Transactions of the American Philological Association 129 (1999) 225–262

Remembering the Enemy: Narrative, Focalization, and Vergil's Portrait of Achilles*

Stephen C. Smith
St. Paul, Minnesota

Achilles was killed before the fall of Troy and cannot appear as a character in the *Aeneid.* Yet throughout the poem we are reminded of his presence—a presence that has generally been seen as malignant. In both the *Iliad* (cf. 2.768–70) and later tradition, Achilles was the greatest of the Greek heroes at Troy and a paradigm of human excellence; but in the *Aeneid* he at first seems to represent indiscriminate violence.[1] This view arises not only from consideration of characters who possess Achillean features—that is, Neoptolemus, Turnus, and the wrathful Aeneas of Books 10–12—but also from attention to the more or less explicit references to Achilles in Books 1–5. These references seem to depict Achilles as an inhuman monster, the very incarnation of the *furor* that Jupiter envisions in chains at 1.294. According to the conventional view, Achilles is, more than any other of the Greeks, the destroyer of Troy, and that is all he is—even the title of "best of the Achaeans," as we shall see, is bestowed on Diomedes instead.

This paper will demonstrate, however, that Vergil's portrait is not as simple as it initially appears to be. A close reading of the references in *Aeneid* 1–5 shows that the poet only rarely speaks of Achilles in his own voice. Instead, it is his characters—Aeneas, Priam, Neoptolemus, Andromache, and Neptune—who evoke the memory of the Greek hero. As a result, each image has a different focus, arising from the speaker's point of view, and these five images, taken together, produce a portrait of Achilles more complex, and more rounded, than it seems at first.

*Quotations from the *Aeneid* are taken from the edition of R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969). All translations are my own.

[1]See especially King 1984.

Achilles as destroyer

The first mention of Achilles in the *Aeneid* establishes the representation of the hero that runs through much of the poem. At 1.29–31 Vergil says of Juno:

> his accensa super iactatos aequore toto
> Troas, *reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli*,
> arcebat longe Latio....
>
> Angered for these reasons, she was keeping
> the Trojans, tossed all over the sea, *those who had*
> *escaped the Danaans and cruel Achilles*, far from Latium.

Achilles is singled out from the other Danaans and thus established as the primary agent of Troy's destruction, at least on the human plane. Moreover, while the other Danaans are not described, he is explicitly characterized as *immitis*, "cruel."

In the *Aeneid*, *immitis* is used of Achilles alone. Elsewhere Vergil applies it only to swallows that eat bees (*G.* 4.13–17) and to Dis at the moment when Orpheus looks back for Eurydice (*G.* 4.492). Dis is *immitis* in that he cannot be swayed—Orpheus moved him to pity once, but is unable to do so again. This application of *immitis* recalls the end of Agamemnon's instructions to the embassy in *Iliad* 9: let Achilles accept his gifts and not be ἀμείλιχος, implacable, as Hades is (*Il.* 9.158).[2] The connection drawn here between Achilles and Hades is later emphasized by Vergil's use of *immitis* to characterize both. Just as this adjective underscores the distance between the swallows and their victims, the bees, and between Dis and his "victims," human beings, so too does it emphasize the link between Achilles and *his* victims, the Trojans. Achilles is not merely cruel, but implacable as well—against *him* there is no recourse.[3] The image with which we are thus presented in 1.30 seems

[2]Proportionally, ἀμείλιχος is even less common in Homer than *immitis* is in Vergil, being used of only Hades (*Il.* 9.158), an Erinys (*Il.* 9.572), and a future master of Astyanax (*Il.* 24.734).

[3]Forbiger on 1.30 suggests that *immitis* here has neutral force: "*immitis* ingenium fortis herois designat, nec magis in contemptum dicitur, quam *saevus Hector*...." ("*immitis* indicates the talent of a mighty hero, and is said no more contemptuously than 'savage Hector'.") Considering the fact that Vergil uses *immitis* of no other heroes, I do not believe that such a reading is tenable. Moreover, the negative thrust of *immitis* is borne out by the dominant portrait of Achilles in the *Aeneid*, whereas *saeuus* in a mostly negative sense does not cohere with Vergil's portrayal of Hector. Considering, again, that *immitis* is used elsewhere in Vergil

appropriate, inasmuch as we are dealing with the tale of a Trojan survivor and might expect to find a Roman poet in sympathy with the chief characters of his story, painting the Greeks in the darkest possible colors.

Vergil reinforces this image of Achilles when Aeneas cries out in despair during the storm that Juno has engineered for his destruction. Now, however, the perspective has changed—it is Aeneas who speaks, not the narrator.

> extemplo Aeneae soluuntur frigore membra;
> ingemit et duplicis tendens ad sidera palmas
> talia uoce refert: "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,
> saeuus ubi Aeacidae telo iacet Hector, ubi ingens
> Sarpedon, ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis
> scuta uirum galeasque et fortia corpora uoluit!" (1.92–101)
>
> Aeneas' legs give way with a sudden chill;
> he groans, and raising both hands to the stars
> he says: "O three and four times happy,
> the ones who got to die before the eyes of their fathers
> and Troy's lofty walls! O bravest of the Danaan race—
> son of Tydeus! Could I not have fallen on the plains
> of Ilium and at your hand poured forth my spirit,
> where savage Hector lies because of Achilles' spear,
> where great Sarpedon lies, where Simois rolled so many shields
> and helmets and strong bodies of men, caught up under its waves!"

In this passage the reader should observe a number of things. First, Aeneas' second exclamation seems at first glance to be addressed to Achilles, as he appeals to *Danaum fortissime gentis.* The "bravest of the race of Danaans" should be the same as the "best of the Achaeans"—i.e., Achilles, as we are led to expect not only from the image of Achilles developed over the centuries between Homer and Vergil but also from Vergil's singling out of Achilles from the other Greeks mentioned in 1.30. But Aeneas goes on to name this great warrior with the unexpected vocative *Tydide*, Diomedes, and Vergil emphasizes

---

only of Dis (at the point when Orpheus looks back, contrary to the god's command) and of birds that eat bees, *immitis* seems intended to evoke sympathy in the audience.

his surprising declaration through the use of enjambment. Achilles has, for the moment, been displaced from his traditional role as the premier Greek warrior.[4]

Second, Aeneas' wish to have died at the hands of Diomedes clearly evokes their duel (*Il.* 5.297–310), in which Aeneas would have been killed had his mother not intervened. Yet the appeal *o Danaum fortissime gentis* should also remind us that Diomedes, too, is called κάρτιστον Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* 6.98),[5] and we must remember the context of that description as well. Helenus is telling Hector *and Aeneas* that Diomedes is the best of the Greeks, *more fearsome than Achilles himself*:

> "ὡς κεν Τυδέος υἱὸν ἀπόσχῃ Ἰλίου ἱρῆς,
> ἄγριον αἰχμητήν, κρατερὸν μήστωρα φόβοιο,
> ὃν δὴ ἐγὼ κάρτιστον Ἀχαιῶν φημι γενέσθαι.
> οὐδ' Ἀχιλῆά ποθ' ὧδέ γ' ἐδείδιμεν, ὄρχαμον ἀνδρῶν,
> ὅν πέρ φασι θεᾶς ἐξ ἔμμεναι· ἀλλ' ὅδε λίην
> μαίνεται, οὐδέ τίς οἱ δύναται μένος ἰσοφαρίζειν." (*Il.* 6.96–101)[6]
>
> "So that she may keep the son of Tydeus away from holy Ilium,
> the wild spearman, mighty bringer of fear,
> whom I say is indeed the mightiest of the Achaeans.
> Never did we fear Achilles, the leader of men, in this way,
> although they say he was born of a goddess; but this one
> rages too greatly, and none can vie with him in might."

Achilles has again been displaced in favor of Diomedes. Moreover, Aeneas' outcry is not simply an echo of Homer. His choice of words emphasizes that he

[4]Cf., however, Stahl 164: "It is not so much a compliment paid to...Diomedes, but an Achillean claim to greatness on the part of Aeneas: the sentence 'only the greatest of the enemy would have been worthy of slaying me' is equivalent to 'I am the greatest on my side'." Given the circumstances of Aeneas' outcry, however, I do not find this argument persuasive. It is interesting to note, moreover, that a scene corresponding in some ways to the present episode is given to Diomedes himself in Book 11. The Latin ambassadors refer to having "touched the hand by which Troy fell" (*contigimusque manum qua concidit Ilia tellus*, 11.245), a description that exceeds that of Priam kissing the hand of Achilles, the hand that had slain many of his sons (*Il.* 24.468). During the course of his speech, Diomedes attributes his troubles to his rash attack on Venus as she tried to rescue her son from his duel with Diomedes (11.275–77, cf. *Il.* 5.311–51), the very duel in which Aeneas wishes that he had died. Finally, Aeneas' surprising distinction of Diomedes as the greatest of the Greek warriors is matched by Diomedes' own comparison of Hector and Aeneas (11.288–92): both were great warriors, but Aeneas surpassed Hector in *pietas* and is thus presumably the greater of the two.

[5]See Heyne on 1.96–98.

[6]All quotations from the *Iliad* are taken from the edition of D. B. Monro and T. W. Allen (Oxford, 1920).

speaks from memory, a memory extending back from the present to his experiences in the war—in other words, the "poetic memory" that runs backward from the *Aeneid* into the *Iliad* and throughout it (Conte 11).

Third, even as Aeneas diminishes Achilles' honor, he emphasizes his destructive prowess by providing a catalogue of Trojan deaths during the war, which is unified by the repeated *ubi*:

> "saeuus ubi Aeacidae telo iacet Hector, ubi ingens
> Sarpedon, ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis
> scuta uirum galeasque et fortia corpora uoluit!" (1.99–101)
>
> "where savage Hector lies because of Achilles' spear,
> where great Sarpedon lies, where Simois rolled so many shields
> and helmets and strong bodies of men, caught up under its waves!"

In the first case, it was Achilles, the descendant of Aeacus,[7] who slew *saeuus* Hector, the greatest defender of Troy.[8] This slaying is not only the climax of the action of the *Iliad* but also the act that portends the almost immediate fall of Troy itself. Moreover, the epithet *saeuus*, which belongs syntactically with *Hector*, may also color *Aeacidae* as a result of their close placement within the line. Its force, however, depends on which association is chosen. With *Hector*, *saeuus* is a near translation of the Homeric ἀνδροφόνος (*Il.* 1.242; 6.498; 9.351; 17.428, 616, 638; 18.149; 24.509, 724), which is used almost exclusively of the Trojan warrior and serves to emphasize his martial prowess; *saeuus*, then, should provide the same emphasis, without negative connotations.[9] With *Aeacidae*, on the other hand, *saeuus* is closer to the earlier *immitis* and the Homeric νηλεής, which, when used for mortals, seems to be reserved for Achilles and his implacable wrath (*Il.* 9.497, 632; 16.33, 204).

In the next case, we are presented with the death of the most powerful of Troy's allies, Sarpedon—*ubi ingens Sarpedon [iacet]*. By emphasizing the formidability of Sarpedon, as he had done for Hector, Aeneas also underscores the prowess of his killer. Since the man who killed him was Patroclus, acting as

[7]The use of *Aeacides* for Achilles, while Homeric, may in this instance be modifying *telo* more specifically than to mean simply "the weapon of Achilles." Peleus is equally *Aeacides*, and it is by Achilles' use of Peleus' *spear* (μελίη: 19.390, 22.328) that Hector dies.

[8]See Williams 1972 on 1.99: "*Saevus* seems at first a strange adjective for Aeneas to apply to Hector, but its point here is that for all Hector's fierceness in war he was killed when Aeneas was not."

[9]See Conington-Nettleship on 1.99 and Forbiger on 1.30 (n. 3 above).

a surrogate for the absent Achilles, Achilles' stature is enhanced as well; what is more, it is the death of Sarpedon that inevitably leads to the fall of Troy.[10]

The third case is less specific, in that no Trojans or Achaeans are mentioned by name, and arguably the least important with respect to Troy's fate; but it is the longest and most impressive of the three. The image of Simois rolling bodies and armor down to the sea is drawn from the opening of *Iliad* 12; here it also evokes the encounter of Achilles and Xanthus/Scamander in Book 21. Achilles fights the river itself, which appears to have been enraged by his slaughter of the Trojan forces.

> "εἴ τοι Τρῶας ἔδωκε Κρόνου παῖς πάντας ὀλέσσαι,
> ἐξ ἐμέθεν γ' ἐλάσας πεδίον κάτα μέρμερα ῥέζε·
> πλήθει γὰρ δή μοι νεκύων ἐρατεινὰ ῥέεθρα,
> οὐδέ τί πη δύναμαι προχέειν ῥόον εἰς ἅλα δῖαν
> στεινόμενος νεκύεσσι, σὺ δὲ κτείνεις ἀϊδήλως." (*Il.* 21.216–20)
>
> "If Zeus has allowed you to destroy all the Trojans,
> drive them from me and carry out your evil work on the plain:
> my lovely currents are filled with corpses,
> and nowhere can I pour my stream into the shining sea,
> choked as I am with corpses; but ruthlessly you keep killing."

It is not so much the slaughter of the Trojans that Xanthus deplores—he seems to concede this to Achilles—as the clogging of his stream with corpses. This clogging is emphasized again in the descriptions of Xanthus framing his appeal to his brother Simois for help against Achilles, who is pressing onward with the assistance of Athena:

> αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ, μέγα γάρ ῥα θεῶν ὄτρυνεν ἐφετμή,
> ἐς πεδίον· τὸ δὲ πᾶν πλῆθ' ὕδατος ἐκχυμένοιο,
> πολλὰ δὲ τεύχεα καλὰ δαϊκταμένων αἰζηῶν
> πλῶον καὶ νέκυες...
> .....
> οὐδὲ Σκάμανδρος ἔληγε τὸ ὂν μένος, ἀλλ' ἔτι μᾶλλον
> χώετο Πηλεΐωνι, κόρυσσε δὲ κῦμα ῥόοιο
> ὑψόσ' ἀειρόμενος... (*Il.* 21.299–302, 305–7)
>
> But he went to the plain, for the great behest of the gods
> urged him on; it was completely filled with the flooding water,
> and many splendid arms were afloat, and the bodies of young men

[10]Sarpedon's death (*Il.* 16.426–507) is the climax of the *aristeia* of Patroclus, which ends when Apollo urges Hector against him (16.721–25); this leads to the successive deaths of Patroclus, Hector, and Achilles, and, through the death of Hector, to the destruction of Troy.

> who had died in battle...
> .....
> And Scamander did not end his wrath, but grew still angrier
> at the son of Peleus, and he caused the waves of his stream
> to crest, raising them aloft...

Aeneas' cry of despair, then, concludes with an allusion to an episode that foregrounds Achilles' destructive prowess: he is powerful enough not only to fill a river with the corpses of the valiant, but even to *challenge* that river. Aeneas' wish is to have died at the hand of Diomedes, the bravest of the Danaans, or, it may be supposed, at the hand of Achilles, the most destructive. As he makes this wish he marks Achilles as inferior to Diomedes, in an implicit comparison that seems to recur during future appearances of the two heroes in Books 1–5.

Finally, the focus on Achilles here owes something to the most important model for Aeneas' outcry, the lament of Odysseus in *Odyssey* 5. Still, it is not simply a translation of that earlier speech.[11] Vergil reformulates the reference to Achilles that concludes Odysseus' speech: Aeneas ends with a description of Achilles' lethal prowess, whereas Odysseus looks back to the day of Achilles' death:

> "ὡς δὴ ἐγώ γ' ὄφελον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν
> ἤματι τῷ ὅτε μοι πλεῖστοι χαλκήρεα δοῦρα
> Τρῶες ἐπέρριψαν περὶ Πηλεΐωνι θανόντι." (*Od.* 5.308–10)[12]
>
> "Would that I had died and met my fate
> on that day when so many Trojans hurled brazen
> weapons at me around the dead son of Peleus."

Although the finale of Odysseus' speech contrasts a glorious death in battle with an ignoble death by drowning, no such coda occurs in Aeneas' speech. Just as Odysseus fixes the day on which he should have died, so Aeneas fixes the place, but it is not simply Troy: it is a locale defined (like that time) in terms of Achilles. Troy becomes the place where Achilles fought, and the Trojan War and the destruction of the city are events defined by the presence of Achilles. In

[11]See Highet 191 for other Homeric echoes in Aeneas' speech. Pöschl 34–41 *passim* compares the Homeric and Vergilian speeches and discusses Vergil's use of this speech to delineate Aeneas' character.

[12]All quotations from the *Odyssey* are taken from the edition of T. W. Allen (Oxford, 1912–19).

terms of the *Aeneid*, Aeneas' speech elucidates the phrase *reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli*, in which Achilles is singled out as the chief destroyer, for it is here that we learn why he has that role.

But the speech goes beyond this, for it also draws on Achilles' prayer during the very confrontation with Scamander (*Il.* 21.272–83) that Aeneas seems to remember at 1.100–101. In evoking that scene too, Vergil does more than focus the reader's attention, through Aeneas' words, upon Achilles. He also introduces Aeneas as a new Achilles as well as a new Odysseus:[13] his hero faces not only death at sea but the denial of his promised destiny. Death at the hands of the foe would have been preferable (Wlosok 19–20).

The next set of references to Achilles, falling within the description of the temple of Juno at Carthage (1.441–95), is more complex. These allusions differ from the one at 1.96–101, which was uttered by Aeneas and therefore clearly reflected his own thoughts. Here Vergil uses his regular narrative voice. However, the fact that the poet himself retains control of the narrative should not lead us to believe that he is providing an objective view of his poetic reality. From almost the very beginning of the description, Vergil focalizes the narrative through Aeneas (Genette 189).[14] The hero's reactions to what he sees are constantly brought to the fore. Vergil's words, then, are not a mere ekphrasis: they are at the same time a report of the "ekphrastic" object as it is *perceived.* Aeneas perceives the pictures on Juno's temple almost as he would his own memories, and just as his viewpoint was circumscribed at Troy, so it is here.

Making a distinction between what Segal, in discussing this passage, calls the "authorial" and the "participatory" voices will be useful at this point. The authorial voice is that of the omniscient narrator, whether he expresses himself *as* the narrator or through, for example, a god; the participatory voice is one embodied in the words (and perceptions) of characters who do not share the

[13]Cf. Wlosok 15: "Es sei gleich hier vermerkt, daß Vergil durch diesen Kunstgriff, die Zusammenarbeitung mehrerer Vorbilder, in der man lange nur stümpferhafte Quellenkontamination gesehen hat, nichts Geringeres bezweckt, als seinen Helden auf einen Schlag programmatisch als neuen Odysseus und neuen Achill einzuführen, in Einklang mit seiner Absicht, die beiden homerischen Epen zu einem römischen Gesamtepos umzudichten." (It should be noted immediately here that Vergil, through this artistic trick—the working together of several models, in which for a long time only a bungled contamination of sources had been seen—aims at nothing less than programmatically introducing his hero as a new Odysseus and a new Achilles at the same time, in accord with his intention of reworking the two Homeric epics into an all-encompassing Roman poem.)

[14]See also de Jong 102–18.

author's omniscience (Segal 68). Aeneas, as Segal notes, "occupies a unique position," switching back and forth between the two voices in the course of the poem (Segal 69). Here, however, the participatory voice is foregrounded. As Aeneas examines the pictures, he relives the war, the old emotions welling up inside; he is, as it were, *participating* in the war once again. In addition, as Clay notes, "Aeneas' history is not historical" (Clay 202). He picks out Priam (*en Priamus*), whose death signifies that of Troy, and, more importantly for our discussion, he picks out Achilles.

Achilles is explicitly mentioned four times, the only Achaean hero to be named more than once; yet even when he is not named, his presence throughout the passage is often felt. It is Achilles, more than any other warrior, who seems to bring about the destruction of Troy.[15] When Aeneas first beholds the painting, we are given a brief summary of its content:

> ...uidet Iliacas ex ordine pugnas
> bellaque iam fama totum uulgata per orbem,
> Atridas Priamumque et saeuum ambobus Achillem. (1.456–58)
>
> ...he sees in succession the battles at Troy,
> and the war made known through the whole world by fame,
> the sons of Atreus, Priam, and Achilles savage toward both.

As in Aeneas' lament during the storm (1.96–101), a capsule account of the Trojan War and the *Iliad* is given in terms of Achilles, whose name is postponed—thereby emphasizing his importance for the war—until the very end of the line (its customary place throughout the Vergilian corpus)[16] and also of the passage as a whole. One might expect the leaders—Agamemnon and Menelaus on the one side, and Priam on the other—to be mentioned, representing the respective forces of Greece and Troy. Achilles, on the other hand, is introduced as a symbol of destructive force; he is not merely *opposed* to Agamemnon or Priam, but *savage* (*saeuum*) toward them both. His anger over Agamemnon's seizure of Briseis brings grief upon the Achaean forces,

[15]Cf. King 1987: 123–24.

[16]This may reflect Homeric usage: of 381 occurrences of the name in Homer, 217 (56.96%) are at line-end. The frequency is even greater if we consider only the occurrences of Ἀχιλλεύς and not those of Ἀχιλεύς, inasmuch as Vergil does not use such variants: of 243 occurrences of Ἀχιλλεύς, 184 (75.72%) are at line-end. The sole exception to the rule in Vergil is the adjective *Achilleae*, which is the second word in 3.326. The metrical shape of the word (⏑ – – –) does not allow it to fall at line-end.

when he withdraws from fighting and Zeus gives victory to the Trojans (cf. *Il.* 1.391–412). Again, Achilles' grief and wrath over Patroclus' death trigger episodes of great destruction for the Trojans and ultimately the death of Hector. Accordingly, the expression *saeuum ambobus* embraces the whole of the *Iliad.* The *saeuitia* of Achilles is, as I mentioned earlier, not that of Hector. Achilles is νηλεής toward Greek and Trojan alike, his implacable wrath making him the "slayer of pity" (cf. *Il.* 24.44, ἔλεον...ἀπώλεσεν). Mentioning Achilles at the beginning of the description, then, intensifies the impression provided by previous references: Achilles, the savage destroyer, here not only of Troy but also of his own people.

After the brief summary at 456–58, Vergil's narrative pauses before continuing with the more detailed description at 466. As in 450–52, we are again presented with Aeneas' reaction to the paintings, now articulated by Aeneas himself.

> constitit et lacrimans "quis iam locus," inquit, "Achate,
> quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?
> en Priamus. sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi,
> sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.
> solue metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem."
> sic ait atque animum pictura pascit inani
> multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine uultum. (1.459–65)

> He stopped and, weeping, said "What place is there now,
> Achates, what region on earth is not full of our suffering?
> Behold Priam. Even here honor has its rewards;
> they weep for the lives of men and mortal affairs touch their hearts.
> End your fear; this renown will bring you some safety."
> Thus he speaks, and feeds his spirit on the empty picture,
> groaning much, his face wet with copious tears.

Whereas Vergil simply tells us that *Iliacas pugnas* are pictured, Aeneas reads into them *lacrimae rerum* and *salus*—sympathy and safety for the Trojans. Unlike Aeneas, we the audience cannot make such a leap of faith. To begin with, Vergil has just said that this temple is (or will be) dedicated to *Juno*, the eternal enemy of Troy.[17] Again, we have learned at 1.297–304, shortly before this scene, that not even Jupiter is convinced Dido will welcome the Trojans without prompting, for he sends Mercury to ensure that the Carthaginians are hospitable. Until Mercury accomplishes his task, it is unclear whether there is,

[17]See Johnson 105; Lyne 209–10; O'Hara 35–39.

in fact, *salus* at Carthage.[18] *Salus* is what the wandering Aeneas longs for, and as he gazes at the images of the Trojan War in a city so much like the one he seeks, he thinks he has found evidence of that *salus*. He seems to see only the "evidence" and not its context. By the time we actually visualize the pictures, then, we have been alerted to the fact that there may be a discrepancy between what Aeneas *sees* on the temple and what he *perceives*. Vergil chooses at this crucial psychological moment to give us those perceptions, rather than a simple description: in other words, he presents a description colored by Aeneas' interpretation of his visual impressions. This is perhaps emphasized by the phrase *pictura inani*, which may suggest that the paintings lack not only, in Servius' phrase, *corporum quae imitatur plenitudine* (Serv. *ad* 1.464), but also the emotional content with which Aeneas invests them. Aeneas perceives *lacrimae rerum*; what he in fact *sees* is the κλέος (*fama*) of the Greeks—and, by extension, the glory of Juno, their patron.

The first images Vergil gives us are those of general routs, in which Achilles is singled out for his prowess:

> namque uidebat uti bellantes Pergama circum
> hac fugerent Grai, premeret Troiana iuuentus;
> hac Phryges, instaret curru cristatus Achilles. (1.466–68)
>
> For he saw how, as they warred around the citadel,
> the Greeks were fleeing on this side, with the young Trojans in pursuit;
> the Phrygians on that side, with Achilles in his crested helmet, looming
> in his chariot.

Just as they had been directly before (458, *Atridas Priamumque*), the two opposing forces are named at once (*Grai, Troiana iuuentus*), but in these masses only one warrior stands out—Achilles. He alone is described (*curru cristatus*), just as at 1.30 and 1.458 he alone receives a modifier (*immitis, saeuum*), and his name appears in the emphatic final position. The flight of the Achaeans that the *Troiana iuuentus* are able to incite parallels not a general Greek rout of the Trojans, but a rout inspired by Achilles alone.[19] Achilles' greatness is re-emphasized by the fact that, in the cases of both the Greeks and

[18]"The traces of humankind are not necessarily those of humanity" (Clay 198).

[19]Vergil does not specify when these two routs occur, but they may in fact be taken as those precipitated by the death of Patroclus: with the Greek defenders of Patroclus' body beaten off, Hector and Aeneas lead their troops in chasing the Greeks to their ships, but Achilles soon emerges in his new armor to drive the Trojans back to Troy (cf. Heyne on 1.466–68).

the Trojans, he syntactically counterbalances an army (*Grai*—***Troiana iuuentus***—*Phryges*—***Achilles***).

Next Aeneas sees an incident obviously inspired by the *Iliad*, that of the slaughter of Rhesus by Diomedes and Odysseus (1.469–73; *Il.* 10). On the temple of Juno, however, only Diomedes is depicted (or, at least, seen by Aeneas) in the act of carrying out this slaying. He succeeds where Achilles cannot: the pseudo-Euripidean *Rhesus* and a scholion attributed to Didymus on *Il.* 10.435[20] both suggest that the reason Troy would not fall was the invulnerability of Rhesus, whom even Achilles would be unable to overcome (*Rh.* 601). Thanks to this accomplishment, Aeneas' recognition of Diomedes as the greatest of the Greek heroes (1.96–97) is confirmed.

In the next scene, however, Achilles helps to hasten Troy's fall when he kills Troilus (1.474–78).[21] His cruelty, too, is accented in the non-Iliadic description of his encounter with the unarmed and clearly inferior Trojan: "La versione dei *Canti Cipri* sembra invece adottata a proposito di Troilo (Procl. *Chrest.* p. 105, 12 Allen) considerato non guerriero adulto, come nell' *Iliade* (24, 257), ma *infelix puer* ucciso in impari duello da A. (*E* 1, 475): la scelta connotava la ferocia di A., già affermata (1, 30 *immitis*, e 458 *saevom*) e più volte ribadita (2, 29 *saevos;* 3, 87 *immitis*)" (Privitera 25).[22] It is unclear whether Achilles is actually depicted in the scene before Aeneas, but the effects of his actions are evident. We also have a parallel to the broader retreat of 1.468, with Troilus balancing the Phrygians, the necessity of his survival equal in importance to all their strength. The description of Troilus' body being dragged through the dust by his horses gives an additional note of pathos to the picture and also prefigures the portrayals of the mutilation and ransom of Hector that follow hard upon that scene.

Depiction of the ransoming is delayed, however, by the Trojan women supplicating the pitiless Minerva (1.479–82). This particular episode

[20]χρησμὸς γὰρ ἐδέδοτο αὐτῷ, φασίν, ὅτι, εἰ αὐτὸς γεύσεται τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ οἱ ἵπποι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σκαμάνδρου πίωσι, καὶ τῆς αὐτόθι νομῆς [γεύσωνται], ἀκαταμάχητος ἔσται εἰς τὸ παντελές. (For he had received an oracle, they say, that if he would taste the water, and his horses drink from the Scamander and [eat] of the pasturage there, he would be utterly irresistible in battle.)

[21]Williams 1990: 43. Cf. Pl. *Bac.* 953–56.

[22]"The version of the *Cypria* seems instead to have been adopted in the case of Troilus, who is considered not an adult warrior, as in the *Iliad,* but an *infelix puer* slain in unequal combat by Achilles; the choice connotes the ferocity of Achilles, which has been already established and several times confirmed." Cf. also Clay 203.

underscores the discrepancy between what Aeneas actually sees and what he thinks he sees. The images on the temple of Juno lead Aeneas to suspect that he has found safety and—perhaps—won that goddess over, just as the Trojan women pray that Pallas turn the enemy from their gates, trying to placate her with a peplos.[23] Like the depiction of the slaying of Rhesus, moreover, this scene draws us away from Achilles and leads us to consider Diomedes. When, at Hector's urging, the women of Troy make their offering to Athena, they pray that the goddess might stop Diomedes, not Achilles (*Il.* 6.305–10). Once again, Diomedes is the primary threat to Troy and accordingly, as at 1.96, the greatest of the Greeks.

The fate that the Trojan women were trying to avert was the death of Hector, the last impediment to the fall of Troy. After the offering scene, we come to a description of the *lytra Hectoris*, subtly different from the event portrayed in the *Iliad*.[24]

> ter circum Iliacos raptauerat Hectora muros
> exanimumque auro corpus uendebat Achilles.
> tum uero ingentem gemitum dat pectore ab imo,
> ut spolia, ut currus, utque ipsum corpus amici
> tendentemque manus Priamum conspexit inermis. (1.483–87)
>
> Three times he had dragged Hector around the walls of Ilium,
> and now Achilles was selling the lifeless corpse for gold.
> Then indeed Aeneas groaned deeply from his heart,
> as he saw the spoils, the chariot, the very body of his friend,
> and Priam stretching out defenseless hands.

In Homer, Achilles drags Hector's corpse not only before the walls of Troy (*Il.* 22.463–64) but, more importantly, around Patroclus' burial mound, presumably as much to further his vengeance as to honor Patroclus:

> ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν ὑφ' ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους,
> Ἕκτορα δ' ἕλκεσθαι δησάσκετο δίφρου ὄπισθεν,
> τρὶς δ' ἐρύσας περὶ σῆμα Μενοιτιάδαο θανόντος

[23]"Aeneas is...beginning to think that his troubles may be over, and that he may have placated the goddess whom Helenus told him he would overcome with gifts. At the center of the description of the murals Vergil places Trojan women bringing gifts to a goddess, who spurns them....That Vergil implies a connection between the attitudes of Juno and Athena seems unmistakable" (O'Hara 38).

[24]"A brutal, ignoble scene, deliberately un-Homeric" (Clausen 18). See also Heyne's *Excursus XVIII ad librum I.*

αὖτις ἐνὶ κλισίῃ παυέσκετο, τὸν δέ τ' ἔασκεν
ἐν κόνι ἐκτανύσας προπρηνέα... (*Il.* 24.14–18)

But when he had yoked his swift horses to his chariot,
he would tie Hector behind it to be dragged;
having pulled him three times about the mound of Menoetius' dead son
he would stop again at his tent and leave him face down,
stretched out in the dust...

In the *Aeneid*, on the other hand, the body was dragged only around the walls of Troy, a cruelly humiliating spectacle for Priam. As in the Troilus-scene, which actually depicts a corpse being dragged, Vergil seems to have left the *Iliad* and, in part, to have sought other sources. In this case, perhaps, he follows a tradition illustrated in Sophocles' *Ajax* and Euripides' *Andromache:*

"Εκτωρ μέν, ᾧ δὴ τοῦδ' ἐδωρήθη παρά,
ζωστῆρι πρισθεὶς ἱππικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγων
ἑκνάπτετ' αἰέν, ἔστ' ἀπέψυξεν βίον... (*Aj.* 1029–31)

Fastened to the rail of the chariot with the belt
which he [Ajax] had given him, Hector was mangled
ceaselessly, until he gave up his life.

... "Εκτορα, τὸν περὶ τείχη
εἵλκυσε διφρεύων παῖς ἁλίας Θέτιδος... (*Andr.* 107–8)

...Hector, whom the son of the sea-nymph Thetis,
driving his chariot, dragged around the walls.

By making such a choice—by having Achilles drag the body of Hector, whether alive (as in *Ajax*) or dead (as in the *Iliad*), only around Troy itself, rather than around Patroclus' tomb as well—Vergil has also altered the significance of Achilles' action. Hector is now not so much the slayer of Patroclus as the defender of Troy; Achilles no longer honors his fallen comrade but shows the Trojans a portent of their own destruction.

Whereas the *Iliad* dwelt on Priam's supplication and Achilles' slow compliance, moreover, the verb used here—*uendebat*—reduces the scene to its bare essentials: Priam pays ransom, and Achilles returns, or sells, Hector's body to him. Like the dragging of Hector's corpse around the walls of Troy, the "sale" of that corpse is drawn from non-Homeric sources, possibly from

tragedy: in the *Phryges*, we are told by a scholiast, Aeschylus staged the body being weighed on a pair of scales along with the ransom.[25] Any warmth or sympathy has been stripped away from the ransoming incident, leaving Achilles a cold-blooded merchant and Priam his pitiful customer.[26] It is this scene—displaying the shameful treatment of his friend's body, Priam's pitiable condition, and, above all, Achilles' cruelty—that provokes the greatest reaction in Aeneas: *tum uero ingentem gemitum dat pectore ab imo* (485).[27] Stanley asserts (270) that this emphasis on Achilles' cruelty is the motivation behind Vergil's use of the post-Iliadic story of Achilles' selling of the body. I believe, however, that more is involved in this depiction of the ransom.

Vergil focalizes the description of the pictures on Juno's temple through Aeneas[28] and makes this focalization clear from the very beginning:

> hoc primum in luco noua res oblata timorem
> leniit, hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem
> ausus et adflictis melius confidere rebus. (1.450–52)
>
> In this grove, for the first time, the strange sight before him
> relieved his fear; here for the first time Aeneas dared to hope
> for safety and to be more confident in his perilous circumstances.

Before we even "see" the pictures, we know Aeneas' reaction to them: *sperare salutem ausus*. As the Trojan walks around the temple, Vergil brings us along, so that the pictures appear suddenly to the audience as well as to Aeneas. The poet achieves this effect by breaking up the basic explanation of Aeneas' reaction (*nam uidet Iliacas pugnas*) with the two subordinate *dum*-clauses.

> *namque* sub ingenti lustrat dum singula templo
> reginam opperiens, dum quae fortuna sit urbi

[25]Aristonicus (?) on *Il.* 22.351: χρυσῷ ἐρύσασθαι· πρὸς χρυσὸν ἀντιστῆσαι. τοῦτο δὲ ὑπερβολικῶς εἶπεν. ὁ μέντοι Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἕκτορος λύτροις ἀληθὲς αὐτὸ ἐξεδέξατο. ("To rescue with gold": to weigh against gold. He says this by way of exaggeration. Aeschylus, however, actually depicted it in *Ransom of Hector*.) The coldness of the verb *uendo* is repeated in Vergil's only other use of it, again paired with *aurum*—in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*, when he mentions an unnamed sinner who betrayed his country, selling it out for gold (*uendidit hic auro patriam*, 6.621).

[26]Cf. Williams 1990: 44.

[27]*Gemitum* evokes *multa gemens* at 465, but it is emphasized strongly by *uero ingentem* and *pectore ab imo*. The intensity of Aeneas' reaction reminds us of the significance of this particular scene to all of Troy, not only to him alone. See also Segal 76.

[28]Cf. Clay 201; Boyle 112–13; Segal 75–76.

artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem
miratur, *uidet Iliacas ex ordine pugnas*
bellaque iam fama totum uulgata per orbem,
Atridas Priamumque et saeuum ambobus Achillem. (1.453–58)

For while waiting for the queen at the great temple
he examines its details, while he wonders at the lot of the city
and the hands of the craftsmen working together and the care
of their work, he sees in succession the battles at Troy,
and the war made known through the whole world by fame,
the sons of Atreus, Priam, and Achilles savage toward both.

The prominence of *uidet*—postponed for four lines and then placed at the head of its clause—warns us that what follows is not simply a matter of description but of perception, particularly Aeneas' perception. Having introduced the subjectivity of his focalizer with *lustrat* and *miratur*, the poet constantly reminds us of it with additional references to Aeneas in the process of *seeing* and *feeling*: the speech to Achates (459–63) is followed by *gemens* (465), *umectat uultum* (465), *uidebat* (466), *agnoscit lacrimans* (470), *infelix* (475), *gemitum dat* (485), *conspexit* (487), *agnouit* (488), *stupet* (495) and the final *miranda* (494), which corresponds to the earlier *miratur* (456).[29]

[29]Compare two other ekphrases in which Aeneas is an onlooker, the doors of the temple of Apollo in Cumae (6.14–33) and the shield (8.626–728). In the case of the former, we are simply informed of the temple's existence. Vergil then begins his description of the doors (6.13–14): *iam subeunt Triuiae lucos atque aurea tecta. / Daedalus, ut fama est....* That the Trojans are actually looking at them does not become clear until after the ekphrasis is completed (33–34): *quin protinus omnia perlegerent oculis....* The presence of the observers does not intrude upon Vergil's description of the panels. In the case of the shield, similarly, we are reminded of Aeneas' presence only before and after the ekphrasis itself (8.617–20, 729–31):

ille deae donis et tanto laetus honore
expleri nequit atque oculos per singula uoluit,
miraturque interque manus et bracchia uersat
terribilem cristis galeam flammasque uomentem...
.....
talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis,
miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet
attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum.

Rejoicing in the goddess' gifts and such honor,
he could not be sated and looked over all the details;
amazed, he turned over in his hands and arms
the helmet, terrifying with its crests and belching forth fire...
.....

With this awareness of the pervasiveness of Aeneas' viewpoint, we must reconsider the "coldness" of the Vergilian ransom-scene. Let us recall that, other than a few attendants, there were no mortal witnesses to the meeting between Achilles and Priam. Homer received his knowledge of the event from the Muse in particular and from the gods in general, and we receive ours through him; we thus partake in the divine perspective and have a privileged view, one not shared by Aeneas. He and the other Trojans saw Priam depart with the ransom and later return with Hector's body; he knows nothing of the words spoken, the emotions shared, the tears shed by the two men. Owing to Aeneas' limited perspective, the moving coda to the action of the *Iliad* is reduced to a commercial transaction.

The tense of the verb *raptauerat* tells us that Aeneas is supplying details that are not represented in the paintings; he sees Hector's body and *remembers* the three circuits around the walls of Troy, circuits that are not themselves depicted.[30] Vergil does tell us what Aeneas sees: Achilles, the suppliant Priam, Achilles' chariot (or Priam's wagon), Hector's corpse, the ransom itself... but no scales, no weighing of the body. Tellingly, the one piece of physical evidence for the *sale* of Hector's corpse is left out. What we seem to have is the scene as described in the *Iliad*. *Vendebat* is not a description of what is happening, but an interpretation on Aeneas' part; hence Achilles is no longer heroic but utterly mercenary. What Aeneas observes is colored by his memories and feelings—especially, perhaps, his memories of facing Achilles on the Trojan plain and of witnessing the death of Priam at the hands of Achilles' son. Brutality is therefore in the eye of the beholder, and not necessarily in the mind of the poet.

He wondered at these things on the shield of Vulcan,
his mother's gifts, and, not understanding the events, he rejoiced in their images,
taking up on his shoulder the fame and fortune of his descendants.

[30]Cf. the depiction of Mettus on Aeneas' shield (8.642–45), in which Vulcan represents the scattered bits of his body and Vergil reminds us of Mettus' punishment, using the pluperfect:

haud procul inde citae Mettum in diuersa quadrigae
distulerant (at tu dictis, Albane, maneres!),
raptabatque uiri mendacis uiscera Tullus
per siluam, et sparsi rorabant sanguine uepres.

Not far away the swift team *had pulled* Mettus
in different directions—you should have kept your word, Alban!
—and Tullus was taking up the bits of the lying man
in the woods, and the brambles were wet, spattered with blood.

In this case, however, it is clearly Vergil supplying the detail expressed in the pluperfect.

In Book 1, then, Vergil has presented an Achilles who does not seem to be, as he claims to be (and is) in the *Iliad*, the "best of the Achaeans." His ferocity and lack of pity are emphasized, just as they are by Homer; his human side, on the other hand, disappears behind a cloud of prejudice and misinterpretation. In bravery Achilles is surpassed by Diomedes, in savagery by no one: he lays low the great defenders of Troy, fills her rivers with corpses, and, having dragged the body of her mightiest defender around the city, sells it back to his father. As far as Aeneas is concerned, Achilles is simply the destroyer of Troy.

This characterization continues in Book 2, when Aeneas tells the story of Troy's fall to Dido and the Carthaginians. He first describes the visit of the Trojans to the now deserted Greek camp (2.26–30). As in 1.30, *saeuus* Achilles is singled out from the other Greeks; of all the others, only the Dolopes, the followers of Neoptolemus and thus in a sense the heirs of Achilles' own Myrmidons, are mentioned.[31] Again, it is Achilles' ferocity that is emphasized even as he is picked out (*immitis*, 1.30; *saeuus*, 2.29). The verb *iuuat* and the demonstratives, however, put us on a level with the Trojan "sightseers." Just as we saw the temple of Juno through the eyes of Aeneas, we see the Greek camp through both his own eyes and those of his countrymen.

With this mention of Achilles, Vergil has begun to set up a chain of references parallel to that in Book 1. The first allusion focuses on Achilles' savagery, while the second undercuts his prowess.

> talibus insidiis periurique arte Sinonis
> credita res, captique dolis lacrimisque coactis
> quos neque Tydides nec Larisaeus Achilles,
> non anni domuere decem, non mille carinae. (2.195–98)
>
> Through snares of this sort and Sinon's treacherous skill
> the situation was accepted, and we were taken by fraud and forced tears,
> we whom neither the son of Tydeus nor Thessalian Achilles,
> neither ten years nor a thousand ships had subdued.

Once again, there is a comparison (implicit at 1.92–101, but explicit here) involving Diomedes and Achilles.[32] In this instance, however, Diomedes and

[31] See Heyne on 2.25–30. Cf. 2.7, *Myrmidonum Dolopumue*.

[32] I believe that Diomedes is singled out together with Achilles at least partly because of their joint appearances earlier in the poem. At 1.97 Aeneas calls Diomedes *Danaum fortissim[us] gentis* but goes on to list the deeds of Achilles; on the temple of Juno at

Achilles are not compared to each other, but to Sinon. The forces arrayed against Troy—Diomedes, *Danaum fortissimus*; Achilles, the destroyer; the long siege; the strength of Greece—are, in the end, powerless. Achilles might single-handedly remove the defenses of Troy, but for all the prowess he displays in fighting, he cannot actually take the city. That prize falls to the treacherous Sinon.

Later, we return to the cruelty of Achilles with a specific example. Just as the Greeks are slipping into the city, Aeneas dreams that he sees the ghost of Hector warning him to escape from Troy. Achilles is named only once in this scene, in a mention of his armor that was stripped from the dead Patroclus, but his handiwork is evident throughout the description of Hector.[33]

> in somnis, ecce, ante oculos maestissimus Hector
> uisus adesse mihi largosque effundere fletus,
> *raptatus bigis* ut quondam, *aterque cruento*
> *puluere perque pedes traiectus lora tumentis.*
> ei mihi, qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo
> Hectore qui redit exuuias indutus Achilli
> uel Danaum Phrygios iaculatus puppibus ignis!
> *squalentem barbam et concretos sanguine crinis*
> *uulneraque illa gerens, quae circum plurima muros*
> *accepit patrios.* (2.270–79)

> In a dream, most mournful Hector seemed to stand
> before my eyes and to pour forth copious tears,
> as once *having been dragged by the chariot, black with*
> *bloody dirt, his swollen feet pierced by a thong.*
> How changed he was in that condition from that
> Hector who returned clad in the spoils of Achilles,
> or having flung Phrygian flames against Danaan ships!
> *His beard filthy, his hair matted with blood,*
> *he bore those wounds, the many that he had received*
> *around his ancestors' walls.*

Carthage, they are the only two Greeks who are mentioned in the descriptions of the scenes. In addition, it is Diomedes and Achilles who separately accomplish the portents of Troy's fall (the theft of the Palladium and the death of Troilus [cf. Pl. *Bac.* 953–55], the death of Rhesus [cf. Serv. *ad* 1.469])—all except for the cutting of the lintel of Troy's gate, which Sinon carried out.

As Austin notes on 2.197, *Larisaeus* has no special importance here and simply means that Achilles, who came from Phthia, was "Thessalian." Although Catullus refers to *moenia Larisaea* (64.36), the only Larisa in Homer is the home of Trojan allies.

[33]*Qui redit exuuias indutus Achilli* is not Homeric; at *Il.* 17.125–31 Hector has others take the armor to Troy, but he does wear it afterwards (cf. 22.322–23). "Here...the force of the present tense in *redit* and *obtruncat* is to convert a single act into a characteristic" (Mackail on 2.275). But cf. Conington-Nettleship on 2.275.

This scene evokes the accounts of Troilus and Hector in Book 1 but surpasses them in pathos. Although in the earlier descriptions we see Troilus' body being dragged behind his chariot and Hector's body lying on the ground, there is no real description of the dead men; there is no contrast with the past, no sign of their importance to Troy. In 2.274–76 we remember Hector as he was—the hero who won the arms of Achilles, who drove Troy's besiegers back and threatened their very ships—and we remember that he was Troy's greatest hope. For a Trojan, then, the mutilation of Hector's body was perhaps the cruelest of Achilles' deeds: the revenge he had sought for the death of Patroclus had been achieved with the death of Hector, rendering the further mutilation pointless. Yet the phrase *pedes tumentis* suggests that Hector was still alive when he was dragged around Troy and that Achilles' actions were even more brutal than they are in Homer.[34] Achilles is no longer simply cruel; he has in fact, as Apollo says, slain pity itself (*Il.* 24.44).

Achilles as fellow human being

The ransom of Hector is a crucial scene on the temple of Juno in Book 1, and it is no less crucial for the characterization of Achilles in Book 2. Priam's retelling of the ransoming of Hector is of critical importance to our understanding of Achilles in the *Aeneid.* It is the first reference to the Achaean that is at variance with the portrait that has thus far been developing in the poem, and Priam's story reveals the falsehood of that portrait, suggesting that we have not been seeing the whole Achilles. The *re*-telling of the ransoming event also forces us to remember the first account of it, that given us by the narrator adopting the perspective of Aeneas in Book 1. It invites us to compare the two versions and determine, if possible, which is truer and more accurate.

Although Hector's ghost tells him to leave Troy, the maddened Aeneas goes out to die in battle. While he fights, he gradually makes his way to Priam's palace, where the defending Trojans are being overwhelmed by the Greeks. As his comrades slip away, Aeneas sees Achilles' son Neoptolemus assault the gates of the palace. After breaking in, Neoptolemus slays Polites before the eyes of his father, and Priam cries out:

> "at tibi pro scelere...pro *talibus* ausis
> di, si qua est caelo pietas quae *talia* curet,

[34]See Henry on 2.270–79. There was, in fact, a non-Homeric tradition, dating at least as far back as Sophocles, that Achilles did drag the still-living Hector behind his chariot. Cf. *Aj.* 1029–31.

persoluant grates dignas et praemia reddant
debita, qui nati coram me cernere letum
fecisti et patrios foedasti funere uultus.
at non ille, satum quo te mentiris, Achilles
talis in hoste fuit Priamo; sed iura fidemque
supplicis erubuit corpusque exsangue sepulcro
reddidit Hectoreum meque in mea regna remisit." (2.535–43)

"But to you, for your crime, for *such* daring,
may the gods—if there is any *pietas* in heaven that watches over *such things*—
render due recompense and hand over the deserved
rewards, to you who have made me watch the slaying
of my son and who have fouled a father's sight with death.
But that Achilles who you falsely claim sired you,
he was **not** *such a one* before his enemy Priam; instead he respected
the oaths and trust of a suppliant, returned Hector's
lifeless corpse for burial, and sent me back to my kingdom."

Neoptolemus, having warded off Priam's feeble spear cast, replies callously:

"referes ergo haec et nuntius ibis
Pelidae genitori. illi mea tristia facta
degeneremque Neoptolemum narrare memento.
nunc morere." (2.547–50)

"Go and take this message to my father,
the son of Peleus: remember to tell that one of my grim
deeds and that Neoptolemus is not worthy of his stock.
Now die."

Priam contrasts the fact that Neoptolemus has pitilessly slain Polites in his father's presence with an act of mercy performed by *Neoptolemus'* father for Priam—Achilles' return of Hector's body, as recounted in Book 24 of the *Iliad.* Even before Achilles is mentioned by name, we can see foreshadowings of that deed in the words *pietas, grates dignas, praemia.* The contrast that Priam is drawing is heightened by his language. An emphatic *at non* breaks the speech in half; the two parts, however, are linked by the repetition of *talis* and by the thought-pattern underlying both:

1. *talis* clause (*talibus, talia*, 535–38; *talis*, 540–41)
2. explanation of *talis* (538–39, 541–43)

The explanation in each case focuses on Priam, one of his sons, and that son's killer. Whereas Neoptolemus forces Priam to witness the death of Polites, his own father blushed with shame and respect when he faced Priam.

In the *Iliad*, Priam had gone into the Achaean camp, led by Hermes, in order to ransom the body of his son Hector (*Il.* 24.322–469). The very thought of such an expedition was greeted with mourning by Hecuba (24.201–16), and the fact that Hermes, the guide of the dead, conducted the king during the night journey reminds us that Priam might not have come back from his mission. In entering the tent of Achilles, he may well have been entering the house of Hades.[35] The man whom Priam encountered, however, was not Achilles the destroyer. Priam first called on Achilles to feel what the Romans would call *pietas*, devotion to duty, in this case to the family especially:[36]

> "μνῆσαι πατρὸς σοῖο, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
> τηλίκου ὡς περ ἐγών, ὀλοῷ ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ·
> καὶ μέν που κεῖνον περιναιέται ἀμφὶς ἐόντες
> τείρουσ', οὐδέ τίς ἐστιν ἀρὴν καὶ λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι.
> .....
> ἀλλ' αἰδεῖο θεούς, Ἀχιλεῦ, αὐτόν τ' ἐλέησον,
> μνησάμενος σοῦ πατρός· ἐγὼ δ' ἐλεεινότερός περ,
> ἔτλην δ' οἷ' οὔ πώ τις ἐπιχθόνιος βροτὸς ἄλλος,
> ἀνδρὸς παιδοφόνοιο ποτὶ στόμα χεῖρ' ὀρέγεσθαι." (*Il.* 24.486–89, 503–6)

> "Remember your father, godlike Achilles,
> whose agemate I am, on the destructive threshold of old age;
> no doubt his neighbors wear him out, and
> he has no one to ward off evil and suffering.
> .....
> But respect the gods, Achilles, and have pity for me,
> remembering your father: yet I am more pitiable,
> and have dared such as no other mortal on earth—
> to raise to my lips the hand of the man who slew my son."

[35]Richardson on *Il.* 24.327–28.

[36]Cf. Privitera 25: "I tratti di A., quasi sempre convenzionali (*G* 3, 91 *magni*; *E* 6, 839 *armipotentis*; 11, 438 *magnum*; 12, 545 *Priami regnorum eversor*), sono più vivi in due luoghi: quando Priamo accusa Neottolemo, che sta per ucciderlo in luogo sacro, di essere figlio degenere di A. (*E* 2, 540 ss.) e così implicitamente proclama la *pietas* e la magnanimità del Pelide...." (The characteristics of Achilles, nearly always conventional, are more vivid in two passages: [the first,] when Priam accuses Neoptolemus, who is on the verge of killing him in a sacred place, of being a degenerate son of Achilles, and thus implicitly proclaims the *pietas* and magnanimity of the son of Peleus....)

Both men wept after this speech, and then a surprisingly gentle (οἰκτίρων, "pitying") Achilles addressed Priam: while he admires his courage, it is the lot of mortals to suffer.

> "ὡ γὰρ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι,
> ζώειν ἀχνυμένοις· αὐτοὶ δέ τ' ἀκηδέες εἰσί." (*Il.* 24.525–26)
>
> "Thus have the gods assigned it to wretched mortals,
> to live in suffering, but they themselves are without grief."

The man who speaks here does not speak as an Achaean to a Trojan, but as one human being to another. Priam's evocation of εὐσέβεια or *pietas*, and their common tears, allow Achilles to turn into something else than the Achaean destroyer of Troy—no longer simply the enemy, he becomes instead a fellow human being.

The interchange between Priam and Neoptolemus is the longest reference to Achilles in the *Aeneid*. Neoptolemus is, of course, the son and heir of Achilles. Since he is also the murderer of Priam, he inherits his father's role as destroyer of Troy on the symbolic level. While Achilles disables Troy's defenses and so ensures her fall (cf. 1.99–101, 466–93), Neoptolemus decapitates Priam and ends the kingdom of Troy (cf. 2.557–58). He appears at the palace as "a reborn Achilles":[37] he has "his father's power" (*ui patria*, 2.491), and he is accompanied by Achilles' charioteer Automedon (*equorum agitator Achillis, / armiger Automedon*, 2.476–77) as well as a band of Scyrian troops (*Scyria pubes*, 2.477). These companions show him to be not only a prince of Scyros but also the son of Achilles, whom Thetis had hidden on Scyros when the war began.[38] Achilles himself is not mentioned at all in this scene until Priam reproaches his son. That speech, however, gives the lie to Neoptolemus' heritage.

When Priam refers to Achilles by name, he is saying that Neoptolemus "claims falsely that [he was] sired" by the Achilles who treated Priam with

[37]Mills 162–63, following Knox, suggests that one function of the snake simile at 2.471–75 is to liken Neoptolemus to Achilles reborn.

[38]Cf. Serv. *ad* 2.263: "NEOPTOLEMUS quia ad bellum ductus est puer, Pyrrhus uero a capillorum qualitate uocitatus est; Achillis et Deidamiae filius, Pelei et Thetidis nepos ex patre, ex matre uero Lycomedis, regis Scyriae insulae." ("Neoptolemus" because he was brought to the war as a boy, but he was usually called Pyrrhus from the color of his hair; the son of Achilles and Deidamia, on his father's side the grandson of Peleus and Thetis, but on his mother's of Lycomedes, king of the island of Scyros.)

kindness. Neoptolemus' claim to be the hero's successor is true insofar as he is the son of Achilles and the destroyer of Troy. Priam, however, insists that the true Achilles (*ille Achilles*) was the man seen in Book 24 of the *Iliad*: not the fanatic warrior, but someone who can acknowledge the humanity he shares with his putative foes.[39] Neoptolemus' indiscriminate violence shows that he is not the son of *that* (*ille*) Achilles, and he himself mockingly admits he does not live up to his father's example.[40] Echoing the *ille* in 2.540, his own use of *illi* is especially effective: "Tell *that Achilles of yours* of my misdeeds."[41] Neoptolemus knows only one side of his father—the destroyer—and only manifests that one side.[42] The Achilles whom Aeneas has continuously shown us shattered Troy's defenses when he slew Troilus and Hector and filled Troy's plain and rivers with corpses. Neoptolemus carries his father's work to its ultimate end, the death of Priam, and in so doing "becomes" his father, the destroyer of Troy.[43] But, insofar as he shares only a single aspect of his father, Neoptolemus *does* lie when he claims to be the son of *ille Achilles*—the man Priam knew.

The gap between the two images—on the one hand, the daemonic force embodied in Neoptolemus and highlighted by the poem's references to Achilles up to this point; on the other, the more humane hero described by Priam—becomes clearer when we re-examine the two references to the ransom of Hector we have encountered. Priam's account of the episode is at variance with the version depicted on the temple of Juno in Book 1.

> ter circum Iliacos raptauerat *Hectora* muros
> *exanimumque* auro *corpus* uendebat Achilles.
> tum uero ingentem gemitum dat pectore ab imo,
> ut spolia, ut currus, utque ipsum corpus amici
> tendentemque manus Priamum conspexit inermis. (1.483–87)

[39]Williams 1972 on 2.540.

[40]Cf. Mills 163; Harrison 210–11.

[41]*Pelidae genitori*, too, may well be ironic, since it reminds us that nobility is a characteristic not of Achilles alone but of Neoptolemus' family in general. It was Peleus' nobility, in fact, that won him Thetis (and, eventually, allowed Neoptolemus' own existence), as Apollonius' Hera says (4.805–7): αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὸν ἄριστον ἐπιχθονίων πόσιν εἶναι / δῶκά τοι, ὄφρα γάμου θυμηδέος ἀντιάσειας / τέκνα τε φιτύσαιο... ("But I gave him, the best of those on earth, to you as husband, so that you might enjoy a pleasing marriage and bear children.")

[42]Cf. Lee 39.

[43]Cf. Putnam 33-37.

Three times he had dragged *Hector* around the walls of Ilium,
and now Achilles was selling the *lifeless corpse* for gold.
Then indeed Aeneas groaned deeply from his heart,
as he saw the spoils, the chariot, the very body of his friend,
and Priam stretching out defenseless hands.

"at non ille, satum quo te mentiris, Achilles
talis in hoste fuit Priamo; sed iura fidemque
supplicis erubuit *corpusque exsangue* sepulcro
reddidit *Hectoreum* meque in mea regna remisit." (2.540–43)

"But that Achilles who you falsely say sired you,
he was not such a one before his enemy Priam; instead he respected
the oaths and trust of a suppliant, returned *Hector's*
lifeless corpse for burial, and sent me back to my kingdom."

With regard to the participants, the two scenes are identical: Achilles and the suppliant Priam, both mentioned by name, and Hector's "lifeless body" (*exanimum corpus, corpus exsangue*). The presence of these elements establishes the *lytra Hectoris*, but it is the verbs that determine the rendering of the incident. In Book 1, Achilles is said to have "sold" (*uendebat*) the mutilated body to the suppliant Priam. In contrast, Priam makes no mention in *his* story of the mistreatment of Hector's corpse or the gifts that he had taken along at Zeus' orders (*Il.* 24.65–76). He focuses not on Achilles' savagery or coldness but instead on his nobility: *iura fidemque / supplicis erubuit* (2.541–42). Where Aeneas perceived a commercial transaction, Priam knows the truth—that Achilles was moved to pity and overcame his characteristic *saeuitia*. The brutal transaction of 1.484 has been replaced by a display of pity and humanity.

Priam was himself a participant in the ransom of Hector, and as such he enjoys a privileged viewpoint that we too share, thanks to Homer (and the gods who gave the story to him). It is a perspective shared by no other character in the poem, not even Aeneas, who is narrating the story of Priam's death but was not actually a witness to what happened in Achilles' tent. The distinct points of view expressed by Priam and Aeneas come into conflict when they are applied to the same event—a conflict that Vergil illustrates by drawing upon different sources for the two depictions. The version of the ransom given by Priam may well be the correct one, since he was actually present. Aeneas would then be wrong in his understanding of the event and its representation in Carthage, but his point of view is not therefore invalidated. Rather than rejecting one

perspective in favor of the other, we should juxtapose them and so try to obtain a fuller portrait of Achilles than either Aeneas or Priam alone could provide.

Achilles as destroyer?

The picture of a humane Achilles is not sustained after the death of Priam. Once the heir of the violent Achilles slays the man who remembers the merciful hero, we return to the portrait of the destroyer. References to Achilles in Books 3–5 are far fewer and less important than those in Books 1–2, but they continue to project that impression of his *saeuitia* already introduced.

When the Trojans arrive in Delos, having fled first from Asia and then from an abortive settlement in Thrace, Aeneas prays to Apollo for guidance (3.85–89). In the middle of this brief prayer Aeneas calls his people *reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli*, echoing the first reference in the poem (1.30). Achilles is once again described as *immitis* and singled out from the other Achaeans as the chief destroyer of Troy. Repetition of the phrase is somewhat formulaic but nevertheless significant. The effect of recalling this previously introduced motif is to enhance the pitiable state of the Trojans: they have lost everything—*moenia, genus, urbs*—as a result of the savagery of Achilles.[44] While the present context of the phrase *reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli* is a prayer for a new home, furthermore, awareness of its earlier context reminds us that Juno is keeping the Trojans from that new home. The Trojans thus seem even more wretched.

The second reference in Book 3 returns us to Neoptolemus and the cruel side of Achilles that he represents. Andromache, the widow of Achilles' most tragic victim, was allotted to Neoptolemus and bore him a son (3.325–27). Just

[44]"The recollection of the proem adds the poet's own voice to the prayer and thereby lends it greater urgency and pathos. It also suggests the ultimate source of Trojan misfortunes—the anger of Juno, who through the Greeks and Achilles had destroyed Troy and would now prevent the founding of Rome" (Moskalew 106).

Aeneas' request (*da moenia fessis / et genus et mansuram urbem,* "to the weary give walls and a people and a city that will endure") also echoes chiastically an early passage in the proem (1.5–7):

> multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet *urbem*
> inferretque deos Latio; *genus* unde Latinum
> Albanique patres atque altae *moenia* Romae.
>
> Having suffered many things in war as well, until he might found
> a city and bring the gods to Latium; whence the Latin people
> and the Alban fathers and the walls of lofty Rome.

as her husband's corpse had suffered at the hands of Achilles, so too has Andromache suffered at the hands of his son, forced to bear him a child and to endure his disdain (*fastus*).[45] What is perhaps more important for our examination of Achilles in the *Aeneid* is the next chapter in Andromache's story. After the birth of Andromache's son, Neoptolemus marries Hermione, the daughter of Helen and Menelaus; Orestes, maddened by love for his intended but stolen bride, slays Neoptolemus at his family altar:

> "...qui deinde secutus
> Ledaeam Hermionen Lacedaemoniosque hymenaeos
> me famulo famulamque Heleno transmisit habendam.
> ast illum ereptae magno flammatus amore
> coniugis et scelerum furiis agitatus Orestes
> excipit incautum patriasque obtruncat ad aras." (3.327–32)

> "...who then, pursuing Leda's
> granddaughter Hermione and a Spartan marriage,
> handed me, a slave, over to Helenus, a slave, as his wife.
> But, burning with a great love for his seduced bride
> and driven by the madness of his own crimes, Orestes
> caught him unawares and cut him down at his ancestral altars."

What Andromache has given us seems to be a twisted reprise of *Iliad* 1, with Hermione standing in for Briseis, while Neoptolemus—the son of Achilles—plays the role of Agamemnon, and Orestes—the son of Agamemnon—the role of Achilles. In this version of the story, however, the new "Achilles" carries out his desire to kill the new "Agamemnon." Neoptolemus, who should be the heir of Achilles, brings destruction on himself as a result of the quarrel and thus cannot fulfill his father's role. Priam's assessment would seem to be correct: Neoptolemus, though the embodiment of the cruelty of Achilles, is no son of the complete, Iliadic Achilles.

What is still more significant in the context of the *Aeneid* is the place of Neoptolemus' death: like Priam, he dies at an altar, and Vergil's language emphasizes the parallel. Compare *patriasque obtruncat ad aras* (332) with

> "iamque aderit multo Priami de sanguine Pyrrhus,
> natum ante ora patris, *patrem qui obtruncat ad aras*." (2.662–63)

> "and soon Pyrrhus will be here, covered in Priam's blood,
> *he who cut down* the son before the father's eyes, *the father at the altars.*"

[45]Andromache perhaps sees this *fastus* as a family trait. Cf. Williams 1962 on 3.326.

Tradition holds that Neoptolemus was slain at Delphi, at an altar he had dedicated to his father Achilles.[46] If we follow the version set forth in Pindar's sixth *Paean* (112–17), Neoptolemus' death is a punishment for Priam's. That Aeneas subscribes to such a belief may be inferred from the repetition of Andromache's *patriasque obtruncat ad aras* (heard in Buthrotum) in his *patrem qui obtruncat ad aras* (narrated in Carthage). Neoptolemus is indeed *degener*, as Priam implied and he himself admitted—he dies, the incomplete Achilles, slain as the direct result of his *saeuitia* and his limitations. He has failed at his father's altar, in, as it were, the very presence of his father, just as he once slew Priam's son Polites before his father's eyes.

We encounter, finally, an extended reference to Achilles from yet another perspective, that of the gods, in Book 5. Neptune recalls for Venus the service he once rendered to Aeneas when, despite his own hatred of Troy, he rescued the Trojan from death at the hands of Achilles (5.800–12). The first *cum*-clause of the speech recalls both the pictures in Carthage (1.467–68) and the conclusion of Aeneas' lament during the storm (1.100–101): the ravaging of Troy is cast in terms of Achilles' destructive prowess, emphasized by allusions to his pursuit (*sequens*) of the Trojan forces and to his clogging Xanthus and Simois with Trojan corpses.

> "cum Troia Achilles
> exanimata sequens impingeret agmina muris,
> milia multa daret leto, gemerentque repleti
> amnes nec reperire uiam atque euoluere posset
> in mare se Xanthus...." (5.804–8)
>
> "When Achilles, pursuing
> the half-dead Trojan forces was pressing them against the walls,
> and slaying many thousands, and the clogged rivers were
> groaning, and Xanthus could find no path nor roll
> into the sea...."

[46]Serv. *ad* 3.332: "PATRIAS ARAS alii Achilleas intellegunt; nam Pyrrhus, ut in historia legimus, occiso patre in templo Apollinis Thymbraei reuersus ad patriam, in numinis insultationem in templo eius Delphico aras patri constituit et illic ei coepit sacrificare...." (Some understand *patrias aras* as those of Achilles; for Pyrrhus, as history tells us, having returned to his fatherland after his father was slain in the temple of Apollo Thymbraeus, as an insult to the god set up an altar to his father in his temple in Delphi and began to sacrifice to him there....)

The same instances of Achilles' power are recalled by Neptune, but there has been a shift in the tone. The god sees the clogging of Xanthus and Simois from the point of view of the gods—not in terms of the human bodies but in terms of the river-gods impeded by those bodies. Neptune's is a *divine* perspective, and it is perhaps unique even among the gods, just as Priam's is among mortals. On the one hand, Neptune was hostile to Troy and wished to destroy the city (810–11); on the other, he has often aided Aeneas (801–4) and thus has set himself apart from the other pro-Greek gods, particularly Juno. No longer do the emotions of Aeneas influence our image of Achilles in battle; instead we hear the words of a god who might be expected to take a longer view of events. To apply Segal's distinction, Neptune inclines more toward the authorial than the participatory voice.

Neptune goes on to recall a more salient example of the Achaean's prowess.[47] In *Iliad* 20, Homer tells us that Achilles and Aeneas encountered each other on the plain before Troy and fought a brief duel.[48] As they faced each other, Achilles taunted Aeneas by reminding him how he had chased the Trojan into Lyrnessos and then sacked the city (*Il.* 20.188–94; cf. *Aen.* 5.805). Aeneas replied that his ancestry was as noble as that of Achilles, implying that each was a match for the other. In fact, they were not; Aeneas fought *nec dis nec uiribus aequis*, "without equal strength or divine support," as Neptune points out to Venus (5.809). In the *Iliad*, Aeneas received no help from Apollo (20.295–96; cf. also 20.334), and his spear could not penetrate Achilles' shield, whereas his own shield was broken (20.267–81). Neptune then decided to step in, for Zeus had decreed that Aeneas was to rule over the Dardanians after the fall of Troy (*Il.* 20.300–308). Although Neptune hates Troy (*Aen.* 5.810–11), he must intervene when a mortal threatens to do what no mortal must do, to go beyond the bounds of fate. The fate-motif, however, is not openly presented in Vergil's text, for Neptune simply hints at concerns over Aeneas' destiny. Contrariwise, the motif is explicitly addressed in Poseidon's speech: Aeneas must not be slain, for he is to rule over the last of the Trojans (*Il.* 20.307–8).

[47]According to Privitera 25, this is one of the two most vivid representations of Achilles' characteristics, the other being the encounter of Priam and Neoptolemus.

[48]Vergil does not present quite the same version of events that occurs in Homer: the image of Achilles clogging the rivers most likely comes from Book 21, after his duel with Aeneas. Likewise, the cloud mentioned by Neptune corresponds closely to that employed by Apollo in *his* rescue of Aeneas (*Il.* 5.344–46), whereas Poseidon first covered *Achilles' eyes* with an ἀχλύς (mist) and then carried Aeneas aloft.

In that episode, Achilles had nearly killed Aeneas, which would have been the ultimate act of destruction for the Trojans—any hope for their future would have died with him. This is the last major reference to Achilles until he reappears in the Sibyl's prophecy in Book 6. Here the savage Achilles, on the verge of destroying not only the city of Troy but, through the death of Aeneas, its future as well, seems to be in the ascendancy.

Or is he? Tellingly, the Achilles of *Aeneid* 5 is not *saeuus* or *immitis* but *fortis*: the negative aspect of the hero is not present. Yet Neptune is not praising Achilles, as Priam did, but making the simple observation that Achilles is *fortis*, "strong" or "brave." He takes a longer, more impartial view of Achilles' actions, commenting on them, for the most part, only when they go beyond what is proper for a mortal: when Achilles hinders a god, such as Xanthus or Simois, or when he threatens to subvert the decrees of fate by slaying Aeneas. Unlike Venus or Juno, the Neptune of the *Aeneid* is no longer especially partisan. When *he* intervenes on Aeneas' behalf, as in *Iliad* 20 or *Aeneid* 1, it is because a line is about to be crossed and the fulfillment of Aeneas' destiny is endangered. Whereas Aeneas sees the destructive Achilles, and Priam recalls the hero tempered by mercy, Neptune offers us a third perspective, for he envisions a man who may be praiseworthy but who also tries to overstep the bounds of mortality.

Different points of view

It would be a mistake to say that Homer's portrayal of Achilles is simple. He is the greatest of the Achaean warriors, but, his pride injured, he withdraws from fighting. He sings, accompanying himself on the cithara. Pride mixed with pity for the Greeks causes him to send Patroclus into battle. His ceaseless grieving over Patroclus erupts into a firestorm of rage and destruction. Moved by an old man's words, he acknowledges his own humanity and surrenders his enemy's mutilated corpse. No mortal character in the *Iliad* sees all these facets of Achilles, but we can perceive the whole man, thanks to Homer's authorial omniscience.

Vergil's portrait of Achilles is similarly multifaceted. The hero's savagery and his mercy, as well as his superiority as a warrior, are all recalled for *us* to consider. The various facets of Achilles' character, however, are almost exclusively presented through the words and thoughts of the characters in the poem, characters who have their own memories, emotions, concerns. As far as Achilles is concerned, we are for the most part deprived of the authorial voice, the unified point of view, and are forced to depend on the participatory

voice and multiple points of view. As Conte says of the *Aeneid*, "The absolute point of view of the norm is not obliterated; it is made relative.... None of [the] points of view is wholly false, at least with respect to the others; it may even be true, within its own field of vision" (Conte 154).

When we share the perspective of Aeneas, we see Achilles as an embodiment of daemonic force, who single-handedly overwhelms Troy's defenses and all but captures the city, who slays her princes and fills her rivers with bodies. For Aeneas, Achilles is cruelty incarnate, as is his son and heir, Neoptolemus. Moreover, Neoptolemus freely accepts this role as destroyer of Ilium when he exults in the deaths of Polites and Priam.

Ironically, in the context of the *Aeneid*, it is Priam who offers us a different view of Achilles. At various times Aeneas focuses on the deaths of Priam's sons Hector and Troilus; Polites is slain at the hands of Neoptolemus before Priam's own eyes. But the Trojan king does not denounce Achilles: instead, he holds up the Achaean as a model for his murderous son to emulate. Priam shows us the Achilles of *Iliad* 24, who was moved by the supplications of Hector's father to remember his own father, to pity an old man, and to acknowledge his humanity.

As Priam recounts his brief story, we are confronted with the disparity between Aeneas' vision of the ransom and Priam's own. In the earlier depiction, Achilles seems nothing more than a merchant (*uendebat*) trafficking in corpses, whereas in the later account he is nothing less than a mortal who realizes his own place in the cosmos and who can feel pity for others, even his enemies. Priam does not deny that Achilles helped to overthrow Troy. How can he? He does, however, reject the simple identity Achilles = destruction by denouncing Neoptolemus, who glories in the same equation. There is a disquieting element in Priam's speech, however: it is reported to us by the very Aeneas who seems to accept the equation that Priam rejects. Does the disparity between the testimony that Aeneas recalls here and the images he has previously viewed make any impression on him, or does he still regard Achilles as merely a figure of violence?

As Aeneas watched the struggle between Neoptolemus and Priam unfold, he was moved by fear for his own father (2.559–64). Thus Priam's words would have had no impact on him at the time. So, too, when Aeneas saw the images on the temple of Juno, his perception of them—of the depiction of the ransom in particular—had not been colored by hearing Priam's version of Achilles' behavior. As Aeneas recounts Priam's last words for Dido, however, the

emotional urgency of the situation is long past; he is no longer afraid for his family. The significance of Priam's speech now emerges and the contrast between Neoptolemus and Achilles becomes clear to him: even the terrifying Achilles, who had slain Hector and mutilated his corpse, had his limits, whereas his *degener* son disregards those limits. There was more to Achilles than Aeneas had realized—he was not merely a force of destruction, but a man who could blush before a suppliant, a man who could be moved by *pietas*.

The fallacy of the equation of Achilles with destruction is made clear in Book 3. Neoptolemus dies at the altar "of his father," as the result of a quarrel recapitulating that in *Iliad* 1. Although he is ostensibly the reincarnation of his father's rage, he ultimately fails, and he does so in the very presence, as it were, of his father. Violence, wrath, cruelty—these are all *part* of Achilles, but they are not the *whole*.

Neptune gives us a third point of view, that of the gods. From a non-partisan divine perspective (as opposed to that of, say, Juno or Venus), Achilles is, to a certain extent, merely a mortal. His actions in war are not a matter of concern to the gods, unless they go beyond what is proper for humans, and thus the Olympians do not rebuke him. For Neptune, Achilles is not *saeuus*; he is simply *fortis*. Like Priam, the gods see the whole of Achilles, but they also see the greater scheme of which Achilles is only a part.

Each of Vergil's spokespersons—Aeneas, Priam, Neptune and, to a lesser extent, Neoptolemus and Andromache—presents us with a different facet of Achilles: the demon, the participant in a wider humanity, the mere mortal.[49] By using multiple characters to focalize his references to Achilles, Vergil is able to present a fuller, and truer, portrait than he would have been able to do by giving us only Aeneas' perspective, without appropriating all of the references for his

[49]The most obvious of these viewpoints, Aeneas' vision of the daemonic/demonic Achilles, is favored by King, who virtually ignores the portrait given us by Priam, which she sees as intended to make Neoptolemus look even worse (King 1984: 34). To consider Priam's recollections only as a rhetorical ploy, however, is not enough, and to dismiss it, as King seems to do, is unwarranted. In his attempt to shame Neoptolemus, Priam directly contradicts an earlier reference to the savage Achilles, and he thus calls into question the accuracy of Aeneas' perspective. Moreover, we need to recall Neoptolemus' own claim to the role of Achillean destroyer. His reply to Priam constitutes a rejection of Priam's image of his father; in other words, he tries to assert the pre-eminence of the portrait of the destroyer. But, as we have seen, when Neoptolemus next enters an Iliadic situation, his rivalry with Orestes over Hermione, he cannot fulfill his father's role, a fact that suggests this one-sided portrait is erroneous.

authorial voice. Achilles is often, to be sure, a figure of violence in the *Aeneid*, yet Vergil's sympathy for the Trojans has not blinded him to the complexity of their enemy. He may be seen through different eyes, but the Achilles of the *Aeneid* is much the same as the Achilles of the *Iliad*.

Ramifications: Achilles in *Aeneid* 6–12

The portrait of Achilles that Vergil constructs throughout Books 1–5 is of great importance to the remainder of the poem, insofar as *both* Aeneas and Turnus are modeled to some degree upon the Greek hero. The complexity of that portrait—Achilles as destroyer, fellow human being, factor in a larger design—suggests that assimilation to Achilles cannot be simply an issue of praise or, more likely, of blame. We should consider in the cases of both Aeneas and Turnus the extent to which each character's words and actions evoke those of the Iliadic Achilles, whether these evocations are conscious (i.e., whether Aeneas or Turnus ever explicitly claims the role of Achilles), or whether either ever resists that assimilation. Such an investigation is beyond the scope of this paper, but a few observations may be advanced, particularly with regard to some of the later, overt references to Achilles in the *Aeneid*.

Perhaps the most famous of all Vergilian allusions to Achilles underlies the Sibyl's prophecy to Aeneas (6.83–97).

> "non Simois tibi nec Xanthus nec Dorica castra
> defuerint; alius Latio iam partus Achilles,
> natus et ipse dea; nec Teucris addita Iuno
> usquam aberit...." (6.88–91)
>
> "You will lack neither Simois nor Xanthus nor
> the Dorian camp; Latium already has another Achilles,
> himself born of a goddess; nor will Juno, attaching herself
> to the Trojans, be far away...."

A new "Trojan War" is about to be fought in Italy, complete with a new Achilles. We may assume, perhaps, that Aeneas understands this prediction to mean that there will be another warrior of tremendous and inhuman brutality to threaten the survival of the Trojans. This is not, however, the only possible interpretation of *alius Achilles*.

Any interpretation hinges on the phrases *Latio iam partus* and *natus et ipse dea*. The former does not seem to be troublesome at first, but the inherent ambiguity of the phrase is emphasized by the parallel that is usually adduced:

"***illic** res laetae regnumque et regia coniunx / **parta tibi**....*" ("**there** happier circumstances and a kingdom and a royal bride **have been prepared for you,**" 2.783-84). *Latio* is often taken to correspond to *illic*—i.e., to be locative ablative—with *tibi* understood, perhaps from 6.88. The meaning of the phrase is then "already prepared (for you) in Latium," and the new Achilles will be a threat to Aeneas. But it is equally possible that *Latio* is in fact dative, corresponding not to *illic* but to *tibi* and changing the sense of the phrase to "already prepared for Latium." In this case, the new Achilles will be a threat not to Aeneas but to Latium. The greatest Italian warrior, inasmuch as he should be a defender of Latium, can perhaps be seen as *alius Hector*, opposing the new Achilles—who would then appear to be Aeneas himself.[50]

This ambiguity is reinforced by the second phrase, *natus et ipse dea*: the new Achilles, like the old, is the son of a goddess. Such a description should lead the audience immediately to think of Aeneas himself, who has been addressed as *nate dea* ten times by this point in the poem.[51] On the other hand, Turnus, who will soon be revealed as the primary threat to the Trojans in Italy and as a possible *alius Achilles*, is also the son of a goddess, the nymph Venilia (10.76). Depending on the interpretation of *Latio iam partus*, then, either Turnus or Aeneas might be the new Achilles foretold by the Sibyl.

Turnus does in fact claim such a role for himself, but in a most un-Achillean situation. At 9.728–30 he slips into the Trojan stockade in the midst of a panicked retreat, a scene that is based chiefly on the description of *Hector* breaking through the Greek wall at Troy (*Il.* 12.465–71). Shortly thereafter, Turnus faces Pandarus in a duel in which Pandarus assumes the role of Achilles and Turnus that of Hector. Just as Achilles taunts Hector at *Il.* 20.428–29, Pandarus gibes at Turnus in 9.735–39. Hector's reply is seven lines long and divided in two by a crucial statement in which he acknowledges his opponent's superiority: οἶδα δ' ὅτι σὺ μὲν ἐσθλός, ἐγὼ δὲ σέθεν πολὺ χείρων ("I know that you are noble, and I am lesser than you by far," 20.434). Turnus' brief response is of a much different tenor (9.741–42):

> "incipe, si qua animo uirtus, et consere dextram,
> hic etiam inuentum Priamo narrabis Achillem."

[50]Cf., on the other hand, Conington-Nettleship on 6.89: "...the sense may well be, 'Latium has her defender already.' "

[51]1.582, 615; 2.289; 3.311, 374, 435; 4.560; 5.383, 474, 709. The phrase occurs only once more in the *Aeneid*, at 8.59, where it is again directed at Aeneas.

> "Begin, if there is any courage in your heart, and join battle;
> you will tell Priam that Achilles was found here as well."

Turnus not only proclaims his own superiority to his opponent but also explicitly claims to be a new Achilles. The reference to Priam makes clear which Achilles Turnus means to be, inasmuch as it recalls the confrontation between Neoptolemus and Priam: Turnus will be Achilles the destroyer of Trojans. But, just as Neoptolemus tried to claim his father's role and eventually failed, so too does Turnus fail, for he is quickly driven out of the stockade (9.789–814; cf. Anderson 26).

Indeed, from this point on Turnus seems modeled chiefly not on Achilles but on Hector. This becomes particularly clear after the duel between Pallas and Turnus (10.439–509), which changes the dynamic for the remainder of the poem. Whether he acknowledges the fact or not, Aeneas fights not for Lavinia and his new kingdom but to avenge Pallas: the duel has irrevocably transformed Turnus into the new Hector, and Aeneas into the new Achilles. Turnus acknowledges as much in the council of the Latins (11.438–40), echoing Hector's words to Polydamas (*Il.* 18.305–9):

> "ibo animis contra, uel magnum praestet Achillem
> factaque Volcani manibus paria induat arma
> ille licet."
>
> "I will face him with courage, even if he surpasses
> great Achilles and wears equal arms forged by the hands
> of Vulcan."

Turnus swears that he will fight Aeneas, even if the Trojan should be equal to or greater than Achilles himself[52] and despite the fact that Aeneas wears heaven-made arms equal to those of Achilles—the very armor that first strongly connects Aeneas and Achilles in the reader's mind.

Yet just before we see the wondrous arms in Book 8, we discover another link between the Trojan and Achaean heroes, one that looks back to Aeneas' speech during the storm in Book 1. When Venus sends an omen—a clash of

[52]Cf. Forbiger on 11.438: "*praestet Achillen* [sic], alterum se exhibeat Achillem, par ei appareat. Alii interpretes cum Servio *praestet* per *superet* explicant. Conington censet difficile esse iudicatu, utra ratio praeferenda sit...." (*praestet Achillen:* "let him show himself a second Achilles, let him appear equal to him." Other interpreters explain *praestet* with Servius as "let him surpass." Conington believes it is difficult to decide which sense is to be preferred....)

weapons, and arms glowing in the sky—portending victory for the Trojans, Aeneas recognizes his mother's handiwork and proclaims his readiness to fight:

> "heu quantae miseris caedes Laurentibus instant!
> quas poenas mihi, Turne, dabis! *quam multa sub undas*
> *scuta uirum galeasque et fortia corpora uolues,*
> *Thybri pater!* poscant acies et foedera rumpant." (8.537–40)
>
> "Alas, what slaughters await the wretched Laurentians!
> What a price you will pay me, Turnus! How many shields
> and helmets and strong bodies of men will you roll under your waves,
> Father Tiber! Let them call for war and break the pact."

During the storm, Aeneas remembers the destruction Achilles wrought at Troy. In Pallanteum, on the other hand, he foretells the fate awaiting the Italians. The Latins will be slaughtered (*caedes*), Turnus will be punished, and bodies and arms will be washed down the Tiber to the sea. Aeneas claims as his future deeds the past deeds of Achilles, and in so doing implies that ultimately *he* will be the Achilles-figure of the war in Italy, a claim vindicated by his violent behavior in Books 10 and 12 and conceded by Turnus in Book 11.

Disturbingly, however, the role that Turnus claims explicitly and Aeneas implicitly, is that of Achilles the destroyer. Yet, despite his boast at 8.537–40 and Turnus' concession at 11.438-40, Aeneas does not willingly assume this role: like the Achilles of both Priam's memories and his own, he is a man of *pietas* and wrath. These are characteristics that do not easily coexist in the same individual, and indeed they seem to be in a state of constant struggle—witness Achilles' outburst against Priam in *Iliad* 24, and Aeneas' own fluctuation between *pietas* and vengeful, destructive *amentia* in Book 2. These forces are still at war in Aeneas, who tries to fight his assimilation to the destroyer, pitying the dead Lausus (10.825–28) and hesitating over the prostrate Turnus (12.938–39). The *pietas* of that Achilles who stands in opposition to the destroyer, the fellow human being known to Priam, can thus appear briefly in the wrathful Aeneas—after the death of Lausus, in the negotiations with the Latins, and even more briefly, perhaps, near the end of the poem—but ultimately, in the slaying of Turnus, *pius* Aeneas is overwhelmed by the destroyer.

In the preceding analysis I have tried to show that Vergil's use of Achilles is both more nuanced and more central to an understanding of the poem and its hero than has generally been supposed. By examining the portrait of Achilles that emerges from the different points of view held by Aeneas, Priam, and

Neptune, we have seen that Achilles is not simply a symbol of violence: he is instead a more complex figure, embodying both wrath and *pietas*. Moreover, we must first come to grips with Achilles before we can fully appreciate the Sibyl's prophecy of *alius Achilles* or understand the struggle between the Achillean figures of Turnus and Aeneas. Aeneas is primarily characterized by *pietas* and so seems at first to be set in opposition to the wrathful Achilles. But just as we see that Achilles shares Aeneas' *pietas*, so too do we see that Aeneas shares Achilles' destructive nature. Aeneas' character, like that of Achilles, is more complex than it would appear.[53]

[53]Portions of this paper were presented at the April 1995 meeting of CAMWS. I would like to thank John F. Miller, Jenny Strauss Clay, Christopher Nappa, and the editor and referees of *TAPA* for their many helpful comments and observations.

Works Cited

Austin, R. G., ed. 1964. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus.* Oxford.

Boyle, A. J. 1986. *The Chaonian Dove: Studies in the* Eclogues, Georgics, *and* Aeneid *of Virgil. Mnemosyne* Supplement 94. Leiden.

Clausen, W. 1987. *Virgil's* Aeneid *and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry.* Berkeley.

Clay, D. 1988. "The Archaeology of the Temple to Juno in Carthage (*Aen.* 1. 446–93)." *CP* 83: 195–205.

Conington, J., and H. Nettleship, eds. 1884. *The works of Virgil, with a commentary.* London.

Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets.* Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vol. 44. Ed. C. Segal. Ithaca.

de Jong, I. J. F. 1989. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad. Amsterdam.

Forbiger, A., ed. 1872–75. *P. Vergili Maronis opera.* Leipzig.

Genette, G. 1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method.* Tr. J. E. Lewin. Ithaca.

Harrison, E. L. 1981. "Vergil and the Homeric Tradition." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3: 209–25.

Henry, J., ed. 1873–92. *Aeneidea, or critical, exegetical, and aesthetical remarks on the* Aeneis. London, Dublin, and Meissen.

Heyne, C. G., ed. 1793. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera, varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustrata.* London.

Highet, G. 1972. *The Speeches in Vergil's* Aeneid. Princeton.

Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's* Aeneid. Berkeley.

King, K. C. 1984. "Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's *Aeneid.*" *MD* 9: 31–57.

———. 1987. *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages.* Berkeley.

Lee, M. O. 1979. *Fathers and Sons in Virgil's* Aeneid: *Tum genitor natum.* Albany.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford.

Mackail, J. W., ed. 1930. *The Aeneid.* Oxford.

Mills, D. H. 1978. "Vergil's Tragic Vision: The Death of Priam." *CW* 72: 159–66.

Moskalew, W. 1982. *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the* Aeneid. *Mnemosyne* Supplement 73. Leiden.

O'Hara, J. J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's* Aeneid. Princeton.

Privitera, G. A. 1984. "Achille." In *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* I. Rome. 24–25.

Putnam, M. C. J. 1965. *The Poetry of the* Aeneid. Ithaca.

Richardson, N., ed. 1993. *The Iliad: A commentary.* Vol. VI: Books 21–24. Series ed. G. S. Kirk. Cambridge.

Segal, C. 1981. "Art and the Hero: Participation, Detachment, and Narrative Point of View in *Aeneid* 1." *Arethusa* 14: 67–83.

Stahl, H.-P. 1981. "Aeneas—an 'Unheroic' Hero?" *Arethusa* 14: 157–77.

Stanley, K. 1965. "Irony and Foreshadowing in *Aeneid,* 1, 462." *AJP* 86: 267–77.

Thilo, G., and H. Hagen, eds. 1881. *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii.* Leipzig.

Williams, R. D., ed. 1962. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber tertius.* Oxford.

———, ed. 1972–73. *The Aeneid of Virgil.* Basingstoke.

———. 1990. "The Pictures on Dido's Temple (*Aeneid* 1. 450–93)." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's* Aeneid, ed. S. J. Harrison. Oxford. 37–45.

Wlosok, A. 1967. *Die Göttin Venus in Vergils* Aeneis. Heidelberg.