

## A ROMAN REPRESENTATION OF THE ΚΕΡΑΜΟΣ ΤΡΩΙΚΟΣ

By MICHAEL CRAWFORD

(Plate XI)

The denarii of M'. Fonteius, to be dated about 107 B.C.,<sup>1</sup> fall into two basic varieties, the first much more common than the second:

1. Jugate, laureate heads of Dioscuri r.; Ship r.; above,  $\mathcal{W}\cdot\text{FONEI}$ ; on r., control-mark. (BMCR Rome 1219; Plate XI, 1)  
below their chins,  $\times$
2. Jugate, laureate heads of Dioscuri r.; Ship r., displaying oval object in stern; before, PP upwards; below their chins,  $\times$ .  
above,  $\mathcal{W}\cdot\text{FONEI}$ ; on r., control-mark. (BMCR Rome 1230; Plate XI, 2)

The heads of the Dioscuri on the obverse of the first variety presumably allude to the Tusculan origin of the moneyer,<sup>2</sup> the ship perhaps to the transmarine origin of the family of the founder of Tusculum; but the symbolism of the second variety, for reasons which are unclear, is considerably more complex. The letters PP are generally held to stand for Penates Publici (rather than *pecunia publica*) and the obverse type is interpreted as reflecting the identification of the Dioscuri and the Penates.<sup>3</sup> The arguments normally advanced for this view, however, are not entirely cogent.

The fullest discussion of the letters PP is that of C. Peyre,<sup>4</sup> who dismisses the resolution *p(ecunia) p(ublica)* on the grounds that the words would be in the ablative and that *pecunia* would be an inappropriate word to describe the bullion from which the issue was made. But the words *pecunia publica* could be regarded as being in the nominative and as descriptive of the issue.<sup>5</sup> Careful examination of the coins, however, settles the matter. The oval object appearing in the stern of the ship on the reverse of the second variety, and only of that variety,<sup>6</sup> must surely be regarded as a *doliolum* containing the *sacra* brought by sea from Troy to Italy<sup>7</sup> and thus as the aniconic counterpart of the Penates on the obverse. PP must stand for Penates Publici.

Despite the difference in scale, the object in question may, I think, be seen to be similar to the object carried by Creusa in the flight from Troy on an Etruscan vase-painting of the early fifth century B.C.<sup>8</sup> If this is so, the two representations, separated by some three hundred and fifty years, reflect remarkable continuity of tradition (see Plate XI, 3).

There is, however, one important difference. In the vase-painting there is only one *doliolum*; but some of the coins of the second variety of M'. Fonteius show a second *doliolum* behind the first.<sup>9</sup> These coins are presumably from carefully executed dies and should be regarded as representing accurately the intention of the designer. Now the Romans eventually came to believe that the *sacra Troiana* were contained in two *doliola* (see below), and it follows that there is a potential analogy with the two *amphorae* sacred to the Dioscuri,<sup>10</sup> but it has been argued that one of the *doliola*, because empty, was without significance and that the analogy does not exist.<sup>11</sup> The evidence for the two *doliola* must be considered in detail.

<sup>1</sup> M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge, forthcoming), no. 307; E. A. Sydenham, *Coinage of the Roman Republic*, no. 566.

<sup>2</sup> L. R. Taylor, *Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* 214.

<sup>3</sup> Cassius Hemina, fr. 6 P (= Servius on Vergil, *Aen.* I, 378); cf. Servius on *Aen.* II, 296; III, 12; Macrobius, *Sat.* III, 4, 7-9; Varro, *LL* V, 58. S. Weinstock, *RE* XIX, 452; R. B. Lloyd, *AJP* 1956, 38; S. Weinstock, *JRS* 1960, 112-14.

<sup>4</sup> *MEFR* 1962, 448-9. N. Masquelier, *Latomus* 1966, 88 is unsatisfactory, particularly over the handling of numismatic evidence; for instance, at 96, n. 9 the dog which appears as a moneyer's symbol on an early issue of denarii is treated as if part of the main type.

<sup>5</sup> The significance of formulae such as *a(rgento) p(ublico)* on the coins is in any case obscure and it is unwise to be dogmatic about their nature.

<sup>6</sup> The object is missing on a plated piece of the second variety in Paris (Ailly 9759—an ancient forgery).

<sup>7</sup> D. Hal. I, 67, 4 = Timaeus, *FGH* 566, F 59. For the symbolism compare the gem displaying Faustulus, the wolf and twins, and Roma, all on a ship, A. Furtwängler, *Antike Gemmen*, pl. 28, 58.

<sup>8</sup> A. Alföldi, *Urahnen*, Pl. XIV = *Early Rome*, Pl. XXV = C. K. Galinsky, *Aeneas*, Pl. 45. The vase is in the Autitensammlungen, Munich, no. 3185.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. Haeblerlin 679 (which I cannot trace).

<sup>10</sup> S. Weinstock, *JRS* 1960, 113-14.

<sup>11</sup> A. Alföldi, *Early Rome* 285, n. 5.



REPRESENTATIONS OF THE ΚΕΡΑΜΟΣ ΤΡΩΙΚΟΣ (see p. 153 f.)

1, 2. DENARII OF M'. FONTEIUS

3. ETRUSCAN RED-FIGURED AMPHORA, DETAIL OF FIGURE OF CREUSA

*Photographs (1, 2) by courtesy of the British Museum, (3) by courtesy of the Antikensammlungen, Munich  
Copyright reserved*

Three stories were attached to the place called Doliola in the late Republic and after, that it was a human burial place,<sup>12</sup> that some sacred property of Numa was interred there<sup>13</sup> and that some of the *sacra Troiana* had been hidden there in two *pithoi* when Rome was captured by the Gauls.<sup>14</sup> A story related to the last of these was also told, that the *sacra Troiana* consisted of two *pithoi*, one full and one empty.<sup>15</sup>

It is clear that all of the three stories relating to the place called Doliola are, in the form in which we have them, aetiological inventions to account for the name of the place;<sup>16</sup> the story concerning the *sacra Troiana* was apparently unknown to Varro.<sup>17</sup> But it is still possible that the Roman belief that the *sacra Troiana* were contained in two *doliola* existed independently of the stories relating to the place Doliola.<sup>18</sup> And the evidence of the coins seems to prove that the belief did so exist. The two *doliola* seem not to have been associated with the place called Doliola before the Augustan period; the coins, however, belong to the late second century B.C., the period for which the assimilation of the Dioscuri and the Penates is first attested, and they associate a pair of *doliola* with the Penates.

It appears, then, that in the late second century B.C. the two *doliola* of the Penates were both significant,<sup>19</sup> in the same way as the two *amphorae* of the Dioscuri were both significant. In these circumstances added interest is attached to the conjecture<sup>20</sup> that the κέραμος Τρωϊκός of Timaeus is a collective entity covering the two *doliola* mentioned in the stories of the year of the Gallic sack of Rome. The identification of Dioscuri and Penates and the assimilation of their symbols which lie behind the types of the second variety of the denarius of M'. Fonteius are close to the set of ideas postulated by Galinsky as the background to the remarks of Timaeus; and although the origin of the Penates remains uncertain, the interpretation of the coin types proposed here carries the set of ideas in question further back in time than any other ancient source.<sup>21</sup>

*Christ's College, Cambridge*

<sup>12</sup> Varro, *LL* v, 157.

<sup>13</sup> Varro, *LL* v, 157.

<sup>14</sup> Plutarch, *Cam.* 20; Festus 60L (number of vessels not stated); Livy v, 40, 7-10 (number of vessels not stated).

<sup>15</sup> Plutarch, *Cam.* 20.

<sup>16</sup> So, briefly, R. M. Ogilvie on Livy v, 40, 7-10.

<sup>17</sup> By contrast, he knew of the story, found in Plutarch, *Cam.* 20, which made the Penates originate in Samothrace and go from there to Troy and thence to Rome, Servius on Vergil, *Aen.* I, 378; III, 148;

cf. II, 325; Macrobius, *Sat.* III, 4, 7.

<sup>18</sup> G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Parola del Passato* 1962, 20-2, ignores this possibility.

<sup>19</sup> I see no way of making sense of the tradition that one *doliolum* was full, the other empty.

<sup>20</sup> C. K. Galinsky, *Aeneas* 154-8, esp. 155, n. 47.

<sup>21</sup> It is of course true, as argued by Weinstock, that the occurrence at Lavinium, home of the Penates, of an archaic dedication to the Dioscuri strongly suggests identity of the Dioscuri and Penates.