

Revue en ligne

# Miscellanea Juslittera

Volume 8

*Droit & Littérature  
(XI<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)*

*Autour du Roman d'Eneas*

*Dossier introduit par  
Jean-Jacques Vincensini*



Revue électronique

**Directrice de la publication :** Gabriele Vickermann-Ribémont

**Secrétaire d'édition :** Jérôme Devard

**Conseil scientifique**

Joël BLANCHARD  
Rosalind BROWN-GRANT  
Martine CHARAGEAT  
Camille ESMEIN-SARRAZIN  
Claude GAUVARD  
Stéphane GEONGET  
Cédric GLINEUR  
Philippe HAUGEARD  
Corinne LEVELEUX-TEIXEIRA  
Nicolas LOMBART  
Bernard RIBEMONT  
Earl Jeffrey RICHARDS  
Iolanda VENTURA



## AUTOUR DU ROMAN *D'ÉNÉAS*

**AUTOUR DU ROMAN D'ÉNÉAS**

Introduction  
Jean-Jacques VINCENSINI .....7

Amour, couple et mariage dans « l'Eneas »  
Nicole CHAREYRON ..... 9

Ovid's *heroides* contextualized : foolish and legitimate marriage in the  
*Roman d'Enéas*  
Barbara NOLAN ..... 17

Coward, Traitor, Landless Trojan : AEneas and the Politics of Sodomy  
Susanne HAFNER ..... 43

Pagan versus Christian Values in the *Roman d'Enéas*  
Raymond J. CORMIER .....53



## PROPOS INTRODUCTIFS



*Le Roman d'Enéas* est l'un des nouveaux romans en vers et en langue française qui s'imposent, au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, en Occident médiéval. Ces « romans d'antiquité » abandonnent la « matière de France » célébrées par les chansons de geste pour adapter des œuvres nourries de la « matière de Rome ». *Le Roman d'Enéas* réécrit très librement l'*Enéide* de Virgile. Il supprime des dieux sublaternes, il gomme des épisodes mais, surtout, il en a perdu l'esprit, son souci dynastique et religieux. Mais il arrive que, loin d'amputer, l'auteur du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle comble les vides ouverts par l'œuvre de Virgile. Dans deux directions. Dans celle de la rationalisation, tout d'abord. Sans y être contraint par sa source latine, le clerc accorde à la question métaphysique une importance cruciale qu'il aborde grâce à certaines modalités de la pensée mythique. C'est ainsi que, après la mort de son fils, la mère de Pallas, soutien de Enéas dans sa guerre contre Turnus, héroïque défenseur du Latium, proclame contre les dieux une véritable *evocatio*, rituel dont Dumézil a déplié la profondeur mythique dans sa fameuse esquisse « L'oubli de l'homme et l'honneur des dieux ».

La seconde direction guide vers l'expression de sentiments amoureux sources de souffrances et de désir. Au point que l'on a pu écrire que « en langue d'oïl, l'amour naît avec l'*Eneas*. » Les dieux ne laissent par le héros troyen dans les bras accueillants de Didon. Tel un poison, la maladie d'amour se répand dans le cœur déchiré de la reine, comme dans celui de la dame qu'un troubadour aurait abandonnée. Mais Enéas la quitte. Il conquiert le Latium, la terre promise, la terre sur laquelle s'élèvera Rome. La terre qui ne s'acquiert pas, dans ce récit novateur, seulement par les armes, mais par le mariage. La conquête du domaine va de pair avec celle de l'héritière du roi local. Elle s'appelle Lavine, cette sublime héritière. Puisant à la source des amours courtoises, l'*Enéas* déroule la marche inexorable du cœur physiquement perdu et du désir insatisfait : « Mon cœur, avec le sien, s'en va / Par l'aisselle, il me l'a arraché ». On chercherait en vain la trace d'une telle déploration dans l'*Eneide*.

Si le romancier développe, pour la première fois dans un roman en

langue française, les problématiques qui touchent à l'amour pur, c'est que commençait à être sensible l'esprit nouveau insufflé par les troubadours. Plus que les romans d'Alexandre, de Thèbes et de Troie, mieux que le roman d'*Apollonius de Tyr* – ces « cousins » d'Antiquité –, *Le Roman d'Enéas* présente l'intérêt de porter un témoignage éclairant sur les conditions esthétiques de l'affirmation du jeune roman médiéval : les grandes problématiques qui agitaient les œuvres antiques – le destin implacable, les malédictions familiales, le respect des dieux, l'amour de la cité – ne suffisent plus. Les narrateurs du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle leur préfèrent désormais la prouesse individuelle, le choc avec le merveilleux et la rencontre de l'amour douloureux et absolu. Le roman occidental ne s'en remettra pas.

Jean-Jacques VINCENSINI



## AMOUR, COUPLE ET MARIAGE DANS L'« ENEAS »\*



La question fondamentale que se posent la plupart des sociétés est la suivante : comment faire coïncider les exigences du corps social avec un acte qui engage la part la plus instinctive et la plus spirituelle de l'être humain ? Les paramètres sont multiples : biologiques, psychologiques, moraux, politiques, démographiques...

La liberté d'aimer a toujours tenté de s'imposer face aux lois du groupe social. De là l'éternelle problématique littéraire : tension entre désir et nécessité, bonheur privé et contrainte de société.

La « mise en situation » de couples semble multipliée à plaisir dans *l'Eneas*. On pourrait être tenté de lire ces variations comme une méditation sur le thème du mariage et de sa coïncidence avec le sentiment amoureux. Pourquoi ce goût de la mise en scène à deux partenaires ? Sensibilité à une mode littéraire ? Echos de débats en vogue ? Choix délibéré à des fins esthétiques ? Ou encore tentation d'esquisser une comédie humaine ? Les duos sont lyriques ou orageux, piquants ou aigres-doux : liaison qui tourne m-alj-mariage à péripéties, querelle-de-vieux épou-x-s'affrontant-au nom de leurs valeur respectives, réconciliation burlesque d'un couple divin tout droit sorti de quelque farce ; tous ces protagonistes forment une pyramide au sommet de laquelle les deux héros expriment leur idéal en trémolos lyriques. Hommes et femmes s'affrontent ou se complètent, se rapprochent ou s'opposent, se déchirent dans la vie ou s'adorent dans la mort. L'auteur compose son « Mariage à la Mode », multipliant les points de vue pour finalement nous amener doucement à entrer dans sa perspective, très nuancée, sans optimisme démesuré, sans pessimisme fâcheux.

La non-coïncidence entre couple et mariage est abondamment exploitée dans la littérature courtoise : adultères gracieux, mariages d'âmes, amitiés illicites, sont autant de promesses d'éternité qui

---

\* Cet article a été initialement publié dans la revue *Perspectives médiévales* n°14 (1988), p. 7-11.

transcendent l'usure du temps, la médiocrité matérialiste ou l'obsession du lignage. La Bovary de château n'est-elle pas devenue un type littéraire ?

Enéas et Didon forment un couple hors mariage, heureux dans ses appétits sans doute, mais marginalisé, réprouvé. L'auteur, optant pour la tradition, le laisse sans fruit, le voue à la destruction. La mort de la pécheresse, absoute mais ayant perdu « son nom et sa gloire » est un avertissement. Le romancier, avec une merveilleuse intuition d'artiste, exprime magistralement le déséquilibre de ce « faux couple ». Pour le navigateur fatigué, deux octosyllabes suffisent à consommer l'union (v. 1522-23). Elle est le repos facile.

Pour la reine fugitive, au contraire, nous sont donnés à voir fantasmes, rêves d'une royauté partagée (v. 1197-1265). Il est un frère en l'exil. A-t-il oublié un destin connu de la Méditerranée ? Croit-elle « refaire sa vie » ? L'auteur, par le biais des jugements de l'entourage, prolonge l'aventure en débat : indulgence des uns (v. 1327-1390), consternation des autres (v. 1539-1600)... Notre jugement varie selon une échelle de valeurs qui privilégie bonheur de l'individu (Anna) ou intérêts de la cité (les barons). Par cette technique des points de vue multipliés, l'auteur formule un problème et donne matière à discussion.

Latinus et la reine illustrent le mariage sans couple, image inversée des amants de Carthage (v. 3351-3382). Incapables d'avoir un projet commun, par leurs dissensions ils font courir à la cité les mêmes dangers. La leçon est claire : dans le mariage, on ne peut faire l'économie des sentiments ! La guerre conjugale allume des brasiers dans la campagne. Un roi (sénile ?) qui, par faiblesse, a déjà promis sa fille, se mue soudain en interprète de l'Olympe pour l'accorder, une seconde fois, à l'élu des dieux. Une reine-mère que ne touche pas le même illuminisme béat ne reçoit pas un compatriote de Paris, l'ex-amant de Didon, avec la même complaisance. Un exilé, recomposant à l'infini son récit pathétique (ces variations sont une des réussites du roman), fascine, apitoie, gommant au besoin ce qui gêne. Tandis que Latinus s'émerveille au bavardage héroïco-lyrique du Troyen (v. 3226-3248), la reine fait un contre-récit remarquable rétablissant les défaillances de l'amnésique (v. 3369-3370). Béatitude contre pragmatisme ! Le Roi porte les yeux sur l'au-delà du destin, la reine arrête son regard sur la réalité concrète (les vagues emportant le coureur des mers n'ont-elles pas emporté aussi la plainte de Didon ?). Et si le romancier donne à son héros le privilège de faire un roman de sa vie, il donne à la reine le pouvoir de démontrer que cette vie n'est qu'un roman, un vécu entaché de subjectivité qu'il promène comme une guenille trouée. Sur l'échiquier du destin, roi et reine s'affrontent, antagonistes mais

complémentaires malgré tout : à lui de voir plus grand, plus haut, plus « divin », à elle de voir plus juste, plus vrai, plus humain ! Au nom de la communauté, il embrasse d'un regard visionnaire sa future lignée ; au nom du bonheur de sa fille, elle tire les conséquences d'une union mal assortie. L'auteur joue à invalider réciproquement les arguments des époux qui, ne raisonnant pas sur les mêmes données, ne peuvent se comprendre. Belle leçon sur la relativité des faits dans nos consciences ! De *l'Énéide*, qui privilégiait la conscience des dieux, l'auteur fait *l'Eneas*, qui privilégie la conscience des hommes pour qui désormais Destin n'est plus Fatalité. Peut-être est-ce par là qu'il atteint sa vraie dimension d'artiste,

Alors, si l'amour (unilatéral ?) sans mariage est source de désordres, si le mariage (sans entente) est cause de guerre, n'y a-t-il pas à rechercher une situation d'équilibre dans la société ? Les couples Lavine-Eneas et Didon-Eneas forment un diptyque tout en ressemblances et dissonances. Au faux couple, voué à la destruction, s'oppose le vrai, promis à l'éternité. Dans le dernier tableau, le « produit » romain éponyme, enfin doté d'une épaisseur psychologique, finit par « se médiévaliser ». L'équilibre esthétique est à l'image de la perfection du couple : au dialogue intime de l'un fait écho le débat intérieur de l'autre. Le duo lyrique est un beau finale où le héros s'affranchit pleinement des dieux qui, d'ailleurs, ont depuis longtemps regagné leur Panthéon. Ce qu'on appelle humblement « matière romanesque » se change en roman. Ce ne sont plus les mots seuls qui « disent ou content ». L'organisation des masses narratives a sa propre éloquence.

Et, si l'idéalisme de la jeune fille en fleurs est corrigé par le héros, dont certains propos pimentés trouveraient leur place dans le manuel de Don Juan (v. 9078-9084), c'est peut-être par souci de vraisemblance : l'auteur dote un être, ayant derrière lui une belle « tranche de vie », d'une certaine distance à l'égard des faiblesses d'amour. Comment ferait-il de cet homme mûr un bachelier transi ? Et s'il place dans sa bouche le gracieux babil des amants courtois, ce n'est que parti pris optimiste d'un auteur, pour qui Amour est gage d'éternelle, jouvence. Ainsi, dans *l'Eneas*, la conservation du patrimoine ne se fera-t-elle pas au détriment du bonheur. L'amour garantit force et vigueur au lignage.

L'épisode des amours de Lavine et d'Eneas ne serait donc qu'une péripétie romanesque s'il ne prenait un éclairage particulier confronté à ceux de Carthage et de la guerre lombarde. Les trois couples s'opposent et se complètent. L'auteur, dépassant les « courtoiseries » traditionnelles, pose un problème : dans quelle mesure le groupe social souffre-t-il de la mésentente ? de la mésalliance ? Dans les dernières pages, l'auteur,

prenant des libertés avec la légende, propose-t-il un idéal où amour et mariage se trouveraient réunis ? Les « bons murs », les « donjons solides » sur lesquels se bâtit la cité semblent autant d'expressions ironiques invitant à le croire !

Entre l'aspiration dont le mythe de Philémon et Baucis constitue une image de référence et la tentation d'un réalisme, où les belles figures, passées soudain au filtre déformant d'une conscience critique, deviennent mesquines, s'offre à voir une palette variée de l'humain. Par ce contrepoint ludique du lyrisme et du réalisme, du quotidien et de l'idéal, l'auteur semble à la recherche d'une voie de conciliation entre bonheur privé et bien public. Aux théorèmes d'un catéchisme de l'amour parfait, énoncé par les tourtereaux, répondent quelques querelles de ménages humains ou divins qui nous donnent à mesurer la distance du rêve à la vie.

Si l'on observe enfin les autres couples du roman, on s'aperçoit-que, là encore, la légende épouse les contours d'une réflexion propre à interpeller des contemporains. Comment l'auteur, que tentent peut-être les voies d'un Burlesque avant la lettre, traite-t-il un couple qui ne manque ni d'intérêt... ni d'humanité : celui que forment l'ombrageux roi des Enfers et sa sémillante épouse infidèle ? Le mauvais goût n'étant pas le seul apanage des hommes, Vulcain, avec sa délicatesse de forgeron, organise une procédure de flagrant délit pour confondre la Belle en présence des dieux vaguement écœurés du procédé : maladresse de jaloux qui précipite la rupture (v. 4376). Vénus, par nécessité, revient à Vulcain avec des arguments qui font toujours leurs preuves. Le lourdaud ne s'y trompe pas, mais, très « fair-play », au lendemain de la « réconciliation », fait résonner la forge infernale des coups d'enclume martelant les armes d'un fils qui n'est pas de lui. Amusante comédie de couple : on s'étonne que les scénaristes de Boulevard n'aient pas encore exploité cet épisode éternellement comique de la (fausse) repentante et de son jaloux calmé. Notre auteur l'a fait ; voilà une histoire dans l'histoire, une fable... presque un fabliau, en contrepoint comique d'une trame romanesque qui ne l'est pas. Les dieux, investis soudain d'une épaisseur charnelle, répliques grimaçantes des héros, cristallisent les situations du rire. L'auteur accroche un tableau sur fond de roman, ornement inutile à l'action, mais qui agrémenté l'œuvre tout en orientant sa signification.

A travers Didon et Sychée se pose la question de la pérennité du couple et de la fidélité posthume. Le problème d'éthique religieuse qui tourmente Didon avant sa « chute », Anna le traduit en termes de psychologie. On sent affleurer un vieux débat d'époque. Pour la veuve austère, il n'est pire péché que de violer la foi promise. Pour Anna, la contrainte de ce principe est

fâcheuse. Le mort, renvoyé aux Champs-Élyséens, laisse la place au vif. Et l'auteur de montrer, en observateur des tempêtes humaines, que les résolutions résistent mal au souffle des passions, que les actes outrepassent bien des discours, que les interdits se rompent devant le flot mal endigué des sentiments le jour où Nature, qui se moque des principes de Culture, réclame son dû. La société que représentent les barons parle d'adultère mais l'auteur ne jette pas la pierre à celle qui a choisi la vie. Par un jeu de points de vue nous entrons dans trois perspectives : celle de l'héroïne (psychologique), celle de la collectivité (sociale), et celle de l'auteur (moraliste) pour qui la coupable, exclue du monde, mérite le pardon. Retrouvant Sychée aux Enfers, Didon se détourne d'Énéas, vivante image du péché. De l'immortalité des âmes faut-il conclure à l'éternité du couple, indissoluble jusque dans l'au-delà ? « Duquel sera-t-elle l'épouse en la Résurrection des Morts ? », demandaient les sadducéens de l'Évangile à propos de la femme qui avait épousé successivement plusieurs frères<sup>1</sup>. Cette myopie humaine que Jésus dénonçait en son temps semble avoir été aussi celle des hommes du Moyen Âge qui débattaient du remariage des veuves.

Et voici maintenant Evandre et sa femme unis dans la même douleur devant le cadavre de leur fils (v. 6171 et suiv.). Un même regard ? Le père pleure un fils unique au nom d'un royaume orphelin, la mère a perdu « toute sa vie » dans une guerre inutile. « Mar vi onques le troïen », le mal aimé des mères ! Décorations posthumes, riches tombeaux sont affaire d'hommes. Elle, se dressant en accusatrice d'un père (criminel ?), dénonce cette forme ennoblée de la vanité qu'est la quête de gloire. N'avait-elle pas l'intuition du malheur ? Là encore, le romancier assigne à chacun sa place et sa fonction. Dans le roman, hommes et femmes ne pèsent pas la vie avec les mêmes poids.

Avec le couple virtuel Lavine-Turnus, le lecteur médiéval aborde l'aspect « foncier » du mariage. L'association familière : mariage/héritage, le retour à la rime : *regne/femme* est signe, fait signe, renvoyant une image au lecteur d'époque. La légende est actualisée. Autre temps, autre civilisation, autre imaginaire ! La traduction n'est plus seulement linguistique, mais sociologique et idéologique. Dans « Tailleurs » et dans « l'autrefois » d'une fresque à l'antique se glissent les traits d'un « ici » et d'un « maintenant », comme dans ces œuvres où les peintres, réitérant à l'infini les scènes d'Adoration, habillent l'Orient de velours hollandais ou façonnent aux Rois Mages des visages de marchands siennois. L'auteur

---

<sup>1</sup> *Évangile de Luc*, XX, 27-30.

n'échappe pas à cette loi de la reconstruction signifiante par hypertrophie ou réduction des éléments d'origine. La rupture de promesse est un *casus belli*<sup>2</sup>. Jusqu'à l'époque moderne, les contradictions du droit ont témoigné de l'embarras des juristes sur la question (voir article « Mariage », *Encyclopaedia Universalis*, vol. 10). La promesse de mariage, s'accompagnant d'une dotation, prend valeur de contrat. Les dieux peuvent bien congédier le Prétendant Turnus comme inapte à produire la descendance latine, il n'en reste pas moins un problème que l'auteur ne peut éluder sous peine de n'être qu'un traducteur zélé. Le plaignant Turnus clame son « bon droit » devant des barons arbitres, dénonce ce « failli » de Latinus, exige réparation du préjudice. Tout l'arsenal du vocabulaire du droit vient en renfort. A des esprits, sinon épris de rationalité, du moins sensibles à la logique réaliste, il convenait de proposer une situation romanesque conforme à l'éthique du temps. Plaidoyers, discussions, guerres... On finit par se mettre d'accord sur le principe d'un combat singulier, sorte de jugement par la lance qui préserve le droit médiéval tout en laissant intact le destin d'Énée. Le lecteur peut être satisfait : les barons dégagent leur responsabilité sans légitimer l'intrus et la victoire du héros prend valeur de sentence divine.

Enfin le problème du mariage avec l'étranger est posé dans le texte : au chant de l'exilé répond la plainte des sédentaires. L'exogamie ne met-elle pas en péril le patrimoine ? Les barons font des réserves. Selon la reine, rien ne vaut la communauté de culture pour la bonne marche des affaires conjugales et sociales (v. 3290). En ne l'appelant que « Troyen », elle renvoie l'étranger à son peuple. Pour l'homme médiéval, toute fusion de communauté ne va pas de soi : préjugés familiaux, craintes des clans, évaluation des risques s'inscrivent en toile de fond de « l'Énéide médiévale ». Ostracisme, xénophobie... mais aussi admiration pour les talents de bâtisseur du nouvel arrivant (v. 7344- 49) dont, en reconnaissant la valeur, on est bien près de reconnaître l'identité.

Ainsi, dans la translation d'une épopée antique, peut se cacher une méditation personnelle sur les notions d'amour, de couple et de mariage envisagées dans leurs rapports avec la société. La fable n'est parfois qu'un habit élégant de la pensée, une poétique du « dire ». De ce savant mariage d'une épopée qui a rencontré un auteur naît un texte original pour qui prend la peine de le sonder. Et ce n'est pas le moindre des mérites de l'auteur que d'avoir trouvé une fin satisfaisant le lecteur du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle sans éluder les questions qu'on pouvait se poser à partir de la trame originelle,

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. Heers, *Le Clan médiévale au Moyen-Âge*, PUF, 1974, p. 116.

d'avoir exprimé des idées d'actualité sans blesser la légende, d'avoir ressuscité cette œuvre d'une rigueur toute romaine sans omettre de l'agrémenter du sel courtois. Mais c'est ainsi que les légendes se recréent dans le vivant et que, dans le hors-temps du mythe, est crypté le temps de l'histoire.

Nicole CHAREYRON





## OVID'S HEROIDES CONTEXTUALIZED : FOOLISH LOVE AND LEGITIMATE MARRIAGE IN THE *ROMAN D'ENEAS*\*



No one can doubt that the mid-twelfth century authors of the *romans antiques* turned to Ovid as they formulated the « love interest » in their innovative vernacular translations<sup>1</sup>. From the great classical *praeceptor's* amatory poems - the *Ars amatoria*, *Remedia amaris*, *Amores*, and *Heroïdes* - they drew not only an interest in the psychology of lovers but also a taxonomy of love's physical symptoms. And their depictions of knights and maidens in love became paradigmatic for courtly medieval romance. Heroes and heroines in the fictions of Chretien de Troyes, Gottfried of Strassburg, Boccaccio, Chaucer, and a host of other writers exemplify Ovidian patterns of amorous conduct as these had been popularized by the *Eneas-poet* and Benoît de Sainte-Maure.

What students of medieval romance have not generally asked, however, is whether these same French poets may also have owed

---

\* Cet article a été initialement publié dans la revue *Mediaevalia* n°13 (1987), p. 157-187.

<sup>1</sup> The classic study on this subject is that of Edmond Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge*, Paris, 1913. See especially Chapter III, « Ovide et quelques autres sources du Roman d'Eneas », p. 73-157. This chapter is a reprint of an earlier article by E. Faral in *Romania*, n°40 (1911), p. 161-234. Other important early studies of Ovid's influence on the *romans antiques* include J.-J. Salverda de Grave's introduction to his critical edition of the *Eneas*, *Bibliotheca Normannica* IV, Halle, 1891 ; M. Warren, « On the Latin Sources of *Thebes* and *Eneas* », *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, n°16 (1901), p.375-387 ; K. Heyl, *Die Theorie der Minne in den ältesten Minneromanen Frankreichs*, Marburger Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie, vol. IV ; A. Dressler, *Der Einfluss des altfranzösischen Eneas-Romanes auf die altfranzösischen Litteratur*, Borna-Leipzig, 1907. Among more recent studies, three have proved particularly useful to me on the subject of love and the *romans antiques* : J. Frappier, « Vues sur la conception de l'amour courtois dans la littérature d'oc et d'oïl au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle », *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, n°2 (1959), p.135-156 ; R. M. Jones, *The Theme of Love in the Romans d'Antiquité*, London, 1972 ; and D. Poirion, « De l' 'Énéïde' à l' 'Eneas' : mythologie et moralisation », *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, n°19 (1976), p. 213-229. Other recent work on love in the *romans antiques* includes R. M. Lumian-sky, « The Structural Unity in Benoît's *Roman de Troie* », *Romania* n°79(1958), p.410-424 ; H. C. R. Laurie, « *Eneas* and the Doctrine of Courtly Love, » *Modern Language Review*, n°64 (1969) ; and R. J. Cormier, *One Heart One Mind : The Rebirth of Virgil's Hero in Medieval French Romance*, Mississippi, 1973.

something to medieval school commentaries on Ovid's amatory poems as they explored the moral and political *problem* of sexual love in their texts. For the first time in medieval vernacular narrative, the authors of the *romans antiques* posed urgent, practical questions about the nature of secular love and its place in a highly structured, politically ambitious society. Ovid's poems offered the twelfth-century "translators" *matiere* for their explorations - the sighs, the insomnia, the lamentations, the tears, the stratagems of love<sup>2</sup>. But, at the same time, medieval school commentaries on Ovid's love poems seem to have provided important moral frames within which to consider the place of Ovidian love in the context of aristocratic life. Both the *Eneas-poet* and Benoît, in different but complementary ways, dramatize lessons about love which have clear parallels in contemporary commentaries, and a knowledge of the commentaries sharpens our perception of these lessons in the poems<sup>3</sup>.

The dominant thematic interests generally found in school commentaries on Ovid's love poems - and in the romances influenced by them - are secular, social, and moral, but they are not typically religious. Neither the commentaries nor the romances deal with worldly attachment vs. spiritual love as D. W. Robertson, Jr., suggested in his several influential studies of *fin'amor*<sup>4</sup>. Nor do they celebrate an amoral code of « courtly

---

<sup>2</sup> For an analysis of the *Eneas-poet's* specific borrowings from Ovid in identifying the symptoms of love and its theory, see E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge*, op. cit., p. 133-50. Lavine's mother neatly summarizes those physical signs belonging to the « nature » of love as she instructs her daughter : « d'amor estuet sovant süer / et refroidir, fremir, tranbler / et sospirer et baallier, / et perdre tot boivre et mangier / et degiter et tressaillir, / müer color et espalir, / giendre, plaindre, palir, penser / et sanglotir, veillier, plorer » (v. 7921-7928). As everyone knows, these symptoms became paradigmatic for lovers in later medieval romance, no doubt under the joint influence of Ovid and the authors of the *romans antiques*.

<sup>3</sup> It is, I think, important to understand just what these lessons were since the *questions* of love as they were posed in the *romans antiques* played a singularly influential role in the formation of medieval romance as a genre.

<sup>4</sup> Robertson's views concerning « courtly love » and the place of secular love in medieval poetry are well represented in his *Preface to Chaucer*, Princeton, 1962 and in two essays : « The Subject of the *De Amore* of Andreas Capellanus », *Modern Philology*, n°50 (1953), p. 14-15-61 ; and « The Concept of Courtly Love as an Impediment to the Understanding of Medieval Texts », *The Meaning of Courtly Love*, Albany, 1968, p. 1-18. It is interesting to note that Robertson, one of the most learned contemporary scholars to explore medieval ideas of love, acknowledged the importance of understanding the medieval Ovid, particularly in relation to Chaucer. Yet while Robertson, in his several studies of love theory, often invokes medieval commentaries on the *Metamorphoses*, especially those by Arnulf of Orleans and Pierre Bersuire, he scarcely considers

love », one that makes adultery a central, positive element in a « religion of love » as C. S. Lewis argued<sup>5</sup>. Instead, they focus on the problem of illicit (or foolish) vs. chaste married love. The most basic school commentaries on Ovid's love poems, as these were adapted by the *Eneas-poet* and Benoît de Sainte-Maure, seem to have provided one important foundation for a poetics of secular love that governs most, if not all, later medieval love fictions. This is not to say that all such narratives of the later Middle Ages can be reduced to simple doctrinal formulations. Poets contextualized received teaching in a wide variety of ways, sometimes within the same poem. Yet a relatively homogeneous core of attitudes towards love and marriage governed both school commentaries on Ovid's love poetry and later medieval fictions concerned with love. Clearly, writers within this tradition also responded directly to Ovid's often-impudent, ironic love poems ; and some of them, including Jean de Meun and Chaucer, extended their explorations into the higher realms of contemporary theology. Yet they seem always to owe a primary debt to moral lessons on Ovid propounded by their schoolteachers<sup>6</sup>.

---

comments on Ovid's love poetry. Had he done so, he might well have modified his argument.

<sup>5</sup> In his influential discussion of « courtly love », C. S. Lewis failed to distinguish the troubadours' « religion of love » from the northern French romancers' quite different treatments of love. Consequently, he considered Chrétien de Troyes' poems juxtaposing *fin'amor* and marriage « strangely archaic », while *Lancelot* is, in his view, the only one of Chrétien's works to reflect the « new ideals of love » (26). But if we place Chrétien's romances in the context of the *romans antiques* and the medieval Ovid of the love poems (neither of which Lewis considered in his study), we observe how fully his fictions participate in a developing clerical ideology of secular love quite different from the one Lewis describes. For Lewis's position, see *The Allegory of Love*, New York, 1958 (first publ. 1936), p. 1-43.

<sup>6</sup> Fortunately, several scholars in this century have brought to light medieval commentaries on Ovid's love poems. Most recently, R. J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum*, Munich, 1986 has provided important new information concerning medieval glosses on the *Heroides*. He has also edited for the first time a commentary on the Epistles contained in a twelfth-century German manuscript (CIm 19475). The bibliography concerning Ovid's place in the medieval schools is extensive and important. Among the studies I have found most useful are the following E. K. Rand, *Ovid and his Influence*, Boston, 1928 ; F. Ghisalberti, « Medieval Biographies of Ovid », *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, n°9 (1946), p.10-59 ; F. Ghisalberti, « Arnolfo d'Orleans. Un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII », *Memorie del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scimze, Lettere, Classe Lettere*, XXIV, fasc. IV (1932), p. 157-234; Lucia Rosa, « Su alcuni commenti inediti alle opere di Ovidio », *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Napoli*, n°5 (1955), p. 191-231; E. Pellegrin, « Les 'Remedia amoris' d'Ovide, Texte scolaire medieval », *Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartes*, n° 115 (1957), Paris,

For the purposes of this essay, I limit myself to the *Eneas* and to twelfth-century comments on Ovid's *Heroides*<sup>7</sup>. For the French poet the issue of appropriate princely love and marriage assumes paramount importance. It is not only Lavine's pointed question to her mother : « Dites lo moi / que est amors ? » (v. 7889-7890) that shapes his poem, but also the larger ethical question : « What kind of love is appropriate for the good king and the good queen ? » Several critics have examined the treatment of love in the *Eneas*, and particularly the poet's calculated juxtaposition of Dido and Lavine, and a few scholars in the last several years have pointed to the key role of marriage and legitimate succession in the poem<sup>8</sup>. In an important recent monograph, Jean-Charles Huchet has argued that the *Eneas* is a poem about marriage. *L'Eneas*, he writes :

« est avant tout l'histoire du mariage scellant l'union du heros troyen avec Lavinia et ordonnant la venue au monde de la prestigieuse lignee dont Anchises, dans l'Autre-monde, développe le film en nommant ceux qui sont encore à naître (v. 2937-2959). Retardant à l'envi la realisation de ce mariage riche de promesses historiques, le roman médiéval nous presente d'abord son envers illicite : la liaison d'Enéas avec Dido... »<sup>9</sup>

While Huchet rightly emphasizes the medieval political ramifications of marriage and « errance » in the *Eneas*, I locate the poem's moral structure within the context of its likely academic background. In school

---

1958, 172-79 ; S. Battaglia, « La Tradizione di Ovidio nel Medioevo », *Filologia Romanza*, n°6 (1959), p.185-224; E. H. Aiton, « Ovid in the Medieval Schoolroom », *Hermathena*, 1960, p. 21-38 ; n° 95 (1961), p. 67-82; F. Munari, *Ovid im Mittelalter*, Zürich and Stuttgart, 1960 ; R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores. Bernard of Utrecht ; Conrad of Hirsau. Dialogus super auctores*, Leiden, 1970 ; J. McGregor, « Ovid at School : From the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century », *Classical Folia* n° 37 (1978), p. 29-51. For further references, see R.J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum*, op. cit., p. 316-23.

<sup>7</sup> As I argue in a forthcoming book on medieval romance, commentaries on all of Ovid's love poems also play an important role in forming the love interest in Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie*, Boccaccio's early classicizing romances, and Chaucer's experiments in the form of the *roman antique*

<sup>8</sup> See especially R. M. Jones, *The Theme of Love in the Romans d'Antiquité*, p. 30-40 ; G. Angeli, *L' "Eneas" e i primi romanzi volgari*, Milan and Naples, 1971, p. 107-114 ; D. Poirion, « De l' "Énéide à l' 'Eneas" : mythologie et moralization », art. cit. p. 213-229 ; L. Patterson, « Virgil and the Historical Consciousness of the Twelfth Century : the *Roman d'Eneas* and *Erec and Enide* », *Negotiating the Past*, Madison, 1987, esp. p. 181 and 191; J.-C. Huchet, *Le roman médiéval*, Paris, 1984, p. 111-150.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 19.

commentaries on Ovid's love poems, and particularly the *Heroides*, the poet would have found a neatly-formulated theory of foolish love and legitimate marriage. And it was this theory, I argue, that gave shape and *sen* not only to his poem but also, *mutatis mutandis*, to most other classicizing romances of the later Middle Ages.

As I shall demonstrate in detail later on, one of the newly enamored Lavine's most original actions in the last third of the poem focuses our attention in an intriguing way on the *Heroides*. After she has fallen in love with Eneas, in order to discover whether her love is mutual, Lavine decides to write him a letter (v. 8767-8773). The poet swiftly summarizes the content of the formal letter, which is written, we are told, in Latin, on a single leaf of parchment. Lavine appears to be learned in the *ars dictaminis* : she moves gracefully from the greeting to the confession of love, to the petition for mercy. And in the letter she pledges her love to the Trojan hero straightforwardly, without guile, without the subterfuge recommended for lovers by Ovid in his *Ars amatoria* (v. 8775-8792). Lavine then ties her letter to an arrow and has one of her archers « deliver » it to her would-be lover by shooting it from her window to the place where he is standing (v. 8807-8838). In a poem deeply indebted to Ovid's amatory works in general, Lavine's letter calls special attention to itself because its « author », like many of the Ovidian heroines, seeks a requited love. If, in fact, Lavine's letter does signal the poet's special interest in Ovid's *Heroides*, then we may usefully ask how else that remarkable, often underrated work, together with its twelfth-century *accessus* and glosses, might enrich our understanding of the *Eneas*<sup>10</sup>. Of course, as in any source study, one must ask not only whether a poet has used inherited materials but also how he has used them. Certain details in the *Eneas*, and particularly in those parts of the poem not strictly based on the *Aeneid*, suggest that the *Heroides*, and specifically the letters of Dido to Aeneas and Paris to Helen, did influence the poet's design of individual episodes or narrative units. Moreover, the structure of the whole poem argues that the French poet probably drew

---

<sup>10</sup> E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge*, op. cit., p. 114-149 noted several reminiscences of the *Heroides* in the *Eneas*, but he did not examine his observations in relation to the poem's structure. Moreover, he did not focus on any of the details examined in my own study. His suggestions of influence include the following : The epitaph on Dido's tomb (*Her.* 14.129; 7.195) ; the *Eneas-poet's* warning that lovers will always be in doubt and fear (*Her.* 1.12; *Her.* 18.109) ; Lavine's need for a confidant (*Her.* 11.33 ff. ; 18.19ff. ; 20.17 ff.). He also notes that most of the physical symptoms of love described in the other amatory works also appear in many of the *Heroides* as well as the image of the god of love, the metaphor of love as a flame or fire, and the idea that lovers will die because of their passion (p. 134-49).

his large scheme for the *Eneas* from twelfth-century schoolroom-commentaries on the *Heroides*.

I. To follow the poet's carefully orchestrated argument concerning legitimate vs. illegitimate or foolish love, we must begin with the opening sequence of the *Eneas* (v. 1-182) and the poet's subsequent treatment of Dido in love. In her monograph on love in the *romans antiques*, R. M. Jones expresses the commonly-held view that the *Roman d'Eneas* examines two love relationships : those between Eneas and Dido and between Eneas and Lavine<sup>11</sup>. In fact, however, the poem begins with a highly concentrated focus on two other relationships : the legitimate marriage of Menelaus and Helen and the adulterous bond between Paris and Helen<sup>12</sup>. In two substantial, calculated departures from his Virgilian model within the first two hundred lines of his poem, the *Eneas-poet* takes up the problem of love and marriage in relation to the fiery destruction of Troy. In the initial twenty-four lines of the *Eneas*<sup>13</sup>, the poet raises a question of causality, following Virgil at the beginning of the *Aeneid* (1.8-11). But the cause

<sup>11</sup> R. M. Jones, *The Theme of Love in the Romans d'Antiquité*, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

<sup>12</sup> Three important exceptions to this tendency are to be found in studies by D. Poirion, R. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, and J.-C. Huchet. Poirion mentions the poet's interpolation of Paris's Judgment and considers it essential for interpreting the poem's love interest (« De l' "Énéide à l' Eneas" : mythologie et moralization », *art.cit.*, p. 214-215 and 225-226). More recently, Poirion has underlined the importance of the Menelaus-Paris-Helen story, but for reasons different from my own : « L'écriture épique : du sublime au symbole », *Relire le "Roman d'Eneas"*, Paris, 1985, p. 1-xiii. Blumenfeld-Kosinski links the Menelaus-Helen-Paris triangle to the Turnus-Lavine-Eneas triangle and tentatively suggests a connection between both of these and a contemporary triangle « of no scant importance » : that of Louis VII, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and Henry II ; see « Old French Narrative Genres : Towards the Definition of the *Roman Antique* », *Romance Philology*, n°34 (1981-8), p. 158. This is a connection which is not outside the realm of possibility and one which my own conclusions tend to support. J.-C Huchet (*Le roman médiéval*, *op. cit.*) discusses the thematic fonction of Menelaus as the wronged husband (p. 21-24) and also the Judgment of Paris (p. 40-59) in ways that complement my own argument.

<sup>13</sup> This is a point recently argued by R. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, « Old French Narrative Genres : Towards the Definition of the *Roman Antique* », *art. cit.*, p. 50. Blumenfeld-Kosinski concludes that in the « implicit » prologue, « the point is made in the DOING, not the TELLING » (emphasis hers). D. Poirion, « L'écriture épique : du sublime au symbole », *art. cit.*, p. VII-VIII, also assumes that the first 24 lines of the *Eneas* comprise a prologue : « Mais l'ensemble des 24 premiers vers, privés de tout modèle rhétorique, constitue un résumé thématique donnant une certaine interprétation de la guerre de Troie ». Several critics, however, have considered the opening sequence abrupt and without clear point. See, for example, G. Angeli, *L' "Eneas" e i primi romanzi volgari*, *op. cit.*, p. 105-106.

explored by the Norman translator differs fundamentally from Virgil's, as does the explanation on which he bases his poetic argument. Instead of introducing his hero, Eneas, as Virgil had done, and asking why he had to suffer nearly insuperable difficulties in pursuit of his destiny, the French poet invites a meditation on the cause of Troy's destruction (v. 1-24). Though we might consider the medieval translator's introduction simply his pedantic effort to replace Virgil's « *ordo artificialis* » with an « *ordo naturalis* », his purpose seems to me considerably more complex and interesting<sup>14</sup>.

As the *Eneas-poet* explains why Troy fell in his poem's opening lines, he initiates a richly nuanced argument about good and bad, legitimate, illicit, and foolish loves. The first noun of the prologue, « Menelaus », and the last, « moillier », outline the poet's theme. Moreover, the poem's opening sentence makes the single, simple reason for Troy's tragic fall explicit :

« Quant Menelaus ot Troie asise,  
 one n'en torna a tresqu'il l'ot prise,  
 gasta la terre et tot lo regne  
 por la vanjance de sa fenne. »

(v. 1-4)<sup>15</sup>

At this point, the poet does not report precisely why Menelaus had to seek revenge on account of his wife. He turns rather to the consequence of a

---

<sup>14</sup> In his influential commentary, Servius suggests Virgil's use (following Horace in the *Ars poetica*) of an artificial order at the beginning of the *Aeneid* : *nam prius de erroribus Aeneae dicit, post de bellon*, see *Vergilii Aeneidos*, éd. G. Thilo, Leipzig, 1878, I, 1, p. 6). In his twelfth-century gloss, Bernard Silvestris expands Servius' observation, making the classical poet's method explicit in medieval rhetorical terms : *Notandum est in hoc libro geminum esse narrationis ordinem, naturalem scilicet et artificialem. Naturalis est quando narratio secundum seriem rerum ac temporum distribuitur, quod fit dum eo ordine quo res gesta est narratur dumque quid tempore primo quid consequente quid ultimo gestum sit distinguatur. Hunc ordinem Lucanus sequitur. Artificialis ordo vero est quando a medio narrationem incipimus artificio atque modo ad principium recurrimus. Hoc ordine scribit ... in hoc opere Virgilius. (The Commentary on the First Six Books of the Aeneid of Vergil Commonly Attributed to Bernard Silvestris, éd. J. W. Jones and E. F. Jones, Lincoln and London, 1977, p. 1-2). For the position that the *Eneas-poet* made a « natural » start and thereby simplified his source », cf. Raymond Cormier, *One Heart One Mind. The Rebirth of Virgil's Hm in Medieval French Romance*, Mississippi, 1973, p. 81. R. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, « Old French Narrative Genres : Towards the Definition of the *Roman Antique* », art. cit., p. 150 argues instead that the *Eneas-poet* introduces the *ordo naturalis* in order to « signal to us that the first part of the romance will constitute an exemplification of creative activity... He makes clear from the very start that his *translatio* will be a creative adaptation of Virgil ... ».*

<sup>15</sup> All references to the *Eneas* in this essay are to the edition by J.-J. Salverda de Grave, *Eneas*, Paris, 1925-1929.

wronged husband's vengeance in Troy's devastation. Not only has the city been burned and a kingdom destroyed. The Trojan ruler, Priam, as well as his wife (« fame ») and children, have been killed. All this destruction, including the destruction of a royal family, the poet concludes, Menelaus has wrought « por le tort fait de sa moillier » (24 : for the wrong done by/concerning his wife)<sup>16</sup>.

The *Eneas-poet's* interpretation of Troy's fall in his prologue is by no means original with him<sup>17</sup>. Yet it is more intensely concentrated on the single theme of a betrayed royal husband's vengeance than other extant twelfth-century epitomes of Troy's destruction. Furthermore, the significance of this particular focus in the *Eneas's* opening lines asserts itself incrementally over the course of the whole poem, particularly in those sections of the narrative which the poet has « in-eched » in his Virgilian source<sup>18</sup>.

In a second major departure from the *Aeneid* early in his work, the poet halts his account of Eneas's departure from Troy in order to interpolate an eighty-three-line account of the fateful Judgment of Paris. Here, in fact, he is returning to the question raised in his prologue. What was the « tort » for which Menelaus had sought revenge ? Filling in a Virgilian allusion to the tale in the *Aeneid*, the poet introduces the Judgment as a matter of information; but he also uses it as an exemplary story. He does not explicitly indicate the Judgment's connection either to Menelaus or to Eneas. Yet, by the way he presents Paris's Judgment, through carefully

---

<sup>16</sup> The syntax of this phrase allows two different readings of the Old French and the poet seems to encourage a certain ambiguity. In fact, the wrong was done to Menelaus by his wife who left her legitimate husband, but also by Paris who shamed and dishonored the Greek king by stealing his lawful wife. In fact, the poet tends to focus more on Paris than Helen as the cause of Menelaus's shame by providing a full account of the fateful Judgment of Paris (p. 99-182).

<sup>17</sup> A twelfth-century *accessus* to the *Ilias Latina*, for example, gives the following description of 'Homer's' *materia* : *materia sua sunt personae de quibus facto illicito coniugio ortum est bellum, intentio sua est dehortari quemlibet ab illicito coniugio, unde offensam deorum incurrat, uti Paris et Helena ac suorum fortiores qui destructi hello cum Troia perierunt*. Cf. R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores*, Leiden, 1970, p. 26.

<sup>18</sup> The term, « in-eched » is Chaucer's and it seems to me a particularly apt one for describing the medieval poets' habits of grafting materials from one source onto materials from another. More than additions, such « in-echings » involve an amalgamation of materials which transforms ail of the borrowed matter. Chaucer uses « in-eched » in his *Troilus and Criseyde* (III, 1329) and B. Windeatt has usefully glossed that verb in relation to Chaucer's « encesse and dymynucioun » of his Italian source. See his edition of *Troilus and Criseyde*, London and New York, 1984, p. 4-II.

calculated choices of detail, he calls for comparisons between this story and others related to it in the poem<sup>19</sup>.

In fact, the episode of the Judgment of Paris, *as the poet tells it*, together with the consequent story of Menelaus's revenge, frames the poem as a whole. But if we are to understand just how Paris's Judgment functions in the *Eneas*, we must first recognize precisely how the poet has shaped the tale. Instead of following any of the available, well-known, allegorizing commentaries on the Judgment, the poet gives a straightforward « historical » version, one which, as I have shown else-where, he could have found in much the same form in contemporary marginal glosses<sup>20</sup>.

In the *Eneas-poet's* rendering, the story is as follows :

While the three goddesses, Venus, Juno, and Pallas are together in a « parlement », Discordia throws a golden apple into their midst on which are inscribed Greek words saying that she will make a gift of the apple to the most beautiful of the three. A great « tençon » arises among the goddesses and they go to seek Paris, who is in a woods, in order to have him judge who should win the apple. Paris cannily awaits bribes from each of them and he is not disappointed. Juno promises that she will give him more (in possessions) than his father has and will make him a « riche home » (v. 137-44). Pallas promises him : « hardemant / et ... pris de chevalerie » (v. 145-53). And Venus proffers : « la plus bele fame del mont » (v. 158-61). Paris, faced with the choice of « richece », « proëce », and « la fame », elects « what pleased him most » - namely the most beautiful wife/woman whom the poet immediately identifies as Helen.

I summarize the Judgment as the *Eneas-poet* presents it not only because it conforms in *nearly* every respect with contemporary marginal glosses on the *Aeneid* but also because it differs in small but significant ways from them. First of all, the story in the *Eneas* differs, in the particular

---

<sup>19</sup> As D. Poirion has rightly pointed out, *cf.* « L'écriture épique : du sublime au symbole » art. cit., p. x), Virgil had already suggested an identification between Paris and Aeneas in his relationship with Dido (*Aeneid* 4. 215-17). But the *Eneas-poet* greatly elaborates this connection. In observing how he uses one story to frame and illuminate another, we discover, among other things, a structural technique which was to play an important part in the subsequent history of romance. Certainly any twelfth-century schoolboy studying classical poetry in glossed manuscripts would have been accustomed to reading various mythological and historical narratives - texts and explanatory glosses - in conjunction with each other. But the *Eneas-poet* adapts that central habit of reading to a significant artistic purpose.

<sup>20</sup> B. Nolan, « The Judgment of Paris in the *Roman d'Eneas* : A New Look at Sources and Significance », *Classical Bulletin*, n°56 (1980), p. 52-56.

combination of elements presented, from every other version I have been able to discover<sup>21</sup>. Secondly, the poet's choice of one key detail - Pallas's bribe - suggests that he may have combined a standard gloss on the *Aeneid* - one containing the golden apple, the inscription, Paris in the woods, and the bribes of the goddesses - with an element drawn from Ovid's *Heroides* 16, Paris's letter of courtship to Helen<sup>22</sup>. In most *Aeneid*-losses contemporary with our poem, Pallas Athena offers Paris « *scientia* » or

---

<sup>21</sup> E. Faral, « Le récit du jugement de Paris dans l'*Eneas* », *Romania*, n°41, 1912, p. 100-102 was the first to explore the sources of the *Eneas-poet's* Judgment story. He argued that the *Eneas-account* combines details from Hyginus with the commentary by Donatus. And he hypothesized that the poet must have used a medieval source which combined the traditions represented by the two ancient commentaries. Most scholars, including Huchet, follow Faral. (For Huchet's discussion, see *Le roman médiéval*, *op. cit.*, p. 40-41). In fact, as I have shown elsewhere, the Norman poet's account is close to that of the first Vatican Mythographer and also to glosses to be found in contemporary *Aeneid* MSS, for example, in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS. Lat. 7930, fol. 57v, and Vatican MS. Reg. Lat. 1563, fol. 35v. I have not been able to find all of the details in the *Eneas-version* given together in a single gloss. BN MS. Lat. 7930 includes the details of the golden apple, the inscription, and Paris in the woods, but the gift of Pallas is different. Juno offers *regna* and Venus, a *mulier* of great beauty, but Minerva (Pallas) promises *omnes artes*, probably following the same tradition as the first Vatican Mythographer (whose Minerva offers *omnium artium scientiam*). MS. Vat. Reg. Lat. 1563 has the golden apple and the inscription but the gloss does not locate Paris in the woods, and Pallas's gift differs. Juno offers the bribe of *regnum* and Venus, *pulcherimam feminam*, but Minerva promises *pulchritudinem textri et operis*.

<sup>22</sup> Of course, it is also possible that the *Eneas-poet* had ready to hand a gloss on *Aeneid* 1.24-26 which combined elements from the usual account (well-typified in the story given in Vatican Mythographer 1) with those represented by Ovid and Hyginus. Interestingly enough, we can find a parallel example of this combination in the twelfth-century gloss on *Heroides* 16 recently edited by R. J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum*, *op. cit.* As Hexter says p. 282, n. 226 : « Unusually, the compiler has created his own version of the introduction to this letter. » His story, placed at the beginning of *Heroides* 16, corresponds to the accounts most common in *Aeneid*-glosses, though it, like the passage in the *Eneas*, includes details from Ovid's version. He tells the story of the golden apple, the inscription, and the goddesses' *litigium*. Then, he gives as the bribes *regnum*, *gloriam*, *uel ut quidam dicunt sapientiam*, and *amorem pull[chre] coniugis*. In his account, the bribes of all three goddesses correspond to those offered in Ovid's letter, though *gloriam* does not translate *virtutem* but is rather the reward of *virtutem*. When the glossator wavers, however, between *gloriam* and *sapientiam* in relation to Pallas's bribe, he seems to be torn between the more common attribution of *sapientia* or *scientia artium* to Pallas and a version of the bribe Ovid mentions.

*sapientia*, whether this knowledge is of things or of the arts<sup>23</sup>. By contrast, the *Eneas-poet* seems to follow Ovid in making the gift of Pallas « hardemant » and « de chevalerie. In fact, his « hardemant » precisely translates Ovid's « virtutem » in *Heroides* 16<sup>24</sup>. The bribe he selects for Pallas appears to have been chosen from among several available versions because it served the poem's particular argument<sup>25</sup>. As at other points in the *Eneas* as a « translatio », this choice reflects an intimate knowledge of primary texts - not only the *Aeneid* but also Ovid's love poems - as well as the poet's impressive independence in adapting their *matière* to his own *sen*. In effect, this choice of Pallas's bribe, like his poem as a whole, represents the author's own inventive narrative commentary on his classical sources and their standard glosses.

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. note 21.

<sup>24</sup> The poet might, however, have drawn the same detail from some version of the story derived from the tradition of Hyginus whose Pallas offers Paris skill in every craft as well as the possibility of being the bravest of mortals. Yet, Ovid seems, on the face of it, to be a more direct and exact source. If I am right in taking *Heroides* 16 to be the Norman poet's source, then it may also be possible that Pallas's « pris de chevalerie » is a translation of the *gloriam* which we find in a twelfth-century marginal gloss on *Heroides* 16. Glory or reputation is here recognized as the necessary corollary for *virtus* or « hardemant ». Of the two scribes who provided glosses for the *Heroides*, identified by Hexter in MS. Clm 19475 as T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>. T<sub>1</sub> wavers between *gloriam*, suggested by Ovid's *virtutem*, and the bribe of *sapientia* commonly given in *Aeneid* glosses (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS. Clm 19475, fol. 22r ; R. J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum, op. cit.*, p. 282). By contrast, T<sub>2</sub> rejects Ovid's text and prefers the common reading, *sapientiam* (Clm 19475, fol. 29v; *Ibidem*, p. 283).

Another detail of some interest is the Norman poet's location of Paris in a « bois ». While most accounts do not specify his whereabouts at the moment the goddesses seek him, Ovid explains that he is in the *nemorosae vallibus ladae*. While the similarity is a slight one and might certainly derive from a marginal gloss rather than Ovid, it is tempting to suppose that the poet adapted the specific locus of the « woods » from the classical love-poet to lend his account verisimilitude. (He also makes his Paris skilled in law and shows him to be ingenious in playing with the vanity of the goddesses.) Dares, in his *De excidio Troiae*, also gives an account of Paris's Judgment. His tale closely follows Ovid's version, and he locates Paris in *Ida silva* (*De excidio Troiae Historia*, éd. F. O. Meister, Leipzig, 1873, p. 9). Unlike Ovid, however, Dares does not provide the details of all three bribes but only describes Venus's gift.

<sup>25</sup> In his article, De l'«Énéide à l'Eneas» : mythologie et moralization », art.cit., p.215, D. Poirion writes of this choice : « *L'Eneas* apporte donc une conception originale de Pallas, ou se reflète la mentalité de la caste militaire dirigeante par opposition à l'orientation religieuse du commentateur. » While it is clear that the poet's conception was not, in fact, original, Poirion is right to suggest that the *Eneas-poet*, unlike Fulgentius or Bernard Silvestris, is aiming for a thoroughly secular use of the Judgment story.

But what lesson does the *Eneas-poet's Judgment* story suggest? How does it illuminate the wrong done to Menelaus? And how does it set a thematic direction for the rest of the poem? The text does not spell out the poet's *sen* directly, but when we turn to medieval commentaries on *Heroides* 16, we find clear guidance for understanding his precise point. Two emphases in these glosses deserve our close attention. First of all, the commentators, closely following Ovid's text, stress Paris's *exclusive* choice of a beautiful wife because he has been « captus » by love. As the second glossator of MS. Clm 19475 puts it : *itaque pulch[re] coniugis amore captus reliquarum [petitiones (?)] postposuit / et Veneri pomum conuenire iudicauit*<sup>26</sup>. It is this exclusivity - the setting aside of other important values for the sake of love - that the *Eneas-poet* will take as a major theme as he goes on to develop the poem's other love affairs. Paris prefers the love of a beautiful wife to the two other goods offered by the goddesses - *proëce* and *richece* - goods which ought to be dear to the heart of a twelfth-century prince. In the poet's argument, *because* the Trojan prince allows pleasure and an exclusive desire for one good over two others to rule him, he steals Helen.

Secondly, one glossator of MS. Clm 19475 understands Ovid's intention in Paris's Heroidian letter to be the condemnation of someone who interferes with a legitimate marriage : *digna est reprehensione qui legitimum [amorem] adulterauit*<sup>27</sup>. By the way he shapes his prologue, the *Eneas-poet* likewise emphasizes Paris's disruption of a royal marriage, an act that is both treacherous and illicit<sup>28</sup>. It is this concern that explains his sharp focus on Menelaus's vengeance in relation to his « moillier » in the poem's first twenty-four lines. What matters is that Paris (misusing *angin* and *savoir*) sets *richece* and *proece* aside for the sake of illicit sexual delight, and he thereby interferes not only with a legitimate marriage but also the perpetuation of a dynasty. The opening one hundred eighty-two lines of the *Eneas* provide, then, an introductory exemplum, preparing the way

---

<sup>26</sup> Clm. 19475, fol. 22r ; R. J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum*, op. cit., p. 282. Hexter suggests the word « petitiones » as a likely reading for the obviously corrupt *spetiones* (p. 286). I follow Hexter's distinction between the first and second scribe of Clm 19475 (p. 164-70).

<sup>27</sup> This part of the gloss is contributed by T, (Clm 19475, fol. 22v ; R. J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum*, op. cit., p. 283).

<sup>28</sup> In at least one later gloss on the *Heroides*, the commentator argues that Ovid's intention was to condemn both treachery and illegitimate love : *Intentio auctoris est paridem de proditione et illicito amore reprehendere* (Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana MS. XXXVI, 27 [14<sup>th</sup> c.] fol. 30<sup>r</sup>).

for a far fuller study of the same lessons about royal *mesure* and legitimate love, negatively presented, in the story of Dido.

II. When we first encounter Dido in the *Eneas*, we learn that she is an ideal « feme » - a word used to mean both woman and wife in the poem. She is also an ideal ruler : « unc ne fu mais par une feme / mielz maintenu enor ne regne [...] Sicheus ot a non ses sire » (v. 379-80 ; 383). According to the poet's subsequent description of her (v. 403-404), Dido had ruled Carthage precisely « par sa *richece*, / par son angin, par sa *proëce*. » By these means, he says, she held the whole country and the barons in submission to her. In twelfth-century terms (and in the terms of the poem), she had attained a perfect equilibrium or *mesure* in the management of her realm. Moreover, we are made immediately aware, because of the repetition of the words *richece* and *proëce*, that this balance involves just those values represented by Juno and Pallas in Paris's Judgment.

In addition, Dido has been a loyal, chaste wife, even in the face of her « sire » Sicheus's death. Confiding to her sister Anna her new passion for Eneas, she gives the poem's first full definition of good married love (v. 1304-1320). Dido's ardent defense of loyalty to her dead husband, which follows Virgil in most of its details, serves to complete the poet's initial portrait of the successful Carthaginian (and medieval) queen. In our first acquaintance with her, she is a perfect example of political, social, and moral « mesure », a balance which includes chaste married love. But, as everyone knows, this initial model of political power (*proëce*), noble possessions (*richece*), and loyal married love in the *Eneas* fails in the face of passion. The author shows how Dido's resolve is undone by obsessive love - which the poet identifies as « foolish ». For him, the word « foolish » is essential to his study of Dido, and foolishness is one of the key qualities he assigns to her love in the epitaph he writes for her tombstone.

The epitaph, which the poet may well have modeled on Ovid's *Heroides* 7 (195-96), reports the fatal judgment that Dido, like Paris, had made<sup>29</sup> :

« la letre dit que : “Iluec gist  
Dido qui por am or s'ocist ;  
onques ne fu meillor paiene,

---

<sup>29</sup> E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge*, op. cit., p. 114 and 114 n. 3) is certainly right in suggesting that the Eneas-poet's interest in epitaphs derives from Ovid, and particularly from the *Heroides*. No doubt, the French writer models Dido's epitaph on the one given at the end of her Ovidian epistle to Aeneas, though Faral also points us to *Heroides* 14.129 (p. 114). But, of course, the *Eneas-poet* alters the Ovidian

s'ele n'eüst amor soltaine,  
 mais ele ama trop folemant,  
 savoir ne li valut noiant. »

(v. 2138-2144)

As the tombstone declares for all posterity, Dido loved « trop folemant ». When we seek to understand what the words « foolish / foolishly » mean in the poet's depiction of Dido's love, the *Heroides* and their twelfth-century commentaries once again prove helpful. Yet, as usual, the *Eneas-poet* also provides his own original gloss on his classical source. In *Heroides* 7, Dido, accusing Aeneas of ingratitude and deafness to her feeling, calls herself *stulta* (7.28). Virgil never uses the word *stultus* to describe Dido's love. Yet, it is precisely the Ovidian Dido's characterization of herself as *stulta* that seems to have led medieval commentators, generalizing from Ovid's text, to argue that Dido in *Heroides* 7 exemplifies *stultus amans*. She is foolish, so one twelfth-century commentator suggests, because she fell in love with someone whose destiny it was to leave her. As Ralph Hexter concludes, the glossator locates a paraphrase of *Heroides* 7.11-12 just after his explanation of Ovid's intention in the letter as a whole in order to clarify the meaning of *stultus*. Dido is « foolish, because like Phyllis, [she] has placed her love in a man 'certain' to go away<sup>30</sup>. This is precisely the emphasis Ovid had given to his Virgilian materials, and it is one that enters centrally into the *Eneas-poet*'s depiction of Dido's love<sup>31</sup>.

The *Eneas-poet*'s translation of « *stultus* » into « *fole* » follows usual Late Latin and early vernacular practice. The *word fole*, from Late *Latin follis*, meaning literally « inflated balloon », was regularly taken as a synonym for *stultus*<sup>32</sup>. When the Norman poet, like Ovid, identifies his Dido as a « foolish » lover, however, his definition goes beyond the classical poet's as

---

<sup>30</sup> Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS. elm 19475, fol. 25v ; R. J. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum*, op. cit., p. 256. The glossator evidently concentrated on her foolishness rather than the illegitimate aspect of her love because he perceived the Ovidian Dido's emphasis on the difference between her feeling and Aeneas's. This is how Hexter reads the gloss and his suggestion seems reasonable ; *Ibidem*, p. 183 and 183, n. 105).

<sup>31</sup> Long ago, Edmond Faral suggested that the *Eneas-poet* drew his idea about the 'inequity of love' from Ovid and he pointed particularly to *Amores* 1. While this important poem may well have contributed to the later poet's depiction of Dido reflecting on her lost love, *Heroides* 7 seems to me a more direct, specific source, and one more helpful in understanding Dido's thematic function in the *Eneas*. E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge*, op. cit., p. 148-149 and *Eneas. A Twelfth-Century French Romance*, New York, 1974, p.

<sup>32</sup> See Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, t. IV, p. 540-541.

well as the glossator's. Dido's own view of her foolishness in the *Eneas* is close to that of her counterpart in *Heroides* 7 and to the twelfth-century commentator's. But the poet also shapes the description of her love as foolish in such a way that it prepares for his later important definition of true, good, mutual love in Lavine. In addition, he develops two other senses of « fole amor », one of which is moral and the other political. And all three meanings of « foolishness » in love - Dido's as well as his own - participate in his large exploration of good and bad, legitimate and illegitimate love for medieval rulers.

Let us turn first to the Norman Dido's Ovidian conception of her folly. In a long monologue of self-assessment, the bereft queen analyzes her love in terms that will stand in systematic contrast to Lavine's ideal of mutual love in the last part of the poem. She has, she says, been « fole » (v. 1814) because her lover does not share her feelings (v. 1823) :

« molt par sui fole ;  
 [...]
 Nos sentons molt diversement :  
 ge muir d'amor, il ne s'en sent,  
 il est en pes, ge ai les mals ;  
 amors n'est pas vers moi loials,  
 quant ne senton comunament.  
 Se il sentist ce que ge sent,  
 qu'il amast moi si com ge lui,  
 ne partisson ja mes andui. »

(v. 1814 ; 1823-1830)

In designing this important speech, the poet seems to be offering his own loss on the Ovidian Dido's view of her love in *Heroides* 7. As Ovid's distraught heroine addresses an absent Aeneas in her letter, she declares : *Ille quidem male gratus et ad mea munera surdus et quo, si non sim stulta, carere velim*<sup>33</sup>. (7.27-28 ; emphasis mine)

The Norman Dido's « molt par sui fole » seems to be a direct translation of Ovid's *si non sim stulta*, though she alters Aeneas's Ovidian deafness to her, declaring instead, « ne ne torna vers moi son oil » (v. 1817). But her point is the same as the Ovidian Dido's : Her Eneas does not pay attention to or share her feeling.

In sum, in the Ovidian Dido's assessment of her situation, we may find the Norman poet's inspiration for his thematically central conception of

---

<sup>33</sup> References to the *Heroides* in this essay are to the edition by H. P. Dörrie, *Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum*, Berlin and New York, 1971.

his own Dido as a « foolish » lover. As her epitaph puts it, the Carthaginian queen loved « trop folement » because she involved herself in « amor soltaine » (v. 2142). The word « soltaine » is crucially important in the epitaph and, at least in one of its senses, it clearly describes the one-sidedness of Dido's love as Ovid had represented it in the *Heroides*<sup>34</sup>. It also bears, however, on the queen's failure as a ruler.

In the poet's larger political argument, Dido's love has excluded two other worldly goods appropriate for rulers – *richece* and *proëce*. The single word « soltaine » seems to cover at once the lack of mutuality in Dido's love for Eneas and the exclusivity of her love, its obliteration of her duties as queen<sup>35</sup>. If the Norman Dido's own Ovidian assessment of her love as foolish is personal and concerns a lack of mutual feelings, the *Eneas-poet* also considers her folly from two different angles, one of which is medieval in inspiration, the other Virgilian. First of all, he provides a moral framework within which to judge all such loves, one that seems to owe as much to medieval clerical attitudes about youthful passion as it does to Ovid's *Remedia amoris* and *Heroides*. His broad moral conception of such love (and his implied definition of folly) is epitomized in a single line of generalizing commentary on Dido's grief: « amors nen a sens ne mesure » (v. 1882). Moreover, the poet directly opposes this lack of sense and measure to wisdom. As he says of Dido in the midst of her passion: « ne set qu'el dit ne qu'ele fait ; // [tot pert le sens et la parole, / Amor l'a fait de sage fole.] » (v. 1406-1408)<sup>36</sup>.

---

<sup>34</sup> The meaning of « amor soltaine » has been usefully studied by Raymond Cormier, who examines Dido's anti-communal love in relation to ideas of community in the *Eneas*. Community in the poem, frequently expressed through the adverb « comunement », has, as Cormier observes, « a quasi-feudal » connotation of « inter- dependence, unanimity, or solidarity of will, act, or opinion »; see R. J. Cormier, *One Heart One Mind: The Rebirth of Virgil's Hero in Medieval French Romance*, op. cit., p. 135; and « *Comunement* and *Soltaine* in the *Eneas* », *Romance Notes*, 14 (1972), p. 1-8).

<sup>35</sup> In Ovid's *Heroides* (16. 165 ff.) Paris expresses his choice as comparably exclusive: *Praeposui regnis ego te, quae maxima quondam pollicita est nobis nupta sororque Iovis, dumque tuo possem circumdare brachia collo, contempta est virtus Pallade dante mihi*. This passage is rich in suggestion for the *Eneas-poet's* treatment of exclusive and communal love. As Paris chooses love for Venus, moreover, he also names the other two gifts (*regnis* and *virtus*) which he, like the twelfth-century Paris, has passed up.

<sup>36</sup> The bracketed lines do not appear in mss. A or B. (See J.-J. Salverda de Grave, *Eneas*, éd. cit., vol. 2, p. 150.) But their sense is implied by the preceding lines, whether or not they were part of the poet's original argument. This is an opposition, of course, which one also finds in the Old French Epic tradition. See, for example, the *Chanson de Roland*, 229: « Laissons les fols, as sages nos tenons. » The *Eneas-poet*, and after him Benoit de Sainte-Maure,

But the *Eneas-poet* does not *simply* oppose wisdom and folly in an abstract way. He considers the ramifications of foolish love in relation to political responsibility. And, in this interest, he clearly follows Virgil rather than Ovid, though his Virgil is distinctly medievalized.

According to the poem's most pressing and most fully developed argument about love, Dido is foolish not so much because Eneas loved his destiny more than he loved her but because she has failed to balance her love in relation to her other responsibilities, and specifically her *proëce* and her *richece*<sup>37</sup>. In addition, in her failure, she rejects the « *savoir* » and « *angin* » which had won her the rule of Carthage in the first place<sup>38</sup>. Once she has succumbed to her passion, the poet hastens to outline the dire political consequences of her foolishness :

« molt soloit bien terre tenir  
 et bien soloit guerre baillir,  
 or a tot mis an nonchaloir  
 et an obli par non savoir.  
 Amors li a fait oblier  
 terre a tenir et a garder. »

(1409-1414)<sup>39</sup>

Furthermore, Dido has become wanton, embraced *luxuria*, given up her good name. And, through her folly, her subjects have learned a medieval clerkly lesson about foolishness<sup>40</sup> :

---

transferring these categories to questions of love, established a very popular framework in later medieval fiction for studying foolish love in opposition to wise conduct.

<sup>37</sup> Interestingly enough, in *Heroides* 16, when Paris is explaining how he has placed (*praeposui*) her before the bribes of Juno and Pallas, he uses the word « *stulte* » to argue that he will never regard his choice of Venus's bribe as « foolish » (*Her.* 16. 165-69).

<sup>38</sup> « *Savoir* », which occupies the poet's attention not only in relation to Dido but also to Paris, Eneas, Turnus, and Lavine, is very often named, in medieval manuscript margins, as the bribe of Pallas in Paris's Judgment. This fact raises an interesting question as to whether, at some point in the compositional process, the *Eneas-poet* may likewise have had his Pallas offer « *savoir* » as her bribe. In any case, though he has made her bribe « *hardemant* » in his account of the Judgment, « *savoir* » is shown to be a necessary virtue for good rulers.

<sup>39</sup> Virgil likewise notes Dido's negligence of her political responsibilities (*Aeneid* 4.86-89). But the *Eneas-poet* highlights her neglect, giving it a central place in his description of Dido and Eneas in love ; he also links it by verbal repetition to Paris's Judgment and to Lavine's final vindicating « *judgment* » of Eneas.

<sup>40</sup> Virgil, too, makes an antifeminist argument about Dido through Mercury, who urges Aeneas to follow his destiny because *semper varium et mutabile femina [est]* (4.569-70). The *Eneas-poet* as narrator makes a comparable judgment, hut one that has to do with the welfare of the kingdom.

« Antr'els dient, et si ont droit,  
molt par est fous qui feme croit :  
ne se tient prou an sa parolle ;  
tel tient l'en sage qui est fole. »

(v. 1589-1592)

To summarize his medievalized Virgilian political argument about Dido, the poet invites us, two thousand lines after Paris's Judgment, to observe how her choice of foolish love - her « judgment » - recapitulates Paris's :

« Grant duel demoinent anviron  
ses pucelles et si baron ;  
formant regretent sa *proëce*  
et son *savoir* et sa *richece*. »

(v. 2125-2128 ; emphasis mine)<sup>41</sup>

After her body has been ceremonially burnt, her subjects recall her « *proëce* », her « *savoir* », and her « *richece* », all of which she, a great ruler, has given up for love.

Moreover, when Dido finds herself in the underworld after her suicide, she does not dare approach Sicheus because : « *li avoit mentie / la foi qu'elli avoit plevie* » (v. 2657-2658). As the *Eneas-poet* alters his Virgilian original, he powerfully epitomizes one of his most important themes : Dido has earned eternal shame because, in her foolish love, she has betrayed her legitimate husband. In this regard, the Norman poet is giving his own medieval political definition of « *stultus* » or « *foolish* » love as opposed to legitimate married love. This opposition, which is systematically rather than casually developed in the poem, seems to derive neither from Virgil nor from Ovid, but rather from medieval commentaries on Ovid's *Heroides* ; it also anticipates the *Eneas-poet's* concluding positive study of Lavine in her good, honest love for the Trojan hero. As one twelfth-century gloss describes Ovid's intention in the *Heroides* :

« His intention is to commend legitimate marriage or love, and he treats of this love in a threefold way : namely, of legitimate, of illicit, and of foolish (love) - of legitimate, through Penelope ; of illicit, through Canace ; of foolish, through Phyllis. But these two parts, namely foolish and illicit, he includes not for their own sake but for the sake of commending the third, and thus by commending legitimate (love), he condemns foolish and illicit.... The final cause is this, that, having seen the usefulness that

---

<sup>41</sup> It is possible that here the poet, concerned not only with Dido's *proëce* and *richece* but also her *savoir*, is coalescing two traditions concerning Pallas's gifts, as they are also coalesced by the twelfth-century commentator on the *Heroides*. See note 24 above.

proceeds from legitimate and the misfortunes that are accustomed to follow from foolish and illicit, we may flee both of these and adhere only to chaste (love). »<sup>42</sup>

Ovid might well have balked at so neat and moral a summary of his letters. Moreover, he might have been surprised to learn that the epistles could all be construed as a series of juxtaposed *exempla* pointing finally to the same simple moral lesson. Yet, medieval schoolteachers clearly taught the *Heroides* as a collection of intentionally juxtaposed, contrastive studies dramatizing either good, legitimate love or illicit or foolish love. Through such calculated *exempla*, they suggest, Ovid aimed to warn his readers against destructive, illicit relationships.

In a parallel way, the *Eneas-poet* uses the stories of Paris and Dido to exemplify the nature as well as the unfortunate consequences of illegitimate and foolish love. Then, in the last long segment of his poem, he introduces a counter-example. If Paris and Dido exemplify illicit and « fole » love driven by exclusive, unbalanced, private desire, the *Eneas-poet* uses the last movement of his poem to provide a third, corrective example in his close, celebratory study of Lavine's courtship and marriage. Instead of preferring love alone, as Paris and Dido have done, Lavine and Eneas enter into a social, politically suitable love. They manage to balance the demands of *proëce* and *richece* with those of love. Lavine accepts a love which takes its place beside her beloved's political responsibilities. As she says, following her imaginary trial of Eneas, her husband will rule during the day (in his public role as king) and she will rule at night (in the matter of love) [v. 9867-9868]. The result of such balance or measure is a love relationship no less powerful than Paris and Helen's, as the poet insists near the poem's end. But this love will issue in a legitimate marriage in which Eneas is king, Lavine, queen. Moreover, it is a love that will produce offspring and thereby insure the political stability of the kingdom<sup>43</sup>.

---

<sup>42</sup> MS. Clm 19475 (fol. r<sup>o</sup>; R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores. Bernard of Utrecht ; Conrad of Hirsau. Dialogus super auctores, op. cit.*, p. 30 : *Intentio sua est legitimum commendare conubium vel amorem, et secundum hoc triplici modo tractat de ipso amore, scilicet de legitimo, de illicito et stulto. de legitimo per Penolopen, de illicito per Canacen, de stulto per Phillidem. Sed has duas partes, scilicet stulti et illiciti, non causa ipsarum, verum gratia illius tercie commendandi interserit, et sic commendando legitimum, stultum et illicitum reprehendit [...] Finalis causa talis est, ut uisa utilitate quae ex legitimo procedit et infortuniis quae ex stulto et illicito solent prosequi, hunc utrumque fugiamus et soli casto adhaereamus.*

<sup>43</sup> R. Blumenfeld-Kosinski, « Old French Narrative Genres : Towards the Definition of the *Roman Antique* », art. cit., Blumenfeld-Kosinski also emphasizes the importance of legitimation and political stability in the poet's argument. See especially p. 157.

III. As I have suggested up to this point, the *Eneas-poet* seems to have turned to Ovid's *Heroides* in developing his first two, negative examples of illicit and foolish love in Paris's Judgment and Dido's one-sided passion for Eneas. We might expect, then, that he would draw in the last part of his poem on those Ovidian epistles celebrating « legitimate » love, as medieval glossators called the chaste married relationships in the *Heroides*. And, indeed, this seems to be the case, at least in a general, theoretical way. As if to improve on Ovid's effort in the *Heroides* in the last segment of the *Eneas* (almost a quarter of the work [v. 7857-10156]), the poet devises his own definition of legitimate love, a definition which is at once Ovidian and anti-Ovidian in character. Although Ovid gives five (or possibly six) examples of married love in his collection of epistles, none offers a systematic, positive model of legitimate love for young would-be royal brides and their suitors<sup>44</sup>. In particular, none of the *Heroides* illustrates directly or simply the differences between illicit or « fole » *amor* and the kind of chaste but also passionate (Ovidian) love suitable for rulers, whether men or women. Yet, to provide such a model seems to have been precisely the task the *Eneas-poet* set himself in the last quarter of his poem. It is as if he were answering medieval schoolmasterly expectations for the *Heroides*, which the Ovidian letters themselves could not fully meet.

The first movement in the poet's study of legitimate love is the famous dialogue between Lavine and her mother - a dialogue which draws heavily, as Faral and others have shown, on Ovidian love theory<sup>45</sup>. « What », Lavine asks, « is love ? » « How will I know it, if I do not hear it discussed ? » « Is it an illness ? » As the mother answers her daughter's questions she neatly summarizes the syndrome of Ovidian love both physical and psychological and she builds the symptoms around an Ovidian image of the God of Love with two darts in one hand, a box signifying his healing power in the other. From her mother's description of love's paradoxically sweet pain, Lavine rightly concludes that anyone who enters into such a condition must be considered « fous » (v. 8012).

As the poem explores Lavine's experience of love, « foolishness » once again becomes a key word. In this instance, however, the author studies the transformation of Ovidian « fole amor » into a passionate love

---

<sup>44</sup> The letters of Penelope (I), Deianira (9), Medea (12), Laodamia (13), and Hypermestra (14) all present wives who are unhappily separated from their legitimate husbands for one reason or another.

<sup>45</sup> E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge*, op. cit., p. 133-150.

consonant with sound political marriage. Most importantly, instead of an absolute opposition between the two kinds of love, legitimate and foolish, good and bad, he argues ingeniously for the possibility of a continuum. Even as he defines Lavine's good love by its systematic contrast to Dido's « *amor soltaine* », he also allows Lavine her erotic attraction to Eneas.

Once Lavine has seen Eneas from her tower window and fallen in love with him, experiencing all that her mother has described, she calls herself « *fole* » (v. 8134 ; v. 8211). But, at the same time, she knows, by a wise intuition granted her by the poet, that the kind of love she feels must be *anti-Ovidian* in its commitment. The movement from Ovidian to anti-Ovidian love in the *Eneas* takes place as Lavine, in the space of fifty lines (v. 8257-8307), considers two opposed definitions of *jole amor*. In her first definition, which she quickly rejects, she calls herself « *fole* » (as Ovid would) because she has committed herself to one lover. If she had not fallen in love with Eneas, then it would not matter whether he or Turnus won the battle for her. If one were killed, she would simply take the other as her lover (v. 8327-8334). This pattern of thought, recognizably Ovidian, is pragmatic and cynical in its tone, duplicitous in character. It also echoes the argument made by Dido's sister, Anna, more than six thousand lines earlier as she advised Dido to give up her « foolish » love (i.e., a chaste, loyal love) for the dead Sicheus in favor of the living Eneas.

As Lavine moves from one conception of foolish *amor* to another, opposite notion, she also revises her (and Anna's) view of folly. Calling herself « *fole* » *because* she had entertained so pragmatic a notion of love, she rejects her own Ovidian analysis of her feeling as foolish in favor of a newly conceived definition of wise erotic love. She knows by intuition that her love must be single and constant, that it cannot be given to more than one man. With a youthful, passionate idealism, she amplifies precisely the notion of faithful love abandoned by Dido much earlier in the poem :

« Puet l'an donc si partir amor ?  
 Or le tiens tu por changeor !  
 Qui bien aime ne puet boiser ;  
 si est leals, ne puet changier ;  
 bone amor vait tot solement  
 d'un sol a autre senglement ;  
 des que l'an velt lo tierz atraire,  
 puis n'i a giens amors que faire.  
 Qui fermement velt bien amer,  
 son compaignon ait et son per ;  
 del tierz apres ne sai ge mie ;

puis sanble ce marcheandie.  
 Rire puet l'an bien a plusors,  
 mais ne sont pas voires amors  
 don l'an apaie dous ou trois ;  
 ne tient d'amor precepz ne lois  
 qui plus que un an velt amer :  
 ne si velt pas amor dobler. »

(v. 8281-8298)

Lavine's clear, simple formulation of faithful single love has no direct precedent in the *Heroides*, though Penelope, whom medieval commentators regularly take to be Ovid's example *par excellence* of legitimate love (*Heroides* 1)<sup>46</sup>, likewise represents her love as single and constant. But Lavine's definition is designed much more directly and systematically than Penelope's letter to counterpoint the counsels to duplicity in the *Ars amatoria*. Above all, Lavine defends fidelity to a single person as a primary requirement for love<sup>47</sup>.

IV. At the beginning of this essay, I suggested that the letter Lavine writes to Eneas after she has fallen in love (v. 8775 ff.) might well be taken as a sign of the poet's interest in the *Heroides*. We must now examine that hypothesis by looking more closely at the epistle as well as its immediate narrative context. First of all, Lavine's letter, like most of the *Heroides*, is by a woman, and a woman who takes the initiative in a matter of love. In addition, its subject is an overpowering passion, which the sender wants to communicate to the recipient. Like many of Ovid's « authors » in the *Heroides*, the *Eneas-poet's* Lavine yearns for assurance from her would-be lover that he shares her feeling.

But there are also important differences between Lavine's letter in the *Eneas* and Ovid's fictive epistles. No letter in the *Heroides* initiates a love that is legitimate. Many of the epistles record the grief occasioned by a separation of lovers, whether they are married or not. And, while the

---

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, the twelfth-century *accessus* quoted above on p. 170 and n. 43.

<sup>47</sup> This defense is made not only by wives but also by lovers in the *Heroides*. Thus Oenone in her letter to Paris (*Heroides* 5) insists that Paris should have remained faithful to her as husbands remain faithful to their wives (5.107-08). She also casts herself as the « chaste » wife of a deceiving husband (133). But Penelope is, according to the medieval commentators, the example *par excellence* of *legitimus amor*. Even if students had not read any of the letters, they would have learned from the schoolmaster's introduction to the *Heroides* that Ovid intended to teach per Penolopen [...] de [...] amore [...] legitime. And without the letters themselves, the *accessus* would have taught students how to think about Ovid's interest in legitimate vs. foolish or illegitimate loves.

exchange of letters between Paris and Helen does begin a love relationship, the relationship is an illicit one. Furthermore, in the *Eneas*-poet's argument, Lavine's letter, unlike Ovid's *Heroides*, is not a fiction but part of a history, and it has a direct effect on the course of that history<sup>48</sup>. Unlike most of the epistles of the *Heroides*, it is actually delivered to its intended recipient, who reads and interprets it. Having tied her letter to a literal arrow (as opposed to Cupid's metaphoric arrow), Lavine has one of her archers shoot her missive to the place where Eneas is standing.

In summarizing the content of Lavine's letter as well as the physical materials she used to compose it, the Norman poet seems to be evoking not only the *Heroides* but also Ovid's several instructions about duplicitous letter-writing in the *Ars amatoria*. In Lavine's composition he implies a set of rules for love-epistles diametrically opposed to Ovid's rules in the *Ars*. As a true lover, she writes a serious, unambiguous letter, one that will affect not only her own life but also the course of political history. Using parchment instead of the wax-tablet Ovid recommends in the *Ars* for safety's sake (messages in wax can be easily erased), she confesses her love for Eneas. Instead of trafficking in « blanditias » as an Ovidian suppliant would, Lavine reveals to her « ami » « tot [...] son talent » (v. 8786)<sup>49</sup>.

In the poet's argument, Eneas actually learns how to love with a mature, single-minded passion only after he has read the letter attached to the arrow (he is wounded not by Cupid's dart but by Lavine's true words of love). As he analyzes her text, he comes to understand the letter-writer's intent. But in order to do so, he must actively reject Ovidian ideas of Cupid's arrow and feminine cunning. The rejection comes by means of the hero's interior dialogue. The Ovidian position of the *Ars amatoria* is richly represented in Eneas's multiple symptoms of passionate love and in his unexamined, self-aggrandizing initial interpretation of Lavine's letter-bearing arrow : « I am wounded to the death » he declares in one of his voices. But another voice in his psyche replies : « You lie ; it fell very far from you. » The second voice also reminds him reasonably enough that the letter has simply assured him of Lavine's love if he wins in battle. Again, in his first voice, he wonders, with an Ovidian cynicism, whether Lavine

---

<sup>48</sup> Most *accessus* to the *Heroides* throughout the later Middle Ages emphasize their fictive character. Ovid, so a twelfth-century glossator puts it, wrote the letters *sub personis illarum grecarum nobilium mulierum* (R. B. C. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores. Bernard of Utrecht ; Conrad of Hirsau. Dialogus super auctores, op. cit., p. 31*).

<sup>49</sup> For Ovid's directions on the art of duplicitous letter-writing for women as well as men, see AA 1.437-58 ; 2.395-96, 543-44 ; 3.469-98, 619-30.

has offered the same love to Turnus as she has to him : « une chose nos fait antandre, / li quels que l'aviegne au prendre, / que ele l'ait aincois arne » (v. 9005-9007). But in his second voice, as he reflects on the content of the letter, Eneas counters with the recognition that Lavine must indeed love him : « ne puet parler d'amor noiant / qui ne aime et qui n'en sent » (v. 9017-9018). Eneas's emergent faith in a true, honest language of love is also the poem's ; moreover, it directly opposes the kinds of rhetorical manipulation advocated for letter writing (and love) in Ovid's *Ars amatoria*.

Finally, Eneas reiterates Lavine's belief that true love must be mutual. Looking back on his relationship with Dido, he compares it with his new experience. Never, he says, would he have left the Carthaginian queen, *if* he had felt towards her what he now feels towards Lavine (v. 9038-9045). This comparison is vital to the poet's vindication of Eneas as a true lover. The wise love he celebrates has a powerful irrational or suprarational component ; at the same time, it also participates fully in rational considerations of social appropriateness and fidelity. In addition, the poet uses Eneas's self-analysis to show the place of legitimate mutual love in relation to the other two aspects of the ruler's life he has been developing - the possession of land (*richece*) and the practice of military courage (*proëce*). For Eneas, unlike Turnus, love animates his attraction for Latium and provides him with the boldness necessary to overcome his enemy (v. 9046-9072)<sup>50</sup>.

Let us turn, in conclusion, to Lavine's imaginary « trial » of Eneas after he has overcome Turnus (v. 9846-10078). Because her beloved does not come to her immediately, she is in anguish and begins to imagine that he does not care for her. In this state, she weighs his worth and examines his love in terms which directly recall the details of Paris's fateful Judgment. A « foolish cause [*fol plait*] I have undertaken », she declares (v. 9847 ; emphasis mine) :

« or avra par unbre de moi  
la terre et lo regne le roi ;  
se il an a tote l'enor,  
molt li sera po de m'amor. »

(v. 9849-9852)

---

<sup>50</sup> Turnus, by contrast, is legalistic ; concerned with his promised inheritance, he seems to regard Lavine not for herself but for her father's land. Indeed, in terms of expressed affection in the poem, he appears to care more for the great woman-warrior, Camille, than for his fiancée.

But Lavine is wise enough to argue the other side of the case as well. If Eneas conquers the world during the day, he will conquer her at night (v. 9868). Furthermore, the barons would never grant him her lands if Eneas did not want her as his wife. In effect, she acquits Eneas, concluding that he will balance well the demands of *richece*, *proëce*, and *amor*.

The poem's concluding scene - the marriage and coronation of Eneas and Lavine - offers a final, celebratory judgment on the moral character of the good prince. Eneas receives Latinus's « realme », his « enor », and his « fille ». Musical instruments sound and all are delighted. The narrator's comment on the joyful scene returns us explicitly to Paris's Judgment and makes a telling comparison :

« Unques Paris n'ot graignor joie,  
quant Eloine tint dedanz Troie,  
qu'Eneas ot, quant tint s'amie  
en Laurente. »

(v.10109-10112)

And, in a swift concluding summary, the narrator assures his audience that Eneas proved a good king. He builds Albe, a city « riche » and « granz ». Unlike Dido, he never abandons the kingdom he has won through « proëce ». When he dies, his son, Ascanius, succeeds him. The rule then descends « d'oir an oir » until Romulus and Remus found the city of Rome.

V. Critics who have puzzled over the artistry of the *Eneas* have not always found reason for praise. As Charles Muscatine says of it : « Apart from being by turns heroic and erotic, the poem appears to have no theme [...] There is no relation between Eneas in love and Eneas at war. The Dido episode, which itself contains some moving poetry, does not shed light on the rest of the poem. »<sup>51</sup> Yet, if we examine closely the poet's « in-echings » of Ovidian materials in his reworking of Virgil, the poem's elegantly logical composition becomes apparent. The architectural balances and harmonies of the *Eneas* are to be found not in the linear narrative but rather in a skillful, almost mechanical juxtaposition of judgments on the problem of secular love in relation to political responsibility. The poem as a whole poses just those questions of balance and reason concerning *richece*, *proëce*, and *amor* which the poet first raises by recounting Paris's fateful, disastrous decision in the goddesses' *tençon*. Dido's choice of

---

<sup>51</sup> Charles Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition*, Berkeley, 1957, p. 13.

Ovidian « foolish » love is then juxtaposed with Paris's Judgment on one side, Lavine's on the other, to exemplify the differences between « stultus » and « illicitus » love and the kind of « castus amor » suitable for contemporary royal lovers. As I have argued in this essay, the poet seems to have drawn his moral scheme from medieval commentaries on the *Heroides* and many of his details from Ovid's amatory works, including particularly *Heroides* 7 and 16. Indeed, as far as I can determine, the *Eneas-poet* was the first vernacular writer to « enclose » the medievalized *Heroides* in an extended, artfully composed vernacular fiction. But he has transformed his Ovidian materials for his own purposes. The result is a subtly crafted guidebook for medieval princes and princesses on the nature and art of sound political love and marriage.

Barbara NOLAN



## COWARD, TRAITOR, LANDLESS TROJAN : ÆNEAS AND THE POLITICS OF SODOMY

Coming to terms with sodomy in Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneas roman* means defining the ulterior motives of Lavinia's mother<sup>1</sup>. It is the queen who brings up this unsavoury accusation, and when she does so, it is politically motivated. She tries to persuade first her husband and then her daughter that Æneas is unqualified to become Lavinia's husband and thus successor to the old king, a new king of reliable longevity, and the father of a dynasty of future kings.

This marks a significant change from the source. In Virgil's *Æneid*, Amata's arguments are part of an entire sequence of tirades directed against Æneas, and they are proportionally small and insignificant in comparison to those of Iarbas, Turnus, or Numanus, the male mouthpieces of the opposing camps<sup>2</sup>. The *Roman d'Eneas*, however, and Veldeke in its wake, assigns considerably more weight to the Amata figure<sup>3</sup>. Although the medieval authors preserved the depiction of the mother's fury which can be found in Virgil, they did not preserve the divine – pagan – background story. Eliminating both Juno as the cause of the mother's fury and Allecto as its means exposes the queen's behavior as extreme and entirely unmotivated. The arguments have remained largely identical, but the deletion of the pagan realm of divine interference demonizes the mother to a much larger extent. This is even more so as the speeches of Iarbas, Turnus, and Numanus have practically disappeared from the text, and thus the queen's efforts to discredit the protagonist stand alone. Placing Veldeke's romance into the larger context of Virgilian reception history, a comparison to the *Æneid*'s medieval Latin reworkings as well as its translation into Anglo-Norman will reveal categorical differences between the Old French text and its Middle High German translation, including changes with regard to argument, structure, and

---

<sup>1</sup> H. von Veldeke, *Eneasroman*, (ed. and trans.) D. Kartschoke, nach dem Text von Ludwig Ettmüller, Stuttgart, 1986.

<sup>2</sup> Vergil, *Æneis. Lateinisch und deutsch*, (ed.) J. and M. Götte, Kempten, 1965.

<sup>3</sup> *Le Roman d'Eneas*, (ed. and trans.) M. Schöler-Beinhauer, Munich, 1972.

motivation. What Lavinia's mother tells her daughter, how she says it, and to what purpose she does so shed light on Heinrich von Veldeke's unique characterization of a hero whom history has squarely positioned between *pietas*, exemplary loyalty, and *zagnisse*, the cowardice of a man who betrays his family and his country in moments of crisis.

In the *Roman d'Enéas*, the queen mainly has Lavinia's marital bliss at heart. She wants to spare her daughter a life of constant competition with the young men at Æneas's court, wooing his favors, his love, and - as the queen would have it - his erotic interest. Heinrich von Veldeke, on the other hand, strategically revises his source by eliminating the queen's sexually explicit and, as it seems, categorically confused examples for sodomy. He even retracts the term itself. Æneas's alleged misbehavior is something « *waz her mit den mannen tût* », (v. 10648) something « *he does with the men* », but limiting its reading to same-sex desire would be seriously missing the point of a romance which is so highly politically charged. After all, the teleological culmination of the *Eneasroman* is the foundation of Rome.

Against Veldeke's drastic changes, the two arguments he does adopt from the Anglo-Norman text gain an entirely different character. One of them is the protagonist's abandonment of Dido. This would constitute a particularly unsuitable illustration of Æneas's sodomitical desire, if one were to read it as gay or the medieval equivalent thereof. Secondly, the queen describes the threat that an attitude like his would pose to the survival of all mankind. By linking these originally separate examples, Heinrich transforms Dido into the prototypical abandoned woman and barren mother. When Æneas deserts her without providing her with a « *kindelin* » (v. 2192), Dido, her dynasty, and ultimately Carthage herself are destined for extinction. The queen's direct comparison between Dido and Lavinia reveals her true concern : Accusing Æneas of sodomy means branding him as unwilling to procreate and hence unfit to be king. In other words : The queen's concern is politics, not sexuality.

First, a closer look at the Old French passages. What the queen has been arguing against is a repetition of the Trojan debacle. In her rendition of the Fall of Troy, she casts Æneas as a second Paris, Lavinia as a second Helena, and their courtship as a repetition of the *raptus*, an unlawful union against the interests of the woman and her family. What is certain to follow, so the mother claims, is a second Trojan war, this time in Latium, with the same disastrous results. So why not take the other candidate, Turnus, « *ki forment t'aime* » (v. 7883) instead of Æneas, « *ki a force te claime* » (v. 7884) ? The parallel construction of these lines brings the two

men in antithetical opposition : one loves Lavinia with all his heart, the other one claims her by force.

Meanwhile, Lavinia has fallen in love with Æneas, and the mother has to change her strategy of argumentation. The competition she is talking about now has become much more existential. The question is not « Turnus or Æneas ? » any more. The question now is : « Man or Woman ? » Lavinia's part has been transformed from that of a lady who can pick and choose the man she loves into one of the competing parties. She is directly included in the competition now as the future queen who has to defend her position against the courtiers in Æneas's immediate environment<sup>4</sup>. This re-versal, per-version, is being verbalized by the mother when she says to her : « ses tu *vers* cui tu t'es donnee ? / Cil *cuiverz* est de tel nature / qu'il n'a guaires de femme cure » (v. 8566-8568).

The queen expands on her allegations with the help of five arguments :

1. Rather than chasing the *bische*, the female deer, Æneas prefers male meat (v. 8570-8571)
2. He does not know how to enter through the narrow passageway, the *guichet* (v. 8774-8775)
3. He has done Dido wrong (v. 8579-8480)
4. He would use Lavinia as a bait to lure young men to his court, who would first be allowed to enjoy themselves with her in order to grant him his turn with them (v. 8584-8594)
5. If all men were like him, mankind would die out within a hundred years' time (v. 8596-8502).

As you can see, the arguments are not personal in any way but are of a general nature. The queen does not blame Æneas for rejecting Lavinia personally. This is a competition between the sexes, and - according to the mother - Lavinia would be fighting a losing battle. She sums it up aptly when she tells Lavinia that Æneas is a man who « les homes prent, les femmes lait » (v. 8607).

However much precision the mother employs in her depiction of Æneas's animosity towards all women, she does not seem to have a clear-cut concept of the crime for which she is actually blaming him. She explicitly calls him a *sodomite* twice, but within her separate exemplifications she seems to contradict herself. What do the queen's accusations actually mean ?

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. S. Crane, *Gender and Romance in Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Princeton, 1993, p. 39-54.

When she claims that Æneas would not pass the *guichet* (v. 8575), for instance, she is referring to vaginal intercourse. « Il n'aime pas pel de conin » (literally : « He does not like rabbit fur » v. 8595) could add to this thesis. *Conin*, derived from Latin *cuniculus*, is the rabbit. Old French literature would at times expand the meaning of *conin* to little animals and their fur in general<sup>5</sup>. Although there is no etymological connection, the similarity of *conin* to *con*, from Latin *cunnus*, allowed for ample punning<sup>6</sup>. Hence when Æneas does not like « pel de conin », the allusion is to pubic hair. This observation does not necessarily imply a dislike of girls ; it could also point towards age as the decisive marker : he likes them very young. Or it could point towards a definition of sodomy as anal intercourse. In this instance, the sex of the passive partner is of secondary importance. This is indeed suggested by the immediately preceding lines : « bien le laireit sor tei monter, / s'il repoeit sor lui troter » (v. 8593-8594). The parallel phrasing of these two lines emphasizes the equality of these two acts, in which the partners are interchangeable, the active and passive parts are interchangeable and the sexes are interchangeable as well<sup>7</sup>.

So what is sodomy then, according to Lavinia's mother ? The queen defines sodomy *ex negativo* : It is not vaginal, it is not exclusive, and it is not with her daughter- if she can help it.

The problems of reading *sodomy* as the medieval equivalent of homosexuality become even more evident when the queen enlists Dido as the prime example. In Dido's case, Æneas is the undisputable and irresistible lover. But he is a *sodomite* anyway, because the decisive criterion proves not to be a sexually defined misbehavior, but the destructive effect Æneas has on women's lives : « Onkes femme n'ot bien de lui, / nen avras tu, si com ge cui, / d'un traïtor, d'un sodomite »

---

<sup>5</sup> *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch/Tobler-Lommatzsch*, (ed.) E. Lommatzsch, rev. Hans Helmut Christmann, Berlin, 1925-2002, 11 vols, 2 : 693. Both the German and the English language have developed comparable terms with regard to the domestic cat.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. W. Burgwinkle, « Knighting the Classical Hero : Homo/hetero Affectivity in *Eneas* », *Exemplaria* 5 (1993), p. 39-40.

<sup>7</sup> Vincent Lankewish reduces his interpretation of sodomy to male-male anal intercourse and sees the Trojans as the people who take everything (and everybody) from behind. Their most prominent victim is Camille, whom Lankewish considers « assaulted from behind ». See V. A. Lankewish, « Assault from Behind : Sodomy, Foreign Invasion, and Masculine Identity in *the Roman d'Eneas* », *Text and Territory. Geographical Imagination in the European Middle Ages*, Philadelphia, 1998, p. 207-44). Lankewish's misunderstanding is based on a selective reading of the Lavine passages, but, most of all, on a misreading of Camille's death : when Arrons kills her, he is standing next to her, shooting her with an arrow through her left armpit (cf. 7197-29).

(v.8581-8583). It is in this context, Dido's fate, that the term *sodomite* is being used for the first time, and it is paired with a second one, the traitor<sup>8</sup>. The term *trâison* appears three more times in the *Roman d'Eneas* (v. 1667, 1673, 1693), and each time in connection with the hero's secret departure from Carthage. More than for the departure itself, Dido blames Æneas for its stealth. The *trâison* consists in the dishonest way in which he leaves. It is a breach of contract, for which Dido uses legal terminology such as *felonie*, *aliance*, or *fiance*<sup>9</sup>.

The second explicit naming of the *sodomite* does not stand alone either. This time, it is combined with another key accusation, that of cowardice :

« les homes prent, les femmes lait,  
la naturel cople desfait.  
Garde, nel me dies ja mais,  
ceste amistië voil que tu lais,  
del sodomite, del coart. »

(v.8607-8611)

As the queen has explained in her earlier debate with Latinus, a coward to her is a man who abandons his family, especially his in-laws, in a time of crisis : Æneas guided his male relatives (his father Anchises and his son Ascanius) and his male companions out of the burning Troy : the men survive. His first wife Creusa and her family, on the other hand, had to perish in the flames. The medieval author taps into a rich literary tradition here, which has, from the very beginning, transmitted parallel and conflicting interpretations of Æneas's acts as *pious* and/or *impious*, depending on whose perspective the narrator would assume. In a commentary on the *Æneid* ascribed to Bernardus Silvestris, the author goes out of his way to establish a direct link between Æneas's masculinity and his desertion of Troy, and he does it etymologically : *Antandros*, the port from which the Trojans leave their old home (III, 6), is derived from *anti* plus *andros*, i. e. *contrarium virilitatis*, [...] *inconstantia*. This renders it the opposite of

---

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed overview, see H. Fromm, « Eneas der Verräter », *Festschrift Walter Haug und Burghart Wachinger*, vol. 1., Tübingen, 1992, p. 139-163. On the influence of Ovid's *Heroides*, see Dieter Kartschoke, « Didos Minne-Didos Schuld », *Liebe als Literatur. Aufsätze zur erotischen Literatur in Deutschland*, Munich, 1983, p. 100-102.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. v. 1705, 1715, 1716. On the « integration of legal rhetoric », see C. Baswell, « Men in the Roman d'Eneas. The Construction of Empire », *Medieval Masculinities. Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, (Minneapolis and London, 1994, p. 155.

« virilitas i.e. viri qualitas [sic] constantia (16, 23)<sup>10</sup>. A man is somebody who stays put. Somebody who leaves goes against the grain of true masculinity.

Both the *coart* and the *tråitor* are men who run off secretly, abandoning the woman and her realm : Creusa dies, Troy falls; Dido dies, Carthage is left without an heir and ruler. The *sodomite*, mentioned in the same breath, is also a man who does not live up to his dynastic responsibilities<sup>11</sup>. Hence the queen's final argument : Marrying a man like Æneas means condemning mankind to extinction : In Virgil as well as in both vernacular versions, Dido claims that having a « parvulus Æneas » (5. 328-329), « vos enfant » (v. 1739), or a « kindelin » (v. 2192), would have made all the difference.

Looking at Heinrich von Veldeke's translation, we can see that he, too, has read the *Roman d'Eneas* this way. Contrary to his source, however, he does not consider the competition for Æneas's amorous favors to be the crucial challenge which Lavinia would have to face. He eliminates the sexually explicit examples which the French version's queen had mustered for that purpose, namely 1) the hunt for male meat, 2) the passage of the *guichet*, and 4) Lavinia as a lure for potential lovers. He does, however, retain the discussion of 3) Dido's fate, and 5) the preservation of mankind, albeit in reverse order. Thus, he stresses even more the importance of the Punic precedent : By mentioning the impending extinction of humanity first and Dido second, he renders her an example for the barrenness of the women who fall for Æneas, and he adds Lavinia as the next potential victim. This is what Veldeke's queen says to her daughter :

« phlâgen alle die man  
des bôsen sides des her phliget,

---

<sup>10</sup> Bernardus Silvestris, *Commentum super sex libros Eneidos Virgili*, (ed.) Guilelmus Riedel, Gryphiswaldae, 1924.

<sup>11</sup> Raymond Cormier points out this important connection between sodomy, cowardice, and treason as well. His suggestion of a « solution to a semantic problem which associates by analogy the Old French term *recreant* and the Old Testament word *abomination* », however, is problematic. Both terms do indeed contain the semantic specter postulated here, but neither one does appear in the *Roman d'Eneas* in this context. Cf. R. J. Cormier, « Taming the Warrior : Responding to the Charge of Sexual Deviance in Twelfth-Century Vernacular Romance », *Literary Aspects of Courtly Culture. Selected Papers from the Seventh Triennial Congress of the International Courtly Society, Amherst, University of Massachusetts, 27 July-1 August 1992*, Cambridge, 1994, p. 153.

den her vil unhôhe wiget  
 der unsâlege Troiân,  
 diu werlt mûste schier zergân  
 inner hundert jâren,  
 daz sage ich dir ze wâren :  
 daz schadete vile sêre,  
 sone worde nimmer mêre  
 an wîbe kint gewinnen.  
 wie mohte ich im ðin gunnen ?  
 ich gunde dir des tôdes baz.  
 nû hâstû wol vernomen daz,  
 wie unrehten lôn  
 her gab der frouwen Didôn,  
 diu ime gût und êre bôt:  
 sie beleib dorch in tôt.  
 von ime quam nie wîbe gût,  
 tohter, noch ouch dir ne tût. »<sup>12</sup>

(v. 10652-10670)

The actual crime against humanity which Æneas commits is his refusal to procreate. The competition Veldeke's queen conjures up is not one between the sexes. It is the contrast between survival and extinction, between dynastic longevity and a marriage without reproduction. Sodomy in the *Eneasroman*, which has been removed into the realm of the *innominandum* (« ezn is ze sagenne niht gût, / waz her mit den mannen tût »; v. 10647-41068), is not a sin of the flesh, it is a political crime. Æneas « der zage » (v. 10639), the coward, will not provide the successor Latium desperately needs, but he will desert Lavinia just as he has abandoned Dido before her and Creusa before her. Moreover, he will add insult to injury by disgracing her « geslehte » (v. 10637) in the eyes of all the world.

The importance of sodomy as a sin against humanity is evident in those medieval German texts which refer to male-male intercourse, few as they are<sup>13</sup>. The two most striking examples, both by the Stricker, may suffice : In his *klage*, the unborn children who have been « versoumet von ir minne »

<sup>12</sup> « If all men were to indulge in the evil habit he indulges in, one which he considers so trifling, the disgraceful Trojan, the world would come to an end within a hundred years' time I can assure you : this would cause great damage, because women would not have children anymore. How can I surrender you to him ? I'd rather surrender you to death. You well have heard how poorly he returned lady Dido's favors who offered him wealth and honor : She still died because of him. No woman has ever received anything good from him, daugher, nor will you. »

<sup>13</sup> For a complete listing, see B. Spreitzer, *Die stumme Sünde. Homosexualität im Mittelalter*, Göppingen, 1988.

(5: 207, line 428) cry out to the heavens<sup>14</sup>. The sodomites are boycotting divine providence when they deprive their own children of the chance to be born :

« Si nement ir selbez chinden  
 beidiu ir sele und ir leben  
 swaz in der got wolde geben,  
 die versument si mit den mannen »

(5 : 207, lines 444-47).

The Stricker makes a similar argument in his text « von den mennelern », the only one which, to my knowledge, has sodomy as its central theme : They commit an injury against the laws of nature when they waste their seed, « vrwrffen [sic] ir samen » (3 : I,182, line 49).

Let us return to the queen's argument, which from the beginning has been a biased one. The context renders her untrustworthy ; we know that she is wrong and that her efforts are futile, just as we know that Æneas and Lavinia have been destined for each other. Lavinia is briefly tempted into lending her mother some credence, when her letter to Æneas seems to remain unanswered, but ultimately, she has no choice but to love him. Æneas is struck by Amor's arrow as well, and the mutuality of the love between the two is what makes all the difference : the affair of state has become a love affair. What used to be a divine mission to found Rome at the predestined place, marrying the royal daughter who happened to live there, has become an irreversible and irreplaceable personal commitment<sup>15</sup>. Love is what makes Lavinia unique. This is also what distinguishes her from Dido, as Æneas himself realizes : If he had felt for Dido what he feels for Lavinia now, he says in the *Roman d'Æneas*, he would never have been able to leave her (cf. v. 9039-9045). According to Heinrich von Veldeke, a tenth of that feeling would have sufficed (cf. v. III80-III86). In an effort to stress the impact of the moment even more, when « dâ hûb sich diu fruntschaft / allerèrest under in zwein », « when their love affair first got started » (v. 10962-10963), Veldeke points out in the epilogue that just when he had reached this line in his story, the infamous theft occurred at the wedding of Cleves. He could not finish the manuscript, and thus the lovers have to wait nine long years for the story to be concluded, for their love affair to be consummated, and for the ancestor of the Roman emperors to be engendered : *Sie konnten zueinander nicht kommen – a coitus interruptus* indeed.

<sup>14</sup> Der Stricker, *Die Kleindichtung*, (ed.) Wolfgang W. Moelleken et al., Göttingen, 1973-1978.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. W. Burgwinkle, « Knighting the Classical Hero : Homo/hetero Affectivity in *Eneas* », art. cit., p. 42.

Æneas was not a *sodomite* after all. Not because he did not want to be where the boys are - there is ample evidence in the text that he did. But because he he was a man with a mission : find a wife, settle down, have a son, and get Rome on its way.

Susanne HAFNER





## PAGAN VERSUS CHRISTIAN VALUES IN THE *ROMAN D'ENEAS*<sup>\*</sup>

This study addresses a surprisingly curious passage in an anonymous Old French romance dating from the mid-twelfth century, produced amid the Norman-Angevin humanistic *renovatio* referred to by Salverda de Grave, who edited the much amplified and free adaptation of the *Aeneid* in the mid-1920s<sup>1</sup>. The episode describes metempsychosis and relies on neo-Platonic elements exploited by Virgil. It occurs when Anchises explains to his son how the human soul, when it forgets its former life, can be recycled so as to spend another period on earth<sup>2</sup>. While elsewhere one sees sometimes inexplicable deviations from the Latin in the innovative vernacular text, the cosmological discourse itself shows how scrupulously the medieval poet can render the classical version. As we will see, a careful comparison, « in stereo », of the two texts reveals heathen, that is, non-Christian values (« bizarre » and « shocking » for one modern reader), which were not condemned as heretical, perhaps given the passionate exuberance of twelfth-century Chartrian Platonism. But aberrant heresy

---

<sup>\*</sup> Cet article a été initialement publié dans la revue *Medievalia et Humanistica*, n°33 (2007), p. 63-86.

<sup>1</sup> The edition of Ms A referred to here was prepared by Salverda de Grave, competently translated by John Yunck, *Eneas : A Twelfth-Century Romance*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1974. A later MS D has been edited more recently by Aimé Petit, with the facing French translation, *Le Roman d'Eneas, Edition critique d'après le manuscrit B.N. fr 60, traduction, présentation et notes*, (éd.) A. Petit, Paris, Livre de Poche, 1997. The present study was the object of a brief presentation at the Fourteenth Biennial New College Conference on Medieval-Renaissance Studies, Sarasota, Florida, March 2004. I am grateful to the following colleagues for their generous comments that have improved its focus, wording, and style : Professors Helen Rodnite Lemay, Teresa Kennedy, Angela Pitts, Deborah Sinnreich-Levi, Tracy Adams, Marvin L. Colker, and Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Haase.

As for the relevance of the topic, I note that D. Brooks, « Who let the Dogma Out ? » *Palm Beach Post* [Fla.], March 11, 2004, reviewing a recent best seller on the alterlife, sarcastically dismisses the contents as an amoral manual for loneliness - an « excellent therapy session », with feel-good bromides for « inner emptiness » - in which the Lord is depicted as a « genial Dr. Phil », centered not on God's glory but on « you », and with ail hurt washed away (not one's sins!).

<sup>2</sup> See the comprehensive article by W. Turner, « Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism », *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 12, New York, Appleton, 1907-1912.

such as this – somehow – might have escaped notice. The romance in this sense is a forrunner.

« One may ask forthwild if the passage we scrutinize mirrors or perhaps epitomizes the contemporary resurgence of speculative metaphysics. It has become a commonplace to assert that the era was a time when humanistic philosophers like Thierry of Chartres, Abelard, or William of Conches deliberated (some said excessively) about the nature of the soul and were then accused of necromancy or black magic. A bold reconciliation of concepts like « world-soul » (*anima-mundi Timaeus*) with the Christian idea of the Holy Spirit was rampant, however much condemned subsequently as heterodoxy. Such notions were related to Bernard Silvestris's « exotic amalgam of elements taken from classical mythology [...] [and] Christian writing pagan duties [were thusly] allegorised. »<sup>3</sup>

Since several researchers have recently signaled the independent episode's importance (Logié, Stahuljak), and since the French scholar Mora Lebrun as identified the crucial reference as « emblematic » and unequivocally heretical<sup>4</sup>, the *Roman d'Eneas* raises literary, linguistic, and metaphysical questions. And in spite of a recent venturesome and non-literary socio-political interpretation (see page 79), it will be suggested that such daring thought could be embraced by the ebullient twelfth-century Renaissance. It could happen even within the first hesitant attempts toward a new vernacular (i.e., non-Latin) literature created for the aristocracy, while the theological threat of heresy was perhaps eclipsed by this era's vigorous enthusiasm. What I propose in the following pages is only to explore, in its full medieval context, the episode's problematic significance. But I fear no real consensus can yet be reached ; conclusions will be mere suggestions, tentative solutions to the puzzle, and limited to the spheres of literary and intellectual influences, the socio-intellectual milieu, or to a notion of authorial reflexivity in the *Roman d'Eneas*<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> D. Luscombe, « Thought and Learning », *New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4, pt. 1, ca. 1074- 1198, (ed.) D. Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith, 1995 ; repr., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 461-98, here p. 474.

<sup>4</sup> F. Mora-Lebrun, « *L'Énéide* » médiévale et la naissance du roman, Paris, PUF, 1994, p. 211-216.

<sup>5</sup> See E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des romans et des contes courtois*, Paris, Champion, 1913. See also on the Judgment of Paris, R. J. Cormier, « Synchronizing Myth : Transmission and Continuity in the Judgment of Paris Episode (*Roman d'Eneas*, v. 99- 182) », with « Appendix 1 : The Judgment of Paris in Some Vatican *Aeneid* Manuscripts » and « Appendix 2 : Adaptations of the Judgment of Paris, ca. 1649-1995 - Creative Arts, Music, and Scholarly Inquiry », *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* 8 (2001), p. 135-158 (with one black and

white manuscript illustration : Reg. lat. 1671, f. 53r).

Courcelle notes (*Lecteurs païens et lecteurs chrétiens de l'Énéide*, vol.1 : *Les Témoignages littéraires*, Institut de France, Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres / N.S. , t. 4, Paris, Gauthier-Villars / De Boccard, 1984], p. 493 n. 253) that the very Macrobian-styled treatise attributed to Bede, *De mundi caelestis terrestrius constitutione*, on two separate occasions (PL XC, 899B, 901C), sympathetically and unreservedly approves of Anchises' speech on the reincarnation of the soul, based on its immortality. Cf. C. Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336*, New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1995, but the notion of *physical* rebirth was doubtless gruesome for heathens (69-71) ; see also 96-97 (Augustine on the immortality of the soul), 156-227 (citations of evidence), 266-269, 284-289 (Beatific Vision), 282-285 (Last judgment) ; Bynum assesses thoroughly the patristic-theological doctrine of bodily resurrection and the question of exactly how composed elements of the human body, once dispersed, could be miraculously reassembled. The Neoplatonic and / or Plotinian view is simply that life for human beings involves, as J. O'Donnell summarizes one viewpoint, a « struggle to free the soul of corporeality » (« Augustine : His Time and Lives », *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001, p. 8-25). A. D. Nok, *Conversion : The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*, 1933 ; repr. London, Oxford University Press, 1961, 1965 pointedly stated that the pagan concept of transmigration « made any belief in redemption unnecessary and any belief in the resurrection of the body unpalatable » (248). As Marcia Colish suggests (*Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition : 400-1400*, New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1997, p. 40), Gregory the Great proposed the notion of purgatory as a temporal locale for creating space to make satisfaction for sins. Linked, she notes, to some versions of ancient pagan religion and philosophy », Purgatory was not timeless like Hell and Heaven, but rather a « neat, and just, administrative treatment » for souls deserving neither Heaven nor Hell (p. 40). Dante's Virgil finds it the place of the deathless suffering (*Purgatorio*, (ed., trans.) A. Mandelbaum, Toronto, Bantam, 1984, p. 20-21).

For the Chartrians, R. Klibansky, « The School of Chartres », *Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society*, Madison and London, University of Wisconsin Press, 1966, p. 8-9. See B. P. McGuire, « Purgatory, the Communion of Saints, and Medieval Change », *Viator* 20 (1989), p. 61-84, here 84 ; McGuire aims to provide a kind of corrective to Jacques Le Goff's *Birth of Purgatory*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1984.

In light of this episode, a New Zealand colleague, Tracy Adams, expresses amazement over the inquisitiveness and audacity of the Old French author and presumes that perhaps the poet felt safe from censure writing a vernacular romance ; Adams asks : « Did theologians read vernacular romances ? » Thanks to her also for the hyperbolic qualifiers (*in littera*, 18 July 2005).

St. Augustine argued against the notion of transmigration « because », as Roland Teske asserts (« Augustine's Theory of the Soul », *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, *op. cit.*, p. 122), « such a view implied that the happiness of the blessed could never be assured if the soul were either ignorant of the truth about its future unhappiness or wretched in fear of it (*De civ. Dei* 12.14, 12.21) ». See also *De civ. Dei* 8.2 (Pythagoras), and 10.29-30 (on Plotinus and Porphyry's views). Resurrection of the fleshly body became Augustine's later concern (*vice* metempsychosis or transmigration).

G. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform : Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers*,

The romance survives in a number of manuscripts, notably the oldest, the Florentine A (Biblioteca Laurenziana), dating from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, and the youngest, Parisian D, dating from the fourteenth century (BNF, fr. 60). Much of the Virgilian mythological scheme has been eliminated, although the romancer does follow the west of the *Aeneid* (basic plot and structure), while the poetic, religious, politico-dynastic aims - the Latin epic's august and civic subtext-have been subsumed and subtly transformed for his courtly and humanistic Plantagenet patrons. On the one hand, simply put, the Old French version expatiates upon the human, personal, and subjective in the story. To reach his audience more effectively- as a gloss might do - the romancer has transformed many characters and situations into a medieval context. On the other, in place of the many suppressions, the medieval poet, while drawing on antecedent scholia, has interposed significant amplifications on, for example, the Judgment of Paris (structurally and thematically crucial to his story), as well as many « marvels of antiquity », which derive from a panoply of ancient sources. For his visionary (and sometimes throbbing) story of reciprocal love, where Eneas becomes enamored of his future bride Lavine (Lavinia in Virgil's text), he borrows principally from Ovidian and contemporary sources that crisscross with the battlefield scenes in the later sections-clashes in Italy between native Rutulians and newly arrived Trojans. Myopic modern-day interpreters have censured this romance as a travesty of Virgil, but that simplistic view has recently been dismissed : many critics now view it as a summa of twelfth-century vernacular learning. Amplifying here, condensing there, the romancer, as assessed by the late French philologist J. Monfrin, reorganizes Virgilian chronology, reduces the intervention of the pagan gods, and expatiates upon the human, personal, and subjective in the story.

The text is renowned not for theological content, nor even for mythographic matter ; rather, indeed, it is regarded more as a kind of high medieval soap opera, particularly when one considers the important Lavine love episodes, however, inventive, which are drenched with Ovidian

---

(New York, Harper and Row, 1959, 1957, p. 33, writes authoritatively (51) : « The Christian concept of spiritual sacramental regeneration means that each individual Christian must die with Christ, be reborn in Him, and begin a new life following Him. It is therefore very different from the principal forms of pagan and of Jewish rebirth ideology. It differs profoundly from the religious-political ideas about reborn or renewed Rome as well as from the messianic idea of Israel. It also differs from the rebirth ideas of Graeco-Roman and syncretistic mystery religions in which the element of ethical renewal, so essential for the Christian concept, was weak. »

imagery. It is obvious, furthermore, in at least two other *Aeneid* VI homologous locations, recently studied (both the Golden Bough episode and Cerberus description), that on occasion the *Eneas* author acted quite independently vis-à-vis his master narrative<sup>6</sup>. Such divergence strengthens the unusual case we are making here for the vernacular author's near-absolute fidelity in adapting Anchises' cosmological speech from Virgil's poetry.

Yet before we approach the Latin and Old French texts in question, a brief discussion of key terminology will help focus the commentary that follows. It involves complex questions. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, metempsychosis is defined as a :

« transmigration of the soul ; passagen of the soul from one body to another ; chiefly, the transmigration of nthe soul of a human being or animal at or after death into a new body (whether of the same or a different species), a tenet of the Pythagoreans and certain Eastern religions, esp. Buddhism. »

The term first appears circa 1590 in Marlowe's *Faust* (whose usage implies that an absent soul makes one beastly). In French, the first occurrence of the word is dated to 1190, but the modern sense of *metempsychose* (passage of one body's soul into another) arose in 1493<sup>7</sup>. Additionally, reincarnation and rebirth seem to be covered by another Greek-derived word, *palingenesia*, that is, a « birth over again, regeneration » (used first by Rabelais, 1546, then in English, 1621, to describe the movement of souls from one place to another). In the fourteenth century, *renaissance par baptême* was taken theologically as a synonym for spiritual regeneration<sup>8</sup>.

Now, Virgil tells us in his magical and prophetic *Aeneid*, book VI, that his hero must make an Odyssean, Herculean, and Orphic visit to the Under-world to consult the spirit of his father and learn about the future of Rome. Passing through the harrowing visions of painful Hades, burning Phlegethon, and the terrifying retributions of Tartarus, and once in

---

<sup>6</sup> R. J. Cormier, « Who Bears the Golden Bough before Charon ? (*Aeneid*, VI. 405-407) - A Correction », *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, n°12 (2005), p. 173-84 ; and *Id.* « Au sillon de Virgile : Un embellissement médiéval de Cerbère », *Le Moyen Age* t. CXIV, 2008/2, p. 273-286.

<sup>7</sup> *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française en 3 volumes*, (ed.) A. Rey et al., Paris, Le Robert, 2006, s. v. « Metempsychose ».

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*, s. v. « Renaissance »

pleasureful and harmonious Elysium, Aeneas meets and embraces Andrus. The scene is like a solemn convergence of destinies.

Bewildered and startled over the sight of a crowd at the riverbank, Aeneas asks about and the father explains how the numerous souls, lined up at the stream of forgetfulness, must expiate their sins for one thousand years, drink from the River Lethe, and then be born anew on earth to live again.

Aeneas, horrified, stands in fear : *horrescit uisu subito causasque requirit / inscius Aeneas, quae sint ea flumina porro, / quibus uiri tanto complerint agmine ripas* (VI. 710-712). Venus's darling puts his reply this way :

*Tum pater Anchises : "animae, quibus altera fato  
corpora debentur, Lethaei ad fluminis undam  
securus latices et longa obliuia potant  
has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram  
iam pridem, hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum,  
que magis Italia mecum laetere reperta."*

(VI. 713-718)<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> C. Day Lewis translation, *The Aeneid*, Anchor Books, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1952, 1953 ; Latin text from *The Aeneid* (P. Vergili Maronis, *Opera-Aeneidos*), (ed.) R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1969 ; reliable and relevant commentary by Eduard Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1957), p. 3-48, (« Einleitung ») p. 16 sqq. 46 sqq. ; see also p. 154, 162 sqq., 164 n. 1, 170 sqq. Inspecting this passage of Virgil, Raymond J. Clark (« The Wheel and Virgil's Eschatology in *Aeneid* book VI », *Symbolae Osloensis* 48 (1973), p. 121-141 asserts that Virgil « should not be read as a Christian eschatologist (p. 134).

Philip Hardie (*Virgil's Aeneid : Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1986) views Anchises' cosmological speech as at once Ennian, Ciceronian, and Lucretian. Aldo Setaioli (« Il Libro VI dell' *Eneide* », *Cultura e lingue classiche* 3, Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1993, p. 323-334) notes that Anchises' speech begins with a reference to etherian flames of Jupiter qua cosmic fire god, that is, a seminal spirit for Virgil-thus revealing Stoic and Platonizing influences of both Lucretius and Cicero.

See also Setaioli's substantial exegesis (*La vicenda dell'anima nel commento di Servio a Virgilio*, Frankfurt, Lang, 1995), which cogently dissects many of these issues ; esp. p. 18 sqq. (in re : Macrobius and the « fiery divine soul ») ; p. 60 n.367 (on Augustine's *City of God*, X, 30, where the « astral destiny of disincarnate souls » [cf. S. MacCormack, *The Shadows of Poetry : Virgil in the Mind of Augustine*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1998, p. 112] or vicious cycle of death and rebirth is called *absurdissimum et stultissimum*) ; p. 98n589 ; 126, 128nn739-740 (Servius confirms the Platonic doctrine ; Lactantius's views) ; 212n1232 (Servius on reincarnation as a philosophical truth « veiled with the poetic symbol of purgation ») ; 223 (reincarnation) ; 224-225n1285, 1288, 1294 (on divine fire and purgation).

Once again, Setaioli (« Interpretazioni stoiche ed epicuree in Servio e la tradizione dell'esegesi filosofica del mito e dei poeti a Roma [Cornuto, Seneca, Filodemo] [I] », *International journal for the Classical Tradition* 10, n° 3-4 [Winter-Spring 2004], p. 335-376) has dealt with Stoic and Epicurean doctrines on the « fiery nature of the soul » (II, my

Aeneas is completely perplexed ; sickened, even, he responds, at the mere thought that these « poor wretches » must return to earth in « sluggish bodies » (VI. 719-720). Pater Anchises counters with a robust eschatological sermon on both the origin and ultimate meaning of life (VI. 724-751), a Genesis-like exposition that « legitimates Rome's claim to rule », notes Bernstein, « by emphasizing the heavenly descent of its founders »<sup>10</sup>. Anchises offers, according to Courcelle, a « metaphysical and Stoic summa permeated with Platonism and Pythagoreanism »<sup>11</sup> and explains to Aeneas how the corrupts human body at death away, so to speak, over a dark period of a millenium, after whick, called forth by God, they drink from Lethe *et incipiant in corpora velle reverti*.

Here are the son's rather bewildered speech and father's ample reply in detail :

*“O pater, anne aliquas and caelum hinc ire putandum est  
sublimis animas iterumque ad tarda reverti  
corpora ? quae lucis miseris tam dira cupido ?”  
“dicam equidem nec te suspensum, nate, tenebo”  
suscipit Anchises atque ordine singula pandit.  
“Principio caelum ac terras camposque liquentis  
lucentemque globum lunae Titaniaque astra  
spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa par artus  
mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet.  
Inde hominum pecudumque genus uitaeque uolantum  
et quae marmoreo fert monstra sub aequare pontus.  
Igneus est ollis uigor et caelestis origo  
Seminiibus, quantum non noxia corpora tardant  
Terrenique hebetant artus morihundaque membra.  
Hinc metuunt cupiuntque, dolent gaudentque, neque auras*

---

translation) and its divine participation in the cosmos, on the role of fate (17), and on Anchises' « ample revelation » (31). Guillaume Stégen years ago dealt in systematic detail with the Virgilian problem (« Virgile et la métempsycose », *L'Antiquité classique* n°36, (1967), p. 144- 158. See also John J. Savage, « Medieval Notes on the Sixth *Aeneid* in Parisianus 7930 », *Speculum* n°9 (1934), p. 204-212.

Plato's *Timaeus* takes the Pythagorean idea into misogynistic waters by describing reincarnation thus : each soul is assigned to a star and starts as a mal ; if wicked it can next enter a woman's body ; if even more evil, an animal is next (trans. H. D. P. Lee, Harmondsworth and Baltimore, Penguin, 1965, ch. 41-42, section 10-11, 57-58).

<sup>10</sup> Alan E. Bernstein, *The Formation of Hell : Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds*, Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 71.

<sup>11</sup> P. Courcelle, *Lecteurs païens et lecteurs chrétiens de l'Énéide. I. Les témoignages littéraires*, Paris, De Boccard, 1984, p. 472, my translation.

*dispiciunt clausae tenebris et carcere caeco,  
 quin et supremo cum lumine uita reliquit,  
 non tamen omne malum miseris nec funditus omnes  
 corporeae excedunt pestes, penitusque necesse est  
 multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris.  
 Ergo exercentur poenis ueterumque malorum  
 supplicia expendunt : aliae panduntur inanes  
 suspensae ad uentos, aliis sub gurgite uasto  
 infectum eluitur scelus aut exuritur igni  
 (quisque suos patimur manis ; exinde per amplum  
 mittimur Elysium et pauci laeta arua tenemus)  
 donec longa dies perfecto temporis orbe  
 concretam exemit labem, purumque relinquit  
 aetherium sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem  
 has omnis, ubi mille rotamuoluere par annos,  
 Lethaeum ad fluuium deus euocat agminie magno,  
 Scilicet immemores supera ut conuexa reusant  
 Rursus, et incipiant in corpora uelle reuert.” (VI. 719-751)*

Regarding the difficulties in this passage dealing with fiery purgation and human rebirth, Brooks Otis once observed : « Consistency is obviously not to be found in Virgil's theology »<sup>12</sup>. Indeed, he continues :

« [Virgil] is telling us that the whole *catabasis* is a dream and that in fact sleep and death are alike in their revelation of an underworld unknown to waking consciousness yet exerting upon it the most powerful effect, precisely because it is only in such a realm that the meaning of time - of past and future, of history and its climax in Rome's eternal empire - can be found. »<sup>13</sup>

According to the authoritative study by Pierre Courcelle, third – and fourth-century Christian apologists from Jerome and Ambrose onward condemned the portion of Anchises' speech that comprised any « abysmal » notion of metempsychosis, rebirth or reminiscence<sup>14</sup>. Never mind that the *Aeneid* had generally become-like a « master narrative » - a transcendent and authoritative « Old Order » repository of potent patriotism, prestigious culture, and reverent religion<sup>15</sup>. Pagan standards

<sup>12</sup> B. Otis, « Three Problems of *Aeneid* 6 », *TAPA* 90 (1 959), p. 165-179, here p.166.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 176.

<sup>14</sup> P. Courcelle, *Lecteurs païens et lecteurs chrétiens de l'Énéide. I. Les témoignages littéraires*, op. cit., p.483-486

<sup>15</sup> See E. G. Sihler, *From Augustus to Augustine : Essays and Studies Dealing with the Contact and*  
60

and heathen identities amid antithetical Christianity had undergone a sea change, an ideological shock or, to use the recent term, a « clash of civilizations »<sup>16</sup>.

It seems to me, as it does to Sabine MacCormack in her skillful account of Augustine's intellectual and religious encounter with Virgil—that Aeneas's extraordinary amazement over this vision arises from his own enormous suffering and loss : wife and father, homeland and passionate love, all given up for a greater imperative, which, as we know, Anchises describes in considerable detail<sup>17</sup>.

Let us consider now the Old French text (in the Yunck translation) that corresponds to the Virgilian passage in question ; once again, it is Anchises who is speaking to his son :

« Son Eneas, I wish to show you your lineage, and to name ail those who are to be born of you : they will be emperors and kings. » “Sire”, said Eneas,

---

*Conflict of Classic Paganism and Christianity*, Cambridge, The University Press, 1923, p. 320 n. 2. Wolfgang Liebeschuetz, « Pagan Mythology in the Christian Empire », *International journal for the Classical Tradition* 2, n° 2 (1995), p. 193-208 surveys, for « conversion » era, i. a., allegorical themes of conflict and tension in the arts and literature. L. Milis (*The Pagan Middle Ages*, trans. T. Guest, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Boydell, 1998) asserts that even though heathenism was « pounded and pulverised as in a mortar » (p. 7), it remained embedded in the medieval mentality.

According to Stefan Freund's *Virgil im frühen Christentum* (2000—reviewed by Eberhard Heck), early Christian writers (before Jerome) manifested no adverse reaction to the metempsychosis portion of Anchises' speech. Heck's profound inspection of Lactantius's use of Lucretius (« Nochmals : Lactantius und Lucretius. Antiluzrezisches im Epilog des lactanzischen Phoenix-Gedichts ? », *International journal for the Classical Tradition* 9, n° 4 (2003), p. 509-523), contrasts (esp. 521) the heathen *hic et nunc* of the human life force as voluptuous over against the Christian teleological viewpoint with death as a construct of eternal salvation. B. Filotas (*Pagan Survivals : Superstitions and Popular Cultures in Early Medieval Pastoral Literature*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005) has published a comprehensive study of pagan survivals as revealed in medieval sermons, wherein she investigates « to what extent [...] Christianity influence[d] and merge[d] with traditional pre-Christian beliefs and practices in popular religion » (p. 11) ; interestingly, she writes, on the subject of notions about the dead : « Pre-Christian Romans, Celts and Germans believed that in some sensé the dead continued to live in the tomb » (p. 337).

<sup>16</sup> See S. Huntington's now-celebrated 1993 essay, « The Clash of Civilizations ? », *Foreign Affairs* 72, n° 3 (1993), as well as his subsequent book, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1996).

<sup>17</sup> MacCormack, *Shadows of Poetry*, esp. 100-131, an extended, complex, and illuminated interpretation of this crucial and cosmic Virgilian passage, among others, in light of Augustine's evolving philosophical and theological understanding regarding the nature of mortality, true blessedness, and felicity. In spite of it ail, however, as the hero reveals to the Sibyl early on (vi. 103-105), he will not yield whatsoever to all Fortune or heavy toil.

“I wish to know if it can be true that those who are now here below will ever take on bodies up above and have corporeal form, will ever be sentient and mortal.” He answered : “Son Eneas, never doubt this. I will tell you the truth about it, and will no hide from you. Those who die up above all come here below to hell. Here it is rendered to each one according as he deserved while he lived. If he was a good man while he lived, he suffers no pains or sorrows but comes to the Elysian Fields. Those who lived evil lives, who always committed crimes, suffer evil and torments, fires and tortures. When, through pains and sorrows, they have made the atonement which their evil deserved, they come to the Elysian Fields. Then they stay here in great comfort and repose, and they have no sorrow. When they have lived here for a time and it comes into their will to return above, then they go to a river down here in hell. A god is there who immerses them in it, and when he removes them from the water they are able to say nothing in the world above of what they found here below. Then no one remembers anything of what happened to him here. The god puts them agam outside, and they return above to take a human body once more. You see here a great company of those who are about to take on mortal life, who will be your sons and descendants. »<sup>18</sup>

In her persuasive monograph on medieval French romance, Francine Mora-Lebrun has convincingly shown how Virgil's Old French adaptor carefully appropriated two « emblematic references » in the segment under review here, namely, purgatory and metempsychosis<sup>19</sup>. The text

---

<sup>18</sup> « Fiz Eneas, voil te mostrer / ta ligniee et toz nomer / çaus ki a nestre sont de toi : / anpereor seront et roi.” / “Sire”, fait il, “ge voil saveir, / se ce puet estre donques voir, / que cil ki ore sont çajus / praignent ja mes cors la desus / et tent forme corporel, / passible soient et mortel.” / Cil li respont : “Fiz Eneas, / Par de ce mes doteras, / ge t'en dirai la verité, / ne te sera par moi celé. / Icil qui muerent la desus / en enfer vient tuit çajus, / sonc ce que chascuns deservi, / tant dementiers que il vesqui, / ça de desoz li est rendu. / Tant com vesqui se buens hom fu, / ne sofre poines ne ahans, / puis vient es Elisien chans. / Cil qui furent de male vie, / qui toz tens firent felenie, / sofrent les maus et les tormenz, / les feus et les cruciemenz ; / quant il ont tot espenoi / les maus qu'avai ent deservi / et par poines et par ahans, / puis vont es Elisien chans : / puis sont ici en grant dolçor / et an repos, n'ont puis dolor. / Quant i ont piece conversé, / et il lor vient a volenté / que il volent aler leissus, / une eve en enfer çajus, / uns deus i est ques en aboivre, / et quant de l'eve le desoivre, / ne sevent rien dire laisus / de quant qu'il ont trové çajus, / ja puis a nul ne membrera / de tot ice que çaus a ; / li deus les met de rechief fors, / I laissus revont pre dre humain cors. / Voiz an ici grant compagnie / qui doivent prendre mortel vie, / qui te seront fil et nevoz » ; *Eneas Roman du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (ed.) J.-J. Salverda de Grave, Paris, Champion, 1925-1927, v. 2879-2925 (= MSA) ; see now also the new edition by Petit (*Roman d'Eneas*, 1997, v. 2970-3007) where incidentally - and in spite of this version's many « embellishments » (my term) and paradoxical faithfulness to Virgil - the presumably heretical passage is fully retained.

<sup>19</sup> F. Mora-Lebrun, « *L'Enéide* » médiévale et la naissance du roman, *op. cit.*, p. 211-216. See also 62

illustrates how the poet strategically at once telescopes, amplifies, and condenses Virgil's Latin, even while remaining quite close to the meaning of the « hypotext ». For example, careful reading shows how Anchises' meaning is rendered faithfully, retaining the self-reference to his own purity and status (*Aeneid* VI. 744-747).

Examining now the text in detail, we may note first how Anchises' opening : « Fiz Eneas, voil te mostrer / ta ligniee et toz nomer / çaus ki a nestre sont de toi: / anpereor seront et roi » (v. 2879-2882) both adapts Virgil's VI. 716-718 (*has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram / iampridem, hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum, / quo magis Italia mecum laetere reperta*), as well as telescopes v. 750 ss. (*rursus, et incipiant incorpora uelle reuerti*). But the echoing infinitives *memorare* and *enumerare* - the Latin's nearly corrective epistrophe - are translated simply by *nomer*. Virgil's vivid and poetic untranslatability comes through with *quo magis Italia mecum laetare reperta* - and is virtually lost in translation.

Then, Eneas's fearful query « Sire », fait il, “ge voil saveir, / se ce puet estre donques voir, / que cil ki ore sont çajus / praignent ja mes cors la desus / et aient forme corporel, / passible soient et mortel » (v. 2883-2888), appears to re-word VI. 719-721 (*o pater, anne aliquas ad caelum hinc ire putandum est / sublimis animas iterumque ad tarda reuerti / corpora ? quae lucis miseris tam dira cupido ?*) -especially *corpora* [...] *dira cupido*, paralleling words by Anchises at VI. 731-732 (*seminibus, quantum non noxia corpora tardant / terrenique hebetant artus moribundaque membra*). Here, *cors*, *corporel*, and *mortel*, as well as the *passible* (able to suffer) are drawn from *animas*, *corpora*, and *lucis miseris*, while the apparent filler "ge voil saveir, / se ce puet estre voir" (v. 2883-2884) imitates the general sense but not the exact wording of *quae lucis miseris tam dira cupido ?* (VI. 721). Anchises' reply, *dicam equidem nec te suspensum, nate, tenebo / suscipit atque ordine singula pandit*, is rendered by « ja mar de ce mes doteras ;/ ge t'en dirai la verité / ne te sera par moi celé (v. 2890-2892).

In the next segment, « Icil qui muerent la desus / en enfer vienent tuit çajus / sonc ce que chascuns deservi, / tant dementiers que il vesqui, / ça de desoz li est rendu » (v. 2894-2896) finds its model (however telescoped) in

---

her dazzling « prequel », « De Bernard Silvestre à Chrétien de Troyes : Résurgences des enfers virgiliens au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle », *Diesseits- und Jenseitsreisen im Mittelalter : Voyages dans l'ici-bas et dans l'au-delà au moyen âge*, Bonn / Berlin, Bouvier, 1992, p; 129-146. D. L. Pike (« Bernard Silvestris' Descent into the Classics : The *Commentum super sex libros Aeneidos* », *International Journal for the Classical Tradition* 4 (1997-1998), p. 343-363), while epitomizing the carefully documented scholarly article on the subject, sheds no light on the present problem-mainly because Bernardus's commentary ends abruptly before the section on Elysium.

the Latin of VI. 724-743 (*Principio caelum ac terras camposque liquentis / lucentemque globum lunae Titaniaque astra / spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus / mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet*), particularly in the oft-disputed *quisque suos patimur Manis* (VI. 743)<sup>20</sup>. The idea is that each according to his or her merits or faults gets rewarded or punished. Then again, the Old French, on the high joys and expiatory sorrows of the afterlife – « Cil qui furent de male vie, / qui toz tens firent felenie, / sofrent les maus et les tormenz, / les feus et les cruciemenz ; / quant il ont tot espenoï / les maus qu'avaient deservi / et par poines et par ahans" (v. 2901-2907) - seems to derive freely from just two lines in Virgil (VI. 739-740 : *ergo exercentur poenis ueterumque malorum / supplicia expendunt : aliae panduntur inanes*), with the nouns *maus*, *tormenz*, *feus*, and *cruciemenz* expanding nicely on *poenis* and *supplicia*. The next three verses of the Eneas (v. 2908-2910), « puis vont es Elisiens chans, / puis sont ici en grant dolçor / et an repos, n'ont puis dolor », draw on VI. 744 (*mittimur Elysium et pauci laeta arua tenemus*), with *mittimur [...] laeta* transposed with « vont [...] dolçor [...] repos [...] n'ont puis dolor » - though not in exact syntactic terms. Near-verbal correspondence may be seen as well : from VI. 751 (*ut [...] incipiant incorpora velle reuerti*) the anonymous draws a more willful « et il lor vient a volenté » (v. 2912) ; at VI. 749 (*ad fluvium deus evocant*) he interprets « uns deus i est ques en aboivre » (v. 2915) ; and at VI. 750, adjectival *immemores* becomes a verbal « nul ne membrera » (v. 2919). The simple Old French *deus* (v. 2915, 2921) simply replaces the Latin *Lethaeum [...] deus*, though the mythological proper name is lost. Nevertheless, the crucial lines « li deus les met de rechief fors, / laissus revont prendre humain cors » (v. 2921-2922) bear all the meaning of what precedes and make quite clear the poet knows what he is saying, not merely implying. What is perhaps misleading is the single occurrence of the word *f eus* here (seven references to light and fire in Virgil), because throughout the Old French text fire and light serve as leitmotifs<sup>21</sup>.

Nevertheless, we can understand from this brief sketch why Philippe Logié was led to call the French romancer a « faithful infidel ». Elsewhere,

---

<sup>20</sup> *quisque suos patimur manis. exinde per amplum / mittimur Elysium, et pauci laeta arua tenemus), / donec longa dies, perfecto temporis orbe / concretam exemit labem, purumque relinquit / aetherium sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem* (VI. 743-747).

<sup>21</sup> *Le Roman d'Eneas*, éd. cit., v. 2895-2910. While « fire and light references » deserve further study, a muscular beginning was made in the late 1980s by Nadia Margolis in « *Flamma, furor, and fol'amors.* » Hardie's Lucretian reading of the *Aeneid*, 1986, *passim*, highlights Virgil's innumerable references to fire.

the same critic had observed that the Eneas poet's « rate of fidelity » to his source : is highest in book VI<sup>22</sup>. As Mora-Lebrun puts it : « [The] heretical doctrine of metempsychosis is uttered in the *Eneas* [...], through Anchises' lips, without equivocation, and with a surprising and even tranquil conviction. »<sup>23</sup> She also stresses the text's insistence on purgatorial pains, as if a cover for the daring passage, attributable perhaps to Servian glosses<sup>24</sup>.

It is arresting to recall here that a poem almost exactly contemporary with the *Eneas*, the *Entheticus* by bishop of Chartres John of Salisbury (a « satire » composed 1154-1156 and dedicated to Becket), categorically refutes the Pythagorean concept of metempsychosis, stating, « True faith forbids belief in the transmission of souls » (*Pura fides prohibet animas de traduce credi*, v. 817). As it was for Origen in the third century, « speaking truth to power » was dangerous in the twelfth century : dissidence was quickly met with a visceral reaction of intolerance as H.-I. Marrou points out<sup>25</sup>. It is well to recall too that from the mid-twelfth century onward, attacks on Dualist heresy raged and « all social classes between 1140 and 1170 » were involved, writes Borst<sup>26</sup>. Their complex quasi-mythological or cosmological doctrine was hardly « popular » in origin, though<sup>27</sup>. Wakefield and Evans report more than five severe condemnations of a Catharist belief in metempsychosis<sup>28</sup> ; in his classic study, Runciman called their doctrine on

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. P. Logié, *L'Énéas, une traduction au risque de l'invention*, Paris, Champion, 1999, p.86-96 ; see also his concise and exhaustive annexe 3, p. 385, for the textual parallels parsed here – *Aeneid* VI 722-751 and *Eneas*, v. 2889-2921, « Metempsychose ». P. Logié's, « Le Traitement du Livre VI de l'Énéide dans l'Énéas : Propositions méthodologiques », *Traduction, transcription, adaptation au Moyen Age : Actes du Colloque du Centre d'études médiévales et dialectales de Lille III, Univ. Charles-de-Gaulle, Lille, Centre, 1996*, p. 41-51 methodically compares the Latin model with the French imitation, concluding that the adaptation is at once paradoxical and subtle, due to fidelity » (p. 47-48, 51). Zrinka Stahuljak, *Bloodless Genealogies of the French Middle Ages : Translatio, Kinship, and Metaphor*, Gainesville / Tallahassee, University Press of Florida, 2005, p. 23 emphasizes, as does Mora-Lebrun, that in the Old French version only wicked souls undergo a kind of purgation, a notion that anticipates ideas of Purgatory about to become codified in the twelfth century.

<sup>23</sup> F. Mora-Lebrun, « *L'Énéide* » médiévale et la naissance du roman, *op. cit.*, p. 214, my translation.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 213-215.

<sup>25</sup> H.-I. Marrou, « L'Héritage de la Chrétienté », *Hérésies et sociétés dans l'Europe pré-industrielle : 11<sup>e</sup>-18<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Colloque de Royaumont, Paris / The Hague, Mouton, 1968, p. 51-58, here p. 52.

<sup>26</sup> A. Borst, « La Transmission de l'hérésie au Moyen Age », *Hérésies et sociétés dans l'Europe pré-industrielle : 11<sup>e</sup>-18<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Colloque de Royaumont, *op. cit.*, p. 273-280, here 275.

<sup>27</sup> H. Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages*, trans. S. Rowan, Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame Press, 1995, p. 212-213.

<sup>28</sup> W. Wakefield and A. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages : Selected Sources Translated and*

this « somewhat vague »<sup>29</sup>, but it is clear the Cathars zealously held to the notion of multiple infusions or transferrals of the soul into other bodies (human or animal). Grundmann considers their ideas « alien » and « speculative »<sup>30</sup>. But beyond that, W. Wakefield summarized the Catharist view on the afterlife : the soul's redemption was available to a select few who had received a special blessing, the *consolamentum*, without which « the soul remained a prisoner in flesh, passing from body to body. There would be no resurrection of bodies which could never [sic] enter the spiritual heavens. »<sup>31</sup>

Human mortality and the soul's immortality have preoccupied philosophers for centuries. Exemplary figure in the Middle Ages - according to Curtius<sup>32</sup> - Pythagoras of Samos, fl. 530 B.C., « held that ail beings were interrelated », observed St. Paul's contemporary Seneca, and that there was a system of exchange between souls that transmigrated from one bodily shape into another. If one may believe him, no soul perishes or ceases from its fonctions at all, except for a tiny interval - when it is being poured from one body into another<sup>33</sup>.

The Silver Age moralist was responding to the ancient Greek philosopher's extravagant reputation as idealistic shaman and mysterious metaphysician. Two of Plato's works, his *Phaedo* and *Republic*, while not

*Annotated*, New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1969, p. 166 (*De heresi catharorum* : souls « pass from body to body ») ; p. 217 (Alain de Lille), p. 233, 313, 338 (Rainerius Sacconi), p. 342. See also M. Maher, « Metempsychosis », *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, New York, Appleton, 1907-1912, vol. 10, esp. the remarks on the Manichaeans and Neo-Manichaeans.

For the *Entheticus*, see R. Pepin, «The Entheticus of John of Salisbury: A Critical Text », *Traditio* 31 (1975), p. 127-194 : souls, according to their inner qualities, sink into bodily prison, thence to be expedited to new bodies : Hinc tamen arguitur, animas quod ab aethere lapsas / Asserit, et corpus carceris esse loco, / Et quod eas propriis exclusas in nova mitti / Corpora pro morum conditione putat. / Et quod eas proprios tandem deducit ad ortus / Corporis, ut cupide rursus ad ima cadant. / Cum semel haec fuerint illo tradente recepta, / Convincit ratio plurima falsa sequi » (v. 767-774).

<sup>29</sup> S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee : A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, New York, Viking, 1961, p. 150.

<sup>30</sup> H. Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages*, op. cit., p. 219.

<sup>31</sup> W. L. Wakefield, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100- 1250*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1974, p. 33.

<sup>32</sup> E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask, Bollingen Library, New York and Evanston, Harper and Row 1963, p. 362-363.

<sup>33</sup> *Epistles of Seneca*, CVIII - [On Pythagorean philosophy]. III. 239-247 ; this letter describes the Stoic lifestyle as one of abstinence, simplicity, and restraint in ail habits ; points out that Sotion, Seneca's mentor, was a vegetarian because of all the blood, cruelty, luxury, and presumed need for variety in one's meat based diet.

widely known to twelfth-century readers, argue for the immortality of the soul, as in the myth of Er; they posit, for a truly just world, an undying but pure essence that can be punished; and, finally, the two treatises refuse, for the incurably wicked and foolish, spiritual rebirth or regeneration<sup>34</sup>. Politically and morally useful, Pythagorean religious pith was rationalized, absorbed, and transmitted through various subsequent Neoplatonic thinkers, such as Plotinus and Macrobius, « loaded with Plato », as later authorities might put it<sup>35</sup>. Aristotle rejected the idea, arguing that the soul belongs to one's individual body and could not « survive a transplant »<sup>36</sup>. Epicurean and materialist Lucretius, for whom mind and vital spirit were one linked embodiment, mocks the notion of Hell's torments. The Timaeon message in Boethius's *O qui perpetua [...] (Consolatio, III, m.9)* substantially and unquestionably assigns purification and return for departed souls (v. 18-21). The whole Platonic-Plotinian dilemma was resolved, grafted, and reconciled by Augustine<sup>37</sup>. Twelfth-century « Platonisms », as Père Chenu calls the flurry of exploratory ideas circulating at the time, saw humans fundamentally as « composed of a body and a soul » - along with interiority however enigmatic, crucial points

---

<sup>34</sup> See Alan E. Bernstein, *The Formation of Hell : Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds*, op. cit., p. 58-61. H. Zander's far-reaching *Geschichte der Seelenwanderung in Europa. Alternativ religiöse Traditionen von der Antike bis heute*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999, p. 87-90, 146-151, 199-216, 216-227, 679-680, deals, i. a., with Virgil, Augustine, the Cathar heresy, and, more generally, the Latin Middle Ages; for this reference, I am grateful to W. Haase. See also E. L. Harrison, « Metempsychosis in Aeneid Six », *Classical Journal* 73 (1977-1978), p. 193-197, 194, 196 sqq. But, lest we forget, Hecuba Aristippus (working in Sicily) is credited with an early translation of the *Phaedo* (1140s); see C. Haskins, *The Normans in European History* (1915; repr., New York, Norton, 1943), 239 sqq., as well as the « Plato Latinus », 11 (= Corpus Platonicum medii aevi).

<sup>35</sup> E. G. Sihler, *From Augustus to Augustine : Essays and Studies Dealing with the Contact and Conflict of Classic Paganism and Christianity*, op. cit., p. 195.

<sup>36</sup> R. Ellmann, *Ulysses on the Liffey*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1972, p. 16-17.

<sup>37</sup> P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, London, Faber and Faber, 1967, p. 88-100 : Augustine « ransacked » Plotinus, 95. The bishop of Hippo, we recall, scoffed at the whole idea of reincarnation as « very absurd and very stupid » (see note 9 above, Setaioli). For the twelfth century, see the standard study by W. Wetherbee (*Platonism a Poetry in the Twelfth Century : The Literary Influence of the School of Chartres*, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1972, esp. p. 177-178) on Bernardus Silvestris's Chartrian *De mundi universitate* (or *Cosmographia*, dated by Wetherbee to 1147) and its captioning of Virgilian cosmogony. Wetherbee writes : « The reminiscences of Plato's *Timaeus*, Boethius's *De consolazione*, Anchises's discourse on the soul in the Vergilian Elysium, define what will come to be the essential context, cosmic and psychological, of Chartrian thought, and introduce a number of its major themes » (p. 21).

all for medieval philosophy<sup>38</sup>. But the Platonic scheme was early condemned by a Church Council (553), and found to conflict with the notion of « linear time [in] Christian eschatology »<sup>39</sup>.

In the *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio* by Macrobius, so esteemed by Chartrian thinkers, the soul's descent begins from celestial space to the body, and returns thereto if no corruption is suffered from impurity ; but the evil ones hover and enter some other depraved bodies, whether of men or of beasts. Corporeality is viewed as an accretion du ring the descent through the spheres. As his editor quips : « Sojourn in a mortal body is death for the soul »<sup>40</sup>. Early-Christian apocryphal gospels teem with horrible visions of condemnation or salvation at the Last judgment : Hell's eternal and everlasting pains punished sinful souls, immersed, for example, in a river or lake of fire<sup>41</sup>. But, as Filotas observes wryly in her study of the durability of heathen beliefs, « Paganism, superstitions, [and] pagan survivals [...] are controversial, nebulous concepts suspect in the eyes of many modern historian »<sup>42</sup>.

Taken together with the ground-breaking Neoplatonic intellectual and metaphysical innovations of a Thierry of Chartres or William of Conches (who served as tutor to the young Henry Plantagenet), and contemporary with the avid Norman-Angevin adaptor, some Arabie metaphysical thought seems to reinforce, or at least embroider upon, the ideas of reincarnation. While she does not illuminate metempsychosis proper, Marcia Colish observes that Averroes (1126-1198), following Aristotle, asserts that at death, creatures leave matter that is recycled and applied toward « new creatures ». There is an economy of matter. While creatures are constantly undergoing change, in contrast with the unmoved mover, matter as such neither comes into being nor passes away<sup>43</sup>. One wonders if some of these ideas go back to Solomon Ibn Gabirol (1021 or 1022-1058) and his « Aristotelianized Neoplatonism »<sup>44</sup>. These notions, here metaphysical, sound to me very much like the famous eighteenth-century

<sup>38</sup> M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle*, 1957; repr. Paris, Vrin, 1966, p. 117.

<sup>39</sup> *Guillelmi de Conchis : Glosae super boetium*, (ed.) L. Nauta, Turnhout, Brepols, 1999, p. xxxix.

<sup>40</sup> *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, trans. W. Hams Stahl, 1952 ; repr. New York, Columbia University Press, 1990, p. 15.

<sup>41</sup> *The Apocalyptic New Testament, Being the Apocalyptic Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses, with Other Narratives and Fragments*, trans. M.J. Rhodes, Oxford, Clarendon, 1924, *passim*, esp. p. 390-391, 558-560, 561-563.

<sup>42</sup> B. Filotas, *Pagan Survivals : Superstitions and Popular Cultures in Early Medieval Pastoral Literature*, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

<sup>43</sup> M. Colish, *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition : 400-1400*, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 156.

Lavoisian formula that applied to energy : « rien ne se perd, rien ne se crée, tout se transforme ». Both Jacques Le Goff and Brian McGuire have reminded us that the mid-twelfth century established a dynamic and diverse matrix for ideas about the afterlife, especially Purgatory.

Over one thousand years after Virgil's time, the new period of chivalric literature dawned, presented for the first time in the vernacular, and cultivated by experts in the trivium. On this very subject, Georges Duby once asserted, « The form we call the romance (*roman antique*) clearly represents the most striking expression of the effort then being made to adapt to the lay audience the auctores whom the school grammarians explicated »<sup>45</sup>. Clearly, one can observe firsthand the mid-twelfth-century genesis, as it were, of medieval French romance by studying the initial hesitant steps of path-breaking translators<sup>46</sup>. The body of Ovid's diverse and visionary work was exploited as well by the Eneas author, a testimony to the rediscovery and timelessness of pagan antiquity.

In Marcia Colish's sweeping and stunning overview of medieval intellectual mentalities - as if to vouchsafe the present endeavor - the conclusion to *Medieval Foundations* states :

« The recycling of classical and medieval materials in updated settings and new genres can be tracked across modern European literature [...] Indeed this Western propensity for reusing ancient sources in fresh ways distinguishes the Middle Ages, as part of the Western intellectual tradition, from the Byzantine veneration of the classics, preserving them in amber rather than using them as inspiration for literary creativity. »<sup>47</sup>

The ancients were clearly not preserved in amber for the innovative French romancers.

---

<sup>45</sup> G. Duby, « The Culture of the Knightly Class : Audience and Patronage », *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1982, p. 248-262, here p. 259. Cf. M. Colish, *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition : 400-1400*, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

<sup>46</sup> See also Buchheit's useful term *kontrastimitation* (P. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid : Cosmos and Imperium*, *op. cit.*, p. 233. The *Roman d'Eneas* emblemizes the Norman-Angevin intellectual revival of this period, as Salverda de Grave affirms : « L'auteur d'*Eneas* appartenait à cette école littéraire qui s'était formée à la cour des Plantagenets » (*Eneas*, éd. cit., p. xx). The editor further speculates that his anonymity was due to « clerical humility ».

<sup>47</sup> M. Colish, *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition : 400-1400*, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

At this point, the reader may wonder how all this metaphysical conjecturing relates generally to the authorial aims of the medieval anonymous. Is his quasi-theological treatment of this rather brief passage from *Aeneid* VI typical or exceptional? How creative a reception does the Old French text admit for Virgil's master narrative? In the very broadest of terms, what facts, first of all, might one assert about this captivating romance? The influential *Roman d'Eneas* has enjoyed a modest revival of scholarly interest since the 1970s. Strategic reading of Virgil's Latin side by side with the corresponding Old French text-translation via comparison has been thus the hermeneutical starting point.

The reader may inquire as well about other translation techniques in the medieval version. On several occasions, the Old French author has added compensatory embellishments to Virgil's text—most notably, in a problematic depiction of Sylvia's stag, where the animal's tame nature is such that it allows its antlers to serve as a candelabrum to illuminate the girl's family dinner table. The stag is first captured as a fawn by the sons of Tyrrhus, then given to their sister, who tames and rears the animal as a pet (*Aeneid* VII. 475-571). The stag's « wondrous beauty and mighty antlers » (VII. 487-89) seemingly invite the romancer to intervene and amplify the description with the kind of medieval *merveilles* he adverts to often, here perhaps to recuperate the numerous references to fire and lightning in Virgil. Apparently, two or more Virgilian episodes are synthesized via intertextuality and fused with an Ovidian parallel. Later, in the expiatory and humanizing scene of the wounding of Aeneas (*Aeneid* XII. 311 sqq.), the medieval poet specifically (a) eliminates Venus's divine intervention, (b) designates the wound as in the arm, (c) turns Virgil's « wild goats » into a roebuck, and (d) changes the magical dittany into a restorative beverage (*Eneas* v. 9566 sqq.)<sup>48</sup>.

---

<sup>48</sup> E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du Moyen Âge*, op. cit., laid out the original groundwork, but D. Kelly, *Medieval French Romance*, New York, Twayne, 1993, is now the standard reference on the whole subject; J.-C. Payen, *Littérature française des origines à 1300 : Le Moyen Âge*, Paris, Arthaud, 1971, p.146-150 called these texts—the *Roman de Thèbes*, *Roman d'Eneas*, and *Roman de Troie* by Benoît de Sainte-Maure — « la heptade classique », grouping them with the shorter tales composed around the same time, « after Ovid », for which, see the edition / translation by R.J.Cormier, *Three Ovidian Tales of Love : Piramus et Tisbé, Narcisus et Dané, and Philomena et Procné*, New York and London, Garland, 1986. For general background on Virgilian glosses, L. Holtz, « La redécouverte de Virgile aux VIII<sup>e</sup> et IX<sup>e</sup> siècles d'après les manuscrits conservés », *Lectures médiévales de Virgile : Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française de Rome (Rome, 25-28 octobre 1982)*, Rome, Ecole française, 1985, p. 9-30.

The medieval adaptor, disdainful of translation obstacles like anachronism or betrayal of Virgil (or Statius for that matter), appropriated the classics for ideological purposes - if we interpret Petit's remarks correctly. In a crisis, the past legitimizes the present, even if the past must be falsified to make it accommodate to present needs. On this subject, Petit asserts :

« The *romans antiques* are thus the site of synthesis, or ideal creations or recreations. Beyond any precise socio-political meaning, over and above its possible role in a humanistic process, anachronism intervenes in the construction of a political universe - that of *fiction romanesque* [sic]. And the political systems presented tous by the romans antiques represent an eloquent example »<sup>49</sup>.

As part of the twelfth-century renewal, Virgil becomes revitalized through both Ovid and a variety of diverse contextual strategies – a uniquely medieval method of assuring the continuity of both authors, Virgil's « old » *Aeneid* and Ovid's « new » *Metamorphoses*, each quasi-sacred in its own way. The independence we have noted in the medieval poet's diverging from Virgil's sacred text strengthens the unusual case we are making here for his fidelity in adapting Anchises' cosmological speech<sup>50</sup>. Besides, the interface we have highlighted regarding Virgil's Underworld episode in regards to metempsychosis allows us special « archaeological »

---

<sup>49</sup> « Ainsi les romans antiques sont le lieu des synthèses, des créations ou recreations idéales. Au delà d'une signification socio-politique précise, au delà du rôle qu'il peut jouer dans une démarche de type humaniste, l'anachronisme intervient dans la construction d'un univers politique, celui de la fiction romanesque. Les systèmes politiques tels que nous les présentent les romans antiques en représentent un éloquent exemple » (A. Petit, *L'Anachronisme dans les romans antiques du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Université de Lille III, Lille, 1985, 1986 ; 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed., new pagination, Paris, Champion, 2002, p. 303-304.

See also R. Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991, *passim*, and esp. p. 103-107, for a definition of « medieval interpretation »; S. Viarre, « L'interprétation de l'*Enéide* : A propos d'un commentaire du douzième siècle », *Présence de Virgile*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1978, p. 223-232. For Ovid gloss and commentary, see *The « Vulgate » Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses : The Creation Myth and the Story of Orpheus*, (ed.) F. T. Coulson, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1991.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. J. Monfrin, « L'histoire de Didon et Énée au xv<sup>e</sup> siècle », *Études de philologie romane*, 1985 ; repr., Geneva, Droz, 2001, p. 535-567 ; also *Id.*, « Les Traductions vernaculaires de Virgile au Moyen Age », *Lectures médiévales de Virgile : Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française de Rome (Rome, 25-28 octobre 1982)*, Rome, Ecole française de Rome, 1985, p. 189-248. On the judgment of Paris episode, see R. J. Cormier, « Synchronizing Myth ».

insights into one twelfth-century truly daring rejuvenator. To use Sir Richard Southern's words regarding this era of philosophical, scientific, and theological « stretching », what he calls the « restless search for new materials » finds its vernacular parallel in the attempted fusion of ancient and modern exemplified by the *Roman d'Eneas*<sup>51</sup>. If one perceives among the translator's goals a manifestation of concepts of what Southern names high-order humanism – « dignity, order, reason and intelligibility [... made] prominent » - and if we glimpse in the romance a hint of an "intelligible order in the universe », then the bridge to the twelfth-century intellectual revival in the Norman-Angevin realms becomes more solid and opens our eyes to the concomitant rise of the vernacular as well<sup>52</sup>.

Moreover, the romance represents more than a « convergence » of Latin and vernacular witnesses<sup>53</sup>. It exemplifies an early but not insignificant « eloquent appropriation" of Virgil's « hypotext ». As Maria Fabricius Hansen might allow (in her extraordinary study of early Christian *spolia*, especially 167-180), the medieval anonymous intentionally reshapes Virgil's masterwork into his own creation. She writes : « [The] ideal of borrowing from a multiplicity of sources with the aim of transforming the gathered material to a coherent but new and different whole seems precisely to have been at stake in building with *spolia* »<sup>54</sup>. One can make the same observation about the *Eneas* romance as a synthesizing translation that « re-uses » and inverts the text of Virgil (and many other sources as well). Diverging with flourish elsewhere - as in book I with a special treatment of the Judgment of Paris episode, in book IV with Dido's deathbed pardon of Eneas, or having the rejoicing Trojans drink from the Tiber in book VII – the poet faithfully translates here, as if in a mode of collusion or confluence, whereas elsewhere, and for the most part he embellishes and his eclectic strategies result in a completely new work, filled with heterogeneity. Taking full ownership of Virgil in every sense of the word (as Petersen does with Homer), the medieval poet is, one might say, reusing « classical columns » correctly here, to build his own Romanesque « church ». His *Kontrastimitation* is a real innovation, just like his egregious and exceptional female heroine, Lavine<sup>55</sup>.

---

<sup>51</sup> R. W. Southern, *Medieval Humanism*, New York and Evanston, Harper and Row, 1970, p. 80.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 32.

<sup>53</sup> M. Colish, *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition : 400-1400*, op. cit., p. 182.

<sup>54</sup> M. F. Hansen, *The Eloquence of Appropriation : Prolegomena to an Understanding of Spolia in Early Christian Rome*, L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2003, p. 19.

<sup>55</sup> In regard to *spolia*, *ibidem*. For Lavine as an « innovator », see *Eneas*, éd. cit., v. 8366-8374.

Can we ever really know if the Old French author-by simply transmitting it - shares the heretical doctrine of metempsychosis ? That is, as one reader asked, regarding what might be called the « Norman metaphor », is he

« possibly [...] suggesting that offspring of the Plantagenet dynasty whom he serves might farther ahead in the course of *translatio imperii* from the Romans be reincarnations of purified souls just as the Trojano-Latin and Roman offspring of Anchises' son Aeneas were ? How, if at all, does the romance author make a connection between metempsychosis and the coming about of the Plantagenets as further offspring of the Trojans ? »<sup>56</sup>

This interpretation has been corroborated to a certain extent by the tempting but solicitous speculations of Stahuljak (*Bloodless Genealogies of the French Middle Ages : Translatio, Kinship, and Metaphor*, 2005), whose explanation for the passage in question focuses on an overly subtle issue of « bloodless » genealogies (linguistic and not procreative), a non-existent textual « patricide », and views the hero- « patricide » himself as the abject of metempsychosis through redemption; the author fails, for example, to mention the important role of Eneas's divine mother. In my own view (still ungrounded speculation), the passage in question is an Ovidian echo of authorial boasting - self-reflectivity ; the anonymous has his own adaptation in mind and its future influence as he describes reincarnation.

Anxious as we are for the « why » regarding the exceptional metempsychosis episode, while trying to answer perhaps more properly by indirection, we must certainly emphasize as well the context of a radical scholastic enthusiasm for rational, novel learning, speculative analyses, and a more systematic theology<sup>57</sup>. Winthrop Wetherbee has sketched a fascinating parallel between the discourse of Virgil's Anchises regarding the « all-pervading « spirit of cosmic life » and the whole scheme of Bernardus Silvestris inspired poetic treatise, *De mundi universitate* (book 2),

---

See also D. S. Wilson-Okamura, « Lavinia and Beatrice : The Second Half of the *Aeneid* in the Middle Ages, » *Dante Studies* n° 119 (2001), p.103-124, here p. 113-117, for powerful arguments regarding our text's *Nachleben* and especially for Dante's knowledge and exploitation of the *Eneas*. Cf. R. J. Cormier, « À propos de Lavine amoureuse : Le Savoir sentimental féminin et cognitif », *Bien Dire Bien Apprendre* n° 24, 2006, « Réception et représentation de l'antiquité », p. 57-70.

<sup>56</sup> W. Haase, in *Littera*, 29 March 2004.

<sup>57</sup> S. P. Morrone, « Medieval Philosophy in Context », *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Philosophy*, 2003, p. 24-27.

which allegorically posits *Natura* as an emblem to underscore Aeneas's Odyssean labors to overcome fate and find his destiny<sup>58</sup>.

It is quite clear, nevertheless, that hungry curiosity, playful and open examination, and measurement of radiant nature and the procreative cosmos, along with a thirst for civilized, urbane, and humanistic freedom, are how Friedrich Heer characterizes the principal ingredients of the « Twelfth-Century Awakening » in his prescient survey of *The Medieval World*. This was an exciting period of intellectual fireworks when a humanist like John of Salisbury could assimilate antique friendship (*amicitia*) to Christ-like charity (*caritas*) thus, once again, blending the legacy of classical learning and Christian thought<sup>59</sup>. As Peter Dronke explains also, twelfth-century secular Latin poetry by and for intellectuals illustrates unquestionably how the heathen gods of mythology remained interiorized and integrated into the worldview<sup>60</sup>. Some eight hundred years earlier, in the final days of the fourth century, it was « becoming unprofitable not to be a Christian », writes James O'Donnell, and he warns as well : « In our haste to dismiss the period as an age of faith, we do not often do justice to the tensions and ambiguities which have remained in

---

<sup>58</sup> W. Wetherbee, *Platonism a Poetry in the Twelfth Century : The Literary Influence of the School of Chartres*, *op. cit.*, p. 177-178. A complete answer to readers' queries in regards to the romancer's aims, specific audience, and, most of all his identity remain in the realm of speculation. It would require (in my opinion) much more contextual study and perhaps a separate historico-literary monograph. Some time back (1962), Walter Schirmer and Ulrich Broich broke important ground on the subject (*Studien zum literarischen Patronat im England des 12 Jahrhunderts*, Cologne, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1962, p. 27-93) : on Henry II as a patron of letters (including history !), but especially needed is deeper analysis of the subject in its formative period, 1130-1154 (with the crucial influence of the chaotic period after the death of Henry I). The recent study by Jean Blacker, *The Faces of Time : Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman Regnum*, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1994, takes up a giant step in this direction.

<sup>59</sup> G. W. Olsen, « John of Salisbury's Humanism », *Gli umanesimi medievali : Atti del II Congresso dell' Internationales Mittellateinerkomitee*, Florence, Sept. 1993, Florence, SISMEL / Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998, p. 447-468, here p. 457. This insight reminds us of how Christianity's ritual dancing was adapted from heathen celtic sources (A. Warburg, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity : Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, Los Angeles, Calif., Getty Research Institute, 1999, 542n367) - Even Conrad of Hirsau (fl. ca. 1135) considered elements of Ovid's works pieces of gold, though covered with mind-tainting and vicious dung, dangerous for young minds : *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, c. 1100 – c. 1375 : The Commentary-Tradition*, (ed.) A. J. Minnis and A. B. Scott, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1991, p. 56.

<sup>60</sup> P. Dronke, « Gli dei pagani nella poesia latina medievale », *Gli umanesimi medievali : Atti del II Congresso dell' Internationales Mittellateinerkomitee*, Florence, Sept. 1993, *op. cit.*, p. 97-110, here p. 110.

Christianity at all periods. »<sup>61</sup> Ambiguity certainly prevails in the *Eneas*, whether in its definition of the new romance hero or in the episode describing the human soul's metempsychosis. The « bird's-eye view of the entire tradition » of the ancients was the advantageous yet respectful boast of William of Conches, a mere dwarf on the shoulders of giants<sup>62</sup>. That is, we modern dwarfs see farther by being borne aloft on « gigantic backs » as Bernard of Chartres puts it<sup>63</sup>. To quote William again finally in a more revealing (albeit problematic) context : « More weight is to be given to the one who follows the more recent writers » (*magis consentiendum est qui iuniores imitatur*)<sup>64</sup>.

In the colossal wake of Virgil-and with borrowings from Ovid, Servius, Boethius, and Macrobius - the *Roman d'Eneas* carries more weight in our view because it syncretizes ancient literary traditions, even while rubbing shoulders with more recent authors, like William of Conches, Thierry of Chartres, or Bernardus Silvestris. Thus, it may be said that the *Eneas* romance assimilated the pagan idea of the afterlife, nonchalantly. It may even be possible to argue for deeper influence of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the *Eneas* than one might expect : perhaps the romancer was so suffused with Ovidian matter and change that the doctrine expounded by Anchises seemed unsurprising and normal, and the translation merely proceeded, en passant. Or else, like Dante's Statius, his sight was just singed by the sparks of holy fire and his own flaming ardor for Virgil's *Aeneid* -those « celestial flames that produce life itself. »<sup>65</sup>

Raymond J. CORMIER




---

<sup>61</sup> J. O'Donnell, « The Demise of Paganism », *Tradition* 35 (1979), p. 45-88, here p. 81, 87.

<sup>62</sup> *Guillelmi de Conchis : Glosae super boetium*, éd. cit., xxxii.

<sup>63</sup> *The Glosae super Platonem of Bernard of Chartres*, éd. P. E. Dutton, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1991, p. 37.

<sup>64</sup> H. Rodnite Lemay, « William of Conches and the New Translations : How an Editor Assesses Influence on Her Author » (paper presented at the 38th International Congress on Medieval Studies, Western Michigan University- Kalamazoo, May 2003), handout 2, 5. I am indebted to Professor Rodnite Lemay for sharing drafts of her work from the Kalamazoo conference (2002, 2003), previewing her exciting new edition of the glosses on Macrobius by William of Conches.

<sup>65</sup> « Al mio ardor fuor seme le faville, / che mi scaldar, de la divina fiamma/ onde sono allumati più di mille ; / de l'Eneida dico, la quai mamma / fummi, e fummi nutrice, poetando : / sanz' essa non fermai peso di dramma ». - *Purgatorio*, XXI, 94-99. Cf. *Aeneid* VI. 730-731.



# Miscellanea Juslittera volume 8 – Hiver 2019

