

Spring 2016

The Romulus and Remus Myth as a Source of Insight into Greek and Roman Values

Dimitri Adamidis

Trinity College, Hartford Connecticut, dimitri.adamidis@trincoll.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/theses>



Part of the [Other Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Adamidis, Dimitri, "The Romulus and Remus Myth as a Source of Insight into Greek and Roman Values". Senior Theses, Trinity College, Hartford, CT 2016.

Trinity College Digital Repository, <http://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/theses/538>

The Romulus and Remus Myth as a Source of Insight into Greek and Roman Values

A Senior Thesis Presented

By Dimitri Adamidis

Advisor:
Professor Gary Reger

For the Classics Department

Trinity College

May 5, 2016

Chapter 1 Introduction

The topic of mythology is probably one of the greatest ways to discover differences between ancient Greek and Roman cultures. The Romulus and Remus myth was one of the most important stories to the Romans, because it gave the mythological origins of their great civilization. The myth is packed with themes of royalty, competition, and the meaning of family as it tells of the Romulus and Remus twins from their royal beginnings to the eventual death of Remus. Many Greek and Roman authors alike covered the myth throughout history, and what is interesting is the stark differences that can be found between the Greek and Roman accounts upon close examination. Some of these major differences can be seen easily in Livy's *History of Rome* and Dionysius of Halicarnassus's *Roman Antiquities*, which were written around roughly the same time period. Both authors cover the myth with many similarities, but also with many differences. The death of Remus is drastically different between the two accounts which gives insights into how the Greeks and Romans differed in their view of family relationships. The treatment of the character Faustulus who was the shepherd that was said to have saved the twins from the Tiber River, has a much greater prominence in Dionysius's account, which downplays the self-sufficiency of the twins. Dionysius and Livy seem to agree that the leader of Rome or any city should be capable, of divine origin, and successful militarily. But there are differences in the narratives throughout that suggest there are differences in the values that Greeks and Romans embodied in their cultures, which can be discovered through the Romulus and Remus myth. Dionysius argues that the twins are more grounded in the mundane than in Livy's account while family and expansionism is kept somewhat separate, while Livy shows that family and state are one in the same with the twins being stronger in their independence. Diodorus Siculus is another Greek author who included the Romulus and Remus myth in his enormous work the *Library of*

History written from about 60 to 30 BCE which yet again differs from both Livy's and Dionysius's account. Unfortunately, Diodorus describes the myth in a very abrupt matter, and has a major difference when he argues that Romulus and Remus are joint founders of Rome. Thus, the three authors give accounts with rather significant differences between them, which can show not just how Romans versus Greeks viewed the myth, but also how there are differences between the Greeks themselves in their interpretations. By exploring the character of Romulus, it can be understood what traits make a good candidate for a foundation myth. At the end of this paper there will also be a quick look into a well-known foundation myth from the Greek side involving Cadmus and his founding of Thebes. The treatment of Cadmus by both Diodorus Siculus and Herodotus will be explored to give insight into how a Greek author treats a myth that is originally Greek, instead of how a Greek author interprets a myth that is inherently Roman. It will also be imperative to explore in this paper what the main purpose of a myth is, and how the authors use it to reflect back on their cultures. Another issue is what is the duty of both Greek and Roman historians, and why is there so many differences present amongst their works. All of these aspects ultimately reflect on how identity differed between the Greeks and Romans, as looking at authors such as Livy and Dionysius really helps understand what some Greek and Roman intellectuals thought in the first century BCE what it meant to be a "true" Greek or Roman.

Chapter 2 The Problem of Myth and Authorship

Ultimately, when dealing with all of the differences whether intentional or unintentional between the Greek and Roman accounts, it has to be remembered that the Romulus and Remus story is a mythological work. The topic of mythology is something that has been studied for hundreds of years across many cultures, along with there being an immense amount of literature on the theory of myth. Rather than trying to summarize and reach a conclusion about the overarching theory of myth, the authors of Trzaskoma, Berman, and Fletcher will be used to help understand the Romulus and Remus story as a mythological work. These authors are helpful because they can help readers understand the big picture of the purpose of mythology, as well as the issues that come along with it. This brings up the question of what purpose did the Greeks and Romans write myth for in the first place. The first purpose of myth can be thought of as a way to systematize the large amount of material that the culture in question had access to and “to find ways that the multifarious tales of local and wider significance could be organized so that they cohered in matters of genealogy, chronology, nomenclature and detail into some larger whole.”¹ Thus there is the purely technical aspect of the myth which is to organize the stories in a way to make them accessible. However, according to Trzaskoma, the second and more important part of mythology would be to consider the “symbolic value [of the myths] in literature and the wider culture.”¹ The myth in a sense must be presented in a way that can be internalized and speak more specifically to the culture who is reading it, even though the significance may not be ultimately understood by an outsider to that culture. Trzaskoma points out that myth is used to help define what it means to be a Greek or Roman citizen, and also as a

¹ Trzaskoma and Smith. “Introduction.” *Writing Myth: Mythography in the Ancient World*. p. xv.

way for the elite to use their knowledge of myth in order to assert their position in society over others.

One of the major problems with mythology has to do with the issue of varying accounts by different authors for the same story. Berman points out in his analysis of the foundation of the city of Cadmus that the original story does not seem to be “the product of a single author”² and that the story could even have been subject to some “sanitization.”² Berman shows that inconsistencies want to be smoothed out by authors, and that simplification might also have been at work, probably for the convenience of the reader. As Fletcher points out, no definition of myth is capable of satisfying everyone, “but it is fair to say that every definition of myth must account for its social meaning.”³ The myth in question is specific to the culture and time period it’s placed in, which changes in definition based on the date and whether it is from a Greek or Roman perspective. Fletcher points out bluntly that “Every mythographer-like anyone writing myth-is writing myth with a purpose, and has his own aims”⁴ which he uses to describe how Hyginus’ *Fabulae* changed from the Greek original when it was written for a Roman audience. The work is more than “simply a Greek book written in Latin,”⁴ as the story changes based on the authorship, and the same can also be said for a Roman work that is translated into Greek. With these principles in mind now the Romulus and Remus myth can be analyzed first according to Livy. Therefore, when reading myth one has to read behind the lines and attempt to determine how the story fits into a larger cultural context at the time in which it was written, in order to gain the maximum value from it. It has to also be understood that there are problems with myth

² Berman. “Greek Thebes in the Early Mythographic Tradition.” *Writing Myth: Mythography in the Ancient World*. p. 53.

³ Fletcher. “Hyginus’ *Fabulae*: Toward a Roman Mythography.” *Writing Myth: Mythography in the Ancient World*. p. 137.

⁴ Fletcher. “Hyginus’ *Fabulae*: Toward a Roman Mythography.” *Writing Myth: Mythography in the Ancient World*. p. 164.

such as inconsistencies between authors, and the fact that authors can pick and choose what parts of a myth to include in their accounts, and which parts to leave out. Each author has his own aims for writing a myth, and once those aims are discovered the inherent value of the myth increases due to its insights into not just the authors' mind, but into the social context of a whole culture.

Chapter 3 Livy's Account

When reading book one of Livy there are reoccurring themes throughout that can be traced back to character or Romulus. One of Livy's goals for writing this part of his history may have been to successfully use Romulus as an archetype for defining what the ideal Roman should be. Romulus would not only be an idealized individual, but perhaps one who more importantly could define the national identity of what it meant to be a Roman. This paper will try to demonstrate what some of those characteristics are, with the most important one being to hold the Roman state as one's highest priority in life. The preservation of the Roman state above everything else including family and friends is the main one, as will be seen later with the conflict between Romulus and his brother Remus. Expansion of the Roman state in an aggressive military way is also another important feature as seen with the battles that Romulus fought after becoming the ruler of Rome, along with the necessity of kidnapping the Sabine women. Another important issue is the idea of independence, and accomplishing feats in life without much aid as can be seen with the description of Faustulus in the story. These characteristics fluctuate with the Greek authors which will be explored later, showing the differences in views that the Greeks had on Roman identity.

Livy first describes the initial conflicts in sections 1.1 to 1.3 that lead to the founding of Lavinium and Alba Longa. Livy discusses Aeneas and Antenor, who were spared from being executed after the capture of Troy. Antenor sailed into the Adriatic with some Eneitians, and together they defeated the Euganei and later disembarked on the part of their land which was called Troy. Aeneas then went afterwards to Macedonia, then to Sicily, and then to Laurentian territory where he disembarked. In one tradition, the king of the Laurentian territory who was Latinus was defeated, and made a peace with Aeneas. In the other account, Latinus established a

friendship with the Trojans because he felt bad that their own city had been destroyed, and that they were now homeless exiles. The Trojans then built a permanent town there which Aeneas called Lavinium after his wife who was Latinus's daughter. Aeneas then had a son named Ascanius who built the city Alba Longa at the foot of the Alban hills. Ascanius was then succeeded by his son Silvius and the lineage followed down to Numitor and Amulius who had a dispute over who should take the throne.

The conflict between Numitor and Amulius eventually lead to Amulius ruling over his brother, and turning Rea Silvia into a Vestal virgin in order to prevent another family bloodline to the throne. After Mars may or may not have raped Rea Silvia she gives birth to the twins Romulus and Remus, but Amulius has them thrown into the Tiber River. From there, they are saved by Lupa the she-wolf and then raised to adulthood by the shepherd Faustulus. Livy at least starts out pleased about Rome's great history when he mentions "the Fates had, I believe, already decreed the origin of this great city and the foundation of the mightiest empire under heaven."⁵

In sections 1.4-1.6, Livy describes the upbringing of the twins and their youth. The initial relationship between Romulus and Remus is free of any conflict, as they both were shepherds who also hunted and distributed their earnings to the other shepherds. Both boys "associated themselves in their serious undertakings and in their sports and pastimes"⁵ which shows both twins were similar in their endeavors. There is a clear overtone early on that Romulus may be the better representative for the founder of Rome over Remus. Livy describes how at the Palatium festival there was a gang who was jealous of the two brothers, and decided to ambush them in order to steal from them. Romulus defended himself against the gang during the Palatium festival whereas "Remus was taken prisoner and brought before Amulius, [where] his captors

⁵ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.4.

impudently [were] accusing him of their own crimes.”⁶ Romulus is depicted as stronger as he is able to look out for himself whereas Remus is captured.

After the festival Numitor and the twins were involved in a plot to kill King Amulius with the help of Faustulus. Later, even though Romulus backed down from the plot to kill Numitor, Remus only lent his assistance and was not involved in carrying out the actions of the plot itself. Thus, even though Remus is a participant he really doesn’t accomplish much because it is not as if he killed the king himself. At any rate, for whatever part Romulus and Remus played in Amulius’s assassination, Livy describes how their actions were appreciated by the people of Alba. The actions of the twins for Amulius’s assassination were well received by the people of Alba, and their grandfather Numitor had now become king.

After this the twins decided that they wanted to build a new city in an area which they wanted to be considerably bigger than the Alban and Latin towns. Livy establishes the myth as one based in competition as he describes that the finding of a new city “was disturbed by the ancestral curse – ambition – which led to a deplorable quarrel over what was at first a trivial matter,”⁷ as augury was needed to settle the dispute between the two brothers as to who the new city would be named after. Perhaps Livy thought that there was another version for this part of the story that was more believable, given the fact that he thought the matter as trivial, but nevertheless Livy does not offer an alternate view on the matter. Augury was critically important at the time, as it was enough to cause a second dispute where Romulus claimed that he saw twelve vultures appear to him, whereas Remus had only seen six.

After the augury was described, Livy makes a rather quick jump to the death of Remus in section 1.7. Miles points out that in regards to the augury, “divine will is ambiguous; it is human

⁶ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.5.

⁷ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.6.

action that is decisive”⁸ and Romulus “makes his own destiny,”⁸ which furthers the theme that Romulus made a conscious decision to kill his brother Remus, and the issue of the augury does not excuse the fact that Romulus committed fratricide. Livy describes two different versions for the death of Remus that are slightly different. Livy describes the first account of Remus’s death with “then followed an angry altercation; heated passions led to bloodshed; in the tumult Remus was killed”⁹ which appears rather abrupt, as it would seem that a major event such as this would call for Livy giving it more attention. In this first account it is still clear that Romulus kills his own brother Remus and commits fratricide, however it is slightly indirect as it describes Remus being killed in a tumult. This version is more indirect in that it just reports that Remus was killed, but it does not go into the specifics of how Romulus killed him, thus it is not as gruesome as the second version described below.

In the better-known account which is the second one Livy describes he states, “The more common report is that Remus contemptuously jumped over the newly raised walls and was forthwith killed by the enraged Romulus, who exclaimed, "So shall it be henceforth with every one who leaps over my walls.””⁹ Maybe Livy describes the situation quickly and without the use of much emotional language because he wants to dampen the fact that Romulus killed his own brother. With Remus jumping over Romulus’s wall “contemptuously” it gives the connotation that Remus was the only who was being disrespectful. Romulus is described as “enraged” and responds with a rather cold-hearted statement of how he will kill anyone who unlawfully enters his territory. Even though this version is the more common one as Livy reports, he still does it abruptly and to the point, as he only gives one quick sentence describing the encounter. Livy perhaps is concealing a view that the killing of another family member is something that

⁸ Miles. “Foundation and Ideology.” *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. p. 147.

⁹ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.7.

shouldn't be justified in this situation, but it is difficult to say for sure. It seems augury must be followed and cannot be argued with, because augury was important to the emperor Augustus who ruled at the time Livy was writing. If Romulus indeed had more vultures than Remus, the matter is settled, and there is no more thought to give to the matter from that viewpoint.

Secondly, it is possible the Romans did not see Remus's death as regrettable, as he deserved it by his own decision to enter Romulus's territory which he was not authorized to do. Livy's treatment of the issue likely speaks on behalf of the Roman attitude towards death. The way that the Romans may have seen the issue could also have been relatively simplistic: a man jumps over a wall as an outsider which he has no right to do, thus any man on the other side of that wall has his justification for killing him. Romulus's decision is not based on the moral grounds of whether or not it is appropriate to kill his brother, because it was a necessity to defend Rome against any and all invaders, thus even fratricide could be justified in the defense of Rome. As Olgivie points out, "although the rivalry between the two brothers in which the superiority of the one entailed the eclipse of the other represents an age-old theme prominent in many societies, Romulus' victory was only secured by a crime and that crime of fratricide,"¹⁰ thus readers today may see Remus's death as a harsh thing despite the question of whether or not it was necessary. To a Roman reading Livy's history at this point in the story, it may seem perfectly acceptable as to what Romulus did because Remus oversteps his boundaries and is killed, because Remus should not have been allowed to enter Romulus's territory.

It is interesting to note that Remus did not receive any sort of proper funeral or any mention of burial or other common Roman cultural practices relating to death. One could argue that since the story is only a work of mythology that Livy or any author for the matter perhaps

¹⁰ Olgivie. "Foundation of Rome." *Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*. p. 54.

did not need to pay close attention to what would actually happen in reality, and also the fact that Romans may have seen Remus's death as perfectly justifiable. However, it is not unreasonable to expect that a part of the myth would include what happened to Remus's body afterwards, instead of the story quickly transitioning to the next part without any mention of Remus. As Hope points out, "rituals, customs and expectations surrounding death suggest that memory, individual and personal, as well as collective, did matter to many people,"¹¹ suggesting that even if one did not make a significant impact while living, that does not mean that respecting the dead was not a critical part of Roman culture. Hope describes how Agricola (the father-in-law of the historian Tacitus) "apparently got the balance just right at the death of his infant son reacting, 'without the showy bravery of many a man or collapsing into tears and grief like a women',"¹² and thus showing that there is a gender difference when it comes to mourning. The story may have gone differently if the myth included a specific female present at that point of the plotline, who would have grieved or at least encouraged Romulus to grieve.

In Livy's account, there is not even a mention of a burial which is surprising since there was "subsequent separation of the death-contaminated persona and objects from the world of the dead,"¹³ which shows that even practical concerns of what to do with the body of Remus are ignored. Hope points out that only the members of society lowest on the social chain did not receive any proper funeral rituals along with slaves, and they were just discarded in pits. This would clearly not apply to Remus as given his lineage he was a very high member socially in society along with his brother Romulus. This is very surprising as legend has it Romulus was actually the one who created the pomerium, which was the religious boundary surrounding Rome

¹¹ Hope. "Introduction." *Memory and Mourning: studies on Roman death*. p. xv.

¹² Hope. Introduction. *Memory and Mourning: studies on Roman death*. p. xvii.

¹³ Erker. "Gender and Roman Funeral Ritual." *Memory and Mourning: studies on Roman death* p. 42.

which was kept sacred as “even the army, which was regularly involved with killing and death, was not allowed to cross the sacred boundary.”¹⁴ Since Romulus was the creator of this boundary, it is surprising that Livy wouldn’t include in the details as Romulus being at least concerned about death pollution for both practical and religious reasons.

The issue of gender proves to be a factor again for another reason. Perhaps Livy wanted to present Romulus as someone determined to protect other’s perception of his masculinity, and that any sign of mourning whatsoever would be perceived as a sign of weakness. Romans would want the founder of their great city to be the strongest emotionally and physically archetype of a man possible, and if Romulus was someone who engaged in grieving, it would set the wrong tone for the creation of the city. This probability alone would make any funeral rite or procession completely irrelevant, as Livy would have seen it not at all necessary to the story.

It is also very likely that Livy just wanted to distance himself from a gruesome story that in simplest terms was just not a pleasant tale to tell. After all, Livy does indeed give two versions of Remus’s death. The first one is when Romulus simply saw more birds during the augury than Remus, which gives him the right to rule over the new city, and Remus is killed in a “tumult” as Livy describes it. This first description is much more indirect and doesn’t paint as bad a picture of Romulus, even though it is implied that Romulus killed Remus during the altercation. Livy reports the more common account of Romulus killing Remus for leaping over his walls rather briefly due to the grisliness of the fratricide, which shows that he must have been embarrassed by this version. Livy may have just wanted to get that version of the story over with quickly, and then proceed to the myth with Hercules and Cacus, and then subsequently the part of about how Romulus organizes Rome and essentially sets it up. One way or another, Remus’s death had to

¹⁴ Erker. “Gender and Roman Funeral Ritual.” *Memory and Mourning: studies on Roman death*. p. 43.

be necessary just due to the fact that there could only be one ruler of Rome and not two, thus in some way shape or form one of the brothers had to die. Maybe Romans were expected to harshly deal with any offenders to their territory at the expense of a moral compass, with family members included because it was vital to the function and success of the Roman state from a military perspective. Romans could probably accept the fratricide due to the civil wars which were occurring during the 40's BC. Prior to the time Livy was likely writing was Caesar's civil war¹⁵ and the civil war between the Liberators and the Triumvirs.¹⁶ Thus, the Roman world around the time Livy was about to write was shaken by power struggles and bloodshed, which would have made Roman readers more open to fratricide because they would have known how critical it was to protect the order and peace of Rome in a time of so much turmoil. Anyhow, there really is no reflection whatsoever on Remus's life, or his relationship to his brother. Romulus is not reported to have shown any regret, with his only reaction being "So shall it be henceforth with every one who leaps over my walls"¹⁷ which seems like a rather cold-hearted statement to readers today, but as stated above may have been part of a cultural norm at the time to defend one's territory to the death.

It is important to analyze the myth of Hercules and Cacus that Livy gives right after he reports the second version of the death of Remus in section 1.7. and what purpose it played in Livy's account. The myth describes how Hercules had traveled to Erytheia to seize the cattle of Geryon who was a giant. Hercules ends up leading these coveted cattle all the way back to Eurystheus where he placed them in a cave for the night. A shepherd named Cacus came across the oxen and led them from the cave they were in into his own cave. When Hercules wakes up he

¹⁵ Martin. "The Destruction of the Republic." *Ancient Rome: From Romulus to Justinian*. p. 89.

¹⁶ Martin. "From Republic to Empire." *Ancient Rome: From Romulus to Justinian*. p. 110.

¹⁷ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.7.

notices the cattle are gone and follows their footprints and noise to the cave where he finds Cacus, who he ends up clubbing immediately. Livy takes around forty lines in order to describe this event which is extensive in comparison to the seven for the death of Remus which should be more important in the context of his account.

This myth is similar in certain ways to the death of Remus, as Cacus is a man who committed a wrongdoing and thus his opponent Hercules had the right to kill him, regardless of whether or not it was pleasant. Livy is also likening Romulus to a god, because Hercules was a god and committed the action that he did, thus if Romulus was a god he would also have the right to take that same action. If Romulus is a god like Hercules, then they are on the same playing field and subject to the same rules for how they live their lives. Gary Miles points out that since Mars was the parent of Romulus and Remus that Romulus was of divine ancestry that consequently symbolizes the divine nature of the Romans in general.¹⁸ Either way, Livy still most likely wants to quickly distract his readers from the death of Remus since it is not a pleasant topic and the myth with Hercules and Cacus provides the solution. The description of Remus's death overall points to how preservation of the state takes priority over family.

An important thing to note when trying to describe the way that Livy envisioned Romulus would be to look at the type of person the emperor Augustus was at the time Livy was writing. Miles points out that Romulus was similar to Augustus in multiple respects. He points out that "Just as Romulus' murder of Remus raised the question whether internecine violence and the elimination of equals were unavoidable and necessary conditions for the foundation of Rome"¹⁸ Augustus also did what he felt was necessary as he carried out proscriptions and engaged in civil wars which were necessary to maintain his power. Livy portrays Romulus as

¹⁸ Miles. "Foundation and Ideology." *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. p. 138.

mostly self-made especially with his rise to power and his upbringing, seemingly without much help from Faustulus, and also that he was of divine nature. Augustus also tried to succeed in achieving those same qualities as he was said to be self-sufficient, and that his statue on the Prima Porta, which included a cupid, shows that he was a descendent of Venus along with “bare feet, evocative of heroic nudity; a contrapposto stance, familiar from classical Greek representations of gods and heroes.”¹⁹ Augustus made it a point that he was a descendent of Romulus as his funeral “included not only members of his own family but also distinguished Romans from Romulus on down,”²⁰ which shows that he wanted others to remember Rome’s ancient past. Augustus also wanted to make it clear that he was the founder of a new beginning for Rome at the time he ruled, which relates him to the ultimate founder, Romulus. One way in which this could be seen was how he “restored and repaired many of the pre-existing buildings of Rome which were then often adorned with inscriptions that recalled his generosity.”²¹ To further establish his prominence as a Roman emperor, Augustus also added to his legacy by including multiple statues and commemorations of himself in the Roman Forum.

After the death of Remus, Romulus quickly moves on to organizing the state of Rome in section 1.8. It is interesting to note the glimpse that we get into Romulus’s psyche when the organization of his government is described by Livy. There is nothing out of the ordinary when Livy describes that a government is needed to unite Romulus’s population, but what is of particular importance is when Romulus thought government “would only be respected by a rude and uncivilized race of men.”²² Romulus thought that he needed a variety of external factors of government in order to establish his legitimacy over men. He created the twelve lictors, and

¹⁹ Miles. Livy: “Foundation and Ideology.” *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. p. 165.

²⁰ Chaplin. “Livy, Augustus, and *Exempla*.” *Livy’s Exemplary History*. p. 178.

²¹ Huskinson. “The city of Rome: Capital and Symbol.” *Experiencing Rome*. p. 77.

²² Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.8.

increased the population through the establishment of a refugee camp in order to increase the population. Livy describes these refugees as “a promiscuous crowd of freemen and slaves, eager for change, [who] fled thither from the neighboring states.”²² After this, Romulus created the one hundred senators. Romans when reading this may feel a strong sense of national identity embedded in this, because they might’ve not been able to believe in a world without a strong government, because perhaps Romans also had the view that men and women alike would act uncivilized without a government in place.

Without giving any specifics, Livy in section 1.9 states “The Roman State had now become so strong that it was a match for any of its neighbors in war,”²³ which was a critical feature of Rome. Romans reading the history would have prided themselves on this fact by feeling a sense of national loyalty, as military success was one of the biggest features to the success of a state. After Romulus established the Consualia, Livy makes it clear that all the neighboring cities who were invited were extremely impressed with the various features of Rome such as its walls and the large quantity of houses. While Rome is described at this point in book one undoubtedly as impressive given its supposed growth in a short period of time, the issue of putting the Roman state first over anything else shows up again with the kidnapping of the Sabine women.

The killing of Remus by Romulus was shown to be justified in a complicated way, as it served to protect Rome in Romulus’s eyes. Romulus show his motivation to preserve Rome again with the kidnapping of the Sabine women. Romulus invites the Sabines to a set of games only for the purpose of interbreeding with them. Romulus’s inclination to make sure that there would be an heir to the throne and women to support the city of Rome is too strong for him to

²³ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.9.

rule out kidnapping which he sees as a necessity. Romulus once again shows not a shred of remorse for this action as he states “it was all owing to the pride of their parents in denying right of intermarriage to their neighbours.”²³ The kidnapping of the Sabine women was necessary as Rome was in dire need of women for creating a successful population, and may be viewed as a necessary intermarriage rather than simple kidnapping in a modern context which has a negative connotation. Livy shows that the women were taken as “Romulus sent envoys amongst the surrounding nations to ask for alliance and the right of intermarriage on behalf of his new community,”²³ which shows that he tried to peacefully invite women to intermarry with the Romans. Livy describes, “When the hour for the games had come, and their eyes and minds were alike riveted on the spectacle before them, the preconcerted signal was given and the Roman youth dashed in all directions to carry off the maidens who were present”²³ which shows the Sabine women were not raped but kidnapped. Brown points out that Romulus does not only take the Sabine women “with the intent to marriage and not solely on procreation, but also that he used proper Sabine marriage rights and in a sense complimented the women due to Greek customs pointing to the honor of marriage.”²⁴ As Brown states, “the Romans must reckon with the women as human beings-minds as well as bodies-whose acquiescence and cooperation must be enlisted in order for the project of marriage to work smoothly.”²⁴ Romulus thinks he is doing the Sabine women something honorable by providing them property and rights as new citizens of Rome which is a benefit for the women, thus this whole episode need not be viewed as kidnapping or rape on a primal level. Brown states that “Roman greatness was-and continued to

²⁴ Brown. “Livy’s Sabine Women and the Ideal of Concordia.” *American Philological Association* 125 (1995): 291-319. p. 296.

be-a function not of strength alone but strength tempered with cooperation and compromise.”²⁵

Romulus is a capable leader who will go to any ends to accomplish his goal of creating as strong a Rome as possible. Thus, he is deserving of the title for the ruler of Rome over Remus.

The consequence of this episode is the attack on Rome by Caenina in section 1.10, which Romulus uses as a reason to kill the king of Caenina. The king of Caenina’s spoils were hung up on a tree which later “marked out the site for the temple of Jupiter.”²⁶ In the following verse, Livy tells how Spurius Tarpeius’s daughter was “crushed to death beneath their shields”²⁷ in order to make it look like the citadel in Rome was attacked and that the Romans should not act as traitors. This act that was done was not necessary nor did it even serve a direct purpose, but only served to strike the Roman troops with fear so that they would stay loyal to their army. This is a good example where Romulus is shown to do absolutely anything in order to give his state the upper hand. However, Romulus is still never portrayed as bad or flawed in any way due to his “divine origin and his admission to divine immortality after death”²⁸ along with being “the idol of his soldiers.”²⁸

Another important feature of being a Roman is portrayed by Romulus when the Sabines took the Roman citadel. Romulus states when this happened, “Jupiter, it was thy omen that I obeyed when I laid here on the Palatine the earliest foundations of the City,”²⁹ which points to the externalization of blame. Romulus’s first expression of this event is not to blame his troops or identify himself as the culprit for the battle’s negative turn, but he makes it sound like he has a divine right to succeed. Due to the omens falling out of line with prophecy at that moment it

²⁵ Brown. “Livy’s Sabine Women and the Ideal of Concordia.” *American Philological Association* 125 (1995): 291-319. p. 318.

²⁶ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.10.

²⁷ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.11.

²⁸ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.15.

²⁹ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.12.

immediately becomes the fault of the gods for Rome's blunders. This passage by Livy reaffirms the importance of the high regard held for omens in the Roman state, as the Romans were able to restart the battle which falls in line with the omens. What is interesting is that the Sabine women were able to stop the battle, convincing both sides that they did not want to live as "widows or orphans,"³⁰ which essentially shows that the Sabine women were ready and willing to assimilate themselves into Roman culture. It would seem as Romulus's army had a heart so to speak, but this is dampened by the fact that now the Sabine population as a whole was simply used to expand Rome.

It is easy to tell that Livy wanted to make it clear that Romulus had indeed become a god. As Livy describes, "A violent thunderstorm suddenly arose and enveloped the king in so dense a cloud that he was quite invisible to the assembly."³¹ Romulus was regarded as "god, the son of a god, the King and Father of the City of Rome"³¹ which shows the revered perception the people of Rome had for him. Livy admits that the senate may have torn Romulus "limb from limb"³¹ but refuses to accept that account. Without surprise, he supports the account where Proculus Julius is said to have seen Romulus come down from heaven, as this supports the Roman view of Romulus being a god. It is also likely Livy did not want to write a history that disappointed, and downplay his main protagonist. Romulus was said to have been taken up in a cloud and therefore he essentially vanished. A pattern is starting to become clear with Livy where he seems to give two different contradictory versions of Romulus's actions. This was first seen with the issue of how Remus's death was described, and now with a discrepancy in how Romulus died. The issue of Livy being nervous about Roman identity comes up again because Livy definitely did not want to report that the founder of Rome was eventually dismembered by people from an

³⁰ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.13.

³¹ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.16.

institution, in this case being the senate, that Romulus himself set up. If Livy accepted the account of Romulus being killed by the senate members, it would perhaps imply that a part of Roman identity would be to turn your back on your ruler, which is something Livy definitely did not want to portray. If Livy reports that Romulus was killed by his own people, it could imply that one day Augustus would be killed by his own Roman citizens if he ever abused his power or stepped out of line. Since Augustus associated with Romulus he would have wanted Livy to portray that Romulus vanished into the heavens, because it asserts his divine nature. In addition, it would not be pleasant to accept that Romulus was torn limb from limb as this does not paint a pleasant picture for Rome's ruler. This is similar to how Livy quickly changes topics from Remus being a victim of fratricide, to the story of Hercules and Geryon; fratricide is simply not a topic enjoyable to read. Thus for Romulus's death, he sticks with the amusing account of Romulus's vanishing and being likened to a god. It is clear from this that the supposed immortality of Romulus is critical to how the Romans identified their ruler.

In summary of Livy's account, it is evident that Romulus fits various criteria for myth. Romulus's traits fit into a larger cultural significance for how Livy at least thought a Roman's characteristics should have been at the time. Romulus is portrayed as a more capable human being than his brother Remus throughout childhood, and he is rather self-sufficient, without much outside help from his caretaker Faustulus. Romulus encouraged a strong government for his citizens to participate in, and was also strong militarily. Romulus most importantly would defend Rome at all costs by committing fratricide and kidnapping the Sabine women to keep his population alive. Thus, Livy tries to portray Romulus as the ideal Roman and the myth itself can be considered in terms of its larger social significance for the time Livy was writing in. On the two occasions of Remus's death and Romulus's death Livy gives two different versions of each

which brings up the issue of the nervousness of identity. Fratricide paints an ugly picture for Livy's readers causing Livy to quickly shift to the myth of Hercules and Geryon to change the subject. Livy also disregards the version of Romulus's death which involves him getting dismembered by the members of his own Senate, as this once again does not paint a pleasant picture of Rome's founder for Livy's readers. Thus, it was better for Livy to say that Romulus was taken up in a cloud. Livy shows himself to be very aware of the current situation of Rome which sheds light on why he chose the storylines he did. Due to the civil wars just prior to when Livy was likely writing gives him a reason to report Romulus's act of fratricide as the accepted account, because Romans at the time were desperate just like Romulus was to protect their state from turmoil at all costs. In light of this, the fratricide does not seem as bad given the social context of Livy's time of writing. On the other hand, Livy still reports the fratricide briefly and moves on because he would not have wanted to imply that Augustus who was the ruler of Rome at the time, as someone who would be corrupted enough to commit an act such as fratricide. For the same reason of shedding positive light on Augustus, it makes sense why Livy would quickly dismiss the storyline of Romulus being dismembered by his own senate members, because Livy would not have wanted readers to perhaps consider Augustus one day suffering the same fate if he ever stepped out of line and embodied the characteristics of a tyrant. Therefore, Livy was influenced by Augustus and was under pressure to report what would paint the best possible image for his ruler.

Perhaps Livy's account of the Romulus and Remus myth is the most memorable due to fratricide being a shock for readers, however this is not the only account. When reading Livy's version, the reader must note that they are reading a Roman text that was written by a Roman author himself. Thus, there is also the question of bias and possible modification of the story in

order to place Rome in a better light. In order to determine whether or not the identification of Romulus and his qualities differs between authors, it is critical to look at Dionysius of Halicarnassus who wrote at roughly the same time as Livy. The significance of reading Dionysius's account of Rome's foundation myth lies not solely in the regard that Dionysius as a different author may have some differences in the way he tells his story, but also in the regard that he was a Greek historian which adds a new layer of differences between a version that a Roman author would provide. It is critical to look at Dionysius's account in his *Roman Antiquities* to determine if there is a difference in the way the foundation story was written, as these differences can also give insight into the culture differences between the Romans and Greeks as a whole.

Chapter 4 Dionysius's Reasons for Writing the *Roman Antiquities*

Dionysius of Halicarnassus was a Greek historian who settled in Rome around 30 BCE.³² Rome had much intellectual activity going on at the time, and Dionysius had influences both literary and political from individuals such as Caecilius and Tubero. Dionysius wrote various works such as *On Ancient Orators* and also a study of Thucydides. His main work was the massive *Roman Antiquities* which spanned twenty books in which he covered the Romulus and Remus myth. Before diving into Dionysius's account it is important to try to gain some insight into underlying reasons as to why he would write this account. Perhaps Dionysius's main reason was to write an extensive history for the sake of having a complete history of the Romans for the Greeks. Maybe he just wanted to explain the Romans to the Greeks so that his own people would have a better understanding of the Roman state and culture that was accurate. Whatever the surface level reasons for the writing of the *Roman Antiquities* may be, Dionysius had a greater underlying reason as to creating his work. This issue is not merely a decision on his part to want to write a history for sake of writing it, but one of defining Greek identity. Dionysius has an interesting perspective on Greek identity because of the fact that he was living in Rome, and because of that he may have had a better understanding of similarities and differences between Romans and Greeks. One of his main goals was to show that the Romans and Greeks were very similar from a cultural perspective, and that the Greeks had many misconceptions about Roman origins. Dionysius wants to show that he has the background knowledge to give him the authority to comment on the ethnic origins of the Romans even though he is Greek, and his residency in Rome may have helped his case.

³² Wilson. "Dionysius of Halicarnassus." *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece*. p. 228.

The defining of what it meant to be a Greek is something that Dionysius explored throughout his whole work of the *Roman Antiquities*, but there are also some hints in the section specifically on Romulus and Remus which will be explored further in this paper. According to Schmitz and Wiater, “the *Antiquitates Romanae*, an early Roman history covering the period from the foundation of Rome to the beginnings of the First Punic War, is now discussed as a document of Greek cultural identity rather than a mine for works of (now lost) Hellenistic and Roman historians.”³³ Dionysius would have the authority to comment and explore Greek identity since he was living in Rome and had relations to Roman literary and political figures, meaning he was a Greek who had more exposure to Roman ethnicity as opposed to other Greeks who were living in Greece. Thus, he is a Greek with firsthand experience with Roman culture, and he is in an excellent position to compare the two cultures. Identity is specific to “a particular social context at a specific time,”³⁴ thus the “Greek identity” is something that will change over the generations and the authors. For the sake of this paper, Greek identity at the time in which Dionysius was writing his account will be explored. The difficulties in exploring this question are furthered due to the fact that we do not get a personal look into the mind and thoughts of Dionysius, or most of the writers at the time, as all we have are their works which cause much of the personal introspection of the authors’ to be lost. Also one has to keep in mind that “most of our sources are works of literature of which were written for publication,”³⁵ which can cause more of the authors’ personalities to be lost. Then there is the issue of competition which blurs the search for the Greek identity. Identity is something that is constantly in a state of flux and

³³ Schmitz and Wiater. “Introduction.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p.17.

³⁴ Schmitz and Wiater. “Introduction.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p.22.

³⁵ Schmitz and Wiater. “Introduction.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p.23.

different authors can have different views on what a culture's identity actually is. Greek authors can offer "alternative, sometimes competing conceptions of the Graeco-Roman world, each of which, in turn provides the foundations for their self-image as intellectuals."³⁶ The authors are under pressure to amalgamate the best versions of all the myths and stories they encounter and choose for themselves what they think is true or whatever serves to get across the underlying intentions of their work, which explains why Livy and Dionysius both give extensive lists of authors before they start writing. Both Livy and Dionysius also wanted to come across as well-read and having a proficient background in the work in which they were documenting in order to establish their legitimacy. As Luce points out in regards to Livy, "Carelessness, haste, a lack of interest in some details, ignorance of military matters and the like do not mean that Livy did not know the history of his people-much less that such defects in him warrant our thinking that we know it better."³⁷ This statement does not go just for Livy but could also be applied to Dionysius and probably many other authors, in that sometimes with the knowledge that we have now as readers we can already have acquired a big picture of Roman history that was not necessarily available to the authors in the time periods in which they were writing in. Perhaps some of the aspects that we as readers think are lacking in these authors' accounts is nothing more than the author having preferences over what he wanted to include in order to create a more simplified account that was easier to read. Nevertheless, it cannot be ruled out that the overwhelming amount of sources can possibly cause confusion and even bias for authors as they may be more inclined to choose versions of a story that follow the traditions of either their Greek or Roman ancestors.

³⁶ Schmitz and Wiater. "Introduction." *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p.25.

³⁷ Luce. "Working Methods." *Livy: The Composition of His History*. p. 190.

At the beginning of book one of *Roman Antiquities*, Dionysius describes the reasons as to why he wrote his work. Dionysius first wants to make sure that truth “is enshrined”³⁸ and provided to the readers, and to “provide themselves with the proper equipment for the treatment of their subject.”³⁸ Dionysius at least admits that “a man’s words are the images of his mind,”³⁹ thus at least he admits that variations between authors and stories are bound to exist. Dionysius shows from early on that he is not biased towards the Greeks as a Greek author in his account, based on the way he describes the feats of both the Romans and Greeks. Dionysius describes how in regards to achievements “the supremacy of the Romans has far surpassed all those that are recorded from earlier times...but also in the length of time during which it has endured down to our day,”⁴⁰ which is reasonable enough considering it is difficult to downplay the many victories that the Romans had throughout antiquity up until Rome’s downfall. He up plays Rome quite a bit more when he describes how the Macedonians were eventually destroyed by the Romans.

The story gets more interesting when Dionysius turns to describing a rough history of the Greeks’ world. He says that for the Greeks “it is not fitting to compare them to those just mentioned, since they gained neither magnitude of empire nor duration,”⁴¹ and that the Athenians were not able to extend their rule much further than the sea coast. This is reasonable enough if you look at this from Dionysius’s perspective since the Romans perhaps did conquer a good deal more than the Greeks. However, what makes this all interesting is the language that he chooses to use. He pronounces “Rome rules every country that is not inaccessible or uninhabited, and she is mistress of every sea, not only of that which lies inside the Pillars of Hercules but also

³⁸ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.1.2.

³⁹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.1.3.

⁴⁰ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.2.1.

⁴¹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.3.1.

of the Ocean except that part of it which is not navigable, she is the first and the only State recorded in all time that ever made the risings and the settings of the sun the boundaries of her dominion.”⁴² The language is very loaded and somewhat emotional as Dionysius claims that Rome rules every country and rules everywhere between the rising and setting of the sun, and it seems as if it would stroke the ego of any Roman reading it. Dionysius basically says that Rome rules every region of the world which shows that either his knowledge of the world was limited in scope to the Graeco-Roman world specifically, or he had some motive to really make Rome seem great.

Readers get one of the main overarching reasons as to why Dionysius wrote the work in the first place when he talks about Greek misunderstanding of Roman culture. As Dionysius states, “For to this day almost all the Greeks are ignorant of the early history of Rome and the great majority of them have been imposed upon by sundry false opinions grounded upon stories which chance has brought to their ears...”⁴³ which sums up his intentions. Dionysius seems to want to at least point out that there are probably many false predispositions that the Greeks have about Roman culture and history. Wiater describes how the “purpose of Dionysius’ historical narrative is to prove that the Romans were actually Greeks, ethnically as well as ethically,”⁴⁴ which was of equal importance to defining the Greek identity as its own separate entity. The Greeks could have had negative perceptions about the Romans because they didn’t want to believe in the success of Rome, and all the military success they had as well as the vast amount of territory that they controlled. The Greeks could have doubted their abilities, and their sense of superiority over the Romans was a view that ran the risk of disintegrating. Thus, if Dionysius

⁴² Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.3.3.

⁴³ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.4.2.

⁴⁴ Schmitz and Wiater. “Introduction.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p.26.

could show that the Romans were truly Greeks, it would certainly go a long way to restoring Greek respect for the Romans. Dionysius goes about this proposition in a few different ways. First, Dionysius describes how the Greek and Roman language is similar. Dionysius says how “The language spoken by the Romans is neither utterly barbarous nor absolutely Greek, but a mixture, as it were, of both, the greater part of which is Aeolic,”⁴⁵ which shows how even the two cultures were similar in language. Language is a very distinct way of one group of people identifying themselves as different from another and asides from physical appearance and attributes could very well be the most basic distinction. Dionysius is making a big statement by saying that Greeks and Romans are similar in language, and that the Greeks don’t even have this fundamental aspect of their lives as distinct from the Romans. Dionysius argues that the Roman language is closer to that of the Greeks since the majority is Aeolic Greek which was spoken mostly in central Greece at the time.

Secondly, the Romans and Greeks may be similar in regards to the prehistory of Rome. Dionysius “proves to possess a plupast subsisting in the multiple, complete pasts of the various contributory peoples who once lived at that place ‘in which now the Romans are settled’.”⁴⁶ This is central to Dionysius’s work because he wants to show that “Though these peoples are characterized by wide-ranging travels, they are all Greek by origin: this is crucial to Dionysius’ demonstration that the Romans are not barbarians.”⁴⁴ Dionysius wants to make it clear from the start from his work that he is out to show that the Romans and Greeks are heavily intertwined in their origins. As Haarman points out, “Identity, the mental strategy of distinguishing the Self from the Other, is so elementary as to function as a motor for all kinds of interaction and cultural

⁴⁵ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.90.1.

⁴⁶ Schultze. “Dionysius and Roman self-definition.” *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: the ‘plupast’ from Herodotus to Appian*. p. 114.

activities.”⁴⁷ Thus, the Greeks for quite some time may have identified their own culture as the “self” and being separate from the Romans who are the “other.” But Dionysius seems to be out to prove that this no longer has to be the case. Identity is “not a phenomenon that, once achieved, continues unchanged. Rather identity has the character of a dynamic process that is reactivated in everyday interactions, and is subject to potential changes.”⁴⁷ Dionysius wants to show that he can change Greek perceptions of Romans and help by means of his writing to change their identity and join their ethnic background to the Romans. Luraghi also notes some of the Greek closed-mindedness:

[T]he Greeks constitute a striking example of a civilization that kept alive such binary worldview in spite of extraordinarily intense interaction with other cultures, and in spite of the fact that its carriers were spread discontinuously over a comparatively large tract of land around the Mediterranean and its hinterland, interspersed with people who were different from them in terms of religion, language, and culture⁴⁸

The Greeks prove themselves in some ways to be exclusive creatures, and one of the biggest ways that this shows is in the structure of the poleis. Luraghi points out that “The citizen body was, to all intents and purposes, a closed descent group: membership could only be inherited from one’s father or parents,”⁴⁹ and Greek poleis were even further subdivisions of the Greeks as an identity group due to specific cultural changes throughout the poleis. Dionysius was likely going off the misconception that the barbarian Sicels were known at the time as the original race of people to later make up Rome. But as Schultze points out in a modern assessment of Sicel origins, “Five successive incursions of outsiders overlay the Sicels: (1) Aborigines, demonstrated

⁴⁷ Haarman. “Ethnicity and Language in the Ancient Mediterranean.” *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. p. 19

⁴⁸ Luraghi. “The Study of Greek Ethnic Identities.” *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. p. 213

⁴⁹ Luraghi. “The Study of Greek Ethnic Identities.” *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. p. 220

to be Oenotrian Greeks from Achaea; (2) Pelasgians, from Achaea via Thessaly; (3) Arcadians, led by Evander; (4) Peloponnesians and some Trojans accompanying Heracles; (5) Trojans with Aeneas.”⁵⁰ Dionysius really takes his time to make it clear that there is no reason to think of the Romans as separate from the Greeks given his evidence on their early heritage. Thus the Greeks and Romans are very similar due to their prehistory and language.

Another issue which caused Greek and Roman identity separation is due to both thinking that they were superior to the other. Dionysius directly states that what he wants to show is that “Rome from the very beginning immediately after its founding, produced infinite examples of virtue in men whose superiors, whether for piety or for justice or for life-long self-control or for warlike valour, no city, either Greek or barbarian, has ever produced.”⁵¹ Thus, Dionysius seems almost as if he wants to “clear” the name of the Romans and remove all of the false Greek impressions that have been created over the generations about the Romans. Dionysius does not think that the Greeks have any reason to think themselves better than the Romans, because the Romans are not barbaric. This is an interesting task that Dionysius undertakes, because it certainly would not have been the norm for Greek historians before him and at the time in which he was writing. As Huskinson points out, “In general Romans regarded Greek contemporaries as tending to bother only with their own concerns”⁵² and that “Greeks were often less than willing to identify with the culture of the Roman empire of which they were now part.”⁵²

In general, there is almost a sense of apathy on the Greeks part in discovering and experiencing Roman culture. Huskinson also points out that “some [Greeks] even went so far as to resist using official Latin terminology.”⁵² Miles describes a couple of views that the Romans had about

⁵⁰ Schultze. “Dionysius and Roman self-definition.” *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: the ‘plupast’ from Herodotus to Appian*. p. 116.

⁵¹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.5.3.

⁵² Huskinson. “Looking for Culture, Identity, and Power.” *Experiencing Rome*. p. 15

themselves that showed their superiority over other cultures. The “first is the notion that the Romans were a self-made people who surpassed Hellenistic peoples in morality, practical wisdom, and warfare.”⁵³ The second notion is that “the Romans were superior not in spite of but precisely because of their apparent cultural backwardness: the simple austerity of their rustic traditions fostered a strength of character that the literary sophistication of the Hellenes could not equal.”⁵³ Just as the Romans had these views of themselves as being superior to others such as the Greeks, it is also likely that the Greeks had reasons that were similar as to why they were better than the Romans. As Wiater shows, “All of the negative characteristics ascribed to the Romans represent the opposite of key elements of an image of classical Greek identity...,”⁵⁴ thus the Greeks are desperate to protect their self-image. Parts of the classical Greek identity are surely taken from the values that Homer portrays in the *Iliad* such as honor, glory, and fate which the Greeks likely used to protect their superiority over the Romans.

Dionysius explicitly states that “no accurate history of the Romans written in Greek language has hitherto appeared, but only very brief and summary epitomes”⁵⁵ which is a more technical reason as to why he wrote his history. Dionysius tries to prove his qualifications for undertaking this task as from the time Augustus Caesar ended the civil wars to the time he was writing he “learned the language of the Romans and acquainted myself with their writings,”⁵⁶ thus he should be familiar with Roman culture. He thinks that Hieronymus, Timaeus, and Polybius among other have not created works that are up to par with his standards, and that besides oral tradition he gained his knowledge through the approved “Porcius Cato, Fabius

⁵³ Miles. Livy: “Foundation and Ideology.” *Reconstructing Early Rome*. p. 149.

⁵⁴ Wiater. “Writing Roman History.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p. 73.

⁵⁵ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.5.4.

⁵⁶ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.7.2.

Maximus, Valerius Antia, Licinius Macer, the Aelii, Gellii and Calpurnii.”⁵⁷ Therefore, those reading the *Roman Antiquities* in Dionysius’s view should trust his work because he only took information from sources that were regarded as acceptable to the average Roman intellectual. Dionysius makes a bold move in this regard because he is essentially saying that his Greek account of the Romans is just as valuable if not more so than a Roman account about the Romans, putting Greek and Roman historiography on the same level. And more importantly that Dionysius has read material from both Greek and Roman sources and that those writers can speak to the issue of identity he lays out. As Wiater points out there seems to be a paradox in the work of Dionysius as a whole, as on the one hand Dionysius is trying to write a great piece of Greek literature that can bring back the classical Greek language. But on the other hand “Dionysius sets out to present a detailed account of early *Roman* history, and one which proposes to justify Roman hegemony.”⁵⁸ So in a sense there is an attempt here to write a magnificent work for Greeks to highlight the Greek language, but an unexpected means of doing so as the subject matter is of a Roman nature. Wiater thinks that “the *Antiquitates Romanae* attempts nothing less than providing the (allegedly) barbarian Rome with that cultural and political tradition which she needs to legitimize her superiority,”⁵⁹ which is more or less a defense of the Romans.

It is still difficult to imagine why Dionysius would stick up for the Romans as this would have been very challenging to the views and belief systems of Greeks at the time, which is that they were completely separate from the Romans. Dionysius maybe is reimbursing Rome for all that he learned there “by perpetuating a truthful and positive image of Rome and the political and

⁵⁷ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.7.3.

⁵⁸ Wiater. “Writing Roman History.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p. 70.

⁵⁹ Wiater. “Writing Roman History.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p. 76.

moral values which distinguish both her constitution and the character of her citizens.”⁶⁰

Dionysius feels like he owes it to the Romans to portray them in a positive light because Roman influence on his own knowledge and understanding of his world was beneficial to him. After Dionysius is finished describing the death of Remus, and Romulus performs the initial religious rites for the city he states, “from now on let the reader forever renounce the views of those who make Rome a retreat of barbarians, fugitive and vagabonds, and let him confidently affirm it to be a Greek city, — which will be easy when he shows that it is at once the most hospitable and friendly of all cities.”⁶¹ This confirms that he thinks the Greeks are wrong and that he actually thinks Rome is a great city.

What Dionysius is trying to accomplish by writing his work differs in a major way from one of the main reasons as to why Livy wrote his account. When Dionysius attempts to show that the Romans are essentially Greeks and not the barbarians that many Greeks thought they were at the time, Livy essentially does the exact opposite. In general “Livy repeatedly stresses the low status and dubious backgrounds of the earliest Romans: a motley crew like that needed a long period of time before it could be welded into one nation capable of enjoying the potentially hazardous benefits of *libertas*.”⁶² Livy’s view on the national identity of Rome was that it was something that had to be developed over time into its prime form, and that the early ancestors of Rome such as Romulus were not saints by any measure. Thus, Rome’s national character was one that was dynamic and acquired by a process of trial and error. Dionysius perhaps feels no need to stick up for the Greeks because he just wants to report the truth and clear the misconceptions Greeks at the time may have had about the Romans.

⁶⁰ Wiater. “Writing Roman History.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p. 87.

⁶¹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.89.1

⁶² Luce. “Roman National Character.” *Livy: The Composition of His History*. p. 246.

A similar but slightly different interpretation of Dionysius's work is given by Fox when he says Dionysius "dismantled the polarity between Roman and Greek, made Roman history into Greek history, and thereby, tried to provide Greeks with a sense of participation in that history...and encouraged Romans to continue to be worthy of their Greek ancestors."⁶³ Wiater brings up a very interesting point when he mentions that for Romans to be worthy of Rome they need to be "adopting Greek moral and political virtues as Romulus and the early Romans did, because being Greek, and continuously striving to remain Greek, is the distinctive characteristic of Roman identity."⁶⁴

Perhaps the creation of Rome was Greek in many ways due to the political structure and organization that Romulus was giving it, and that Greek and Roman morals don't differ much either. Wiater argues that "a good Roman citizen can never have a dishonorable private life and nobody with a dishonorable private life can ever be a good Roman citizen."⁶⁵ He argues that the Romans by following Romulus are assimilating Classical Greek values into their lives as a whole. According to Wiater, the Greeks should feel a sense of superiority to the Romans because they model a great deal of their own state according to Greek values. This proposition by Wiater is very likely, because Dionysius mentions in book 2 chapter 12 that Romulus set up a council of elders which was modeled straight after the Greeks. He also states how the members of the Senate were called the "Conscript Fathers" which is an identical Greek institution. Dionysius states that "At any rate, the Greek kings, both those who inherited the realms of their ancestors and those who were elected by the people themselves to be their rulers, had a council composed

⁶³ Fox. "The Style of the Past: Dionysius of Halicarnassus in Context." *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p. 93.

⁶⁴ Wiater. "A Greek Past for the Roman Present." *The Ideology of Classicism: Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. p. 205.

⁶⁵ Wiater. "History and Criticism." *The Ideology of Classicism: Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. p. 174.

of the best men, as both Homer and the most ancient of the poets testify,”⁶⁶ which shows that Romulus models his city after some of the Homeric values. The Senate also had the right of majority vote which was taken straight from the Lacedaemonians. Still, Dionysius says that the best thing that Romulus did was when he did not “slay all the men of military age or to enslave the rest of the population of the cities captured in war or to allow their land to go back to pasturage for sheep, but rather to send settlers thither to possess some part of the country by lot and to make the conquered cities Roman colonies.”⁶⁷ Dionysius then proceeds to put down the Lacedaemonians, Athenians, and Thebans when he says that they were essentially stingy with their granting of citizenship rights, and as a result they had multiple and costly military failures. Dionysius shows that from a religious perspective the Romans may even be superior to the Greeks in a rather humorous passage:

Indeed, there is no tradition among the Romans either of Caelus being castrated by his own sons or of Saturn destroying his own offspring to secure himself from their attempts or of Jupiter dethroning Saturn and confining his own father in the dungeon of Tartarus, or, indeed, of wars, wounds, or bonds of the gods, or of their servitude among men. And no festival is observed among them as a day of mourning or by the wearing of black garments and the beating of breasts and the lamentations of women because of the disappearance of deities, such as the Greeks perform in commemorating the rape of Persephone and the adventures of Dionysus and all the other things of like nature. And one will see among them, even though their manners are now corrupted, no ecstatic transports, no Corybantic frenzies, no begging under the colour of religion, no bacchanals or secret mysteries, no all-night vigils of men and women together in the temples, nor any other mummary of this kind; but alike in all their words and actions with respect to the gods a reverence is shown such as is seen among neither Greeks nor barbarians⁶⁸

Dionysius writes these issues off as a philosophical debate which he will not get into, and that the advantages of Roman myth may only be slight, but it is nonetheless interesting. The theme of

⁶⁶ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 2.12.4.

⁶⁷ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 2.16.1.

⁶⁸ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 2.19.1-2.

Dionysius trying to unite Greek and Roman culture comes up again and his attempt to remove Greek disparity from the Romans.

One of the most important parts of Dionysius's work is how the character of Romulus is portrayed. Schultze has an interesting theory as to how Dionysius at least defines the character of Romulus which may have been a method that other authors have used as well. He states that "Romulus is depicted as drawing upon a shared stock of experience: a collective Greek *plupast* which ranges from Homer onwards is available to him"⁶⁹ which shows that Dionysius' definition of Romulus may not be original. Thus, Romulus may purely be based on what are known as the "Homeric values" and Dionysius may be attributing some of those known heroic values to Romulus. Schultze argues that "The Romans have emerged from their primeval Arcadian cradle to participate fully in the lifestyle and values of the Greeks of the heroic age,"⁶⁹ which shows that Dionysius may have tried to mold Romulus into a typical Greek hero due to Dionysius's own Greek background and culture, even though Romulus is a Roman. Some examples of Romulus's heroic nature will be explored later but a couple of the biggest examples are how successfully he handled his institutions, especially with the integration of the Sabine women into his culture, along with his military successes. This also plays into the issue of why Dionysius chose between the three different accounts for the founding of Rome the variation that included Romulus essentially triumphing over his brother and winning over the territory of Rome even though it lead to Remus's death. The other accounts which either involve Remus establishing Rome or having the territory handed down to Romulus do not make for as great a story if Dionysius is modeling parts of Romulus on Homeric heroes.

⁶⁹ Schultze. "Dionysius and Roman self-definition." *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography. The 'plupast' from Herodotus to Appian.* p. 128.

Chapter 5 Dionysius's Different Romes

Dionysius starts off in book 1, chapter 72 of *Roman Antiquities* by acknowledging that there are many different accounts of Rome's foundation story. He states that there are some accounts that say the city was named after the founder Romulus after the Trojan War, and another that states Aeneas named the city Rome after a Trojan woman when he entered Italy alongside Odysseus. He even mentions that Aristotle describes Rome being founded on a random encounter by the Achaeans when they stumbled upon land off Cape Malea during a violent storm. He goes on to mention a variety of other stories by purely Roman authors that give varying accounts of how the actual city of Rome was founded. In spite of all this Dionysius commits to "relate the most probable of these stories."⁷⁰

It is interesting to see how Dionysius gives a plethora of versions of Rome's foundation myth, even if he doesn't take much of an interest in them. It seems as if Dionysius wants to make it clear to his Greek audience that he is indeed giving a fair portrayal to the myth, or at the very least that he knows what he is talking about through deep research of the material that he is presenting. Livy also states in his history that he is giving the versions of the story that he feels are most accurate, however he does not go nearly into the same level of background information in his work as Dionysius does. This is not to say that not having that large amount of background material necessarily detracts from Livy's history at all because perhaps it was just a difference between Greek and Roman writing styles. It is possible that Livy did not feel like he needed the same level of justification for what he was writing as Dionysius did as a Roman author. The Roman tradition of historiography could have called for a different writing style that also could account for the difference between Livy and Dionysius. It could be due to the fact that Livy was

⁷⁰ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.76.4.

a Roman author writing about a Roman story, thus there was a greater sense of trust with his readers because they could relate to the fact that they were reading a work by a fellow Roman. Maybe Dionysius felt like he was coming in at a disadvantage as he was a Greek author writing about a Roman story, and that he needed to prove the validity of his sources first before he started giving Romulus's account. At any rate, there is no doubt that there is an extra level of detail at least initially in Dionysius's account that is not found in Livy's. Dionysius mentions that he does not want "to give merely a cursory account of these things, as if they were universally agreed on,"⁷¹ which shows that there was much debate over what the proper account of the myth was.

Let's now look at some further versions Dionysius offers. He also mentions that Odysseus could have been the founder according to the priestesses at Argos which is fairly different from most of the other accounts, however he says that Damastes of Sigeum and others agree with this. Dionysius tells of how Callias says that Roma was a Trojan woman who married Latinus who had three sons named Romus, Romulus, and Telgonus which is interesting as this brings a third brother into the picture. Xenagoras said that Romus was the son of Odysseus, and had two other brothers who had their own cities named after them. Dionysius of Chalcis stated that Romus was indeed the founder of Rome but may have been the son of Ascanius or Emathion. It is likely that Dionysius wanted his readers to know that his version was the true account, because he had done so much extensive research on the material and then amalgamated everything together into the version that he thought was the best. Dionysius also mentions previous Roman writers and their differing versions, which only adds to the problem of what the accepted account should be. Dionysius does not explicitly state that these other accounts are

⁷¹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.72.1.

wrong, but he also does not state that they are common or accepted accounts. Dionysius wants his readers to take things with a grain of salt because it is so difficult to decide on what the accepted account should be, but at the same time to trust him because his background is so extensive. As Schultze points out, Dionysius's "painstaking demonstration of the correctness of the 'long' chronology (Rome founded many generations after the arrival of Aeneas) over the 'short' (Rome founded by a son or grandson of Aeneas) is based upon diverse arguments which cumulatively establish the foundation date of Rome..."⁷² which shows his argument is likely valid due to the vast research he has done. And since Dionysius looks at Roman historians as well he wants to make it clear that his account offers the best of both the Greek and Roman worlds, because he looked at how the story differed and changed between two different cultures.

In chapter 73, book one of *Roman Antiquities* Dionysius makes it known that he actually had three choices when choosing what the proper foundation of Rome was. Readers learn that there was actually the possibility of three Romes in addition to the possibilities mentioned in the previous paragraph when looking at the works of previous historians. The first explanation is in 1.73.2 when Dionysius says that Romulus and Remus were taken as hostages by Aeneas and later delivered to Latinus who was the king of the Aborigines at the time. Then Latinus decided to leave Romulus and Remus the kingdom since he did not have any successors himself. This is a big contrast from the accepted story of the twins defeating Amulius and establishing their own territories for the boundaries of Rome with Romulus killing Remus in the end, because Romulus in this account is depicted as accomplishing so much and working hard for the establishment of Rome.

⁷² Schultze. "Dionysius and Roman self-definition." *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: the 'plupast' from Herodotus to Appian*. p. 120.

Dionysius goes on to mention the second cited founding of Rome which is also rather anti-climactic like the first possibility he writes about. He goes on to say that when Aeneas died Ascanius divided the territory of the Latins into three parts, and gave two to his brothers Romulus and Remus. Ascanius was said to be responsible for creating Alba, and Remus built multiple cities of Capuas, Anchias, Aeneia, and eventually Rome which he named after himself. Rome in this context was “for some time deserted, but upon the arrival of another colony, which the Albans sent out under the leadership of Romulus and Remus, it received again its ancient name.”⁷³ Like in the first scenario Dionysius provides, there is no real struggle in attaining the city of Rome, as Ascanius basically hands down the territory to his twin brothers followed by them divvying up the land. In this version what is most surprising is that there isn’t even any mention of Romulus acquiring any territory, but only Remus who created three territories. Romulus is commonly thought of as the founder of Rome, but in this case it was actually Remus who designated Rome’s territory. This is even in light of the fact that due to the etymology of the words that Romulus is more likely to go with Rome due to their similar sounding nature, but nevertheless Remus is the one who names Rome. Like the in first case this description is also widely different than the accepted account Livy gives.

And there is still a third account for the founding of Rome that Dionysius found given by Antiochus of Syracuse. This Rome was founded before Aeneas and the Trojans entered Italy, when Morges reigned and a man who had “been banished from Rome”⁷⁴ named Seicelus came to him. However, for this Rome that was founded earlier than the Trojan War, Dionysius says it is questionable whether the city was located in the same place as it was today. Schultze sums the issue up nicely with the reason “the recurrent foundations of Rome have an importance for

⁷³ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.73.3.

⁷⁴ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.73.4

Dionysius is not in that he buys into the notion of successive Romes receding back into the mists of time, but in that it enables him to concretize the nature of disputes that lie within the *plupast* even – or, perhaps, *especially* – of a city so great as Rome.”⁷⁵ As Dionysius amalgamates all the possible founding stories of Rome into one section, it also gives him more backing later on in his work to define what he thinks is the most likely account which is closer to Livy’s than these three, although still different in many aspects. Even though Dionysius keeps this part of his account where he mentions the three foundings relatively brief, only devoting one large paragraph to them, the implications are nonetheless central to his work.

First, that as a historian it was basically impossible to confirm which story for Rome’s founding was the right one, and at the same time it is also not possible to refute another historian who may claim something different. There is also the issue of trying to determine why an author may pick and choose a specific storyline, as Dionysius relates multiple accounts whereas Livy only gives two accounts with Remus’s death and the founding of Rome. These are two reasons that there cannot be one single authoritative account of a myth. Livy probably chose a more specific story for Romulus as he was depicting him in a favorable way for Augustus during the Augustan age in which he was writing. He wanted Romulus to be remembered as someone great and accomplished, and not as someone who committed fratricide. The tale of the fratricide however was probably too well known by the Romans thus Livy would not have wanted to omit it entirely. That is why he mentions Remus’s death and quickly switches gears to the story of Hercules and Geryon. Dionysius wants to find a way to relate both the Greeks and the Romans in terms of their origins and ancestry, thus that is why he gives multiple accounts for the founding of the Roman state and a considerably larger historical background into which the myth fit. It is

⁷⁵ Schultze. “Dionysius and Roman self-definition.” *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: the ‘plupast’ from Herodotus to Appian*. p. 125.

important to keep in mind when reading Dionysius's account of the myth that as a Greek perhaps he did not feel the same pressure to write in a way that would portray Augustus in the best possible light, despite the fact that he was writing during the Augustan age. Since Dionysius was not a Roman like Livy, Dionysius may have not been nervous at all to choose an account which might have portrayed Augustus negatively.

Chapter 6 Dionysius's Account

Dionysius's account is largely similar to Livy's at least in the earlier parts of his description of Romulus's and Remus's lineage. However, there are slight differences in the tone that Dionysius uses. When Livy describes the conflict between Amulius and Numitor he is plain in his language when he states that violence ensued resulting in Amulius expelling "his brother and seiz[ing] the crown."⁷⁶ The difference with Dionysius's description is only slight, but the language that he uses is filled with more emotion. He states how Amulius "after forcibly excluding his elder brother Numitor from the dignity that was his inheritance"⁷⁷ was having a "desire never to be dispossessed of the sovereignty."⁷⁷ Extra detail can be seen in Dionysius's account when he describes Numitor's son Aegestus being killed in an ambush, whereas Livy just says Amulius "murdered his brother's sons."⁷⁶ The addition of extra detail by Dionysius can especially be seen when he describes the rape of Ilia by Mars. Livy simply mentions "The Vestal was forcibly violated and gave birth to twins"⁵ and "named Mars as their father...because the fault might appear less heinous if a deity were the cause of it."⁵ Dionysius goes into much more detail and mentions that some sources say Amulius was the culprit as he might have disguised himself in armor. Since Mars was a god, Dionysius mentions "God is incapable of any action that is unworthy of his incorruptible and blessed nature,"⁷⁸ but then goes on to say how it is not pertinent to give much attention to these debates.

When Romulus and Remus are found by the she-wolf there is also a much more detailed description of the encounter. There is added detail when the herdsman "were beholding a

⁷⁶ Livy. *History of Rome*. 1.3.

⁷⁷ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.76.1

⁷⁸ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.77.3.

supernatural sight and advanced in a body, shouting to terrify the creature.”⁷⁹ The differences with Dionysius’s descriptive language may be solely due to the fact that he is a different author with a writing style that should be expected to have slight variations. It is also possible that there is a difference in the writing due to the Greek audience, who may have preferred a more emotional description of the events taking place in the myth. The added descriptions in Dionysius’s account do not necessarily make for a better history than Livy’s because much of it would seem as filler material, and he most likely could have gotten his points across with less information. Livy seems to get the same points across as Dionysius with fewer words which denotes a difference in style between the two authors.

The other side to these differences is the probability that Dionysius used a much broader range of stories than Livy did which led to differences in style. Dionysius is likely to have borrowed the opinions and judgments of the other historians he was pulling his sources and information from, and not only that but also the language and the tone in which he wrote. There is also now the question of what statements or opinions of Dionysius are original and what are products of the other writers he had read before creating his account. It is possible that a similar phenomenon happened in Livy’s writing as well, however it would be harder to justify that as Livy doesn’t explicitly state which sources and historians he used. Livy’s mentioning of alternative storylines is rather brief throughout, thus it is difficult to tell how he feels about them. Livy also may have wanted to make the account more concise and less tedious to read in the exclusion of providing alternative accounts frequently throughout the narrative as Dionysius did. Overall, it is difficult to come to a definite conclusion on the choices made between Dionysius

⁷⁹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.79.7.

and Livy due to the question of whether or not the opinions and language are original, or byproducts of the material that the two authors read prior to making their accounts.

Dionysius like Livy does not try to ground Romulus and Remus in being typical humans as he recognizes them as something beyond the average man. He says “when they came to be men, they showed themselves both in dignity of aspect and elevation of mind...as we might expect those to be who are born of royal race,”⁸⁰ in spite of the fact that they lived their early adulthood as shepherds. Dionysius may be hinting here that the founder of a city as great as Rome should be of royal race due to an implication that those born of royalty and their respective heirs have an inherent ability to rule over others. Livy mentions that “Faustulus had from the beginning suspected that it was royal offspring that he was bringing up,”⁶ which also implies that there is something particularly special about the way in which royal blood manifests itself. This language used by Dionysius and Livy most likely portrays a belief system at the time that they were writing that heirs make the best rulers, and not a random citizen born of a royal class.

The aspect of competition between the two brothers is also present in Dionysius’s account like it is in Livy’s. Dionysius describes Romulus and Remus quarreling over the boundaries to the meadows for grazing that belonged to them, which foreshadows their later dispute which leads to Remus getting killed. Dionysius also portrays Romulus as a superior candidate for the founder of Rome. Numitor’s men devised a plot to attack the brothers, as they were tired of fighting with Romulus and Remus over their disputes over the meadow boundaries. As a result, the men decided to ambush the two brothers, however Romulus was not present at the time of the ambush. Romulus is depicted as more pious than Remus as Romulus “had gone at the time to a place called Caenina to offer sacrifices for the community according to the custom

⁸⁰ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.79.10.

of the country,”⁸¹ thus he was respecting the traditions of his country unlike Remus who was absent from this. Perhaps it was not necessary for Remus to go offer sacrifices like his brother did at the time, but the language that Dionysius uses particularly in calling it a custom, gives the implication that Remus was destined to be in the wrong place at the wrong time with Romulus somehow getting rewarded for acting religiously. Remus would initially appear to be the stronger of the two as he went out to ambush his attackers, but he was overtaken by them and taken prisoner.

This is only one version of the story however, and Dionysius gives a second account which he says is by Aelius Tubero and which is similar to the story Livy gives. Dionysius in this version tells how at the festival for Pan the Lupercalia ambushers overtook both of the brothers. In this version Romulus and Remus are seen in the same light as they are both adhering to religious customs by attending the festival, and Remus is not off doing something else before he is ambushed. Dionysius does not mention that Romulus was successful in defending himself like Livy does, but he still mentions that Remus was captured by his enemies. Romulus is once again depicted as having better decision-making over his brother as he decides to gather a large force to “free his whole family from the lawlessness of Amulius,”⁸² instead of foolishly trying to save Remus by himself. This is not to say that Remus is always portrayed as a weak person as Numitor noticed “his grace of body, so much was there that was kingly in his bearing, but also observed his nobility of spirit.”⁸³ Dionysius’s treatment of Romulus and Remus is similar in the regard that Romulus and Remus were both considered above average in terms of their character in their respective world. There are various hints seen throughout the accounts that suggest

⁸¹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.79.13.

⁸² Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.80.4.

⁸³ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.81.3.

Romulus is the more deserving leader of Rome before the actual death of Remus. This is evident by Romulus being of royal descent and the avoidance of being captured in the ambush unlike Remus. Dionysius thus tries to set the stage for Romulus as a capable leader over Remus early in the myth in order to justify Romulus's qualifications.

Faustulus is a critical character in the Romulus and Remus myth as he is the one responsible for rearing the twins. Faustulus's presence is made known repeatedly in Dionysius's account, and he is portrayed as someone who gives a large amount of assistance throughout the narrative. Part of this observation may be due to the general formula that Dionysius uses for his writing, which involves a much more detailed and drawn out narrative that is not seen in Livy's account. Livy's account in general is more succinct and to the point, but there may be more to the frequency of Faustulus's appearance in the twins' story than it would seem upon first look. Both Livy and Dionysius mention Faustulus's interference in Romulus's decision to go after Amulius after the capture of Remus, and both authors treat this issue with a similar description. After this issue however, Livy does not mention Faustulus again, as the story shortly after cuts to Remus's death. Dionysius goes on to describe how Faustulus had actually come face to face with Amulius while Romulus was planning his attack with the others. Faustulus is said to have brought the ark that originally contained the two twins as babes into town which got him in trouble with the guards. Faustulus is questioned by Amulius when he is brought in, but Amulius is said to have believed him. Faustulus is proven to be a huge aid to the twins once again when he was "suspecting from the king's unaccountable mildness that his intentions were not in harmony with his professions"⁸⁴ when Amulius says he would treat the twins with respect. Faustulus makes up an excuse that he was intending to ask Amulius's daughter for the location

⁸⁴ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.83.1.

of the twins' mother so that he could report to her on their wellbeing, in order to buy the twins time. Faustulus's excuse ends up serving the twins well as Numitor is eventually informed by a messenger of Amulius's impending threat. The twins then came afterwards with some troops allowing them to kill Amulius.

In the parts leading up to Amulius's death, Livy does not describe the actions of Faustulus in this level of detail which is surprising given the comparatively large treatment Dionysius gives him. This discrepancy in a sense perhaps gives Romulus and Remus a larger grounding in the mundane, since Dionysius does not make them entirely self-sufficient, by reminding readers that Faustulus is largely responsible for making Romulus and Remus successful. It may also be worth speculating that Livy could have been relying on different sources than Dionysius, which would automatically warrant a different analysis. Anyhow, Faustulus is just a shepherd and his main part played in the death of Amulius is indeed the simple making of an excuse, but it is still a critical action in the story nonetheless. Romulus and Remus do not accomplish everything just due to their own capabilities, but use another human being to help them in their endeavors. In Dionysius's account the theme of Faustulus is more easily seen, who took the twins from the she-wolf and raised them, along with helping save Remus and killing Amulius as he was constantly protecting them in various ways right from their first encounter. Livy's attention is much more focused on Romulus and Remus alone, even though the story is more succinct, but as a Roman author he may have thought it to be more important to place the spotlight constantly on the twins and Romulus especially, because that was what Livy likely thought readers were the most interested in. Dionysius may give a more holistic understanding of the twin's universe, because he can develop Faustulus who is not a main protagonist into someone who is responsible for causing the twins, especially Romulus to have achievements in spite of having a difficult

early life. This is a big contrast from Livy who places an “emphasis on Romulus as a hero who is characterized by self-sufficiency, and whose essential character reflects the formative influence of his austere rustic upbringing,”⁸⁵ thus Livy wants Romulus to be portrayed more as an independent hero.

Dionysius also includes a whole other approach to Romulus’s and Remus’s story when he gives an alternate account of the twins’ story from the point of their saving from the she-wolf. Dionysius points out that some would call the she-wolf’s part in the twins’ story “melodramatic absurdity,”⁸⁶ which shows there may be some conflict with Livy’s account. Dionysius explains how the infants’ grandfather gave the twins over to Faustulus in order to protect them from getting in the hands of Amulius. Dionysius takes away from some of the dramatic effect of Livy’s account when he describes how the she-wolf may have been a misunderstanding in translation. Dionysius points out that the she-wolf could have been in fact Faustulus’s wife named Laurentia, who received the nickname Lupa. Lupa according to Dionysius started off as a term that was equivalent to a prostitute, but later meant companion. Dionysius probably felt that as a good historian he should not just state the version of the story he prefers but put the other storylines out there as well. Livy likely only described the version of the story that includes the she-wolf as it adds some impact to the mythological aspect of the story, which separates it from the Greek account, however the reason is not entirely clear.

Dionysius continues the account when he describes how Romulus and Remus eventually were split up with the population with the people of Alba. This is the part of the account which leads up to the eventual killing of Remus. In Livy’s account, the dispute between Romulus and Remus and Remus’s slaying is very abrupt, with not much happening in the leading up to the

⁸⁵ Miles. “Foundation and Ideology.” *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. p. 138.

⁸⁶ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.84.1.

event. Dionysius also makes the transition to Remus's death rather abruptly, but unlike Livy he describes the bond between the twins with more emotional language. He stated that their rivalry "produced the greatest of evils,"⁸⁷ and that the twins were "being now no longer one in mind or feeling it necessary to entertain brotherly sentiments toward each,"⁸⁷ as they both wanted rule over the other. Dionysius describes how both had an insatiable desire to rule which would prevent the two from coexisting. Dionysius and Livy both agree on Romulus seeing twice the number of vultures as Remus when they were trying to settle their dispute through augury. Dionysius mentions however that Romulus was trying to trick Remus by sending messengers to tell Remus that he had indeed seen the vultures appear to him first, which later backfires on Romulus as the twelve vultures appear when the two were together on the Palatine hill. This extra detail provided by Dionysius provides some extra fuel to the fire that is the competition that is brewing between Romulus and Remus, which is manifested more in his account than in Livy's.

In Dionysius's account there is also collateral damage as a result of the twin's actions. Dionysius states how the augury was based upon the quality of the birds that appeared, and not on the quantity. As a result of this "many were slain on both sides"⁸⁸ when a war broke out between the people of Alba over the dispute. Faustulus is also said to have died in this battle, as he willingly throws himself into the midst of the battle due to his psychological dilemma of not being able to settle the dispute between the two brothers. The story definitely gets a more personal feel in Dionysius's account as Faustulus as a character is developed more, and there is some insight into his emotions. Faustulus is still a major character in Livy's account but exists more as a formality to push the story along, rather than being given heavy character

⁸⁷ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.85.5.

⁸⁸ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.87.1.

development. Faustulus does not die in Livy's account as he did in Dionysius's narrative. From a metaphorical perspective it could be argued that Faustulus was like the glue that was holding Romulus's and Remus's relationship together, and his death also signifies the destruction of their relationship as Remus dies in the battle the same time as Faustulus. Livy does not mention Faustulus after the death of Remus so it is difficult to compare his account with Dionysius's in that regard. But it's clear in Dionysius's account that family means something even if only to a small extent as Faustulus basically acted as the twins' father, and that family can play a role in a life rooted in competition which the twins exhibited.

The starkest difference between Dionysius's and Livy's account is the way in which Dionysius describes the death of Remus. Remus's death seems to happen rather suddenly and unexpectedly in Dionysius's account as was the case with Livy's however the storyline is very different. Dionysius says that Remus is killed in the battle when the people of Alba were disputing over where the site of the new city should be. Livy reports that Remus intruded on Romulus's territory and was slain by him personally. Remus's slaying in Livy's account as examined earlier in this paper goes hand in hand with the necessity of defending Rome's territory as experienced by the Romans with the civil wars at the time Livy was writing.

Dionysius goes as far to say that Romulus "gained a most melancholy victory though the death of his brother and the mutual slaughter of citizens,"⁸⁹ which shows at the least a brief look into Romulus's psyche. Romulus also "became dejected and lost all desire for life,"⁸⁹ and felt "grief and repentance"⁸⁹ over what happened. There are many implications from this part of the account. Romulus seems down to earth and to have a healthy range of human emotions when he sees his brother slain. The conflict originally stemmed out of a disagreement over where the

⁸⁹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.87.3.

new city should have been placed, but despite that Romulus's supposed grief shows that he valued his brother which keeps his relationship with Remus and expansionistic endeavors separate. This is not captured in Livy's account, where Romulus was portrayed as someone who had to take severe action to protect his territory at the expense of family ties.⁹⁰

When looking back on the previous analysis earlier in the paper of how Livy created a Romulus devoid of any emotion after the death of Remus, it becomes clear that Dionysius may be giving a more accurate representation of Roman death despite the fact that he is a Greek author. Romulus shows some grief to an extent in this case, which should be expected when one loses a family member. However, since Romulus is a male, the mourning is not extensive and he is able to recover from it fairly quickly, and the story moves on to the next part. The difference between Livy and Dionysius on this issue is interesting because it must have been intentional on Livy's part as Livy definitely had full understanding of how the Romans dealt with death. Dionysius being a Greek author in this case shows readers how he has done his homework by showing that he has an understanding of how mourning fits into the Roman way of life. In either case, both Livy and Dionysius show that the state prevails in the end, because in both accounts Remus has to die and Romulus gets to be the sole ruler. Dionysius's account is striking because it is not that Romulus killed Remus in battle and then felt remorse afterwards, which would be understandable. It is the fact that Dionysius chooses to report that Remus was killed by someone other than Romulus. It is not clear whether or not Dionysius would have chosen Romulus to have

⁹⁰ The same theme of family vs. state also comes up heavily in Virgil's *Aeneid* which was also written during the Augustan Age like Livy's *History of Rome*. Romulus has to kill his brother Remus in order to carry out his duty which is to protect the territory of Rome at all costs. Something similar happens in the *Aeneid* between Aeneas and Dido. During Aeneas's quest to find a city in Italy he gets sidetracked by having relations with Dido. Dido was hoping to marry Aeneas, but before their relationship progressed, Mercury comes in to remind Aeneas of his original task of finding a city. Thus, Aeneas departs from Dido because he feels a drive to set out what he originally intended to do, and Dido ends up committing suicide. Aeneas values his ultimate goal of finding a city over his personal relationships, even though it led to the death of Dido. Romulus values the protection of his city over his brother Remus, thus he had no choice but to kill him. Both Romulus and Aeneas stick to their overall life purposes doing away with any distractions. Virgil may have been just as nervous as Livy to write in favor of Augustus, because by having Aeneas put his eventual city over personal relationships shows that he is mentally prepared to do what it takes to rule a city, just as Augustus would have wanted to be portrayed.

remorse if Romulus had been the particular soldier to kill Remus, but the fact that Romulus is depicted to have any emotion at all is a striking difference in character than the Romulus that is seen in Livy's account. Dionysius treats his account fairly when he describes the version that Livy gave when Romulus killed Remus for leaping over his wall, but Dionysius makes it clear that the first version he gives is the most likely.

Another way that the story of Remus's death could be interpreted in Dionysius's account is that even though Romulus did show some emotion after Remus's death, there is still a disconnection in the brotherly relationship. In the next verse after Remus's death, it is stated that "no obstacle now remained to the building of the city,"⁹¹ which implies that Remus was at one point an obstacle. This implies that there was never meant to be a mutual decision to place the city in a location that was agreed upon by the twins, but instead bloodshed was the only way to solve the dispute. Romulus may have shown remorse after his brother's death, but he may have seen it as being a necessary step to further his plan, and not so much as collateral damage as the result of Alba's civil war. The fact that Romulus himself did not directly kill Remus does not excuse the fact that Remus had to die in order to progress Romulus's story. And Remus is not mentioned again after his death with the story changing gears to Romulus's setting up with the new city, which may assert that Remus was indeed treated like an object. Before Romulus defined the boundaries for his new city he "caused the people to come out and leap over the flames in order to expiate their guilt."⁹¹ However, it is not clear what sins or guilt the people of Alba needed atonement for, as Romulus could have been referencing the possible fact that the civil war they were fighting was wrong, or maybe the citizens just needed to purify themselves in general before inaugurating the new city.

⁹¹ Dionysius. *Roman Antiquities*. 1.88.1

Dionysius does something similar to Livy in his account which is making it clear that Romulus being the founder and ruler of Rome is an event that is sanctioned by the gods. Dionysius undermines Romulus's abilities more than Livy particularly when he describes the assistance that he has received from Faustulus throughout the account. Before Romulus actually begins to rule Rome, Dionysius states how he awoke early one morning and prayed to King Jupiter in the heavens for confirmation that he should be Rome's ruler. Then a flash of lightning came across the sky from east to west because that is where the sun and moon arise from, as well as the circular revolution of the firmament. One theme of a foundation myth can thus be the need for divine permission in order to find a city.

Much of the general storyline that Dionysius and Livy follow are largely the same, but with striking differences at certain points of the narratives. Remus's death in Livy's account shows that family and territory are kept the same for the Romans, as Romulus had to kill his brother in order to take control over his territory. Dionysius gives a Romulus with some emotion, which shows that maybe the Greeks allowed family to intervene in some of their territorial endeavors. Faustulus also helps the twins greatly in Dionysius's account being responsible for guiding them throughout their life, and his death also marked the destruction of the relationship between the brothers. Also, in the context of the Augustan Age, it is possible that Dionysius was not afraid to portray Romulus as someone needing assistance from others to help achieve his goals, because being Greek Dionysius did not feel this pressure to always put Augustus on a pedestal like Livy. Livy almost makes Romulus and Remus seem supernatural, as Faustulus does not help them nearly as much in his account, and the twins go about their lives largely on their own, which makes their feats more impressive. Perhaps the Romans valued a greater sense of independence because it was the marker of a stronger person, and with Romulus being tied to

Augustus, this also puts Augustus in a better light because he would have wanted to be portrayed as self-sufficient.

Dionysius also used more sources following a Greek tradition of using many sources to write a story, whereas Livy was writing simpler in order to make the story more concise and probably easier to read. As Luce points out, Livy's "aim was to read through his sources with an eye to selecting the one whose version would form the basis of his account...according to various criteria: general credibility, the fame and reputation of the writer, closeness of the author to the period in question, potential for effective literary adaption, and fullness."⁹² Livy therefore had to go through a long editing process that would exclude a lot of the sources if they did not meet his list of qualifications, and Livy was also known to swap certain parts of his account if he did not determine it to be pleasing to his readers. More exploration is needed to discover the underlying reasons for all of these differences, but the takeaway is that the Greeks and Romans have fairly different ways in which they can treat the same story. Whether or not the differences are stated explicitly or not, it is important to note that there are many implications throughout the writing of both authors that can speak to differences in their cultures, and differences in what they and their societies valued as a whole.

In order to make a full comparison between Dionysius's and Livy's account, the death of Romulus according to Dionysius must be examined. Dionysius first mentions the version which Livy promotes, which is when Romulus was taken up into the heavens during a passing storm. Dionysius states that the more likely account would be Romulus getting killed by his own people due to his taking of war hostages, and tyrant-like harsh treatment of those whom he wanted to punish. Thus, Romulus could have been killed in the senate-house and divided into pieces before

⁹² Luce. "His Sources." *Livy: The Composition of His History*. p. 147.

having a secret burial. Dionysius states that it is possible that the newest citizens of Rome may have simply revolted and killed Romulus. Dionysius nonetheless gives a few possibilities for the death of Romulus and he would accept either one of the two realistic scenarios he provides. The only striking difference between his description of Romulus's death versus Livy's is the fact that Livy states he follows the storyline where Romulus was seen coming down from the heavens according to Proculus Julius. Livy did not want to portray the founder of Rome as someone who despite all of his success and triumphs would end up being killed by his own people, because that would also mean that Augustus could be assassinated. Thus, even though he may not believe in the story where Romulus comes down from the heavens, he may have to say just for the sake of his readers that he prefers that account, as unrealistic as it is. Livy instead focuses on Romulus being self-sufficient, strong militarily, and willing to protect his territory at all costs, which is exactly how Augustus would have wanted to be portrayed. Dionysius who does not feel any special ties to Augustus probably feels like he has the freedom to state the plausible account of Romulus getting killed by his own people, and to not feel any shame for claiming so.

Chapter 7 The Account of Diodorus of Sicily

There are clearly multiple major differences between the accounts of Livy and Dionysius, which shows how Greeks and Romans have varying interpretations of one of the greatest myths ever told, and those differences are further amplified when studying Diodorus of Sicily.

Diodorus was a Greek historian who wrote the *Library of History* between 60 and 30 BCE, therefore overlapping with Livy's *History of Rome* and Dionysius's *Roman Antiquities*. There are several major differences in this account from the other two sources which will be explored in the following paragraphs.

Diodorus's work of the *Library of History* was a massive work which spanned forty books including the history of Egypt, Mesopotamia, India, Scythia, Arabia, and Greece along with Europe. He wrote during the Augustan Age during the time of the Second Triumvirate where he covered a large range of topics like Herodotus with "the utopias of Iamboulos and Euhemeros, lawgivers such as Charondas or Zaleukos...Akragantine luxury, Iphikrates' military inventions, the glories of Persepolis, Alexander's funeral bier, Indian suttee, the flooding of Rhodes, the myth of Lamia, and Dead Sea asphalt, to name but a few."⁹³ This is important to keep in mind before analyzing his work, only because his actual coverage of Romulus and Remus's story is a small part of it. Since his work is already so long, it is likely that he may not have been able to give it the same attention that Livy or Dionysius gave their works, although that is not to say that their works are not also long and extensive. Diodorus due to the nature of his work may have had to move more quickly through the story, and with fewer details and only hit on the important points, which may drastically change the way in which the story is interpreted. Also, if Diodorus gave his sources at the start of every section of his work, it would

⁹³ Green. "Introduction." *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11-12.37.1*. p. 4.

easily start to get tedious and overwhelming. Thus, this cannot be held against Diodorus due to the length of his work, and maybe he can be forgiven for that aspect. Also “it has been argued that Diodorus’ only value lies in the fact that he was too inept to alter his sources”⁹⁴ meaning that he probably lacked diversity in his sources, and also likely used one source for a number of the books in the *Library of History*. Schmitz argues that due to this fact, it was likely required for Diodorus to condense much of the sources he was working from to a great extent, which caused bias in his work. It is difficult to define a single Greek identity throughout the work of Diodorus, as “he was aware of the process of canonization which would soon clearly define which areas of language, literature, philosophy, and history were important ...and which ones were not.”⁹⁵ Therefore, Diodorus throughout his work commented on the various parts of Greek and especially Roman culture, and left it to the readers and time to decide which elements would become important in their cultures.

From the very start of Diodorus’s work, a major difference can quickly be seen from Livy and even Dionysius’s account; that Romulus and Remus are the joint founders of Rome. Diodorus also suggests that Romulus might not be the founder of Rome “since there were many kings in the period between Aeneas and Romulus...and the date of this founding falls after the Trojan War by four hundred and thirty-three years.”⁹⁶ He goes on to describe the lineage of Romulus, describing how Ascanius succeeded Aeneas and established Alba Longa. Diodorus also throws in a bit of myth citing the historian Fabius who stated that Aeneas followed a sow that he was sacrificing to a hill. Aeneas was going to name this as the founding place of the city,

⁹⁴ Schmitz. “The Image of Athens in Diodorus Siculus.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p. 235.

⁹⁵ Schmitz. “The Image of Athens in Diodorus Siculus.” *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. p. 251.

⁹⁶ Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. 7.5.1.

except that a dream told him he had to wait 30 years before naming the city since the sow dropped 30 pigs on the hill. Ascanius later succeeds Aeneas and names Alba Longa as the official name of the city. A dispute then follows after Ascanius passes, between his son Iulius who thought that he should take the throne, and Silvius who was the brother of Ascanius and technically the son of Aeneas by Lavinia. Eventually, the people of Alba Longa vote to have Silvius as the king and Iulius as pontifex maximus. Then Silvius's descendants of Aeneas and Latinus ruled, and many others who followed afterwards. Eventually down the lineage one named Aventius ruled for 37 years, and in a battle he ended up naming the Aventine hill. He then goes on to say Aventius's son Proca ruled before Amulius took the throne. Diodorus then states that "Amulius reigned a little more than forty-three years and was slain by Remus and Romulus, who were the founders of Rome."⁹⁷ Diodorus refers to Romulus as "Romulus Silvius" who he goes on to say was "an arrogant man throughout his entire life and dared to contend with God."⁹⁸ He portrays Romulus in a humorous manner when he says that when God would send thunder from the heavens that Romulus would tell his soldiers to "strike their shields with their blades, and he would then say that the noise they raised was greater than thunder."⁹⁹ Thus, the account is brief and readers do not get a look into Romulus's psyche, and he is not portrayed nearly as divine as the Romulus's in Livy's and Dionysius's account. Diodorus's work shows how myth can be personal to a particular author, and can vary widely based on their preferences and what they choose to include or exclude.

⁹⁷ Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. 7.5.12.

⁹⁸ Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. 7.7.1.

⁹⁹ Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. 7.7.1.

Chapter 8 Cadmus and the Founding of Thebes

This discussion so far has looked at a Roman author writing about a Roman myth, and two Greek authors writing about a Roman myth. The remainder of this paper will look into a Greek author writing about a Greek foundation myth. Specifically, how Diodorus Siculus and Herodotus treat the myth of Cadmus and his founding of Thebes. Starting in Book V, chapter 47 of the *Library of History*, Diodorus starts talking about the islands which are around Greece in the Aegean Sea. He begins by discussing the island of Samothrace and the issues it was having with flooding. Eventually he discusses how Cadmus who was the son of Agenor, the Phoenician king of Tyre, stumbled upon Samothrace when he was traveling to Europe, and initiated himself into Samothrace. He then married Harmonia in a wedding that was provided for by the gods. “After this Cadmus, they say, in accordance with the oracle he had received, founded Thebes in Boeotia.”¹⁰⁰ Thus, the founding of Thebes is treated rather abruptly without any real details. Diodorus goes on to discuss other islands such as Rhodes, Syme, and Naxos before coming back to Cadmus. Diodorus describes how Cadmus was the first to bring the letters of the alphabet from Phoenicia to Greece, but apparently this is ignorance on the part of the Greeks. Diodorus says how all written monuments disappeared in a major flood, and the Egyptians took the opportunity to attribute the subject of astrology to themselves essentially stealing it from the Greeks. A similar situation happens when Egyptians in Sais which the Athenians found also, suffered a flood resulting in a loss of written records. Because of these situations, Diodorus argues that the Greeks only suppose that Cadmus brought the letters from Phoenicia to Greece, when in reality he could have stolen them and not really have made any new discovery. Diodorus says that the Phoenicians only learned the letters from the Syrians and taught them to the Greeks,

¹⁰⁰ Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. 5.49.2.

and since Phoenicians were sailing to Europe together with Cadmus who was said to have founded the alphabet, it was hence attributed to him. Later when Cadmus went to Europe, he first ended up in Rhodes where he created a temple to Poseidon. He is also depicted as pious when he is said to have “honored likewise the Lindian Athenian with votive offerings.”¹⁰¹ Thus, Diodorus does not go into a whole lot of detail about Cadmus, but only hits on the major points of his life and accomplishments.

Herodotus is another author who touches upon Cadmus but in a rather brief way similar to Diodorus. Herodotus mentions in Book V, chapter 57 of *The Histories* that the Gephyraians were Phoenicians who came back to Boeotia with Cadmus and established themselves in a certain district called Tanagra. He goes on to say how they were driven out of their territory by the rest of the Boeotians and went to Athens. Herodotus mentions that the Phoenicians with Cadmus “brought in among the Hellenes many arts when they settled in this and of Boeotia, and especially letters, which did not exist, as it appears to me, among the Hellenes before this time,”¹⁰² and how they changed the original Phoenician alphabet along with the Ionians who changed them further. Herodotus goes on to say how the letters had even made their way to the temple of Ismenian Apollo at Thebes. Overall, Herodotus does not tell a consistent story, but rather bits and pieces of the most important highlights of Cadmus’s life.

Both Herodotus and Diodorus unfortunately treat this account of Cadmus rather abruptly, but there could be multiple reasons for this. First, it could be that the founding of Thebes is not exactly on the same caliber as the founding of Rome by Romulus which was the basis for the start of a great empire. Herodotus and Diodorus may not have thought the founding of Thebes needed as much attention as the founding of Rome, however this is not to say that Thebes was

¹⁰¹ Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. 5.58.3.

¹⁰² Herodotus. *The Histories*. 5.58.

not a major *polis* and didn't have significant importance. Secondly, many Greeks reading either Herodotus's or Diodorus's work may have already known the myth, thus it may have not been that important to go into extreme lengths to describe it, or repeat the various parts of it. Or perhaps Herodotus and Diodorus thought it necessary only to touch upon the most important aspects of Cadmus's life, because they thought the other parts of the myth were only filler material.

When comparing Cadmus to Romulus there are some similarities and differences, although the Greek authors do not give much to go on. Cadmus is not of divine origin unlike Romulus which is a major difference, but at least Cadmus's wedding was provided by the gods so there is some divine significance there. In one of the accounts Livy gives for the Romulus and Remus myth, he notes how Romulus beat Remus in the augury by the display of more birds in the sky over Remus which allowed him to be the founder of the city of Rome. Thebes was also founded on a divine principle as Diodorus says that he received an oracle telling him to do it. Cadmus is also pious just like Romulus is, as Cadmus created the temple to Apollo. Livy had also mentioned that Romulus was a religious man especially when Romulus attends the Palatium festival. Diodorus mentions how Cadmus was attributed to finding the Phoenician alphabet which was a major accomplishment, but like described previously Diodorus says that he had really just stolen it from the Egyptians which really downplays that accomplishment. Thus, Diodorus is not afraid to depict Cadmus's flaws even with the little amount of attention that he gives to Cadmus in the *Library of History*. Interestingly, Livy does not really depict Romulus as flawed, even with the large amount of writing he gives to his story, and really plays him up as self-sufficient and strong in every aspect as he was a good leader. Herodotus like Diodorus also

is not afraid to point out the flaws of Cadmus, as he says how he and his people were driven out of Tanagra to Athens. So Cadmus is depicted as someone who is not able to hold his territory.

Herodotus describes how Cadmus brought the Phoenician alphabet with him but did not say anything about it being stolen or copied like Diodorus does. He says how the alphabet made its way to the temple of Ismenian Apollo at Thebes, but then again that does not really paint an explicit picture of Cadmus being pious in any way. Thus, there is a major difference between Romulus and Cadmus who at least by Herodotus and Diodorus, Cadmus is depicted in a rather modest way. Romulus either wins in battle or slays his own brother in order to gain control of the city in Livy's and Dionysius's account, and then fights subsequent wars along with undertaking a major process of setting up the government and all of its institutions. Romulus is depicted as very religious and in most cases rather self-sufficient. It could just be the lack of material that Diodorus and Herodotus assign to Cadmus, thus there is no comparison to Romulus just due to the sheer number of events that took place in Romulus's life. The main reason still is most likely just because Thebes may not be the most significant of places in the Hellenic world, as it is not a foundation story about something more impressive such as Athens or Rome. Thus, it is hard to make a comparison with the founding of a state as great as Rome. The comparison becomes even more difficult when there is no look into the personality of Cadmus, or any aspects of his psyche. Herodotus in his mentioning's of Cadmus seems like he is strictly reporting the facts, so it is difficult to say whether or not he was trying to do more with the myth. Diodorus also reports the facts of Cadmus and does not discuss much else about his life, but at least Diodorus is honest in the whole debate about the origins of the Phoenician letters, so there is no bias there of Diodorus trying to stick up for Cadmus even though he is a Greek author. Thus, the comparison between Romulus and Cadmus can be made, but unfortunately the founding of Thebes and the founding

of Rome are not exactly in the same league in terms of importance, which also dampens what can be said about the differences between Cadmus and Romulus.

Chapter 9 Conclusions

This last part of the paper will serve as a guide to accounting for all of the differences seen between the accounts of the Romulus and Remus myth, and attempt to draw conclusions about them. There is no doubt that the main purpose of myth in the first place was for the Greeks and Romans to express their values as a culture through stories. Livy and Dionysius have been shown to write for different purposes expressed mainly through the character of Romulus. Romulus is constantly portrayed by Livy throughout his account as superior to Remus in capability. Romulus can take care of himself as Faustulus does not seem in Livy's account to constantly assist Romulus, which shows that he is self-sufficient. Livy is clearly nervous about Roman identity in a way as he reports that the common account which we can say Livy accepts is when Romulus is said to have personally killed his brother for leaping over his walls. Even though this account is not pleasant, Livy accepts it but shows he is nervous about it because he quickly jumps to the story of Hercules and Geryon which likens Romulus to a god. Perhaps since Romulus in a sense could be a model for the emperor Augustus, Livy did not want to imply that Augustus was someone who would also be willing to commit fratricide, as that does not reflect well on a ruler. Nevertheless, Livy shows that one major Roman trait was the necessity to defend the state of Rome and all of its territory at any cost, and this was essential to being a responsible citizen of Rome. A second trait of a good Roman as set by Romulus, was to participate in a strong government as Livy points out how Romulus tried to make Romans more civilized by setting up his various institutions. A third characteristic of a good Roman was to be strong in war due to the depiction of Rome being successful militarily in Livy's extensive description of Romulus's wars. The rape of the Sabine women portrays the characteristic of the need to preserve the Roman state at all costs, as Romulus needed to save the population of Rome. And

most importantly Livy portrays Romulus as a god as described by his death, to show that Rome really is a place of the divine.

There is this issue of the nervousness of identity as seen with Livy and the rather embarrassing account of Rome's ruler Romulus committing fratricide, which may reflect badly upon Augustus who wanted to be portrayed after Romulus. Dionysius concerns much of his time struggling with the idea of Greek identity. Dionysius seems like he wants to prove the Greeks wrong and show that they are closer to the Romans than they think, and attempt to clear up much of the negativity that the Greeks may have about the Romans, while also asserting their superiority over the Romans from a cultural standpoint. But Dionysius is not just writing in order to prove a point to the Greeks, as he equally could be doing the same thing to the Romans. Dionysius likely thought that the Romans did not know as much as they should have about their history and origins, and that the Romans are in a state of ignorance because they are not aware of how close they are to the Greeks. Dionysius perhaps implies that Greeks are superior to Romans because at least he himself and likely other Greeks knew more about Roman history than even the Romans did themselves. This is not to say Dionysius is necessarily out to bash the Romans, as he does stress the strengths of their empire. But he is out to prove his point that Greeks and Romans were similar in various ways such as with language, prehistory, and ancestral origins. The Greeks could have been desperate to not just defend their identity, but to keep it as separate as possible from the Romans likely because of the whole idea of classical identity, especially with the Homeric tradition, and keeping it exclusive to themselves. Nevertheless, Dionysius definitely backs up his argument describing how Romulus modeled much of his government after Greek institutions with the council of elders, the Conscrip Fathers, and the ability of majority vote.

As for Dionysius's depiction of Romulus, he still reports that the most common report is when Romulus triumphed over Remus and founded Rome himself. But that doesn't stop Dionysius from reporting other versions for the founding of Rome which don't involve Romulus, or anything extravagant at all. Dionysius wants to show how he has done his homework, and how the Romans need to be reminded that there is much more to their origins than they may think. It is also a reminder of how there is no single version of a myth, and writers have the ability to pick and choose what they see fit. It drives home the point of how the founding of Rome could just as easily been Aeneas stumbling upon the territory and deciding to name it Rome after a Trojan woman, instead of the whole story with Romulus. Dionysius may have chosen to accept the account with the rivalry between Romulus and Remus as the standard, because it allowed him to look at what values the Romans regarded as important through the portrayal of Romulus. For this reason, Dionysius chooses this account because it is the more personal one, because he can look into Romulus's psyche. Livy may automatically have been pressured to report the account involving both Romulus and Remus in rivalry, because it allowed the portrayal of Romulus that Augustus would have wanted, with Romulus's actions being explored extensively. And also of course Augustus would have wanted it to be known that his state was of divine origin, courtesy of Romulus's ancestral origins.

Dionysius's account in general seems to pay more attention to the smaller details with more extensive descriptions of the happenings of Romulus and Remus than Livy's account does. One can speculate that perhaps Dionysius thought the Greek audience would have appreciated it more. Or it could be that Dionysius wanted to show off his extensive research by showing that he was aware of these minor details. There are still vast similarities between Dionysius and Livy as both waste no time in making it known that Romulus is of divine origin and a capable ruler for

the city of Rome. As pointed out in this paper, Faustulus plays a much larger role in assuring the success and safety of Romulus and Remus in Dionysius's work which brings them closer to earth, especially Romulus. Livy does not employ the same development of Faustulus as Dionysius which shows that Dionysius is not ashamed to ground Romulus as closer to a human being, rather than someone of divine origin. This difference is likely due once again to Livy giving Romulus the trait of self-reliance, which would have been more favorable to Augustus. This also ties hand in hand with the fact that the she-wolf could have been Lupa according to Dionysius, who was Faustulus's wife, as opposed to some mythological figure who miraculously saves the twins. This again would take away from Romulus's divine portrayal if Livy mentioned this also. The most striking difference between the two accounts which stay largely the same is with Remus's death. Dionysius gives a storyline where Remus is killed indirectly in a battle when the people of Alba were disputing where the new city should have been placed, as opposed to Livy who states that Romulus directly commits fratricide over Remus. In Dionysius's account Romulus mourns over Remus which shows how Dionysius wanted to portray the value of family at least being somewhat important, however in the end expansionism still wins. In Livy's account, no mourning is present and family is not something that is shown to be more important than preserving the territory of Rome. As shown previously in this conclusion, Livy is clearly nervous by this idea and quickly switches to the story of Hercules and Geryon because he knows that this issue of fratricide is questionable and may not portray Rome's founder in the best light. But in terms of asserting that the state of Rome should be preserved over anything else in one's life, even family, it definitely comes across strongly in Livy's account. Dionysius downplays Romulus's divine origin in the end with his acceptance of Romulus being killed by his fellow Romans due to some of his behavior wandering into tyrant territory and the taking of war-

hostages. Livy does not do this as he only reports the story of Romulus being seen as coming down from the heavens, which affirms his divine nature.

Diodorus of Sicily also describes the Romulus and Remus myth in his *Library of History*, but it falls short in that it is abrupt, however that is most likely due to the nature of his work, which was very extensive in the topics he covered but abbreviated in the depth he was able to cover them. Diodorus describes a lineage and a backstory that lead to both Romulus and Remus being the founders of Rome after they both slay Amulius. He does not say much more than this except that Romulus was an arrogant man. This is a prime example of how there is no single authoritative source for a myth as Diodorus is not even close in his story to the other Greek author examined who was Dionysius. Romulus does not have personality in this account and he is not exactly portrayed as divine or capable of ruling Rome in any way. This is partly because Diodorus does not go into detail about the life of Romulus or Remus, thus it is hard to gauge how Diodorus would have interpreted them. Diodorus may simply have accepted this version of the story and preferred it, or it could have been due to the sources he looked at which as described previously in this paper were suspiciously biased and condensed. It is thus difficult to compare Dionysius to the other authors and determine which values and traits he would have picked for Romulus. Once again this is mainly an issue that lies with the type of work that the *Library of History* was, as Diodorus was trying to cover many different cultures over a large time period which likely only allowed him to quickly touch on each topic of interest, as he wouldn't have the time to write extensively about every episode of every culture. Diodorus's account therefore does not really provide insight into Greek and Roman values and culture, but proves the point that myth can indeed be a highly subjective and varying topic based on who is writing it.

The last section of this paper attempted to observe the Greek foundation myth of Thebes involving Cadmus, however the results of this comparison to the Romulus and Remus myth were disappointing. Herodotus and Diodorus both give only bits and pieces about Cadmus's story, and not the whole myth in its entirety with every last detail. A comparison of this nature likely suffers from the same issues as the *Library of History*, as Diodorus couldn't really get into extensive detail about every last subject, and Herodotus's *The Histories* was an extensive nine-book work that was covering not only Greece but Northern Africa and Western Asia. So it is expected that they had to select out only the most important parts concerning the stories that they wanted to get across. This is not to say that Dionysius's work was not also very extensive as the *Roman Antiquities* covered everything to do with Rome up until the First Punic War over 20 books. Dionysius however in his work does not have an issue with including an extensive amount of detail, because he is able to focus solely on Roman history. The founding of Thebes also is not equivalent to the founding of Rome, thus perhaps it does not deserve the same amount of attention, and Herodotus and Diodorus may have assumed that Greeks already knew the story in its entirety. For what it's worth there are still some comparisons that can be made between Romulus and Cadmus. Cadmus still has a wedding sanctioned by the gods which makes him associated with the divine, however he is not of divine origin like Romulus. Both Dionysius and Livy factor in augury into the founding of Rome, and Cadmus received an oracle essentially giving him permission to find Thebes, thus there is this idea of the need for divine permission in finding a city. Cadmus is also depicted as pious like Romulus due to his finding of the temple of Ismenian Apollo at Thebes. Livy and Dionysius both portray Romulus as pious especially in his attending of festivals, thus the theme of a religious ruler sticks for the founder of a city. Even though the insight that Herodotus and Diodorus give seem lacking, it can still be inferred that a

foundation myth should involve a founder who is pious, has divine origin or assistance, and receives divine permission for the founding through practices such as augury or receiving an oracle.

Therefore, there are many different aspects that constitute the interpretation of a myth. Using a myth to determine character traits and values of a culture is of the highest importance, as it can provide insight into what beliefs a society operated on. But beyond that there is still so much more than can be learned from a myth on various levels. Livy shows how one can almost be nervous about what they are writing and their own identity, even when they are writing about their own origins. Mythology is a tricky subject, and Livy shows that it has to be written in accordance with the state of the affairs at the time when writing, such as is the case with Romulus being a reflection of the emperor Augustus. Dionysius shows his readers that one cannot get too comfortable with their notions of identity and origins, as he points out with the multiple foundings of Rome and different storylines for multiple parts of the Romulus and Remus myth. Dionysius dissolves the us-versus-them mentality between the Greeks and the Romans arguing that they are essentially the same peoples who just ended up in different locations geographically. And even on a more general note, Dionysius shows the value of historical writing and good research, proving how extensive background knowledge on a subject can lead one to the conclusion that perhaps one group of people can actually know more about another group of people better than those people know themselves. Thus, as a historian Dionysius does an excellent job of fitting the Romulus and Remus myth in a larger context, arguably making his piece of writing more valuable purely from a general knowledge standpoint of the ancient world than Livy's. Finally, Diodorus proves the point of there being no single authoritative version of a myth as his account differs dramatically from both Livy and Dionysius

with a very different interpretation of it. Also, he illustrates that there is no reason to assume any similarities between other authors of the same Greek background as himself, due to the vast differences in his account from his fellow Greek Dionysius. From Diodorus, readers can learn that it is beneficial to read as many varying accounts of a myth from as many authors as possible, if they want a clear picture of it and want to avoid bias. Thus, each historian has his own personality and taste that is reflected in his work that can be totally different from another historian. As for the study of Romulus, readers can learn that a good founder should be self-sufficient, a successful military leader, and ready to defend their territory no matter the cost. These are some of the things that either a Greek or Roman would value as these characteristics are reflected in both Livy's and Dionysius's account, just to different extents. One thing that is for sure is that a suitable founder for a city needs to be pious and in a sense divinely cut out to accomplish the task of being a founder. This is a reflection on the importance of religion in Livy's and Dionysius's time of writing, but this does not reflect however in Diodorus's work. But most importantly a myth should never be observed in isolation, but in its overall context of time period and the culture of the author who was writing it. Because of the overarching insights that can be gained just from looking at this single Romulus and Remus myth, it no doubt stands as one of the greatest myths of all time do to its usefulness in accomplishing that comprehension.

Works Cited

- Berman, D.W. "Greek Thebes in the Early Mythographic Tradition," *Writing Myth: Mythography in the Ancient World*, ed. S.M. Trzaskoma and R.C. Smith. Leuven: Peeters-Bondgenotenlaan, 2013. Print. pp. 37-54.
- Brown, Robert. "Livy's Sabine Women and the Ideal of Concordia." *American Philological Association* 125 (1995): 291-319. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Feb. 2016.
- Cary, Earnest. "Book I, End." *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Roman Antiquities*. Harvard University Press, 18 Sept. 2012. Web. 20 Dec. 2015.
- Chaplin, Jane D. *Livy's Exemplary History*. N.p.: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- Erker, Darja S. "Gender and Roman Funeral Ritual," in *Memory and Mourning: Studies on Roman Death*, ed. V.M. Hope and J. Huskinson. Oxford: Oxbow, 2011. Print. pp. 40-60.
- Fletcher, K.F.B. "Hyginus' *Fabulae*: Toward a Roman Mythography, in *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*, ed. T.A. Schmitz and N. Wiater. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011. Print. pp. 133-164.
- Fox, Matthew. "The Style of the Past: Dionysius of Halicarnassus in Context," in *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*, ed. T.A. Schmitz and N. Wiater. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011. Print. pp. 93-114.
- Green, Peter. *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11-12.37.1*. Austin: U of Texas, 2006. Print.
- Haarman, Harold. "Ethnicity and Language in the Ancient Mediterranean," in *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. J. McInerney. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2014. Print. pp. 17-33.
- Hope, Valerie M. "Introduction," in *Memory and Mourning: Studies on Roman Death*, ed. V.M. Hope and J. Huskinson. Oxford: Oxbow, 2011. Print. pp. xi-xxiv.
- Huskinson, Janet. *Experiencing Rome: Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge in Association with Open UP, 2000. Print.
- Livius, Titus. "Livy's History of Rome: Book 1." *Livy's History of Rome*. J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1996. Web. 20 Dec. 2015.
- Luce, T. James. *Livy: The Composition of His History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1977. Print.
- Luraghi, Nino. "The Study of Greek Ethnic Identities," in *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. J. McInerney. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2014. Print. pp. 213-227.

- Martin, Thomas R. *Ancient Rome: From Romulus to Justinian*. N.p.: Yale UP, 2012. Print.
- Miles, Gary B. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995. Print.
- Ogilvie, R. M. *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965. Print.
- Schmitz, Thomas A., and Nicolas Wiater. "Introduction," in *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*, ed. T.A. Schmitz and N. Wiater. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011. Print. pp. 15-45.
- Schultze, Clemence. "Dionysius and Roman self-definition," in *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography The 'Plupast' from Herodotus to Appian*, ed. J. Grethlein and C.B. Krebs. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. Print. pp. 113-138.
- Siculus, Diodorus. "Diodorus Siculus. The Library of History." *LacusCurtius • Diodorus Siculus*. Harvard University Press, 19 Feb. 2014. Web. 11 Feb. 2016.
- Trzaskoma, Stephen M., and R. Scott Smith. "Introduction," in *Writing Myth: Mythography in the Ancient World*, ed. S.M. Trzaskoma and R.C. Smith. Leuven: Peeters-Bondgenotenlaan, 2013. Print.
- Wiater, Nicolas. *The Ideology of Classicism: Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011. Print.
- Wiater, Nicholas. "Writing Roman History," in *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*, ed. T.A. Schmitz and N. Wiater. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011. Print. pp. 61-91.
- Wilson, N. G. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.