the dynasty's association with Epirote power in 232 B.C., completes this survey (pp. 189–218). The division of the subject matter truncates F.'s argument. If the mythical status of the Molossian kings played a significant part in the constitutional character of Epirus, these links are but occasionally picked up in the chronological discussion.

F. is primarily concerned with dynastic myths, but insofar as she includes the kingdom of Epirus in the scope of her work, she broaches some highly topical themes in the study of early Aegean state formation, notably the use of myth in the forging of community origins, and the history of *ethne*. It is a pity that F. has not incorporated relevant research papers of the Copenhagen Polis Centre in her discussion (many of which have likewise been published by Steiner), or consulted, for example, Jonathan Hall's *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997), which explored the relationship between myth-making and community identities. By focusing exclusively on the mythical origins of the Molossian royal dynasty, F. has side-stepped the question of how the monarchy fitted into, or aggregated, the administrative structures of the Molossian ethnos, and of the Epirote *koinon*, which came to be dominated by the Molossians. These institutional structures, which are documented in inscriptions from the second quarter of the fourth century B.C. onwards, provide important evidence of the mechanisms of government. F. is aware of this material; she explores and discusses many of these documents (pp. 127–58, 174–88), but does not use the evidence they provide to clarify the respective rôles of ruler and magistrates or elected officials. She rightly draws attention to the constitutional nature of royal power, but the biographical narratives relating to Arybbas, Alexander the Molossian, and Pyrrhus, which form the backbone of her historical analysis (pp. 159–215), illuminate the internal affairs of Epirus in a rather partial manner. In view of Macedonia's close political relations with Epirus, particularly from the reign of Philip II onwards (pp. 159–88), F. might have considered more seriously the institutional parallels between the two kingdoms, which M. Hatzopoulos has referred to in his *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings* (Athens, 1996), pp. 101–4, 327–8, and elsewhere.

University of Liverpool ZOFIA HALINA ARCHIBALD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni130

ROMULUS AND REMUS

A. MEURANT: *L'idée de gémellité dans la légende des origines de Rome*. Pp. 335. Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1997. Paper, BFr 1200. ISBN: 2-8031-0175-0.

M. attempts to situate the literary tradition of the Roman founders Romulus and Remus on a wider canvas of world mythological traditions for twin gods and heroes, and more specifically to identify the relationship of the twin founders to parallel traditions in neighboring Indo-European mythologies. As M. demonstrates, so common a phenomenon as twin births (statistically, one in eighty births worldwide) was greeted throughout world cultures by a mixture of awe and dread. Societies viewed the birth of twins as a disturbance in the natural order of things and as a harbinger of momentous events.

Despite the obvious parallels with the Greek Dioscuri or the Sanskrit Aśvin twins, the Roman founders' myth poses a number of discrepancies to the Indo-European norm. Just as human twins tend to display contrasting extroverted/dominant and

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

introverted/subordinate personalities, Indo-European mythologies tended to associate the dominant twin with equestrian arts, warfare, and mortality (as with Castor) and the subordinate twin with cattle herding, agriculture, and divinity (Pollux). In the typical narrative the equestrian warrior twin meets a violent end through rivalry with the divinely linked agro-pastoral twin. The Roman tradition exhibits an anomalous twist. Although Romulus presents himself as the extroverted horse-twin and Remus the introverted agro-pastoral twin, in the Roman narrative the 'mortal' twin obviously prevails. While the Roman narrative of gemination would appear to hold some things in common with the Indo-European paradigm, therefore, it was adapted possibly to the exigencies of native rationalism.

Examining the Romulus and Remus tradition more specifically as a 'Latin' narrative, M. demonstrates that the founders' myth entails a recurring pattern of fratricidal conflict centering around the theme of lust for power, *cupido regni*. Four successive pairs of fratricidal figures—Aeneas and Turnus, Ascanius and Silvius, Numitor and Amulius, and Romulus and Remus—became locked in dynastic struggles provoked by the Latin requirement of exogamic succession via the uterine line. When males descended through the male line of the family desired power, their need to extinguish the threat posed by male descendants of the uterine line inevitably placed them in a moral predicament, converting their *cupido regni* into an *avitum malum* that was inevitably doomed. Relying on René Girard's theory of 'mimetic duplication', M. analyzes the narrative structure of this cycle by arranging the dynastic rivalries along triangular trajectories. In each instance the mimetic rivals are influenced by a third-party mediator. During the dynastic struggle the internal mediator tends to become the mimetic double of the figure infected by *cupido regni*. The violence engendered by internal mediation rapidly transforms itself into a recurring pattern of vengeance, posing a menace to society as well as to the maintenance of social hierarchy. The resulting disintegration of social barriers generates further mimetic doublets that drag the community through accelerating thresholds of violence. To break the cycle the society must channel the energy into a scapegoat, an emissary victim, through whose death the violence achieves a positive end. In essence, the death of the emissary victim (Remus) represents one more instance in a long sequence of violent acts; but it is also the culminating act that brings the cycle to a close.

M. demonstrates that with each passing generation of the Roman dynasty the process of mimetic duplication revolves around increasingly narrow trajectories. Aeneas and Turnus were 'false brothers', Ascanius and Silvius were half brothers, Numitor and Amulius were legitimate brothers, and Romulus and Remus were twins. Since all but the last set of antagonists were not genuine twins, the cycle passes through successively closer orbits until the rivalry between Romulus and Remus brings mimetic culmination. The creators of this legend therefore employed mimetic duplication to announce the arrival of the most fully developed set of twins, the ones whose blood sacrifice inaugurated the founding of Rome.

M. argues that the Roman narrative conforms more to the triangular model of mimetic duplication than it does any Indo-European tradition of gemination, and he infers that an autochthonous pre-Indo-European narrative in Italy possibly formed the basis of this tradition.

Purdue University NICHOLAS K. RAUH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni131

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni131 Published online by Cambridge University Press