MEDEDELINGEN DER KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE
AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN, AFD. LETTERKUNDE
NIEUWE REEKS – DEEL 45 – No. 9

# HOW TO RECONCILE GREEKS AND TROJANS

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO

NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY – AMSTERDAM/OXFORD/NEW YORK – 1982

ISBN 0 4448 5576 9

AANVAARD SEPTEMBER 1982

I

I owe to my late colleague of Pisa, Marino Barchiesi – a Latinist of rare intelligence (*I Moderni alla ricerca di Enea,* Bulzoni, Rome 1981) – my first awareness that Aeneas has a place of his own in American literature as a prototype of the immigrant. "Aeneas at Washington" by Allen Tate, most conspicuously, and, less so, Robert Lowell's "Falling Asleep over the Aeneid" are only the most recent links in a chain, which goes back through Thornton Wilder's *The Cabala* to Longfellow's *Evangeline,* which contains the line "bearing a nation with all its household into exile". That Hermann Broch should give its final form to "Der Tod des Vergil" in his American exile, and that one of the most penetrating recent evaluations of the *Aeneid* should come from the American Brooks Otis under the characteristic title *Virgil. A Study in Civilized Poetry* (1963) is perhaps part of the same story. And there is of course the admiration of T.S. Eliot for Virgil. As for myself, I can testify to having read in the Chicago University Library a tragedy *Aeneas* published in 1885 by Charles Gildehaus and republished in Saint Louis in 1888 together with two other tragedies, *Sibyl* and *Telemachus* – the whole being dedicated to William Shakespeare. Towards the end of the tragedy Aeneas leaves no doubt about his ideal destination:

> The humblest member of our commonwealth
> shall own a passport ampler than a king's
> to make condition. Let us, gentle friends,
> be most exact and proper with ourselves,
> and staff our virgin law so full of justice [etc., etc.]

That even beyond the borders of America our time, which has seen so many exiles and emigrants, should altogether be very sensitive to the poem of Aeneas is not surprising. What is surprising is that not enough recognition has yet been given to the fact that Dido too was an emigrant – a more unfortunate emigrant than Aeneas just because she was a woman. The troubles which Aeneas could inflict upon those with whom he came into contact multiplied after his arrival in Italy. It was the task of Virgil to sort out the various traditions about the ambiguous events surrounding Aeneas and to produce his own version.

If by reflecting on Aeneas as an immigrant we can begin to perceive some of the universal implications of the Aeneas myth, Virgil's care for it, just in the time of Augustus, may indeed indicate some of the more specific reasons why this myth was central to Roman ideology and served Augustus well.

The Greeks had known migrations throughout their history. No stigma attached to them. That idealized nation of the *Odyssey,* the Phaeacians,

had retired to Scheria under the guidance of Nausithoos to escape the Cyclops (6, 4–12). Who would have blamed them? But in classical Greece to be *autochthones* was more respectable than being *epeludes,* emigrants. The Athenians took pride in their autochthony, which they contrasted with the migrations of the Dorians. As Albrecht Dieterich showed in *Mutter Erde,* autochthony was the precondition for claiming to have been procreated by Mother Earth herself. Autochthony did not necessarily imply civilization. The Ethiopians had the reputation of having been generated by the Earth, but were not on the same level as the Athenians. Yet the Athenians succeeded well enough in linking their own superior merits with autochthony. As there is no time and no place in which the Romans were free from Greek influences, the appreciation of autochthony spread to Rome. Let me quote this Greek conceit in Livy's words (38, 17): "generosius in sua quidquid sede gignitur". It is therefore the more remarkable that when the Romans came to speak about themselves, they seldom made any effort to claim autochthony. What the Romans had to say about themselves was centred on Romulus and Aeneas. We may take it for granted that the two stories were originally independent and only later were connected by artificial genealogies which made Romulus a descendant of Aeneas. According to the Romulus legend, the twins Romulus and Remus started out as leaders of rather disreputable robber bands; the foundation of the city they envisaged was marred by fratricide; the killer Romulus went on collecting refugees from the neighbourhood whom he provided with sanctuary. The primitive institutions, such as the three tribes allegedly corresponding to three main groups of settlers – Latins, Sabines and Etruscans – and some of the religious fraternities, such as the Luperci ("*fera quaedam sodalitas*", as Cicero says, *pro Caelio* 26), would reflect the conditions in which the new robber state was founded. Even Livy, who does his best to make the founders of Rome respectable, has to describe them as "a miscellaneous rabble without distinction of bond or free *[sine discrimine liber an servus esset]* eager for new conditions" (1, 8, trans. B.O. Foster, Loeb). Some sensitive scholars have chosen to believe that this cannot be a native tradition and therefore must be the invention of enemies of Rome. This thesis has been developed, with the erudition and the logical rigour we would expect of him, by one of the best contemporary students of ancient historiography, H. Strasburger (*Sitzungsb. Heidelberg. Ak.* 1968, 5). Unfortunately, such a suggestion is entirely incredible. It does not explain why the Romans, having been accused by some enemies of having started their collective life with fratricide and robbery, declared themselves delighted and turned the accusation into a sacred national tradition. Nor does it explain why other Latin cities, most clearly Praeneste, claimed to have been founded by a leader of robbers (Serv. *Aen.* 7, 678). Secondly, and even more decisively, this solution is incompatible with all we know about the development of the legend of Romulus. In the fifth and fourth centuries

B.C. the Greeks imagined that Rome was founded by one man, or even by one woman, whose name, Rome, would have been given to the city. They did not think of twin brothers and fratricide. But in 296 B.C. the legend of the twins was consecrated by a public monument in Rome (Liv.10, 23, 12), and in 269 the wolf and the twins appear on the coins of Rome. We must assume that the story of Romulus and Remus was current in Rome in the fourth century B.C., when the Greeks apparently did not yet know it. One is left to wonder which enemies of Rome had managed to persuade the Romans in the fourth century B.C. or earlier that Romulus had murdered his brother. Twins who become rivals fill the chronicles of gods and men, and the archetype of brother killing brother has its place in familiar sacred history. Juvenile robber bands certainly played their part in real history during the monarchic period of Rome. The Romans took in their stride the idea that they were the descendants of robbers and had a fratricide in the foundation ritual of their city. They did their best to inform the Greeks about their own version of the foundation of Rome. The story of the twins was told by the first Roman historian in the Greek language, Fabius Pictor, about the end of the third century. If Diocles of Peparethos, as Plutarch seems to suggest, preceded Fabius in telling the same story (*Rom.* 3) Diocles must have learned it from Roman oral tradition. We now know that, to please the Romans, the Greeks of Chios put up a piece of sculpture representing the twin brothers, in a public place, about 200 B.C. An inscription the text of which had been circulating privately for about thirty years was finally published in the not very accessible *Chiakà Chronikà* of 1975, pp. 14–27, and has been made more accessible, with a first attempt at a commentary, by M. Moretti in *Riv. Fil. Class.* 108, 1980, 33–54. From about 200 B.C., the story of Romulus and Remus, including the murder of the latter, was evidently the orthodox explanation of the origins of Rome and the symbol of Roman power offered to the friends and the subjects of Rome. The Greeks, to all appearances, learnt about the twins and the fratricide from the Romans themselves. At the same time, more or less, the story of Aeneas reaching the shores of Latium with his companions, not exactly in splendour, was put into Latin verse by Naevius and into Greek prose by Fabius Pictor. In other words, it was definitely consecrated by the earliest monuments of Roman literature under Hellenistic influence. Here again, a recent discovery has added some new elements to our scanty information. A catalogue of a library of the second century B.C. found painted on the walls of a house of Tauromenium (modern Taormina) in Sicily has given us some details of the account Fabius Pictor provided of Aeneas' wanderings, including his special alliance with the founder of the Latin city of Lanuvium.[1]

1 The text edited by G. Manganaro in A. Alföldi, *Römische Frühgeschichte,* 1976, 83–96.

I shall soon return to an examination of the development of the Aeneas legend. What I want to emphasize for the moment is the obvious cumulative effect of these two stories of Romulus and Aeneas. They presented the Romans as the descendants of the Trojan immigrants and the foundation of Rome as a further occasion for collecting stragglers of dubious reputation. The personal connection of Aeneas and Romulus was envisaged in different ways. Here it may be enough to register the oldest version known to us, perhaps to be dated about 350 B.C., by a Sicilian writer Alcimus (*F.Gr.H.* 560, F.4), who made Romulus the only son of Aeneas by Tyrrhenia. Romulus in his turn was for Alcimus the father of Alba, whose son Rhodios (a strange name almost certainly to be emended to Rhomos) became the founder of Rome. Here a Greek writer evidently tried to combine Greek and Roman stories: though he did not make Romulus the founder of Rome, he treated him as the son of Aeneas. As such, Alcimus' version is no evidence for Roman genealogical thinking about 350 B.C. But it confirms that while the Greeks, and more precisely the Athenians, claimed autochthony as a reason for pride, the Romans were ready to be seen and received as *epeludes,* as migrants, of a very strange, and un-Greek, kind.

Whatever one may think of the character and progressive evolution of Roman imperialism, we must not separate the character it took and the evolution it achieved from this early indifference of the Romans towards racial purity and stability. The Romans, who thought their city to be originally populated by individuals of different extraction, were also ready to extend their citizenship to foreigners. The specific development of Roman imperialism which first extended Roman citizenship to the whole of the Italian peninsula and then to the greatest part of the populations of the provinces is not separable from this very early attitude of the Romans towards their own humble and mixed origins. On the other hand, whatever we may say of the details of the attitudes (I must emphasize the plural *attitudes*) of the Greeks towards their own origins, the pride in autochthony and purity prevailed: it characterized the severe restrictions limiting citizenship inside the individual *poleis* and the basic unwillingness to turn from the city-state to the territorial state. The stories of Aeneas and Romulus are therefore very relevant to any attempt to understand the nature of Roman political mentality.

## II

With this in mind, we may return to the story of Aeneas with the three specific purposes of seeing: 1. how, contrary to its premises, it paradoxically made Aeneas a migrant hero; 2. what chances this story had of being acceptable to the Greeks as an invitation to like the Romans and to

collaborate with them; 3. how the Romans, and more specifically Virgil, managed to turn the image of the Trojan Aeneas into a symbol of friendship between Greeks and Romans. It may help the understanding of my argument if I add here a point which I shall repeat later, namely that Aeneas remained specifically the symbol of reconciliation between Greeks and Romans, and never became a generic symbol of friendship between the various peoples of the Roman Empire. For instance, to the best of my knowledge, the story of Aeneas was never used to say a nice word about the Carthaginians, though Dido was after all the founder of Carthage.

Aeneas had been provided with a perfect genealogical tree in the *Iliad,* book XX, 215ff. Thus Aeneas belonged to a cadet branch of the royal family of Troy. As a good cadet he had reasons for complaining against the ruling branch, which did not show him sufficient respect (13, 460ff; 20, 179). At the outbreak of the war he was, like his father, Anchises, a sort of shepherd king near Mount Ida. Homer is not very clear about his status. During the war he was next to Hector in valour among the Trojans, but had to be saved by his divine protectors more than once. In the fight against Diomedes, he was saved by his mother, Aphrodite, and Apollo. In the struggle with Achilles, he was rescued by Poseidon, who told him that he should leave Achilles alone: once Achilles is dead, no Greek warrior will be able to kill Aeneas. Indeed, Poseidon promises that Aeneas will reign among the Trojans, and his children's children after him. Thus Poseidon repeats on the battlefield the promise Aphrodite had made to Anchises on parting after their brief love interlude: "and you shall have a dear son who shall reign among the Trojans, and his children's children after him, springing up continually" (*Hom. Hymns* V, 195–7, trans. H.E. White, Loeb). Whether book XX of the *Iliad* here echoes the Hymn to Aphrodite or vice versa, both texts reflect a historical situation: the poet implies that a dynasty claiming descent from Aeneas reigned in the Troad after the destruction of Troy. Apparently, some tradition had developed that Aeneas had survived the destruction of Troy by the Greeks and had established a new kingdom in the same region. Some later texts, most notably Demetrius of Scepsis quoted by Strabo 13, 1, 52–3, presuppose the existence of a degraded royal family claiming such a descent from Aeneas in the fourth or third century B.C. This of course does not prove that the poet of the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite composed his poem for a member of a dynasty allegedly deriving from Anchises. Whatever the true historical background, the message of the Homeric poetry was unambiguous: Aeneas had *not* left the Troad, had *not* left Asia; he had established there a monarchy for generations to come. This excluded emigration both for Aeneas and for his direct descendants.

How then did it happen that Aeneas was sent out of the Troad and became a sort of Trojan competitor to the Greek Odysseus both in his peregrinations and in his love adventures? Place names which seemed to allude

either to Aeneas himself or to his father may have helped to turn the sedentary Aeneas into a vagabond. The place Aineia in Macedonia was certainly considered rather early to have been founded by him: local coins with the image of Aeneas carrying his father on his shoulders go back to the sixth century B.C. The name of Mount Anchisia in Arcadia encouraged the idea that Aeneas and his old father had travelled there. Modern scholars have also toyed with the idea that Aeneas was made to travel in order to explain the foundation of sanctuaries dedicated to his mother Aphrodite: at least it is a fact that ancient tradition associates many cult places of Aphrodite with the pilgrimages of Aeneas. But the obvious truth is that we simply do not know why, against the authority of Homer, Aeneas and his Trojan companions were made to abandon the region of Troy and to find a new place to settle in the West. In the fifth century, Aeneas had made himself at home in Sicily among the Elymi, as Thucydides knew (6, 2). At the end of the century, Hellanicus said that Aeneas had founded Rome. Hellanicus' text is known to us only second-hand through Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who wrote in the first century B.C. The manuscripts of Dionysius leave us in doubt whether Hellanicus had said that Aeneas founded Rome *with* Odysseus or *after* Odysseus. As "after Odysseus" does not make much sense, it would seem that, according to Hellanicus, Odysseus and Aeneas had combined forces in founding Rome. Another tradition which seems to go back to the end of the sixth century B.C. (Hecataeus, 1.F.62 Jacoby) is that the city of Capua in Campania owed its name to the Trojan Capys: evidently Aeneas was not the only Trojan to have been credited with the foundation of a city in Southern Italy.

This reinforces the claim of the Tabula Iliaca, a relief of the first century A.D. – and admittedly a garbled and composite source – when it attributes to Stesichorus, a Greek poet active in Italy about 550 B.C., the story that Aeneas reached Campania. Such evidence as we have seems to point to the conclusion that the wanderings of Aeneas in Italy were already registered by Greek poets in the sixth century B.C. and were registered in cold historical prose a century later. In joining the name of Odysseus to that of Aeneas in the foundation of Rome, Hellanicus reminds us that Odysseus had already been linked with the Latin race. In Hesiod's *Theogony* Odysseus appears as the father of Latinus. No other Greek source makes Aeneas the direct founder of Rome, but the tradition reappears in a difficult passage of Sallust, *Catilinarian Conspiracy*, 6, 1–2; and there are plenty of other texts which in one way or in another relate Aeneas to the direct founder or founders of Rome.[2]

2 N. Horsfall, *J.H.S.* 99, 1979, 26–48 has a better case in denying that the Roman Tabula Iliaca reflects Stesichorus than in disputing the credibility of Dionysius about Hellanicus (cf. his article in *C.Q.* n.s. 29, 1979, 372–390). The captions of the Tabula Iliaca raise two problems: whether the author of the captions intended to establish a connecti-

The number of Attic vases representing Aeneas which have been found in Etruria has led to the conclusion that in the sixth century B.C. the Etruscans had taken a special interest in the story of Aeneas and had transmitted it to their Latin neighbours. This is by no means unlikely; but we must remember that Greek vases arrived in Etruria in the thousands, and we simply do not know whether the relatively high number of representations of Aeneas reflects the preference for Aeneas of the Attic vase-painters or of the Etruscan buyers. Three vases made by Etruscans with Aeneas as a subject might in themselves be interpreted as an imitation of Greek themes: one of them is the Munich amphora depicting Creusa carrying an earthenware jar with sacred objects. There is only one original Etruscan piece, of about 500 B.C. – a scarab of the de Luynes collection in Paris which represents Aeneas carrying Anchises and the Penates – to testify that the Etruscans had a genuine interest of their own in Aeneas (*J.H.S.* 99, 1979, plate IIIb): not very much. Statuettes of Aeneas carrying his father have been found in a temple of Veii. They would be of decisive importance if we could date them in the sixth or fifth century B.C. as was suggested by the first archaeologists who published them. The very crude manufacture of these statuettes makes it very difficult to date them on stylistic grounds: even if we discount extreme dates, such as 200 B.C., we cannot, however, exclude the possibility that they reflect the prestige of Aeneas in Latium and neighbouring territories after he had been accepted as an ancestor in Latium in the fifth or fourth century B.C.[3]

There was in fact at least one other place in Latium which claimed Aeneas and contributed to shape the legend of this settling in central Italy. In the early third century B.C., the Sicilian historian Timaeus learned from natives of Latium that Aeneas had brought sacred objects of his own to Lavinium, where they were preserved (566 F. 59 Jac.). These domestic sacred objects must be identical with the domestic gods of the Roman people, the *Penates populi Romani,* whom the Roman consuls used to visit cere-

on between Stesichorus and Aeneas' migration to the West and whether this connection, if any, was correct. In the case of Dionysius there is only one problem: whether Dionysius is reliable in reporting Hellanicus. I still believe that the author (Isidore?) of the Tabula Iliaca intended to establish a connection between Stesichorus and Aeneas' journey to the West and was correct in doing so. But obviously I attribute less probability to this opinion than to the opinion that Dionysius read and understood his Hellanicus. Cf. F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie,* 1979, 155; D. Ambaglio, *L'opera storiografica di Ellanico di Lesbo,* 1980, 124–6, and my own remarks in *La storiografia greca,* 1982, 353–356.

3 It will be enough to refer to the bibl. in L. Vagnetti, *Il deposito votivo di Campetti a Veio,* 1971, p. 88, but for the lower date cf. M. Torelli, *Dialoghi di Archeol.* 7, 1973, 399–400. The historical implications of the oinochoe 179 of the Bibl. Nationale of Paris *(C.V.A.* France, 7, pl. 12) – if it represents a scene of the destruction of Troy – are obscure to me. I cannot quite follow F. Zevi's conjectures in *Gli Etruschi e Roma* (Colloquio M. Pallottino), 1981, 148.

monially in Lavinium once a year. The poem *Alexandra* attributed to Lycophron is the first to state (or rather to imply) that Aeneas founded Lavinium (1. 1259). Modern scholars dispute whether the *Alexandra* was written about 270 B.C. or about 190 B.C.: I have repeatedly taken position for the earlier date, but a date of about 190 B.C. would not detract from the importance of this evidence. Lycophron depends on earlier and good authors for his statements, and he is confirmed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1, 64), who speaks of a sanctuary dedicated to Aeneas – more precisely of a *heroon* – existing in Lavinium in his own days (late first century B.C.) and seems to have visited it. The literary evidence has received powerful support from archaeology in the last twenty years. The excavations on the site of ancient Lavinium by P. Sommella brought to light a sacred building of the fourth century B.C. which includes a tomb of the seventh century B.C. This has been identified as the sanctuary of Aeneas mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. If this identification is correct, a tomb of the seventh century would have been regarded in the fourth century, for whatever reason, as the tomb of Aeneas and surrounded by a sanctuary: a *heroon* normally implies a tomb in it.[4] There are, however, complications. We hear from the second century B.C. annalist Cassius Hemina (fr. 7 Peter) that Aeneas was worshipped as *pater indiges,* while Livy asserts that Aeneas died by drowning in the river Numicus and received a cult under the name of Iuppiter Indiges (1, 2, 6). The Numicus flowed near Lavinium. An inscription discovered at Tor Tignosa, not very far from Lavinium, reads, according to M. Guarducci: "Lare Aenia d(ono)" – that is, "gift to Lar Aeneas". The question raised by this much debated inscription is whether Lar Aeneas means "god Aeneas" and therefore confirms the existence of a cult of Aeneas, as a god, in Lavinium.[5] Even if we take Lar Aeneas to be equivalent to "god Aeneas", we have still to explain why Aeneas was considered in Lavinium either a full god (in the Latin way) or a hero (in the Greek way) and why he was called either *pater indiges* or even simply *indiges* (the variants are collected by A. Schwegler, *Römische Geschichte,* I, 1853, 287–8).

4 Cf. F. Castagnoli, *La Parola del Passato* 32, 1977, 355; C.F. Giuliani and P. Sommella, *ib.* 367. Though I consider it probable that the *heroon* was built for Aeneas in the fourth century B.C., the objections by T.J. Cornell, *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 2, April 1977, 79–8 remain serious: the inscription of the *heroon* did not mention the name of Aeneas, and the place of the *heroon* is rather far from the Numicus. The answer by F. Castagnoli, *Studi Romani* 30, 1981, 13 does not entirely solve these doubts. C. Cogrossi in M. Sordi: (ed.), *Politica e religione nel primo scontro tra Roma e l'Oriente,* 1982, 79 – 98 is speculative.

5 M. Guarducci's reading of the text, as represented in *Mitt. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. Rom* 78, 1971, 73–118, seems on the whole plausible: it was confirmed by A. Degrassi, *I.L.L.R.* 1271, in 1963. But notice the doubts by T.J. Cornell, *Liverpool Classical Monthly* cit. in note 4, 79. For the interpretation of Lar see the acute remarks by J. Heurgon, *Mél. Piganiol,* 2, 1966, 655–664.

Underlying these specific questions is a more general and important question: whether and how Aeneas came to be connected with Lavinium. In the present state of the evidence, it is equally conceivable that early, say, in the sixth or fifth century B.C., the citizens of Lavinium directly imported Aeneas from Greek legend or that later, in the fourth century B.C., they received Aeneas from Rome. Correspondingly we do not know whether in his story that Aeneas founded Rome *with* Odysseus (or less probably *after* Odysseus) Hellanicus was simply imposing a Greek pattern on Roman origins or somehow reflecting an active Latin interest in being colonized by a Trojan. To have been founded by Aeneas meant, for Latins, not to be Greeks, while keeping some of the glory of being related to the Trojan war. It was a proclamation of noble origins combined with the recognition of diversity from the Greeks. In Rome, the Trojan idea had to be reconciled with a tradition attributing the foundation of the city to one or two indigenous beings. In Lavinium the competition of a native founder was apparently not so strong.

Whatever the details, if the Romans toyed with the idea of their city having been directly founded by Aeneas – a notion which we have found repeated by Sallust – they settled for a compromise. Aeneas was left to Lavinium, but his descendants founded Rome. Chronological difficulties in placing the foundation of Rome immediately after the destruction of Troy helped to reinforce this compromise when chronology became a serious consideration, but we may doubt that in the fifth or fourth century B.C. the Latins worried about it.

What we can learn from combining literary evidence and archaeological exploration is that Aeneas was important to Lavinium at least from the fourth century B.C. onwards. He was considered the founder of the city. On the other hand, archaeology confirms that Lavinium was an important religious centre for archaic Latium. Somebody has called the city a little Italian Delphi. It must have appeared suitable to its situation that Aeneas should be its founder. As after all Rome was known to have been founded by Romulus, the Greek legend that Aeneas was the founder of Rome could be modified to the extent that Aeneas was considered the ancestor of Romulus. This process allowed the insertion of a third Latin city into the process, Alba Longa. Alba Longa had been destroyed by Rome very early, and its aristocracy had been transferred to Rome. At a certain point some of these aristocratic clans from Alba Longa claimed Trojan descent. By crediting Aeneas' son Ascanius with the foundation of Alba Longa, their claims were both justified and used to increase the prestige of Rome. We know that the Aemilii and the Julii were among the clans which claimed such Trojan ancestry. For our purpose they are less interesting than the clans of the Geganii, the Nautii and perhaps the Decii which disappeared in the fourth and third centuries B.C., but are known to have boasted of their Trojan ancestors. Whatever theory we ultimately prefer, the Tro-

jan legend appears to have taken root in Rome and in the rest of Latium not later than the early fourth century B.C.[6]

## III

If our account is roughly correct, the Greeks imagined Aeneas travelling to the West not later than the sixth century B.C. In the late fifth century, Aeneas was already considered by some Greeks to be the founder or co-founder of Rome. The Romans did not completely accept these stories about Aeneas, because they had their own founder – Romulus. But they adapted their own foundation legend to accommodate Aeneas and harmonized it with the claims of other Latin cities, especially Lavinium and Alba Longa, to Trojan ancestry. As there were authoritative Greek writers who declared the Romans to be Trojan descendants of Aeneas, the Romans could go round the Mediterranean claiming acknowledgement of this descent and exploiting it diplomatically. I shall soon mention some cases of this exploitation. But the Romans were bound to find in certain quarters unwelcome reactions to their claims. Some Greeks might think that the Romans, as Trojans, were the natural enemies of the Greeks. Some others might think that Aeneas was not quite the good Trojan he was reputed to be: if he really left Troy, had he not been a traitor to his side? And finally there was the simple, but old and formidable objection that acording to Homer Aeneas and his descendants had been fated to rule the Troad, not Latium. Were not the Romans cheating in claiming that they were the descendants of Aeneas?

All three types of objections are documented in our tradition. They confirm that after all it was not so easy for the Romans to be acceptable as Trojans in the Greek world, even if some writers had presented Aeneas as a good Trojan and the Romans as the descendants of this good Trojan.

We start with the most dangerous consequence the Romans had to face in their claim to be Trojans. It was the probability of being told by unsympathetic Greeks: "So if you are Trojans, never mind Aeneas; you are the enemies of the Greeks". We know that this is what happened about 281 B.C. when Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, landed in Southern Italy to help the Tarentines. As Pausanias tells us, obviously using a good source (1, 12,1): "Pyrrhus remembered the sack of Troy, and he had the same hopes for

6 The evidence on the Decii is ambiguous; it depends on the interpretation of the title of L. Accius' tragedy *Aeneades sive Decius* (I, 281, Ribbeck$^2$). But the evidence on the Nautii (Dionys. 6, 69; Verg. *Aen.* 5, 704; Serv. *Aen.* 2, 166) and on the Geganii (Serv. *Aen.* 5, 117) is unambiguous. See P.T. Wiseman, *Greece and Rome* 2 s., 21, 1974, 153–160.

his success in the war, as he, a descendant of Achilles, was waging war against a colony of the Trojans''. This statement, the authenticity of which can hardly be doubted, has perhaps not the world-shaking significance that Jean Perret tried to attribute to it in his *thèse* of 1942, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome,* where he suggested that Pyrrhus in fact invented the Trojan origins of the Romans in order to have an excuse, as a descendant of Achilles, for attacking them. We do not have to argue now that his theory goes against both evidence and common sense. But the simple notion that the Romans, *qua* Trojans, were enemies of the Greeks could hardly be alien to the adventurous king who claimed descent from Achilles. It was a notion bound to have some reverberations even later. We have a papyrus containing a strange forgery – a letter allegedly sent by Hannibal to the Athenians after the battle of Cannae (R. Merkelbach, in B. Snell, *Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek,* 1954, no. 129, 1.106). In this letter Hannibal promises to deal with the Romans in the way in which the Greeks of old had dealt with the Trojans. We are not certain about the date of this forgery (perhaps the late second century B.C.); but it clearly reflects the exploitation of the Trojan legend in ideological warfare against the Romans (E. Candiloro, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 14, 1965, 171–176).

The second obstacle the Romans had to surmount was, as I have said, the rumour that Aeneas had been a traitor to his own side. After all, Homer had left it entirely unclear how Aeneas would survive the destruction of Troy and get his new kingdom. Aeneas was not alone among the Trojan heroes in being suspected of treason. Antenor is treated by Homer as one of the worthiest Trojans: seven of his eleven sons are said to have died for their country. Before the war, we are told, he had had as guests in his house both Odysseus and Menelaus. Later traditions credited him with having survived and emigrated to Italy with the Eneti, whom Homer knew to be allies of the Trojans (*Il.* 2.851). As there were Veneti in Northern Italy, it was easy to conjecture that Antenor had brought his Eneti there and founded Patavium, the present Padova, on Venetian ground. But Antenor became a traitor in the tradition preserved by Lycophron (l. 340) and after him by Dictys and Dares. If Antenor had been a traitor, why not the other emigrant to Italy, Aeneas? Menecrates of Xanthos is quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1, 48) as a historian who said that Aeneas betrayed Troy out of hatred for Paris and because he was allowed by the Greeks to save his household. We have no sure way of dating Menecrates, but the language and style of the few fragments is not incompatible with a date in the fourth century B.C. (Jacoby *F. Gr. H.* 769). The accusation of treason was repeated by a Roman historian, G. Lutatius Catulus, consul in 102 B.C., in his *Communes Historiae.* He is quoted by the author of the *Origo gentis romanae,* who wrote perhaps about A.D. 360. I have argued in the *Journ. Rom. Studies* of 1958 that the quotations

from archaic authors in the *Origo* are, as a rule, authentic.[7] In imperial times the treachery of Aeneas was alluded to by numerous authors, such as Dictys and Dares, and was exploited by Tertullian, *Ad nationes* 2.9, 12, in an anti-pagan argument. Servius, the commentator of Virgil, came to believe, we do not know why, that even Livy had considered Aeneas a traitor (*Aen.* 1, 242). The tradition that Aeneas had become acceptable to the Greeks only by turning traitor to the Trojans was not necessarily created to embarrass the Romans, but certainly became embarrassing. One recognizes the embarrassment in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and perhaps in Virgil.

Finally, the Romans had to face the objection, that according to the oldest and most authoritative sources, Aeneas had never left the Troad. The distinguished antiquarian Demetrius of Scepsis, himself a native of the Troad, emphasized this fact in the second century B.C. He was taken seriously by Strabo, who used him as his main source for his description of the region around ancient Troy. Demetrius thought he knew that Aeneas remained in that region and that his son Ascanius, jointly with a son of Hector, moved to a new Scepsis, which by a lucky coincidence happened to be the birthplace of Demetrius. We must assume that in Demetrius' account Aeneas moved from the city of Troy to the city of Old Scepsis in the neighbourhood and there established his kingdom (Strabo 13, 1, 53). Emilio Gabba showed in a fundamental study that Demetrius, who witnessed the Roman intervention in Asia and the use which the Romans made of their Trojan ancestry, was not an innocent erudite oblivious of contemporary issues (cf. M. Sordi ed., *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico,* 1976, 84–101). He knew perfectly well that by denying the reality of Aeneas' immigration into Latium he was by implication inviting the Romans to leave alone the descendants of Aeneas in the Troad. In simpler words, Demetrius of Scepsis was hostile to the Romans before the Romans permanently established themselves in Asia Minor and made it dangerous for any local writer to say the things Demetrius was saying. One must add that in that crucial second century B.C. several Greek writers supported the Roman claim that Aeneas had migrated to Latium. Thus Demetrius of Scepsis was a minority voice in an extended polemic.

We must see the use the Romans made of the legend of Aeneas in the third and second centuries B.C. in relation to this barrage of criticisms. In the mythologically oriented world of Greek culture, the Romans could

7 On Menecrates cf. P.M. Smith, *Harv. St. Class. Phil.* 85, 1981, 33 who sees anti-Greek, not anti-Roman bias. My friend D. Asheri allowed me to see a chapter on Menecrates of a yet unpublished book. He plausibly treats Menecrates as a neutral observer of previous (fifth century B.C.) politically tinged debates on Greco-Trojan (= Persian) relations. On the attribution of the *Communis historia* or *communes historiae* to the consul of 102 cf. A. La Penna, *Scritti in onore di B. Riposati,* Rieti 1979, 229–240.

not expect not to be challenged when they presented their credentials as the descendants of one of the best of the Trojans and his companions. It shows their strength that they were soon able to operate with some success on the assumption that they could speak on behalf of the Trojans and their descendants. About 237 B.C. the Romans took the Greek inhabitants of Acarnania under their protection against the Aetolians, because the Acarnanians had not taken part in the war against Troy: they were the good Greeks (Just. 28, 1,5; Strabo 10, 2,25). It seems that the special relation between Rome and the new Ilion in the Troad (which was taken to be the continuation of the old Troy) goes back approximately to the same time. Suetonius, *Claud.* 25.3, relates that the Romans asked a king of Syria called Seleucus to free the inhabitants of the Troad from all taxation. If the document was not a forgery, the most likely Seleucus to have been involved seems to be Seleucus II Callinicus of about 240 B.C. At that date the Romans would have been feeling strong enough to interfere with the internal affairs of the Seleucid State and to parade as the protectors of their remote cousins left behind in Troy. Again, in 205 B.C., the introduction of the cult of Cybele into Rome was justified by reference to the Phrygian origins of Aeneas (the most explicit evidence is, however, Ovid, *Fasti* 4, 251ff.). It is unnecessary here to add that consanguinity (*syggeneia*) was recognized as an argument in Hellenistic diplomacy.[8] The Romans by using it showed that they were learning how to play the game. Nearer home we are told that in 263 B.C. at the beginning of the first Punic war the inhabitants of Sicilian Segesta killed the Carthaginian garrison and joined the Romans because of their common descent from Aeneas (Zonaras, 8, 9): a fact which Cicero, *Verr.* 4, 72, and Diodorus 23.5 remembered. Later, as a very interesting inscription published by G. Manganaro in 1963 shows (reproduced with textual improvements in A. Alföldi, *Röm. Frühgeschichte* 88; cf. J. et L. Robert, *Rev. Ét. Grecques* 1965, 499), the citizens of another Sicilian town, Centuripae, were anxious to remind the citizens of Rome and Lanuvium about their connections with Latium going back to Aeneas. In 217 B.C., the Romans themselves erected a temple to Venus of Eryx, another Sicilian town, because Aeneas was supposed to have founded Eryx: they were then in a difficult stage of the second Punic war. About 196 B.C., the city of Lampsacus in Asia Minor sent requests to the Roman Senate in the name of the old Trojan brotherhood (Dittenberger, *Syll.*[3], 591).[9] When the Romans finally managed to get a hold in Asia a few years later, the Trojans of course became especially useful. (Livy 37,9,7; 37, 37,2; 38, 39, 10). In general, one can say that Aeneas helped the claims of Rome over Sicily and her interventions in the Greek East.

8 Cf. D. Musti, *Ann. Scuola Normale Pisa* 2, 32, 1963, 225.

9 The reference to Troy in Ennius' Annals ll. 358–9 may be connected with this event, as E. Badian acutely suggested in *Ennius,* Entretiens Fondation Hardt, 1971, 178–9.

## IV

These claims, though very important in providing the Romans with pretexts for interventions abroad, did not, however, contribute greatly to what by and by became a necessity to the Romans, apart from being an ambition: to be acceptable to the Greek world, even while keeping outside it. By the middle of the second century B.C., and of course even more so later, the Romans controlled the whole of metropolitan Greece and were extending their grip over the Asiatic Greeks, not to speak of the Greeks of Italy. They needed the co-operation of the Greek upper classes to govern the territories they controlled, and, above all, they needed the intelligence and the knowledge of the Greeks to make the Empire work as a whole. The exploitation of Western Europe and Punic Africa was partly conditioned by the co-operation of the Greeks. Thus the Aeneas myth had to be turned into a myth of real collaboration between Greeks and Romans, if it was to be really useful in the new situation. What is interesting in this new stage is the reshaping of the myth, the stressing of selected features of it, in order to present it as a myth of reconciliation between the two races. I should like to leave out of my picture an element which is indeed very curious and mysterious in itself and has attracted a great deal of attention from modern scholars, but which seems to be irrelevant to our quest. We know that in historical times the Ancient Romans performed a strange ceremony on May 14. Twenty-seven straw puppets were thrown by the Vestal Virgins into the Tiber from the bridge Sublicius. These puppets had the name of Argei. What was the origin of the ceremony and what is the original meaning of the name Argei are important questions in themselves.[10] Though the etymology of Argei from the city of Argos was current in ancient Rome and gave rise to various explanations (for instance, that Heracles when in Latium threw these puppets into the Tiber in memory of dead Argive companions), I am not aware that anybody in antiquity connected this ritual with the enmity between Trojans or Romans *and* Greeks or Argives. This connection, as far as I know, was first proposed by H. Diels and accepted with modifications by G. Wissowa at the end of the last century (cf. K. Latte, *Röm. Religionsgeschichte,* 1960, 412–414). Such a modern idea played no part in the meaning of the Trojan legend in Roman minds. On the contrary, the Romans liked to think that Greek heroes such as Euander and Heracles had come to the site of future Rome before the Trojan Aeneas. A tradition which was already to be found in the earliest of the Roman historians, Fabius Pictor, maintained that sixty years before Aeneas the Arcadian Euander had come to Latium, had settled on the Palatine with his followers and had organized a

10 A heterodox interpretation in G. Maddoli, *Parola del Passato* 26, 1971, 153–166.

little independent Greek colony with all the best attributes of Greek civilization: knowledge of the alphabet, which Euander passed on to the other inhabitants of Latium, knowledge of musical instruments, cult of the rustic god Pan (from which cult the Roman festival of the Lupercalia would have developed), and altogether that enviable idyllic peace and simplicity we still call Arcadian. How this legend of Euander came into being remains something of a mystery. We can say fairly safely that there is no historical foundation for it, if by historical foundation we mean an authentic settlement of Greeks on the Palatine. Giambattista Vico had already understood this. In recent years, Professor Emilio Peruzzi has tried to refurbish the old legend of a Greek settlement by turning it into a Mycenaean settlement, to which some Mycenaean sherds found near by would lend credibility (for instance, in *La Parola del Passato* 1974, 309). But Arcadian heroes are different from Mycenaean tradesmen, and Mycenaean sherds, even when they exist (which is very doubtful in our case), are rather witnesses for trade than for settlements.[11] Some Greek, we may suspect, noticed the similarities between the name of the Palatine and the Arcadian name Pallanteum and between the Lupercalia and the Arcadian ritual of the Lycaea: he deduced that somebody must have brought such Arcadian features to Latium and attributed the operation to the fabulous Euander. Euander had something in common with a god or hero of Latium called Faunus with whom he could be identified and this would explain why the Latins wrote in the Greek alphabet. The Romans accepted Euander gladly.

Euander was closely followed by no less a hero than Heracles, another Greek. Heracles had been worshipped in Rome since time immemorial in the *ara maxima* of the Forum Boarium not far from the Palatine. It was said that Euander had organized this cult in the presence of Heracles himself and had placed it in the hands of two *gentes,* the Potitii and the Pinarii, who transmitted it to their descendants for some centuries. Furthermore, when he went away from Latium for other adventures, Heracles left behind on the Capitoline hill some of his followers of Peloponnesian origin. Thus at least two of the future Roman hills had been occupied by Greeks before Aeneas arrived.

All would depend, of course, on Aeneas' behaviour after his arrival. But we are perhaps already in a position to forecast that it was not the intention of those historians and poets who took charge of the arrival of Aeneas to make him an enemy of the Greeks he found on the spot. We cannot say much about those early Roman historians and poets, such as Fabius

11 E. Peruzzi's latest book, *Mycenaeans in Early Latium,* Rome 1980, includes with exemplary honesty its own refutation in the archaeological appendix by L. Vagnetti (see especially p.164). See also the authoritative statement by R. Peroni, in *Enea nel Lazio, BImillenario Virgiliano,* 1981, 87–88.

Pictor and Naevius, who first gave literary shape to the story of Aeneas in Latium. But we have the full text of the two writers of the Augustan age who reshaped the story for their time, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Virgil, and we can see with our own eyes that they wanted the story to mean reconciliation and friendship between Greeks and Trojans. It is also fairly evident that though they innovate many important elements in the tradition (and disagree among themselves about the innovations), they did not transform an anti-Greek story into a pro-Greek one. The philhellenism pre-existed.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus had only one serious ambition. He wanted the Romans to be Greeks – not pure Greeks, which was impossible, but as Greek as possible in the circumstances. He was convinced that the Latin language was a sort of Greek dialect of the Aeolian variety, and he was not the first to think so. This is less strange than believing that Welsh is the Hebrew of the lost tribes. In book VII Dionysius has an elaborate comparison of the Roman games (*ludi Romani*) with the Greek games and assumes a very close imitation of Greek institutions in Rome. The explanation of these institutional similarities was sought by Dionysius in the early strata of the population of Latium: the Aborigines, notwithstanding their name which points to autochthony, had come from Arcadia; the Pelasgians were Greek, and Greeks of course were Euander, Heracles and their followers. What is more, the Trojans themselves had been (he says) a nation as truly Greek as any and had come from the Peloponnese to Asia (I, 61). Aeneas was ultimately a Greek. In Dionysius' story, King Latinus had decided to make war against Aeneas and his band. But after an interview with Aeneas he was convinced that he should share power and land with the newcomer. He declared to Aeneas: "I cherish a kindly feeling towards the Greek nation" (I, 58). As we can see, Dionysius was in no need to make Euander a prominent link between Aeneas and Latinus. Euander provided a prominent background of Hellenism for Rome; but Aeneas, in Dionysius' opinion, was Greek in his own right.[12]

The more sophisticated Virgil – not being a Greek himself, like Dionysius – was not so optimistic. He knew that there were differences between Greeks and Romans. Aeneas himself, by descending "imas Erebi....ad umbras", had learned that the struggles between Romans and Greeks were bound to be long and bloody. The destruction of Corinth would be the revenge for the destruction of Troy. Yet when he reaches Latium Aeneas finds his staunchest ally in the Greek king Euander. Old family bonds, the recollection of a visit of father Anchises to frozen Arcadia, and the common enemies on the land in which they are both immigrants un-

12 For all this I simply refer to E. Gabba, *Miscellanea di Studi Alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni*, 1963, 188–194; D. Musti, *Tendenze nella storiografia romana e greca su Roma arcaica*, 1970; id., *Gli Etruschi e Roma*, quoted, 23–44.

doubtedly helped; but what Virgil wants us to feel is that Euander, "Romanae conditor arcis", is the man who really introduces Aeneas to what is best in Roman ancestral virtues and beliefs and gives him the support he needs. King Latinus is well-meaning, but weak and at the mercy of those who surround him. He knows that Aeneas' ancestor Dardanus went from Italy to Asia (7, 205; 240): he admits that Aeneas was really returning to the land of his ancestors. This does not help Aeneas much. Altogether the Greek notion of autochthony is characteristically picked up by Virgil only to be dropped again. The Trojan Penates are never explicitly declared to be of Italian origin, not even in 3, 147–171 (cf. 3, 94; 167). The connection between Rome and the recently founded Nicopolis (3, 503), of which we were reminded by V. Buchheit, is never central to the *Aeneid*[13]. It is due to the Greek Euander, who apparently does not care for Dardanus, that the Trojan Aeneas can settle in Latium and rule the Latins. Next to Euander, Diomedes himself – the old contender with Aeneas – gives him decisive negative help by refusing to help the Latins and warning them that the best they can do is to make peace with Aeneas. He, Diomedes, had seen too much of the consequences of the destruction of Troy for the Greeks to want another duel with Aeneas.

The *Aeneid* is not a poem of general reconciliation. Poor Dido spells out the future tragedy of the Punic wars, which, ending as they did in the total destruction of the Carthaginian nation, were beyond redemption. Nor is Virgil entirely certain that civil wars, such as those prefigured in the war between Turnus and Rome, will not happen again. The Etruscan Virgil who is a friend of the Etruscan Maecenas is ambivalent about his Etruscans: some fight for, some fight against Aeneas. Where Virgil seems unequivocal is about the Greeks. Their common interests with the Trojans go back to the arrival of Aeneas in Latium. Euander sealed the pact. For Homer, the Trojan war started the wanderings of the Greeks. For Virgil, the *Odyssey* precedes the *Iliad.* Aeneas' wanderings are earlier than Aeneas' war, and the war leads to Aeneas' permanent settlement in Latium. Aeneas built cities, he did not destroy them. It is the Greek Euander, with the implicit blessing of Diomedes, who makes this reversal possible.

If I were a student of Virgil, I should worry less about the relations between the figure of Aeneas and the personality of Augustus, and a bit more about the *Aeneid,* as the poem of the reconciliation between Greeks and Romans. This was after all the teaching of Eduard Norden in his memorable essay on the *Aeneis* of 1901 (now in *Kleine Schriften* 1966, 358–421).

When it reached Rome the story of Aeneas gave the Romans the chance to decide whether they wanted to be Trojans rather than Greeks. By pre-

13 We do not know, for lack of evidence, whether Virgil invented the Italian origins of Dardanus. For the two opposite views V. Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms,* 1963, 151–172; N. Horsfall, *Journ. Rom. St.* 63, 1973, 68–79.

ferring this option the Romans declared themselves the opponents of the Greeks, but left open the possibility of reconciliation. In any case, through Aeneas, the Romans put themselves into the sphere of the Greeks without considering themselves Greek.

The story of Aeneas is a story of self-definition which is less tragic than the story of Romulus. It is at the root of the unusual symbiosis of Greeks and Romans. It provided a model for the medieval legends of Trojan descent. In its second stage, during the last centuries of the Republic, it helped, and therefore occasionally hampered, the imperialistic ambitions of the Romans. In this secondary development Aeneas became important to the upper class which controlled the policy of conquest. The *gentes* which claimed Trojan origin were classified by Varro. One of them supplied the first emperors. As the shade of Virgil said to Thornton Wilder, or at least to his hero in *The Cabala:* "The secret is to make a city, not to rest in it".

R.H. Klausen, Aeneas und die Penaten, Hamburg 1839–40

A.W. Zumpt, De Lavinio et Laurentibus Lavinatibus commentatio epigraphica, Berlin 1845.

A. Schwegler, Römische Geschichte I, Tübingen 1853.

J.A. Hild, "La légende d'Enée avant Virgile", *Rev. Hist. Rel.* 6, 1882, 41–79; 144–177; 293–314.

E. Wörner, art. Aineias in Roscher's Lexikon I, 1884, 157–191.

E. Pais, Ancient Legends of Roman History, London 1906.

W.W. Fowler, Aeneas at the Site of Rome, Oxford 1917.

J. Carcopino, Virgile et les origines d'Ostie, Paris 1919.

J. Gagé, "Les Étrusques dans l'Énéide", *Mél. Éc. Fr. Rome* 46, 1929, 115–144.

L. Malten, "Aineias", *Arch. Religionsw.* 29, 1931, 33 – 59.

C. Koch, Gestirnverehrung im alten Italien, Frankfurt 1933.

E. Wikén, Die Kunde der Hellenen von dem Lande und den Völkern der Apenninenhalbinsel bis 300 v. Chr., Lund 1937.

H. Boas, Aeneas' Arrival in Latium, Amsterdam 1938.

A. Momigliano, "Thybris Pater" (1938), now in *Terzo Contributo,* Roma 1966, 609–639.

J. Perret, Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome, Paris 1942.

E. Goldmann, "Di Novensides and Di Indigetes", *Class. Quart.* 36, 1942, 43–53.

F. Börner, Ahnenkult und Ahnenglaube im alten Rom, Leipzig 1943.

P. Boyancé, "Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome", *Rev. Ét. Anc.* 45, 1943, 275–290 (= *Études sur la réligion romaine*, Rome 1972, 153–170).

J. Berard, "Nouvelles notes sur la légende de la diaspora troyenne", *Rev. Ét. Grecques* 57, 1944, 71–86.

V. Ussani jr., "Enea traditore", *St. Ital. Fil. Class.* N.S. 22, 1947, 109–123.

B. Tilly, Vergil's Latium, Oxford 1947.

W. Ehlers, "Die Gründungsprodigien von Lavinium und Alba Longa", *Mus. Helvet.* 6, 1949, 166–175.

P. Grimal, "Enée à Rome et le triomphe d'Octave", *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 53, 1951, 51–61.

F. Bömer, Rom und Troja, Baden-Baden 1951.

E. Bickermann, "Origines gentium", *Class. Phil.* 47, 1952, 65–81.

E.D. Philipps, "Odysseus in Italy", *J.H.S.* 73, 1953, 53–67.

E. Vetter, "Di Novensides, di Indigetes", *Indogerm. Forsch.*, 62, 1955, 1–32.

A. Alföldi, Die trojanischen Urahnen der Römer, Basel 1957 (cf. S. Weinstock, *J.R.S.* 49, 1959, 170–1).

K. Schauenburg, "Aeneas und Rom", *Gymnasium* 67, 1960, 176–191.

R. Merkelbach, "Aeneas in Cumae", *Mus. Helvet.* 18, 1961, 83–99.

J. Gagé, "Enée, Faunus et le culte de Silvain Pélasge", *Mél. Éc. Fr. Rome* 73, 1961, 69–138.

G. Pugliese Carratelli, "Achei nell'Etruria e nel Lazio?", *Parola del Passato* 17, 1962, 5–25.

P. Boyancé, La religion de Virgile, Paris 1963.

V. Buchheit, Vergil über die Sendung Roms, Heidelberg 1963.

C.J. Classen, "Zur Herkunft der Sage von Romulus und Remus", *Historia* 12, 1963, 447–457.

Id., "Gottmenschentum in der römischen Republik", *Gymnasium* 70 1963, 312–338.

J. Gagé, "A propos des origines et du cheminement de la légende troyenne de Rome", *Rev. Hist.* 229, 1963, 305–334 and 230, 1963, 1–24.

A. Alföldi, Early Rome and the Latins, Ann Arbor 1963.

L. Lacroix, "Sur les traces d'Enée en Sicile", *Bull. Fac. Lettres Strasbourg* 42, 1964, 265–270.

A. Sadurska, Les tables iliaques, Warsaw 1964.

E. Heitsch, Aphroditehymnos, Aeneas und Homer, Göttingen 1965.

J. Heurgon, "Lars, Largus et Lare Aineia", *Mél. A. Piganiol,* II, Paris 1966, 655–664.

J. Cl. Richard, "Enée, Romulus, César et les funérailles impériales", *Mél. Éc. Fr. Rome* 78, 1966, 67–78.

A.G. McKay, "Aeneas' Landfalls in Hesperia", *Greece and Rome* 14, 1967, 3–11.

D. van Berchem, "Rome et le monde grec au VI$^{e}$ siècle a.n.e.", *Mél. A. Piganiol,* II, Paris 1966, 739–748.

S. Mazzarino, Il pensiero storico classico, I–III, Bari 1966–7.

G. Pugliese Carratelli, "Lazio, Roma e Magna Grecia prima del secolo IV a.C.", *Parola del Passato* 23, 1968, 321–347.

H. Strasburger, "Zur Sage von der Gründung Roms", *Sitzungsb. Heidelberg. Akad.* 1968.

K. Schefold, "Die römische Wölfin und der Ursprung der Romsagen", *Festschrift für R. Laur-Belart,* Basel 1968, 428–439.

G.K. Galinsky, Aeneas, Sicily and Rome, Princeton 1969.

J. Heurgon, "Inscriptions étrusques de Tunisie", *CR Ac. Inscr.* 1969, 526–551 (cf. *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 47, 1969, 284–294).

H.G. Kolbe, "Lare Aineia?", *Mitt. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. Rom* 77, 1970, 1–9.

W.A. Schröder, *Cato, Origines* I, Meisenheim am Glan 1971.

M. Guarducci, "Enea e Vesta", *Mitt. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. Rom* 78, 1971, 73–118.

A. Alföldi, "Die Penaten, Aeneas und Latinus", *Mitt. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. Rom* 78, 1971, 1–57.

J. Perret, "Rome et les Troyens", *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 49, 1971, 39–52.

G. Binder, Aeneas und Augustus, Meisenheim am Glan 1971.

V.I. Georgiev, "Troer und Etrusker. Der historische Kern der Aeneas-Sage", *Philologus* 116, 1972, 93– – 97.

F. Della Corte, La mappa dell'Eneide, Firenze 1972.

F. Castagnoli, *Lavinium,* I, Roma 1972.

P. Sommella, "Heroon di Enea a Lavinium", *Rend. Pont. Acc. Archeol.* 44, 1971–72, 47–74.

E. Weber, "Die trojanische Abstammung der Römer als politisches Argument", *Wiener Studien* 6, 1972, 213–225.

W. Wimmel, Hirtenkrieg und arkadisches Rom, München 1973.

W. Fuchs, "Die Bildgeschichte der Flucht des Aeneas", *Aufstieg und Niedergang d. Römischen Welt* I, 4, Berlin 1973, 615–632.

N. Horsfall, "Corythus: the Return of Aeneas in Virgil and his Sources", *Journ. Rom. St.* 63, 1973, 68–79.

K.W. Weber, "Troiae Lusus", *Ancient Society* 5, 1974, 171–196.

P. Sommella, "Das Heroon des Aeneas und die Topographie des antiken Lavinium", *Gymnasium* 81, 1974, 273–297.

A. Alföldi, Die Struktur des voretruskischen Römerstaates, Heidelberg 1974.

I. Cazzaniga, "Il frammento 61 degli Annali di Ennio: Quirinus Indiges", *Parola del Passato* 29, 1974, 362–381.

G.K. Galinsky, "Troiae qui primus ab oris...", *Gymnasium* 81, 1974, 182–200.

Id., "The Tomb of Aeneas at Lavinium", *Vergilius* 20, 1974, 2–11.

T.N. Gantz, "Lapis Niger: the Tomb of Romulus", *Parola del Passato* 29, 1974, 350–361.

E. Peruzzi, "I Micenei sul Palatino", *Parola del Passato* 29, 1974, 309–349.

R.E.A. Palmer, Roman Religion and Roman Empire, Philadelphia 1974.

T.J. Cornell, "Aeneas and the Twins: the Development of the Roman Foundation Legend", *Proceed. Cambridge Philol. Soc.* 201, 1975, 1–32.

E. Gabba, "Mirsilo di Metimna, Dionigi e i Tirreni", *Rend. Accad. Lincei* 8, 30, 1975, 35–49.

P.M. Martin, "Dans le sillage d'Enée", *Athenaeum* 53, 1975, 212–244.

R. Schilling, "Les Lares Grundiles", *Mél. J. Heurgon,* II, 1976, 947–960.

J. Perret, "Athènes et les légendes troyennes d'Occident", *Mél. J. Heurgon,* II, Rome 1976, 791–803.

G. Dumézil, "Virgile, Mézence et les Vinalia", *Mél. J. Heurgon,* I, Rome 1976, 253–263.

G. D'Anna, Problemi di letteratura latina arcaica, Roma 1976.

D. Briquel, "Les jumeaux à la louve", *Recherches sur les religions de l'Italie antique* (ed. R. Bloch), Genève 1976, 72–97.

A. Alföldi, Römische Frühgeschichte, Heidelberg 1976.

Civiltà del Lazio Primitivo, Roma 1976.

E. Gabba, "Sulla valorizzazione politica della leggenda delle origini troiane di Roma fra III e II sec. a.C." in M. Sordi (ed.), *I Canali della propaganda nel mondo antico,* Milano 1976, 84–101.

J. Gagé, "Comment Enée est devenu l'ancêtre des Silvii Albains", *Mél. Éc. Fr. Rome* 88, 1, 1976, 7–30.

O. Carruba, "Nuova lettura dell'iscrizione etrusca dei cippi di Tunisia", *Athenaeum* 54, 1976, 163–173.

T.J. Cornell, "Aeneas' Arrival in Italy", *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 2, 1977, 77–83.

J. Heurgon, "La thèse de Jérome Carcopino et les fouilles actuelles dans le territoire des Laurentes", *Hommage à la mémoire de J. Carcopino,* Paris 1977, 169–174.

J. Gagé, "Bases de migration 'dardanienne' et escales 'troyennes' dans la mer Ionienne", *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 55, 1977, 84–112.

R. Scuderi, "Il mito eneico in età augustea", *Aevum* 52, 1978, 88–99.

J. Poucet, "Le Latium protohistorique et archaïque", II, *Ant. Class.* 48, 1979, 177–190.

F. Castagnoli, "Il culto di Minerva a Lavinium", *Quaderni Lincei,* 246, 1979.

R. Schilling, "Le culte de l'indiges à Lavinium", *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 57, 1979, 49–68.

N. Horsfall, "Some problems in the Aeneas Legend", *Class. Quart.* 29, 1979, 372–390.

id., "Stesichorus at Bovillae?", *J.H.S.* 99, 1979, 26–48.

G. Eltmann, "Aeneas in his Prime", *Arethusa* 12, 1979, 175–202.

B. Liou-Gille, Cultes héroïques romains. Les fondateurs, Paris 1980.

W. Suerbaum, "Hundert Jahre Vergil-Forschung", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt"* II, 31, 1, Berlin 1980, 99–110 (bibl. on Vergil).

R. Schilling, "La déification a Rome: tradition latine et interférence grecque", *Rev. Ét. Lat.* 58, 1980, 137–152.

G. Dury-Moyaers, Enée et Lavinium, Bruxelles 1981.

F. Zevi, "Note sulla leggenda di Enea in Italia", in *Gli Etruschi e Roma. Incontro di studio in onore di M. Pallottino,* Roma 1981, 145–158.

Enea nel Lazio, archeologia e mito, Roma 1981.

"Virgil: 2000 Years", *Arethusa* 14, 1, 1981.

P.M. Smith, "Aineiadai as Patrons of Iliad XX and the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite", *Harvard Studies in Class. Philol.* 85, 1981, 17–58 (to which I refer especially for literature on Homer).

F. Castagnoli, "La leggenda di Enea nel Lazio", *Studi Romani* 30, 1982, 1–15.

M. Sordi, "Lavinio, Roma e il Palladio", in M. Sordi (ed.), *Politica e religione nel primo scontro tra Roma e l'Oriente,* Milano 1982, 64–78.

C. Cogrossi, "Atena Iliaca e il culto degli eroi", *ib.*, 79–98.

D. Quint, "Painful Memories: *Aeneid* 3 and the Problem of the Past", *Classical Journal* 78, 1982, 30–38.