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Preface

This volume had its genesis, appropriately enough, among friends enjoying a fine lunch provided by a host, who as it happened was not at the table due to a scheduling conflict. The discussion of coins, wine, and the importance of friendship that afternoon naturally led to the consideration of ways to thank our host for his habitual generosity. Many who knew him were at one time or another a guest at his table; these moments of good cheer and serious conversation, he felt, were the best way to explore ideas in numismatics, to think of grand new projects, and to bring together old colleagues and new friends in an attempt to ever widen the circles of knowledge and acquaintance. As a host, he preferred to ask questions and let others do the talking, to recede to the sidelines (that afternoon to the point of invisibility!), convinced that his role was secondary to the “real” work of others. We all knew this not to be true. Although he modestly considered himself no more than an amateur, there is no question he made substantial contributions to numismatic scholarship, stewardship, and education. A volume of essays in his honor seemed the right answer for all he had done for us individually and collectively.

The enthusiastic response to the *Festschrift* for Richard Beyer Witschonke, “Rick” to most all who knew him, proved the value of the man and the project. Sadly, he did not live to see it completed, although he took great pleasure in reading early drafts of many of the papers. His decade-long battle with cancer, in which he displayed his typical good cheer and immense fortitude, came to an end on 24 February 2015. Now as a Gedenkschrift, we hope that this volume will serve as a fitting tribute to an exceptional individual.

Born in 1945 and raised in Connecticut, Rick graduated from Harvard Business School in 1972 with an MBA with high honors and took a position with American Management Systems (AMS), a technology consulting firm. Rick worked for AMS for most of his career, and after leaving the company in 2000, he continued to work in technology consulting in California before deciding to retire to Califon, New Jersey, to be with his partner Heidi Becker in 2003. Soon thereafter, he began to volunteer several days a week at the American Numismatic Society (ANS) in New York City, before becoming a Curatorial Associate in 2006. Numismatics, especially the coinage of the Roman Republic, had long been a major passion of his; another collecting passion was fine wine.

Rick’s coin collecting interests began as a teenager. In 1960 at age 15, he obtained a Roman Republican denarius from a Lu Riggs auction. His interest in *denarii* intensified after reading Edward A. Sydenham's *The Coinage of the Roman Republic* (1952), which inspired him to learn more about Republican coinage in general. Republican period coinage was his major collecting focus for the next several decades, during which time he assembled an impressively comprehensive collection of Roman Republican and provincial coins. Most of the Republican collection was sold over the last several years and is featured in the 2013 Numismatic Ars Classica publication *The RBW Collection of Roman Republican Coins*. The second part of his collection, almost 3,500 Provincial coins of the Republican period he bequeathed to the ANS. This absolutely unique group of coins, probably the only area of Roman coinage that has never been properly catalogued, is comprised of coins from the third to first centuries BC, produced in various parts of the Mediterranean region under Roman control. A volume on this portion of the collection will be published in the near future by the ANS.
Rick's affiliation with the ANS began after his first visit in the late 1960s, when he became, for a while, the ANS's youngest member. In 1999, Rick was elected a member of the Society's Governing Council and served one term as an ANS Trustee. Where he felt better able to serve the Society, however, was in the curatorial department helping with the care of the Roman collection, and in sharing his passion for coinage with Summer Seminar students. With his immense enthusiasm for teaching and his conviction that the Seminar is one of the most important activities of the ANS, since it helps to train the next generation of numismatists, Rick was asked to co-direct the Seminar in 2006. Thanks to his enormous input and energy, an already good program was turned into a great program. His commitment to teaching was demonstrated again in the summer of 2014, when he was already in steep decline from the cancer and in tremendous pain; he still insisted on coming into the Seminar to teach his full roster of sessions.

Although he never considered himself a scholar, Rick nevertheless shared his vast knowledge of Republican coinage in a series of critical articles published by several of the most respected numismatic periodicals and helped as well to edit Festschriften for his close friends, one for Charles Hersch that appeared in 1998, and another for Roberto Russo, that appeared in 2013. Perhaps his greatest contributions to scholarship, however, stemmed from his experience as a businessman. A quick study, highly decisive, and hugely pragmatic, he was able to undertake large scale, complicated projects and see them to fruition. At the same time, he demonstrated an amazing openness to new ideas and perspectives, investing his time, resources and energy in assessing and launching new projects. Such traits were well demonstrated by the computerized die-recognition project he launched and financed, now being further developed by the ANS, which promises to create a software package for automating die studies that will be available in the near future. He also played an important role in the early stages of the ANS's various digital project initiatives, including Nomisma.org, and more recently in helping to organize and launch Coinage of the Roman Republic Online (www.numismatics.org/crro) and Coin Hoards of the Roman Republic (www.numismatics.org/chrr).

As is always the case, a volume such as this one would not have been possible without the assistance, diligence, and hard work of others not named on the title page or in the table of contents. Here we must thank Ute Wartenberg for her immediate and full support of the volume; Andrew Reinhard for his excruciating eye for editorial detail; Aadya Bedi and Alan Roche for image assistance; and Muserref Yetim, whose typesetting and design have given this book life.

Peter G. van Alfen

Gilles Bransbourg

Michel Amandry
A Bibliography of Richard B. Witschonke
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Book Reviews


Ulysses’s Return and Portrayals of Fides on Republican Coins

Liv Mariah Yarrow

Ulysses\textsuperscript{1,2} is depicted twice on the Republican coins, once in the 180s BC and again about a century later in the late 80s (\textit{RRC} 149/1–5, 189–180 BC and \textit{RRC} 362/1, 82 BC, Figs. 1 and 2). Both times the coins also have a legend identifying the moneyer as a member of the Mamilian \textit{gens}. The earlier bronze issue uses the typical designs: the prow of a warship on the reverse with a different divinity indicating each denomination: Janus for the \textit{as}, Saturn for the \textit{semis}, Minerva on the \textit{triens}, Hercules on the \textit{quadrans}, Mercury on the \textit{sextans} and Roma on the \textit{uncia} (Russo 1998, 145). The moneyer’s intervention is to add his name under the prow and to stand a little figure of Ulysses on the deck of the ship. The bearded traveler with a staff and cloak, and wearing a \textit{pileus}, would have been a familiar image of Ulysses to just about any viewer in the ancient Mediterranean (Touchefeu-Meynier 1968). The names of moneyers and symbols, often allusions to the moneyer’s name, were already commonplace on the Republican series. These symbols often “float” above the prow suggesting no interaction between design and the moneyer’s mark.\textsuperscript{3} The placement of the small figure of Ulysses on the prow

\textsuperscript{1} I offer this essay in gratitude and admiration for Rick’s generous support and rigorous intellectual mentoring of the next generation of numismatists. It could not have been written without opportunities provided by Leonard and Claire Tow Faculty Travel Fellowship, The PSC-CUNY Research Award Program, British School at Rome, and the Brooklyn College Classics Department. Portions were presented at Leeds University and the ANS Summer Seminar and it has been much strengthened by feedback received on each occasion, as well as from the comments of this volume’s editors, C. J. Smith, G. Farney, L. Morgan, and S. D. Ackerman. All remaining shortcomings are my own.

\textsuperscript{2} I use Ulysses when talking about Italic and Roman literary and artistic representation and Odysseus when referring to Greek, especially Homeric representations.

\textsuperscript{3} Examples include the bronze issues \textit{RRC} 121, 124, 142 amongst many others. That symbols could be integrated into the pictorial space of the design is evident from \textit{RRC} 122. The dog is consistently placed on the exergue line on all the silver issues, but by contrast hovers over the prow on the bronze. Eventually moneyers will freely allow such symbolic additions to interact with the standard type; for example, \textit{RRC} 313/2–4, where the prow-stem is decorated with the head of Venus, which
Liv Mariah Yarrow

cleverly integrates the new symbol with the standard type, creating a scene that further emphasizes Ulysses's role as a traveler, but cannot be read as alluding to a specific narrative episode. While it is possible to argue that the figure is not intended to interact with the prow any more than any other moneyer's symbol, the consistent placement of the figure on the prow, as well as the numerous Hellenistic precedents of coin types with figures standing on prows, make it likely they would have been read together on this specimen at least by some viewers. Crawford sees this as the first private type, albeit a small change from the symbols and moneyer's names seen on previous issues (RRC II, p. 726). For him and most other commentators, the type is private because of how it advertises the origins and heroic, even divine, associations of the moneyer’s family.

About a century later, a member of the same family once again served as a moneyer (RRC 362/1). The obverse shows a young Mercury, readily identifiable by his winged hat and caduceus. The prevailing suggestion is that the moneyer is claiming Mercury as a divine ancestor for his gens. It is also likely that the moneyer was inspired by the obverse of an earlier sextans, particularly one executed in a fine style with the caduceus (Fig. 3). According to Crawford, a sextans obverse with a fine style Mercury was part of his ancestor’s own series (RRC 149/5a). More typically, sextantes had only depicted the head of Mercury alone, and there are many of this more common style without the caduceus extant from the earlier Mamilian issue (RRC 149/5b). The control marks behind the head of Mercury spell a version of the moneyer’s name, and each control mark is represented by several dies according is crowned by a Cupid, echoing the reverse design of the denarius in the same series, RRC 313/1, Venus in a biga crowded by Cupid.

4. Hellenistic precedents include the Nike on prow type of Demetrios I Poliorketes (e.g., Newell 22, pl. II, 14) and the Athena on a prow used at Phaselis and Arados and other mints (SNG von Aulock 4430–4436 and BMC Phoenicia pp. 13, 88–90).

5. Stevenson, Smith, and Madden 1889, s.v. “C. MAMIL. LIMETANVS” erroneously claims that the Ulysses reverse is also known paired with an obverse similar to that of RRC 383/1.

6. See n. 9 and corresponding discussion.

7. If so, the type is extremely rare the only attested specimen is Paris, A 21099 [non vidi].
to Crawford. The reverse has Ulysses, again with his pileus, staff, and cape. He is represented walking forwards and holds out his right hand in a gesture, maybe a gesture of greeting. In front of him at his feet, a dog stands and looks up at him. We are immediately reminded of the scene in Homer when Odysseus's dog Argos is the first to recognize him upon his homecoming.

... half-dead from neglect, here lay the hound, old Argos. But the moment he sensed Odysseus standing by, he thumped his tail, nuzzling low, his ears dropped, though he had no strength to drag himself an inch towards his master... (Hom. Od. 17.328–333, Fagles trans.)

The episode is tragic, even painful. Argos, tick-infested and living in a dung heap, dies as the disguised Odysseus tries to conceal his feelings for his hound. In Homer's version, Argos and Odysseus never actually greet each other. Argos wakes, but cannot rise. Odysseus choke back his tears, comments on the fine old hound to the swineherd and walks by into the palace. Argos gets no final pat farewell before he dies. The image of the coin is not quite Homer's version. It is Ulysses and Argos to be sure, but the scene leaves out the swineherd and emphasizes a joyful reunion that Homer makes Odysseus forego in order that he might not risk his disguise before his confrontation with the suitors. The moneyer has bracketed Ulysses with his own name, including his cognomen, Limetanus.

This issue of C. Mamilius Limetanus in 82 BC was the focus of two articles in 2007 and 2008. The authors, Morgan and Farney respectively, did not know one another's work at the time of publication. While they disagree on a few fundamental points, broadly speaking their reading of the iconography of the type is in harmony. Both connect the moneyer's cognomen to a lex Mamilia related to the regulating of property boundaries, and both see Mercury as a reference to that god's role as a guardian of boundaries, as well as an ancestor of the moneyer through Ulysses as indicated by the reverse type.

Farney's overall interpretation rests on the lex Mamilia de limitibus being associated with the tribunate of the moneyer's father, also C. Mamilius Limetanus, in 109 BC. He proposes that the family used their divine association with Mercury to address religious anxieties and arguments arising over agrarian issues, and thus also to promote their own family's position within the key political issues of

8. On the lex Mamilia, see Corp. Agr. 4.16–18, 22.33–24.4, 30.14–21, 60.14–25, 110.18–25, 136.1–12 and Cic. Leg. 1.55–57. Morgan 2007, 195 rejects the possibility that the Lex Mamilia de limitibus is related to the Lex Mamilia Roscia Perducea Alliena Fabia, anticipating the publication of his colleague's seminal work (Bispham 2008, 233–238 and 417–418 with a survey of previous scholarship). Farney 2008, 255 leaves open the possibility of a connection, citing Crawford 1989, who also wants to separate the lex Mamilia Roscia from the literary testimony and connects it instead with the lex Julia Agraria. Bispham refutes this latter proposed connection as well (2008, 234).


10. So also Crawford 1989, 187, although Morgan perceives some doubt in Crawford's wording (2007, 196 n. 140). Farney 2008, 255 tries to strengthen the family connection with agrarian reforms by citing Cichorius's restoration of the name C. Mamilius to what he thought was a list of land-commissioners appointed under Drusus's law of 91 BC (1922, 124–125). A better reading of the stone and a discovery of a related inscription, make the suggestion impossible; the inscription records local magistrates in charge of restoring the walls c. 48 BC (?) (CIL i.3166 and 3166a with Bispham 2008, 305–308 and 488–489). See also Roselaar 2010, 269 with further references to earlier scholarship.
the period. Morgan focuses on the statement found in Urbicus, likely to derive from Frontinus, that because of the archaic language (antiqui sermonis) of the \textit{lex Mamilia}, it was hard to understand its actual meaning (\textit{Corp. Agr.} 24.1–3), and the implication in Cicero that the law is a reenactment of a statute of the Twelve Tables (Cic. \textit{Leg.} 1.55–57). From these points, as well as the tribute of 109 BC’s acclaim in our extant sources for his corruption legislation instead of any agrarian policy (Sall. \textit{Bf} 40, 65), he deduces that the \textit{lex Mamilia de limitibus} and the cognomen is more likely to date to agrarian controversies of the fourth century conflict between plebeians and patricians.\footnote{Smith 1996, 176 less specifically hypothesizes a fourth century BC date for the first engagement of the Mamilii in Roman politics based on the date of Tusculum’s likely enfranchisement; see also n. 21 and n. 68.} His arguments against a date of 109 BC for the \textit{lex Mamilia de limitibus} are substantive and demand consideration, but a fourth century date does not seem to fit well with what we know about the gens’s history of office-holding at Rome. There is no evidence of Mamilii holding office at Rome until the mid third century when at least two branches of the family, the Turrini and the Vituli, reached the consulship as well as other prominent magistracies, and held at least one augurship.\footnote{BNP, s.v. “Mamilus [3], [5], [6], and [7]” and \textit{MRR} I.201–202, 204, 210–211, 221, 289, 291, 295. Some variant manuscript readings and conflicting sources might suggest that a Mamilius held the consulsip in 480 BC and others served as a military tribune with consular power in 405 BC and 400 BC, but these are more likely to be the result of the common confusion of the name Manlius and Mamilius, rather than reflecting actually events or even an alternative historical tradition: Livy 2.43.11 and 2.47.1 with \textit{MRR} I.25 n. 1; Diod. 14.17.1 \textit{contra} Livy 4.61.1 with \textit{MRR} I.80 n. 1; Livy 5.12.9–10 with \textit{MRR} I.85 n. 1. Ogilvie does not even entertain the possibility (1965).} If we are to hypothesize a date for the \textit{lex} prior to 109 BC, it still seems unlikely to be more than a generation or two before the 260s.\footnote{Stevenson, Smith and Madden 1889, s.v. “Mamilia” dates the \textit{lex} to A.U.C. 589 (= 165 BC), presumably linking it to the efforts of P. Lentulus to recover \textit{ager publicus} in Campania, Gran. Lic. 28.31–6 and Cic. \textit{Agr.} 2.82; I know of no evidence to justify this connection.}

Morgan’s most significant contribution, however, is his sharper reading of the reverse type (2007, 198). He sees the depiction of Ulysses at his own threshold as he returns to defend his property from the greedy suitors as symbolically linked with the promotion of the branch of the gens Mamilia that took its cognomen from the \textit{lex de limitibus} and the relevance of agrarian issues in contemporary discourse. The mythological narrative evoked by the iconography recounts not only a memorable moment at a boundary, a \textit{limes} of sorts, but also the subsequent battle against the suitors and Ulysses’s final triumphal assertion of his rights to his household and land. So read, the reverse type reinforces and makes more specific the connotations of the use of Mercury on the obverse. The moneyer and his family become heroically associated with the defense of individual property rights.

By reading the type as primarily “personal,” that is to say associating the iconography with the legislation of one of the moneyer’s ancestors, as well as the potential resonance that might have in a contemporary political context, we miss out on what resonances the type might have for a contemporary audience, beyond the glorification of a single gens. The following discussion surveys three categories of comparative evidence and argues that other broader interpretations of the type are possible, indeed perhaps even more plausible. The first presents the literary traditions surrounding Ulysses and the Mamilii, as well as comparative epigraphic evidence; particular emphasis is given to their relationships to the Roman people and surrounding communities, especially their specific connection to Tusculum. The second considers iconographic parallels found on gem and glass-pastes, and how the deployment of the Ulysses and Argos image should be read in different contexts, as well as considering how the meaning of an image is affected by its dissemination. Third and finally, the historical context
of the iconography and its potential symbolism is reconsidered in light of the use of other coin types, especially the so-called oath-swearing scenes, which share a similar semantic meaning.

**Ulysses as a Shared Progenitor**

Although Ulysses’s role connecting the peoples of the Mediterranean has been the subject of a landmark study (Malkin 1998), he is still perhaps not the most familiar character connected with Rome’s foundations. Thus it will not be amiss to survey the most relevant testimony. Sometime in the latter half of the sixth century BC, a poet appended to the end of Hesiod’s *Theogony* a catalogue of goddesses who had sex with mortal men (ll. 936–1022; West 1966, 398–99). This gives us the earliest Greek account of the origins of the Latin peoples:

Circe, the daughter of Hyperion’s son Helius, in love with patient-minded Odysseus, gave birth to Argius and Latinus, excellent and strong, [and she bore Telegonus because of golden Aphrodite]. These ruled over all the much-renowned Tyrrhenians, far away, in the inner most part of the holy islands (ll. 1011–6; Most trans.).

Tyrrhenians, Τυρρηνοῖσιν in the text, is another name for the Etruscans, and Argius has been associated with Italian god Faunus (Frazer 1983, 90; Wiseman 1995, 47–48). The reference to Telegonus is marked off in most editions, as it is considered a still-later interpolation (West 1966, 398–99). Dionysius of Halicarnassus writing in the late first century BC knows an account from a certain historian, Xenagoras, perhaps from the third century BC, who said that “Odysseus and Circe had three sons, Rhomos, Anteias, and Ardeia, who set up three cities and named their foundations after themselves” (*BNJ* 240 F29 = Dion. Hal. 1.72.5). Dionysius also tell us that the fifth century BC historian Hellenicus of Mytilene has Aeneas travel with Odysseus into Italy whence he founds Rome and names the city after a Trojan woman, Rhome (*FGrH* 4 F84 = Dion. Hal. 1.72.2; Solmsen 1986). Odysseus as a travelling companion of Aeneas may also be alluded to in the convoluted prophetic language of Lykophron’s *Alexandra* (1226–80). Plutarch knew a version in which the city founder was Rhomanos, son of Odysseus and Circe (*Romulus* 1). And, a later commentator on Virgil writing in the fourth century AD, had heard a story in which Latinus, son of Circe and Odysseus, named the city after his dead sister, Rhome (Serv. *comm. Aen.* 1.273). Perhaps most striking is the account given by Hyginus, a freedman of Augustus, in which Telegonus, son of Circe and Odysseus, accidently kills his father and marries Penelope from which union Italus is born, while simultaneously Telemachus, Odysseus’s son by Penelope, marries Circe and thus fathers Latinus. Hyginus’s summary may reflect the plot of the much earlier sixth century BC epic, the *Telegonia* of Eugammon of Cyrene (Wiseman 1995, 49–50; West 1966, 433–43). Even if all these short literary references do not add up to a single fully developed

---


15. Hyginus, *Fabulae* 127 with Wiseman 1995, 49 n. 37. Rowland 1966, 413, following Altheim 1938, 68, summarizes the legendary genealogies as if they were a unified account and by focusing on Italus and Mamilia as offspring of Telegonus comes to the conclusion that *RRC* 362/1 was intended to demonstrate the moneyer’s kinship with the Italians, citing in support of this theory a number of passages that connect Circe or Angitia or Medea to the Marsi among other peoples. This seems highly unlikely.
narrative of the Greek Odysseus as a founder of Rome, at least as they have come down to us today, they still represent a substantial narrative pattern. Thus, while there is no particularly unity between our received accounts regarding Odysseus’s connection to the origins of Rome and the Latin people, he, as a wandering hero, certainly offered an opportune means of connecting the community on the Tiber to the wider thought-world of the Greeks, and he could be put to the same use for other communities in Italy and elsewhere.

Telegonus and Tusculum are certainly strongly connected in Latin literature, albeit in authors working in the Imperial period. Almost always, Telegonus is linked to the walls of the city, but none of these sources mention the Mamillii, and some do not directly connect Telegonus back to Circe and/or Odysseus. Moreover, in the Republican period, the connection of Ulysses to Tusculum through Telegonus is not always a narrative certainty; other potential founders of Tusculum are recorded (Diod. 7.4) and Callias, the court historian of Agathocles, the early third century tyrant of Syracuse, has a version of events in which Telegonus is the brother of Romus and Romulus, all sons of Latinus by a Trojan woman named Rhome (Callias FGrH 564 F5 = Dion. Hal. 1.72.5).

It is in the context of these narrative variations both regarding Rome, Tusculum, and other communities that we should consider the literary traditions surrounding the gens Mamilia themselves. A distinguished Latin family, they are primarily associated with Tusculum. Livy relates how Tarquin Superbus, Rome’s last legendary king, sought out an alliance with Octavius Mamilius by offering him his daughter’s hand in marriage (1.49.9). As part of the narrative, Livy reports that Mamilius was, according to tradition, descended from Ulysses and Circe. Dionysius says nearly the exact same thing, except adds the detail that this connection is through Ulysses’s and Circe’s son, Telegonus (4.45.1). We must rely on Festus for the information that Telegonus had a daughter Mamilia from whom the gens descended—a rather odd account given the patrilineal naming customs of Italic peoples: we need not assume Festus’s version was the most widely accepted. This Octavius is remembered for instigating the formation of an anti-Roman league of thirty Latin towns, either on his own (Livy 2.18) or in close collaboration with the exiled Sextus Tarquinius (Dion. Hal. 5.61). There is a suggestion that this league was a sort of aristocratic conspiracy suppressing the will of the common people (Dion. Hal. 6.2). At the subsequent battle of Lake Regillus, Mamilius commanded the right wing and features prominently in the surviving narratives (Dion. Hal. 6.11–12, Livy 2.19–20). This battle is one of the

16. Hor. Ep. 1.29–30 links Tusculum to Circe, but does not directly mention Telegonus. Ov. Fast. 3.92 and Stat. Silv. 1.3.83, and Sil. Ital. 12.535 link just Telegonus. Hor. Od. 3.29.8, Prop. 2.32.4, and Sil. Ital. 7.692 link the city and Telegonus, at least by implication, back to Circe and Ulysses. All of the above, excepting Statius, refer to the walls and/or the height of the city. If Pi 2003’s hypothesis is right that Tusculum emphasized its Ulyssean connections in light of Tiberius’s own genealogical associations, it is possible that some of these references reflect that resurgent interest. A statue base honoring Telegonus which is said to be from the theater at Tusculum is often used as evidence of a special connection between the hero and the city; I find the evidence problematic, see appendix A for evidence and discussion.

17. Gallia 2007, 61 urges skepticism that this narrative derives from "some as-yet-unknown Tusculan tradition," or that other accounts of legendary events can be traced back to specific "local" or "regional" historiographical traditions, contra Mele 1987, 174–176. Instead, he sees the accounts that place Superbus in the company of other dictators as appealing to Roman audiences because they emphasize the despotism of Rome’s last king, analogous to how connecting Numa to Pythagoras emphasizes the former’s wisdom. In the same spirit, Ogilvie 1965, 195 suggested that the marriage of Superbus’s daughter to Mamilius is modeled on the actions of Hippias; he sees the whole account of Tarquin as modeled on the story of Harmodius and Aristogeiton.

most celebrated in the Roman tradition, being won with the divine aid of the Dioscuri, who them-

selves delivered news of the victory to Rome.\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, it symbolized the end of monarchical rule at
Rome and established the \textit{foedus Cassianum} which defined relations, both public and private, between
Rome and Latium through the first century BC (Cic. \textit{Balb.} 53). Being on the “wrong” side of this battle
would be an odd tradition for a \textit{gens} to use to promote their antiquity.\textsuperscript{20} It is balanced out by the
narrative of a Lucius Mamilius, the dictator of Tusculum some 40 years later, who is said to have rescued
the Capitoline from an attack by the Sabines (Livy 3.15–18 and Dion. Hal. 10.16). He received citizen-
ship as his reward.\textsuperscript{21} It may be that this heroic fulfillment of the mutual defense clause of the \textit{foedus
Cassianum}, not Octavius’s connection to Superbus, which was the focal point of the family tradition.

Overall, the early identity of the Mamilii is wrapped up in the struggles between Latium and
Rome for an appropriate balance of power. Lake Regillus was only won by Romans through the di-
vine intervention of the Dioscuri, and the resulting treaty was one of mutual defense, protection, and
collaboration. The moral of that story is that Rome needs the Latins. The same moral is found in the
story of Lucius Mamilius’s rescue of the Capitoline. We find a similar moral lurking in the version
of Telegonus’s parentage reported by the third century Sicilian historian, Callias, already mentioned
above. Romus, Romulus, and Telegonus are brothers, sons of one father, Latinus. The brothers are the
founders of cities, the father the eponymous progenitor of the whole race. Brothers may quarrel, but
sons are dependent on their father. In this sort of mythic thinking, one cannot quite help wondering
where the Latinus in Callias’s version may intersect with other narrative accounts. We also saw three
different mythic versions that made Latinus a descendent of Ulysses. The most famous was the late
sixth century emendation to Hesiod, but there was also a version in Servius’s commentary on the
\textit{Aeneid} and the elaborate narrative summarized by Hyginus that might also have sixth century ante-
cedents. While Callias may have had all, or one, or none of, these specific traditions in mind, together
they add up to a substantial narrative pattern of Ulysses as a collective progenitor of the Latin people,
including, but not exclusive to, Rome, upon which Callias and others could draw for their individual
reconstructions of the legendary past. If we worry a little less about how Telegonus and thus Tusculum
enter into the equation, we can also add back into our thinking the version of that other third century
historian, Xenagoras, in which the eponymous founders of Rome, Antium, and Ardea, all descend
from Ulysses. We, in fact, see in Xenagoras’s version a very similar narrative strategy to that in Callias’s
account. The eponymous founder of Rome has as his brothers the founders of other Latin cities, and
those cities all have common ancestor in Ulysses (Wiseman 1995, 49–50).

I would argue that when Ulysses is selected by moneyers of the \textit{gens Mamilia}, the message con-
vveyed is not a singular assertion of the worthiness of their personal ancestors or the heroic lineage

\textsuperscript{19} It is this protection of the Roman state that is recalled by the use of Dioscuri as the standard reverse type at the
beginning of the denarius series; Crawford \textit{RRC II}, p. 715 n. 3 and p. 720.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Cic. \textit{Ad Att.} 9.10.3 for the use of this narrative as a negative \textit{exempla} in the republican period. It is the descendants
of Mamilius’s victorious opponent that celebrate this memory (\textit{RRC} 335/9 and Val. Max. 1.8.1).

\textsuperscript{21} Cato F25 = Prisc. Gl. 2.227k: \textit{Nam de omni Tusculana ciuitate soli Lucii Mamilii beneficium gratum fuit}; Livy 3.29
implies Tusculum may have been offered the same reward at this time. See Humbert 1978, 175 n. 69 for discussion. The
traditional date of 381/380 BC for the enfranchisement of Tusculum is based on Livy 6.26 and 8.37. Forsythe 2005, 205
argues for the historicity of the Sabine attack and Tusculan rescue on the basis that it is not particularly flattering to the
Romans and thus must represent a tradition preserved through family memory. The \textit{turris Mamilia} and its role in the ritual
of the October horse has sometimes been connected with these earlier Mamilii, but the problem is rife with speculative
reconstructions; see Appendix B.
of their hometown, but instead a celebration of the common origins of Rome and her fellow Latins. Ulysses as a wandering hero was shared by multiple communities and used to unite them. This is not to suggest that the Mamilii did not take pride in their special connection to this myth, but the importance of that connection is that the myth is one they shared, not just with the people of Tusculum, but with the Roman people, and other Latins and Italians besides. In fact, this sharing of the Ulysses between communities is perhaps the only stable narrative element, in a sea of variable, competing traditions.

**Loyal Argos**

So far the focus has been only on the general associations of Ulysses in a regional, as well as familial context. However, the particular figure of Ulysses represented on the coin of 82 BC would have been very familiar to many Italians, particular those of the ruling classes, those whom Cicero called the domi nobiles. The images on the coins are directly borrowed from the iconography of a popular seal ring type in use in Italy from at least the mid-fourth century BC onwards. There are at least 12 known gems and one gold ring from Tarentum depicting the Ulysses and Argos scene. There are also numerous gems depicting Ulysses alone and holding a staff. The primarily Italic usage of the design on both precious stone and glass-paste intaglios is confirmed by the acquisition notes for most specimens, and the existence of the design on at least one Etruscan scarab. While the provenance of few such objects can be absolutely certain, only two specimens are said to have been acquired outside Italy. Glass pastes gave those of lower economic means the ability to possess a seal or decorative intaglio. The use of the subject on glass pastes, as well as precious stones, makes clear the wide appeal of the imagery.

I find myself largely, but not completely, in agreement with a little-noticed publication of Toynbee (1977, 4):

> It was almost certainly from a gem that Caius Mamilius Limetanus's die-engraver got his model from the denarius reverse-type struck in 82 BC. … The type is believed to allude to the mon-eyer's claim to be descended the son of Odysseus by Circe, Telegonos, who founded Tusculum,

---

22. Brommer 1976, 273, updating Toucheuf-Meynier 1968, 227–228. The gem database of the Beazley Archive [http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk] seems to record two more specimens one recently surfacing on the market and the other known in the nineteenth century, not corresponding any of those catalogued by Brommer; Platz-Horster 2005, 82 and Christie's, London: 1819–1022. The connection to the coins has long been observed among those studying gems, less so in reverse; Böhm 1997, 99–100 and pl.36, an art historian working on the republican coin series, is the exception that proves the rule.

23. New York Metropolitan Museum no. 41.160.766, AGDS Munich no. 1375; there are also very similar representations that seem to shift the iconography of Odysseus the traveler with Odysseus in the guise of the beggar, by representing him as more bent over and with a crooked staff: New York Metropolitan Museum no. 17.194.31, British Museum no.1923.0401.795, AGDS Munich no. 488 and 1374, Ashmolean Garnet, Boardman and Vollenweider 1978, no. 381. Images of the Metropolitan and British Museum specimens are available online at the sites of the respective institutions. All of these have the more common representation of Odysseus with his legs crossed. It is less common for him to be represented striding forward such as he is on the coins, although specimens are known: AGDS Munich no. 1373 and 3243. The rendering of the crooked staff on gems such as these has led, McCabe to suggest that the crooked staff on RRC 77/1 may be a reference to the gens Mamilia (Russo et al. 2013, no. 325).

24. AGDS Munich no. 488 is said to have been acquired on the Istanbul art market and Henig 1974, no. 466 records a specimen reported to have been found in Britain at Brecon but the actual specimen could not be located at the time of his cataloging. Of course, nothing precludes these objects originating Italy.
from which the Mamillii came. But with Telegonos Argos appears to have little connection: the intrinsic charm of the Argos story and the availability of glyptic models are more likely to have influenced Mamilius's choice of this type.

What Toynbee does not answer is why the “intrinsic charm” of the story should have resonance at this historical moment.

While there are a variety of means of representing the Ulysses and Argos scene, such as slight variations in the figures's stance, or the length of staff, or amount of clothing, invariably there is a gesture of apparent greeting and eye contact between the two. A garnet in the Munich collection provides the closest direct visual parallel for RRC 362/1 (Fig. 5), but is by no means a mirror image. Ulysses's right arm is bend upwards instead of being extended forwards, and the top of the staff is curved instead of being straight. The closest parallel for RRC 149/1 is the glass paste, also at Munich (AGDS Munich 1375), which, like the small figure on the coin, also emphasizes the substantial cloak over the figure’s far shoulder, which drapes down the front of his body.

The presence of these two types of Ulysses on so many intaglions demonstrates that the iconography had wide resonance as a marker of identity and should not be thought of as restricted to just a single gens or even just the hometown of that gens. The lack of previous scholarly integration of this evidence into numismatic and historical discussions can be perhaps explained by the gems and glass pastes not being particularly well known, even if numerous. Other than on gems and the coin in question, Odysseus and Argos is a very rare artistic subject in antiquity, with no known direct parallels in other media, with the exception of one sarcophagus lid from Naples where Odysseus is shown seated outside the doors of his home, rather than standing, and is without his staff.25 Second, and more importantly, these iconographic parallels on seals let us consider what symbolic resonance the image has in a personal context. If we understand why the image was chosen for so many seal rings, we will be significantly closer to understanding why the same image was adopted for a public coin type. In the ancient world, a seal was used to confirm the identity of the sender of a document, and an unbroken

seal stood surety for the confidentiality of the communique. Argos is the first to recognize Ulysses on his return to Ithaca. The seal itself is an aid to recognition, and thus on one level the iconography simply plays upon the function of the mark itself and the action in the scene (Moreno 2008, 422–424). The owner of such a ring says with each use: “recognize me as Odysseus was recognized.” However, it is not just recognition that the scene recalls.

On a more symbolic level, the Odyssean scene portrays an archetypal act of fidelity. The loyalty of dogs, even unto death and beyond, is nearly proverbial in Greco-Roman literature (Pliny, *HN* 8.142–7), and they are used as particularly poignant symbols of *fides* or *pistis* in funerary art (Toynbee 1973, 102–124; Ahlquist 1994, 255–261 and 264–271). Just as we might still call a dog “Fido,” from inscriptions we know of Roman dogs named “Fidelis” and “Pistos” (Toynbee 1948, 27). In his *Republic*, Plato uses an extended analogy comparing the characteristics necessary for his guardians to those possessed by dogs (2.375A–376B), a passage that no doubt influenced other literary works in which good soldiers are explicitly or implicitly compared to dogs, such as in Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* (1.6.40–1; Whidden 2007–8), or the less well known *Cynegetica* of Grattius from the late first century BC (Henderson 2001). Given these associations, it is no surprise that they on their own appear relatively regularly as a numismatic symbol in Greek, Italic and Roman contexts.26 In the Republican period, the dog was associated with the *Lares*, protective divinities. A coin of 109 BC depicts a dog between the *Lares Praestites* (Fig. 6),27 an image explained by Ovid in a passage that nicely makes explicit the association of the dog with the concept of *fides*, and how that concept is deeply connected with the well-being of the city of Rome.

To the *Lares Praestites*, with small statues of the gods. / Curius vowed them: but time destroys many things, / And the long ages wear away the stone. / The reason for their epithet of "Praetites" / Is that they keep safe watch over everything. / They support us, and protect the City walls, / And they’re propitious, and bring us aid. / A dog, carved from the same stone, used to stand / At their feet: why did it stand there with the *Lares*? / Both guard the house: both are loyal (*fidus*) to their master: / Crossroads are dear to the god, and to dogs. / Both the Lar and Diana’s pack chase away thieves: /And the *Lares* are watchful, and so are dogs. (Ovid, *Fasti* 5.137–8, trans. Kline; cf. Plut., *Rom. Ques.* 51)

There are also numerous intaglios with a bearded shepherd and his dog, nearly identical to the Odysseus and Argos type.28 These specimens also often originate in Italy, and some are thought to be Etruscan in style.29 The motif is thematically related to the Odysseus and Argos type, while at the same time eschewing a mythological framework for a more generalized pastoral idyll. As a point of comparison, it helps us understand that the master-and-hound motif has deep symbolic resonance even

---

26. Mints known to use the dog as a coin type include: Argos Amphilochikon, Ceos, Epidaurus, Eryx, Hatria, Mamertini, Motya, Nuceria Alaterna, Paestum, Phaestus, Rome (*RRC* 24/6 and 26/4), Same, Segesta, Syracuse, Tuder, Volsini, and another unidentified Etruscan mint. Many more use the dog as a mint mark or divine attribute.

27. *RRC* 298/1. I follow Mattingly 1998 on dating.

28. This iconography also shares something with representations of Silvanus; cf. the jasper intaglio in the Déri Museum (Debrecen, Hungary) [http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/item/objekt/131742] .

29. British Museum no. 181.4.0704.1320 = Walters 1926, no. 990 [image available online]; *AGDS* Göttingen 345–346; also a similarly rendered, and sometimes indistinguishable, shepherd and goat motif: AGDS Berlin 406 [http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/item/reproduktion/3308627], *AGDS* Göttingen 343–344.
when a narrative framework is lacking. Themes of loyalty, trustworthiness, and steadfast devotion are all appropriate for personal emblems and seal rings. They are qualities that may be celebrated in the individual, but which were also conceived of as integral to the well-being of the state.

I suggested above that Ulysses as a founder embodied ideas of Roman interdependence among fellow Latins. Sharing the Ulysses narrative provided a familial bond between communities. By adding Ulysses to their coins in the 180s, the Mamilii were celebrating the foundational connection between Rome, Tusculum, and the Latins, peoples whose historic relationship was secured through the actions of their own ancestors. The Ulysses coin of the late 80s BC still encompasses those ideas, but with the addition of Argos into the iconographic field, the symbolic potency is heightened: now it is specifically the bonds of fidelity which are being celebrated. If we wanted to stay within a mythological framework, we could say that it is the fides of Rome and her immediate neighbors, all the sons of Ulysses, which is being encoded in the scene. Yet, fides is also what binds soldiers to their generals, and citizens to their community, and allies with allies (Hölkeskamp 2000). All of these bonds were fraught socio-political issues in the 80s BC. The rebellion of the Italian allies during the Social War provided a deeply unstable political landscape throughout the peninsula, which was exploited and abused by the factions of Cinna, Marius, and Sulla. Not just Samnites and other far-flung communities were drawn into the struggle, but even loyal Latin towns, like Praeneste, saw blood upon their walls.30 Fears of further unrest were so great that in 84 BC, a proposal was even entertained to demand hostages from the Italian towns and colonies.31 The coin itself was minted in 83 or 82. In 83, Sulla landed in Italy, and the Capitol burned on July 6 of that same year in uncertain circumstances; communities throughout the peninsula were forced to take sides (App. BC 1.84–86). Until the Civil War was settled, there was no certainty whether the terms which ended the Social War would be honored and implemented. At stake was the enfranchisement of perhaps millions of Italians (Liv. Per. 86.3). In this period, even whole legions of Roman soldiers were known to break faith with their commander simply for entering into negotiations with the opposing faction (Diod. 38/39.16; Vell. Pat. 2.25). There is a political truism that says that whenever an ideological concept or principle is being loudly proclaimed, the more absent it is likely to be. Sumptuary legislation limiting spending on private luxuries provides excellent evidence for perceived extravagances. Cicero drumming on about concordia ordinum is solid proof of societal division. So too with celebrations of fides: the image on the coin reflects the present anxieties over divided loyalties and insecurities over the social contract.32

30. Most traditions have Praeneste founded by Caeculus: Cato Orig. 59 Peter; Virg. Aen. 7.678–81 with Serv. com. Aen. 7.678; Solin. 2.9 and Festus s.v. “libri Praenestini”. There was, however, another tradition that it was founded by Prainestos the son of Latinus, son of Odysseus and Circe: Serv. com. Aen. 8.328; Solin. 2.9; Lydus De mens. 1.12; Steph. Byz. s.v. “Prainestos.” Or even by Telegonus, son of Odysseus and Circe: Pseudo-Plutarch, Parallela Minora 41 = Moralia 316b 1.
31. Liv. Per. 84 says it was not implemented; Val. Max. 6.2.10 suggests it was.
**Fides in Broader Context**

That *fides* could be incorporated with a foundation myth or be directly equated with Roman identity was not new. Not much is certain about the identity of the fragmentary historian, Agathokles, not even his date: anything from the fifth to second century BC has been suggested. He does, however, give us a narrative that places *fides* at the heart of Rome and her foundations:

Agathokles, who wrote on the *history of Kyzikos*, says that Aeneas was driven by Helenos's prophecy to come to Italy. He brought with him his grand-daughter, a daughter of Askanios called Rhome. And according to Agathokles, when the Phrygians had conquered Italy and especially those regions which are now close to the City [of Rome], she was the very first person to dedicate a sanctuary of *Fides*, on the Palatine. Later, when the city of Rome was founded on this hill, it was thought just that she should give her name to the city, because she had dedicated the place to *Fides*. (*BNJ* 472 F5a = Festus, s.v. “Roma”)

Most of the standard accounts attribute the establishment of the cult of *Fides* to Rome's second king, Numa. In the historical period her temple was “restored” on the Capitoline in the mid-third century BC and again with great fanfare at the very end of the second century (Reusser 1993; Clark 2007, 59–60, 61–64, and 169–170). In Jupiter's prophecy in the *Aeneid*, *Fides* is elevated to the role of Roman law-giver on par with Remus, Quirinus, and Vesta. Similarly, the popularity of *fides* throughout Italy as a theme for intaglios suggests the wide resonance of such cult honors and foundational narratives; Clark has rightly emphasized how such divine qualities can be significant markers of identity (2007, 37 and passim, cf. Var. Lat. Ling. 5.74).

Near, or at the end of, the war with Pyrrhus, the Locrians created a coin, which has the earliest known depiction of the personification of *Roma* (*HN Italy* 2347–2351; Fig. 7). She bears a scepter, rests her right arm on a shield, and sits upon a curule chair. She is being crowned by the personification of *Pistis*, the Greek equivalent of *Fides*. Both figures are labeled with legends so the audience cannot mistake the unusual scene. This type of labeling on coins is relatively rare in Italy; legends usually named minting authorities, such as a city ethnic or magistrate's name. Our literary sources on the Pyrrhic War are spotty, but according to the epitomes of Cassius Dio (fr. 40.48 and Zonar. 8.6e-f), the Locrians changed sides a few times and suffered the consequences of those choices—a pattern of events that repeated itself in the Hannibalic War. I take this “celebration” of Roman good faith as an expression of a rather desperate hope that they might benefit from this particular Roman virtue. Likewise, the passage from Agathocles we just looked at, whether it is from this time period or some other moment, seems also to encode an anxiety over the consequences of breaking faith with the Romans, a theme that may bind together unequal parties (235).

33. Most of the intellectual “heavy lifting” on *fides* as a (if not the) fundamental and defining characteristic of Roman republican society, politics, and foreign relations has been done by Hölkeskamp 2000, note especially that *fides* may bind together unequal parties (235).

34. Liv. 1.21.4; Dion. Hal. 2.75.3; Plut. *Numa* 16.1; Cic. *Nat. D*. 2.61.


36. We do, however, see a little earlier experimentation with the labeling of images on Locrian coins, especially relevant is *HN Italy* no. 2310, which shows another deified abstract concept, *Eirene (= Peace)*. Other labeling examples include *HN Italy* 430 (Aesernia), 558 (Irnthii), 948 (Tarentum), 1561–1564, 1629 (Metapontum) and 2246–2247 (Hipponium). At no mint is such labeling the norm.
people for whom the concept of loyalty lay at the heart of their very foundation.

The visual representation of fides was captured on the first Roman gold coins, the so-called oath-swearers type from c. 217 BC (Fig. 8).37 It is likely to have been intended to inspire confidence in the new semilibral bronze standard, especially in the wake of the Trasimene disaster. Notice how the two standing figures use their swords to touch a pig which is being held by a third figure: this seems to be a deeply Italian ritual act invoking the power of the gods to ensure the good faith of the two parties. A conservative reading of the image would identify it as a generic oath-swearing scene, one which emphasizes the religious aspect of such promises of fidelity.38 The often dismissed, but tenaciously persistent, counterview is that the image may represent a mythological scene encoding the same idea, such as the oath sworn by Aeneas and Latinus at the climax of Virgil’s Aeneid.39

The preference for a generic or a specific interpretation of the oath-swearing scene on these early coins and later redeployment of similar iconography has depended greatly on what types of comparative evidence have been emphasized in the scholarly discussion. The evidence is not purely numismatic, but also includes four extant gems,40 as well as the Stráže lanx, a richly decorated round silver platter discovered in 1939 in south western Slovakia.41 Those focused on the lanx do not doubt that a specific episode for Rome’s legendary history is portrayed, although there is minimal consensus about which episode. Brutus and Poplicola is a current popular suggestion.42 Given that the central scene is surrounded by a detailed narrative frieze depicting what seem to be other scenes from Rome’s legendary history, it seems very likely in this context that a specific narrative is meant to be evoked, even if we cannot be certain which one.43 Another art historical study has hypothesized that the iconography of the armed sacrifice goes back to a statue group on the via sacra depicting Romulus and Tatius.44 If the

37. LIMC IV, s.v. “Fides,” cf. Wiedemann 1986, 484: “fides, the characteristic of adhering to a treaty one has made.”
38. RRC 28 and 29. The literature is vast. Meadows 1998, 126–127 gives an overview with references to the most relevant previous scholarship.
40. Known gems include AGDS Vienna 1098; Furtwängler 1896, no. 1135 (now lost?) and 1136 (Berlin); Vollenweider 1979, no. 90 (Geneva); Henig et al. 1994, no. 136.
42. Cf. Plut. Popl. 2; Steinhart 2009, 15–16, building on Wölfel 1997 and Simon 2001, favors this interpretation, and surveys some of the scholarship on other options. Steinhart and Simon both dismiss the possibility of Aeneas and Latinus or Romulus and Tatius as they perceived no signs of “königlichen Würde” (”royal dignity”) in the iconography. If this type of iconography does represent a foedus (see n. 46 and corresponding discussion), then it would be unlikely to represent Poplicola’s loyalty oath in a domestic context.
43. Steinhart, 2009, 28–29 provides annotated line drawings of the 12 distinct scenes that make up frieze, comparing how each has been identified by himself and previous scholars.
44. Kuttner 1995, 124–125 inspired by Serv. ad. Aen. 8.641: huius autem facti in sacra via signa stant, Romulus a parte Palatii, Tatius venientibus a rostris. There is no direct reference to an oath scene here but Servius is commenting on Virgil’s
identification of this antecedent is accurate, it would not necessarily mean that all the instances of the figure grouping represent Romulus and Tatius, only that they echo that pairing in their compositional arrangement.

In recent Anglophone scholarship, the iconography has been most discussed by historians of religious ritual practice, especially those focused on the role of the *fetiales*. Even while the specific interpretation of the imagery is hotly contested, this scholarship has built on the basic finding of Bleicken that the scene represents a coniuratio to the more specific assertion that the image represents a foedus. The key evidence is a closely analogous numismatic image from the Augustan period that is identified with a legend (Fig. 9). For our purposes, the connection of the image with the idea of treaty-making or foedus, and possibly the fetiales as well, is important because both were linked to fides by the ancient authors. Perhaps the most significant of such assertions is Ennius's line:

Accept and give fides and strike well a firm foedus.

We know the line made an impression because Virgil borrowed the first half, putting it into the mouth of Aeneas speaking to Evander (*Aen. 8.150*; Macrobr. *Sat. 6.1.13*). The Ennius verse comes from an exchange between Aeneas and the king of Alba Longa, i.e., Latinus, and thus represents the first, even the foundational, foedus for Rome.

Most of the fetiales scholarship on this iconography accepts the basic underlying premise that multiple representations on different media should be interpreted as indicating that the scene is generic and not a reference to a specific event. The Augustan coin types, in fact, help us find a middle ground account of the oath and based on his comments on 8.639 it seems that he is reporting that the signa, what form they took, were erected near the site of the oath. 45. Zollschan 2011 contra Richardson 2008. Rich 2011 reports Richardson’s views in a rather agnostic fashion. Weidemann 1986 does not discuss the coinage. The crux of the controversy swirls around the silex (flint knife) mentioned by Livy 1.24.8 and the clear use of swords on most of the representations. None seem to be aware that Vollenweider 1979, no. 90 (Geneva) has been interpreted showing the armed left hand figure holding a silex (Zwierlein-Diehl 1981, 795); in its other details this gem closely parallels RRC 28 and 29.

46. Bleicken 1963, 66 for the linking of coniuratio and foedus. Note that he also identifies RRC 312/1 as an oath scene, an interpretation already proposed by Rubino 1868, 186. Crawford in RRC connects this with the miracle of the sow, noting Origo Gentis Romanae 12.5 (a fragment of Cato the Elder) to connect the obverse and reverse images into a single reference to Lavinium (so also Farney 2007, 259). The version of Aeneas’s oath to Latinus found in Virgil includes the promise to found a city in Lavinia’s name (*Aen. 12.194*), thus the oath-swearng interpretation does not preclude a connection to Lavinium. It seems odd that if a reference to the miracle of the sow is intended that no piglets are represented. Moreover, even if the miracle was the intended representation, the precedence of oath-swearng iconography suggests that many contemporary viewers would have seen it as such. One notable difference is that the figures on RRC 312/1 do not seem to have swords and the right-hand figure is clearly represented as open handed on some specimens.


between these two schools of thoughts. By labeling the image, the moneyer makes clear that this foedus scene represents a specific foedus distinct from other similar imagery. But the distinctions between this image and previous images extend beyond the legend. The figures are both togate with heads covered; an altar stands between them; no attendant holds the victim; and no swords or other sacrificial instruments are visible. As such, it distinguishes itself from the compositional arrangement found on the gems, the lanx, and RRC 28 and 29, as well as those later coins which imitate them, especially RRC 234/1 and the coinage of the Marsic federation during the Social War. Roughly put, two men and a pig are enough to symbolize a foedus, but that does not mean certain standard compositional arrangements did not evoke a specific foedus, especially one of foundational significance. Moreover, recalling a specific legendary foedus does not detract from the image's ability to communicate a more generic message appropriate in the contemporary context in which it is deployed.

In the context of the Hannibalic War, the Roman oath-swearing iconography of RRC 28 and 29 with its strong invocation of fides seems to be in a competitive dialogue with imagery used by Rome's former allies in Campania. Both Capua and Atella struck oath-scene coins during the period when they had sided with the Carthaginians (HN Italy 487, Fig. 10 and HN Italy 466). Notice that the scene is still of two men swearing on a pig, but in this version they are almost identical figures. The third figure holding the pig is missing. The swords are raised instead of touching the animal. The visual strategy is very similar to that found on the Augustan coins and also the little understood provincial bronzes: the Campanian coinage is representing a foedus, but explicitly a different one than that on the Roman coins. We cannot be absolutely certain which image was produced first, but it is more likely to have been the Roman issue. If so, the Campanian iconography may be trying to provide an alternative claim to loyalties amongst equals, whereas the nuanced Roman image, which distinguishes in costume and facial hair the two oath swearers, may be making an assertion to have a more fundamental, pre-existing claim upon the fidelity of their Italian allies through a foundation myth. Just because we cannot recognize which narrative is meant does not mean it was not readily recognizable to the contemporary viewers, perhaps as Kuttner speculates from some well-known public image. Recalling a specific narrative of communal significance does not detract from the image's ability to

52. HN Italy 428, cf. 408, 411, 413, 415, 423 (eight standing figures, four on each side of the pig and attendant) and 425 (four standing figures, two on each); see Pobjoy 2000 for contextualization.
53. See n. 47.
54. See n. 38 and discussion at HN Italy, p. 64.
55. See n. 44.
communicate an abstract value or concept. Quite the opposite, the invocation of the shared narrative reinforces the generic concept. This applies equally to these oath-swearing scenes and to the Ulysses and Argos imagery discussed in the previous section. In both instances, the well-known image is deployed in a numismatic context to promote the concept of fides at a moment when Roman-Italian relations are particularly strained, when old allies were being forced to choose sides.

The iconography RRC 28 and 29, not the Campanian oath-swearing scenes, was certainly the image that remained most potent in the minds of Romans and Italians alike. As already alluded to, it was revived as a coin type by the Romans in probably 137 BC, perhaps inspired by the making of controversial treaties in Spain.\footnote{56 For a more optimistic interpretation of the events and Mancinus’ actions, see Rosenstein 1990, 148–50.}

Crawford has suggested that the foedus depicted is that made by the moneyer’s ancestor at the Caudine Forks in 321 BC and that the image represents an alternative tradition in which that foedus was viewed as an honorable one: “the scene on the denarius stands as a simple statement of an exemplum to be followed and a powerful appeal to the concept of fides Romana.”\footnote{57 1973, 6; an interpretation accepted by Mattingly 1998, 162. That, at least, something like this scene is how Romans of the late republic imagined the form of the treaty-making at the Caudine Forks can be inferred from Cic. de Inv. 2.91.}

Part of the ability of the type to convey this message is its deployment of a well-known prototype, one recognizable and decodable by its audience. Even if the allusion to the Caudine Forks and the moneyer’s family history was missed (or never even intended), the type still manages to communicate the fundamental importance of fides.

More dramatically, the image was appropriated and adapted by the Italian allies during the Social War. The Italian general C. Papius Mutilus struck coins with just two or four figures swearing an oath, but the vast majority of the Marsic coins with an oath-swearing scene have eight figures, a dramatic multiplication of the Roman model and a clear desire to differentiate this image from its predecessor, while retaining the reference to fides. Except here, the fides being celebrated is that between all the numerous allies joined to oppose Roman hegemony in Italy.\footnote{58 I cannot agree with Burnett 1998, 169 that the image is ambivalent and may refer to Roman duplicity after Caudine Forks; there would be no reason for such a scene to require multiple figures.}

In this type of borrowing, the Italian allies are participating in the similar type “ideological monotony” as that which Morestein-Marx has identified in the Roman contio (2004, 229–40). Fides is a fixed good within the political rhetoric of Roman Italy, an indisputable shared value point. Through the coinage, the Italian allies are presenting themselves as the true representatives and defenders of this pre-established ideological position.\footnote{59 I owe this suggestion to C. J. Smith.} The appropriation of the oath-swearing imagery was so powerful, especially in its message of opposition to Roman hegemony, that it likely inhibited further usage by the Roman state. As we saw above, the Augustan revival uses a very different iconographic strategy to distinguish itself from its predecessors (Fig. 9 and n. 47 above).

What, then, does it mean when the Ulysses and Argos imagery is chosen by a moneyer of the gens Mamilia in the 80s BC? It is just possible, that in the aftermath of the Social Wars, when the loyalty of the Italians was being tested once again by the vicious factionalism of Sulla and the Marians, this iconography was used to proclaim the fundamental, even foundational, fides that bound Rome to her neighbors, the same message which had previously been encoded in the oath-swearing imagery. That the idea to promote the same ideological virtue with an alternate myth originated with the Mamilii is unsurprising, given how the gens was closely associated not just with Ulysses, but also with the early
Roman-Latin power struggles. It is also likely Mamilius would have been attracted to the obverse and reverse types because of possible resonances with the *lex Mamilia de limitibus*, as suggested by both Farney and Morgan.60 However, the specific iconography of Ulysses and Argos already strongly connoted personal *fides* to the elites throughout the Italic peninsula as demonstrated by the seal rings. It is the fact that the myth was shared in common by multiple communities that gave the iconography its powerful resonance, instead of it remaining only esoteric family lore.

**APPENDIX A: TELEGNUS IN THE TUSCULUM THEATRE**

The theatre at Tusculum had a statue of Telegonus, a fact often employed as evidence of the special relationship between the community and this potential founder.61 In fact, it is part of a set of bases all from the theatre, probably dating to the time of Tiberius (*CIL* 14.2647–2651). The following readings are given in the *Corpus Inscriptiones Latiae*.62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2647</th>
<th>2648</th>
<th>2649</th>
<th>2650</th>
<th>2651</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORESTES</td>
<td>PYLADES</td>
<td>IASO</td>
<td>TELEMACHOS</td>
<td>DPHILVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEG[ONVS]</td>
<td>POETES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has been suggested that the following inscriptions are also part of the same decorative program in the theatre, a program like the Forum of Augustus in Rome that honored *summi viri* alongside legendary heroes and founders:63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2600</th>
<th>2601</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q CAECILIVS</td>
<td>METELLVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M FVLIVS M F</td>
<td>SER N COS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>AETOLIA CEPIT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The whole set is problematic. The blocks do appear to be a set: all of roughly the same size and shape and stone. The placement of the inscriptions on the blocks is irregular. Some start lower down the stone than others. Some start at the far left hand edge, while others are more centered. The letter shapes and sizes are, however, relatively consistent. Mommsen suggested, and most have accepted, that on the Jason/Telegonus block, one name was substituted for another on the stone at some later point.64 But this is hard to accept given there are no traces of erasure and it is difficult to see how

---

60. Farney has suggested to the author in private correspondence that an emphasis on *fides* on the coin type harmonizes well with republican religious anxieties regarding the moving of boundaries and boundary stones, a point supported by the language used in some of the Latin treatises on land-surveying, Hyg. *Grom., De Gen. Contr. 90.6–7* and Sic. Flacc., *De Cond. Agr.* 104.9.


62. The quality of the stones may have deteriorated since the initial reading, but given that the break on the Pylades base seems to be of a great age, the transcriptions in *CIL* may include unmarked restorations. I was able to inspect and photograph 2647–2650 on display in the Museum in Praeneste in March 2011 and could only read 2548 as PYLAD[ES], 2649 as IASO / TELEG[ONVS], and 2650 as TELEMACHOS. If the ending of 2649 is only a reconstruction, this could potentially solve the puzzle of why it has a Latin name form and the others Greek forms in Latin script. The Diphilos base is said to be at Villa Rufinella, Frascati [*non vidi*].

63. Pi 2003, esp. 62 n. 66; 64–65 illustrates all seven bases.

64. Pi 2003, 60 concurs assuming plaster covered the IASO originally, although she also offers by way of comparison *L’Année épigraphique* 1985, 0712. 3. The latter is certainly a red herring in this context, as it labels a visual scene.
one name could have been covered in plaster and the other left visible. If it was a case of re-use or an initial carving error, the stone could have been reoriented and a different side carved. I know of no traditional connection between Jason and Telegonus that might untangle the oddity of this stone.\textsuperscript{65}

Taking all this into consideration, it is hard to make a case that the Telegonus base demonstrates any more special relationship between that particular hero and Tusculum and the other individuals also honored in the series. One would have to assume that the primacy was demonstrated by the placement of the statue in relation to the others in their original deployment in the theater (Pi 2003, 61). This is certainly a possibility, but is based on the assumption that Telegonus must have been honored in this context more than the others because of the literary sources discussed above (n. 15 and n. 16).

Appendix B: Turris Mamilia and the October Equus

The relationship of the \textit{gens Mamilia} to the early Roman state and/or Roman religious practice is also sometimes deduced from the testimony regarding the \textit{Turris Mamilia}. Every October, on the Ides, the Roman people sacrificed the right hand horse of the winning chariot team in games honoring Mars. After sacrifice, the head of the horse was fought over by the residents of the Via Sacra and the Subura district. This ritualized battle determined whether the head of the \textit{equus October} would hang for the next year on the house of the King, the \textit{Regia} in the forum on the via Sacra, or on the \textit{turris Mamilia}, the tower of the Mamilii, whose location is unknown, but is assumed to have been in the Subura district, or so at least one source, Festus reports (s.v. “October Equus”).\textsuperscript{66} This has been interpreted as reflecting an ancient claim by the Mamilii to be an alternative authority to the Roman kings.\textsuperscript{67}

More recently the antiquity of the tower, and by implication the original Mamilian associations with the ritual, have been questioned and mid third century date proposed for its building, based on the attested use then of “Turritus” as a \textit{cognomen} among leading members of the \textit{gens}.\textsuperscript{68} How in the third century a rising plebian \textit{gens} and their residence came to play a central role in a major Roman festival cannot be recovered, but it may have been facilitated by the traditional accounts that connected this historical \textit{gens} with legendary figures from much earlier in Rome’s history.\textsuperscript{69} What is perhaps notable is that there is nothing in our reports of the \textit{October Equus} rituals that suggests the Mamilii’s Tusculan identity is central to the symbolic role of their tower.

65. According certain traditions both descend from Autolycus, see n. 9 and also Apollod. 1.107.
66. Radke 1990, 345, \textit{contra} Scholz 1970, 111, argues it is not necessary to hypothesize an earlier version of the ritual focused on the \textit{regia} alone.
67. So Pascal 1981, 279–280, cf. Altheim 1938, 68 and 147. Dumézil 1975, 153 hypothesized that the Suburans represented an old enemy whose defeat the ritual re-enacts, the old enemy likely being the Mamilii of Tusculum.
68. Welch 1999, 93; she also thinks it was most likely not a public building, but a part of a private residence, which seems to have remained a landmark of the district into the Imperial period (\textit{CIL} 6.33837). Smith 1996, 176 suggests the \textit{turris} might have dated to the time of Tusculum’s incorporation into the Roman citizen body in the fourth century as possibly an honorific monument for L. Mamilius. On \textit{CIL} 6.33837, see Liu 2009, 75–6, 182–3, and 342–3.
69. The plebeian status of the \textit{gens} is dramatically confirmed by Livy’s description of the controversy surrounding C. Mamilius Atellus’s election as \textit{curio maximus}; 27.8.1–3 with Smith 2006, 216.
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