

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

I

JUPITER THE ANTIQUARIAN: THE
NAME OF IULUS (VIRGIL, *AENEID* 1.267–8)

ALESSANDRO BARCHIESI

In his prophecy to Venus, Jupiter declares:

at puer Ascanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo
additur – Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno – ...

But the boy Ascanius, to whom now the extra name ‘Iulus’ is given (he was called ‘Ilus’ while the Ilian state stood firm with its kingdom)

(Virg. *Aen.* 1.267–8)

This is a very intense moment in the poem and in its reconstruction of the Roman past. The name ‘Iulus’ provides the transition – brilliantly analysed in terms of prosody and politics by Cowan 2009 – between Trojan Ilus and Roman Iulius. The survival and metonomasia of Ilus are also crucial to the difficult negotiation between Augustan dynastic ideology and the Latin tradition of Silvius and the kings of Alba Longa.¹

The sentence is usually considered as a statement of fact – at this point in the story Iulus is acquiring his future name, and it appears to be obvious that Jupiter’s prophecy is complementary to the narrator’s voice. Taken together, the two voices conspire to give *nunc* a particular emphasis: a loaded moment in the plot, in the story itself, and in the tradition of the Aeneas legend, a legend so fertile in dynastic manipulations. Yet, if we consider whose voice it is, this will be seen to be more than

I thank Cesare Letta and T. J. Cornell for allowing me to see their treatments of Cato in advance of publication. They are of course not responsible for my argument.

¹ O’Hara 1996: 90–1 analyses the use of *nunc* in signposting the making of new names and their aetiology, and examines the links with Alexandrian practice and self-consciousness; cf. id. at 88–90 on changes of name. However, our passage is made special by the direct speech of Jupiter, whose use of the present is not identical with that of the narrator (although both have singular authority in this poem, especially because of their control over historical temporality).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Alessandro Barchiesi

a statement:² as Maurizio Bettini puts it to me, ‘an indicative used by Jupiter becomes an imperative to other people’, and Jupiter’s speech is a prime example of the illocutory and performative force of *for*, *faris* and *fatum* in Roman culture (*Aen.* 1.256 *fatur*, 258 *fata*, 261 *fabor*, 262 *fatorum arcana*).³ We should rather view the sentence as ‘performing’ the change of name under the authority of Jupiter.

Interestingly, this is also the first occurrence of the character Iulus or Ascanius in the poem, and indeed the first moment where we find out for sure that he is travelling with his father towards Italy:⁴ in Ennius, and possibly in Naevius,⁵ Aeneas

² For a character who is both ‘new’ in age and ‘new’ when compared to the previous epic tradition, the initial appearance in a text has considerable weight. Analogous in terms of emphasis and ‘newness’ is the first visual appearance of Telemachus in the *Odyssey*, at which point (1.114) he is styled *theoeides*: the passage is so important in the poetics of the work that it forms the main case study in Richard Martin’s well-known discussion of Homeric formulas relating to Telemachus as (he proposes) ‘the last action hero’ of Greek epic (cf. Martin 1993: 229–36). If we consider the analogy between Iulus and Telemachus, the alternative etymology of ‘Iulus’ from ‘Iobolos’ or ‘arrow-shooter’, on which see below, gains particular interest; compare the idea of Telemachus as ‘the one who fights from afar’.

³ See further Bettini 2008.

⁴ For this point see Casali 2007, 121–4 and 2010: 49. This version of the story was powerfully supported by the visual tradition, but its definitive canonization came only with the building of Augustus’ Forum, after the publication of the *Aeneid*. This would be one of many points (cf. also Casali 2007 and 2010) where the poem problematizes or draws attention self-reflexively to its own bold innovations vis-à-vis the mainstream tradition: (i) when do we realise that Anchises is dead and buried in Sicily in this poem? – at 3. 710 with the brisk statement ‘Here is where I lose my father Anchises – this had been foretold by no prophet, no advance warning ...’; and indeed so far as we know the story was not anticipated by Naevius and Ennius. (ii) And who spreads the news of Aeneas and Dido’s love story? – Fama, who specialises in *factum* and *prauum* as well as in *uerum*, and who sings *infecta* as well as *facta* (4.188–90; see a splendid page in Feeney 1991: 187 and the more complex discussion in Hardie 2011: ch. 3 *passim*). The surprise is of course more pointed and embarrassing if, as I tend to believe, there was no such love story in Naevius, where Aeneas was travelling under the vigilant eyes and auspices of his father Anchises. (iii) Another surprise innovation, a meeting between Aeneas and Andromache in Buthrotum, is announced by Aeneas as *incredibilis rerum fama* (3.294; see Feeney 1991: 186 with n. 229).

⁵ Especially important here as a model since, according to a famous note in Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.2.31), Naevius (fr. 14 Strz.) has contributed something important to the idea of a consolation by Jupiter to Venus through optimistic prophecy: this has often been conjectured to be relevant to the emphases on repetition, reassurance and already written tradition at the beginning of Jupiter’s speech in Virgil: ‘the destiny of your people has not changed, their future is still valid – but since you are still unsure and anxious I will speak a bit longer and consult and read for you the secrets of the fates’ (cf. *Aen.* 1.257–62).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Jupiter the antiquarian: the name of Iulus

has a daughter Ilia with him, a daughter who will generate the twins, and no male son from Troy.⁶ The fact that there is no mention of Ascanius in the *Iliad* was also part of the inherited myths that the narrative of the *Aeneid* will have to reshape:⁷ note that the great pathos of the speech by Andromache in *Aen.* 3.339–43 actually climaxes with the questions about Ascanius ('and the boy Ascanius? Is he alive, is he breathing? The one who already in Troy [this is an unfinished line] ... is he thinking about his lost mother? Is he drawn towards the ancient *uirtus* and manly deeds by the example of his father Aeneas and his maternal uncle Hector?'): this moment is not only a masterpiece of tragic and humane intensity, but also a calculated reminder of how carefully Ascanius needs to be inserted into the mosaic of the Homeric tradition and the family mesh of the royal family of Ilion. It is a *paralipomenon* for the *Iliad*, and the presence of the half-line may be significant as a pointer to a narratological and ideological concern of the poet: 'the one who already in Troy ...' looks as if the narrator had been brooding over ways to make Ascanius a recognisable character 'already' in the Trojan past.

It takes Jupiter's voice to conjure up and guarantee the presence of Iulus in the narrative. We shall shortly hear that he is going to be the successor of Aeneas in Italy and the founder of Alba Longa and of its dynasty: another weighty choice and innovation that requires the authority of Jupiter.⁸ By the end of the story Aeneas will be the only major character in the plot who has male progeny alive.⁹

⁶ It is therefore with a touch of antiquarian polemics that Jupiter finds a way to use the name 'Ilia' in the very sentence that announces the presence and name of a son of Aeneas in the plot.

⁷ The importance of the alternative traditions (cyclic, visual (see the bibliography in Horsfall 2008: 501), antiquarian, lyric and dramatic) should not obscure the fact that most of Virgil's mainstream Roman models, Homer, Naevius, Ennius and (as we shall see) Cato are an obstacle to the recognition of Ascanius / Iulus as a crucial actor and eponymous ancestor of the Julii in an epic about Aeneas.

⁸ On the importance of seeing Iulus as *heres* (4.274; cf. 7.424) of King Aeneas, see Eidinow 2003.

⁹ See the two splendid, complementary treatments of this aspect of *mors immatura* in the poem by Quint 2001 and Gowers 2011; on the importance of the difference between a 'pure Trojan' and a 'mixed' bloodline of Aeneas in Italy, and on its implications for the ethnogenesis of the Romans, the fundamental treatment is Bettini 2006.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Alessandro Barchiesi

The entire speech is inscribed in a situation of family relationship: Venus is introduced as a daughter speaking to her father, and therefore we are constantly reminded that Aeneas is the grandson of Jupiter (he is in fact the closest descendant of Jupiter among the heroes of the Trojan war, at least among those who are still alive and in human form at the inception of the *Aeneid*) and that Iulus is the great-grandson. His degree of relationship to Jupiter is therefore on the paternal side the same as Achilles' to Zeus: Peleus is the Aeacid grandson of Zeus – and yet on the maternal side Venus has more Jovian blood than the relatively undistinguished Thetis. The Roman naming system is of course not yet functioning at this moment, but in many aspects (space, time, etc.) the speech of Jupiter is both a prophecy and the learned activation of Roman cultural norms: they will be crucial (and shape up progressively) in the rest of the epic. Note, for example, how Jupiter makes the transition from *hiberna* at 266 and *menses* at 269 and *anni* at 272 to the specifically Roman time measure of *lustrum* at 283, while his narrative progressively glides into the operations of the Roman state. Therefore it could be relevant that the one who validates the new name, or better cognomen, 'Iulus' (*nunc ... additur*) is also the *pater familias*, and that the imposition of a cognomen is a loaded moment in a Roman life.

What, then, does this cognomen signify? In the long run, it is ideologically important that the name of Iulus comes, so to speak, from the future: it is validated and made necessary by the existence of a Julian emperor (or two, if we include the *diuus Caesar*). But, in the dramatic chronology of Virgil, we should turn to aetiologies of a different nature. Jupiter must be choosing among existing antiquarian interpretations of Iulus, and they are not in short supply. According to Servius, *Aen.* 1.267, Cato said that only after killing Mezentius did Ascanius acquire the name Iulus, because he had 'iouulos', *prima barbae lanugo*, at the time. According to Servius Auctus on the same verse, the antiquarian Lucius Iulius Caesar, cos. 64 BCE, said that after the victory over

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Jupiter the antiquarian: the name of Iulus

Mezentius Ascanius took a name meaning either *ioulos* or *iobolos* ‘arrow-shooter’.¹⁰ Those etymologies are both compatible with the plot of the *Aeneid*, where Iulus is in transition from boyhood to manhood and performs a couple of effective arrow shots (7.496–502, 9.590–637), but I fail to see why Jupiter in such a loaded context should have been much impressed with either: rather, he is using his power against the antiquarian tradition to anticipate the acquisition of the cognomen, whereas we have seen it was in Italy that Ascanius, perhaps more plausibly, received his new name. It would be nice to find a contextual relevance, or better a hidden power in the new name.

There is, however, a third etymology, but it does not receive much attention because it surfaces for us in the *Origo gentis Romanae* (*OGR*), a late and suspiciously erudite text that Peter, wrongly¹¹ but influentially, had excluded as a quarry from his collection of fragmentary historians: the text, *OGR* 15.5, is now admitted as *F11* in the new collected *FRH* edited by Cornell 2013:

igitur Latini Ascanium ob insignem uirtutem non solum Ioue ortum crediderunt, sed etiam per deminutionem declinato paululum nomine, primo Iolum, dein postea Iulum appellarunt. a quo Iulia familia manauit, ut scribunt Caesar libro secundo et Cato in Originibus.

So the Latins not only believed, on account of his outstanding courage, that Ascanius was descended from Jupiter, but by slightly changing the name to form a diminutive, called him first Iolus and then afterwards Iulus. And it is from him that the Julian family has descended, as Caesar writes in his second book, and Cato in the *Origines*. (Trans. Cornell)

The *OGR* implies that the name Iulus can be reconstructed as < Iolus < *Iouilius or *Iouilos and that this idea was put forth by the augural specialist (and family historian?) L. Caesar. But is it also a testimony for the more authoritative Cato? The passage has generated a fragment of Cato’s *Origines* in Schroeder

¹⁰ On L. Caesar see Bickel 1957, Erskine 2001: 23, 246–7, and Smith 2010. This Caesar deserves some attention from Virgilian scholars: his record in politics and scholarship indicates the early activity of the Julii both in ideological matters and, if he has been correctly identified from inscriptions of the 70s BCE (see Smith 2010: 253), at the site of the city of Ilion.

¹¹ See the critical summary of the arguments in Smith 2005.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Alessandro Barchiesi

(9e), Chassignet (I, 9b) and P. and Cugusi (I, 12b) but obviously not in Peter nor in Jordan before him.¹² In a recent paper, before the FRH were issued, Cesare Letta (2010) has set the record straight: he demonstrates that our tradition supports the attribution to Cato of both the etymology from *ioulos* ‘down, facial hair’ and that from *Iolus* ‘Little Jupiter’ but not that from *iobolos* ‘arrow-shooting’. In our Virgilian context the force of ‘Iolus’ comes from the manner in which the new cognomen encapsulates Ascanius’ status as the living offshoot of Jupiter among the Latini – although of course much hinges on whether a Roman family can claim him as an ancestor. The new commentary by T. J. Cornell also accepts the derivation from Jupiter as Catonian, although with significant caveats:

These multiple citations [in the *OGR*] raise the problem of deciding whether the same information was to be found in all the named sources, or, if not, what exactly is being attributed to each. A notorious case is 15.5, where Caesar and Cato are cited as saying that Ascanius was named Iulus because he was believed to be descended from Jupiter, and that he was the ancestor of the Julian family. The problem is that L. Caesar is elsewhere said to have given a different explanation of the name Iulus (*DS ad Aen.* 1.267), and Cato to have written that Ascanius died without issue (*DS ad Aen.* 6.760). An easy escape from this difficulty is to suppose that Cato derived the name Iulus from *Iovilus, and that Caesar declared Ascanius/Iulus to be the ancestor of the Julii. The original antiquarian who consulted the two sources (Verrius Flaccus?) would have made this clear, but in the course of transmission the information was drastically abridged and reduced to a couple of brief sentences, and the sources simply listed together at the end. If so, our author is absolved from dishonesty, and the authenticity of the original citations is upheld. But this solution is only hypothetical, and suspicion inevitably remains (see further the commentary on Cato 5 F6 and 11).

This point, if true, has significant consequences for our question. An etymology in Cato is worthy of both notice and appropriation by Virgil and Virgil’s Jupiter – and not only because he was a prime source for foundation stories. First of all, Cato had no intention of validating the idea that the Julii are legitimate descendants of Iulus and so of Jupiter – in fact we know

¹² For a history of the problem see Cornell 2013 ad loc.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Jupiter the antiquarian: the name of Iulus

(Serv. *Aen.* 6.760 = Cato, *FRH* 8) that he pointedly declared that Iulus (like Romulus) died childless. Therefore, just like Naeuius and Ennius, with their emphasis on the marriage with the daughter of the local king and a mixed genealogy, and no Ascanius on board to Italy, he is a powerful problem for the *Aeneid*, a potential source for a non-Julian reading of the Aeneas legend.¹³

The wording of the *Origo* supports the idea that the *Origines* did have the etymology from Jupiter's name. Otherwise, the *Origo* would have no reason to quote Cato in this context. This Catonian model could be a worthy intertext for Jupiter's declaration and performance of name change: Virgil's Jupiter is allowing Iulus (and the Julians) to appropriate his own name, and to start this new bloodline in Italy under a name that means 'little Jupiter'.¹⁴ Now the language of *cui nunc cognomen Iulo | additur* acquires full force, together with the family background of the conversation. It is also pointed that Jupiter responds to the implicit ambition of a name like 'little Jove' by calling Iulus a few lines later (1.288) *magnus*, as the origin of the Julian/Caesarian bloodline. According to the *Origo*, exceptional *uirtus* was the motivation for this name, truly a *cognomen ex uirtute*.¹⁵

Virgil may have been aware of previous operations by the Julian clan in seeking a privileged association with Jupiter. Two promising clues exist. The first is the Julian altar on the Julian home turf at Bovillae for Vediovis, a local god commonly etymologized 'The Little Jupiter',¹⁶ with an archaising inscription of the late second century BCE:

¹³ We now tend to think that Cato could be already aware of attempts to secure Iulus for the Julian *gens*: their emergence and activity can be dated to a time before Cato according to the recent survey by Badian 2009. In this case, in his *Origines* he blocked or forestalled their propaganda.

¹⁴ NB in the epic Jupiter has another son in the West, in Africa this time, I-arbas, another very active empire builder.

¹⁵ Note Andromache's interest in discovering traces of ancient *uirtus* in Aeneas' son Ascanius at 3.342: with Jupiter's name in the remade identity, this is being taken care of.

¹⁶ The god is, however, represented with arrows (Gell. 5.12.11): this opens up another association with Iulus, an avid archer in Virgil, but also the possibility that the

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Alessandro Barchiesi

VEDIOVIEI PATREI GENTILES IVLIEI

VEDIOVEI AARA

LEEGE ALBANA DICATA

(ILS 2988 = *ILLRP* 270)

The spelling in the text looks as if someone was trying hard to evoke the authentic ‘Alban’ voice from the deep past of the family and the region.

The second initiative is Julius Caesar’s fixation on becoming a very young flamen Dialis, not an easy choice for a young Roman – the flamen could not spend a night outside Rome, ride a horse or divorce and, perhaps less problematic, he was forbidden to touch goats. The priesthood is described in a famous paper by John Scheid (1985) as a living statue of Jupiter and a permanent reminder to the Roman people that Jupiter has been a citizen of Rome from the origins onwards. The speech in *Aeneid* 1 is presented by the poet as the very beginning of Jupiter’s participation in the Roman community.

Perhaps then, since Virgil’s Jupiter anticipates the style of Roman antiquarians, Iulus is a cognomen, an additional cognomen or (in modern terms) agnomen, as implied by *additur*, and Ascanius the nomen, and Jupiter punningly validates a cognomen *ex* himself (Little Jupiter)¹⁷ to substitute

etymology from *iobolos*, in spite of its weaker support, had some function in this tradition after all.

¹⁷ Note also two places in the *Aeneid* in which Iulus and Jupiter are directly linked to a degree unusual for all the other characters. (1) In book 2, the first occurrence of the name of Aeneas’ only son in the chronology of the *fabula* (if not in the poem) is Ascanius at 2.598: the boy begins to be called Iulus at 674, 677 and 684, a cluster of occurrences connected to the great omen of the flame on his head, sent by Jupiter, and confirmed by the *augurium impetratium* typical of Jupiter, the thunder (on the significance of the name Iulus in such a context see Horsfall 2008: 484); (2) in book 9, the *aristeia* of Iulus culminates in a prayer of the young warrior to Jupiter, immediately answered by augural thunder (9.621–37; Dingel 1997: 235 briefly mentions the etymology ‘Little Jupiter’ in this connection). It would be more normal for an archer to invoke Apollo (as Pandarus does at *Il.* 4.119). In the prayer, Iulus mentions some special sacrifice and perhaps even a future temple for Jupiter; commentators are usually silent because this is a vague anticipation, but it could be connected to Iulus’ future role in Alba Longa, since the Alban cult of Iupiter Latiaris must be awaiting in his future. In Virgil, the more traditional connection of Latinus with that cult seems less likely, since for him Iulus will be the founder of Alba and so presumably of its religious traditions centering on Jupiter Latiaris. Otherwise the anticipation could be a vague hint towards Iupiter Capitolinus at Rome as a god of victory.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Jupiter the antiquarian: the name of Iulus

the ominous name of a fallen city, more exactly the name of its founder (Ilus)¹⁸ – a clear token of protection for a struggling Trojan family, reassuring for Venus, who is motivated in her actions only by fear about the future destiny of this family.¹⁹

¹⁸ There is also a certain degree of family symmetry in the choice of the new name: a name from the *auus* on one side of the family tree is replaced by a name related to the grandfather on the other.

¹⁹ She is not much concerned about Anchises who has just died in her favourite Drepanon – not entirely a surprise since the *H. Hymn. Aphr.* already suggests that Venus will be interested in her descendants not in Anchises, and will not even be very concerned about the individual destiny of Aeneas.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-11627-6 - Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve

Edited by Richard Hunter and S. P. Oakley

Excerpt

[More information](#)

2

NEGLECTED AND UNNOTICED ADDITIONS
IN THE TEXT OF THREE SPEECHES OF
CICERO (*IN VERREM* II.5, *PRO MURENA*,
PRO MILONE)

D. H. BERRY

Latius patet ... contagio quam quisquam putat (Cic. Mur. 78)

The text of Cicero's speeches, particularly those speeches which have historically been the most read, has attracted a good many additions. These are usually glosses, originally placed in the margin but later incorporated into the text in the course of transcription; occasionally, however, they are interpolations.¹ The purpose of a gloss was to explain some feature of the text (historical or linguistic, for example) which would originally have required no explanation but was likely to be obscure to readers of the glossator's own time. The glossator may also have been motivated by a desire to impress his own special knowledge on the reader. Often this knowledge did not amount to much, and was derived from another passage, generally an earlier passage, in the same text, with the result that the information provided was frequently superfluous and sometimes inaccurate. When the text with its marginal glosses came in due course to be transcribed, the copyist might be uncertain whether the marginalia were actually glosses or were parts of the original text that had been accidentally omitted and then restored; and in cases of doubt he might prefer to copy into the main text any words which seemed to him to have

I am grateful to the conference audience, particularly to Peter Brown, David Butterfield and Stephen Heyworth, for comments on the delivered version of this paper. Professor Reeve was my tutor at Exeter College, Oxford from 1983 to 1984, and later gave me substantial help and guidance in my research on the text of Cicero's *Pro Sulla*. This paper is offered to him in gratitude.

¹ A gloss is 'an explanatory word or phrase clarifying the meaning of a word that might be unfamiliar to a reader, or a marginal note of explanation or comment' (Burchfield 1996: 333); an interpolation is a deliberate insertion into the text, whether or not intended to mislead.