

# 8

## Roman Coins as Historical Evidence: The Trojan Legends of Rome

RICHARD E. MITCHELL

Numismatics forms part of our material record of the past and deserves greater consideration than it receives from most historians. Philip Grierson once remarked that "history without numismatics is imperfect," but he also cautioned that "numismatics without history is impossible."<sup>1</sup> Without doubt, the most important contribution a numismatist can make is the application of numismatic evidence to the solution of historical problems. As Michael Crawford stated it: "Numismatics cannot be an end in itself, only a servant of history."<sup>2</sup> Herein lies the true importance of the numismatic contributions of Theodor Mommsen, E. J. Haebler, Harold Mattingly, Laura Breglia, Andreas Alföldi, and Rudi Thomsen.<sup>3</sup>

However, despite special pleading, numismatics is dependent upon the literary tradition and cannot stand alone. When a coin is the only record we possess of an event, a cult, or a state's existence, both numismatist and historian alike are virtually helpless. Tales of treaties, wars, religious celebrations, monuments, and state honors paid to individuals are only a few features from the sources commonly used to date and interpret Roman coins. Consequently, numismatic evidence is most often used to modify, confirm, or otherwise illustrate what already is known in part. For example, certain denarii of the Republic stand as *testimonia* to the importance of certain *gentes* and help us to see more clearly the significance

<sup>1</sup> *Numismatics and History* (Historical Association Publication, London, 1951), p. 15. Consideration of space requires that citations be kept to a minimum. An attempt will be made to cite works which have ample references to the primary and secondary material.

<sup>2</sup> "Roman Republican numismatics," *A Survey of Numismatic Research, 1960-1965*, I (Copenhagen, 1967), 161.

<sup>3</sup> For an excellent discussion of "160 years of research," see Rudi Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, I (Copenhagen, 1957), 210-248.

of *pietas*, *mos maiorum*, and *honores* and how family claims to greatness, based upon the accomplishments of ancestors, gradually replaced the pride supposedly once felt in the *res publica*. The later denarii, especially those of the first century B.C., underline the developing role of the individual in Roman politics and the destruction of traditions we are told earlier generations held dear. From imperial coinage we see the cult of the individual focused on the emperor alone and learn of the religious and mythological foundations of the principate, the growth of ceremonies, and the development of cults; and frequently we obtain a portrait of the emperor personally and some idea of the regalia of his office.<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, some numismatic evidence is earlier than any surviving Roman literary record, and while the coin types reflect the official Roman attitude of their time, the coin material has a greater claim to authenticity than the literary record since it is unaffected by subsequent rationalizations of historical developments. For example, we are all familiar with the story of how the writing of Roman history began only after Rome obtained hegemony over the Italian peninsula, was well on her way to a similar position in the Western Mediterranean, and already had considerable contacts with Eastern Mediterranean states. Indeed, Fabius Pictor's work is often explained as an attempt to present Roman development and rule in the most favorable light to a Greek speaking world.<sup>5</sup> Thus we know that traditional interpretations of Roman expansion and internal developments prior to the Second Punic War are, to a degree, products of hindsight and greatly affected by the contemporary events and prejudices of the writers, by the existing Greek historical and rhetorical traditions, by contemporary philosophical assumptions, and by the strong aristocratic, if not gentile, bias of the authors. The growth of Rome's empire is presented as divine will, as the consequence of her religious, moral, or governmental excellence: a race of Cincinnati destined to rule the world. We are told by ancient and modern historians alike that the early Romans were patriotic, proud, and noble folk who were without imperial ambitions or greed until Carthage forced their hand. Similarly, in their quest for *virtus*, in their observance of *pietas* and *fides*, true Romans found their strength, and while giving aid to weaker states, had no desire or need for the higher culture and refinements known

<sup>4</sup> A. Alföldi, "The main aspects of political propaganda on the coinage of the Roman Republic," *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly* (Oxford, 1956), pp. 63-95, presents a reflective, provocative, but not always successful attempt to survey the trends in Republican coinage.

<sup>5</sup> E. Badian, "The early historians," *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey (New York, 1966), pp. 1-36. This is an admirable study with excellent bibliographical notes.

to others.<sup>6</sup> Like the old Washington Senators, the Roman senators were first in war, were first in peace and, while not last in the American League, were last in the acquisition of the economic, cultural, and artistic sophistication that characterized the civilization of their Hellenic neighbors.

The earliest Roman coins are unaffected by these later justifications or explanations for Rome's success, but they must be correctly dated and interpreted if we are to obtain historical evidence from their specific types, weights, or particular styles, which offer insights into Republican history. The coins, unlike modern specimens, do not date themselves, and they have often surrendered secrets they may never have intended to reveal. They tell a scholar who dates them to the third century things they would never dream of telling a specialist who supports their fourth century origin, and each scholar claims that the numismatic evidence fits his period. Although adequate presentation of the various theses and the evidence to support them appear elsewhere,<sup>7</sup> a brief survey of the scholarship and the current state of our knowledge will serve as a necessary background for our main problem. While drastic shifts in dating Rome's earliest didrachm coinage occurred in the last hundred years, all chronologies, high and low, have always rested squarely on the literary tradition.

Pliny says Rome first struck silver coins in 269 B.C. when, in the consulship of Quintus Ogulnius and Gaius Fabius, the denarius was issued.<sup>8</sup> Other literary evidence confirms the 269 (or 268) B.C. date but does not mention the denarius. Those who accept this "traditional" date for the denarius assume that certain heavier silver coins, without value marks, are earlier than the denarius and must have been struck elsewhere than in Rome before 269 B.C. Because Rome established permanent contact with coin-producing and coin-using cities to the south in the period from 340 to 270 B.C., the coins were generally assigned to Campanian or South Italian mints. Capua and Neapolis in particular were supposed to have been influential in the development of early Roman coinage. In this manner the coins acquired the name "Romano-Campania."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See D. C. Earl, *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome* (London, 1967), p. 11 ff. and esp. the eulogy for L. Caecilius Metellus (p. 24). R. M. Henry, "Roman tradition," *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, 34 (1937), 7 ff., is still useful.

<sup>7</sup> In addition to Thomsen's presentation cited above (note 3), see *Early Roman Coinage*, II-III (Copenhagen, 1961), for an extensive discussion of the various theses. Compare R. E. Mitchell, "A new chronology for the Romano-Campanian coins," *N.C.*, 6 (1966), 66 ff.; "The fourth century origin of Roman didrachms," *A.N.S., Museum Notes*, 15 (1969), 41 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *N.H.*, pp. 33, 42-47.

<sup>9</sup> Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, I, 19 ff., presents the ancient literary evidence important for the study of early Republican coinage and photographs and complete descriptions of all Roman coins mentioned in this essay.

The theory concerning their fourth-century Campanian origin came under attack in 1924 when Harold Mattingly wrote that metrologically and stylistically the coins ought to be dated closer together. He suggested that four mints issued the coins simultaneously. The horse's head and horse types of the Romano-Campanian coins were interpreted as copies of Punic types and were dated according to the treaty concluded by Rome and Carthage against Pyrrhus.<sup>10</sup> Subsequently, when Mattingly lowered the date for the denarius, he was forced to abandon his original chronology for the Romano-Campanian coins and dated the first four issues to 269 B.C. Thus Mattingly concluded there were no true Romano-Campanian coins.<sup>11</sup>

Early in his career, Mattingly complained that although numismatists were attracted to his position, historians remained unimpressed.<sup>12</sup> By the middle of the century this had changed. However, while only a few numismatists continued to support the traditional chronology, the Mattingly revolution, untouched by traditionalists, was struck a mortal blow from another quarter. Rudi Thomsen's exhaustive and penetrating study of *Early Roman Coinage* came to several conclusions which shook the foundation of the Mattingly edifice and at the same time proved the unacceptable nature of certain traditional interpretations.

Thomsen demonstrated the sequential order of the Romano-Campanian issues. The sequence is clearly shown by the metrology of the coins and is borne out by the hoard evidence.<sup>13</sup> The *ROMANO*-inscribed coins began with the bearded, helmeted Mars/horse's head coin, the heaviest of the group, and proceeded to the lightest, the coin with helmeted Roma/Victory attaching palm to a trophy. The latter was struck on the six scruple standard (about 6½ grammes). The coins with *ROMA* legend followed in sequence, also issued on the six scruple standard, including the early issues of the quadrigatus, the last of the Romano-Campanian coins. That the latter was replaced by the denarius during the Second Punic War, as Thomsen averred, is now clearly demonstrated by the hoard evidence from Morgantina.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> "The Romano-Campanian coinage and the Pyrrhic War," *N.C.*, 4 (1924), 181 ff.

<sup>11</sup> To trace the development of Mattingly's argument, consult "The first age of Roman coinage," *J.R.S.*, 19 (1929), 19 ff.; "'Aes' and 'pecunia,'" *N.C.*, 3 (1943), 21 ff.; "The first age of Roman coinage," *J.R.S.*, 35 (1945), 65 ff.; and *Roman Coins* (London, 1960).

<sup>12</sup> *J.R.S.* (1929), 20.

<sup>13</sup> Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, III, 49 ff.. developed the position already advanced by L. Breglia, *La prima fase della coniazione romano dell'argento* (Roma, 1952).

<sup>14</sup> Thomsen's *Early Roman Coinage*, II, is devoted to establishing the date of the denarius' first appearance. On Morgantina, see T. V. Buttrey, "The Morgantina excavation and the date of the Roman denarius," *Atti, Congresso Internazionale di Numismatica* (Roma, 1961), p. 261 ff.

Also thanks to a Romano-Campanian bronze overstrike of a Syracusan coin, Thomsen demonstrated that the *ROMANO* coins were still issued in the 280's, at a time when the supporters of the traditional chronology assumed the *ROMA* coins were in circulation.<sup>15</sup> Thomsen did not prove, however, that the *ROMANO* coin in question could not be earlier than the 280's, which must remain probable since the coin is one of only two prominent bronze issues, *litra* and half *litra* pieces, issued together with all four *ROMANO* staters.<sup>16</sup>

In his placement and interpretation of the earliest Romano-Campanian coins, Thomsen returned to Mattingly's origin thesis: certain types were Carthaginian inspired and date to the time of Pyrrhus' Italian adventure. Elsewhere I have shown that neither Thomsen's *terminus post quem*, i.e., 300 B.C., for the first Roman issue nor the Punic interpretation of the types is numismatically or historically defensible.<sup>17</sup>

According to Thomsen, the third *ROMANO* coin with youthful Hercules/she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus types was the first silver coin struck at Rome in 269 B.C. The consuls of that year, Q. Ogulnius and C. Fabius, are reflected in the choice of types, since Ogulnius and his brother erected the statue of the she-wolf and twins on the Capitol in 296 B.C. and the Fabii considered Hercules their patron.<sup>18</sup> In fact, there is no reason the coin cannot be as early as 296 B.C. and, indeed, Thomsen's date for the Hercules' coin led him into a most illogical interpretation and date for the last *ROMANO* issue, the Roma/Victory.<sup>19</sup> Because of the similarity between Greek control letters on both the Roma coin and a coin depicting Arsinoe II, the Roma issue has long been associated with the Roman-Egyptian legations of 273-272 B.C. However, Thomsen's unreasonable date for the Hercules didrachm led him to suppose it was struck on an Egyptian standard, a statement that has not a shred of evidence to support it, while the Roma/Victory, which actually bears the physical evidence of the Roman-Egyptian contact, was issued circa 260 B.C. A date near 272 B.C. is more appropriate for the Roma/Victory,

<sup>15</sup> Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, III, 101 ff. Compare Breglia, *La prima fase*, pp. 82 ff., 127; Charles Hersh, "Overstrikes as Evidence for the history of Roman Republican coinage," *N.C.*, 13 (1953), 41, 44 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Mitchell, *Museum Notes* (1969), p. 48 ff.

<sup>17</sup> Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, III, 93 ff. Compare Mitchell, *Museum Notes* (1969), p. 43 ff.

<sup>18</sup> Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, III, 120 ff., is based on the argument advanced by Franz Altheim, "The first Roman silver coinage," *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress* (London, 1936), p. 142 ff.

<sup>19</sup> For a discussion of the evidence and bibliography, see Mitchell, *N.C.* (1966), p. 66 ff., and *Museum Notes* (1969), p. 56 ff.

not only because it attests to Rome's Egyptian embassy, but because it was struck on the six scruple standard. Pyrrhus introduced this standard during his stay at Tarentum, and Rome encountered it no later than her conquest of the city in 272 B.C. Roma and Victory were particularly appropriate types for that year, and there are strong reasons to believe the Roma coin was actually struck at Tarentum.<sup>20</sup>

One can see that directly connected with the problem of a particular coin's date is the historical interpretation of the specific types selected for an issue, which supposedly lend support to the chronological placement of the coin material. I want to concentrate on those coins which by their types and according to modern commentary are associated with the legends concerning Rome's foundation. My primary concern is to show that the historical interpretation of the coin types which justifies locating them in accordance with a lower chronology for Rome's earliest didrachm coinage is neither defensible numismatically nor the most acceptable historically.

The use and abuse of the legend concerning Rome's Trojan origin by senate, noble, and emperor in the last two centuries B.C. are familiar to classical scholars. While specific problems remain unanswered, the general evaluation of the evidence is not much in doubt. On the other hand, the evaluation of the Trojan legend's existence and the identification of its specific features in the "pre-literary" period of Rome's existence are problems which continue to entice and perplex those interested in either the development of Rome's official state policy or in the transmission and alteration of the foundation legend in the literary tradition.

Coins have provided considerable evidence for the elucidation of the final phase of the legend's importance, and Rome's first didrachms have been used as evidence for an earlier period of the legend's development because they are both earlier than the first Roman literature and because some types feature subjects associated with Rome's foundation stories. In this area few scholars have turned numismatics into history's handmaiden as extensively as Andreas Alföldi, albeit with considerable controversy over his interpretations. His work deals with the entire length of Roman history and rarely goes unnoticed, even if his evaluation of the numismatic material and his speculation on its historical importance sometime fail to win support. This is not the case, however, in his Trojan explanation of an early Roman didrachm.<sup>21</sup> His interpretation is supported by no less an

<sup>20</sup> Mattingly, *J.R.S.* (1949), p. 68 ff., argues for Tarentum, but his stylistic arguments are not always convincing.

<sup>21</sup> *Die trojanischen Urachen der Römer*, Rektoratsprogramm der Universität Basel für das Jahr 1956 (Basel, 1957), is the most important of Alföldi's publications for our purpose,

authority than Rudi Thomsen,<sup>22</sup> among others,<sup>23</sup> and for this reason Alföldi's views must be dealt with in detail.

The coin in question is the Roma/Victory didrachm,<sup>24</sup> for which Alföldi has offered a most ingenious interpretation and date. The Phrygian helmet worn by the female on the obverse is the key to his identification. E. J. Haeblerin<sup>25</sup> had suggested the helmet might contain a reference to Rome's Trojan origin, and Alföldi finds in the Trojan slave woman Rhome the probable candidate to convey such a meaning. He states that the so-called Phrygian helmet derives from the Persian tiara and that the motif generally came to serve as a trademark denoting the peoples of Asia Minor, including Trojans. While the motif is employed in exactly this generalized fashion on South Italian fourth century pottery, Alföldi insists that once the motif was borrowed by the Romans the general meaning stopped: "In Rom aber hört diese Unsicherheit auf; da kann es sich einzig und allein um den goldenen Kopfschmuck der trojanischen Urmutter des Römervolkes handeln."<sup>26</sup>

Alföldi is anxious to show that Roman belief in their Trojan ancestry is not simply a Greek invention, prompted by the normal Greek speculation on the origins of non-Greeks, or a late literary invention designed to denigrate the Romans as barbarians or flatter them as descendants of Homeric heroes. While only Greek sources attest to her name, Rhome's essence, not her name, emerged from the native tradition of Rome. Indeed, contends Alföldi, the Romans did not originally look to Aeneas, whom the Etruscans worshipped as their *Stammvater*, but focused on a woman as the source of their ancestry. It was natural, considering the Etruscan domination over Rome, that the *Urmutter* whose immaculate conception would give the twins to Rome, should be considered Trojan—an inheritance from the Trojan-oriented foundation story of the Etruscans which was not Greek in origin. Thus Rome's belief in her *Urmutter* is deeply rooted in Italian pre-history and her Trojan character is as old as

---

but my summary of his views also borrows from the following publications, in particular the last item: "The main aspects," *Essays in Roman Coinage*, p. 63 ff.; "Timaios' Bericht über die Anfänge der Geldprägung in Rom," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Röm. Abt.*, 68 (1961), 64 ff.; and *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor, 1963). I justify drawing from all the aforementioned publications because Alföldi's thesis seems generally consistent, if not always clear. I trust his views are not misrepresented herein.

<sup>22</sup> *Early Roman Coinage*, II, 160 f.

<sup>23</sup> G. Karl Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton, 1969), p. 188 f.

<sup>24</sup> Alföldi, *Troj. Urhnen*, Taf. III.1; Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, III, 133, fig. 38.

<sup>25</sup> "Der Roma-Typus auf den Münzen der römischen Republik," *Corolla Numismatica* (Oxford, 1906), p. 146 f.

<sup>26</sup> *Troj. Urhnen*, p. 8.

the Etruscan hegemony in Latium. That the Romans eventually depicted their Trojan ancestress on a coin issued circa 260 B.C. proves to Alföldi that she had long since become flesh and blood to them.<sup>27</sup>

In support of his views, Alföldi argues that Aristotle's account<sup>28</sup> of the Trojan slave women who burned the ships of their Achaean captors and forced them to settle in Italy is older and preferable to Hellenicus' confused and combined tale which brings Rhome with Aeneas to Italy, after Odysseus, where she fires the boats of her own kinsmen.<sup>29</sup> Alföldi sees in Aristotle's story the original tradition concerning the *Urmutter* and finds it consistent with similar tales accepted from the Greeks by the half barbarian peoples of the West. Alföldi's arguments, as expressed in various works, are not easy to follow or organize coherently since the historical and temporal relationships between various sections and arguments are not always clear. For example, he does not specifically date Aeneas' entry (reentry?) into a position of importance in the Roman foundation story. Apparently he believes that Aeneas became important in the Roman legend as a consequence of the federal center and cult at Lavinium coming under Roman control in 338 B.C. As early as the sixth century, Etruscans introduced Aeneas at Lavinium where he was identified with the divine ancestor of the Latins. After Rome took control, a history of early Roman-Lavinian *foedera* was fabricated to justify Rome's claim to Latin leadership and to support her priority in the Trojan legend of Aeneas.<sup>30</sup>

Naturally, as Rome's power and influence increased, Rhome was cast in a more favorable light. Thus while in Hellenicus (circa 450 B.C.) she is a slave, by the time of Callias (circa 300 B.C.) Rhome has been given a more prestigious pedigree: wife of Latinus and mother of Rhomylos, Rhomos, and Telegonos, who found Rome and name it after their mother.<sup>31</sup> Her genealogy was altered to conform to Rome's increased aspirations—ambitions fully recognized by her Hellenic neighbors. As further proof of her importance, Alföldi refers to the account of Agathocles

<sup>27</sup> *Troj. Urhnen*, p. 9 ff.      <sup>28</sup> Dionys. Hal., 1.72.3-4.

<sup>29</sup> Dionys. Hal., 1.72.2 (= *F.G.H.*, 4 F 84). Alföldi, *Troj. Urhnen*, p. 9 ff., also believes that the story of Rhome was contained in Hieronymus of Cardia and Timaeus, but there is no evidence. For the correct view that Aristotle reports Aeneas came to Italy with and not after Odysseus, see Lionel Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford, 1939), p. 191, n. 1; and the discussion in E. D. Phillips, "Odysseus in Italy," *J.H.S.*, 73 (1953), 57 f. Indispensable for all the problems discussed herein is W. Hoffmann, "Rom und die griechische Welt im vierten Jahrhundert," *Philologus*, Suppl. 27.1 (1934).

<sup>30</sup> *Troj. Urhnen*, pp. 10, 18 f.; compare *Early Rome*, pp. 176 ff., 206 ff., 251 ff., 265 ff., and 391 ff.

<sup>31</sup> Dionys. Hal., 1.72.5 (= *F.G.H.*, 564 F 5a). Compare Fest., 372 L. (= *F.G.H.*, 564 F 5b).

of Cyzicus,<sup>32</sup> who attributed the erection of a temple of *Fides* to Trojan Rhome, an act which resulted in the city bearing her name. Alföldi assumes that a Locrian coin, issued about 274 B.C., featuring a seated female (ΡΩΜΑ) being crowned by another (ΠΙΣΤΙΣ), is clear evidence not only that Rome politically employed *fides* as an ethical concept at this time, but that the coin reflects an earlier, pre-existing tradition concerning Rhome's association with the temple of *Fides*. The Locrians were addressing themselves to the current Roman belief in their Trojan ancestry, centering around Rhome. According to Alföldi ΡΩΜΑ on the coin is not a personification of the city but is a Greek form taken directly from the Latin (Roma).<sup>33</sup>

As Alföldi and countless others recognize, both Timaeus and Lycophron attest to Rome's pretensions in regard to certain preexisting features of the Trojan legend and to Aeneas' importance to the story.<sup>34</sup> Rome had certainly staked her claim prior to the third century. According to Alföldi, around 300 B.C., after the Romans defeated the Samnites and began moving southward into Magna Graecia, the Roman sphere was inundated by Greek culture. Consequently, while a tradition developed which claimed a purely Greek ancestry for the Romans, the question of Rome's Trojan descent became an ambiguous concept. On the one hand, its claimants used it to associate themselves with the Homeric literary tradition and thereby with Greek culture, while on the other hand, despite a tendency to minimize the differences between Greeks and Trojans, the Trojans were viewed by some as barbarians. It was natural in such a climate to find Rome expressing herself on her coins both in terms of her pretensions to Greek culture and her claim to Trojan ancestry.<sup>35</sup> Alföldi maintains that early Roman coin types "speak to the Greeks of Magna Graecia and they use for that purpose allegorical concepts drawn partly from the Greeks themselves."<sup>36</sup> The Romans did this "to show that they

<sup>32</sup> Fest., 328 L. (= *F.G.H.*, 472 F 5).

<sup>33</sup> *Troj. Urahnen*, p. 11 f., and Taf. XI.1

<sup>34</sup> A. Momigliano, "Atene nel III secolo a.C. e la scoperta di Roma nelle storie di Timeo di Tauromenio," *Rivista Storica Italiana*, 71 (1959), 529-556 (= *Terzo Contributo*, I (Roma, 1966), 23-53), has an excellent discussion of the pertinent fragments of Timaeus and Lycophron (for Lycophron, see esp. p. 47. n. 71) and a helpful bibliography (pp. 51 ff.). Alföldi (*Troj. Urahnen*, passim, and *Early Rome*, pp. 125 ff., 171 f., and 248 ff.) draws conclusions about Timaeus' work (and Lycophron's dependence upon him) that cannot be supported by the existing evidence. See also Alföldi, *Mitteilungen, Röm. Abt.* (1961), p. 64 ff.; and the entirely proper criticism of A. Momigliano, "Timeo, Fabio Pittore e il primo censimento di Servio Tullio," *Miscellanea di Studi Alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni* (Torino, 1963), pp. 180-187 (= *Terzo Contributo*, II, 649-656).

<sup>35</sup> *Troj. Urahnen*, p. 27 ff.

<sup>36</sup> "The main aspects," *Essays in Roman Coinage*, p. 65.

belonged to the same sphere of culture as the Greeks."<sup>37</sup> Moreover, Alföldi contends that by the Pyrrhic War, at the latest, Rome was making political use of her claim to Trojan origin. Pyrrhus, however, was chiefly responsible for reversing the process of Trojan-Greek assimilation. He portrayed the Trojans as barbarians and enemies of the Greeks. Alföldi accepts Pausanias' account of Pyrrhus' new Trojan War,<sup>38</sup> finding proof of it in the Pyrrhus-Achilles/Thetis coin struck by Pyrrhus in Magna Graecia.<sup>39</sup> Alföldi correctly points out that, according to Pausanias, Pyrrhus was reacting to Rome's claim to Trojan descent, not putting forth the idea for the first time as Jacques Perret maintains.<sup>40</sup> Rome's Trojan ancestry also was recognized by Sicilians. The Segestans, for example, claimed Trojan descent through Aeneas, and when they defected from the Carthaginian side in 263 B.C., they looked to the Romans as their kin: "sie wussten wohl," says Alföldi, "dass dieses Verfahren den Römern sehr erwünscht war."<sup>41</sup>

The later third century evidence concerning Rome's political use of her supposed Trojan ancestry, as well as the reaction of others to it, is well known and does not effect the focus of this essay.<sup>42</sup> Rather our concern is the Rhome coin which Alföldi asserts supplies us with "das früheste unmittelbare Zeugnis für die politische Verwertung der Trojanerherkunft in der grossen Politik des dritten Jahrhunderts durch den Römerstaat selbst."<sup>43</sup> It was employed "um eine vornehmere Eintrittskarte zum diplomatischen Spiel der Weltpolitik als die Rivalin vorzulegen."<sup>44</sup> The Rhome type obtains its significance from Alföldi's assumption that a "Dido"-type in Phrygian bonnet depicted on a Siculo-Punic coin issued a few years earlier actually served as the prototype for the Roman issue.<sup>45</sup> Rome was answering Dido with Rhome: the confrontation of *Urmütter*. However, by this time, Alföldi asserts, Rhome's name was no longer used and she was now called Ilia or Rhea Silvia.

<sup>37</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>38</sup> Pausanias, I.12.1. Alföldi, *Troj. Urnahmen*, p. 28.

<sup>39</sup> Alföldi, *Troj. Urnahmen*, p. 28 ff., Taf. XII.1; Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, III, p. 137, fig. 39.

<sup>40</sup> Jacques Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome*, 281-231 (Paris, 1942); Alföldi, *Troj. Urnahmen*, p. 14. Despite an untenable thesis, Perret's collection of the literary references is extremely helpful. Both E. J. Bickerman, *Classical Weekly*, 37 (1943), 91-95, and A. Momigliano, *J.R.S.*, 35 (1945), 99-104, have excellent reviews of Perret's work.

<sup>41</sup> *Troj. Urnahmen*, p. 29. Compare Galinsky, *Aeneas*, p. 173, where the initiative is placed with the Romans.

<sup>42</sup> See Alföldi, *Troj. Urnahmen*, p. 29 ff.; and the works cited above (notes 34 and 40) for helpful notes and bibliography. Also, Galinsky, *Aeneas*.

<sup>43</sup> *Troj. Urnahmen*, p. 32.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> *Troj. Urnahmen*, p. 31, Taf. IV.1; John Svoronos and Barclay Head, *The Illustrations of the Historia Numorum* (Chicago, 1968), pl. XXXIV.8.

Romulus already existed as a fixed eponymous founder, and Rhome's identity was consequently fused with the mother of the twins. The fact that a Trojan woman was featured on the *Wappenmünzen* of the Roman Republic shows that by the First Punic War Rhome-Ilia was accepted in the official foundation story of Rome.<sup>46</sup> Alföldi speculates on the origins and possible early date for the meeting of Dido and Aeneas and on the central importance of Sicily in the formation of the Roman-Carthaginian struggle and its romantic parallels, and concludes that regardless of details, precedents and themes at least had been established which the earliest Roman literary figures followed and embellished. In the Dido-Aeneas tale, Naevius was merely giving a romantic poetic form to a conflict already heralded by Timaeus' synchronism of the foundation dates of Rome and Carthage as well as expressed by the coat of arms displayed on a Roman coin issued in direct opposition to the *Wappenmünzen* of Carthage and as a direct attack on the Punic foundation story.<sup>47</sup> Alföldi convincingly argues that such a background "could well inspire poets to embroider further on this theme."<sup>48</sup>

We are not concerned with Alföldi's view that Rhome-Ilia's Trojan character became too much of a liability for Rome to bear, resulting in the Hellenization of the Phrygian-Trojan helmet on Roman denarii, or with his interesting evaluation of the evidence of divine will acting through a female to herald Rome's greatness. He argues that while such alterations and transfigurations obscure the original Trojan *Urmutter* of the Romans, they do not prohibit a reconstruction of the original. In other words, Alföldi assumes that Rhome, a name known only to Greek sources, was recast as Ilia, Rhea Silvia, Roma, and Vesta among others by the Romans when they began to record their own versions of their legendary past.<sup>49</sup>

There are objections to Alföldi's arguments, but chiefly our concern is whether his interpretation and date for the Romano-Campanian didrachm are the most acceptable. His interpretation is based upon a series of inter-related conjectures which focus on Rhome's importance and place in the tradition, on her association with Ilia and their identification with the Roman coin type, and on the Trojan character of the latter, as well as on the Etruscan origin of the Trojan legend and its early importance in Etruria, Lavinium, and Rome. Alföldi also assumes that the "scientist" can

<sup>46</sup> *Troj. Urahnen*, p. 33.

<sup>47</sup> *Troj. Urahnen*, p. 31 ff., *Early Rome*, p. 158 f. Also Galinsky, *Aeneas*, p. 188: "Because it was so closely associated with Sicily, the Trojan legend of Rome took on anti-Carthaginian overtones. This is confirmed by Alföldi's ingenious observation that the Roman state had the head of its Trojan ancestress, Rhome, put on the coins struck during the First Punic War (fig. 131a)."

<sup>48</sup> *Early Rome*, p. 159.

<sup>49</sup> *Troj. Urahnen*, pp. 13, 33 ff.

unravel the perplexing "clouds of mythology" by studiously assessing their historical content.<sup>50</sup> By combining or emending various accounts and relating them to the archaeological evidence he obtains a personally reliable picture of the early development of the Trojan saga. His faith in the reliability of the early Greek tradition about Rome is based upon the belief that the Romans were obedient to their speculations: "Dies geschah allerdings mit einer einzigen, aber bedeutsamen Abweichung: die trojanische Urmutter wurde von den Römern nicht mehr Rhome genannt, da sie in Romulus schon einen festeingewurzelten Namensgeber besaßen, sondern entweder Ilia oder aber Rea Silvia."<sup>51</sup>

Apparently the Romans did borrow considerably from earlier Greek accounts when they began to record their own past in poetry and prose. The Greeks were interested in Rome, particularly it seems in the legendary and regal period more than in the early Republic.<sup>52</sup> They may have added considerable detail and embellishments to the Roman story, sometimes certainly incorporating local names and customs into their accounts. It is also possible that they began very early to see parallels between their own historical development and Rome's.<sup>53</sup> In this way Greek speculation became part of the "official" Roman version which began with Fabius Pictor. Fabius, writing in Greek, not only tried to remedy the situation by presenting Roman development in a more favorable light, but he also doubtless demonstrated his indebtedness to Greek sources and helped to canonize particular features of Rome's past history which were Greek in origin.<sup>54</sup> However, the important question is not whether Romans were influenced by such Greek traditions but whether Trojan Rhome, or rather her essence, played a significant role in the Roman tradition, albeit converted from her original position as *Urmutter* to simply the mother of the twins. Except for his identification and interpretation of the "Rhome" coin, there is no evidence to support Alföldi's position.

Although Rhome is consistently depicted as the eponym of the city, like

<sup>50</sup> *Early Rome*, p. 250 f.      <sup>51</sup> *Troj. Urahenen*, p. 12.

<sup>52</sup> Emilio Gabba, "Considerazioni sulla tradizione letteraria sulle origini della Repubblica," *Fondation Hardt, Entretiens*, 13 (Genève, 1966), 135-169.

<sup>53</sup> R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5* (Oxford, 1965), consult the index (p. 765) for references: "Greek: episodes adapted from Greek mythology and history." Also informative is Hermann Strasburger, "Zur Sage von der Gründung Roms," *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-Hist. Klasse* (1968, 5 Abhandlung), pp. 7-43.

<sup>54</sup> Consult F. W. Walbank, "The historians of Greek Sicily," *Kokalos*, XIV-XV (1968-1969), 476 ff.; A. Momigliano, "Linee per una valutazione di Fabio Pittore," *Rendiconti Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, XV (1960), 310-320 (= *Terzo Contributo*, I, 55-68), and the works cited above (notes 34, 52, and 53).

Ilia she is only a secondary character and neither could play the important role Alföldi assigns them nor could they be depicted as martial figures on coins.<sup>55</sup> Rhome could not have been replaced, even in name, if her position had been as central to the Roman tradition as Alföldi maintains. In fact, when closely examined, the tradition about Rhome is far from consistent in the Greek sources. She is variously depicted as Trojan, Greek, or slave; as the daughter of Italus and Leucaria or of Telephus (Hercules' son); as the wife of Latinus (son of Odysseus and Circe or Hercules), of Ascanius, or of Aeneas; and as the mother of Rhomylos, Rhomos, and Telegonos.<sup>56</sup> Similarly, Rhomos is presented as the son of Rhome, of Odysseus and Circe, of Ascanius, of Emathion, or of Aeneas, and like Rhome as the child of Italus and Leucaria.<sup>57</sup> Clearly there was no stable tradition among the Greeks for the Romans to follow, and the former freely postulated ancestors and genealogies for their invented eponymous founders. Indeed, the Greeks were so unclear about Rhome that she is closely associated with the legends of all three great wandering heroes, Hercules, Odysseus, and Aeneas. Only in the third century in one account alone is she the granddaughter of Aeneas,<sup>58</sup> a position equal to that occupied by Romulus and Remus in Naevius and Ennius.<sup>59</sup> If the Romans recast her as Ilia before 260 B.C. they also had to change her relationship with Aeneas together with her eponymous function. No direct equation between Rhome and Ilia can be made. That a third century Greek presented Rhome as the mother of Rhomylos and Rhomos (and Telegonos) is not proof the Romans had recast her as Ilia. True, Ilia, as the name suggests, may well have been considered the Trojan daughter of Aeneas,<sup>60</sup> but her role in the saga is very insignificant and even at an early time her fall from grace may not have been a feature of the tradition pleasing to the Romans.<sup>61</sup> As a vestige of the Roman *Urmutter*, Rhome would have to replace either Aeneas or Romulus, and this is precisely what Rhome does in the various Greek versions of the saga.

However, the Romulus and Remus legend is demonstrably older than the third century B.C. because a statue of the she-wolf suckling the twins was erected on the Palatine near the Ruminal fig tree in 296 B.C. and a Romano-Campanian coin struck about the same time copied the statue

<sup>55</sup> S. Weinstock, rev. of Alföldi, *Troj. Urahn*, in *J.R.S.*, 49 (1959), 170 f.

<sup>56</sup> The ancient references are collected in C. Joachim Classen, "Zur Herkunft der Sage von Romulus und Remus," *Historia*, 12 (1963), 447 ff.; Strasburger, *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie* (1968), 9 ff.; and Alföldi, *Troj. Urahn*, p. 10 ff.

<sup>57</sup> Consult the note above for references.

<sup>58</sup> Agathocles of Cyzicus, in *Fest.* 328 L. (= *F.G.H.*, 472 F 5a).

<sup>59</sup> Serv., in *Aen.*, I.273.

<sup>60</sup> Compare Serv., in *Aen.*, VI.777.

<sup>61</sup> Compare Strasburger, *Sitzungsberichte Heidelberg* (1968), p. 26 ff.

group for its reverse type.<sup>62</sup> Although the evidence is open to discussion, Romulus may have existed alone half a century or more earlier,<sup>63</sup> and Rhome may have unduly complicated the Roman tradition. For example, Rhome and Rhomos are each presented as the child of Italus and Leucaria<sup>64</sup> and they are obviously female and male versions of the same type of Greek speculation. One could easily claim that Rhome was recast as Rhomos and, since Rhomos may have entered the Roman tradition as Remus, that she was ultimately identified with Remus.<sup>65</sup> Remus was introduced into the Roman story before the statue's existence, and Callias,<sup>66</sup> writing about this time, displays the typical Greek disregard for the local tradition known to his contemporaries Timaeus and Lycophron<sup>67</sup> by combining in the same story eponymous Rhome with her eponymous sons Rhomylos and Rhomos, who found the city and name it after their mother. Like Alcimus and others before him, Callias, apparently incorporated elements of fourth century Roman beliefs, but we can not assume that his story, or any other Greek account, presents a contemporary Roman version of the foundation story unless it can be independently supported by archaeological evidence or inferred from the developed Roman version.

Thus Rhome is not unknown to Roman literature because she became identified with Ilia before the Romans began to develop their own literary tradition. She is unknown because she represents a Greek version of the city's origin and name which was in direct contradiction with the native belief centering around Romulus (and Remus?). As E. J. Bickerman demonstrated, the Greeks did not generally take into consideration local foundation stories when developing their own versions. When they first set forth Rome's foundation legend, they mainly drew "inferences from the name of the city to a person or supposed founder or foundress: Romos

<sup>62</sup> Ludwig Curtius, "Ikonographische Beiträge zum Porträt der römischen Republik und der julisch-claudischen Familie," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Röm. Abt.* (1933), p. 204 f.; Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, III, 119 f.

<sup>63</sup> For the legend's development, see Ogilvie, *Commentary*, pp. 32 ff., 46 ff.; Classen, *Historia* (1963), pp. 47 ff.; and Raymond Bloch, *The Origins of Rome* (London, 1960), p. 47 ff., with pl. 6, which shows a fourth-century bas-relief from Bologna of a wolf suckling a single child.

<sup>64</sup> Plut., *Rom.*, 2.3; Dionys. Hal., I.72.6.

<sup>65</sup> Compare Classen, *Historia* (1963), p. 453 ff., with bibliographical references.

<sup>66</sup> Dionys. Hal., I.72.5 (= *F.G.H.*, 564 F 5a).

<sup>67</sup> See note 34 above. It has always seemed possible that Lycophron obtained his information directly from the Roman legates who visited Egypt in 273 B.C. Q. and N. Fabius as well as Q. Ogulnius had good reason to be well informed about Rome's legendary past and to desire to tell their story to others. I plan to develop this idea in a future publication.

or Roma [Rhome]."<sup>68</sup> The Romulus legend developed locally while Rhome (Rhomos and Rhomanos) remained a characteristically Greek etymological explanation.

For Greeks there was no problem with a story that included Rhome, Rhomylos, and Rhomos, but for Romans, Romulus' existence precluded belief in other eponymous characters, and the mother of the twins could not have been called Rhome. This is certainly the reason Alföldi must transform her into Ilia, but apart from his interpretation of the coin, there is no evidence the Romans adopted Trojan Rhome but changed her name. Yet what of the "Trojan" helmet worn by the female on the Roman coin? There is no reason to separate the motif from the South Italian context in which it originated and from the area where the coin is most frequently found.<sup>69</sup> The ROMANO-inscribed didrachms were all struck in Campania or South Italy, and all bear stylistic, metrological, and typological affinities with the coins of Magna Graecia.<sup>70</sup> Alföldi himself recognizes this<sup>71</sup> but prefers to seek the prototype for the "Rhome" coin in a Carthaginian specimen, not appreciating that it is more reasonable to seek the type's origin both in its nearest numismatic parallels and in territories where the Romans were most active. Both the coins of Velia,<sup>72</sup> which fell to Rome in 293 or 272 B.C.,<sup>73</sup> and those of Tarentum feature helmets which form the closest parallels to the Roman coin in question. Perhaps Cicero's reference to priestesses who came to Rome from Velia contains a clue to the significance of the Roman type,<sup>74</sup> but we know little of the matter. As for Tarentine coins, several depict Taras on the reverse holding a "Phrygian" helmet very like the one found on the Roman coin, but it is impossible to say if the helmet is identified with Tarentum or one of her foes. The helmet occurs on a coin from the Pyrrhic period and could possibly refer to Rome's defeat, but it is also known on earlier specimens as well as featured on the obverse of earlier Tarentine coins

<sup>68</sup> "Origines gentium," *Classical Philology*, 47 (1952), 65 ff., presents a most helpful and balanced discussion of the "historical" methods of the Greeks.

<sup>69</sup> Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, I, 101. M. Thompson, O. Mørkholm, and C. M. Kraay, *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards* (New York, 1973), presents additional hoard evidence. Compare R. E. Mitchell, "Hoard evidence and early Roman coinage," *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica*, 75 (1973), 89 ff.

<sup>70</sup> Mitchell, *Museum Notes* (1969), p. 41 ff.

<sup>71</sup> *Troj. Urahnen*, p. 30 f.; "The main aspects," *Essays in Roman Coinage*, p. 65 ff.

<sup>72</sup> Alföldi, *Troj. Urahnen*, Taf. IV.5; Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, III, 125, fig. 3.

<sup>73</sup> Livy, X.54.9 (293 B.C.). K. J. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1926), p. 430 f., makes Livy's reference an anticipation of Sp. Carvilius' second consulship (272 B.C.).

<sup>74</sup> *Pro Balbo*, pp. 24, 55. Compare H. Le Bonniec, *Le cult de Cérès à Rome* (Paris, 1958), p. 397 ff.

where the helmet is worn by a youthful rider.<sup>75</sup> We can say no more than that the helmet motif was known at Tarentum, but such information is sufficient in light of previously stated arguments that Tarentum was both the mint where the Roman coin was struck and the place where its weight standard was encountered. Considering the close parallel between the Roman and Tarentine (and Velian) coins, the origin of the helmet type should be sought in the context of Roman activities in South Italy and not seen as a reaction to a Punic Dido, whose very existence at such a time is problematic to say the least.<sup>76</sup>

There is no literary or physical evidence that either Dido or Rhome-Ilia figures in Roman diplomatic propaganda about 260 B.C. Rather, the Roman type ought to depict a goddess, and the aforementioned Locrian coin offers better evidence for the Roman coin type's identity. The seated figure (ΡΩΜΑ) on the Locrian coin does not wear a Phrygian helmet or bonnet, and there is no reason to believe she is Rhome instead of the earliest extant depiction of the personification of the city—Roma.<sup>77</sup> Unlike Rhome or Ilia, Roma would certainly be presented in a martial fashion if the occasion demanded. If the helmet she wears on the Romano-Campanian coin has significance, it may well carry a reference to the city's Trojan origin. From Timaeus and Lycophron we have knowledge of certain features of Rome's claim, focusing on Aeneas, Lavinium, and Romulus and Remus, and the evidence is contemporary with or earlier than the Locrian coin. It is reasonable to assume that Agathocles of Cyzicus, or his source, was guilty of combining a Greek etymological explanation for the city's name with a few accurate details of Rome's ethical pretensions which were first voiced in the Roman campaigns in South Italy in the 270's.<sup>78</sup> It is also possible that Agathocles translated

<sup>75</sup> For the Tarentine coins in question, see *S.N.G., A.N.S.*, I, pl. 30, 1106-1111 (= Evans, Period VII), pl. 26, 966-973 (= Evans, Period IV), and pl. 26, 990-993 (= Evans, Period V). Compare Alföldi, *Troj. Urahnen*, Taf. IV.9-11.

<sup>76</sup> Compare A. S. Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), p. 11 ff., who believes that Timaeus did not connect Aeneas with Dido (p. 17), and even on the point of whether it was Naevius or Virgil who first did so says "an agnostic attitude is here the only safe one (p. 21)."

<sup>77</sup> Alföldi, *Troj. Urahnen*, Taf. XI.1. Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, II, 155 ff., discusses the Locrian coin and concludes that the figure is Roma. Yet Thomsen supports Alföldi's argument: "We can not but accept his [Alföldi's] conclusion that the goddess with this head-dress on the early Roman coins must be the ancestress Rhome, or Roma in the Latin form of the name (p. 161)." I do not question that Greeks could have translated Roma into their own Rhome. The problem is Rhome's identification with Ilia and Rhea Silvia and the *Urmutter* propaganda of the First Punic War. Thomsen does not present Alföldi's position accurately.

<sup>78</sup> For Agathocles, see Fest., 328 L. (= *F.G.H.* 472 F 5). See the excellent discussions

Roma into a Trojan ancestress because of etymological speculations he discovered in early Greek authors.

The foundation of Alföldi's belief in the original significance of Rhome is his confidence that he uncovered the Etruscan roots of the Greek tradition concerning the Trojans in Italy. The Etruscans considered Aeneas their *Stammvater*, and the sources which connect him with Rome were referring either to Etruscan Rome or to the Trojanization of the ancestral cult at Lavinium. Etruscan kings repeatedly conquered Rome, Alföldi contends, and Rome's regal hegemony is an annalistic fabrication. The true successor to Alba Longa was not Rome but Lavinium, where in the sixth century Aeneas was introduced by the Etruscans and identified with the divine ancestor of the Latins. Originally Rome would not accept either Etruscan Aeneas or his detour at Lavinium. Trojan Rhome remained Rome's inheritance until Etruria, Latium, and Lavinium were brought under control. Thereafter, Rome began to use the Aeneas legend to gain political acceptance in Latium and Magna Graecia and, by fabricating a history of her own early dominant position, placed herself at the center of the saga.<sup>79</sup> In pressing his argument, Alföldi must amend, combine, and alter accounts to make them conform to his thesis.<sup>80</sup> There is no need to discuss his "historical" reconstruction since sufficiently strong and telling arguments have been leveled against it to discredit it thoroughly.<sup>81</sup> Alföldi's method of ferreting out the Etruscan and Lavinian roots of the early tradition are equally objectionable. For example, Alcimus reports that Aeneas' wife was Tyrrhenia, and by stressing her Etruscan name Alföldi tries to establish the original connection of Aeneas with Etruria, not Rome.<sup>82</sup> True, this may be weak evidence that Alcimus knew an Etruscan name, but the name is not historical evidence that

of Hoffmann, *Philologus*, Suppl. (1934), p. 60 ff.; and Filippo Cassola, *I gruppi politici romani nel III secolo a.C.* (Trieste, 1962), p. 171 ff., esp. p. 175.

<sup>79</sup> This is a short summary of some of Alföldi's main points in *Troj. Urahn* and *Early Rome*.

<sup>80</sup> He accepts the emendation of Aristotle (*Early Rome*, p. 251, n. 3), he combines several versions of the Rhome legend despite their variations (*Troj. Urahn*, p. 10 f.), and he alters the statement of Hesiod (*Troj. Urahn*, p. 24 f., where Hesiod's statement is connected with Alba Longa, and *Early Rome*, p. 188 f., where Alföldi is the one to "confuse the conquerors and the subjugated"). There are too many such Procrustean examples to cite completely.

<sup>81</sup> See A. Momigliano, rev. of A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, in *J.R.S.*, 57 (1967), 211 ff.: "There is a curious similarity between the method Alföldi attributes to Fabius Pictor and the method he himself uses in studying Fabius: 'Fabius was prepared to demonstrate this at any cost'; so is Alföldi. (p. 212)."

<sup>82</sup> Alcimus in Fest., 326 L. (= *F.G.H.*, 560 F 4). Alföldi, *Troj. Urahn*, p. 14 ff.; *Early Rome*, p. 278 ff.

Etruscans controlled Rome in the regal period or that the legend of Aeneas was in origin Etruscan. All the evidence cited by Alföldi can only prove, at the most, that the legend of Aeneas was "something that archaic Rome had in common with Etruria."<sup>83</sup>

Although it is true that Aeneas was popular in Etruria as early as the sixth century,<sup>84</sup> there is no evidence that the Etruscans worshipped him as their *Stammvater* or that he had a cult in Etruria. The evidence Alföldi unearths to prove his thesis admits of more than one explanation. The statues from Veii do not conclusively establish his extraordinary position<sup>85</sup> nor does the large percentage of pottery depicting Aeneas known to have been found in Etruria. G. Karl Galinsky is not surprised by the Etrurian provenience of a large percentage of Aeneas pots; it is what one expects.<sup>86</sup> The pottery depicting Ajax, to take a random sample, shows that the provenience of a slightly higher percentage of them was Etruria.<sup>87</sup> Aeneas' extraordinary position in Etruria remains unproven.

As for Aeneas' importance at Lavinium, his association with the cult of *Indiges* is a secondary development, and the literary and physical evidence employed by Alföldi to date his early arrival there is fourth century or later in date as are the earliest literary references to Lavinium's importance in the Trojan legend.<sup>88</sup> Galinsky forcefully argues that Aeneas' introduction is the consequence of Rome's "political and religious reorganization of the Lavinian cults" which occurred in 338 B.C.<sup>89</sup> Roman control resulted in "the Trojanization of Lavinium's Penates and their identification with Rome's own."<sup>90</sup> Galinsky also asked the crucial question: "Why would the influential Roman historians . . . who did their best to promote Rome's claim to Trojan descent, want to defeat their purpose by suppressing the Lavinian tradition on which this claim was to be based?"<sup>91</sup> In truth, they did not suppress it, anymore than they totally fabricated the importance of regal Rome. Thus even if Aeneas' early acceptance in Italy can be established there is no evidence that Rhome, not Aeneas, was accepted by Rome and, since the focal point of the earliest Greek accounts is Rome, no reason to believe that the various

<sup>83</sup> A. Momigliano, "An interim report on the origins of Rome," *J.R.S.*, 53 (1963), 102.

<sup>84</sup> Alföldi, *Troj. Urahn*, p. 14 ff.; *Early Rome*, p. 278 ff.

<sup>85</sup> See Galinsky, *Aeneas*, p. 122 ff., with bibliographical references.

<sup>86</sup> Alföldi, *Early Rome*, p. 283; compare Galinsky, *Aeneas*, p. 123 ff.

<sup>87</sup> See J. D. Beazley, *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford, 1956). I want to thank my student Richard Saller for this statistical information.

<sup>88</sup> Alföldi, *Troj. Urahn*, p. 19 ff.; *Early Rome*, p. 246 ff.; Galinsky, *Aeneas*, p. 141 ff. Compare A. Drummond, rev. of Galinsky, *Aeneas*, in *J.R.S.*, 62 (1972), 218 ff.

<sup>89</sup> Galinsky, *Aeneas*, p. 160.

<sup>90</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 156.

<sup>91</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 145.

traditions establish Aeneas' priority in Etruria and Lavinium and their dominance over Rome.

While there is no evidence that Aeneas was not accepted very early by the Romans, there is very little proof that he was. The strongest arguments are in favor of considering the earliest tradition about the Trojans in Italy as a Greek fabrication. By the fourth century, however, the Trojan legend was accepted by Romans and combined with the original local, native tradition concerning Alba Longa and Romulus and contaminated by the idea of a Trojan colony at Lavinium led by Aeneas which was modeled on the story of Alba Longa.<sup>92</sup> Subsequent generations worked out the difficulty of Aeneas' association both with Alba and Lavinium and eventually solved the chronological problem of Aeneas' arrival date and Romulus' later foundation of the city by giving Lavinium the lead for thirty years, the Alban kings for three hundred, and Rome for eternity. No evidence or historically acceptable reason exists for placing Rhome in this development or for identifying her with Rhea Silvia and her poetic counterpart Ilia. If Rome accepted the Trojan legend early, Aeneas must not be disassociated from it. If, as seems more reasonable, it is primarily a fourth century development, then both Aeneas and Romulus are part of the story. In either case there is no room for Rhome.<sup>93</sup>

There are many objections to Alföldi's many arguments, but chiefly our concern is whether his interpretation and date for the Romano-Campanian coin are the most acceptable. Much that he has written is admittedly very attractive and helps to solve countless problems, despite creating more, and since we can never be certain of what the Romans believed even when they tell us, for the sake of argument we will assume that his identification of the coin is correct in order to comment directly upon his historical interpretation and date. Rhome cannot be accepted, but a Trojan *Urmutter* is a remote possibility.

If Alföldi's assumption that the so-called Dido-type was the prototype for the Roman coin is correct, his explanation that the latter was issued as anti-Carthaginian propaganda cannot stand. Indeed, S. Weinstock finds

<sup>92</sup> See Bickerman, *Classical Philology* (1952), p. 65 ff.; Classen, *Historia* (1963), 447 ff. (Die ältesten griechischen Berichte erwähnen nur Rhome, die der römischen Tradition fremd ist, p. 452); and Strasburger, *Sitzungsberichte Heidelberg* (1968), p. 7 ff., for bibliographical references and discussion.

<sup>93</sup> Alföldi, *Early Rome*, p. 201: "A broad stream of Etruscan influence inundated the [Roman] state religion as well as private religiosity." This is the most perplexing feature of Alföldi's thesis. If early Rome was greatly indebted to Etruscan, Latin, and, through Etruscan mediation, Greek influences, why is Aeneas not associated with early Rome but the concocted Rhome is? Why is Aeneas prominent later while there is no sign of Rhome.

it incredible that a Punic "Dido" would be used as the prototype for a Roman coin issued as a direct attack on the original.<sup>94</sup> Since Alföldi assumes that the Romans and Carthaginians were on the same side during the Pyrrhic War, a time nearer the emission date of the Punic coin in question, and since he accepts Mattingly's and now Thomsen's argument that the horse's head and horse-types of earlier Romano-Campanian coins were inspired by Punic coin types of Rome's ally in the Pyrrhic War,<sup>95</sup> then it is more reasonable to assume that the "Dido" head also was borrowed from a friendly Carthage rather than to assume the type was directed against Carthage. Indeed, the Pyrrhic War is not only a better time for the possible borrowing of the type, if Alföldi is followed, but as we shall see it offers the best possible historical context in which to place the Roman issue according to the best evidence available.

As Alföldi suggested, Rome began to make political use of the Trojan saga before the Pyrrhic War and, reacting to Rome's claim, Pyrrhus depicted himself on a coin as a descendant of Achilles and set about to wage a new Trojan War against the Trojan colonists. What better occasion for the "Rhome" issue than the Pyrrhic War or, if the Victory reverse type has significance, its successful completion? Rome's Trojan *Urmutter* would be a direct response to Pyrrhus-Achilles and his Trojan War. Add to this the fact that the Roman coin in question was issued on the reduced standard Pyrrhus introduced at Tarentum which quickly spread to other Magna Graecian cities and that the metrological evidence can be seen to support a date in the 270's for the Roman coin's issue. Moreover, as mentioned above,<sup>96</sup> almost all numismatics are agreed that the sequence of Greek letters on the Roman didrachm is associated in some way with a similar sequence found on coins depicting Arsinoe II, sister-spouse of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The embassy Ptolemy sent to Rome and Rome's return legation certainly provided ample evidence to support the Roman coin's 273-272 B.C. date. In addition, the closest parallels to the "Trojan" helmet type are found on Tarentine coins, some issues of which are in metrological agreement with the six scruple Roman coin. In sum, the female in "Trojan" helmet and the Victory attaching palm to a trophy are extremely appropriate subjects for such a date, and the evidence from both the coins metrology and Greek control letters are

<sup>94</sup> Weinstock, *J.R.S.* (1959), p. 171.

<sup>95</sup> *Troj. Urhnen*, p. 31 ff.; "The main aspects," *Essays in Roman Coinage*, p. 67. But Alföldi believes the horse-types have their own Roman significance. He accepts Mattingly's late dating of the earliest didrachms, but not his four mint theory.

<sup>96</sup> See above, 69 f.

in total agreement with the literary evidence and Alföldi's interpretation of the Trojan ancestress of Rome.<sup>97</sup>

*University of Illinois at Urbana*

<sup>97</sup> A final point should be made. If the coin type in question is Rhome-Ilia, why is she not the obverse of the she-wolf and twins coin rather than Hercules? I will address myself to this question in a future publication.