DISSERTATION

CONCERNING

The arrival of AENEAS in ITALY.

AM sensible of the many disadvantages I lie under in entering the lists with two of the greatest men of the last age, Cluver, and Bochart, who have both treated the arrival of Aeneas in Italy as a sable, and exhausted the whole store of their learning, which I own to have been very great, in supporting this affertion. However, in this unequal contest, I have the satisfaction to find, that the united stream of the Greek and Roman history runs in my favor; which makes me hope that an affectation of singularity will rather be imputed to them, for having opposed the authority of so many great authors, than to me, for opposing That of the two great men I am to contend with.

Bochart, in his letter to Ségrais, the French translator of the Aeneid, lays great stress upon a passage in Homer, which I shall consider presently, as decisive against the arrival of Aeneas in Italy; and, after he has employed all the arguments he can find to shew the impossibility of it, justifies Virgil for having brought him thither: In order to do this the more effectually, he gives a long list of Greek and Roman authors, most of them quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, to prove that Aeneas did, really, land in Italy, and was the ancestor of the Alban kings, from whom the founders of Rome were descended. If Bochart did not do this to shew how much learning he could display on both sides of the question, he must have been very inattentive to his subject, not to see that the authorities he has quoted to justify Virgil, absolutely destroy the arguments he had, before, made use of

to contradict the arrival of Aeneas in Italy. The method I shall obferve in treating this subject, will be, first, to examine the objections made by Cluver, and Bochart, which are, nearly, the same; and then, to give my own reasons in support of the system I have adopted.

Their first objection is drawn from the verses in Homer, which have, already, been taken notice of, and from a Strabo's comment on

them.

To this objection it may be answered that, if, as I have, before, observed, we read, b

Νυν δε δη Αινειαο βιη ΠΑΝΤΕΣΣΙΝ αναξει, Και σαιδες σαιδων, τοι κεν μεθοπιδε γενωνθαι,

The difficulty vanishes at once: And, though this reading is not to be found in any of the manuscripts, or editions of Homer, which are, now, extant, yet we know from c Strabo that it was, formerly, in some of them, THES YEADSON are his words. But, if, at all events, we must read Τρωεσσιν, instead of σαν εσσιν, the answer our author has given to this objection seems, very well, founded: The sense of which is, that Aeneas, and his posterity, might, as properly, be said to have reigned over the Trojans, who followed him into Italy, as if he, and they, had staid in Phrygia. I am sensible that d Strabo says it was reported, revelue, that the descendants of Scamandrius, the son of Hector, and of Ascanius, the son of Aeneas, reigned for many ages in Scepsis, a city in Phrygia: But, this objection he himself obviates, by saying that, if we are to read Tewerous, there is an end of this succession to the kingdom of Scepsis in the family of Scamandrius. He says, indeed, in the same place, that these verses in Homer contradict, still more, the arrival of Aeneas in Italy; for which reason, some write wallerow, referring the word to the Romans. However, let it not be imagined that Strabo treats the arrival of Aeneas in Italy as a fable; fince, in giving an account of that part of Italy, where Aeneas landed, he fays, in fo many words, that many places there were ennobled by his presence, ενδοξα δε δια την Αινεις γεγονεν επιδημιαν .

² See the 186th annot. on the first book. b Iliad v. y. 307. c B. xiii. p. 906. d Ib. B. v. p. 355.

212 DISSERTATION CONCERNING THE

It is, next, objected by Bochart, that f Festus quotes Agathocles Cyzicenus for saying that Aeneas was buried in the city of Berecynthia. The reader will, I believe, think that a quotation of three or four words from an author, whose works are, now, lost, cannot add any great force to his argument; which is, still, lessened by this consideration, that Strabo, in his very accurate description of that country, makes no mention of it.

He, then, says that Ascanius, must have remained in Phrygia, because many places in that country, as the lake Ascanius, a river of the same name, a part of the country, and a little island near adjoining, received their names from Ascanius, the son of Aeneas.

This argument I have met with in several authors of a more modern date than Bochart, from whom, I believe, they took it. However, it may be, easily, answered. In the first place, this lake, and river, are not in Phrygia, but in Bithynia, or, as some have thought, in Mysia, as will appear, evidently, from the following words of Euphorion, quoted by Strabo,

ΜΥΣΟΙΟ σας' ύδασιν Ασκανιοιο.

This is confirmed by homer, quoted, also, by Strabo, upon this occasion,

Παλμυν, ΑΣΚΑΝΙΟΝ τε, Μοςαν Β' ύιον Ιπποιωνος, ΜΥΣΩΝ αγχεμαχων ήγηθοςα καθεροθυμον. Οι γ' εξ ΑΣΚΑΝΙΗΣ εριδωλακος ηλθον αμοιδοι.

These verses, particularly the first, will supply me with another answer to this objection. This Ascanius was not the son of Aeneas, but one of the leaders of the Mysians, or of the Phrygians, if you please, for Mysia, and Phrygia border on one another, who came to the assistance of the Trojans. And, by the last verse, it is plain that this country, and, consequently, the lake, and river were known by this name in the time of, and very probably, long before, the Trojan war. Ascanius, therefore, the son of Aeneas, could not give his name to these places, after the taking of that city. I said it was probable that the name of Ascania had been given to this country long before the Trojan war; because, if any consequence can be drawn from a similitude of names,

it is not improbable that אשכנו Aschenez, or, as the Septuagint calls him, Aoxava, the son of Gomer, the son of Japhet, the son of Noah, might have reigned over this country many ages before the Trojan war, and have given his name to it. And this opinion, I find, Bochart himself espouses, when he is to account for the peopling of the earth by the descendants of Noah: For, there, he derives the name of this country from k Aschanaz. But, when he has another object in view, and is to shew that Aeneas never went to Italy, he shifts the scene, and fays that this lake, river, and country received their names from Ascanius, the son of Aeneas. I shall not dwell long on the next objection, because I think it may be answered in a few words. Bochart fays, that, if Aeneas had come into Italy, he would, certainly, have introduced there the worship of Venus, and Apollo; the first being his mother, and the other his protector, according to Homer; and he says, that both these deities were unknown to the first Romans, and their ancestors.

As to the worship of Venus; 'Strabo tells us that there was a temple dedicated to her in Lavinium: The antiquity of which will appear by this; that the care of this temple was derived to the Ardeates from their ancestors; emimed 80 and 80 and megogoroum Apdealai. And the antiquity of the worship, paid by the old Romans to Apollo, is proved by a passage in Festus, where he says, that he was, formerly, called aperta at Rome, quod patente cortina responsa ab eo dabantur.

I do not, indeed, find that any worship was paid by the Romans to Cybele (which is the next objection) till the year of Rome 550, when this goddess, which, by the way, was nothing but a stone, was brought to Rome from Pessinus, a city in Phrygia, with great ceremony. But it must be observed, that this ridiculous goddess was a local deity, and worshiped at Pessinus, not at Troy.

His next argument, that Minerva, and Vesta, who are acknowledged to have been Trojan deities, were not known to the first Romans, turns, slatly, against him: Because the Palladium, which Aeneas is said, by all historians, to have brought with him into Italy from Troy, plainly, resutes his objection concerning Minerva: And the institution

i Genesis, c. x. y. 3. k Geogr. sacr. B. iii. c. 9. 1B. v. p. 355. m In voce aperta.

214 DISSERTATION CONCERNING THE

of the Vestals among the Albans, the ancestors of the Romans, as effectually, destroys the other relating to Vesta. This order of priestesses we find, by 'Livy, was derived from the Albans, Alba, oriundum facer dotium. And our author will tell us, in the second book, that there was an ancient temple of Vesta at Alba.

I come now to the last objection of Bochart, upon which he seems to lay the greatest stress; though, in my opinion, it least deserves it. It is this: The Latin language, fays he, has borrowed many words from the various nations, with whom the Latines had any commerce, but none from the Phrygians. To prove this, he has ranfacked all the old Greek lexicons, and scholiasts, to find Phrygian words; of which he has amassed a reasonable number. I look upon it as a very lucky circumstance that both the Phrygian language, and characters are, so absolutely, lost, that no trace of either appears; otherwise, it is plain, from Bochart's manner, that we should have been overwhelmed with an innundation of Phrygian learning. In this mass of Phrygian words, he owns that, though none of them were borrowed by the Latines, many were adopted by the Greeks. This concession, which is supported by the testimony of many authors, is all I defire: For, if the Greeks used any of these Phrygian words, it is certain that the first Romans used them also; since both the language, and the characters of the first Romans were the same with Those of the Greeks. That the language of the first Romans should be Greek will not be wondered at, when it is confidered that the inhabitants of Latium were, for the most part, originally, Aborigines, an Arcadian colony; and that the people, who then lived on the spot, where Rome was afterwards built, were, also, Arcadians, who had settled there with Evander. This Dionysius has, already, informed us of, and his account is confirmed by all the Greek and Roman historians. Their language, afterwards indeed, received an alteration by the mixture of many Italian words, that, by degrees, corrupted the Greek language, which the Romans had, originally, used; επω τόζε τοις Ελληνικοις ονομασι των Ιταλικών επικεχυμενών, fays Plutarch, in speaking of the language, spoken by the Romans in the time of Romulus. If their language was Greek, the characters of it must, also, have been Greek; and, that they were

fo, appears by a passage in our quathor, where he says that the terms of the alliance, entered into by Tullius with the Latin cities, were ingraved on a brazen pillar in Greek characters, such as were, anciently, used in Greece; which pillar, he says, stood in the temple of Diana, in his time.

Having answered, I hope, all the objections urged against the arrival of Aeneas in Italy, I shall, now, offer some proofs in support of it. I was to quote the authority of Virgil, the plan of whose Aeneid is formed upon this fact, I suppose it would be said that he is a poet, and, confequently, not tied down to historical truth. But, is not Homer a poet alfo; and has not his authority been infifted on to prove that Aeneas, and his posterity reigned in Phrygia after the taking of Troy? And why may not Virgil be prefumed to have been as well informed of what passed in Italy, his own country, immediately after that event, as Homer, of what passed in Phrygia at that time, a country, to which he had no fort of relation? Let Homer, therefore, and Virgil be laid out of the case, and let the truth of a point of history be, as it ought to be, tried by historians. The reader has, already, seen that Dionysius, and all the Greek and Latin historians he has quoted, affirm this fact, and the authority of Dionysius, as founded on That of those authors, ought to have the greater weight, because he had their works before him, and the modern writers, who deny it, are deprived of that advantage. This being the state of the case, it seems to me little less absurd in the latter to censure Dionysius for having advanced this fact, on the authority of those historians, without having read their writings, than it would be in a judge to condemn a man without hearing the proofs he had to offer in his defence.

If the loss of these historians has deprived me of many proofs in favor of Dionysius, it has, however, saved me the trouble of quoting a long list of Greek and Latin authors, whose reasons we may, and ought to suppose, would have the same effect upon us, as they had upon him, and all other historians, who have written upon this subject; that is, they would convince us of the reality of a fact, which the loss of those authors, and, possibly, the affectation of erecting great edifices with few materials, have, of late years, brought into dispute.

I shall, therefore, content myself with quoting two authors, whom Dionysius might have quoted, and did not; and, after them, some of those, who writ after he published his history.

The first I shall mention is Sallust, whose authority was never, I think, called in question, though his style has been censured by men of more delicacy, than judgement: Nothing can be more explicit than what he says in his Catilinarian war; "urbem Romam (sicut ego accepi) condidere atque habuere initio Trojani, qui, Aeneâ duce, profugi, incertis sedibus vagabantur.

The next is Varro, the greatest antiquary of an age, in which Cicero He mentions the arrival of Aeneas at Laurentum in Italy, as attended with a circumstance not heard of before, nor fince, I believe, but once. s Ex quo die Troja est egressus Aeneas Veneris, eum per diem quotidie stellam vidisse, donec in agrum Laurentem veniret, in quo eam non viderit ulterius; quâ re cognovit terras esse fatales.

This historical fact was too remarkable to escape the notice of t Livy, who relates it in a manner peculiar to himself; fed ad majora initia rerum ducentibus fatis, primo in Macedoniam [Aeneam] venisse; inde in Siciliam quaerentem sedes delatum; ab Sicilia, classe Laurentem agrum He, then, mentions the marriage of Aeneas with Lavinia, tenui//e. the daughter of Latinus, king of the Aborigines; the building of Alba by Ascanius, the son of Aeneas, and all the other incidents, which Cluver, and Bochart have thought fit to treat as fabulous.

After this, I would ask, whether any historical fact of an ancient date can be attested by authors of greater authority? And whether an attempt to subvert the credibility of a fact, so attested, by conjectures, forced constructions, scraps of quotations quoted by other authors, and vague affertions, unsupported by the testimony of a single historian, is not an attempt to transform all history into romance, to destroy the use, by destroying the credit, of it, and to deprive mankind of the best guides both in public and private life, examples?

We have feen what the opinion of the Roman historians was concerning the arrival of Aeneas in Italy, and the descent of the Romans from the Trojans. Let us, now, examine what opinion the leading men among the Romans, and the Roman senate itself, entertained of

END OF SAMPLE TEXT



The Complete Text can be found on our CD:

Primary Literary Sources For Ancient Literature
which can be purchased on our Website:

www.Brainfly.net

or

by sending \$64.95 in check or money order to:

Brainfly Inc.

5100 Garfield Ave. #46

Sacramento CA 95841-3839

TEACHER'S DISCOUNT:

If you are a **TEACHER** you can take advantage of our teacher's discount. Click on **Teachers Discount** on our website (www.Brainfly.net) or **Send us \$55.95** and we will send you a full copy of **Primary Literary Sources For Ancient Literature AND our 5000 Classics CD** (a collection of over 5000 classic works of literature in electronic format (.txt)) plus our Wholesale price list.

If you have any suggestions such as books you would like to see added to the collection or if you would like our wholesale prices list please send us an email to:

webcomments@brainfly.net