

SOME PROBLEMS IN THE AENEAS LEGEND

(1) INTRODUCTION: AENEAS IN HOMER¹

If the Iliadic Aeneas has a fault, it is that he fails to die: 20.302 *μόρμιον δέ οἱ ἔστ' ἀλεάσθαι*. In Homer, he is not memorable, but closer inspection reveals a warrior of authentic distinction. As Helenus says to Aeneas and Hector: 'seeing that on you lieth the task of war in chief of Trojans and Lycians οὐνεκ' ἄριστοι/πάσαν ἐπ' ἰθὺν ἔστε μάχεσθαι τε φρονέειω τε (6.77 ff.; tr. Lang, Leaf, and Myers). Such testimonials are repeated by friends and enemies alike; Aeneas strikes fear into Idomeneus in 13, helps rescue Hector from Telamonian Ajax in 14, and, alongside Hector, routs the Greeks in 15 and 17. But the record does have its less impressive moments: Achilles, on his 'great foray' drives the solitary Aeneas in panic from his watch over the Trojan flocks on Ida to Lyrnessus, which he sacks, forcing Aeneas to flee back to Troy.² In Book 5, Aeneas strikes not a blow at Diomedes before he is felled by a stone and saved by Apollo in a cloud. Though Aeneas and Achilles are described jointly as ἔξοχ' ἄριστοι at 20.158 and though Aeneas stands up bravely to fight, Posidon must come to his rescue.³ But this is Homer's problem: among his leading heroes—on either side—only a limited number serve traditionally as spear-fodder. The survivors have to be rescued supernaturally or by force of numbers from combats which could all too easily prove fatal. Aeneas and Diomedes are both survivors; neither can be allowed to win the combat in book 5 conclusively. It is certainly not a mark of cowardice that Aeneas has to be rescued from Diomedes.

In the *Iliad*, Aeneas' virtues extend far beyond the military: he is called *βουληφόρος* more than any other hero⁴ and he *θεὸς δ' ὥς τίετο δῆμῳ* (11.58). Twice (above), he is saved by divine intervention: Posidon tells him that Achilles is *φιλτερος* to the gods than himself, but even Achilles admits that Aeneas must be *φίλος* to them to have got away as he did (20.334, 347). To the gods, Posidon observes (20. 297 ff.) that Aeneas does not deserve to suffer *ἀλγεα*, for *κεχαρισμένα δ' αἰεὶ/δῶρα θεοῖσι δίδωσι τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν*. Aeneas is not *εὐσεβέστατος* of the Homeric heroes—that distinction must, as it happens, go to Odysseus (*Od.* 1.66 f.; Galinsky, p. 43)—but his *pietas erga deos* has foundation enough in the *Iliad*.⁵ We cannot expect detailed characterization of an essentially secondary character. The Homeric Aeneas knows he is secondary and resents it: before his attack on Idomeneus, Deiphobus has to encourage him to go to the help of his brother Alcaethous; previously he has been standing 'the last in the press, for Aineias was ever wrath against goodly Priam, for that Priam gave him no honour, despite his valour among men οὐνεκ' ἄρ' ἐσθλὸν ἔόντα μετ' ἀνδράσιν οὐ τι τίεσκεν (13.461). Was there more to it, as Achilles

¹ On Homer's Aeneas, see (e.g.) E. Wörner, *Roscher*, i. 157 ff., G. Karl Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome* (Princeton, 1969), pp. 11 ff.

² 20.187 ff.; cf. W. Leaf, *Troy* (London, 1912), pp. 245 f.

³ Cf. Sir John Hackett's light-hearted but perceptive comments, *PCA* 68 (1971), 15.

⁴ 5.180 etc.; Galinsky (n. 1), p. 36. But I am not here concerned with the survival and development of his reputation for sagacity.

⁵ A. Drummond, *JRS* 62 (1972), 219, against Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 41 f. *et passim*.

suggested there might be? He asks Aeneas (20. 178 ff.): 'doth thy heart bid thee fight with me in hope of holding Priam's honour and lordship among the horse-taming Trojans?' But even if Aeneas kills him, Priam will not make him king, for he has sons of his own and is ἔμπεδος οὐδ' ἁεσίφρων. The suspicion of discontent, the allegation of treasonous ambitions and the fact of survival are a potent combination (cf. p. 384), not least because, if there is one common factor in all explanations of Troy's fall, it is that she did not fall in a fair fight: 'nous sommes trahis'—by the δόλος or *furtum* of the horse, by the theft of the Palladium, by Sinon, Antenor, Antenor's wife Theano, by Helen—for a start.⁶ Troy did not fall to the horse alone—at least after Demodocus' summary narrative; there have to be one or more accomplices. Clearly accusations of betrayal could be made to fit those who were fortunate enough—or cunning enough—to survive. This clearly remains true, even though Posidon's rescue of Aeneas is a reward for his *pietas* and has, moreover, a purpose: Zeus has come to hate the race of Priam, so Hector and his father will die: νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνεΐαο βίη Τρῳέσσω ἀνάξει/καὶ παίδων παῖδες τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται (20. 307 f.). That some admirer of Rome introduces the reading πάντεσσιν for Τρῳέσσω—a reading noted by Strabo (13, p. 608) and imitated by Virgil (*Aen.* 3.97 f.)—may serve as an indication of how closely the Homeric Aeneas came to be studied.

(2) THE EPIC CYCLE

In the Epic Cycle, we have fewer references to Aeneas than might at first sight appear. There is no mention of him in Proclus' summary of the *Little Iliad* and it has been clear enough—or should have been so—since Cobet's publication of a scholium on Eur. *Andr.* 14⁷ that the lines 'he [Neoptolemus] put Aeneas on board his sea-faring ships, a prize surpassing those of all the Danaans' are in fact probably by Simias of Rhodes, c. 300 B.C.⁸

The *Iliou Persis* is substantially more helpful: 'the serpents appeared and destroyed Laocoon and one of his two sons; being vexed⁹ at the portent, Aeneas and his followers withdrew to Ida.'¹⁰ In Arctinus, there is no hint, implicit or explicit, of treason or of cowardice, nor any suggestion that Aeneas sailed westwards. He provides though, the first clear attestation of the Trojans' continued occupation of the Troad. That occupation is not precluded by Homer's Τρῳέσσω ἀνάξει, but Strabo (13, p. 608) is clearly wrong to claim

⁶ Cf. R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*³ (Leipzig, 1928), p. 10, who compares, *inter alia*, the explanation for the Roman defeat at Cannae in Val. Max. 7.4. ext. 2 'decepti magis quam victi sumus'. See too Liv. 21.54. 1 ff. and 22.48.2 ff. with H. Bruckmann, *Die röm. Niederlagen im Geschichtswerk des T. Livius* (diss. Münster, 1936), pp. 61, 85, *et passim*.

⁷ Appendix to Eur. *Phoen.* ed. Geel (Leyden, 1846), p. 281, Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 112, M. Schmidt, *Troika* (diss. Göttingen, 1917), pp. 45 ff., Gow–Page, *HE* ii. 511, E. Bethe, *Homer*, ii.2, 177, J. Perret, *Les*

Origines de la Légende troyenne de Rome (Paris, 1942), p. 370, J. Griffin, *JHS* 97 (1977), 51 n. 62. G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* (London, 1969), p. 199 (n. on p. 156) remains unconvinced.

⁸ For further discussion of this fragment, cf. p. 000.

⁹ Proclus' use of δυσφορήσαντες I find hard to explain; neither Huxley's 'in their dismay' (n. 7, p. 146) nor Evelyn-White's 'alarmed' (*Hesiod etc.*, Loeb edn., p. 521) render the word accurately.

¹⁰ Galinsky (n. 1) renders (p. 47) 'cowardly escapes'; this is not in the Greek.

that Homer says that the house of Aeneas will reign not merely in the Troad, but ἐν τῇ Τροίᾳ. The *Homeric Hymn* to Aphrodite,¹¹ whose date and precise relationship to *Il.* 20 are not important for this paper, varies Homer's phrasing slightly: Aphrodite tells Anchises that their son ἐν Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει (*H. H.* 5.196), but even that expression does not serve firmly to localize the prophecy. The Iliadic phrasing was both vague enough and specific enough to perform a political function. Strabo¹² relates that Scepsis was founded by a son of Hector and by Ascanius and that their families remained kings for a long time and retained certain regal privileges even under the democracy. He quotes the local historian, Demetrius of Scepsis, as asserting that Scepsis was the capital of Aeneas 'lying as it does midway between the district subject to Aeneas and Lyrnessus to which he is said to have escaped when pursued by Achilles'.¹³ The legendary connection of the Aeneadae with this region is well attested: Dardania on Ida is older than Troy herself in Homer (20.216); on Ida, Venus and Anchises made love (*Hes. Theog.* 1010); Aeneas was born and brought up there (*H. H.* 5.256 ff.) and there was saved from Achilles (above). The survival of the Aeneadae in the Troad is widely attested in early texts: Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 4 F 31 = D. H. 1.47.5) has Aeneas sail away, while Ascanius, in company with the Hectoridae, resettles Troy. Agathocles of Cyzicus,¹⁴ perhaps writing in the third century B.C.¹⁵ and himself citing *complures auctores* refers to Aeneas' grave at Berecynthia and to a descendant who sails west. This localization in the Troad was evidently irreconcilable with Aeneas as the founder of Lavinium or Rome; D. H. 1.53.4 f. bears witness to the pedantic contortions aimed at resolving the dilemma: there were those who maintained that Aeneas led his followers to Italy and settled, then returned to Troy, ruled there and was indeed succeeded by Ascanius.¹⁶

It is highly questionable whether we should attempt further to explore Arctinus' account (cf. Huxley (n. 7), pp. 154, 157) on the basis of D. H. 1.69.3 (anticipated at 1.68.2): 'according to Arctinus, one Palladium was given to Dardanus by Zeus and this was in Ilium until the city was taken. It was hidden in a secret place and a copy was made . . . This copy the Achaeans took.'¹⁷ This story does not square easily with Proclus' summary: he records that in Arctinus 'Aias the son of Ileus [*sic*], while trying to drag Cassandra away by force, tears away with her the image of Athena' (Evelyn-White (n. 17), p. 521). There is no suggestion that the Palladium in question is anything but authentic. Nor is it clear from the disputed narrative in Dionysius why Troy fell, if her great talisman, the Palladium, remained within the walls. Dionysius' Arctinus,

¹¹ Possibly seventh-century: N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford, 1974), p. 11, A. Lesky, *RE* Suppl. xi. 829 f.

¹² 13, pp. 607 f.; cf. Huxley (n. 5), p. 131, K. Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (Göttingen, 1961), p. 509 n. 2, A. Hoekstra, *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Formulaic Tradition* (Amsterdam, 1969), p. 40.

¹³ Tr. W. Leaf, *Strabo on the Troad* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 275.

¹⁴ Thus nearly a native of the Troad, as Hellanicus' follower, Damastes of Sigeum

(on whom see p. 382) actually was. Curiously, Cephalon of Gergis (= Hegesianax of Alexandria in the Troad) has no time for local claims and has Aeneas found Pallene in Thrace (*FGrHist* 45 F 7).

¹⁵ *FGrHist* 47 2 F5; Festus s.v. *Romam* p. 269M; for the date, see T. J. Cornell, *PCPS* 1975, 19 n. 3; hereafter 'Cornell'.

¹⁶ For the anti-Roman political implications of Aeneas' continued sojourn in the Troad, I refer to Cornell, pp. 26 f.

¹⁷ Tr. Evelyn-White, *Hesiod etc.*, Loeb edn., 523.

moreover, tells a story suspiciously similar to the anonymous narrative given by Dionysius himself at 2.66.5 in his survey of the *penates*' origin: Aeneas, on account of his *ἐμπειρία*, common sense, took the *penates* with him and the Achaeans stole a mere copy. It is clear from Roland Austin's masterly survey of stories about the Palladium (*ad Aen.* 2.163) that it only becomes necessary to devise pseudo-Palladia when the Romans claim the authentic Trojan Palladium as one of their own *pignora imperii*, in the face of a very widespread story that it had been spirited away by the Greeks to accelerate Troy's fall (see below, p. 389). I share, therefore, a widely held reluctance¹⁸ to acknowledge D. H. 1.69.3 as authentic Arctinus. Had it been, then we might have expected the epically attested survival of the Palladium in the Troad to have been advanced in legitimization of the claims of the royal house of Scepsis in Strabo's detailed account.

(3) STESICHORUS, *ILIOU PERSIS*

There would seem at first sight to be a natural chronological progression from the fragments of the Epic Cycle to Stesichorus (PMG fr. 205), on the basis of an inscription (*IG* xiv. 1284, p. 330,7) *ΙΛΙΟΥ ΠΕΡΣΙΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΣΤΗΣΙΧΟΡΟΝ* on the central panel of the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (c. 15 B.C.). Many have supposed that the flight of Aeneas with father, wife (?), son, *sacra*, Misenus the trumpeter, and Hermes as guide, by sea, *εἰς τὴν Ἑσπερίαν* was narrated by Stesichorus.¹⁹ But scepticism about the authenticity of this fragment is old-established²⁰ and widespread.²¹ I discuss the problem at length elsewhere (*JHS* 1979) and do not propose to repeat my arguments in full; here, the briefest summary will suffice:

Stesichorus (fr. 201 = Schol. Eur. *Or.* 1287) related that at the sight of Helen, stones fell from the hands of the Achaeans; on the *Tabula*, we find Menelaus, as in Ibycus and Euripides, pursuing her with a sword. The conflict is irremediable.²²

The emphasis given to Aeneas' departure from the main gate of Troy as the central scene of the central panel²³ must reflect the importance of the Aeneas-legend as dynastic propaganda at the time the *Tabula* was produced.

The scene within the walls of Troy, low on the left, in which Aeneas takes a large cylindrical box from the hands of a kneeling Trojan, who turns towards a warrior who is running up,²⁴ only makes sense as an illustration of the story of Panthus in *Aen.* 2.318 ff. (cf. Austin ad loc.).

¹⁸ Austin, loc. cit., Bethe, *Homer*, ii. 2,254 f., E. Wörner, Roscher iii. 1302, K. Gross, *Die Unterpfeiler der röm. Herrschaft* (Berlin, 1935), pp. 69 f.

¹⁹ Cf. Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 106 ff., for a recent account of the problems and implications for the Aeneas-legend if the evidence of the *Tabula* be accepted as authentic.

²⁰ Attested at least as far back as F. G. Welcker, *Ann. Inst.* 1 (1829), 234, n. 10.

²¹ M. Paulcke, *de Tabula Iliaca quaestiones*

Stesichoreae (diss. Königsberg, 1897), p. 89 n. 200.

²² Cf. C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*² (Oxford, 1961), pp. 105 f.

²³ U. Mancuso, *Mem. Acc. Linc.* xiv. 8 (1909), 669.

²⁴ For reproductions, cf. (e.g.) A. Sadurska, *Les Tables iliaques* (Warsaw, 1964) p.1.1, M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, iii (Rome, 1974), pl. 161a, F. Bömer, *Rom und Troia* (Baden-Baden, 1951), p.1.2.

In the bottom right-hand corner of the central panel, Aeneas is shown *ἀπαίρων εἰς τὴν Ἑσπερίαν*. It is unlikely that Stesichorus would or could have used the word *Ἑσπερία*, which appears to have been an invention (first as an adjective) of the Hellenistic dactylic poets.²⁵ Aeneas is accompanied by Misenus, his trumpeter:²⁶ this is the Misenus of the Roman antiquarian tradition, as reflected by Virgil (*Aen.* 6.164 f.) and by the *Pontificalia* of L. Julius Caesar (*OGR* 9.6.; cf. D. H. 1.53.3); Timaeus knew him as a follower of Odysseus (p. 145.19 Geffcken).

In two important details of the scene in the gateway, the *Tabula* departs from the Greek traditions of representation:

Anchises is carrying, as he does in the scene of embarkation, a *cista*, evidently containing the *penates*. Such a *cista* is never connected with Aeneas in Greek art²⁷ and before the Roman coinage of the late Republic is illustrated only by an Etruscan scarab of c. 490 B.C.²⁸

Aeneas carries Anchises on his left shoulder: this is the schema familiar in Greek archaic art, known to the Etruscans and universal in Roman monumental art; classical Greek artists represented Anchises riding piggyback.²⁹

In the gate scene, there is an indistinct form behind Ascanius, which does not reappear in the embarkation. If this is Creusa, then the artist may be suggesting that she disappears between the two scenes, as she does in the *Aeneid*, in conflict with the widely attested account which has Aeneas' wife follow him into exile (cf. Austin on *Aen.* 2.795).

Texts of Stesichorus' *Iliou Persis* had not disappeared by the Augustan age; Dionysius of Halicarnassus knew his Stesichorus well, as the rhetorical works bear witness, and freely cited poetic sources in his learned survey of the evidence for Aeneas' wanderings in *A. R.* 1. He does not mention Stesichorus.³⁰

The fact that an inscription does give Stesichorus' name should not disconcert us. The learning of the *Tabulae* depends substantially upon mythological handbooks and that is precisely where we should expect to find confusion in the *Quellenangaben* and sources cited falsely without scruple or hesitation.³¹ Since therefore there is much on the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* that cannot be Stesichorus' and much indeed that is positively Roman, it is impossible to isolate elements in the story of Aeneas that can with certainty be referred back to Stesichorus' poem. I do not therefore believe that any profitable discussion of its role in the development of the Aeneas-legend is possible.

(4) HELLANICUS

If then I am right in supposing that neither in Arctinus nor in Stesichorus did Aeneas rescue any *sacra* from Troy, then our earliest literary attestation is

²⁵ A. R. 3.311, Agathyllus ap. D. H. 1.49.2, Enn. *Ann.* 23; cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.530 = 3.163.

²⁶ Cf. J. Hubaux, *AC* 2 (1933), 161.

²⁷ Cf. B. B. Shefton, *Wiss. Ztschr. Rostock* 16 (1967), 534 n. 25.

²⁸ Cf. P. Zazoff, *Etr. Skarabäen* (Mainz, 1968), p. 41.

²⁹ Cf. W. Fuchs, *ANRW* i.4. 616 ff., Zazoff, loc. cit.

³⁰ Cf. K. Seeliger, *Die Überlieferung der gr. Heldensage bei Stesichoros* (progr. Meissen, 1886), p. 33.

³¹ Wilamowitz, *Kl. Schr.* v.1. 498, W. Speyer, *Die Lit. Fälschung im Altertum* (Munich, 1971), pp. 75 ff.

presumably that in Hellanicus' *Troica*: Dionysius introduces *A. R.* 1.46 ff. with the words (1.45.4): βούλομαι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς Αἰνείου παρουσίας εἰς Ἰταλίαν . . . μὴ παρέργως διελθεῖν. There follow two chapters of narrative which emphasize Aeneas' heroic resistance at the fall of Troy and refer four times in two pages (1.46.1, 2.4, 47.6) to his concern for the ἱερὰ πατρώα (or similar expressions) which he carries off to Pallene, the westernmost prong of Chalcidice, lying immediately to the south of Aineia.³² The narrative concludes (48.1) ὁ μὲν οὖν πιστότατος τῶν λόγων, ὃν κέχρηται τῶν παλαιῶν συγγραφέων Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τοῖς Τρωικοῖς (*FGrHist* 4 F 31) περὶ τῆς Αἰνείου φυγῆς τοῖσδε ἐστίν. We do not therefore have a verbal citation of Hellanicus, but there seems no reason to question that Dionysius has reproduced the substance of Hellanicus' narrative. On the strength of his introductory words, Jacoby (*FGrHist* 1.444) infers that in the *Troica* Hellanicus had Aeneas continue to Italy. Yet Dionysius in practice refers to the *Troica* only to illustrate the Αἰνείου φυγή; when he passes to τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἔξοδον (1.49.1), the *Troica* are not mentioned again, perhaps because they contained nothing relevant to the foundation of Rome and were limited in scope to events in or near the Troad.³³

Lionel Pearson argues implausibly³⁴ that all of Dionysius 1.47.6–1.72.2 derives primarily from Hellanicus: thus (189) he would have us believe that in Hellanicus Aeneas stopped at Zacynthus,³⁵ since he does so in Dionysius 1.50.3, where Zacynthus is described as the son of Dardanus and Bateia which 'as a name for the wife of Dardanus is peculiar to him (Hellanicus)'. This is not so: the fragment of Hellanicus which mentions Bateia has no reference to Zacynthus (24a), and Bateia is in fact named elsewhere (D. H. 1.62.1, *Apld.* 3.12.1); she is not a distinctive mark of Hellanicus' genealogy, nor is Dionysius obedient to Nissen's Law in following with fidelity Hellanicus or any other dominant source for long stretches.³⁶

'Few are now prepared to assert on oath that the *Tabula Iliaca* represents Stesichorus or that Dionysius' quotation . . . (i. 72.2) is a genuine fragment of Hellanicus'.³⁷ Yet Momigliano comes near enough to taking such an oath and the unwisdom of such a source has already been shown sufficiently in the case of Stesichorus. The passage in question (*FGrHist* 4 F 84) is introduced with the words ὁ δὲ τὰς ἱερείας τὰς ἐν Ἀργεὶ καὶ τὰ καθ' ἕκασταπραχθέντα συναγαγών. Stephanus of Byzantium cites the *Priestesses* ten times, giving name, author's name, and book number. It is highly probably too that Dionysius quotes from it in *A. R.* 1.22, where he names the author (*FGrHist* 4 F 79b). But he does not there name the work and is not therefore here referring back to a work already named (*pace* Perret (n, 7), p. 378, n. 3) and the periphrastic form of citation is apparently unique for him.³⁸ But no other work with the

³² Aineia: whence a coin of c. 490–480, showing Anchises sitting on Aeneas' left shoulder (cf. p. 000): M. Price and N. Waggoner, *Archaic Greek Coinage, The Asyut Hoard* (London, 1975), pp. 43 f., p1.B, 194.

³³ Cf. Jacoby, *RE* viii.115 ff., W. Schur, *Klio* 17 (1921), 149; compare D. H. 1. 49.1 (= *FGrHist* 391 F 4 and 45 F 7), 50.1, and Conon, *FGrHist* 26 F 1 (46.3 f.).

³⁴ *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 188 ff.

³⁵ Cf. E. J. Bickerman, *CW* 37 (1943–4), 94.

³⁶ Cf. (e.g.) F. Cauer, *Die röm. Aeneassage, Jhb kl Phil, Supplbd.* xv (1886), 162 ff.

³⁷ Momigliano, *JRS* 35 (1945), 100 = *Terzo contributo*, p. 680.

³⁸ 1.8.3, οἱ τὰς Ἀθηναίων πραγματευόμενοι is intrinsically different because in the plural. See E. Pais, *Storia critica* i (Rome, 1918), 233 n. 1 and H. Kullmer, *Die Historiae des Hellanikos, Jhb kl Phil Supplbd.* xxvii (1902), 645.

same title is known and it may be that Hellanicus' *Priestesses* was so well known that Dionysius on neither occasion felt obliged to give both author and title.³⁹ So the very fact that Dionysius paraphrases the author's name is hardly⁴⁰ to be treated as cogent argument against the fragment's authenticity.⁴¹

The author of the *Priestesses*, according to Dionysius *Αἰεῖαν φησὶν ἐκ Μολοσσῶν εἰς Ἱταλίαν ἐλθόντα μετ' Ὀδυσσέως* (*reliqui*; Ὀδυσσεά, Urbinas 105) οἰκίστην γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως, ὀνομάσαι δ' αὐτὴν ἀπὸ μιᾶς τῶν Τριάδων Ῥώμης· ταύτην δὲ λέγει ταῖς ἄλλαις Τρωάσι παρακελευσαμένην κοινῇ μετ' αὐτῶν ἐμπρῆσαι τὰ σκάφη βαρυνομένην τῇ πλάνῃ.

Aeneas' presence in up-country Epirus is seldom attested: it could have been motivated either by a visit to the oracle at Dodona, which is not, however, suggested before Varro⁴² or possibly by his captivity in Neoptolemus' hands. This captivity, sharply at variance with Aeneas' departure as a free man in the *Troica* (cf. Perret (n. 7), p. 370) is only mentioned explicitly twice:

(i) In the fragment probably of Simias already discussed (cf. p. 373).
Neoptolemus

*Αἰεῖαν ἐν νηυσὶν ἐβήσατο ποντοπόροισιν
ἐκ πάντων Δαναῶν ἀγέμεν γέρας ἔξοχον ἄλλων*⁴³

Simias does not locate the captivity and Neoptolemus has after all two realms, in Epirus⁴⁴ and in Phthia: it is not clear which Simias envisaged as Aeneas' destination, though Schol. Lyc. 1268 might suggest Phthia.⁴⁵ If Simias did in fact refer to an Epirote captivity, then one might even be tempted to see a contemporary motive behind this version, which would then portray the humiliation of the Romans' founder-hero in Epirus at the time of Pyrrhus' rise (cf. Perret (n. 7), pp. 377 f.).

(ii) Schol. Lyc. 1232 refers to the story in (?)Simias as though it belonged to the *Little Iliad* (thus suggesting that the misattribution of the passage quoted above is of considerable antiquity) and adds that after Neoptolemus' death Aeneas settled in the Chalcidice. This move is no more than a crude attempt to reconcile (?)Simias' narrative with Lycophron's own and has no independent value.⁴⁶

It is, *pace* Perret, neither chronologically nor geographically inconceivable that Hellanicus should have mentioned Aeneas' presence as a prisoner ἐν Μολόσσοις. But difficulties abound:

In the *Priestesses*, Aeneas is apparently no longer free but captive; he cannot therefore have withdrawn gallantly as in the *Troica* but has in some way been

³⁹ Cf. Jacoby, *RE* viii. 144, Kullmer, loc. cit., G. de Sanctis, *Storia dei romani* i (Turin, 1907), 198 n. 7.

⁴⁰ *Pace* F. Cauer, *de fabulis Graecis* (diss. Berlin, 1884), p. 12 n. 19.

⁴¹ As even Perret (n. 7, p. 378 n. 3) admits!

⁴² Ap. Serv. *ad Aen.* 3.256, Serv. Dan. *ad Aen.* 3.349; cf. D.H. 1.51.1, *Aen.* 3.466; note that at *Aen.* 3.294 ff., Aeneas does not go inland.

⁴³ Cf. W. Christ, *SBMünchen* 1905.1.111, Perret (n. 7), p. 370, P. Boyancé, *REA* 45 (1943), 285 ff.

⁴⁴ Against Perret, loc. cit., cf. Boyancé, loc. cit. (n. 43), Pind. *Nem.* 7.37 ff., 4.50 ff., *Paean* 6.110 ff., etc.

⁴⁵ Cf. Perret (n. 7), p. 370, E. Wörner, *Roscher* i. 167.53 ff.

⁴⁶ *Pace* N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford, 1967), p. 385, O. Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* i.218 n. 4.

made prisoner. His settlement at Pallene has had, moreover, to be abandoned for some unspecified reason (cf. Perret (n. 7), pp. 375 f.). We are left to wonder how he passes out of Neoptolemus' thrall, how and why Odysseus reached the land of the Molossi, if indeed he did, and how and why, moreover, Aeneas departed thence in the company of his old enemy. N. G. L. Hammond⁴⁷ attempts to reconcile the *Troica* and *Priestesses* fragments by supposing that Aeneas travelled overland from Pallene to the land of the Molossians, along Neoptolemus' old route through south-west Macedon⁴⁸—apparently as a free man. This hypothesis solves only one solitary difficulty of those mentioned and is supported by no literary or archaeological evidence. Aeneas' presence is attested on the coasts of Macedon and Epirus, but, save at Dodona, not inland.⁴⁹ Lycophron 1239 is no help: Aeneas there passes through 'Almopia'. Historically, this was an area in the Axios valley, some distance north of the Thermaic Gulf and, even by Lycophron's standards, hardly on the route from Rhacelus in Chalcidice to Tyrrhenia, between which it lies in the narrative. But at Lyc. 1237 all manuscripts of the poem and two of the scholia contain the reading 'Αλμωνία, which is called a town πλησίον Κίσσου ὄρους (schol. ad Lyc. 1232), that is to say, in the Chalcidice, inland from Aineia. This was an area, of course, rich in associations with Aeneas.⁵⁰ The reading 'Αλμωπία derives from S. Byz. s.v. and was introduced into the text of Lycophron by Canter. It should, I suspect be ejected, *qua facilius*, in favour of the MS. 'Αλμωνία. Even if we leave 'Αλμωπία undisturbed in the text of Lycophron, it cannot really be used to support an overland march by Aeneas from Saloniki to Igoumenitsa!

The Priestesses fragment continues: εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἐλθόντα μετ' Ὀδυσσεώς (*alii*, Ὀδυσσέα) οἰκίστην γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως. The genitive should be read, and not only because it is confirmed by the parallel versions of Syncellus and Eusebius. The words μετ' Ὀδυσσεώς have usually been taken with what follows, even though no other ancient text attests a meeting of Aeneas and Odysseus in Latium, or, more important, Odysseus' direct participation in the foundation of Rome.⁵² The alternative proposed by Perret and Galinsky⁵³ is hardly any more attractive: 'coming to Italy with Odysseus, he became founder of the city'. This version leaves unsolved the questions posed by ἐν Μολόσσοις which were mentioned above and clearly poses new ones too: are we, for example, to suppose that Aeneas and Odysseus parted before Aeneas founded Rome and that Odysseus went off to some unspecified destination? One could go on: on any interpretation, the *Priestesses* narrative up to this point is excessively complex, implausible, and, above all, incompatible with that in the *Troica*.

If the narrative in the *Priestesses* shares any difficulties, it is with Lyc. 1242 ff.⁵⁴

⁴⁷ Loc. cit.; cf. A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor, n.d.), p. 279, who supposes that in Lycophron Aeneas travelled from Thrace to Etruria by land.

⁴⁸ Proclus, *Nostoi* p. 108.28 f., Allen, Pind. *Paeon* 6.110, Hammond, op. cit., p. 383.

⁴⁹ Strab. 13, p. 608: a settlement near Macedonian Olympus is no exception.

⁵⁰ Cf. above, p. 377, Lyc. 1236 f., with scholia and *Aen.* 5.537.

⁵¹ Cf. Jacoby ad loc., Perret (n. 7), pp.

371 ff., Pearson (n. 34), p. 191 n. 1, Cornell, p. 18 n. 7, with further bibliography.

⁵² Perret (n. 7), p. 373, H. A. Sanders, *CPh* 3 (1908), 318 f., F. Cauer (n. 40), p. 7; but cf. Serv. Dan. ad *Aen.* 1.273 = *FGH Hist* 819: Clinias (??) made Aeneas' wife Rhome the daughter of Telemachus; a chronological horror: cf. Cornell, p. 18.

⁵³ N. 7, 373 and *Lat.* 28 (1969), 7 respectively.

⁵⁴ Cf. E. D. Phillips, *JHS* 73 (1953), 60 f., 67.

In Lycophron, it is foretold that Aeneas, ancestor of Romulus and Remus (1232), whose role as founders of Rome we are left to infer from the phrase ἔξοχον ῥωμῇ γένος, shall come to Etruria; 'with him an enemy shall join a friendly force, convincing him by oaths and prayers of supplication' (1242–3)—viz. Odysseus. The locale of this alliance is not specified, nor is its purpose and outcome. At least the pre-eminence of Aeneas and his descendants remains unimpaired: Odysseus neither comes to Latium nor shares in the foundation of Rome (*pace* Phillips, 61). Aeneas shall further be joined (1245 ff.) by Tarchon and Tyrsenus.⁵⁵ Their role, relationships, and destiny are left equally obscure. At least in Lycophron, as in the *Priestesses* fragment, Odysseus and Aeneas meet on Italian soil. The coincidence is the more striking since such a meeting is not attested elsewhere (cf. Phillips, p. 67). Josifovic (*PW* Suppl. 11.902) is surely right to see in the complex and diverse elements of *Alex.* 1232 ff. an intention to allude to the cosmopolitan character of Rome, πόλις 'Ελληνίς and πόλις Τυρρηνίς. If the coincidence of Odysseus and Aeneas on Italian soil in the *Priestesses* is authentically Hellanican, it is no more than a hasty conjecture: 'Rome, a place in the far West, known from mere hearsay reports, has no distinct meaning for him [sc. Hellanicus].'⁵⁶ If, on the other hand, the *Priestesses* fragment belongs to an age in which the theory of Rome as a πόλις 'Ελληνίς was current, an age in which both Greek and Trojan founders of Rome were common currency in the speculations of historians and mythographers, then it acquires a certain interest as an attempt comparable with Lycophron's to reconcile disparate versions.⁵⁷

My suggestion⁵⁸ that Plut. *Rom.* 2.1 and Alcimur *FGrHist* 560 F 4 = Fest., p. 326.35L 'would appear to point to the . . . conclusion that a Greek writer of the fifth century—possibly Hellanicus—may have linked Aeneas with the Etruscans in his account of the Trojan settlement of Central Italy' was probably optimistic, for Dr. Cornell (pp. 18 ff.) has shown conclusively how ill advised it is to try to seek out order, sense, and reason in such fragmentary accounts, shorn of their original contexts.

The possibility that Hellanicus F4 (*Phoronis* = D. H. 1.28.3) lends support to the Hellanican authorship of the *Priestesses* fragment must also be considered:

In the reign of Nanas the Pelasgians were driven out of their country by the Greeks; they left their ships at the mouth of the Po and Κρότωνα πόλιν ἐν μεσογαίῳ⁵⁹ εἶλον καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ὁρμώμενοι τὴν νῦν καλεομένην Τυρσηνίην ἔκτισαν.⁶⁰ Lycophron (1244) moreover describes Aeneas' ally from Etruria, Odysseus, as νᾶνος the dwarf' who in his roaming searched out every recess of sea and earth.' The allusions are rendered unnecessarily complex, even for Lycophron, by idle scholastic speculation: νᾶνος should be compared with Lat. *nanus*, a dwarf, and the Homeric Odysseus was a little man (e.g. *Il.* 3.193); there is an agreeable piquancy in the description of the mighty Greek, the

⁵⁵ Cf. Horsfall, *JRS* 63 (1973), 73.

⁵⁶ E. J. Bickerman, *CPb* 47 (1952), 66.

⁵⁷ Cf. Galinsky (n. 53), pp. 1 ff.,

Phillips (n. 54), p. 67, Cornell, pp. 16 ff.

⁵⁸ *JRS* 63 (1973), 78.

⁵⁹ At least therefore he must mean Cortona not Croton.

⁶⁰ On Hdt. 1.57.1, cf. K. von Fritz, *Die gr. Geschichtsschreibung* i Anm. (Berlin, 1967), 226 f. n. 35.

heroic wanderer who submits to the Trojan-Roman Aeneas, as 'tiny'.⁶¹ At *Alex.* 805 ff. Lycophron records of Odysseus that Πέρρη δέ μιν θανόντα, Τυρσηνῶν ὄρος/ἐν Γορτυναίᾳ δέξεται πεφλεγμένον. Πέρρη probably refers to Mte. Pergo near Cortona, not to Perugia,⁶² and Γορτυναίᾳ may possibly allude to the foundation of Cortona by Pelasgians (= Etruscans),⁶³ recalling as it does the name of Γυρτώνη in Thessalian Pelasgiotis.⁶⁴ The death of Odysseus at Cortona was also recounted by Theopompus.⁶⁵

Whether Lycophron's Nanos and Hellanicus' Nanas can be reconciled is a much-vexed question.⁶⁶ Even if we do suppose—and many do—that one of the names has been corrupted in transmission by a single letter, the near-identity of spelling is highly suggestive. Conclusive proof could only come with the help of *Alex.* 805 ff., whereby we are provided with the same localization for Odysseus in both Hellanicus and Lycophron. But even if we do accept that the two Lycophron passages supplement each other,⁶⁷ we are left wondering whether the equation Nanos = Nanas really makes sense. Granted that Hellanicus considers that Etruscans are Pelasgian and knows that Cortona is an Etruscan city, he can hardly be thought to have supposed that Odysseus was the leader of an Etruscan migration, any more than Lycophron may be presumed to say that Odysseus/Nanos was himself an Etruscan. Only if we suppose extensive garbling in Lycophron between the stories (i) of the Pelasgian/Etruscan foundation of Cortona and (ii) of the death there of Odysseus under the name of Nanos/Nanas, are Hellanicus and Lycophron to be reconciled. And that in turn requires us to suppose that Nanos/Nanas was a genuine alternative name for Odysseus. We are indeed told that Nanos was an ancient⁶⁸ name for Odysseus. This is most improbable (cf. Hartmann, loc. cit.), not least because the Etruscans are known to have named him Utuse. It is irrelevant that Nanus is attested as an Etruscan proper name on an inscription from S. Quirico d'Orcia.⁶⁹ Could we be sure that Hellanicus F 4 in fact recounted the association of Odysseus with Cortona, then the authenticity of the *Priestesses* fragment would receive substantial support, if not actual proof. But we clearly cannot be.

In the *Priestesses* fragment, there remains for discussion only the story of Rome's eponym Rhome: μία τῶν Ἰλιάδων τῶν δὲ λέγει ταῖς ἄλλαις Τρωάσι παρακελευσαμένην κωῆ μετ' αὐτῆς ἐμπρῆσαι τὰ σκάφη βαρυνομένην τῇ πλάνῃ. This version, which connects the foundation of Rome with the burning of Trojan ships by a Trojan woman and is accordingly described as 'senseless' by Bickermann,⁷⁰ is not common: Cf. Plut. *Virt. Mul.* 1, *Rom.* 1.2, and Polyaeus 8.25.2, all accounts where the possibility of influence from Latin historiographical traditions cannot be ruled out. Trojan incendiaries are attested as burning their own ships elsewhere: Sicily (*Aen.* 5.613, 'some writers' ap. D. H.

⁶¹ Cf. A. Brelich, *Gli eroi greci* (Rome, 1958), pp. 235 f.; for a sane and sceptical discussion of the problems, see A. Hartmann, *Unters. über die Sagen vom Tod des Od.* (Munich, 1917), pp. 154 ff.

⁶² A. Neppi Modona, *Cortona etrusca e romana* (Florence, 1925), pp. 11 ff.

⁶³ J. Geffcken, *Timaos' Geogr. d. Westens*, *Phil. Unters.* xiii (1892), 44 f., M. Pallottino, *L'origine degli etruschi* (Rome, 1947), pp. 17 ff. etc.

⁶⁴ Cf. Hieronymus of Cardia, *FGrHist* 154 F 17.

⁶⁵ *FGrHist* 115 F 354; cf. Horsfall, *CQ* N. S. 26 (1976), 297.

⁶⁶ See recently, St. Josifovic, *RE Suppl.* xi. 896.

⁶⁷ Hartmann (n. 61), pp. 156 f. does not.

⁶⁸ i.e. Etruscan; so, e.g., Geffcken (n. 63), p. 44.

⁶⁹ *TestLingEtr*² ed. M. Pallottino, p. 441.

⁷⁰ *CPh* 47 (1952), 66.

1.52.4) and Caieta (Caesar and Sempronius ap. *OGR* 10.4). Again the authorities are Roman or under Roman influence.⁷¹ The story, complains Strabo (6, p. 264) is widely localized. In other versions, the incendiaries are still Trojan women, but they are captives and the ships are Greek. This explanation is applied to the foundation of Rome only⁷² by Aristotle's pupil Heraclides Lembos.⁷³ It is attested widely elsewhere, localized both in Chalcidice⁷⁴ and in the West. It is clear enough that it was a favourite with Timaeus and that he offered it as applicable to Setaeum,⁷⁵ to the river Neaethus⁷⁶ near Croton and even⁷⁷ to Pisa. The story's origin is unclear:⁷⁸ from this survey, it does, however, emerge that the version in our fragment is completely out of keeping with that in the Greek historians, in whom we might expect authentic Hellanicus to find some faint echo, and resembles rather that current at Rome.⁷⁹ We are reminded of the argument against the authenticity of 'Misenus' on the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*.⁸⁰

If then there is much in *FGrHist* that cannot be Hellanicus, if indeed there is little in it that clearly could be, then we are left with the problem of what was said by Hellanicus' pupil, Damastes of Sigeum (*FGrHist* 5 F 3):

Dionysius, after the story of the burning of the ships, concludes ὁμολογεῖ δ' ἄτ' ὧ [sc. the author of the *Priestesses*] καὶ Δαμάσθης ὁ Σιγεὺς καὶ ἄλλοι τῷ ἐς. 'Some others' is clearly beyond hope. It is, however, exasperating that the degree of *homologia* is not specified. Did Damastes simply allude to the burning of ships, in some place unknown, by female incendiaries, whether free or captive?⁸¹ It is perfectly possible that some story of this type had appeared in the *Nostoi* (with, presumably, the women as captives in Greek hands) and was a commonplace to both Hellanicus and Damastes. Pearson⁸² regards the reference to Damastes as 'final proof' of the authenticity of the *Priestesses* fragment. That Hellanicus referred to Aeneas in the *Priestesses* in terms similar to those of part of *FGrHist* 4 F 84 is perfectly possible; that Damastes followed his master Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 5 T 1) is equally possible. It remains unlikely that either mentioned the foundation of Rome.⁸³

⁷¹ Cf. A. Kiessling, *de D. H. Antiquitatum auctoribus Latinis* (diss. Bonn, 1858), p. 40.
⁷² Cf. Bickerman (n. 70), p. 78 n. 14, Cornell, p. 18.

⁷³ *FGrHist* 830 F 136, ap. Festus s.v. *Romam* p. 269M; cf. Serv. Dan. *ad Aen.* 1.273, Solin. 1.2; compare, however, Aristotle, fr. 609R (= D. H. 1.72.4; cf. Plut. *Q. R.* 6) who localizes the episode in 'a place in the land of the Opicans which is called Latinion, lying near the Tyrrhenian Sea'. Cf. further n. 122.

⁷⁴ Strabo 7, fr. 25, Conon, *FGrHist* 26 F 1.13, S. Byz. s.v. *Scione*, Polyaeus. 7.47.

⁷⁵ Strabo 7, p. 264, S. Byz. s.v.; cf. Tz. *ad Lyc.* 1075, Geffcken (n. 63), p. 22.

⁷⁶ Lyc. 921, 1074 ff., *MythogrGr* ed. Wagner i. 220 (= Apld. fr. ap. Schol. *ad Lyc.* 921), Strab. 6. p. 262, etc.; cf. Geffcken (n. 63), p. 22 n. 1.

⁷⁷ Serv. Dan. *ad Aen.* 10.179; cf. Justin

20.1.11, Geffcken (n. 63), p. 148, R. Rütter, *de Timaei fabulis*. . . (diss. Halle, 1901), p. 21.

⁷⁸ Cf. Cornell, pp. 18 f. We should be wary of eliciting any special or historical significance from the nationality of the ships burned; cf. Schur (n. 33), pp. 146 ff., Perret (n. 7), pp. 396 ff., W. Hoffmann, *Rom und die gr. Welt, Phil. Supplbd.* xxvii (1934), 112 n. 254, A. Alföldi, *Troj. Urabnen* (Basel, 1957), p. 10, A. Schwegler, *Röm. Gesch.* i (Tübingen, 1867), 404 n. 29.

⁷⁹ Cf. F. Cauer (n. 40), pp. 15 f.

⁸⁰ Cf. above, pp. 375 f. and *JHS* 99 (1979).

⁸¹ Cf. E. Ciaceri, *Studi storici* 4 (1895) 508, Schwegler (n. 78), p. 304 n. 10; *contra*, de Sanctis (n. 39), i. 198 n. 7.

⁸² (n. 34), p. 191; cf. Bickerman, *CW* 37 (1943-4), 94.

⁸³ Too many of the difficulties are ignored in Horsfall, *CQ N. S.* 24 (1974), 111.

A striking inference, though not one crucial to my argument, is that since the dates of Dionysius of Chalcis,⁸⁴ of Alcimus the Sicilian,⁸⁵ of Agathocles of Cyzicus,⁸⁶ and of Xenagoras⁸⁷ are all doubtful, the earliest unquestionable⁸⁸ references to the legendary foundation—as against the history and institutions—of the city of Rome are not to be discovered before the third-century Sicilian historians Callias (*FGrHist* 564 F 5 = 840 F 14) and Timaeus.⁸⁹ Momigliano's recent confident assertion (*op. cit.* (n. 89), p. 55) of the 'early' date for Lycophron acquires an added significance in this context, as perhaps does the Roman ἀρχαιολογία of Hieronymus of Cardia (*FGrHist* 154 F 13).

But for us the important conclusion of this discussion of *FGrHist* 4 F 84 is that between the departure of the Trojan *sacra* from Troy in Hellanicus' *Troica* and their presence at Lavinium in Timaeus, all is silence. Only archaeology can provide the figure of Aeneas *penatiger* in the West with any sort of early history.

(5) ἐπ' ὤμων πατέρ' ἔχων (S. Fr. 373.2P)

The extreme rarity of Aeneas' rescue of the Trojan *sacra* as a motif of pre-Roman art (simply the de Luynes scarab, p. 376) stands in the sharpest contrast to the popularity of his rescue of his father (below, pp. 386 f.). The literary tradition reflects a similar contrast: Aeneas' rescue of the *sacra* from Troy is first attested in Hellanicus' *Troica* (p. 377); the date of the earliest known explicit reference in the West is wholly uncertain—possibly mid-third century, conceivably a hundred years earlier (cf. p. 382) and the first certain mention of Trojan *sacra* in the West is, as has just been observed, in Timaeus.

Aeneas' rescue of his father is first described in the surviving literature in a messenger's speech in Sophocles' *Laocoon* (fr. 373P = D. H. 1.48.2): Aeneas had been bidden to leave by Anchises himself, who had recalled Aphrodite's behests and observed what the fate of the Laocoontidae portended (D. H. *ibid.*). Sophocles' description: ἐπ' ὤμων πατέρ' ἔχων κεραυνίου/νῶτου καταστάζοντα βύσσινον φάρος by its vivid juxtaposition of rescuer son and crippled father, emphasizes that Anchises was unable to leave unaided and that Aeneas was, therefore, though surrounded by οἰκετῶν παμπληθία, primarily his father's saviour.

But the existence of a sixth-century (at the latest) artistic representation of the rescue⁹⁰ leads us to infer that there is likely to have been a rescue-scene in early narrative lyric or indeed in the epic cycle, though the summary of the *Iliou Persis* (cf. pp. 373 f.) does not really suggest the urgent and perilous withdrawal which might have compelled Aeneas to carry his father.

⁸⁴ *FGrHist* 840 F 10; cf. Cornell, p. 19 n. 3.

⁸⁵ *FGrHist* 560 F 4 = 840 F 12; cf. Cornell, p. 7 n. 11.

⁸⁶ *FGrHist* 472 F 5 = 840 F 18–9; cf. Cornell, p. 19 n. 3.

⁸⁷ *FGrHist* 240 F 9 ÷ 840 F 17; cf. Cornell, p. 20 n. 4.

⁸⁸ Aristotle (above, n. 73 = *FGrHist*

840 F 13) does not after all mention Rome by name in this passage.

⁸⁹ Jacoby on *FGrHist* 566 F 59–61, Geffcken (n. 63), pp. 39 ff., Horsfall (n. 83), p. 112, Momigliano, *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 53 ff.

⁹⁰ Cf. p. 376 above, W. Fuchs, *ANRW* i.4. 616 ff., Horsfall, *JHS* 99 (1979).

The two rescues, of father and of *sacra* are first linked by Hellanicus, *Troica* (FGrHist 4 F 31 = D. H. 1.46.4): ἀγόμενος ἐπὶ ταῖς κρατίσταις συνωρίσι τὸν τε πατέρα καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς πατρώους. But behind this simple statement there lies a real problem and a need for explanation: between Aeneas as a prince of Troy at the time of the sack and Aeneas as the independent ruler of Trojan survivors, whether in the Troad or elsewhere, there was, if not an inconsistency, then at least a tension. It seems that in the *Iliou Persis* Aeneas left Troy before the sack proper (cf. p. 373); in Hellanicus (FGrHist 4 F 31; cf. p. 377), he effected an orderly tactical withdrawal and left the Troad under the terms of a treaty with the Achaeans; how Anchises was evacuated is not specified, but the gods and property were saved (D. H. 1.46.4); in Menecrates of Xanthus (fourth-century; ap. D. H. 1.48.3) he himself betrayed Troy.⁹¹ Menecrates' wording recalls expressions of hostility towards Aeneas in the *Iliad* (13.461, 20.178 ff., cf. p. 373) and he develops these hints into lurid 'fact'. The reward for treachery was that he was allowed to save his household.

In this whole discussion, our most important text is our most elusive: Αἰνεΐας δὲ σῶσας μὲν τοὺς πατρώους καὶ μητρῶους θεοὺς, σῶσας δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν πατέρα δόξαν εὐσεβείας ἐξηνέγκατο, ὥστε καὶ πολέμιοι μόνῳ ἐκέκω ὦν ἐκράτησαν ἐν Τροίᾳ ἔδοσαν μὴ συληθῆναι, (Xen. *Cyn.* 1.15). The date of composition of these lines is far from clear. The first chapter of the *Cynegetica* is perhaps the hardest to accept as Xenophontic,⁹² though it is probably by the same hand as the remainder;⁹³ even it has its champions of authenticity.⁹⁴ If the chapter is not by Xenophon, then its date is altogether uncertain: it may still be as early as the first half of the fourth century B.C.⁹⁵ and we cannot assume, with Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 43 f., that it has undergone the influence of Roman versions of the Aeneas-legend. The same motif that we find in the *Cynegetica*, that Aeneas' survival was a reward for his *eusebeia*, recurs in all probability in Timaeus:⁹⁶ given the chance to carry off what he could by the Greeks, Aeneas chose his father; then allowed to choose τῶν οἰκόθεν, he chose the household gods; he was then allowed to take what he wished and to depart unmolested. Though the story in Timaeus could be one that he learned in central Italy (and one that the author of *Cynegetica* 1 picked up later still) it looks, rather, like a natural development, more piquant and more circumstantial, from that in Hellanicus' *Troica*. In Hellanicus, the *sacra* do not go beyond Pallene; in the *Cynegetica*, no destination is specified; Timaeus knew they were to be found at Lavinium. Equally, though the form of the narrative in the *Cynegetica* is rather different, and though the order of father and gods is reversed, I suspect that the author and Timaeus are in fact

⁹¹ Cf. Acusilaus, FGrHist 2 F 39, a crudely rationalist interpretation of *Il.* 20.300 ff.

⁹² *RE* s.v., 1913. 61 ff.

⁹³ *Ibid.* 1917. 61 ff., W. Jaeger, *Paideia* (tr. Highet) iii (Oxford, 1945), 329 n. 130.

⁹⁴ A. Drummond (*JRS* 62 (1972), 219, cites Jaeger, loc. cit., and di Benedetto, *Maia* 19 (1967) 22 ff., 230 ff. Cf. too, with

great caution, *Xénophon, L'art de la chasse*, ed. E. Delebecque (edn. Budé), p. 42.

⁹⁵ L. Rademacher, *RhM* 52 (1897), 25.

⁹⁶ Geffcken, 147. 10 ff.: Lyc. *Alex.* 1263 ff. and D. S. 7.4; cf. Varr. *Res Hum.* ap. Serv. Dan. *ad Aen.* 2.636 and *Historiae* 2 ap. Schol. Ver. *ad Aen.* 2.717; also Apld. Epit. 5.21 and Q. S. 13.345 ff.

telling the same story.⁹⁷ Supposing (as I am reluctant to do) that *Cynegetica* 1.15 is authentic Xenophon, it provides an explicit statement c. 391–90 that the rescue of father and gods demonstrated Aeneas' *eusebeia*. This would be an easy and credible development from his characterization in Homer (cf. p. 372). However, if *Cynegetica* 1 is substantially later (even the Second Sophistic has been suggested), our first definition of Aeneas' *eusebeia* in terms of specific acts should probably be attributed to Timaeus (cf. Lyc. 1270): it may well therefore be subject to Roman influence, but need not of course for that very reason be out of keeping with Greek poetical and historical traditions.

Galinsky's attempt to dismiss the literary tradition concerning Aeneas' *eusebeia*⁹⁸ fails therefore to convince me, as it failed to convince Drummond (n. 94). I am equally sceptical of his denial⁹⁹ 'that the representation of Aeneas carrying Anchises inherently serves to convey, above all, the Trojan's *pietas*'. It is true that we do not have an explicit reference to Aeneas' action as a demonstration of *eusebeia* until a century, or perhaps two, after the vases which represent it. Yet Aeneas' characterization in Homer and the early fame of his rescue of his father make me suspect that the moral force of his action as a symbol of *eusebeia* was far too obvious to require explicit comment and the silence of fifth-century Greek authors on the subject does not persuade me that Aeneas was not then regarded, as he came later to be, as *εὐσεβέστατος* (similarly, Drummond, loc. cit.).

It does not militate against this reputation for *eusebeia* that there do exist scenes in which Aeneas is less directly involved in assisting his father's departure: Aeneas leads Anchises on a Parthenon metope (Galinsky (n. 1), p1.41 a–b etc.) and on a white-ground lekythos from Gela;¹⁰⁰ on an Apulian krater (BM F 160), the Ilioupersis painter shows Anchises, leaning on his staff, leading Ascanius to safety without any help from his son.¹⁰¹ But these rare variants do not detract significantly from the likelihood that Aeneas did enjoy a reputation for *eusebeia* in the fifth century, any more than does his occasional role as assistant to Paris in the rape of Helen;¹⁰² that was indeed an act of *asebeia*, but such an act is no more incompatible with his famed piety than are the *δόλοι* of Odysseus with the unmatched sacrifices he offers to the gods (*Od.* 1.66 f.).¹⁰³

⁹⁷ *Cyn.*: ἔδοσαν μὴ συληθῆναι :: Lyc. 1268 f. τοῦτω μόνω πόρωσιν αἵρεσιν, δόμων/λαβεῖν ἃ χρῆζει.

⁹⁸ (n. 1), pp. 42 ff.; particularly p. 54: I fail to see how Galinsky reaches the conclusion that Aeneas' carrying of his father was not represented as an act of *pietas* before Sen. *Ben.* 3.37. If what is required is formal testimony, then *Auct. ad Herenn.* 4.46 will serve: (as example of paradox) 'ut si quem impium, qui patrem verberaverit, Aenean vocemus'; the remark is pointless unless Aeneas' *pietas erga patrem*, symbolized, what is more, by a concrete act, is already so familiar as to be proverbial.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 53 ff., accepted without question by Cornell, p. 13.

¹⁰⁰ *ARV* 385, no. 223; for varying traditions about Anchises' age and physical

condition, cf. Austin on *Aen.* 2.649.

Certainly, if Aeneas is leading, not carrying his father, he is better ready to resist pursuers.

¹⁰¹ E. Gerhard, *Arch Ztg* 5–6 (1847–8), 226 f., with pl. xv, A. D. Trendall, *South Italian Vase-painting* (London, 1966), p. 20 with pl.7, Galinsky (n. 1), p. 57 with pl. 42. The identifications are highly likely, rather than certain.

¹⁰² Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 40 f., Cypria 103.1 Allen, L. Ghali-Kahil, *Les Enlèvements et le retour d'Helène* (Paris, 1955), pp. 29, 53, *et passim*.

¹⁰³ Dr. Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood kindly drew my attention to Brelich (n. 29), for a full survey of ambiguity in conduct as an essential characteristic of the Greek mythological hero.

That Aeneas was represented as having been assisted in his flight by the notorious traitor Antenor is a strange aberration in certain recent books;¹⁰⁴ neither of the two vases in question portrays Antenor. The treason of Antenor is not attested before Lyc. 340 ff. and it is a detail which Lycophron will not have invented; that of Aeneas appears first in Menecrates of Xanthus (p. 384). With the illusory exception of Lycophron, their acts of treason are attested only in prose and belong not to the world of poetry but to that of history.¹⁰⁵

Representations of Aeneas' rescue of Anchises on artefacts have been studied so fully¹⁰⁶ that no new survey is required, except perhaps in respect of vase-paintings, where Galinsky's data (n. 1, pp. 122 ff.) must be updated and modified, particularly in the light of Brommer, *Vasenlisten*₃, pp. 386 ff.¹⁰⁷ To the twenty¹⁰⁸ BF and RF vases depicting Aeneas' escape which have a known Etruscan provenance—Nola, in the Etruscan sphere of influence, is included—we should add:

(1) Brommer, no. 35; Villa Giulia 94; CVA III He. 13.1 (It. 50): BF amphora found at Civita Castellana.

For the following, we can only speculate about likely provenances:

(2) J. D. Beazley, *Campana fragments in Florence* (Oxford, 1933), p. 19 with p1.12.2.¹⁰⁹

(3) RF neck-amphora from a Campanian collection now in Boston: Brommer, 389, *ARV*² 654.13.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ Alföldi (n. 47), pp. 283 f., followed unhesitatingly by Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 154 f. The BF amphora described by Galinsky (n. 1), p. 55, n. 104, as in a private collection in Hamburg and as published by Alföldi is in fact in the Museum für Kunst u. Gewerbe (1906.380) and has been published widely: *ABV* 397, K. Schauenburg, *Gymn.* 67 (1960), 176 ff.: no. 7, with pl. viii.1. The figure behind Aeneas was identified by Alföldi (loc. cit.) as Antenor without any justification: cf. R. Ballheimer, *Griech. Vasen aus dem Hamburg. Mus., 48 Versamml. Deutscher Philologen* (Hamburg, 1905), p. 14 with pl. 3, E. von Mercklin, *Führer durch das Hamburg. Mus.*, (1930), 30, no. 82. Neither Ballheimer nor von Mercklin were prepared to identify the figure. The same applies to the Ilioupersis calyx-crater by the Altamura painter in Boston: see C. C. Vermeule, *Ill. London News*, 10 Oct. 1959, pp. 398 f., J. D. Beazley, *Attic Vase Paintings in . . . Boston* (Boston, 1963), p. 62, *ARV*² 590, no. 11. There is again nothing whatever to suggest that the figure marching ahead of Aeneas is Antenor. For further arguments against the interpretations of Alföldi and Galinsky, cf. now Mark I. Davies, *Lex. Icon. Myth. Class.* i (1974), 17.

¹⁰⁵ Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 48 f., Momigliano,

JRS 48 (1958), 70, A. Wlosok, *Die Göttin Venus* (Heidelberg, 1967), p. 47, E. Gabba in *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico* ed. M. Sordi (Milan, 1976), pp. 91 ff., and R. Scuderi, *ibid.*, pp. 39 ff.

¹⁰⁶ K. Schauenburg, loc. cit. (n. 104), Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 103 ff., W. Fuchs (n. 90), pp. 615 ff., etc. To the list in Brommer³, three additions, for which I am indebted to Miss M. Loudon, may be made: (i) Münster Inv. 738 = *Boreas* 1 (1978), 189 f. (no provenance); (ii) Sotheby, Catal. 10, Apr. 1978, no. 216, p. 56. (no provenance); (iii) Beazley Archive, Ashmolean Museum: Amphora type B. Box 2 (Delos).

¹⁰⁷ Note that Brommer, nos. 12 and 13 are one and the same vase, München 1546; see Beazley, *Paralipomena*, p. 172. Despite Beazley, *ABV* 483.1 (cf. *Catal. Ravenstein* i (1871), 190 f.) I share Brommer's unease about the identification of the figures on Brussels R312 (p. 388, *sub fin.*). The head and shoulders of the figure carried are suspiciously far forward: a corpse?

¹⁰⁸ Schauenburg (n. 104), p. 186. Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 123, 130.

¹⁰⁹ A reference for which I am indebted to Mr. Dyfri Williams.

¹¹⁰ On the identification, see Brommer, *Satyrspiele*² no. 149; Caskey—Beazley, ii. 39.

(4) Brommer, no. 41 = Beazley, *Paralipomena*, 61.

(5) Brommer, no. 45 = K. Schauenburg, *Röm. Mitt.* 71 (1964), 60.

For the following:

Brommer, no. 36 (*Gymn.* 76 (1969), p1.2 = *Bull. Metr. Mus.* 1969, 433, p1.9).

Brommer, no. 55 (*Hesp. Art Bull.* 33 (1965) A.5)

and Brommer, no. 56 (*Gymn.* 76 (1969) p1.1)

let alone Brommer, no. 60 (fr., 'Deutung nicht sicher'),

there exists unfortunately not even a basis for speculation. It emerges therefore that the statistical spread has not altered significantly between Brommer² and Schauenburg (on whom Galinsky is based) and Brommer³.

We have, therefore, at very least twenty-one vases from Etruria showing Aeneas' escape from Troy with Anchises out of a total of about seventy from all provenances, whether known or unknown, showing this scene. On the other hand, Etruria, including Nola and Suessula, provides a total of fifteen¹¹¹ representations of other episodes from Aeneas' life.

Aeneas' departure from Troy is clearly, then, a theme in some demand among the Etruscan clients of Attic potters; it is indeed by some distance the most popular *single* episode involving Aeneas (cf. Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 127 f.); next most popular is the combat of Aeneas and Diomedes, on a mere four vases of Etruscan provenance, out of a total of (?) nine representations of this scene (Brommer, *Vasenlisten*³, p. 396). This is not surprising: as we have seen, the Homeric Aeneas is of secondary interest. Only the bloody elimination of his betters has elevated the Aeneas of post-Homeric narrative to eminence.

Antenor alone stands comparison: already in Sophocles' *Antenoridae* (Strabo 13, p. 608) he departed in freedom for the Adriatic along with his sons;¹¹² his departure was carried out with the Greeks' consent and he was not burdened with an aged and crippled father. This scene did not attract the painters. Though he and Aeneas alone among the Trojan survivors of Troy carried their families (or at least a creditable proportion of them) to safety, Aeneas' achievement, in its fame and popularity, clearly outstripped Antenor's. They differed in that Aeneas rescued both *sacra* and a crippled father; Antenor, with no such burden, departed, moreover, by kind permission of the conquerors.¹¹³ There is no comparison to be drawn with Aeneas' negotiated departure from the Troad in Hellanicus' *Troica* (p. 377) or from Troy in the *Cynegetica* and Lycophron, etc. (p. 385). In these passages, Aeneas earns the right to depart unharmed as a reward for the virtues he displays during the sack, not for the services he has rendered in betraying the city.

The vase painters apparently knew nothing of any negotiations. For them, Aeneas shows at one and the same time his warlike bravery (Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 56, 124) and the filial devotion unambiguously proclaimed by his evident readiness to jeopardize his own escape by attempting to secure that of his father and his son at the same time. Escape and rescue cannot (*pace* Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 54 ff.) be differentiated.

If then these scenes are not merely exciting episodes of escape but go some

¹¹¹ Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 125 ff.; to this number, I have not been able to add.

¹¹² Apparently it is only in Serv. Dan.

ad Aen. 1.242 that his wife Theano travels with him.

¹¹³ Cf. Pearson, *Soph. Frag.* i. 86 ff.

way towards proclaiming Aeneas' *pietas erga patrem* (pace Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 56 f.) we may observe that for such a virtue to be symbolized in the vase-paintings of the period 525–470 is certainly not out of keeping with our conclusions from the literary evidence (cf. p. 385).

Neither Attic exporters nor Etruscan customers can have been wholly unaware of the uniqueness of Aeneas' achievements.¹¹⁴ If exporters sent twenty-one 'departures' to Etruria and only four 'combats with Diomedes', then this is a clear and marked preference. Perhaps neither potters nor customers were interested in the scene's evident moral implications and saw it merely as an exciting episode full of poignant human interest. If, however, the Etruscans did find in Aeneas a virtue they admired, which they may have done, it should not be labelled *pietas*;¹¹⁵ neither the word nor the concept has any place among the securely established findings of modern Etruscology.

(6) CONCLUSIONS

The general conclusions to be drawn from my discussion are limited and negative. That is fully in keeping with recent tendencies in the interpretation of the supposed archaeological evidence for the establishment of the Aeneas-legend in Italy. I refer in particular to Torelli's destructive criticism of the conventional dating of the Veii statuettes,¹¹⁶ to the acknowledgement that the Lar Aeneas of the Tor Tignosa statuettes no longer watches benignly over these studies¹¹⁷ and to the growth of scepticism at the expense of the 'Tomba di Enea' which was unveiled with an enthusiasm reminiscent of Schliemann gazing on the face of Agamemnon in the *Messaggero* of 31 Jan. 1972.¹¹⁸

I hope to have shown the need to distinguish sharply between Aeneas' rescue of his father and his rescue of the penates. The former is securely established in Greek art¹¹⁹ and literature. It was, I must insist, a scene popular with the Etruscans and endowed with a distinct moral symbolism for those who cared to see it. That is not of course to say that the vases showing the rescue of Anchises in themselves constitute evidence for any sort of hero-cult of Aeneas in Etruria. The rescue of the penates is quite another matter: the

¹¹⁴ Unique certainly at the fall of Troy: for the Catanian story of Amphinomus and Anapias, cf. V. M. 5.4.4, Galinsky (n. 1), p. 56, Fuchs (n. 90), p. 624.

¹¹⁵ As was done notably by F. Bömer (n. 24), pp. 47 ff.; he has had many followers – e.g. U. Knoche, *Festschr. Snell* (Munich, 1956), p. 90, P. Boyancé, *Religion de Virgile* (Paris, 1963), pp. 61 f., Schauenburg ((n. 104), pp. 189 f. Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 57 ff. and 130 f., and Cornell rightly insist that this argument is gravely fallacious. The vases are distinctively Etruscan (not Roman) in provenance; the virtue is not.

¹¹⁶ *Roma medio-republicana* (1973), pp. 335 f. etc.; for a summary, J. Perret, *REL* 49 (1971), 41 ff. and T. J. Cornell, *LCM* 2 (1977), 78.

¹¹⁷ Cornell, p. 14 n. 5, with further references.

¹¹⁸ Cf. (pro) P. Sommella, *RendPontAcad* 44 (1971–2), 47 ff. and *Gymn.* 81 (1974), 273 ff., G. K. Galinsky, *Vergilius* 20 (1974) 2 ff.; (contra): T. J. Cornell (n. 116), pp. 77 ff.; cf. R. E. A. Palmer, *Roman Religion and Roman Empire* (Philadelphia, 1974), p. 121, T. N. Gantz, *PP* 29 (1974), 358 n. 32. I am most grateful to Dr. Cornell for an advance view of his *LCM* paper; I disagree with much in it and in his *PCPS* contribution, but have benefited immensely from his articles and from extended discussions with him.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Fuchs (n. 90), p. 620 on the Parthenon metopes.

existence of a cult of the penates in Latium is clearly ancient and predates any connection with the Trojan legend.¹²⁰ We find that in Hellanicus' *Troica* Aeneas saves his gods and presumably they travel with him as far as Pallene. That will not have been an unfamiliar form of story: compare the ἀγάλματα τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἰρων καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀναθήματα which the Phocaeans took to Alalia (Hdt. 1.164, 166) or the τῶν θεῶν . . . τὰ ἀγάλματα brought from Myus to Miletus.¹²¹ I do not wish to assign any special significance to the de Luynes scarab, for all that it is Etruscan, datable to c. 490, and unique in pre-Roman art as a representation of Aeneas' rescue of his gods. In isolation, it is certainly not proof of any cult of the Trojan *penates* in the West in the sixth or fifth centuries; assuredly the artist thought that the box he represented Anchises as carrying contained sacred objects of Trojan origin. That, as we have just seen, is the sort of thing that colonists did in the Greek world; it is by no means the same thing as proclaiming with sacral solemnity 'feror exul in altum cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis'. If Aeneas was famous for saving his father, then it may have occurred to an isolated artist that he could have saved a box of sacred objects at the same time (cf. Perret (n. 7), pp. 40 f.).

In all the above, no word of Rome or of Lavinium. Even if my conclusions regarding Hellanicus and Damastes are wrong and those historians did mention Aeneas' founding of Rome, there is nothing to suggest that they believed him to have brought the sacred objects of Troy with him. As far as Pallene, yes; but the very lowest price to be paid for acknowledging the Hellanican authorship of *FGrHist* 4 F 84 is an admission that the *Troica* and the *Priestesses* are utterly irreconcilable on the subject of Aeneas. Silence, therefore, reigns upon the theme of the Trojan penates and their cult until Timaeus. There is nothing at all in the literary evidence,¹²² nothing secure in the archaeological, that might serve to show that when the Romans took over the cults of Lavinium in 338 they found any trace of the presence of Aeneas there. Yet Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566 F 36, 59) records an awareness of the Trojan origins of religious ritual at both Rome and Lavinium. It was when the story that Rome's gods were in part of Trojan origin 'poteva assumere un valore politico'¹²³ that the Romans might reasonably begin to put about such a story.¹²⁴

We may wonder indeed by how long any connection of Troy with Rome or with any centre in Latium predated the development of such a connection as a matter of religious and political propaganda. If my scepticism regarding the authenticity of the Hellanicus and Damastes fragments is in fact misplaced, then the Greeks of the fifth century were vaguely aware of a city named Rome in the West to which they assigned almost as a matter of routine an eminent survivor of the

¹²⁰ Galinsky (n. 1), pp. 147 ff., Alföldi (n. 47), pp. 258 f., F. Castagnoli, *Atti viii Convegno . . . Studi Magna Grecia* (1968/9), p. 97, etc.

¹²¹ Paus. 7.2.11; cf. Plut. Them. 10.4, S. Weinstock, *RE* xix. 435.4 ff., A. J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City* (Manchester, 1964), p. 14.

¹²² Kiessling's emendation of Λατίνιον to Λαουίνιον at D. H. 1.72.3 is inadmissible normalizing, nor need the whole passage, strictly speaking, be relevant to this dis-

cussion; cf. n. 73.

¹²³ F. Castagnoli, *Lavinium i* (Rome, 1972), 99; his whole discussion is admirable in its caution and scepticism.

¹²⁴ There is apparently no difficulty in suggesting that the Veii statuettes might belong to a period as late as the late fourth century or even later; cf. n. 116. Torelli's proposal (loc. cit.) that they symbolized the *pietas* of the new Roman colonists at Veii is clearly ingenious rather than mandatory.

Trojan war, with at least some reputation as a traveller, as founder. In this case, it would have been likely that Roman statesmen of the late fourth or early third centuries improved upon such bald statements in their accounts of the penates, not least if it was known at Rome that in some Greek authors Aeneas had actually rescued certain sacred objects from Troy. Even if he was not thought to have carried them very far, he may have been known to have earned at least a part of his reputation for *pietas* by having rescued them at all in the chaos of the sack of Troy.

But if my scepticism is justified, then there may have been no connection whatever in legendary terms between Troy and Rome/Lavinium/Alba before the late fourth century, at which point the polemical advantages or disadvantages of such a connection may have suggested themselves more or less simultaneously to Greek historians and Roman statesmen.

University College London

NICHOLAS HORSFALL