

AENEAS'S FLIGHT FROM TROY IN VARRO'S *ANTIQUITATES HUMANAE* AND LATER SOURCES

I. VARRO'S WORDS IN THE FRAGMENT

Schol. Verg. Veron. *Aen.* II 717¹:

[CAPE SACRA] MANU. Varro secundo humanarum refert Aenean capta Troia arcem cum plurimis occupasse magnaue hostium [gratia obtinuisse a]beundi potestatem. itaque [cum eum] vellet auferre cumque circa [aur]um opesque alias ceteri morarentur, Aenean patrem suum collo [tulisse mirantibus]que Achivis hanc pietatem redeundi Ilium copiam datam ac deos Penates ligneis sigillis vel lapideis, terrenis quoque Aenean [umeris extulisse], quam rem Graecos stupentes omnia sua auferendi potestatem dedisse eaque [ratione saepius redeuntem omnia e Troia abstulisse et in] [navibus posuisse].

Atticus de patre consentit, de dis Penatibus negat, sed ex Samothracia in Italiam devectos, contra quam opinionem refertur [fuisse simulacr]a Vestae incensis deae eius aris ex ruinis Troicis liberata (Att. fr. 1 Peter). additur etiam ab L. Cassio Censorio, miraculo magis Aenean patris [dignitate sanctio]rem inter hostes intactum propter operavisse concessisque eis navibus in Italiam navigasse. idem historiarum libro I ait Ilio capto [Aenean cum dis Pena] tibus umeris impositis erupisse duosque filios, Ascanium et Eurybaten, brachio eius innixos ante ora hostium prae[tergressos, data] s etiam ei naves concessumque, ut quas vellet de navibus securus veheret

(Grab the sacred things with your hand. Varro in the second [book] of the humanities says that Aeneas, when Troy had been seized, occupied the citadel with many others, and that they obtained, by great benevolence of the enemy, permission to leave. So [...] he wanted to take away, and whereas others were wasting time on gold and other goods, Aeneas took his father on his shoulders, and that the Achaeans, impressed by this piety, gave him permission to go back to Ilium, and that he also took upon his shoulders the gods Penates, statuettes of wood, stone and ceramic, and that, astonished by this, the Greeks granted him permission to take all his belongings, and thus he went back and again, and took everything from Troy and put it on ships.

Atticus agrees about the father but denies the fact of the gods Penates, saying that they were brought to Italy from Samothrace. Against this opinion [*scil.* Varro's] he refers that what was salvaged from the ruins of Troy were the statuettes of Vesta, after the altars of the Goddess had been set on fire. It is also added by L. Cassius, sometime censor, that Aeneas... passed untouched through the enemies as if inviolate by a miracle rather than because of the dignity of his father, and having been given ships, set off towards Italy. The same in the second book of histories says that

1. I here reproduce the text as established by Baschera 1999.

when Troy was captured, Aeneas, having taken upon his shoulders the gods Penates, rushed out, and with his two sons Ascanium and Eurybates placed on his arms, passed through in the sight of the enemies, and was given ships, and was granted that he would travel safely on whichever of them he wanted).

A problem arises when we try to establish what was taken from Varro in the text we are analysing. This is the passage as reported by Mirsch 1887 (pp. 88 sg., fr. 9), on the basis of the edition of the *scholia* prepared by Mai 1818 (pp. 37 f.):

Varro secundo humanarum refert Aeneam capta Troia arcem cum plurimis occupasse magnaue hostium ... obtinuisse obeundi potestatem. Ita ... auferre. Cumque circa arma opesque alias ceteri morarentur, Aeneam patrem suum collo extulisse; mirantibusque Achivis hanc pietatem, redeundi Ilium copiam datam, ac deos Penates ligneis sigillis vel lapideis, terrenis quoque Aeneas ... quam rem Graecos stupentes omnia sua auferendi potestatem dedisse, eaque ... – Atticus de patre consentit, de Penatibus negat, sed ex Samothracia in Italiam devectos. Contra quam opinionem refertur ... a Vestae, incensis deae eius aris, ex ruinis Troicis liberata. Additur etiam a L. Cassio Censorio, miraculo magis Aeneam patris ... rem inter hostes intactum properavisse. Item Varro humanarum libro II ait: Ilio capto ... Penatibus umeris impositis erupisse duosque filios Ascanium et Eurybatem brachio eius innixos ante ora hostium prae ... s etiam ei naves, concessumque, ut quas vellet de navibus securus veheret.

Where the manuscript has *Varro secundo historiarum* (without considering the unfounded conjecture *annalium* by Lion mentioned in the apparatus²), Mirsch applies the correction *humanarum*, and where the manuscript has *idem historiarum libro I*, he accepts Mai's addition of *Varro* before *item*. He also accepts Niebuhr's correction of *historiarum* into *humanarum* at l. 8³.

Mirsch, overall, produces a text which has an extended passage from Varro at the beginning, two names of dissenting authors in the middle (one of them rather puzzling), and, as an impressive *grand finale*, Varro's very words. It would be something to have so much left of Varro's *Antiquitates* in a single piece of text, especially his very words, given the scarcity with which they are reported. Unfortunately, it looks like this is yet another case of nineteenth-century overconfidence.

I do believe that Mirsch had a good reason to correct the first *historiarum*

2. The proposal by Lion 1826, II, p. 315, in fairness presented rather doubtfully, was based on Char. *gramm.* p. 133, 25 sg. Barwick (= col. 81 Putschius) *scriptulum, quod nunc vulgo sine t dicunt, Varro in Plutotoryne dixit. idem III annali eqs.*

3. Niebuhr 1827, p. 199 n. 9.

into *humanarum*. Not only, in fact, are *historiarum libri* / *historiae* composed by Varro never attested, but a comparison with this passage from Servius auctus (*Aen.* II 636) seems to confirm that *humanarum* is the right word:

Varro rerum humanarum ait permissum a Graecis Aeneae, ut evaderet et quod carum putaret auferre; illum patrem liberasse, cum illi, quibus similis optio esset data, aurum et argentum abstulisse. sed Aeneae propter admirationem iterum a Graecis concessum, ut quod vellet auferret; illum, ut simile, quod laudatum fuerat, faceret, deos Penates abstulisse; tunc ei a Graecis concessum, ut et quos vellet secum et sua omnia liberaret

(Varro, in the human antiquities says that the Greeks gave permission to Aeneas to escape, bringing with him whatever he held dear; and he freed his father, while those to whom a similar chance was given took gold and silver. But Aeneas, because of the admiration of the Greeks, was again allowed to take with him whatever he wanted, and, doing something similar to what he was being praised for, he took the gods Penates. Therefore, he was granted by the Greeks that he could both take with him whatever he wanted and recover all his belongings).

It is, again, through a comparison with this passage, that Keil was able to integrate the very corrupt text of the *Scholia Veronensia*.

The similarity of the two passages not only confirms that the work mentioned by the compiler of the *Scholia Veronensia* is indeed the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum*, but also that the account of the episode of the *Penates*, edited both by Servius and the compiler of the *Scholia Veronensia*, must have been in there too. Varro in the second book of the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* must have dealt with the story of Aeneas, from the seizing of Troy to his arrival in Italy, and most probably beyond.

It appears that, in the Scholiast's commentary, Varro has the first place. He is mentioned as primary source for the account of the famous episode of Aeneas lifting his father Anchises upon his shoulders and taking the *Penates*.

As to the second mention of Varro, I am very reluctant to accept Niebuhr's correction of the second *historiarum I* into *humanarum II* and the consequent arbitrary addition of the name *Varro* before *idem*. I believe that the key to understand this wrong attribution is the second of the two names mentioned in the *Scholia Veronensia*: L. Cassius Censorius.

II. VARRO OR CASSIUS HEMINA?

In the edition of the *Scholia Veronensia* by Claudio Baschera, the name of *Cassius Censorius* is put in the *Index scriptorum operumque anonymorum*, with the

statement «fortasse nomen corruptum»⁴. The name is indeed corrupted, but not unidentifiable; I am convinced, with Peter⁵, and with Beck-Uwe⁶ that the person behind it is Lucius Cassius Hemina, the Roman annalist who wrote around 150 BC.

The appellative *ensorius* given by the scholiast though, brings up a problem, since there is no evidence that Hemina was ever a censor. Scholars tried to solve this problem in different ways. Ritschl was convinced that the name of Piso had somehow dropped out of the manuscript and proposed the integration *et Pisone* before *ensorio*⁷. Peter himself originally adopted this conjecture⁸, save rejecting it at a later stage⁹.

Other such as Schmidt followed by Forsythe¹⁰ and Chassignet, proposed the substitution of *Cassius* with *Calpurnio*, thus eliminating Hemina from the picture altogether. Forsythe himself had previously suggested that a line or two must have dropped out of the *Scholia Veronensia* because of a haplography, where the eye of the copyist jumped from the *-io* of *Cassio* to the *-io* of *Calpurnio*¹¹. According to this reasoning, before the story of Aeneas related by Piso, there would have been a couple of lost lines of Hemina, probably dealing with the Samothracian origins of the Penates. Beck-Uwe has sufficiently proven the improbability of such a complicated restoration¹².

Perret kept *L. Cassio* but deprived him of the exclusive authorship of the text that follows by integrating *et Catone* before *ensorio*¹³. The fact that the author quoted by the *Scholia Veronensia* is indeed Cassius Hemina seems to be corroborated by this passage of Macrobius' *Saturnalia* (*Sat.* III 4, 9):

Cassius vero Hemina dicit Samothracas deos eosdemque Romanorum Penates, proprie dici θεοὺς μεγάλους, θεοὺς χρηστούς, θεοὺς δυνατούς,

which can be directly compared to this passage of Servius auctus (*Aen.* I 378)¹⁴:

4. Baschera 1999, p. 140.

5. Peter 1914, p. 170.

6. Beck-Uwe 2001, p. 252 n. 14.

7. Ritschl 1867, p. 449.

8. Peter 1870, p. 96.

9. Peter 1914, p. 170.

10. Schmidt 1978, p. 1617; Forsythe 1994, p. 93 n. 27.

11. Forsythe 1990, p. 338.

12. Beck-Uwe 2001, p. 252 n. 14.

13. Perret 1942, p. 550.

14. On the influence of Varro's *Res humanae* on Servius see Canetta 2014.

Alii autem, ut Cassius Hemina, dicunt deos penates ex Samothracia appellatos θεοὺς μεγάλους, θεοὺς δυνατούς, θεοὺς χρηστούς.

Not only it is obvious that Macrobius and Servius auctus were drawing from the same material, but also that Cassius Hemina had, somewhere in his work, dealt with the *Penates*. Common sense suggests that a mention of the *Penates* could only fit two places: a treatise dealing with religious things, or one which deals with the history of how they arrived in Italy. In Hemina's case, it's logical to opt for the second possibility. Let us, for now, put aside Hemina and come back to him later.

The reason for this discussion is that scholars have never agreed on what Mirsch considers to be Varro's very words. If the manuscript has *idem* (why should this be Varro?) *historiarum I*, what convinced Mirsch to make two major corrections and mend the text in *Item Varro rerum humanarum secundo*? In addition to this, the manuscript clearly has *idem*, not Mai's *item*.

Normally, an isolated *idem* (meaning 'the same', 'the above-mentioned') would refer to the last mentioned name, but Mirsch read *item* on Mai's edition, and, unable to identify L. Cassius Censorius, and strong in the belief that Varro had extensively dealt with Aeneas and his story, attributed the words *Ilio capto ~ securus veheret* to Varro, linking the passage to the first mention of Varro in the first line. The insertion of the proper name *Varro* by Mirsch was an obvious consequence of this theory. This thesis was accepted by Peter who excluded that *idem* referred to Hemina on the basis of some dubious reasoning¹⁵.

If one supposes for a moment that Mirsch was right, how would he explain the fact that Varro in one place mentions Aeneas carrying his father on his shoulders, and in another place not only fails to mention Anchises, but tells that there were the two sons Ascanium and Eurybaten, to be carried out of Troy together with the *Penates* by Aeneas? This discrepancy cannot be easily explained.

Furthermore, it would be very unusual that Varro's very words on Aeneas would not have been reported in their entirety either by Macrobius, and most of all Servius, who in many other places had always privileged Varro's account among that of others, and who benefited from the same material available to the scholiast of Verona.

15. Peter 1914, p. CLXX: «hic 'idem' tamen continuat et supplet ea, quae scholiasta ex Varro primo loco excerpit, ut, etsi Wissowa (*Abhandl.* p. 106 sq.) adversatur, super Cassium et Atticum *historiarum librum II* (sic enim scribendum est) citans ad Varronis *historiarum vel humanarum librum secundum redisse videatur*». Cf. Cornell 2013, III, p. 163.

While providing the reader with all the possible variations of a story or myth was indeed what made an erudite commentary, such as Servius' or the *Scholia*, a precious tool, this attitude does not seem congruent with Varro's purpose, which was not providing a selection of possible versions from which the reader could choose the one they most fancied. Varro very authoritatively establishes the right tradition. He mentions the account he considers the true one¹⁶, eventually adding sentences as *non ut (nunc)* etc.¹⁷.

I am therefore convinced that the second passage is used to provide an alternative to Varro's version, and Hemina together with Atticus are put forward as dissenting authorities. Atticus only partially agrees with Varro; Aeneas did indeed save the father Anchises, but when it comes to the Penates, he states that they arrived in Italy directly from Samothrace, and that the object which Aeneas brought from Troy, having salvaged it from the burning altars of Vesta, was in fact a statuette of the goddess herself.

Different is the case of Hemina, who wrote that it was rather by a miracle, and not because of the dignity of his father, that Aeneas, having become more inviolate (than others), hurried unscathed between the enemies and sailed to Italy on ships that had granted him. *Ante ora hostium*, thematically linked to the *miraculo* of the previous sentence, is a remark that would be considered obvious unless it had the purpose of stressing the fact that there was something miraculous in this event, not quite the compassion of the Greeks for the pious Aeneas. Aeneas's safe escape from Troy, according to Hemina, had nothing to do with his personal piety and the esteem that it gained in the eyes of the amazed Greeks, but rather a miracle, a divine intervention which not only permitted our hero to pass unhurt between the enemy hosts, but also compelled them to provide him with ships, something comparable to what happened to the Hebrews in Exodus, where God somehow forced the Egyptians to give them all their precious belongings¹⁸. Interestingly, Hemina's version of the story is the one that will become predominant in the Augustan era and following generations.

As to the *idem*, I am persuaded, with Cornell¹⁹, that behind it is the subject

16. According to Macrobius it was Varro's custom to provide his favourite explanation as last whenever alternative views were provided. Cf. *Macr. Sat.* III 2, 3 *his a Varrone praescriptis intellegere possumus id potissimum ab eo probatum quod ex sua consuetudine in ultimo posuit.*

17. Varro *ling.* V 25, 1; 73, 8.

18. *Exod.* 12, 35 f. *feceruntque filii Israhel sicut praeceperat Moses et petierunt ab Aegyptiis vasa argentea et aurea vestemque plurimam dedit autem Dominus gratiam populo coram Aegyptiis ut commodarent eis et spoliaverunt Aegyptios.*

19. Cornell 2013, III, p. 164.

of the previous sentence, Cassius Hemina, and that there is no contradiction between his account of the story (i.e. that the Penates were brought by Aeneas from Troy) and his theory of the Samothracian origin of the Penates as it appears in the above-mentioned passages of Servius auctus²⁰ and Macrobius²¹. What about the *ensorio*, then? The simplest explanation would be that it's either an error, perhaps an interpolation, an addition²² or a corruption²³ originating from the passage of Nonius which reads (p. 346, 22): *Cassius Hemina lib. II de censoribus* eqs.

I also agree with Cornell that, when it comes to an edition of the passage, the best option is to leave it as it appears in the manuscript with all its inconsistencies, keeping in mind that compilers were not modern-day philologists as far as accuracy and clarity are concerned²⁴. The only exception I would allow is the reintegration, in the light of Serv. auct. *Aen.* II 636, of *humanarum* for the first *historiarum* of the palimpsest.

III. MACROBIUS, SERVIUS AND *SCHOLIA VERONENSIA*

A comparison of passages from Macrobius, Servius, and the *Scholia Veronensia* show such strong links, that the possibility of an unidentifiable common source is very likely. A short description of each passage follows. In *Macr. Sat.* III 4, 7-13 we read:

Varro Humanarum secundo Dardanum refert deos Penates ex Samothrace in Phrygiam, et Aeneam ex Phrygia in Italiam detulisse. qui sint autem di Penates, in libro quidem memorato Varro non exprimit: sed qui diligentius eruunt veritatem Penates esse dixerunt per quos penitus spiramus, per quos habemus corpus, per quos rationem animi possidemus: esse autem medium aethera Iovem, Iunonem vero in-um aera cum terra, et Minervam summum aetheris cacumen: et argumento utuntur quod Tarquinius, Demarati Corinthii filius Samothracicis religionibus mystice imbutus, uno templo ac sub eodem tecto numina memorata coniunxit. Cassius vero Hemina dicit Samothracas deos eosdemque Romanorum Penates, proprie dici θεοὺς μεγάλους, θεοὺς χρηστοὺς, θεοὺς δυνατούς.

In order we have:

- 1) A statement that Varro in the second book of the *Antiquitates humanae*

20. Serv. auct. *Aen.* I 378-9 = F7 Cornell.

21. *Macr. Sat.* III 4, 9.

22. Scholz 1989, p. 173, puts it in square brackets.

23. Scholz 1989, p. 174; Santini 1995, p. 132.

24. Cornell 2013, III, p. 164.

says that the *Penates* were brought in Phrygia from Samothrace by Dardanus and then taken from there to Italy by Aeneas.

2) A statement that Varro does not explain who or what the *Penates* are.

3) A description of the theories on the identity of the *Penates* by other scholars whom Macrobius considered more accurate than Varro (*qui diligentius eruunt veritatem*). In practice the *Penates* are identified with *Iovis*, *Iuno*, and *Minerva*. The argument used by these authors to prove their theory was the fact that Tarquinius son of Demaratus of Corinth (i.e. Lucius Tarquinius Priscus, fifth king of Rome), ‘mystically soaked in Samothracian religion, put together the above-mentioned gods in one temple, under the same roof’.

4) A short passage in which Cassius Hemina says that the Gods of Samothrace, and the Roman *Penates* are properly called *great gods*, *propitious gods*, and *mighty gods*.

Of our three authors, Servius is the one who gives the greatest amount of information. We have:

1) Two mentions of Varro’s *Antiquitates humanae* (the second book is specified in one passage), and of the fact that these unidentified statuettes made of wood or stone/marble were brought to Italy by Aeneas; each passage is then accompanied by the description of the complete journey of the *Penates*:

Serv. *Aen.* I 378: Varro deos Penates quaedam sigilla lignea vel marmorea ab Aenea in Italiam dicit advecta ... idem Varro hos deos Dardanum ex Samothracia in Phrygiam, de Phrygia Aeneam in Italiam memorat portavisse;

Serv. *Aen.* III 148: Varro sane rerum humanarum secundo ait, Aeneam deos Penates in Italiam reduxisse, quaedam lignea vel lapidea sigilla ... sane hos deos Dardanum ex Samothracia in Phrygiam, Aeneam vero in Italiam, ex Phrygia transtulisse).

2) The same information as Macrobius about other scholars (*non nulli* in Servius) identifying the *Penates* with Jupiter, Juno and Minerva, and mention of Tarquinius Priscus:

Serv. *Aen.* II 296: non nulli tamen Penates esse dixerunt, per quos penitus spiramus et corpus habemus et animi rationes possidemus. eos autem esse Iovem, aetherem medium; Iunonem, imum aëra cum terra; summum aetheris cacumen, Minervam: quos Tarquinius, Demarati Corinthii filius, Samothraciis regionibus mystice imbutus, uno templo et sub eodem tecto coniunxit;

3) A mention of Cassius Hemina’s theory:

Serv. *Aen.* I 378: alii autem ut Cassius Hemina, dicunt deos Penates ex Samothracia appellatos θεοὺς μεγάλους, θεοὺς δυνατοὺς, θεοὺς χρηστοὺς.

4) And finally, the story of Aeneas rescuing the *Penates* and his father Anchises from Troy, in the context of his escape from the seized city, where Varro's *Res humanae* are explicitly mentioned (Serv. *Aen.* II 636 cit. *supra*).

The text of the *Scholia* only has: 1) A mention of the second book of Varro's *Antiquitates humanae*; 2) an account of the rescuing of *Penates* and Anchises by Aeneas, while escaping Troy; 3) a vague description of the *Penates*.

The nuclei of information from the three different sources could be grouped as follows:

Attribution to Varro and *Antiquitates*

- a) Macrobius (*Sat.* III 4, 7): *Varro humanarum secundo ... refert.*
- b) Servius (*Aen.* III 148): *Varro sane rerum humanarum secundo ait.*
- c) *Scholia Veronensia* (*Aen.* II 717): *Varro secundo humanarum refert.*

Identity of the *Penates* for Varro

- a) Macrobius (*Sat.* III 4, 7): *qui sint autem di Penates in libro quidem memorato Varro non exprimit.*
- b) Servius (*Aen.* I 378): *Varro deos Penates quaedam sigilla lignea vel marmorea ab Aenea in Italiam dicit advecta; (III 148): Varro sane rerum humanarum secundo ait, Aeneam deos penates in Italiam reduxisse, quaedam lignea vel lapidea sigilla.*
- c) *Scholia Veronensia* (*Aen.* II 717): *ac deos Penates ligneis sigillis vel lapideis, terrenis quoque.*

Identity of the *Penates* according to other unidentified authors

- a) Macrobius (*Sat.* III 4, 8): *sed qui diligentius eruunt veritatem Penates esse dixerunt per quos penitus spiramus, per quos habemus corpus, per quos rationem animi possidemus: esse autem medium aethera Iovem, Iunonem vero imum aera cum terra, et Minervam summum aetheris cacumen: et argumento utuntur quod Tarquinius, Demarati Corinthii filius Samothracicis religionibus mystice imbutus, uno templo ac sub eodem tecto numina memorata coniunxit.*
- b) Servius (*Aen.* II 296): *non nulli tamen penates esse dixerunt, per quos penitus spiramus et corpus habemus et animi rationes possidemus. eos autem esse Iovem, aetherem medium; Iunonem, imum aera cum terra; summum aetheris cacumen, Minervam: quos Tarquinius, Demarati Corinthii filius, Samothracicis regionibus mystice imbutus, uno templo et sub eodem tecto coniunxit.*
- c) *Scholia Veronensia*: nil.

Journey of the *Penates*

- a) Macrobius (*Sat.* III 4, 7): *Varro humanarum secundo Dardanum refert deos Penates ex Samothrace in Phrygiam, et Aeneam ex Phrygia in Italiam detulisse.*

- b) Servius (*Aen.* I 378): *idem Varro hos deos Dardanum ex Samothraca in Phrigiam, de Phrigia Aeneam in Italiam memorat portavisse.*
 c) *Scholia Veronensia*: nil.

Aeneas' (miraculous) escape from Troy

- a) Macrobius: nil.
 b) Servius (*Aen.* II 636): *Varro rerum humanarum ait permissum a Graecis Aeneae, ut evaderet et quod carum putaret auferre; illum patrem liberasse, cum illi, quibus similis optio esset data, aurum et argentum abstulisse. sed Aeneae propter admirationem iterum a Graecis concessum, ut quod vellet auferret; illum, ut simile, quod laudatum fuerat, faceret, deos Penates abstulisse; tunc ei a Graecis concessum, ut et quos vellet secum et sua omnia liberaret.*
 c) *Scholia Veronensia* (*Aen.* II 717): *refert [scil. Varro] Aenean capta Troia arcem cum plurimis occupasse magnaue hostium [gratia obtinuisse a]beundi potestatem. Itaque [cum eum] vellet auferre cumque circa [aur]um opesque alias ceteri morarentur, Aenean patrem suum collo [tulisse mirantibus]que Achivis hanc pietatem redeundi Ilium copiam datam ac deos Penates ligneis sigillis vel lapideis, terrenis quoque Aenean [umeris extulisse], quam rem Graecos stupentes omnia sua auferendi potestatem dedisse eaque [ratione saepius redeuntem omnia e Troia abstulisse et in] [navibus posuisse].*

Reference to Hemina in relation to the identity of the Penates

- a) Macrobius (*Sat.* III 4, 9): *Cassius vero Hemina dicit Samothracas deos eosdemque Romanorum Penates, proprie dici θεοὺς μεγάλους, θεοὺς χρηστοὺς, θεοὺς δυνατοὺς.*
 b) Servius (*Aen.* I 378): *alii autem, ut Cassius Hemina, dicunt deos penates ex Samothraca appellatos θεοὺς μεγάλους, θεοὺς δυνατοὺς, θεοὺς χρηστοὺς.*
 c) *Scholia Veronensia*: nil.

It is evident that the three texts are strictly linked by a common source, and that the discrepancy of information among the texts can be explained by the different purpose of each of them. In Macrobius, the interlocutors of the dialogue are mainly interested in theological speculation starting from what they read in the *Aeneid*. Their only concern at that point is to identify the *Penates*.

Different is the case of Servius, who, as said before, is the most accurate of our witnesses, and indeed produced the most complete commentary as far as Vergil is concerned. His commentary is structured as a verse-by-verse explanation, as evident in the case of the above-mentioned *Serv. Aen.* II 636, where the focus is on the double *primum* of *Aen.* II 636 *optabam primum montis primumque petebam*. Servius explains this *primum* as meaning *praecipuum*, but Servius auctus gives us the long account we examined above (*sed Varro rerum humanarum ... liberaret*).

The compiler of the *Scholia Veronensia*, on the other hand, was much more indulgent towards those particulars that Thomas will describe as *fales et légendes*, without overloading the reader with unnecessary grammatical or antiquarian details²⁵. In fact, his commentary of *Aen.* II 717 focuses on the words with which Aeneas invites his father Anchises to grab the Penates (*sacra*) which he was fearful of picking up himself since his own hands had been defiled by the recent shedding of blood²⁶.

In all three witnesses of the story, the mention of Varro's *Antiquitates* occurs, and it is fair to postulate that they were the source of these accounts. This said, it is highly likely that all three, rather than having access to the *Antiquitates*, used second-hand information found in one or more of those lost great commentaries on Vergil prepared when the *Antiquitates* had not yet disappeared, and which were the common source of all later commentators.

IV. *PENATES, PALLADIUM, VESTA*

As mentioned above, in Varro's account handed down by this fragment, we learn that Aeneas, thanks to his piety, saved his father, took the *Penates* and all his belongings. Then we read that Atticus was of the same opinion about the father Anchises (*Atticus de patre consentit*) but did not agree with the identity of the deity saved by our hero. According to him in fact, Aeneas did not save the *Penates* (*de dis penatibus negat*), but the statues of Vesta from her burning altars (*simulacr]a Vēstae incensis deae eius aris*).

We are not in the position of reconstructing Atticus' very words, but it is certain that, for the compiler, the opposition between Atticus' account and Varro's was clear and strong, as suggested by the two verbs *consentit* and *negat*. In Varro's and Atticus' times a debate was obviously going on about the identity of the *Penates* in the context of the codification and systematisation of the cultural patrimony of Rome.

Cassius Hemina does not mention the father *Anchises*, and says that Aeneas, when escaping Troy, was carrying the *Penates*, together with his two sons Ascanius and Eurybates hanging from his arms. It is very curious that a Eurybates, as a son of Aeneas, is never mentioned anywhere else. The only

25. Thomas 1880, p. 273.

26. Verg. *Aen.* II 717-20 *Tu, genitor, cape sacra manu, patriosque Penates / me bello e tanto digressum, et caede recenti / attrectare nefas, donec me flumine vivo / abluero.*

Eurybates that classical antiquity knew, or at least transmitted, was Odysseus' squire²⁷ and herald of the Greek army during the Trojan War.

Without doubt Vergil's *Aeneid* established a tradition on Aeneas' flight from Troy with his father, his son Ascanius and the *Penates*, which would be predominant until our time. Nevertheless, if we trust the judgment of Servius auctus, Vergil often followed here and there very different traditions, in our case relating to these gods²⁸.

Ancient scholars up to Varro and before Vergil, never agreed on the identity of the *Penates* themselves. From the texts we have heretofore analysed, it appears that Varro did not say anything specific about the *Penates* in the second book of his humanities; Servius and the *Scholia Veronensia* only mention some sort of wooden or stone figures, while Macrobius goes as far as stating that Varro *quid sint ... non exprimit*. A possible explanation for this unusual omission would be that he was planning a much more in-depth tractation of this subject in the *Res divinae*²⁹, or perhaps the fact that our authors only had access to epitomes of the *antiquitates humanae*, if not only to second-hand information found in one of those lost great Vergilian commentaries³⁰.

Interesting suggestions are offered by numismatic and sculptural evidence. The oldest witnesses to the story of Aeneas' escape from Troy are a



© The Trustees of the British Museum. Shared under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) licence.

27. Hom. *Od.* XIX 246.

28. Serv. auct. *Aen.* I 378: *sane de diis penatibus licet varias opiniones secutus sit Vergilius, omnes tamen diversis locis complexus est.* Serv. auct. *Aen.* III 119: *sane hoc loco Vergilius secutus veterum opinionem ... quamvis diversis locis alias opiniones aliorum secutus poeta de diis penatibus diversa dixerit.*

29. There is evidence of the fact that Varro had dealt with the identity of the *Penates* in the *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, as it appears from passages such as Varro *ling.* V 58.

30. Thomas 1879, p. 273.

series of coins of the times of Julius Caesar, all datable between 48-46 BC. To give one example for all, I have reported the picture of a silver denarius minted in Asia Minor between 47-46 BC, now in the British Museum (registration number R.8922).

Both the obverse and reverse of the coin have a religious theme. The first has a wreathed head of Venus in profile; the second depicts the scene of Aeneas' escape from Troy. The very purpose of this religiously centred propaganda was to stress and reaffirm the divine descent of Caesar, in view of his re-election to the dictatorship (as in 63 BC). He was indeed made dictator for ten years in 47 BC, and for life on the year of his death (44 BC).

Aeneas is depicted as heading right, his legs in the unequivocal running position. On his left shoulder he carries the old father Anchises, and on his right hand stands out a statue of a figure in armour, with shield and spear. There are no doubts that this figure is the Palladium, and the resemblance of the scene with one impressed on a fifth century BC drachma (British Museum, n. 1880,0503.3), which represents the scene of Diomedes stealing the Palladium, is a proof of that.



© The Trustees of the British Museum. Shared under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) licence.

The statuette is identical, a woman in armour and helmet, with the round shield on the left side, and a lifted spear on the right. The Palladium was a statue of three cubits height³¹, and was given by Zeus to Dardanus, or dedicated by Electra.

According to a tradition attested by many vases, coins and sculptures, this

31. [Apolloḍ.] *bibl.* III 143 ἦν δὲ τῷ μεγέθει τρίπηχυ, τοῖς δὲ ποσὶ συμβεβηκός, καὶ τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ δόρου διηρμένον ἔχον τῇ δὲ ἐτέρᾳ ἡλακάτην καὶ ἄτρακτον.

statue of Athena was kept in Troy and stolen by Diomedes and Odysseus. After that, it arrived in Italy, first in Lavinium, and later was jealously kept by the Vestal virgins in the temple of Vesta. According to an alternative tradition, upheld, among others, by Pausanias³², Diomedes and Odysseus only stole a false copy of the prodigious statue, while the real one was saved by Aeneas, and brought to Italy³³. Ovid mentioned both the accounts in his *Fasti*³⁴.

Coins of the imperial period seem to bear witness to an important change in this iconography. Three samples are included, one of them being an aureus minted under Antoninus Pius between AD 140-143, as Rome was approaching nine hundred years of existence (British Museum n. 1896,0608.26).



© The Trustees of the British Museum. Shared under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) licence.

The second and third ones, which cannot be reproduced here for copyright reasons, are respectively a sestertium of Lucius Verus (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston n. 1983.7), minted in Troas, Ilium, between AD 161-169,

32. Paus. II 23, 5 τὸ μὲν δὴ Παλλάδιον – καλεῖται γὰρ οὕτω – δῆλόν ἐστιν ἐς Ἰταλίαν κομισθὲν ὑπὸ Αἰνείου.

33. Cf. also Rutledge 2012, p. 162 ss.

34. Ov. *fast.* VI 419-36: *moenia Dardanides nuper nova fecerat Ilus / (Ilus adhuc Asiae dives habebat opes); / creditur armiferae signum caeleste Minervae / urbis in Iliacae desiluisse iuga. / cura videre fuit: vidi templumque locumque; / hoc superest illi, Pallada Roma tenet. / consultitur Smintheus, lucoque obscurus opaco / hos non mentito reddidit ore sonos: / aetheriam servate deam, servabitis urbem: / imperium secum transferet illa loci. / servat et inclusam summa tenet Ilus in arce, / curaque ad heredem Laomedonta redit; / sub Priamo servata parum: sic ipsa volebat, / ex quo iudicio forma revicta sua est. / seu gener Adrasti, seu furtis aptus Ulixes, / seu fuit Aeneas, eripuisse ferunt; / auctor in incerto, res est Romana: tuetur / Vesta, quod assiduo lumine cuncta videt.*

and a bronze coin of Macrinus (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston n. 1986.761), minted in Apamea, Bithynia, between AD 217-218. Both these coins are available to see on the website of the Museum of Fine Arts of Boston³⁵.

In all these coins, as in most of those belonging to the imperial period, Aeneas heads to the left holding with his right hand his son Ascanius, who wears a Phrygian hat, and carrying on his left shoulder/arm his elderly father. Anchises' hands in Caesar's sestertium appear to be empty and firmly holding onto Aeneas' neck, whereas on the last three imperial coins Anchises appears to be carrying a strange object which has the shape of a box in the first coin, and of a rounded container, probably a *cista*, in the others. All these coins are most probably a reproduction of the sculptural group that embellished the central part of the left hemicycle of the Forum Augusti, as attested by Ovid³⁶.

Not only does Ascanium/Julus join the group on imperial coins, but the Palladium is substituted by the object carried by Anchises, the *Penates*. This evidence suggests that something changed in the common reception of the myth of Aeneas' escape from Troy and arrival in Italy during the imperial age. Without doubt the reason for this shift is to be found in the great Augustan poem of the *Aeneid*³⁷. Before Vergil created the standard tradition, there were various opinions on what Aeneas was actually carrying with him. As far as Varro is concerned, the hypothesis by which it was the Palladium to have been brought from Troy by the hero can be very easily discarded. Not only does Varro explicitly mention the *Penates*, but the improbable idea that the Palladium may have been part of the group named *Penates* is refuted by Varro himself, who in *De familiis Troianis*, wrote that the Palladium was indeed stolen by Diomedes, but as he was suffering many misadventures because of it, and was commanded by an oracle to give it back to the Trojans, he gave it to Aeneas in Calabria, while the latter was performing a sacrifice³⁸. He adds that, because such a sacred ritual could not be in-

35. <https://collections.mfa.org/objects/162645/>, and <https://collections.mfa.org/objects/162552/>.

36. Ov. *Jast.* V 551 sg. e 563 sg. *ultor ad ipse suos caelo descendit honores / templaque in Augusto conspicienda foro... hinc videt Aenean oneratum pondere caro / et tot Iuliae nobilitatis avos.*

37. Verg. *Aen.* III 148 *effigies sacrae diuum Phrygiique penates, / quos mecum a Troia mediisque ex ignibus urbis / extuleram.*

38. Serv. *Aen.* II 166 *hoc [scil. Palladium] cum postea Diomedes haberet, ut quidam dicunt: quod et Vergilius ex parte tangit, et Varro plenissime dicit: credens sibi non esse aptum, propter sua pericula, quibus numquam cariturum responsis cognoverat, nisi Troianis Palladium reddidisset, transeunti per Calabriam Aeneae offerre conatus est. sed cum se ille velato capite sacrificans convertisset, Nautae quidam accepit simulacrum: unde Minervae sacra non Iulia gens habuit, sed Nautiorum; III 407 Diomedem, qui cum multis*

errupted, a man called Nautes received the Palladium in his stead, and this is the reason why it is not the *gens Iulia* that is sacred to Minerva, but the *gens Nautiorum*. It was this unidentified Nautes, according to Varro, who brought the Palladium to Rome³⁹.

As mentioned above, Atticus believed that Aeneas brought to Italy from Troy the statuette(s) of the goddess of fire⁴⁰, Vesta, after having rescued them from the flaming altars. His opinion is not completely ungrounded, as the name of Vesta is often associated with Aeneas and the various traditions of his arrival in Italy. The goddess also closely linked to the Palladium, as the statuette was kept in her temple under the protection of her sacred fire. Ovid (*fast.* VI 437) gives account of how the Pontifex Maximus Lucius Caecilius Metellus saved the statue from the fire (again!) that burned the temple in 241 BC, and was blinded for having touched the sacred thing with impure hands.

In the *Aeneid* Vesta is twice found in the company of the *Penates*. In the first occurrence, Aeneas receives a visit from the phantom of Hector, who commends to him the ‘sacred things and the *Penates*’ of Troy, and then shows him the statue of Vesta and her sacred bands⁴¹. In the second place⁴², Ascanium swears by the Great *Penates*, the *Lares* of the Assaracus, and the *penetralia*⁴³ of candid Vesta.

The same Servius auctus was somewhat puzzled by Vergil’s inconsistency. He feels it necessary to point out that it is not clear whether Vesta was to be included in the number of the *Penates*, or if she was normally accepted as a companion to them. He also points out that, as a matter of fact, this link

casibus adfligeretur, Palladium, quos apud ipsum erat, Troianis oraculo iussus est reddere. quos cum vellet implere, Aeneam invenit sacrificantem: qui, ut supra diximus, sacrificii ordinem non rupit, et Palladium Nautes accepit: unde Nautarum familia Minervae sacra servabat.

39. Serv. *Aen.* V 704 *propter illud quod supra diximus, fingitur, quia ipse [scil. Nautes] Romam Palladium detulit: unde Nautiorum familia Minervae sacra retinebat: quod etiam Varro docet in libris quos de familiis Troianis scripsit.*

40. Serv. *Aen.* I 292 *Vesta vero pro religione, quia nullum sacrificium sine igne est, unde et ipsa et lanus in omnibus sacrificiis invocantur. Vesta autem dicta vel ἀπὸ τῆς ἑστίας, ut digammos sit adiecta, sicut ἦρ ver, Ἐβετός Venetus, vel quod variis vestita sit rebus. ipsa enim esse dicitur terra, quam ignem habere non dubium est, ut ex Aetna Vulcanoque et aliis locis ardentibus datur intellegi; II 296 Vestam deam ignis, quae, ut supra diximus, terra est.*

41. Verg. *Aen.* II 293-97 *sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia penatis; / hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere / magna pererrato statues quae denique ponto. / sic ait et manibus uittas Vestamque potentem / aeternumque adytis effert penetralibus ignem.*

42. Verg. *Aen.* IX 258-60 *excipit Ascanius per magnos, Nise, penatis / Assaracique larem et canae penetralia Vestae / obtestor.*

43. The same root seems to link *Penates*, *penetral*, *penitus*, as something that is hidden, unrevealed, and mysterious.

between the two was heavily attested in the origins of Roman religion, as consuls, praetors and dictators, at the point of leaving the magistracy, performed, in Lavinium, a joint sacrifice to Vesta and the *Penates*⁴⁴. In the same passage, Servius auctus also suggests that Vergil's *Vesta Potens*, could well be interpreted as the θεοῦς δυνατοῦς of Cassius Hemina, in Macr. *Sat.* III 4, 13, and Serv. *Aen.* I 378.

The fact that the *Scholia Veronensia* mention Atticus' version in contradiction to that of Varro (Vesta against Varro's *Penates*), seems sufficient to prove that no association between the two was actually made by Varro in the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* or elsewhere, and that he did not express, at least in the *Res humanae*, an opinion on the identity of the *Penates*. If Varro ever discussed the identity of the *Penates*, possibly in the *res divinae*, he certainly did not include Vesta in their number.

In Servius⁴⁵ we read that Varro upheld the opinion that the *Penates* and the *magni dei* were the same thing, as in the foundation of houses the writing MAGNIS DIIS was carved. According to the same passage, Varro, with many others would have identified the *Penates* with the Dioscuri Castor and Pollux⁴⁶. The passage from which Servius gained this information did not belong to the *Antiquitates humanae* or *divinae* but is found in the *De lingua Latina*. It reads:

Terra enim et Caelum, ut Samothracum, initia docent, sunt dei magni, et hi quos dixi multis nominibus, non quas Samothracia ante portas statuit duas virilis species aeneas dei magni, neque ut volgus putat, hi Samothraces dii, qui Castor et Pollux, sed hi mas et femina et hi quos Augurum Libri scriptos habent sic: 'divi potes', pro illo quod Samothraces Theoi dynatoi.

Besides other things, the last line of the passage is a clear proof of the fact that Varro was well acquainted with the work of Cassius Hemina ('divi potes',

44. Serv. auct. *Aen.* II 296 *sed in primo libro dictum, quos deos penates ab Aenea advectos diversorum opinio prodiderit; quod etiam singulis locis, ubi de penatibus varias opiniones poeta secutus dixerit, notatum invenitur. hic ergo quaeritur, utrum Vesta etiam de numero penatium sit, ancomes eorum accipiatur, quod cum consules et praetores sive dictator abeunt magistratu, Lavini sacra penatibus simul et Vestae faciunt: unde Vergilius, cum praemisisset 'sacra suosque tibi c. T. p.', adiecit 'et manibus vittas Vestamque potentem'. sed 'potentem' potest ad illud accipi θεοῦς δυνατοῦς, sicut vocari penates dictum est.*

45. Serv. *Aen.* III 2 *Varro quidem unum esse dicit penates et magnos deos, nam et in basi scribebatur MAGNIS DIIS.*

46. Serv. auct. *Aen.* III 2 *id est Varro et alii complures magnos deos adfirmant simulacra duo virilia, Castoris et Pollucis. in Samothracia ante portam sita, quibus naufragio liberati vota solvebant. alii deos magnos Caelum ac Terram putant, ac per hoc Iovem et Iunonem. dii penates a Samothracia sublati ab Aenea in Italiam advecti sunt.*

pro illo quod Samothracas Theoi dynatoi) whom he might have excerpted in the composition of his treatises.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baschera 1999

Gli Scolii Veronesi a Virgilio, Introduzione, edizione critica e indici a cura di Claudio Baschera, Verona 1999

Beck-Uwe 2001

H. Beck-W. Uwe, *Die frühen römischen Historiker, I. Von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius*, Darmstadt 2001

Canetta 2014

I. Canetta, *Una fonte per il commento di Servio a Virgilio: Le 'res humanae' di Varrone*, in *Fragments d'érudition: Servius et le savoir antique*, édité par A. Garcea, M.-K. Lhommé et D. Vallat, Hildesheim 2016, pp. 17-29

Cornell 2013

The Fragments of the Roman Historians, General editor T.J. Cornell [...], Oxford 2013

Forsythe 1994

G. Forsythe, *Some notes on the History of Cassius Hemina*, «Phoenix» 44, 1990, pp. 326-44

Lion 1811

Commentarii in Virgilium Serviani sive Commentarii in Virgilium, qui Mauro Servio Honorato tribuuntur, ad fidem codicum Guelferbytanorum aliorumque recensuit, et potioribus variis lectionibus indicibusque copiosissimis instruxit H.A. Lion, Accedunt Virgillii interpretes a Maio primum editi, Philargyrius et Probus, I-II, Göttingae 1826

Mai 1818

Virgillii Maronis interpretes veteres: Asper Cornutus Haterianus Longus Nisus Probus Scaurus Sulpicius et anonymus, edente notisque illustrante A. Maio [...], Mediolani 1818

Mirsch 1882

P. Mirsch, *De M. Terenti Varronis Antiquitatum rerum humanarum libris XXV*, «Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie» 5, 1882, pp. 1-144

Niebuhr 1827

B.G. Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte*, zwente völlig umgearbeitete Ausgabe, I, Berlin 1827

Perret 1942

J. Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281-231)*, Paris 1942

Peter 1870

Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae, disposuit recensuit praefatus est H. Peter, I, Lipsiae 1870

Peter 1914

Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae, iteratis curis recensuit H. Peter, I, Lipsiae 1914 (repr. Stuttgartiae 1967)

Ritschl 1867

Friderici Ritschelii Opuscula Philologica, III, Lipsiae 1877

Santini 1995

C. Santini, *I Frammenti di L. Cassio Emina: Introduzione, Testo, Traduzione e Commento*, Pisa 1995

Schmidt 1978

P.L. Schmidt, s.v. *Victor 69* in *RE*, Suppl. XV (1978), coll. 1583-676

Scholz 1989

U.W. Scholz, *Zu L. Cassius Hemina*, «Hermes» 117, 1989, pp. 167-81

Rutledge 2012

S.H. Rutledge, *Ancient Rome as a Museum: Power, Identity, and the Culture of Collecting*, Oxford 2012

Thomas 1880

E. Thomas, *Essai sur Servius et son commentaire sur Virgile d'après les manuscrits de Paris et les publications les plus récentes, avec la liste et la description des manuscrits de Paris, l'indication des principaux manuscrits étrangers; la liste et l'appréciation des principales éditions; et un tableau général des scolies sur Virgile*, Diss. Paris 1879.

ORAZIO CAMAIONI

★

L'articolo è parte del progetto più ampio di una nuova edizione, corredata di traduzione e commento, delle *Antiquitates rerum humanarum* di Varrone. Il contributo prende in analisi il resoconto della fuga di Enea da Troia descritto in Schol. Verg. Veron. *Aen.* II 717 (fr. 2, 9 Mirsch). La prima parte dell'articolo, prendendo le mosse da Mirsch, stabilisce il testo critico corredata da traduzione, mentre la seconda si occupa di problemi riguardanti l'attribuzione del passo e la sua storia testuale. Segue poi un confronto con i due resoconti dell'episodio della fuga di Enea traditi da Macrobio e Servio; le somiglianze degli stessi fanno pensare ad una fonte comune, le *res humanae*, verisimilmente fruite attraverso informazioni di seconda mano contenute in uno dei grandi commentari virgiliani ormai perduti. Le differenze tra i passi, d'altra parte, sono giustificate dalla natura e dagli scopi propri di ciascun testo. La quarta parte dell'articolo offre alcune testimonianze numismatiche che mostrano come non esistesse un consenso su ciò che Enea aveva portato da Troia in Italia; per alcuni, infatti, si trattava del Palladio, mentre per altri, incluso il Varrone delle *Antiquitates humanae*, si trattava dei Penati. Quando Virgilio consacrerà la leggenda di Enea col suo *opus magnum*, sarà proprio la seconda versione ad essere accettata e canonizzata, forse a motivo della statura intellettuale del Reatino.

This contribution is part of the wider project of a new edition with commentary and translation of Varro's Antiquitates rerum humanarum. The article focusses on the account of Aeneas' flight from Troy described in Schol. Verg. Veron. Aen. II 717 (fr. II 9 Mirsch). The first part of the contribution establishes the critical text with translation, starting from Mirsch and highlighting problems regarding

the attribution of the passage and its textual history. Then follows a comparison of the text with other accounts of the event related by Macrobius and Servius; The similarities of these texts point to a common source, Varro's res humanae, which the authors likely accessed through the second-hand information found in one of the lost great commentaries of Vergil. The discrepancies, on the other hand, are justified by the different nature and purpose of each text. In the third part of the contribution, some numismatic evidence is offered to show how, before the Aeneid, there wasn't a consensus about what Aeneas brought from troy to Italy; for some it was the Palladium, for others, including Varro in the antiquitates humanae, they were the Penates. When Vergil consecrates the legend of Aeneas in his opus magnum, it was the latter tradition that was accepted and canonised, perhaps owing to the intellectual stature of the Reatinus.