

## Copyright Notice

Staff and students of this University are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA Licence which allows you to:

- Access and download a copy
- Print out a copy

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this module or course of study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by the University.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Title of extract: **The making of the Trojan Legend**

Name of Author: **Gruen, E.S.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome. Gruen, E.S.**

Name of Visual Creator or other acknowledgement (if applicable):

Journal details –title/Vol/Year (if applicable):

Publisher: **Duckworth**

Pages scanned: **6 - 51**

-----  
Course of Study (Module name and number): **Julius Caesar CLAH7002**

Name of Designated Person  
authorising scanning:

Date authorised: 16.07.13

Moodle/Powerpoint

*E. L. Hams*

## THE MAKING OF THE TROJAN LEGEND

The canonical tradition on Rome's origins had taken firm root by the age of Augustus. As the orthodox tale had it, the city derived from a settlement of Trojan refugees, adversaries of the Greeks, remnants of a people defeated by the Achaean expedition that sacked Troy. Survivors of that calamity, under the leadership of the intrepid hero Aeneas, made their way west, suffered hardships and detours, and eventually reached the shores of Italy. There they faced still further struggles with the indigenous inhabitants before establishing themselves on a permanent basis. The progeny of Aeneas ultimately effected the founding of Rome—via Lavinium and Alba Longa, and after many generations. That story, at least in essentials, held sway in the Augustan era, enshrined in Vergil's epic and endorsed in Livy's history.

Yet the tale did not commend itself to everyone—even in the *saecula aurea* of Caesar Augustus. Some Greek intellectuals demurred. Eager as they were to assure themselves a place in the larger world of the Roman Empire, they felt discomfort with the idea that Rome owed her beginnings to a people perceived as the preeminent foe of Hellas. The geographer Strabo dissented, citing the authority of Homer to the effect that Aeneas never left the Troad. And he noted other versions, such as the local tale at Skepsis that had Aeneas found a dynasty there or the legends that brought him either to Macedonian Olympus or to Arcadia.<sup>1</sup> Each

1. Strabo, 13.1.53 (C607–608).

of them posed an implicit challenge to the doctrine that made Italy the destination of the Trojans.

But the doctrine dominated. The rhetorician and historian Dionysius of Halicarnassus conceded its validity but reinterpreted its meaning. He took as his mission the demonstration of Rome's Hellenic origins. Indeed, for Dionysius, Rome is a Greek city many times over. Successive bands of Hellenic transplants peopled the peninsula. Aborigines, coming from Arcadia, drove out the Sicels. Then the Pelasgians arrived from Argos via Thessaly.<sup>2</sup> There followed a band of Arcadian colonizers under Evander, sixty years before the Trojan War, who occupied a hill near the Tiber and named it Pallantium, after their own Arcadian home town, thus to account for the later appellation of Palatine.<sup>3</sup> That saga, however, told only part of the tale. The legends of Heracles served Dionysius' purposes as well. The great Greek hero made a detour to Italy on his way home from Spain, fought some successful battles, married the daughter of Evander, and left both offspring and a garrison to help mold the future of the peninsula.<sup>4</sup>

Dionysius could now turn to Aeneas. The Trojan leader's role in Rome's beginnings was too well entrenched to be discarded or ignored. So Dionysius did the next best thing: he made Aeneas a Greek. The Trojans, in his reconstruction, stemmed from the Peloponnesus, from Dardanus, son of Zeus and member of the ruling house of Arcadia. Dardanus led out an expedition after his native land had been devastated by flood and eventually settled in the Troad.<sup>5</sup> That tradition stands in sharp contrast to the account retailed by Vergil, who claimed that Dardanus, ancestor of the Trojans, came from Etruria. The race of Aeneas held Italy as its *patria*. By leading his compatriots to those shores, Aeneas returned to the land of his forefathers.<sup>6</sup> Dionysius rejects

2. Dion. Hal. 1.60.3, 1.89.1–2. On the traditions that brought the Pelasgians to Italy, see now the exhaustive study of D. Briquel, *Les Pélasges en Italie* (Paris, 1984), *passim*.

3. Dion. Hal. 1.31, 1.60.3, 1.89.2.

4. Dion. Hal. 1.41–44.

5. Dion. Hal. 1.60–61. This version of Dardanus' origin not only circulated among Greek writers but had the authority of Varro; Servius, *Ad Aen.* 3.167, 7.207.

6. Vergil, *Aen.* 1.378–380: *sum pius Aeneas . . . / Italiam quaeso patriam*; 3.94–96, 3.167–168, 7.206–207, 7.240. That Vergil fabricated the idea of Dardanus' Italian heritage was argued by V. Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms* (Heidelberg, 1963), 151–166; persuasively questioned by N. Horsfall, *JRS*, 63 (1973), 74–79, now in J. N. Bremmer and N. M. Horsfall, eds., *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London, 1987), 99–104. Note the Etruscan inscription from North Africa in which settlers from Etruria, probably in the early first century B.C., associate themselves with Dardanii; J. Heurgon, *Scripta varia* (Brussels, 1986), 433–447.

the idea altogether. In his text, when Aeneas reaches Italy and confronts Latinus, with both armies drawn up to contest for supremacy in Italy, the Trojan declares unequivocally: "We are Trojans by race, inhabitants of one of the the most celebrated cities of the Greeks."<sup>7</sup> Latinus' gracious response duly laid the basis for reconciliation between the forces of the two peoples: "I have a soft spot for the whole Hellenic race."<sup>8</sup> As Dionysius characterized the Trojans, "One would find no people more ancient or more Greek."<sup>9</sup> So Aeneas is a Greek.

Dionysius, as is clear, engaged in Hellenic overkill, swamping Rome with repeated waves of eastern immigrants to confirm its role as torch-bearer for Greek civilization. He even goes so far as having Romulus defend the rape of the Sabine women by assuring the victims that this was an ancient Hellenic practice.<sup>10</sup> But then Dionysius was fighting a rearguard action in the age of Augustus—a time when Rome's non-Greek, Trojan origins ranked as orthodoxy.<sup>11</sup>

It had not always been so. Nor was Dionysius by any means the first to insist upon the Hellenic sources of Roman history. Reports of Greek expatriates making their way to Italian shores recur with frequency in Greek literature and historiography, combined in complex and diverse ways with legends on the founding of Rome. The fact deserves emphasis: a strong and tenacious Greek component exists in the fabric of tales surrounding Rome's origins. That component may, in fact, be earlier than the Aeneas story. And it retained vitality well beyond the emergence and development of that story. How did this happen and what does it mean?

An appropriate starting point can be detected: the age of overseas

7. Dion. Hal. 1.58.2: ἡμεῖς γένος μὲν Τρῳᾶς ἐσμεν, πόλεως δὲ οὐ τῆς ἀφανιστῆς ἐν Ἑλλήσιν ἐγενόμεθα.

8. Dion. Hal. 1.58.5: ἀλλ' ἐγώ γε εὐνοϊάν τε πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν γένος ἔχω.

9. Dion. Hal. 1.89.2: τούτων γὰρ ἂν οὐδὲν εὖροι τῶν ἐθνῶν οὔτε ἀρχαιότερον οὔτε Ἑλληνικώτερον.

10. Dion. Hal. 2.30.5: Ἑλληνικὸν τε καὶ ἀρχαῖον ἀποφαίνων τὸ ἔθος.

11. It does not follow that Dionysius was consciously reacting against anti-Greek prejudice among the Romans, as is inferred by H. Hill, *JRS*, 51 (1961), 88–93; similarly, P. Toohey, *Arethusa*, 17 (1984), 9–12. E. Gabba, *RSI*, 71 (1959), 365–368, believes Dionysius sought to combat a Greek historiographical tradition hostile to Rome and to provide a justification for the Roman empire. P. M. Martin, *MEFRA*, 101 (1989), 113–142, has a similar view. The matter is examined now *in extenso* by Gabba, *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (Berkeley, Calif., 1991), *passim*; especially, 1–22, 93–118, 191–200.

colonization. That era naturally sparked an interest in the West. Greeks, in characteristic fashion, inclined to interpret the western past in light of their own national traditions. Ancient tales of voyagers and migrants took on renewed vigor as anticipation of or justification for colonizing activity. The circumstances would naturally call attention to such legends as the western adventures of Heracles or the settler-heroes of the *Nostoi*—most particularly the wanderings of Odysseus. The West was the special sphere of Odysseus. The Homeric *Odyssey* contains several references to Sicily and southern Italy.<sup>12</sup> The hero reappears regularly in stories of western settlement and in connection with Greek colonization.<sup>13</sup> Those traditions eventually connected with legends on the origins of Rome.

An important and intriguing item occurs very early in the record. The concluding lines of Hesiod's *Theogony* register the union of Odysseus and Circe, which produced as offspring Agrius and Latinus, future rulers over the Tyrrhenians.<sup>14</sup> The passage has noteworthy implications. Debate continues on the precise specification of the term "Tyrrhenians," the significance of "Agrius," and the date of the passage. The *Theogony* as such probably dates to the late eighth century, but the concluding appendix most likely represents a later insertion. Etruscans, it has been argued, would hardly have entered Greek consciousness before the sixth century: hence an allusion to that people and to an association with Latium belongs no earlier.<sup>15</sup> But that theory presupposes a strict designation that would be uncharacteristic of early Greek writers on Italy. The Greeks, in fact, used the term "Tyrrhenoi" loosely and broadly, sometimes as equivalent to Pelasgians, sometimes to encompass Latins, Umbrians, and Ausonians.<sup>16</sup> Encounters with Italian peoples, including those of Etruria and Latium, through commercial contact and Greek settlements, extend back to the eighth century and

12. Homer, *Odyssey*, 1.182, 20.383, 24.211, 307, 366, 389.

13. See J. Bérard, *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile*<sup>2</sup> (Paris, 1957), 303–322; E. D. Phillips, *JHS*, 73 (1953), 53–55, 64–66; cf. L. Pearson, *YCS*, 24 (1975), 178–180.

14. [Hesiod], *Theog.* 1011–1016: Κίρκη δ' Ἡελίου θυγάτηρ Ὑπεριονίδαο / γείνατ' Ὀδυσσεύς τε ταλασίφρονος ἐν φιλότῃ / Ἀγρίον ἠδὲ Λατίνον ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε. / οἷ δὲ τοι μάλα τῆλε μυχῷ νήσων ἱεράων / πᾶσι Τυρσηνοῖσιν ἀγακλειτοῖσιν ἀνασσόν.

15. E. Wikén, *Die Kunde der Hellenen von dem Lande und den Völkern der Apenninenhalbinsel bis 300 v. Chr.* (Lund, 1937), 76–77; M. Durante, *PP*, 6 (1951), 216; M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), 435–436.

16. Dion. Hal. 1.29.1–2.

may find reflection here.<sup>17</sup> The name Agrius remains problematic, possibly an equivalent of Faunus or of Silvius, both figures in the mythical genealogy of ancient Latium.<sup>18</sup> "Latinus," in any case, points to a location with adequate specificity. Whether the Hesiodic lines belong in the seventh or sixth century, they disclose Hellenic interest in central Italy, possibly Etruria and certainly Latium, and the introduction of those lands into the Greek legendary complex. And most significant, Odysseus takes the role of ultimate ancestor to the rulers of those regions. The passage appropriately exemplifies the Greek penchant for reshaping foreign experiences by imposing Hellenic lore.

A long time would pass before Rome itself attracted the attention of Greek intellectuals; just how long no one can specify. Rome captured Veii at the beginning of the fourth century, thus achieving superior power in Latium and Etruria. As Rome entered into relations with the Greek cities of Campania in the mid-fourth century, Hellenic writers took notice of the town previously just on the margins of their consciousness. And when they did, they claimed the site, as so often, for Hellas. Heracleides Ponticus, philosopher, scientist, and pupil of Plato, writing in the mid-fourth century, referred to Rome simply as a "Greek city."<sup>19</sup> The matter seemed straightforward and uncomplicated. Greeks assumed that all cities of stature could be traced to Hellenic roots. Once the assumption is made, invention follows—and an effort to incorporate the origins within the matrix of Greek legend.

The school of Aristotle had a hand in shaping the tales—or rather some of the tales. Aristotle himself endorsed a version that had Achaean, not Trojan, warriors driven by storm to Italy while trying to return home after the fall of Troy. They got no farther. In an act of defiance the Trojan women brought as captives burned the ships. The stranded Achaeans had to remain in Italy and took up permanent residence at a site Aristotle called Latinium.<sup>20</sup> Aristotle's pupil Heracleides Lembos sharpened the identification. He noted that Achaeans returning from Troy were shipwrecked in Italy and made their way to the point on

17. Cf. Phillips, *JHS*, 73 (1953), 55–56; G. Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium* (Brussels, 1981), 39–41; T. P. Wiseman, *JRS*, 79 (1989), 131–132. See, in general, the collection of papers, with archaeological testimony, in *PP*, 32 (1977), *passim*, and *PP*, 36 (1981).

18. See F. Altheim, *A History of Roman Religion* (London, 1938), 214–216; Durante, *PP*, 6 (1951), 216–217; A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1965), 238–239; Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 43–44.

19. Plut. *Cam.* 22.2: πόλις Ἑλληνίδα Ῥώμην.

20. Dion. Hal. 1.72.3–4.

the Tiber where now sits Rome, and there they settled when Trojan captives, instigated by a certain Rhome or Rhomes, set their vessels ablaze.<sup>21</sup> So Greek intellectuals stretched the legends attaching to the fall of Troy to extend to the origins of Rome. But this rendition, as is clear, gave Achaeans, not Trojans, credit for settling the site at its beginning.<sup>22</sup>

The notion of Rome as Greek in character and lineage earned widespread credence. Plutarch, in his life of Romulus, conveys a bewildering variety of accounts of how Rome derived its name. One postulated a certain Rhome, daughter of Telephus, the son of Heracles. Another pointed to Rhomanos, son of Odysseus and Circe. Still another suggested Rhomos, sent from Troy by Diomedes. And yet one other named Rhome, granddaughter of Telemachus, and thus descendant of Odysseus.<sup>23</sup> These reconstructions by no means exhaust the extant versions, or even those transmitted by Plutarch, but they indicate both the diversity and the tenacity of tales that presume a Greek derivation. The same holds for the variant retailed by Xenagoras, perhaps in the early third century. He recorded three sons of Odysseus and Circe: Rhomos, Anteias, and Ardeias, the founders, respectively, of the Latin towns, Rome, Antium, and Ardea.<sup>24</sup> Xenagoras' conjecture, however mechanical, suggests a quickened interest among Greeks in the cities of Latium. The fabricated genealogies, despite divergences and inconsistencies, underscore the persistence with which Greek writers ascribed Hellenic descent to Rome. That conviction can be illustrated by a quite different story. Alexander the Great and, after him, Demetrius Poliorcetes, it is reported, remonstrated with the Romans for failure to check Etruscan piracy, which harassed Greek possessions. Demetrius appealed to the Romans for collaboration on the grounds of common kinship with the Greeks.<sup>25</sup>

21. Festus, 329, L. The tale of incendiarism itself had several variants; cf. Dion. Hal. 1.52.4; Plut. *Rom.* 1.2; *Virt. Mul.* 1; Strabo, 6.1.14 (C264); Vergil, *Aen.* 5.613. But Heracleides' text is the first extant one to attach Rhome as chief arsonist to the foundation of the city; see E. J. Bickermann, *CP*, 47 (1952), 78, n. 14; T. J. Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 18; N. Horsfall, *CQ*, 29 (1979), 381–382; F. Solmsen, *HSCP*, 90 (1986), 102–107.

22. Still another pupil of Aristotle, the learned Theophrastus, was reportedly the first non-Roman to write with some care about Roman affairs; Pliny, *NH*, 3.57. What he said and how much remain unknown. We cannot be sure even that he dealt with the origins of the city.

23. Plut. *Rom.* 2.1, 2.3.

24. Dion. Hal. 1.72.5. Xenagoras' date is quite uncertain. See F. Gisinger, *RE*, 9A.2 (1967), 1410–1411, n. 1; Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 20–21, with good bibliography.

25. Strabo, 5.3.5 (C232): διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας συγγένειαν. Cf. L. Braccisi, *Alessandro e i Romani* (Bologna, 1975), 47–72.

None of this, to be sure, shows any deep or abiding curiosity about Rome by Greek intellectuals. The first Greek writer even to provide a sketch of early Roman history, we are told, was Hieronymus of Cardia in the first half of the third century.<sup>26</sup> What it does show is a familiar form of Hellenic intellectual imperialism, a spinning out of tales in accord with Greek legends, and ascription of foreign cities to Greek founders.<sup>27</sup>

Aeneas' part in the legend was, of course, as much a Greek creation as Odysseus', but it may have come later—and been slow to gain ascendancy. A formidable obstacle stood in the way: the authority of Homer. In book 20 of the *Iliad*, Poseidon predicts that "the might of Aeneas and the sons of his sons shall rule over Trojans."<sup>28</sup> Much the same statement recurs in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. The goddess here forecasts for Anchises the glorious future of his progeny: his son and descendants will reign among Trojans.<sup>29</sup> That forecast would seem to preclude western migration on the part of Aeneas, or at least to discourage speculation along those lines. The Homeric verses, it may be inferred, represent prevailing opinion on the subject in archaic Greece.<sup>30</sup>

Indeed, they remained a formidable stumbling block for long thereafter. When the link between Aeneas and the origins of Rome had been forged, the Homeric lines became an embarrassment. Greek writers expended considerable energy to reinterpret or to explain them away. Some tried to reconcile the traditions by postulating two men named Aeneas, one of whom went to Italy, while the other remained in the Troad. A different version had Aeneas bring the Trojans to Italy and then return to the Troad to reign there and turn the kingdom over to his son.<sup>31</sup> A third effort sought to evade the implications of the Homeric lines through emendation of the text. By altering Homer's *Τρώεσσι* to *πάντεσσιν*, the emender would have Aeneas and his progeny exercise universal rule, a retrospective anticipation of the Roman Empire.<sup>32</sup> The

resort to emendation itself implies that the natural reading of the passage interfered with the development of the Trojan legend to explain the origins of Rome. The incongruity continued to trouble writers as late as the end of the Republic and the era of Augustus. Strabo, in fact, appealed to Homer as powerful testimony against those who would have Aeneas reach the land of Italy and perish there.<sup>33</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus acknowledged the force of those lines and felt obliged to offer an exegesis: "rule over Trojans" could mean "rule over Trojans in Italy"—hardly what Homer had in mind. Dionysius thus held to the text but also saved the legend.<sup>34</sup> It is plain enough from the refutations and rationalizations that the most obvious reading of the text still caused discomfort several centuries after Homer. At the time of the composition of the *Iliad* and the Homeric hymns, the tale of Aeneas' adventures in Italy had evidently not yet obtained a foothold. And given the authority of Homer, its acceptance would be some time in coming.

A possible fragment of the sixth-century Sicilian poet Stesichorus suggests that the story might be in formation in his day. The evidence comes from the Tabula Iliaca Capitolina, a carved relief of the Augustan period, combining scenes from the *Iliad* and later poems of the epic cycle.<sup>35</sup> The central panel includes a representation of Aeneas carrying Anchises who holds the household gods, leading Ascanius, and being guided by Hermes. The hero is evidently departing from Troy. An inscription, which describes the scene, cites the *Iliupersis* of Stesichorus and reports that Aeneas is heading *εἰς τὴν Ἑσπερίαν*.<sup>36</sup> Does this constitute evidence that the Trojan legend of Rome's foundation was already circulating in the sixth century?

The authority of this text has more than once been called into question. Discrepancies exist between the scenes depicted on the relief and

26. Dion. Hal. 1.6.1.

27. Cf. Bickermann, *CP*, 47 (1952), 65–81.

28. Homer, *Iliad*, 20.307–308: *νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο βίῃ Τρώεσσι ἀνάξει / καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοὶ κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται*.

29. *Hom. Hymn Aphr.* 5.196–197: *σοὶ δ' ἔσται φίλος υἱὸς ὃς ἐν Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει / καὶ παῖδες παῖδεσσι διαμπερὲς ἐκγεγάονται*.

30. Nothing in the epic cycle suggests western movement by Aeneas or his offspring; cf. Horsfall, *CQ*, 29 (1979), 373–375; Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 37–38; P. M. Smith, *HSCP*, 85 (1981), 25–28.

31. Dion. Hal. 1.53.4.

32. Strabo, 13.1.53 (C608); cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 3.97–98.

33. Strabo, 13.1.53 (C608). Strabo's inference that the Homeric text definitively leaves Aeneas in Troy, however, is inaccurate. A. Momigliano, *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1984), 443, misleadingly suggests that the message of the Homeric poems unambiguously excludes emigration by Aeneas or his descendants.

34. Dion. Hal. 1.53.4–5. That interpretation, of course, may not have been original with Dionysius.

35. See A. Sadurska, *Les Tables Iliques* (Warsaw, 1964), 24–37. The purpose of those representations has been much debated: as classroom aids for schoolchildren, as votive offerings, or as labeled objets d'art for the newly rich. N. Horsfall, *JHS*, 99 (1979), 31–35, makes a strong case for the last alternative; see also W. McLeod, *TAPA*, 115 (1985), 153–165.

36. Stesichorus, *FGH*, 840 F6b: *Ἰλίου Πέρσις κατὰ Στησίχορον . . . Αἰνείας σὺν τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀπαίρων εἰς τὴν Ἑσπερίαν*.

the extant fragments of Stesichorus. The term *ἑσπερία* does not otherwise appear in Greek literature before Apollonius Rhodius. And Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who knew Stesichorus' work well, cited forty-six authors on Aeneas' travels—but never Stesichorus. Hence, it has been maintained, the inscription as well as the pictorial representations reflect knowledge of the *Aeneid*, and cannot convey genuine Stesichorus.<sup>37</sup> The skepticism is salutary but excessive. The relief certainly mirrors the understanding and expectations of the Augustan era, and the wording need not accurately reproduce Stesichorus' lines, but a citation of that poet could hardly have come out of the blue. Some basis for it should exist. The *Iliupersis* of Stesichorus, however garbled and contaminated, gave reason for its use as a caption for the carved relief.<sup>38</sup> But even if the fragment be taken as given, it does not bring Aeneas to Italy, let alone to Rome. That limitation may help to explain why his version is ignored by Dionysius. The most that can be inferred is that the tradition known to Stesichorus had Aeneas migrate westward.

That itself, however, is significant. Stesichorus came from Himera in Sicily. For western Greeks, the stories of heroic wanderers after the Trojan War held special appeal. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that Sicilian writers cultivated the tale of Trojans voyaging west. By the late fifth century Sicilian traditions have Trojans reaching their island.

The fact is attested by the best of authorities. Thucydides reports the tradition that after the fall of Ilium, Trojan fugitives crossed the seas to Sicily, where they settled, took the name of Elymaeans, and founded the cities of Eryx and Segesta.<sup>39</sup> Aeneas receives no mention in this text.

37. J. Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (231–81)* (Paris, 1942), 84–89, 110–115, 306–309; Horsfall, *JHS*, 99 (1979), 35–43; idem, *CQ*, 29 (1979), 375–376; F. Castagnoli, *Studi Romani*, 30 (1982), 7–8.

38. See, *inter alios*, P. Boyancé, *Études sur la religion romaine* (Rome, 1972), 1160; G. K. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton, N.J., 1969), 106–113; Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 48–53.

39. Thuc. 6.2.3; cf. Paus. 5.25.6. Thucydides' source is generally taken to be Antiochus of Syracuse; K. J. Dover, in A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford, 1970), IV, 199–202; questioned by Solmsen, *HSCP*, 90 (1986), 97; K. J. Rigsby, *CQ*, 37 (1987), 334. But there is no good reason to doubt that his data ultimately derived from Sicilian traditions. In addition to Trojan migrations Thucydides speaks of "Phocians" sailing from Troy and driven by storm first to Libya, then to Sicily. Rigsby, 332–335, proposes emendation to "Phrygians," thus suggesting that Thucydides followed the Homeric distinction between Trojans and Phrygians from Troy. But that would be at variance with customary fifth-century usage that amalgamated the two terms—and it is hardly an obvious correction.

His entrance into the tale may come later.<sup>40</sup> But there seems little doubt that the inventiveness of Sicilian writers either created or amplified narratives of Trojan travels. They served as pivotal transmitters and formulators.<sup>41</sup>

The Greeks of Sicily, we may safely surmise, maintained contact with fellow nationals in Italy—and with major developments in the peninsula. Those developments increasingly involved Rome. As Romans expanded influence into the Greek-speaking areas of Italy in the fourth century, they thereby provided the impetus for foundation stories fitted into the complex web of Hellenic legend.

Sicilian historians were instrumental in promoting and entangling the tradition. Alcimus composed a work on the antiquities of Sicily and Italy, perhaps in the later fourth century.<sup>42</sup> He provides what may be the earliest extant notice that actually associates Aeneas with the founding of Rome. Alcimus considers Aeneas and Tyrrhenia the parents of Romulus, who then fathered Alba, and she in turn gave birth to Rhomus, who founded the city and gave it his name.<sup>43</sup> It would be faulty to conclude from the non-Greek name Romulus that Alcimus obtained his story from Rome itself, thus reflecting the city's native traditions. Romulus, in his version, is not a twin, or even the city's founder. Alcimus' reconstruction arises from Rome's preeminence in Latium and Etruria, and supplies a Trojan lineage as explanation.<sup>44</sup>

A different and equally involved genealogy comes from another Sicilian author: Callias, historian of Agathocles, the Syracusan ruler, at the beginning of the third century. Callias does not include Aeneas in

40. Certainly he became a central figure in Sicily in subsequent generations. For Cicero, *Verr.* 2.4.33, Aeneas himself was founder of Egesta. A cult of Aphrodite Aeneias at Eryx, and a temple to Aeneas at Egesta existed by the end of the Republic; Dion. Hal. 1.53.1. But no firm evidence allows for a confident dating of their creation. Cf. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 63–70.

41. The thesis of J. Perret, in *Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon*, II (Rome, 1976), 791–803, that these tales stem from Athenian justification of imperialist ventures and the rivalries stimulated among Greeks, is farfetched and implausible.

42. The date is, unfortunately, not secure; Perret, *Les origines*, 386–387; Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 7, n. 1.

43. Festus, 326, 328, L: *Alcimus ait, Tyrrhenia Aeneae natum filium Romulum fuisse, atque eo ortam Albam Aeneae neptem, cuius filius nomine Rhodius condiderit urbem Romam*. The emendation of Rhomus for Rhodius is plausible and generally acknowledged. On Alcimus' tale, see the contrasting interpretations of Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 6; and D. Musti, *Gli Etruschi e Roma* (Rome, 1981), 26–28.

44. Despite Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 441, this is not evidence for the way in which Romans expected themselves to be perceived.

the family tree, but he does have a Trojan woman, Rhome, who marries Latinus, and whose sons Romus, Romulus, (and Telegonus) found the city and name it after her.<sup>45</sup> Greek ingenuity played a vital role in the fashioning of Italian legend.

Tales of Trojan origins, however, by no means drove out putative Hellenic ancestors. The traditions overlapped, became amalgamated, and emerged in bewildering blends. The eponymous creations (characteristically invented by Greeks)—Rhome, Rhomos, Romanos—appear in multiple manifestations. Most are undatable either absolutely or relatively. Certain writers, as already noted, gave Rhome solid Greek lineage as daughter or granddaughter of Heracles, Telemachus, or Odysseus. Others made her wife of Aeneas or Ascanius, or granddaughter of Aeneas. Comparable conceptions had Rhomanos as son of Odysseus, Rhomos as son of Aeneas or Ascanius or Emathion or even Zeus. Still others compounded the eponyms: Rhome as wife of Latinus or daughter of Italus, Rhomos as son of Italus and grandson of Latinus.<sup>46</sup> The Hellenic component, however, was rarely absent. Even Latinus had Greek roots: he was son of Telemachus and grandson of Odysseus in one version, son of Odysseus and Circe in another, son of Heracles in a third.<sup>47</sup>

The amalgamation of diverse strands seems especially lively in the late fourth and early third centuries. In that era the school of Aristotle took an interest in the sources of western settlement, and Sicilian writers reinterpreted Hellenic traditions in light of Rome's burgeoning role in Italy. It was probably the period when Xenagoras attached the offspring of Odysseus and Circe to the foundation stories of Rome, Ardea, and Antium.<sup>48</sup> And it may well be the period that produced a

45. Dion. Hal. 1.72.5; Festus, 329, L, who gives Caltinus for Callias. C. J. Classen, *Historia*, 12 (1963), 448–463, argues from the names Rhomos and Rhomylos that Alcinus and Callias must have been working with Latin traditions. But the formulation and elaboration are plainly Greek.

46. Plut. *Rom.* 2.1–3; Dion. Hal. 1.72.6; Festus, 326, 328, L; Servius, *Ad Aen.* 1.273; cf. Bickermann, *CP*, 47 (1952), 67; Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 17–18. The story of Rhome as Aeneas' granddaughter is ascribed to Agathocles, a Cyzicene historian; Festus, 328, L; cf. Cornell, 19, with bibliography. On Rhome, see R. E. Mitchell, *Illinois Classical Studies*, 1 (1976), 70–82, as against A. Alföldi, *Die trojanischen Urahnen der Römer* (Basel, 1957), 9–34. On subsequent Greek etymological interpretations of the name Roma, see I. Opelt, *Philologus*, 109 (1965), 47–56.

47. Plut. *Rom.* 2.3; Servius, *Ad Aen.* 1.273; Hyginus, 127; Dion. Hal. 1.44.3.

48. See above, n. 24.

particularly bizarre linking of traditions—one that combined the voyages of Odysseus and Aeneas.

The tale requires scrutiny. It has Aeneas come to Italy from Epirus, together with Odysseus, and become founder of the city, which he designated as Rome, taking the name from one of the Trojan women who set fire to the ships.<sup>49</sup> Whence derives this remarkable version that has the old antagonists Aeneas and Odysseus arrive in Italy in tandem as prelude to the founding of Rome? Dionysius assigns it to a treatise titled *The Priestesses of Argos*, and we know from Stephanus of Byzantium that a work by that title was composed by the fifth-century historian Hellanicus of Lesbos. Does the tale, in fact, represent authentic fifth-century Greek opinion on the origins of Rome?

Extended discussion of the fragment would be out of place here. Hellanicus did indeed record traditions about history and events in the West.<sup>50</sup> He calculated, for instance, the dates of migration of Sicels from Italy to Sicily.<sup>51</sup> And he took an interest in the Aeneas story. His *Troika* recorded Aeneas' departure from the Troad across the Hellespont to Pallene in Chalcidice.<sup>52</sup> But arrival in Pallene, apparently as final destination, is hardly compatible with a voyage to Italy.<sup>53</sup> Troubling doubts arise about the antiquity of the tradition in *The Priestesses of Argos*. How likely is it that Hellanicus took any notice of Rome, an insignificant little town in the fifth century? It strains credulity to imagine that any Greek writer at that time would consider it worthwhile to speculate on the origins of Rome. Greeks pursued or elaborated the stories of wanderings after the Trojan War. And they debated the various versions of how and by whom the ships were destroyed.<sup>54</sup> But attachment of these tales to the history of Rome seems premature and anachronistic in fifth-century Greece. If the fragment properly belongs to Hellanicus, it

49. Dion. Hal. 1.72.2: *Αἰνεΐαν φησὶν ἐκ Μολοττῶν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἐλθόντα μετ' Ὀδυσσεὺς οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως, ὀνομάσαι δ' αὐτὴν ἀπὸ μιᾶς τῶν Ἰλιάδων Ῥώμης*. The reading μετ' Ὀδυσσεὺς is decidedly preferable to μετ' Ὀδυσσεά; see now Solmsen, *HSCP*, 90 (1986), 94–95.

50. Dion. Hal. 1.28.3.

51. Dion. Hal. 1.22.3.

52. Dion. Hal. 1.47.4–1.48.1.

53. The inconsistency is rightly insisted on by Horsfall, *CQ*, 29 (1979), 377–380. Recognized also by Solmsen, *HSCP*, 90 (1986), 101–102, who, however, supposes that Hellanicus expanded his geographical horizons when he came to write *The Priestesses of Argos*; so also Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 53–54.

54. Cf. Strabo, 6.1.14 (C264); Dion. Hal. 1.52.4, 1.72.4; Plut. *Rom.* 1.2; Polyaeus, 8.25.2; W. Schur, *Klio*, 17 (1921), 146–148; Solmsen, *HSCP*, 90 (1986), 104–110.

stands quite isolated; no clear evidence of Hellenic speculation on the origins of Rome exists for perhaps another century.<sup>55</sup> Better to suppose that Dionysius erred in ascribing this text to Hellanicus, or that another writer composed a treatise with this title, or that a later scholar interpolated the material.<sup>56</sup> The account, as transmitted, almost certainly represents a patchwork of separate items and independent traditions: the western migration of Odysseus, the flight of Aeneas, the burning of ships after return from Troy, and the foundation story of Rome. That these were assembled by Hellanicus as early as the fifth century is a dubious proposition. A more plausible setting would seem to be the later fourth century when tales of Aeneas and Latium, of Odysseus' western ventures, and of arsonist Trojan women were circulating in the school of Aristotle and elsewhere.

The interweaving of these strands reappears in the infuriatingly obscure *Alexandra* of Lycophron. In that poem, Cassandra, in customary dark and allusive fashion, refers to the meanderings of her kinsman, evidently Aeneas, and has him joined by a former foe in Italy, now bringing a friendly troop: the *νάνος*, whose own wanderings had carried him over every stretch of land and sea. The reference is clearly to Odysseus, and the verses proceed to recount legends on Aeneas' founding of Lavinium, mother city of Rome.<sup>57</sup> Dispute persists on Lyco-

55. The authenticity of the tradition is usually regarded as settled because Dionysius finds confirmation of it in Damastes of Sigeum; 1.72.2: *ὁμολογεῖ δ' αὐτῷ καὶ Δαμαστής ὁ Σιγεύς*. Damastes, as we know, was the pupil of Hellanicus, a contemporary of the Peloponnesian War; Dion. Hal. *De Thuc.* 5.330; Suidas, s.v. *Δαμάστης*. But it is unclear just how much of the material cited from *The Priestesses* reappeared in Damastes. The overlap may not have gone beyond the story of the burning of the ships. So Horsfall, CQ, 29 (1979), 382; reiterated in Bremmer and Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 15–16.

56. See Perret, *Les origines*, 367–380. His doubts about Hellenic authorship have not met with much favor, and many of his arguments are indeed weak. Some trenchant criticisms were leveled by P. Boyancé, *REA*, 45 (1943) = *Études sur la religion romaine*, 161–170. The case was revived in different form by Horsfall, CQ, 29 (1979), 376–383, who, however, places too much weight on ostensible inconsistencies between Hellanicus' *Troika* and *The Priestesses of Argos*. Belief in Hellenic authorship still prevails in the scholarly literature; e.g., Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 103–106; Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 53–56; Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 107–109, 444–445; Solmsen, *HSCP*, 90 (1986), 93–110; J. Poucet, *Les origines de Rome* (Brussels, 1985), 185, with further bibliography; Poucet, *LEC*, 57 (1989), 238–240; Gabba, *Dionysius*, 12.

57. Lycophron, 1226–1280. The *νάνος* is often associated with Nanas, a legendary Etruscan figure noted by Hellanicus, thus a reflection of other tales that link Odysseus to Etruria; Dion. Hal. 1.28.3; Lycophron, 805–806; Theopompus, *FGH*, 115 F354. See the discussions of Schur, *Klio*, 17 (1921), 137–143; Phillips, *JHS*, 73 (1953), 60–61; Dury-

phron's date, and resolution seems remote. No need to enter that controversy.<sup>58</sup> But even if one postulates the earliest possible time, the reign of Ptolemy II, we are no earlier than the first half of the third century. That is an appropriate era. Rome's rising stature on the international stage would give incentive for the patching together of disparate traditions on the city's beginnings.

The tale of collaboration between Aeneas and Odysseus carries special significance. The value lies not in the insight provided into fifth-century Greek opinion of the city's foundation—a problematic and questionable deduction. Rather, it demonstrates the continued claim that Odysseus had upon a place in the story of Rome's origins, a claim still valid well into the third century. That conclusion stands, clear and firm, amidst the shaky hypotheses and the uncertain chronology. The notion of Rome as a Greek foundation or one with a substantial Greek component remained alive and well, even at a time when Aeneas might otherwise have held the field.

Diverse speculations on the origins of Rome proliferated. Tales fitting a postulated Romus or Romulus into traditions of Greek or Trojan migrations took shape.<sup>59</sup> Even Alexandrian scholars contributed to the proliferation: Eratosthenes himself had Romulus as grandson of Aeneas.<sup>60</sup> One need not conclude that Greeks depended on Roman folk tales for these creations. For the most part Hellenic legend makers merely conceived eponyms and attached them to the Aeneas or Odysseus sagas. Few of the reconstructions betray any knowledge of the

Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 65–72—although the near-unanimous assumption that Lycophron's material derives from Timaeus is undemonstrated and undemonstrable. Poucet, *RevBelge*, 61 (1983), 148–149, is properly skeptical. So also L. Pearson, *The Greek Historians of the West: Timaeus and His Predecessors* (Atlanta, 1987), 85. Horsfall, CQ, 29 (1979), 381, injects further doubts about the nanos-Nanas equation. These do not, however, affect the conclusion that Lycophron's *νάνος* is Odysseus. Cf. Homeric references to Odysseus' short stature; *Iliad*, 3.193; *Odyssey*, 6.230.

58. The poem itself, if its author is the court poet of Ptolemy II, will date to the early third century. But the lines in question, implying a preeminence for Rome, may well be a later composition. The early date was ably defended by Momigliano, *JRS*, 32 (1942), 53–64 = *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome, 1960), 446–454; followed by P. Léveque, *REA*, 57 (1955), 36–56. Arguments for a later date, either for the poem as a whole or for the Roman section, can be found in K. Ziegler, *RE*, 13.2 (1927) 2354–2381; S. Josifovic, *RE*, Suppl. 11 (1968) 925–930; P. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), II, 1066–1067, n. 331; S. West, CQ, 33 (1983), 122–123, 129–131; *JHS*, 104 (1984), 127–151.

59. Plut. *Rom.* 2.1–3; Dion. Hal. 1.72.1, 1.72.5–6; see above, nn. 43, 45, 46.

60. *FGH*, 241 F45.

twins Romulus and Remus. And those writers who do indicate such knowledge refashioned the story to their own taste. Lycophron, for example, has Odysseus accompany Aeneas to Italy and makes Aeneas the direct ancestor of the twins.<sup>61</sup> This and similar notions eventually raised troubling questions about chronology. The traditional date of Troy's fall, 1184, was not easily reconcilable with that of Rome's foundation, placed by Timaeus in 814/3. The solution, in its essentials, was first adumbrated for the Greek world by Diocles of Peparethus in the middle or late third century: Aeneas' descendants reigned for some generations in Alba Longa, and the last of that line produced a daughter who gave birth to Romulus and Remus. Diocles' version, not any Roman attempt to reconcile the conflicting chronology, paved the way to a solution. Indeed Roman writers such as Naevius and Ennius remained content with the fiction that had Aeneas as maternal grandfather of Romulus. But Diocles' outline was adopted by Fabius Pictor and became the basis for the canonical Roman version.<sup>62</sup> So even the standard and familiar tale, as later consecrated by Livy and Vergil, owed its original form to a Hellenic creation.

Two central points emerge with clarity from all the foregoing, and deserve to be accented. First, the conception and development of traditions that linked the origins of Rome with Troy came from the workshops of Greek historians, writers, and intellectuals. Their initial concerns were not with Rome at all but with spinning tales of migrations to the West in the wake of the Trojan War. The Greeks of Sicily and southern Italy, eager to attach their pedigree to the great legends that derived from the epic tradition, elaborated these tales. Rome came late to Hellenic attention. When it did, in the course of engagement with Italian-Greek cities in the fourth century, Greek writers invented eponymous founders and joined the beginnings of Rome to their own literary traditions—as was their wont.<sup>63</sup> And their formulations in turn served to shape Rome's construction of what became the canonical tale. Second, Greek conceptions by no means concentrated exclusively upon

61. Lycophron, 1232–1233, 1242–1244.

62. Plut. *Rom.* 3.1–3: τὰ μὲν κυριώτατα πρῶτος εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐξέδωκε Διοκλῆς Πεπαρήθιος, ὃ καὶ Φάβιος ὁ Πικτωρ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἐπηκολούθηκε. It is not clear from this language whether or to what extent Plutarch regarded Diocles as creator of this solution—or in what respects Diocles was followed by Fabius. But Diocles' contribution was plainly pivotal. On Naevius and Ennius, see Servius, *Ad Aen.* 1.273; and the extended discussion of G. d'Anna, *Problemi di letteratura latina arcaica* (Rome, 1976), 43–103. For Timaeus' date, see FGH, 566, F60.

63. See, in general, Bickermann, *CP*, 47 (1952), 65–81. Cf. Cornell, *LCM*, 2 (1977), 82–83.

the Aeneas saga, a fact often ignored. Indeed, the initial stories of westward wanderings seem to have featured Greek migrants, notably Odysseus. And even after the Aeneas saga underwent evolution at the hands of Sicilian historians and others, the notion of a basic Hellenic ingredient at the core of Roman history persisted and held its place among the learned reconstructions. It appears, among other sources, in Aristotle and writers of his school, in the third-century historian Xenagoras, and in the hybrid inventions that matched Aeneas and Odysseus as companions in the settlement of the West.<sup>64</sup> Hence, the idea that Roman origins lay in Hellas retained its hold upon many Greek intellectuals. Dionysius of Halicarnassus worked within a long and well-established convention.

These conclusions provoke an even more intriguing question. The discussion hitherto has treated Rome as essentially a passive recipient of Greek legends and fictitious creations. That, of course, tells only part of the story. Rome had its own indigenous traditions to explain the founding of the city, notably those involving the twins Romulus and Remus, which were eventually worked into place with the Hellenic sagas. At the time when Greek versions of the origins of Rome first impinged upon Roman consciousness, however, they came in several varieties. Many of those versions gave a greater role to Achaeans than to Trojan heroes, and yet it was the Aeneas tale that eventually prevailed. This outcome could not have been foreseen from the beginning. How to account for it? Why did the Romans adjudge themselves Trojans rather than Greeks? The question goes to the heart of Rome's cultural awakening and sense of identity.

A preliminary issue needs to be confronted. By what route did the Aeneas legend first reach Rome? A common thesis traces transmission through Etruria.<sup>65</sup> Considerable archaeological testimony seems to

64. Even Polybius, who knew the Trojan legend and lived many of his adult years in Rome, endorsed the myth that the Palatine was named after Pallas, son of Heracles and Lavinia, the daughter of Evander; Dion. Hal. 1.32.1. Fabius Pictor too acknowledged the Hellenic elements in prehistoric Italy. He notes Heracles' arrival in the peninsula; G. Manganaro, *PP*, 29 (1974), 394–397. And he conveys the contribution of Evander; fr. 1, Peter. On the persistence of Odysseus in tales of Rome's origins, see Galinsky, *Latomus*, 28 (1969), 3–18, who goes too far, however, in having Odysseus' part unchallenged before the time of Vergil.

65. E.g., F. Bömer, *Rom und Troia* (Baden-Baden, 1951), 14–39; Alföldi, *Die trojanischen Urahnen*, 14–19; idem, *Early Rome and the Latins*, 278–287; Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 12–140. Further bibliography in Castagnoli, *Lavinium*, 1: *Topografia generale, fonti, e storia delle ricerche* (Rome, 1972), 98.

stand in support, but as is now increasingly acknowledged, that testimony lends itself to a quite different interpretation. The motif of Aeneas' departure from Troy with Anchises enjoyed relatively high popularity in late sixth-century vase paintings. Approximately seventy vases display that scene, of which at least twenty-one have Etruscan provenance.<sup>66</sup> What does this prove? Another fifteen vases depict scenes of Aeneas as warrior or engaged in other activities.<sup>67</sup> The evidence suggests that Aeneas was a favorite figure in Etruria, not that he was celebrated as a settler in the West. The tastes of the artist rather than the interests of the consumer seem to take precedence. It is noteworthy that almost all these items are clustered in the late sixth century. They suggest an artistic fad, not a foundation myth.<sup>68</sup> A similar conclusion can be drawn from statuettes found at Veii depicting Aeneas carrying Anchises. They exhibit interest in the tale of Aeneas' escape from Troy and perhaps reverence for the qualities of *pietas* displayed in his deed, but they hardly prove that Aeneas was reckoned as a founder hero in Etruria. The terra-cotta statuettes, in any event, previously dated to the sixth or fifth century, may in fact belong to the fourth or even the third century—thus well postdating Rome's dominance of Veii and vitiating any theory that they represent Etruscan transmission of the legend to Rome.<sup>69</sup> Other material is scanty and inconclusive.<sup>70</sup> No substantive evidence buttresses the conclusion that Rome derived the idea of her Trojan origins from Etruria.

Latium is the more logical place to look. Greek writers who speak of western migrations and the founding of cities did not consider Rome the only Latin site worth attention. An early tradition affixed to Hesiod's

66. See the survey of K. Schauenberg, *Gymnasium*, 67 (1960), 176–190; and further W. Fuchs, *ANRW*, I.4 (1973), 615–632; Horsfall, *CQ*, 29 (1979), 386–388; S. Woodford and M. Loudon, *AJA*, 84 (1980), 30–33; F. Calcioni, *LIMC*, I.1 (1981), 386–388, no. 59–91.

67. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 125–130.

68. Knowledge of the Aeneas saga is not tantamount to belief in the foundation myth. Cf. J. Perret, *REL*, 49 (1971), 40; Cornell, *LCM*, 2 (1977), 78; Horsfall, *CQ*, 29 (1979), 386–388; Poucet, *AntCl*, 48 (1979), 178–181; Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 165–168; Castagnoli, *Studi Romani*, 30 (1982), 3–4.

69. Perret, *REL*, 49 (1971), 41–43; Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 169–173; M. Torelli, *Lavinio e Roma* (Rome, 1984), 227–228.

70. See the summaries by Poucet, *AntCl*, 48 (1979), 178–181; and Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 18–19. Cf. F. Zevi, in G. Colonna et al., eds., *Gli Etruschi e Roma* (Rome, 1981), 148–153. Livy, 9.36.3, provides the intriguing notice that, according to some sources, Roman boys in the late fourth century were commonly educated in Etruscan literature. Even if that be true, however, it does not indicate that the Trojan story came via that route.

text, as we have seen, made Odysseus father of Latinus—an evident allusion to Latium rather than to any particular city within it.<sup>71</sup> Aristotle reported that Achaeans whose ships had been burned were forced to settle in “Latinium.”<sup>72</sup> Alcimus spoke of Alba, granddaughter of Aeneas who gave birth to Rhomos, founder of Rome.<sup>73</sup> Callias had the Trojan woman Rhome marry Latinus.<sup>74</sup> Xenagoras reported three sons of Odysseus—Rhomos, Anteias, and Ardeias—who were responsible for founding those three Latin cities.<sup>75</sup> Timaeus' researches in the early third century gathered information on the legend of Trojan ancestry that stemmed from both Rome and Lavinium.<sup>76</sup> And Lycophron reports the narrative of the sow with piglets and Aeneas' founding of a city, evidently Lavinium.<sup>77</sup> So the traditions of Trojan or Greek ancestry had encompassed Latium by the early third century. They did not need to reach Rome via Etruria.

The canonical story in its full-blown form associated Rome most closely with two Latin towns: Lavinium and Alba Longa. Aeneas established a Trojan settlement at Lavinium, guided there by a gigantic sow who delivered thirty piglets. The number signified the years to elapse before Aeneas' son Ascanius would in turn depart to found a new city at Alba Longa. Ascanius thereby inaugurated the line of Alban kings which occupied three centuries until the birth of the twins Romulus and Remus who would be the creators of Rome. The roles of Lavinium and Alba Longa had been firmly fixed in the tradition by the end of the Republic.<sup>78</sup> Varro, assiduous researcher into Roman antiquities, reported that Lavinium was the first Trojan settlement in Latium and the repository of the Trojan Penates.<sup>79</sup> The annual ceremony to honor the

71. Hesiod, *Theog.* 1011–1013.

72. Dion. Hal. 1.72.3–4. The word is occasionally emended to “Lavinium,” but without good reason. If emendation be resorted to, “Latium” is more plausible.

73. Festus, 326, 328, L.

74. Dion. Hal. 1.72.5; Festus, 329, L.

75. Dion. Hal. 1.72.5.

76. Polyb. 12.4b–4c; Dion. Hal. 1.67.3–4.

77. Lycophron, 1255–1260.

78. E.g., Vergil, *Aen.* 1.267–274; Livy, 1.1–3, 1.23.1; Dion. Hal. 1.52–59, 1.66. Despite common presumption, Sallust, *Cat.* 6.1, does not dispute this tale and present Aeneas as direct founder of Rome. As a careful reading of the passage shows, Sallust only makes the point that a mixture of Trojans and aborigines constituted the early Romans; cf. W. A. Schröder, *M. Porcius Cato: Das erste Buch der “Origines”* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1971), 69.

79. Varro, *LL*, 5.144: *oppidum quod primum conditum in Latio stirpis Romanae, Lavinium; nam ibi dii Penates nostri*; cf. Plut. *Cor.* 29.2; Val. Max. 1.8.8; Servius, *Ad Aen.* 7.661.

cult of Aeneas took place not in Rome but in Lavinium.<sup>80</sup> And Alba Longa had its own special prestige. Late Republican aristocrats traced their lineage back to the legendary rulers of that city.<sup>81</sup> Roman writers embraced the connection and perpetuated it.<sup>82</sup> When and why?

Much speculation surrounds the role of Lavinium in transmission of the Trojan legend, spurred in part by excavations at the site. It is often held that a cult of Aeneas existed in Lavinium from an early stage, thus supplying the intermediate link for adoption of the Trojan lineage in Rome.<sup>83</sup> Literary sources report that Aeneas received worship at Lavinium under the name of Indiges, Pater Indiges, or Jupiter Indiges.<sup>84</sup> An inscription found not far from Lavinium has been read as *Lare Aenia d(ono)*, suggesting a dedication to Lar Aeneas.<sup>85</sup> And the discovery of a seventh-century tomb, restructured as part of a larger monument in the fourth century, when combined with Dionysius' testimony on a hero shrine for Aeneas at Lavinium, seemed to confirm the idea.<sup>86</sup> But the evidence, even in ensemble, is thin, disputed, and untrustworthy. The worship of Aeneas as Indiges implies attachment of the former to a preexisting Laviniate cult that honored a founder-hero. Nothing shows or suggests that the amalgamation of Aeneas and Indiges in Lavinium predated the Roman adaptation of the Trojan legend. Reading of the inscription is highly problematic; clear legibility ends with the *Lare*, and a phrase like *Lar Aeneas* has no discernible parallel. Hence it gives little

80. Serv. Auct., *Ad Aen.* 1.260; Asconius, 21, C; Val. Max. 1.6.7. Other testimony in Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, 260–261; S. Weinstock, *RE*, 19.1 (1937), 428–440.

81. Livy, 1.30.2. Cf. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, 238; T. P. Wiseman, *Greece and Rome*, 21 (1974), 153–154.

82. Cf. Livy, 5.52.8.

83. Alföldi, *Die trojanischen Urahnen*, 19–25; idem, *Early Rome and the Latins*, 250–278; Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 141–169; Moyaers, *RevBelge*, 55 (1977), 43–50; Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 173–246. On the excavations, see Castagnoli, *Lavinium, I; Lavinium, II: Le Tredici Are* (Rome, 1975); Dury-Moyaers; Torelli, *Lavinio e Roma*. This last needs to be read with great caution; see C. Ampolo, *CR*, 102 (1988), 117–120. Note also Zevi, in *Gli Etruschi e Roma*, 145–148, 153–156. The archaeological data do not suggest chronological priority of Lavinium over Rome, or vice versa; cf. Poucet, *Les origines*, 133–134; idem, *LEC*, 57 (1989), 234–238.

84. Livy, 1.2.6; Festus, 94, L; *Origo gentis Romanae*, 14.4; Vergil, *Aen.* 12.794–795. The information dates back at least to the early second-century historian Cassius Hemina; fr. 7, Peter.

85. M. Guarducci, *BullComm*, 76 (1956–58), 1–13; *ILLRP*, 1271.

86. Dion. Hal. 1.64.5; P. Sommella, *RendPontAcc*, 44 (1971–72), 47–74; idem, *Gymnasium*, 81 (1974), 273–297; Galinsky, *Vergilius*, 20 (1974), 2–11; Castagnoli, *Studi Romani*, 30 (1982), 12–13; Gabba, *Dionysius*, 139.

support to the notion of a shrine for Aeneas. As for the tomb, numerous discrepancies undermine its value as testimony for an antique cult of Aeneas. The mound described by Dionysius has neither the right size nor the right location to correspond with the excavated monument. And an inscription on the shrine attested by Dionysius honors Pater Indiges but makes no mention of Aeneas. So, it predates rather than confirms the identification. The idea of an archaic cult for Aeneas at Lavinium which lay behind Rome's embrace of the legend thus rests on the shakiest foundations and had best be discarded altogether.<sup>87</sup> The cults of Lavinium go well back into antiquity, but the city's adoption of the Aeneas-Troy saga may have awaited Rome's, rather than anticipated it.

The traditions connected with Alba Longa lead to the same conclusion. The Mons Albanus, like Lavinium, served as site for annual Roman rituals recalling its role in Rome's origins. The *feriae Latinae* were celebrated here by Roman officials as reminder and renewal of Rome's ties to its Alban heritage. Alba carried prestige as an ancient religious center for the Latin peoples.<sup>88</sup> The Alban king list spanned the chronological distance required to reconcile the dates of Troy's fall and Rome's foundation. But that artificial creation does not itself undermine the significance of Rome's association with Alba. The fact that Naevius connected Alba with Rome while implicitly denying the chronological gap between the Trojan War and Rome's beginning implies that deeper reasons existed to link the two cities.<sup>89</sup> Tradition had it that Rome had defeated Alba Longa in the seventh century, razed the city, and absorbed its population.<sup>90</sup> This account makes all the more striking Rome's

87. The strongest objections to use of this evidence were leveled by Cornell, *LCM*, 2 (1977), 78–81. See further Poucet, *AntCl*, 48 (1979), 181–183; idem, *RevBelge*, 61 (1983), 153–159; Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 446–447; Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 16–17; Poucet, *LEC*, 57 (1989), 231–238. Aeneas' landing place at the port of Lavinium was given the name of Troia; Dion. Hal. 1.53.3. The fact is emphasized by Moyaers, *RevBelge*, 55 (1977), 45–47. But the toponym may be consequence of rather than stimulus for the legend; cf. Castagnoli, *Studi Romani*, 30 (1982), 9. A sixth-century dedication to Castor and Pollux at Lavinium has also been used as evidence for an archaic cult of Aeneas through identification of those deities with the Trojan penates; S. Weinstock, *JRS*, 50 (1960), 112–114; Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 154–156. But the identification is dubious and the conclusion unwarranted; Castagnoli, *Lavinium, I*, 1909; cf. Dury-Moyaers, *Énée et Lavinium*, 198–205, 211–226.

88. Sources and discussion in Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, 29–34; Poucet, in F. Decreus and C. Deroux, eds., *Hommages à Josef Veremans* (Brussels, 1986), 239–244.

89. Naevius, *BP*, 1.21–22, W. So, rightly, Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 15.

90. Livy, 1.27–30. On this story, see Poucet, in *Hommages Veremans*, 254–258.

willingness to perpetuate and celebrate its ties to Alba as a mother city. The dual ancestry of Lavinium and Alba created some confusion among the early narratives as to priority between them. Fabius Pictor had the pregnant sow lead Aeneas to Alba Longa, where she dropped her litter, whereas Lycophron evidently placed that site at Lavinium.<sup>91</sup> The need to reconcile differences between the two traditions is exemplified by the tale of the Trojan Penates brought from Lavinium to Alba and twice mysteriously vanishing to turn up again in Lavinium. Those episodes produced the compromise which kept the images in Lavinium but gave the task of caring for them to men from Alba.<sup>92</sup> As is clear, the Trojan origins embraced by Rome were embedded in a Latin context and enmeshed with Latin legends.

When did the embrace take place and what was its significance for Rome and the Latins? Greek intellectuals, as we have seen, made reference to Latium or Latin towns, as well as to Rome, in the context of foundation stories. The appendix to Hesiod's *Theogony* shows Hellenic awareness of Latium but alludes neither to Romans nor to Trojans. Aristotle brought Achaeans to Latium; his pupil Heracleides Lembos brought them to Rome. The Sicilian Callias circa 300 had a Trojan woman marry Latinus and their offspring found Rome. None of these alternatives shows close parallel to or direct ancestry of the tales eventually adopted by Latin writers. The reports arose from Greek speculation rather than local tradition.

Alcimus' testimony has more to offer. His may be the first extant text to designate Alba as connecting link between Aeneas and the foundation of Rome.<sup>93</sup> But Alcimus' date is uncertain, and even if one puts him in the later fourth century, it would be prudent to avoid sweeping conclusions. Alcimus' evidence suggests claims by Alba Longa to the ancestry of Rome, but the involvement of Aeneas as grandfather may be the historian's superimposition of Greek legend rather than a sign that Alba acknowledged a Trojan connection.

Greek interest in Rome intensified in the third century. The period brings accumulating testimony that Trojan features of the legend gained ascendancy. Pyrrhus himself signaled their prevalence among the west-

91. Fabius Pictor, *FGH*, 809 F2 = Diod. 7.5.4; Lycophron, 1252–1260. On Lycophron's denotation, see d'Anna, *Problemi*, 64–67.

92. Dion. Hal. 1.67.1–3; Val. Max. 1.8.7.

93. Festus, 326, 328, L. See above, n. 43.

ern Greeks. He proclaimed himself in Italy as descendant of Achilles and announced that in that capacity he would duplicate his ancestor's success by bringing a Hellenic war upon the Romans, mere colonists of the Trojans. The taking of Troy provided a talisman that promised similar triumph for the Epirote king.<sup>94</sup> Pyrrhus' declaration does not itself prove that the Romans had already embraced Troy, but it does demonstrate a broad familiarity with the legend in the Greek communities of Sicily and southern Italy by the early third century.<sup>95</sup>

Pyrrhus' failure in Italy further enhanced the reputation of Rome—and the fascination of Greek intellectuals. Hieronymus of Cardia produced the first summary of Rome's early history.<sup>96</sup> And Timaeus, yet another Sicilian historian, pursued a more thorough investigation. He included commentary on Rome in his general history of Sicily, and he composed a separate monograph on the Pyrrhic War.<sup>97</sup> Timaeus' testimony is vital. Most significantly, it indicates that, for him at least, the Trojan origins of Rome were already standard doctrine. The historian's researches aimed at confirmation and demonstration of accepted tenets. He found evidence for Rome's Trojan ancestry in the festival of the October Horse: the sacrifice of the horse on the Campus Martius symbolized the capture of Troy through the ruse of the wooden horse. Polybius took Timaeus to task for that misguided and naive conclusion—rightly so—but Timaeus did not draw it alone and unaided. The belief was widely shared, and the historian obtained it from informants, presumably Roman informants.<sup>98</sup> He acquired corroborative testimony also from Lavinian intermediaries, describing sacred objects in the sanctuary at Lavinium as emblematic of the Trojan Penates. The identification gave evidence of the tradition that Lavinium was the site of a Trojan settlement and a parent city of Rome. Local legends reinforced the

94. Paus. 1.12.1: μνήμη τὸν Πύρρον τῆς ἀλώσεως ἐσῆλθε τῆς Ἰλίου καὶ οἱ κατὰ ταῦτ' ἠλπιζε χωρήσειν πολεμοῦντι; στρατεύειν γὰρ ἐπὶ Τρώων ἀποίκους Ἀχιλλέως ὦν ἀπόγονος.

95. Perret's bold thesis, *Les origines*, 409–419, 427–434, and passim, that Pyrrhus' claim created the legend of Rome's Trojan origins, has not found takers. See the decisive refutation by Momigliano, *JRS*, 35 (1945), 99–104. Further bibliography and discussion in Martin, *MEFRA*, 101 (1989), 117–118.

96. Dion. Hal. 1.6.1.

97. Polyb. 12.4b.1; Dion. Hal. 1.6.1; Cic. *Ad Fam.* 5.12.2; Gellius, 11.1.1. See, most recently, F. W. Walbank, *SCI*, 10 (1989–90), 50–51.

98. Polyb. 12.4b.1–12.4c.1; cf. Festus, 190, L: *quem hostiae loco quidam Marti bellico deo sacrari dicunt, non ut vulgus putat, quia velut supplicium de eo sumatur, quod Romani Ilio sunt oriundi.*

Sicilian historian's conviction that the legacy of Troy was a prime component in the history of Latium.<sup>99</sup> Although Alba goes unmentioned in the miserably scanty fragments, there is no reason to doubt that it held a place in the narrative by this time. Just when Timaeus penned the relevant passages escapes certainty. Conjectures range from 315 to the 260s.<sup>100</sup> One may tentatively infer that the legend of Rome's Trojan origins as mediated by Lavinium, Alba, or both had taken hold in Latium by the early third century.<sup>101</sup>

A suitable time for Roman adoption and adaptation of the legend now suggests itself. The later fourth century brought a convergence of political and cultural circumstances that made the Trojan connection in a Latin context particularly attractive. This was the era in which Rome defeated the forces of the Latin League and extended military and political control over the cities of Latium. It was also the era in which Rome spread its influence into Campania and entered into diplomatic relations with Greek cities such as Naples. The time proved propitious for embrace of the fables that linked Rome and Latin cities to the heritage of the Hellenic past.

The dissolution of the Latin League after 338 set Roman relations with Latium on a new and different footing. The victor no longer dealt with a federal organization but established separate compacts with the

99. Dion. Hal. 1.67.3–4. Timaeus' language, *πυθέσθαι δὲ αὐτὸς τὰτα παρὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων*, need not mean that he got the story in Lavinium itself; so Schur, *Klio*, 17 (1921), 142–143. But that seems a preferable surmise to the conjectures that he interviewed Lavinian merchants in Sicily. Perret's effort, *Les origines*, 440–449, to discredit the testimony is unavailing. See d'Anna, *Problemi*, 68–73; Moyaers, *RevBelge*, 55 (1977), 34–35; Castagnoli, *Studi Romani*, 30 (1982), 8–9; Poucet, *LEC*, 57 (1989), 240–242.

100. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, 248: ca. 315. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 19: the 260s. One item inclines to the latter: Dionysius dated Timaeus' treatment of Rome later than that of Hieronymus; 1.6.1.

101. Cornell suggests that the Romans did not become aware of the Trojan legend until the course of the third century but does not discuss Timaeus' evidence; *LCM*, 2 (1977), 82. The assertion of Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 448, that the Trojan legend took root in Rome and the rest of Latium by the early fourth century is in no way established by his arguments. The paintings in the Francois tomb at Vulci may be relevant here. If the ingenious reconstruction of F. Coarelli, *DialArch* (1983–84), 43–69, is right, the identification of Romans and Trojans was already accepted fact by the late fourth century, but his conclusions are speculative and undemonstrable. Equally inconclusive are alleged depictions of Aeneas on Praenestine cistae of the third or second century. One depicts a triumphal figure engaged in some religious act, but there is nothing to show that this is Aeneas; G. Bordenache Battaglia, *Le ciste prenestine*, 1.1: *Corpus* (Rome, 1979), 58–60. And another, sometimes regarded as a depiction of Latinus sanctioning the wedding of Aeneas and Lavinia, is of dubious authenticity; Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 162–164; Bordenache Battaglia, 127–129.

several cities. Rome also extended citizenship to some and framed alliances with others. A complex of arrangements developed which both assured Roman preeminence and maintained the integrity of the Latin communities.<sup>102</sup> The new situation encouraged attention to cultural bonds that tied Latium to Rome, while legitimating the supremacy of the latter.

Whether the legend reached Rome from the Latin towns or vice versa is unanswerable.<sup>103</sup> A different consideration deserves emphasis. The tradition of Trojan origins took shape in the later fourth century because it held advantages both for Rome and for the towns of Latium. It was attractive for Latins to advance the idea that their most ancient and renowned sites had been the mother cities of Rome. The concept offered prestige and priority in the new world of Roman Italy. Alba Longa, no longer extant as a physical site at that time, served as symbolic representative of Latium's antiquity, and Lavinium, seat of religious cults and possessor of a celebrated past, gained revitalized recognition through a formal treaty with Rome that would have ceremonial renewal each year.<sup>104</sup> So the Latin towns had reason to endorse the connection. Rome, for its part, found similarly welcome benefits in the legends. They lent a cultural legitimacy to its position of authority in Latium. Rome was now heir to the region's glorious past; not just conqueror and suzerain but cultural curator. The treaty with Lavinium suited that posture, as did the practice of Roman officials' honoring the cult of the Penates in Lavinium rather than in Rome.<sup>105</sup> And equally important, the assimilation of the legends announced a link with the Hellenic world, thereby to validate Rome's association with the Greek cities of Italy. The political circumstances of the late fourth century provided the proper setting.

The central question now demands response. Why did the Romans choose to consider themselves descendants of Trojans rather than Greeks? It is essential to stress that Greek speculations and creative

102. Cf. H. Galsterer, *Herrschaft und Verwaltung im republikanischen Italien* (Munich, 1976), 87–89; E. T. Salmon, *The Making of Roman Italy* (London, 1982), 40–56; Cornell, in *Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup>, VII.2 Cambridge, (1989), 365–367.

103. Speculation on the matter is pointless and unproductive. A summary of recent contributions to that debate is in Poucet, *AntCl*, 48 (1979), 186–190; cf. idem, *LEC*, 57 (1989), 240–245.

104. Livy, 8.11.15; cf. *ILS*, 5004. See Castagnoli, *Studi Romani*, 30 (1982), 11–12. It is, of course, quite possible that Alba is included in the tale because that city was already tightly associated with Rome's native story of Romulus and Remus.

105. See above, n. 80.

fancies about the remote origins of Latin cities postulated Hellenic roots as often as they imagined Trojan ancestry. The Hellenic versions, as conveyed by writers such as Aristotle, Heracleides Lembos, Callias, and Xenagoras, were still quite current in the late fourth and early third centuries. Furthermore, Trojans had been the losers in the Greek siege and had developed a reputation for effeminacy on top of that.<sup>106</sup> How is it then that the Trojan heritage and not the Greek prevailed in the Roman consciousness?

Did Romans look to Troy as symbol of opposition and resistance to Greece?<sup>107</sup> Such was the construction placed upon the legend by Pyrrhus when he solicited the support of Italian Greeks against the colonists of the Trojans.<sup>108</sup> But the Romans did not conceive the association as an antihellenic gesture. It suffices to cite the dedication made at Delphi in 194 and composed in Greek verse by T. Flamininus, victorious Roman general in the Second Macedonian War. Flamininus proclaimed himself both descendant of Aeneas and champion of Greek freedom.<sup>109</sup> The Romans knew no contradiction between those two postures. Nor did adoption of the Trojan legacy require eradication of Hellenic elements in the Italian past. Heracles and Evander, for instance, both appear in Fabius Pictor's account of early settlers in Italy, and these traditions in no way diluted the Trojan character of the Roman stock.<sup>110</sup> Troy held a meaning quite different from antagonism to Hellas.

Were Romans drawn to Aeneas rather than to Odysseus because the latter had a reputation for sly shrewdness, whereas the former exemplified *pietas*, the preeminent Roman virtue?<sup>111</sup> That interpretation narrows the issue intolerably—as if Romans were merely choosing between heroes, weighing respective qualities, and selecting a favorite.

106. On Trojan effeminacy, see, e.g., Euripides, *Orest.* 1111–1113; Vergil, *Aen.* 4.215–217, 9.614–620, 12.99–100.

107. Perret, *REL*, 49 (1971), 49–50. Cf. Toohey, *Arethusa*, 17 (1984), 9–12, who sees Rome's adoption of the Trojan legacy as a sign of Hellenophobia.

108. Paus. 1.12.1.

109. Plut. *Flam.* 12.6–7: Αἰνεάδας Τίτος ὕμνων ὑπέρτατον ὤπασε δῶρον / Ἑλλήνων τεύξας παισὶν ἐλευθερίαν. There are earlier examples also of the compatibility of Trojan ancestry and collaboration with Greeks; cf. Zon. 8.9.12; Justin, 28.1.5–28.2.14; Suet. *Claud.* 25.3.

110. For Heracles, see the Taormina inscription in Manganaro, *PP*, 29 (1974), 394–397. For Evander, see Fabius, fr. 1, Peter.

111. So Bömer, *Rom und Troia*, 39–49; cf. d'Anna, *Problemi*, 61. Galinsky, *Latomus*, 28 (1969), 6–18, implausibly suggests that the claim on an Odyssean heritage was undisputed until Vergil implicitly denied it.

And if Odysseus were uncongenial to Roman taste, would Livius Andronicus have undertaken a Roman adaptation of the *Odyssey*, the first major literary work in Latin?<sup>112</sup>

The embrace of Troy had subtler and more significant import. It enabled Rome to associate itself with the rich and complex fabric of Hellenic tradition, thus to enter that wider cultural world, just as it had entered the wider political world. But at the same time, it also announced Rome's distinctiveness from that world.<sup>113</sup> The Roman upper classes welcomed incorporation into the cultural legacy of Hellas but preferred to carve out their own niche within it. They sharpened a sense of their identity and laid a foundation for a national character. Troy proved especially serviceable in this quest. Its glorious past lay in remote antiquity, its people no longer extant, its city but a shell of its former self. Troy persisted as a symbol, not a current reality. No risk, then, of identification with contemporary folk whose defects would be all too evident and all too embarrassing. Romans could mold the Trojan image to their own ends. The legacy of Troy gained circulation through the epics of Naevius and Ennius and became the starting point for the historical works of Fabius Pictor and Cato the Elder—all of which celebrated the values of the nation. As in so much else, the Romans astutely converted Hellenic traditions to meet their own political and cultural purposes. The successful and enduring version that made Trojans the forebears of Rome owed its origin to Greek inventiveness and its reformulation to Latin ingenuity. The Greeks imposed the Trojan legend upon the West as a form of Hellenic cultural imperialism, only to see it appropriated by the westerner to define and convey a Roman cultural identity.

The Trojan connection had entrenched itself in Roman consciousness by the early third century. When historiography commenced at Rome, that connection was well established and unquestioned. But unanimity

112. Rightly noted by Poucet, *Les origines*, 285.

113. Cf. G. Colin, *Rome et la Grèce* (Paris, 1905), 147–165; Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 109, 447, 459. It might be objected that if Greek intellectuals such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus could identify Trojans with their nation, then the Romans' link with Troy would hardly mark them as distinct from Greeks; cf. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 93–96; Gabba, *Dionysius*, 14. But the difference in attitude is, in fact, profound. Dionysius strained to make the Trojans Greek; he did not see the Greeks as Trojans. Rome's acceptance of the Trojan lineage in no way equated Romans with Greeks. One can add further that when Romans first encountered Trojan tales they were not yet conversant with the learned reconstructions represented by Dionysius.

on the fundamental point did not bring uniformity in the tradition—very far from it. The fact is striking and noteworthy. Scholarly efforts to discern a rectilinear progression repeatedly encounter frustration. That should occasion no surprise. Roman writers, well aware that they were working with legendary material and malleable traditions, felt free to redesign and embellish within the general framework. They found no virtue in mere reproduction of predecessors, nor did they regard themselves as promoting a canonical tale. Their presuppositions had little in common with modern expectations.

Historical writing in Rome began perhaps a century after the concept of Trojan origins had taken hold. But the fable stayed fluid. Fabius Pictor, the earliest of Roman historians, composed his narrative toward the end of the third century.<sup>114</sup> The general chronological outline of what became the prevalent tale already found place in his work. Fabius acknowledged a gap of unspecified time between the era of Trojan migration and the founding of Rome, which he set in 748/7, employing the Greek form of reckoning familiar to a readership that commanded the language: the first year of the eighth Olympiad.<sup>115</sup> Just how long a gap he postulated or transmitted eludes certainty. Confident assertions that he accepted Eratosthenes' date for the Trojan War and put Aeneas' peregrinations in the twelfth century go beyond the evidence. But he certainly allotted several generations to the kings of Alba Longa, culminating in the usurpation of Amulius and the birth of the twins. A long time had elapsed.<sup>116</sup> Fabius' conception of the origins of Alba claims still greater interest. The historian had Aeneas led by the great white sow to that site, where she dropped her thirty piglets. An oracle had bidden Aeneas to found a city on the spot to which the sow directed him, but a vision in his dream persuaded him to wait thirty years, as indicated by the number in the litter. Aeneas' death canceled plans, but Ascanius eventually established Alba after the thirty years had elapsed.<sup>117</sup> Lavinium makes no appearance in the skimpy fragments of Fabius Pictor,

114. Fabius as earliest historian: Dion. Hal. 1.6.2, 7.71.1; Livy, 1.44.2, 2.40.10. On the date of the work, not susceptible to precise proof, see the discussion of B. Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition* (Rome, 1979), 227–246.

115. Dion. Hal. 1.74.1; cf. Solin. 1.27.

116. Plut. *Rom.* 3.1–3; Mangano, *PP*, 29 (1974), 394: *πολὶ ὕστερον ἐγένοντο Ῥωμύλος [καὶ Ρ]έμος καὶ Ῥώμης [κτίσις ὑ]πὸ Ῥωμύλου*. Some have convinced themselves that Fabius invented the Alban king list; Perret, *Les origines*, 491; Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, 126. The claim is unpersuasive and at odds with Plut. *Rom.* 3.1–2. Cf. Schröder, *Cato: Das erste Buch der "Origines"*, 170–171.

117. Fabius Pictor, *FGH*, 809, F2.

though one cannot rule out the possibility that his text recorded its foundation by Aeneas.<sup>118</sup> What matters, however, is that the sow drew Aeneas to the Alban Mount and not to Lavinium. Fabius' version of the story did not subsequently carry the day.

The broad outlines of the legend in Cato's *Origines* must have had close similarity to the Fabian reconstruction. Roman historians now took as established fact a lengthy divide between the fall of Troy and the beginnings of Rome. Cato, writing in Latin and consequently avoiding certain conventions of Hellenic historiography, abandoned dating by Olympic years. He set Rome's foundation at 432 years after the Trojan War.<sup>119</sup> Cato's starting point remains unclear. Dionysius took it to be the date assigned by Eratosthenes to the fall of Troy, that is, 1184/3 B.C., thus putting Rome's foundation in 752/10 or 751/0, depending on whether Cato did or did not employ inclusive reckoning. But the conclusion of Dionysius, though widely accepted, is only an inference. Eratosthenes' chronology, however influential in Hellas, need not have impressed Cato the Censor. The Alexandrian knew of no long gap between the Trojan War and the origins of Rome, a fundamental fact for Cato. On that matter, Cato and Fabius concurred.<sup>120</sup>

The surviving fragments of *Origines*, book 1, indicate an elaborate tale. The narrative included Aeneas' arrival in Italy with Anchises, his marriage to Lavinia, daughter of the aboriginal king Latinus, the founding of Lavinium, a breakdown of relations between Trojans and Latins, followed by a series of contests that brought about the deaths in turn of Latinus, Turnus, and Aeneas himself, a further war between Ascanius and Mezentius, and then Ascanius' settlement of Alba Longa.<sup>121</sup> How much of his account coincides with Fabius' is a matter for speculation,

118. So, rightly, d'Anna, *Problemi*, 93–97, as against Perret, *Les origines*, 325–334.

119. Dion. Hal. 1.74.2: *Κάτων δὲ Πόρκιος Ἑλληνικὸν μὲν οὐχ ὀρίζει χρόνον, ἐπιμελής δὲ γενόμενος εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς ἀρχαιολογουμένης ἱστορίας ἔτεσιν ἀποφαίνει δυσι καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ τετρακοσίοις ὑστεροῦσαν τῶν Ἰλιακῶν*.

120. The reference to Eratosthenes' dating is clearly Dionysius' own, not Cato's; Dion. Hal. 1.74.2: *ὁ δὲ χρόνος οὗτος ἀναμετρηθεὶς ταῖς Ἐρατοσθένους χρονολογίαις κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος πίπτει τῆς ἐβδόμης ὀλυμπιάδος*. On the whole question, see R. Werner, *Der Beginn der römischen Republik* (Munich, 1963), 113–119, with full bibliography; Schröder, *Cato: Das erste Buch der "Origines"*, 167–170. Roman historians plainly felt no compulsion toward unanimity on the precise date of the city's foundation. L. Cincius Alimentus, a close contemporary of Fabius Pictor, put it "around" the fourth year of the twelfth Olympiad, i.e., 729/8; Dion. Hal. 1.74.1: *Λεύκιος δὲ Κίγκιος . . . περὶ τὸ τέταρτον ἔτος τῆς δωδεκάτης ὀλυμπιάδος*.

121. Cato, *HRR*, fr. 4–14. See the summary by Schröder, *Cato: Das erste Buch der "Origines"*, 91–92.

not worth pursuing here.<sup>122</sup> But Cato certainly diverged from Fabius in his narrative of the sow prodigy. Whereas the earlier historian had located the event in Alba itself, thus denoting that site as Aeneas' destined foundation from which a vision had to deter him, Cato places it in Lavinium, already the city of Aeneas.<sup>123</sup> The saga lacked uniformity even on so basic a point. The sow's litter, however, carries the same significance for Cato as for Fabius: the thirty piglets presage a thirty-year wait before the foundation of Alba Longa.<sup>124</sup>

Yet even on this matter the Latin historiographic tradition divided. Cassius Hemina, reckoned among Rome's earliest historians, composed his work in the middle or later second century.<sup>125</sup> But Hemina, far from following the versions of his predecessors and contemporaries, put the prodigy of the sow at the time of Romulus and Remus!<sup>126</sup> Just what significance the piglets had for Hemina remains obscure, but he evidently felt no obligation to reproduce a canonical tale.<sup>127</sup> Such items as the miracle of the sow, the first designated settlement of Aeneas, and the relationship of Lavinium and Alba were hardly minor details. Roman historians nonetheless felt free to dissent and to refashion the narrative.

That tendency can be discerned in Polybius as well. The Greek historian composed his magnum opus in Rome, had the acquaintance of

122. Perret, *Les origines*, 540–544, ascribed to Cato the idea of Lavinium as Aeneas' initial settlement in Latium, as well as the introduction of such personages as Latinus, Lavinia, Ascanius, Turnus, and Mezentius. Schröder, *Cato: Das erste Buch der "Origines"*, 94, questions some of the conclusions but agrees on Turnus and Mezentius; cf. 118–122; also Horsfall, in Bremmer and Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 23.

123. *Origo gentis Romanae*, 12.5: *Cato in Origine generis Romani ita docet: suem triginta porculos peperisse in eo loco, ubi nunc est Lavinium, cumque Aeneas urbem ibi condere constituisset*, etc. Cf. Perret, *Les origines*, 535–536; W. Ehlers, *MH*, 6 (1949), 168–172; Schröder, *Cato: Das erste Buch der "Origines"*, 141–142. Nor is that the only occasion in which Cato took issue with Fabius on the early history of Rome; cf. Dion. Hal. 4.15.1.

124. Serv. Auct. *Ad Aen.* 1.269: *vel quod Cato ait XXX annis expletis eum [Ascanius] Albam condidisse; Origo gentis Romanae*, 12.5. The first passage is wrongly denied to Cato by Perret, *Les origines*, 524–526, on the basis of Serv. *Ad Aen.* 6.760. In fact, the latter, which suggests that Ascanius did not wait thirty years to found Alba, is more Servius than Cato; cf. d'Anna, *Problemi*, 107–108.

125. Censorinus, *De Die Nat.* 17.11; Pliny, *NH*, 13.84, 28.12. On Hemina's date, see now G. Forsythe, *Phoenix*, 44 (1990), 326–333, with bibliography.

126. Hemina, in *Diomed.* I.384, K = HRR, fr. 11: *Pastorum vulgus sine contentione consentiendo praefererunt aequaliter imperio Remum et Romulum ita ut de regno pararent inter se. Monstrum fit: sus parit porcos triginta, cuius rei fanum fecerunt Laribus Grundilibus*. Cf. Perret, *Les origines*, 554–555.

127. D'Anna, *Problemi*, 104–113, suggests that Hemina, by divorcing the sow from the Aeneas story, was responsible for the version that has Ascanius found Alba shortly after the death of Aeneas; cf. Serv. *Ad Aen.* 6.760.

Cato, and doubtless knew the *Origines*. But on at least one noteworthy point of early Roman history, Polybius held an opinion at sharp variance with that of the Censor. Cato produced or perpetuated the tradition that Aeneas married Lavinia, daughter of the indigenous king Latinus.<sup>128</sup> That link held a pivotal place in the national past. Polybius, by contrast and quite strikingly, has Lavinia as daughter of Evander and wife of Heracles—a significant chronological distance from the time of Aeneas.<sup>129</sup> Arcadian lore may lurk behind that version. It was surely not Polybius' intent to undermine the Roman self-conception. The presentation of diverse strands and the endorsement of variants had ample precedents; it was accepted practice at a time when traditions were fluid and particulars susceptible to manipulation. What merits notice, however, is that such fluidity continued in the mid-second century, perhaps 150 years after the embrace of the Trojan origins. The connection itself delivered the vital message. All the rest was malleable.

When one moves from historiography, whose practitioners took seriously the duty of recovering the past, to poets, diversity increases. Even the main line of the tradition wavers and fragments.

Naevius' *Bellum punicum* saw the light of day in the late third century.<sup>130</sup> It appeared, therefore, contemporaneously with the history of Fabius Pictor. Our evidence does not permit decision on the priority of one or the other.<sup>131</sup> We do know, however, that Naevius altogether ignored the long chronological span that, for Fabius, separated Aeneas and the foundation of Rome. He had no need for intervening settlements or Alban king lists. The poet simply declared Romulus a grandson of Aeneas through his mother's side.<sup>132</sup> Nothing more can be said with certainty about Naevius' version of this matter.<sup>133</sup> But that is enough. He cared little about perpetuating a canonical tradition on

128. Serv. *Ad Aen.* 6.760.

129. Polyb. in Dion. Hal. 1.32.1. By contrast, Polybius' date for the founding of Rome, the second year of the seventh Olympiad, i.e., 751/0, is very close to Fabius', 748/7, and probably to Cato's; see above n. 120.

130. Cicero designates it as a work of Naevius' old age; *De Sen.* 50.

131. Perret, *Les origines*, 477, opts for Naevius. If Fabius' work appeared first, so he postulates, Naevius would never have altered his chronological scheme. That reasoning, as we have seen, is altogether fallacious.

132. Serv. *Ad Aen.* 1.273: *Naevius et Ennius Aeneae ex filia nepotem Romulum conditorem urbis tradunt*.

133. Naevius presumably did know of an Alban connection with Rome's founding, for his text alludes to Amulius; Naevius, *BP*, 24, Morel = 21–22, Warm. Cf. Festus, 370, L, a much disputed fragment; see M. Barchiesi, *Nevio epico* (Padua, 1962), 165–166, 523–526.

Rome's prehistory. Theories about whether he opted for an Eratosthenian or a Timaeon date seem singularly misguided.<sup>134</sup> Naevius could dispense with arcane chronological research.

The great epic of Q. Ennius was produced after publication of Rome's earliest histories, those of Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus, and after the chronological studies of Eratosthenes. Yet Ennius simply followed the scheme of his poetic predecessor Naevius: Aeneas' daughter was mother of Romulus, founder of the city.<sup>135</sup> The discrepancy between the era of Aeneas and the time of Romulus was a matter of complete indifference. Ennius did have some date in mind for the city's origins, but he did not press for precision. A speaker in the *Annales* makes reference to a time "more or less seven hundred years" from the founding of Rome.<sup>136</sup> That Ennius had recourse to the researches of Eratosthenes is a common but unverifiable conjecture.<sup>137</sup> There is no more reason to believe that the poet felt bound by Alexandrian scholarship than by the chronological scheme of Fabius Pictor.<sup>138</sup> Varro, who had the text of Ennius before him, took the seven hundred years as reckoned from Ennius' own day.<sup>139</sup> That computation implies a date in the early ninth century, at odds with all other dates. But why not? Cincius' date differed from Fabius', both differed from Timaeus', and all of them from Eratosthenes'. The assumption that Ennius' epic had to settle upon an established date is fundamentally flawed. The origins of

134. Scholars have devoted much discussion to the date assigned by Naevius to the city's beginnings. Most put it in 814/3, the Timaeon date, on the ground that Naevius included the Dido-Aeneas tale, thus adopting Timaeus' synchronism of Rome and Carthage; F. Noack, *Hermes*, 27 (1892), 434-436; Barchiesi, *Nevio epico*, 206, 477-479; d'Anna, *Problemi*, 79-80. But no Naevian fragment makes explicit reference to the tale. The nearest we have is Serv. *Ad Aen.* 4.9: *cuius filiae fuerint Anna et Dido Naevius dicit*. The poet can certainly not have dwelled long over the story; cf. E. V. Marmorale, *Naevius poeta* (Florence, 1953), 246-247. And no secure inferences can be made about chronology.

135. Serv. *Ad Aen.* 1.273; see above n. 132. The woman's name in this version is Ilia, probably also the name employed by Naevius; Serv. *Ad Aen.* 6.777. Ennius' version, like Naevius', included the Alban connection; Ennius, *Annales*, 33, V = 31, Sk.

136. Varro, *RR*, 3.1.2: *septingenti sunt paulo plus vel minus anni / augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est*.

137. See, e.g., d'Anna, *Problemi*, 80-83; and most recently, O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), 314-315.

138. The confident assertions of d'Anna, *Problemi*, 83: "per Ennio Eratostene doveva avere un prestigio superiore a Fabio Pittore," and Skutsch, *Annals*, 314, n. 2: "It is impossible to surmise that Ennius . . . could have disregarded the chronology of Eratosthenes," are without foundation.

139. Varro, *RR*, 3.1.2: *nam in hoc nunc denique est ut dici possit, non cum Ennius scripsit, "septingenti sunt."*

the Roman people in Troy were the paramount point, long since entrenched and firm. All else could fluctuate. The imagination of poets and even the ingenuity of historians had broad leeway.

Roman writers, as is plain, could be quite cavalier about the particulars of their nation's origins. One would, therefore, hardly expect Greek intellectuals to adhere to a standard line of interpretation. Even among those who took the trouble to inform themselves about traditions in Rome and Latium and who regarded the Trojan background as a given, diversity prevailed.

Timaeus subscribed to the legend of Rome's origins in Troy. And he undertook research in Latium to bolster the thesis, finding support both in Lavinian traditions and in Roman institutions.<sup>140</sup> The Sicilian historian's reconstruction also presupposed a stretch of many generations between the fall of Troy and the creation of Rome. He set the former in the distant past, in the twelfth century or possibly even the fourteenth.<sup>141</sup> For the latter he produced a new date: 814/3, to coincide with the founding of Carthage. The symbolism appealed to his imagination, equating the two powers who now dominated the western Mediterranean—or even presaging their coming clash.<sup>142</sup> The date itself stands alone, not elsewhere attested, perhaps drawn from Carthaginian tradition rather than the speculations of Greek or Roman intellectuals. Dionysius of Halicarnassus professed himself baffled: he could not discern the chronological criteria employed by his predecessor.<sup>143</sup> They may owe less to historiographical principles than to contemporary circumstances and ingenious invention. Timaeus certainly felt free to create.

How Timaeus proposed to account for the chronological divide

140. See above, nn. 98-99.

141. The date of 1194/3 is indicated by Timaeus, *FGH*, 566, F 125—417 years before the first Olympiad. But a strong case can be made for 1335/4, the date also given by Duris of Samos, *FGH*, 76, F41. See especially Timaeus, *FGH*, 566, F 80—the colonization of Corcyra six hundred years after the Trojan War. See the acute discussion by D. Asheri, *Saggi di letteratura e storiografia antiche* (Como, 1983), 53-67, with good bibliography.

142. Cf. A. Momigliano, *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1966), 46-51.

143. Dion. Hal. 1.74.1: *Τίμαιος μὲν ὁ Σικελιώτης οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτῳ κανόνι χρησάμενος ἅμα Καρχηδόνι κτιζομένη γενέσθαι φησὶν ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ πρότερον ἔτει τῆς πρώτης ὀλυμπιάδος*. D'Anna, *Problemi*, 69-73, implausibly takes this as an example of Dionysius' criticism of Timaeon methodology. The view of L. Moretti, *RivFilol*, 80 (1952), 296-298, that Timaeus reconciled the traditions by having Rome founded twice, lacks any basis—though welcomed by d'Anna, 74-75. Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 24, rather optimistically, takes the Timaeon date as based on solid tradition and buttressed by archaeological data on the Iron Age settlement.

between Aeneas and Rome defies conjecture.<sup>144</sup> The matter may not have concerned him much. It evidently did concern Diocles of Peparethus, however, a writer of the later third century, whose work, according to Plutarch, was followed in the main by Fabius Pictor. Diocles' narrative, at least in the view of Plutarch's source, contained reference to Aeneas' descendants as rulers of Alba, whose last representatives played out the story that issued in Romulus and the founding of Rome.<sup>145</sup> The tale of the Alban kings who served to fill the long gap between Aeneas and Romulus was therefore either invented or first brought to Greek attention by Diocles.

But not all Greeks by any means chose to adopt that version. Scholars and writers, even those well acquainted with the tale, could ignore it at will. The learned Eratosthenes fixed the time of Troy's fall in 1184/3, a date that held sway among subsequent Greek chronographers; but he also made Romulus the grandson of Aeneas, thus implicitly discarding Timaeus' chronology and dismissing the whole saga of the Alban succession.<sup>146</sup> The Alexandrian scholar was plainly familiar with Roman legends and even, like Timaeus, juxtaposed Rome and Carthage.<sup>147</sup> But he put the pieces together in his own way.

So also, we may be sure, did another Alexandrian writer, the poet Lycophron. The problems attaching to Lycophron's difficult text cannot and need not be pursued here. The verses that celebrate an imperial Rome almost certainly belong to the early second century, at the earliest.<sup>148</sup> The poet therefore would have had access both to Greek reconstructions and to Roman versions of the city's beginnings. His verses, in fact, show extensive knowledge of various particulars that reflect Hellenic, Latin, and even Etruscan traditions. Lycophron's erudition, however, did not induce him to reproduce the schemata of his predecessors. There is, for instance, no suggestion that he adopted Timaeus' belief in an interval of at least three and a half centuries between the Trojan War and the founding of Rome. Lycophron simply has Aeneas leave two lion cubs, an obvious allusion to Romulus and Remus.<sup>149</sup> The poet did

not have to bother with straightening out chronological inconsistencies. Still more revealing, however, is the legend of the sow and thirty piglets as it appears in the *Alexandra*. Latin writers differed on the story, as we have seen, whether in the location of the prodigy or the era in which it occurred. But Lycophron produced a variant even on the meaning of the omen: it referred not to the years that should pass before the founding of Alba but to the thirty communities that would make up the Latin League.<sup>150</sup> The purpose need not be polemical; Lycophron reflects a patriotic tradition in Lavinium, where a bronze image of the sow and her offspring had been erected to recall the episode.<sup>151</sup> But the poet felt no compulsion to follow an established line. Neither Timaeus nor Diocles set a pattern for the verses of the *Alexandra*.

Hegesianax of Alexandria Troas affords a particularly striking instance. A historian who wrote of Aeneas and the aftermath of the Trojan War, he had the opportunity to obtain firsthand information on Roman attitudes toward the city's origins, for he served as ambassador of Antiochus III to the Roman senate in 193.<sup>152</sup> Yet his version had little in common with anything retailed by Roman writers—or by most of the Greeks for that matter. According to Hegesianax, Aeneas had four sons: Ascanius, Euryleon, Romulus, and Romus, the last of whom founded the city that took his name.<sup>153</sup> If Hegesianax, who surely took the trouble to inform himself, knew of a canonical version, he plainly discounted it.<sup>154</sup> His version is all the more remarkable, for as we now know, the Chians in this very period voted to erect a monument to Romulus and Remus, founders of Rome, prompted by information they had acquired from Rome itself.<sup>155</sup> Hegesianax could treat the legend as he pleased.

It would be superfluous to multiply examples. Further variations could easily be cited long after the time when the idea of a Trojan

---

future rather than immediate descendants—but that reading largely depends on the presupposition that Lycophron followed the Timaeian version; cf. d'Anna, *Problemi*, 76.

150. Lycophron, 1253–1260: *κτίσει δὲ χώραν ἐν τόποις Βορειόγων / ὑπὲρ Λατίνους Δανίους τ' ὠκισμένην, / πύργους τριάκοντ', ἐξαριθμήσας γονὰς / σὺς κελ- αὐῆς*.

151. Lycophron, 1259–1260.

152. Livy, 34.57–59.

153. Dion. Hal. 1.72.1. Hegesianax wrote under the pseudonym Cephalon of Gergis; Athen. 9.393d.

154. Cf. Perret, *Les origines*, 512–513; Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 25.

155. The inscription, with text, Italian translation, and sound commentary, can be found conveniently in Moretti, *RivFilol*, 108 (1980), 33–54.

144. There is nothing to suggest that his narrative contained the Alban king list; contra: H. Strasburger, *SitzHeid* (1968), 17.

145. Plut. *Rom.* 3.1–2.

146. Serv. *Ad Aen.* 1.273.

147. Strabo, 1.4.9 = C66.

148. Lycophron, 1226–1230; see above, n. 58.

149. Lycophron, 1232–1233: *τοιούσδ' ἐμός τις σύγγονος λείψει διπλοῦς / σκύμνους λέοντας, ἔξοχον ῥώμῃ γένος*. The passage can, of course, be interpreted to signify

extraction for Rome had become firm doctrine.<sup>156</sup> As an extreme but illuminating instance, one might note the hopelessly obscure Promathion, who composed a history of Italy perhaps in the first century B.C. He evidently drew on Etruscan memory or fabrication to produce a bizarre tale unparalleled elsewhere in our evidence. The account centers upon an Etruscan king of Alba overthrown by the twins, who were born from the union of a servant girl and a disembodied phallus. That peculiar narrative neatly demonstrates the basic proposition: even in the late Republic, when Greek writers gathered material from Italy on the origins of Rome, they would still encounter a bewildering diversity and inconsistency.<sup>157</sup> The absence of anything resembling a standard line is inescapable.

The fact needed to be established, for it affects an issue often considered and often misconceived: a supposed political dimension to variants on the Trojan legend.

Demetrius of Skepsis, writing in the early second century, composed a learned *Catalogue of the Trojans*. That work contained the claim that Aeneas ruled at Skepsis and the implication that he had never left the Troad to migrate to the West. The sons of Aeneas and Hector then held their royal seat at Skepsis for generations to follow.<sup>158</sup> The thesis of Demetrius, so it has been argued, represents anti-Roman polemic, a denial of Rome's Trojan origins, thus implicitly relegating Romans to the class of barbarians in a Greek intellectual retaliation for Roman imperialism.<sup>159</sup> The omission of reference to Rome's foundation in the *Chronicle* of Apollodorus, composed in the second half of the second century, may, on this theory, indicate disdain for Rome.<sup>160</sup> And further,

156. See, e.g., on Agathocles of Cyzicus and Dionysius of Chalcis, Perret, *Les origines*, 380–388, 463–467; Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 19–20, n. 3, with further bibliography.

157. Promathion's version is cited by Plut. *Rom.* 2.3–6. The effort of S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico*, I (Bari, 1973), 3, 190–199, and II.1 (Bari, 1974), 5, 59–71, to date Promathion to the fifth century, although accepted by d'Anna, *Problemi*, 46–52, was adequately refuted by E. Gabba, *FondHardt*, 13 (1966), 147–149; cf. Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 21, n. 4, 25, n. 4, 26.

158. Strabo, 13.1.52–53 = C607.

159. So, most vigorously, E. Gabba, *RSI*, 86 (1974), 630–633; and idem, in M. Sordi, ed., *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico*, *ContrIstStorAnt* (Milan, 1976), 85–91. The view is accepted with modifications by Cornell, *PCPS*, 201 (1975), 26–27; Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 451–452; Horsfall, in Bremmer and Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 13; and J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme* (Paris, 1988), 223–229.

160. Gabba, *RSI*, 86 (1974), 630–633; idem, *Dionysius*, 198.

one can cite Menecrates of Xanthos, perhaps a contemporary of Demetrius, who maintained that Aeneas betrayed Troy to the Achaeans and was welcomed into their ranks, thus suggesting that Rome's ancestor was a despicable traitor, yet another instance of anti-Roman propaganda.<sup>161</sup>

The proposition is dubious and unacceptable. Most fundamentally, it misconceives a mentality that not only entertained inconsistent versions but continued to multiply them. The absence of a canonical tale permitted and encouraged variants. If Roman writers could regularly disagree on key components of the story, Greeks surely encountered no restrictions on inventiveness. Readers of Demetrius' work in Skepsis would find no more animosity to Rome than would readers of Lycophron's poem in Alexandria. Divergent tales were the very stuff of legend—and the Trojan tales proved especially prolific.

The thrust of Demetrius' reconstruction is not hard to grasp. Patriotic motives spurred the scholar who transferred the ancient seat of power to his own home town, especially as he could contrast Skepsis with the run-down remains of contemporary Troy. Civic pride and rivalry among towns in the Troad played a central part.<sup>162</sup> But there is more to it than that. Squabbles among scholars affected the conclusions. Demetrius' *Catalogue of the Trojans* required him to be steeped in Homer, and the bard's notorious lines implied that Aeneas and his descendants never left the Troad.<sup>163</sup> If Demetrius engaged in polemic, he directed it not against Rome but against those who disputed his reading of Homer.<sup>164</sup>

A plethora of discrepancies, it might be argued, does not account for Demetrius. He took the further step of breaking the Roman-Trojan connection altogether, thus putting his tale in a quite different category. Is it so? Roman writers, to be sure, held firm to that connection, whatever their differences on details. But the Greeks went their own

161. Gabba, in Sordi, *I canali*, 92–93; cf. Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 450–451.

162. Cf. Strabo, 13.1.27 = C594; 13.1.34 = C597. Demetrius visited Ilium around the time of the Antiochene War; Strabo, 13.1.27 = C594. Gabba, in Sordi, *I canali*, 88, sets the visit in 190 and suggests that Demetrius may have witnessed L. Scipio's sacrifice at Troy (Livy, 37.37.1–3)—an altogether speculative proposal.

163. Homer, *Iliad*, 20.307–308. Strabo, 13.1.52–53 = C607, cites the Homeric lines and discusses the disputes over them in conjunction with the scenario of Demetrius. There is a full discussion of the Strabo passage, with different objectives, in P. M. Smith, *HSCP*, 85 (1981), 34–43.

164. For quarrels among the erudite on this issue, see Dion. Hal. 1.53.4–5.

way, unhindered by cultural motives that prompted the western nation. Legends that ascribed a Hellenic, rather than a Trojan, background to Rome's beginnings continued to circulate in late Hellenistic Greece.<sup>165</sup> Demetrius' version, one among many, might stir civic fever in Skepsis but would hardly stimulate anti-Romanism.

As confirmation one can point to Hegesianax of Alexandria Troas, a close contemporary of Demetrius. Hegesianax composed a *Troika* of his own and, like Demetrius, believed that Aeneas never went to Italy. His rendition has the Trojan hero reach Thrace and perish there. Yet Hegesianax, twice an envoy to the Romans as a courtier of Antiochus III, was surely not producing hostile propaganda.<sup>166</sup> One could go further still. Polybius himself, as we happen to know, subscribed to the tale that Evander brought Arcadians to Italy and was responsible for founding Rome. The Arcadian historian, for intelligible reasons, promoted the story; it was a link between his native land and the conquering power. The Trojan legend does not appear in the extant fragments of Polybius. Yet no one will claim him as an enemy of Rome.<sup>167</sup>

No need to linger over Apollodorus and his failure to record the foundation date of Rome. Any number of reasons can be excogitated for the omission. The bewildering variety and inconsistency of suggested dates prior to Apollodorus might be reason enough. It would take a very so-

165. See above, pp. 16–20.

166. Dion. Hal. 1.49.1. On his service as envoy in 196 and 193, see Polyb. 18.47.4, 18.50.3; Livy, 33.34.1–4, 34.1–4, 34.57–59; Appian, *Syr.* 6. Perret, *Les origines*, 512–513, in fact, takes Hegesianax's story as evidence of scorn and hostility toward Rome. See also P. M. Martin, *MEFRA*, 101 (1989), 119–120. He was, to be sure, a *philos* of Antiochus; Athen. 4.155a–b; cf. 3.80d. And the conference of 193 was a tense affair. But a figure hostile to Rome would not have been chosen as envoy by Antiochus at a time when he sought to maintain cordial relations. Another envoy on that mission, Menippus, was accorded public recognition by Rome; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 601; see E. S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley, Calif., 1984), 626–629. By contrast, Gabba takes Hegesianax as espousing a pro-Roman version: Aeneas died in Thrace but his son founded Rome; Dion. Hal. 1.72.1; Gabba, *RSI*, 86 (1974), 631; idem, in Sordi, *I canali*, 88–89. The whole political dimension, however, is purely hypothetical. If Hegesianax wanted to appease the Romans, why leave Aeneas in Thrace and endorse a tale that coincides with no other known version?

167. For Polybius and the Evander story, see Dion. Hal. 1.32.1. Polybius does refer to the legend of Troy but only to refute Timaeus' faulty inference from the October Horse; Polyb. 12.4.b–c. Bickermann, *CP*, 47 (1952), 67, and Gabba, *RSI*, 86 (1974), 632, take Polybius' version as indicating preference for Greek rather than Trojan origins. But the Evander and the Aeneas tales were by no means incompatible. Fabius Pictor embraced them both; *HRR*, fr. 1. Cf. D. Musti, *FondHardt*, 20 (1974), 129–132; Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme*, 226.

phisticated reader indeed to detect propaganda in the silence.<sup>168</sup> Menecrates of Xanthos merits a word or two. He at least endorsed a tradition sharply critical of Aeneas, the tale that he betrayed Troy out of hatred for Paris.<sup>169</sup> Does this then represent negative Hellenic reaction to Rome?<sup>170</sup> The case has nothing to recommend it. For one thing, Menecrates' date is altogether insecure. An anti-Roman objective makes sense only if he is placed in the late third or second century. But the Ionic dialect of the fragments points much more strongly to the late fifth or early fourth century, thus safely removing Menecrates from any debate over Rome's Trojan origins.<sup>171</sup> But even if one postulates a late Hellenistic date, the idea of anti-Romanism has little or no force. The relevant fragment not only records Aeneas' treachery but has him welcomed as "one of the Achaeans."<sup>172</sup> The bland tone suggests a known and acceptable tale, anything but polemic. If Menecrates' story had propaganda value at all, it may have been Lycian propaganda, undermining the Greek tradition of Troy's fall as an Achaean accomplishment.<sup>173</sup> Or perhaps even anti-Persian propaganda, relevant in late fifth- or early fourth-century Hellas, thus equating Asiatic Troy with the realm of Persia.<sup>174</sup> More likely still, Menecrates simply counts among those many writers who addressed conflicting strands of post-Homeric traditions, chose among them, or invented new ones. He may indeed have adopted the line that kept Aeneas in Troy and that knew of no western migration, in which case discrediting Aeneas could not reflect on the repute of Rome.<sup>175</sup> And the transformation of Aeneas into an Achaean would protect his descendants from the charge of barbarism.<sup>176</sup> On any and all counts, Menecrates' treatise stands outside the realm of anti-Romanism. The whole

168. On the silence, see F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin, 1902), 26–28, who, however, shows that Eratosthenes also gave no date for Rome's foundation. Should he too be branded with anti-Romanism? The argument dissolves.

169. Dion. Hal. 1.48.3.

170. Gabba, in Sordi, *I canali*, 92–93; Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 450–451.

171. See the careful treatment of Asheri, *Fra Ellenismo e Iranismo* (Bologna, 1983), 127–132, with bibliography.

172. Dion. Hal. 1.48.3: εἰς Ἀχαιῶν ἐγγεγόνει.

173. So P. M. Smith, *HSCP*, 85 (1981), 33–34.

174. So Asheri, *Fra Ellenismo e Iranismo*, 151–152. That is a less plausible proposition for a historian who was himself an Asiatic Greek.

175. One need not pause over the suggestion of P. M. Martin, *MEFRA*, 101 (1989), 114–116, that Menecrates' version gives a mythological veneer to hostility between Rome and the tyrants of Syracuse.

176. See the sound remarks of Asheri, *Fra Ellenismo e Iranismo*, 144–153.

concept of the Trojan legend as manipulated by Greeks to avenge themselves on Rome falls to the ground.<sup>177</sup>

Alleged manipulation of the legend for political purposes deserves a closer look. A series of episodes in the third and early second centuries alludes to the link between Troy and Rome in the context of diplomacy and war. The accumulation of instances has fostered a cynical conclusion: that Rome exploited the legend to facilitate intervention and expansionism in the Greek East.<sup>178</sup> That analysis misplaces the emphasis and misconceives the motivation. The episodes themselves, upon further inspection, present a very different picture.

The legend's first appearance as a diplomatic or military instrument lends valuable insight. The device was employed by a Greek, not a Roman. Pyrrhus, the ruler of Epirus, cited the Trojan connection in 281 in order to build support against Rome among the Greeks of the West. He announced to his allies the expectation of a successful outcome: as descendant of Achilles, he would recreate the Achaean victory at Troy by subduing the colonists of Troy.<sup>179</sup> The propaganda may or may not have had effect, but it was Hellenic propaganda. The Romans had no cause to exploit it.<sup>180</sup>

Two decades later appeal to the Trojan story came again in the course of a Roman war, and again from a people other than the Romans. Early in the First Punic War, the city of Segesta expelled its Carthaginian

garrison and threw in its lot with Rome. The Segestans offered as explanation their consanguinity with Rome: both claimed Aeneas as ancestor.<sup>181</sup> Rome certainly welcomed the defection of Segesta, a major gain in the contest with Carthage. But there is nothing to show that Rome utilized the Trojan connection to advance its own purposes in the island.<sup>182</sup> To this point only the Greeks were playing that game.

A third episode leads to a similar conclusion. War broke out between Acarnania and the Aetolian League in the 230s, inducing the Acarnanians, so the report has it, to seek Roman aid. They reached back to remote antiquity to justify the request: Acarnania had been the only Greek state to refrain from warring on Troy. Roman envoys took up the Acarnanian cause, requesting removal of Aetolian garrisons and autonomy for Acarnania. The Aetolians summarily dismissed the request and treated the legates with scorn. Rome chose not to pursue the matter.<sup>183</sup> The tale's authenticity has long been disputed, and the question need not be decided here.<sup>184</sup> Even if one accepts the events as fact, however, they point clearly to Acarnanian initiative. The Romans were willing to acknowledge the relationship but not to press it on the diplomatic front.

181. Zon. 8.9.12. Allusion to the relationship occurs also in Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.72, 2.5.83, 2.5.125; Diod. 23.5; Plut. *Nic.* 1.3. Cf. the Segestan coins that represent Aeneas and Anchises; BMC, *Sicily*, 59 ff. A relationship was claimed also by Centuripae through Lanuvium; see Mangano, *PP*, 29 (1974), 396.

182. D. Kienast, *Hermes*, 93 (1965), 478–489, conjectures that Rome seized upon the idea to ingratiate itself with the Greeks of Sicily and to combat Carthaginian influence in the island. But the hypothesis depends on dating Rome's supervision of the Aphrodite cult at Eryx to the immediate aftermath of the First Punic War, a view by no means proved or even suggested by Diod. 4.83.7.

183. Justin, 28.1.5–28.2.14. Other allusions to Roman benefits for Acarnania because of the latter's stance in the Trojan War are given by Strabo, 10.2.25 = C462; Dion. Hal. 1.51.2.

184. M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce, et les monarchies hellénistiques au IIIe siècle avant J.-C.* (273–205) (Paris, 1935), 5–22, made a powerful case against authenticity. The chief exhibit in his presentation is Polyb. 2.12.7, who places Rome's first entrance into diplomatic relations with Greeks in 229/8. The testimony is not necessarily decisive. One can argue that Polybius did not know of the Acarnanian affair—so M. Gelzer, *Hermes*, 68 (1933), 144—or that he did not regard it as a significant diplomatic exchange—so E. Manni, *PP*, 11 (1956), 187; F. P. Rizzo, *Studi ellenistici-romani* (Palermo, 1974), 71–76. The tale can, in any case, not be regarded as a Roman invention, despite Holleaux, for the Romans came off badly in the narrative. S. I. Oost, *Roman Policy in Epirus and Acarnania in the Age of the Roman Conquest of Greece* (Dallas, 1954), 92–97, considered it the product of Aetolian propaganda. Others simply retail it without argument; D. Golan, *RivStorAnt*, 1 (1971), 96–97; Weber, *WS*, 85 (1972), 218–219; Gabba, in Sordi, *I Canali*, 100; Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 452; Horsfall, in Bremmer and Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 21.

177. A fragment of Naevius is sometimes seen as reflecting knowledge of the story of Aeneas' betrayal; 23, Morel: *blande et docte percontat, Aenea quo pacto / Troiam urbem liquerit*; cf. Gabba, in Sordi, *I Canali*, 91–92. But the inference is purely speculative. And even if true, Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* is probably too early to be responding to any anti-Romanism among Greek intellectuals. The composition of A. Postumius Albinus' work, *De adventu Aeneae*, may or may not have been part of the debate. The title hardly proves it; *Origo gentis Romanae*, 15.4; Serv. *Ad Aen.* 9.707. More important, Q. Lutatius Catulus, around the end of the second century, actually endorsed the tale that had Aeneas as betrayer of Troy; *Origo gentis Romanae*, 9.2. One may presume that Catulus did not take that position out of animosity to Rome.

178. So, most recently, Momigliano, *Settimo contributo*, 453: "In general, one can say that Aeneas helped the claims of Rome over Sicily and her interventions in the Greek East"; Horsfall in Bremmer and Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, 21: "Trojan kinship would give the Romans a fine pretext . . . for interference in the affairs of Asia Minor."

179. Paus. 1.12.1. See also Pyrrhus' coin issues in southern Italy and Sicily with images of Thetis and Achilles; BMC, *Thessaly*, 111, no. 7–8; 112, no. 9–19.

180. E. Weber, *WS*, 85 (1972), 214, speculates that the Tarentine Greeks suggested this line to Pyrrhus.

Their demarche concluded without issue. As before, the Greeks hoped to capitalize on the legend; the Romans merely engaged in response and reaction.

A similar circumstance can be discerned in a Roman reply to diplomatic feelers from the Syrian ruler Seleucus, probably Seleucus II. The king sought *amicitia* and *societas* with the western power, and the Romans replied in positive fashion, with the proviso that Seleucus absolve the Ilians, their *consanguinei*, of liability for tribute. Such, at least is the information contained in a letter read to the senate by the emperor Claudius three centuries later.<sup>185</sup> The flimsy testimony has given grounds for doubt. Yet no obvious reason for forgery exists.<sup>186</sup> The story itself, in any case, seems consistent with the rest of our information. The initiative again came from the East. Rome did not provoke the diplomatic interchange, but once the proposition was advanced, Roman leaders took the opportunity to reaffirm their association with the legends of Troy. The purpose was hardly imperial expansionism. If anything concrete emerged from this negotiation, we hear nothing of it. The Roman objective was neither protection of Ilium nor interference in the internal affairs of the Seleucid realm. The proposal asserted a cultural connection. Greek initiative enabled the Romans to present that connection in an international context.

The Greek impulse gave rise to Roman policy. By the later third century the Romans themselves promoted the legend in a public and conspicuous manner. Aggrandizement, however, was not the aim. In the dark days of the Hannibalic War, religious consciousness became more intense and more acute. The disaster at Trasimene in 217 called forth urgent advice from the Sibylline Books recommending that a temple be vowed to Venus Erycina. The vow was duly carried out, with Sibylline sanction, by Q. Fabius Maximus two years later. A temple of Venus Erycina rose on the Capitol in 215.<sup>187</sup> The association with Aeneas and Troy plainly provided the central ingredient in this move. The cult had its origin in Sicilian Eryx, a site where, the legend had it,

185. Suet. *Claud.* 25.3: *recitata vetere epistula Graeca senatus populique Romani Seleuco regi amicitiam et societatem ita demum pollicentis, si consanguineos suos Ilienses ab omni onere immunes praestitisset.*

186. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce*, 46–60, considered it a Roman invention; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, N.J., 1950), II, 943–944, n. 40, took it as an Ilian fabrication. But neither offered substantive reasons. For a defense of the story, see Rizzo, *Studi ellenistico-romani*, 83–88.

187. Livy, 22.9.7–10, 22.10.10, 23.30.13–14, 23.31.9.

Aeneas had dedicated a shrine to his mother.<sup>188</sup> Establishment of the cult in Rome was not presented as transfer of a foreign deity. Venus Erycina took her place on the Capitol itself, in the vicinity of Jupiter Maximus Capitolinus, an unmistakable signal that she represented the national heritage.<sup>189</sup> The principal purpose of the move must have been reassurance and a boost to public morale in the grim circumstances after Trasimene. Homage to the goddess who both promised divine protection and emphasized a link with the ancient past could lend confidence in the endurance of Rome's legacy. Embrace of the Trojan tie now had overt state sanction.<sup>190</sup> It gave public display to Rome's antiquity and the cultural origins that could stimulate patriotic pride.

When military fortunes shifted in the Hannibalic War and Roman success seemed assured, the link with Troy gained still more attention at the state level. In 205, with Rome's forces poised for the invasion of Africa and the conclusion of the conflict, the cult of Magna Mater was transported from Mount Ida to Rome and established on the Palatine. Mount Ida was the birthplace of Aeneas, his refuge, and a place of assemblage before his departure.<sup>191</sup> And Magna Mater was a protective deity of the Trojans.<sup>192</sup> The symbolic features of the move stand out. Rome collaborated here with the kingdom of Pergamum, overlord of the Troad. A striking procession welcomed the goddess who was honored with elaborate rites and a home on the Palatine. The inauguration of the cult and its festival asserted the significance Rome set upon its origins and their links with the antique legends of Hellas.<sup>193</sup> The episode had diplomatic, military, and religious implications. But all were joined by the golden thread of the Trojan legend that announced Rome's cultural credentials to the nations of the Hellenistic world.<sup>194</sup>

188. Diod. 4.83.4–7; Vergil, *Aen.* 5.759–760.

189. See, especially, R. Schilling, *La religion romaine de Vénus* (Paris, 1954), 248–254; cf. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 173–175; I. Bitto, *ArchStorMessinese*, 28 (1977), 121–133.

190. Cf. also the oracular warning of Cannae by the seer Marcius, a forecast brought to light in 212, which refers to Romans as descendants of Troy; Livy, 25.12.1–10: *annem, Troiugenam fuge Cannam*. The public identification of Romans and Trojans by this time is quite clear. Perret, *Les origines*, 54–57, wrongly takes this as reflecting hostility between Romans and Greeks. See Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, 177–178.

191. Homer, *Iliad*, 2.820–821; Dion. Hal. 1.46–48.

192. Vergil, *Aen.* 6.784–787, 7.135–140, 9.80–92, 9.617–620, 10.156–158, 10.228–235, 10.250–255; Ovid, *Fasti*, 4.251–254; Paus. 10.26.1.

193. See especially Ovid, *Fasti*, 4.247–272. Other sources, bibliography, and discussion in Gruen, *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy* (Leiden, 1990), 15–21.

194. See the full treatment in Gruen, *Studies*, 5–33.

The conclusion is reinforced by the Peace of Phoenice in 205, which brought a formal terminus to the First Macedonian War. The signatures framed that treaty in the same year as Cybele's cult was transferred to Rome. And there can be no coincidence in the fact that the two states who headed the list of Rome's *adscripti* in the document were Ilium and Pergamum.<sup>195</sup> The war itself had been a rather sorry episode in Rome's history and a stain on its reputation, but Romans could salvage esteem by associating themselves with a proud heritage. Ilium, a small and impotent town in the politics of the Hellenistic titans, had had no part in the war, of course. Rome could satisfy no imperial ambitions by associating her fortunes with that community. The value of Ilium lay on a symbolic plane. It accorded to Rome the cultural stature that could not be won on the battlefield.<sup>196</sup>

Determined and consistent efforts to justify prestige beyond mere military success also accompany Rome's eastern involvement in the early second century. Victory over Philip V and the subsequent "liberation" of the Greeks inspired the Roman commander T. Quinctius Flamininus to wax eloquent in Greek. He dedicated precious objects at Delphi inscribed with his own verses, reminding the Hellenes that their liberation came at the hands of a descendant of Aeneas and a representative of the Aeneiadae.<sup>197</sup> There were no military goals to achieve here; martial supremacy had already been established. The conjunction of Greek freedom and Trojan ancestry tells the tale clearly enough. Flamininus enunciated Rome's claim to a place in the cultivated community of the Mediterranean.

Rome maintained the posture in the course of conflict with Antiochus III. Entrance of Roman forces for the first time into Asia Minor summoned forth an appropriate gesture. The naval commander C. Livius Salinator in 190 made sure to inaugurate the campaign with a sacrifice to Athena at Ilium.<sup>198</sup> And the arrival of the consul, L. Scipio, gave added drama and meaning to the scene. His sacrifices were accompanied by mutual expressions of joy by Romans and Ilians at the common heritage that bound them to one another.<sup>199</sup> Further, the Ilians reaped benefits

195. Livy, 29.12.14.

196. Efforts to deny the authenticity of Ilium's inclusion in the Peace of Phoenice fail to take account of that cultural dimension; see Gruen, *Studies*, 31–33, with references to the literature.

197. Plut. *Flam.* 12.6–7: Αἰνεάδας Τίτος ὕμνων ὑπέρτατον ὥπασε δῶρον, / Ἑλλήνων τεύξας πασιὶν ἐλευθερίαν.

198. Livy, 37.9.7.

199. Livy, 37.37.1–3: *sacrificavit Minervae praesidi arcis et Iliensibus in omni rerum ver-*

from the peace settlement of 188, a tax immunity and the acquisition of two towns. Livy's analysis accurately assesses the meaning: the Ilians obtained favor not so much for any recent services as in acknowledgment of Rome's ancestry.<sup>200</sup> There was little profit in cultivating Ilium for any substantive assistance it might provide, nor is it likely that other Greek states would contribute to a war effort or render postwar allegiance on the basis of a Trojan connection. Rome looked to the symbolic effect. The nation shunned the label of barbarian and struck the pose of heir and standard-bearer of an antique civilization shared by Trojans and Achaeans.

Exploitation for concrete advantage remained a Greek, rather than a Roman, objective in the early second as in the third century. Lampsacus, a city of the Troad, took the Roman pronouncements at face value and staked a claim for privilege and consideration. In the aftermath of the Second Macedonian War, a Lampsacene envoy called attention to the *syngeneia* that held between his city and Rome, hoping for inclusion in the peace treaty and thus protection by the victor.<sup>201</sup> The aim, it appears, went unfulfilled.<sup>202</sup> The Ilians themselves hoped to obtain further stature by championing the causes of allies before the Romans, but their efforts on behalf of the Lycians drew only ambiguous response from the senate and no concrete action.<sup>203</sup> Rome showed little interest in translating cultural propaganda into substantive gains.

*borumque honore ab se oriundos Romanos praeferentibus et Romanis laetis origine sua*; Justin, 31.8.1–4.

200. Livy, 38.39.10: *non tam ob recentia ulla merita quam originum memoria*. Absence of these provisions in Polybius' account of the Peace of Apamea, 21.46, gives no grounds for doubting their genuineness; see Magic, *Roman Rule*, II, 950–951, n. 60; H. H. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seiner Zeit* (Wiesbaden, 1964), 292.

201. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 591, lines 18–19, 21–22, 24–25, 30–31, 54–56, 60–61. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce*, 53–56, takes Lampsacus' use of the intermediacy of the Massiliotes rather than the Ilians to mean that the Trojan connection counted for little. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen*, 290–293, by contrast, concludes that Ilium was not free to intervene, a sign that it stood under Seleucid hegemony. But Lampsacus' claim to direct consanguinity with the Romans could only be weakened if it depended on Ilian intermediacy.

202. Cf. Bickermann, *Philologus*, 87 (1932), 277–279; Gruen, *Hellenistic World*, 23, 542–543.

203. Polyb. 22.5.1–7; see H. H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (Munich, 1957), 81–128; Gruen, *CQ*, 25 (1975), 64–68; F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford, 1979), III, 181–183. Cf. also the Greek oracular pronouncement, perhaps from Delphi, of the early second century, which predicted Rome's victory over Philip and represented the clash between Rome and Carthage as one in which Trojans had overcome Phoenicians; Plut. *Mor.* 399c; cf. Justin, 30.4.1–4. This may represent another instance of Hellenic efforts to curry Roman favor by endorsing the Trojan legend.

Allusions to Troy and the legend in interstate relations cease abruptly after the early second century. They reappear only at the end of the Republic in very different circumstances.<sup>204</sup> Lacunose sources do not account for the absence. We are reasonably well informed on matters of diplomacy and warfare in subsequent years. The change is a real one. An explanation emerges readily and conforms conveniently to the preceding analysis. The Roman conqueror in the late third and early second centuries felt the need to project a different image, to demonstrate roots in distant antiquity, and to claim a share in the common culture of the eastern Mediterranean. Successes on the battlefield were accompanied by insistence upon the civilized qualities of the victors, who revived the distinctions of their Trojan forebears. With the conclusion of the eastern wars, that insistence lost its urgency. The Trojan connection had been recognized and acknowledged across the Mediterranean. Roman arms had vindicated Troy. And the nation's spokesmen had established its cultural credentials. There was no further need to reproduce the message.

Greek intellectuals created the myth of Troy. And Greek intellectuals molded it to help explain and justify the colonization of the West. The story evolved in multiple forms. Greek pioneers held prime place at the outset, then were paralleled or overlaid in importance by Trojan refugees and by Troy's principal survivor, Aeneas. The fables expanded and diversified, shaped by Sicilian historians and combined with the indigenous traditions of Etruria and Latium. Rome's increasing power and authority in the peninsula soon demanded its inclusion in the complex fabric of developing legend. Greeks invented Hellenic forebears, eponymous founders, and Trojan intermediaries. By the time such creations reached the level of public consciousness in Rome, a bewildering variety of versions entangled the tradition.

The matter of articulating its origins took on importance for Rome in the late fourth century. The aftermath of the Latin War and expanded contacts with Hellenic Italy provided the impetus. Political and cultural motives combined to develop a narrative that would bring mutual esteem to Romans and Latins and establish a pedigree that connected Rome to the Hellenic world. The idea of a Trojan rather than a Greek derivation proved especially appealing. It fitted the Romans within the matrix of Greek legend that stretched back to remote antiquity while

marking a differentiation and projecting a separate identity. The absence of contemporary Trojans enhanced the appeal; the tale was malleable and adjustable to national needs.

The adoption of Trojan roots, however, did not entail coalescence of the tradition. A wide range of versions still circulated in the third and second centuries. Greek intellectuals, even those conversant with Roman accounts, had no reason to hew to a Roman line and continued to produce variants that contrasted in character, chronology, and narrative. Hence, those who altered the Aeneas tale in discrepant and ostensibly unflattering ways engaged not in political propaganda but in conventional scholarly wrangling. The notion of a canonical story remained remote. That conclusion is more strikingly confirmed by Roman writers themselves. While unanimous on the Trojan connection, they coincided on little else. Historians and poets felt free to improvise, extract, conflate, and diverge. The multifarious strands of the tradition, long after the embrace of Troy, give insight into a mentality that prized inventiveness over consistency.

Advertisement of the Trojan association had cultural rather than political or diplomatic ends in view. Allusions to the legend in interstate relations of the third and early second centuries represent either Greek initiative or Roman posturing and did not issue in concrete benefits. But in a broader sense the distinctions dissolve and the objectives are mutually reinforcing. The circumstances attendant upon Rome's new status in late fourth-century Latium and Magna Graecia gave incentive for adoption of the Trojan heritage, and the parading of that heritage a century later closely accompanied the display of Roman might in the Mediterranean. The attachment of Troy and Rome carried a comparable symbolism in each case. Preeminence in the peninsula went hand in hand with embrace of traditions that gave the suzerain a cultural legitimacy. And demonstration of military power abroad prompted insistence on the antiquity and the refined credentials of the conqueror.

204. For references, see Weber, *WS*, 85 (1972), 221–225.