

TROY AS PROTO-TOURIST ATTRACTION IN ALEXANDERS SAGA AND KIRIALAX SAGA

Alenka Divjak

***Abstract:** The site of ancient Troy nowadays enjoys the reputation of a popular tourist attraction. It is less generally known, however, that Troy had already been regarded by classical and late antiquity as a highly attractive proto-tourist site endowed with meaningful mythical, historical and cultural associations. As such, Troy was ideally suited to attract the most notable personalities of classical and late antiquity, for example Xerxes, Alexander the Great, the Roman general Sulla, Julius Caesar, the emperors Hadrian and Julian the Apostate etc., who can be regarded as proto-tourists like many of their contemporaries visiting Troy. Like the antiquity, the medieval period also expressed its fascination with Troy in numerous poems and prose texts. Troy found its way in medieval Icelandic literature as well and it is the purpose of this article to compare two medieval Icelandic accounts of a visit to Troy, the first account focusing on the visit undertaken by the historical Alexander the Great in Alexanders saga (The saga of Alexander the Great), and the second account concentrating on the visit undertaken by the fictitious Greek prince Kirialax, the eponymous protagonist of Kirialax saga (The saga of Kirialax). By juxtaposing these two texts encompassing the visit to Troy, the article aims to achieve two objectives: first, to present a rich set of traditions clustering around Troy in medieval Icelandic literature and second, to underline the differences in priorities set by the historical Alexander the Great on one side and the fictitious hero Kirialax on the other in terms of proto-cultural tourism, which makes them view Troy from two rather different historical and cultural perspectives.*

***Keywords:** cultural tourism, tourist attraction, Troy, Alexanders saga, Kirialax saga, proto-tourists*

I. Introduction

Cultural tourism is one of the fastest growing sub-branches of tourism which is increasingly attracting the attention of tourist professionals who endeavour to supplement the conventional sun, sea and sand holidays with less traditional options. According to the definition of cultural tourism in Wikipedia, cultural tourism is "the subset of tourism concerned with a country or region's culture, specifically the lifestyle of the people in those geographical areas, the history of those people, their art, architecture, religion(s), and other elements that helped shape their way of life. Cultural tourism includes

tourism in urban areas, particularly historic or large cities and their cultural facilities such as museums and theaters. It can also include tourism in rural areas showcasing the traditions of indigenous cultural communities (i. e. festivals, rituals), and their values and lifestyle."¹ At the same time the profile of a cultural heritage visitor has also been developed, emphasizing the fact that cultural tourists identify arts, archeological sites, museums, and cultural activities as their primary reasons for travelling. Cultural tourists focus mostly on art galleries, theaters and museums, historic sites, communities or landmarks, cultural events, festivals and fairs, ethnic communities and neighbourhoods, architectural and archaeological treasures, their choice of travels and destinations being primarily motivated by a wish to learn something new.² The purpose of this article is to go deep into the medieval past with the purpose of shedding some light on two medieval Icelandic texts, *Alexanders saga* and *Kirialax saga*, which both encompass a visit to Troy, and try to find a reply to a tantalising question of whether the protagonists of the respective sagas can be regarded as proto-tourists. However, before the analysis of both sagas can be performed, it is necessary to set these two visits to Troy into a broader historical and cultural context of the ancient and medieval world which regarded the famous Ten-Year War fought at Troy as a central historical event with far-reaching implications.

Troy, widely celebrated as a centre of ancient civilization, is located on the northwest coast of Turkey, Hisarlik, on the lower slopes of Mount Ida, and the Turkish tourism establishment is fully aware of the tourist value of Troy as indicated by a considerable number of websites referring to Troy as a tourist destination which was added to the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1988. It is necessary to point out that the popularity of Troy as an archaeological site endowed with rich historical associations is deeply rooted in the ancient past. As a result, Troy was visited by numerous prominent personalities of classical and late antiquity: Xerxes in 480 B.C., Alexander the Great in 334B.C, the Roman general Sulla ca. 85 B.C., Julius Caesar in 47 B.C., Octavius Augustus in 20 B.C., the emperor Hadrian in 124 A.D. and the notorious emperor Julius the Apostate in 355 A. D. By visiting Troy, endowing it with rich gifts and bestowing various benefits on its inhabitants, all these personalities demonstrated their awareness of historical traditions associated with this site, showed off their erudition and enhanced their prestige, especially as all their visits were to a lesser

1 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cultural_tourism

2 <http://www.culturalheritagetourism.org/resources/visitorProfile.htm>

or greater degree recorded in classical and late antiquity accounts as events of some importance in the life of an influential political figure.

Troy owes most of its fame to the Ten-Year War, which was regarded by ancient and medieval historians as a central historical event in the history of the world. One quite automatically regards Homer's *Iliad* as the primary source of classical and medieval accounts of Troy, but in the West the medieval knowledge of Troy was based primarily on the *Illias Latina* or the so-called Latin Homer, a condensed version of the *Iliad* (c. 1070 hexameters) written in the first century A. D. (ed. and tr. Scaffai 1982). Additional knowledge of Troy was provided by other Latin texts: Virgil's *Aeneid*, Ovid's *Heroides* and *Methamorphoses*, and especially two widely read Latin prose texts: Dictys Cretensis' *Ephemeris belli Troiani*, of the fourth century (ed. Eisenhut 1958), and Dares Phrygius' *Historia de excidio Troiae*, of the early sixth century (ed. Meister 1873). Homer's work was nearly forgotten in western Europe in the medieval period, this ignorance being caused by the decline in the knowledge of Greek in the West (Merkle 1989: 273-277; Eisenhut 1985: 11-12). Homer was an elusive figure and enjoyed the reputation of a sage, but the information on Homer found in medieval texts was scanty. Since the western knowledge of the *Iliad* was derived from the *Illias Latina*, he was even regarded as a Latin writer and believed to have lived many centuries after the events dealt with in the *Iliad*. As a result, his fame was far inferior to that of Dictys and Dares whose respective *Ephemeris belli Troiani* and *Historia de excidio Troiae* were regarded as historical works contemporary with the Trojan War and accepted at face value for many reasons. Firstly, Dares and Dictys, who were in reality fictitious figures, claimed they had fought in the war, Dares on the side of the Trojans and Dictys on the side of the Greeks, enjoying therefore a highly respected status of eyewitnesses. Secondly, Dictys' and Dares' versions, which excluded the pagan gods as active participants in human affairs and tried to find a rationalistic explanation of the events which were in Homer's work described as the deeds of gods had won the approval of medieval Europeans (Griffin 1908: 41-43; Graus 1989: 28-29; Wolf 1932: 54-55) who regarded pagan gods as a select group of human beings to whom their descendants attributed a divine status and worshipped them as gods, even though they little deserved this veneration (Cooke 1927). Thirdly, both Dares and Dycytis created the catalogues of the most notable participants in the war, brief descriptions of the main protagonists, Greeks and Trojans, men and women, and provided the exact number of soldiers and ships as well as the number of the dead on both sides. Although all these details were the products of Dictys' and Dares'

imagination, the veracity of the details, however bizarre, had never been questioned in the Middle Ages.

In the West, Dares' pro-Trojan account had a greater weight than Dictys' pro-Greek version of events. Dares' claim that he fought on the side of the Trojans had a strong appeal for the western, pro-Roman audience who held the Trojans in higher esteem than the Greeks. Apart from Dares' *Historia*, Virgil's *Aeneid* most decisively contributed to the popularity of the Trojans in the West. Even though the *Aeneid* did not satisfy all medieval moral and historiographical standards - the gods interfere in human affairs and Aeneas, Priam's son-in-law and a paragon of virtue, is regarded by Dictys and Dares as a traitor and a man of dubious character (Dihle 1994: 32-33) - the poem was highly valued as a source on the history of Troy (Reinhold 1966: 201-205; Graus 1983: 30-31). It was popular for two fundamental reasons: first, the Trojans are regarded as the ancestors of the Romans (Bickerman 1952: 66-67) and second, the transformation of a small tribe into a powerful nation provided medieval historians with the models for writing histories of their own nations (Southern 1970: 179-180, 188-189). Since the Trojans were seen as the ancestors of Roman emperors, medieval European rulers wishing to enhance their prestige and stress their links with the Romans traced their descent from Troy (Heusler 1908: 1-12; Leach 1921: 130-132; Graus 1983: 32-38; Sanford 1944: 35-37; Reynolds 1983: 376-380), and numerous medieval historians from Fredegarius (seventh century) to Dudo of Normandy (eleventh century) and Geoffrey of Monmouth (twelfth century) endeavoured to provide their ruling families with Trojan ancestors. It is therefore understandable that a prestigious topic such as the history of Troy did not remain confined to the field of history, but found its way into medieval literature, prose and poetry, Latin and the vernacular (Eisenhut 1983: 3-8; Meister 1873: XIII-L).³

II. Comparison of troy in *Kirialax Saga* and *Alexanders Saga*

Medieval Icelandic literature also produced texts which in various degrees referred to events at Troy. In some of them Troy is the main

³ For a good survey of the medieval prose works and poems dealing with the Trojan War, see the *Anonymi Historia Trojana Daretis Frygii*, ed. Stohlmann, pp. 272-277. His list of works includes: the *Excidium Troiae* (late antiquity), the works of Gottfried of Rheims (11th c.), Hugo Primas of Orleans (11th c.) and Petrus Sanctonensis (12th c.), the anonymous poem *Pergama flere volo* (11th c.), the *Ylias* by Simon Aurea Capra (c. 1155), the *Roman de Troie* by Benoît de Ste. Maure, the *Frigii Daretis Ylias* by Joseph of Exeter, the 1180s, the *Troilus* by Albert of Stade (early 13th c.), and the *Historia destructionis Troiae* by Guido de Columnis (13th c.).

theme, for example in the mid-thirteenth-century *Trójumanna saga* (The saga of the Men of Troy)⁴, while in others it is only one of the topics (Heusler 1908: 13-37) as, for example in the *Alexanders saga*⁵ and the *Kirialax saga*⁶. Even though it is the *Trójumanna saga* which encompasses the Matter of Troy in its entirety, dealing with the Trojan War as well as the city's history before and after the war, this article focuses on *Alexanders saga* and *Kirialax saga* even though they both encompass only relatively brief accounts of Troy, the reason for this choice being the same narrative pattern shared by both accounts: a Greek prince visits Troy before his decisive confrontation with the non-European world and concentrates on examining the traces of the most notable event in the history of the ancient world, the Ten-Year War, visiting the burial site of the heroes fallen at Troy. Conditionally speaking, both the historical Alexander and fictitious Kirialax can be regarded as proto-tourists, visiting an attractive location with the purpose of broadening their horizons and directing their attention to the cultural monuments and traces of historical events. All this leads us quite naturally to the questions concerning

4 The versions: *Trójumanna saga* in Hauksbók, eds. Finnur and Eiríkur Jónsson, pp. 192-226, p. 204; *Trójumanna saga*, ed. Louis-Jensen, 1963, pp. 7-8; *Trójumanna saga. The Dares Phrygius Version*, ed. Louis-Jensen, 1981, pp. 36-37.

5 The *Alexanders saga* is the Old Norse prose translation of the *Alexandreis* by Walter of Châtillon from the twelfth century. The translation was performed in 1260 by the abbot Brandr Jónsson, of the famous Icelandic monastery in Þykkvabær (1247-1262) and later the bishop of Hólar (1262-†1264), the translation being probably commissioned by the Norwegian king Magnús. The saga is preoccupied with the life of Alexander the Great from his childhood to his death in Babylon, focusing in great measure on his war-expeditions to the Asia Minor, Egypt, Persia and India. His visit to Troy with his army was recorded by Plutarch in *The Life of Alexander the Great*, Section 15, and then by many other writers, classical and antique.

6 *Kirialax saga* is a late medieval Icelandic saga written probably in the fourteenth century. It belongs to the genre of Icelandic *riddara sögur* (sagas of the knights), Old Icelandic derivatives of medieval European romance. The eponymous hero undertakes a sea-voyage on an exceptionally grand scale: Troy, Sicily, Jerusalem, India, Gibraltar, all long-haul destinations which are - with the exception of Gibraltar which is mentioned only in passing - described in great detail, being based on medieval Icelandic and Old Norse accounts, itineraries, historical works, encyclopaedias and other types of learned and belletristic literature. In addition to the descriptions of these destinations, *Kirialax saga* encompasses other learned references as well: St Ursula, St Christopher, the Minotaurus story, the Wheel of Fortune, Hagia Sophia and the imperial palace in Constantinople, Theodoric the Ostrogoth and Attila, all these references emphasising a unique position of the saga among other medieval Icelandic *riddara sögur*. The saga's learned character has been often commented on and the older scholarship in particular has dedicated a considerable amount of attention to the medieval Icelandic written records in order to trace parallels with the learned references in the saga (Kålund, 1917: 6-12; Cook 1982: 303-326; Divjak 2009: 118-261).

- a. the protagonists' motivation for visiting the site,
- b. cultural attractions they see at Troy,
- c. their attitude towards the central historical event: the Ten-Year War,
- d. the visits of notable rulers of antiquity to Troy.

In common with its Latin original, the *Alexanders saga* is primarily the biography of Alexander the Great, focusing mostly on his war expeditions and conquests. In the saga, Alexander's visit to Troy is given some prominence and the hero worships Achilles as if he were a deity, while he feels little regard for the Trojan side. This lack of regard for the Trojan side and the admiration for the Greeks is in line with the prevailing atmosphere in the *Alexandreis* where Alexander the Greek is much more highly regarded than any Roman hero in terms of heroism and military competence. This anti-Roman attitude was rare in the medieval West which regarded classical Greece as the country inferior to Rome in the arts of war and rule (Dionisotti 1990: 85-86), but this admiration for the Greeks was widely acceptable in the Eastern part of the former Roman empire, strongly influenced by the Greek culture. The Greek Dictys, for example, did not attempt to hide his hostility toward the Trojans, depicting them as a treacherous and barbarian race, even worse, their influence was, according to Dictys, so damaging to the Greeks that they experienced a moral decline during the Trojan War. His version of events was popular in the Greek speaking part of the empire, and medieval Byzantine writers, such as Joannes Malalas (sixth century), Georgius Cedrenus (11th c.), Constantine Manasses (12th c.), Joannes Tzetzes (12th c.) relied on his account (Eisenhut 1983: 12-14; Reinholdt 1966: 204-205). The passage from *Alexanders saga* focuses on Alexander's visit to Troy, running as follows:

Eptir þetta ferr Alexander konungr a þann luta rikisens er Frigia heitir. Þar hafðe staðet forðom borg su er Troia var kaulloð. Þat hafa menn fyr satt, at þessi borg hafe forðom mest veret oc sterkost sem raun bar á þviat Agamennon Gricia konungr sat um hana .x. vetr með marga kappu oc otalegan her aðr hann fenge broteð hana fyr Priamo konunge oc sonum hans. Þengat for Alexander konungr fyr forvitne ef hann mætte si nockvot merke þeira stortiðenda er þar haufðo gorz. ok hann kom nu þar sem Troia hafðe staðet. hennar mätte nu ecki sia annat en grunndvoll einn. Þar af matte þo sia hvesv mikil borgen mynde veret hafa. oc nu er konungr hugðe at hvar hverge þeira kappanna er þar fellv mundo iarðaðer vera. Þviat var á legsteinom ritað yfir hveriom þeira. Þá kemr konungr þar at er Achilles var iarðaðr. En þetta var ritað a legsteine hans. Her hvilir Achilles enn sterke er drap Hectorem son Priami konungs. Sia enn same var svikenn í trygð oc drepinn af Paride

broðor Hectoris i solarguðs hofe. A þenna legtitul sa konungur. Þviat honom þotte mikils um vert. oc eftir þat bar hann sialfr reykelisi yfir leiðet sem þar vere nockvorr heilagr maðr iarðaðr. (ed. Unger 1848: 14).

After this Alexander the king went to that part of the kingdom called Phrygia, where once stood the town of Troy. Men consider that this town was once the largest and the strongest ever to be attacked, for Agammemnon, king of the Greeks, besieged it for ten years with many heroes and innumerable army before he was able to penetrate it and reach king Priam and his sons. To this place Alexander came out of curiosity to see if there were any traces of great events that had taken place there. He came to where Troy had stood; there was nothing to see of it but the foundation. From it, however, he could tell how large the city must have been. Then he directed his attention to the burial places of the heroes who had fallen, because there was such an incredible tombstone over each of them. He came to the place where Achilles was buried, and this is what was written on his tombstone:

‘Here lies Achilles the strong, who killed Hector, the son of King Priam. He was betrayed and killed by Paris, Hector’s brother, in the temple of the sun god.’

The king studied this inscription, which seemed of much worth to him, and then he placed incense on the tomb as if it had been that of a holy man (tr. Cook 1982: 314).

In the *Kirialax saga*, the account of the hero’s visit to Troy is also rather short, being limited to 41 lines in Kålund’s printed edition. Nevertheless, in spite of its brevity the passage reflects fairly accurately the intellectual and moral dilemmas raised by various ancient and medieval accounts of the Trojan War which will be discussed in the next sub-chapters:

Eirn hvern dag bidr Kirialax kongin lia ser sina heimuliga menn, þa sem leid var kunneg, at rida fyr forvitnis sakir ok skemtanar *i þan stad, sem Troia hafdi stadið fordum*, „ok villda eg sia borgar stadin,” ok sva var gert. Nu ridr Kirialax med morgum riddurum, þar til sem Troia hafdi stadið skamt fra; matti en vida sia borgar veggina, þar sem eigi hafdi brunnet, ok voru svo sterkir, at med ongum hætte matte vinnazt; þa voru en maurg hus ok herbergi. Kirialax reikar nu um borgar stadin. Hann kom þar sem var leidi Ektores hins fræga, var þar gerr yfir sem ein kapella med marmara ok allt buit med gull, ok sa legstein, sem yfir var hans beinum, var allr grafin med undarligum meistara domi, ok á maurkut þau hinu storu verk, er hann felldi eirn samt XX hertuga ok kappa þeira

Grikkiana; ok eirn titaul pentadan med latinu staufum sa hann á legsteininum, af gulle gert, svo segianda „her hviler herra Ektor hin hæste kappi allz heims.” Hann sa ok leidi Akillas hins fræga, var þar ok med því-likri mynd pentad allt med gulli ok á grafit þat fræga verk, er han felldi Ektorem. Greinigt su saga miog med meisturunum, med hverium hætti þat gerdizt; sumir sanna, at Akillas hefði heited á Pallacem, bardaga gydiuna, ok Ektore hafi hun birzt i þeira vidrskipti med miclu liose, svo at hann matte varla i gegn sia ok hafi tekit af ser hialmin, hneigandi i gegn med litilæte; en meistari Dares segir, at Akillas beid þess, at Ektor var nær sprungen af mædi ok hafi adr barezt vid hina sterkuztu kappa ok unnet þa, ok hafi þa Akillas komit i mot honum ok unnet hann svo. En þessi verk legsteinana hofdu gera latid hinu fyr kongar þeira ættmenn, Alexandr magnus ok sidan Iulius Cesar ok adrir keisarar heidnir. I midium borgar stadnum var leidi Priami kongs ok þar nærri sona hans Alexandri, Paris ok hins fræga Troili ok Deifebus ok margra anara. En sem Kirialax hafði skodat þenna stad sem hann villdi, þa hvarf hann aptur til sinar borgar (ed. Kälund 1917: 25-26).

One day Kirialax asked the king to lend him his trusted men, who knew the way, to ride with him out of curiosity and for entertainment to the place where Troy had once stood, "and I wish to see the site of the town," and this was done. Now Kirialax rode with many knights to the place where Troy had once stood. The walls of the town could still be seen in many places where they had not been burnt and they were so strong that they could not be broken down in any way; there were still many houses and quarters. Now Kirialax wandered around the site.

He came to the place where the tomb of the famous Ektor stood which was built like a chapel made of marble and all ornamented with gold, and the tombstone which was raised over his bones was all decorated by masters of extraordinary skill. On it there was recorded his great deed when he alone killed twenty chieftains and Greek heroes, and he saw on the tombstone, made of gold, an inscription written in Latin letters saying this: "here rests sir Ektor, the bravest hero in all the world." He also saw the tombstone of the famous Akillas which was also all decorated with gold in a similar way and there was carved the famous deed that he had killed Ektor. Scholars disagree widely on this story - the way it happened. Some claim that Akillas prayed to Pallas, the goddess of war, who became visible to Ektor in their dealings with a bright light so that he could hardly see and took off his helmet, kneeling before her humbly, but master Dares says that Akillas waited until Ektor was close to death through exhaustion because he had been fighting before against the strongest champions and defeated them, and after that

Akillas confronted him and defeated him in this way. But the building of these tombstones had been commissioned by the earlier kings, their relatives, Alexander magnus and then Iulius Cesar and other heathen emperors. In the centre of the town there was the tomb of King Priamus and nearby were those of his sons Alexander, Paris and the famous Troilus and Deifebus and many others. And when Kirialax had examined the town as scrupulously as he wished he turned back to his town (tr. Divjak 2009: 312-313).

A. Protagonists' motivation for visiting the site

In spite of Alexander's love of knowledge and a first-rate education provided by Aristotle, his travels are in the first place military expeditions, his visit to Troy being no exception. In the *Kirialax saga* the reverse is true: Kirialax's travel is primarily motivated by more peaceful and intellectual inclinations, while the battles in which he gets involved are of a defensive character. Alexander, by contrast, assumes the role of a conqueror and his opponents are always in the position of defenders. He controls the events from the very beginnings: it is he who starts the war, brings it to the enemies' territories and makes decisions about when the fighting will take place. His visit to Troy is a part of his ambitious campaign, which evokes memories of the war which his Greek ancestors had won against the Trojans long ago. At the same time he pays his respect to Achilles whom he believed to be, as known by extratextual references, his ancestor and venerated him by placing incense on his tomb, which gives to his visit an emotional dimension as well. Kirialax, by contrast, is not in a position of influencing the course of events in the same measure as Alexander. He has to wait for the arrival of Solldan's army, his visit to the city can be seen as an occupation with which he tries to fill in the time of inactivity, and as he does not seem to have any ancestors among the Trojans or their Greek opponents, his visit is much more impartial and neutral.⁷

In other words, the fictitious Kirialax much more corresponds to the profile of a cultural tourist travelling with the purpose of enriching his life with new travel experiences which include cultural activities than the historical Alexander with his military ambitions. In addition, it is necessary to point out that Alexander's sightseeing at Troy is highly selective, being focused on Achilles, his grave and tragic death, completely ignoring the Trojan side. Kirialax, by contrast, can be

⁷ Kirialax has promised to Soba, the king of Phrygia, to assist him with his army and strategic instructions to defeat the army of king Solldan of Babylonia (modern Cairo or Alexandria in Egypt) with his allies from North Africa and the Near East who is soon to invade Phrygia. In the meantime Kirialax has decided to visit Troy in Soba's kingdom.

regarded as a curious proto-tourist who is interested in the history of Troy in its entirety and even though the passage reveals an unmistakable partiality for the Trojans, it still sheds some light on the opposite side. Kirialax's sightseeing is therefore more diverse, more universal and again more in line with the tendencies of cultural tourists: to examine one site in its entirety and from all perspectives.

B. Cultural attractions at troy

B. 1. General View of Troy

In the *Alexanders saga* Troy is depicted as being completely destroyed. Yet, even though only the site where the city had once stood can still be seen, Troy is nevertheless an impressive sight to behold. The remark, though brief, that Agamemnon and his champions needed ten years to capture the city confirms the *Alexanders saga*'s admiration for the Greeks because it stresses the difficulty of their task and the value of their achievement. The partiality for the Greek cause is also demonstrated by the lack of any references to the treachery with which the Greeks eventually captured the city and in which they were assisted by the two Trojan heroes, Aeneas and Antenor (Eisenhut 1983: 99-100, 106; Meister 1873: 48-49).

In the *Alexanders saga* there is no mention of any entertainment among the reasons for Alexander's visit, only curiosity, while in the *Kirialax saga* the wish for amusement is mentioned together with curiosity as the motivation for Kirialax's trip to Troy. By contrast with Alexander, all of whose steps are carefully planned and who goes straight to the graves of the Greek heroes, Kirialax is less straightforward in his whereabouts. Thus he is depicted as wandering around the town before his attention becomes eventually focused on the tombs of the heroes fallen at Troy. His wandering therefore suggests that Troy in the *Kirialax saga* is not entirely ruined and so many things can still be seen there that he needs some time to reach his final destination, the tombs.

Among the buildings seen by Kirialax the city walls, so strong that they cannot be captured in any way, deserve special attention, as the mention of their remnants contradicts the impression created in the *Alexanders saga* that the Greeks managed to bring about a complete destruction of the city. This reluctance on the part of the saga-writer to represent Troy as a complete desert points to his pro-Trojan sympathies which did not allow him to see the town as a place raised to the ground. However, the cursory manner in which the city walls and human habitations are treated and the fact that Kirialax himself is not depicted as examining them, only as wandering around the city, suggests only a

limited degree of interest in Troy as a whole. There is also a complete lack of any information on the inhabitants of Troy and its architectural achievements even though medieval Icelandic texts provided enough evidence about the city's architecture, history and population. In the history of Troy the city-walls are closely associated with the pre-war Troy, while the fate of its inhabitants after its fall is closely associated with the post-war Troy (Divjak 2009: 129-131). The absence of such pre- and post-war elements means that a considerable part of the history of Troy is ignored in the saga and the focus is exclusively on the most dramatic moment of the Ten-Year War, the duel between Hector and Achilles, and this event which brought the two heroes their greatest glory is manifested through their tombs which are depicted as an example of sophisticated sepulchral architecture. It can be argued again that even though both heroes head in the same direction, being focused on the same object of interest, the graves of ancient heroes, Kirialax's plans are less rigid, more inclusive and more universal, allowing him to examine the site from a broader cultural and historical perspective.

B. 2. Description of Hector's and Achilles' Burial Sites

In the *Alexanders saga*, Troy can hardly be regarded as an architectural attraction. Alexander sees the graves of the heroes and reads the inscriptions on their tombstones, but these heroes remain unidentified, with the exception of Achilles, whose tombstone receives Alexander's particular attention. This focus on Achilles as a representative of the Greek side is contrasted with the *Kirialax saga* where the interest of the saga-writer is focused on the Trojans, describing in detail Hector's tomb and referring to the tombs of Troilus, Deiphebus and Priam, although in passing, while giving far less attention to Achilles, the most notable representative of the Greek side.

In the *Kirialax saga*, Hector's tomb, described in greater detail than that of Achilles, is made visible in the reader's imagination in a way that the city itself is not. The tomb has the shape of a chapel which is built of marble and covered with gold and the reference to the superb skill of the artists, 'med undarligum meistara domi' changes the tomb into an artistic creation. The presence of all these details suggests that there is a strong element of partiality for Hector, the most notable and admired representative of the Trojan side. This is further confirmed by a far smaller amount of interest directed at Achilles' tomb, its description being only a third of the length of that given to Hector's tomb. In addition, Achilles' tomb is hardly an original architectural creation, being seen explicitly as an imitation of that of Hector, for it is said that it is built in the same form.

The saga-writer's partiality for the Trojan side is further confirmed by the fact that no tomb of any other Greek hero is mentioned, even though many notable Greeks - Ajax, Palamedes and Patroclus, for example - lost their lives before the walls of Troy. The tombs of King Priam, his sons Alexander Paris, Troilus and Deiphebus, the main representatives of the Trojan side, by contrast, are carefully listed, and even though all these figures have a very subordinate place in the account of Troy in the *Kirialax saga*, the very mention of their names is enough to underline the vitality and prestige of Troy. The supposition that the writer was partial to the Trojan side and Hector in particular is further confirmed by the account of Hector's and Achilles' behaviour in their final encounter. The emphasis of the account is on Hector's most famous deed, his victory over twenty Greek dukes and heroes against whom he fought alone without the assistance of other Trojans. By contrast, Achilles' best known deed, his killing of Hector, which brought him immortal fame, is referred to in half a sentence, although this event was a turning point in the history of Troy.

The designations of both heroes, however brief, also point to the military superiority of the Trojan side by giving more attention to Hector, being depicted as 'frægr', famous, and 'hinn hæsti kappi', the greatest champion, in contrast to Achilles, being denoted only as 'frægr'. In the *Trójumanna saga* Achilles' and Hector's physical appearance and characters are, by contrast, much better determined, both in military and non-military terms, being based on *Daretis Phrygii de Excidio Troiae Historia* (ed. Meister 1873: 14-17). Hector is mild, popular, gentle, beloved, wise, dignified and the best warrior (Jensen 1981: 65; 1963: 21) while Achilles is a man of distinction, stubborn, active, valorous, harsh with enemies and skilled in arms (Jensen, 1981: 67-68; 1963: 23). In the *Kirialax saga*, however, both Hector and Achilles are determined exclusively in terms of fame and courage and especially in terms of their final confrontation in which Hector lost his life and Achilles achieved his greatest fame.

C. The duel between Hector and Achilles

In the *Alexanders saga*, two most notable events of Achilles' life are engraved on his tombstone, his fight with Hector and his death. However, the pro-Greek *Alexanders saga* does not give any details about the heroes' final confrontation, as a more detailed account of the duel would seriously diminish the value of Achilles' achievement. The treachery of the Trojan side which later brought about Achilles' death is, by contrast, dealt with in greater detail, as the tombstone mentions the treachery, the place of death and the name of the murderer, Hector's

brother Paris, an irresponsible womanizer (Ehrhart 1987: 18-19, 23-25, 76-77, 90-91). On the other hand, the details damaging to Achilles' reputation, such as his killing of the exhausted Hector with the assistance of the goddess Athena and his fatal passion for Polyxena, Paris' and Hector's sister, are omitted.

It is one of the ironies that Achilles' fame as the greatest hero among the Greeks is based on his victory over Hector, while his own death was far from being heroic. In both Dictys and Dares, Achilles is seen as the victim of his love for Priam's daughter Polyxena (Merkle 1989: 207-208) and literary tradition depicts him as a man of strong erotic passions (King 1985: 21-64; Stohlmann 1968: 195-223). Polyxena's mother Hecuba, who wanted to avenge the death of her sons killed by Achilles, devised a plan with Paris and Deiphebus to murder him. Achilles was accordingly persuaded by Hecuba to come into the temple of Apollo situated outside the city walls to discuss his wish to marry the princess, the assignation which did not end well for Achilles. There is no sign of this tragedy either in the *Kirialax saga*, because it undermines the reputation of the Trojans, or in the *Alexanders saga*, because it reveals Achilles' moral weaknesses. As both Alexander and Kirialax visit Troy because it is the resting place of some most notable heroes of antiquity, there is no place in either of them for emotions, weaknesses and faults which might have damaged the images of Achilles and Hector as ideal heroes.

In the *Kirialax saga*, Hector's duel amounts to ten lines in Kålund's printed edition, one quarter of the entire account. Only two lines of them are dedicated to Achilles whose victory over Hector is depicted as being far from heroic and as a result of fortunate circumstances rather than of his own valour. This negative assessment of Achilles' prowess is all the more obvious when contrasted with the account of Hector's death which is much more complex and reflects the ambiguity with which his death was viewed in antiquity and the Middle Ages, as the preserved versions of Hector's death differ precisely on the question of whether his death was the result of his fatigue or Athena's interference.

The Old Norse tradition preserved both versions of Hector's death, as indicated by the *Trójumanna saga* and the *Hauksbók*. The *Trójumanna saga* (Jensen 1963: 43-44) as well the *Hauksbók's* version (Finnur and Eiríkur Jónsson 1892-1896: 213-214) avoid any mention of Pallas Athena and accept Dares' rationalistic explanation of the hero's death which was promoted by medieval historiography. The rationalistic version repeats Dares' claim that in the duel Hector seriously wounded Achilles' leg, which enraged Achilles and made him even more determined to kill Hector who had been already exhausted by his

previous fight with numerous Greeks (ed. Meister 1873: 30). By contrast with this rationalistic explanation, the more literary and romantic version of the *Trójumanna saga* (Jensen 1981: 181-182) promotes the idea that Pallas Athena herself assisted Achilles in his fighting against Hector (Würth 1992: 16-18). Both versions of Hector's death – rationalistic and romantic – reveal the partiality for the Trojan side by emphasising Hector's disadvantageous position in his fight against Achilles and the dubious value of Achilles' victory. This partiality, however, is more strongly expressed in the romantic version where Athena's divine intervention additionally stresses the unfairness of Hector's defeat.

Both versions of Hector's death, circulating in the medieval European as well as medieval Iceladic tradition, are given in the *Kirialax saga*. In the account, it is possible to recognise the features of the rationalistic or Dares' version, blaming Hector's fatigue as the cause of Achilles' victory. On the other hand, the passage encapsulates elements typical of the romantic, euhemeristic or Homeric version, seeing Achilles' victory over Hector as a result of Athene's active involvement in the fight between the two, which reveals the medieval fondness for classical myths which could not be diminished by ecclesiastical misgivings (Curtius 1953: 211-212). By introducing the rationalistic version of the duel the saga-writer demonstrated his knowledge of the trends in contemporary historiography, while his use of the Homeric version highlighted his fondness for the romantic and the marvellous which is the red thread of the saga.

D. Notable rulers of antiquity

Alexander the Great stopped at Troy after his invasion of Asia in 334 B.C., Troy being the first town he reached. Even though Troy would have enjoyed its fame as a burial site of the most notable heroes of antiquity without Alexander as well, his visit helped to change the site into a fashionable place for all those who, apart from being aware of the site's traditional associations, wanted to imitate the behaviour of notable figures. In the *Kirialax saga*, this aspect is further emphasised by the fact that Alexander's example is followed by Julius Caesar and many other heathen emperors who, far from being passive observers, actively contributed to the visibility of the site by having the tombstones erected in honour of the heroes fallen at Troy whom they regarded as being their ancestors. The references to Alexander and Caesar are very brief, and the modern reader needs to be familiar with Alexander's and Caesar's associations with Troy in order to understand the emphasis which the mention of Alexander and Caesar gives to the account in the saga.

Alexander's sympathies for the Greek side in the Trojan War, widely known in antiquity and the Middle Ages, came from his belief that he was Achilles' descendant. At the same time his visit had military connotations, as he came to Troy shortly before his confrontation with the Persians. Julius Caesar, by contrast, traced his ancestors back to the Trojans, but his visit, like that of Alexander, was also motivated by military considerations, as he visited the site before the battle of Pharsalus (Meissner 1910: 167-168). Apart from Alexander and Caesar, the mention of other unspecified heathen emperors in the *Kirialax saga* also serves to intensify the impression that a visit to Troy is an event of some significance in a ruler's life, appealing both to his military interests, the sense of tradition and intellectual inclinations. In addition, the fact that Troy in the *Kirialax saga* is visited by the admirers of both sides, Trojan and Greek, makes the site more universally acknowledged and estimated and, as such, more apt to enhance the prestige of its visitors. In the *Kirialax saga*, the eponymous hero is depicted as being a mere observer and a far more passive figure than Alexander who left a permanent mark on the site. Nevertheless, in the *Kirialax saga* Troy is far more visible, attractive, colourful and romantic than in the rather dry and ascetic account in the *Alexanders saga*, this sophistication being the result of the saga's willingness to juxtapose and examine contrasting and controversial medieval traditions surrounding Troy in medieval Icelandic records. It can also be argued that from a tourist perspective, the account of a visit to Troy in the *Kirialax saga* better matches the definition of cultural tourism than Alexander's acts at Troy. According to Richards who argues that cultural tourism is 'the movement of persons to cultural attractions away from their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs' (Richards 1996), the fictitious hero of this interesting medieval Icelandic saga can in reality be regarded as a proto-tourist.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Alexanders saga*, edited by C. R. Unger. Christiania (Oslo): Feilberg & Landmark, 1848.
- Anonymi Historia Troyana Daretis Frigii*, edited by Jürgen Stohlmann. Wuppertal, Ratingen, Düsseldorf: Henn, 1968.
- Daretis Phrygii de Excidio Trojae Historia*, edited by Ferdinand Meister. Leipzig: Teubner, 1873.
- Dictys Cretensis*, edited by Werner Eisenhut. Leipzig: Teubner, 1958.
- Ilias Latina, Baebius Italicus*, edited and translated by Marco Scaffai. Bologna: Pàtron, 1982.

- Die Ephemeris belli Troiani des Diktys von Kreta*, edited by Stefan Merkle. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Rómverja saga*, edited by R. Meissner. Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1910.
- “*Trójumanna saga*.” In *Hauksbók*, edited by Finnur and Eiríkur Jónsson, 192-226. Copenhagen: Thieles Bogtrykkeri, 1892-96.
- Trójumanna saga*, edited by Jonna Louis-Jensen. Editiones Arnarnagnæanæ, Series A, vol. 9. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1963.
- Trójumanna saga. The Dares Phrygius Version*, edited by Jonna Louis-Jensen. Editiones Arnarnagnæanæ, Series A, vol. 8. Copenhagen: C. A. Reitzel, 1981.
- The Trojan War. The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian*, translated by R. M. Frazer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 1966.

Secondary Sources

- Bickerman, Elias J. “Origines Gentium.” *Classical Philology* 47 (1952): 66-81.
- Cary, G. *The Medieval Alexander*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Cook, Robert. “Kirialax saga: A Bookish Romance”. In *Les Sagas de Chevaliers (Riddarasögur), Actes de la V^e Conférence Internationale sur les Sagas Présentés par Régis Boyer*, 303-326. Toulon, 1982.
- Cooke, John Daniel. “Euhemerism: A Medieval Interpretation of Classical Paganism.” *Speculum* 2 (1927): 396-410.
- Curtius, E. R. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, tr. Willard R. Trask. London: Routledge, 1953.
- Dihle, Albrecht. *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, translated by Manfred Mahlzahn. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Dionisotti, A. C. “Walter of Châtillon and the Greeks.” In *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition: Essays in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, edited by Peter Godman and Oswyn Murray, 73-96. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Divjak, Alenka. *Studies in the Traditions of Kirialax saga*. Ljubljana: Inštitut Nove revije, zavod za humanistiko, 2009.
- Ehrhart, Margaret J. *The Judgement of the Trojan Prince Paris in Medieval Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press Middle Ages Series, 1987.
- Eisenhut, W. “Spätantike Troja-Erzählungen - mit einem Ausblick auf die mittelalterliche Troja-Literatur.” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 18 (1983): 1-28.
- Graus, František. “Troja und trojanische Herkunftssage im Mittelalter.” In *Kontinuität und Transformation der Antike im Mittelalter*, edited by Willi Erzgräber, 25-34. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1989.
- Griffin, N. E. “Un-Homeric elements in the medieval story of Troy.” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 7 (1908): 32-52.
- Heusler, Andreas. “Die gelehrte Urgeschichte im altisländischen Schriftum.” *Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Classe* 3 (1908): 1-101.

- Leach, H. G. *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Reinhold, Meyer. "The Unhero Aeneas." *Classica et Medievalia* 27 (1966): 195-207.
- Reynolds, Susan. "Medieval *Origines Gentium* and the Community of the Realm." *History* 68 (1983): 375-390.
- Richards, G. Cultural tourism in Europe. CABI, Wallingford, 1996. Accessed February 25, 2014. <http://tram-research.com/atlas>.
- King, Katherine Callen. "Achilles Amator." *Viator* 16 (1985): 21-64.
- Sanford, Eva Matthews. "The Study of History in the Middle Ages." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 5 (1944): 21-43.
- Scully, Stephen. *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Southern, R. W. "Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing. 1. The Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th Series* 20 (1970): 173-196.
- Stohlmann, Jürgen. "Deidamia Achilli. Eine Ovid-Imitation aus dem 11. Jahrhundert." In *Literatur und Sprache im Europäischen Mittelalter*, edited by Alf Önnersfors, Johannes Rathofer, Fritz Wagner, 195-223. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973.
- Wolf, Max. "Der Lügner Homer." *Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift* 20 (1932): 53-65.
- Würth, Stephanie. "Intention oder Inkompetenz: Die Bearbeitungen der *Trójumanna saga*." *Skandinavistik* 22 (1992): 1-26.

Note on the author

ALENKA DIVJAK is Assistant professor at Grm Novo mesto - Centre of Biotechnics and Tourism which encompasses the following educational units: Vocational College, Biotechnical Gymnasium, Secondary School of Agriculture, and Secondary School for Tourism and Catering. She teaches English at the secondary school of agriculture and professional terminology in a foreign language at the vocational college. She has a PhD in Old Norse literature (2000), obtained at the University of Leeds, The School of English, Great Britain, which was in Slovenia recognised as a PhD in English literature. She teaches professional terminology in the following programmes at the vocational college: Tourism and Catering, Nature Protection and Landscape and Countryside Management. alenkadivjak@hotmail.com