

## REVIEW–DISCUSSION

### TALES OF RIVALRY IN ROME

J. Neel, *Legendary Rivals: Collegiality and Ambition in the Tales of Early Rome. Mnemosyne Supplements*. Monographs on Greek and Latin language and literature, 372. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014. Pp. x + 274. Hardcover, €114.00. ISBN 978-90-04-27269-9.

**R**omulus, Rome's founder, had a twin brother, Remus. Since the brothers wished to found a city, and since only one of them could do that, or at least only one of them could give his name to the city, the equality that came with being twins constituted a problem. This was solved by means of a competition, a competition that Romulus won (unambiguously, ambiguously, or just by cheating). At some stage afterwards, Remus was killed. This may have happened because Romulus' victory was not certain, Remus' men claimed victory for Remus, and a violent altercation ensued, or because Remus leapt over his brother's walls. In some versions, it was Romulus himself who killed his brother, in others, a man called Celer, or, in one late version, an otherwise unknown and somewhat mysterious Fabius. And so on.

But, if the city could only be founded by one individual, why should Rome's founder have had a twin brother in the first place? The story is obviously not historical, so Remus must have been invented for some reason; his existence must have served some purpose. For those who are prepared to draw comparisons with other mythological stories, ones broadly similar in nature, and to base arguments on those comparisons, the discerning of patterns and parallels may offer some explanation, or may simply move the problem into a much larger context where it may, or may not, be solved. Th. Mommsen famously connected the twins with the consulship, the dual magistracy that was so fundamental to Roman republican ideology. That hypothesis, however, is inevitably undermined by the death of Remus. If a consul died, a suffect consul would be appointed to replace him, precisely to maintain the duality of the consulship and so the equality, the checks and balances, and the power-sharing that came with that duality. In the case of Romulus and Remus, in contrast, their equality posed something of a problem, a problem that was overcome by means of an augury contest; naturally there could be no suffect (that would have defeated the purpose of the augury contest too); and the victor went on to found the city, name it after himself, and become its sole ruler (the brief coregency with Titus Tatius aside). More recently, T. P. Wiseman has suggested that the twins should instead be connected with the two orders of the Roman

state, the patricians and the plebeians. One of the criticisms that have been made of Wiseman's argument—and it is one that is very relevant in the present context—is that it makes the development of much of the story too late, for Wiseman puts the creation of Remus and the story of his death in the fourth and early-third centuries BC.

In this book, Jaclyn Neel offers not so much (or not necessarily) a new explanation of the myth of Romulus and Remus, but at least a new way in which subsequent retellings of it may be interpreted. She proposes to identify a narrative pattern, one to which a number of early Roman stories—but most notably the story of Romulus and Remus, the discussion of which fills almost the entire book—allegedly adhere. The essential feature of this narrative pattern is what Neel calls 'dyadic rivalry'. Dyadic rivals are 'two closely connected characters in a single story who initially seem to share a single function and cooperate towards the same ends', but who 'at a later point in the story ... cease to act as allies and instead become rivals or are put in opposition to one another, ultimately leading to the death or disappearance of one of them' (14); thus, the Roman stories Neel analyses

... are all about leading men in the state who initially work closely with a colleague on a project vital to Rome's continuing prosperity. Yet this goal can only be accomplished by the elimination of one rival; the collegiality that is at the heart of the Republican system is broken. At the same time, the hero of the tale is praised for being a founder or savior and retains extraordinary influence over later events (18–19).

Such a pattern may seem to admit a reasonable number of stories, especially given that the dual nature of the consulship meant that, year after year, there were two men in office alongside one another. Neel does, however, impose some limits: she excludes stories from the historical period (that is, in her view, the fourth century BC and onwards) and stories from outside central Italy. That may still seem to leave room for a good many episodes. In the end, however, Neel only really discusses five instances of what she identifies as dyadic rivalry at any length (viz. the stories of Romulus and Remus, Romulus and Titus Tatius, Amulius and Numitor, Brutus and Collatinus, and Manlius Capitolinus and Camillus).

As for the significance of these stories of dyadic rivalry, Neel believes that they 'offered a way for writers to think about and represent the changing power dynamics in the city, addressing topics ranging from aristocratic competition to personal power, and the appropriate limits of each in the Roman state' (12). Stories of dyadic rivalry, she says, 'represent one way, though not the only way, for various writers to think about the changing politics of their eras' (16), to conceive 'of power relations at Rome, and particularly the status of men who played a foundational role in the city's history' (17), and 'to think

through the antagonistic politics of the current day' (23). Furthermore, 'the model of dyadic rivalry implicitly questions the value of shared power, and thus illuminates the problems and tension inherent in this ideal at Rome' (19), but, at the same time, 'dyadic rivals offer a safe way to discuss potentially sensitive political issues' (12).

Having proposed all this, Neel sets out in her book to 'explore the use of these dyadic rivals as a means of problematizing shared power, aristocratic virtue, and the rewards granted to individual predominance' (4). And she identifies a general trend in the evidence for the stories of dyadic rivalry:

The earliest evidence suggests that rivalry could be productive, bringing benefits to the city even when it meant the elimination of one of the Roman elite. Rivalry was a negative force for the state by the civil wars of the first century. Under Augustus, this perception again changes. In Augustus' own self-fashioning, dyadic rivalry is de-emphasized, just as elite ambition is sharply curtailed by the Principate. Such rivalry problematizes the relationship between ideal collegiality and a system that rewarded individual predominance. The interplay between the need to share power and the drive to achieve could produce tangible benefits to the state; by the first century, however, such benefits were undermined by increasingly acrimonious aristocratic squabbling (23).

Naturally enough, Neel identifies a comparable trend in the handling of the story of Romulus and Remus:

By the 40s, the characterization of Romulus becomes more negative. The experience of civil war may have encouraged Roman authors to re-examine their foundation legend and to question the positive value of competition. Instead of benefitting the city, rivalry appears as harmful, indicating a problem with the status quo among the Roman elite. It is at this point that the Romulus legend became pointedly 'good to think with', as the authors of this period saw their ancestral culture devolving into chaos (54).

However, 'the preoccupations of these tales were ultimately Republican, as is shown by their virtual disappearance after the Augustan era ... [the tradition of historical writing on the origins of the city] was intimately concerned with problematizing, justifying, and exemplifying the virtues of collegiality. With the establishment of the Principate, shared power ceded to individual predominance' (4).

The several passages quoted in the preceding paragraphs naturally represent only a small and selective sample of Neel's ideas, and, as can be seen from the page numbers, the order in which they are presented here is sometimes

different from the order in which they appear in the book. Nonetheless they should suffice to provide a clear overview, in her own words, of Neel's approach and, more broadly, some indication of her main conclusions. It may also be useful at this point to provide a very quick overview of the book's content and layout: chapter 1, which is entitled 'Setting the Stage', does just that, clearly and well; chapter 2, which is less helpfully entitled 'Birds', looks at some of the second century evidence for the story of Romulus and Remus; chapter 3, 'Invective', argues that negative depictions of Romulus date only to the 40s BC, while in earlier accounts the depiction of him is ambiguous or even positive; chapter 4, 'Rites', looks at the Lupercalia, the Parilia, and the god Quirinus; chapter 5, 'Art', generally looks at artistic depictions of the twins, although there is also a section on Castor and Pollux (who are not dyadic rivals); chapter 6, which also gets an unhelpful title ('Walls'), explores the handling of the story of Romulus and Remus in writers of the Augustan period; chapter 7, 'Parallels', discusses Romulus and Titus Tatius, Amulius and Numitor, and Brutus and Collatinus, while chapter 8, 'Tyrants', Manlius Capitolinus and Camillus; chapter 8 ends with brief sections on *regnum* and Cicero's *rector*.

## I

It may be obvious from what has been said already that a number of assumptions lie behind Neel's approach. A few of these it is not necessary to buy into, but a few it is, and this may be problematic for some. First of all, Neel assumes throughout that works of literature were only for consumption by the elite. As a result, it is only when she looks at religious rituals and the visual arts that other audiences are taken into account. The assumption may well be a necessary one to make, since, in Neel's view, stories of dyadic rivalry (and the one story that dominates her discussion is, after all, nothing less than the very foundation myth of Rome) provided 'a means of problematizing shared power, aristocratic virtue, and the rewards granted to individual predominance' (4); indeed, 'the central theme of the Romulus saga may be broadly understood as a means of problematizing collegial vs. individual authority and ambition' (172). It is one thing to suggest that members of the Roman elite, in dialogue *only with one another*, may have 'problematized' (an easy word, one too frequently used by Neel, and one which needed to be unpacked; as it is, the reader is usually left to do the work) such important ideals as shared power, aristocratic virtue, and the rewards for achievement in the competitive environment of republican Rome. It is another to suggest that the elite may have done this in a wider context, that is, before the people of Rome as a whole. Thus there may be good reason for Neel to maintain that texts were only ever produced

for the elite.<sup>1</sup> But were they? When it came to the purchasing of books, which were expensive, and the reading of them in private, it may very well be possible to talk in terms of the elite only. Ennius' *Annales*, however, was certainly performed on the stage in Aulus Gellius' day (*NA* 18.5.2) and there is no reason to suppose that this was something new. The stories of Romulus and Remus and Brutus were performed as well, in plays, something which Neel barely mentions (which is especially significant, given the role of theatrical performances in other work on this subject).

Second, Neel assumes that, when any given author related a story of dyadic rivalry, he did so with his own contemporary social and political context in mind, and moreover, that that context was regularly the primary influence on how the story was handled. Thus the way in which any such story is related in any particular work is often ultimately a reflection of some contemporary issue or development. Other considerations, such as literary and artistic concerns, only occasionally feature in the discussion. The wider purpose of any given work may also seem to be less important; indeed, even genre, apparently, has a greater bearing. Neel uses Cicero's work to gauge the 'changing conception' of Romulus. The depiction of Romulus in the *De re publica* is positive, but later, in the *De officiis*, it is negative. This is, however, not due to the different arguments and different purposes of those works. Neel claims that, because 'both of these works are examples of the same genre, the differences in the depiction of Romulus are more likely to be tied to changes in Cicero's opinion than to the differing purposes of the text. In this case, it seems likely that that [*sic*] the change in Cicero's depiction of Romulus is tied to the conflict between Caesar and Pompey and the defeat of the Pompeians in the civil war' (77). When Cicero wrote the *De re publica*, the environment in which he worked allowed for a positive treatment of Romulus but, when he wrote the *De officiis*, all that had changed; by that time, the environment prompted Cicero to present Romulus in a negative way. The fact that Cicero's argument in the *De re publica* required him to depict Romulus as a good king living in a literate age is not a significant factor, or so it would seem.<sup>2</sup> Nor is the fact that Romulus'

<sup>1</sup> She says: 'because dyadic rivals problematize shared power, they are most relevant to citizens with a significant stake in political affairs' (13). See 91, however, for the idea that 'elite patrons' used festivals to 'broadcast' such themes to the citizen body of Rome as a whole; the Lupercalia 'put the concerns encoded in dyadic rivalry onto a public stage'. But, in contrast, see 138: 'monuments were meant for public consumption, and extended beyond the elite ... it was more productive to reaffirm elite cooperation and equality ... the unfavorable aspects of dyadic rivalry were simply too negative to depict on public monuments.' It is unclear why this should be the case with monuments, but not with rituals performed at public festivals.

<sup>2</sup> There is some acknowledgement of Cicero's 'philosophical aims' (78–9), but Cicero still seems to have been bounded by the wider environment.

murder of Remus appears, in the *De officiis*, in the context of an argument about morality and expediency.

In some cases, the desire to unearth the political context and the associated message results in some rather forced and consequently tenuous arguments. Pompeius Trogus (actually, Justin) covered the foundation of Rome in a mere five words: *urbs Romana ab adolescentibus conditur*. It may seem difficult to draw much in the way of a conclusion from such an extremely brief handling of the story, beyond noting that Justin does not appear to have been at all interested in telling it. But *ab adolescentibus* is, it would appear, not dismissive, evidence of a lack of interest, or simply the result of the process of abridgement. Trogus, Neel claims, has the city founded by both brothers (which apparently reveals that ‘even in the Augustan period the city’s foundation could be viewed as a joint endeavor’ (171)). Moreover, Trogus does not mention the death of Remus, although, Neel notes, he may have known the story that Remus had been killed by his brother (and of course he could hardly have not). So, on the basis of *urbs Romana ab adolescentibus conditur*, Neel proposes the following: ‘as a Gaul, Trogus may have wanted to integrate the losing rival more closely with the foundation as a means of connecting outsiders with Rome. This would be especially relevant if there were a tradition in which Remus founded his own city elsewhere, a possibility that seems likely based on surviving Greek evidence’ (172). The ‘losing rival’ is obviously Remus; how his involvement in the founding of Rome connects ‘outsiders’ with the city is unclear (he was Romulus’ twin brother after all); and, if Rome was founded ‘by the young men’, that is, by both Romulus and Remus, and if there was also a tradition that Remus founded his own city, does that mean that Remus founded two cities? Be that as it may, this is an extraordinary amount to infer from, ultimately, just a single prepositional phrase.<sup>3</sup> Who would have picked up on Trogus’ hidden message,<sup>4</sup> and what would Trogus have gained by presenting his views in such a manner in the first place?

Elsewhere, the desire to find political messages in the evidence leads to conclusions which not only seem to go beyond the evidence, but which also show little regard for artistic concerns. In his seventh epode, Horace famously traced the causes of the civil wars of the first century back to Romulus’ murder of his brother. Neel observes that, in the poem, ‘Romulus is not blamed ... for desiring the kingship’, and that ‘his regal state is entirely absent’ (86). This is not at all surprising, since the argument of Horace’s poem requires only the act of fratricide; the motive for it is irrelevant, and it would certainly destroy the impact and effectiveness of the poem, were Horace to start elaborating on

<sup>3</sup> Even Neel seems to have doubts, as the very next paragraph shows (172).

<sup>4</sup> Neel does maintain, though, that ‘contemporary parallels are intentionally obscure’ and that ‘dyadic rivals suggest vague parallels to recent events without commitment’ (12). Such a view may seem to offer a fairly free hand.

motives and aspirations. Nonetheless, Neel goes on to suggest that the fact that ‘Horace offers no commentary on Romulus as a political figure or his desire for rule ... may indicate an increasing acceptance of individual dominance as a solution to internecine strife’ (87). So Horace is not simply connecting the metaphorical fratricide of his own times with the literal fratricide in the foundation story; he is also apparently revealing (or betraying) his growing acquiescence to monarchy.

Connected with this is the assumption that the model of dyadic rivalry is so often the dominant paradigm in Roman thought, at least when it came to those stories that feature dyadic rivalry or even just to one of the protagonists of those stories. Thus, when Augustus placed a statue of Romulus in his new forum, but did not include one of Remus, this was not because it was better to leave Remus out, as his presence might call to mind the story of his murder at the hands of his brother, nor was it because, having been killed at a young age, Remus may not have qualified as a *summus vir* anyway. No, Remus does not appear in Augustus’ forum because Augustus did not want to encourage anyone ‘to reflect on the shared power among the earlier elite’ (133), which is, in Neel’s view, what stories of dyadic rivalry were all about.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, the running of the *luperci* at the Lupercalia was a re-enactment of the race between Romulus and Remus and an example of ‘risk-free aristocratic competition’ (95); the Lupercalia itself was, apparently, ‘a ritual re-enactment of the productive competition seen in narratives of dyadic rivalry’ (117–18) (although, it may be asked, just how many of the spectators would have been aware of *that*, if those narratives were only for elite consumption?). When Julius Caesar added a third group of *luperci*, he defused the dyadic rivalry, ‘he undermined the productive competition that ... underlies the Lupercalia and set himself at the head of the contemporary state’ (98). This is because the ‘new *luperci* mitigate[d] the ferocity of dyadic rivalry by spreading it more widely’ (99). Strictly speaking, if there are three teams in a competition, the rivalry between those teams cannot be called *dyadic*; but the ferocity of the competition (or the rivalry between the teams) is not necessarily affected by the numbers involved. Having

<sup>5</sup> According to Neel, however, dyadic rivalry was over by Augustus’ day, and it ‘ceased to be an important component [of the stories of Romulus and Remus, etc.]’; thus ‘authors of the Principate turned resolutely away from dyadic rivals’ (236). She notes, though, on the same page, that ‘Plutarch’s biographies of Romulus and Camillus include their unfortunate rivals; late antique writers, too, show interest in those who failed as well as those who succeeded.’ Neel’s dyadic rivalry is certainly to be found in Plutarch, and this is especially problematic, given her arguments about authors and their sources (see section II below). At 131 she discusses the appearance of Romulus and Remus on the Ara Pacis; in this case, there is no suggestion of an invitation ‘to reflect on the shared power among the earlier elite’; instead, they ‘were probably chosen as a symbol of prosperity, peace, and abundance, and of course as symbols of the city itself’.

more teams may just as easily increase the ferocity of the competition as alleviate it.

A further assumption, and this is one Neel acknowledges early on, is ‘that we do not possess all of the variants of these tales [of dyadic rivalry] that could be and were told; therefore, the inclusion or exclusion of any given variant in an author is a deliberate choice, and that choice is related to the author’s overall goals for his work’ (12). This is a perfectly legitimate assumption, and is one with which few would disagree. What is significant about it, however, is what is left out, and what is left out is, of course, invention. The idea that writers *choose* to relate the versions they do of a story crops up in a number of places throughout the book; the idea that writers may invent versions of their own is not really given any serious consideration,<sup>6</sup> and yet there is no good reason to leave this possibility out of the discussion. It would, after all, give them greater flexibility to deal with contemporary issues. So why not include invention as well? It is not made clear, but, while there are places in Neel’s book where invention must be understood, or where it has been assumed to have taken place, there are also places in the book where allowing room for invention could be problematic for the argument Neel wants to make.

For example, Neel believes that the rivalry between Camillus and Manlius Capitolinus is dyadic. She claims that Livy emphasises ‘the parallelism between Camillus and Romulus’ and, by doing so, ‘sets up expectations of dyadic rivalry by encouraging the reader to reflect upon Remus’ (214–15).<sup>7</sup> That is, Livy and his readers have dyadic rivalry in mind when they think of Romulus, and so they automatically also think of Remus, his dyadic rival. Furthermore, it would seem that, when Camillus is compared to Romulus, the expectation of dyadic rivalry is automatically carried over to Camillus, who therefore needs a dyadic rival of his own; or, at least, as Neel goes on to claim in the very next sentence, that ‘this role [*sc.* of Remus, the dyadic rival] is quickly filled [in Camillus’ case] by Manlius, whose jealousy of Camillus in Livy finds a parallel in Diodorus’ description of Remus’ jealousy of Romulus at the foundation of the city ... Livy may then have transferred part of the tradition about Remus that he had earlier passed over—his jealousy of his brother—into the Manlius tale’ (215). The argument here obviously depends on the idea that Remus’ jealousy was to be found in amongst all the different versions of the story of Romulus and Remus that were available to both Diodorus and Livy; Diodorus chose to

<sup>6</sup> One prominent instance is found at 237, in the very last paragraph of the book.

<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, Neel also suggests that, ‘although there is very little evidence for Manlius outside of Livy, the little we have suggests that Livy’s narrative does not emphasize dyadic rivalry as strongly as it could have. Because Livy depicts Manlius as a tyrant, his account offers the opportunity to examine dyadic rivalry in comparison to other modes of tyrannical discourse’ (209). If Livy’s account were designed to provide an opportunity to examine dyadic rivalry, it may seem odd that Livy does not emphasise dyadic rivalry in it.



include his jealousy (and, in doing so, provided proof that it was indeed to be found in some earlier version), while Livy chose to leave it out, at least when he was relating the story of the twins. Later, when he was dealing with a separate but supposedly parallel episode, Livy decided to borrow the detail and insert it into that other episode. If either instance of jealousy were, however, simply an invention, such a 'transfer' could not have taken place.

For Neel's main objectives and conclusions, not all of these several assumptions need to be accepted; some, however, do, and if they are not palatable, much of the rest of the book will be difficult to swallow.

## II

The two assumptions, that writers choose which version(s) of a story of dyadic rivalry to relate and which to omit, and do so largely for purposes of social and political commentary (or, as Neel puts it, 'to think through the antagonistic politics of the current day'), have predictable enough consequences for the nature of the discussion that follows. To show how these two assumptions are useful for the understanding of stories of dyadic rivalry (and potentially even Roman writing about the past more generally), and to lend some support to the assumptions themselves, it is necessary for Neel to attempt to date some of the different versions of her tales of dyadic rivalry, to try to find the context in which any given selection may have been made. That is potentially an extremely difficult task, but it is made considerably easier by a couple of factors.

First, the pattern of dyadic rivalry and the significance that Neel assigns to it mean that stories of dyadic rivalry can really be slotted into almost any context. Cassius Hemina's date is uncertain, so the context and significance of his version of the story of Romulus and Remus are also uncertain. As it turns out, if he wrote in the mid-second century BC, his version happily fits with that context (51), but, if he wrote later, in the 120s, his version also happily fits into a post-Gracchan context (52). But it could also be said that his version would just as easily fit into a fifth, fourth, or third century context, or a first century one for that matter. If Romulus and Remus get along, the message may conceivably be one of harmony or the beneficial nature of collegiality; if they fight, this could be a timely reminder of the importance of collegiality or a comment on contemporary strife, or whatever else may seem to fit. The premise is that the story of Romulus and Remus was used to say something about contemporary collegiality and competition. The problem is that the nature of the pattern of dyadic rivalry and the significance Neel gives it allow for that premise to be 'proved' in almost any context. The approach is, in this respect, entirely circular.

Second, there is Neel's handling of the evidence. She argues that only contemporary evidence can really be used; whatever a writer's sources, debts,

methods, and so on may be, what that writer writes can only safely be used as evidence of his own times, even when he names his sources.<sup>8</sup> Thus, for instance, even though Dionysius of Halicarnassus, when he wrote his account of the story of Romulus and Remus, drew upon sources such as Fabius Pictor to do so, his work can only safely be used in the context of his own times; it is not possible to draw any conclusions about Fabius Pictor's handling of the story from Dionysius' account of it. The problem is that the writings of later authors are shaped by later events and, when an author draws upon the writings of his predecessors, he selects and alters this material, often does not acknowledge his debts nor always specify where the borrowed material begins or ends, and he may in any case have contaminated that material with other material from a different source.<sup>9</sup> Such evidence therefore cannot safely be used. But the refusal to attempt in any serious way to try to take Pictor's work properly into account runs what seems to be the even greater risk of erroneously moving earlier developments into much later times, and consequently missing the original context or even the earlier existence of any given version. The result in several instances is effectively the creation of an argument from silence, but that silence has been achieved because Neel has dismissed so much of the evidence, ultimately, in some cases, on the grounds that it is only available at second-hand and in a context that is not entirely reliable and/or is difficult to unpick with any certainty.

The argument that sources modify and effectively update their material cuts both ways. As Neel notes (70–1), it has been suggested that the first use of Romulus in a 'negatively propagandistic' manner for which there is evidence dates to the early 60s BC, and specifically to the debate about the *lex Gabinia*. Plutarch, in his biography of Pompey, has one of the consuls warn Pompey that, if he were to behave like Romulus, he would meet the same fate as Romulus. The problem for Neel (who maintains that the first negative depiction of

<sup>8</sup> Hence: 'because I am primarily concerned with changes to the Republic, I have set the death of Augustus as an endpoint to my argument. This means that, unusually, I have not analyzed authors who wrote in later eras', 'later accounts [are] skewed by their authors' own experiences' (21); see, e.g., 58 on the use of Plutarch and Appian; see also 10–11 for criticism of Wiseman and ver Eecke, who 'use their evidence out of strict chronology' and 'fail to address the potential changes introduced ... by later compilers'.

<sup>9</sup> E.g., 12: 'the producers of all our sources made choices about what stories they would present in their works, and such choices must not be separated from their social, political, and cultural milieux'; 58–9: 'although later writers preserve some earlier sources, the brevity of these accounts often provide [*sic*, but the sentence needs to be rephrased in any case; the subject should be the accounts, not the brevity of them] little information. When these sources are preserved, their start and end points are not demarcated; moreover, the extent of paraphrasing and summarizing is likely to be considerable. Even when we have a fairly explicit reference to (for example) Licinius Macer, we cannot assume that this reference preserves an accurate picture of Macer's work.' On Dionysius, see 74–7 and 183–5.

Romulus actually dates to the 40s) is that Plutarch is not a contemporary source. Moreover, in the several passages of Sallust, Catullus, and Cicero that she has discussed so far in her work, “‘Romulus’ had to be qualified in some way in order to be used disparagingly’ (71). Presumably, therefore, if Plutarch’s story were genuine, the consul who warned Pompey would have said that, if Pompey were to behave like Romulus the tyrant, he would meet the same fate as Romulus the tyrant. Plutarch, Neel notes, lived ‘almost two hundred years later when the Romulus-tyrant link was established’ (71). Her view, therefore, is that Plutarch’s story is late and anachronistic. The obvious objection is that, if Plutarch lived at a time ‘when the Romulus-tyrant link was established’, he simply would not have needed to say ‘Romulus the tyrant’ (as someone in the 60s would have, if Neel’s argument is accepted); indeed, if ‘Romulus’ and ‘tyrant’ were generally treated as synonyms in Plutarch’s day, it would have been tautologous for him to do so. Instead of supposing that Plutarch, or some late source that he followed, invented an anachronistic tale wholesale, it seems easier to suggest that Plutarch may have simply modified the material he found in his source to fit with the circumstances of his own day (just as Neel has other writers doing).

Neel’s approach naturally means, or at least ought to mean, that the ‘fragmentary’ evidence—that is, the quotes, paraphrases, and summaries of earlier works, such as Fabius Pictor’s, that are found in later ones—cannot be used, or at least cannot be used outside the political and social context of the author who is doing the actual paraphrasing and summarising. In places, this is the stance she takes; however, not only are there numerous instances in her book where she readily uses the fragmentary evidence, there are also places where she attempts to trace debts in later writers back to earlier ones, simply because it fits with the argument that she happens to want to make at the time to suppose that such debts exist. It is, consequently, often difficult to avoid the feeling that Neel uses or dismisses the fragmentary and other such evidence as and when it suits her to do so.

Her approach to the fragmentary evidence would seem to preclude the possibility that anything much can be said about the way in which the several stories that she discusses had been told prior to the first century BC, simply because the earliest extant evidence for those stories only really comes from that century. In the case of the story of Romulus and Remus, Neel proposes that, in the second century, it was generally handled positively, that Romulus and Remus were equals, and that their competition benefitted the state. But how can such a conclusion be drawn, when all the relevant works from that period have been lost? Neel is prepared, here at least, to make some exceptions. Her second chapter is devoted to the handling of the myth of Romulus and Remus in the second century BC, or rather, in the works of two authors from that century, Ennius and Cassius Hemina (the conclusions that she draws from just two very short passages from the works of these men are then treated

as broadly applicable to the second century as a whole, but that is a different problem). Ennius' *Annales* is lost, as is Cassius Hemina's history; the evidence for what they wrote is found only in later writers, writers who drew upon their works for their own purposes. The decision to take this material into account therefore needed some justification. It is found tucked away in a footnote (p. 27, n. 12): 'the authenticity of Ennius' poetic account is fairly secure because of its meter; Hemina's is similarly secure because it is cited by Diomedes for grammatical interest.' It may well be true that fewer people would go to the trouble of forging a quote from a work of poetry, since that would require them to produce something metrical, but do grammatical interests ensure that material is authentic any more than do, say, historical? Any argument about the value of metres is also somewhat undermined by the various textual problems and associated emendations that are found in the passage of Ennius in question.<sup>10</sup> In the case of Hemina, it may be noted that Diomedes quotes him only because he is interested in what Hemina has to say about the *lares Grundiles*. The fragment consists of two sentences; the second is immediately relevant to Diomedes' discussion, but the first is much less so (it only really serves to provide something of a date, which is needed simply because Hemina's chronology is unusual). For Neel's argument, in contrast, the first sentence is immediately relevant, the second is not (so much so that she only reproduces a part of it).<sup>11</sup> For his purposes, Diomedes does not actually need to reproduce Hemina verbatim, certainly not in the case of the first sentence. It is not impossible that this material may have been compressed or abridged in some way.

Even apart from the question of the authenticity and the integrity of the transmitted material, the passage of Ennius is really just too short to be helpful. The fragment reads (following Neel, 34–5):

curantes magna cum cura tum cupientes  
 regni dant operam simul auspicio augurioque.  
 in Murco Remus auspicio sedet atque secundam  
 solus avem servat. at Romulus pulcher in alto  
 quaerit Aventino, servat genus altivolantum.  
 certabant urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent.  
 omnibus cura viris uter esset induperator.  
 expectant veluti consul quom mittere signum

<sup>10</sup> These are discussed by Neel, at 34, n. 41; 35, n. 42; 36–8.

<sup>11</sup> The text, as it appears in *FRHist* (6 F 14), but with the section that Neel quotes underlined, reads: 'hinc quoque Grundiles lares dictos accepimus, quos Romulus constituisse dicitur in honorem scrofae quae triginta pepererat. haec ita esse hoc modo adfirmat Cassius Hemina in secundo historiarum: pastorum vulgus sine contentione consentiendo praefecerunt aequaliter imperio Remum et Romulum, ita ut de regno par<ar>ent inter se. monstrum fit: sus parit porcos triginta, cuius rei fanum fecerunt laribus Grundilibus.'

volt, omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras  
 quam mox emittat pictos e faucibus currus:  
 sic expectabat populus atque ore timebat.  
 rebus utri magni victoria sit data regni.  
 interea sol albus recessit in infera noctis.  
 exin candida se radiis dedit icta foras lux  
 et simul ex alto longe pulcherrima praepes  
 laeva volavit avis: simul aureus exoritur sol.  
 cedunt de caelo ter quattuor corpora sancta  
 avium, praepetibus sese pulchrisque locis dant.  
 conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse propitium  
 auspicio regni stabilita scamna solumque.

Neel translates:

Caring with great care and at the same time desiring kingship, they performed auspices and augury at the same time. On the Murcus (mss: *monte*, hill) Remus sat in auspicy and alone watched for a favorable bird. But fortunate Romulus searched on the high Aventine and watched for a race of high-fliers. They fought over whether to call the city Rome or Remora. Everyone was concerned to see which one would be leader. They were watching, like when a consul is about to give the signal: then everyone looks eagerly at the gates of the starting-points, where soon the painted chariots will burst out of the openings—thus people were waiting and showed fear on their faces. At issue was which one would gain the victory and the great kingdom. Meanwhile the bright sun sank back into the dark of night. Then the shining light, striking out with its rays, showed itself, and from way up in the air, an exceptionally lucky favorable bird flew on the left, at the same time as the golden sun rose. There came down from heaven twelve sacred bodies of birds, and they appeared in favorable and fortunate places. From this Romulus saw that the throne confirmed by the auspices and the royal territory were given to him alone.

It is quite clear from this just what is at stake in the augury contest, and that, in the end, Romulus is the winner. But what happens afterwards? Does Romulus murder Remus in Ennius' version of the story? O. Skutsch thought he may have, but the evidence Skutsch used to support this suggestion—a number of further fragments from book 1 of the *Annales*—is dismissed by Neel, because the context of the several fragments is too uncertain (46–7). That may

be the case,<sup>12</sup> but that leaves only a gap, one which cannot safely be filled either way.

What is also unclear from Ennius' account is whether or not Remus received an omen too. Neel is very keen to argue that he did, as this is apparently crucial to establishing that the competition was fair. She says: 'the idea that both twins see a sign maintains the equality of their competition' (35).<sup>13</sup> It is not clear why this is the case. This is, after all, to confuse the results of the competition with the way in which it was run. A football match that ends with a score of 2–1 cannot be said, on the basis of the score alone, to have been more equal or more fair than another with a final score of 1–0. It may be the case that the players on the losing team that manages at least to score one goal may feel slightly better about the result than those on the losing team that does not score any goals at all, but even that cannot safely be deduced from just the score. It is equally difficult to see how a version of the story in which Remus received no omen would mean that the competition was unfair, or that Remus was any less of an equal. The equality of Romulus and Remus was, after all, due to their status as twins; the purpose of the augury competition was precisely to overcome the hurdle that their equality created, since only one of them could give his name to the city and rule it.<sup>14</sup> If one of the brothers had been superior to the other, there would have been no need to have a competition in the first place.

On the basis of the evidence of Ennius and Hemina Neel concludes that, in the second century, the story of Romulus and Remus was handled positively. Subsequently in her work, when she comes across some other positive handling of the story, she often discusses that handling, if it dates to the first half of the first century, in terms of continuity with the second century; but, if

<sup>12</sup> In the third line of the passage quoted above, Neel reads *in Murco Remus auspicio sedet atque secundam*, in preference to *auspicio se devovet*, although the latter has been defended on the grounds that it is the *lectio difficilior* (see 36–8). That reading is obviously problematic for Neel: if Remus were to devote himself, that would presumably eliminate much of the dyadic rivalry.

<sup>13</sup> See also 39; later still, in her final conclusion, Neel claims that, in the Republic, 'ideals of fair competition required a losing competitor to be given a second shot' (236). But when the competition is to decide who will get to found and name the city, how is it possible for anyone to get a 'second shot'? If that is the criterion for a fair competition, then the competition to decide who would found and name Rome must have been inherently unfair. Neel proposes to get around this with the suggestion that Remus could have founded a city of his own and thus become a 'winner' (46 and n. 98)—but not of an augury contest, unless he happened to pick up another rival elsewhere, thus necessitating another such contest. These same ideas about what makes a competition fair are also found in Neel's discussion of the Lupercalia: 'because the festival recurs yearly, Remus in the narrative has the chance to run again the following year. Thus the competition is fair' (95).

<sup>14</sup> As Livy 1.6.4 says: *quoniam gemini essent nec aetatis verecundia discrimen facere posset, ut di quorum tutelae ea loca essent auguriis legerent qui nomen novae urbi daret, qui conditam imperio regeret ...*

it dates to the later part of the first century, she suggests that that handling is an echo of the second century, or of one of those works which show continuity with that century.<sup>15</sup> But if Sallust, Cicero, Dionysius, Virgil, Ovid, and Trogus too show either continuity with, or echoes of, the second century, it may be easier just to suppose that the story could be handled in a variety of different ways, that there was no general trend from one sort of handling of it to another, but that different interpretations and versions were always possible, depending on, in some cases, the political circumstances of the day, in others, the argument of any given work and, in others still, the literary and artistic concerns of the author, and so on.

In Ovid's *Fasti*, Romulus, when he learns of his brother's death, is upset. Something similar is found in Dionysius' account. The story is sympathetic to Romulus, and therefore, Neel thinks, it is probably early. The fact that it is found in both Dionysius and Ovid apparently supports this contention: 'Dionysius names primarily Greek-language sources, indicating a strong reliance on early Roman historiography such as Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus (although he was also capable in Latin). Ovid's presentation of Romulus, in contrast, is strongly influenced by Ennius' (146). Neel elsewhere maintains that it is impossible to discern Pictor's account of events in Dionysius' narrative, even though Pictor was one of Dionysius' sources, but in this instance she is quite happy to suggest that Dionysius may have been drawing on a work like Pictor's, even though Dionysius does not say at this point that he is. The only discernible difference is that, in those instances elsewhere (see below for a significant example), Dionysius' debt to Pictor is potentially damaging to the case

<sup>15</sup> E.g., 66: 'the neutral semantics of Romulus' name on its own here [in Sall. *Hist.* 1.55.5M], as in Catullus, continue the equalizing second-century use of Romulus and Remus'; 88: 'what is notable about the evidence from the mid-first century is the absence not only of the fratricide, but also largely of twinship ... This is similar to the twins' equality in Ennius and Hemina, and suggests continuity rather than a break between the 130s and 60s'; 94: 'in this account [of events related by Dionysius], which seems to belong to the second century, Romulus and Remus act in concert'; 149: 'the wholly positive image of the founder [in the *Aeneid*] seems more similar to the depiction seen earlier in Cassius Hemina'; 150: 'this omission [of Remus, in a passage of Virgil's *Aeneid*] echoes the laudatory history of Cicero's *de Re Publica*'; 167: 'this version [in Ovid] of Remus' death contains significant echoes of the second-century accounts'; 168: 'Remus' statement [in Ovid] looks back to the Ennian depiction of the brothers as equals'; 171: 'this [detail in Trogus] seems similar to the account found in Cassius Hemina, although it is perhaps going too far to say that Trogus had read Hemina'; this also applies in the case of rituals, 95: 'the Lupercalia can be connected to the second-century account of the twins'.

Neel wants to make, while in the case of Romulus' grief, it fits with her argument.<sup>16</sup> Naturally the idea that Dionysius relied on works written in Greek must apply elsewhere (although it does not seem to),<sup>17</sup> or otherwise not at all.

### III

In Neel's reconstruction, the negative depiction of Romulus dates to the 40s. For many, that may seem too late, and indeed Neel has needed to leave quite a lot of evidence out of the equation to reach this conclusion. Things become even more tenuous, however, for Neel argues that the story of Amulius and Numitor also constitutes an example of dyadic rivalry, one, significantly, that developed 'in tandem' with the story of Romulus and Remus (181). This means that the story of the negative conflict between Numitor and Amulius must be late too, and so Neel needs to explain away all the evidence to the contrary.

Part of her solution is to argue that Numitor, the grandfather of Romulus and Remus, is actually a late addition to the story. She sets about doing this, first, by noting that, according to Servius, both Naevius and Ennius had made Romulus and Remus the grandchildren of Aeneas; in this version of the tale, Numitor could not have appeared or, if he did, he could not have been the twins' grandfather (181). She then proceeds, on the basis of a comparison with Herodotus' account of the exposure of Cyrus by Astyages, to suggest that the story of the exposure of Romulus and Remus at the instigation of Amulius required only the involvement of Amulius; that is, the story could have been told without Numitor. In the *De re publica*, she notes (182), Cicero does not mention Numitor, although he does include Amulius. Numitor does appear in Dionysius, and Dionysius drew upon Fabius Pictor's work but, Neel argues, this sort of evidence cannot safely be used; in Dionysius' account it is impossible to disentangle the material that comes from Pictor from the material that comes from other sources (183–5).<sup>18</sup> (So much, then, for the argument that 'Dionysius names primarily Greek-language sources, indicating a strong reliance on early Roman historiography such as Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus';

<sup>16</sup> Ennius may also, apparently, be the common source of Livy and Cicero in their accounts of the censorship of Fulvius Nobilior and Aemilius Lepidus (29); Neel admits that there are no fragments from Ennius' account of these events (28); it just fits her reconstruction to suppose that Livy and Cicero both 'reflect' Ennius' narrative.

<sup>17</sup> See 74 for an argument that heads in the opposite direction.

<sup>18</sup> See especially 185: 'the only evidence for Numitor's appearance in the earliest Roman traditions is Dionysius' citation of Fabius Pictor. Because this citation does not make Fabius' contribution clear, it is a fragile claim.' Plutarch's evidence is dismissed for the same reason (184); but see Plut. *Rom.* 3.1: Diocles told the principal elements of the story, and Pictor followed him closely in most points. See also the presentation of this material in *FRHist*.



but on all this, see below). Thus Numitor turns out to be an invention of the first century BC!

The idea that, since Naevius and Ennius cannot have included Numitor, he cannot therefore have existed in their day is obviously very dangerous. As D. Feeney has argued, the fact that both were writing epic poems may have made the earlier foundation date for Rome (that is, two generations after the fall of Troy) more attractive to them, as it was closer to heroic times. In the case of historians (like Fabius Pictor), a later date, one closer to ‘historical’ times may have had greater appeal; hence the inclusion of the Alban kings, which allowed for the foundation to be moved down into the eighth century.<sup>19</sup> But, in any case, Neel’s argument leaves out of consideration the writings not just of Fabius Pictor, but also of Cincius Alimentus, Postumius Albinus, C. Acilius, Cato the Elder, Cassius Hemina, Calpurnius Piso, and so on. In most cases, what these men had written about Romulus and Remus and their genealogy is unknown, but the loss of so much material means that it is extremely difficult to argue that a figure such as Numitor did not exist in the second century BC. Moreover, Cicero’s account in the *De re publica* is hardly evidence of a version of the story in which Numitor did not appear. Cicero’s account focuses on Romulus; even Remus appears only in passing, in a single prepositional phrase,<sup>20</sup> while Amulius, the man who exposed Romulus and who was later deposed and killed by him, could not easily be left out. Numitor is unnecessary for Cicero’s account; his involvement would both bog down the narrative and water down Romulus’ prominence. For similar reasons, Rhea Silvia, Faustulus, and the others are all left out too.

If Neel’s argument is followed, Numitor, on existing evidence, first appears in Licinius Macer and then in Valerius Antias. In Macer, however, the conflict between the brothers is ‘emotionally, not politically, motivated’ (because Macer seems to have had Amulius rape Rhea) while, according to Neel, in Antias there is no indication of political rivalry ‘at all’ (186; but see n. 47: the passage she quotes in her text is not actually attributed to Antias). In contrast, in Livy’s version of the story the conflict between the two is due to their ‘desire for political control’ (187). So, just as with the story of Romulus and Remus, the negative aspects of dyadic rivalry apparently date to the later first century BC.

Having discussed all this, Neel subsequently announces that ‘the mid-first century BCE historian Aelius Tubero, in contrast, relates essentially the Livian

<sup>19</sup> D. Feeney, *Caesar’s Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History* (Berkeley, 2007) 86–99 (99 on Naevius and Ennius); Neel concedes (184) that Pictor’s work included the Alban kings, but she believes that that ‘does not require the inclusion of Numitor’.

<sup>20</sup> Neel says: ‘by omitting further reference to Remus, Cicero implies that Romulus had *not* done wrong’ (81, Neel’s emphasis). Or was it better just to pass over the whole affair in silence, precisely because Romulus *had* ‘done wrong’?

story' (187). The context naturally leads to the assumption that the story in question must be the story of Amulius and Numitor. The accompanying footnote, however, has only a reference to the story of Remus' capture by Numitor's men (n. 49: *FRHist* 38 F 3 = D. Hal. *AR* 1.80.1–3). It is not entirely clear if Neel means to imply that Tubero's account of the entire story of Amulius and Numitor was the same as Livy's, simply on the basis of the similarities in their accounts of the story of Remus' capture, but it seems that that may be the case; she says that 'this is the most secure attribution of the strife narrative before Livy' (187). Significantly, the evidence for Tubero's account is found in Dionysius; but, not only can his version be safely extracted from Dionysius' text, Neel seems to want to turn Tubero into Dionysius' main source. At least, she says that 'Tubero may indeed have been Dionysius' source for his Greek materials' (187);<sup>21</sup> presumably, by 'Greek materials' she means the material that was found in the works of those Roman historians who wrote in Greek, including, most notably, Fabius Pictor. It is difficult to see what these 'Greek materials' may have been otherwise.

Earlier Neel had suggested that Dionysius' story of Romulus' grief came from a second century source. 'Dionysius', she had argued then, 'names primarily Greek-language sources, indicating a strong reliance on early Roman historiography such as Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus' (146). Now, however, some forty pages later, having Dionysius rely on second-century sources has become a problem, because Numitor appears in Dionysius, but Neel does not want him to appear in the works of any writers of the second century. Having Dionysius rely more heavily on Tubero may seem to offer a potential solution to this problem. But, if Dionysius was getting his 'Greek materials' from Tubero, why should the story of Romulus' grief not also be from Tubero? Or, since Tubero was presumably only transmitting these 'Greek materials', why should Numitor be a late invention? Why could he not have been included in these 'Greek materials' too? The change from 'Greek-language sources' to 'Greek materials' (if Neel is indeed referring to the former with the latter expression) is, of course, a necessary one, since Tubero wrote in Latin. This is, however, also a problem, since the idea that Dionysius got this material from Tubero naturally undermines any suggestion that Dionysius may have preferred to consult works such as Pictor's or Alimentus' because they were written in Greek, and yet it is with that suggestion that the argument seems to have begun.

<sup>21</sup> This claim is accompanied with a reference to J. H. Richardson, 'L. Iunius Brutus the Patrician and the Political Allegiance of Q. Aelius Tubero', *CP* 106 (2011): 155–61. Readers can decide for themselves if any sort of argument along these lines is to be found anywhere in that paper.

Be all that as it may, if the strife between Amulius and Numitor—something which was presumably designed to ‘problematize’ collegiality and individual ambition and all that—was to be found in Tubero,<sup>22</sup> what is to be made of the fact that Tubero appears to have included a third group of *luperci* in his account of the story of Romulus and Remus? This third group can be none other than the *luperci Iuliani*, and so Tubero’s inclusion of them must mean that, by the time he was writing his history, he was a supporter of Julius Caesar.<sup>23</sup> It is also a problem that the addition of the third group of *luperci* was, on Neel’s own interpretation, intended to ‘mitigate the ferocity of dyadic rivalry’ (99, my italics); indeed, the Lupercalia ‘becomes a celebration of peace returning to Rome, courtesy of Caesar’ (102). If Neel’s arguments are followed, Tubero’s account of the foundation of Rome starts to look a little inconsistent. Presumably something must give way, either the idea that Tubero’s version of the story of Amulius and Numitor was the same as Livy’s, or the idea that this story constituted a tale of dyadic rivalry (with all that that means for Neel),<sup>24</sup> or Neel’s interpretation of the significance of the third group of *luperci*. It may be, however, that the whole lot should go.

A not dissimilar approach is taken with the story of Brutus and Collatinus, which is also, Neel argues, a case of dyadic rivalry. In order to understand how she handles the evidence in this instance, it is useful first to take note of her assessment of the story of Brutus and his dyadic rival. Neel asserts that

... Brutus and Collatinus, the first two consuls of the Republic, fail to share power. The presence of dyadic rivalry in this story is more notable because the hero, Brutus, is not only related to the Roman kings, but also is ambitious enough to overthrow them before pushing his colleague out of office. Brutus thus eliminates his potential rivals, and provides another example of the problematic relationship between collegiality and ambition.

<sup>22</sup> It would seem to make little difference if Neel means to refer only to the story of Remus’ capture, and not to the whole story of Amulius and Numitor, as dyadic rivalry is still at the heart of that episode (see 94–5).

<sup>23</sup> Some discussion, and references to earlier work, can be found in the paper cited in n. 21 above. Neel seems to have anticipated this. When she states that Tubero’s version was the same as Livy’s, she adds to her footnote that ‘Tubero was a friend of Cicero’s [*sic*]’ (187, n. 49). The implication is presumably that he was not a friend of Caesar.

<sup>24</sup> Note 181: ‘by adding a generation of strife [that is, the conflict between Numitor and Amulius], first-century writers place increasing stress on the tension between ambition and collegiality: it ends in murder ... Assigning new conflict to the pre-Romulean generation adds a further dimension to the curse narrative presented by Horace; the cycle of violence started before the foundation and would continue into the future. This increasing bleakness fits well in an atmosphere of civil war.’ See 190 too.

... Brutus forces Collatinus into exile, problematizing the message of shared power (191).<sup>25</sup>

If the story of Brutus pushing out his colleague is indeed designed to ‘problematize’ the message of shared power, what is to be made of the prompt appointment of a suffect consul to replace Collatinus? Neel does not adequately address this issue,<sup>26</sup> which is unfortunate, since it rather undermines her interpretation of the story. And why does Collatinus get forced out in the first place? According to the ancient evidence, Collatinus’ expulsion was simply due to his name, for Collatinus was a Tarquin. This is potentially something of a problem for Neel’s interpretation, and so again she needs to explain the story away or somehow get around it. She tries to do this with several arguments, none of which is persuasive. She argues that Brutus was actually more closely related to Tarquinius Superbus than Collatinus was. That may be true, from a biological point of view, but it does not make him a Tarquin; he was a Junius, while Collatinus, regardless of the greater biological distance, *was* a Tarquin. She claims that, although Tarquinius Superbus was a tyrant, not all the Tarquins were tyrannical, and so, presumably, the fact that Collatinus was a Tarquin need not automatically be a problem. The ancient sources are clear though: the name Tarquin was hated. She also argues that ‘although Collatinus is exiled because of his name, only Brutus refers to him as ‘Tarquin’; Livy himself consistently calls him by his cognomen’ (195);<sup>27</sup> and later that

In Livy, the focus is solely on kingship and command. Brutus’ remarks before the people calling for Collatinus’ removal do not mention the name ‘Tarquin’ at all; it must be inferred from the repeated references to kings and his subsequent request. The need to make this inference, together with Brutus’ own relationship to the royal family, detracts from

<sup>25</sup> Brutus’ actions are potentially worse still: in Livy’s account ‘Collatinus feels threatened; he worries that even if he abdicates, he will be subject to further harassment ... Suetonius reports that Caesar feared indictment by Cato before he crossed the Rubicon, and Caesar himself apparently reported the same. Brutus, then, is perhaps threatening a new civil war’ (196)!

<sup>26</sup> She says only that ‘Brutus’ lingering ambiguity is not fully expelled by his immediate acceptance of a successor to his colleague. A reader remembering Romulus would know that successors are equally disposable’ (206). But why should the reader think of Romulus at this point? It goes back, presumably, to the assumed ubiquity of dyadic rivalry in Roman thought.

<sup>27</sup> Neel does note (195), though, that this may be due to the need ‘to differentiate Collatinus from Sextus Tarquin’ (and also from the ousted king, Lucius Tarquin). This is quite obviously the issue; if Livy had simply called him ‘Tarquin’, it would have made things very unclear.

the justice of his cry for exile: it is not clear that Collatinus' name requires his removal (196).

Livy's account of Brutus' 'remarks before the people' begins (2.2.7): *'hunc tu' inquit 'tua voluntate, L. Tarquini, remove metum. meminimus, fatemur: eiecisti reges; absolve beneficium tuum, aufer hinc regium nomen'*, and it ends with: *'amicus abi; exonera civitatem vano forsitan metu; ita persuasum est animis cum gente Tarquinia regnum hinc abiturum'*; and earlier (2.2.3), when he reports the views that were circulating among the people about the hateful name of one of the consuls (*consulis enim alterius, cum nihil aliud offenderit, nomen invisum civitati fuit*), Livy writes: *pulso Superbo penes Collatinum imperium esse. nescire Tarquinius privatos vivere; non placere nomen, periculosum libertati esse*. To say that 'it is not clear that Collatinus' name requires his removal' is simply perverse.

Augustine says (*De civ. D.* 3.16) that Collatinus was ruined by his name. He should have been forced, Augustine suggests, to change *that* instead of his fatherland; he could easily have dropped 'Tarquinius' and just been known as L. Collatinus. On Neel's reconstruction, it would not have made any difference; his rivalry with Brutus was dyadic, and so his days must have been numbered.

So, at the end, the negative depiction of Romulus and Remus dates only to the 40s BC, as the evidence to the contrary is difficult to unpick, modified, or simply anachronistic; the same applies to Numitor; while the founder of the Roman Republic, the man who drove out the Tarquins, established the consulship, and secured liberty at Rome, actually wanted to rule on his own; although his name was Junius Brutus, he was the real Tarquin, while Tarquinius Collatinus was simply his defeated dyadic rival. It should, by this stage, be abundantly clear that, while Neel's book is stimulating and provocative, what it stimulates and provokes is, for the most part, incredulity and disagreement.

*Massey University*

J. H. RICHARDSON  
j.h.richardson@massey.ac.nz