Proceedings of the Virgil Society 23 (1998) 73–100
© 1998

Imperium sine fine: Virgil, Augustus and Frederick Barbarossa

A paper given to the Virgil Society on 24 February 1996

Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneasroman* is a late twelfth-century version of the *Aeneid*, written in Middle High German rhyming couplets, but its immediate source was the anonymous Old French *Roman d'Eneas*.[1] Given the importance of Augustus and Empire to Virgil, it seems hardly coincidental that Veldeke mentions Frederick Barbarossa (Holy Roman Emperor, 1152–90) twice in his text, and this paper explores some of the reasons why the story of the *Aeneid* might have seemed apposite to a later twelfth-century German audience.

Virgil's works were probably known to the medieval authors from their schooldays. Although pagan works presented a challenge to contemporary Christian values with their many references to the pagan gods and the Roman moral code, even such authorities as Tertullian and Jerome had been able to see some value in their study and Jerome had considered Virgil essential reading for boys.[2] By the twelfth century, Virgil's works were part of the staple diet of all educated men.[3]

Whilst the *Roman d'Eneas* is clearly based on the *Aeneid*, it is not what we today would call a translation: Virgil is never mentioned and there are some notable differences. The Old French author adopts a straightforward narrative sequence, beginning with a short account of the fall of Troy, rather than proceeding *in medias res*, as Virgil does. References to Aeneas's wanderings and to the funeral games in Sicily, which take up Books 3 and 5 of the *Aeneid*, are almost completely omitted, and the Gods are given a much reduced role. On the other hand, the Old French author introduces some entirely new aspects into his work. The Judgement of Paris is inserted near the beginning as the cause of Juno's anger against the Trojans and, in the second half of the

work, the poet describes at length the love affair between Eneas and Lavinia, which is presented in typical courtly romance fashion. Whereas the *Aeneid* ends famously on an ambiguous note, with Turnus's life fleeing 'moaning, resentful, to the Shades',[4] in the *Roman d'Eneas*, Eneas's ultimate victory over Turnus is followed by his marriage to Lavinia and succession to Latinus as King of Latium.

Veldeke follows the same general pattern as the anonymous Old French author, but he expands even more on the love between Eneas and Lavinia and goes to some lengths to create parallels between Dido and Lavinia as part of a general tendency to show greater sympathy for Dido. Unlike his French predecessor, Veldeke often mentions Virgil by name to substantiate his story and his references to Barbarossa are also without parallel.

Little is known of Veldeke beyond what can be gleaned from his works and from passing references to him in the works of later writers. Although he came from the Maastricht area, and would thus be considered today to be Dutch or Flemish, the *Eneasroman* survives only in Middle High German. It is assumed that the author had a clerical education. From the epilogue to the *Eneasroman*, we learn that the work was completed at the behest of Hermann, Count Palatine of Saxony, after being lost whilst on loan to the Countess of Cleves.[5] From this it is deduced that the *Eneasroman* was roughly four-fifths complete by 1174 and probably finally completed by 1190.[6] The *Roman d'Eneas* would have been written earlier, probably around 1160. Although we have no information about the author whatsoever, there are linguistic grounds for believing that he was associated with the Anglo-Norman court of Henry II of England and his Queen, Eleanor of Aquitaine.[7]

The *Eneasroman* survives in six more or less complete manuscripts.[8] Another late manuscript contains a heavily abridged version and there are five further fragmentary copies. Two of the complete manuscripts and the abridged version are lavishly illustrated and one of these, the famous Berlin manuscript dating from the second decade of the thirteenth century, is arguably the most beautiful manuscript of any German poem of such early date.[9] Two manuscripts actually date from the end of the twelfth century and are thus relatively close in time to the likely date of composition—the rest are evenly spread across the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. The *Roman d'Eneas* survives in seven virtually complete manuscripts and in two others with rather

large *lacunae*.[10] All of these date from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with the possible exception of MS A, which may date to the end of the twelfth century. Furthermore, one manuscript (D) is very different to the others and seems to offer almost an independent rehandling of the material.

There is not time to provide a detailed analysis of the political circumstances prevailing at the point when Veldeke was writing and a brief sketch must therefore suffice.[11] When the emperor Henry V died in 1125, the Salian dynasty was extinguished and there were two powerful families with rival claims to the throne: the Welfs or Guelphs and the Hohenstaufen or Staufer, also known as the Ghibellines. Henry V was succeeded by Lothar III, Count of Supplinburg, and then by Conrad III, of the Hohenstaufen family. When Conrad died, his nephew Frederick Barbarossa was elected in preference to Conrad's eight-year old son, Frederick of Rothenburg, who was considered too young to provide the necessary stability. Barbarossa was the son of Conrad's brother and a Welf princess and thus had all the right credentials to calm the rivalry between the two families. However, he inherited a power base which rested on imperial and family property holdings and their associated feudal rights rather than on any central authority. His Welf cousin, Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony and Bavaria, also controlled vast swathes of property and enjoyed exceptional power and prestige. Like Barbarossa, Henry the Lion claimed descent from Charlemagne. He himself was the grandson of Lothar III, and his wife was the daughter of the English King Henry II and a granddaughter of the Empress Matilda (wife of the Emperor Henry V, then of Geoffrey of Anjou—Henry II was the product of her second marriage). Through his marriage, Henry the Lion not only strengthened his imperial connections, but also gained a father-in-law who was one of Barbarossa's chief adversaries in Europe.

In the early years of Barbarossa's reign, relations between the two cousins seem to have been good and Henry the Lion provided crucial military support on a number of occasions. However, Henry did not take part in any of Barbarossa's Italian campaigns after 1161 and the relationship finally soured when Henry refused his support at Chiavenna in 1176. On this occasion, Barbarossa asked Henry for military assistance in his troubles with the Lombard League and may even have gone on his knees to do so. Henry wanted the imperial city of Goslar and the nearby silver mines in return. Barbarossa refused and so did Henry—a rift

developed which culminated in outlawry being pronounced against Henry in 1179, and *Oberacht*, a more severe form of outlawry involving active dispossession of fiefs in the name of the Empire, was pronounced in 1180. By 1181, Henry was brought to his knees and obliged to go into exile at the Anglo-Norman court for three years; it was a dramatic fall from grace, and one which cannot fail to have made a deep impression on the German nobility at the time.

Barbarossa actually spent 16 of his 38 years of rule campaigning in Italy, the first emperor for many years to take an interest in setting up a new basis for government there. Like Aeneas, Barbarossa was a foreigner returning to the land of his ancestors in Italy, a point which was evidently not lost on the anonymous author of the *Carmen de gestis Frederici I imperatoris in Lombardia.*[12] This poem, which survives in incomplete form in only one manuscript, is a historical epic in Latin hexameters dealing with Barbarossa's first and second campaigns in Italy, breaking off in the middle of the battle of Carcano in 1160. The poet is thought to have been a Bergamask and to have composed the work during the period 1162–6.

In this poem, Barbarossa is variously described as 'pius Fredericus', 'pater Fredericus', 'rex pius' and 'pius ductor', recalling Virgil's characterization of Aeneas, and there are many reminiscences of the *Aeneid*. Most notably, it is the fury Allecto, who does not appear in Veldeke's work, who inflames the Lombard cities to rebel against Barbarossa, reserving a second visit and two snakes from her hair for the city of Milan, his most formidable adversary.

One consequence of Barbarossa's energetic campaigning in Italy was increased tension with the papacy. This reached its climax during the papacy of Urban III (1185–7), who was a Milanese by birth and well remembered Barbarossa's destruction of the city in 1162. Barbarossa had proposed in 1184 that this son, Henry VI, should be crowned co-emperor in his lifetime, but this was bitterly opposed by Urban, who refused to resign the archbishopric of Milan in order to deprive the emperor of the right of *regalia* during the vacancy. Not to be outdone, Barbarossa went ahead on 27 January 1186 with the wedding and coronation in Milan of Henry VI and Constance, heir presumptive to the throne of Sicily, both ceremonies performed by the Patriarch of Aquileia. Although historians disagree as to whether this was an imperial coronation, in violation of the pope's rights, it certainly had an imperial

flavour, reminiscent of the Byzantine ceremony in which the reigning emperor appointed his successor co-emperor. Contemporary chroniclers also claim that Barbarossa himself invested his son with the title of *Caesar*.[13]

To understand the appeal of the Aeneas story to a medieval audience, it is necessary to remember that Aeneas was not only the *pater pius* of Rome but also the legendary ancestor of peoples such as the Franks and the Britons. In about 1136, Geoffrey of Monmouth completed his *Historia regum Britanniae*, in which he described how Brutus, a grandson of Aeneas, came to Britain via Greece at the behest of the gods, leading a band of Trojan exiles to found a second Troy.[14] In 1183, Gottfried of Viterbo, tutor to the future emperor Henry VI and a member of the royal chapel under Conrad III, Barbarossa and Henry VI, completed his *Speculum regum*, in which he traced the descent of Charlemagne from Troy via two different routes: the Franks could trace their descent from a party of Trojan exiles led by Priam junior (!), whilst Charlemagne's mother, a Byzantine princess, could trace her descent back via the Byzantine and Roman emperors to Aeneas.[15] Charlemagne was thus doubly vindicated in his claim to be heir to the Roman Empire. In 1185, Gottfried completed the *Memoria seculorum*, which he then transformed into the *Liber memorialis*. The latter traced Charlemagne's descendants down to Frederick Barbarossa and Henry VI. It was at this time that Barbarossa was locked in dispute with the pope over his attempts to make the empire hereditary and therefore Gottfried's genealogy, which so neatly avoided any mention of papal authority, may have provided welcome secular proof of the validity of Staufer aspirations.

Veldeke's two references to Barbarossa, the so-called *Stauferpartien*, have excited much scholarly interest and remain something of a puzzle.[16] They were once thought to be interpolations by a later hand but are now considered to be Veldeke's work, albeit possibly a late addition. By the time he wrote these parts, Veldeke would have already secured the patronage of Hermann, Count Palatine of Saxony, to complete the *Eneasroman* and thus have no immediate need of imperial patronage, unless he was planning a new literary project. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Barbarossa himself was a great patron of the arts, although his second wife, Beatrix, was highly literate and fostered poetry, and his son, the future Henry VI, was a skilled poet in his own right.[17] Why, therefore, should Veldeke choose to mention Barbarossa?

The first of the *Stauferpartien* occurs after the death of the young warrior, Pallas. This is a pivotal point in the story, since in the *Aeneid*, as well as in both medieval versions of the story, there is a causal link between the death of Pallas and Aeneas's decision not to spare the life of Turnus.

We first encounter Pallas in Book 8 of the *Aeneid* as he rushes alone to investigate the arrival of Aeneas and the Trojans at Pallanteum. Subsequently, Evander agrees to help Aeneas and sends Pallas with him to learn the art of war. For Virgil, Pallas, like the Trojan, Euryalus, and the Etruscan, Lausus, is one of a number of young men destined to lose their lives in the battle for Latium. Pallas eventually faces Turnus and, although it is clear that he is outmatched, he exclaims *aut spoliis ego iam raptis laudabor opimis | aut leto insigni: sorti pater aequus utrique est* ('Soon shall I have fame, either by seizing a commander's spoils, or by an illustrious death. My father is equally resigned to either lot': *Aen.* 10.449–50).[18] Pallas calls on Hercules, his father's patron, to assist him, but as Jupiter says to Hercules: *stat sua cuique dies, breve et inreparabile tempus | omnibus est vitae; sed famam extendere factis, | hoc virtutis opus* ('For each man his day stands fixed. For all mankind the days of life are few, and not to be restored. But to prolong fame by deeds, that is valour's task': *Aen.* 10.467–9).

Pallas's death is quick and brutal. Turnus takes as his spoils Pallas's magnificent belt, ominously decorated with scenes from the blood wedding of the Danaides, fifty maidens who, with one exception, killed their husbands early on their wedding night. The belt is heavy with symbolism: Pallas, like the bridegrooms, dies as one of the many on the threshold of what should have been a happy occasion and, like them, he will be avenged. At this point, in the words of R. D. Williams, Virgil 'compels the attention'[19] by breaking the narrative, as follows:

> *nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae*
> *et servare modum rebus sublata secundis!*
> *Turno tempus erit magno cum optaverit emptum*
> *intactum Pallanta, et cum spolia ista diemque*
> *oderit.* (*Aen.* 10.501–5)

How blind are men to fate and futurity, and how little they know how to preserve moderation at the proud moment of

> success! For Turnus there will come a time when he will wish that he could pay a great price for Pallas to be restored unharmed, and will hate this day and its spoils.

The news of Pallas's death has an electrifying effect on Aeneas. He captures eight young men to be used as human sacrifices on Pallas's pyre, something which would have seemed barbarous even in Virgil's day, and he slays Magus as the latter begs for his life, anticipating his later attitude towards Turnus. The hallmarks of Aeneas's reaction are rage and fury: Virgil peppers the narrative with phrases such as *Dardanides contra furit* ('Enraged, the Dardan-born confronted them': *Aen.* 10.545) and *torrentis aquae vel turbinis atri | more furens* ('His rage was the rage of a mountain torrent or black tornado': *Aen.* 10.603–4). Aeneas is deprived of an encounter with Turnus at this stage, thanks to the intervention of Juno, and Book 10 climaxes in the deaths of Mezentius and Lausus, father and son. Virgil portrays anger raging on both sides of the battlefield. As he slays Orodes *subridens mixta Mezentius ira* ('Mezentius smiled, and anger was in the smile': *Aen.* 10.742). Meanwhile, the gods above *iram miserantur inanem | amborum* ('pitied the pointless fury of both sides': *Aen.* 10.758–9).

Pallas is introduced by the Old French author in much the same way as by Virgil. However, there is one important alteration: Pallas is dubbed a knight and his sword is girded on by Eneas. Little is made of this by the author at the time, but it perhaps serves to explain the sense of responsibility that the French Eneas later feels for Pallas's death. When Eneas and Pallas return to relieve the siege of the Trojan camp, the French author dispenses with preliminaries and moves almost immediately to the battle between Pallas and Turnus. The battle commences after Pallas has delivered a long speech haranguing the fleeing Trojans and it is noticeable that he gives Turnus a much stiffer contest than his Virgilian forebear. Only after his death do we learn that the French Pallas has already killed a hundred men in battle. As Pallas dies, the narrator comments drily *ne li puet mes chaloir | qui que puisse la femme avoir* ('It can concern him no longer who gets the woman': *RdE.* 5753–4).[20] There are no contemptuous remarks by Turnus, but the latter does remove from Pallas's finger a gold ring bearing a jacinth carved with a lion cub and given to the boy by Eneas. The narrator comments, in a manner reminiscent of Virgil:

> *...Por fol le fet:*
> *puis fu tels jor, se il saüst,*
> *que ja bailliez par lui ne fust,*
> *se il s'en peüst repentir,*
> *car por l'anel l'estut morir.* (*RdE.* 5770–4)

> He does this in folly. Later there would be a day—if only he could have known it—when he would never have taken it if he could have repented of it, for because of that ring he was to die.

The French Eneas is moved by Pallas's death to sorrow rather than anger—*molt ot grant duel en son corage* ('There was very great sorrow in his heart': *RdE.* 5849)—and he vows to take revenge: *vangerai vos, se faire el puis* ('I will avenge you if I can': *RdE.* 5855). The atmosphere of rage and fury is missing, as are the innumerable fights in which Virgil's Aeneas vents his anger. The French Eneas encounters and wounds Mezentius almost immediately, but the latter is carried off by his supporters and thus the motivation for Lausus's intervention is changed: by implication, he seeks revenge and, when he lies dead, the narrator comments: *son pere cuida vangier, | mais il lo compara molt chier* ('Lausus had hoped to avenge his father, but paid for it very dearly': *RdE.* 5919–20).

Veldeke introduces Pallas in much the same way as his French predecessor. The main differences are that the knighting ceremony is a much grander affair and, perhaps significantly, Evander talks of crowning Pallas. Veldeke does not describe this actually happening, but Pallas is frequently referred to as 'the young king'. Furthermore, there is no suggestion that Eneas is in any way associated with girding on Pallas's sword. As in the *Roman d'Eneas,* Pallas is next seen arriving with Eneas to relieve the siege of Montalban and, as in the French, he plunges straight into battle with Turnus. Veldeke goes into much more detail about the arms and armour of the combatants, but the encounter itself is indecisive and attention turns briefly to Eneas, who is distinguishing himself elsewhere in the field. Pallas is also active and the effect is to raise tension before his second and final encounter with Turnus. When this encounter eventually takes place, Veldeke's Turnus reacts to Pallas with anger rather than contempt: *daz was Turnô vile zorn* ('This made Turnus furious': *En.* 205,13).[21]

Veldeke seems to be even more concerned to show Pallas as a worthy opponent for Turnus, to the extent that Pallas nearly kills his adversary, but eventually Turnus runs him through with his sword *sô daz herm lant unde wîb | immer mêr mit fride liez* ('so that the latter henceforth let him have his land and his bride in peace': *En.* 206,18–19). The point of view is thus changed from that of Pallas (at the moment of death the French Pallas did not care who got the girl) to that of Turnus. Veldeke revives the Virgilian notion, absent in the French, that Pallas's appointed day had come: his men lament *daz her alsô veiger was* ('that he was doomed to die in this way': *En.* 206,23). Like his French predecessor, the German Pallas has killed more than a hundred men, but Veldeke stresses the honourable nature of his death rather than his bravery. In fact, his great feat of arms avails him little *wan daz man in lobet noch | und diu tugent is von im gescriben* ('except that his praises are still sung, and his excellence is written about': *En.* 207,2–3). This is a clear echo of Virgil, again absent in the French: Pallas has prolonged his fame by deeds, the true task of valour.

As in the French, Turnus removes a ring from Pallas's finger and the narrator remarks that this will be his undoing, but Veldeke does not give quite such a detailed description of the ring and instead makes the point that it was given to Pallas by Eneas *dorch trouwe und dorch fruntschaft, | dorch minne und dorch gesellеschaft* ('as a token of loyalty, friendship, affection, and companionship': *En.* 207,15–16). The effect is to make Turnus's action an offence against these values. Veldeke is at pains to show the episode as an aberration on Turnus's part: *Turnûs der helt kûne | vergaz sîn selbes sêre drane* ('Turnus the bold hero forgot himself completely when he saw it': *En.* 207,22–3). However, he also makes the ring seem much more important, for Turnus would have survived *niwan daz vingerlîn, | daz her in dar umbe slûch* ('if it had not been for the ring, for which he slew him': *En.* 207,34–35).

The reaction of Veldeke's Eneas is much closer to that of the Virgilian original: on hearing of Pallas's death, *daz was Ênêê vil zoren* ('Eneas was very angry': *En.* 210,40); *vor leide und vor zorne | ne mohter niht gesprechen* ('he could not speak for grief and anger': *En.* 211,8–9); *Ênêas der hêre | was erbolgen sêre* ('worthy Eneas was greatly enraged': *En.* 211,19–20). Eneas kills innumerable opponents before facing Mezentius, and Veldeke follows the French author faithfully here, showing the wounded Mezentius being carried off before Lausus takes the field.

However, the medieval authors truly come into their own in describing the funeral arrangements for Pallas. Virgil deals with this in two stages: first we see Aeneas lamenting the loss of Pallas and having the body returned in state to Evander, then, soon after, the body is received in Pallanteum. Aeneas's lament and the description of the body lying on the bier are suffused with sorrow. Aeneas's speech refers to the role of Fortune, and the body of Pallas is memorably compared to a plucked flower. The ill-starred youth is returned to his homeland in style, accompanied by the spoils which he had won in battle and by the intended human sacrifices. It seems likely from the description that the body will be burnt on a pyre, the traditional classical hero's funeral. Evander is, of course, distraught, but he is magnanimous in his grief. He bears no grudge against the Trojans or Aeneas but he demands the death of Turnus in revenge and, indeed, this motivates Aeneas's actions in the end.

The French author greatly expands this part of the narrative, taking the action in one sweep from Eneas's lament to the funeral rites in Palantee. The French Pallas is provided with a much more lavish bier and with hundreds of captives to accompany the funeral procession. Again there is a profound air of sorrow as Eneas sees the body off and his speech of lament is particularly moving. As in the Virgilian original, Eneas laments the hand of Fortune in Pallas's death and he compares the boy to a rose withered by the sun, a touching and peculiarly medieval reworking of the plucked flower motif. However, the French Eneas holds himself much more directly responsible for Pallas's death than his Virgilian counterpart. In line with the general pattern in the *Roman d'Eneas*, Eneas vows to take revenge. He reveals that he had sworn to Pallas's parents that their son would not be killed without him and exclaims: *manti lor ai tot planement* ('quite plainly I have lied to them': *RdE.* 6179). At Palantee, the French author introduces Pallas's mother who, according to Virgil, was long dead. The mourning by Pallas's parents is described at length and his mother, in particular, blames the Trojans. Both are inconsolable. The effect of the changes is to make the motivation for Eneas's final action spring from within: the French Eneas does not need to be charged to take revenge—it is his own first thought. The grief caused by Pallas's death provides the justification: the unavenged death is a slight on Eneas.

Veldeke again follows the same plan as the French author, but as Eneas's speech concentrates on Pallas's virtues, rather than the

appearance of the body, no comparison to a flower is made. Instead, the German Eneas laments the loss of his young comrade-in-arms and specifically refers to Pallas being only seventeen years of age, underlining the tragedy. Veldeke shows Eneas feeling guilty about Pallas's death, but there is no suggestion that he made such a positive commitment to Pallas's parents as his French predecessor had. Nevertheless, the bitter laments of Pallas's parents are even more protracted in the *Eneasroman*, and Pallas's mother specifically blames Eneas personally, rather than the Trojans in general.

Both medieval authors now follow with a description of the tomb of Pallas and the accompanying burial rites. The precise details need not detain us, but clearly there is no parallel in Virgil. However, there is a parallel within the medieval texts, for a similarly intricate tomb and burial rites are awarded to the female warrior Camilla, Queen of the Volscians. Camilla is an ally of Turnus, and, in the *Aeneid*, her death conspicuously foreshadows Turnus's own. The very last line of the *Aeneid*, used to describe the death of Turnus, is in fact identical to the line describing Camilla's death at 11.831. Furthermore, her desire for spoils, the arms of Chloreus, brings about her death just as Turnus's despoiling of Pallas brings about his. However, once Camilla is dead, Virgil has no more to say about her.

By contrast, the medieval authors both give Camilla almost identical treatment to Pallas: her death is lamented by Turnus, she is provided with a costly bier, and her body is returned to her homeland, where it is laid to rest in a tomb of even greater architectural complexity than that of Pallas. In both cases, the tone of Turnus's lament for Camilla closely follows that of Eneas's lament for Pallas. Significantly, however, only the French Turnus specifically makes a link between the two deaths, saying *molt est Pallas chier comparez, | un chevalier que lor ocis* ('Pallas—a knight of theirs whom I killed—is very dearly bought': *RdE.* 7388–9). For Veldeke, the parallel rests at the level of their youth and virginity. In both cases, the highest Christian ideal, chastity, is merged with the finest traditions of Rome.

Veldeke now goes a stage further than even the French author. In his *De gestis regum anglorum*, written in about 1140, the English chronicler William of Malmesbury describes the rediscovery of Pallas's uncorrupted body as follows:

Tunc corpus Pallantis filii Evandri, de quo Virgilius narrat,

> *Romae repertum est illibatum, ingenti stupore omnium quod tot secula incorruptione sui superavit... Hiatus vulneris quod in medio pectore Turnus fecerat, quatuor pedibus et semis mensuratum est. Epitaphium hujusmodi repertum:*
>
> *Filius Evandri Pallas, quem lancea Turni*
> *Militis occidit more suo, jacet hic.*
>
> *...Ardens lucerna ad caput inventa arte mechanica, ut nullius flatus violentia, nullius liquoris aspergine valeret extingui. Quod cum multi mirarentur, unus, ut semper aliqui sollertius ingenium in malis habent, stilo subtus flammam foramen fecit; ita introducto aere, ignis evanuit. Corpus, muro applicitum, vastitate sui moenium altitudinem vicit; sed procedentibus diebus stillicidiis rorulentis infusum, communem mortalium corruptionem agnovit, cute soluta et nervis fluentibus.*
> (William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum anglorum* II.206)[22]

> At that time, the body of Pallas, the son of Evander, of whom Virgil speaks, was found entire at Rome, to the great astonishment of all, for having escaped corruption for so many ages... The gash which Turnus had made in the middle of his breast measured four feet and a half. His epitaph was found to this effect:
>
> Pallas, Evander's son, lies buried here
> In due order, transfix'd by Turnus' spear.
>
> ...There was a burning lamp at his head, constructed by magical art; so that no violent blast, no dripping of water could extinguish it. While many were lost in admiration at this, one person, as there are always some people expert in mischief, made an aperture beneath the flame with an iron style, which introducing the air, the light vanished. The body, when set up against the wall, surpassed it in height, but some days afterwards, being drenched with the drip of the eaves, it acknowledged the corruption common to mortals; the skin and the nerves dissolving.

William's description of the tomb's eternal, inextinguishable flame and the epitaph is quite close to the description given in the *Roman d'Eneas*, although we cannot be certain of the direct source, yet the

French author does not allude to the rediscovery: in fact, he specifically states *se fist li rois l'us estouper, | qu'en n'i peüst ja mes antrer* ('the king had the entrance stopped so that no one could ever enter': *RdE*. 6527–8). Veldeke, on the other hand, attributes the rediscovery to Barbarossa during his first Italian expedition in 1155, the occasion of his imperial coronation in Rome. It is impossible to be certain whether Veldeke was the first to attribute this action to Barbarossa (it is more usually associated with an earlier emperor, either Henry II or Henry III), but the rediscovery of ancient tombs was in vogue at this time. In 1191 for instance, the graves of Arthur and Guinevere were miraculously rediscovered in Glastonbury, just in time to revive the flagging finances of the recently burnt monastery.[23] However, the significance of Veldeke's reference may lie in part in the classical origins of this tradition.

Perhaps the most famous ever event of this type was the legendary rediscovery of the tomb of Achilles by Alexander the Great. This was reported by, amongst others, Cicero, in the following words:

> *Quam multos scriptores rerum suarum magnus ille Alexander secum habuisse dicitur! Atque is tamen, cum in Sigeo ad Achillis tumulum adstitisset: 'o fortunate,' inquit, 'adulescens, qui tuae virtutis Homerum praeconem inveneris!' Et vere. Nam, nisi Ilias illa exstitisset, idem tumulus qui corpus eius contexerat nomen etiam obruisset.*
>
> (Cicero, *Pro Archia* 10.24)[24]

> We are told that Alexander the Great took around with him a great number of authors engaged in writing about his achievements. And yet, as he stood beside the tomb of Achilles at Sigeum, he uttered these words: 'Fortunate youth, who found Homer to proclaim your valour!' He was right; for, if the *Iliad* had never existed, the tomb where Achilles' body was buried would have buried his memory as well.[25]

Whilst it is open to doubt whether Veldeke could have known *Pro Archia*, the sentiment behind this extract seems to have been widely known in the twelfth century. For instance, in his *Policraticus*, completed in 1159, John of Salisbury states the following:

> *Quis enim Alexandros sciret aut Caesares, quis Stoicos aut*

> *Peripateticos miraretur, nisi eos insignirent monimenta scriptorum? ...Arcus triumphales tunc proficiunt illustribus viris ad gloriam, cum ex quibus causis et quorum sint impressa docet inscriptio. Liberatorem patriae, fundatorem quietis tunc demum inspector agnoscit, cum titulus triumphatorem, quem nostra Britannia genuit, indicat Constantinum. Nullus enim umquam constanti gloria claruit, nisi ex suo vel scripto alieno. Eadem est asini et cuiusvis imperatoris post modicum tempus gloria, nisi quatenus memoria alterutrius scriptorum beneficio prorogatur. Quot et quantos arbitraris fuisse reges, de quibus nusquam sermo est aut cogitatio? Nichil ergo consiliosius est captatoribus gloriae quam litteratorum et scribentium maxime gratiam promereri.*
>
> (John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, Prologus 16–31)[26]

> Who would know of Alexander or Caesar, or would respect the Stoics or the Peripatetics, unless they had been distinguished by the memorials of writers? ...Triumphal arches advance the glory of illustrious men whenever inscriptions explain for what cause and for whom they have been erected. It is only because of the inscription on a triumphal arch that the onlooker recognises that Constantine (who was of British stock) is proclaimed liberator of his country and founder of peace. No one would ever be illuminated by perpetual glory unless he himself or someone else had written. The reputation of the fool and the emperor is the same after a moderate period of time except where the memory of either is prolonged by the benificence of writers. How many kings have there been of whom there is nowhere a word or thought? Therefore, there is no better counsel to those who seek glory than to be worthy of the greatest thanks of men of letters and of scribes.[27]

At a later point, John actually quotes from the *Aeneid* (9.446–7) to illustrate the point that Nisus and Euryalus would be unheard of, if it were not for Virgil and goes on to say *Nemo prudentiam Ithaci aut Pelidae vires agnosset, nisi eas Homerus divino publicasset ingenio* ('No one would have heard of the sagacity of the Ithacan [Odysseus] or of the prowess of the son of Peleus [Achilles] had not the divine genius of Homer made them known': *Policraticus* VIII,14).[28]

This sentiment surely also lies behind Veldeke's reference to Barbarossa: a great man needs poets as well as historians in order to make his mark on posterity. It picks up neatly the Virgilian sentiment embedded in Veldeke's description of Pallas's death: great deeds will live on in poetry: *wan daz man in lobet noch* | *und diu tugent is von im gescriben* ('except that his praises are still sung, and his excellence is written about': *En.* 207,2–3). At the same time, Barbarossa is associated by inference with a paragon of youth and valour, possessed of all the Roman secular virtues and imbued with a hint of sanctity by his blameless life and chastity.

There is, however, further possible significance to the mention of Barbarossa's first Italian campaign. The army which set out in 1154 was comparatively small and by far the largest contingent of knights was provided by Henry the Lion. The highlight of this campaign was the imperial coronation in Rome on 18 June 1155 and Henry the Lion played a decisive role in quelling an uprising in Rome on the very day of the coronation. It is quite likely that the mention of this campaign would also evoke the Duke's memory. The fact that Veldeke specifies the first campaign may also be a tacit allusion to more painful memories of later campaigns. In particular, Barbarossa's ambitions in Italy suffered a decisive setback in 1167. A few days after the imperial coronation in Rome of his second wife, Beatrix, Barbarossa's army was decimated by a sudden outbreak of disease. Over 2000 knights are said to have perished, including the scions of many noble families. The imperial chancellor, Rainald of Dassel, was amongst the casualties, but so too were two young men very close to the emperor: his cousins Frederick of Rothenburg, son of Conrad III, and Welf VII. Both would have been shining examples of the tragic loss of young life and the political significance of their deaths was profound: Barbarossa was able to take possession of Frederick's lands and was also able to secure for his own family the considerable inheritance of his uncle, Welf VI, who now had no direct heir, thus outmanoeuvring Henry the Lion.

Interestingly, Veldeke may not have been the first to make a link between Barbarossa and Pallas. In the *Carmen de gestis Frederici I imperatoris in Lombardia* Barbarossa appears before Milan *Auratis... longe conspectus in armis,* | *ut roseus claro cum surgit Lucifer ortu* ('With golden armour shining in the distance, | Like the rising morning star at rosy dawn': ll. 2384–5). The use of the phrase *conspectus in armis*, the reference to the morning star, and other direct allusions to

Aeneid 8 in the immediately preceding lines suggest that this is an allusion to Virgil's description of Pallas as he leaves Pallanteum:

> *ipse agmine Pallas*
> *in medio, chlamyde et pictis conspectus in armis,*
> *qualis ubi Oceani perfusus Lucifer unda,*
> *quem Venus ante alios astrorum diligit ignis,*
> *extulit os sacrum caelo tenebrasque resolvit.*
> (*Aen.* 8.587–91)

> In the centre of the column was Pallas, conspicuous in his gaily coloured mantle and arms; he was like the morning star, which Venus loves more than all constellation-fires, when dripping from the Ocean's wave he lifts his holy countenance in the sky and the darkness melts quickly away.

The second of the two *Stauferpartien* occurs towards the end of the *Eneasroman*, during the description of Eneas's wedding, when Veldeke states that the only festival which can compare with it is the *Mainzer Hoffest* of 1184 (*En.* 347,14 ff.). This was the occasion on which Barbarossa's two sons, the future Emperor Henry VI and Frederick, Duke of Swabia, were knighted and Veldeke says of Barbarossa:

> *ez wirt noch uber hundert jâr*
> *von ime gesaget und gescriben,*
> *daz noch allez is beliben.*
> (*En.* 348,2–4)

> A hundred years from now, all that remains to be said will still be told and written of him.

As in the first of the *Stauferpartien*, the suggestion is that great deeds will live on in writing. The mention of Barbarossa at this point seems to suggest an analogy: just as Eneas is laying the foundation for the Roman Empire and its future glory, Barbarossa is presented at a particular high point in his reign. Although he had not achieved all he might have hoped for in Northern Italy, he had decisively outmanoeuvred Henry the Lion and was feeling confident enough to propose that

his son be made co-emperor. Furthermore, his son was betrothed in the same year to Constance of Sicily, posthumous daughter of King Roger II and aunt of the reigning King William II. This was later to prove a spectacular success when William unexpectedly died childless at the age of 32, naming Constance as his heir. The overwhelming mood is one of optimism.

From his description, it would appear that Veldeke attended the *Mainzer Hoffest,* as indeed did many of his contemporaries.[29] There are said to have been 70 princes in attendance and the knights were numbered in tens of thousands; one source counted 70,000, excluding clerics and other ranks! It was a truly memorable event, compared by others to the biblical feasts of Ahasuerus (Book of Esther) and Solomon. Despite the immense size of the event and the magnificence of the spectacle, one man above all others must have attracted attention: Henry the Lion, in exile since 1181, made a brief reappearance at the *Mainzer Hoffest* before being permitted to return permanently in 1185.

I do not believe that it is a coincidence that both mentions of Barbarossa could also evoke the memory of Henry the Lion. It may also be no coincidence that Veldeke locates the Sibyl at Iconium instead of Cumae (l. 82,15). The reference to Iconium has traditionally been ascribed to the vagaries of scribal transmission, the assumption being that a hapless scribe failed to recognize Cumae as the correct reading and substituted Iconium, which was close to the scene of Barbarossa's fatal accident in 1190.[30] However, in 1172, Henry the Lion made a pilgimage to Jerusalem with a large following and was received like a king by the Greek emperor.[31] On his way back, the Seljuk Sultan Kilij Arslan received Henry at Iconium and greeted him as a blood relative, claiming descent from a high-born German lady. The Sultan declined to be converted to Christianity but one of his gifts to Henry was a pair of hunting leopards trained to ride horses. This incident may well have contributed to later legends surrounding the duke's nickname. In Brunswick, as early as *c.* 1200, it was related that the duke had brought back from the Orient a lion which he had helped to vanquish a dragon. Carvings on the church door at Valthjofsstad in Iceland, dating to *c.* 1230, show a fight with a dragon and a lion couched on a grave, and the legend found literary expression in *Reinfried von Braunschweig,* composed by an Alemannic poet *c.* 1300. This raises the possibility that Henry's encounter with the Sultan was reasonably well-known. As a seat of Muslim

defiance, Iconium may have seemed an apt location for the gates of Hell.

It would be unwise to read the *Eneasroman* purely as an allegory of contemporary events. However, it clearly could have had all kinds of resonances for a later-twelfth-century German audience. Eneas's opponents might evoke memories of the Lombard League or of the papacy or indeed of Henry the Lion. If, indeed, Veldeke did intend his audience to be reminded at various points of Henry—something of which we can never be certain—then we are compelled to examine the final conflict between Eneas and his great adversary, Turnus, in the light of its possible relevance to the struggle between Barbarossa and his quasi-regal 'super-vassal'.[32]

In the *Aeneid*, when Aeneas finally gets the better of Turnus in single combat, the latter kneels before him and appeals for mercy for the sake of his father. Aeneas hesitates and thinks of sparing him, but then he catches sight of Pallas's belt and cries out *Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas | immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit* ('It is Pallas, only Pallas, who by this wound which I now deal makes sacrifice of you; he exacts this retribution, you criminal, from your blood': *Aen.* 12.948–9). As he speaks, Aeneas is consumed by anger: *furiis accensus et ira | terribilis* ('His fury kindled and terrible in his rage': *Aen.* 12.946–7). It is the last act of rage, and Turnus's spirit flees, moaning, to the Underworld.

In the same situation, the French Turnus surrenders unconditionally and offers to become Eneas's vassal. As he holds out his helmet *Eneas en ot grant pitié* ('Eneas had great pity on him': *RdE.* 9793), but when Eneas sees the ring *tot son grant duel en refreschist, | quant de Pallas li remenbra* ('All his great sorrow was renewed when he recalled Pallas': *RdE.* 9798). Although he is *toz taint d'ire* ('all dark with anger': *RdE.* 9800), it is his *molt grant duel* ('very great sorrow': *RdE.* 9808) which is stressed. As he takes the last act of vengeance, he cries *ne t'ocirra mie Eneas, | mais de toi se venche Pallas* ('Eneas will not kill you, but Pallas avenges himself on you': *RdE.* 9809–10). Turnus is killed more in sorrow than in anger, in keeping with the tone of the *Roman d'Eneas*. However, the sorrow is ultimately eclipsed by the great joy attendant on Eneas's wedding to Lavinia and their joint coronation as King and Queen during the lifetime of Lavinia's father, Latinus.

Veldeke noticeably spins out the final confrontation between the two rivals. The German Turnus promises to live the life of a martyr if Eneas spares him and states that he does not yet wish to die *want neheiner*

slahte nôt | *is sô grimme sô der tôt* ('for no plight is as terrible as death itself': *En.* 330,29–30). Eneas takes pity on him and admires his noble qualities; in fact, he is even inclined to be generous and grant him fiefs, riches and clothes, but the sight of the ring prompts an abrupt change: *ez mûz al anders sîn* ('it must all be otherwise': *En.* 331,22). The execution of Turnus is specifically tied to the taking of the ring, which is described as *ein bôsiu girheit* ('base greed': *En.* 331,31). Eneas's last words to Turnus—*Pallas sal ich rechen* | *der reiner tugende hete genûch* ('I will avenge Pallas, who had excellence in ample measure': *En.* 331,36–7)—place the two characters in direct opposition to one another. Turnus is not a bad knight—Veldeke proceeds to award him a eulogy which is unparalleled in either of his sources—but he is flawed in comparison with Pallas. Justice demands that the balance be redressed and Veldeke's Turnus is dispatched completely dispassionately, in marked contrast to his Latin and French predecessors.

It seems to me that Veldeke's Eneas acquires here something of the air of the medieval Just King, dispensing justice without rage or sorrow. To illustrate this, I would like to refer again to John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, which has been described as the first true political treatise of the Middle Ages. John cites David and Samuel as examples of men who killed without attracting the accusation of murder, saying:

> *Hic siquidem gladius est columbae, quae sine felle rixatur, sine iracundia ferit, et, cum dimicat, nullam omnino concipit amaritudinem. Nam sicut lex culpas persequitur sine odio personarum, ita et princeps delinquentes rectissime punit, non aliquo iracundiae motu sed mansuetae legis arbitrio.* (*Policraticus* IV,2)
>
> This is indeed the sword of the dove, which quarrels without bitterness, which slaughters without wrathfulness and which, when fighting, entertains no resentment whatsoever. For since law will prosecute the blameworthy without personal animosity, the prince most properly punishes transgressors not according to some wrathful motive, but by the peaceful will of law.[33]

In the *Eneasroman*, Eneas achieves this equanimity in his handling

of Turnus's surrender. At the most basic level, Turnus has transgressed by taking Pallas's ring, but this in turn is symbolic of a general offence against the values of knighthood. When describing the function of the military order, John of Salisbury specifically states that they should not 'serve either rage or vanity or avarice or their own private will'. Whilst Eneas follows the will of the gods/God, Turnus is seen to serve the rage, avarice and private will which are the antithesis of what the military order stands for, but his greatest crime is to oppose the Just King, again in the words of John of Salisbury:

> *Vtique qui a Deo potestatem accipit, legibus seruit et iustitiae et iuris famulus est. Qui vero eam usurpat, iura deprimit et voluntati suae leges submittit. In eum ergo merito armantur iura qui leges exarmat, et publica potestas saevit in eum qui euacuare nititur publicam manum. Et cum multa sint crimina maiestatis, nullum grauius est eo quod adversus ipsum corpus iustitiae exercetur.*
>
> (*Policraticus* III,15)

> He who receives power from God serves the laws and is the slave of justice and right. He who usurps power suppresses justice and places the laws beneath his will. Therefore justice is deservedly armed against those who disarm the laws, and the public power treats harshly those who endeavour to set aside the public hand. And, although there are many forms of treason, none of them is so serious as that which is executed against the body of justice itself.[34]

Eneas's earlier angry reaction to the death of Pallas may perhaps be explained in terms of righteous anger. In the prologue to Book III of *Policraticus*, John of Salisbury states:

> *et magister caelestis hominem homini diligendum docuerit ut se ipsum. Unde patet indignum esse tanto magistro discipulum qui veritati non congaudet et adversus publicae salutis hostes non excandescit.*
>
> (*Policraticus* III, prologus)

> the Celestial Master teaches that a human being should love his fellow human beings just as he loves himself. And it is apparent that the disciple who does not rejoice with the truth and does not burn with anger against the enemies of public welfare is unworthy of so great a master.[35]

He later states:

> *Sic et potestas, cum inferiorum vitia mansueta manu curare non sufficit, poenarum acrimoniam dolens recte vulneribus infundit, et pia crudelitate saevit in malos, dum bonorum incolumitas procuratur.* (*Policraticus* IV,8)
>
> When mild power does not suffice for the ruler to cure the vices of inferiors, he [the ruler] properly administers intensely painful blows of punishment; pious cruelty rages against the evil, while the good are looked after in safety.[36]

The decision by both medieval authors to continue beyond the death of Turnus seems to suggest a strong desire to show Eneas in an unmistakably positive light. The picture of Aeneas as a model leader of men was by no means self-explanatory, even in Virgil's time and the tradition of *Aeneas proditor*, Aeneas the traitor, which dates back to at least the fourth century BC, was also well-known in the Middle Ages.[37] This tradition is preserved in the Latin translations of the *Ephemeris Belli Troiani* written by Dictys of Crete and the *De excidio Troiae Historia* of Dares Phrygius, dating to the fourth and early sixth centuries respectively. Both of these works were popular in the Middle Ages.

In the twelfth-century *Commentary on the First Six Books of Virgil's 'Aeneid'* attributed to Bernardus Silvestris we read:

> *Atque hoc non usque secundum historie veritatem, quod Frigius describit; sed ubique ut Augusti Cesaris gratiam lucraretur, Enee facta fugamque ficmentis extollit.*
> (Bernardus Silvestris, *Commentum*, Prologue)[38]
>
> Virgil does not write, however, the true version of the story, as does Dares Phrygius; rather, he extols the deeds of Aeneas

> using poetic fictions so that he might earn the favor of Augustus.[39]

Later, he goes on to state:

> *Est enim historia quod Greci Troiam devicerunt; quod vero Enee probitas enarratur fabula est. Narrat enim Frigius Dares Eneam civitatem prodidisse.*
>
> (Bernardus Silvestris, *Commentum*, Bk 2)

> The Greek destruction of Troy is history, but Aeneas's honesty is fiction, for Dares Phrygius narrates that Aeneas betrayed his city.

Otto of Freising, Barbarossa's uncle, refers to Aeneas in his *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus* in the following terms:

> *Hinc Romanorum gentem duxisse originem ab Enea profugo et, ut ipse adulatur, viro forti—ut vero ab aliis traditur, patriae proditore ac nicromantico, utpote qui etiam uxorem suam diis suis immolaverit—, scribit Virgilius.*
>
> (Otto of Freising, *Chronica* I,25)[40]

> Virgil writes that the Roman people traced its descent from there, that is, from Aeneas; the latter was a refugee and, as the former flatteringly calls him, a brave hero—however, as it is transmitted by others, he was a traitor to his country and a necromancer, who even sacrificed his own wife to the gods.

Barbarossa certainly knew of his uncle's work, for Otto sent him a copy some time after March 1157. However, the emperor did not read Latin, and Otto sent an accompanying letter to Rainald of Dassel, the imperial chancellor, asking him to act as *interpres*, a task which would have involved more than mere translation.[41] We cannot, therefore, be certain as to whether Barbarossa was familiar with the details.

The author of the *Roman d'Eneas,* perhaps unsurprisingly, pays little attention to the theme of empire. This subject can have had scant appeal in Anglo-Norman circles and it is noticeable that the text

concentrates much more on the qualities of leadership required of a king. The crucial quality is the ability to withstand the blows of Fortune and, with this in mind, the narrative focuses on the sorrows which Eneas has to bear. It is possible that the author intended to honour Henry II of England by association with Augustus as a man of letters. Alternatively, Henry was perhaps to be seen as the bringer of peace to a country riven by civil war under his predecessor, King Stephen.[42]

Veldeke, on the other hand, is much concerned with the achievement of empire and the trappings of success. The reduced role given to the gods and the elimination of all the scenes set in Olympus mean that there is no opportunity for Jupiter, who is not even mentioned by Veldeke, to give his famous speech, alluded to in the title of my talk, about the Romans' imperial destiny. However, there are a number of passing references to imperial dignity. When Eneas sets off to meet Dido in Carthage, he takes with him 500 knights *sô wol getân, | ob si vor den keiser solden gân | daz si im wol gezâmen* ('so handsome they would have been a credit to him, even in the presence of the emperor': *En.* 34,21–3). Later, Eneas's scabbard is so magnificent that *solde manz vor den keiser tragen, | den hêrsten, der ie krône trûch, | ez wâre lobelîch genûch* ('if it were worn in the presence of the emperor, the foremost ever to wear a crown, it would be splendid enough': *En.* 160,36–8). Finally, as Eneas prepares to go to Latinus's court after his victory, he appears in his finery *sô nie nehein keiser wart, | kristen noch heiden* ('like no emperor that ever was, Christian or heathen': *En.* 336,38–9), and his robe is fit to be worn at the great celebrations at Easter. Whilst comparisons with the emperor are something of a commonplace in medieval German literature, the effect in the *Eneasroman* is to emphasize the connection between Eneas and the achievement of empire.

Veldeke's references to Barbarossa are not out of keeping with the spirit of Virgil, who often alludes to Augustus. Virgil establishes a link at the very beginning of the *Aeneid* between empire and the containment of *furor*, uncontrolled rage. Book 1 opens *in medias res* with tension between the will of Jupiter and the anger of Juno as Aeneas, *fato profugus* ('fated to be an exile': *Aen.* 1.2), is suffering *saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram* (for Juno was ruthless and could not forget her anger: *Aen.* 1.4). When Venus subsequently seeks confirmation from Jupiter of the Trojans' destiny, his response makes it clear that Juno must change her attitude in order for the Romans to achieve their great destiny:

> *his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono:*
> *imperium sine fine dedi. quin aspera Iuno,*
> *quae mare nunc terrrasque metu caelumque fatigat,*
> *consilia in melius referet.*
> (*Aen.* 1.278–81).

> To Romans I set no boundary in time or space. I have granted them dominion, and it has no end. Yes, even the furious Juno, who now wearies sea, earth, and heaven with the strain of fear, shall amend her plans.

He then goes on to make a clear reference to a coming reign of peace as he prophesies the containment of *furor impius*, the particular form of mad strife associated with civil war.

Veldeke clearly wanted to capitalize on this idea. Whilst both medieval authors extended the story of Aeneas beyond the death of Turnus to incorporate the wedding of Eneas and Lavinia, Veldeke's description of the wedding is far more detailed than that of the Frenchman. Although both conclude with a summary of Aeneas's descendants, the *Roman d'Eneas* stops at Romulus and Remus and the foundation of Rome, whilst Veldeke goes as far as Augustus and the birth and death of Christ. Veldeke thus introduces a Christian perspective at the end which is quite absent from the French. The *Roman d'Eneas* does include a brief genealogy of Aeneas's family down to Augustus during the visit to the Underworld, but Christ is not mentioned. By contrast, the genealogy at the corresponding point in the *Eneasroman* stops at Romulus and the foundation of Rome (Remus being, presumably, an embarrassment). Both medieval authors thus move the focus away from the death of Turnus, but Veldeke's work reaches a more definite climax. The second mention of Barbarossa, just before the final roll call of Eneas's descendants, associates him with the achievement of empire and seems to suggest that Barbarossa and the Staufer dynasty are the heirs to the great imperial tradition founded by Aeneas.

The vision which Veldeke presents is of Barbarossa associated, through the link with Pallas, with the best traditions of the Roman Empire, tinged with the highest ideal of Christendom: chastity. The sword-giving ceremony, cornerstone of chivalry, is highlighted twice—at Pallanteum and at the *Mainzer Hoffest*—and Barbarossa is associated with both—

directly in the last case, by implication in the former. The mention of the *Mainzer Hoffest* in connection with Eneas's wedding also links Barbarossa to the achievement of empire and the establishment of the *pax Romana*. By association with Eneas at this point, Barbarossa is presented as having vanquished his enemies, whatever the truth of the historical situation. It is very tempting indeed to see the exile or social death of Barbarossa's erstwhile 'super-vassal' Henry the Lion echoed in the execution of Turnus, particularly as Henry was denounced by Gottfried of Viterbo as a traitor to the Empire, deserting Barbarossa for the sake of 'Greek gifts'. Perhaps his desire for Goslar and the silver mines was seen as 'base greed', similar to that of Veldeke's Turnus. Furthermore, the favourable mentions of Henry in his early days by Otto of Freising and his continuator Rahewin in the *Gesta Frederici* and by the anonymous author of the *Carmen de gestis Frederici I imperatoris in Lombardia* would tend to suggest that his loss as an ally would have been keenly felt. Yet the final tone of the *Eneasroman* is positive and seems to look forward to a new golden age, the *etas aurea mundi* (l. 2616) which the author of the *Carmen* describes Barbarossa re-establishing.

King's College, London **CAROL MAGNER**

Notes

1. For general background and evidence regarding sources, see Kurt Ruh, *Höfische Epik des deutschen Mittelalters*, Grundlagen der Germanistik, 2nd edn, vol. 1 (Berlin: Schmidt, 1977), pp. 70–88; Gabriele Schieb, *Henric van Veldeken: Heinrich von Veldeke*, Sammlung Metzler: Realienbücher für Germanisten, Abteilung D: Literaturgeschichte (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1965), pp. 39–66; John R. Sinnema, *Hendrik van Veldeke*, Twayne's World Authors Series: The Netherlands, 223 (New York: Twayne, 1972), pp. 67–69.

2. See Harald Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, Studia graeca et latina gothoburgensia, 6, also published as Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift, vol. 64 (Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1958), p. 109.

3. See L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 110–14.

4. This and all subsequent translations of the *Aeneid* are based on: *Virgil: The Aeneid*, translated into English Prose with an Introduction by W.F. Jackson Knight, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956; repr. 1974).

5. ll. 352,19–354,1. These and all subsequent line numbers from the *Eneasroman* are taken from the following edition: *Heinrich von Veldeke: Eneasroman*, Mittelhochdeutsch/Neuhochdeutsch nach dem Text von Ludwig Ettmüller ins Neuhochdeutsche

übersetzt, mit einem Stellenkommentar und einem Nachwort von Dieter Kartschoke, Universal-Bibliothek, 8303 (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1986), hereinafter referred to as the Reclam edition. Whilst the authorship of this section of the epilogue has been doubted, the authenticity of the information it contains has not been seriously questioned—see Kartschoke's note to this passage in the Reclam edition, p. 824.

6. For dating of the *Eneasroman*, see the references cited under footnote 1 above, including the chronology printed at the front of Sinnema's book, and Schieb, pp. 1–7.

7. For the dating of the *Roman d'Eneas*, see Raymond J. Cormier, *One Heart One Mind: The Rebirth of Virgil's Hero in Medieval French Romance*, Romance Monographs, 3 (University of Mississippi: Romance Monographs, 1973), pp. 20–2. With regard to patronage, Cormier states that 'the evidence points to a close association with the Anglo-Norman Court' (p. 19).

8. Details of the manuscripts are taken from Kartschoke's postface to the Reclam edition of the text, pp. 856–7.

9. Illustrations from the Berlin manuscript are reproduced in: *Heinrich von Veldeke: Eneasroman. Die Berliner Bilderhandschrift mit Übersetzung und Kommentar*, hg. von Hans Fromm, mit den Miniaturen der Handschrift und einem Aufsatz von Dorothea und Peter Diemer, Bibliothek des Mittelalters, 4 (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1992).

10. Details of the manuscripts are taken from the introduction to *Eneas: A Twelfth-Century Romance*, translated with an Introduction and Notes by John A. Yunck, Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies, 93 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), pp. 4–7. All subsequent translations of the *Roman d'Eneas* are based on this edition.

11. For what follows see: Horst Fuhrmann, *Germany in the High Middle Ages c. 1050–1200*, trans. by Timothy Reuter, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), esp. pp. 135–86.

12. All references to the text are to: *Carmen de gestis Frederici I Imperatoris in Lombardia*, ed. by Irene Schmale-Ott, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 62 (Hanover: Hahn, 1965). Background information is taken from the introduction to *Barbarossa in Italy*, ed. and trans. by Thomas Carson (New York: Italica Press, 1994), and all subsequent translations are based on this edition.

13. See I.S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073–1198: Continuity and Innovation*, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), esp. pp. 500–4.

14. Easily accessible in translation as: *Geoffrey of Monmouth: The History of the Kings of Britain*, translated with an Introduction by Lewis Thorpe, Penguin Classics (London: Penguin Books, 1966).

15. See Friedrich Hausmann, 'Gottfried von Viterbo: Kapellan und Notar, Magister, Geschichtsschreiber und Dichter', in *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, ed. by Alfred Haverkamp, Vorträge und Forschungen, 40 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1992), pp. 603–21; and Heinz Thomas, 'Matière de Rome æ Matière de Bretagne: Zu den politischen Implikationen von Veldeke's *Eneide* und Hartmann's *Erec*', *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 108 (1989), 65–104.

16. The passages concerned are ll. 226,16–227,10 and ll. 347,13–348,4. See Kartschoke's note on ll. 226,16ff. on pp. 800–1 of the Reclam edition of the text.

17. See Joachim Bumke, *Höfische Kultur: Literatur und Gesellschaft im hohen Mittelalter*, 6th edn, 2 vols (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1986; repr. 1992), pp. 647–52.

18. All references to the text of the *Aeneid* are to: *The Aeneid of Virgil*, ed. with Introduction and Notes by R.D. Williams, 2 vols (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1972–3).

19. See Williams's note to *Aen.* 10.501–2 on p. 354 of vol. 2 of the text.

20. All references to the text are to: *Eneas: Roman du XIIe siècle*, édité par J.-J. Salverda de Grave, Les classiques français du Moyen Age, 44 and 62, 2 vols (Paris: Champion, 1985, 1983).

21. Translations of the *Eneasroman* are based on: Rodney W. Fisher, *Heinrich von Veldeke 'Eneas': A Comparison with the 'Roman d'Eneas' and a Translation into English*, Australian and New Zealand Studies in German Language and Literature, 17 (Bern: Lang, 1992).

22. The text and translation are quoted from Yunck's footnote to ll. 6485–94 of the *Roman d'Eneas* on p. 183 of his translation.

23. The discovery of Arthur's tomb is described by Giraldus Cambrensis in his *De instructione principis*, written in about 1195.

24. The text is taken from *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*, vol. VI, ed. by Albert Curtis Clark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911; repr. 1952).

25. The translation is taken from *Cicero: Selected Political Speeches*, trans. by Michael Grant (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).

26. This and subsequent references to the text of Books I–IV of *Policraticus* are taken from *Ioannis Sarisberiensis Policraticus I–IV*, ed. by K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 118 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993).

27. The translation is taken from *John of Salisbury: Policraticus, Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*, ed. and trans. by Cary J. Nederman, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

28. The text is taken from *Ioannis Saresberiensis episcopi carnotensis Policratici sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri VIII*, ed. by Clemens C.I. Webb, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909). The translation is based on *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers, Being a Translation of the First, Second, and Third Books and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books of the 'Policraticus' of John of Salisbury*, trans. by Joseph B. Pike (New York: Octagon Books, 1972).

29. For fuller details of the *Mainzer Hoffest*, see J. Bumke, *Höfische Kultur*, pp. 276–81.

30. See Kartschoke's note on this line at p. 777 of the Reclam edition.

31. For what follows, see Karl Jordan, *Henry the Lion: A Biography*, translated by P.S. Falla (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 153 and 219–20.

32. Fuhrmann's phrase (see footnote 11 above).

33. Translated by Nederman (see footnote 27 above).

34. Translated by Nederman (see footnote 27 above).

35. Translated by Nederman (see footnote 27 above).

36. Translated by Nederman (see footnote 27 above).

37. For more details of the *Aeneas proditor* tradition, see G. Karl Galinsky, *Aeneas,*

Sicily, and Rome, Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology, 40 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 47–50.

38. This and all subsequent references to the text are to *The Commentary on the First Six Books of the 'Aeneid' of Vergil Commonly Attributed to Bernardus Silvestris*, A New Critical Edition by Julian Ward Jones and Elizabeth Frances Jones (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977).

39. This and all subsequent translations are taken from *Commentary on the First Six Books of Virgil's 'Aeneid' by Bernardus Silvestris*, trans., with introduction and notes, by Earl G. Schreiber and Thomas E. Maresca (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979).

40. Text and translation (the English is mine) taken from *Otto Bischof von Freising: Chronik oder Die Geschichte der zwei Staaten*, trans. by Adolf Schmidt, ed. by Walther Lammers, Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters: Freiherr vom Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe, 16, 4th edn (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980).

41. The letter precedes the text of the *Chronica* in the edition cited above (footnote 40).

42. Cormier (see footnote 7 above) points out (p. 19, footnote 14) that Henry II's restoration was celebrated as a renewal after the anarchy and that he had been compared to Augustus.