A WOMAN TO RULE THE WORLD

Rome Personified in the Roman Republic

Campbell H. Orchard

A thesis submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Classical Studies
2019

Frontispiece: RRC 264/1. Silver denarius. ROMA X and helmeted head of Roma,
right/C·SERVEIL: Battle on horseback between man armed with sword and man armed with
spear. American Numismatic Society : <http://numismatics.org/collection/1937.158.616>

Für Mama, Papa und Opa

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
ABSTRACT	viii
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER I: PREVAILING VIEWS ON ROMA	6
CHAPTER II: ROMA - A FIGURE FROM THE EAST?	24
CHAPTER III: ROMA - A FIGURE FROM THE WEST?	52
CONCLUSION	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
FIGURE LIST	95
APPENDIX	99

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks are first due to my supervisor, Jeff Tatum, for guiding and encouraging me throughout my time writing this thesis. I must also acknowledge Judy Deuling, who has always encouraged my love of numismatics throughout my time at Victoria University and has always supported my academic endeavors.

This has been one of the hardest tasks I have ever undertaken, and so I am indebted to many. A great thank you goes to Marie Richardson, Philippa Becroft and Xiaodan Gao at Student Learning. My thesis would not be in its current state nor format without their help. Many thanks must also go to my dear friend Eliza Cummings, who never said no to proofreading my work and provided a lot of insightful feedback on my writing style. Many thanks also to Marlene Wallnisch, Catrin Dannenberg and Alissa Rogg for helping with German. I am also grateful to all those who attended my talk, and especially to those who raised questions and discussion afterwards. Finally, this project would not have been possible without the staff of the VUW Library, especially those at the Interloan department.

To my parents, who nurtured my love for history and numismatics; to my sister, Pasquale, for proofreading my work and keeping me positive when the going got tough; to my friends, who showed me support, no matter what; to the team at SACL for supporting me in the writing process.

ABSTRACT

Revitalised by Mussolini in the early twentieth century as a symbol of the ‘New Roman Empire’, Roma has endured a long history of national representation. Traditionally the figure of Roma is on the one side associated by historians with the Roman imperial cult and Augustus, and on the other by Numismatists as the helmeted female figure on the coinage of the Roman Republic. However, these figures are not presently considered one and the same. When describing this figure, Roma is considered a Greek innovation travelling west, which naturally discounts well over two centuries of Roman issued coinage. Roma inaugurated by Hadrian and previously manipulated by Augustus was not simply a Greek import, but a complex Roman idea, which, true to Roman form, incorporated native and foreign elements in shaping an outward looking signifier of Roman identity.

ABBREVIATIONS

App. Mac. = Appian. *Macedonian Fragments in Roman History*.

Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux.* = Arrian. *The Periplus of the Euxine Sea*.

Ath. = Athenaeus. *The Learned Banqueters*.

BMC = *British Museum Catalogue*.

BNJ = I. Worthington (ed.). 2016. *Brill's New Jacoby*.

Cass. Dio = Cassius Dio. *Roman History*.

Cic. *Nat. D.* = Cicero. *On the Nature of the Gods*.

CNH = L. Villarong. 1994. *Corpus nummum hispaniae ante Augusti aetatem*.

DFHG = *Digital Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*.

Dion. Hal. = Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities*.

ERC - Thomsen, R. 1957-1961. *Early Roman Coinage: A Study of the Chronology*.

Festus = Festus. *On the Meaning of Words*.

Hdt. = Herodotus. *The Persian Wars*.

HHAphr. = *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*.

HH Italy = Rutter, N. K., and A. M. Burnett. 2001. *Historia Nummorum: Italy*.

Hom. *Il.* = Homer. *Iliad*.

Hor. *Epist.* = Horace. *Satires. Epistles*

Liv. = Livy. *History of Rome*.

LSAM = Sokolowski, F. 1955. *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*.

OGIS = Dittenberger, Q. 1960. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*.

Ov. *Fast.* = Ovid. *Fasti*.

Paus. = Pausanias. *Description of Greece*.

Pind. *Pyth.* = Pindar. *Olympian Odes. Pythian Odes*.

Plut. *Demetr.* = Plutarch. *Lives, Demetrius and Antony*.

Plut. *Flam.* = Plutarch. *Lives, Flamininus*.

Plut. *Pyrr.* = Plutarch. *Lives, Pyrrhus and Gaius Marius*.

Plut. *Rom.* = Plutarch. *Lives, Theseus and Romulus*.

Polyb. = Polybius. *The Histories*.

RDGE = Sherck, R. E. 1969. *Roman Documents from the Greek East*.

RRC = Crawford, M. H. 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*.

Sall. *Cat.* = Sallust. *The War with Catiline.*

SIG = *Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum.*

Solin. = Solinus.

Strab. = Strabo. *Geography.*

Suet. *Aug.* = Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars, Augustus.*

Tac. *Ann.* = Tacitus. *Annals.*

Val. Max. = Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Doings and Sayings.*

Verg. *Aen.* = Virgil. *Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid.*

fig. 0.1

INTRODUCTION

Roma is a precariously placed figure within Roman religion. Generally, she is considered a female deity, a personification of the city and perhaps even as a representative of the Roman state.¹ Nevertheless, scholars persistently disagree over her origin, context and symbolism. Although poorly understood in these important respects, Roma has remained in the modern world as a significant symbol of the Roman empire, not least as a symbol of Italian unification and the personification of Mussolini's 'New Roman Empire'.² It is clear Roma is a figure inviting further attention.

Roma was first introduced to Rome's civic religion during Hadrian's 121 CE inauguration of a temple to *Venus Felix* and *Roma Aeterna* in the Forum Romanum, the political, constitutional, and symbolic centre of the Roman state.³ This temple was the largest temple in ancient Rome and housed the enthroned deities *Venus Felix* (mother of the Roman people) and *Roma Aeterna* (eternal Rome).⁴ The inner chambers of the temple were arranged symmetrically back-to-back. Roma's chamber faced west, looking out over the Forum Romanum, and Venus' chamber faced east, looking out over the Colosseum (**fig. 0.1**). The symmetrical placement of the deities was perhaps influenced by the palindrome they represented: *AMOR* (love) and *ROMA* (Rome); a desire for the future of Rome.

Little of the temple has survived; however, the coinage of Hadrian (c. 125 CE) and Antoninus Pius (c. 145 CE), and later a bronze follis of Maxentius (c. 307 CE) commemorating the

¹ Mellor 1991, 956.

² Italy's Unknown Soldier is interred beneath a statue of Roma at the *Altare della Patria*, a monument built in honour of Italy's first king, Victor Emmanuel. The tomb acted as a symbol of mourning for those nations affected by the Great War. In Italy this symbol was exploited by the fascist dictatorship as a symbol of nationalism: "On this hill that recalls the glories and the grandeur of Rome and which in the effigy of the Father of the Fatherland summarizes the memory of the struggles, the sacrifices, the martyrs, the heroisms that prepared and carried out the resurrection of Italy."

³ Ath. 8.361 and relevant coinage reveals that Hadrian inaugurated the temple in 121 CE during the Parilia, a festival celebrating the birthday of Rome, and changed the festival's name to Romaea. The date of the temple's completion is complicated: See Boatright 1987, 119-33.

⁴ The temple is thought to have been 145m long with a width of 100m and a total height of 31m. The temple contained two *cellae*, each housing an enthroned cult statue: See Claridge 2010, 117-121.

restoration of the temple,⁵ provide a glimpse of how the statue of Roma within the temple may have looked.⁶

On the reverse of the coins, Roma is draped and seated with her helmed head facing forwards. (fig. 0.2, 0.3, 0.4). She is commonly depicted in profile to allow for ease of identification on a flat medium. Her right hand bears the personification of victory, symbolizing Rome's eternal power. She grips a spear in her left hand, and a shield lies at her feet. Roma's military accoutrements are generally considered representative of militaristic prowess and tantamount with Rome's military accomplishments. The new cult of Venus and Roma introduced to Rome by Hadrian flourished and spread throughout the empire, promoting loyalty and solidarity to Rome. Roma's position as a symbol of the empire may be proven by the coins struck by later emperors, which featured Venus and Roma, alone or together, or by the legends *Roma Aeterna* and *Veneri Felici*. Nevertheless, Hadrian's inauguration of Roma's cult and divine position within Rome's civic religion was hardly revolutionary.

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for access.

This thesis argues that Roma was not just a figure introduced by the Greeks as a cultural response to Roman expansionism but was a pre-existing Roman figure on Roman coinage. Roma is currently considered a figure of the east, a Greek influence that travelled west and was later embraced by Augustus as a method of uniting the vast and culturally diverse Roman Empire. However, whilst the above statement is likely true in many respects, I argue that the east's influence on Roma is overly emphasised. Influence was culturally and politically

⁵ The evidence supports the notion that this coin commemorates Maxentius' rebuilding of the temple after the fire, a deed seen as worthy of the shared aggrandizing title, saviour of the city (CONSERVATORES VRB SVAE).

⁶ See Lorenzatti 1991, 119–138 for interpretation of the temple.

multidirectional. Roma should not be considered a purely Greek creation in response to Roman movement within the Mediterranean, but the product of a two-way cultural discourse.

Chapter I covers the current academic view on Roma, which is, by and large, the view presented by Ronald Mellor. Mellor has covered the development of the goddess Roma in great detail from her rise in the east to her eventual manipulation by Augustus into a ruler's cult able to symbolize a united empire. This is concluded with Hadrian's transition of Roma into a divinity synonymous with Vesta, the hearth and the home. Mellor's research is important and fundamental but is not beyond reproach. By reviewing the main scholarship on Roma, it will become clear that although there is an overall narrative for the development and spread of Roma from the Greek east into Rome's imperial cult, this narrative is one sided and ignores Roman numismatic evidence, which illustrates a pre-existing Roman equivalent of the Greek Roma.

Chapter II builds upon the points discussed in Chapter I and discusses and underlines the reality that Roma existed well before Augustus and Hadrian appropriated her. I will show that prior iterations of Roma, particularly that of Rhômê and the other eponymous figures for Rome, are important to our understanding of the development and reception of Roma in the east. Whilst Rhômê was not the same as Roma on Roman coinage and Roma in Greek cult, the figure is revealing of how Roma's personification eventually developed and provides an explanation for why the Greeks would later develop and accept Greek cult. Furthermore, Chapter II also explores the Greek adoption of figures representative of Rome as objects of cult. As Roman power spread throughout the Greek east, Roma became one of several conduits for dealing with Rome. This chapter serves to illustrate that cult to the Roman state would not have diplomatically been nearly so effective had the object of the cult not also been recognisable to the Romans and why Rome did not cultivate a similar cult.

Chapter III considers Roma's origins in conjunction with the west. Roma is generally considered a Greek import; some scholars discredit the figure traditionally identified as Roma on Rome's earliest coinage (c. 285 BCE – c. 211 BCE) and the later Roman denarius (c. 211 BCE onward). These coins clearly predate the inauguration of any Greek cult to Roma (c. 195 BCE), and may have influenced its development, or at least the iconography later associated with Roma. Furthermore, comparison is often made between Roma and the Greek Goddess Pallas Athena. This chapter investigates whether this view of Roma is too simple and argues

that the right appreciation of Roma is more complicated than a reductive 'west copies the east' model would suggest. This investigation is shaped around issues relating to identification of Roma on Roman coinage. Naturally, there are problems and risks attached to such identification; however, this discussion will open further appreciation of Roma and encourage discussion on the interculturalization between Rome and those cultures within her sphere of influence.

Through this analysis, I will prove that the Roma inaugurated by Hadrian and previously manipulated by Augustus was not simply a Greek import, but a complex Roman idea, which, true to Roman form, incorporated native and foreign elements in shaping an outward looking signifier of Roman identity.

CHAPTER I

PREVAILING VIEWS ON ROMA

The study of ancient religion and, in particular, ancient political cults presents immense difficulties in terms of understanding and interpretation. Many of these difficulties stem from the inseparability of religion from other facets of ancient life, such as culture and politics, and our general lack of a clear picture. Our modern ingrained distinction between religion and politics is not relevant in the pagan Graeco-Roman context, and pagan antiquity did not distinguish between worship and honours. A lot of recent scholarship on Roman cult has focused on the Roman Empire and the interactions between Romans and the inhabitants of conquered areas. These studies attempt to define and refine ideas regarding romanization and what constitutes being Roman. In contrast, the Republican period (c. 509 BCE – c. 27 BCE) has received less attention.⁷ This lack of attention is partly due to the lack of records detailing the history and development of Italy prior to the establishment of the Roman Empire and the fact that many sources have been lost, including literary and archaeological. Furthermore, accounts detailing Rome's rise in the Republican period were not contemporary accounts and were written from a pro-Roman perspective. As a result, the reliability of these sources is unknown, particularly as there are discrepancies between the archaeological and literary record. Much of what appears simple, intrinsically holds far more complexities than at a first glance. Roma is one such figure.

This chapter forms the premise on which this thesis is based. It outlines and examines the current view on the rise and development of the figure Roma on both Roman coinage and in eastern Greek cult. By reviewing the main literary sources on Roma, it will become clear that although there is an overall narrative for the development and spread of Roma from the Greek east into Rome's imperial cult, this narrative is one sided and ignores Roman numismatic

⁷ Clark 2007 has made huge progress on the study of Roman cult in the Republican period. She presents a new critical account of divine qualities in the Republic and how they reflect Roman self-representation. On the language, religion and culture of the Roman Republic, see Habinek 1998; Williams 2001; Gruen 1992; Dench 1995 and 2005; Beard *et al.* 1998.

evidence, which shows a Roman equivalent. It is clear that those investigating Roman numismatics and those investigating Greek cult are not communicating. Discussion of both sides will expose the inherent weakness of ignoring the wider picture of Roma's utilization in both a Roman and Greek context. It will also help to establish an extended narrative involving interculturalization between Rome and its neighbours, and Rome as an active participant in propagating Roma.

1.1 Roma on Roman Coinage

Roma is commonly first encountered on the denarii of the Roman Republic. Depictions of Roma will be discussed further in Chapter III; however, this section will illustrate how Roma is currently viewed within academia. Roma is commonly identified as the female figure wearing a canonical Phrygian helmet (**fig. 1.1**) or an Attic helmet with a gryphon crest and side wings (**fig. 1.2**), occupying the obverse of many Roman Republican coins.⁸ She is found on both the Roman pre-denarius coinage (c. 285 BCE – c. 211 BCE) and later on the Republican denarius, sestertius and quinarius, for which the type is regularly used from c. 211 BCE and only sporadically from c. 100 BCE.⁹

fig. 1.1

fig. 1.2

The change in obverse from a divine figure representative of the Roman pantheon to a mortal ruler reflects the transition of power in Rome away from a collective body (the senate) to the individual. It is in the mid first century that Roma and other divinities utilized by Roman mints were by and large discontinued in favour of the likeness of whoever held power at the time. The imagery on coins took an important step when in c. 44 BCE coins were issued bearing the

⁸ The Phrygian helmet is a classic Greek helmet that received wide use in Greece and Magna Graecia. The helmet is identified for its canonical top crowning the helmet: Archibald 1981, 252-254. The Attic helmet appears to have been more popular in Italy than in Greece (most examples come from Italy: archaeologically it has been especially prominent in Samnite and Lucanian burials and associated art. The helmet itself was very popular as an artistic motif, often used to impart an archaic look to the wearer. Versions of this helmet usually include a cranial ridge, hinged cheek pieces, the vestige of a nasal guard (an inverted 'V' over the brow): Connolly 1981, 60-63, 107-109 and 237.

⁹ For a catalogue of Roman Republican coinage, see RRC; Seaby 1978.

portrait of Julius Caesar (**fig. 1.3**).¹⁰ While earlier moneyers had issued coins with portraits of ancestors, Caesar's was the first Roman coinage to feature the portrait of a living individual, providing a visual manifestation of the power that Caesar wielded. Previously, Roma (amongst other divinities) had been the visual manifestation of Roman power on coinage. In the following year (43 BCE), the successors of Caesar and even his enemies produced coins bearing their own images. The image of a leader on a coin could be used to help gain the loyalty of their users. There was also a growing trend for *imperatores* (commanders) and their lieutenants to strike independently of the central Roman mint. This not only met the immediate financial needs of armies in the field but also allowed commanders to assert the legitimacy of their right to lead their troops.¹¹

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

Identification of the helmeted female figure as Roma is contentious. Disagreement regarding the identification of Roma concerns whether or not the identifying legend of the coin can be used to identify the figure.¹² The helmeted female figure is generally identified as Roma on account of the Greek stamp ΡΩΜΗ (RHOMĒ) on Pre-Denarius issues (**fig. 1.4**), which was later replaced by the Latin ROMANO (**fig. 1.5**) and then again by ROMA on all following issues (**fig. 1.6**).

¹⁰ Caesar minted many coins in his name but does not appear to have been directly behind the minting of his own portrait (RRC II, 617 3n.). The portrait first appears in c. 44 BCE alongside the *quattuorviri monetales*. While influence by Caesar cannot be ruled out, all Caesar's issues prior to 44 BCE focus on his patron Venus and the motifs of his Gallic victories: RRC I, 88ff.

¹¹ Stewart 1997, 186 ff.; Wallace-Hadrill 1986, 72.

¹² Alföldi 1956, 5ff. has tried to show that the figure of Roma is descendant from the eponymous figure Rhômê. Mattingly 1960, 49ff. identifies the figure as Diana in the form of Bellona Victrix. Knoche 1952, 326ff. doubts the attribution based on literary and philological evidence. Crawford (RRC II, 721ff.) identifies the figure as Roma; however, also possibly as Diana. The figure is also identifiable with Virtus (McDonnell 2006, 148).

In the mid second century BCE, the legend ROMA shifted from the reverse to the obverse of the coin. However, there is uncertainty regarding the use of the coin legend ROMA as an identifier for Roma on the obverse of Roman coinage.¹³ This is not bolstered by the fact that divinities other than Roma were occasionally accompanied on the obverse by the ROMA legend, although this does not appear to have been common place.

Furthermore, it is uncertain as to why a figure without apparent cult in Rome would be introduced onto Roman coinage in the first place. It is postulated that the helmeted female figure actually represents someone else. The varied helmet types and changing legends have naturally led some to argue that the helmeted figure identified as Roma actually represents a divinity firmly set within the Roman pantheon, such as Minerva, Diana and Bellona to name but a few.¹⁴ However, the fact that the ‘ROMA’ stamp usually only appeared alongside the female helmeted figure contradicts this view.

These issues naturally raise questions as to the identity, origin and purpose of the figure. If the figure is indeed Roma, the lack of evidence relating to a western cult raises further questions in regard to how the figure was considered by the Roman people and their neighbours. Was Roma a divinity, or a personification, and was she actually recognized as such? E. Badian thought not, stating that “The Romans knew no such goddess.”¹⁵ Badian’s statement in

¹³ RRC II 724ff.

¹⁴ See note 12.

¹⁵ Badian 1995, 2.

conjunction with the aforementioned issues regarding the identity of the helmeted figure on Roman coinage entirely discredits Roma as a known figure within the Roman pantheon and the west. However, godhood and worship in antiquity do not appear to have come hand in hand. In fact, most gods appear to have never received worship by the Roman state.¹⁶ Unlike the Greek states who were trying to curry favour with Rome, this need for Rome itself did not exist. Despite these issues, the persistent use of the figure on Roman coinage and the eventual introduction of a Roman Ruler's cult in the eastern Mediterranean, dedicated to the Goddess Roma and the Emperor, point towards Roman use of the figure. The image of Roma would go on to be perpetuated throughout the history of the empire, reappearing on coinage, and even inspiring similar figural representations of empire, such as the later personification of Britannia (fig. 1.7).

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

1.2 First Documented Appearance of Roma

Interestingly, Roma as a figure of cult in the east, and later the emperor's cult, is considered separate and uninfluenced by the helmeted female figure used for close to two centuries on Roman Republican coinage. Instead, Roma is described as a figure of no real tradition: an amalgamation of eclectic attributes, crafted to serve as many functions as possible.¹⁷ While this may be true, religion in antiquity was not a rarefied sphere, but a system to aid people in conceptualizing and articulating their world. The utilization of Roma as versatile figure representative of a complex myriad of possibilities overcomplicates the figure and her intended use.

¹⁶ Gradel 2002, 28.

¹⁷ Mellor 1967, 22.

Mellor maintains that Roma was first embraced by Rome in the east in c. 30 BCE as part of a cult associated with Augustus.¹⁸ As the empire became increasingly more cosmopolitan, this 'Roma' would later transform into the eternal spirit of the empire. Intriguingly, Mellor postdates the Roman utilization of the goddess Roma until Augustus, despite contradicting numismatic evidence. However, Roma as a figure of Greek and eastern cult does not appear until c. 195 BCE, roughly ninety years after the appearance of Roma on Italian coinage, and nearly twenty years after the inception of the denarius in c. 211 BCE, on which Roma was the only figure to be depicted on the obverse.

I The First Temple to Roma

Cult to Roma was clearly inspired by Hellenistic ruler cult. The institution of Greek ruler cult was an innovation of the Hellenistic period. The first of these cults was established under Alexander, whose conquests, power, and status had elevated him to a degree that required special recognition.¹⁹ Prior to Alexander, no one could reach a position of such generally acknowledged pre-eminence as to justify the granting of divine honours; however, Alexander's achievements were so extraordinary that he required honorifics above those he had surpassed. The cults of Alexander's successors and the Hellenistic period continued Alexander's new world order and are found in various different contexts. The primary context was the dependence of Greek cities upon particular kings. The cities acknowledged benefactions received from a king by the establishment of a cult, which would include a temple or altar, priests, sacrifices, and games, modelled on that granted to the Olympian gods. Rulers were also honoured by having their statues placed in pre-existing temples. The king was thought to share the temple with the god, and thus to partake in the honours rendered to the deity and, on occasion, in the deity's qualities.²⁰

According to the Tacitus (c. 56 CE – c. 120 CE) the first temple and cult to Roma originated in Smyrna on the Aegean coast of Anatolia (**map 1**).

The deputies from Smyrna... passed on to the arguments in which they rested most confidence: their good offices towards the Roman people, to whom they had sent their naval force to aid not merely in foreign wars but in those with which we had to cope in Italy, while they had also been the first to erect a temple to the City of Rome, at a period when the Roman fortunes stood high indeed, but had not yet

¹⁸ Mellor 1991, 983-984.

¹⁹ Badian 1981, 27-71.

²⁰ Gradel 2002, 27-53; Price 1984, 23-52

mounted to their zenith, as the Punic capital was yet standing and the kings were still powerful in Asia.

Tacitus, *Annales* 4, 56.

The passage references the fierce competition for the right to establish a temple to Tiberius in 26 CE in Asia Minor. The competing cities relied upon arguments of antiquity, loyalty to Rome, and genealogy to assert their claim. Smyrna's claim relied chiefly on its ties to Rome, which rested upon its temple and cult to Roma. According to Smyrna's envoys, as reported by Tacitus, Smyrna had been the first to erect a temple to the goddess Roma, at a time when Rome was not yet at the height of its power. Tacitus is the only literary evidence for the establishment of a Roma cult in Smyrna; however, the establishment of honours in the Hellenistic east was not unusual within Hellenistic diplomacy. The temple's establishment is further corroborated by later imperial numismatic evidence, which depict a temple to Rome in Smyrna with the goddess' image or name clearly indicated (**fig. 1.8 and 1.9**).²¹ The same coins specify that Smyrna was 'three times neokoros of the Augusti.' It seems then that the imperial cult had moved into Smyrna's c. 195 BCE temple of Rome. Roma's usual image on Smyrna's coinage had been armed and enthroned, often with a personification of victory in her hand. This would later be replaced by a small temple to represent her position as guardian of the imperial cult.²²

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

The impetus behind the temple likely stemmed from the pro-Roman aristocracy in Smyrna, who were concerned with maintaining good relations and accruing political gain with the growing power in the west. The claim that Smyrna was the first to erect a temple to Rome is indicative of similar acts throughout the eastern Mediterranean, which reinforces the spread of cult to Rome in the east. It also serves as an indicator of Roman soft power: the spread of Roman influence through indirect Roman involvement.

²¹The cult of Roma was first developed to enable the Greeks to deal with the increasing military and political importance of the Roman state through the familiar methods of Hellenistic diplomacy: Mellor 1981, 1026ff. See also Mellor 1975 for analysis of Roma's role within the Greek world.

²²Burrell 2004, 327.

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

map 1

Contextual evidence further supports Smyrna's c. 195 BCE establishment of the cult to Roma. In 197 BCE Smyrna cut ties with Antiochus III and the Kingdom of Pergamum and appealed to Rome for aid. Smyrna appears to have created a cult to the personification of Rome (Roma) to establish a bond between the two cities and give thanks to Rome for guaranteeing its political independence.²³ The establishment of a cult and temple to Roma in Smyrna was perhaps the first 'public' establishment of Roma as a divinity in the east (but not her first time as a divinity *per se*).²⁴ The establishment of a Roma cult, or a cult directed at Rome, was important to the figuration of the relationship between the establishing city and Rome, symbolising a religious-political diplomacy.

II The Spread of Cult to Rome

The temple to Roma at Smyrna would soon be followed by cults, altars, priesthoods, and festivals throughout the Greek world. The spread of cult throughout the east, whether to Roma, or another figure representative of Rome, indicates the importance of Rome as an effective mediator and ally in the east, and as a guarantor of independence.²⁵ The Kingdom of Pergamum (**map 2**), a large Greek kingdom in Asia Minor, likely aided the spread of the cult throughout the east. Pergamum had been amongst the most loyal supporters of Rome in the Hellenistic world, and profited greatly as an ally of Rome, annexing most of the Seleucid Empire's former holdings after their defeat to Rome in c. 188 BCE. Pergamum's bequeathment to Rome in 133 BCE and the gradual capitulation of the Greek east is likely to have further enhanced the spread of the Roma cult.²⁶

Greek cities, like the democratic city-states of Athens and Rhodes, accepted Roma as analogous to their traditional personifications of the *Demos*, the personification of the city's free citizen body. Examination of cults of Roman power suggests that they focused on those aspects of Rome that were recognisably Greek and familiar. Such aspects were selected in order to make

²³ Tac. *Ann.* 4.55-56.

²⁴ When discussing cult, it is important to acknowledge both a 'public' and 'private' scene. 'Public' cult is explicitly worshipped by the state, whereas 'private' cult is that worshipped within a private setting: Beard *et al.* 1998, 251.

²⁵ Mellor suggests that cults to Roma were set up throughout the east as a sort of political currency with Rome (1975). I think it is important to note that whilst cult to Roma was most certainly used as a form of political currency (cf. Gruen 1984, 187, 734), it is an exaggeration to suggest that Roma was the only figure utilised in such a manner.

²⁶ On Pergamum and the Attalids: Kosmetatou 2003, 159-174. On bequeathment of Pergamum to Rome: Gruen 1984, 592-600.

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

Rome more intelligible to a Greek audience; however, because Rome's power renders it abnormal, it was elevated to cult status. As awareness of the newly created goddess spread throughout the east, she began to be depicted in art and in literature.²⁷ According to Mellor, as there was no precedent set for Roma's iconography, it was left open to interpretation by different groups. In fact, Roma would allegedly remain without a set iconographic form until the inauguration of Hadrian's temple to Roma and Venus in Rome in c. 121 CE. This, however, contradicts numismatic evidence. Roman coinage clearly had a set form for Roma, which was established before the rise of the cults in the eastern Mediterranean.

Motivation behind cult to Roma was political in nature. Greek cities utilized the figure of Roma to conceptually visualise and acknowledge the increasing power of the Roman state, whilst also providing an effective medium for interaction with Rome. Doubtless their acceptance of the personification Roma as a medium for engaging Rome was aided by its apparent conformity with certain aspects of Hellenistic ruler cult.²⁸ Within this practise, Roma stood as the embodiment of the city Rome, providing a platform from which eastern elites could pay honours through the institution of the cult of the goddess. However, I would posit that initial cult to Roma was not ruler cult, but more in-line with Greek saviour cults, only later developing into a ruler's cult as the Roman Empire expanded and amalgamated. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter Two.

III The Roma of Augustus: c. 27 BCE – c. 14 CE

The institution of ruler cult continued into the Hellenistic period with cities often granting divine-like honours to powerful kings, either in thanks for the benefaction of the king or for political motive. Rome's increasing power created an interesting dilemma. Rome's growing empire was not ruled by a king but by an ever-changing body of elected officials. Moreover, Roman Republican values were averse to monarchic rule and the associated Hellenistic honour of ruler divinity.²⁹ Augustus could not risk the association of being identified as a monarch or god, problematic on account of the assassination of Julius Caesar in 44 BCE, who was accused to have desired a crown. Furthermore, Augustus' invective speeches against Cleopatra VII and

²⁷ On a number of Greek coins, Roma is depicted in the guise of a warrior goddess (similar to that of Athena), or in the crown of a city's Tyche (the city's fortune). Roma is, perhaps, also identifiable in a number of dedications towards Rome; however, it is possible that some of the texts here are actually referring to the demos of the Romans: Fayer 1976 discusses the utilization of Roma in the art of the east.

²⁸ Rulers' cult is a misnomer and extended beyond purely honouring rulers: Gruen 1984, 178-179.

²⁹ Erskine 1991, 106 and note 2.

Marc Antony, who had become an eastern king in all but name, would have appeared hypocritical had Augustus also accepted honorifics associated with Hellenistic kingship. Mellor suggests that joint cult to Dea Roma and Augustus bypassed this issue and allowed for a safer mode of ruler worship for Augustus; however, Chapter II will illustrate that such association was hardly new.³⁰

Augustus' promotion of a new cult dedicated to himself and Roma was clearly just a fig leaf veiling worship to himself and barely disguising his position as the singular political head of Rome (**fig. 1.10**). In fact, by sharing a cult and temple, Augustus by association would share in Roma's dedications and qualities. Roma was a goddess whose veneration as *Princeps Civitatis* (first among the cities) was made official by Augustus as part of a propaganda campaign in the west of the Roman Empire. He thus gave the empire concept religious orders, built a series of temples to Roma and Augustus with his *Res Gestae*, and attached inscriptions to popularize the new goddess.³¹

Like the ruler cult of Alexander's successors, Augustus also created a divine link to secure his power by deifying Julius Caesar. However, by positioning his own worship alongside that of Roma, Augustus avoided an obvious ruler cult and the negative connotations it held in Rome.³² Little remains of Roma's cult temples in the eastern Mediterranean. Four altars and one deliberately mutilated statue survive.³³ This has naturally made research on Roma, her origins and meaning problematic. However, what does appear clear is that Augustus made use of an existing institution, supplanting and adopting Roma's qualities with himself as representative of the Roman state.

³⁰ Mellor 1969, 24ff.

³¹ For Augustus' association with Roma, see Fishwick 1987, 125-130; Mellor 1969, 24-50; 1991, 983ff.

³² Fishwick 1987, 72.

³³ Mellor 1991, 960-3

1.3 Current Scholarship on the Goddess Roma

I Dea Roma: The Development of the Idea of the Goddess Roma (1969)

When studying Roma, there are four main English texts to examine. R. Mellor has published quite extensively on the topic of Roma, with no less than three bodies of work espousing his extensive research and views. The crux of the thesis is that the Roma utilized in western imperial cult is in fact of eastern origin, finding the antecedent of Dea Roma in Augustan Rome as the eastern Thea Rhômê and in Roman personifications of *Res Publica* (republic) and *Patria* (fatherland). Mellor further argues that whilst the above is intrinsically linked, there must have been a far simpler and more emotional meaning of Roma for humble soldiers and provincials to understand. Mellor believes that Roma and Vesta were combined to create a new Dea Roma, which carried the “awful name of Roma and the power of the hearth fire.”³⁴ Mellor has also described the term ‘provincial cult’ as misapplied. He describes the term as too broad as it includes both cults to Roma as propaganda for emotional loyalty, as well as those without Roma, which were concerned with organization and administrative allegiance.

Mellor’s *Dea Roma: The Development of the Idea of the Goddess Roma* is conceived as a general survey of the cult of the goddess Roma; however, whilst extensive, it is far from complete. Mellor’s *Dea Roma* provides a view of the eventual Roman imperial cult and how Roma came to play a part in it; however, it is not beyond reproach. Mellor dismisses Roman numismatic evidence as proof of Roma in Rome. Furthermore, Mellor’s comment on the misuse of ‘provincial cult’ to identify cults to Roma ignores that fact that Greek cult was dedicated to a myriad of figures thought to be representative of Rome. Roma likely fit into both categories.

II Roman Republican Coinage (1974)

Crawford’s *Roman Republican Coinage* (1974) outlines reasons (pp. 721-725) for why he himself has identified the figure on Roman coinage as Roma. As part of his analysis, Crawford focused on the helmet types and created a progression of types: the Phrygian helmet during the Pyrrhic War (280 BCE – 275 BCE); the Attic helmet in 225 BCE, and then minimally altered for the new denarius in 211 BCE.³⁵ Crawford’s analysis utilises the technical details of the coins as evidence, whilst also relying upon a macro view of the numismatic evidence to identify

³⁴ Mellor 1967, 105-117.

³⁵ RRC, II, 722.

the Roma head as “one of continual minor modifications”.³⁶ Crawford also presents the idea that the goddess Diana is linked to Roma through numismatic iconography.³⁷

While Roma’s iconography and symbolism may have come in part from imagery associated with the goddess Diana, Crawford’s analysis delves no further than this and does not seek origin, context, or linkage to the eventual imperial cult; at least not to the great extent of Mellor.

III Thea Roma: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World (1975)

The second volume of work by Mellor is *Thea Roma: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World* (1975), which expands upon the ideas developed in *Dea Roma* and is the most comprehensive English study on the figure of Roma to date. The volume is divided into two parts: part one investigates the origins of the goddess and the history of the cult, surveying the diffusion of her cult region by region in the Greek speaking world; part two approaches the subject thematically - the Greek view of Roma, honours paid to her, the continuance of her cult into the imperial period, and her later features.

The material is meticulous and exhaustive. However, the chapter detailing the complex problem of the origin of Roma as a religious personification and cult figure is brief, focusing primarily on the geographical surveys. Mellor mainly focused on coins from Athens and Macedon and their visual connection to Athena.³⁸ Mellor saw Athena as the clear model for Roma’s representation in the east, and since “Roma came from the east to the west” in Mellor’s view, there was a clear link between Athena and Roma on Roman coinage.³⁹ Mellor was not convinced that the head on early Republican coins was Roma, as a cult to her had yet to be established in the east.⁴⁰ I also question Mellor’s proposal that cult to Roma, based on the use of epithets, distinguishes her as a divinity over and above other personifications of Rome. Mellor believes that because Roma also received common epithets shared with kings, that her cult in the east was descendant of Greek ruler cult, the epithets eventually transferring to the Roman emperors, and the ruler cult from the east to the west. However, these epithets were also common of saviour cult prior to the Hellenistic period and were not exclusive to Hellenistic

³⁶ RRC, II, 722 and n. 1.

³⁷ RRC II, 723-725. Based on crescent and dog. I find this observation unconvincing. Dogs do appear on other coins in the same series in tandem with other deities. Both the crescent and dog are not present together on the coin; but one or the other.

³⁸ Mellor 1975, 163; 1991, 962-963.

³⁹ Mellor 1975, 162.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*

kings. They were also later applied to Jesus in the New Testament and were amongst the most commonly used in Hellenistic religion. This will be discussed further in Chapter II.

Numerous cults honouring Alexander the Great's successors were essentially saviour cults established by independent cities as a method of currying favour and support from the individual in power, their variations and contradictions attributable to local independence.⁴¹ Civic worship of this kind was awarded to an individual on account of his accomplishments, not qua ruler, although the recipient was usually not local. Given the context for Roman intervention in the east, the fact that Rome is acting as a 'liberating' force and ally, rather than the conqueror we all associate Rome with today, it is likely that any cult initially dedicated to Roma was a form of saviour cult in thanks for Rome's aid. I think it is important to note that whilst ruler cult and saviour cult share many common epithets, rulers were never identified outright as a god, only godlike. Roma, on the other hand, is distinguished as a god in the east, revealing cult to Roma as something else other than Hellenistic ruler cult. This would all naturally change as Rome began to amalgamate liberated and conquered territories into an empire and Greek cities attempted to interact and cooperate with the new world order.

IV Mellor's 'The Goddess Roma' (1991)

Mellor's *The Goddess Roma* (1991) presents a general summary of his Roma scholarship to date, whilst referencing the previous two theses for more in-depth discussion. The chapter is well laid out and clear regarding the eastern development of Roma, whilst extending further into the empire and imperial reception of the figure. Once again it carries forward many of the intrinsic issues of his previous works, mainly regarding his reception of numismatics. Mellor seeks the origins and early evolution of Roma and the cult of Roma exclusively in the Hellenistic Greek world, firmly accrediting "Augustus, his political theorists and poets" in orchestrating the Roman adoption of Θεά Ρώμη (Goddess Roma) and Hadrian in deifying her.

Mellor's belief in an eastern conception is based on that of U. Knoche, who doubts the traditional attributions on the basis of literary and philological evidence.⁴² Furthermore, Mellor excludes Republican counter evidence, excluding Roma's visual representation on coins and in art, which were of course the most widely issued image of Roma. He believes that Roma's

⁴¹ Fishwick 1987, 12.

⁴² Knoche 1952, 326 ff. collects literary testimonia to show that the word 'Roma' was not used metaphorically before the first century BCE.

cult in the east came first, and that the figure on Republican coinage is either a separate figure, or a geographical personification and not the goddess Roma.⁴³ Whilst Mellor finally admits that “the goddess Roma is perhaps best known from her frequent depiction on Roman coinage”, he goes on to argue that the coinage of Locri in Magna Graecia should be dated later and that it might be seen as the “vanguard of the wave that swept cults and personifications of Roma throughout the Greek world during the second century.”⁴⁴ It is important to note here that whilst Locri was a Greek town, in c. 285 BCE it was under Roman occupation. Furthermore, if Mellor is correct about a later dating for the Locrian coin (c. 204 BCE), then the imagery of Roma on Roman coinage, which began to be issued in great numbers from c. 211 BCE, is more than likely to have influenced the Locrian depictions.⁴⁵

Mellor’s view on the existence of Roma on early Roman Republican coins has since been overturned by Crawford based on his dating timeline, but the overall conclusion that Athena was linked to Roma’s representation in the east is logical and not without evidence.⁴⁶ Mellor of course follows the old Greek predilection of Hellenising the Romans and ignores the socio-political development of Rome and the city’s burgeoning relationship with Italy. I am by no means questioning the importance of Mellor’s study. Nor am I discrediting the remarkable work done by Mellor in compiling such a wealth of information on the figure Roma, who was until then relatively unknown in scholarship. I do, however, hope that my comments and analysis will further enhance and supplement the work already done by Mellor. To Mellor, the appellation Roma of these periods solely specified the geographical region and had no associations with the goddess who was developing in the east. Recently the view that the helmeted figure on coinage represents Roma has been revived.⁴⁷ Mellor ignores the considerable number of cases arguing for an earlier date of c. 285 BCE, rather than the late date c. 204 BCE that Mellor agrees with.⁴⁸

⁴³ Mellor 1991, 975-976.

⁴⁴ Mellor 1991, 961 – 962.

⁴⁵ Mellor 1975, 162ff. Cf. RRC II 724: the Locrian didrachm appears in almost every detailed work on Roma and Crawford utilized the didrachm as complete evidence to explain the early “existence of the personification Roma” by the Pyrrhic War (280-275 BCE).

⁴⁶ RRC II 721ff.

⁴⁷ RRC II 724ff.; Burnett 1986, 68ff.

⁴⁸ The early and late chronologies were best argued by Harold Mattingly (1924/1928) and Michael Crawford (RRC I-II) respectively, while Rudi Thomsen recently presented the case for a middle chronology (ERC I-III).

Chapter Overview

This chapter has provided a brief background into the prevailing view of Roma as a figure in both the east and the west. The study of ancient religion and cult, and by association Roma, is difficult due to gaps and discrepancies in the archaeological record, particularly regarding the implementation of Roma in the Roman Republic. Roma is usually recognised as the figure on the obverse of Roman pre-denarii (ca. 245 BCE) and Roman denarii (c. 211 BCE onward). Moreover, there is debate on whether the helmeted female head depicted Roma or not. Furthermore, as there is no known cult to Roma in Republican Rome, the question arises as to why a figure like Roma with no apparent Roman cult would be used on Roman coinage in the first place.

As a result, studies on the origins of the Roman imperial cult exclude the Roma on Roman coinage from the narrative and instead look to the eastern Mediterranean for Roma's origins. Currently, the narrative is that Roma's first cult was founded in the eastern Mediterranean in c. 195 BCE and spread alongside Roman intervention in the east. It is believed that Roma was selected for cult worship directed at Rome based on the Greek pre-disposition for personifying places. This ignores other figural representations utilised by the Greeks for representing Roman power. Furthermore, according to this eastern narrative, cult to Roma would continue to spread through the eastern Mediterranean until Augustus appropriated her in c. 30 BCE and introduced her to Rome as a figure of imperial cult. Such a narrative ignores pre-existing Roman foundations, which had clear numismatic representation in Rome from the third to first century BCE and clearly influenced Augustan depictions of Roma. Augustus, his political theorists and poets were not innovative in adopting cult to Roma as part of the imperial cult. They simply utilized pre-existing developments like Greek cult dedicated to figures representative of Rome, particularly to Roma, and merged the Greek cult with the concept of the Roman Roma to spread and cultivate Augustus' personality throughout the Roman Empire.

CHAPTER II

ROMA - A FIGURE FROM THE EAST?

Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes intulit agresti Latio.

Conquered Greece took captive her savage conqueror and brought her arts into rustic Latium.

(Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.156-7)

Chapter I examined the prevailing view of Roma as a figure of the east travelling to the west and revealed a number of issues with this narrative. Chapter II further examines the concept of Roma's Greek development and underlines the reality that Roma existed prior to Augustus and Hadrian appropriating her. Whilst the Greeks were not intrinsically behind the development of Roma, there were Greek influences that need to be examined. Prior iterations of Roma, particularly that of Rhômê, are important to the development of the personification Roma and explains why some Greek cities later developed cult to Roma.

Chapter II also examines the type of cult offered to Roma. It asserts that cult to Roma, and by extension to Rome, was not merely a form of Hellenistic ruler cult, but a far more complex idea involving developments of Greek saviour and divine cult, and the concepts of *pistis* and *fides* (good faith, trust, and reliability), thereby ingratiating the Greeks with the growing Roman power. Chapter II also serves to illustrate why Roma was not accorded similar worship within Rome. Finally, Chapter II argues that Roma was merely one of several conduits utilized by the Greeks in dealing with the rising power of Rome. From this it will become clear that the imperial cult developed under Augustus was nothing innovative, but merely a continuation of pre-existing honours previously accorded to representatives of the Roman state.

2.1 Eponymous Rome

Before Roma became a personification, she was an eponymous figure introduced by the Greeks to create a history behind the naming of the city of Rome. Roman culture was unquestionably influenced by the Greeks. Greek cultural influences were visible within Rome's political and religious practises, their literature, their art, and their architecture. It is a safe generalization that whenever one culture type is widely adopted by other societies, it is normally due to political, social or economic power. Hellenization describes the process through which non-Greek communities adopted Greek material culture, language and literature, styles and iconography, cults and myths, cultural practices, and even Greek identity.⁴⁹ Greece was civilization, and to become civilized Rome had to become Hellenised. When the Greeks came into contact with the peoples of Italy and Sicily, they adapted and invented Hellenised foundation myths to explain the origin of the peoples and link them back to Greece.⁵⁰ Naturally, this Hellenistic influence complicates the study of Roman religion. In which direction did influence flow, or did the Greeks and non-Greeks remain largely separate? The arguments presented in Chapter II and III demonstrate the complex cultural exchange as the Greeks attempted to come to terms with Rome's increasing power, and the multi-directional influence of the Greeks and Romans in Roma's development.

I Rome's Foundation

Initially, Roma was a figure utilized by the Greeks to link the city of Rome to their world view and common history. Whilst the Romans were not Greeks, they were culturally similar, and so the Greeks tied Rome's foundation myths to the Trojan War.⁵¹ The prevailing view on the city of Rome's founding is that it was founded by an Italic people who later merged with the Etruscans. By c. 600 BCE, the Etruscans, a people located north of Rome, ruled much of northern and central Italy, including Rome.⁵² According to Herodotus, the Greeks believed the Etruscans had migrated from Asia Minor in the east to Italy in the west.⁵³ It was with this eastern origin in mind that Greek legend connected Rome's origins with Troy and the Trojan War.⁵⁴ The Greek attitude towards the Trojans was complex. Although the Trojans had been

⁴⁹ Vlassopoulos 2013, 9.

⁵⁰ On Greek foundation myths for cities, see Brillante 1990, 91-140.

⁵¹ Galinsky 1969, 95-96 expands further on the foreign adoption of Greek/Trojan ancestry.

⁵² Cornell 1995, 151ff.

⁵³ Hdt. 1.94.

⁵⁴ Solmsen 1986, 92ff. discusses how the Greeks acknowledged their joint colonisation of Italy and Sicily with the Trojans.

their enemies, they also had supposed Greek ancestry. While the Trojans were regarded by some as barbarians, they had by the time of Homer (late eighth or early seventh century BCE) come to be considered as belonging to the most venerable and widely-known of Greek sagas.⁵⁵ For this reason, they were accepted by the Greeks as a portion of their common past, reflecting a Greek view to portray the world as either stemming from, or being subdued by the Greeks, and allowing for these peoples to identify with that rich cultural history.⁵⁶

To the Greeks, the Romans, as well as the Trojans, were both Greek and non-Greek. It was only much later, after the Romans had started utilizing the Trojan legend for political purposes, that the distinction between Greek and Trojan could be divested of its cultural meaning and be used in a predominantly political sense.⁵⁷ The Romans tied themselves to Greek culture when it was diplomatically beneficial to relate to their Greek neighbours. Vergil's *Aeneid* is one such example to reflect the Greek influence. Aeneas, a hero of Troy, was well-known to Greco-Roman legend and myth as a character in the *Iliad*.⁵⁸ He was also a very popular figure in Etruscan myth and art.⁵⁹ Virgil adopted the tales of Aeneas's wanderings around the Mediterranean. He took Aeneas' vague association with the foundation of Rome and devised a compelling foundation myth that tied Rome to Troy. This would be used to explain the wars against the Greeks and the Punic Wars between Rome and Carthage (c. 264 – 146 BCE), and served to glorify traditional Roman virtues. The example demonstrates the changing nature of Rome's founding legend to coincide with major events within Rome's history and provides background to important Roman traits.

II Hellanicus of Lesbos on Rhômê

Rome's earliest mention is in relation to the Aeneas legend and is preserved in fragment 84 by Hellanicus of Lesbos c. fifth century BCE. The fragment speaks of a woman called Rhômê, who was brought to Italy by Aeneas and Odysseus as a Trojan refugee after the Trojan War.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Malkin 2001, 3-15: Greek identity was based on common descent from mythical heroes. Greek literature and cultural identity based on that literature focused on the exploits of these heroes, whose most famous achievement was the joint expedition against Troy.

⁵⁶ Gruen 1992, 31.

⁵⁷ Galinsky 1969, 96

⁵⁸ Aeneas appears several times in Greek myth, prior to his more extensive treatment in Vergil's *Aeneid*: HHAphr. 5; Hom. *Il.* 13.455-540.

⁵⁹ Galinsky 1969, 103-105.

⁶⁰ Dion. Hal. 1.28.1-4 = BNJ 4 F 84: *The compiler of the Priestesses at Argos and the events during the tenure of each of them says that Aeneas came from the land of the Molossians with Odysseus to Italy and was the founder of the city, and it was named after Rhômê, one of the women from Troy. He says that she, weary of wandering, conspired with the other Trojan women and set fire to the ships.*

Weary of their long wanderings in search of a new home, Rhômê incited the other Trojan women to set fire to the ships and so forced the expedition to settle and found Rome. Thus, it was in honour of Rhômê that the city of Rome was named. The bringing of Aeneas to Rome reflects the tradition of Aeneas in Etruscan art and the Etruscan influence on Rome (**fig. 2.1**).⁶¹ However, Hellanicus' tale also awkwardly reconciles the Trojan and Aeneas tradition with the founding of Rome. Aeneas does not willingly establish Rome but was forced to. The act of burning the ships by the Trojan women is generally associated with the Greek settlement of Italy and Sicily and appears to have been a recurring theme of the migration west.⁶²

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

⁶¹ Galinsky 1969, 122-132: More than 58 vases found within Etruria depict the motif of Aeneas departing Troy.

See also the survey of Schauenburg (1960) 179-190.

⁶² Solmsen 1986, 104-7; Fowler 2013, 567-8.

Hellanicus' tale is characteristic of the pseudo-legends invented by Greek authors to account for the foundation and naming of foreign cities.⁶³ Hellanicus introduced Rhômê alongside pre-existing legends in order to explain how Rome was named and how the city was relevant to the Greek world. It is the product of several foundation myths amalgamated together: Rome founded by the Greek hero Odysseus; Rome founded by the Trojan hero Aeneas; and Rhômê as the eponymous founder of the city.⁶⁴ Hellanicus seems to have been the first to bring Aeneas to Latium alongside Odysseus and his inclusion in the tale is interesting.⁶⁵ By including Odysseus as a cofounder of Rome with Aeneas, Hellanicus not only reinforces Rome's foundation as part of the common Greek history, but also links Aeneas' characteristics with those of the clever and pious Odysseus. Odysseus' involvement likely also stemmed from his fantastical adventures in Homer's *Odyssey*, which was popular within the Greek speaking world, particularly around Sicily, Magna Graecia, and other western regions. Rhômê, however, was merely a woman introduced by Hellanicus used to explain Rome's naming.

III The Etymology of Rome

The creation of the Trojan heroine Rhômê may have been the result of a linguistic misunderstanding. Rome was originally Umbrian, not Etruscan or Latin. The Umbrian *Rūma* translates to (town of) flowing waters. *Rūma* stems from *rūmōn* (river; flowing water). This was an Indo-European formation built on the root *reu-* (to flow) and the derivational suffix *mo*. When the Etruscans took Rome, they would have adopted the Umbrian name, which would have been *Rūma*.⁶⁶ The Etruscan language contains no phonemic long vowels. There was also no phonemic contrast between *u* and *o*.⁶⁷ As a result, the early Latins would have adopted *Rūma* as *Rōma*.⁶⁸ Interestingly, there was a similar Greek word *ῥεῦμα* (reuma: that which flows) to the Umbrian/Etruscan *Rūma* or *rūmōn*.⁶⁹ However, the changes in pronunciation between Umbrian and Etruscan likely led many Greek historians to identify Rome's name with the Greek word *ῥώμη* (rome: strength; force; might). Rhômê's gender and the Etruscan phonetic contrast are likely linked to this linguistic misunderstanding. Hellanicus' choice of the word *ῥώμη* as the name of the eponymous heroine is revealing of the linguistic similarities between

⁶³ Galinsky 1969, 91-93.

⁶⁴ Solmsen 1986, 93-100 discusses in-depth Odysseus' role in Rome's founding.

⁶⁵ Hes. 1011 describes Odysseus' and Circe's son Latinus as ruling over Tyrsenoi (the Etruscans). See also Solmsen 1986, 93-110; Fowler 2013, 84-96.

⁶⁶ Baldi 1999 identifies no such word in the Etruscan language.

⁶⁷ Bonfante 2002, 71-81.

⁶⁸ Gordon 2010

⁶⁹ Corssen 1868, 364.

Roma and *ῥώμη* and in turn of how the Greeks viewed Rome. Such linguistic similarities will not only have influenced the creation of Rhômê as a heroine, but her name's association with *ῥώμη* may have, alongside the *topos* of ship burning, influenced the decision to have Rhômê burn the ships.

IV Additional Literary Accounts of Rhômê

Rhômê was not the only eponymous figure relevant to Rome. This multiplicity illustrates that the Rhômê legend was not widely accepted. Most of the Greek accounts on Rhômê are either of unknown authorship or ascribed to obscure writers and are difficult to date.⁷⁰ Hellanicus was a prolific writer; however, his authorship is contentious and research has shown several of his works to be misattributed and of later date, casting doubt upon his authorship.⁷¹

There are several other variations which alternate between several eponymous figures of Rome. It is clear that as Roman power increased, the Greeks began to pay the Romans more attention, with particular regard to Roman origins and their relation to the Greeks. In the stories where Rhômê is eponymous for the city, she is usually linked to Aeneas, either as a companion, his wife, or as the wife or daughter of his son Ascanius. Rome was named in Rhômê's honour.⁷² Just as Corinth was named after Corinthus or Athens after Athena, it seems evident that, to the Greeks, there must have been an eponymous Rhômê, Rhomos or Romulus.⁷³

There are more than thirty stories recorded from the Hellenistic and early Roman period involving an eponymous figure for the foundation of Rome. Although not all of these involved Aeneas, the following ancient historians encapsulate the main Greek variations. With aspersions cast upon Hellanicus, the next earliest datable version to utilize an eponymous figure for Rome is that of the Sicilian historian Alcimus (late fourth century BCE). Alcimus wrote of a direct connection between Aeneas and Romulus as father and son and claimed that Rome was

⁷⁰ Krampf 1913, 15-20 summarises the various versions of the Rhômê legend.

⁷¹ Horsfall 1979, 376-83; Gruen 1992, 17-18. For a less sceptical view, see Solmsen 1986, 93-110; Fowler 2013, 566. Hellanicus was concerned with systematizing the various traditions and the inference is that both traditions had enough traction to require this construct.

⁷² Rome founded by Aeneas: Dion. Hal. 1.72.5. Rome founded by Ascanius: Dion. Hal. 1.72.6. Rhômê as a descendant of Aeneas: Plut. *Rom.* 2.1; Festus 328, 16L = BNJ 472 F 5 and BNJ 840 F 18. Rhômê married to Aeneas: Plut. *Rom.* 2. For connections with Italus or Latinus see Kallias (third century BCE) *apud* Dion. Hal. 1.72.5 and Festus 269M = BNJ 840 F 14a and b; Plut. *Rom.* 2. For Rhomos as similarly attached to either Aeneas or Italus and Latinus: Dion. Hal. 1.72.6 = BNJ 840 F 10 and 11.

⁷³ Corinth named for Corinthus: Paus. 2.1.1. Athens named for Athena: Hdt. 8.1.1.

founded by Aeneas' great-grandson Rhomos.⁷⁴ This is the first mention of Romulus in connection to Aeneas and the first to base the naming of Rome on a male eponym. Furthermore, the source mentions marriage between Aeneas and Tyrrhenia, which is our earliest literary connection between Aeneas and the Etruscans.⁷⁵ Another Sicilian historian, Callias of Syracuse (early third century BCE), seemed unaware of Aeneas but wrote of the arrival in Italy of Trojan Rhômê. According to Callias, Rhômê would marry Latinus and give birth to Rhomos, Romulus, and Telegonus. These sons founded Rome and named it after their mother.⁷⁶

Another account by Agathocles of Cyzicus (early third century BCE) identified Rhômê as the granddaughter of Aeneas and states that she was the first to dedicate a temple to *fides* on the Palatine hill, an act which resulted in the city bearing her name.⁷⁷ Agathocles rejected the tradition that Rhômê was a Trojan captive and instead granted her a more noble ancestry. Furthermore, Agathocles adds more important detail regarding Roman customs and the temple to *fides*. At the time of writing in the early third century BCE, *fides* was already considered an important concept by the Romans and featured prominently in their dealings with the Greeks.⁷⁸

Timaeus of Tauromenium (c. 356 – 260 BCE) in his writings on Pyrrhus of Epirus also made the connection between Rome and the Trojans. According to Timaeus, Aeneas founded both Lavinium and Rome.⁷⁹ Furthermore, Timaeus' account, like that of Agathocles, reflected Roman customs and tendencies and their relations to the Greeks. Dionysius Chalcidensis (c. 250 BCE) named Romus as the founder of the city but says that according to some this man was the son of Ascanius, and according to others the son of the Trojan prince Emathion.⁸⁰

The above examples are just a few variations demonstrating the multiplicity of Greek eponymous figures for Rome. They illustrate change based on the Roman relationship with their neighbours. Hellanicus was the first to establish a Trojan and Greek origin for Rome. Alcimus connected Roma to the Etruscans through Romulus' mother. Likewise, Callias illustrated Roman relations with the Latins through Latinus, and possibly also the Greeks if this

⁷⁴ BNJ 560 F 4 = Festus 266 M.

⁷⁵ Galinsky 1969, 122-32.

⁷⁶ BNJ 564 F 5a = Dion. Hal. 1.72.5. See also D'Anna 1976, 58; Vanotti 1995, 39-40.

⁷⁷ BNJ 472 5a = Festus 269 M; BNJ 472 F 5b = Solin.1.3.

⁷⁸ Ziolkowski 1992, 28-31.

⁷⁹ BNJ 566 F 36 = Polyb. 12.4b.1-4c.1; BNJ 566 F 59 = Dion. Hal. 1.67.4. See also Wiseman 1995; Galinsky 1969, 44-45; Laing 1910, 54-55. It was by Timaeus' authority that universal Greek agreement on Trojan settlement in Latium was formed.

⁸⁰ DFHG IV 195.11

Latinus is the same Latinus, who was the son of Odysseus and Circe. Agathocles and Timaeus both wrote their versions in relation to the Pyrrhic War and so stressed a noble Trojan ancestry and its influence on Roman customs. Dionysius named a male eponym but again stressed Roman relations with Troy.

V Rhômê's Relation to the Aeneas Legend

Although the Romans would come to accept the Trojan connection with the origins of their city, the idea that Aeneas, or a descendent or associate of Aeneas, founded Rome was a purely Greek idea. The Greek sources after Hellanicus show that Aeneas was not related to Rhômê or connected with her in any other way until the early third century BCE. Roman legends were unique in that they were willing to accept a Greek scheme. This was imposed on the basic Roman folk memory and allowed the products of Greek scientific curiosity to become the focal point of Rome's own creation legends. The true native legends likely revolved around an eponymous ancestor. After the expulsion of the Etruscans, Aeneas is neither associated with Rome or Latium, and only appears again in c. 300 BCE. Rhômê would continue to see use, and her continued use in Greek foundation legends indicates a possible local tradition for the people.⁸¹ The idea of a Trojan origin only seems to resurface during the Pyrrhic war and in later conflicts against the Carthaginians. Rhômê is not in Aeneas' retinue as long as his journey ends anywhere other than Italy or the site of Rome.⁸²

The Greek foundation myth of Rhômê as the namesake for Rome never appears to have been taken very seriously in Rome. Rome developed its own foundation myth associated with the builders of Rome, Romulus and Remus, and relegated Aeneas and his descendants to Alba Longa.⁸³ It is argued that Aeneas was regarded as a founder by the Romans, who adopted him under Etruscan influences before adopting the better known tale of Romulus and Remus.⁸⁴ Aeneas, however, does seem to have been the subject of a foundation myth in Southern Etruria in the late sixth century BCE. Furthermore, genetic evidence supports the idea of a link between Anatolia, where Troy was located, and Etruria in Italy. This could explain the popularity of

⁸¹ Alföldi 1952, 5ff.

⁸² Galinsky 1962 consolidates all the changing termini of Aeneas' wanderings.

⁸³ Sall. *Cat.* 6.1.2: Sallust is the only author in Roman literature to refer to Aeneas as founder. The myth of Romulus and Remus, in comparison to the Greek stories, were rich in content, making extensive reference to local topography and traditions, whilst also embracing many local aetiologies. Liv. 1.4-16 is most famous account of Romulus. Other accounts appear in Dion. Hal. 1.76-88; Ov. *Fast.* 2.129-44, 2.363-503, 3.1-78, 3.127-34, 4.807-62; Plut. *Rom.*; Verg. *Aen.* 6.777-83.

⁸⁴ Galinsky 1969 122ff., and especially 139 on BNJ 4 F 84 = Dion. Hal. 1.72.1-2 and the decline of Etruscan rule in Rome. Cf. Horsfall 1979, 386ff. for updates to Galinsky's list.

Aeneas in Etruria, as it perhaps was considered a part of their common history.⁸⁵ Roman families with Etruscan leanings may have accepted Aeneas as founder under Etruscan rule and forsaken him alongside the departure of Etruscan rule.

Rhômê's inclusion in the Greek foundation myths for Rome rival that of the Roman founders Romulus and Remus. Rhômê was either a figure pulled in or created to grant Rome a foundation history relating to that of its Greek neighbours. The principal motivation behind the revival of the Aeneas legend was likely related to Rome's orientation toward the Greeks in southern Italy and the Greek world. The descent from Aeneas was created to build a close political and cultural bond between Romans and Greeks. Rather than being viewed as a Latin barbarian city, utilisation of the Aeneas myth was intended to show that Rome had a respectable pedigree. This is perhaps why the legend involving the founding of Rome by Aeneas, indirectly through Romulus and Remus, continued into the period of the Roman Empire and the legend of a Trojan slave did not. The Romans placed emphasis on the Greek aspect of the Trojan legend, and this use of the legend found its immediate reflection in Greek historiography. According to Galinsky, the legend would later be revived as an expression of anti-Carthaginian overtones because the Trojan legend of Aeneas, and by association Rhômê, was so closely associated with Sicily.⁸⁶

Alföldi observed that the Roman state introduced the head of its Trojan ancestress, Rhômê, for the first time during the First Punic War. He argued that Rhômê was chosen as the political antithesis to the representation of Dido on the Carthaginian coins of Magna Graecia and Punic Sicily (**fig. 2.2**).⁸⁷ However, it is likely the figure is not Dido, but Tanit - the chief Phoenician goddess.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, it does still remain possible that Rome's new coinage depicting Roma was introduced as a counter to the Carthaginian tutelary goddess. These coins were issued one or two generations prior to the first Roma didrachm. Alföldi proposed that Rhômê's essence emerged from the native tradition of Rome and that the Romans did not originally look to Aeneas, worshiped by the Etruscans as the founder, but focused on a woman as the source of

⁸⁵ For an overview of the studies, see Kron 2013, 56-78.

⁸⁶ Galinsky 1969, 93-102.

⁸⁷ Alföldi 1957, 32.

⁸⁸ On the Carthaginian and South Italian coinages of the Second Punic War, see Robinson 1964.

their ancestry.⁸⁹ The examples of Cyrene, Smyrna, and many other cities show that women founders were perfectly acceptable.⁹⁰

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

Rhômê could not have been replaced as the founding figure of Rome had her prominence been properly established in Rome. Whilst the utilization of Rhômê on Roman coinage would place her in great prominence, evidence is not sufficient in establishing her as frequent or constant in later Roman tradition.⁹¹ Rome had other foundation figures and its foundation myths changed and developed to reflect changes in Rome's ongoing relations with its neighbours.⁹² Rome utilized the myths involving Aeneas to associate with their Etruscan neighbours, whilst also identifying themselves as 'Greek' in later conflicts against Carthage. This identity also changed to reflect a Trojan origin in the war against King Pyrrhus of Epirus c. 282 – 275 BCE, who styled himself as the successor of the Greek hero Achilles and destined to destroy the Trojans (in this case, the Romans).⁹³

Examination of Rhômê is crucial for discussion regarding the development and spread of a figure representative of Rome. Nevertheless, it hardly matters how we view Trojan Rhômê; the basic fact is that she stood for the city. Rome founded by Rhômê is the least complicated version behind Rome's name. It is important to note, however, that Rhômê was not a personification for the city of Rome. She was not a deity representative of the city. Rhômê was

⁸⁹ Alföldi believed Trojan ancestry was not simply a Greek invention but pre-existed in Italy (1952, 55ff.).

⁹⁰ Cyrene: Pind. Pyth 9. Smyrna: Strab. 14.1.4. There are also several early illustrations in the Hesiodic Catalogues which show an existing treatment of eponyms and their genealogical aspects in the belief of many natures and cultures.

⁹¹ Alföldi assigns an early Roman coin depicting a female head in Phrygian helm and a contemporary Locrian coin with a woman seated with sword and shield (but without Phrygian helmet) and crowned by Pistis as the Trojan Rhômê. S. Weinstock believes that the evidence for such an attribution is not strong enough; it is more natural to assume that because Fides had become the symbol of the protective power of Rome the Locrians expressed their gratitude to Rome by issuing their coin, and Agathocles dated her cult back to the time of Rhômê. As to the coins of Rome, Rhômê as a Trojan slave or wife and mother could not wear a helmet which belongs to a fighting woman like an Amazon, or a queen, or a goddess.

⁹² Perret 1971, 49-50. Cf. Toohey 1984, 9-12, who views Rome's adoption of the Trojan legend as Hellenophobia.

⁹³ Paus. 1.12.1. See also Galinsky 1969, 96-97; Alföldi 1956, 14 and 28 ff.; ERC III, 137.

a relatively unknown figure in Roman literary tradition, who conveniently appears in the Greek narrative to explain Rome's naming convention. She has no role whatsoever in any other telling of Aeneas' or any other adventures. This Rhômê does not, unlike the later 'Roma', represent the Roman state as a collective.⁹⁴ It shows an organic appearance of Roma as the Greeks saw her – as the eponymous founder of Rome. It is organic, she comes and goes depending on Roman relations with their neighbours, and her origin alters in different ways to reflect this. However, just because Rhômê is not a personification does not mean that she did not influence later personifications of Roma. The figure of Rhômê provides an explanation for why the Greeks would later develop and accept a cult to the deity of Roma. They formulated a figure to understand and link Rome's origin to their own as they attempted to understand their relationship in conjunction with Rome. The Rhômê/Trojan legend was one such method utilized to achieve this.

2.2 Θεά Ρώμη and the Spread of Rome in the East

The earliest known cult to Roma was established with the dedication of a temple to Roma at Smyrna in c. 195 BCE.⁹⁵ The temple likely marked Rome's successful alliance with Smyrna against Antiochus III of the Seleucid Empire.⁹⁶ The cult appears to have spread elsewhere in the second half of the century and a number of Hellenistic states embraced worship of Roma. Games and sacrifices were instituted at Delphi in c. 189 BCE and similar honours were offered at Athens in c. 184 BCE.⁹⁷ Several festivals also appear to have been organized in her honour.⁹⁸

Cult to Roma was used as a tool for dealing with the Roman state by not only hailing the growing western power, but also conducting official worship in its honour. Such cult clearly attracted the attention of Greek elites as they endeavoured to come to terms with Roman power and figures like Roma were utilised as conduits for engaging Rome. The spread and acceptance of these cults were aided by their apparent conformity with certain aspects of Hellenistic ruler

⁹⁴ Mellor 1991, 955-956 believes that although Rhômê was mortal, that the Greeks began to use her as an early personification of the city; however, Rhômê's role within the story of Rome's founding is so minor and unreported that this is unlikely. Additionally, the first report of Greek cult to Roma isn't until 195 BCE, which depending on whether Hellanicus or Callias is accepted as the earliest retelling of Rhômê and the founding of Rome is far too removed to be likely.

⁹⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 4.56.1.

⁹⁶ Mellor 1975, 14-16; Fayer 1976, 31-32.

⁹⁷ Delphi: RDGE 38.6-7; Athens: Traill 1971, 308, 311-312.

⁹⁸ Festival dating: Gruen 1984, 178n.

cult, modelled on that granted to the Hellenistic kings and the Olympian gods.⁹⁹ However, whilst it is true that there are many common characteristics of the ruler cult in the Hellenistic and the Roman periods, these cults were not uniform institutions. Only the isolation of ruler cults from their contemporary contexts adds any credibility to this view. Despite their apparent similarities, ruler cults differed in respect to their context and purpose.

I The Relation of Roma Cult to Hellenistic Ruler Cult

Cults of the ruler were not new to the Greeks in the Hellenistic period. The origins of ruler cult go back at least to the divine honours paid to Antigonus and Demetrius by Athens in c. 307 BCE.¹⁰⁰ Alexander the Great's successors fought for dominance over his fractured empire after his death in 329 BCE. They relied on their prominence, tied in part to their relationship with Alexander, and the military power provided by their soldiers.¹⁰¹ Loyalty was now given to an individual of power, rather than to a city or state. Ruler cult, established by the Hellenistic cities, was intended to honour the ruler, either in gratitude for political benefactions, or for diplomatic reasons. The establishment of ruler cult was not an indication of subjugation, but the city's attempt at diplomatically dealing with a foreign power.¹⁰² For example, Erythrae, a Greek city in Asia Minor, celebrated cults to several foreign powers, influenced by its position on the fringe of several different power blocks.¹⁰³

Ruler cult seems to have been based on pre-existing Greek heroic (saviour) and divine honours. Civic worship of this kind was paid to an individual on account of their accomplishments and what they could offer, and not for their capacity as a ruler.¹⁰⁴ For many 'free' cities coming to terms with the rulership of a king, the cults of heroes and gods were two models available to them for honouring the power that the city depended on.¹⁰⁵ The introduction of divine honours was no more than grade inflation to distinguish the recipient from the more commonly used

⁹⁹ Features of Roma cult: Mellor 1975, 135-80; Price 1984, 23-77 provides background on the introduction of ruler cult and the system of exchange between the Greeks and the Romans.

¹⁰⁰ Diod. Sic. 20.46.2; Plut. *Demetr.* 10.3-4.

¹⁰¹ Emergence of the Hellenistic kingdoms: Adams 2006, 28-51.

¹⁰² Ruler cult in Macedonia pre and post Alexander were rare. These cities possessed a different structure to the Greek cities with no civic self-government or autonomous local citizenship. The lack of established independent civic traditions combined with the tradition of accepted monarchy in Macedonia explains the absence of ruler cult within Macedonia. See Price 1984, 26-27.

¹⁰³ At Erythrae there were cults to Alexander the Great, Antiochus I of Syria, the king of Pergamum, and Roma. See LSAM 26 = I. Erythrae 207; Varinlioglu 1980, 149-156; Price 1984, 40.

¹⁰⁴ Wilcken, 1938, 10-13 and 305-308.

¹⁰⁵ On the establishment of a 'cult of Alexander': Adams 2006, 32-35.

saviour honours.¹⁰⁶ This resulted in a form of civic worship and central worship with official priesthoods and various other organisations, both of which increased in prominence as powerful rulers established themselves and their families.

Over time, power of the individual replaced the civic state as the main form of political power.¹⁰⁷ The numerous foundations honouring Alexander the Great's successors adopted many of the features of heroic and divine cult, such as priesthoods and epithets, attributable to saviour cults. The variations and contradictions between these cults are attributable to local independence.¹⁰⁸ The according of divine honours and apotheosis of the venerated ruler also aided in mitigating the political instability within dynastic successions by introducing a theoretical and propagandistic position of power. This in turn linked the rulership of the current ruler to the power of their predecessor.¹⁰⁹

Motives for the establishment of divine cult likely differed between monarchs; however, a desire to emphasize a link with the dynasty's founder, to sacralise power, and to provide a focus of loyalty on the individual was constant throughout.¹¹⁰ Interestingly, people do not seem to have appealed to the deceased ruler's protection. This indicates that these cults and honours were politically driven.¹¹¹ Greek cities, long accustomed to rendering official respect to Hellenistic kings, quite easily adopted the same demeanour toward Rome. Rome was not like other Mediterranean powers; political roles within Rome were temporary and generally represented by a collective. Dedicating cult to Roma, or even the Demos of the Romans, aided the Greeks in maintaining cult to Rome with a figure not only representative of the Roman collective, but also a figure who would not end their term of office or die.

II Common Epithets of Roma and Hellenistic Ruler Cult

Roma's acknowledged godhood in the Greek east further sets Roma apart from ruler cult. *Isotheoi timai* (divine-like honours) were equal to those bestowed upon the gods; however, the

¹⁰⁶ Price 1984, 24.

¹⁰⁷ Power in the Greek world has previously revolved around the Greek Polis and not the individual: Shipley and Hansen 2006, 60, 62-64; Dahmen 2007, 3-4; Habicht 1970, 17-28, 254 ff.; Badian 1981, 48-63. Heyman 2007, 65.

¹⁰⁸ Habicht 1970, 37ff.

¹⁰⁹ Price 1984, 32-39; Fishwick 1987, 11.

¹¹⁰ Fishwick 1987, 13.

¹¹¹ Price 1984, 34-37.

phrase itself implies that whilst the honours are alike, the recipient was not a god.¹¹² The power to offer protection was an essential feature of the king's mortal divinity and explains why, especially in the early stages of Hellenistic ruler cult, it was not the ruler who declared his/her own divinity. Tacitus identified the practice as *Graeca adulatio* (Greek flattery). *Adulatio* is often considered to have been used in scorn. However, Tacitus does not appear to criticize the phenomenon of divine honours granted to the ruler, but more the granting of divine honours to the unworthy.¹¹³ Tacitus' statement shows that this process of dedicating ruler cult was indicative of diplomacy.

Mellor argues for Roma's position as a goddess to the Greeks based on the epithets and cult she received.¹¹⁴ The epithets accorded to Roma were common to ruler cult; deified Hellenistic rulers had no set epithets and many rulers shared the same epithets. These epithets included *theos* (god), *soter* (saviour), *euergetes* (benefactor), *epiphanes* (remarkable), *nikephoros* (bringer of victory), *hegemon* (leader), *archegetes* (first leader), *aenaos* (everlasting) and *sebastos* (venerable).¹¹⁵ These same epithets were also commonly used by saviour cults prior to the Hellenistic period, and were also later applied to Jesus in the New Testament.¹¹⁶ These were amongst the most commonly used epithets in Hellenistic religion, further indicating that cult to Roma was nothing new or noteworthy. The context of these Greek courtesies is clear enough.

Such epithets, whilst explicitly revealing Roma's divine position, also reveal how the Greeks conceived of Roma and her cult. It seems to have been the king's patronage and position of immense power that placed him onto a similar level to the gods, and the same can be applied to Roma.¹¹⁷ However, whether Roma was seen by the Greeks and Romans as a goddess or not is irrelevant. Graeco-Roman paganism favoured exterior action over interior dogmatic belief and saw divinity as relative rather than as absolute. Pagan divine cult, and this is especially

¹¹² ἴσο-θεός, ὅν – equal to the gods, godlike. The attribute *theos* (god) was usually given only posthumously. E.g. OGIS 246; Price 1985, 48-49.

¹¹³ Tacitus' reference to the *graeca adulatio* (greek adulation or flattery) of benefactor-cult was set within the Graeco-Eastern context of the Roman civil war and referred to Theophanes of Mytilene, whose god-like honours were occasioned by no merit other than his friendship and influence with Pompey (Tac. *Ann.* 6.8: cited and explicated in Gradel 2002, 8)

¹¹⁴ Θεός; Mellor 1975, 112; Σωτήρ: *ibid.* 112-113; Εὐεργέτης: *ibid.* 113-114; Ἐπιφανής: *ibid.* 114-115; Νικηφόρος: *ibid.* 115-116; ἡγεμών: *ibid.* 116-117; Ἀρχηγέτης: *ibid.* 117; Αἰέναιος: *ibid.* 117; Σεβαστός: *ibid.* 118; Πόλις: *ibid.* 118-119; Βασιλεύς: *ibid.* 119.

¹¹⁵ Heroic versus divine: Price 1984, 24, 32-34, 165-7.

¹¹⁶ Price 1980, 33; Mellor 1975, 117; Porter and Pitts 2013, 293-295

¹¹⁷ Joint dedications to gods and kings was not uncommon: OGIS 17; SEG 37.612; 39.1232

relevant to the cult to Roma, was a system of mutual obligation in which individuals of lesser power celebrated entities of superior power. Divine honours, whether accorded to men, gods, or other entities, stood at the apex of a sliding scale of honorific activities.¹¹⁸ It was merely a variation of pre-existing secular accolades.

III Ῥωμαῖοι Εὐεργέται – Romaiοι Euergetai

The main epithet Roma and the Romans shared with Hellenistic ruler cult is *euergetes*, which was often used as an epithet within cults of the ruler established by individual cities rather than centrally organised dynasties.¹¹⁹ A common inscription which often appears alongside locations with cult to Roma is Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κοῖνοι εὐεργέται (the Romans as common benefactor).¹²⁰ The use of the title Ῥωμαῖοι εὐεργέται, which first appears in 182 BCE, after the defeats of Philip V and Antiochus III by the Romans, became widespread after the battle of Pydna in 168 BCE. The introduction of this cult is considered an act by which the Greeks expressed deference to Rome and the Greek position as beneficiary. This highlights Rome's role as a common benefactor and draws attention to any benefits that Rome may have conferred on the city.¹²¹ Roma is also found alongside the epithet *Euergetes* at Delos, Assos, Stratonicea and in Lycia. This continued to be in use through the whole of the first century BCE until the time of Augustus, when the emperor is referred to as the benefactor of all.

The conception of the Romans as benefactors was common among the Greeks. However, unlike the Greek kings, the Romans did not have the same need to promote Greek culture or to prove that they were Greeks to maintain their position. Rome was usurping power in the east. Hellenistic ruler cults were the product of royal intervention in Greek cities and were reciprocated by local benefaction.¹²² These honorific cults were city cults and organised by the provincial or city assembly. These assemblies were to an extent the product of Roman rule and

¹¹⁸ Gradel 2002, 25-26.

¹¹⁹ Erskine 1990, 70-72.

¹²⁰ “the three words αὐτονομία, δημοκρατία, or ἐλευθερία, used interchangeably or in combination, designate fully free government: they are used by truly independent states”; that “such phrases as ‘free and exempt from tribute,’ ‘free and exempt from garrisons’ spell privileges out, rather than imply that a city could be free, yet pay tribute”; and “that freedom and exemption from tribute are (or should be) synonymous emerges from a comparison of the Livian and the Polybian accounts of the Roman settlement of Asia Minor in 188: Dmitriev 2011, 232 with reference to Liv. 37.56.4–6 and Polyb. 21.24.6–9, 21.45.2–3

¹²¹ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κοῖνοι εὐεργέται is a common honorific phrase, however, in many examples Rome is not the subject, but is in some way relevant to the person (ordinarily Greek) being honoured. This would change in the last half of the first century BCE. See Erskine 1990, 76-87.

¹²² Price 1984, 56.

had the important task of representing local interests to Rome.¹²³ This mostly occurred in honorific decrees where the citizen was honoured because he obtained some benefit from the Romans for his city, defining local honour in relation to Roman power, and not simply as a benefactor.

2.3 Cults to Roman Power

Beyond tradition, power played an important role in Graeco-Romano paganism in according divine worship. Religion and politics were linked, and the question as to whether a figure was a god or not was unimportant. In a world with an infinite number of gods, divinity was not in itself an interesting characteristic to worshippers. Worshippers could only ever cultivate a modest number of gods amongst the vast assortment of divinities. It was the god's power and its relevance to worshippers which determined which deities would be cultivated and worshiped, not their presumed divinity or humanity. The same can be applied to Hellenistic ruler cult and the later cults accorded towards representatives of Rome. Simply identifying cult to Rome as a continuation of Hellenistic ruler cult detracts from how Roman power spread throughout the Greek east. Whilst the term 'ruler cult' does describe the eventual situation between Rome and its Greek allies as one of ruler and client, it hides the important underlying concepts of Greek *pistis* (Roman *fides*) and Greek freedom.¹²⁴ It was these concepts which made the east so receptive to the establishment of cult to the Roman state.

Roma was not the only representation of Rome to receive honorary cult. The standard picture of the formation of the imperial cult in the Greek world presents the Greeks as the sole initiators. Cities decided to establish honorific cults with an eye to gain political advantage. An initiative from Rome was not required, only modification and adjustment.¹²⁵ It was alongside Roman intervention in the east in the late third/early second centuries BCE that representatives of Roman power, particularly holders of *imperium*, began to receive treatment similar to Hellenistic ruler cult and be accorded altars, temples, sacrifices, priests and games - especially in the Greek cities of Asia Minor.¹²⁶ When the Romans first entered the eastern Mediterranean,

¹²³ Theophanes is honoured by the Mytilenians because he recovered from the Romans the common benefactors of the city, their territory and their ancestral freedom (RKE 14). Embassies to Rome perhaps also indicates that Rome did confer some benefits on the city (RKE 2, 10, 11). See also Mellor 1975, 36-9 on the cult of Roma and Augustus at Pergamum.

¹²⁴ Dmitriev 2011, 237ff.

¹²⁵ Bowersock 1965, 121

¹²⁶ Fischwick 1987, 46ff. cf. Suet. *Aug.* 52.1

the custom of paying *isotheoi timai* (divine-like honours) as an expression of homage and gratitude for services rendered had long been in place.¹²⁷ This was simply turned around and applied to the Romans.

Hellenistic ruler cult served as the basis of, and justification for, much of the new political order. Considering divine honours were a conventional expression of gratitude to those seen as deliverers, the worship of powerful Romans might be seen formally as a continuation of the cult of the *euergetes* (benefactor). There has been criticism of this account which has pointed to the importance of Roman interest and involvement in the Greek cults of the east. Greek diplomatic advances to Rome with offer of cult were likely seen by the Romans as a ploy to gain favour.¹²⁸ In the later imperial period, the emperor declining offers of Greek cult did not discourage the Greeks, indicating that there were no overt Roman pressures per se on the development of cult directed towards the emperor and the Roman state.¹²⁹

Cult towards Rome is conceivable in diplomatic contexts due to its intrinsic significance to the Greeks. Diplomatic interaction between the Greeks and Rome during the imperial period over the establishment of cult also shows that the formation of cult as a diplomatic tool was not as one sided as it might at first seem. In the imperial period, individual cities often chose to inform the emperor of their proposals for a cult.¹³⁰ It is interesting identifying whom the Greeks saw as the source of power in Rome. In the Republican period the recipient of Greek cult seems to have been interchangeable between the governor/liberator at the time and personified representations of the city, for example Roma or the Genius of Rome.¹³¹ Later cult in the imperial period seems to have focused more on the senate and the emperor himself, rather than a personification representative of the state.¹³² By this time, worship of the emperor had become normalised to Roman understanding. It is important to note that the notification of cult to Hellenistic kings was much less regulated.¹³³ Even though Roman involvement in the

¹²⁷ *ibid.*

¹²⁸ Offers of cult were often made in association with requests concerning privileges or other matters: Millar 1977, 420-34.

¹²⁹ Price 1984, 65ff.

¹³⁰ Cult to Augustus communicated via embassy by Sardis; Mytilenean decision to establish cult early in the reign of Augustus was presented to the emperor by an embassy; the Samians also made a decree and notified the emperor of the celebration of imperial victories and accessions (Millar 1977, 410-420)

¹³¹ Fears 1978, 460 proposes that the Genius Publicus had been worshipped as part of state cult since 218/17 BCE. See also Fears 1978, *Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ Ο ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ Genius Populi Romani*.

¹³² Price, 1985, 69.

¹³³ *ibid.* 73-74.

establishment of cult directed towards Rome and its figures of power is unclear, what is certain is that the Greeks used figures and Roman officials as representative of the Roman state as a base for their diplomatic dialogue with Rome.¹³⁴ These ‘Roman’ figures were multifarious; however, they did represent the Roman state, and Tacitus’ *Graeca Adulatio* would not have been so apparent to the Romans if the figures were not recognisable.

I Hellenistic Cult to Roman Officials

Contrary to Mellor’s observation that Roma was established by the Greek cities as their main conduit of political diplomacy with Rome, cult to the Roman state appears to have been multifarious and utilised various figures and leaders of Rome to represent Roman power in the east. According to Plutarch, the Roman general Titus Quinctius Flamininus (c. 229 – 174 BCE) was the first Roman to receive permanent cult in the east. He was given divine honours jointly alongside a representation of the Roman state (possibly the Goddess Roma, or the city of Rome itself) for his military achievements and liberation of Greece on behalf of the Greek allies.

*And the Roman faith (pistis) we revere, which we have solemnly vowed to cherish;
sing, then, ye maidens, to great Zeus, to Roma, to Titus, and to the Roman faith:
hail, Paean Apollo! hail, Titus our saviour (soter)!¹³⁵*

Plut. *Flam.* 16.4

The above hymn refers to the return of Greek freedoms by the Romans after the defeat of Philip V and Macedonia in c. 197 BCE.¹³⁶ A mark of honorific texts is that the honoured appears in the accusative as the object of the transaction. The politics of honouring follows a hierarchy with the most important figure usually placed first and then followed in descending order. In the hymn, the *Pistis* (not to be confused with Roman *fides*) of the Romans is the first to appear, followed by Zeus, Roma, and finally by Titus Flamininus, who is referred to as *soter* (saviour).¹³⁷ This form of inter-relationship relating to the return of Greek liberties between Rome and individual Greek cities would last for several centuries and served as the foundation

¹³⁴ Mellor 1975, 27-110.

¹³⁵ πίστιν δὲ Ῥωμαίων σέβομεν, τὰν μεγαλευκτοτάταν ὄρκους φυλάσσειν: μέλπετε κοῦραι, Ζῆνα μέγαν Ῥώμαν τε Τίτον θ’ ἅμα Ῥωμαίων τε πίστιν ἡῖε Παιάν, ᾧ Τίτε σῶτερ.

¹³⁶ The declaration in Polyb. 18.46.5; Liv. 33.32.5; Plut. *Flam.* 10.4; App. *Mac.* 9.4; Val. Max. 4.8.5. The *senatus consultum*: Polyb. 18.46.15; Liv. 33.33.7.

¹³⁷ *Deditio* has been one of the most debated topics in Roman republican foreign politics, largely in connection with the following three closely interwoven problems: (1) the relationship between Latin *fides* and Greek *pistis*; (2) whether the meaning of *fides* in the expression *deditio in fidem* changed over time; and (3) the relationship between *deditio* and *deditio in fidem*. For full discussion, see Dmitriev 2011, 237-277. See also, Calderone 1964, 37-51, 61-84; Gruen 1982 50-68.

for a new political order, in which Roman *pistis* would guarantee Greek freedom and rights in return for loyalty.¹³⁸ Surrendering into the Roman trust (*fides*) began to be reciprocated by a Roman pledge to preserve the status of individual Greek cities, provided they remained loyal to Rome. The status and freedom of Greek cities depended on their ‘good faith’ in Rome. ‘Good faith’ was pledged by both sides, constituting a bond of reciprocal obligations. This formed a network of patron-client relationships between Rome and individual Greek cities and laid the foundation of the *Pax Romana* (Roman peace) in the second century BCE.¹³⁹

The Greek practice of reciprocal obligation, usually a Greek form of soft surrender, established a moral bond between the two involved parties, without the need to assume the form of a legally binding agreement. The moral obligation of the city that had surrendered came in return for benevolent treatment, including the protection of the city’s ‘freedom’ and other rights and benefits.¹⁴⁰ This also seems to have been the case for those cities bordering the powerful spheres of influence, such as Erythrae, which established a bond in order to guarantee their current position of independence. This could of course change - Flamininus’s declaration led to a change of political regime, which was introduced in many Greek communities.¹⁴¹

Adapting the Greek approach, which treated the city’s ‘freedom’ as a composite of several rights, gave the Romans a possibility of establishing and controlling the status of cities in a more refined way. Such rights could be given or withdrawn on an individual basis. Roman ‘freedom’ likely meant the removal of pro-Macedonian factions in favour of those in support of the Roman cause. Flamininus’s letter to the city of Chyretiae shows that the status and the rights of this city were determined by Flamininus and the Roman people.¹⁴² This formula can probably be traced to the original declaration of Greek freedom by Flamininus. The declaration was made on behalf of the senate and Flamininus, but the *senatus consultum* (decree of the senate) was expected to express the will of the Roman people.¹⁴³ It was then repeated in his

¹³⁸ The declaration of Flamininus (based on the *senatus consultum*) had already proclaimed the “freedom” of the Greeks, in addition to other rights they received from Rome, such as freedom from being garrisoned, freedom from taxes, and freedom to use ancestral laws. This suggests that Flamininus’s declaration was modelled on earlier Greek pronouncements of Greek freedom (Dmitriev 2011, 228-230).

¹³⁹ The Greek slogan of freedom and early Roman politics in Greece shows that the Romans adopted and adapted Greeks’ understanding and use of the slogans, manipulating them to weaken opponents, justifying wars of “liberation,” and intervene in individual poleis as desired (Dmitriev 2011, 228ff.)

¹⁴⁰ Gruen 1984, 22n.

¹⁴¹ Liv. 34.48.2.

¹⁴² *IGSyll³* Sherk, *Documents*, no. 33.

¹⁴³ Dmitriev 2011, 199.

letters to individual cities and in their honorific decrees to him. It would not be a stretch to suggest that in the absence of formal agreements between Rome and individual Greek cities, their relations were founded on such letters and on honorific decrees, like those for Flamininus, which were set up by numerous Greek cities. The Roman *Pistis* (fides), therefore, became the basis of Greek freedom – that is a mutual understanding of cooperation and respect. Cult to Flamininus allegedly continued into Plutarch’s time, with Titus receiving worship alongside Zeus, Roma, the *Pistis* of the Romans and Apollo.¹⁴⁴ Similar cults are recorded at Corinth, Argos, and Gytheum.¹⁴⁵ Although men like Titus Flamininus were voted divine honours, the Greeks must have been aware that these offices changed regularly, and that the Roman senate controlled Roman foreign policy. Therefore, the Greeks accorded honours to figures such as Roma and the Roman Demos, abstract concepts untethered from mortality. Instead of voting cult to an official who could fall out of favour or lose office, they transferred these honours to a concept representative of the Roman state and people as a whole.

II The Roman Demos

Aside from Roman officials, Roma was not the only personification used by the Greeks to represent Rome, and some Greek cities gave cult to the Roman Demos instead. Mellor’s research focuses strongly on the pursuit for the goddess Roma in the east.¹⁴⁶ As a result, he misses a large proponent of what cult to the Roman state was: multifarious. Mellor argues and then assumes that many of the references to ancient statues to the *Demos* of the Romans, in fact, indicate the likeness of the Goddess Roma.¹⁴⁷ Mellor’s only evidence for his view is the foundation of Vibius Salutaris at Ephesus, where the same statue is referred to as of Rome and also of the Roman Demos.¹⁴⁸ However, there is no indication that a statue of the Roman Demos could not be referred to as of Rome – for it is literally depicting just that. Other references to this foundation also mention a set of three statues: the senate, the equestrian order, and the people.¹⁴⁹ This implies that there was a statue of the Demos.¹⁵⁰ Mellor has collected many

¹⁴⁴ Plut. *Flam.* 16.3-4.

¹⁴⁵ Dmitriev 2011, 275.

¹⁴⁶ Mellor 1969; 1975; 1971.

¹⁴⁷ Mellor’s hypothesis is that the Demos of the Romans, mentioned as the object of cult in many inscriptions, is no genuine divinity and has no divine status independent of Roma. Statues said to be of the Roman Demos “must be statues of the goddess Roma...since only Roma was a goddess (1975, 25-26).

¹⁴⁸ Mellor 1975, 152. Cf. statue base in the British Museum: 1868,0620.56; 2013,5017.29.

¹⁴⁹ Jones 1977, 79.

¹⁵⁰ A coin in the British Museum, BMC 15, depicts the Roman Demos with the inscription ΔΗΜΟC ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ. The figure is youthful and togate and clearly male.

references to the cult of the Roman Demos, not all mentioning Roma.¹⁵¹ This implies that the Roman Demos was as accepted as Roma as a means of according honour to Rome.

The statues Mellor identifies as Roma are identified as the Roman Demos in Greek testimony. ΔΗΜΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ is of course masculine in case and not feminine, indicating a male subject. Mellor believes this is a textual mistake and bases his attribution on the statue base, which identifies the statue as *urbs Romana* (Roman city) and ἡγεμὼν Ρώμῃ (hegemon Rome).¹⁵² However, such an explanation is unlikely. Numismatic evidence is clear that in the Greek world the Roman *Demos* was represented as a male in a toga, or with a cornucopia, like that of the Genius Populi Romani, and inscribed ΔΗΜΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ (Roman Demos).¹⁵³ Furthermore, the divine power of the collective people (like that of the Greek *demos* of the Romans) was worshipped in the city of Rome in the cult of Genius Publicus.¹⁵⁴ Together with the ruler cult, the worship of the personified city or people represented a religious response to a transformation in social and political values and institutions: Rome's 'liberation' of the Greek east. The Roman demos, like that of Roma, represented a figure that both parties could recognize.¹⁵⁵

III Personification of Roma

Roma clearly represented and personified Rome. Personification was frequently used by the Greeks to honour the governments of democratic cities, which may have been deified and honoured with cults and festivals as democratic analogues to the ruler cult of the Hellenistic kingdoms.¹⁵⁶ Personification can be found in literature, art and cult from the Archaic period onwards; with the development of the art of allegory in the Hellenistic period, they came to acquire more 'intellectual' overtones. The use of allegory as an interpretive tool then enabled personifications to survive the advent of Christianity, to remain familiar figures in the art and literature of late antiquity and beyond.

When Cicero was writing in the first century BCE, he found it hard to believe that personified allegorical ideas should hold any divine power.¹⁵⁷ However, it does seem that in ancient Greece

¹⁵¹ Mellor 1975.

¹⁵² *ibid.* 25-26, 152-53.

¹⁵³ See note 150. Cf. Fears 1978, *O ΔΗΜΟΣ O ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ Genius Populi Romani*, 279-280.

¹⁵⁴ *ibid.* 275ff. Fears makes a case that the Roman Demos is the equivalent of the Genius Publicus.

¹⁵⁵ See also Erskine 1997, 25-37.

¹⁵⁶ Webster 1954, 10.; Nilsson 1961, 145.

¹⁵⁷ *Cic.Nat. D.* 3.24.61.

and Rome, a number of personifications did receive cult and worship.¹⁵⁸ Evidence relating to cult is the best evidence we have to indicate people believed in the divine powers of personification.¹⁵⁹ However, personification varied depending on the medium under consideration. Within literature, it is difficult to distinguish between animate and inanimate. Literary personification, at its simplest, is when the entity being personified is quantified by a verb or adjective denoting human action.¹⁶⁰

Within the visual arts, the artist must either represent an abstract in human incarnation, or the idea must be expressed without recourse to anthropomorphism at all. However, the largest problem involving the visual arts is recognising the personification rather than the question of personification.¹⁶¹ Why are most personifications female? This is not necessarily the case; however, city personifications were perhaps depicted as women. Female personification was likely used for reasons of grammatical gender. In many Indo-European languages, the word for city is usually feminine. Home is also gendered feminine and was considered the domain of women. Thus, women represented the hearth and home; and likewise, the personification of the city represented hearth and home.

IV Cult and Divinity

When discussing Roma, it is important to define the capacity in which she served, and how she was received. Already, it has been established that Roma received worship in the Greek east, and it is argued by Mellor it was the Greeks who made Roma a goddess. In addition, Badian has stressed that the Roman people knew no such goddess.¹⁶² I believe this is an interesting consideration; did the Romans know such a goddess? As proposed by Price, classical antiquity had no generally accepted definition of what a god was in absolute terms, or what it took to become one. Price takes this ambiguity as enabling worship of the emperor in the imperial cult, however, there is no evidence that this was ever relevant to cult practise.¹⁶³

Most gods appear to have never received worship by the Roman state. Our imagined distinction between religion and politics is not relevant in the pagan Graeco-Romano context, and pagan

¹⁵⁸ Mellor 1975, 22-110. Contra Mellor: Fears 1978, *Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ Ο ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ Genius Populi Romani*.

¹⁵⁹ Stafford 2002, 2.

¹⁶⁰ *ibid.* 9.

¹⁶¹ *ibid.* 14.

¹⁶² Badian 1995, 2.

¹⁶³ Price 1984, 247-248; Gradel 2002, 26 and 28-30.

antiquity did not distinguish between worship and honours. Interestingly, many of the honours received by Roman attributes (divine qualities) received worship in Rome due to the qualities they represented being considered important attributes for the Roman statesman and the Romans themselves.¹⁶⁴ Furthermore, there were many more qualities that, whilst receiving personification, did not necessarily receive cult on a state level, but can sometimes be found to have received worship at a private level instead.¹⁶⁵ This of course shows that just because a quality did not receive public cult, it does not mean that it was not considered divine in some way.

It is a common claim that divine honours to a Roman citizen conflicted with the traditional Roman mentality, and that the phenomenon was fundamentally an import from the Greek world.¹⁶⁶ This view is, however, as stated by Gradel, unfounded. Divine honours were not concerned with the nature of the being worshipped, but merely expressed superhuman status and power in relation to his/her worshippers.¹⁶⁷ If this is applied to the figure of Roma, the physical representation and embodiment of Rome as a state, then the appellation of a cult dedicated to Roma and divine worship are quite understandable. Within this context, there is also no need for the Romans to worship themselves. This of course does not preclude Roma from holding divinity and being seen in such a light by the Romans. In fact, Roman embracement of the figure, particularly under Augustus, reveals a familiarity with the figure, who naturally, even in the Roman context, represents a union between the city and state, and Augustus, the first citizen himself.

2.4 The Imperial Cult

Imperial cult was largely the creation of the Greeks in response to Greek *pistis* and Roman freedom. However, in contrast, the imperial image itself was in some sense the product of Rome. In the imperial period, standardized types were setup throughout the empire, and I see no reason why this would be any different to the proliferation of the image of Roma. The imagery had a Greek origin but was largely the product of Rome. This is perhaps a hangover from earlier Roman coinage, which largely remained the same.

¹⁶⁴ Clark 2007, 29-72.

¹⁶⁵ Gradel 2002, 8-13, 111-12, 129, 153-5, 240.

¹⁶⁶ Garnsey and Saller 1987, 164ff. Galsterer 1990, 16.

¹⁶⁷ Gradel 2002, 30.

The usual assumption on the Greek initiative in the establishment of a cult to Roma fails to account for Roman intervention, both in the provinces and in Rome. It also fails to allow for the constant and covert pressure exercised by Rome.¹⁶⁸ However, this naturally is accompanied by the danger of either under-estimating or over-estimating Roman pressures and controls. Of course, in this instance the minting of coinage and most certainly the travel of coinage was a form of Roman soft power. The pressure to acknowledge Roman power would have generally accompanied the journey of Roman coinage, which most often depicted Roma. Travel and trade did exist between Rome and Greece, which necessitated people coming into contact for exchange. Whilst Roman coin hoard evidence in Greece is lacking, it is important to remember that currency exchanges did exist, and likely people sold precious metals back to the local mint.¹⁶⁹ Roman coinage did not truly usurp Greek coinage until the third century CE. During the imperial period, almost all imperial statues in the Greek world were erected by the Greeks themselves. For example, only three of the imperial statues at Ephesus were erected by Roman officials; the rest were local.¹⁷⁰ In fact, Roman officials are rarely recorded as having assisted in the process.¹⁷¹ Despite this, for such dedications to interact with Rome, the object of the cult required awareness and recognition of both parties to be successful.

Augustus's worship alongside Roma show that Augustus had clearly come to represent Rome. Apart from the occasional intrusion of a magistrate's name on coinage or in dedications, there is very little remaining to indicate the subject status of cities under the Roman Republic.¹⁷² All this changed under Augustus. During Augustus' reign, more than two hundred cities issued the imperial portrait, indicating the subject status of the cities to Rome and Augustus.¹⁷³ Such change reflects a dramatic change in the reality of power in both Rome and the Mediterranean. This change in power can be marked by the transfer of cult to Roma to one of both Augustus and Roma, with Roma later being dropped. The emperor had adopted the qualities represented by Roma.

Previous attempts at worship or honours directed at Rome by the Greeks had either been directed at magistrates, Roma or the Roman Demos, so the proliferation of the imperial portrait

¹⁶⁸ Price 1984, 173-6.

¹⁶⁹ Howgego 1995, 91-95, 98-100.

¹⁷⁰ I. Ephesos II, 251-304 v. 1500-5

¹⁷¹ Arrian as governor of Cappadocia was shocked to discover that a statue of Hadrian was neither a good likeness or attractive and asked for the emperor to provide another one: Arr. *Perip. M. Eux.* I. 3n. 67.

¹⁷² Burnett 2011, 1-30.

¹⁷³ *ibid.*

and the joint cult to Augustus and Roma was a complete turnaround. Some cities minted an extensive range of coins depicting the imperial family and even some provincial governors.¹⁷⁴ This practise did not outlive Claudius and reflects the rush to deal with the change in the power structure. This practise was not a survival from the Republic, but something new. Those in Rome's territories were no longer certain on how to honour Rome. Power had clearly transferred from Rome as a democratic unit, to the individual (Augustus). According to Price, the greater consolidation of cults in the imperial period was part of a more extensive change in the relationship between honours and the ruler.¹⁷⁵

Augustus and Roma were the recipients of numerous civic cults of Asia Minor and Bithynia in c. 29 BCE, with the earliest cults being dated to Asia Minor.¹⁷⁶ The replacement of piecemeal and isolated cults by a new dynasty and organisation of cults helped to strengthen the idea that the cults themselves had real constitutive power. In the third century BCE, although divine honours were accoladed to Hellenistic rulers, no explicit statement was made about the ruler's divine status.¹⁷⁷ In the second century BCE, these latent ideas were elaborated and developed the idea that the accolade of divine-like honours deified a person. This most certainly seems to have been the case with Augustus. The imperial cult succeeded brilliantly in solving the problem of Augustus' charismatic authority. Charismatic authority is naturally unstable and may not last the lifetime of its possessor and certainly could not be transmitted to his successor.¹⁷⁸ Cult and ritual served to objectify and institutionalise this unstable form of charisma. The outburst of cults to Augustus ensured the perpetuation of this charismatic authority.

Chapter Overview

This chapter has further examined the origins of Roma within the Greek east. Her first iteration is purely that of an eponymous figure to explain the naming of the city Rome. Initially, eponymous figures for Rome were utilised by Greek writers to link Rome into an overall history of the Mediterranean. Such a narrative, particularly in regard to the Italian and Sicilian peoples, often involved Trojan ancestry, identifying the peoples of Italy and Sicily as

¹⁷⁴ Price 1984, 53-68.

¹⁷⁵ Price 1984, 56.

¹⁷⁶ Habicht 1973, 55-64.

¹⁷⁷ Habicht 1973, 171 – 9.

¹⁷⁸ On charismatic rulership, see: Price 1987, 58ff.

descendants of Trojan refugees. Rome's heritage was tied to the Trojans and Greeks, depending on whether it was beneficial to do so, and foundation myths would constantly change to represent current Roman relations with their Etruscan and Greek neighbours.

Eponymous use of a Roma-like figure representative of the city's naming and foundation story date back to the fifth century BCE. This figure, named Rhômê, was introduced to pre-existing 'Trojan' legend involving the figure of the Trojan hero Aeneas and his adventures to Italy; however, Rhômê was not a part of Aeneas' retinue as long as his voyage ended anywhere other than Italy and the site of Rome. The creation of a female heroine to explain Rome's name likely resulted from a linguistic misunderstanding, mistaking the Umbrian word Ruma (flowing river), which likely identified the location of Rome by the Tiber, for Rhômê, the Greek word for strength. This naming convention may have inspired the other eponymous figures believed to have founded Rome, such as Rhômê, Romus, and Rhomos. The Greek foundation myth involving Rhômê does not seem to have been taken very seriously within Rome itself, and they developed their own foundation myth involving Romulus and Remus. It is unlikely that the Trojan heroine Rhômê and the Roma on Roman coinage and in Greek cult are one and the same. It would have been difficult for Rhômê to have been replaced had her prominence ever been properly established. Whilst Rhômê was not the same as Roma on Roman coinage and in Greek cult, the figure is revealing of how Roma's personification eventually developed and provides us with an explanation for why the Greeks would later develop and accept Greek cult.

Following the development of eponymous Rhômê, Roma is not seen again in the Greek east until c. 195 BCE, when she was granted cult by the Greek city of Smyrna. Roma's cult, or cult to the Roman state, was not just a continuation of Hellenistic ruler cult. Based on the use of epithets and Greek acknowledgement of Roma's divinity as Thea Rhômê, it was more akin to saviour and divine cult.

The Roman presence within Greece was something entirely new, and whilst Greek rulers accrued honours via benefaction and a sense of greekness to the Greek cities, Rome was in a unique position in that it did not need to reciprocate. As Roman power spread throughout the Greek east, Roma became one of several conduits for dealing with Rome. Roma, who was not universally adopted throughout the Greek east, but was one such means of politically giving honour to Rome. Whilst Roman officials were granted honours and did receive cult, positions of power within Rome constantly changed hands, far more frequently than the power of a

Hellenistic monarch. Roma and other personifications of the Roman state and people provided an ongoing and unchanging object for those honorifics. It is clear that Augustus' cult was merely a continuation of pre-existing Greek systems for Roman officials and personifications representative of the Roman state.

CHAPTER III

ROMA - A FIGURE FROM THE WEST?

In Chapters I and II, the current view on the goddess Roma's origins and the spread of her cult throughout the Greek east were explained: the goddess Roma was established by the Greeks as a figure of honorific cult to politically and diplomatically communicate with the Roman state. Furthermore, Chapter II established that Roma was not the only figure utilized by the Greeks to represent Rome, but was in fact one of several, including living officials, who were utilized to honour Rome. Cult to the Roman state was multifarious and focused on several figures whom the Greeks considered representative of Rome and its Roman power. These Greek cults to Rome were dedicated to figures such as Roma, the Roman Demos and Rome's military leaders. However, cult to Rome would not have been an effective religious-diplomatic tool if unrecognizable to those Romans in positions of power. Some scholars base Roma's Greek origins on the assumption that lack of a Roman cult to the goddess Roma equates to no worship and thus no recognition.¹⁷⁹ It is argued that the goddess Roma originated as a Greek figure and migrated west into Roman religion, when in fact Graeco-Roman influence was multidirectional.¹⁸⁰

This chapter focuses on Roma as a figure of the Roman west by considering her identification and prominent position on the obverse side of Roman coinage. The coinage of the Roman Republic clearly depicted Roma before the inauguration of any Greek cult to Roma (c. 195 BCE onward). In order to establish a methodology to identify Roma, a short introduction on the establishment of Roman coinage and its Greek influence in Italy is presented. This is followed by a chronological discussion of coinage identified as depicting Roma. This will establish the numismatic features and material evidence utilized to identify Roma. In turn it will also firmly establish the figure on the coin as representative of Roma through comparison with other Roman deities. This discussion will not only establish Roma as the most common

¹⁷⁹ Badian 1995, 2; Mellor 1975; Fayer 1975, 273-288.

¹⁸⁰ Chapter I summarizes Mellor's argument for an eastern origin.

iconographic type on the coinage of the Roman Republic but will also show a Roman figural precedent for identifying Roma as a figural representation synonymous with the Roman state.

3.1 The Introduction of Roman Coinage

Roman coinage could not have developed without the influence of Rome's Greek neighbours. Rome was late in adopting a precious metal currency, whereas the Greeks had been utilizing precious metal currency since the seventh century BCE. Furthermore, the Greeks of Magna Graecia in Italy had been producing silver coinage since the sixth century BCE.¹⁸¹ Rome's late adoption of a precious metal currency was likely due to supply and demand - central Italy was not rich in minerals and had no native access to silver. However, trade between Rome's Greek neighbours and their mother cities in Greece seem to have met the necessary demand for minerals.¹⁸² However, the absence of a precious metal coinage in Rome should not be taken to indicate that Rome had no means of monetary trade. In fact, Rome created its own form of localised proto-currency from the fifth century BCE until the end of the third century BCE.¹⁸³ Rome's archaeological record is devoid of coin finds earlier than the third century BCE, which indicates a general lack of Roman requirement for precious metal in contrast to their Greek and Etruscan neighbours.¹⁸⁴ Furthermore, the late Roman adoption of coinage perhaps relates to their relationship with their allies, whereby an annual military levy would be supplied to Rome, rather than a monetary tribute.¹⁸⁵ However, it is likely, as shown by the appearance of Greek standard coinage in Rome in the third century BCE, that Rome simply utilized the local Greek currencies whenever monetary transaction outside of Rome was required.¹⁸⁶

I Rome's First Coinage:

Rome's earliest silver coinage was derived from that of its Italian neighbours; it was of a similar weight (7.3 g) and conservatively emulated the typical style of Hellenistic Greek coinage.¹⁸⁷ Hellenistic coins were commonly adorned with unique badges to represent and promote the prestige of the minting city or state. They would often incorporate the profile head of a divinity on one side, and a symbol of the city on the other. The Corinthian standard and Attic standard

¹⁸¹ On the first coinage: Howgego 1995, 1-23.

¹⁸² Shephard 1993; Crawford 1985, 1-15. Crawford provides a survey of the spread of coinage in Italy and the Mediterranean prior to and during the Roman Republic.

¹⁸³ Catalogue of Rome's proto-currency: Vecchi 2013.

¹⁸⁴ Crawford 1985, 17.

¹⁸⁵ Erdkamp 2011, 47-74.

¹⁸⁶ Crawford 1985, 17ff.

¹⁸⁷ *ibid.* 25ff.

were both popular and influential in Southern Italy and Sicily and are examples of the most common design type.¹⁸⁸ The Corinthian stater (8.6 g) was adorned with the helmeted head of Athena on the obverse and a flying Pegasus on the reverse (**fig. 3.1**). The Athenian drachm (8.6 g) likewise depicted the helmeted head of Athena on the obverse and an owl on the reverse (**fig. 3.2**). These coins typify the common design elements of Greek coinage throughout the Greek speaking world and more than likely influenced the coinage of Magna Graecia and Rome's earliest coinage.¹⁸⁹ Early Roman coinage did, however, have one important difference. In comparison to the coinage of their neighbours which tended to regularly use repeated imagery, early Roman coin designs often varied.¹⁹⁰

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

The figures depicted on Roman coinage reflect the Greek influence and utilized the same iconographic types as on Greek coinage. The style and design were conservative, and the coins were usually adorned with mythical scenes or personifications of various gods and goddesses. Rome's first coinage on the Greek standard first appeared in c. 300 BCE in conjunction with the Pyrrhic War.¹⁹¹ This coinage is called Romano-Campanian coinage for its origins outside of the city of Rome.¹⁹² It arose alongside acquisitive and market-orientated economic behaviours relating to the acquisition of wealth outside of existing Roman social networks, which was set in motion by the influx of foreign wealth as Rome increased its holdings in Italy and the Mediterranean. The first 'Roman' coin seems to have been struck around the time of the *foedus neapolitanum* – the Treaty of Naples.¹⁹³ It was a bronze litra (RRC 1/1), likely minted by Neapolis, with the Greek legend ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ (ROMAION) (**fig. 3.3**).¹⁹⁴ The litra

¹⁸⁸ Hands 1909, 308-309.

¹⁸⁹ Mitchell 1969, 41ff.

¹⁹⁰ Burnett 2012, 299-300.

¹⁹¹ Mitchell 1966, 66ff.

¹⁹² Mattingly 1924; 1928; 1938.

¹⁹³ Cornell 1995, 394 believes Rome's earliest coinage on the Greek standard was issued to commemorate the *foedus neapolitanum*; however, this does not explain the length of time for which these coins were issued. Vagi 2014, 79 has instead suggested that these coins were for the everyday use of the Roman population of Naples.

¹⁹⁴ Mattingly 1938, 199ff.

was later followed by a series of four silver didrachms,¹⁹⁵ a silver fraction and a bronze issue with the Latin legend ROMANO.¹⁹⁶ Based on the change from a Greek legend to a Latin legend, these coins are believed to have been minted under the auspices of Rome and not by Rome itself.¹⁹⁷

fig. 3.3

II Rome's First Didrachms:

The sequence of Rome's first didrachms is clearly shown by the metrology of the coins and is supported by hoard evidence.¹⁹⁸ The earliest of the silver didrachms (RRC 13/1) with Latin legend ROMANO is dated c. 280 – 276 BCE based on an example found at Poseidonia/Paestum (**fig. 3.4**).¹⁹⁹ The second didrachm (15/1) in the series is dated to c. 250 BCE (**fig. 3.5**). The dating of the second didrachm is based on five freshly struck examples found together with three examples of the first Didrachm (RRC 13/1).²⁰⁰ The third type (RRC 20/1) appears to have circulated alongside late Neapolitan didrachms and Campano-Tarentine didrachms (**fig. 3.6**). The third didrachm is dated by related overstrikes to c. 260/250 BCE.²⁰¹ The fourth and latest issue in the didrachm series (RRC 22/1) is dated to c. 242 BCE based on the decreased weight of the coin in comparison to previous coin issues in the series (**fig. 3.7**).²⁰² The fourth Romano-Campanian didrachm is also the first 'Roman' coin to depict the figure of Roma. The figure of Roma adorning the fourth Roman didrachm would become the most frequently utilized deity on Roman Republican coinage until the end of the Roman Republic.²⁰³

¹⁹⁵ RRC 13/1

¹⁹⁶ ROMANO is likely a derivative of the Latin genitive ROMANORUM: Burnett 2012, 300.

¹⁹⁷ The correspondence between weight reduction and changing legends in the silver issues, as well as hoard evidence, rules out the idea that coins with ROMANO and ROMA legends were struck simultaneously; cf. Rutter and Burnett 2001.

¹⁹⁸ For a survey of modern views up to the mid 1950s, see ERC I 210-47; ERC III 49ff. For more recent discussions, see Mitchell 1966; RRC 35-46; Burnett 1977, 1978, 1980; Crawford 1985, 25-34.

¹⁹⁹ This didrachm is usually dated c. 280 – 276 BCE. An example found at Poseidonia/Paestum shows the coin must date before c. 273 BCE: Bernard 2018, 4.

²⁰⁰ RRC 15/1 is considered a new introduction after a cessation in minting; however, further studies on stylistic variation and die differences may reveal a more continuous spread.

²⁰¹ Burnett and Crawford 1998, 55-7.

²⁰² Huzar 1966, 337-346; Mitchell 1976, 69ff. proposes a date of 272 BCE in accordance with Rome's Egyptian Embassy and because it was struck on a standard, which had been introduced by Pyrrhus during his stay at Tarrentum (Mattingly 1949, 68ff.).

²⁰³ ERC II establishes the date of the denarius' first appearance; Buttrely 1961, 261ff.

She was utilized on both the pre-denarius coinage and then ongoing throughout the second and first centuries on the denarius. However, the Roman portrayal of Rome's personification in c. 242 BCE was preceded by one other coin from the Greek town of Locri in Bruttium, Italy.

fig. 3.4

fig. 3.5

fig. 3.6

fig. 3.7

3.2 The First Depiction of Roma

Before discussing Roman usage of Roma, it is important to note that Rome may not have been the first city to figurally depict Roma as the personification of Rome. The first known coin to depict Roma, although a figural depiction quite different to the Roman portrayal, originated from the Greek town of Locri in Magna Graecia (**fig. 3.8**).²⁰⁴ The legend $\Lambda\text{OKP}\Omega\text{N}$ links the coin to Locri. However, insomuch as the Locrian stater is of a Greek origin, I believe the impetus behind the issuing of this coin, like the Romano-Campanian series, to be Roman.

fig. 3.8

²⁰⁴ Rutter and Bennett 2001, 181.

I Description:

The obverse of the coin depicts a bearded and laureated Zeus facing left. However, it is the reverse that is relevant for our purposes. On the reverse of the coin stands Pistis, draped and facing left, with her arm outstretched to crown the seated figure of Roma.²⁰⁵ Pistis, the Greek personification of faith and the Greek equivalent of Roman *fides* (trust), is identified by the legend ΠΙΣΤΙΣ (PISTIS). Roma sits bareheaded and enthroned on a curule chair, facing right with a shield, a Roman *scutum*, resting at her feet.²⁰⁶ Her right leg stretches forward, and her drapery pulls against her as she reclines on the throne, which, together with the sceptre tucked beneath her right arm, symbolises her authority. Like the Pistis figure, the legend ΡΩΜΑ (ROMA) identifies the figure as Roma. This type of labelling is unusual in Italy; legends usually named the minting authorities, such as the city or the city magistrate's name.²⁰⁷ However, in this instance, the labels serve to identify the figures and aid in delivering the message of the coin. The shield indicates a military utility, whilst the sceptre and curule chair indicate rulership. Pistis crowning Roma indicates that Roma has been crowned victorious.

II Purpose:

The coin is a strong propagandist message for Roman supremacy over Locri. The coin, which clearly depicts the greatness of Rome was not produced for the Romans, but as a transferable reminder that Rome was in-charge. This would be consistent with Karl Galinsky's definition of the role of coinage in propaganda: "coinage at best can reaffirm 'propaganda' though not create it. At most, coin types can serve as a reflection on, and as a record and affirmation of, something that is already known through other sources."²⁰⁸ However, the coin also illustrates that Roman superiority depended on a relationship between Rome and its allies. Whilst the coin acknowledges Rome's military might, it moreover indicates the importance of cooperation between the two cities, as represented on the coin by the *pistis* of Locri crowning Roma. They give Rome their faith in return for security, protection and other benefits. This is similar to the relationship illustrated by ruler cult in Chapter II.

²⁰⁵ See Chapter II for discussion on the Greek Pistis.

²⁰⁶ The scutum was a shield generally used by the Italic peoples, and by the Pyrrhic War was a shield identifiable with the Roman Legions, which had by then moved away from traditional hoplite warfare.

²⁰⁷ Such labelling is uncommon; however, there was some experimentation on Locrian coins: HN Italy no. 2310; HN Italy 430 (Aesernia); 558 (Irnthii); 948 (Tarentum); 1561–1564; 1629 (Metapontum) and 2246–2247 (Hipponium).

²⁰⁸ Galinsky 1998, 39.

III Background:

The Locrian stater is traditionally identified alongside the surrender of the Locrians to Rome in c. 275 BCE. In 285 BCE the Greek city of Thurii asked Rome for aid against the Lucanians. The cities of Rhegion, Kroton and Locri joined Rome in the alliance, and all received Roman garrisons. Rome's increased involvement in Magna Graecia alienated the city of Tarentum. Tarentum's governing body, believing that Rome had encroached upon its hegemony of Southern Italy, called on King Pyrrhus of Epirus for aid and commenced the Pyrrhic War in 280 BCE. After Pyrrhus' initial success, Locri ejected the Roman garrison and joined Pyrrhus.²⁰⁹ At the time of the war, Locri produced much of the silver coinage in Italy. Pyrrhus appears to have abused his position of power, introducing strict regulations upon the Tarentine Alliance, levying taxes and men, and minting tetradrachms of Attic weight (17.30 g).²¹⁰ These coins were of a higher worth and substantially heavier than the coinage used in Southern Italy at the time.²¹¹ The coinage was also not entirely representative of the minting cities, with some carrying imagery influenced by Pyrrhus' own coinage as king of Epirus and ruler of Sicily.²¹² Locri was recaptured by Rome in c. 275 BCE whilst Pyrrhus was in Sicily. It is postulated that the Zeus/Roma and Pistis coin marks the return of Locri to the Roman Federation.²¹³ I believe that as Pyrrhus used Locri and other cities like Tarentum to mint his coinage, Rome and those who were pro-Roman in the city of Locri likely did the same.

IV Dating:

Dating of the Locrian stater is contentious, and scholars are divided on whether the Locrian stater is 'Pyrrhic' (c. 275 BCE) or 'Hannibalic' (c. 215 BCE) in date.²¹⁴ Little is known of Locri between the Pyrrhic War and the second Punic War. However, as soon as Hannibal arrived in Southern Italy after defeating Rome at Cannae in 216 BCE, Locri once again changed sides. Locri and the other Bruttian cities would be punished severely by Rome for their betrayal, which further provides an end date for Locri's localized coinage.²¹⁵ Mattingly and Seltman, and Mellor by extension, have identified Bruttian coinage as Hannibalic not only due to the

²⁰⁹ Cass. Dio, *Zonar.* 8.6 reveals that the Locrians changed sides a few times and suffered the consequences for those choices

²¹⁰ Lomas 1993, 53.

²¹¹ Hands 1909.

²¹² Franke 1989, 463-5. The coins minted in Tarentum from the time of Pyrrhus' occupation proclaimed his descent from Achilles, Alexander the Great and Alexander the Molossian. This was part of a propaganda campaign by Pyrrhus to convince Tarentum and southern Italian cities and to justify his presence in Italy.

²¹³ Macdonald 2008, 45.

²¹⁴ Mellor 1975, 19, 132 and 163 believes in a later date. Dmitriev 2011, 234 explains the position.

²¹⁵ Scheu 1955, 102-103.

Bruttians having aided Hannibal in Southern Italy, but more importantly because Carthaginian drachms and hemidrachms have been found alongside Bruttian silver in three of the four coin hoards containing Bruttian silver.²¹⁶ However, such a short timeframe for the number of various styles and types included is unlikely. Instead, I would suggest, based on stylistic similarities to other coinage of the Pyrrhic period, particularly to the ragged haired Zeus on the coins of Pyrrhus (**fig. 3.9**), and the weight of the coin, that the Locrian stater is Pyrrhic. The coin's weight (7.23 g) corresponds to the end of the Pyrrhic War and the reduced weight of Locri's final silver issues (7.25 – 7.10 g).²¹⁷ Furthermore, the Locrian stater's weight is comparable to that of the Hercules/Wolf and Twins ROMANO issue (c. 7.16 g [RRC 20/1]), which has been dated c. 269 – 266 BCE and borrows its weight and type from the Greek staters of Southern Italy (**fig. 3.10**).²¹⁸ In addition, didrachms of the second Punic War weighed significantly less: c. 6.11 g, which further corresponds to the eventual weight of the Roman Denarius c. 4.23 g.

fig. 3.9

fig. 3.10

In comparison to the Locrian stater, comparable examples from the second Punic War are not nearly as detailed and are of a significantly lighter weight.²¹⁹ These changes not only reflect the economic hardship in Italy at the time of the second Punic War, but also reflect the debased weight standard of coinage in Italy prior to Rome transitioning to the new and similarly weighted denarius system. Locrian staters of the Pyrrhic War show characteristics of emergency war issue; the style is often crude, with poor striking, and overstriking appears to have been common.²²⁰ We can be fairly certain regarding the date of this coin as there are a number of Syracusan coins which have been stamped over Locrian issues.²²¹ The design and minting of the Locrian stater is most certainly Greek. However, I do find it poignant that Locri's last coin issue references the city's *deditio in fidem* to Rome. *Deditio in fidem* was an

²¹⁶ Mattingly 1934, 34; Seltman 1955, 251.

²¹⁷ Howgego 1995, 114; Crawford 1985, 32-33.

²¹⁸ Crawford 1985, 33.

²¹⁹ Robinson 1964; Crawford 1985, 32-33.

²²⁰ MacDonald 2008, 45.

²²¹ This coinage was initially assigned to Locri but is now assigned to the Sicilian city Syracuse. The image of wreathed Zeus occurred frequently on Pyrrhus's Sicilian coinage. See Corroccio 2004, 82, 184 and 261.

autonomous state's voluntary surrender of sovereignty to Rome. It was the precondition for the peaceful end of war, and in part for securing the protection of Rome. It is also of note that the Locrian type also appears to be the very last coin minted at Locri.²²² After this, Rome began to produce its own silver coinage. It is reasonable to hypothesise that it was the Pyrrhic war that evoked the substantial issues of silver by Rome's allies, most of which stopped production after the war.

In summary, the Locrian stater was produced at Locri by the Greeks and reflected their vision of Rome's policy of *deditio in fidem* towards a Greek city. However, it would be unwise to assume Locri minted this coin of their own accord. The coin was issued locally for Locrian consumption to spread the message of the relationship between Locri and Rome. Locri utilized ideas and images that held meaning to both parties. Secondly, whilst the coin depicts Roma, the figure is the artist's own interpretation - the helmeted figure of Roma had not yet been introduced as a set figure on Roman coinage. However, the fact that the Republican Roma type was regularly distributed by the Roman state from c. 211 BCE reveals that, in terms of the goddess Roma, it should not matter whether the Locrian type was produced during the Pyrrhic War or during the Second Punic War. The Locrian stater issue was a limited affair, minted as a symbol of cooperation with Rome under the auspices of the Roman state to demonstrate Locrian deference to Rome. In comparison, when Rome utilized Roma on their own coinage, it selected a distinct image, so that there could be no confusion between the Roman depictions of Roma and the Locrian image of Roma. The image, similar to Athena, was bold for two reasons: at the time there was no precedent for the modelling of a personification of an Olympian god; secondly it broke the Greek norm of utilising a Tyche with a turreted crown to represent the city.²²³ The type was distinct and sent a powerful message via Rome's coinage: Rome was supreme. This type would be issued consistently as a symbol for Rome, from its inception in the third century BCE until the design ceased to be used in the first century BCE.

²²² MacDonald 2008, 45.

²²³ Burnett and Burnett 1986, 70.

3.3 Roma on Roman Coinage

Roma is traditionally identified as the female figure wearing an Attic or Phrygian helmet with a gryphon crest and side wings and occupying the obverse side of many Roman Republican coins (**fig. 3.11**).²²⁴ She is first found on Rome's pre-denarius coinage (c. 269 BCE – c. 212 BCE). She then regularly features on the Roman denarius, on which the Roma type is frequently used from c. 211 BCE, and then sporadically from c. 100 BCE.²²⁵ However, there is disagreement regarding the identification of the figure as Roma, especially on Rome's earliest coinage. This disagreement largely concerns whether or not the identifying legend of the coin can be used to identify the figure. It is also uncertain why a figure without apparent cult in Rome would be introduced on coinage in the first place. It is postulated that the helmeted female figure actually represents a divinity firmly set within the Roman Pantheon, such as Italia, Minerva, Diana or Bellona.²²⁶ Naturally, such discrepancies raise questions as to the identity, origin and purpose of Roma. If the figure on the coins is Roma, the lack of evidence relating to a cult in Rome raises further questions as to how the figure was received by the Roman people and their neighbours.

fig. 3.11

I Pre-denarius coinage: The Legend ROMANO

Disagreement regarding the identification of Roma chiefly concerns her identification via the coin's legend. It is argued that the legend, which appears on more coins than just the Roma type, cannot be used as an attributable factor for Roma.²²⁷ Roma has generally been identified on coinage on account of the Greek stamp ΡΩΜΗ (RHOMĒ) on the Locrian stater (**fig. 3.12**), and then by the Latin ROMA on Rome's denarius series.²²⁸ However, such identification is not applicable to Rome's pre-denarius series where such legends are either infrequent or not there

²²⁴ See note 9.

²²⁵ On the dating of the denarius: ERC II 311; Crawford 1974, 28-35.

²²⁶ Alföldi 1956, 5ff. has tried to show that the figure of Roma is descendant from the eponymous figure Rhômê. Mattingly 1960, 49ff. identifies the figure as Diana in the form of Bellona Victrix. Knoche 1952, 326ff. doubts the attribution based on literary and philological evidence. Crawford (RRC II, 721ff.) identifies the figure as Roma; however, also possibly as Diana. Burnett and Burnett 1986 agrees with Crawford.

²²⁷ Mattingly (1960) and Knoche (and by extension Mellor) disagree with using the legend to identify Roma.

²²⁸ RRC.

at all. This raises further doubt about identification of Roma via the legend on the denarius series.

fig. 3.12

The first ‘Roman’ silver didrachm to depict the figure of Roma (RRC 22/1), dated c. 242 BCE, belongs to the fourth issue in the Roman pre-denarius series (**fig. 3.13**). The obverse of the coin depicts the head of Roma facing right and wearing a Phrygian helmet. Imagery located behind the head, depending on the coin, interchanges between a cluster of grapes, a shield, or a cornucopia. The head of Roma on the didrachm is similar to earlier Roman non precious coins: a semis c. 275 – 270 BCE (RRC 19/2 [**fig. 3.14**]) and an as c. 270 – 266 BCE (RRC 21/1 [**fig. 3.15**]). Both of these coins are adorned by a female head wearing a Phrygian helmet and were part of a coin issue which also included Minerva in a Corinthian helmet (RRC 14/2 and 17/1a-i [**fig. 3.16**]). The differences in appearance and the simultaneous issuing of the coins clearly show that two separate figures are represented. On the reverse of the didrachm (**fig. 3.13**) depicting Roma, winged Victory stands right and attaches a wreath to a long palm branch.

fig. 3.13

fig. 3.14

fig. 3.15

fig. 3.16

The legend ‘ROMANO’ is located on the reverse to the left side of Victory. The monogram beneath the wreath on the reverse of the coin varies between coins and is perhaps indicative of an artist mark or minter’s mark. The alternating mark on the reverse in combination with

alternating imagery behind the head of Roma on the obverse indicates ongoing minting of the coin.

The legend ROMANO was not an identifier for Roma and was utilized to identify Rome as the minting authority. The form ROMANO (the Romans) was not exclusive to coinage depicting Roma but was utilized on a variety of Roman coins until c. 241- c. 231 BCE (**table 1**).²²⁹ The use of ROMANO likely mirrored the transition from the Greek genitive utilized on Hellenistic Greek coinage to identify minting authorities. In fact, RRC 22/1 is the only coin adorned by Roma to include the ROMANO legend. Other Roman pre-denarius coinage identified as depicting Roma correspond in date to RRC 22/1; however, include no legend (**table 1**). They are identified as depicting Roma via the Phrygian helmet, which appears on no other figure in contemporary Roman coinage.

II Pre-Denarius Coinage: The Legend ROMA

The significance behind the changing legend from ROMANO to ROMA is not certain.²³⁰ The first Roman coin to include both the 'ROMA' legend and the figure of Roma was a half-litra (RRC 26/4) dated c. 234 - 231 BCE (**fig. 3.17**). The obverse of the coin depicts the head of Roma facing right and wearing a Phrygian helmet. The reverse of the coin is adorned with a dog standing right with ROMA in the exergue. Once again, it is important to note that the 'ROMA' legend, like the ROMANO legend likely identified the minting authority and was not exclusive to pre-denarius coinage adorned by Roma; most pre-denarius coins believed to depict Roma are legendless (**table 1**). Correspondence between weight reduction and changing legends in the silver issues and hoard evidence rules out the likelihood that coins with ROMANO and ROMA legends were struck simultaneously.²³¹ It is possible that coinage marked with the legend ROMANO were minted by Rome's neighbouring allies, and that the change of legend from ROMANO to ROMA represents the change of mint from Rome's allies, to that of Rome.²³²

²²⁹ **Table 1** utilizes Crawford's catalogue and lists every helmeted figure to appear on pre-denarius Roman coinage. These figures include Minerva, who appears once in an attic helmet (RRC 2/1) and then subsequently in the Corinthian helmet; Mars, who wears the Corinthian helmet; Roma, who is at first adorned by the Phrygian helmet, and later the Attic helmet; and Mercury, who wears a *petasus* (a Greek hat).

²³⁰ Mattingly 1945, 65-77. See also Burnett and McCabe 2016, who suggest that the legend shifted in the last year of the First Punic War.

²³¹ Rutter and Burnett 2001, 45.

²³² Pedroni 1993, 46.

fig. 3.17

III Identification of Roma via Iconography: Coinage

In c. 211 BCE a whole new coinage system was introduced. Appearing for the first time was the silver denarius, a coin that would be the principal silver coin of Rome until the 3rd century CE. This coinage, despite constituting a new denomination and type, represents a continuation of late pre-denarius iconography. The standard design of this coin features Roma wearing an Attic helmet (commonly seen on the uncia [pl. unciae] c. 225 – 217 BCE onward) on the obverse and the Dioscuri (the mythical twins, Castor and Pollux) galloping on horseback on the reverse (**fig. 3.18**). In the early second century BCE, a new design was introduced, with Luna the moon goddess (**fig. 3.19**), and later Victory (**fig. 3.20**), in a chariot on the reverse.²³³ The bronze denominations, although there were reductions in the weight, remained the same as those in the earlier period, with a standard design of a ship's prow on the reverse, and continued to be issued until c. 80 BCE. Of these denominations, Roma continued to see use on the uncia, which prior to the introduction of the denarius was the most common denomination on which she appeared (**table 1**).

fig. 3.18

fig. 3.19

fig. 3.20

²³³ Woytek 2012, 325.

Attribution of Roma partially rests on the fact she is the one helmeted figure on Roman coinage not wearing a Corinthian helmet. Instead, she wears either a Phrygian helmet, or an Attic helmet with a gryphon crest and side wings. Roma's association with a Phrygian helmet seems to have been common c. 242 – 226 BCE, until the Attic helmet supplanted it. Depictions of Roma wearing a Phrygian helmet do continue, albeit infrequently (**fig.3.21**). Despite depictions of Roma appearing in both the Phrygian helmet and Attic helmet appearing, they are quite clearly the same figure. In fact, the helmeted head of Roma is in most cases clearly distinguishable from the other helmeted heads in the vast range of Roman coinage. For examples, depictions of Mars and Minerva appear on both Roman (and to a large extent on Greek coinage) to exclusively wear the Corinthian helmet with the one exception of RRC 2/1 (**fig. 3.22**). However, this is not quite the case with earlier coin issues of the Roma figure. Coins following the Pyrrhic War, and especially after the first Punic War, really start to develop their own identity.

fig. 3.21

This content is unavailable
Please consult the print
version for access.

In most cases, it is obvious that the figures on earlier pre-denarius coinage serve as precursors to the Roma figures depicted on the later Roman denarii. For instance, the head on the uncia is very similar to the head on the denarius in terms of style and conception, but with the inclusion of a horsehair crest. The helmet is also occasionally replaced with a Phrygian helmet (**fig. 3.23**). It is likely that added details like the side wings were left out due to the lower worth of the coin, the hardness of the metal, and the frequency for which the dies would need to be replaced. The style and iconography of the heads are very similar, and it is unlikely to represent another figure.²³⁴ Furthermore, it is likely that the female head with the Phrygian helmet, which occurs in pre-denarius coinage, is also that of Roma. The addition of side wings to the helmet on the denarius is a development. I think this is reinforced by all the minor modifications implemented to the figure of Roma throughout the type's lifespan on Roman coinage.

²³⁴ RRC 721-722.

fig. 3.23

Furthermore, it is important to note that no other figure on Roman coinage is depicted with a Phrygian helmet (**table 3**). The only similar Greek example was part of a limited series minted c. 334 – 300 BCE in Lucania, Magna Graecia (**fig. 3.24**). The stater depicts Athena in a Phrygian helmet (normally depicted with a Corinthian helmet); however, the helmet is far more ornate than the helmet depicted on the Roma type and includes a flowing horse hair crest and centaur decorations. The Phrygian helmet on the Roma type is less ornate with a small spiked crest and simple fluting on the cranial guard (**fig. 3.25**).

This content is unavailable
Please consult the print
version for access.

fig. 3.25

IV Identification of Roma via Iconography: Gems

The iconographic similarities between the Roma figures and the differences with other divinities are not enough to firmly attribute the figure as Roma. A gem in Paris, Cabinet des Médailles, c. 89 – 42 BCE provides evidence for the identification and perpetuation of Roma in Roman society (**fig. 3.26**).²³⁵ The design of the gem is a copy of the Roma head portrayed on the obverse of the denarius of Publius Nerva (**fig. 3.27**). The coin depicts the bust of Roma facing left. She wears an Attic helmet and holds a shield in her left hand and has a spear resting on her shoulder in her right hand. A crescent is positioned above the figure and she is surrounded by a border of dots. Most importantly, the gem is accompanied by the legend HAVE ROMA (HAIL ROMA).²³⁶ The legend is clearly a salutation to the figure and provides

²³⁵ Furtwangler 1900, I-III no. 54.

²³⁶ RRC II 723 describes the gem as reading AVE ROMA. However, according to the original publication (Furtwangler 1900, II no. 54), the gem reads HAVE ROMA. Mellor 1991, 974-975 does not agree with this view and argues that Roma only came to be identified as such after the Greeks brought the cult of Roma to the west.

clear evidence of identification by the engraver that the helmeted figure acted as a symbol of Rome.

fig. 3.26

fig. 3.27

A second gem (**fig. 3.28**) in the British Museum (1923,0401.408) appears to bear an even closer resemblance to the denarius of Publius Nerva (**fig. 3.27**). Notice the star and crescent and the denomination mark on the denarius. Even the shield design is the same. According to the British Museum, this gem dates from the first to second century CE and depicts Athena wearing a helmet with two side plumes and aegis.²³⁷ The British museum have identified the figure as Athena believing the helmet to be Corinthian; however, closer examination of the gem reveals the helmet to be of the Attic type. The helmet includes a cranial guard above the brow and a ridge extends over the top of the helmet to provide the wearer further protection. These are not features of the Corinthian helmet (**fig. 3.29**). Furthermore, there is no aegis visible on the gem; if there is an aegis, it is covered by a shield. For this reason, I believe the figure on the gem to be the same figure as on the Roman denarius: Roma. Unfortunately, the second gem lacks a legend to identify the figure; however, the combination of the first gem and comparison with numismatic evidence points to the figure being Roma (more numismatic evidence to be discussed below). The gem also serves to illustrate that the image of Roma remained in use, even after she ceased to appear on the Roman denarius.

fig. 3.28

fig. 3.29

²³⁷ Catalogue number: 1923,0401.408

V Identification of Roma via the legend:

The evidence confirming how the legend identifies the helmeted figure as Roma is complex. The legend ROMA is usually located on the reverse of early republican denarii. However, there is a long series of denarii c. 136 - 107 BCE where the legend ROMA is relocated from the reverse of the coin to the obverse, next to the female helmeted head (**table 4**). The changing location of the legend appears to have predominantly been on Roma type denarii.²³⁸ On other types of Roman denarii from the same period (i.e. depicting figures other than Roma on the reverse), the legend remains on the reverse. The appearance of the legend alongside the head of Roma indicates association between the figure identified as Roma and the legend ROMA. As on the gem in the Cabinet des Médailles with the legend HAVE ROMA (**fig. 3.26**), it is clear on these Roma type denarii that the legend appearing alongside the Roma head is not geographic in sense. Reading and writing were not common outside of the elite. It is therefore natural to assume that a pictorial representation was used for ease of recognition and association. Whilst the legend 'ROMA' also served as an identifier for the image of Roma, the iconography of the figure would have been far easier to recognize.

VI Three exceptions to the obverse legend:

Despite the association of identifying the figure of Roma via the ROMA legend, there are three exceptions where the ROMA legend appears alongside heads other than that of Roma: a denarius depicting the head of Philip V of Macedon (RRC 293), an androgynous helmeted head on the denarii of Quintus Lutatius Cerco (RRC 305), and a diademed female head on the denarii of Aemilius Lepidus (RRC 291).²³⁹

Exception 1:

On the denarius depicting Philip V of Macedon c. 113 – 112 BCE (RRC 293 [**fig. 3.30**]), Michael Crawford considers the ROMA legend a design takeover from the previous moneyers. On earlier coins in the series, the legend ROMA always appears on the obverse with the female helmeted head.²⁴⁰ This perhaps indicates that the legend served as an identifier for the figure of Roma. In addition to the ROMA legend on the Philip coin, the Greek character Φ (Phi) is

²³⁸ In regards to the labelling of the figures. Michael Crawford at the same time agreed that “in Latin the word ‘Roma’ is not used to express this concept, but rather ‘res publica’ or ‘patria’” and concluded that “it perhaps follows that the artists who placed Roma on the coinage of the Roman Republic and labelled her with the legend ROMA were expressing a Roman concept in their own way (RRC II 723ff.).

²³⁹ *ibid.*

²⁴⁰ *ibid.* 724.

also present to identify Philip. The inclusion of the Φ further leads the reader away from identifying the figure of Philip as Roma.

fig. 3.30

On the obverse of the coin the head of Philip V of Macedon faces right and wears a helmet adorned with goat horns and a diadem. The helmet is a traditional Macedonian headdress and appears on Macedonia's own coinage depicting Philip V of Macedon.²⁴¹ The Φ is not a reference to the moneyer; the reverse depicts an equestrian statue carrying a laurel-branch and the legend L·PHILIPVS X appears on a tablet beneath the horseman. Therefore, there are two levels of association to this coin. The first references the submittal of a Hellenistic monarch to a Roman context. The second is a visual pun. The moneyer behind the minting of RRC 293 was Lucius Marcius Philippus, but the coin depicts Philip V. The imagery of the Macedonian king refers to the activities of one Quintus Marcus Philippus.²⁴² Q. Philippus was connected in some manner with Philip V of Macedon and may have been the first member of the family to bear the surname Philippus. However, this does sound rather cruel considering the Macedonians were allegedly deceived by Quintus Marcius Philippus in 172 BCE, who conducted talks with the Macedonians when war had already been secretly declared.²⁴³

Exception 2 and 3:

The other two coins to include the legend ROMA on the obverse of the denarius (RRC 291 and 305) could potentially depict Roma, although I do have some doubts about the helmeted head on RRC 305. The figure is rather androgynous and could be identified as either Roma or Mars. On the coin (**fig. 3.31**), the figure wears a Corinthian helmet, with side plumes, which sits high on the head to reveal the figure beneath. From my time examining Republican denarii, I can only think of Minerva and Mars wearing this style of helmet on Roman coins; however, without the plumes. Furthermore, contemporary examples of Mars on Roman coinage are depicted with far more ornate helmets (**fig. 3.32**). As there are no other examples of these figures depicted

²⁴¹ Liv. 27.3.2-3; Plut. Pyrr. 11.5.

²⁴² Rowan 2017, 259-60.

²⁴³ Liv. 42.14.1; App., *Mac.* 11.3; Val. Mx. 2.2.1. See also Briscoe 1964, 66-77.

in conjunction with the ROMA legend on the obverse, I am inclined to believe, despite the inclusion of a Corinthian helmet, that the androgynous helmeted figure does in fact represent Roma. Similarly, it is likely that the legend ROMA occurring beside the female head on RRC 291 [fig. 3.32] may also have been used to identify the head as that of Roma. Again, the legend does not seem to appear alongside any other examples.

Apart from the above exceptions (RRC 291, 293 and 305), the ROMA legend on the obverse is only commonly associated with figures other than Roma after c. 106 BCE (**Table 2**). This possibly represents a change of artist who was unaware of the significance. It is clear that the legend on the Locrian coin identifies Roma as the personification of Roma; however, the ROMA legend appears to have been used to express a broader concept. Crawford believes the Romans used the legend ROMA to represent the nationalist concepts of *res publica* (republic) or patria (fatherland), and that the artists who utilised both the figure of Roma and the ROMA legend were perhaps expressing a Roman concept in their own way.²⁴⁴ In addition, the ROMA legend's later usage (c.106 BCE onward) alongside the moneyer's personal marks perhaps indicates that it was already common knowledge that the helmeted female head stood for Roma. Incidentally, far fewer Roma types were produced after 110 BCE. In addition, the ROMA legend is found only 25 more times on the obverse; three of those figures represent the traditional helmeted Roma figure (RRC 364/3a-c) and five represent a female figure who could be Roma (RRC 343/1a-c and 362 1a & c) (**table 2**). The ROMA legend also appears less frequently on the reverse on first century BCE coinage. It would appear that the ROMA legend is displaced to allow more room on the coin for the moneyer's mark and propaganda.²⁴⁵

²⁴⁴ RRC II, 725.

²⁴⁵ Meadows and Williams 2001, 37-47 link the introduction of blind balloting to the increasing use of Roman coinage for personal propaganda.

VII Roma on the Reverse of Roman Coins

Roma is also occasionally depicted on the reverse of Roman coinage. The head of Roma mirroring the head on the obverse appears on the reverse of two pre-denarius coins (RRC 21/1 and 27/5); however, she appears more frequently on denarii between c. 119 BCE – 46 BCE (**table 3**). On these denarii, the helmeted head of Roma mirroring the head on the obverse appears two times, and full corporal representations appear fifteen times. These depictions of Roma can be neatly split into five categories:

1. Roma crowning a trophy (RRC 281/1),
2. Roma seated on shields and in some cases crowned by Victory (RRC 287/1, 335/1 and 446/1).
3. Roma crowned by a male figure (RRC 329/1)
4. Roma and Venus (RRC 391)
5. Italia and Roma

On these denarii, Roma is often depicted with military equipment such as her helmet, sword and shield. She is also commonly seen bearing a sceptre and is usually depicted alongside military trophies, such as arms and armour. Roma, as with the series on the obverse, is not named on every coin on which she appears; however, she can be identified through comparison with those coins on which she is identifiable. These examples further serve to show that Roma was a recognised figure on Roman coinage and adds credence to previous identifications of Roma on the obverse of Roman coinage.

VIII RRC 281/1

This is the first denarius to depict a full figural depiction of Roma and is dated c. 119 BCE (**fig. 3.33**). The obverse of the coin depicts the double headed Janus alongside a legend to identify the moneyer. On the reverse, Roma stands facing left with a sceptre in her left hand and crowns a trophy with her right hand. The trophy is surmounted by a helmet in the form of a boar's head and flanked by a carnyx (trumpet) and Gallic shields on each side. Roma is depicted in a chiton and wearing an Attic helmet with a horse hair plume. She is perhaps identified by the legend ROMA, which is situated to the right and hugs the figure. This coin commemorates the victories achieved in 121 BCE by Consuls Domitius Ahenobarbus and Q. Fabius Maximus over the Allobroges and the Avernii in Gaul.

fig. 3.33

IX RRC 287/1

This coin c. 114 BCE depicts Roma on both the obverse and reverse (**fig. 3.34**). The obverse of the coin is believed to depict Roma based on the legend ROMA, located below the head, and the side wings which are commonly associated with Roma on the helmet. However, it should be noted that the helmet is of the Corinthian type, which is normally associated with Minerva or Mars and the figure does appear masculine. However there appears to be hair falling out of the helmet onto the nape of the neck, leading me to believe the figure is feminine. On the reverse, Roma is seated facing right on a pile of shields. As on RRC 281/1, Roma wears a chiton and a helmet, which by its shape is most likely an Attic helmet. She holds a spear in her left hand and another helmet sits at her feet. There is no legend to identify the figure. However, later coins depicting a seated goddess on shields are associated with the ROMA legend: RRC 335/1c (**fig. 3.35**) and RRC 335/2 (**fig. 3.36**). Furthermore, on either side is a she-wolf suckling the twins Romulus and Remus, and a flying bird. The wolf was a symbol commonly utilized in Rome. The iconographical link between Roma and the wolf is maintained on coinage throughout the 70s BCE and would continue to appear on Roman coinage well into the Empire. The last example of the pairing with Roma depicted on the obverse and the wolf on the reverse is found on bronzes minted c. 324 – 330 CE.²⁴⁶

fig. 3.34

fig. 3.35

²⁴⁶ The wolf depicted on Iberian coinage changed to a she-wolf under Roman occupation (Evans 1997, 86).

fig. 3.36

XII RRC 403/1

RRC 403/1 c. 70 BCE is the most obvious depiction of Roma on the reverse of Roman denarii (fig. 3.37). The obverse of the coin depicts the jugate heads of Honos and Virtus facing right. The figures are identifiable via the legends HO for Honos and VIRT for Virtus. Virtus is also equipped with a helmet. On the reverse of the coin Italia and Roma clasp hands. The figures are identifiable via the identifiers ITAL for Italia and RO for Roma. Interestingly, in this depiction Roma wears a diadem in place of a helmet. She also bears the fasces in her left hand (a symbol of military and political power) and places her right foot on a globe, which symbolises Roman domination.

fig. 3.37

fig. 3.38

There is often confusion between the figures of Roma and Virtus. Virtus was the deity of bravery and military strength, the personification of the Roman virtue of *virtus*. Virtus is often identified alongside Honos (personification of honour) and was often honoured together with him, such as in the Temple of Virtus and Honos at the Porta Capena in Rome itself. Virtus is often represented by a female figure wearing military dress. She is often depicted wearing a helmet, with her right breast exposed and holding a spear and shield. Roma and Virtus are nearly identical in their iconography. This is revealing about how Romans conceived of themselves, or at least of how the Roman elite conceived Rome.²⁴⁷ However, in all depictions of Virtus on Roman coinage, the legend VIRT or VIRTUS has been included to identify the figure and avoid confusion with that of Roma (fig. 3.37-38).

²⁴⁷ McDonnell 2006, 142-149.

Furthermore, it should be noted that Bellona, another contender for the identity of the Roma figure on the obverse of Roman coinage is never identified by a legend or identifier.²⁴⁸ Whilst it is possible the figure of Roma on Rome's earliest coinage was Bellona, the fact that the figure is not identified with Bellona at a later point speaks volumes.²⁴⁹

3.4 The Spread of Roma

The emergence of Roman coinage in both concept and design was heavily influenced by the Greeks. The repeated coin types may have been utilized as a badge for the state and to build a sense of trust and power via a pattern of continuation. It would only be a small jump to conclude that the pattern on Roman minting followed the same idea. This idea was to keep coinage and its symbology similar to keep trust high in the denarius and, therefore, the stated value of the coin.

Roma was adopted as a symbol of Rome due to the consistent use of the figure on Roman coinage. She clearly held meaning to the Romans, and so foreign civic states utilized the figure as a symbol of that power. However, Thonemann's monograph perhaps shows otherwise regarding the readability of imagery on coinage. He argues that one of Alexander the Great's client kings, Abdalonymus (c. 332 BCE) did not understand the imagery on the obverse on Alexander's coinage, confusing Heracles for Alexander on the tetradrachm.²⁵⁰ If one is to believe Thonemann's inference that even a client king may struggle with identification of imagery; then how much chance did the average viewer have? Nevertheless, I argue that even this inference of attribution remains applicable. The Roma figure on the denarius only ever bore the inscription ROMA, unlike most other coins in the denarius series. The Roma figure was also in most cases suitably different in style to other female figures depicted on Roman coinage. These alternative figures utilized different iconography and, when confusion as to the identity of the figure was possible, bore an identifying legend to separate the figure from Roma. It is likely that the average viewer, on account of the legend and separate iconography to Minerva, assumed the helmeted figure in a Phrygian or Attic helmet to be Roma.²⁵¹

²⁴⁸ RRC I-II.

²⁴⁹ Mattingly (1960) argues that the figure is in fact Bellona. Burnett and Burnett 1986, 67—69 discredits Bellona as a possibility based on iconographic differences.

²⁵⁰ Thonemann 2016, 147.

²⁵¹ Burnett and Burnett 1986.

Furthermore, if the helmeted figure did not initially represent Roma, she probably came to be thought of as such via the legend and the singular use of the figure on Roman coinage by Rome.

The images on coins are a valuable source of iconography related to religion and a record of important events. Unfortunately, literary sources are inadequate to assess the impact of coin types and their associated images.²⁵² It is more productive to analyse the way in which the imagery may have become embedded in private and public context. This concept can perhaps be applied to how Roma cult spread alongside Roman intervention in the Mediterranean and the stationing of the Roman army. In the early years of Roman expansion in the third century, the effect of Roman control appears to have been unequivocal. By the end of the second Punic War, not only had all the cities in Italy and Sicily ceased to mint silver coinage, but the local silver had virtually disappeared from circulation in favour of Rome's own coinage or coinage in favour of Rome.²⁵³

In contrast, territories outside of Italy continued to mint their own coins. Greek currency seems to have been fairly localised. The continuation of many Greek currencies, despite the Roman presence in the east, demonstrates that the scale of Hellenistic currency was too large and in wide use for Rome to displace and enforce their own coinage, which was of a different weight standard.²⁵⁴ It was only in the third century CE that Roman currency managed to fully displace these local currency systems. Adding to this, Rome did not have physical or administrative control over the majority of the Hellenistic world until Pompey conquered Syria and the eastern coastline of the Mediterranean - even in 133 BCE, the Roman Republic only had control over Greece and Macedonia.²⁵⁵ Roman power to enforce the denarii on the Hellenistic east would have therefore been impossible due to geographical boundaries alone. It is, however, evident that despite maintaining the various Greek standards of coin weight, that many Greek states in the east did mint coinage depicting Roman imagery, particularly in the imperial period.²⁵⁶

The following sections, although not exhaustive, serve to briefly demonstrate the spread of the Roman Roma figure on coinage outside of the Roman coinage system. It is important to note that whilst utilization of Roma outside of Rome is demonstrable, further research is required in

²⁵² On confusion of Roman historians on their adoption of coinage

²⁵³ Crawford 1985, 51.

²⁵⁴ Crawford 1985, 116-132.

²⁵⁵ App. *Mith.* 17.118.; Polyb. XXXVIII. 3.12; Touratsoglou 1987, 53.

²⁵⁶ Fayer 1976.

relation to the Roman introduction of the figure on the denarius and the reception of the figure on coinage other than Rome's. Fayer discusses the use of the Roma figure on coinage in the Greek world in the imperial period. Her study demonstrates that depictions of Roma vary between cities; however, she is always depicted as a woman. In choosing to honour Rome, the Greeks could choose between a Roman official, the Roman Demos, or Roma. In choosing Roma, it is likely that the Greeks were aware of the Roman predisposition towards utilizing Roma on Roman coinage, and similarly adopted her for their own, utilizing their own local iconographic variations to depict the goddess. However, despite these variations between cities, the following examples demonstrate similar iconographic depictions to the Roman usage of the figure.

I Iberia

In Iberia, denarii were introduced, but were further accompanied by local mints with standard Roman iconography and Iberian and Celtic legends.²⁵⁷ Most Spanish coinages were linked with urbanisation and with areas of economic activity.²⁵⁸ As far as the silver coinages are concerned, the possibility that they were struck to pay regular taxes to the Romans is now rejected, since during the second century BCE there were not enough coinages to do so.²⁵⁹ However, despite many areas not owning a mint until later, coin finds show that coins had been present previously, and that the population had used both Roman and native coinages.²⁶⁰ It is reasonable to think that there must have been some sort of overseeing issuing authority in place and that it was authorized by Roman governors. The decision to strike seems to have been made by city authorities.²⁶¹ Those elites promoted by the Roman state named members of the Roman administration in gratitude. Normally the legend identifies the issuing city, or the name of an ethnic group, or members of the civic elite. Many of the coins maintain their own script, further suggesting local control, contrasting with coins from Turdetania which were in Latin from the beginning.²⁶²

Roma seems to have been used on some of this local currency, perhaps either indicating Roman involvement in the mint, or an attempt to imitate and placate the Romans by Iberian officials

²⁵⁷ Based on hoard evidence, Crawford dates the institution of Iberian coinage to the first half of the second century (1985, 93-94).

²⁵⁸ Keay 1990, 122-128.

²⁵⁹ Ripollès 2012, 362-363; Crawford 1985, 97.

²⁶⁰ *ibid.* 365-366.

²⁶¹ Ripollès 2005, 82-83.

²⁶² *ibid.* 84-86.

(fig. 3.39-41). The Iberian legend ARSEETAR indicates that these coins came from Saguntum, which was originally the Punic town of Arse.²⁶³ The maintenance of civic coinage was an indication of identity and the acceptance of Roman imagery was a symbol of loyalty and friendship. In this instance, concerning Iberia, Roma is considered a representation of Rome as a Mediterranean power. The figure on the coin is clearly feminine and is stylistically similar to that of the ROMA figure on Roman denarii. Furthermore, there are similarities in how the helmets have been modelled. The helmets are abstract in design; however, I believe them to be winged Attic helmets similar to that seen on Roman coinage depicting Roma.

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

II Dacia

Roman coins depicting Roma did not only appear in Iberia. There is also evidence of large Republican hoards in Dacia (modern day Romania).²⁶⁴ This is a bit of an anomaly, as hoards of Roman Republican coins in the East are very rare. However, silver was used extensively in the Hellenistic world as a means of trade, and this region did fall under Hellenistic influence.²⁶⁵ It is unclear how the coins reached Dacia; however, the presence of these coins in Dacia is indicative of Roman coinage use in the East.²⁶⁶ The majority of the coins date from 89 - 80 BCE and 49 - 40 BCE, which corresponds to the period of the highest output of Roman coinage.²⁶⁷ It is speculated that the hoards are the result of trade, or perhaps even military service.²⁶⁸ Unfortunately, the situation is not clear enough because of the hoards' structure, but also due to incomplete information. It is not possible to determine the main phases of entry and circulation of the denarius.

Dacia also produced a surprising number of imitation Roman denarii. These range from faithful copies, barely distinguishable from their Republican prototypes, to more crude

²⁶³ CNH II 304, 305; Burgos 1992, 2039-2040

²⁶⁴ Lockyear 1999; Crawford 1985, 226-227.

²⁶⁵ Crawford 1977, 117.

²⁶⁶ Lockyear 1996, 401. On Trade routes from and to pre-Roman Dacia: Crawford 1977, 121; Stan 2014, 46-48. Contra Crawford: Chitescu 1971, 159 and 1981, 10-13.

²⁶⁷ Hoard analysis: Stan 2014, 52-66.

²⁶⁸ *ibid.* 52.

interpretations.²⁶⁹ However, these imitation coins are not considered counterfeit as they often carried more silver than their Roman equivalent. Instead they were produced to make up a perceived shortfall in the supply of circulating coinage in Dacia.²⁷⁰ As previously stated, Roma did not commonly appear on Roman coinage after c. 110 BCE; however, there are several examples from the Dacian hoards that clearly depict the Roman version of Roma (**fig. 3.42-43**). It is likely that these imitation denarii, like the coinage produced by Locri and in Iberia, were produced in cooperation with Rome and represent a two-way relationship between Rome and Dacia.

This content is unavailable.
Please consult the print version for
access.

III Gortyn

There are also examples in Gortyn in Crete following the defeat of Mithridates. The Roman conquest of Crete in 68 - 66 BCE is recorded on one of the most important coin issues of tetradrachms struck at Gortyn. There are only five specimens (**fig. 3.44**). They depict Roma on the obverse in her traditional attic winged helmet (as on the Roman denarius), adorned with an elephant's head. Aside from her identifiable Roman iconography, she is further identified by the legend ΡΩΜΑΣ (ROMAS). On the reverse of the coin is the legend ΓΟΡΤΥΝ (GORTYN) and the cult image of Artemis Ephesia in a field with a bee and an elephant's head.²⁷¹ The elephant's head is the family emblem of the Caecilii Metelli, and this tetradrachm was doubtless struck at Gortyn after the conquest of Crete by Q. Caecilius Metellus in 67 BCE and whilst he was organizing the government of the island. Crete was constituted a Roman Province in 66 BCE and again, as with previous examples, the image of Roma has been used to illustrate a relationship with Rome and Rome's hegemony over Crete.

²⁶⁹ Davis 2006, 322.

²⁷⁰ *ibid.*

²⁷¹ Svoronos 1890, 181 no. 190.

fig. 3.44

IV Athens

There is also an example from Athens dating to before the First Mithridatic War (91 – 90 BCE). The coin is one of the new Attic style drachms and depicts the helmeted head of Athena facing right on the obverse (**fig. 3.45**). The reverse includes the usual Attic owl; however, with a miniature Roma seated to the right identified by a ΡΩ (RO).²⁷² The seated Roma emulates the seated figure of Roma identified on the reverse of some Roman denarii. As with the previous examples, the coin ties Athens to Rome and ties the artistic depiction with the Roman types.

This content is unavailable
Please consult the print
version for access.

V Bithynia

Bithynia is especially interesting. There is a series dated to 62 - 59 BCE depicting Dionysus on the obverse – the usual deity depicted on coinage of the area (**fig. 3.46**). The legend ΝΙΚΑΙΕΩΝ (NIKAIEON) identifies the city of Nicaea as the minting authority. On the reverse one can see Roma seated on a pile of shields, holding Nike in her right hand and a spear in her left.²⁷³ The coin clearly emulates the type utilized on RRC 287/1, 335/1 and 446/1, the legend ΡΩΜΗ (ROME) confirms the figure's identity. This coin forms part of a series of standardized coinages organised for the cities of Bithynia and Pontus as part of ordering the new province.²⁷⁴ The degree of similarity between the coins in the series suggests either initiative from a controlling authority, or at least a collaboration between the different cities.²⁷⁵ Nevertheless, once again, Roman imagery has been utilized on Greek coinage to demonstrate a collaboration and friendship with a Greek city, and perhaps even the Roman position as hegemon.

²⁷² Thompson 1961, 1124c

²⁷³ BMC 3, SNG Cop 466, SNGvA 532

²⁷⁴ Güney 2015, 32-35.

²⁷⁵ *ibid.* 44-49.

This content is unavailable
Please consult the print
version for access.

Again, whilst not exhaustive, the above examples have demonstrated foreign adoption of Roman iconographic types to illustrate a relationship with Rome. At times, those regions in the Greek east had also accorded cult to Roma. The above demonstrates that both the Greeks and the Romans viewed the Greek ΡΩΜΑ (ROMA) or ΡΩΜΗ (ROME) as one and the same with the Roman Roma.

Chapter Overview

This chapter has argued for a Roman origin for the figure of Roma. As first established in Chapters I and II, cult to the goddess Roma in the eastern Mediterranean was first established in c. 195 BCE. However, as chapter III has demonstrated, depictions of Roma were already well established in Italy prior to the introduction of any cult of Roma in the east.

Roma's first figural depiction was probably on the coinage of Locri in Magna Graecia. The style and weight of the coin point towards a date during or shortly following the Pyrrhic War. The coin was issued locally for Locrian consumption to spread the message of Locrian deference to Rome. Secondly, whilst the coin depicts Roma, the figure is the artist's own interpretation; the helmeted figure of Roma had not yet been introduced as a set figure on Roman coinage. However, the fact that the Republican Roma type was regularly distributed by the Roman state from c. 211 BCE reveals that, in terms of the goddess Roma, it should not matter whether the Locrian type was produced during the Pyrrhic War or during the Second Punic War. The Locrian stater issue was a limited affair, minted under the auspices of the Roman state to demonstrate not only Locrian deference to Rome, but also a cooperative relationship between the two cities.

Rome did not mint its own Roma type coinage until the c. 246 BCE. By 211 BCE, the Roma type had become the most proliferated figure on Roman coinage and would appear almost continuously on the denarius until the first century BCE, and sporadically thereafter.

The Roma on Roman coinage is Hellenistic in appearance and reflects the Greek influence on Roman coinage. The Roma on Roman coinage is also iconographically distinct from other Roman gods and goddesses. As has been demonstrated, the ROMA legend can be used to identify the figure of Roma on the obverse of Roman coinage. This legend appeared beside no other head on the obverse until c. 110 BCE. Roma's identity on Roman coinage is further clarified by inscriptions on a gem and on Roman coinage from the first century BCE. Furthermore, Roma alongside military iconography is identifiable on the reverse of Roman coinage from the first century BCE.

Similar images of Roma would also appear outside of Rome on the coinage of mints controlled or inspired by Rome, but also on Greek coinage of certain cities looking to diplomatically associate themselves with Rome. These depictions, which were clearly based on the Roma figure on the obverse would also appear in Greek depictions of Roma. This is evidenced by the cult statues depicted on coins and would continue to influence the Roman depiction of Roma into the imperial period, also appearing on Augustus' Ara Pacis.

Despite a lack of hoard evidence for the exchange of Roman money in the eastern Mediterranean, coinage was produced as both a fiscal and cultural means of exchange. It is therefore more than likely that the Greeks who did dedicate cult to Roma were inspired by and utilized the Roman figure of Roma as a symbol for Rome. This in turn would have influenced the Greeks to accord cult to Roma as a single and eternal figure for representing Rome.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined the complexities that arise in identifying Roma and her purpose prior to her adoption by Augustus as a figure of the imperial cult. Roma is traditionally associated with eastern Greek cult dedicated to Rome, which was then adopted and brought to Rome by Augustus in the late first century BCE. The story of Roma, however, was more complicated than that, and, as we have seen, Roma's origins lay in Italy.

Roma first appeared in the fifth century BCE as an eponymous figure synonymous with the foundation of Rome. This figure, called Rhômê, was not a personification and nor was she representative of the Roman state. Furthermore, the Rhômê legend does not seem to have been widely received and appears to have faltered in her competition with other eponymous figures and legends that were promulgated to explain Rome's foundation story.

Nevertheless, Rhômê is important to our understanding of Roma for a couple of reasons. First, Roma as a female heroine and warrior seems to correlate with a linguistic misunderstanding between Umbrian and Greek. Rhômê was a strong female figure who was willing to stand up against the men of the expedition. Furthermore, her gender appears to be based on the female gender of the city (*urbs/polis*) and reflects the home and hearth. Second, legends such as that of Rhômê reveal a willingness to create and accept a figure of Rome as part of a local story to represent Rome as connected to the Greek world. She is a conflation of Umbrian *rūma* with the Greek *ῥώμη*.

The figure of Roma did not appear as a figural personification of the Roman state until the third century BCE. She was first utilized as a benefactor on the coinage of Locri in Magna Graecia c. 275 BCE. The coin was likely minted towards the end of the Pyrrhic War and reflects the subject nature of Locri to Rome. Coins in the Greek world were a symbol of civic pride and independence; however, the Locrian stater provides a scene of *deditio in fidem* to Rome. The coin was minted for local use; however, the message on the reverse of the coin would have been unlikely without Roman impetus. Furthermore, the *adulatio* would have been fruitless

had the Romans in diplomatic contact with Locri been unable to recognize and identify with the figure and subject matter on the Locrian stater.

Roma first appeared on Roman coinage in c. 246 BCE. Whilst the figure on earliest depictions of Roma includes no textual identifier, she can be identified as Roma via iconographic similarities with later coins definitively depicting Roma. Furthermore, the iconography for Roma is suitably different to the depictions of other deities on Roman coinage.

From c. 211 BCE, the figure of Roma became the main deity to be depicted on Roman coinage until the first century BCE. Her iconography does develop; however, the changes are for the most part minor modifications and still clearly depict the same figure. Until the very end of the second century BCE, Roma was the only figure on the obverse of Roman coinage to appear consistently alongside the legend ROMA, which acted as an identifier for the figure. Figures with similar iconography, such as Virtus, are identified via legend to signify that they represent a separate figure. Identification via the legend is further supported by a gem hailing the figure of Roma HAVE ROMA.

Identification of Roma on the reverse of some late Republican denarii further exhibits Roman awareness of the figure. As on the obverse, Roma was often depicted as a military type goddess. Similar types would be utilized in depictions of Roma in the Greek world and in depictions of Roma in the later imperial cult. Furthermore, similar figural depictions are visible in other Roman occupied areas of the Mediterranean.

Coinage is often discounted as a source for Roma due to a lack of coin hoard evidence in the eastern Mediterranean. However, this should not be taken to mean that Roman coinage did not travel and that there was no awareness of Roman coin types in the Greek world. Coinage is inherently a transferable commodity. It can be exchanged both as a fiscal entity and as a cultural curiosity. Roman coinage may not have supplanted local Greek coinage but was likely exchanged at the currency exchange for coinage of a local weight and denomination. To suggest that those of the aristocracy who dealt politically with Rome were unaware of Roman currency types would be ridiculous, particularly with the spread of the Roman legions in the Mediterranean who were paid with Roman denarii.

Roma was first introduced on the obverse of Roman pre-denarii in c. 246 BCE and then as the main figure type on Roman denarii from c. 211 BCE onwards. Cult worship accorded to Roma did not appear until c. 195 BCE. Later Greek coinage in the Roman imperial period occasionally depicted Roma in a similar vein as to what was depicted on Roman coinage. On Smyrna's coinage, Roma appears similar to her depiction on Roman coinage, particularly the later full figural depictions of Roma enthroned.

Cult to the Roman state was dedicated to various figures thought to be representative of Rome. Whilst cult to Roma did exist, it was by no means universal to the eastern Mediterranean, with cult being dedicated to Roman officials, Roma, and the *Demos* of the Romans. Cult dedicated to the Roman state would not have been nearly so effective had the object of the cult not also been apparent and recognisable to the Romans. Hence the Greeks utilized a range of figures that they believed achieved this goal. Roma provided a recognisable figure for both Greeks and Romans. She was not bound by the time restrictions of political office. She was unchanging and eternal.

Argument that the Romans knew no such goddess as Roma is false. Power played an important role in according worship. Religion and politics were linked, and the question as to whether a figure was a god or not was unimportant. Divinity was not in itself an interesting characteristic to worship. Worshippers could only ever cultivate a modest number of gods. It was the god's power and its relevance to worshippers that determined which divinities would be accorded cult. Within this context, there was no need for the Romans to worship themselves by awarding cult to Roma. Such cult would not have served a purpose as it did for the Greeks.

Lack of cult to Roma in Rome does not preclude Roma from holding divinity and being seen in such a light by the Romans. Later Roman embracement of Roma, particularly under Augustus, reveals a familiarity with the figure of Roma, who naturally represented a union between the city, state, and Augustus.

The development of Roma was multidirectional. She was both a creation of the Greeks and the Romans. The introduction of personified figures was clearly a Hellenistic influence; however, the implementation and proliferation of Roma on Roman coinage was purely Roman. She was a symbol of Rome and Roman power and would eventually be adopted as one of several figures diplomatically awarded cult by the Greeks. Roma was a recognisable symbol of both the Greek

and Roman worlds, and so it is of no surprise that the two merged under Augustus. Branding did exist in the ancient world and Roma was clearly a figure to rule the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Anonymous. *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica*. Translation by H. G. Evelyn-White. Cambridge, MA., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1914.

Appian. *Macedonian Fragments in Roman History, Volume II*. Edited and translated by B. McGing. Loeb Classical Library 3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912.

Arrian. *The Periplus of the Euxine Sea*. Translated by W. Falconer. 1804.

Athenaeus. *The Learned Banqueters, Volume IV: Books 8-10.420e*. Edited and translated by S. Douglas Olson. Loeb Classical Library 235. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Cicero. *On the Nature of the Gods. Academics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 268. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.

Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume I: Books 1-11*. Translated by E. Cary, H. B. Foster. Loeb Classical Library 32. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Translated by E. Cary. Loeb Classical Library 319. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Festus. *On the Meaning of Words*. Edited by W.M. Lindsay. Leipzig, 1913.

Herodotus. *The Persian Wars, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Translated by A. D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library 117. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Homer. *Iliad, Volume I: Books 1-12*. Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by William F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library 170. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Horace. *Satires. Epistles. The Art of Poetry*. Translated by H. R. Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library 194. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Livy. *History of Rome, Volume XII: Books 40-42*. Translated by E. T. Sage, A. C. Schlesinger. Loeb Classical Library 332. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Ovid. *Fasti*. Translated by James G. Frazer. Revised by G. P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library 253. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Pausanias. *Description of Greece, Volume I: Books 1-2 (Attica and Corinth)*. Translated by W. H. S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 93. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.

Pindar. *Olympian Odes. Pythian Odes*. Edited and translated by W H. Race. Loeb Classical Library 56. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Plutarch. *Lives, Volume I: Theseus and Romulus. Lycurgus and Numa. Solon and Publicola*. Translated by B. Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 46. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Plutarch. *Lives, Volume IX: Demetrius and Antony. Pyrrhus and Gaius Marius*. Translated by B. Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 101. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Plutarch. *Lives, Volume X: Agis and Cleomenes. Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus. Philopoemen and Flaminius*. Translated by B. Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 102. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

Polybius. *The Histories, Volume V: Books 16-27*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank, C. Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 160. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Sallust. *The War with Catiline. The War with Jugurtha*. Edited by J. T. Ramsey. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 116. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Strabo. *Geography, Volume VI: Books 13-14*. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Loeb Classical Library 223. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars, Volume I: Julius. Augustus. Tiberius. Gaius. Caligula*. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Introduction by K. R. Bradley. Loeb Classical Library 31. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Tacitus. *Histories: Books 4-5. Annals: Books 1-3*. Translated by C. H. Moore, J. Jackson. Loeb Classical Library 249. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Doings and Sayings, Volume I: Books 1-5*. Edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library 492. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Virgil. *Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid: Books 1-6*. Translated by H. R. Fairclough. Revised by G. P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library 63. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Secondary Sources:

- Adams, W. L. 2006. "The Hellenistic Kingdoms." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*, by G. R. Bugh, 28-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Agugiaro, G. 2009. *Advanced Methodologies for Acquisition, Integration, Analysis, Management, Visualisation and Distribution of Data in the Framework of Archaeological and Architectonical Heritage*. Padova: University of Padova.
- Alföldi, A. 1957. *Die trojanischen Urahnen der Römer : Rektoratsprogramm der Universität Basel für das Jahr 1956*. Basel: Buckdruckerei Friedrich Reinhardt.
- Archibald, Z. H., J. K. Davies, and V. Gabrielsen, . 2011. *The Economies of Hellenistic Scoeities, Third to First Centuries BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Archibald, Z. 1998. *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace: Orpheus Unmasked*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Badian, E. 1981. "The Deification of Alexander the Great." In *Ancient Macedonian studies in honor of Charles F. Edson*, by H. J. Dell, 27-71. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.
- Badian, E. 1995. *From the Roman Republic to Augustus: Continuity and Change in Some Motifs of Roman Coins*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University.
- Baldi, P. 1999. *The foundations of Latin*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Beard, M., J. North, and S. R. F. Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. Vol. I & II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernard, S. 2018. "The Social History of Early Roman Coinage." *Journal of Roman Studies* 108: 1-26.
- Bloy, D. 2012. "Roman Patrons of Greek Communities Before the Title *πάτριων*." *Historia Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 61 (2): 168-201.
- Boatright, M. T. 1987. *Hadrian and the City of Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bonfante, G., and L. Bonfante. 2002. *The Etruscan Language: An Introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brillante, C. 1990. "Myth and History: History and the Interpretation of Myth." In *Approaches to Greek Myth*, by L. Edmunds, 91-140. London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Briscoe, J. 1964. "Q. Marcus Philippus and Nova Sapientia." *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1-2): 66-77.
- Burgos, F. A. 1992. *La moneda hispánica desde sus orígenes hasta al siglo V*. Madrid: Editorial Vico & Segarra.
- Burnett, A. M., and A. Burnett. 1986. "The Iconography of Roman Coin Types in the Third Century BC." *The Numismatic Chronicle* 146: 67-75.
- Burnett, A. M., and M. Crawford. 1998. "Overstrikes at Neapolis and coinage at Poseidonia-Paestum." *Ashton and Hurter* 55-7.
- Burnett, A. 2011. "The Augustan Revolution Seen from the Mints of the Provinces." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 101: 1-30.
- Burrell, B. 2004. *Neokoroi. Greek Cities and Roman Emperors*. Leiden: Brill.
- Buttrey, T.V. 1961. "The Morgantina Excavations and the Date of the Roman Denarius." *Atti del Congresso internazionale di Numismatica*. Rome. 261-67.
- Calderone, S. 1964. *IIIΣΤΙΣ-FIDES: Ricerche di storia e diritto internazionale nell'antichità*. Messina: Università degli Studi di Messina.
- Champion, C. 2007. "Empire by Invitation: Greek Political Strategies and Roman Imperial Interventions in the Second Century B.C.E." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137 (2): 255-275.

- Chaniotis, A. 2005. *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Claridge, A. 2010. *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, A. J. 2007. *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Classen, C. J. 1963. "Zur Herkunft der Sage von Romulus und Remus." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 12 (4): 447-457.
- Connolly, P. 1981. *Greece & Rome at War*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cornell, T. J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 BC)*. London: Routledge.
- Corroccio, B. 2004. *Dal basileus Agatocle a Roma. Le monetazioni siciliane d'età ellenistica*. Messina: Pelorias 10.
- Corssen, W. 1868. *Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Crawford, M. H. 1985. *Coinage & Money under the Roman Republic: Italy & the Mediterranean Economy*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Crawford, M. H. 1969. *Roman Republican Coin Hoards*. London: Royal Numismatic Society.
- Crawford, M. H. 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*. Vols. I-II. London: Cambridge University Press.
- de Callatay, F. 2011. "More Than It Would Seem: The Use of Coinage by the Romans in Late Hellenistic Asia Minor (133-63 BC)." *American Journal of Numismatics* 23: 55-86.
- Dench, E. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples from the Central Apennines*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dench, E. 2005. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dmitriev, S. 2011. "The Neokoriai of Ephesus and City Rivalry in Roman Asia Minor." In *Priests and State in the Roman World*, by J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo, 529-552. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Donlan, W. 1970. "The Foundation Legends of Rome: An Example of Dynamic Process." *The Classical World* (Johns Hopkins University Press) 64 (4): 109-114.
- Drummond, A. 1978. "ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ. The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World by Ronald Mellor." *The Classical Review* 28 (1): 93-94.
- Erdkamp, P. 2011. *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Erskine, A. 1991. "Hellenistic Monarchy and Roman Political Invective." *The Classical Quarterly* 109-120.
- Erskine, A. 1997. "Greekness and Uniqueness: The Cult of the Senate in the Greek East." *Phoenix* 51 (1): 25-37.
- Evans, J. D. 1992. *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Fayer, C. 1975. "La Dea Roma sulle monete Greche." *Studi Romani* 23: 273-288.
- Fayer, C. 1976. *Il Culto della dea Roma: origine e diffusione nell'Impero*. Pescara: Editrice Trimestre.
- Fears, J. R. 1978. "Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ Ο ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ Genius Populi Romani. A Note on the Origin of Dea Roma." *Mnemosyne* 31 (3): 274-286.
- Fears, J. R. 1977. "Thea Romi: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World by Ronald Mellor." *The American Historical Review* 82 (2): 339.
- Fears, J. R. 1978. "Θεά Ρώμη; The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World by Ronald Mellor." *Gnomon* 50 (5): 457-461.
- Fishwick, D. 1987. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- Forsythe, G. 2006. *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fowler, R. L. 2013. *Early Greek Mythography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franke, P. R. 1989. "Pyrrhus." In *The Rise of Rome, Volume VII*, by F. W. Walbank, A. G. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen and R. M. Ogilvie, 456-485. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Furtwangler, A. 1900. *Die antiken Gemmen: Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst im klassischen Altertum*. Vols. I-III. Leipzig: Gesecke & Devrient.
- Güney, H. 2015. "The Roman Monetary Economy in Bithynia during the second half of the first century BC. The case of Nicomedia." *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 31-53.
- Galinsky, G. K. 1969. "Troiae qui primus ab oris ... » (Aen. I, 1)." *Latomus* 28 (1): 3-18.
- Galinsky, K. 1998. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Galsterer, H. 1990. "A Man, a Book, and a Method: Sir Ronald Syme's Roman Revolution after Fifty Years." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, by K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher, 1-20. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Garnsey, P., and R. P. Saller. 1987. *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gordon, G. 2010. *Paleoglot*. June 11. Accessed November 13, 2018. <http://paleoglot.blogspot.com/2010/07/etymology-for-rome.html>.
- Gradel, I. 2002. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Griffith, G. T. 1968. *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic Worlds*. Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis N.V. Publishers.
- Gruen, E. S. 1984. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Vol. I & II. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gruen, E. S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Habicht, C. 1970. *Gottmenschen und Griechische Städte*. Munich: Bech.
- Habicht, C. 1973. "Die augusteische Zeit und das erste Jahrhundert nach Christ geburt." *Boer* 41-88.
- Habinek, T. N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hamlin, A.D. F. 1915. *College Histories of Art History of Architecture*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Hands, A. W. 1909. *Coins of Magna Graecia. The coinage of the Greek colonies of southern Italy*. London: Spink & Son.
- Hard, R., and H. J. Rose. 2004. *The Routledge handbook of Greek mythology : based on H.J. Rose's "Handbook of Greek mythology"*. London: Routledge.
- Heyman, G. 2007. *The Power of Sacrifice: Roman and Christian discourses in conflict*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press.
- Holloway, R. R. 1978. *Art and Coinage in Magna Graecia*. Bellinzona: Edizioni Arte E Moneta.
- Hopkins, K. 1980. "Taxes and Trade in the Roman Empire (200 B.C.-A.D. 400)." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 70: 101-125.
- Horsfall, N. 1979. "Some Problems of the Aeneas Legend." *The Classical Quarterly* 29 (2): 372-390.
- Howgego, C. 1990. "Why did Ancient States strike Coins?" *The Numismatic Chronicle* 150: 1-25.

- Howgego, C. 1995. *Ancient History from Coins*. London: Routledge.
- Huzar, E. G. 1966. "Egyptian Influences on Roman Coinage in the Third Century B.C." *The Classical Journal* 61 (8): 337-346.
- Jones, C. P. 1977. "THEA ROME: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World by Ronald Mellor." *Phoenix* 31 (1): 77-81.
- Knoche, U. 1952. "Der Augusteische Ausprägung der Dea Roma." *Gymnasium* (59): 324-349.
- Kosmeatou, E. 2003. "The Attalids of Pergamom." In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, by A. Erskine, 159-174. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Krampf, F. 1913. *Die Quellen der römischen Gründungssage*. Leipzig.
- Kremydi-Sicilianou, S. 2005. "'Belonging' to Rome, 'Remaining' Greek: Coinage and Identity in Roman Macedonia." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, by C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett, 95-106. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kron, G. 2002. "Fleshing out the Demography of Etruria." In *The Etruscan World*, by J. M. Turfa, 56-78. London: Routledge.
- Lockyear, K. 1999. "Hoard Structure and Coin Production in Antiquity - an Empirical Investigation." *The Numismatic Chronicle* 159: 215-243.
- Lomas, Kathryn. 1993. *Rome and the Western Greeks 350 BC - AD 200: Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy*. London: Routledge.
- Lorenzatti, S. 1991. "Vicende del tempio di Venere e Roma nel Medioevo e nel Rinascimento." *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e storia dell'Arte (XIII)* 119-138.
- Lualdi, C. 2015. "A Coined Victory of Pyrrhus: the Propagandistic Iconography on the Gold Staters of Pyrrhus in his Sicilian Coinage, an Interpretative Proposal." In *Pecunia Omnes Vincit: The Coins as an Evidence of Propaganda, Reorganization and Forgery: Conference Proceedings of the Second International Numismatic Conference*, by B. Zajac, A. Jurkiewicz, P. Koczwara and S. Jellonek. Kraków: Institute of Archaeology, Jagiellonian University. 18-32.
- Mørkholm, O. 1991. *Early Hellenistic Coinage: from the accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336-186 B.C.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacDonald, D. 2008. *Overstruck Greek Coins: Studies in Greek Chronology and Monetary Theory*. Atlanta: Whitman Publishing.
- Malkin, I. 2001. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Martínez-Pinna, J. 1997. "RHOME: EL ELEMENTO FEMENINO EN LA FUNDACIÓN DE ROMA." *Aevum (Vita e Pensiero – Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore)* 71 (1): 79-102.
- Mattingly, H. 1924. "The Romano-Campanian Coinage and the Pyrrhic War." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 4: 181-209.
- Mattingly, H. 1929. "The First Age of Roman Coinage." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 19: 19-37.
- Mattingly, H. 1938. "'Romano-Campanian' Coinage: An Old Problem from a New Angle." *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 1 (3): 197-203.
- Mattingly, H. 1952. "The Different Styles of the Roman Republican Coinage." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 12 (42): 67-71.
- Mattingly, H. 1957. "Review: Die trojanischen Urahnen der Römer by Andreas Alföldi." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 17: 286-288.
- Mattingly, H. 1960. *Roman Coins from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Mattingly, H., and E. S. G. Robinson. 1938. "The Earliest Coinage of Rome in Modern Studies." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 18: 1-35.
- McDonnell, M. 2006. *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Meadows, A., and J. Williams. 2001. "Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome." *Journal of Roman Studies* 91: 27-49.
- Mellor, R. 1967. *Dea Roma: The Development of the Idea of the Goddess Roma*. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Mellor, R. 1975. *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Mellor, R. 1991. "The Goddess Roma." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, by W. Hasse and H. Temporini, 950-1030. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Mette, H. J. 1960. "'Roma' (Augustus) und Alexander." *Hermes* (Franz Steiner Verlag) 88 (4): 458-462.
- Millar, F. 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co.
- Mitchell, R. E. 1969. "The Fourth Century Origin of Roman Didrachms." *Museum Notes (American Numismatic Society)* 15: 41-71.
- Mitchell, R. E. 1966. "A New Chronology for the Romano-Campanian Coins." *The Numismatic Chronicle* 6: 65-70.
- Mitchell, R. E. 1976. "Roman Coins as Historical Evidence: The Trojan Legends of Rome." *Illinois Classical Studies* (University of Illinois Press) 1: 65-85.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1961. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. Vol. II. Munich: Beck.
- Panagopoulou, K. 2007. "Between Necessity and Extravagance: Silver as a Commodity in the Hellenistic Period." *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 102: 315-343.
- Paz García-Bellido, M. 1989. "Punic Iconography on the Roman Denarii of M. Plaetorius Cestianus." *American Journal of Numismatics* 1: 37-49.
- Pedroni, L. 1993. *Ricerche sulla prima monetazione di Roma*. Naples: Liguori.
- Perret, J. 1971. *Rome et les Troyens*. Paris.
- Porter, S. E., and A. Pitts. 2013. *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill.
- Price, S. R. F. 1980. "Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 90: 28-43.
- Price, S. R. F. 1984. *Rituals and Power: The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ripollès, P. P. 2005. "Coinage and Identity on the Roman Provinces: Spain." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, by C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett, 79-94. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ripollès, P. P. 2012. "The Ancient Coinages of the Iberian Peninsula." In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, by W. E. Metcalf, 356-374. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, E. S. G. 1964. "Carthaginian and Other South Italian Coinages of the Second Punic War." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 5: 37-64.
- Rochette, B. 1997. "'Ρώμη=ρῶμη." *Latomus* (Société d'Études Latines de Bruxelles) 56 (1): 54-57.
- Rowan, C. 2017. "Coinage between Cultures : Mediating Power in Roman Macedonia." In *The Inbetweenness of Things : Materializing Mediation and Movement between Worlds*, by P. Basu, 251-68. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rutter, N. K. 2012. "The Coinage of Italy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, by W. E. Metcalf, 128-141. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rutter, N. K., and A. M. Burnett. 2001. *Historia Nummorum: Italy*. London: British Museum Press.

- Scheidel, W. 2012. *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheu, F. 1955. "The Earliest Coins of The Bruttians." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 15 (45): 101-12.
- Scheu, F. 1964. "The Coinage of the Lucanians." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 4: 65-74.
- Seaby, H. A. 1978. *Roman Silver Coins: The Republic to Augustus*. Vol. I. London: Seaby.
- Seltman, C. 1955. *Greek Coins: A History of Metallic Currency and Coinage Down to the Fall of the Hellenistic Kingdoms*. London: Spink & Son Ltd.
- Shepherd, R. 1993. *Ancient Mining*. London: Elsevier Applied Science.
- Sokolowski, F. 1955. *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Solmsen, F. 1986. "Aeneas Founded Rome with Odysseus." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (Department of the Classics, Harvard University) 90: 93-110.
- Stan, M. G. 2014. "The Phenomenon of Roman Republican Coinage in Pre-Roman Dacia. A Reexamination of the Evidence." *Journal of Ancient History and Archeology* 44-67.
- Stewart, A. 1997. *Attika: Studies in the Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*. London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.
- Svoronos, J. N. 1890. *Numismatique De La Crète Ancienne*. Mâcon: Imprimerie Protat Frères.
- Sydenham, E. A. 1941. "Ornamental Detail as a Guide to the Classification of Republican Denarii." *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* 1 (3/4): 117-127.
- Thompson, M. 1961. *The New Style Silver Coinage of Athens*. ANSNS.
- Thomsen, R. 1957-1961. *Early Roman Coinage: A Study of the Chronology*. Vols. I, II and III. København: Nationalmuseet.
- Thonemann, P., ed. 2013. *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*. Vol. XI. London: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
- Thonemann, P., ed. 2016. *The Hellenistic World: Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toohy, P. 1984. "POLITICS, PREJUDICE, AND TROJAN GENEALOGIES: VARRO, HYGINUS, AND HORACE: Stemmata Quid Faciunt? Juvenal, "Sat." 8.1." *Arethusa* 17 (1): 5-28.
- Touratsoglou, I. 1987. "Macedonia." In *The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic*, by M. Crawford and A. M. Burnett. Oxford: B.A.R. 53-78.
- Toynbee, J. M. C. 1956. "Picture-Language in Roman Art and Coinage." In *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*, by R. A. G. Carson and C. H. V. Sutherland, 205-226. London: Oxford University Press.
- Traill, J. S. 1971. "Greek Inscriptions Honoring Prytaneis." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 40 (3): 308-29.
- Vanotti, G. 1995. *L'altro Enea. La testimonianza di Dionigi di Alicarnasso*. Rome: L'ERMA di BRETSCHNEIDER.
- Varinlioğlu, E. 1980. "Inscriptions from Erythrae." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 38: 149-156.
- Vecchi, I. 2013. *Italian Cast Coinage: A descriptive catalogue of the cast coinage of Rome and Italy*. London: London Ancient Coins Ltd.
- Villaronga, L. 1994. *Corpus nummum Hispaniae ante Augusti aetatem*. Madrid: José A. Herrero.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2013. *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1986. "Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus." *Journal of Roman Studies* 76: 66-87.
- Wardman, A. 1982. *Religion and Statecraft among the Romans*. London: Granada.

- Webster, T. B. L. 1954. "Personification as a Mode of Greek Thought." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17 (1/2): 10-21.
- Wilcken, U. 1938. *Zur Entstehung d. hellenistischen Königskultes*. Berlin: Akad-Vlg.
- Williams, J. H. C. 2001. *Beyond the Rubicon: Romans and Gauls in Republican Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, G. 2005. "Aspects of Identity." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, by C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett, 19-28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ziolkowski, A. 1992. *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and Their Historical and Topographical Context*. Rome: L'Erma" di Bretschneider.

FIGURES

Maps:

1. Map of the eastern Mediterranean. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-world-history/early-cities-and-the-distribution-of-power/377E0F34B49E3EA01F99175B7EFBAD4B/core-reader> 10/04/19.
2. Map of Asia Minor. <https://cglamboy.wordpress.com/2015/11/23/the-assembly-of-pergamos/> 10/04/19.

Introduction:

- 0.1. Floorplan of temple to *Venus Felix* and *Roma Aeterna* in Rome. Hamlin 1915.
- 0.2. As, Rome, 125 CE. Hadrian/seated Roma. RIC 666.
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/hadrian/RIC_0666.jpg
- 0.3. Aureus. Rome, 145 CE. Antoninus Pius/seated Roma. RIC 147.
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_0147.jpg
- 0.4. Follis, 307 CE. Maxentius/Roma seated in temple. RIC VI Aquileia 113.
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/maxentius/aquileia_RIC_113.jpg 10/04/19.

Chapter I

- 1.1. Roman didrachm, 265 – 242 BCE. Roma in Phrygian helmet/ROMANO and Victory. RRC 22/1. American Numismatic Society: <http://numismatics.org/collection/1941.131.6>
- 1.2. Roman denarius, c. 209 BCE. Roma/ Dioscuri. RRC 50/2.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-50.2> 10/04/19.
- 1.3. Roman denarius, c. 44 BCE. wreathed head (Caesar?)/Venus seated holding Victory and sceptre. Cr. 480/7. <http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1410.html> 10/04/19.
- 1.4. Stater. Locri, 275 - 270 BCE. Zeus/Rome crowned by Pistis; ΛΟΚΡΩΝ. HN Italy 2347–2351. <http://numismatics.org/collection/1944.100.7030> 10/04/19.
- 1.5. See 1.1.
- 1.6. Roman half-litra, 234 – 231 BCE. Roma/Dog and ROMANO. RRC 26/4.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-26.4> 10/04/19.
- 1.7. Four pence coin, 1888, Queen Victoria/Britannia seated right. Private Collection.
- 1.8. Smyrna AE35, 212 – 217 CE. Caracalla/ three tetrastyle temples, each surmounted by a wreath, with Roma seated left in the centre temple. BMC 416.
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/caracalla/smyrna_BMC_416.jpg 10/04/19.
- 1.9. Smyrna AE26, 253 – 268 CE. Gallienus/three tetrastyle temples, of Tiberius, Roma and Hadrian, surmounted by wreaths. NEOKOPQN NC, OV below. BMC 470.
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/gallienus/smyrna_AE26_BMC_470.jpg 10/04/19.

- 1.10. Roman as, 9 – 14 CE. Augustus/altar to Roma and Augustus. RIC 230.
http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RIC_0230.1.jpg 10/04/19.

Chapter II

- 2.1. Red figure Etruscan vase, c. 470 BCE. Aeneas and family fleeing Troy. Staatliche Antikensammlungen.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ascanius#/media/File:Amphora_Aineias_Ankhises_470_B_C_Staatliche_Antikensammlungen.jpg 10/04/19.
- 2.2. Carthaginian tetradrachm, c. 320 – 310 BCE. Head of Tanit (or Dido?)/lion.
<https://www.mfa.org/collections/object/tetradrachm-with-head-of-tanit-or-dido-4253> 10/04/19.

Chapter III

- 3.1. Locrian stater in style of Corinthian stater, 350 – 275 BCE. Athena/Pegasus. HN Italy:2338, SNG ANS:506.
https://www.vcoins.com/en/stores/numiscorner/239/product/coin_bruttium_lokroi_e_pizephyrroi_stater_350275_bc_rare/1110218/Default.aspx 10/04/19.
- 3.2. Athenian drachm, 465 – 454 BCE. Athena/owl.
<https://www.numisbids.com/n.php?p=lot&sid=2937&lot=214> 10/04/19.
- 3.3. Neapolitan litra, 326 – 242 BCE. Apollo/man-headed bull and ΠΩΜΑΙΩΝ. RRC 1/1.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-1.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.4. Metapontum didrachm, 280 – 276 BCE. Mars/horse and ROMANO. RRC 13/1.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-13.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.5. Didrachm of uncertain mint, 275 – 270 BCE. Apollo and ROMANO/galloping horse. RRC 15/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-15.1a> 10/04/19.
- 3.6. Roman didrachm, 269 – 266 BCE. Hercules/she-wolf suckling twins and ROMANO. RRC 20/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-20.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.7. See 1.1.
- 3.8. See 1.4.
- 3.9. Sicilian drachm c. 270 BCE. Zeus/Dione seated and ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΥΡΡΟΥ.
https://images.vcoins.com/product_image/131/4/6/4YcxMJ7qMnC2X9aAd35A8Tkmy6WE3K.jpg 10/04/19.
- 3.10. See 3.6.
- 3.11. See 1.2.
- 3.12. See 1.4.
- 3.13. See 1.1.
- 3.14. Roman semis, 275 – 270 BCE. Female head/Roma. RRC 19/2.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-19.2> 10/04/19.
- 3.15. Roman as, 269 – 266 BCE. Roma/Roma. RRC 21/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-21.1> 10/04/19.

- 3.16. Roman litra, c. 269 BCE. Minerva/horse head and ROMANO. RRC 14/2.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-14.2> 10/04/19.
- 3.17. See 1.6.
- 3.18. Roman denarius, c. 211 BCE. Roma/Dioscuri and ROMA. RRC 44/5.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-44.5> 10/04/19.
- 3.19. Roman denarius, 194 – 190 BCE. Roma/Luna in biga and ROMA. RRC 133/3.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-133.3> 10/04/19.
- 3.20. Roman denarius, c. 156 BCE. Roma/Victory in biga and ROMA. RRC 197/1a.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-197.1a> 10/04/19.
- 3.21. Roman quinarius, c. 211 BCE. Roma/Dioscuri. RRC 97/2.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-97.2> 10/04/19.
- 3.22. Uncertain value, c. 300 BCE. Minerva/man-headed bull. RRC 2/1. Howgego 1995, plate 55.
- 3.23. Roman uncia, 225 – 217 BCE. Roma/prow. RRC 35/6.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-97.2> 10/04/19.
- 3.24. Lucanian stater, Velia, 350-310 BCE. Athena in Attic helmet/lion and YEΛHTΩN. Williams 329. http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/lucania/velia/Williams_327.jpg 10/04/19.
- 3.25. See 1.1.
- 3.26. Gem in Cabinet des Médailles, Paris. Roma and HAVE ROMA. Furtwangler 1900, plate 54.
- 3.27. Roman denarius, 113 – 112 BCE. Roma and ROMA/ballot scene and P·NERVA. RRC 292/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-292.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.28. Gem depicting Minerva (Roma?), 1st – 3rd century CE. BMC 1923,0401.408.
https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=968126001&objectId=435909&partId=1 10/04/19.
- 3.29. Roman aureus, 211 BCE. Mars/eagle and ROMA. RRC 44/2.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-44.2> 10/04/19.
- 3.30. Roman denarius, 113 – 112 BCE. Philip V and ROMA/equestrian statue and L·PHILIPPVS. RRC 293/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-293.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.31. Roman denarius, 109 – 108 BCE. Roma and ROMA CERCO/ship and Q·LVTATI Q. RRC 305/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-305.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.32. Roman denarius, 114 – 113 BCE. Laureated female and ROMA/equestrian statue and MN·AEMILIO· L E P. RRC 291/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-291.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.33. Roman denarius, c. 119 BCE. Janus and M·FOVRI·L·F/Roma standing left, holding sceptre in left hand and crowing trophy with right hand; ROMA. RRC 281/1.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-281.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.34. Roman denarius, 115 – 114 BCE. Roma and ROMA/Roma, wearing Corinthian helmet, seated right on pile of shields, holding spear in left hand. RRC 287/1.
<http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-287.1> 10/04/19.

- 3.35. Roman denarius, c. 96 BCE. Apollo and A·ALB·S·F L·METEL/Roma seated left on pile of shields, holding sword in left hand and spear in right hand, crowned from behind by Victory; C·MALL. RRC 335/1c. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-335.1c> 10/04/19.
- 3.36. Roman denarius, 99 – 96 BCE. Apollo/Roma seated left on pile of shields, holding sword in left hand and spear in right hand, crowned from behind by Victory; C·MALL. RRC 335/2. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-335.2> 10/04/19.
- 3.37. Roman denarius, c. 70 BCE. Jugate heads of Honos and Virtus; HO VORT KALENI/ Italia on left and Roma on right, clasping hands; between clasped hands, cornucopia; behind Italia, caduceus; Roma wears diadem, holds fasces in left hand and places right foot on globe; ITAL RO CORDI. RRC 403/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-403.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.38. Roman denarius, c. 71 BCE. Virtus; VIRTVS IIIVIR/Warrior, holding shield in left hand and raising up fallen figure with right hand; SICIL MN·AQVIL MN·F·MN·N. RRC 401/1. <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-401.1> 10/04/19.
- 3.39. Iberian drachm, late third century BCE. Roma/man-headed bull and ARSEETAR. CNH 304 no. 2. http://www.coinproject.com/coin_detail.php?coin=204731 10/04/2019.
- 3.40. Iberian drachm, late third century BCE. Roma/man-headed bull and ARSEETAR. CNH 305 no. 4. http://www.coinproject.com/coin_detail.php?coin=259857 10/04/2019.
- 3.41. Iberian as, 233 – 200 BCE. Roma and SAGUNT/prow and Iberian script. CNH 312 no. 61. http://www.coinproject.com/coin_detail.php?coin=259858 10/04/2019.
- 3.42. Dacian imitation denarius. c. first century BCE. Roma/Victory in biga. Davis 1006, fig. 16.
- 3.43. Dacian imitation denarius. c. first century BCE. Roma/Victory in biga. Davis 1006, fig. 18.
- 3.44. Gortyn tetradrachm, c. 66 BCE. Roma/Ephesian Artemis and ΓΟΡΤΥΝ. Svoronos 1890, 181.190.
- 3.45. Attic new style drachm, 91 – 90 BCE. Athena/ owl standing on amphora with Roma seated on the right. Thompson 1124c. http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/attica/athens/Thompson_1124c.jpg 10/04/2019.
- 3.46. Nicaea, Bithynia AE 23mm, 59/8 BCE. Dionysus and ΝΙΚΑΙΕΩΝ/Roma seated on shields; ΡΩΜΗ below. http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/bithynia/nicaea/RecGen_7.jpg 10/04/2019.

APPENDIX

Table 1 Roman Pre-Denarius Coins c. 300 BCE – c. 211 BCE of Helmeted Obverse Figures					
Reference	Date	Denomination	Mint	Obverse	Legend
RRC 2/1	300 BCE	Uncertain	Uncertain	Head of Minerva in Attic helmet	ROMANO
RRC 13/1	280 BCE - 276 BCE	Didrachm	Metapontum	Head of Mars in Corinthian helmet	ROMANO
RRC 13/2	280 BCE - 276 BCE	Litra	Metapontum	Head of Mars in Corinthian helmet	ROMANO
RRC 14/2	280 BCE - 276 BCE	Semis	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 17/1a-i	269 BCE	Litra	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	ROMANO
RRC 19/2	275 BCE - 270 BCE	Semis	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	
RRC 21/1	270 BCE - 266 BCE	As	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	
RRC 21/2	270 BCE - 266 BCE	Semis	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 22/1	265 BCE - 242 BCE	Didrachm	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	ROMANO
RRC 23/1	264 BCE	Didrachm	Messana	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	ROMANO
RRC 24/1	265 BCE - 242 BCE	Tressis	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	
RRC 24/2	265 BCE - 242 BCE	Dupondis	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	
RRC 24/3	265 BCE - 242 BCE	As	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	
RRC 25/1-2	241 BCE - 235 BCE	Didrachm	Rome	Head of Mars in Corinthian helmet	ROMA
RRC 25/3	241 BCE - 235 BCE	Litra	Rome	Head of Mars in Corinthian helmet	ROMA
RRC 25/5	241 BCE - 235 BCE	Semis	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 26/4	234 BCE - 231 BCE	Half-Litra	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	ROMA

RRC 27/1	230 BCE - 226 BCE	Didrachm	Rome	Head of Mars in Corinthian helmet	ROMA
RRC 27/2	230 BCE - 226 BCE	Litra	Rome	Head of Mars in Corinthian helmet	ROMA
RRC 27/5	230 BCE - 226 BCE	As	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	
RRC 27/6	230 BCE - 226 BCE	Semis	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 35/3a-b	225 BCE - 217 BCE	Triens	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 35/5	225 BCE - 217 BCE	Sextans	Rome	Head of Mercury in petasus	
RRC 35/6	225 BCE - 217 BCE	Uncia	Rome	Head of Roma in Attic helmet	
RRC 36/3a-b	225 BCE - 217 BCE	Triens	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 36/5	225 BCE - 217 BCE	Sextans	Rome	Head of Mercury in petasus	
RRC 37/1a-c	225 BCE	As	Unknown	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet with transverse crest, facing	ROMA
RRC 38/3	217 BCE - 215 BCE	Triens	Roma	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 38/5	217 BCE - 215 BCE	Sextans	Rome	Head of Mercury in petasus	ROMA
RRC 38/6	217 BCE - 215 BCE	uncia	Rome	Head of Roma in Attic helmet	ROMA
RRC 38/7	217 BCE - 215 BCE	Semuncia	Rome	Head of Mercury in petasus	ROMA
RRC 38/8	217 BCE - 215 BCE	Quartuncia	Roma	Head of Roma in Attic helmet	ROMA
RRC 41/1a-b	215 BCE- 212 BCE	Mixed	Rome	Head of Roma in Phrygian Helmet	
RRC 41/4	215 BCE- 212 BCE	Dupondis	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 41/7a-b	215 BCE- 212 BCE	Triens	Rome	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	ROMA
RRC 41/10	215 BCE- 212 BCE	Uncia	Rome	Head of Roma in Attic helmet	ROMA
RRC 41/11	215 BCE- 212 BCE	Semuncia	Rome	Head of Mercury in petasus	ROMA
RRC 42/3	214 BCE- 212 BCE	Sextans	Sicily	Head of Mercury in petasus	ROMA
RRC 42/4	214 BCE- 212 BCE	Uncia	Sicily	Head of Roma in Attic helmet	ROMA

RRC 42/5	214 BCE-212 BCE	Semuncia	Sicily	Head of Mercury in petasus	
RRC 43/3a-c	214 BCE-212 BCE	Triens	Luceria	Head of Minerva in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 43/4	214 BCE-212 BCE	Sextans	Luceria	Head of Mercury in petasus	
RRC 43/5	214 BCE-212 BCE	Uncia	Luceria	Head of Roma in Attic helmet	
RRC 43/6	214 BCE-212 BCE	Semuncia	Luceria	Head of Mercury in petasus	
RRC 44/2-4	211 BCE	As	Rome	Head of Mars in Corinthian helmet	
RRC 44/5	211 BCE	Denarius	Rome	Head of Roma in winged Attic helmet	

Note: Minerva appears twenty-nine times on the pre-denarius coinage. Minerva only wears an Attic helmet on the RRC 2/1 and a Corinthian helmet on every coin following.

Mars appears nine times. He wears a Corinthian helmet every time and is usually bearded. He appears distinctly male.

Roma appears sixteen times on pre-denarius coinage. She initially wears a Phrygian helmet on the earlier coins; however, has transitioned to an Attic helmet by the time of the first denarius in c. 211 BCE.

Mercury appears nine times. He wears a petasus and is quite clearly male.

Table 2	
Coins with ROMA legend after 110 BCE	
RRC 313/1a-c	Saturn & ROMA
RRC 317/2	Saturn in quadriga & ROMA
RRC 329/1c-d	Hercules & ROMA
RRC 329/2	Janus & ROMA
RRC 335/9	Diana & ROMA
RRC 335/10a-b	Apollo & ROMA
RRC 343/1a-c	Female bust (Roma?) & ROMA
RRC 369/1	Apollo & ROMA
RRC 370/1a-b	Apollo & ROMA
RRC 371/1	Apollo & ROMA
RRC 362/1a&c	Female bust (Roma?) & ROMA
RRC 364/31,b,c	Roma & ROMA

Note: After 110 BCE the ROMA legend appears on the obverse 25 times. Three of these times are alongside the traditional Roma figure and five are alongside a figure who could be identified as Roma.

Table 3
Roma on the reverse of Roman denarii

Reference	Date	Obverse	Reverse
RRC 281/1	119 BCE	M·FOVRI·L·F: Laureate head of Janus.	ROMA: Roma standing left, holding sceptre in left hand and crowing trophy with right hand; above, star; the trophy is surmounted by a helmet in the form of a boar's head and flanked by a carnyx and shield on each side.
RRC 287/1	115 – 114 BCE	ROMA X: Helmeted head of Roma, right.	Roma, wearing Corinthian helmet, seated right on pile of shields, holding spear in left hand; at feet, helmet; before, she-wolf right, suckling twins; on either side, bird flying.
RRC 317/1	104 BCE	A: Helmeted head of Roma left.	L·SAT: Helmeted head of Roma left.
RRC 329/1a-d	100 BCE	B dot above and below ROMA: Bust of Hercules seen from behind, with head turned to right and club over left shoulder; on left, shield and control-mark.	B dot above and below LENT·MAR·F: Roma standing facing, holding spear in right hand and wearing helmet with triple crest; to right, male figure crowning her with right hand and holding cornucopia in left hand; between, control-mark. Laurel-wreath as border.
RRC 335/1a-c & 2	99 - 66 BCE	A·ALB·S·F L·METEL: Laureate head of Apollo right. Border of dots.	C·MALL: Roma seated left on pile of shields, holding sword in left hand and spear in right hand, crowned from behind by Victory. Border of dots.
RRC 391/3	75 BCE	MAXSVMVS: Bust of Libertas right, draped and wearing diadem; behind, pileus and inscription.	C·EGNATIVS·CN·F CN·N B: Roma and Venus, each holding staff in right hand; Venus has Cupid about to alight on shoulder; on either side, rudder standing on prow ; on left, control mark.
RRC 421/1	59 BCE	S·C SVFENAS: Head of Saturn right; behind, harpa and oval object.	PR·L·V·P·F SEX·NONI: Roma seated left on pile of armour, holding sceptre in right hand and sword in left hand; behind, Victory holding palm-branch in left hand and crowning Roma with right hand; around, inscription.
RRC 449/4	48 BCE	[LIBERTATIS]: Laureate head of Libertas right.	C·PANSA·C·F·C·N: Roma, helmeted, seated right on pile of arms, holding sceptre in right hand and placing left foot on globe; on right, flying Victory crowning Roma.