ATHENAEUM

Studi di Letteratura e Storia dell'Antichità

pubblicati sotto gli auspici dell'Università di Pavia

VOLUME NOVANTOTTESIMO

I

2010

Estratto

ANA RODRIGUEZ-MAYORGAS

Romulus, Aeneas and the Cultural Memory of the Roman Republic

AMMINISTRAZIONE DI ATHENÆUM
UNIVERSITÀ - PAVIA

COMO - NEW PRESS EDIZIONI - 2010

ATHENAEUM

Studi Periodici di Letteratura e Storia dell'Antichità

DIRETTORI EMILIO GABBA (onorario)
DARIO MANTOVANI
GIANCARLO MAZZOLI (responsabile)

SEGRETARI DI REDAZIONE FABIO GASTI - DONATELLA ZORODDU

INDICE DEL FASCICOLO I

(*Continua nella 3ª pagina di copertina*)

Note e discussioni

Recensioni

Notizie di pubblicazioni

Norme per i collaboratori

Tutti i contributi, redatti in forma definitiva, debbono essere inviati su file allegando PDF a:
Redazione di Athenaeum, Università, 27100 Pavia - E-mail: athen@unipv.it
I contributi non accettati per la pubblicazione non si restituiscono.
La Rivista dà ai collaboratori gli estratti in formato PDF dei loro contributi.
Per tutte le **norme redazionali** vd. pagina web della Rivista: http://athenaeum.unipv.it
Nella pagina web della Rivista sono consultabili gli **indici generali** e gli **indici dei collaboratori** dal 1958 al 2010.

La Rivista «Athenaeum» ha ottenuto valutazioni di eccellenza fra le pubblicazioni del suo campo da parte delle principali agenzie mondiali di ranking.

• **Arts & Humanities Citation Index** dell'**ISI** (**Institut for Scientific Information**), che la include nel ristretto novero delle pubblicazioni più importanti del settore, sulla base di valutazioni qualitative e quantitative costantemente aggiornate.

• **ERIH** (**European Reference Index For the Humanities**), categoria A
(«High-ranking international publications with a very strong reputation among researchers of the field in different countries, regularly cited all over the world... It is recommended that in category A, only 10 to 25% of the total list should appear; this percentage target will differ from one discipline to another»).

• **MIAR** (**Matriu d'Informació per a l'Avaluació de Revistes**), categoria «Estudios clásicos», con l'indice di diffusione più alto (9,977), insieme ad altre 33 pubblicazioni.

Inoltre «Athenaeum» è presente nei database:
Arts and Humanities Search (AHSearch)
Francis (Institut de l'Information Scientifique et Technique del CNRS)
Modern Language Association Database (MLA)
Scopus – Arts & Humanities

Le quote d'abbonamento per il 2010 sono così fissate:
ITALIA: € 55,00 per i privati; € 90,00 per Enti e Istituzioni
EUROPA: € 120,00 + spese postali
RESTO DEL MONDO: € 150,00 + spese postali.
Gli abbonamenti coprono l'intera annata e si intendono tacitamente rinnovati se non disdetti entro il novembre dell'anno in corso.
I versamenti vanno effettuati sul c/c postale 98017668 intestato a «New Press Edizioni Srl», Via Carso 18/20 - 22100 COMO, o tramite bonifico bancario su CREDITO VALTELLINESE sede di Como, IBAN: IT 40Y 05216 10900 000000008037, BIC: BPCVIT2S, specificando come causale «Rivista Athenaeum rinnovo 2010».

I dattiloscritti per pubblicazione e i libri per recensione devono essere inviati a «Rivista Athenaeum», Università, Strada Nuova 65 - 27100 PAVIA
E-mail: athen@unipv.it

Pagina web della Rivista: http://athenaeum.unipv.it

La Rivista «Athenaeum» è distribuita in tutto il mondo in formato elettronico da ProQuest Information and Learning Company, che rende disponibili i fascicoli dopo 5 anni dalla pubblicazione.
Periodicals Index Online: http://pio.chadwyck.co.uk/marketing/journalLists.jsp?collection=all

ROMULUS, AENEAS AND THE CULTURAL MEMORY OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

Introduction

The account of the origins of Rome transmitted by ancient historians such as Livy or Dionysius of Halicarnassus is a complex story in which native elements are mixed with foreign ones. Aeneas' arrival in Latium after the war of Troy was connected to the old Roman legend of the twins suckled by a she-wolf and to the foundation of the city by one of the brothers. The Trojan hero was linked to Romulus by the Alban dynasty, so that the former became an early ancestor of the Roman people, which contributed to shape a cultural identity related distantly to the Hellenic world through a hero from the side defeated by the Achaeans [1]. Scholars agree to date this event to the fourth c. B.C. and argue political reasons to explain the decision to adopt a Greek mythological character [2].

Nevertheless little attention has been paid to the impact that this adaptation might have had on the cultural memory of the Romans and how Aeneas might have been remembered in Rome has never been thoroughly examined. Therefore, this paper will consider whether the Trojan hero was actually part of the Roman memory since the fourth century. In order to do so, it will be necessary to evaluate the means by which the remembrance of the remote past was performed and updated by the Romans [3]. The contrast between the conspicuous role played by Romulus in this cultural memory and the absence of any evidence concerning Aeneas will question the adoption of the Trojan hero in early Republican times. In that respect, we will suggest the possibility that the account of the Trojan hero could be considered an intellectual discovery made by the Roman writers of the third century B.C., which might have led them partly to elaborate the first Roman histories.

The account of Rome's origins has been a contentious question for a very long time. Since the first historians who left a written version of the story of the foundation and of the monarchy lived five centuries later than the events they sought to record, modern scholarship has emphatically contested the reliability of

---

1 E.S. Gruen, *Cultural and National Identity in Republican Rome*, Ithaca - New York 1992, pp. 50-51.

2 On the date, it has been suggested also the sixth c. B.C. (A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, Ann Arbor 1965, pp. 250-265) and the third c. B.C. (J. Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281-31)*, Paris 1942, pp. 412-424). Vd. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity* cit., pp. 28-29 and A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome. Local Tradition and Imperial Power*, Oxford 2001, pp. 147-148.

3 For a general approach stressing mainly the aristocratic memory, see K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic*, in N. Rosenstein - R. Morstein-Marx (eds.), *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, Oxford 2006, pp. 479-495.

the information transmitted therein [4]. Furthermore, lacking any direct evidence that could support most of the detailed narration, it has been suggested that these early writers had an excellent opportunity to fabricate the past of their country at will. In that sense Alföldi asserted that Fabius Pictor no doubt felt free to establish a new story for his city because he was not forced to follow any former written literary tradition [5]. This approach has been critiqued by scholars such as T. Cornell who, among other arguments, has rightly pointed out that ancient authors wrote for Roman readers who were not wholly devoid of any idea of their own past. He believes that Pictor's fellow citizens must have shared certain beliefs about former times so that he could not have concocted a story totally from scratch without facing strong controversy [6]. To what extent their knowledge resembled what can be called currently «historical facts» is another question that is difficult to ascertain.

Jan Assmann's concept of *cultural memory* illustrates that shared knowledge suggested by Tim Cornell [7]. According to this scholar, ancient state societies were particularly concerned about their remote past because it made them aware of their unity and peculiarity, in a word, of their identity. And, being most of their members illiterate, that past was usually remembered and reenacted by means of rituals and ceremonies that brought them together recurrently every year. As we will see, the Roman case is no exception [8].

---

[4] For a brief account and criticism, see A. Grandazzi, *The Foundation of Rome. Myth and History*, Ithaca-London 1997 [1991], pp. 23-36.

[5] Alföldi, *Early Rome* cit., pp. 169-175.

[6] T.P. Cornell, *The Formation of the Historical Tradition of Early Rome*, in I.S. Moxon - J.D. Smart - A.J. Woodman (eds.), *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, Cambridge 1986, pp. 67-86; *The Value of Literary Tradition Concerning Archaic Rome*, in K.A. Raaflaub (ed.), *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome. New Perspectives on the Conflict of Orders*, Berkeley 1986, pp. 52-76.

[7] J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, München 1992, pp. 34-36; *Collective Memory and Cultural Identity*, «New German Critique» 65 (1995), pp. 125-133 (originally published in J. Assmann - T. Hölscher [eds.], *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, Frankfurt am Main 1988); *Cultural Memory: Script, Recollection and Political Identity in Early Civilizations*, «Historiography East and West» 1/2 (2003), pp. 154-177. Assmann draws on M. Halbwachs' work on collective memory (*Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, Paris 1994 [1925]), which has inspired much of the current research on social memory. Vd. P. Nora, *Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire*, «Representations» 26 (1989), pp. 7-24; P. Connerton, *Cultural Memory*, in Ch. Tilley et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Material Culture*, London 2006, pp. 315-324, and for a review J.K. Olick - J. Robbins, *Social Memory Studies*, «Annual Review of Sociology» 24 (1998), pp. 105-140.

[8] We do not share Uwe Walter's opinion that the concept of *cultural memory* cannot be applied to the Roman case due to the differences between Oriental and Greco-Roman societies. Vd. U. Walter, *Memoria und res publica. Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*, Frankfurt am Main 2004, pp. 18-26.

Romulus, the forebear of the Romans

Romulus and his twin brother Remus are currently thought to be unhistorical figures. Their miraculous birth, adventures and death reported time and again by ancient authors seem clearly to indicate their mythical character. If the Roman tradition on the foundation times kept a kernel of truth, nowadays there is not reliable evidence to separate historical facts from pious fantasy [9]. On the other hand, there is currently little doubt that the twins' legend was an ancient and genuine Roman story on the origins of the city [10]. The extant evidence allows us to assert undoubtedly that this was well established by the end of the fourth century B.C., since Livy (10.23.5) informs us that in 296 B.C. the brothers Ogulnii dedicated as aediles a statue of the infant founders under a she-wolf at the *ficus Ruminalis*, probably in the Palatine. Some years later, in 269/8 B.C., the consuls Q. Ogulnius and C. Fabius Pictor minted a didrachm displaying on the obverse the sculptoric group [11]. The archaeological evidence often presented as related to the origins of Rome have confronted some skepticism. The Capitoline she-wolf, dated in the sixth or fifth c. B.C., is a bronze statue most probably of Etruscan origin that seems to depict the animal that took care of the twins. However, it has also been taken as the symbol of some Italian city. On the other hand, the main figures of the scene engraved in the Praenestine mirror, dated in the second half of the fourth c. B.C., two children suckled by a she-wolf and encircled by a lion, two birds and four human figures, had been recently interpreted as the Lares Praestites by T.P. Wiseman. However, considering the constituents of the foundation legend and the rest of the evidence, both representations in our opinion, can be more easily explained if related

---

9 Few scholars, such as A. Carandini, hold the idea of a historical Romulus (A. Carandini - P. Carafa, *Palatium e Sacra via I*, «Bollettino di Archeologia» 31-33 [2000], pp. 119-133; A. Carandini, *Archeologia del mito. Emozione e ragione fra primitivi e moderni*, Torino 2002, pp. 147-167; *Remo e Romolo. Dai rioni del Quiriti alla città dei Romani (775/730-700/675 a.C.)*, Torino 2006, esp. pp. 35-72 and 445-453; Grandazzi, *The Foundation of Rome* cit., pp. 149-157). For a criticism, see J. Poucet, *La fondation de Rome: croyants et agnostique*, «Latomus» 53 (1994), pp. 95-104; T.P. Wiseman, review of A. Carandini, *La nascita di Roma. Dèi, lari, eroi e uomini all'alba di una civiltà*, «J.R.S.» 90 (2000), pp. 210-212, and P. Fontaine, *Des «ramparts de Romulus» aux murs du Palatin. Du mythe à l'archéologie*, in P.-A. Deproost - A. Meurant (eds.), *Images d'origines. Origines d'une image*, Louvain-la-Neuve 2004, pp. 35-54.

10 T.P. Cornell (*Aeneas and the Twins: the Development of the Roman Foundation Legend*, «P.C.Ph.S.» 21 [1975], pp. 1-32) has aptly refuted Strasburger's (1968) claim that the legend of the twins was a Greek fabrication to discredit the Romans (H. Strasburger, *Zur sage von der Gründung Roms*, Heidelberg 1986).

11 Some scholars have revised Livy's wording to assert that there existed a previous she-wolf statue under which the aediles set up the twin group. Vd. C. Dulière, *Lupa Romana. Recherches d'iconographie et essai d'interpretation*, Bruxelles-Rome 1979, pp. 53-57; J.D. Evans, *The Art of Persuasion. Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*, Ann Arbor 1992, pp. 80-81. On the date of the coinage, see M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* I, Cambridge 1974, no. 20, and *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic*, Berkeley 1985, p. 31.

to the childhood of Romulus and Remus, especially the mirror scene [12]. In any case they would show that the main elements of the legend were old and Italian in origin, as were the very names of the twins [13].

But perhaps there is another fact that should be also valued positively: the recurrence of the same traditional account in the Roman sources. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the Roman historians do not transmit any other native account explaining the existence of their city, which implies that if there was ever an older and alternative story, this was well forgotten by the end of the third century B.C. In fact, the few variations of the story that have come down to us are quite irrelevant. In an effort of rationalization, some authors deemed that the she-wolf, who looked after the children, was actually a prostitute, for these women were called *lupae* in Rome [14]. And perhaps it was this same reasoning which made some of them think that it was not the god Mars, but Rhea's uncle, Amulius, who had raped her [15]. Some other version finally seems to claim that both brothers were granted the ruling power by the shepherds [16]. Nonetheless, all these changes are simply variations on the same story attempting to deal with its apparently disturbing or incomprehensible aspects [17].

It is also significant that none of the Roman historians from Fabius Pictor onwards concedes credibility to the various Greek versions that linked the foundation to eponymous figures such as Rhome (Ῥώμη) or Rhomos (Ῥῶμος), or to the Trojan hero Aeneas, with the striking exception of Sallust who claims the latter to have

---

12 On the she-wolf statue as an Italian civic symbol, see E.J. Bickerman, *Some Reflexions on Early Roman History*, «R.F.I.C.» 97 (1967), pp. 393-408, and Crawford, *Coinage and Money* cit., pp. 403-404. *Contra*, T.P. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome. Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000-264)*, London 1995, pp. 60-61. T.P. Wiseman, who believes in a late fabrication for the figure of Remus, has suggested this new interpretation of the Preanestine mirror (*Remus. A Roman Myth*, Cambridge 1995, pp. 65-71). Although the surrounding figures cannot be recognised certainly, it is still most probable that the children are Romulus and Remus. Vd. R. Adam - D. Briquel, *Le miroir prénestin de l'Antiquario communale de Roma et la légende des jumeaux divins en milieu latin à la fin du IV^e^ siècle av. J.-C.*, «M.E.F.R.A.» 94/1 (1982), pp. 33-65; T.P. Cornell, *La leggenda della nascita di Roma*, in A. Carandini - R. Capelli (eds.), *Roma. Romolo, Remo e la fondazione della città*, Milano 2000, pp. 48-50, esp. 45-57.

13 Vd. C. Ampolo, *Introduzione*, in C. Ampolo - M. Manfredini (eds.), *Le vite di Teseo e di Romolo*, Milano 1988, pp. xxxii-xlii; C. de Simone, *Il nome di Romolo*, in A. Carandini - R. Capella (eds.), *Roma. Romolo, Remo e la fondazione della città*, Milano 2000, pp. 31-33.

14 Valerius Antias F 2 Beck-Walter (= *OGR* 21.1); Plut. *Rom.* 5.1.

15 Licinius Macer F 1 Beck-Walter (= *OGR* 19.5-7).

16 Cassius Hemina F 14 Beck-Walter.

17 Even the «Promathion version» transmitted by Plutarch (*Rom.* 2) does not depart much from the traditional account. S. Mazzarino (*Antiche leggende sulle origini di Roma*, «Stud. Rom.» 8 (1960), pp. 383-392) has suggested that it should be dated in Servius Tullius' monarchy. T.P. Wiseman (*The Beginnings* cit., 57-61) believes it also an old tale. *Contra*, E. Gabba, *Considerazioni sulla tradizione letteraria sulle origini della repubblica*, in O. Reverdin (ed.), *Les origines de la République romaine*, Vandoeuvres/Genève 1967, pp. 135-169, esp. 148 ss.; Cornell, *Aeneas and the Twins* cit., p. 26; Gruen, *Culture and National Identity* cit., p. 40.

founded Rome (*Cat.* 6.1-2) [18]. In the written tradition other Greek heroes are thought to have previously inhabited or visited the place of the prospective city, but they do not seem to have been envisaged as founders of Rome before the twins' legend existed [19]. Institutionally Rome only arises with Romulus. The Arcadian Evander was supposed to have arrived in Latium and established a settlement in the Palatine. He was praised for having brought writing to Italy [20]. Under his rule, Hercules stayed in Rome and found his stock stolen by a local inhabitant called Cacus. After its recovery, he or Evander set up an altar – the Ara Maxima – and organized the cult [21]. According to Strabo, Acilius maintained that Rome was a Greek foundation because this ancient sacrifice to Hercules was a Greek rite [22]. However, this statement has to be qualified. It alludes most probably to Evander's settlement of whom the Greek geographer has been talking immediately before, and above all it does not preclude the later foundation, since in another fragment passed on by Plutarch Acilius connects the race of the naked *Lupercii* with an event involving Romulus and Remus, which occurred before the foundation of the city [23]. Therefore it seems that the reception of alien figures like Hercules or Evander did not modify or replace the native legend of the founders of Rome, but simply contributed to complete and enhance the written account on the origins [24].

---

18 The oldest datable Greek reference, by Helanicus of Lesbos (V c. B.C. *FGrH* 4 F 84), maintained that Aeneas founded Rome and named it after a Trojan woman (see also Kleinias *FGrH* 819 F 1). Rhomos is sometimes presented as her son (Kallias *FGrH* 546 F 5a), as Odysseus and Circe's son (Xenagoras *FGrH* 240 F 29) or as Aeneas' great-grandson (Alkimus *FGrH* 560 F 4). The scholars have tried to date, and trace the filiation of, this perplexing variety of Greek versions. Vd. Perret, *Les origines* cit.; C.J. Classen, *Zur Herkunft der Sage von Romulus and Remus*, «Historia» 12 (1963), pp. 447-457; E. Manni, *La fondazione di Roma secondo Antioco, Alcimo e Callia*, «Kokalos» 9 (1963), pp. 253-269; G.R. Basto, *The Roman Foundation Legend and the Fragments of the Greek Historians*, Ann Arbor 1980; J. Martínez-Pinna, *La fundación de Roma en los fragmentos históricos griegos*, «Revista de Historiografía» 1/1 (2004), pp. 20-37. For an understanding approach, see Cornell, *Aeneas and the Twins* cit., pp. 16-27. Sallust might have followed his master L. Ateius Philologus in making Aeneas the founder of Rome (vd. G. D'Anna, *Il mito di Enea nella documentazione letteraria*, in *L'epos greco in Occidente. Atti del 19 convegno di studi della Magna Grecia*, Taranto 1980, pp. 231-245, esp. 236-237).

19 A. Mastrocinque (*Romolo. La fondazione di Roma tra storia e leggenda*, Padova 1993, pp. 12-22) has argued on the chronological precedence of Hercules over Romulus as cultural hero involved in Rome's foundation. But the earliest evidence of Hercules' theft of Geryon's oxen coming from Etruria and Capua does not fully support that hypothesis.

20 So claimed Fabius Pictor (F 2 Beck-Walter), Cincius Alimentus (F 1 Beck-Walter) and Cn. Gellius (F 2b Beck-Walter).

21 Cassius Hemina F 5 Beck-Walter; Liv. 1.7.4-14; Verg. *Aen.* 8.184-305; Prop. 4.9; Ovid. *Fasti* 1.465-586.

22 Strabo 5.3.3 = F 1 Beck-Walter.

23 Plut. *Rom.* 21.9 = F 3 Beck-Walter. The name recorded in Strabo is actually *Kúlios* but Peter's as well as Chassignet's and Beck-Walter's edition of the Roman historical fragments arguably attributes it to Acilius. Vd. M. Chassignet (ed.), *L'annalistique romaine* I, Paris 2003, p. 94 nt. 2.

24 The statue of Hercules found in a temple of the Forum Boarium (dated to 530 B.C.) might show

This coherence of the Roman sources – striking when compared to the Greek ones – should be considered itself a valid proof of the antiquity of the twins' legend, which might be established tentatively in the late monarchic period (first half of the sixth c.) as has been suggested [25]. However, apart from its antiquity, any inquiry into the cultural memory of the Republican Romans has to be concerned particularly about the nature and significance of this recollection, as well as about the means of transmission.

There is an apparent agreement among the ancient Roman historians that it was Romulus who founded Rome, that is to say, that before him neither Rome nor the Romans existed. And this close relation was evident since the city took its name after the legendary figure [26]. So whether they believed him a mythical or a historical character, he was the only explanation the Romans had for their existence as a political community. It is in this sense that Romulus must be understood as a «civilizing hero», for what later generations thought to be his contribution was not teaching a new technology such as agriculture or any other accomplishment, but establishing the basic institutions that lay the foundations of the state [27]. Thus in the historiographical tradition Romulus is thought to be responsible for some of the oldest traditions such as the *pomerium* (Plut. *Rom.* 11.3.3), the *spolia opima* (Liv. 1.10.5), the patriciate (Liv. 1.8.7), the three tribes (Ramnes, Tities and Luceres), the ten *curiae* (Liv. 1.13.6-8), and some laws (Liv. 1.8.1).

As it is well known, it is very common in oral traditions that the account of the origins of a people or state resulted from a *telescoping process* in which more recent events are carried back to the first times and that an archetypal figure as the personification of an entire epoch accounts for the establishment of a new order [28]. This might well have been the case of Rome. In fact, even though some of the institutions attributed to him could possibly date from an early time like the king's council or the tribes, others are unlikely to precede the end of the sixth century, like the emergence of the patriciate. Finally there are some other facts which are

---

that the Romans knew about his deeds by the mid-sixth century B.C. Nonetheless, it would be hasty to conclude that they already believed in the story of Hercules and Cacus as transmitted by later Roman historians. In fact, the terracotta depicts Hercules accompanied by Athena/Minerva, which does not play any role in Cacus' episode.

25 J.N. Bremmer, *Romulus, Remus and the Foundation of Rome*, in J.N. Bremmer - N.M. Horsfall (eds.), *Roman Myth and Mythography*, London 1987, pp. 25-48, esp. 47-48; Cornell, *La leggenda della nascita* cit., pp. 47-50.

26 Cic. *Rep.* 2.7.12; Liv. 1.7.3; Plut. *Rom.* 2.2.

27 A. Fraschetti (*The Foundation of Rome*, Edinburgh 2005 [2002], pp. 44-45) has pointed out recently that the foundation of the city may indicate a switch from a pastoral community to an agricultural one. However, it is noteworthy that Roman writers never linked Romulus, but previous mythical figures like Saturn, to the introduction of a new economic system (Verg. *Aen.* 3.813-814; *OGR* 3.1-3).

28 Cf. D.P. Henige, *The Chronology of Oral Tradition. Quest for a Chimera*, Oxford 1974, pp. 27-64.

doubtless anachronistic such as the issue of legislation, which takes on an outstanding dimension in the version of Dionysius of Halicarnassus where the first king is represented virtually as the maker of an actual constitution [29]. This lawgiver *topos* as well as the hero-founder one, the *oikistes*, is unmistakably Greek and there is no doubt that Greeks were deeply concerned about the stories on the origin of peoples. Therefore it has been consequently claimed that the literary report on the foundation was greatly influenced by Hellenic ideas [30]. However, it is worthy noting that Romulus' deeds do not account for the whole apparatus of the state in Republican times, but only for some of its oldest elements. As it has been pointed out, contrary to the Greek tradition, the Roman writers envisioned the emergence of the Roman state as a process accomplished throughout generations [31]. Romulus is unmistakably the reason why Rome exists, but he did not establish the city once and for all as its inhabitants knew it in Republican times. Therefore he does not wholly fit into the Greek notion of *ktisis*, which allows us to suspect that his involvement in the foundation, though afterwards adorned by Hellenic features like the legislation, was originally a Roman belief.

For a city-state, as Rome was until the second century B.C., the account on the settlement origin is evidently a key element in the construction of its identity. Consequently accepting the antiquity and importance of the myth it can be easily agreed that the twins' legend held a central place in the cultural memory of the Roman Republic. How did Romans remember and celebrate this past? It has been suggested that the twins' legend might have been remembered by the *carmina convivalia* and the theatrical plays [32]. However, in both cases there is no supporting testimony. The *carmina* were songs intoned at the aristocratic banquets, that disappeared some generations before Cato the Elder (Cic. *Brut.* 19.75). They led Niebuhr to argue the existence of a traditional Roman epic in early time. This *ballad theory* has been convincingly refuted [33]. In fact, the only assumption that can be deduced from the sources is that the attendants to those gatherings sang the deeds of

---

[29] Cf. J. Poucet, *Les origines de Rome. Tradition et Histoire*, Bruxelles 1985, pp. 99-106, 211-217. Dionysius is thought to have drawn his account on Romulus accomplishments from a late Republican political pamphlet, see E. Gabba, *Studi su Dionigi d'Alicarnasso*, I. *La costituzione di Romolo*, «Athenaeum» 38 (1960), pp. 175-225. *Contra* J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *Dionysius on Romulus: a Political Pamphlet?*, «J.R.S.» 61 (1971), pp. 18-27.

[30] Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome* cit., p. 59.

[31] See Cic. *Rep.* 2.1.3; T.J. Cornell aptly infers from this that the Romans knew too much about their history to project the origins of everything back to Romulus (*The Foundation of Rome in the Ancient Literary Tradition*, in H.McK. Blake - T.W. Potter - D. Whitehouse [eds.], *Papers in Italian Archaeology* I, Oxford 1978, pp. 131-140).

[32] Fraschetti, *The Foundation* cit., pp. 6-7.

[33] A. Momigliano, *Perizonius, Niebuhr and the Character of Early Roman Tradition*, «J.R.S.» 47 (1957), pp. 104-114.

distinguished men, which indicates that most likely the *carmina* did not sustain the recollection of the origins, but an aristocratic memory [34].

The theatrical plays of historical theme (*fabulae praetextae*) have also been thought to be a means of remembering [35]. The *theater theory* has stressed not so much the written *praetexta* as the previous theatrical performances (*ludi scaenici*) that took place during certain festivals like the *ludi Romani* and *ludi plebeii* dedicated to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, or the *Liberalia* in honor of Liber. T.P. Wiseman has suggested that on such occasions the Romans recreated their mythological traditions, and the evidence for that is found according to him in the melodramatic flavor of some historical accounts by Dionysius, Livy or Plutarch, beginning with the fable of the twins, that would be based on these performances [36]. Unfortunately, as in the case of the alleged Roman epic, we lack any evidence that could attest the existence of a traditional historical drama performed in those festivals and we should consider as a telling indication of the contrary that even from the third century B.C. the *fabulae praetextae* do not seem to have achieved as much success as the comedies did, given the small amount of titles recorded. Therefore, H. Flower's assertion that the *theater theory*, although tempting, is based more on modern imagination than on ancient evidence, seems quite appropriate [37].

Even though not perhaps to the *ludi scaenici*, the memory of the founder was linked to other festivals that were landmarks in the Roman calendar. There is little doubt that the feasts marked by the official calendar must have borne the memory of past times, since leading characters willing to build up a public image and to be remembered in the future like Caesar or Augustus did not forget to include therein references to their own achievements [38]. The same inference can

---

34 Cic. *Brut.* 19.75 (*de clarorum virorum laudibus*); *Tusc.* 1.2.1 (*de clarorum hominium virtutibus*); Id., 4.2.3 (*clarorum virorum laudes atque virtutes*); Varro *de vita* 2 (*laudes maiorum*); Val. Max. 2.1.10 (*egregia superiorum opera*). It is not clear whether the carmina were passed down unaltered or created impromptu. Vd. E. Peruzzi, *La poesia conviviale di Roma arcaica*, «P.P.» 48 (1993), pp. 332-373. Zorzetti has suggested that these meetings, influenced by the Greek symposia, brought together the members of aristocratic sodalitates (*The* Carmina Convivalia, in O. Murray [ed.], *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford 1990, pp. 289-307; *Poetry and the Ancient City: the Case of Rome*, «C.J.» 86/4 [1991], pp. 311-329).

35 Walter, *Memoria und res publica* cit., pp. 75-83.

36 Vd. T.P. Wiseman, *Roman Legend and Oral Tradition*, «J.R.S.» 79 (1989), pp. 193-220. He considers also that the twins' legend was initially created and transmitted by this means (1995, pp. 129-141). T.J. Cornell (2003, pp. 91-94) has recently supported this theory of historical drama to explain the account on Coriolanus' life (*Coriolanus. Myth, History and Performance*, in D. Braund - C. Gill [eds.], *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome. Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*, Exeter 2003, pp. 73-97).

37 H.I. Flower, *Fabulae Praetextae in Context: When Were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?*, «C.Q.» 45 (1995), pp. 170-190, esp. 188-190.

38 Cf. A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the fasti*, in M. Whitby - P. Hardie - M. Whitby (eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, Bristol 1987, pp. 221-230; R. Laurence - C. Smith, *Ritual, Time and Power in Ancient Rome*, «A.R.P.» 6 (1995-6), pp. 133-151.

be drawn from the following resolution that Cicero conveyed in a letter to Brutus in 43 B.C. (23.8):

> There came that most joyful day of D. Brutus' liberation, which happened also to be his birthday. I proposed that Brutus' name be entered in the Calendar beside that day, following the precedent of our ancestors who paid that compliment to a woman, Larentia, at whose altar in Velabrum you Pontiffs offer sacrifice. In trying to confer that on Brutus I wished the Calendar to contain a permanent record of a most welcome victory (trans. Shackleton Bailey).

The *sempiterna nota* is clearly intended to hold the recollection of Brutus' deed, as the *Laurentalia* celebrated in December 23rd honored and remembered Acca Laurentia up to Cicero's time, a woman of whom Cato claims had bequeathed her land property to the city of Rome [39].

As M. Beard has aptly pointed out, the agricultural character of the Republican calendar does not prevent it from acquiring other meanings, namely, the memory of previous figures or events [40]. In fact, due to the constant adaptability of the festivals, the citizens of Rome could keep up the celebration of feasts whose initial link to the rural life had lost much of its sense for an urban society. She illustrates her point with the example of the *Parilia* celebrated on April 21st. Dedicated to the god Pales it apparently involved a ritual purification of the livestock in which the participants had to make offerings and jump over bonfires. Ovid (*Fasti* 4.721-806), who explains in detail the feast and reminds that it coincides with the anniversary of the city, considers that this ceremony enacted the procedure of the shepherds who abandoned their huts to found Rome. Dionysius (1.88) provides that same information as a historical fact and asserts that in the *Parilia* the Romans of his day still celebrate the date when Romulus founded Rome, which can be found likewise in Plutarch (*Rom.* 12.1-2). That in late Republican times this date was already accepted as the anniversary of the city, can be easily confirmed on diverse evidence other than Dionysius'. Not only both Cicero and Varro claim that Rome was founded in the *Parilia* but also the *Fasti Antiates maiores*, the only pre-Julian calendar preserved, has the entry *Roma cond*(*ita*) recorded for that day [41].

---

[39] Cato *Orig.* 1, F 23 Chassignet. D. Feeney holds that before Caesar no individual was honoured by a calendrical feast (D. Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar. Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, Berkeley 2007, p. 189). Therefore, Cicero would be artfully presenting this precedent to avoid naming the dictator. Plutarch (*Rom.* 4-5) transmits two versions on Acca Larentia that made her Faustulus' wife and a prostitute of Hercules' temple.

[40] M. Beard, *A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday*, «P.C.Ph.S.» 213 (1987), pp. 1-15; *Rituel, texte, temps: les Parilia romains*, in A.-M. Blondeau - K. Schipper (eds.), *Essais sur le rituel* I, Louvain-Paris 1988, pp. 15-29.

[41] Cic. *Div.* 2.47.98: *L. quidem Tarutius Firmanus... urbis etiam nostrae natalem diem repetebat ab iis Parilibus, quibus eam a Romulo conditam accepimus*; Varro *Rust.* 2.1.9: *Non ipsos* [*Romulum et Remum*] *quoque*

Dionysius suggests, and Plutarch claims, that the *Parilia* was originally a pastoral festival that existed before the foundation. This might be true, but to establish when and why this pageant was linked to the beginning of the city can only be hypothetical [42]. It might have occurred the moment the twins' legend was linked to the origin of the city. It clearly involved the reinterpretation of some elements of the ritual like the bonfires that ended up being reliable facts in the work of a historian such as Dionysius. It seems reasonable to think that the meaning of such a pastoral ritual must have been reshaped before Rome's population ceased being mainly a rural community, otherwise it would have disappeared and would not have been kept up to imperial times.

Besides the *Parilia*, the *Lupercalia* in February 15th is the Roman festival in which the remote past of Rome is more clearly involved. This feast has been thoroughly studied [43]. The central element of the ritual is the famous race of the *luperci*, who after slaughtering goats removed their skins and used them as strips to strike all whom they meet in their way [44]. The nude racers started in the *Lupercal*, a cave located on the southeast Palatine, and most probably covered a circular path around the hill [45]. Those young men who performed the ritual stemmed from aristocratic families and were part of two *sodalitates*, the *Fabiani* and the *Quinctilii*. This festival has prompted several interpretations which do not have to preclude each other [46]: it has been regarded as a ritual purification of the city, carried out by *luperci*, whom some scholars identify with he-goats and others with wolves; it has been argued too that those youngsters fulfilled an initiatory rite that took them out of the community to live for some time in the wild: and finally it was also a fertility rite, since the women flogged by the *luperci* were thought to improve their chances to give birth [47].

But what is of more importance for us is that the *luperci* were considered to perform the lives of Romulus and Remus as shepherds. Some features of the festival

---

fuisse pastores obtinebit, quod Parilibus potissimum condidere urbem? Vd. A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae*, XIII. *Fasti et Elogia*, fasc. II. *Fasti anni numani et iuliani*, Roma 1963, p. 9.

42 A. Carandini thinks that those festivals recorded in all the surviving calendars and written in capital letters belonged to the primitive one of 10 months, instituted by the first kings, in which the *Parilia* in April 21st would mark the beginning of the year (*Della fondazione di Roma. Considerazioni di un archeologo*, in A. Carandini - R. Capella [eds.], *Roma. Romolo, Remo e la fondazione della città*, Milano 2000, pp. 9-11).

43 Vd. D.P. Harmon, *The Public Festivals of Rome*, in *ANRW* II.16.2, Berlin - New York 1978, pp. 1440-1468; Ch. Ulf, *Das römische Lupercalienfest: ein Modellfall für Methodenproblem in der Altertumswissenschaft*, Darmstadt 1982; P.M.W. Tennant, *The Lupercalia and the Romulus and Remus Legend*, «A.Cl.» 31 (1988), pp. 86-87; Fraschetti, *The Foundation of Rome* cit., pp. 15-17.

44 Plut. *Rom.* 21.5; Ovid. *Fasti* 2.359-452; Val. Max. 2.2.9

45 Plut. *Rom.* 21.3; Varro *Ling.* 6.34. For Varro's testimony see Wiseman, *Remus* cit., pp. 81-82, and A. Kirsopp-Michaels, *The Topography and Interpretation of the Lupercalia*, «T.A.Ph.A.» 84 (1953), pp. 35-59.

46 As A. Mastrocinque has pointed out recently (*Romolo* cit., pp. 139-145).

47 This last sense of the festival has been suggested to be late. T.P. Wiseman dates it in the late third century B.C. (*Remus* cit., p. 84).

itself point clearly to this connection. There seems to be an apparent semantic relation between the participants (*luperci*), the place (*Lupercal*), where Romulus and Remus were found, and the feast (*Lupercalia*) which link them to the character that plays a major role in the survival of the twins, the *lupa*[48]. In addition, the Roman authors gave an explanation to this feast that always involves the twins' life prior to the foundation of the city. Gaius Acilius, historian of the mid-second century B.C., asserted that the *luperci* ran naked because Romulus and Remus once lost their flocks and ran nude to avoid sweating (Plut. *Rom.* 21.7). Ovid agrees with him, though specifying that the beasts had been stolen. Other alternative versions were also brought forward. Thus an unknown poet called Butas, quoted by Plutarch (*Rom.* 21.6), held that the festival enacted the joyful race of the twins up to the *Lupercal* after defeating Amulius, whereas Valerius Maximus (2.3.9a) prefers to picture the scene after obtaining from their grandfather Numitor the permission to found a new city. Despite these minor divergences, which might be showing the writers' creativity or erudition, there remains in all the accounts a strong relationship between the festival and the twins, which allows us to argue that the *Lupercalia* was the annual feast that reminded the Romans of the old times when Romulus and Remus lived among shepherds in a wild and rural environment[49]. Unfortunately apart from the *luperci's* sacrifice and race, very little is known about the celebration that took place in the *Lupercalia*. Is it on that occasion when the Romans sang those traditional hymns stressing the superior look of the twins that betrayed their royal and divine origin[50]? Since Dionysius only let us know of their existence incidentally, it's impossible to ascertain, though most probably the occasion was a public one. In any case these hymns evince that the legend of Romulus and Remus was an overriding constituent of the Republican cultural memory, which was celebrated and enacted by the Romans in public gatherings.

The presence of the twins in the life of the city is attested also by *mnemotopoi*, i.e. by the landmarks in the urban landscape that the Romans connected to the

---

48 Varro *Ling.* 5.85; 6.16; Ovid. *Fasti* 2.381-382.

49 In all these accounts, the tradition of the *Lupercalia* is set by the twins (see also *OGR* 22). However, in another version held by Aelius Tubero, historian of the mid-first c. B.C., and followed by Livy (1.5), Romulus and Remus were celebrating this feast, established by Evander, when the latter was ambushed by cowherds and brought to Alba (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.80.1-2). For T.P. Wiseman this is a clear indication of the priority of Evander's story (*Remus* cit., p. 88). It might also showcase, on the contrary, how the fabulous legend was rationalized and set in a Greek historical context in the late Republic. Dionysius' account allows to think so, since after presenting Fabius Pictor's version, he states that other authors not considering fiction suitable for historical accounts assert that the twins were not exposed but given in to Faustulus, an Arcadian who descended from those who arrived with Evander, that his wife took care of then and was called *lupa* because of her past as a prostitute and that the boys were sent to Gabii to learn letters, music and the use of Greek arms (*Ant. Rom.* 1.84.1-6). Tubero's version clearly shares this same perspective.

50 Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.79.10.

story of their remote past [51]. The *Lupercal*, as we have seen, is one of them. It was supposed to be a place frequented by the she-wolf, and it was still visible in the late Republic [52]. Its importance as a public monument is undeniable, since Augustus undertook its restoration (*R.G.* 4.2). Not far from there in the Cermalus there was another landmark still standing, the *ficus Ruminalis*, a fig-tree under which the she-wolf suckled the twins [53]. Another tree was also linked to Romulus again at the descent from the Palatine into the Circus Maximus. There was a cornel-tree that had grown out of the cornel-wood shaft of a spear hurled by Romulus from the Aventine to try his strength. Surrounded by a wall it stood there until Caesar's times. Even though Plutarch (*Rom.* 20.5) is the only one to report the fact, there is no reason to call it into question. Finally, there was another trace of Romulus in the Palatine, the *casa Romuli*, a primitive house, thought to be the abode of the founder that underwent restoration by special attendants [54]. We argue that all these spots acted as *mnemotopoi*. Not only do they show that in Republican times the twins' legend was embedded in the Roman cultural memory, but also facilitated and embodied this memory, that before the end of the third century B.C. did not have any other medium of transmission except the oral communication, the material environment and the ritual.

Aeneas' arrival in Rome

The other national hero who shares with Romulus the status of ancestor of the Romans is Aeneas and it is in this capacity that he appears in Virgil's *Aeneid*. But this Trojan hero has a quite different background and his introduction in the Roman cultural sphere is still an elusive question. Initially he played a minor role on the Trojan side and he was thought to have ruled over the survivors after the war

---

51 I borrow the term *mnemotopos* from J. Assmann (*Das kulturelle Gedächtnis* cit., pp. 33-34). C. Edwards (*Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*, Cambridge 1996, p. 30) has pointed out as well that in the Republic the urban landscape was Rome's chief historical text, functioning topography as a substitute for literary narrative. Vd. also Walter, *Memoria und res publica* cit., pp. 155-179.

52 Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 79.8.

53 Liv. 1.4.5; Ovid. *Fasti* 2.411; Plut. *Rom.* 4.1. Afterwards Tacitus (*Ann.* 13.58) and Pliny (*H.N.* 15.77) located the *ficus Ruminalis* in the Comitum and the latter reports that it was transferred to this new place by the augural powers of Attus Navius in times of the last Tarquinius. Vd. E.J. DeRose, *The Sacred Figs of Rome*, «Latomus» 50/4 (1991), pp. 798-808.

54 Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.79.11; Varro *Ling.* 5.54.1. In Augustan times another house of Romulus was found in the Capitoline (Vitr. 2.1.6; Sen. *Contr.* 2.1.4). Vd. A. Balland, *La casa romuli au Palatin et au Capitole*, «R.E.L.» 62 (1984), pp. 57-80; Edwards, *Writing Rome* cit., pp. 33-42; Walter, *Memoria und res publica* cit., pp. 179-183. The remains of Romulus' house in the Palatine have been tentatively identified archaeologically. Vd. P. Pensabene, *L'area sud-ovest del Palatino*, in M. Cristofani (ed.), *La grande Roma dei Tarquini*, Roma 1990, pp. 86-90; Mastrocinque, *Romolo* cit., pp. 93-96.

(*Iliad* 20.306-308). Nevertheless at some point the Greek authors started to refer to his voyage to the western Mediterranean and they finally made him arrive in Latium and found Rome [55]. Given the important commercial relationships with the Greeks since the eighth c. B.C., the Italians might have had some early knowledge of the Trojan hero. In fact, it is attested that the Etruscans did, since Aeneas is depicted, carrying his father Anchises, by the end of the sixth c. B.C. in black- and red-figure vases of Etruscan provenance and in terracotta statuettes from Veii. It can be assumed from this evidence that the Etruscans knew about Aeneas' departure and wanderings, though which version of the story they handled and how they integrated it into their cultural background is far from being apprehensible [56]. It has been also much debated whether he was worshipped as a hero founder in Veii, without reaching any positive conclusion [57]. Be that as it may, this phenomenon was restricted to Etruria and there is no archaeological trace whatsoever pointing to a Roman acceptance of or acquaintance with Aeneas' legend.

Considering the links that Roman authors established between Aeneas and Lavinium, most scholars have thought this city to be the original place where the Trojan legend would have been first adopted by local inhabitants and later borrowed by the Romans. Some archaeological discoveries have even prompted the assumption

---

55 This version held by Hellanicus of Lesbos and Damastes of Sigeum in the fifth century (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.72.2) has been found inconsistent with other fragments of Hellanicus regarding Aeneas. Vd. Perret, *Les origins* cit., pp. 367-78; N.M. Horsfall, *Some Problems in the Aeneas Legend*, «C.Q.» 29 (1979), pp. 372-390. It has been also discarded by E. Gruen (*Cultural and National Identity* cit., pp. 17-19). Other scholars, however, find it reliable. Vd. G. Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium. A propos des découvertes archéologiques récentes*, Bruxelles 1981, pp. 53-55; C. Ampolo, *Enea ed Ulisse nel Lazio da Ellanico a Festo*, «P.P.» 47 (1992), pp. 321-342. It is even more dubious that the reference to Aeneas' journey to the West in the *Tabula Iliaca* is a faithfull extract from Stesichorus' *Ilioupersis* (sixth c. B.C.). Vd. Perret, *Les origins* cit., pp. 306-309; N.M. Horsfall, *Stesichorus at Bovillae?*, «J.H.S.» 99 (1979), pp. 26-48; A. Momigliano, *How to Reconcile Greeks and Romans*, in *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Roma 1984, pp. 437-462, esp. 444; Gruen, *Cultural and National Identity* cit., pp. 13-14.

56 Could he have played the same role that I. Malkin (*The Returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity*, Berkeley 1998, pp. 156-176) assigned to Odysseus as a cultural mediator between Greek colonists and traders and Etruscans?

57 The theory was defended by A. Alföldi (*Die trojanischen Urahnen der Römer*, Roma 1957, pp. 278-287; *Early Rome* cit., p. 14-19) and G.K. Galinsky (*Aeneas, Sicily and Rome*, Princeton 1969, pp. 122-137) but it has been afterwards discarded. Vd. Perret, *Les origines* cit., pp. 41-43; T.J. Cornell, *Aeneas' Arrival in Italy*, «L.C.M.» 2/4 (1977), pp. 77-83, esp. 78; J. Poucet, *Le Latium protohistorique et archaïque à la lumière des découvertes archéologiques récentes*, «A.C.» 48 (1979), pp. 177-220, esp. 178-181; *La diffusion de la légende d'Énée en Italie centrale et ses rapports avec celle des Romulus*, «L.E.C.» 57 (1989), pp. 227-254, esp. 228-231; F. Castagnoli, *La leggenda di Enea nel Lazio*, «Stud. Rom.» 30 (1982), pp. 3-6; Gruen, *Cultural and National Identity* cit., p. 22). Besides, M. Torelli (*Statuetta votiva raffigurante Enea ed Anchise*, in *Roma medio-repubblicana. Aspetti culturali di Roma e del Lazio nei secoli IV e III a.C.*, Roma 1977, pp. 335-336) has dated the statuettes from Veii two centuries later, i.e. in the fourth c. B.C. and believes them to be a product of Roman influence after the conquest of the city.

that Aeneas was venerated as founder by the Lavinians at least since the fourth c. B.C. The more remarkable one is a burial mound dating from the seventh c. B.C., monumentalized in the fourth c. B.C., that has been identified as the heroon of Aeneas described and located in the city by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.64.5) [58]. This same century seems to provide a suitable context for the Roman adoption of the Trojan legend: the end of the Latin war (338 B.C) and the renewal of the *foedus* with Lavinium (340 B.C.). In this scenario Aeneas would have acted as the symbolic figure uniting all the Latins, but above all as the prestigious Greek ancestor that would have buttressed Rome's image in Italy [59]. However, the identification of the *tumulus* raises a twofold problem: on the one hand, it is not situated by a stream as Dionysius specifies, this being a detail of importance, since the burial was set up where Aeneas was supposed to have disappeared while fighting by the river. On the other hand, the inscription he reports does not actually mention Aeneas but Πατρὸς θεοῦ χθονίου. This designation is probably the Greek rendering of *Pater Indiges* or *Juppiter Indiges*, the two epithets that Aeneas received when he was identified with a previous local divinity [60]. Nevertheless, as it has been stressed, the fact that the inscription does not show this identification allows us to infer that it was not probably recognized officially in the first c. B.C., at least at Lavinium [61].

Thus, in our opinion, the archeological evidence found in this city does not really support the hypothesis of an ancient cult of Aeneas in which the Romans would have participated. Moreover, although it is widely accepted that since the fourth c. B.C. the newly elected Roman magistrates traveled to Lavinium to fulfill a sacrifice in honor of the Trojan ancestor, the sources surprisingly refer to the Penates alone as recipients of such a performance (Asc. *Scau.* 18-19) or together with the goddess Vesta (Serv. *ad Aen.* 2.296; Macrob. 3.4.11), but Aeneas – or Indiges – is never mentioned except for a fourth/fifth-century A.D. commentarist of the *Aeneid*, who, on the contrary, claims that the consuls along with the pontiffs sacrificed

---

58 On the *heroon*, vd. P. Sommella, *Heroon di Enea a Lavinium. Recenti scavi a Pratica di Mare*, «R.P.A.A.» 44 (1971-2), pp. 47-74; *Das Heroon des Aeneas und die Topographie des antiken Lavinium*, «Gymnasium» 8 (1974), pp. 273-297. Other evidence is an inscription found at Tor Tignosa (Lavinium), that was thought to be a dedication to Aeneas as Lar, i.e. as ancestor of the Latin people. Vd. M. Guarducci, *Cippo latino arcaico con dedica ad Enea*, «B.C.A.R.» 76 (1956-8), pp. 3-45, esp. 3-7; *Enea e Vesta*, «M.D.A.I.(R.)» 78/2 (1971), pp. 73-118, esp. 73-83. However, the text, initially read as *Lare Aineia d(ono)*, is mostly illegible beyond the first word and has been read quite differently. Vd. H.-G. Kolbe, *Lare Ainia?*, «M.D.A.I.(R.)» 77 (1970), pp. 1-9; Cornell, *Aeneas' Arrival* cit., pp. 78-79.

59 F. Castagnoli, *Lavinium* I, Roma 1972, pp. 96-100; G.K. Galinsky, *The Tomb of Aeneas at Lavinium*, «Vergilius» 20 (1974), pp. 2-11; Dury-Moyers, *Énée* cit., pp. 175-179.

60 Varro *Ant. Rer. Div.* 214; Liv. 1.2.5; Verg. *Aen.* 12.794-5; *OGR* 14.4.

61 Cornell, *Aeneas' Arrival* cit., pp. 79-81; J. Poucet, *Un culte d'Énée dans la région lavinate au quatrième siècle avant Jésus-Christ?*, in H. Zehnacker - G. Hentz (eds.), *Hommages à Robert Schilling*, Paris 1983, pp. 190-197.

at the temple of Aeneas Indiges – and do not refer to the other two [62]. In addition, two testimonies show Roman magistrates performing a ritual in Lavinium in the second c. B.C. that must have been already an old tradition at that time [63]. The ceremony targeted the Penates, but again it remains doubtful whether it implied the cult of Aeneas in Republican times or even in Imperial times.

This ceremony performed at Lavinium might have had a connection with the treaty between Rome and this city (Liv. 8.11.15). An inscription of the time of the emperor Claudius, which explicitly refers to this *foedus*, shows a *pater patratus*, head of the fetiales' college as the representative in charge of ceremonies that took place in Lavinium. The epigraph, set up in Pompeii, explicitly states that Romans and Latins have a common origin, which is celebrated (*colo*) in Lavinium, and it has been suggested that it involved the cult of the Penates [64]. It seems that the sacrifice performed by the newly elected magistrates and the priesthood attested in the imperial inscription are two different ceremonies celebrated in Lavinium by Roman representatives. But in both cases the relationship with Aeneas remains unproven [65]. We consider that the lack of any reference to his cult even in Augustan literature, where he plays a mayor role as model for the new Caesar, is utterly inexplicable if this worship is to be accepted. On the contrary it is our contention that there might have not been actually such a cult in Lavinium, a city that, as the archaeological survey indicates, was mostly abandoned by the end of the Republic and did not regain vitality until the second c. A.D. [66].

Even dismissing the possibility of a cult of Aeneas, for some scholars there is some indication that in the third c. B.C. the Latins venerated the Trojan hero. The key text in this regard is a fragment of Timaeus quoted by Dionysius, who claims that

---

62 Sch. Veron. *ad Aen.* 1.259: *Aeneae Indigeti (Ascanius) templum dicavit, ad quod pontifices quotannis cum consulibus (ire solent sacrificaturi)*. See *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* IV, pp. 710-711.

63 Asconius (*Scau.* 18-19), the first-century A.D. commentarist of Cicero's speech *Pro Scauro* – for a trial that took place in 104 B.C. – reports that Scaurus was accused of having neglected the sacred ceremonies in honor of the Penates of the Roman people at Lavinium in his capacity as tribune of the plebs. Valerius Maximus (1.6.7) informs that the sacred chicken escaped from their enclosure in Lavinium and got lost when C. Hostilius Mancinus was about to carry out a sacrifice as consul in 137 B.C.

64 CIL X, 797; ILS II, 5004: *Sp. Turranius... pater patratus populi Laurentis foederis ex libris Sibullinis percutiendi cum p(opulo) R(omano); sacrorum principiorum p(opuli) R(omani) Quirit(ium) nominisque Latini, quai apud Laurentis coluntur...* A. Alföldi (*Die trojanischen* cit., p. 21) is probably right in reading *sacra principiorum*, «die Kulte der Uranfänge», instead of «the sacred beginnings» as D.C. Braund did (*Augustus to Nero: a Source Book on Roman History*, London-Sydney 1985, pp. 152-153). Vd. also Alföldi, *Early Rome* cit., pp. 260-265; Castagnoli, *La leggenda di Enea* cit., p. 12.

65 M. Beard - J. North - S. Price (*Religions of Rome* I, Cambridge 1998, pp. 323-324) even consider the religious practice in Lavinium attested in the inscription to be almost certainly an *invented* tradition in the second c. A.D.

66 Vd. Castagnoli, *Lavinium* cit., pp. 38-39; C.F. Giuliani, *Lavinium*, in *Enea nel Lazio. Archeologia e mito*, Roma 1981, pp. 162-166.

> concerning their figure and appearance (of the Penates), Timaeus, the historian, makes the statement that the holy objects preserved in the sanctuary at Lavinium are iron and bronze caducei and a Trojan earthenware vessel; this, he says, he himself learned from the inhabitants (trans. E. Cary) [67].

The passage is greatly confusing, non the least because of the still incomprehensible relationship between the caducei and the Trojan legend. Considering the wording, it cannot be inferred that the Sicilian historian actually presented those sacred objects as the Penates – that is Dionysius' deduction. This identification, in fact, would contradict the Roman tradition that envisages these divinities with human form [68]. Therefore, assessing whether the Lavinians thought the *iera* came from Troy or Timaeus infers so and what they told exactly about these objects are frankly elusive questions. Did the Lavinians already believe Aeneas to have founded their city as Roman authors would afterwards insist or just to have visited it? This fragment does not help to reach any certain conclusion to this question. The Hellenistic historian is generally assumed to have been well-informed on Italian matters and even to have collected personally the information in place [69]. Nevertheless it cannot be overlooked that sometimes he was misled in his interpretation, for instance about the horse sacrifice at Campus Martius during the *october equus*. He accepts that the Romans performed this ritual in order to commemorate the fall of Troy caused by the wooden horse, far-fetched reading that Polybius (12.14b-c) completely rejects, and no other evidence from Republican times supports [70]. This misinformation should make us consider the possibility that Timaeus'

---

[67] *Ant. Rom.* 1.67.4: σχήματος δὲ καὶ μορφῆς αὐτῶν πέρι Τίμαιος μὲν ὁ συγγραφεὺς ὧδε ἀποφαίνεται· κηρύκια σιδηρᾶ καὶ χαλκᾶ καὶ κέραμον Τρωικὸν εἶναι τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἀδύτοις τοῖς ἐν Λαουϊνίῳ κείμενα ἱερά, πυθέσθαι δὲ αὐτὸς ταῦτα παρὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων.

[68] Besides, his contemporary Lycophron in the *Alexandra* (1262) has Aeneas building a temple for the *images* of the ancestors' gods (πατρῷ' ἀγάλματα θεῶν) and Dionysius himself designates them as ἕδη (statues). The Roman Penates are gods and depicted sometimes as young warriors, which facilitated that they were confused with the Dioscuri. Vd. A. Duboudieu, *Les origines et le développement du culte des Pénates à Rome*, Roma 1989, pp. 430-439). D'Anna (*Problema di letteratura latina arcaica*, Roma 1976, pp. 68-71) has proposed to see the sacred objects as cult artifacts, rather than as the Penates, which would have been hidden from the public's sight. Could Timaeus have thought of an offering made by the Trojans to the temple in Lavinium like the bronze vessels that they are supposed to have deposited in Dodona and in a temple of June in Apulia (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.51.1; 3)? This has been also suggested by J. Perret (*Les origines* cit., p. 341). For a thorough discussion, see Dubourdieu, *Les origines* cit., pp. 264-285.

[69] A. Momigliano, *Atene nel III secolo a.C. e la scoperta di Roma nelle storie di Timeo di Tauromenio*, «R.S.I.» 71 (1959), pp. 529-556, esp. 532-556. On Timaeus' methodology, vd. R. Vattuone, *Sapienza d'Occidente. Il pensiero storico di Timeo di Tauromenio*, Bologna 1991, pp. 19-62.

[70] However, it is noteworthy that Festus in the 2nd c. A.D. depicting the festival comments that some people say that the horse is dedicated to the war god, Mars, in place of a victim, not as the common people think, because it was being punished, since the Romans originated in Troy and the Trojans were defeated by the likeness of a horse (190 L). Therefore in Imperial times the learned remark has become widespread belief,

fragments only attest his certainty that Aeneas had arrived in Italy and that in order to prove the point he privileges this view in the rendering of native customs, rather than the actual perspective of the local inhabitants to this regard.

What does it inform us about how the Romans remembered their Trojan ancestry? In fact, very little. It is generally assumed that the legend of Aeneas was well established among the Romans by the third century B.C. Certainly they might have known about it – which one of the many circulating versions is impossible to ascertain – and those who represented them abroad resorted to it in the second c. B.C. to articulate the cultural and mythical relationship of Rome with the Hellenic world. However when compared with the native legend of Romulus and Remus, Aeneas does not conform seemingly the features of the recollection of the twins. Disassociated from the foundation of the city, Aeneas has no place in the urban landscape, not even as a visitor. Accordingly there is not any *mnemotopoi* pointing to his connection with the settlement. In addition to this, the hero of Troy does not seem to have been linked with any festival celebrated in Republican times or to have been worshipped in the city, which is most puzzling if the cult of Aeneas in Lavinium is to be accepted[71]. As it was already mentioned, Roman authors identified the son of Venus and Anchises with the god *Indiges*. Nevertheless it remains uncertain whether the identification had any effect on the actual cult of this god or it belongs to the scholarly investigation only. The Imperial calendars seem to support the latter theory, since three of them record a feast in honor of *Sol Indiges* on August 9th and two record some *Agonalia Indigeti* on December 11th, but in both cases a reference to Aeneas is surprisingly lacking[72].

Conclusions

Therefore, if the Romans accepted Aeneas as an ancestor in the third c. B.C., his deeds and memory must have been spread around by mere hearsay, which draws a clear contrast with the conspicuous presence of Romulus in the festivals established in the calendar and in the topography of the city[73]. In fact, the lack of

---

though there were still those who interpreted the sacrifice differently. On the original meaning of the feast, vd. F. Coarelli, *Il Campo Marzio. Dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica*, Roma 1997, pp. 61-73.

71 Dionysius, convinced of the Greek origins of Rome, asserts that the arrival of Aeneas and the Trojans in Italy is attested by all the Romans and evidences of it are to be seen in the ceremonies observed by them both in their sacrifices and festivals (*Ant. Rom.* 1.49.3). But he eventually fails to give any example of them.

72 Vd. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones* cit.: The mention to *Sol Indiges* appears in the *Fasti Vallenses* (p. 148), *Allifani* (pp. 180-181) and *Amiternini* (pp. 90-91) and to the *Agonalia Indigeti* in the *Amiternini* (pp. 198-199) and the *Ostienses* (p. 106).

73 In this regard we share T.J. Cornell's statement that there is no sign of the Roman belief in Aeneas as an ancestor before the third century B.C. (*Aeneas' Arrival* cit., pp. 82-83).

any celebration involving this mythological figure leads us to conclude that he cannot be regarded as part of the cultural memory of the Republican Rome. It is hard to believe that there was a well-established remembrance of Aeneas among the Romans, if the Trojan origins did not deserve any public demonstration or celebration. This absence contrasts sharply with the attention that the Hellenic past of Italy aroused among the Roman writers and should prompt a reconsideration of the significance of the first historiography.

Due to the fragmentary state of the Roman histories up to the last century B.C., the first works of Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus have always raised more questions than answers, especially regarding the unsolvable issue of their sources. Nevertheless there seems to be a consensus on their main purpose: the defense of a Roman standpoint about the recent conflict with Carthage and the presentation of the cultural credentials of the city to the Mediterranean powers [74]. With a view to reach a wide hellenized audience, the histories were written in Greek following the example of the Egyptian Manetho and the Babylonian Berosso and they contained a pro-Roman account of the military and political undertakings of the city to oppose the histories of Philinus of Agrigentum, Sosilos of Sparta and Silenus of Kaleacte, who have adopted a Carthaginian stance. Given the fact that the Roman historians were likewise generals and senators, their rendition of the events must have been certainly skewed as Polibius asserts (1.14.1-3). Nevertheless, we argue that this fact does not have to exhaust all the possible reasons of their activity as historians. It is noteworthy, for example, that all the histories address the Roman past from the origins up to the current affairs of the time of the writer, differing in this point from the Greek tradition in which every author tended to take up the account where his predecessor had left off [75]. How much space was devoted in every work to relate the early times is impossible to tell, but none of them failed to refer to the story of Aeneas and of other Greek heroes like Evander or Hercules who had arrived in Latium [76]. Indeed Postumius Albinus most likely wrote a whole

---

74 Vd. M. Gelzer, *Römische Politik bei Fabius Pictor*, «Hermes» 68 (1933), pp. 129-166. D. Timpe, *Fabius Pictor and die Anfänge der römischen Historiographie*, in *ANRW* I.2, Berlin - New York 1972, pp. 928-969, esp. 953-957; B. Gentili - G. Cerri, *History and Biography in Ancient Thought*, Amsterdam 1988 [1993], pp. 36-50; D. Musti, *Il pensiero storico romano*, in G. Caballo - P. Fedeli - A. Giardina (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica* I, Roma 1989, pp. 177-240; F. Pina Polo, *Die nützliche Erinnerung: Geschichtsschreibung, mos maiorum und die römische Identität*, «Historia» 53/2 (2004), pp. 147-172.

75 J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge 1997, pp. 289-292.

76 Prior to Antipater's *Bellum Punicum*, the first Roman historical monograph, there are references to Aeneas and Ascanius or facts associated to them in Pictor (F 1; 3; 5 Beck-Walter), Cincius (F 3 Beck-Walter), Cato (*Orig.* 1, F 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 14 Chassignet), Acilius (F 2 Beck-Walter), Postumius Albinus (F 2; 3 Beck-Walter) Cassius Hemina (F 6; 7 Beck-Walter), Q. Fabius Maximus (F 1 Chassignet), L. Calpurnius Piso (F 3, 4 Beck-Walter), Sempronius Tuditanus (F 2 Beck-Walter) and Cn. Gellius (F 9 Beck-Walter). They are

book on the Trojan refugee that is named *de adventu Aeneae* in several occasions [77]. Their interest in their remote past exceeds the need of fulfilling the literary topic of the *ktisis* with which some Greek histories used to begin. Had it been so, they would have just followed one of the previous Hellenic versions of the myth. On the contrary, Fabius, Cincius and Cato showed a deep concern about the origins of Rome seeking, for example, to establish accurately the chronology of the foundation. Knowing most likely the date established by Timaeus (814/3 B.C.), each of them, nonetheless, suggested a different temporal frames for such an event [78]. How they calculated theses dates is unclear. They might have taken as reference point the setting-up of the Republic or the Trojan war [79]. In any case, it is obvious that the prevalent oral tradition did not provide the age of the city and that by the end of the third century this question became a matter of debate for some Romans. The query involved likewise the genealogical relationship between Aeneas and Romulus. In this point Fabius and Cincius disagreed not only with the Greek writers but also with the Latin poets of Italian origins but educated in the Hellenic culture Naevius and Ennius, who still envisaged a close link [80]. In the Roman tradition, on the contrary, Aeneas' son, Ascanius, founds Alba Longa and his stepbrother, Silvius, initiates a dynasty from which Romulus and Remus descended. From Fabius onwards Roman historians certainly adopted this version, which most probably reworked traditional material on Alban kings within a new chronological frame [81].

This concern about the origins, which made Roman historians start always

---

only missing in Fannius and Vennonius, most likely because their histories were less quoted than the others' and thence fewer fragments have come down to us.

77 Postumius Albinus F 3 Peter; *O.G.R.* 15.4.

78 Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F60. According to Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.74.1-2), Fabius dated the foundation in the first year of the 8th Olympiad (748/7 B.C.), Cincius in the fourth year of the 12th Olympiad (729/8 B.C.) and Cato 432 years after the fall of Troy – which would be in 752/1 B.C. following Eratosthenes' date of that event.

79 Most scholars are inclined to the second option: vd. O. de Cazavone, *La détermination chronologique de la durée de la période royale à Rome*, in *La Rome des premiers siècles: légende et historie*, Florence 1992, pp. 69-98.; Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar* cit., pp. 88-92. Nevertheless, Dionysius (1.74-75) proceeds the opposite way in his dating of the foundation.

80 Both poets claimed that Romulus was Aeneas' grandson (Serv. *ad Aen.* 1.273).

81 According to an inscription from the gymnasium of Tauromenium, in Fabius' history the reign of Romulus came long afterwards Aeneas' arrival (F 1 Beck-Walter); and Cincius reported on king Tiberius Silvius (F 4 Beck-Walter). It is not settled whether the Alban dynasty is a Roman elaboration or was invented by Diocles of Peparethus, as some scholars have suggested basing on Plutarch's statement that Fabius followed this Greek author on the origins' legend (*Rom.* 3.1-3). Vd. Gruen, *Cultural and National Identity* cit., p. 20; Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar* cit., p. 96. Nevertheless, being Alba most likely part of the Latin tradition, its relation to Romulus and Remus must have been established by the Romans, whether was Diocles or Fabius the first to write about it. Vd. J. Martínez-Pinna, *La fundación de Roma* cit., p. 22).

their accounts on Rome with the arrival of Aeneas, did not only aim to win Greek readers' affection, who already believed in the link between some Trojan wanderers and Rome. Apart from the propagandistic purpose that these histories might have sought, we argue that they were also making a statement about how Romans (or at least some aristocrats) envisaged their origins. And in this sense the first Roman historiography should not be only compared to its Sicilian or Hellenistic counterparts in order to grasp its historical meaning, but also to the prevalent oral memory which certainly constituted a major reference point for the Romans [82]. Thus in contrast with the existent tradition that only celebrated and remembered the twins' legend as the beginning of Rome, Fabius' and Cincius' narratives were establishing a new truth about the past. As D. Feeney has stressed recently, the chronological fixing of the foundation in the eighth century moved definitely the city's origins from myth to history, but above all it discovered a *pre-foundational* time unheard of by most Romans [83]. Romulus was no longer the oldest character in Roman past. In the third c. B.C. versions of Aeneas' arrival at Latium must have been circulating in Italy. To what extent they were part of public opinion in the city is hard to ascertain, but it should be stressed that there was no official or collective recognition in Rome of the Trojan past [84]. Against this background, the first histories established a new comprehensible past that enhanced the narrow memory of the city-state. The investigation and ascertainment of these remote events might have been the reason why Romans started their histories by the origins, although the main contents were devoted to the current issues as Dionysius claims (1.6.2) [85].

That writing about this Hellenic background of Rome was more an intellectual challenge than a political move for them is apparent, in our opinion, in the fact that they kept telling the Hellenic past of Rome even after Latin became with Cato the language of historiography by mid-second century. Thus, contrary to Romulus,

---

82 J. von Ungern-Stenberg, *Überlegungen zur frühen römischen Überlieferung im Lichte der Oral-Tradition-Forschung*, in J. von Unger-Stenberg - H. Reinau (eds.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung*, Stuttgart 1988, pp. 237-265, esp. 249-250.

83 Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar* cit., pp. 88-100.

84 According to E. Gruen (*Cultural and National Identity* cit., pp. 46-48) the construction of a temple to Venus Erycina on the Capitol in 215 B.C., and the reception of the cult of Magna Mater in 205 B.C showed the Romans' will to promote the Trojan legend. Nevertheless, A. Erskine (*Troy* cit., pp. 198-226) has rightly remarked that both events were only related to the figure of Aeneas by Augustan authors, and not the contemporaries. The Roman exploitation of the Trojan ancestry in the third century is likewise dubious. Only in the second century Roman generals acknowledged it publicly, in Greek land. Vd. Gruen, *Cultural and National Identity* cit., pp. 44-50; Erskine, *Troy* cit., pp. 168-196.

85 Vd. Timpe, *Fabius Pictor* cit., pp. 932-940. As J.G.A. Pocock (*The Origins of Study of the Past: A Comparative Approach*, «Comparative Studies in Society and History» 4/2 [1962], pp. 209-246, esp. 215-217) aptly highlights, the historian's work is most often motivated by the will of establishing a new version of past events at odds with the prevalent tradition.

who was part of the popular belief in Rome, Aeneas was only adopted as ancestor of the Romans by the elite, who were familiar with the Greek historiography by the late third century, and his deeds probably remained mostly an erudite knowledge for some time [86]. In this sense, the Roman example shows how a collective memory can split up when a new source of authority on the past, the Greek histories in this case, to which only a few Romans had access, arises. These Romans, in turn, became themselves the new specialists on history and contested the past transmitted in festivals and represented in the urban landscape. Their purpose was not to substitute but to enhance the prevailing memory that did not go back further than to Romulus; and for them the character of Aeneas represented an intellectual discovery as well as an object of belief. In fact, until the first c. B.C. there seems to be no mistrust on the veracity of this story. It is only in the last century when some Roman authors turn their interest to biographies and contemporary monographs, Claudius Quadrigarius begins his narrative with the Gallic sack, and Cicero and Livy maintain that the events before the foundation are fabulous and hardly truth-based [87]. Surprisingly this lack of interest and questioning of the remote past at the end of the Republic coincides with the rise of Aeneas as an ancestor of the Romans and especially the *Iulia gens* in the public opinion [88].

Ana Rodriguez-Mayorgas
a_mayorgas@yahoo.es

86 Cornell, *Aeneas' Arrival* cit., p. 83; A. Erskine (*Troy* cit., pp. 23-45) stressed that only with the *Iulii* Aeneas becomes a major element in Roman identity and self-image.

87 It was most likely Claudius Quadrigarius who claimed that there were not truthful documents on the times prior to the Gallic sack (Plut. *Num.* 1.2). Vd. B.W. Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*, Ann Arbor 2002 [1979], pp. 122-126, 152-153; Cic. *Rep.* 2.2.4; Liv. *praef.* 6.

88 I would like to thank Erich Gruen for encouraging me to publish this paper and for his advice and comments that have helped to improve it. I feel also grateful to Julia Whitten who kindly revised and corrected my English.