate destiny, while Aphrodite can do no more than delay the inevitable, in the *Aeneid* their roles are reversed: now Juno can do no more than delay the ordinances of Fate as she proves powerless to stop them, all the while Venus fiercely fights for their fulfillment. This echoing of one another's antecedent poetic articulations blurs the distinctness of the goddesses' identities, and the contiguity is, in turn, both dramatized in the seamless merging of their influence within Dido and amplified by the parallel erotic coloring of their preoccupation with Aeneas.

If, upon closer inspection, the principal divine antagonists of Vergil's poem appear "cut from the same cloth," so to speak, the affinity casts a critical light on their vehement opposition and its cost of suffering and destruction. It carries implications that extend beyond the mythological level of poem's narrative and into its historical themes and concerns.[2] For instance, inasmuch as the conflict between the Trojans and the Italians resonates with historical wars of Rome, the

[2] Gransden (1984: 55) remarks that for Vergil "history is a series of cyclical paradigms, events and figures moving in and out of different time-scales. The structure of the *Aeneid* is synchronic, not diachronic."

dubious distinctness between the divine patrons of each side suggests the tragic senselessness of such conflicts and the bloodshed that they entail. In particular, we might think of how the complicated dynamics between Venus and Juno map onto the civil conflicts of Rome's later history. For instance, Aeneas' side, under the patronage of his mother, resonates with the side of Augustus, the ultimate victor and purported descendant of Venus. Augustus' conflicts with Marc Anthony and Cleopatra, in turn, suggest the alignment of his side with Juno and her dark energies. At first sight, this paradigm positions Augustus as the champion of selfless *pietas* against the dark passions of Anthony and his Eastern horde – a contrast of order and chaos, of good and evil, depicted on Vulcan's shield in Book 8. Yet, on a deeper level, the parallels become more complicated and less polarized.[3] On the one hand, the persona of the majestic Augustus, the fierce defender of divinely – ordained empire and civilized peace, resonates with the characterization of the *Aeneid*'s Venus, who is committed to the fulfillment of Jupiter's promises for Rome's greatness and, as Wlosok has argued, prizes the achievement of a peaceful existence for her people.[4] On the other hand, however, this flattering resonance is also reinforced by the constructedness of both figures, a constructedness that reconfigures a darker past. As the ambivalent and often wildly destructive poetic articulations of Aphrodite are reworked into the kindly *genetrix* of the Aeneadae in Vergil's Roman epic, so Octavian, the fomenter of civil war whose dark *fama* encompasses the proscriptions of the Second Triumvirate, seizure of private land, and displays of immoderate cruelty at Perusia, is rehabilitated into the fatherly Augustus, the benevolent restorer of the Republic. In the case of both figures, however, the voices of their earlier *famae* cannot be entirely silenced and betray the complexity and ambiguity of their

[3] For the complications destabilizing the apparent polarity in the Actium scene, see, e. g., Lyne 1987: 27-35, Putnam 1998: 146-149, 161-162.
[4] Wlosok 1967: 59, 139-146.

characters. Moreover, critical consideration of the dark characterizations of their chief antagonists – Juno and Marc Anthony – reveal fundamental commonalities that gravely destabilize any morally – charged dichotomies.

I hope that this mere adumbration of the possible political significance of the ways in which Vergil chose to construct his Venus and his Juno invites explorations that lie beyond the scope of my largely philological study and may one day contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the poet's view of his complicated world.

APPENDIX 1. The Good Roman Mother.

As in the case of Homer's Thetis, the role of Vergil's Venus is fundamentally that of a devoted mother.[1] It would not be an overstatement to say that, on the narrative level, virtually all she says or does in the *Aeneid* stems from her care and concern for her son and his bloodline.[2] Her very potency as the goddess of erotic passion is subordinated to her identity as mother.[3] She occasions Dido's love to ensure Aeneas' safety in Carthage. Correspondingly, during her interaction with Vulcan, her sexuality comes in to play within the framework of a maternal agenda: to procure divine armor for her son. The narrative of the procurement begins with Venus as a concerned mother (*Venus … exterrita mater*, 8.370); the final lines feature *dona parentis* and *fata nepotum* in emphatic final position (8.729, 731). The parent-child relationship not only frames and shapes the episode, but also resonates with its rich intertextuality.

In designating Vulcan as *aeterno devinctus amore* (8.394), Vergil references the Lucretian qualification of Mars while he enjoys the embraces of Venus as *aeterno devictus vulnere amoris* (1.34). Most readily, this intertext prompts thought of Aphrodite's adulterous behavior in *Odyssey* 8 and so highlights the transgressive eroticism of the goddess of love. A reminiscence of the larger Lucretian context, however, also engages with Venus' maternal identity. The initial lines of Lucretius' prayer to the goddess begin with the epithets *Aenaedum genetrix* and *alma Venus* (1.1-2); the prayer concludes with the request that she secure peace for her Roman

---

[1] She is termed *genetrix* (1.590, 1.689, 4.227, 8.383, 12.412, 12.554) six times, *parens* (2.591, 2.606, 2.664, 4.365, 6.197, 8.531, 8.729) seven, and *mater* (1.314, 1.382, 1.405, 1.585, 1.720, 3.19, 8.370, 12.52, 12.107) nine.
[2] Cf. Wlosok 1967: 108.
[3] Thus, Highet (1972: 271) writes that "Venus in the *Aeneid* is not the goddess of sexual love so much as a protective guardian and mother." Similarly, Wlosok (1967: 108) remarks that all that Venus does in the *Aeneid* fits in with her role as "Aeneadenmutter" and states "Bei dem Überblick über die Verwendung der Venus als Liebesgöttin machten wir die überrasdıende Feststellung, daß Vergil diese, wie man denken möchte, konstitutive Erscheinungsform der Göttin in der Aeneis völlig zurücktreten läßtl."

descendants (1.40). She is to secure this "gift" through the use of her sexual ability to subdue Mars and thus, as in Vergil, by subordinating her eroticism to serve her devotion to her bloodline. Of course, Venus' role as mother is most richly highlighted throughout the Vulcan episode by the multifaceted alignment of the goddess with the Iliadic Thetis. Generally speaking, like Thetis, Venus begs the smith-god to produce new arms for her son, and like Thetis, she personally delivers them to the hero. There is also a more nuanced dialogue with the Iliadic model. For instance, Highet observes that in their pleas before Hephaistos / Vulcan, Thetis and Venus both "emphasize the sorrows of motherhood and the bitterness of war." He adds that when Venus delivers Aeneas' weapons, "she speaks like Thetis to Achilles in *Il.* 19.8-11."[4]

In fact, alignments of Venus with Achilles' mother occur throughout *Aeneid*. The love goddess' tearful lament over her son' misfortune before Jupiter in Book 1 and, to some extent, her imprecation of Cupid both recall Thetis' entreaty of Zeus in *Iliad* 1. Like the ever-consoling Nereid, Venus comforts her son when he is distressed by the loss of his ships – utilizing augury to assure him of their survival. Knauer also finds parallels between Venus' calming of Aeneas in Book 2 and Thetis' comforting of Achilles in *ll.* 1.362-363 and 18.73-77.[5] Highet, in turn, observes that in her speech to Zeus at the council of the gods in Book 10, Venus "reverts to some of the themes she treated in her first speech" and "elaborates them with the emotion of Thetis imploring Zeus on behalf of Achilles (ll. 1.503-510 + 514-516)."[6]

Thetis is a devoted and thoughtful mother; however, as Wlosok notes, "[d]ie homerische Göttin ist nicht eigentlich die Beschützerin des Achill. Den Beistand im Kampf leisten Athene

[4] Highet 1972: 274.
[5] Knauer 1964a: 381.
[6] Highet 1972: 275.

und andere Olympier."[7] In contrast, Venus is fundamentally both.[8] She resembles Athena – the emblematic protectress and assistant to heroes – in both her Iliadic and Odyssean roles, on the battlefield and beyond.[9] Commenting on her meeting with Aeneas in Book 1, Putnam remarks that "once more, as in [Book 2], through her own person, and in [Book 6], through both doves and bough, it is Venus who helps bridge the transitional period and leads her son through a time of doubt and trial to the point where he can quite literally surmount an opposing hill and view Dido's Carthage."[10] Farrell observes the underrated importance of her maternal presence in Book 5, noting that Venus not only secures safe passage for Aeneas from Neptune but she is symbolically powerful throughout the book by way of quiet references that occur at significant points in the narrative.[11] Greenwood observes that the goddess "shows a deep and passionate concern for her son's safety in four well-defined ways": (1) "she consults various deities" and "schemes and engineers with those gods to ensure that he should come to no serious harm"; (2) she visits Aeneas "to provide him with useful, sometimes crucial information"; (3) "she sends signs or symbols … which help cheer, assist and guide him in his quest"; (4) she "performs small-scales 'miracles' which benefit her son greatly either in the form of simple 'cosmetic' improvements or in more immediate life-saving intervention."[12] In taking a tally of Venus' interventions, Leach remarks that on "the basis of numerical comparison, she is, in fact, a more assiduously activist mother than Thetis."[13] The poem is framed by her persistent support for

---

[7] Wlosok 1967: 110.
[8] Wlosok (1967: 109-110) calls Venus "Nachfolgerin der homerischen Göttinnen Athene und Thetis."
[9] For Venus' military assistance, see Sec. 1.5, pp. 63-66.
[10] Putnam 1965: 58.
[11] Farrell 1999: 106-108. Most of these references involve her son Eryx, although Venus is directly named in connection with her cult on Mount Eryx (5.759-760).
[12] Greenwood 1989: 132. His article goes on to examine five incidents within the last category "from the point of view both of the contextual appropriateness of the intervention and of the benefits derived by Aeneas." Farrell (1999: 109) also offers a brief survey of Venus' interventions and remarks that she is a mother who helps [Aeneas] at every turn."
[13] Leach 1997: 363.

Aeneas: the first book contains four instances of her activity on his behalf, the last has three. Besides her assistance within the course of the plot, Aeneas' words reveal further involvement: he speaks of her extensive guidance during his wonderings and her promise of a *signum* and *Volcania arma* for the war in Italy.[14] Indeed, in the course of creating these weapons, Vulcan takes on certain attributes of a parent.[15] We might say that Venus' ardent love for her son "infects" her husband and her maternal devotion carries over into the forging of Aeneas' armor. Gillis perceives some of this when he asserts that Venus

> is a good mother. And this is the reason for Vergil's placement of his memorable description of the faithful wife rising early to fulfill her parental duty by providing for her small children in an atmosphere of healthy family life (8.407-15). It is a bridge between the two scenes, seduction and forging, but shares with them the theme of maternal concern.[16]

Although the shield is a *donum* from Vulcan, more fundamentally, it is a gift from an enterprising mother to her beloved son. Moreover, the "long term-gift she has given is the *fama et fata nepotum* (8.731)," namely, "a concrete symbolic materialization of the initial promise Jupiter had made to Venus in *Aeneid* 1" – in the words of Leach[17] – and of the corresponding preview Anchises had given Aeneas in *Aeneid* 6: the *dona* of grandfather and father.[18] From this perspective, Venus assiduously helps Aeneas gain possession of his rightful inheritance and in so

---

[14] 2.382 & 8.534-536. Servius (*ad* 1.382) relates the traditional story from Varro (which he thinks Vergil *per legem artis poeticae aperte non potest ponere*) that this guidance – daily (*cotidie*) and stretching from the time Aeneas had left Troy all the way to his arrival in Italy – was accomplished via the Star of Venus. Similarly, Servius Danielis *ad* 2.801.

[15] See Sec. 1.5, pp. 82-84

[16] Gillis 1983: 132.

[17] Leach 1997: 358. Similarly, Lada-Richards (2006: 44) reflects that "Rome's future glory is not just promised but 'realized' by way of being embossed on Vulcan's *opera fabrilia*."

[18] Putnam (1965: 138) comments that "Venus' specific and present interest in her son takes grander shape in the vision of the whole race of her future offspring..., depicted on the shield which is forged as a result of her appeal to Vulcan."

doing – continues Leach – "reinforces a very recognizable Roman pattern of maternal behavior with divine power."[19] Leach also points out that when "Venus delivers the arms, she emphasizes their derivation as *munera* produced by her husband's art (8.611—12)" and that with "this combined epic and social sanction she has done the best for Aeneas that her personal and official status could accomplish, and the [embrace] she receives in return for her gift pays symbolic tribute to supportive maternity."[20]

On the emotional level, Venus is no less distraught by her son's misery than Thetis is by the suffering of Achilles. The very first words of her introduction establish her emotional pain: *tristior et lacrimis oculos suffusa* (1.228).[21] Moreover, her words to Cupid and Vulcan testify to the long-term quality of her anguish: *nostro doluisti saepe dolore* (1.669) *durum Aeneae flevissem saepe laborem* (8.380). Throughout the narrative, she is racked with anxiety. As Leach observes, *cura* is "the designation of maternal sentiment most commonly attached to Venus in the *Aeneid*; it is employed both by the goddess herself, and also by Vergil to describe her."[22] In "becoming the mother of the Romans, Venus has also been made a recognizably Roman mother, and Vergil's audience would surely have judged her behavior in that category."[23] This Romanization of the goddess of love is most pronounced within her first scene in the epic, which as an introduction of the goddess can be viewed as programmatic. Gutting has detailed the

---

[19] Leach 1997: 362. Cf. Leach's observation that "Venus' gift of the shield as a *donum parentis* bestows property within her power in order to help her son take possession of his father's inheritance" (358).
[20] Leach 1997: 358. She remarks that Venus' soliciting of "favors for her son by a different father" from Vulcan "is not so strange in the light of the Roman custom where a mother is expected to give first priority to the property rights of her son irrespective of her current marital circumstance even if Vergil here keeps both the actualities of Venus' liaison with Anchises and the parentage of Cupid discretely in the background" (357-8).
[21] Venus' tears resonate with the tears (*lacrimis*) of Thetis and Eos at 8.384, placed in the same metrical position.
[22] Leach 1997: 365-6.
[23] Leach 1997: 371. She relates that in the context of Roman culture "one of the most commonly expected and voiced emotions of parenthood is *cura*. (...) When other characters address Venus' *cura* as a motive for action, they give external testimony to anxiety as an expected norm of maternal feeling" (365-6). In general, her article counters criticism of Venus in her role as mother by examining the goddess' attitude and activity in the context of Roman expectations ("norms that bridge the transition between politically defined periods," 354) of a mother's duty toward her son.

multiple aspects of her characterization as an upper-class *matrona*, noting, for instance, that she "seeks to preserve Aeneas' birthright, Italy, with the fervor of a *matrona* jealously guarding her boy's inheritance" and that, just "like a human *matrona*," she can seek her goal "only through the indirect means of domestic politics, and so she lobbies Jupiter, her *paterfamilias*."[24]

Consequently, as Leach points out, if

> we follow the formulations of Roman social history, which has lately given considerable attention to the subtleties of familial interactions, we can see that the relationship between Venus and Aeneas, while deliberately non-Homeric, and also by the standards of twentieth-century western society somewhat emotionally unsatisfying, is not at all unnatural or unmaternal by Roman customs.[25]

Leach concludes that Venus "has been appropriated and transformed from the sexually compelled love goddess who resented her mortal liaison and wanted no part of maternity into a figure who gains her Roman identity through stages of her maternal maturation."[26]

---

[24] Gutting 2009: 41-42. Leach (1997: 356) remarks that Jupiter kisses his daughter in "the manner of a Roman *paterfamilias*." Cf. Leach' s observation concerning the Venus-Vulcan episode in Sec. 1.5, p. 82. The correspondence to a Roman matron is strengthened by Venus' embeddedness within a familial structure. Vergil steadily establishes her domestic integration: she is presented as a daughter close to her father, a mother who commands the respect of her sons (whose fraternal bond is highlighted at 1.667-669), an exceedingly caring grandmother (1.678, 10.46ff., 10.132), a revered mother-in-law (2.787), and a wife.

[25] Leach 1997: 364.

[26] Leach 1997: 371.

APPENDIX 2. Dark AMOR in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*

Vergil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* reflect many of the poetic characterizations of Aphrodite, EROS, and their workings that have been surveyed in Sections 1.2-3 and 2.3. Although we do find a certain amount of manipulation and revision, overall, Vergil's pre-*Aeneid* align with the poetic tradition that views love as an elemental chaotic force, undermining the stability of civilized existence.[1]

In line with Hesiod's *Theogony*, the narrative of the song of Clymene in *Georgics* 4 implicitly frames AMOR[2] as a primordial force whose workings and therefore existence stretch all the way back to the beginning of the universe, to Chaos itself: *aque Chao densos divum numerabat amores* (G. 4.347). Like his Greek predecessors, Vergil assimilates the workings of AMOR to the natural energies of fire and sea. *Eclogue* 2 opens with the figurative burning (*ardebat*, 1) of the goatherd Corydon, who goes on to specify its cause: *me ... urit AMOR* (68). Echoing Hellenistic treatments of the conceit of erotic fire that transfer its cause directly to the beloved,[3] the speaker of Alphesiboeus' song in *Eclogue* 8 declares herself burned by her beloved Daphnis (*Daphnis me ... urit*, 83), just as the sexually arousing female burns (*urit,* 215) the bulls who catch sight of her in *Georgics* 3. In the same poem, an old horse' sexual prowess is likened to the burning of twigs, which produces *magnus sine viribus ignis* (99); we are also told that AMOR *uersat ignem* in the bones of Leander (258). We have here particularizations of the erotic fire into which all mortal creatures are said to tumble: *in ... ignem... ruunt* (244).

---

[1] Cf. Wlosok's (1967: 108) observation: "Die Erwähnungen der Venus in den Eclogen und Georgica ... sind ganz konventionell."

[2] As I have in the case of EROS, I will henceforth, write the singular Latin noun that denotes both erotic passion and the its divine personification in capitals. For my reasoning, see p. 18 note 9.

[3] As, for instance, in Callimachus, *Aetia* 67.2 and *A.P.* 12.109.

It is noteworthy that with the exception of the *Georgics* 3.99 simile involving the image of burning twigs, the extent to which we should view Vergil's identifications of erotic passion with fire as figurative assimilations is put into question by the anchoring of the operation of the AMOR that stirs the mares in *Georgics* 3.269-279 in the realm of the actual: *continuoque avidis ubi subdita flamma medullis, / vere magis, quia vere calor redit ossibus* (271-272). The adjective *subita* explains the invisibility of erotic *flamma*, but, more significantly, love's fire is enhanced by and so ontologically bonded with the physically detectable *calor* which, in the spring, warms the bones of the animals. This "movement" of the conventionally figurative toward the literal becomes even more apparent if we examine Vergil's reception of the Greek "sea of love" conceit.

On the figurative side, there may be a channeling of the conventional association between erotic suffering and the overwhelming sea in *Eclogue* 8, namely in the lovesick goatherd's final wish: *omnia vel medium fiat mare* (58). Read as a metaphorically, the wish would thus entail a turning of the tables on the universe – encompassing the goatherd's cruel beloved, his rival, heartless AMOR (43-50), and the other unjust gods (19-20) – by making it suffer the same erotic turmoil that has driven the heartbroken man to his own undoing (appropriately, a death in the sea). The wish would thus be a fitting culmination to the reversals featured in the preceding verses and an emulation of the Greek poets' predilection for "turning the tables" on Aphrodite and EROS. Vergil also implicates the sea in erotic turmoil in an explicitly figurative manner in *Georgics* 3, as erotic passion and rivalry stirs the defeated bull – bemoaning his ignominy and lost love (*multa gemens ... quos amisit inultus amores*, 226-227) – to mount a return attack, which the poet likens to a formidable wave crashing with vehemence and turmoil onto the shore (237-241):

fluctus uti medio coepit cum albescere ponto,

longius ex altoque sinum trahit, utque volutus

ad terras immane sonat per saxa neque ipso

monte minor procumbit, at ima exaestuat unda

verticibus nigramque alte subiectat harenam.[4]

as a wave begins to whiten at mid sea and drags from the deep its lengthy curve, then, rolling towards land, makes an enormous racket on the rocks and leans forward no less than might a mountain while the waves beneath it whirl in eddies and disgorge up from the deep the dark sand.[5]

The erotic nature of the simile is underscored by the following verses, which declare that all creatures (*omne adeo*...242) experience erotic passion in a manner suggestive of the frenzied, boiling turmoil of the falling wave:[6] in *furias ignemque ruunt* (244). Furthermore, when Vergil turns to the particularization of this erotic frenzy thorough its various manifestations, the turbulent sea – noisily crashing against the rocks – once again features in the experience of one incensed by *durus AMOR* (259-262):

....nempe abruptis turbata procellis

---

[4] The general model for this simile is *Il.* 4.422-6, on which see Thomas 1988b: 85.

[5] Trans. P. Fallon, modified.

[6] The simile is perhaps marked by another affinity with the erotic. If the wave is read as in some sense representative of the force of Aphrodite – after all (in addition to the many other associations of waves with love in poetry), in the *Hippolytus,* we find the proclamation ἔστι δ' ἐν θαλασσίωι κλύδωνι Κύπρις (448-9) – then certain parallels emerge between Vergil's verses and those that describe Aphrodite's origin in Hesiod's *Theogony*. The wave's beginning (*coepit*) *medio ponto* and its long journey to the shore (*longius ex altoque sinum trahit*) recall the fall of Ouranos' genitals πολυκλύστῳ (much dashing / rising in waves) ἐνὶ πόντῳ (*Theog*. 189) and their long journey (φέρετ'... πουλὺν χρόνον) around the πέλαγος (the open sea, which can be equated with Vergil's *medius pontus*) to the shore of Cythera and then Cypris. Moreover, the wave's starting point, described in terms of its foamy whiteness (*medio coepit ...albescere ponto*), strongly evokes the source from which grew the body of the love goddess: λευκὸς ἀφρὸς (*Theog*. 190-191). Significantly, in the simile of *Il.* 4.422-6, the wave – one of many in a continuous series (ἐπασσύτερον, 423) – is introduced as arising at the shore (ἐν αἰγιαλῷ πολυηχέϊ κῦμα θαλάσσης ὄρνυτ', 422-423) and only later described as having crested in the sea (πόντῳ μέν τε πρῶτα κορύσσεται, 424). Homer makes no mention of its journey to land. Furthermore, the larger Hesiodic context, Gaia's stirring of Kronos to attack Ouranos, that is, the triangle of a female inciting violence between two kindred males, aligns with the context of Vergil's simile, where a female stirs two males to violence that is likewise "domestic."

nocte natat caeca serus freta, quem super ingens

porta tonat caeli, et scopulis inlisa reclamant

aequora.

... indeed, late at night he blindly swims the sea, unsettled by storms, and above his head heaven's great gate thunders and the waves reverberate as they crash against the cliffs.

These lines incorporate a number of elements figuratively linked with the force if EROS in Greek poetry: violent storms (*abruptis procellis*), a lover caught in turbulent waters (*turbata natat freta*), lightning (*porta tonat caeli*), dangerous elements suggestive of shipwreck (*scopulis inlisa reclamant aequora*). And yet, although they can be viewed as symbolic of the elemental force of love, in Vergil's text these elements do not fit within a figurative framework but a mythical one: within the story of Leander's fatal crossing of the Hellespont to reach his beloved Hero.[7] Perhaps a similar repositioning also operates behind the lovesick goatherd's suicidal dive into the waves (*in undas*) in *Eclogue* 8.59-60, which echoes the dive of Anacreon's speaker ἐς κῦμα.[8]

Vergil does follow his Greek predecessors quite closely when he delineates the universal extent of AMOR's power within the mortal world (G.3.242-244):

***Omne** adeo **genus** in **terris hominum**que **ferarum**que*

*et genus aequoreum, pecudes pictaeque **volucres**,*

---

[7] For Vergil's conversion of Apollonius' simile of bulls fighting over a female (*Arg*. 2.88-9) and the Iliadic simile of irrigation (21.257-62) into literal events, see Thomas 1988a: 84 & 1988b: 81.

[8] There is a more direct – depicting a suicidal and non-metaphorical jump – poetic precedent for the goatherd's leap into the sea in Theocritus 3.25-6 and perhaps in Hermesianax (Frag. 9 Lightfoot), the last noted by Clausen (1994: 254). However, as R. Coleman (1977: 242) observes, there is an incongruity of mood between the posturing phrasing of the unfulfilled threat – one of many – of Theocritus' goatherd and the poignant farewell of Vergil's tragic figure, modeled on Daphnis of *Idyll* 1. Moreover, in terms of Hermesianax, his apparent treatment of the suicide of the lovelorn Melancas of Chalcis in the first book of the *Leontion* survives only as a remark in the argument to Theocritus' *Idyll* 9, and we are left in the dark about the poetic details, including whether Melancas's jump off a cliff actually involved the sea.

in furias ignemque ruunt: AMOR ***omnibus*** *idem.*

Indeed, every race of men and beasts on land, and of creatures of the water, and flocks, and painted birds rush into the raging fire: love is the same for all.

Although this description of love's sway over the creatures of land, water, and air bears correspondences with Sophocles Frag. 941.9-11 and Euripides' *Hippolytus* 1272-1279, in terms of its overall structure and content, it most markedly resembles the description of Aphrodite's dominion in the *HHA* (3-6):

ἐδαμάσσατο **φῦλα** καταθνητῶν **ἀνθρώπων**,

οἰωνούς τε διιπετέας καὶ **θηρία πάντα**,

ἠμὲν ὅσ' **ἤπειρος** πολλὰ τρέφει ἠδ' ὅσα πόντος·

πᾶσιν δ' ἔργα μέμηλεν ἐϋστεφάνου Κυθερείης.[9]

she overwhelms the races of mortal men and winged birds and all the beasts, as many as the land nourishes and the sea; for the works of fair-wreathed Kytherea are a care for all.[10]

Vergil likewise envisions the workings of AMOR as a natural force in *Ecologue* 2, where Corydon aligns his yearning for Alexis with the innate desires of animals: lions, wolves, and goats are drawn by their instinctive predilections (*trahit sua quemque voluptas,* 2.65). More prominently, when the poet devotes a significant part of *Georgics* 3 to the examination of the

[9] It must be acknowledged that some of the correspondences to the *HHA*, particularly of the elements with a sense of universality (cf. *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 19-24), can be attributed to the influence of conventional hymnal style. For a survey of the conventions of hymnal language, see Norden 1913: 150-163. Thomas (1988a: 86) has noted certain parallels between Vergil's passage and Lucretius 1.1-20 and 2.342-4. However, Lucretius' first passage – a meditation on the life-generating force of Venus – is not only more detailed and much more extensive, but deals not just with creatures but also with vegetation and a multitude of inanimate elements of the natural world; his second passage, meanwhile, though closer in structure, concerns itself not with the sexual drive but with the differentiation among all living things. Thus, although I do not deny that these verses of Lucretius likely influenced Vergil's language, they could not have been his primary model in terms of content and structure.

[10] Trans. S. C. Shelmerdine, modified.

sexual drives galvanizing the animal kingdom (209-279),[11] his treatment of AMOR is saturated with images of the natural world, images that evoke – at times, with a dynamic momentum – mountains and cliffs (213, 240, 253, 254, 261, 269-270, 276), rivers (213, 254, 269-270), forests (223, 248), winds (233, 259, 273-274, 277-278) and the tumultuous sea (237-241, 254, 259-262), and the like.

By characterizing the AMOR as *saevus* (47) in the lament of the goatherd of *Eclogue* 8, Vergil also echoes the Greek poets' use of the adjective ἄγριος to describe EROS. He specifically establishes a connection with Theocritus' *Idyll* 3.15-16 as the lovesick goatherd dramatizes AMOR's ruthlessness through his declaration that the god is the product of harsh mountains or remote, wild peoples (43-45).[12] Indeed, as Coleman observes, when the goatherd claims that *AMOR* is *nec generis nostri puerum nec sanguinis* (45), he is denying "even those anthropomorphic attributes which convention (e.g. Mosch. 1, Meleager *A.P.* 5.178) bestowed on him"[13] and thus intensifying the god's savage elementality. Vergil also conveys love's fiercely wild energy through his narrative of its effects: under AMOR 's sway, the boar becomes *saevus* (*G.* 3.248) and the lioness is never *saevior* (*G.* 3.246). Erotic impulse turns animals into frenzied, unstoppable forces (G. 3.242-279) and aligns men with animals. Through subtle poetic maneuvers, Vergil utilizes the story of Leander's nocturnal attempt to swim across the stormy Hellespont to underscore his point that *AMOR omnibus idem* (*G.* 3.244); *human* passion *is* the elemental impulse that drives animals to burst through all barriers and elicits their utmost savagery. Withholding all names, the poet positions a manifestation of a human passion in close proximity to manifestations of animal sexuality: the introduction (*quid iuvenis...*?, 258) directly

[11] He briefly references animal sexuality in *Georgics* 2: *Venerem certis repetunt armenta diebus* (329).
[12] Coleman 1977: 238-239.
[13] Coleman 1977: 239.

follows the descriptions of an erotically frenzied lioness, bear, boar, tiger, horses, and hog (3.245-257). Moreover, notes Thomas,

> the reader who has seen human terms applied to animals throughout the first half of the book, who has seen *iuvenis* applied at one moment to animals, the next to men (105-6, 118, 165...), and who has just read (253-4) that opposing crags and rivers will not keep out the animal affected by *amor*, will initially be unsure not of the identity of the youth, but of the nature of the animal. The uncertainty is resolved partially with *parentes* at 262 but not finally until the last word of the passage at 263, *virgo*. The ambiguity is reinforced by the resumption of the subject of animal passion at 264, where the words *quid lynces...*? eliminate any distinction between Hero and Leander and the animals.[14]

Otis comments that Vergil "does not name Leander and Hero because he clearly wants to preserve the animal and anonymous context of *amor* as here described. *Amor* is, in his view, a terrible *furor* by which man himself is assimilated to the animal."[15] Just as Aphrodite in the *HHA*, AMOR – who *omnia vincit* (*Ec.* 10.69) – threatens the hierarchical organization of the universe which differentiates not only between god and man, but also between man and beast. Vergil makes this blurring of categories quite explicit in *Eclogue* 6, where Pasiphae desires to mix with the Cretan bull and, in her wanderings through the mountains as she yearns for him, becomes effectively assimilated to a heifer in heat (45ff.).

Thus, in line with the Greek tradition, Vergil implicitly positions the workings of AMOR at odds with rational, civilized existence.[16] Lines 209-279 of *Georgics* 3 – in the words of Miles –

---

[14] Thomas 1988a: 89-90.
[15] Otis 1964: 175.
[16] Cf. Otis, who notes that in *Georgics* 3 "love emerges in its full animal, sexual power ruling both beasts and men and overcoming in its violence all rational moderation" (Otis 1964: 176).

"focus our attention upon the destructive consequences of the energies which *amor* releases."[17] For instance, bulls moan as they become awash in blood from their numerous wounds (220-222), lion cubs suffer neglect (245), and bears engage in widespread carnage (247-247). The theme of devastation gains force as Vergil punctuates his treatment of AMOR by images of elemental destruction: crashing waves, sometimes flinging out dark sand or destroying mountains (239-241, 254, 261-262), mountains collapsing (240), and turbulent lightening storms (259-261). Moreover, the elemental and overwhelming quality of erotic impulse suggests that it is not always possible to curb AMOR′s dark energy and the consequences can be disastrous.[18] Erotically incensed, horses can no longer be controlled by the tools which incorporate them into the fabric of civilized usage (*neque eos iam frena virum neque verbera ... retardant*, 252-253). The perils inherent in this effect of Venus are brought out by the gruesome exemplar of Glaucus' horses tearing apart their master: *mentem Venus ipsa dedit, quo tempore Glauci /Potniades malis membra absumpsere quadrigae* (267-268).[19] The incompatibility of erotic fury and civilized existence is also intimated by the withdrawal of the incensed bull from his community, which Vergil "civilizes" by centering it around the man-made stables (*stabula*) and by anthropomorphizing it as *regna avita* (227). Instead, as he stokes the fires of his passions, the bull has his life devolve to the *duritia* of primitive existence.[20]

Vergil also embraces the traditional conceptualization of erotic passion as a force detrimental to the integrity of the family unit and the community at large. He channels Aphrodite's

---

[17] Miles 1975: 180.
[18] Cf. Miles 1975: 183-184.
[19] Miles notes that after he describes "Glaucus' dreadful slaughter by his own frenzied mares, the mares' irresistible flight across all obstacles and their poisonous *hippomanes* (267-283), Virgil leaves the account of animal lust without warning and without any resolution of the chaotic forces which he has revealed" (180).
[20] Thomas 1988a: 84. Moreover, in *G.* 3.209-211 Venus and the blind goads of amor are positioned as "the chief obstacles to the husbandman's work"[20] since turning them away from horses and cattle does more than any other care in terms of safeguarding the animals' usefulness.

destruction of her marriage into Clymene's song in *Georgics* 4 (*narrabat inanem / Volcani, Martisque dolos et dulcia furta,* 345-346) and alludes to the terrible disintegration of Procne's marriage in *Eclogue* 6.78-81 and *Georgics* 4.15. He shows that erotically-rooted passion can undermine even the fundamental bonds between parents and children. AMOR compels the lioness to forget her cubs (*G.* 3.245) and teaches Medea to murder her children: *AMOR docuit natorum sanguine matrem commaculare manus* (*Ec*. 8.47-48). AMOR drives Leander away from his parents (*nec miseri possunt revocare parentes*, G. 3.262) and motivates Scylla to betray her father, Nisus, who turns against her and, in bird form, perpetually hunts her (*G.* 1.404-409).[21] As we have seen, the sexually enticing female incites gory violence by provoking rival bulls (*amantis, G*. 3.218) to battle one another other (*G.* 3.220-223). Miles observes that in this way AMOR initiates

> a self-generating process in which the passions aroused by violent conflict – anger, shame, vengefulness – themselves lead to renewed conflict. (...) By focusing and concluding as it does, the narrative has emphasized the way in which the violent, uncontrolled energies released by *amor* may be self-perpetuating rather than fulfilling. The final result of the battle of the bulls, as Virgil presents it, is not consummation, but injury, anguish, and continued violence.[22]

Noticeably, the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* intimate the affinity between love and death that we find in Greek poetry. We have noted the lethal violence of erotically incensed animals (with Venus herself inspiring Glaucus' horses), AMOR's role in the killing Medea's children and in the

---

[21] First attested in Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* (vv. 613-622 contain a partial account), the myth is recounted fully in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (8.6-151) and involves Scylla's theft of her father's supernatural lock of hair in order to enable Minos, with whom she has fallen in love, to take her city, which he does. For more on the Scylla myth, see Appendix 3, p. 235.

[22] Miles 1975: 179-180.

death of Leander and Hero,[23] the suicide of the lovesick goatherd in *Eclogue* 8. But there is more. In *Georgics* 4, Aristaeus' lust precipitates Eurydice's death, and this, in turn, moves the lovesick Orpheus to venture into Erebus, to the very realm of death. Recalling *Theognidea* 1295-98 and *Theocritus* 3., Corydon addresses his beloved Alexis as someone who will lead him to his death (*mori me denique coges*, *Ec*. 2.7), [24] while Gallus, like the Daphnis of *Theocritus* 1, is depicted as perishing from love (*AMORE peribat*, *Ec*. 10.10).[25] Furthermore, many effects of love are echoed by the effects of the plague that constitutes the focus of the final section of *Georgics* 3: effectively, "love and plague are bound together."[26] This affinity intimates the deadly force of the former by associating it with the countless deaths of the latter.

Finally, AMOR's characterization as *improbus* (*Ec*. 8.47, 50) continues the censure inherent in the Greek designation of Ἔρος as κακός.[27] This type of implicit moral rejection also operates in Vergil's narrative of how bees form a paradigmatic society marked by order, unremitting industriousness, and patriotic selflessness; for, we are also told that this is a society in which sex has no place (*G*. 4.198-199): *neque concubitu indulgent, nec corpora segnes / in Venerem solvunt*.[28] Otis comments that the bees express "a civic ideal to be set against the disruptive passion of amor in the first part of III. *Labor omnibus unus* is the answer to *amor omnibus idem*."[29] In *Georgics* 3.209-10, as he concludes his exposition of the care and management of horses and cattle, the poet makes the rejection of Venus strikingly explicit: *non ulla magis viris*

---

[23] In mentioning Procne's *manibus pectus signata cruentis* (G. 4.15) and Philomela's *dapes* (*Ec*. 6. 79) for Tereus, Vergil also points to the deadly consequences of illicit passion.
[24] Some editors prefer the variant *cogis*, for which there is equally good authority (Coleman 1977: 93).
[25] As Otis remarks (1964: 142), the dying lover becomes a convention of amatory elegy.
[26] Thomas 1988a: 88.
[27] Vergil extends this language of implicit censure to Amor's effects. For instance, we are told that he causes the tiger to become *pessima* (*G*. 3.248).
[28] A society that is free of the ills attributed to sexual reproduction echoes Hesiod's utopia before the creation of woman (*Op*. 90-92) and the wishes of Hippolytus and Jason in Euripides (*Hipp.* 618-623, *Med.* 573-575).
[29] Otis 1964: 186.

industria firmat / quam Venerem et caeci stimulos avertere AMORIS. Man's diligent care (*industria*) in fostering in his horses and bulls the kind of strength that he can utilize, which one might term the civilizing regulation of the animals' natural power, is directed against (*avertere*) the forces of Venus. Vergil also stresses the need for men to regulate animal sexuality in his lesson on equine conception. He informs us that as soon as mares come into heat (*ubi concubitus primos iam nota voluptas / sollicitat*, *G*. 3.130-131), they should be denied food and kept away from water, made to run to the point of agitation, and led to exhaustion from the sun (131-132). Ostensibly, this is to make them prone to conceiving by preventing a dulling and sluggishness of their "reproductive soil" (*genitali aruo*, 136) from excessive indulgence (*nimio luxu*, 135). However, implicit in this disproportionally harsh treatment of the erotically incensed animals is a vehement offensive against erotic energy, a heavy-handed curbing, which, in a sense, amounts to the putting of Venus "in her place."[30] The goddess, traditionally identified with an active force which seizes its victims, is herself seized and buried deep within the reproductive soil (*rapiat sitiens Venerem interiusque recondat*, 137), where, immobilized, she can no longer do damage but only serve man's purpose.

[30] A consideration of Vergil's account reveals that, in addition to being forcefully weakened through inordinate exercise and exposure to the sun, the mares are not actually kept from *overindulgence*, but from basic necessities.

APPENDIX 3: An overview of the Helen Episode debate and new arguments for Vergilian authorship.

Between verse 2.566 and 2.589, most modern editions of the *Aeneid* print the following text:[1]

Iamque adeo super unus eram, cum limina Vestae
servantem et tacitam secreta in sede latentem
Tyndarida aspicio; dant claram incendia lucem
erranti passimque oculos per cuncta ferenti. 2.570
illa sibi infestos eversa ob Pergama Teucros
et Danaum poenam et deserti coniugis iras
praemetuens, Troiae et patriae communis Erinys,
abdiderat sese atque aris invisa sedebat.
exarsere ignes animo; subit ira cadentem 2.575
ulcisci patriam et sceleratas sumere poenas.
'scilicet haec Spartam incolumis patriasque Mycenas
aspiciet, partoque ibit regina triumpho?
coniugiumque domumque patris natosque videbit
Iliadum turba et Phrygiis comitata ministris? 2.580
occiderit ferro Priamus? Troia arserit igni?
Dardanium totiens sudarit sanguine litus?
non ita. namque etsi nullum memorabile nomen
feminea in poena est, habet haec victoria laudem;
exstinxisse nefas tamen et sumpsisse merentis 2.585

[1] Although they are sometimes bracketed, as, for instance, in Mynors' OCT edition.

laudabor poenas, animumque explesse iuvabit

ultricis †famam et cineres satiasse meorum.'

talia iactabam et furiata mente ferebar,

‘I was the last one alive when I saw her on guard there at Vesta’s

Shrine, keeping silent and well out of sight, in its innermost sanctum:

Helen, Tyndareus’ daughter. The flames, as I wandered at random,

Passing my eyes over everything, shed the light needed to see her.

She, common demon of war for both Troy and her homeland, foreseeing

Teucrian wrath because Pergamum fell, then Danaän reprisals,

Then the rough ire of the husband she’d left, had now hidden in terror,

Crouched by the fires of the altar, unseen by their eyes full of hatred.

Flames were now rife in my soul, ire rose up within me, demanding

Vengeance for my dying homeland and summary, criminal justice.

“Must she see Sparta again unharmed—and her uncle’s Mycenae—

Riding in glory, a queen who has just given birth to a triumph?

Is she to see married life, her ancestral home and her children,

Served by a court full of women from Troy and of Phrygian pageboys,

Though Priam died by the sword, though Troy is but one massive bonfire,

Though our Dardanian shore has sweated out blood beyond measure?

No! While you don’t win a glorious name if you punish a woman,

Here is a victory earning its own special kind of approval.

I will be praised for destroying the blight of a curse, for exacting

Punishment earned, and my soul will be glad it has duly accomplished

Vengeance we burned for—and sated the thirsting ash of my nation."

Such were my rioting thoughts as my mind's rage swept me towards her.

A longstanding and vigorous debate behind these twenty-two lines – conventionally designated as *Aeneid* 2.567-588 and known collectively as the Helen Episode – has been generated by one simple closed-ended question: "Did Vergil write them?"[2] Unfortunately, *pace* any scholar's dogged assertion, a "yes" or "no" answer is not possible. What the ancient world has left us does not permit this type of unqualified certainty.

And yet we cannot refrain from attempting to know whether or not the Helen Episode belongs to the *Aeneid* because of the substantial influence that the passage, or its absence, exerts on how we read the poem. As part of the text, the Helen Episode meaningfully shapes the story. It exemplifies a type which, as Conte puts it, "regulates the 'fabula' like a gear, receiving and transmitting the motion of the narrative."[3] The characterization of Aeneas is significantly affected by the episode's presence or absence. The removal of the contested lines silences certain striking tragic and Homeric echoes. By allowing the lines to remain, we open up interpretative avenues. Without them, we must wonder why, upon her epiphany, Venus proceeds to restrain her son (*dextraque prehensum / continuit*, 592-593). One could go on. As Austin pointedly remarks, "The genuineness of this 'Helen-episode' is a major problem of Virgilian scholarship."[4]

Thus, the significant effects of the episode's inclusion or exclusion tempt us to answer a closed-ended question that (at this point in time) we cannot actually answer. But there is a way

---

[2] In his 1992 monologue dedicated to the Helen Episode, Berres provides a chronological bibliography of 84 works of scholarship that deal with the contested lines between 1820-1984, to which we might add La Penna 1978. After 1984, the following publications have engaged with the debate (pages have been listed for works not chiefly concerned with the Helen Episode): Conte 1986 (196-207), Suzuki 1989 (94-102), Horsfall 1995, Geymonat 1995 (300), Egan 1996, Matthiessen 1997, Bleisch 1999 (209), Scafoglio 2000, Erbse 2001, Fish 2003, Murgia 2003, Syed 2005 (74-78), Delvigo 2006, O'Hara 2006 (86), Horsfall, 2006/7, Horsfall 2008 (553-586), Peirano 2012 (243-263), Conte 2016 (69-87), Kraggerud 2017 (164-165).

[3] Conte 1986: 200.

[4] Austin 1964: 217.

out of this predicament; it involves adjusting the enquiry. Hence, I will attempt to answer a different question, but one that we are actually equipped to address, namely "What is the likelihood that Vergil wrote the Helen Episode?" I will do this by looking critically at why the original question was posed in the first place, the available evidence, and the interpretations that have led others to propose their answers. In the process, I will contribute my own arguments and ultimately contend that the likelihood of the Helen Episode's authenticity justifies regarding the *Aeneid* as a poem of which it constitutes an integral part.

1. Transmission

I do not believe that Fairclough was wrong in 1906, when he wrote "We say it with confidence that, if this splendid passage had come down to us with the same manuscript authority as the rest of the *Aeneid*, not a word of protest would have been raised against its authenticity."[5] As things stand, a highly irregular transmission casts its long shadow over the twenty-two lines. They are not found in the primary manuscripts of the *Aeneid*. The manuscripts and earliest print editions that do feature the Helen Episode – henceforth HE – appear to have integrated text previously preserved in the commentary of Servius and the amalgam known as Servius Auctus.[6] The latter is thought to contain elements taken from the lost commentary of Aelius Donatus, a fourth-century grammarian and commentator, who was also Servius' teacher. We believe that Donatus himself wrote the extant dedicatory epistle, which claims a familiarity with virtually all the authors who were skilled in Vergil's work (*fere omnibus ... qui in Virgilii opere calluerunt*) and describes what would have followed as a gift resulting from contributions (*munus collaticium*), preserving the genuine voice of ancient authority (*sinceram vocem priscae auctoritatis*). Both

[5] Fairclough 1906: 222.
[6] Also known as Servius Danielis.

Servius and Servius Auctus transmit the lines of the HE – Servius in his *Vita* and Servius Auctus within the commentary for 2.566. In the Servian *Vita*, the lines are used to illustrate the type of *superflua* that were removed by Tucca and Varius in the process of their editing what Vergil had left upon his death (*hos versus constat esse detractos*, 11-12). Servius Auctus likewise tells us the verses were taken out by Tucca and Varius.[7] At 2.592, both commentaries remark *constat esse sublatos*, with regard to the lines of the HE. Both present the same reasons for their removal: *nam et turpe est viro forti contra feminam irasci, et contrarium est Helenam in domo Priami fuisse illi rei, quae in sexto dicitur*.

Rowell says that what we find in Servius concerning the HE had been taken from the earlier commentary by Donatus. He argues that the curious beginning of the Cassellanus (i.e. the chief) manuscript of Servius Auctus preserves a fragment of Donatus' introduction to the *Aeneid*: ARMA VIRUMQUE CANO ET IN SECUNDO LIBRO ALIQUOS VERSUS POSUERAT *quos invenimus cum pervenerimus ad locum de quo detracti sunt*. Rowell thinks that this beginning refers to the excision of the HE (216 ff.).[8] In turn, Goold, who champions the spuriousness of the episode, contends that the passage and anything connected to it in Servius Auctus had been adopted from Servius and preserves nothing that goes back to Donatus.[9] He stresses, moreover, that Servius himself cannot be trusted, prone as he is to "inexactitudes" and not proffering his sources.[10] He counters Rowell by claiming that the odd beginning of the Servius Auctus commentary in the Cassellanus manuscript preserves a fragment (changed by a compiler) of Servius' *Vita*, rather than a preface by Donatus. However, in his side by side

---

[7] *Ad* 2.566.
[8] Rowell 1966: 216ff.
[9] Goold 1970. Pp. 101-132 contain the lengthy argument and p. 133 the concluding statement. Goold hypothesizes that Servius inherited the passage, not from Donatus, but "from some commentary little used and of no great authority and influence" (134).
[10] Goold 1970: 135; in general, 126-129 and 134-140.

comparison of what is found in Servius and the Cassellanus manuscript of Servius Auctus, he misrepresents the portion written in miniscule, citing it as beginning with *quos constat esse detractos* – echoing Servius' *Vita* 12 – rather than *quos invenimus cum pervenerimus ad locum de quo detracti sunt.*[11] Finally, although Goold makes his case with imposing force, he simply does not have the ultimate proof that Donatus made no mention of the disputed lines, namely Donatus' commentary itself.[12]

The lack of consensus about the episode's transmission or its significance is paralleled by the uncertainty regarding its classification by those who see it as an interpolation.[13] In his survey of the most common types of interpolation in Latin texts, Tarrant mentions the passage as an example of interpolation which does not "fit neatly into a single category." He speculates that the writer "may have been motivated by a desire to fill (if only *exempli gratia*) a lacuna in Virgil's draft of the poem, but the resulting passage is also a sustained and at least partially successful emulation of Virgil's epic manner."[14]

2. Language and style

Thus, as Tarrant has done, scholars are forced to turn to the examination of the text itself, since an examination of what we know of its transmission refuses to produce conclusive answers and, as Peirano puts it, "the fact that a passage is transmitted by indirect tradition and is attested only

[11] Goold 1970: 130; Rowell 1966: 216.
[12] Although Servius Auctus might reflect some Donatian elements, this hybrid text does not transmit *everything* from Donatus' commentary, which remains lost to us. Consequently, we cannot be sure that it lacked all reference to the HE (Murgia 1971: 206 n. 10; Camps 1969: 126).
[13] Murgia 1971 believes that it actually "does not make a great deal of difference for the question of authenticity whether or not Donatus transmitted the lines" (203-204), since the "record of all our scholiasts in such questions is very poor, and Donatus' record perhaps worst of all, except for the fact that, unlike Servius, he sometimes specifies his sources" (204). He illustrates Donatus' unreliability with a few examples from the *VSD* (204-206).
[14] Tarrant 1987: 297.

in later manuscripts is not on its own sufficient reason to doubt its authenticity."[15] Many have pronounced their opinion about the style of the HE.[16] Unfortunately, the result is more contention, which underscores the subjectivity and instability of such evaluations. For instance, although early in the debate, analysis of the lines' metrical quality has been used to argue against Vergilian authorship, it has not been able to generate enduring conclusions.[17] This lack of consensus and instability of opinion is perhaps most vividly illustrated by the dramatic shift in outlook experienced by a single scholar. Shipley admits that he used to consider the passage an interpolation, in part, because of its metrical peculiarities. Yet, in the end, a re-examination of these "very peculiarities of versification" actually led him to regard the passage as Vergilian.[18]

Heinze claims that linguistic usage proves that the lines are not Vergil's.[19] Conversely, Camps is of the opinion that linguistically "there is nothing in the passage to make Virgilian authorship seem unlikely."[20] Even Goold concedes that the "verses contain much which echoes the language of Virgil,"[21] and a fellow disputer of authenticity, Horsfall, follows suit, admitting that "there are no indefensible lapses (though they have been claimed) in Virgilian style or usage."[22] In a lengthy list published in his 1961 article, Austin defends particular words and phrases that had generated the objection of being un-Vergilian.[23] More recently, Horsfall has contributed his "defence" of the Vergilian character of linguistic usage in the HE.[24] I will not here replicate the

---

[15] Peirano 2012: 247-248. Horsfall 2006/7: 14 provides a list of irregularly transmitted "authentic" passages.
[16] Austin lists many formidable critics, some of whom decry the HE's style as sub-par, while others champion its poetic splendor (1961: 186).
[17] Austin: 1961: 187; Conte 1986: 198; etc.
[18] Shipley 1925: 172. For instance, he realized that in regard to the feature of "*et* following a vowel or *m* at the penthemimeral position" the passage conforms to the context of "the 400 lines of which it is the center" (181-82).
[19] Heinze 2003: 26.
[20] Camps 1969: 125.
[21] Goold 1970: 145.
[22] Horsfall 2006/7: 9. In her contemporaneous publication, Delvigo (2006: 208) highlights the Vergilian nature of lines 567-568.
[23] Austin 1961: 188.
[24] Horsfall 2006/7: 20-22.

arguments for individual elements, but a close look at one of the disputed words and phrases will give us a sense of the operative approaches:

573 *praemetuens*: This word is not found elsewhere in the Vergilian corpus. As Shipley observes, however, thirteen verbs compound with *prae* occur only once in the epic, while *presensit* at 2.297 – like *praemetuens* – is found nowhere else in Vergil.[25] Moreover, Lucretius (an influence on Vergil) uses *praemetuens* in *De Rerum Natura* 3.1019 and another form of the word at 4.823.

576 *sceleratas sumere poenas*: This phrase is remarkable and unparalleled, but, according to Camps, "not more remarkable than many Virgilian liberties with language; for instance, *quod scelus … merente?* (7.307) for *cuius sceleris poenam merente?*"[26] Similarly, Austin thinks that it "bears all the marks of a Virgilian invention."[27] In contrast, Murgia deems the words as too extravagant for Vergil.[28]

Conte, in turn, accepts the phrase as a Vergilian adaptation of the bold enallages of Greek tragedy.[29] He argues that the conceit along with *sumpsisse merentis/ ...poenas* at 585-586, is "the spontaneous, almost instinctive product of a characteristic and unmistakable linguistic gesture," which "contains the stylistic identity of the author of the *Aeneid*," but also happens to be a type of "secondary detail" that would escape reproduction by an emulator of Vergilian style.[30] In agreement with Conte, Peirano sees *sceleratas sumere poenas* and the other enallages in the HE as occurrences of a "peculiarly Vergilian stileme"; however, she observes that "what makes such

[25] Shipley 1925: 183-184.
[26] Camps 1969: 125.
[27] Austin 1961: 190.
[28] Murgia 1971: 213
[29] Conte 1986: 205. He cites the *Andromache* as an example: πατρὸς φόνιον αἰτήσει δίκην ["he will demand *homicidal* justice for his father" instead of "justice for the *death* of his father"] (1002).
[30] Conte 2016: 86.

stilemes identifiable also makes them reproducible."[31] To explain the semantic perplexity of *sceleratas*, Hatch suggests that Vergil employs the word to communicate Aeneas' evaluation of his behaviour from a later perspective, i.e. as a "term of self-reproach;"[32] Egan, meanwhile, views the striking adjective as "multi-referential" and thus conveying both Helen's transgressions and the morally reprehensible nature of her punishment.[33]

While some critics of authenticity have attacked the language of the HE as un-Vergilian, others argue that it is in fact *too* Vergilian to be authentic. Goold is suspicious of how the verses echo Vergil's language in the "well-know parts of the *Aeneid*."[34] Drawing on Goold's suspicion, in his 2006/7 article Horsfall declares that lexically the HE contains no "real invention, or innovation." On the very next page, however, he defends the reading of *flammae* (for *famam*) with *explesse* as a justified use of the genitive – although not attested elsewhere in Vergil – because it operates under "the force of analogy in linguistic invention."[35] As he proceeds to effectively "defend" other unparalleled uses, he identifies what are essentially other lexical innovations, though he does not label them as such, stating, for instance, that *nefas* marks "experimental use."[36] Moreover, in his commentary on *Aeneid 2*, he clearly points to a lexical invention by describing *furiata* (588) as an "interesting new word." In fact, he calls the author of the HE an "inventor" albeit "within the rules."[37] And yet, according to Horsfall, none of this

---

[31] Peirano 2012: 259. She points out that the Servian commentaries recognize Vergil's penchant for the use of transferred epithet. We should note that Conte (2016: 85-86) also speaks of the presence in the HE of a more subtle Vergilian stileme and one that is limited to the *Aeneid*, namely the conclusion of a verse with the bacchiac genitive plural possessive adjective. This occurs at 2.587: *ultricis †famam et cineres satiasse meorum*.
[32] Hatch 1959: 255. Reckford is of a similar opinion, remarking that Aeneas is describing "an outbreak of passion with a measure of clarity and objectivity that join with Virgil's own" (1981: 87).
[33] Egan 1996: 384.
[34] Goold 1970: 145-146. Cf. Horsfall's remark: "Repeatedly, the writing is excessively Virgilian, the work of one who spares no effort to prove that the author is Virgil. His efforts have convinced many distinguished Latinists, but the sweat of his efforts has stained the page and in the end it is those sweat stains that give him away" (2006/7: 24).
[35] Horsfall 2006/7: 18-19.
[36] Horsfall 2006/7: 22.
[37] Horsfall 2008: 563.

inventing and innovating is "real." Unfortunately, he never goes on to explain precisely what this rather mysterious "real invention, or innovation" that the HE apparently lacks actually entails.[38]

Murgia, meanwhile, thinks that the stylistic features of the HE are not in themselves suspect, but their use lacks Vergilian restraint. For instance, he feels that repetition has been used "with exceedingly heavy hand" and is an intentional mannerism employed by the interpolator to mimic Vergil's style. [39] But is the employment of this stylistic feature really uncharacteristically excessive? Within the twenty-two lines we see nine words or their close cognates occur twice and two words or their close cognates (*patriae, patriam, patrias, patres*; *poenam, poenas, poena, poenas*) occur four times. But we can compare the HE to 6.550-577, for instance, where eleven words or their close cognates occur twice and two of the same (*sono; sedeo, sedes*) three times. Moreover, since the HE constitutes words spoken by a character and half of the passage's lines belongs to a frenzied soliloquy, its stylistic features should be compared with similar distraught speeches rather than with the epic at large. After all, as a masterful poet, Vergil shaped language according to its role and context. Thus, if we look at the soliloquy of the maddened Dido (4.590-629), who similarly aims to inflict death and rages against an individual viewed as the source of her misfortunes, we also find abundant repetition: thirteen words or their close cognates occur twice, four of them (*patrius, pater; prex, precor, imprecor; do; flamma*) three times, and one word (*arma, arma, armis, armis*) is repeated four times.[40] Such "excessive" repetitions

---

[38] His statements that the HE exhibits "brilliantly meticulous warming-over of ingredients whose familiarity emerges more and more clearly from close study" and that the "few deviations, or near deviations from attested Virgilian usage ... are the work of a writer who has studied this specialised idiom of the *Aen*.—one both extremely complex but ultimately finite—in the finest detail" (2006/7: 19-20) are neither sufficiently precise nor sufficiently compelling to remedy his self-contradictions.

[39] Murgia 1971: 215-216. Similarly – though with a qualification – Horsfall views the repetition as immoderate compared to Vergil "at his majestic best" (2006/7: 18). For a list, see Austin 1961: 194.

[40] Highet 1972: 171 observes that the "hatred which hisses out in lines 585-587 is as violently expressed in multiple sibilants as that of Dido in 4.603-606. Thinking of what she could have done in revenge, Dido utters four verbs all of the same form: '*tulissem ... implessem ... exstinxem ... dedissem*.' Thinking here of what he will achieve by executing Helen, Aeneas utters four verbs all of the same form: '*exstinxisse ... sumpisse ... explesse ... satiasse*.'"

accentuate the passionate fixations of the distraught characters. In Aeneas' case, as Reckford observes, the "incantatory" repetition of the lines reflects "a disturbed mind" of a man who is "working himself up with words to a frenzy that must naturally culminate in the murder of Helen."[41] Furthermore, the frequent and flat reiteration (without *variatio*) of *poena* and *patria* in the HE, just like the use of *do*, *flamma*, and *arma* in Dido's monologue, emphasizes the words' thematic significance.[42]

To sum up, in terms of its lexica, for those who argue against its authenticity, the HE is either too much or not sufficiently like the rest of the *Aeneid*. This situation is problematic because it means that by arguing against once stance, one inevitably provides support for the opposite stance, which, however, leads to the same conclusion (of the HE's inauthenticity). This essentially amounts to a lack of falsifiability.

3. Stage of composition

Not only is the estimation of the stylistic features of the HE as falling short of the Vergilian standard a very subjective point in the case against authenticity, it can also be countered by a defence from a different direction. If the HE is perceived as somewhat less polished than the rest of the epic, this quality can be attributed to something quite certain and that we should not let slip from our sight: (unlike the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*) the *Aeneid* is not a work that has undergone full and utter completion. Vergil died before he could put the finishing touches to the lengthy poem, which through the scattering of its half-lines reveals a piecemeal method of composition. While we might be cautious about the reliability of Vergil's biographical

---

Numerous verbal repetitions – as noted by Berres (1992: 56) – also characterize the segment that relates Dido's passionate reaction after Aeneas' response to her confrontation about his preparations for departure (4.362-389). Berres also points out a number of other parallels between this segment and the HE (55-56).

[41] Reckford 1981: 88.

[42] Conte observes this "expressive insistence" in the HE (1986: 206).

tradition,[43] what the *Vita Suetonii vulgo Donatiana* (henceforth *VSD*) tells us about the process of composition is quite probable:

> *Aeneida prosa prius oratione formatam digestamque in XII libros particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque, et nihil in ordine arripiens. Ac ne quid impetum moraretur,* ***quaedam inperfecta*** *transmisit,* ***alia levissimis versis veluti fulsit****, quae per iocum pro tibicinibus interponi aiebat ad sustinendum opus, donec solidae columnae advenirent.* (23-24)

In the case of the *Aeneid*, after writing a first draft in prose and dividing it into twelve books, he proceeded to turn into verse one part after another, taking them up just as he fancied, in no particular order. And that he might not check the flow of his thought, he left some things unfinished, and, so to speak, bolstered others up with very slight words, which, as he jocosely used to say, were put in like props, to support the structure until the solid columns should arrive.[44]

It makes sense that as complex and extensive a work as the *Aeneid* would have been crafted not from beginning to end, but rather, in parts undergoing varying stages of composition: while some parts were already polished, others were "lightly" composed but not yet perfectly revised.[45] In line with this process, the HE could have remained only "lightly" composed while the rest of the narrative sequence to which it belongs received its finishing touches.[46] In fact, Austin does not consider "the passage as a unit, a single draft," but rather as "a collection of drafts, stages, or

---

[43] Horsfall 2006: 3-4, for instance, urges a more critical approach.
[44] Trans. J. C. Rolfe.
[45] Cf. Fairclough 1906: 229.
[46] Harrison 1970 envisions the Venus scene as part of an initial "simple arrangement" based on the *Iliad*, whereby the scene with Venus was introduced "as a foil to the sinister activities of Minerva toward the beginning" (328). The HE was devised later, as Vergil was working backwards, "to motivate Venus' intervention (329-330). Korte (1916) views the scene as a later addition, a supplementary excuse for Aeneas' abandoning of Troy. He observes that, if one proceeds from 566 directly to 632, the flow of the narrative does not actually suffer (1916: 147).

strata in a scheme, with a clear disintegration toward the end."[47] He argues that such obvious problems as repetitions (of vocabulary and expression) and contradictions speak against forgery by someone otherwise "capable of the imaginative conception that the passage shows both in thought and expression."[48]

Goold, however, doubts that "Virgil's versification in its early stages" could "ever take such an imperfect shape." As proof, he proclaims the apparent fact that in the manuscript which "Varius edited, the poet had written down only elegant verse."[49] But what did Varius' editing consist of? Did he really inherit an "essentially complete" epic that he merely proofread?[50] Could the procedure of editing have been that simple? More importantly, could the writing process of such a lengthy, multifaceted poem really have left no traces of verses in a state of flux – not unfinished but *unpolished* – with which the editor might have been confronted? Evidently, Goold is guided by the claim in the *VSD* that Varius edited the epic *summatim* (41). But if we are making arguments based on the *VSD*, then its earlier description of Vergil's creative process is significant for revealing this process' complex and fragmented nature (23-24). For instance, it establishes two distinct categories for Vergil's unfinished verses: *quaedam … alia*. The first group consists of incomplete verses (*inperfecta*), which have presumably come down to us as the many half-lines in the epic, polished in so far as they extend. Only these types of verses seem to

---

[47] Austin 1961: 197.
[48] Austin 1964: 218; 1961: 194, 198. For Berres (1992), the generally unfinished state of the episode is central to his claim for its authenticity. Cf. Highet 1972: 167-168 and his remark that all "that we are told of Vergil's method of composing and revising confirms what we see throughout the epic, and makes it likely that the passage containing Aeneas' monologue is his work—although incomplete, and discarded by himself as unsuitable to the advancing plan of the poem" (168).
[49] Goold 1970: 155.
[50] Goold 1970: 155. Although Goold claims that "[l]ittle was left for an editor to do" (155), he does acknowledge that the lines enclosing the HE as we have them cannot constitute what Varius had initially found. He concedes: "We must frankly acknowledge that the introduction to the *cum*-clause was in all probability composed and later deleted" (160). Deleted by whom? Vergil or Varius? And if by Varius, would this really be that much different from his deleting the HE?

be addressed in Donatus' subsequent description of Varius' editing: *Edidit ... auctore Augusto Varius, sed summatim emendata, ut qui versus etiam inperfectos sicut erant reliquerit* (41). And yet there was clearly a second type of unfinished work: the rough drafts, i.e. content propped up by loosely styled verses (*alia levissimis versis veluti fulsit)*. If the overall polished quality of individual verses defines the first publication of the *Aeneid*, as Goold argues, then this scenario strongly suggests that any relatively less polished passage, such as the HE, would have been edited out, especially if their unfinished state had in some way been indicated by Vergil himself.[51]

Goold does not accept that the HE could be a work in progress because he considers it a "finished product."[52] He deems this evaluation proven by the carefully composed structure of the passage, its unification by ring composition.[53] However, the presence of an underlying structure does not necessarily signify that there is no longer room for manipulation and refinement of particular words or phrases, i.e. factors of style. Moreover, if the passage belongs to those whose content Vergil initially propped up with *levissimi versi*, this suggests that the underlying structure, i.e. the content, preceded stylistic fine-tuning. Additionally, Goold proposes that verses 2.623ff. – with the difficult *deo ducente* – "were to be rewritten" to accommodate the subsequently added Venus scene.[54] By the same token, why could the HE not likewise warrant rewriting in the process of Vergil's composition?

Shipley reasonably imagines that the lengthy and piecemeal process of creating and crafting the *Aeneid* might have had the physical manifestation of a workshop "littered with many similar

[51] Austin 1961: 197; Camps 1969: 125.
[52] Goold 1970: 154.
[53] Goold 1970: 147-148. Interestingly, Horsfall believes the HE to be deficient in unity (2008: 564).
[54] Goold 1970: 157.

chips, in the form of studies, sketches, and rough drafts of minor parts of the poem." [55] If the HE had been discarded as such a "chip," either by his editors or by the poet himself, it could have entered the indirect tradition – and thus continued on – by being inadvertently allowed to pass into someone's hands. Alternately, Vergil could have intentionally shared the passage – by itself or along with other verses – with one or more individuals, either by sending it to someone for perusal or by holding a reading.[56] Thus, it could have been saved before the poet – perhaps because of negative feedback – or his editors ultimately decided against its inclusion in the epic. In short, many possible scenarios could have enabled the HE's survival outside the original publication of the *Aeneid*.

4. Ancient reception

Nonetheless, Goold declares that these types of speculations fail "on the score of probability," since we have no references to the episode before Servius.[57] We should recall, however, the argument advanced by Rowell – and unconvincingly denied by Goold – that the episode had been transmitted in Donatus, who, in turn, could have preserved earlier sources.[58] Moreover, there is an intertextual correspondence – first perceived by Heitland[59] – between the presentation of Helen as *Troiae et patriae communis Erinys* (*Aen*. 2.573) and Lucan's qualification of Cleopatra as *Latii feralis Erinys* (*B.C.* 10.59). As Bruere has shown, this correspondence is underscored by multiple verbal and conceptual parallels that link the contexts of the

[55] Shipley 1925: 184.
[56] The *VSD* informs us that Vergil had given a recitation of Books 2, 4, and 6 for Augustus. We also learn that he gave other public recitations, especially of the parts about which he was unsure and consequently sought advice (32-33). Even if this specific information cannot be fully trusted, it is highly probable that, over the years, the poet made others familiar with at least parts of his writing.
[57] Goold 1970: 162-165.
[58] See Sec. 1.
[59] Heitland 1887: CXXVI. Cf. Austin 1961: 196.

descriptions.[60] Berres, in turn, has detected a potential intertext with the HE in Valerius Flaccus.[61]

5. Omission from direct tradition

In his commentary *ad Aen*. 2.592, Servius brings up the possible grounds for the episode's omission by the inheritors of Vergil's text: the perceived inconsistency with the account of Helen in Book 6 and the shamefulness of Aeneas' behaviour of: *turpe est viro forti contra feminam irasci*.[62] We will return to both issues later, but the ancient commentator's second reason merits some consideration at this point. Although Servius' view tends to be dismissed by modern scholars,[63] it is in fact quite possible for such an evaluation of Aeneas' role in HE to precipitate the episode's rejection. We must remember that for a very long time the *Aeneid*'s reception occurred within a moral climate that was dramatically different from our own, and, as Stahl observes, Aeneas' behaviour could have appeared "abhorrent … to puristic admirers of Augustus' paradigmatic forefather."[64] Perhaps the HE was originally excised on stylistic

[60] Bruere 1964: 267. Murgia 2003 has posited that Lucan's text came first and the interpolator of the HE appropriated the common elements from it or from a lost common model. His arguments, however, are not decisive, as he himself admits (425), and are firmly countered by Conte (2016: 76-81).

[61] Berres 1992: 68-69. There have been attempts to demonstrate other echoes of the HE in Roman literature, but they fail to be persuasive. For instance, we might note Basto's claim of a reflection of *Aen.* 2.567-569 in Horace's *Epl*. 1.5.31 and his, more cautious, proposition of other parallels between the HE and Horace (1984: 20-23). For the dubious echoes of the HE in Ovid's *Heroides*, Seneca's *Troades*, and Statius' *Thebaid*, see Berres 1992: 63-65, 70-71.

[62] See Sec. 1.

[63] Austin, for instance, calls Servius' reasons "worthless" (1961: 186). Otherwise, they are largely absent from pertinent discourse.

[64] Stahl 1981: 169 and, similarly, Fish 2003: 128. Syed 2005: 76 argues that, since frenzy in the *Aeneid* is usually associated with women, ancient readers could have viewed Aeneas' frenzied display as "a blot on his masculine power of self-control." Erbse 2001: 432-433 suggests that Varius and Tucca were encouraged in their removal of the unflattering depiction of Aeneas by a Homeric precedent, namely the apparent removal of lines 9.458-461 from the vulgate text of the *Iliad*. Like the HE, these verses are missing form the MS tradition and have come down to us indirectly, through a citation in Plutarch (*Mor*. 26, and in part at *Mor*. 72B and *Vita Coriolani* 32), who credits Aristarchus with their excision (ἐξεῖλε). Plutarch suggests that the Hellenistic editor removed them because he was alarmed (φοβηθείς) by their unflattering depiction of Phoinix, Achilles' venerable mentor. Like Aeneas, Phoinix admits an intention to commit shameful bloodshed (of his father), which is thwarted by divine intervention. Erbse argues that the obvious parallels between both passages imply that Vergil's editors knew of the Aristarchus'

grounds, but then *continued* to be kept apart from the vulgate text of the epic as the years passed and Aeneas – like Augusts – became progressively more idealised in his significance for Roman readers.[65]

6. Embeddedness within the *Aeneid*: the immediate context

Although the possibilities for the HE's omission and indirect transmission cannot be regarded as anything more than probabilities, it is clear that without the episode, the text contains a lacuna.[66] Removing the HE leaves an inverted *cum* clause without an appropriate main clause. Venus' restraining gesture in *continuit* (593) and her subsequent words require an explanation. Aeneas' thoughts for his family cannot be immediately followed by Venus' reproachful directive for him to be mindful of his family. Although Heinze admits that without the HE another scene is required to answer the issues raised by the subsequent lines, he rejects the HE as un-Vergilian in its "whole conception."[67] In terms of other narrative possibilities, Heinze arrives at the conclusion that the immediate context allows only one: Aeneas resolving to put "an end to his life by his own hand," perhaps blaming Helen and Paris in his thoughts or words[68] at some point in the process.[69] Although Heinze's scenario might explain Venus' restraining her son, it does

---

excision and followed its example. (On the issue of the reliability of Plutarch's claim about Aristarchus, see Hainsworth 1993: 123, with references to additional scholarship.)

[65] Peirano 2012: 255 notes the long history of "the tradition of reading the poem as an extended encomium for its hero and his descendants." This approach would oppose the reintegration of any passage deemed unflattering to Aeneas.

[66] Heinze 2003: 27; Austin 1961: 194; Camps 1969: 124.

[67] Heinze 2003: 28.

[68] Since he just condemned Aeneas' soliloquy as evidence of forgery, Heinze is careful to specify that Aeneas' words could be brief enough not to constitute a soliloquy. Yet his proposal indirectly discloses, in contrast to his strong objections, that even he recognizes that the context calls for Aeneas' narration of something he had originally spoken to himself. Whether these words amount to a line, two, or a dozen is – in my view – tantamount to splitting hairs.

[69] Heinze 2003: 29-30. Highet responds to Henize with the observation that there "is no trace whatever in the text of" any such suicidal purpose and emotions "and it is rendered unlikely by the emphasis with which Aeneas says that he now thought of his family (560-563), i.e., that he must now fight no more, but survive to save them" (1972: 173-74 n. 127).

not fit with her first words to him: *nate, quis indomitas tantus dolor excitat iras*? (2.594). Having just stopped a man who had sunk in despair deep enough to commit suicide, she would not be asking what pain has excited his *anger*. If Aeneas were to kill himself, that action could scarcely be attributed to his immense anger: grief and desperation, yes, but hardly anger. Even, if he had somehow expressed rage at Paris and Helen shortly before, it would be strange for Venus to bring this up in her very first words to someone she has just saved from self-destruction or qualify it as the noteworthy consequence of his pain. We would, instead, expect something along the lines of "What great pain has led you to such a desperate act?" Furthermore, the brief cursing of Helen and Paris by Aeneas that Heinze envisions hardly warrants the extensive response from Venus. I just cannot see how in the circumstances imagined by Heinze Vergil could have Venus focus on this type of hatred while barely acknowledging her son's motivation for suicide. Perhaps recognizing Venus' reference to the lovers as ill-fitting within his proposed context, Heinze felt the need for further justification since he argues that "Virgil is employing the well-known convention, of which the tragedians were particularly fond, whereby one refers back to the first causes of misfortune."[70] His observation, however, also reinforces the appropriateness of having Helen feature in a scene that immediately follows Aeneas' witnessing of the dramatic climax of Troy's misfortunes: Priam's murder. As Conte observes, Aeneas' profound suffering "implicitly poses the question that springs from all deep grief: 'Who is to blame?'"[71] Moreover, Venus' injunction to look at those actually guilty of the terrible destruction "could only have been made (in a way yielding an unbroken development of narrative tension in crescendo) to someone threatening to take revenge, through a shameful act, on the wrong person."[72] Thus, the

[70] Heinze 2003: 29.
[71] Conte 1986: 200.
[72] Conte 1986: 203.

context requires the storyline elements conveyed by the HE. It also makes perfect sense for Venus to mention Paris immediately after exculpating Helen.[73] She is essentially saying "Son, in the blindness of your mortal vision, you are blaming and going after the wrong person. It is not Helen who destroyed Troy. And in case your thought naturally shifts to the next person commonly held responsible for the war,[74] i.e. the man who brought Helen to Troy, he's not to blame either. In point of fact, there is no one to blame on the mortal plane. Troy owes its destruction not to any mortals, but to the gods. Look, I'll show you."[75]

Goold rightly observes that Aeneas must, at this point, "occupy a position of wide survey for his mother to show him the gods at their battle stations (604ff.)." He also believes, however, that this conflicts with the earlier *erranti* (570), "which conceives of Aeneas at ground level."[76] But does it? The verb contains no such inherently limiting conception and allows for a broad scope of interpretation. Hence, Austin reads the word as indicating "that Aeneas was pacing about the roof, looking everywhere"[77]; Camps takes it to mean "as I hesitated"[78]; Egan proposes interpreting *erranti* in its more figurative sense, that is, as a wondering of the mind "of the distraught and delusion-prone hero."[79]

Not only does the HE constitute an integral and seamlessly integrated part in the progression of the storyline of Book 2, it also contributes to the network of serpentine imagery that permeates the book's entire fabric. And it does so in a manner that is in keeping with Vergil's subtle artistry. Knox's seminal study of the serpent motif has made clear that although the second book

---

[73] Heinze questions why Venus would mention Paris, "for Aeneas cannot have given him a single thought during the whole of this scene" (2003: 27). Goold makes an objection along the same lines (1970: 157).
[74] *Il.* 6.283-284, 6.327-329; *Il.* 3.325 Schol. A; Pindar, *Paian* 8a; *Agam.* 1156; *Hec.* 943, etc.
[75] These reasons for the inclusion of Paris in Venus' speech have been, for the most part, already observed by Fairclough (1906: 224).
[76] Goold 1970: 157.
[77] Austin 1961, 188-189.
[78] Camps 1969: 124-125.
[79] Egan 1996: 388.

of the *Aeneid* contains only three passages that overtly showcase the creature,[80] these "passages are the base which supports a complex structure of references to the dominant image; elsewhere in the book the figure of the serpent is evoked by phrase after phrase which reminds us of its presence where it lies half-concealed in the language – *latet anguis in herba*."[81] In other words, although the manifestations of the serpent are remarkably pervasive, they are subtle and call for the reader's attentiveness to the fine-tunings of language and its inter- and intra-textual resonances. For example, the motif can be found lurking in the language Sinon uses to depict his fictitious escape from the Greeks: ... *vincula rupi, / limosoque lacu per noctem obscurus in ulva / delitui* .... (2.134-136). Knox comments that the appearance of the rare *delitescere* intertextually links the toxic words of a man whose very name evokes a coiling with the only other appearance of this verb in Vergil, namely with *Georgics* 3, where it is used of a viper: *saepe sub immotis praesepibus ... mala tactu / vipera delituit* (416-417).[82]

The description of Helen within the HE (*limina Vestae / servantem et tacitam secreta in sede latentem,* 2.567-574) contributes to the dominant metaphor in a very similar manner, continuing the theme of serpentine concealment and destruction. As Knox points out, *limina servantem* recalls Vergil's depiction of the serpent who killed Euridice in *Georgics* 4: *immanem ante pedes hydrum moritura puella/ servantem ripas alta non vidit in herba* (458-459).[83] Elaborating on this intertextual association, Delvigo observes that *servantem* not only occupies the same metrical position in the HE as it does in the *Georgics* line, but that it also conveys the same meaning of

[80] Most vivid, of course, is the episode in which sea serpents kill Laocoon and his sons, but there are also similes that feature snakes: Androgeos is likened to a someone who happens upon a snake (2.378-81), while Pyrrhus is himself assimilated to a snake that has shed its skin (2.471-475).
[81] Knox 1966: 125.
[82] Knox 1966: 133-134.
[83] Knox 1966: 138. While Knox' identifies the HE's participation in the overarching serpentine metaphor, Delvigo 2006 further illuminates this participation; unlike Knox, she frames it as evidence in support of the episode's Vergilian paternity.

"dwelling" along with "guarding." She remarks that this sense of the verb is often associated with those – whether human or animal – who guard something sacred or precious and cites such a usage in Lucretius, where it describes the snake that guards the gleaming apples of the Hesperides: *Hesperidum servans fulgentia mala /...serpens* (5.32).[84] Moreover, in the *Aeneid* itself, we find *servare* again coupled with *limina*. At 6.574-575 the Sybil asks Aeneas whether he perceives the form of the terrible guardian at the outer threshold to Tartarus: *cernis, custodia qualis / vestibulo sedeat, facies quae limina servet?*. The prophet is referring to the snake-holding Tisiphone.[85] In fact, her words are framed by another snaky monster, for in the following line (6.576), she relates that on its other side the gate is guarded by the Hydra, whose fifty monstrous dark mouths (*quinquaginta atris immanis hiatibus*) – as Vergil could expect his reader to know – belong to its multiple serpentine parts.[86]

As with other instances of the subtle evocation of the dominant image in the Book 2, additional elements in the passage help to bring out the latent snake metaphor.[87] The description of the Helen as *latentem* in a secluded place – Delvigo points out – likens her to a viper crouching in the shadows and resonates with Vergil's words in *Eclogue* 3: *latet anguis in herba* (93), and this serpentine connection is, in turn, reinforced with by the resonance of *abdiderat* in line 2.574 (*abdiderat sese atque aris invisa sedebat*) with the portion of *Georgics* 3 concerned with snakes (*caput abdidit alte*, 422). The preponderance of sibilants in *Vestae / servantem et tacitam secreta in sede* likewise helps to assimilate Helen to a snake.[88] What is more, this sound

---

[84] Delvigo 2006: 209.
[85] *torvosque sinistra / intentans anguis,* 571-572.
[86] Cf. Vergil's description of the Hydra killed by Hercules: *centum anguis cinctamque ... serpentibus Hydram* ["the Hydra girt with a hundred snakes and serpents"] (7.658). Although Delvigo notes the joining of *servare* with *limina* in the *Aeneid* (2006: 209), surprisingly, she does not proceed to highlight the serpentine dimension of this intratextual resonance.
[87] Knox 1966: *passim*.
[88] Delvigo 2006: 209.

effect echoes the hissing sonority that characterizes Vergil's language as he talks about snakes in *Georgics* 3[89] and as he depicts the approach of the giant sea serpents in *Aeneid* 2 (*sanguineae superant undas, pars cetera pontum / pone legit sinuatque immensa volumine terga. / fit sonitus spumante salo; iamque arva tenebant / ardentisque oculos suffecti sanguine*, 207-210).

7. Embeddedness within the *Aeneid*: the larger context

Although, as we have seen, the HE is quite embedded within its immediate context, beginning with Servius, readers have thought it to be at odds with a more removed part of the *Aeneid*, namely Deiphobus' narration of Helen's activity in Book 6. The HE presents Helen at the altar of Vesta, hiding from both Greeks and Trojans. We also hear about her activities on that same night from Helen's third husband, Deiphobus, whom Aeneas encounters in the Underworld. Deiphobus explains his mutilated appearance by relating that his wife had treacherously provided a signal for the Greeks, stolen his weapons as he slept, and led Menelaus and his companion Odysseus into his bedroom. Some see the apparent narrative incongruity between this account and the HE as symptomatic of the episode's unfinished state.[90] It is possible to question the veracity of Aeneas' account, or perhaps even of Deiphobus' report. Quinn suggests that Vergil's purpose might be partly "to emphasize the elusiveness of truth – it is so hard to find out what happened; partly, to compress his narrative, by leaving out details the reader can easily supply for himself, or about which he wishes to imply something less than certainty."[91] Reckford sees the discrepancy between the reports of Helen's behavior in Book 2 and 6 as modelled on the

[89]As Delvigo 2006: 209 remarks, this onomatopoeic effect in the *Georgics* 3 is most intense in lines 424-426: *solvuntur, tardosque trahit sinus ultimus orbis. / est etiam ille malus Calabris in saltibus anguis / squamea convolvens sublato pectore terga*.

[90] For instance, Fairclough 1906: 229; Camps 1969: 125. Cf. Harrison 1970: 329-330 and Highet 1972: 175.

[91] Quinn 1969: 171. Quinn adds that this "notion of the manysidedness of truth has its relevance to the Deiphobus Tableau with its reversal of Homer's account of his death (amplifying the anti-Greek note of [6.]489-93)."

contrasting accounts of Helen's activity during the war that we find in *Odyssey* 4 (240-289).[92] In the first, Helen herself relates how she recognized Odysseus when he had managed to infiltrate Troy disguised as a beggar. She declares that not only did she not give away his identity but that she felt joy when the he managed to kill many Trojans before returning to the Greek camp, since at this point her sympathies had changed in favor of her own people. Menelaus answers his wife's account with his own recollection of her "encounter" with Odysseus during which she showed emphatic support for the Trojan side. He recounts how, on Troy's final night, she tried to lure Greek warriors out of the wooden horse by making herself sound like each man's wife and calling out to them as she walked around the horse accompanied by Deiphobus.[93] Suzuki observes that, like these two contrasting narratives, the Vergilian accounts about Helen engage in the traditional debate regarding Helen's role in the Trojan War. She writes, "The two portraits of Helen in Books 2 and 6 ... may appear to contradict one another, in that Aeneas describes her as cowering and helpless and Deiphobus represents her as a dangerous agent of destruction. In fact, the contradictory portraits encapsulate the doubleness of Helen—as did the two stories told about her in *Odyssey* 4."[94] Drawing on Suzuki and seeing the incongruity as part of Vergil's destabilization of epic's fundamental role as memorial of the past, Bleisch argues that "Vergil's divergent accounts of Helen's conduct at the fall of Troy are more than a reflection of Helen's puzzling character; they are part of an over-arching pattern of dialogic narrative in Vergil's *Aeneid*. Palinurus' death, Deiphobus' death, Helen at the fall of Troy: each is presented in conflicting versions, first from Aeneas' point of view, then from another eyewitness' perspective.

---

[92] Reckford 1981: 96.
[93] Od. 4.242-289. Suzuki (1989: 73) sees the two competing narratives as contributing to the *Odyssey*'s conception of Helen "as an emblem for the doubleness of poetry."
[94] Suzuki 1989: 102.

Vergil's dialogic narrative undermines the objective, monologic authority of *epos*, as the single point of view of epic is refracted into multiple perspectives."[95]

Austin actually sees the discrepancy as a point in support of Vergilian authorship, arguing that the otherwise supremely skilful imitator, who must have been steeped in Vergil's work, would not have forged a passage that so obviously contradicted the narrative or "provide possible critics with such a useful handle against himself."[96] Horsfall, meanwhile, does not believe the inconsistency is really an issue at all, remarking that "the *Aeneid* is full of such inconsistencies of plotting and detail."[97] In fact, he suggests that it could be "a learned feature" of the interpolation "demonstrating the author's intimate familiarity with the work of earlier Virgil-scholars," or a cautious choice by the forger, since the "Helen-story in the HE is deeply, predictably traditional" and the treatment in Bk. 6 "an audacious, unconventional novelty."[98]

But Horsfall gravely exaggerates the traditional aspect of the HE and the novelty of the passage in Book 6. In point of fact, each episode contributes a significant variation to the mythical store of Helen's fortunes at the end of the war, and like the HE, Deiphobus' narrative has a number of traditional models.[99] In the *Odyssey*, the bard Demodocus sings of the time when Menelaus and Odysseus, having emerged from the Trojan horse, attacked the house of Deiphobus (8.499-520). Helen's pro-Greek sympathies also go back to Homer. In the *Iliad,* having learned of the duel for her possession, she experiences a longing for her first husband, her parents, and Sparta (3.139-140).[100] When she next sees Paris, she declares her wish that he had

---

[95] Bleisch 1999: 209.
[96] Austin 1961: 186. Cf. Camps 1969: 126.
[97] Horsfall 2006/7: 11. In observing that the apparent conflict is in keeping with other discrepancies in the epic, he follows Camps (1969: 126).
[98] Horsfall 2008: 556-557.
[99] Reckford 1981: 96 notes that "there is much traditional material and meaning in both versions." Cf. O'Hara 2006: 86.
[100] Iris instils this desire in Helen's θυμός.

not survived the fight (3.428ff.). As we have already noted, in the *Odyssey* she recalls a change of heart and a desire to go back home during the war (4.259ff.). Moreover, Deiphobus' report of having been cut down in his own house through the treachery of his *coniunx* (523), who was assisting Menelaus (termed her *amanti*, 526), resembles the Homeric story of a wife's treachery and murder by her lover that the shade of Agamemnon – victim of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus – delivers likewise in the underworld.[101] Less obvious motifs link the Vergilian scene with the vengeance Odysseus exacts on the suitors, specifically, the removal of weapons by Telemachos – part of a grand plot in which Penelope was implicated, according to a dead suitor (24.121ff.) – and the brutal mutilation of Melanthios (22.473ff.).[102]

Egan attempts to solve the narrative difficulty by positing that the female figure Aeneas saw was not, in fact, Helen but, rather, his mother Venus. Yet we do not actually need to go to such lengths to reconcile Aeneas' words with Deiphobus' report, since, as Stahl points out, "Helen's fear of Menelaus' wrath (*praemetuens* 2.573) does not exclude an earlier (2.310f.: *Deiphobi … domus*) cooperation with Menelaus and Ulysses (6.525ff., or with the Greeks in general, 6.517ff.), from hope (*sperans* 6.526) to gain a point with her former husband."[103] The narrative compatibility of the two episodes is underscored by a "close inner coherence of emotion and idea" representing "war, suffering, anger, and revenge," as noted by Reckford,[104] and by a number of lexical correspondences: *scelus, Lacaenae, Phrygias, flammam, coniunx, limina,*

[101] That *Odyssey* 11.385 ff. is echoed in this scene has been observed by Fairclough & Brown (1919: 482). Reckford focuses on the similarity between the circumstances surrounding the deaths suffered by Agamemnon and Deiphobus (1981: 93). See also Otis 1963: 292 and 296; Knauer 1964: 114-17.
[102] Reckford 1981: 94-95. Bleisch also suggests a parallel between Deiphobus and Telemonian Ajax as well as an allusion to Aeschylus' *Oresteia* and Catullus 65 (1999: 201, 210, 212ff.).
[103] Stahl 1981: 176 n. 24. Horsfall's argument that Helen's fear of the Greeks in Bk. 2 and her active aid in Bk. 6 constitutes "a grave incompatibility of intent" (2008: 556) does not hold ground. Her help could have been motivated by an understandable fear. This attempt to ingratiate herself with men who had suffered so much because of her infidelity was unlikely to erase all resentment against her and make her position immediately secure.
[104] Reckford 1981: 96, 86.

scilicet, exstingui scelerum, poenas in Book 6 are paralleled by forms of the same words in the HE.[105]

Opponents of the episode's authenticity also view its portrayal of Aeneas as ill-conceived and inconsistent with his character at large. Heinze writes that Helen's pivotal role in the events of the previous years was enough reason for Vergil's hero to "curse" her "as the cause of the whole war" but "would hardly put into his head the insane notion of killing her."[106] Yet, psychologically, it makes perfect sense that after years of watching his companions fall on the battlefield, a Trojan who is now witness to the destruction of his city at large and the vicious slaughter of his king and kinsman in particular, who imagines a similar scenario befalling his own father and son, whose own immediate comrades have just perished, who is left alone and helpless against all the unjust horror, it makes perfect sense that such a man would grow somewhat mad and in a fit of insane rage seize the sudden opportunity to do something with significant impact, to punish a pivotal figure, even if this happened to be a defenceless woman, provided that he deemed her to be the cause of all the devastation and yet liable to escape unscathed and to please the Greeks with her return.[107] I agree with Heinze that it would indeed be strange for Vergil to have the pius Aeneas debate killing Helen as she clings to an altar if the circumstances were not what they are, that is, if this was a calm calculation made in cold

[105] Some of these have been noted by Highet (1972: 175).
[106] Heinze 2003: 27.
[107] Some demur that in contemplating Helen's murder, Aeneas fails to behave like a proper gentleman or to display the respect owed to a woman. For instance, Shipley talks about "the lack of chivalry" (1925: 184) and Horsfall about ancient critics who would have liked "the gentlemanly Aeneas … to treat Helen with the respect due to her sex" (2006/2007: 12). Such observations, however, do not actually reflect ancient values, but are a product of later cultural ideals (cf. Connigton 1876: *ad* 2.567). Let us remember that Servius comments that to rage against a woman is unseemly for a man who is *fortis*. That is, a strong, brave man demeans himself by fighting a woman because she is so much his inferior, not because of any romantic notion of the "venerableness" of the fair sex. Highet 1972: 169 brings up the Homeric precedent in *Odyssey* 22.435-473, where Telemachos ruthlessly kills those of his household women he deems guilty of consorting with the suitors.

blood.[108] However, the hell of horrors in which Aeneas finds himself during Troy's last night does drive him into momentary madness. Indeed, this madness dramatically expresses the depth of his grief for his people and actually demonstrates his piety. Stahl calls it a "holy" "community-oriented *furor* …and *ira*" stemming from his patriotism and dedication to justice, which cause him to set aside "his private worries."[109] In killing Helen, Aeneas would "have fulfilled both his political wish to avenge his country (*ultricis* 587, certainly picks up *ulcisci* 576) and his pious desire of satisfying (the ashes of) the dead (for *meorum* 587, cf. *meorum* 12.947, where Aeneas feels under a similar obligation)."[110] As Fairclough observes, the fact that "Helen is a *nefas*, an unholy thing, is (at least at such a time) a sufficient defence against the charge of impiety,"[111] and, as Austin adds, "to blot out a *nefas* is equivalent to sustaining what is *fas.*"[112]

Murgia, in turn, argues that the scene presents Aeneas as uncharacteristically concerned about how others speak of him and that this preoccupation, characteristic of a "shame-culture hero of traditional epic," is the "motive" for his impious conduct. Too much like a Homeric warrior, he is driven to kill Helen by a desire for the heroic glory this feat will confer upon him (*laudabor*, 586).[113] Even if Murgia's problematic claims that, as a rule, Aeneas does not care about what others say and that it is strange for him to think like a Homeric hero are set aside, his understanding of the passage is in itself flawed.[114] As Stahl has previously noted, Aeneas

---

[108] Heinze 2003: 27.
[109] Stahl 1981: 168-169, 171-172. He argues that Aeneas' "death-defying courage and uncontrollable emotions of patriotism" were emphasized by Vergil in order "to bring out a positive, valuable feature in the personality of Aeneas" (168). In his view, Vergil and his intended audience expected Aeneas to act like a high-spirited and violent Homeric hero when the situation called for it, rather than seeing such heroic *furor* as an unfortunate lapse from his Stoic refinement. Cf. Horsfall 2006/7: 12.
[110] Stahl 1981: 169.
[111] Fairclough 1906: 226.
[112] Austin: 1964: 226.
[113] Murgia 2003: 404-05.
[114] Murgia tries to anticipate the immediate objections by explaining away the contrary evidence at 1.378, where Aeneas introduces himself (*fama super aethera notus* ["known through my fame over the heavens"]) in the manner that echoes Odysseus' assertion of his heaven-reaching renown (*Od*. 9.19-20), and at 2.317, where the Trojan

actually acknowledges that killing Helen will not win him any military, i.e. heroic, glory (*nullum memoriable nomen feminea in poena est, nec habet victoria laudem*, 583-584).[115] Therefore, if he were indeed motivated according to the priorities of a traditional epic hero, he would have given up his endeavour at this point. And yet Aeneas presses on, and, finding his plan unjustified from the viewpoint framed by heroic values, he shifts his perspective and revaluates his choice in terms of religious justice. Nevertheless, the sense that he is violating a standard code of conduct seeps into this new framework and produces a subtle undercurrent of doubt in the following lines. For Aeneas tries just a bit too hard to talk himself into action; he is desperate to convince himself that what he wants to do on an emotional level is justified as a rational choice. I believe that *laudabor* needs to be understood within the context of this uncertainty: Aeneas is reaching out to others to settle his anxiety. He is not thinking of killing Helen to gain praise in the *future* (i.e. heroic glory), but, rather, he creates a vision of external approval in the *present* to allow for the execution of an internally contested plan. In other words, he is not seeking future glory, but present sanction.

Along with Heinze, Peirano sees the HE's "preoccupation with the issue of reputation" as "modeled on Euripides, *Orestes* 1131-1151, in which Pylades asserts that the killing of any woman other than Helen would be a 'shameful slaughter' (v. 1133 δυσκλεὴς ... φόνος·)."[116] She attributes this allusion to the literary sophistication of the episode's anonymous author, who was not only intimately familiar with poetry but also with its exegesis.[117] Thus, she argues that Aeneas' soliloquy, which flatters its speaker through various rhetorical strategies, is rooted in the

expresses a desire for the glory of a heroic death (*pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis*). Nevertheless, Murgia's efforts fail to be persuasive.

[115] Stahl 1981: 169.

[116] Peirano 2012: 256; Heinze 1993: 60 n. 75. For more on HE's engagement with the *Orestes*, see Sec. 10, below.

[117] Peirano 2012: 256.

defensive exegetical tradition, illustrated by Servius and Tiberius Cl. Donatus.[118] This tradition reads the *Aeneid* as "a long oration in praise of its main character."[119] Although her arguments have some persuasive force in the context of the 11 lines that make up Aeneas' speech, they do not fare as well in the context of the remaining lines, which make up the other half of the episode. In fact, the initial 10 lines of the HE, which convey Aeneas' detection of Helen at the altar of Vesta and his intention to kill her, undercut the point of her lengthy exposition of the "rhetorical exegesis of the poem in which the aim is to recover the author's laudatory intent and its fulfillment in the text."[120] In Servius' view, Aeneas' intention to kill a woman paints the Trojan in such a negative light that it warrants the exclusion of the entire episode. Peirano deals in a curt and unpersuasive manner with the problem as to why an anonymous author would include in his interpolation both a speech that taps into the defensive reading of the *Aeneid* and a scenario that challenges this very reading. She simply chalks it up to an intention to "subvert", "parody," and "undermine the interpretation of Aeneas as a uniformly noble character shared by readers such as Servius and Tiberius Cl. Donatus,"[121] and she qualifies this choice to "compromise Aeneas' claim to *pietas*" as "typical," but provides no further explanation.[122]

[118] She says, for instance, that even "the statement that concludes and focuses on the pleasure (v. 586 *iuvabit*) that Aeneas will derive from the vengeance is obliquely flattering since it highlights that the source of such reward is actually Aeneas' devotion to his people (v. 587 *cinere satiasse meorum*), who have been wronged by Helen" (2012: 256).
[119] Peirano 2012: 255.
[120] Peirano 2012: 255.
[121] Peirano 2012: 263.
[122] Peirano 2012: 262.

8. Form

Heinze questions the authenticity of the HE by observing that it contains a soliloquy imbedded in Aeneas' account of the events and that this form does not occur elsewhere in the *Aeneid*.[123] Furthermore, according to Henize, since there are no soliloquies in Odysseus' account of his experiences, in contrast to his lengthy soliloquies elsewhere in the story, Vergil "would have been aware of the contrast and it would come naturally to him to adhere to convention."[124] Yet, Vergil tends to appropriate Greek conventions, rather than slavishly imitate them, innovating in his manipulation of inherited tradition. In this case, the soliloquy exemplifies his dramatization of epic scenes.[125] It works in tandem with the many close echoes of the *Orestes* noted in the episode.[126] The soliloquy also makes the intensity of Aeneas' passion more immediate. It removes the distance implicit in a narrative of past events. In repeating his fiery words Aeneas is, in a sense, recreating – rather than recounting – the event within Dido's halls. His death-bent rage will be echoed by her own frenzied soliloquies in Bk. 4: fire ignites fire. Far from being an incongruent element, Aeneas' mad outburst is a motif which connects the HE with the dramatized rage of Book 4.

Peirano again follows Heinze when she declares the form of Aeneas' monologue as evidence for its non-Vergilian paternity.[127] Although she acknowledges the soliloquy recalls "tragic monologues in which a hero or heroine considers his or her own predicament," she argues that it also

---

[123] Highet (1972: 170) observes that "as repeated by Aeneas in the course of his narrative, [his soliloquy] sounds no more unnatural than his outburst in 2.657-670, with its apostrophe to Venus, its melodramatic '*reddite me Danais!*', and its prefatory exclamation, '*nam quod consilium aut quae iam fortuna dabatur*?'"

[124] Heinze 2003: 27.

[125] Although Austin already notes the dramatic quality of the scene in his defense of the soliloquy (1961: 194), this point is further developed by Conte (1986: 204-206).

[126] Heinze admits that the technique of literary imitation present in the scene is "very similar to Virgil's own" (2003: 28). Cf. Austin 1961: 196.

[127] Peirano 2012: 257.

> closely resembles the deliberative type of the *suasoria* in which practitioners advised a historical or mythological figure faced with a decision. Moreover, since the speech presents the case in the voice of Aeneas, it has close affinities with rhetorical *ethopoeiae*, that is, impersonation exercises in which students would be required to compose a speech containing, for example, the "words that Niobe might use when her children lie dead" (Aphthonius 35 ed. Rabe). .... Similarly, the author of the Helen episode may be thought to have crafted his speech prompted by the idea of inventing "the words that Aeneas might use when about to kill Helen" (*quae verba dixerit Aeneas mactaturus Helenem*).

Peirano goes on to cite a speech by Libanius, "an *ethopoeia* of Medea as she is about to kill her children," as a parallel, since it "has much in common with the Helen episode in its close affinity to the tragic monologue."[128] Beside repeatedly drawing our attention to the fact that the form of the HE can be easily accounted for by Vergil's known engagement with the works of tragic poets, Peirano is undermined in her argument that the HE is aligned with the rhetorical practices that she has outlined by her seeming unawareness that Aeneas' "close-call" with Helen is not congruent with the traditional mythological scenarios normally used in these practices:[129] it seems to be have been invented by the author of the episode in the manner of the modifications of the mythological tradition that we find in the rest of the *Aeneid*.[130] To be convincing, Peirano's theory requires either a tradition of Aeneas' attempt on Helen's life, for which we have no evidence, or the pre-existence of *Aen.* 2.567-576 (in which Aeneas takes notice of the vulnerable Helen and experiences the impulse to kill her) in Vergil's text, to which her

---

[128] Peirano 2012: 258.
[129] See, for instance, the mythological scenarios motivating the *ethopoeiae* in the *Greek Anthology* 9.458-471, 473-477.
[130] It is an adaptation of the traditional story of Menelaus' initial rage toward of Helen when he first confronts her during the sack of Troy. See note 143, below. Cf. Conte 2016: 73-74.

interpolator could then react by composing Aeneas' speech. In short, as with her theory that the HE is a product of the "defensive" reading of Vergil's poem, the persuasiveness of Peirano's arguments breaks down in the context of those lines that do not belong to Aeneas' monologue, that is, in the context of half of the HE.

9. Internal issues?

Beyond the question of the episode's appropriateness and consistency with the rest of the epic, those who regard the HE as spurious point to apparent issues within the passage itself. Thus, Goold doubts that Aeneas could see into "the penetralia of Vesta" from a rooftop.[131] We should note, however, that Helen is sitting at the altar of Vesta: *aris … sedebat* (574). Normally, Graeco-Roman altars were located *in front* of a temple, if there was one, within a sacred precinct (the *temenos*), which was often separated by a wall, furnishing what could be described as a *secreta sedes* (568). The entrance to a sanctuary was marked by a gate or gate building (the *propylon*),[132] in turn, furnishing such *limina* (568) as Helen appears to observe (*servantem*, 568). Hence, not under a roof, but rather behind a wall, she would be hidden (*latentem*, 568, *abididerat sese*, 574) from those at ground level but visible to someone like Aeneas, looking down into the precinct from a nearby rooftop. Indeed, as Fairclough notes, "it was the hero's advantageous position aloft that enabled him to discover Helen, the flames lighting up the whole scene (569)."[133] Rather strangely, Horsfall insists on seeing Aeneas' position on the roof as problematic because, if Helen is down below, the hero cannot "talk" to her."[134] But Aeneas'

[131] Goold 1970: 157. Curiously, he points out this apparent difficulty immediately after remarking that Aeneas must be at ground level. Cf. Highet 1972: 172.
[132] For an overview of *temenos* walls, the *propyla*, and the altars of Greek sanctuaries, see, for instance, Pedley (2006: 57-62).
[133] Fairclough 1906: 223.
[134] Horsfall (2008) conveys this mistaken notion of Aeneas addressing or talking to Helen on several pages: 557, 558, and 572.

words patently constitute a soliloquy, not an address. He is clearly speaking *about* her (in the third person) and not *to* her. There is absolutely no indication that he expects her to hear his words.

Murgia, meanwhile, objects to the use of *triumpho* (578) in connection with Helen. He declares such a word inappropriate, given that Helen could not celebrate a triumph because in "Roman law, the first requirement for celebrating a triumph is that the victor must have *imperium,*" which she almost certainly did not have, even as a queen.[135] But Murgia is being far too literal and his objection is rather anachronistic. After all, since within the context of the narrative Roman laws did not yet exist, this strict definition does not really hold, and, more importantly, even technical words can be used with poetic licence to signify approximate meanings. The poetic function of *triumpho* is to render more vivid the contrast between the impunity and privilege of the Greek queen and the horrific fate of king Priam (581).[136]

10. Intertextuality

All in all, scholars on both sides of the authenticity debate see the HE as "brilliantly conceived."[137] Supporters of Vergilian authorship also point to its intertextual complexity whereby, in keeping with Vergil's practice throughout the epic, it engages with other texts. Thus, Aeneas' angry deliberation on whether he should kill Helen echoes Achilles' indecision about slaying Agamemnon in the first book of the *Iliad*.[138] The parallel with the *Iliad* is strengthened by the subsequent appearance of Venus, who like Athena, physically restrains the enraged

[135] Murgia 2003: 416.
[136] Cf. Stahl 1981: 169.
[137] This exact qualification has been voiced by Austin (1961: 196), Goold (1970: 159), and Murgia (2003: 405).
[138] Harrison (1970: 330) even sees a verbal echo of Homeric usage in *subit ira … ulcisci* (575-576).

hero.[139] Conte observes that this underlying Homeric structure "straddles the two dividing lines between the challenged and unchallenged parts of the text"[140] and thereby suggests a common, i.e. Vergilian, authorship of both parts. Notably, this archetypal pattern, which structurally connects the HE with what follows, has also been identified in other contexts. It is at play at the beginning of *Odyssey* 20, when Odysseus contemplates and soliloquizes about killing his unchaste female servants, only to be checked by the sudden appearance of Athena, who, like Venus, marvels why his thoughts are not with his family and proceeds to assure him of her divine protection.[141] Other suggested parallels include *Iliad* 9.458-459, where Phoenix plans to kill his father but one of the gods halts his anger,[142] the thwarting of Menelaus by Aphrodite or another deity during his attempt to kill Helen (a scene found in both literature and art), and Apollo's intervention in connection with the plot to kill Helen in the *Orestes*.[143] As has been noted earlier, echoes of the *Orestes* – including the characterization of Helen as an Erinys[144] – contribute to the HE's dramatic quality, which is further reinforced by the tragic echo of Ennius' *terra sudat sanguine* (*Scaenica* 181 Vahlen) in *sudarit sanguine litus* (582).[145] In view of this, Conte argues that the HE displays a typically Vergilian integration of Homeric material, which is moulded "according to dramatic forms of expression that are intrinsic to Vergil's art." As such,

---

[139] Conington 1876: *ad* 2.589, *et al*.
[140] Conte 1986: 204.
[141] Fairclough 1906: 226. Anticipating Conte, Fairclough argues that since the HE fits into the larger pattern of this scene, it must have been composed by the same poet, i.e. Vergil (224).
[142] As observed by Erbse (2001: 432-33) – see note 64, above. Fish (2003: 126) also notes the parallel and the similar dubious textual history of both these Iliadic lines and the HE.
[143] *Little Iliad* fr. 28 West; Austin 1964: *ad* 2.72; Gantz 1993: 657; Murgia 2003: 405 n. 2.
[144] Aeschylus' νυμφόκλαυτος Ἐρινύς ["a Fury that as a bride brings wailing"] (*Ag*. 749) might be the starting point of this conceptualization of Helen as a fury (Austin 1964: 221). For a review of the parallels between the *Orestes* and the HE, see Reckford 1981: 92. Cf. Heinze 1993: 28 and 60-61 n. 75.
[145] As noted by Conte 1986: 205. Ennius' *Lacedaemonia mulier, Furiarum una* ["the Spartan woman, one of the Furies"] (*Scaenica* 71) constitutes another possible resonance (Austin 1964, 221-222, etc.).

the HE "bears the coherent, recognizable signature" of the manner in which Vergil constructs intertextual discourse.[146]

The intertextual richness of the HE also includes multiple lexical correspondences with Lucretius.[147] Moreover, Fish makes a case for the authenticity of the passage by asserting that it communicates ideas found in the writings of the Epicurean philosopher Philodemus. He argues that, since in his anger Aeneas views Helen's punishment as a source of pleasure and this impulse is wisely rebuked by Venus, pointing "out the improper anger and its perilous consequences,"[148] the lines reflect Philodemus' principles on how to deal with this sort of unhealthy rage, as articulated in his treatises *On Anger* and *On the Good King*. [149] He believes that this correlation proves Vergilian authorship because a connection between Vergil and Philodemus has been secured by the discovery of a text by the philosopher and addressed to the poet.[150] On the other side of the debate, dismissing Fish's claims of correspondence between the HE and Philodemus' teachings as a "passing coincidence" with no "textual force"[151] (although he does acknowledge the other aforementioned parallels), Horsfall asserts that the HE shows "very limited use of Greek sources," indicative of the limitations of its interpolator.[152] He proclaims that "in a context such as *Aen.* 2, where the literary tradition is extremely complex,

---

[146] Conte 1986: 206.
[147] Austin 1961: 194; Goold 1970: 147; Horsfall 2006/7: 17, etc.
[148] Fish 2003: 124
[149] Fish 2003: *passim*, but especially 128. It must be noted, however, that Venus does not actually chastise Aeneas for the joy he envisions in punishing Helen. His anger is improper because he is deluded about her role in Troy's miserable fortune. Fish's opinion about Venus' rebuke also stands in contrast with Stahl's view that there is no evidence of moral reproach concerning Aeneas' intended punishment of Helen in Venus' speech (1981: 170).
[150] Fish 2003: 111.
[151] Horsfall 2006/7: 25-26. However, somewhat puzzlingly, he also goes on to state that "it is only natural that there is some coincidence between Philodemus and the emotions expressed in HE; you would expect that, given the care with which the author has studied the narrative of *Aeneid* 2, which involves so much rage and madness." But if echoes of Philodemus stem from the continuation of the way Vergil writes in the rest of Book 2, can we then be dealing with mere coincidence?
[152] Horsfall 2008: 561 n. 25.

and V. is writing at the very apex of his poetic efforts and linguistic density, the syllabus of sources behind these lines is strangely limited."[153]

11. New arguments for Vergilian authorship

In response to Horsfall's heavy-handed claim, let us recall that, in addition to the already noted intertexts, the HE along with its immediate context engages extensively with another Homeric episode, namely the interaction of Aphrodite with Paris and Helen in *Iliad* 3.373-447. We have surveyed the numerous points of close correspondence in Chapter 1[154] and can now observe that this intertext connects the HE with proximate and undisputedly Vergilian parts even more intimately than does the echo of Achilles' rage and restraint by Athena in *Iliad* 1, a parallel advanced by Conte as decisive proof of the HE's Vergilian paternity. Moreover, the HE has yet another hitherto undetected intertextual dimension that strengthens its claim to authenticity in three of the categories that we have considered above: intertextuality (Sec. 10), charges of incongruity (Sec. 7), and, most significantly, ancient reception (Sec. 4).

We have noted that Aeneas' presentation of Helen's situation during the sack of Troy has been perceived as incompatible with Deiphobus' account of his experience of that same night in Book 6, where he tells Aeneas (513-530):

namque ut supremam falsa inter gaudia noctem
egerimus, nosti: et nimium meminisse necesse est.
cum fatalis equus saltu super ardua venit *6.515*
Pergama et armatum peditem gravis attulit alvo,
illa chorum simulans euhantis orgia circum

[153] Horsfall 2008: 560.
[154] Sec. 1.5, pp. 66-71.

ducebat Phrygias; flammam media ipsa tenebat

ingentem et summa Danaos ex arce vocabat.

tum me confectum curis somnoque gravatum *6.520*

infelix habuit thalamus, pressitque iacentem

dulcis et alta quies placidaeque simillima morti.

egregia interea coniunx arma omnia tectis

emovet, et fidum capiti subduxerat ensem:

intra tecta vocat Menelaum et limina pandit, *6.525*

scilicet id magnum sperans fore munus amanti,

et famam exstingui veterum sic posse malorum.

quid moror? inrumpunt thalamo, comes additus una

hortator scelerum Aeolides. di, talia Grais

instaurate, pio si poenas ore reposco. 6.530

That last night: how we squandered its hours in our false celebrations,

You well know. One is forced to recall it too hideously clearly.

Up from the plain came the fateful horse, leaping over our towering 6.515

Pergamum, pregnant with infantry, heavily armed, in its belly.

She staged what seemed like a chorus, and led, in a circle around it,

Phrygian women who screamed in a wild celebration of Bacchus.

She, in their midst, was brandishing fires that would ruin a nation,

Calling Danaäns forth from the citadel's crest. I, exhausted, 6.520

Heavy with sleep and with cares, lay trapped in the bed of our marriage,

Unfulfilled and accursed, as a sweet, deep slumber like tranquil

> Death pressed down on my stillness. My wife, royal pick of the whole flock,
> Strips, meanwhile, all arms from the house, even eases my trusty
> Sword out from under my head, opens doors, calls in Menelaus, 6.525
> Hoping, I'm sure, this would make a grand gift for her lover and stamp out
> Rumours based on her past that had made her a byword for evil.
> Why draw it out? They burst into my bedroom along with Ulysses,
> Aeolus' spawn, always ready to prompt an atrocity. Oh gods!
> Pay the Greeks back in kind, if my prayer for justice is righteous. 6.530

We have also noted Stahl's sagacious observation that, on a narrative level, the accounts of Aeneas and Deiphobus are not actually contradictory:[155] Helen's sudden change of loyalty and assistance does not need to entail immediate favor from her husband, or the Greek side in general, especially in light of the horrendous cost and duration of her initial betrayal. Moreover, inasmuch as Deiphobus' report of Helen's activity on Troy's final night invites the thought of Menelaus' account in *Odyssey* of how, with Deiphobus at her side, Helen tried to make the Greeks in the Trojan horse betray themselves, it also brings to mind Helen's own memory of the war (which directly precedes Menelaus' words).[156] While her account of the support she had secretly offered to Odysseus certainly does contrast with Menelaus' story,[157] it is important to note that it is not at all incompatible with it. On a narrative level, the two recollections are reconciled by the mutability of Helen's loyalties (which we have already considered in Sec. 7). Helen explains her attitude toward Odysseus as motivated by a change of heart and a desire to go

[155] Sec. 7, p. 220.
[156] *Od.* 4.242-289.
[157] See Sec. 7, pp. 217-219, for Reckford's and Suzuki's view of this contrast as a model for the incongruity between the two depictions of Helen in the *Aeneid*.

back home.[158] This echoes her Iliadic change of heart: when she hears of the contest between Menelaus and Paris, she experiences a γλυκὺν ἵμερον for her family and homeland, which is instilled in her θυμός by Iris.[159] This divine interference, in turn, lends some plausibility to Menealus' explanation that a δαίμων must have compelled Helen to switch sides yet again. Hence, a Homeric network of contrasting but *not* incompatible accounts of Helen's position during the Trojan War facilitates a narrative cohesion between the reports we find in the HE and *Aeneid* 6.

I propose that similar support is supplied through another allusion underlying Vergil's text, one that engages with an apt myth. Lyne has observed that a frequent phenomenon within dense and allusive poetry like Vergil's is what he calls "implicit myth." He explains that poets "can and do assume great familiarity in their readers with myths and fables; and they often expect readers to sense a myth or fable behind a text with the aid of minimal explicit reference," a "signal."[160] The myth that I believe Vergil expected his readers to sense behind the text of the HE and Deiphobus' speech is that of Scylla, daughter of the Megarian king Nisus. First attested in Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* (which contains a partial account),[161] the story involves the besieging of Megara by Minos, the notorious ruler of Crete. For a long time, Minos makes little headway in his siege because of Nisus' supernatural advantage: a purple lock of immortal hair. However, Scylla, who has fallen in love with Minos after watching him from the city's fortifications, eventually removes her father's protective lock from his head; she is able to accomplish this while Nisus sleeps. She then offers the lock as a gift to her beloved. Unfortunately for her, Minos

[158] 4.241ff. See Sec. 7, pp. 219-220, for a consideration of Helen's fickleness as one of the traditional elements of Deiphobus' story.
[159] 3.139-140.
[160] Lyne 1987: 139.
[161] 613-622.

is horrified by her treachery and, after sacking her city, wants nothing to do with her. Abandoned and detested by all, she curses Minos and throws herself into the sea, where she is consequently transformed into the bird *ciris*, while her father becomes a sea-hawk. Evidence that Vergil was quite familiar with this myth comes from the first book of his *Georgics*, where we find the metamorphosized Scylla and Nisus in the skies, with the latter engaged in a shrill pursuit of his daughter, who thus pays the penalty for depriving her father of his lock of purple hair (*pro purpureo poenas dat Scylla capillo*, 1.405).

Recognition of Vergil's use of this mythic model elucidates the somewhat incongruent declaration made by Deiphobus that Helen removed his trusty sword from under his head as he slept: *fidum capiti subduxerat ensem* (6.524). The incongruence concerns the declaration's context: the fact that Deiphobus slept with a sword underneath his head communicates a state of danger, a state in line with an ongoing siege but at odds with a time when the inhabitants believe themselves free from all the former threats against their city. Deiphobus begins his story by establishing the setting as the joyful night that follows the departure of the Greek army. His descriptive brevity at this point is due to Aeneas' shared experience of this circumstance (*nosti*, 6.514) and is a clear nod for the reader to recall the latter's narrative in Book 2, which includes a statement that effectively conveys the sense of release from the ills of war felt by the Trojans at this point: *ergo omnis longo solvit se Teucria luctu* (2.26). The men of Troy no longer need to live in tense readiness for attack. The sweet slumber that is as deep as the tranquility of death (*dulcis et alta quies placidaeque simillima morti,* 6.522) into which Deiphobus, *confectus curis,* falls that night likewise intimates his own release from the prolonged state of anxiety and apprehensive caution necessitated by the long siege. Against this background, the sword underneath his head is a rather ill-fitting detail. I suggest that this subtle incongruence is a

purposeful poetic element, intended to signal that Scylla's myth has been incorporated into the allusive fabric of Vergil's text. The correspondence of Helen's removal of Deiphobus' sword to Scylla' removal of Nisus' lock is underscored by the common motif of a treacherous love gift, procured by both Scylla and Helen for Minos and Menelaus, respectively, to help the men destroy their enemies. The underlying myth also resonates with the rather incongruous designation of Menelaus, Helen's original husband, as her *amans* (526). In Scylla's myth, her gift does not secure her the reception she expected. Although he uses her help to conquer the city, Minos is incensed by her shameful desertion of her fatherland (for the sake of a lover). Responsible for the destruction of her city, she ends up alone, hated by both sides. This continuation of the myth does not operate in the poetic layers of Deiphobus' account, but it does resonate with the narrative continuation of Helen's story on the night Troy fell that we find in the HE, and, in turn, further reconciles Helen's precarious position with Deiphobus' account. In effect, the underlying structure of Scylla's myth bonds the HE to the Deiphobus episode in *Aeneid* 6; it intimates not only that the two passages are compatible but that they are complimentary.

The use of the myth fits in with Vergil's narrative practices. As Heinze has noted, rather than recounting past events by means of the epic narrator, Vergil prefers to give this task to his characters.[162] The drawback of this narrative technique is a limitation of knowledge. Hence, Aeneas can only relate what Helen's situation was like at the time that he saw her – not what sequence of events led her there. Likewise, Deiphobus can only speak of Helen's circumstances up to the moment of his own death at the hands of the Greeks she had led into his house. Since Vergil's artistic principles furnish little opportunity to fill in the gap of what happened to Helen

[162] Heinze 2004: 307.

between Deiphobus' last sight of her and Aeneas' discovery of her hiding place, the reader must deduce that missing part her story on his own. It is an example of Vergil's narration κατά τὸ σιωπώμενον,[163] and Scylla's story works to intimate the change in Helen's fortunes.

Vergil's utilization of the myth is also brought out both by his predilection for references to Crete[164] and by certain affinities between the Homeric Helen and Scylla. For instance, this figure's very name (female puppy) and Aeschylus' play on it as he calls her κυνόφρων can be connected with Helen's characterization of herself as dog-like in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: κυνὸς in the *Iliad* and κυνώπιδος in the *Odyssey*.[165] Finally, in terms of the larger narrative of *Aeneid*, the embedding of Scylla's myth fits in with Vergil's tendency to unify the epic through *intra*textual parallels: Scylla's tragic tale also mirrors that of Dido, who likewise devastates her city because of a lover, a man who – like Minos – forsakes her and elicits her curses.

The enmeshment of the myth of Scylla in the poetic fabric of HE also strengthens the case for the episode's authenticity by addressing the most potent argument of the proponents of its spuriousness, namely the dearth of references to the episode before Servius. I propose that we can add yet another engagement with the HE by a Roman author to the ones that has been detected in Lucan and Valerius Flaccus[166]; I believe there is an intertextual engagement between the HE along with Deiphobus' narrative on the one hand and Ovid's rendition of Scylla's myth in his *Metamorphoses*, on the other.[167] A comparison of the relevant passages and their contexts in the *Aeneid* with the *Metamorphoses*' rendering of Scylla's tale reveals substantial structural

[163] On the use of this method by Vergil, see Heinze 2004: 309.
[164] 3.104ff., 4.70, 4.146, 5.285, 5.588, 6.14ff., 6.432, 8.294, 12.412.
[165] *Cho*. 621, *Il*. 6.344, *Od*. 4.145.
[166] Sec. 4.
[167] It is worth noting that just as Aeschylus' Scylla echoes Homer's Helen, so does her Ovidian counterpart. Ovid describes Scylla as watching battles from a tower, a *turris* (8.14); in the *Iliad*, Helen likewise watches the fighting beneath Troy from a tower (πύργος, 3.384) and, like Scylla, wishes for the city's enemy to win (*Il.* 3.428ff.).

and narrative correspondences alongside numerous lexical parallels. Below is the most relevant part of Ovid's narrative (8.104-133):

Scylla freto postquam deductas nare carinas
nec praestare ducem ***sceleris*** *sibi praemia* ***vidit****,* *8.105*
consumptis precibus violentam transit in ***iram***
intendensque manus passis ***furibunda*** *capillis*
*'quo fugis' exclamat '****meritorum*** *auctore re****licta****,*
o ***patriae*** *praelate meae, praelate* ***parenti****?*
quo fugis immitis, cuius ***victoria*** *nostrum* *8.110*
et ***scelus*** *et* ***meritum*** *est? nec te* ***data*** *munera, nec te*
noster amor movit, nec quod spes omnis in unum
te mea congesta est? nam quo ***deserta*** *re****vertar****?*
in ***patriam****?* ***superata*** *iacet! sed finge manere:*
proditione mea clausa est mihi! ***patris*** *ad* ***ora****?* *8.115*
quem tibi donavi? cives odere ***merentem****,*
finitimi exemplum ***metuunt****: obstruximus orbem*
terrarum, nobis ut Crete sola pateret.
*hac quoque si prohibes et nos, ingrate, re****linquis****,*
non genetrix Europa tibi est sed inhospita Syrtis, *8.120*
Armeniae tigres austroque agitata Charybdis.
nec Iove tu ***natus*** *nec mater imagine tauri*
ducta tua est: (generis falsa est ea fabula); verus,
[et ferus et captus nullius amore iuvencae]

qui te progenuit, taurus fuit. exige ***poenas****,* *8.125*

Nise ***pater****! gaudete malis modo prodita nostris,*

moenia! nam, ***fateor****,* ***merui*** *et sum digna perire.*

sed tamen ex illis aliquis quos impia laesi

me perimat. cur qui vicisti crimine nostro

insequeris crimen? ***scelus*** *hoc* ***patriae****que patrique est,* *8.130*

officium tibi sit. te vere ***coniuge*** *digna est,*

quae torvum ligno decepit adultera taurum

discordemque utero fetum tulit.

When Scylla saw that the vessels had been launched and knew that the king refused her crime's reward, her prayers exhausted, she turned to storming fury and with streaming hair and hands outstretched she cried in passionate rage: "Whither are you fleeing, leaving behind her who achieved so much, deserves so well? You were more to me than my father, more than my fatherland. Whither are you fleeing, cruel man, whose triumph is my crime and my deserts? The gift I gave, my love for you, my hopes built all on you alone, do they not move you? Abandoned, where can I turn? Turn again homme to my fatherland? It lies in ruins. Suppose it stands, its gates are closed to me by my betrayal. Back to my father's arms? He was my gift to you! My countrymen hate me and have good cause. The neighbouring cities fear my example. I am banished from all the world: Crete alone is open now. If you forbid me Crete, ungrateful wretch, and leave me here, you're not Europa's son. Your mother was the Syrtes' desolate sands, a tigress of Armenia, or Charibdis, lashed by the wild south wind. Jove's not your father, coaxing his darling in a bull's disguise. That fable's false. It was a real bull that begot you. Nisus,

> father, punish me! Take your revenge! Ye towers and battlements that I betrayed rejoice in my distress! Yes, I have earned your joy! And I deserve to die. But let my death come at the hand of one my wrong has injured. Why should you impeach my crime, who triumphed by my crime? My sin against my father and my country takes as my service done! Fit mate were you of that adulteress who in a cow of wood beguiled a savage bull and bore a discordant offspring in her womb![168]

Both poets present characters growing violently angry: in the *Aeneid* at 2.575, we have *exarsere ignes animo; subit ira;* meanwhile Ovid, at *Metamorphoses* 8.107, gives us *violentam transit in iram*. In passionate monologues, these enraged characters revile the individuals they deem responsible for their misfortunes and the downfall of their fatherlands. Both Scylla and Aeneas (either literately or in the mind's eye) see the objects of their hate returning unscathed whence they had come, and, to varying degrees, both are presented as forsaking their families for the sake of an overwhelming passion. Vergil and Ovid portray a woman making a gift of an object in which a family member puts his trust: we have *fidum* in Vergil (6.524) and *fiducia* in Ovid (8.10). The woman offers this gift to the man she now prefers: we find *munus amanti* in *Aeneid* 6.526 and *pignus amoris … munera* in *Metamorphoses* 8.92-95. Scylla's words at the end of 8.132-133 resonate with the deceptive wooden horse that brings Helen's *amans* into Troy, a contraption termed by Vergil a *machina feta* and repeatedly imaged as having an *uterus.*[169] The Ovidian question *nec te noster amor movit?* (8.111-112) resembles the Vergilian question *quonam nostri tibi cura recessit?* (2.595). Moreover, in his account of Scylla's miserable predicament and reaction (8.104-132), Ovid employs vocabulary that substantially reflects Vergil's description of Helen's situation and the reactions it inspires (*Aen.* 2.567-600) – bolded

---

[168] Translation by A. D. Melville with minor modifications.
[169] *ligno* at 2.45; 2.37-8; 2.20, 38, 52, 243, 258.

above.[170] In fact, *patria* occurs three times in each passage, and the first two forms are identical: *patriae, patriam* (*Aen*. 2.573, 576; *Met.* 8.109, 114). Like the HE, Ovid's passage is marked with abundant repetition.[171] Indeed, Scylla's repeated question *quo fugis?,* positioned at the beginning of lines 8.108 and 8.110, resembles the metrically identical *quid furis?*, which begins *Aeneid* 2.595. There are also lexical parallels between Ovid's text and Deiphobus' report.[172]

Through his close reading of Ovid's "re-writing" of the *Aeneid* in *Metamorphoses* 13-14, Casali has shown Ovid to be interpreter of Vergil who engages with a number of the *quaestiones* that have been the concern of the ancient exegesis preserved in Servius, including issues of inconsistency.[173] A similar engagement might be at play in Ovid's take on Scylla's story in *Metamorphoses* 8. In subtly echoing those sections of *Aeneid* 2 and 6 that, along with the HE, deal with Helen and fit together to evoke most of Scylla's story, this early reader of Vergil highlights the narrative congruence of elements that, according to Servius, were deemed incompatible enough to warrant the excision of the HE.

To conclude, as we have initially noted, the decision to read the *Aeneid* with or without the Helene Episode cannot be based on a "yes" or "no" answer regarding the episode's authenticity, but must instead be informed by the criterion of *likelihood*. Our examination of the various factors pertinent to the consideration of the episode's paternity ultimately demonstrates a

---

[170] The following words or their variations are common to both *Aeneid* 2.567-600 and *Metamorphoses* 8.105-132: *scelus* (*Aen*. 576; *Met*. 105, 111, 130)*, ira* (*Aen*. 572, 575, 595; *Met*. 106), *furio* (*Aen*. 588, 595; *Met*. 107)*, mereo* (*Aen*. 585; *Met*. 108, 111, 116, 127), *patria* (*Aen*. 573, 576, 577; *Met*. 109, 114, 130)*, parens* (*Aen*. 591, 596; *Met*. 109), *victoria* (*Aen*. 584; *Met*. 110)*, desertus* (*Aen*. 572; *Met*. 113), *verto* (*Aen*. 571; *Met*. 113)*, supero* (*Aen*. 597; *Met*. 114), *os* (*Aen*. 593; *Met*. 115), *pater* (*Aen*. 579; *Met*. 115, 126, 130), *metuo* (*Aen*. 573; *Met*. 117), *linquere* (*Aen*. 597; *Met*. 108, 119), *natus* (*Aen*. 579, 595; *Met*. 122), *poena* (*Aen*. 572, 576, 584, 586; *Met*. 125), *fateor* (*Aen*. 591; *Met*. 127), *coniunx* (*Aen*. 572, 597; *Met*. 131).

[171] In addition to the reoccurrence of *patria*, we find *patris, pater, patri* (115, 126, 130), *meritorum, meritum, merentem, merui* (108, 111, 116, 127), and *sceleris*, *scelus, scelus,* (105, 111, 130).

[172] *Met.* 8: *nox* (82), *somnus*, *thalamos* (84), *fatali* (83), *caput*, *scelerata* (94), *munera* (95), *di* (97), *falsa* (123), *poenas* (125), *gaudete* (126), *(im)pia* (128).

[173] Casali 2007: 186-188, on the contradictions regarding the mode of Polydorus' death, and 188-189, on the problematic direction of the wind to which the Trojan fleet gives sail on its departure from Thrace.

reasonable likelihood that Vergil is the author of the contested twenty-two lines. I think we can, therefore, in good conscience allow them to make their valuable contribution to Rome's finest epic poem and this particular study.

WORKS CITED

Amerasinghe, C. W. 1953. "'Saturnia Juno' - Its Significance in the *Aeneid*." *Greece & Rome* 22: 61-69.

Anderson, W. D. 1955. "Venus and Aeneas: The Difficulties of Filial Pietas." *Classical Journal*, 50: 233-238.

Anderson, W. S. 1957. "Vergil's Second *Iliad*." *Transaction of the American Philological Association*, 80: 17-30.

——— 1969. *The Art of the Aeneid*. Wauconda.

Austin R. G. ed. 1955. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Oxford.

——— 1961. "Virgil, *Aeneid* 2.567-88." *Classical Quarterly* 11:185-198.

——— ed. 1964. *Aeneidos Liber Secundus*. Oxford.

——— ed. 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. Oxford.

Bailey, C. 1935. Religion in Virgil. Oxford.

Basto, R. 1984. "Horace and the Helen episode." *Vergilius*, 30: 20-24.

Ben, N. van der. 1986 "Hymn to Aphrodite 36-291: Notes on the Pars Epica of the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite." *Mnemosyne* 39: 1-41.

Bergren, A. 1989. "The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite. Tradition and Rhetoric, Praise and Blame." *Classical Antiquity* 8: 1-41.

Berlin, N. 1998. "War and Remembrance: *Aeneid* 12.554-60 and Aeneas' Memory of Troy." *American Journal of Philology,* 119.1: 11-41.

Berres, T. 1992. *Vergil und die Helenaszene: Mit einem Exkurs zu den Halbversen*. Heidelberg.

Bleisch, P. 1999. "The Empty Tomb at Rhoeteum: Deiphobus and the Problem of the Past in *Aeneid* 6.494-547." *Classical Antiquity*, 18.2: 187-226.

Block, E. 1981. *The Effects of Divine Manifestation on the Reader's Perspective in Vergil's Aeneid*. New York.

Brown, A. S. 1997. "Aphrodite and the Pandora complex." *Classical Quarterly* 47: 26-47.

Brown, C. G. 1989. "Ares, Aphrodite, and the Laughter of the Gods." *Phoenix* 43: 283-293.

Bruère, R. T. 1964. "The Helen Episode in *Aeneid* 2 and Lucan." *Classical Philology*, 59: 267-268.

Buchheit, V. 1963. *Vergil über die Sendung Roms. Untersuchungen zum Bellum Punicum und zur Aeneis*. Heidelberg.

Burbidge, J. 2010. "*O quam te memorem, virgo?* Interpreting Venus in *Aeneid* 1.314-417." In A. C. Smith & S. Pickup (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite.* Leiden: 51-78.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. Trans. J. Raffan. Cambridge.

Cairns, F. 1989. *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge.

Calame, C. 1999. *The Poetics of Eros in Ancient Greece*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Princeton.

Campbell, M. 1994. *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica III 1-471*. Leiden – New York – Köln.

Camps. W. A. 1969. *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid*. Oxford.

Carson, A. 1986. *Eros the Bittersweet*. Champaign - London.

Cartault, A. 1926. *L'art de Virgile dans l'Enéide*. Paris.

Casali, S. 2007. "Correcting Aeneas's Voyage: Ovid's Commentary on *Aeneid* 3." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 137: 181-210.

Clausen, W. 1987. *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*. Berkeley – Los Angeles.

——— ed. 1994. *Virgil, Eclogues*. Oxford.

Coleman, R. ed. 1977. *Vergil, Eclogues*. Cambridge.

——— 1982. "The gods in the *Aeneid*." *Greece & Rome,* 29: 143-168.

Conington, J. 1876. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera. Vol. 1*. 3rd ed., rev. H. Nettleship. London.

——— 1883. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera. Vol. 3*. 3rd ed., rev. H. Nettleship. London.

Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Trans. C. Segal. Ithaca - London.

——— 2016. *Critical Notes on Virgil*. Berlin - Boston

Cyrino, M. S. 1995. *In Pandora's Jar: Lovesickness in Early Greek Poetry*. Lanham - New York - London.

——— 2010. *Aphrodite*. London / New York.

Davies, M. 1983. "Alcman 59^{A} P." *Hermes* 111.4: 496-497.

Delvigo, M. L. 2006. "Elena e il serpente." *Materiali e discussioni per I'analisi dei testi classici*, 57: 207-210.

Di Cesare, M. A. 1974. *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Vergil's Aeneid*. New York – London.

Egan, R. B. 1996. "A reading of the Helen-Venus episode in *Aeneid* 2." *Échos Du Monde Classique = Classical Views*, *40*: 379-395.

Erbse, H. 2001. "Zwei umstrittene Abschnite in der Aeneis Vergils." *Hermes, 129*: 431-434.

Estevez, V. A. 1978-79. "Capta ac deserta: The Fall of Troy." *Classical Journal* 74: 97-109.

Fairclough, H. R. 1906. "The Helen Episode in Virgil's *Aeneid* II.559-623." *Classical Philology* 1: 221-230.

Fairclough, H. R. & Brown, S. L. eds. 1919. *Virgil's Aeneid: Books I-VI*. Chicago – New York – Boston.

Farrell, J. 1999. "*Aeneid* 5: Poetry and Parenthood." In Perkell, C. (ed.), *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: An Interpretive Guide*. Norman.

——— 2012. *Aeneid* 5. In R. T. Ganiban et al., *Vergil Aeneid Books 1-6*. Newburyport, MA.

Faulkner, A. ed. 2008. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford.

Feeney, D. C.1991. *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford.

Fish. 2003. "Anger, Philodemus's Good King and the Helen Episode of *Aeneid* 2.567-589: A New Proof of authenticity from Herculaneum." In Armstrong, D. et al (eds), *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*. Austin.

Fordyce, C. J. ed. 1977. *Virgil, Aeneid VII-VIII.* Oxford.

Foster, J. 1973-4. "Some Devices of Drama used in *Aeneid* 1-4." *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 13: 28-41.

Franco, C. 2014. *Shameless: The Canine and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*. Oakland.

Fratantuono L. 2007. *Madness Unchained: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid*. Lanham, Md.

Ganiban, R. T. 2012. *Aeneid* 1. In R. T. Ganiban et al., *Vergil Aeneid Books 1-6*. Newburyport, MA.

Gantz, T. 1993. Early Greek Myth. Baltimore – London.

Geymonat, M. 1995. "The Transmission of Virgil's Works in Antiquity and the Middle Ages." In N. Horsfall (ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden- New York – Köln: 293-312.

Gillis, D. 1983. *Eros and Death in the Aeneid*. Rome.

Goold, G. P. 1970. "Servius and the Helen Episode." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* 74: 101-168.

Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. eds. 1965 *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge

Gransden, K. W. 1984. *Vergil's Iliad: An Essay on Epic Narrative*. Cambridge.

Greenwood, M. A. 1989. "Venus Intervenes: Five Episodes in the *Aeneid*." *Liverpool Classical*

Monthly, 14: 132-36.

Griffin, J. 1985. *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. Chapel Hill.

——— 1986. *Virgil*. Oxford – New York.

Gutting, E. 2006. "Marriage in the *Aeneid*: Venus, Vulcan, and Dido." *Classical Philology,* 101: 263-79.

——— 2009. "Venus' Maternity and Divinity in the *Aeneid*." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici,* 61: 41-55.

Gutzwiller, K. 1992. “The Nautilus, the Halycon, and Selenaia: Callimachus's *Epigram* 5 Pf. = 14 G.-P.” *Classical Antiquity*, 11.2: 194-209.

Hainsworth, B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. III: Books 9-12*. (ed. G. S. Kirkwood) Cambridge.

Hardie, P. R. 1986. *Vergil’s Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.

——— 1997. “Virgil and Tragedy.” In C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge: 312–326.

——— 2002 “Another Look at Virgil’s Ganymede.” In T. P. Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*. Oxford: 333-361.

——— 2009a. “The Word Personified: Fame and Envy in Virgil, Ovid, Spencer.” *Materiali e discussioni l’analisi dei testi classici*, 61: 101-115.

——— 2009b. *Lucretian Receptions: History, The Sublime, Knowledge*. Cambridge

——— 2012. *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*. Cambridge.

Harrison E. L. 1970. Divine Action in *Aeneid* Book Two.” *Phoenix* 24: 320-332.

——— 1972-73. "Why did Venus wear boots? Some reflections on *Aeneid* 1.314." *Proceedings of the Virgil Society,* 12: 10-25.

——— 1981. "Vergil and the Homeric Tradition." In F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*. Liverpool. 209-25.

——— 1982. "Virgil's Use of the Substitution Motif." *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 7.9 (Nov.): 127-8.

Harrison, S. J. ed. 1991. *Vergil, Aeneid 10*. Oxford.

Hatch, N. L. 1959. "The Time Element in Interpretation of *Aeneid* 2.575-76 and 585-87." *Classical Philology* 54: 255-257.

Hawkins, J. 2004. "The ritual of therapy: Venus the Healer in Virgil's *Aeneid*." in A. Barchiesiet *et al.* (eds.), *Rituals in Ink. A Conference on Religion and Literary Production in Ancient Rome held at Stanford University, February 2002*. Stuttgart: 77-97.

Heinze, R. 2004 [1902]. *Virgil's Epic Technique*. 2nd ed. Trans. H. Harvey *et al*. London.

Heitland, W. E. 1887. "Introduction." In C. E. Hasting (ed.), *M. Annei Lucani Pharsalia*. London: V-CXXXI.

Henderson, J. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. Oxford.

Henry, J. 1873-92. *Aeneida, or Critical, Exegetical, and Aesthetical Remarks on the Aeneid*. 4 vol. London.

Hershkowitz, D. 1998. *The Madness of Epic: Reading Insanity from Homer to Statius*. Oxford.

Heyne, C. G. 1797. P. *Virgilius Maro varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus*. 3rd ed. 4 vols. Leipzig.

Highet. G. 1972. *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton.

Horsfall, N. 1995. Review of D. Gall, *Ipsius umbra Creusae – Creusa und Helena*. *Classical Review* 45: 162-163.

——— ed. 2000. *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary.* Leiden.

——— ed. 2006. *Aeneid 3.* Leiden.

——— 2006/7. "Fraud as Scholarship: The Helen Episode and the Appendix Vergiliana." *Illinois Classical Studies* 31/32: 1-27.

——— 2008. *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden – Boston.

Hunt, J. W. 1973. *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in Virgil's Aeneid*. London – Amsterdam.

Hunter, R. 1999. ed. *Theocritus: A Selection*. Cambridge.

Husdon-Williams, T. 1910. *The Elegies of Theognis*. London.

Jacobson, H. 1987. "Vergil's Dido and Euripides' Helen." *American Journal of Philology,* 108: 167-168.

——— 2001. "*Aeneid* 12.391-2: Iamque aderat Phoebo ante alios dilectus Iapyx / Iasides." *CQ* 51: 308-309.

Jackson, K. 2010. "Father-Daughter Dynamics in the Iliad: The role of Aphrodite in Defining Zeus' Regime." In A. C. Smith & S. Pickup, eds., *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite.* Leiden: 29-50.

Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley – Los Angeles.

Kahlmeyer, J. 1934. *Seesturm und Schiffbruch als Bild in antiken Schriftum*. Hildesheim.

Keith, A. M. (2000) *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Khan, H. A. 2002. "The Boy at the Banquet: Dido and Amor in Vergil, *Aen.*1." *Athenaeum* 90: 187-205.

——— 2003. "Venus' intervention in the Dido-affair: controversies and considerations." In C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History 11* (Collection Latomus 272). Bruxelles: 244-274.

Kirk, G. S. ed. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Volume II: Books 5-8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knauer, G. N. 1964a. *Die Aeneis und Homer. Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis*. Göttingen.

——— 1964b. "Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5.2: 61-84.

Knox, B. M. W. 1950. “The Serpent and the Flame: The Imagery of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*.” *The American Journal of Philology*, 71.4: 379-400.

Korte, A. 1916. “Zum zweiten Buch von Vergils *Aeneis*.” *Hermes* 51: 145-150.

Kraggerud, E. 2017. *Vergiliana: Critical Studies on the Texts of Publius Vergilius Maro.* New York. 164-165

Krevans, N. 2002-3. "Dido, Hypsipyle, and the bedclothes," *Hermathena* 173/174: 174-183.

Lacey, W. K. 1966. “Homeric ἕδνα and Penelope’s κύριος.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 58: 55-68.

Lada-Richards, I. 2006. '"*Cum femina primum*': Venus, Vulcan, and the Politics of Male *mollitia* in *Aeneid* 8." *Helios,* 33: 27-72.

La Penna, A. *1978*. “Deifobo ed Enea (*Aen*. VI 494-547).” In, *Miscellanea di studi in memoria di Marino Barchiesi (Riv. Cult. Class. Med. 20). Roma*: 987-1006.

——— 2003. “I volti di Venere nell’*Eneide*.” In E. Lell (ed.), *Arma Virumque: Studi di Poesia e Storiografia in onore de Luca Canali*. Pisa: 97-107.

Leach, E. W. 1997. "Venus, Thetis and the social construction of maternal behavior." *Classical Journal* 92.4: 347-371.

Leaf, W. ed. 1900. *The Iliad*, Vol. 1. London.

Lesky, A. 1947. *Thalatta*. Vienna.

Loyd-Jones, H. 1971. *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley – London.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil’s Aeneid*. Oxford

Mackail, J. W. ed. 1930. *The Aeneid*. Oxford.

Mankin, D., ed. 1995. *Horace: Epodes*. Cambridge.

Matthiessen, K. 1997. "Uberlegungen zur Helenaepisode der Aeneis." In B. Czapla et al. (eds.), *Vir bonus dicendi peritus*: *Festschrift fur Alfons Weische*. *Wiesbaden*: 291-297.

McCallum, S. L. 2012. *Taking Love Seriously: Amor and Erotic Elegy in Vergil's 'Italian Iliad.'* Diss. Toronto.

Miles, G. B. 1975. "*Georgics* 3.209-294: *Amor* and Civilization." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity,* 8: 177-91.

Murgatroyd, P. 1995. "The Sea of Love." *Classical Quarterly* 45.1: 9-25

Murgia, C. E. 1971. "More on Helen Episode." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 4: 203-217.

——— 2003. "The Date of Helen Episode." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101: 405-426.

Murrin, M. 1980. *The Allegorical Epic: Essays in Its Rise and Decline*. Chicago – London.

Nelis, D. 2001. *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds.

Newton, F. L. 1957. "Recurrent Imagery in *Aeneid* IV." *Transaction of the American Philological Association* 88: 31-43.

Norden. E. 1913. *Agnostos Theos*. Berlin.

O'Hara, J. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic*. Cambridge.

——— 2012. *Aeneid* 4. In R. T. Ganiban et al., *Vergil Aeneid Books 1-6*. Newburyport, MA.

O'Brian, J. V. 1993. *The Transformations of Hera: A Study of Ritual, Hero, and the Goddess in the Iliad*. Lanham

Oliensis, E. 1997. "Sons and Lovers: Sexuality and Gender in Virgil's Poetry." In C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge: 294–311.

Otis, B. 1964. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford.

Page, T. E. ed. 1923. *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books I-IV*. London

——— ed. 1931. *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books VII-XII*. London

Papachrysostomou A. 2008. *Six Comic Poets: A Commentary on Selected Fragments of Middle Comedy*. Tübingen.

Paschalis, M. 1984. "The Affair between Venus and Anchises and the Birth of Aeneas in the *Aeneid*." *Dodone*, 13: 25-40.

Pavlock, B. 1990. *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition*. Ithaca – London.

Pease, A. S. ed. 1935. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus.* Cambridge, MA.

Pedley, J. 2006. *Sanctuaries and the Sacred in the Ancient Greek World*. Cambridge.

Pelliccia, H. 1985. *The Structure of Archaic Greek Hymns*. Diss. Yale.

——— 1990. "Aeschylean ἀμέγαρος and Virgilian *inamabilis*." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 84: 187-194.

——— 2010-2011. "Unlocking *Aeneid* 6.460: Plautus' *Amphitryon*, Euripides' *Protesilaus* and the Referents of Callimachus' *Coma*." *The Classical Journal* 106.2: 149 – 221.

Peirano, I. 2012. *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context*. Cambridge - New York.

Phillips, J. E. 1977. "Juno in *Aeneid* 4. 693-705." *Vergilius* 23: 30-33

Polleichtner, W. 2005. *Aeneas' Emotions in Vergil's Aeneid and their Literary and Philosophical Foundations: An Analysis of Select Scenes*. Doctoral Dissertation.

Pöschl, V. 1962. *Image and Symbol in the Aeneid*. Trans. G. Seligson. Ann Arbor.

Putnam, M. C. J. 1965. *The Poetry of the Aeneid*. Ithaca - London.

——— 1985. "Possessiveness, Sexuality and Heroism in the *Aeneid*." *Vergilius* 31: 1-21.

——— 1998. *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven – London.

Quinn, K. 1969. *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description.* Ann Arbor.

Reckford, K. 1981. "Helen in Aeneid II & VI." *Arethusa* 14: 85-99.

——— 1995-1996. "Recognizing Venus (I): Aeneas Meets His Mother." *Arion* 3: 1-42.

Redfield, J. M. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago.

Reed, J. D. 1997. *Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the Adonis*. Cambridge.

——— 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton - Oxford.

Ricottilli, L. 1990. "*taceo*." *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, vol. 5.* Rome: 7-14.

Rowell, H. T. 1966. "The Ancient Evidence of the Helen Episode in *Aeneid* II." In Wallach, L. (ed.), *Classical Tradition: Literary & Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*. Ithaca: 210-221.

Segal, C. P. 1965. "The Tragedy of the *Hippolytus*: the Waters of Ocean and the Untouched Meadow." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 70: 117-169.

——— 1981. "Art and the Hero: Participation, Detachment, and Narrative Point of View in *Aeneid* 1." *Arethusa*, 14.1: 67-83.

Scafoglio, G. 2000. "La scena di Elena tramandata da Servio: discussione filologica." *Vichiana,* 4.2: 181-200.

Schmidt, V. 1973. "Dans la chambre d'or de Vulcain." *Mnemosyne*, 26. 4: 350-375.

Seo, J. Mira. 2013. *Examplary Traits: Reading Characterization in Roman Poetry*. Oxford.

Shipley, F. W. 1925. "The Virgilian Authorship of the Helen Episode, *Aeneid* II.567-588." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 56: 172-184.

Skinner, M. 2005. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*. Malden – Oxford – Carlton.

——— 2007. "Venus as Physician: *Aeneid* 12.411-19." *Vergilius* 53: 87-99.

——— 2013. "Troy and Trauma in the *Aeneid*." In D. Lateiner et al. (eds.), *Roman Literature, Gender, and Reception: domina illustris. Essays in Honor of Judith Peller Hallett*. London – New York: 40-52

Smith, P. 1981. *Nursling of mortality. A study of the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. Frankfurt.

Smolenaars, J. J. L. 2004. "A Disturbing Scene from the Marriage of Venus and Vulcan: *Aeneid* 8. 370-415." *Vergilius* 50: 96-107.

Spence, S. 1988. *Rhetorics of Reason and Desire: Vergil, Augustine, and the Troubadours*. Ithaca – London.

Stahl, H-P. 1981. "Aeneas - an 'Unheroic Hero?'" *Arethusa* 14: 157-77.

Strauss-Clay, J. 2006. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. London.

Suzuki, M. 1989. Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic. Ithaca – London.

Syed, Y. 2005. *Vergil's Aeneid and the Roman Self*. Ann Arbor.

Syson, A. 2013. *Fama and Fiction in Vergil's Aeneid*. Columbus.

Taran, S. L. 1979. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.

Tarrant, R. 1987. "Typology of Interpolation in Latin Poetry." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 117: 281-298.

——— ed. 2012. *Vergil, Aeneid 12*. Cambridge.

Thomas, R. F. ed. 1988. *Virgil, Georgics*. 2 vol. Cambridge.

——— 1999. *Reading Virgil and his Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*. Ann Arbor.

Thornton, A. 1976. *The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid*. Leiden

Thornton, B. S. 1997. *Eros: The Myth of Ancient Greek Sexuality*. Boulder / Oxford.

Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman marriage: iusti coniuges from the time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian*. Oxford.

Turkeltaub, D. 2003. "The Three Virgin Goddesses in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite." Lexis,* 21: 101-116.

Vernant, J.-P. 2006 [1965]. *Myth and Thought among the Greeks*. Trans. J. Lloyd. New York.

Worman, N. 1997. “The Body as Argument: Helen in Four Greek Texts.” *Classical Antiquity*, 16.1: 151-203.

West, M. L., ed. 1966: *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford

Williams, R. D. 1965-66. "The Opening Scenes of the *Aeneid*." *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 5: 14-23.

——— ed. 1972. *Aeneid I-VI*. London.

——— ed. 1973. *Aeneid VII-XII*. London.

Wlosok, A. 1967. *Die Gottin Venus in Vergils Aeneis*. (Bibliothek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, Neue Folge, 2. Reihe, 21). Heidelberg.

Zeitland, F. 1999. “Reflections on Erotic Desire in Archaic and Classical Greece.” In J. I. Porter (ed.), *Constructions of the Classical Body*. Ann Arbor: 50-76.

Zimmerman, C. 1994. “An Iliadic model for Theocritus’ 1.95-113,” *American Journal of Philology,* 115: 375-380.