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GALLUS’ GRYNIUM AND VIRGIL’S CUMAE(*)

Clifford Weber

I

As every schoolboy used to know, Italia is one of the first words in the Aeneid. Prominent by virtue of this fact alone, it stands out even more on account of its enjambment, line-position, and polysyllabicity. Thus, strong emphasis is placed on Italy from the very beginning of the Aeneid, and the reason why is clear. Whatever its significance in the context of Augustan Rome, Italy is quite simply the goal which Aeneas must endure unremitting toil to reach, and for which, in his own words, he feels nothing less than amor (4.347). Therefore, in Book 3, when Aeneas and his men first reach Italy, both their shouts of joy—punctuated by the repetition of Italia three times within two lines—and Anchises’ blast on the Ennian trumpet are, one feels, nothing less than the occasion demands, brief though this landing is destined to be:

Italiam primus conclamat Achates,
Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant.
Tum pater Anchises magnum cratera corona
induit implevitque ptero, divosque vocavit
stans celsa in puppi:
'Di maris et terrae tempestatumque potentes,
ferte viam vento facilem et spirate secundi.' (3. 523-529)

If such a reaction is justified to even an abortive landing in Italy, so much the more is it to be expected when a successful landing is made at the beginning of Aeneid 6. There, however, from the first line on, the prevailing emotion is sorrow, and nowhere is there even one occurrence of the word Italia. Indeed, it almost seems as if the poet is consciously avoiding the word, for in line 6, when he refers to Italy,

(*) I am pleased to acknowledge my sincere gratitude to these savants at Tokyo University: Profs. Masaaki Kubo and Tomohiro Mizutani of the Department of Greek and Latin Classics; Prof. Sadao Ito of the Department of Western History; and Mr. Masanori Aoyagi of the Institute for Cultural Exchange. For the duration of my sabbatical year I was constantly the beneficiary of their extravagant generosity, without which the research for this paper could not have been completed. I am also indebted to Prof. Michiya Matsushima of the Women’s University of Art in Tokyo, and to Prof. Daniel Clift of Kenyon College for his helpful suggestions. Finally, lest my treatment of Aeneid 6. 14-33 cause Professor Ross to be blamed for provoking a rash of indiscriminate Gallus-hunting, I feel obliged to indicate that my conclusions were reached well in advance of the publication of his important new book.
he writes *litus* in *Hesperium*, not in *Italianum*. Secondly, instead of adopting an archaising, Italic style to reflect the nationalistic import of the events he describes, Virgil has produced what is one of the most uncompromisingly neoteric passages in the entire *Aeneid*. Finally, the bare fact of Aeneas' landing seems to interest the poet as little as its significance, for after only 8 matter-of-fact lines concerning the landing (1-8), Virgil devotes no fewer than 20 lines to the apparently minor detail of the doors of the temple at Cumae (14-33).

In short, there is a far-reaching inconcinnity between what the beginning of *Aeneid* 6 would seem to require and what Virgil has in fact written. Nor has this inconcinnity gone unnoticed. Indeed, the attention of scholars has been so preoccupied with it that another anomaly has attracted relatively little attention. This lies in the fact that although the general situation parallels Odysseus' landing among the Cimmerians in *Odyssey* 11. 13-22, there is no Homeric analogue at all for the ecphrasis to which the beginning of *Aeneid* 6 is chiefly devoted: Because this fact is in itself no less remarkable than its failure to elicit scholarly interest, I propose to consider what, if not Homer, Virgil's "source" for this ecphrasis might have been.

II

Because of its important ramifications, which will be considered below, let us begin with the extreme neotericism of *Aeneid* 6.14-33, a quality which has already been mentioned. Not only is the insertion of a story within a story, or of a scene within a scene, a characteristic of most epyllia, but it is often accomplished by means of the ecphrasis of a work of art, as in Catullus 64, for example. Thus, once Virgil had decided to insert the Minotaur myth into the story of Daedalus and Icarus, and to do so by means of a detailed description of the bas reliefs on temple doors, his adoption of the style of the epyllion was largely a foregone conclusion.\(^{(4)}\)


\(^{(2)}\) See Georg N. Knauer *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1964), 130.


\(^{(4)}\) The same is true of the two other major ephrases in the *Aeneid*, l. 466-493 and 8. 626-728, though in the latter, because of its Roman theme, the occasional neotericisms are insignificant in comparison to the epic-archaic style which dominates the passage. Not so, however, the ecphrasis in l. 466-493, which is thematically related to our passage and, if anything, even more neoteric in style. For example, it has never been remarked, to my knowledge, that out of 28 lines in l. 466-493, as many as 6 (including 479, where *non aequae* is one "metrical" word: cf. Cic., *Fin.* 5. 9. 26, Ov., *Tr.* 4. 6. 48, Suet. *Claud.* 44. 1) have a post-caesural molossus, the emblem of Catullus' hexameter. This frequency is even higher than that in Prop. 1. 3, where 8 post-caesural molossi are among the neotericisms cited in *Ross Backgrounds* 55.
Before turning to details, however, let us consider to what extent the passage before us displays the general characteristics of an epyllion. First of all, instead of narrating his myth entire, from beginning to end, in an epyllion the poet relates only certain episodes, and in such a way that he either only alludes to familiar episodes or omits them entirely. Thus, out of all the episodes in the myth of the Minotaur, Virgil selects Daedalus’ landing in Italy and erection of a temple to Apollo, while he makes no mention whatever of such important characters as Theseus, or of such familiar episodes as the slaying of the Minotaur and the fall of Icarus. He does mention the murder of Androgeos and the Athenian reparations, Pasiphae’s passion and disguise, the birth of the Minotaur and the construction of the Labyrinth, and Ariadne’s love for Theseus, but all of these in a highly elliptical fashion. As Norden observes, ille in line 27 is a tacit recognition of Virgil’s allusive treatment of these episodes.

The origin of the selectivity and allusiveness which we have just considered is to be traced to the Alexandrian poet’s conception of himself as a scholar writing for a small, elite audience of learned readers. The same origin may be assumed for a second characteristic of neoerotic narrative, that is, the use of unfamiliar myths, or of unfamiliar versions of well-known myths, as plot material. In our passage, the first example of this characteristic is found in line 18, where it is said that Daedalus’ first landing in the West was made at Cumae. As Norden’s note on the line clearly shows, the historical tradition put it either in Sicily (Diodorus and Pausanias) or in Sardinia (Sallust). Secondly, in lines 21 and 22, the amount of Athens’ tribute to Minos is reduced by half, for in place of the usual levy of seven youths and seven maids a year, Virgil omits the maids. Finally, in lines 29 and 30, if reginae refers to Ariadne, then Virgil is alleging here that it was “Daedalus himself,” not Ariadne, who rescued Theseus from the Labyrinth with the clue of thread. Indeed, as if to underscore his “challenge” to tradition, Virgil models the first part of line 30 on Catullus 64., 113, where regens . . . vestigia filo refers not to Daedalus but to Theseus. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to suppose that the neoterics felt themselves free to invent variant myths at will. On the contrary, since they adhered to a literary programme of which ἀναπότυπον ὀνόματος ἀναγνώρισθαι was a cardinal principle, the mythological “variants”

---

(5) Servius’ comment on Ed. 8. 47 serves to show that the ancients too were aware of this neoerotic trait.
(7) See Wendell Clausen GRBS 5 (1964): 183; Norden Aeneis VI 125, concerning the import of gelidas evavit ad arcos (line 10): “Solche compendia fabulae, die das Denken des sagen-kundigen Lesers reizen sollten, waren gerade in demjenigen poetischen γιόν, in dessen Stile Vergil diese Episode dichtete, ausserordentlich beliebt” (emphasis mine). See also Ross Backgrounds 62 on Prop. 1. 1. 15.
(8) For references see Norden Aeneis VI 120.
(9) It is curious that Norden (ibid. 129) neglects entirely this striking discrepancy; cf. Otis Virgil 284.
(10) Callim. 612P.
of which they made use were no less "traditional" than more familiar accounts. Indeed, many such "variants" were the product of the same sort of patriotic revisionism that was no doubt responsible for transferring Daedalus' landing to Cumae.\(^{(11)}\)

The trite and the familiar are not all that the neoterics refined out of their narrative verse; they also renounced an objective narration of events in favor of a pseudo-subjective portrayal of extreme and often morbid emotion, most notably the emotion of erotic passion.\(^{(12)}\) This neoteric predilection is much in evidence in our passage, where, after disposing of the facts of his narrative within the brief space of only 6 lines (14-19), Virgil then devotes all of 14 lines (20-33) to a digression in which the emotional element reigns supreme. The horror of the Athenian tribute, Pasiphae's morbid infatuation, Ariadne's seemingly hopeless love for Theseus, Daedalus' compassion, and, finally, Daedalus' grief over the loss of his son—these are the "events" on which the poet dwells.

This subjective cast of neoteric narrative is a good point of departure from which to identify those linguistic and metrical mannerisms in our passage which are characteristically neoteric; for not a few of these are rhetorical tropes designed to enhance the subjectivity of the narrative.\(^{(13)}\) To this category belong the exclamation in line 21, the apostrophe in lines 30 and 31,\(^{(14)}\) the coincident bucolic diaeresis and sense-pause in line 30, and the "pathetic" anaphora in lines 32 and 33.

Other mannerisms are due to the pedantry which we have already seen in the neoteric treatment of myth. For example, "the avoidance of a common proper name is... a 'learned' mannerism in neoteric poetry."\(^{(15)}\) Its replacement by a "learned" periphrasis is illustrated in our passage by \(\text{Delius vates}=\text{Apollo}\) in line 12, \(\text{Minoia regna}\) and \(\text{Cnosia tellus}=\text{Creta}\) in lines 14 and 23 respectively, and \(\text{Cecropidae}=\text{Athenienses}\) in line 21. The neoteric descent of the last of these periphrases is demonstrable, for it is first attested in Callimachus,\(^{(16)}\) where it appears in the same line-position and in the same context as here.\(^{(17)}\) By far the most extreme periphrasis, however, occurs in line 27, the whole of which is equivalent to the single word \(\text{Labyrinthus}\). Also, the onomatopoeia in this line is itself the legacy of the Alexandrians and their neoteric successors.\(^{(18)}\)

As has already been briefly observed, erudition was explicitly demanded of the neoteric poets by the very founder of the tradition which they embraced. "\(\text{Αμάρτητον}\)
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"οὔτε δεῖδω," wrote Callimachus, and subsequently his Roman heirs, as if to affirm that the same was true of them, regularly began their narratives with parenthéses like *ut aiunt, ut Grai perhibent*, and so on.\(^{19}\) Thus, by appending *ut fama est* (line 14) to the beginning of our passage, just as he began his Aristaeus epyllion with *ut fama*,\(^{20}\) Virgil places his narrative firmly within the tradition of the neoteric epyllion.

A 'self-conscious awareness of the Alexandrian origin of their creed is reflected also in the neoterics' extravagant use not only of Greek proper names (especially, it would seem, those that were phonetically distinguishable from Latin words), but even of Greek forms.\(^{21}\) So in our passage, there are three Greek proper adjectives: beside *Chalcidicus* (line 17),\(^{22}\) there are *Minōia* (14) and *Cnosia* (23), both of which are also peculiarly Greek phonetically.\(^{23}\) There are as well two Greek forms: *Androgeo* (20), a genitive singular, and *Cectopidae* (21), a patronymic whose Callimachean origin has already been mentioned.

The cultivation of highly artificial patterns of word order was yet another area in which the neoterics followed closely in the footsteps of their Alexandrian mentors. One of these patterns—in which the first word in the line is an adjective modifying the last word in the line—appears twice in our passage: *Chalcidica... arce* in line 17, and *magnum... amorem* in line 28.\(^{24}\) In fact, the 20 lines of our passage contain 14% of the occurrences of this pattern in *Aeneid* 6. This fact is itself a reflection of the difference between the neotericism of lines 14-33 and the style of *Aeneid* 6 as a whole.

At the same time, for all the ways in which it differed from the traditional epic, the epyllion grew out of a desire to transform that genre, not to destroy it. Hence,

---

\(^{19}\) "So ist das die reine Buchpoesie"—ibid. 123, which should be consulted for fuller details than I have given here.

\(^{20}\) G. 4. 318. The additional parallel between *fugiens Minōia regna* and *fugiens Peenea Tempe* (N.B. the un-Latin hiatus in both *Minōta* and *Penēia*, for which see Quint. *Inst*, 12. 19. 57) raises the strong possibility of a conscious echo of the Aristaeus epyllion in our passage, for which see pp. 52-53 below.

\(^{21}\) For this phenomenon in Catull. 64 see Fordyce *Catullus* 277; for the quite different bias of the native tradition see L. R. Palmer *The Latin Language* (London, 1954), 100-101.

\(^{22}\) Although this adjective occurs 5 times in classical prose, it does not follow from this that *Chalcidicus* was therefore only formally Greek. In Cio. *Nat. D*. 3. 10. 24 it modifies a Greek proper noun, and in Varro *Rust*. 1. 41. 6, 1. 57. 2, 3. 9. 6 it is always *ca* -ordinat with other Greek proper adjectives. Thus, these four occurrences corroborate the conclusion that unlike *Chalcidensis, Chalcidicus* was Greek in tone as well as in form. (In classical prose *Chalcidensis* occurs only in Livy—35. 38. 10, 49. 6, 50. 8, 36. 11. 1, 37. 45. 17, 38. 38. 18—who, moreover, never uses *Chalcidicus*. 'The fifth occurrence of *Chalcidicus* in classical prose is Trog. *proll*. 8; for *Chalcidicus* in poetry see p. 52 below.)

\(^{23}\) See n. 20 above.

\(^{24}\) Norden's figures (*Aeneis* VI 391) flatly contradicted Fordyce's curious contention (*Catullus* 275) that the patterns in question were "purely Latin devices, which owed nothing directly to Greek precedent."
in Catullus 64, for example, there are usually at least suggestions of the archaic epic which the neoteric epyllion was intended to supplant.\(^{(25)}\) Most often these suggestions take the form of such elements of epic style as traditional poetic diction, synthetic compounds, archaisms, colloquialisms, technical terms, alliteration, and so on. So in our passage too, there are words culled from the traditional poetic lexicon: *letum* for *mors* (line 20), *tellus* for *terra* (23), *proles* for *progenies* (25), and *vestigia* for *pedes* (30).\(^{(26)}\) Secondly, *biformis* in line 15 is the sort of synthetic compound that was a hallmark of the style of Latin tragedy.\(^{(27)}\) To the category of archaisms belong these words and phrases: *praepetibus* (line 15), the *origi~* of which can be traced to the language of augury,\(^{(28)}\) the syncopated form *supposta* (24),\(^{(29)}\) and the connective *sed enim* (28).\(^{(30)}\) *Pendere poenas* (line 20) and *ductis sortibus* (22) are both technical terms,\(^{(31)}\) while in line 15, finally, there are two alliterative pairs.

These, then, are the characteristics of the neoteric epyllion which are to be found in the passage before us. To them Virgil has added, moreover, unmistakable echoes of Catullus 64, the epyllion par excellence. Specifically, as every commentary duly observes,\(^{(32)}\) *inextricabilis error* in line 27 is modeled on *inobservabilis error* in Catullus 64. 114, *tecti* in line 29 on the same word in the same line in Catullus, and *caeca regens filo vestigia* in line 30 on Catullus 64. 113. There are two additional parallels, however, which, though hardly less striking, have to my knowledge gone unnoticed. First, the summary catalogue of episodes in lines 20–22 in our passage parallels the similar catalogue in Catullus 64. 76–79 almost item for item: *letum Androgeo* (line 20)=*Androgeoneae . . . caedis* (Catullus 64. 77), *pendere poenas* (20)=*poenas exsolvere* (64. 77), *Cecropidae* (21)=*Cecropiam* (64. 79), and *septena quotannis corpora natorum* (21–22)=*electos iuvenes simul et decus innuptarum* (64. 78). Secondly, a father’s grief over the loss of his son is both the dominant theme of our passage and a major theme of Catullus 64.\(^{(33)}\)

---

\((25)\) See ibid.

\((26)\) See Norden *Aeneis VI* 321; Palmer *Latin Language* 109, 111.

\((27)\) For Latin synthetic compounds see ibid. 102–103 (where there are other examples having the prefix bi-), 110; Norden *Aeneis VI* 128.

\((28)\) Ibid. 124–125; see also Michael Wigodsky *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry* (Wiesbaden, 1972), 112–113, and the references cited there.

\((29)\) See Norden *Aeneis VI* 127–128.

\((30)\) For which see Quint. *Inst.* 9. 3. 14.

\((31)\) For the latter see Norden *Aeneis VI* 127.

\((32)\) But Fordyce (Catullus 293) does not mention the parallel between Catull. 64.113 and *Aen.* 6. 30.

\((33)\) Had the prominence of this theme in *Aen.* 6. 14–33 been fully appreciated, there would never have been such uncertainty about the relevance of this passage to its context. Daedalus’ longing for Icarus subtly anticipates Anchises’ expression of longing for Aeneas in the climactic lines 687–694. A correlate analogy is thus established between Daedalus’ Crete and Anchises’ Troy, and it is re-enforced by the parallelism between our ephrasis and that in 1. 466–493, where Troy, as the subject portrayed, fills the same role as Crete in our passage. Finally, the horrors of the Minotaur and of the Trojan War were both *Veneris monimenta nefandae* (cf. Rutledge *CL* 67 [1971–72]: 111–112 for the same observation). For somewhat similar interpretations cf. Wigodsky *Early Latin Poetry* 129–130; Viktor Pöschl *The Art of Vergil*, trans. Gerda Seligson (Ann Arbor, 1962), 149–150.
Thus, Daedalus and Icarus parallel Aegeus and Theseus.

It should now be abundantly clear that *Aeneid* 6.14-33 is nothing less than a miniature epyllion, and that as such, it is thoroughly neoteric in style. Though it might seem reasonable next to examine—as has never, to my knowledge, been done—what are the ramifications of its neoteric beginning for the interpretation of the most Roman book of the *Aeneid*, this question lies far beyond the scope of the present inquiry. Of more immediate significance is the fact that the neotericism of *Aeneid* 6.14-33 leads to three important conclusions concerning Virgil’s “source” for this passage. First of all, as our exegesis of *ut fama est* has already established, the tradition to which the passage belongs is such as to rule out completely any possibility of *inventio*. It would have been an intolerable inconsistency to adopt a neoteric style and at the same time violate so fundamental a neoteric principle as ἀμφοτέρων ἀνθρώπων. Secondly, because of the neotericism of *Aeneid* 6.14-33, we can narrow our search for the source of this passage to the Alexandrian and neoteric poets. For the same reason, finally, a third conclusion is justified: it will not be surprising if Virgil’s reference to his source is complex, allusive, and sophistical in nature.

III

Among the first 13 lines of *Aeneid* 6, line 2 is unique, for unlike the rest of those lines, it is fully as neoteric as any line in our ecphrasis. It is neoteric in substance, inasmuch as it contains an oblique aetiological reference to the Chalcidian foundation of Cumae, and stylistically too it is marked by an abundance of neoteric mannerisms: two Greek proper names, a noun at the end of the line modified by an adjective before the caesura, and an especially recherche figure of speech, the transferred epithet. Because of this qualitative uniqueness, and also because of its position at the very beginning of Book 6, line 2 is very prominent. On this account, in turn, strong emphasis is placed on the subject with which line 2 is implicitly concerned, that is, on the Chalcidian origins of Cumae. The same theme is stressed in another way: because of its “transference,” its separation from the noun it modifies, and its location in the most prominent position within the line, the adjective Εὐβοικίς receives as much emphasis as does the line in which it occurs. Thus, because of the prominence both of line 2 as a whole and of the adjective Εὐβοικίς within it, the Chalcidian foundation of Cumae emerges as one of the main themes of *Aeneid* 6.1-13.

The neotericism peculiar to line 2 has another, more obvious result. Because of it, when the reader first encounters the ecphrasis, he has some sense of *déjà vu*. In

(34) For another passage answering the same description see n. 60 below.
(35) Pp. 48-49 above.
(36) Norden’s reasons for drawing the same conclusion (*Aeneis VI* 121) are more subjective and therefore less compelling.
line 17 this sense is especially strong, for reasons that are obvious when that line is juxtaposed with line 2:

\[
\text{et tandem EUBOICIS Cumarum ADLABITUR ORIS (2)}
\]

\[
\text{CHALCIDICA que levis tandem super ASTITIT ARCE (17)}
\]

Specifically, two lines describing a landing and containing a verb compounded with ad, each filling the fifth foot, each having the same voice, mood, person, and number, each modified by tandem, each governing a noun which is itself modified by a proper adjective related to Euboea. Lines 2 and 17 have also in common a neoteric separation of noun and modifier, which elsewhere in the ecphrasis occurs only once (line 28). In both cases, moreover, the modifier refers to Chalcis. In line 17, therefore, Virgil further intensifies his emphasis on the Chalcidian foundation of Cumae, and he does so in three ways: by simply repeating the theme, by recalling its first occurrence both in manner and in specific detail, and by separating Chalcidica from the noun it modifies and locating it prominently at the beginning of the line.

Beside line 17, the only other reference to Chalcis anywhere in Virgil is in Eclogues 10.50, where Chalcidico alludes to Euphorion of Chalcis, the Alexandrian poet whose aetiological poem on the Apolline grove at Grynum was “translated” by Cornelius Gallus.\(^{(37)}\) In fact, apart from these two lines in Virgil, the adjective Chalcidicus does not occur anywhere in Latin poetry until Lucan and Columella.\(^{(38)}\) Even when they refer to the Chalcidian origins of Cumae, the poets (all of them post-Virgilian) consistently call it Euboean;\(^{(39)}\) not until Statius is it called Chalcidian.\(^{(40)}\) Secondly, in both Aeneid 6.17 and Eclogues 10.50, Chalcidicus is separated in neoteric fashion from the noun it modifies, which itself occupies the same position in both lines. Now in view of these facts, it would seem necessary to conclude that Chalcidica in Aeneid 6.17 would inevitably have recalled the earlier occurrence of the word in Eclogues 10.50. On the other hand, if only on grounds of plausibility, this fact could hardly suggest an allusion to the poetry of Gallus, were it not for two additional points of contact between our passage and contexts that are in some way related to that poet.

The first of these points of contact has already been mentioned.\(^{(41)}\) It lies between the first line of our “epyllion” and the second line of the Aristaeus epyllion, and in particular between the second halves of these lines. If either fugiens Minola regna (Aeneid 6.14) or fugiens Peneia Tempe (Georgics 4.317) were located far within the

---

(37) Serv. Ecl. 6. 72, 10. 1, id., Filagrius ibid. 10. 50. As for Euphorion’s source, we know from Ath. 4. 149 D of a monograph on Grynean Apollo written by Hermias of Methymna. The modus operandi of other Alexandrian didactic poets would suggest that this treatise by Hermias might well have served as Euphorion’s “sourcebook.”

(38) Luc. 5. 236, Columella Rust. 10. 414.


(40) Id. Silv. 2. 2. 94, 5. 3. 182.

(41) In n. 20 above.
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passage to which it belongs, the resemblance between the two could not be considered either deliberate or significant. In fact, however, both phrases occur at the very beginning of passages which are formally identical, and hence the one can only echo the other. Secondly, if Servius is to be believed, the Aristaeus epyllion was Virgil's substitution for the laudes Galli which he excised "irato Augusto." (42) From this fact it does not follow, of course, that an echo of the Aristaeus epyllion will necessarily bring Gallus to mind. But if that echo is accompanied by other, less ambiguous allusions to Gallus, then in view of the "learned" poetic tradition to which the Daedalus "epyllion" belongs, the possibility cannot be dismissed that in Aeneid 6.14 the echo of fugiens Peneta Tempe is intentional and meant to recall, at least for the cognoscenti, the encomium on Gallus which originally began where those words occur.

The reference to the Pasiphae myth in Aeneid 6.24-26 is the third element which our passage has in common with a context related to Gallus, for except for Aeneid 6.447, where she is one of the entries in a catalogue of victims of durus amor, Pasiphae appears elsewhere in Virgil only in Eclogues 6.45-60. There her morbid passion constitutes the topic on which Silenus dwells longest in his song. Now the fact that Pasiphae and Gallus both appear in Silenus' song is obviously not enough in itself to establish a connection between the heroine and the poet. It is also the case that a discussion of Aeneid 6.14-33 is no place for undertaking yet another exhaustive analysis of Eclogue 6. Nevertheless, the discovery of a relationship between Pasiphae and the poetry of Gallus would obviously have important implications for the possibility of allusions to that poetry in Aeneid 6.14-33. Thus, Eclogue 6 is a subject which cannot be ignored. At the same time, our discussion of it must be limited to this one question: does Eclogue 6 yield any evidence which enables us to progress from pure speculation to plausible hypothesis concerning the connection between Silenus' song and the poetry of Cornelius Gallus?

IV

If plausible hypotheses are to be our goal, they must follow to the greatest extent possible from incontestable facts. (43) Let us begin, then, with a general outline of the contents of Eclogue 6, which are these: a dedicatory proem, Silenus, ἐνίκος, Gallus, and an epilogue. Now not only are these undeniably the principal topics to which Eclogue 6 is devoted, but it is also equally certain that the structural frame which they establish is this chiasmus:

(42) Serv. Ecl. 10. 1, G. 4. 1.
(43) Professor Ross has occasionally lost sight of this principle. In particular, his conclusions ultimately depend on the questionable hypothesis that ille in line 70 refers to Orpheus (Backgrounds 23-24), and so they are less than fully persuasive, despite the cogency of the other arguments on which they rest.
The validity of this schema is confirmed by more than the certainty of its constituent parts. The chiastic symmetry inherent in the topics as we have summarized them is complemented and re-enforced by the same phenomenon in numerical terms. That is, A consists of 12 lines and B+C of 30 lines, while A' consists of 13 lines and B'+C' of 31 lines. Secondly, the correlation between B and B' in particular is mirrored in the obvious resemblance between the two groups of four lines with which those sections end:

B. tum vero in numerum Faunosque ferasque videres
ludere, tum rigidas motare cacumina quercus;
nec tantum Phoebo gaudet Parnasia rupes,
nec tantum Rhodope miratur et Ismarus Orphea. (27-30)

B'. Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat
cantando rigidas deducere montibus oinos.
His tibi Grynei nemoris dicatur origo,
ne quis sit lucus quo se plus iactet Apollo. (70-73)

The poet's power over nature, his particular effect on trees which are termed rigidae, the pride of Apollo's shrines in their lord, or his pride in them—these are the themes which appear sequentially in corresponding lines of both passages and thus complement and re-enforce the thematic and numerical symmetry of B+C and C'+B'.

Given the different forms in which it appears, the symmetrical structure just outlined can hardly be questioned. The significance of this structure, to be sure, is a question admitting of far less certitude, but even so, now that we have the benefit of Pöschl's study of the Aeneid, it is not likely that the symmetry of Eclogue 6 is only a meaningless adornment, an instance of ars gratia artis. Unless we are to suppose that Virgil did not discover the potential of structure as an expressive medium until

(44) Including 2 lines of mythical—as opposed to philosophical—cosmogony at the end.
(45) Including 2 lines of metamorphosis at the end.
(46) This is simply the reverse of the scheme which Otto Skutsch (CPhil. 58 [1963]: 238-239) discovered in the first nineteen poems of Propertius' Monobiblos, where A (1–5)=89 couplets and B (6–9)=71 couplets, while A′(15–19)=88 and B′(10–14)=70. Although others will perhaps not agree, I believe that in view of the fact that Eclogue 6 and the Monobiblos were written within a few years of each other, and in conformity with the same neoteric ideology, their structural similarity is in itself corroboration of the schema proposed for Eclogue 6.
he began the *Aeneid*, it can be safely assumed that Pöschl's conclusion concerning *Aeneid* 1.8-296 may apply as well to *Eclogue* 6: "The composition is expression of a fact."(47)

This is indeed the case, for Virgil describes Silenus in terms which bring to mind the critical terminology current in Gallus' circle, and by so doing he articulates the nature of the relationship between Silenus and Gallus which is implied by the symmetry of B and B'. The drunkenness of Silenus suggests the metaphorical drunkenness of those historical poets who, because of their neglect of *ars* in favor of *ingenium*, were labeled "wine-drinkers."(48) The significance in literary terms of the fact of Silenus' drunkenness is further indicated by Virgil's choice of words. For example, much more often than it is used of drunkards, *inflatus* (line 15) refers to writers of an anti-Callimachean persuasion.(49) Such is also the implication, in the same line, of the reference to Silenus' veins, for in Persius 1.76, where Accius is called a wine-drinker, his *oeuvre* is termed *venosus*. (50) In line 17, Silenus' wine jug is termed *gravis*, the use of which in the context of Silenus' drunkenness quite naturally brings to mind its common application to non-Callimachean genres like epic and tragedy. Indeed, in this context it may not be implausible to see in *attrita* an allusion to the well-worn road which for Callimachus and his descendants served as a metaphor for the familiar and the hackneyed. (51) Finally, in line 18 Silenus is called a *senex*, as is Hesiod also in line 70. (52) This characterization is close to *priscus* in sense and thus implies that Silenus' style of poetry is archaic and obsolete. (53) No doubt the same significance attaches to *hesterno* in line 15.

It should now be abundantly clear what "fact" is expressed by the correspondence of sections B and B'. Because of the metaphorical import of Silenus' drunkenness,

---

(47) Pöschl *Art of Vergil* 16; the same assumption underlies Otis' analysis of the *Eclogues* (see especially *Virgil* 97, 106-107, 128-143).
(48) For this metaphor see J. C. Bramble *Persius and the Programmatic Satire: A Study in Form and Imagery* (Cambridge, 1974), 48-49, and the references cited there.
(49) In Prop. 2. 34B, which is concerned in its entirety with literary theory, Callimachus himself is called *non inflatus* in line 32.
(50) I owe this reference to my student, Mr. Robert Carver.
(52) In Prop. 2. 34B. 77 Hesiod is called *vetus*.
(53) *Priscus* is in the fact which Horace uses of Cratinus (*Epist*. 1. 19. 1), and in the very passage in which Cratinus serves as the wine-drinker par excellence. Similarly, in Prop. 2. 34B. 30, it is more for literary than for chronological reasons that in his attempt to convert the poet Lynceus to a Callimachean point of view, Propertius calls Homer (presumably) *vester senex*.
antithesis is established between the ingenium of Silenus and the ars of Gallus. Between the two senes Silenus and Hesiod, however, a complementary relationship is established, principally by means of the echo between lines 27-30 and 70-73. On the one hand, therefore, because of the identification of Silenus with Hesiod, whose calami are then inherited by Gallus, Eclogue 6 gives expression to the unity of the Hesiodic (or "Silenic") tradition. On the other hand, the poem is no less concerned with the fundamental difference between the archaic period of that tradition and its post-Callimachean manifestation.

If the chiastic-symmetry of sections B and B' serves to express the opposition between the archaic and the Gallan branches of the Hesiodic tradition, then in sections C and C' it is natural to see concrete examples of this opposition. Section C is a carmen which both in style (archaic) and in substance (philosophical and mythological cosmogony) violates the Callimachean ideology espoused by Gallus. Section C', on the other hand, is Gallan in both manner and matter. Its manner is what we should expect of a poet who, like Gallus, was schooled by Parthenius in the poetry of Alexandria in general and of Euphorion in particular. In substance, section C' has to do primarily with ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα of the sort recommended to Gallus by Parthenius, and secondarily with metamorphosis, to which Parthenius devoted a poem of his own.

The two carmina in sections C and C', therefore, serve as mutually antithetical paradigms of the opposition between archaic ingenium and Gallan ars within a single Hesiodic tradition. This conclusion, in turn, leads to the central question of this discussion. If their function is as we have described it, is it likelier that the two carmina in sections C and C' each contain only general examples of one type of poetry, or likelier that they contain specific references to actual poems which are themselves paradigms of either archaic ingenium or Gallan ars? While the latter would seem to me the more plausible alternative (how could a paradigm of Gallan artifice have nothing to do with Gallus' poetry?), it has more than plausibility to recommend it. In section C, of the three myths to which reference is made in lines 41 and 42, the Pyrrha myth is the only one for which no Hesiodic source exists. Also, the

---

(54) For examples of this unity see Clausen GRBS 5 (1964): 184-185.
(55) The archaic style of section C is sufficient to establish its anti-Callimachean character. Positive proof, however, is contained in Prop. 2. 34B. 51-54, where a De rerum natura is one of the genres forbidden the would-be elegist. The others are epic (37-40, 61-66), tragedy (41), and geographical périgeiēs (33-36).

Not only is this our fourth reference to Prop. 2. 34B, but ten lines of that poem (67-76) are in praise of Virgil's Eclogues. In addition, like Silenus in Ecl. 6. 13-17, in Prop. 2. 34B. 59 the elegist is portrayed sleeping off the effects of the previous night's revelries. The conclusion would therefore seem justified that the influence on Prop. 2. 34B of the Eclogues, and of Eclogue 6 in particular, is considerable.

archaic tradition of Hesiodic poetry was represented by philosophical as well as by mythological didactic, and hence the first ten lines of section C contain references to Empedocles, Parmenides, and, of course, Lucretius.\(^{(57)}\) In section C', on the other hand, we are on far weaker ground, since the loss of practically all of Gallus makes it impossible to know with certainty whether the myths in this section are specific references to Gallus' poetry, or only examples of the kind of myths found in it. Nevertheless, independently of any consideration of Eclogue 6, Ross has concluded that two of the four myths in section C' were used by Gallus in his poetry.\(^{(58)}\) In conclusion, then, specific sources can be either demonstrated or plausibly postulated for the greater part of each of the carmina in sections C and C', and hence facts tend to confirm what plausibility suggests, that is, that the carmen in section C' consists of specific references to actual poems of Gallus. If, in turn, this conclusion is justified, then the following answer can now be given to the question with which this discussion began: the myth of Pasiphae, to which the lion's share of the Gallan carmen in section C' is devoted, must have occurred somewhere in Gallus' own poetry. The obvious importance of this conclusion for Aeneid 6. 14-33 is sufficient justification for the digression which has been required to reach it.

V

At this point it will be well to review the conclusions which we have reached so far. They are these:

1. *Aeneid* 6.14-33 is a miniature epyllion which, as such, is among the most neoteric passages in the entire *Aeneid*. From this fact three conclusions follow:
   A. *Aeneid* 6.14-33 must have a "source"
   B. That source must be either neoteric or Alexandrian
   C. The manner of Virgil's allusion to that source can be expected to be learned, oblique, and artificial

2. Virgil places strong emphasis on the role of Chalcis in the foundation of Cumae

3. Beside *Aeneid* 6.17, the only other reference to Chalcis in Virgil is in *Eclogues* 10.50, where Gallus alludes to his "translation" of the aetiological poem by Euphorion of Chalcis on the sacred grove of Apollo at Grynium

4. The phrase *fugiens Minioa regna* in *Aeneid* 6.14 recalls *fugiens Penetia Tempe* in *Georgics* 4.318, which occurs where an encomium on Gallus is supposed originally to have begun

5. It is likely that the myth of Pasiphae, to which *Aeneid* 6. 24-26 is devoted, was used by Gallus in his poetry

\(^{(57)}\) See Ross *Backgrounds* 25, n. 5.

\(^{(58)}\) For Hylas (lines 43-44) see ibid. 79-81; for Atalanta (61) see ibid. 61-65, 82, 90-91.
From these conclusions it is finally possible to derive a hypothetical "source" for *Aeneid* 6.14-33: Taken as a whole, conclusions 3-5 point emphatically in the direction of Cornelius Gallus, whose poetry would be precisely the kind of source that conclusion 1. A leads us to expect. On the basis of conclusions 2 and 3, moreover, there is reason to identify his "translation" of Euphorion's poem on the Grynean grove as the specific poem of Gallus on which *Aeneid* 6.14-33 is modeled: To be sure, this identification cannot be proved. For one thing, only a single line of Gallus survives. For another, although Ross has persuasively argued that Propertius 1. 20.33-38 is an imitation of part of it, what is known about Gallus' "translation" of Euphorion is effectively limited to the little that Servius and others have to say about it. Finally, neither is it possible to learn of the "translation" from the original. The poem on the Grynean grove is not given as the source of any of the extant fragments of Euphorion, and of those fragments for which no source has been transmitted, none can be definitely assigned to that poem. Nevertheless, despite these limitations, our hypothesis is supported by yet another consideration. Chalcidian colonists had founded the temple of Apollo at Cumae, and a Chalcidian poet had written of the foundation of the grove of Apollo at Grynium. To write of the former by borrowing, through Gallus' "translation," from the latter is precisely the sort of sophistical artifice that is to be expected (per conclusion 1. C above) in a passage like ours, and that is in fact to be found in other neoteric contexts. That this is exactly what Virgil has done seems implicit in the fact (conclusion 3) that in *Aeneid* 6.17, at the same time as he alludes to the Chalcidian foundation of Cumae, he also brings to the reader's mind Euphorion's poem and its "translation" by Cornelius Gallus. Finally, there are two facts which might appear to contradict our hypothesis. First, although some of the unattributed fragments of Euphorion must belong to the poem on the Grynean grove, none of them bears any resemblance to anything in *Aeneid* 6. 14-33. Secondly, all ancient references to that poem, or to Gallus' "translation" of it, mention only a grove and say nothing about a temple of the sort described in

(60) *Backgrounds* 79–80. Like *Aen.* 6. 14-33, moreover, the passage where these lines occur (Prop. 1. 20. 17–50) is also "an epyllion in miniature," which may itself have been an innovation of Gallus' (Ross op. cit. 78).
(61) See n. 37 above.
(62) Catull. 66, for example. On the promontory of Zephyrium, east of Alexandria, stood a temple dedicated to Arsinoe, wife of Ptolemy II. Another promontory of the same name was populated for a brief period by Locrians and was subsequently commemorated in the name of the settlement which they founded nearby, viz., Epizephyrian Locri (see *PW*, s.v. "Zephyrion," by Gerhard Radke, 229. 60–230. 22). Hence, by a perverse syllogism identical to that proposed for our passage, Arsinoe is called Locrian in Catull. 66: 54.
(63) For Euphorion's poem see Serv. *Ecl.* 6. 72; for Gallus' "translation" see n. 37 above,
our passage. In fact, however, neither of these objections is material. In the first place, wherever among the unattributed fragments it may lie hidden, what remains of the poem on the Grynean grove can be no more than a tiny fraction of the entire poem. If only from the law of probability, therefore, it follows that no similarities are likely to be found between Aeneid 6.14-33 and any of the unattributed fragments of Euphorion. Neither does the absence in ancient references of any mention of a temple lead to the conclusion that therefore Gallus’ poem on the grove at Grynium cannot have been the “source” for Virgil’s description of the temple at Cumae. It is known that in addition to the grove mentioned by Virgil and Servius (64) (and by other sources too), (65) the sanctuary at Grynium comprised an oracle and a temple also: Its prominence was such that it can justly be considered the religious center of the Aeolic dodecapolis. (66) The oracle at Grynium, moreover, together with those at Patara and Didyma, was one of the three major oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor; it was the only one in Aeolis that had any prestige. (67) Its origins were ancient, (68) while the recent discovery of one of its responses established that it was active at least into the first century B.C. (69) As for the temple at Grynium, the archaeological remains are few. (70) Nevertheless, its image survives on a number of Imperial coins struck at Myrina, the details of which show a Doric metope and triglyph at

(64) Virg. Ecl. 6. 72, Serv. ibid., Aen. 4. 345.
(66) At Aegae, for example, Dittenberger suggests (OGI 1: 481) that Apollo’s epithet Chresterius was due to the influence of Grynium; see further A. Bouché-Leclercq Histoire de la divination dans l’antiquité 3 (Paris, 1879–1882), 260; C. Picard Éphèse et Claros (Paris, 1922), 460; The Oxford Classical Dictionary, s.v. “Aeolis,” by Donald E. W. Wormell. For epigraphical evidence of games at Grynium see Louis Robert Rev. Phil. 3 (1929): 128.
(67) Farnell Cults 4: 224. On Lesbos there were at least two Apolline oracles: one of Apollo Napeaus, and the other of Apollo Myricaeus (see p. 66 below). At Methymna there may also have been an oracle of Apollo Smintheus (so P. Corssen Ath. Mitt. 38 [1913]: 19; see p. 66 below). On the mainland, if Keil-Premerstein Erster Bericht, 91 (100s B.C.) is from Aegae, then it proves that there was an oracle there, for the man whom it honors is called “keeper of the oracle of Apollo” (see Nilsson GGR 12: 545; cf. n. 66 above).
(68) Strab. 13. 622, which is copied in Steph. Byz., p. 213. 10–11.
(69) The inscription in question was published by George E. Bean in JHS 74 (1954): 85–87; for bibliography see Louis Robert in Études déliennes (Paris, 1973), 482, n. 14. Despite Bean in The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites (Princeton, 1976), s.v. “Gryneion,” there is no evidence that the Grynean oracle was still active in the A.D. 100s, for Aristid. Or. 51. 7–8 mentions only the sanctuary as a whole, and not the oracle in particular. Epigr. Gr., 1035 is an oracle not from Grynium but from Claros (see Picard Éphèse et Claros 461, n. 4; Bull. épigr. 1959: 245; Louis Robert loc. cit.). As late as the 200s B.C., the sanctuary at Grynium was still serving as a repository for inscriptions: see OGI, I. 266. 18 (263 B.C.), 229. 85 (244 B.C.), Inscr. Perg., 158. 32. For a list of inscriptions which mention Grynium see Louis Robert loc. cit., to which add the funerary inscription published by Salomon Reinach Rev. Arch. 6 (1885): 94.
(70) See Princeton Encyclopedia, s.v. “Gryneion,” by George E. Bean.
frieze.\(^{(71)}\) Strabo, moreover, describes this temple as sumptuous ("μολυτηλῆς") and built of white marble.\(^{(72)}\) The temple of Apollo at Grynium must therefore have been a truly imposing edifice—too imposing, certainly, for Euphorion to have ignored it entirely in his account of the origin of the grove.

VI

Even if Euphlorion’s poem had failed to provide an artificial means of doing so, there is evidence to suggest that Virgil would have been justified on historical grounds for linking Cumae with Grynium. In order to discover the nature and extent of this evidence, let us examine what is likely to have been the origin of the cult of Apollo at Cumae.

Cumae was the first Greek colony in the West, being founded around the middle of the 700s B.C., probably for the sake of trade.\(^{(73)}\) Euboeans from various cities constituted the majority of the original settlers,\(^{(74)}\) and the leaders of this contingent were Chalcis and Eretria.\(^{(75)}\) Chalcis supplied one oecist and enjoyed the status of metropolis.\(^{(76)}\) The other oecist came from Cyme, after which the colony was named.\(^{(77)}\) Although there is ancient authority for locating this Cyme in Aeolis,\(^{(78)}\) many scholars have impugned this evidence on the grounds that it derives from a chauvinistic fabrication of Ephorus, who came from Aeolic Cyme. In their view it was Euboean Cyme that gave Cumae its name.\(^{(79)}\) Finally, the tusks of the Erymanthian boar were supposed to reside in the temple of Apollo at Cumae,\(^{(80)}\) and from this some have inferred that Arcadians from Psophis also settled Cumae.\(^{(81)}\) This conclusion, however,

\(^{(71)}\) For the coins in question see Edmond Pottier and Salomon Reinach La nécropole de Myrina 1 (Paris, 1887), 54, n. 3; BMCTroas, s.v. "Myrina," nos. 44–45; Head Hist. Num. 556; for the details of the image see Bluma L. Trell Num. Chron. 12 (1972): 50–51. Gynerean Apollo is ubiquitous on the coins of Myrina, but among the figurines excavated in the necropolis, representations of Apollo are very rare (see Pottier and Reinach op. cit. 1: 144, 399), as they also are among the figurines found at IIium (see n. 159 below).

\(^{(72)}\) Strab. 13. 622. The existence of a temple at Grynium cannot, however, be inferred from passages like OGI, I, 229. 85, where a treaty concluded between Smyrna and Magnesia ad Sipylum in 244 B.C. is deposited εγὼ Γρυνεὺς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. For τὸ ἱερὸν is not necessarily the temple: in Strab. 13. 622, for example, it denotes the grove, and in Paus. I. 21. 7 the whole sanctuary.

\(^{(73)}\) Dunbabin Western Greeks 7.

\(^{(74)}\) Ibid.

\(^{(75)}\) Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7. 3. 1; cf. Dunbabin Western Greeks 7.

\(^{(76)}\) Strab. 5. 243. The earliest reference to Cumae as a Chalcidian colony is Thuc. 6. 4. 5.

\(^{(77)}\) Strab. 5. 243.

\(^{(78)}\) [Scymn.] 238–239.

\(^{(79)}\) See, for example, Julius Beloch Campanien \(^{3}\) (Breslau, 1890), 147–148. Despite the judicious remarks in Dunbabin Western Greeks 6–7, one can find this conclusion adopted wholesale as recently as the Princeton Encyclopedia, s.v. "Kyme," by Marian H. McAllister.

\(^{(80)}\) Paus. 8. 24. 5.

\(^{(81)}\) See Roy M. Peterson The Cults of Campania 1 (Rome, 1919), 52.
is too tenuous to warrant consideration here.

As is perhaps to be expected, it was usual for Greek colonists to preserve in their colony the cults of their native land.\(^\text{(62)}\) We are not likely to err, therefore, if we begin our search for the origins of Cumaean Apollo by considering what contingent of colonists is likeliest to have brought Apollo to Cumae.\(^\text{(63)}\) We cannot answer this question, however, without first examining the nature and extent of the worship of Apollo in Euboea and Aeolis in general, and in Chalcis, Eretria, and the two Cymes in particular.

In Chalcis there was a cult of Apollo Delphinius, whose sanctuary was dedicated in 191 B.C. to Flamininus as well as to Apollo. Though this sanctuary has yet to be excavated, the existence of the cult was recently confirmed by a Chalcidian inscription dedicating a tripod to Apollo Delphinius.\(^\text{(64)}\) Beyond this, however, there is no evidence concerning either Apollo Delphinius or any other Chalcidian cult of Apollo. For example, the god is apparently never portrayed on the coinage of Chalcis. To be sure, Norden supposed that in addition to his cult at Sicilian Naxos, Apollo Archegetes was worshiped at Cumae also, and that in both colonies his cult was an offshoot of the same cult in Chalcis.\(^\text{(65)}\) There is no evidence at all, however, of the worship of Apollo Archegetes at Cumae, and at Naxos the Chalcidians dedicated an altar to this god not because they were Chalcidians, but because they were colonists.\(^\text{(66)}\)

It is also the case that on one occasion Chalcis dedicated an altar at Delphi, and that earlier, in obedience to the oracle, it had sent there a tenth of its population as a tithe dedicated to Apollo.\(^\text{(67)}\) These episodes, however, are hardly evidence of a Chalcidian cult of Apollo; neither is the fact that by the late 400s B.C., a Chalcidian procession was part of the festival on Delos.\(^\text{(68)}\)

Despite a paucity of information from literary sources, there is an abundance of epigraphical and archaeological evidence for the worship of Apollo in Eretria. The temple of Apollo Daphnephorus in the middle of the city was built between 530 and

\(^{\text{(62)}}\) Dunbabin Western Greeks 182; A. J. Graham Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece (Manchester, 1964), 14–15.
\(^{\text{(63)}}\) Against this approach it might be argued that like the cult of Apollo Archegetes at Sicilian Naxos (also a Chalcidian colony), the cult of Apollo at Cumae was established not in order to preserve the religion of the metropolis, but in honor of the arrival of the Greek gods in a new land (see ibid. 26; A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover A Historical Commentary on Thucydides 4 (Oxford, 1959–1970), 214–215.
\(^{\text{(64)}}\) The sanctuary is mentioned in Plut. Flam. 16. 3; the inscription was published by Hubert Gallet de Santerre in BCH 77 (1953): 217.
\(^{\text{(65)}}\) Norden Aeneis VI11 117, where the dove mentioned in Vell. Pat. I. 4. 1 is erroneously attributed to the agency of Apollo Archegetes; cf. Beloch Campanien 4 146, 160.
\(^{\text{(66)}}\) See n. 83 above.
\(^{\text{(67)}}\) For the altar at Delphi see PW, s.v. "Apollon," by K. Wernicke, 66. 47–48; for the Chalcidians sent to Delphi see Strab. 6. 257.
\(^{\text{(68)}}\) Paus. 9. 12. 6.
520 B.C. and first excavated by Kourouniotis around the turn of the century. It had several precursors, moreover, one of which, dating to the 700s B.C., is the oldest building yet found in Eretria. Hence, the Eretrian cult of Apollo Daphnephorus was already in existence at the time when Cumae was settled. The temple is designated the repository of a large number of inscriptions, many of which were found on the site, and most of which date to the 300s or 200s B.C. When a treaty was concluded between Eretria and Chaerephanes in the late 300s B.C., the oaths were taken in the temple of Apollo Daphnephorus.

Epigraphical evidence also indicates that in Eretria—and, as will be seen below, in its immediate vicinity as well—the worship of Apollo was commonly combined with the worship of Leto and Artemis. For example, in a treaty between Eretria and Histiaeia which probably dates to between 410 and 390 B.C., provision is made for a tithe to Apollo, while the treaty itself is to be deposited in the sanctuary of Artemis Amynasia near Eretria. In the treaty between Eretria and Chaerephanes mentioned above, the oaths are to be sworn in the name of Apollo, Leto, and Artemis, in that order, and the same triad is portrayed in an anaglyph on the stele on which the treaty is inscribed. On at least three occasions the statue of an honoree was dedicated by the Eretrians to Artemis, Apollo, and Leto, while two inscriptions of the 200s B.C. record one dedication to Apollo Trimoridius (?), Leto, and Artemis, and another to Delian Apollo combined with the same two goddesses. In addition to the link with Delos which the latter inscription implies, there is evidence of two dedications made by Eretria at Delphi. Finally, though the context is unclear, the triad of Apollo, Demeter, and Dionysus is mentioned in an Eretrian law of the early 200s B.C. which was found near the temple of Apollo Daphnephorus.

It is hardly surprising that there is no evidence whatever of a cult of Apollo in Cyme on Euboea’s eastern coast, for this city is mentioned by only one source. Ancient though it was, moreover, it had been reduced to a dependent position probably as early as the end of the 500s B.C., so that its coins, for example, can be only conjecturally identified.

(91) IG, XII. 9, 191A. 11, 43. The temple is also mentioned ibid., 204. 8–9, though the context is unclear.
(92) Ibid., 188. 13–15, 17–18.
(93) Ibid., 191A. 48, 54.
(94) Ibid., 276–278, the first two dating to the 100s B.C.
(95) Ibid., 267, 266.
(96) Plut. Mor. 402 A, IG, XII. 9, p. 162. 67–68, which I am unable to locate in Delph. 3. It dates to between 254 and 271 B.C.
(97) IG, XII. 9, 207. 11.
(99) Head Hist. Num. 360; BMCCentral Greece, p. 136.
Elsewhere in Euboea, we find in Carystus the same association of Apollo with Artemis as is so amply documented for Eretria.\(^{100}\) Also, one of the types of coin minted by Carystus before 336 B.C. has the head of Apollo on the obverse.\(^{101}\) Near Carystus, however, in a quarry called Marmarium, there was a sanctuary of Apollo Marmarinus,\(^{102}\) and hence the coin type in question need not imply a cult of Apollo within Carystus itself. Amarynthus, located less than a mile from Eretria, was the site of the principal sanctuary of Artemis Amarysia, the chief Eretrian deity, who was worshiped all over Euboea.\(^{103}\) Nevertheless, here too, as in Eretria itself, inscriptions have been found which record dedications to Artemis, Apollo, and Leto.\(^{104}\) The same is true of Tamynae, also near Eretria, where an inscription of uncertain date records a dedication to Apollo and Leto, and probably to Artemis too; another, of the late 100s B.C., a dedication to Artemis, Apollo, and Leto; and a third, of uncertain date, a dedication by the Eretrian populace to Leto, and probably to Artemis and Apollo also.\(^{105}\) Tamynae was the site of a sanctuary of Apollo, and it may be this sanctuary to which an inscription, now lost, of the 300s B.C. refers when it mentions Apollo in an uncertain context and provides for the protection of the grove around a sacred precinct.\(^{106}\) In addition, Tamynae was the site of games called the "Tamynia," in which one of the events was an encomium in praise of Apollo.\(^{107}\) Finally, beyond the immediate vicinity of Carystus and Eretria, traces of the worship of Apollo are few and limited to Orobiae, where before Strabo's day there was an oracle of Apollo Selinuntius, and to Histiaea, where the head of Apollo perhaps appears on the obverse of one of the commonest types of coin minted between ca. 197 and 146 B.C.\(^{108}\) Thus, with the exception of Eretria and its environs, Euboea as a whole quite clearly did not regard Apollo as one of its principal deities, and even in and around Eretria, as at Carystus also, the god is often to be found not enjoying the single-minded devotion of his worshipers, but sharing it with his sister and his mother in a cult of which he is only a third part.

Located not far south from where the Xanthus enters the Aegean, Aeolic Cyme was

---

\(^{100}\) IG, XII. 9, 14, an inscription from Carystus of the first century after Christ, records a dedication to Artemis by one Phrynis, who calls herself the priestess of Artemis and Apollo.

\(^{101}\) Head Hist. Num. 357; BMCCentral Greece, s.v. "Euboea: Carystus," no. 12.

\(^{102}\) Strab. 10. 446.

\(^{103}\) For the distance of Amarynthus from Eretria see ibid. 10. 448; for the "pan-Euboean worship of Artemis Amarysia see Livy 35. 38. 3.

\(^{104}\) IG, XII. 9, 140. 4-5, 141. 4, 142. 4, two of which are datable to the mid-second and early first centuries B.C.

\(^{105}\) Ibid., 97. 4, 98. 3, 99. 4.

\(^{106}\) For the sanctuary of Apollo at Tamynae see Harp., s.v. "Taµu11ae"; the inscription is IG, XII. 9, 90=Sokolowski II, 91.

\(^{107}\) IG, XII. 9, 91. 3.

\(^{108}\) For the oracle of Apollo Selinuntius at Orobiae see Strab. 10. 445; for Apollo on coins of Histiaeae see Head Hist. Num. 364.
one of the 'original Aeolic cities mentioned by Herodotus.\(^{(109)}\) Together with Lesbos, it was one of the centers from which the earliest' Aeolic settlers expanded outwards into Asia Minor.\(^{(110)}\) Though notorious in antiquity for its lack of great achievements, as a member of the Delian League Cyme paid far more tribute (9 talents) than any other Aeolic city, and more also than the largest cities in Ionia.\(^{(111)}\) Centuries later, moreover, Strabo could still call Cyne "the biggest and best of the Aeolic cities."\(^{(112)}\)

Apollo must have been worshiped in Cyme, for there Alexander the Great once dedicated to Apollo a candlestick which had been seized from the Thebans.\(^{(113)}\) Otherwise, almost nothing is known about the existence, much less the importance, of a cult of Apollo in Aeolic Cyme.\(^{(114)}\) In 1887 there was discovered at Cyme a life-size bust which probably belonged to an Augusteum, and which perhaps portrays Apollo;\(^{(115)}\) Beyond this, however, nothing excavated at Cyme gives any evidence of the worship of Apollo there.\(^{(116)}\) Also, the portrayal of Apollo on Cymæan coins is extremely rare.\(^{(117)}\) From this, however, it would be mistaken to infer that Cyme must therefore have had little regard for the god, for from Eretria, the home of Apollo Daphnephorus, there are apparently no coins at all on which Apollo appears!

Whatever Apollo's status within Cyme itself, Cyme, as an Aeolic city, was located on a coast along the whole of which, "as far as Tenedos, Apollo is specially honored."\(^{(118)}\) To begin with the original Aeolic cities,\(^{(119)}\) a cult of Apollo in Larisa Phriconis is implied by a coin type on the reverse of which Apollo is shown;\(^{(120)}\) Near Temnus there was a precinct of Apollo Cynnius which was plundered and burned by Prusias in 157-156 B.C.\(^{(121)}\) In honor of the same god Temnus may have celebrated a festival called the "Cynnia,"\(^{(122)}\) though on the city's coins Apollo is only

\(^{(109)}\) Hdt. 1. 149.
\(^{(110)}\) Strab. 13. 622.
\(^{(112)}\) Strab. 13. 622.
\(^{(113)}\) Pliny *HN* 34. 3. 14.
\(^{(114)}\) The inscriptions of Cyme are now published in H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, eds. *Die Inschriften der griechischen Städte aus Kleinasien* 2 (Bonn, 1972- ), but this volume was published too recently for me to have been able to consult it.
\(^{(116)}\) Letter from Prof. Jan Bouzek, 4 August 1977.
\(^{(117)}\) In *BMCTroas*, s.v. "Cyme," only nos. 93-94. On a bronze Cymæan coin dating to the reign of the Antonines, however, Apollo is portrayed on the reverse, and on the obverse, significantly, "the Sibyl of the Cymæans." For references see n. 187 below.
\(^{(118)}\) Strab. 13. 618.
\(^{(119)}\) Except for Smyrna and Notium, which were eventually seized by Ionic Colophon and for this reason are omitted from the present discussion.
\(^{(121)}\) Polyb. 32. 15. 12.
\(^{(122)}\) Robert *Ét. Anat.* 93.
occasionally portrayed. In the same region in which Larisa and Temnus were located, Apollo Agyieus was also worshiped, though the exact site of this cult is not known. Aegae was the site of a sanctuary of Apollo Chresterius. Though it is never mentioned in any literary source, this was the principal shrine of Aegae. It included a temple, dedicated in 46 B.C., and seems to have occupied a very large area which extended a considerable distance beyond the limits of the city. The importance of Apollo at Aegae is further indicated by the dedication of the market hall there to the Caesars and Apollo, and by an inscription which records a private dedication to Apollo Chresterius. Passing over Grytnium, which has already been described in detail, we come finally to Cilla, where even before its settlement by Aeolians there was a cult of Apollo Smintheus. In the historical period, however, the Apollo of Cilla was called Cillaeus, and under this name he had a sanctuary there.

On the island of Lesbos, there is relatively little evidence of the worship of Apollo within the city of Mytilene itself. An inscription of unknown date records a dedication to Apollo, while the first four letters of his name are all that survives on another. Also, it is probable that the throne of Potamon was originally made for a priest of Apollo and only later (after 45 B.C.) assigned to the rhetor. Finally, beginning around 440 B.C. Apollo often appears on the coins of Mytilene. Outside the city, however, in a place called Maloeis, there was a sanctuary of Apollo Maloeis, where the Mytileneans worshiped and celebrated a local festival of major importance.
to judge by the wording of an inscription of Imperial date, it would seem that Artemis too was worshiped there.\(^{(135)}\) In another place near Mytilene, moreover, a definite case is to be found of Apollo and Artemis being worshiped together, for at Thermæ, north of the city, Apollo Thermius was worshiped alongside Artemis Thermia.\(^{(136)}\) As for the cities between Mytilene and Methymna, it is certain that Apollo was worshiped in Eresus, for an inscription found near there records a dedication to Apollo, and the god is portrayed on the city's coins.\(^{(137)}\) It is somewhat uncertain, however, what epithet Apollo usually had in Eresus. It was probably Eresius or Ereseus, but it could also have been Lycius.\(^{(138)}\)

In Antissa the only evidence of a cult of Apollo is the portrayal of the god on the reverse of a coin.\(^{\text{(139)}}\) When we come finally to Methymna, we find that as in Mytilene also, there are relatively few traces of the worship of Apollo within the city itself. The only epigraphical evidence is a decree of Imperial date honoring a poet who is called "keeper of the oracle" of Smintheus, and even on Methymna's coins, Apollo rarely appears.\(^{(140)}\) Nevertheless, in the territory of Methymna, there was a sanctuary of Apollo on Mount Lepetymnus\(^{(141)}\) and, in the city of Nape, an oracular cult of Apollo Napaesus, who was represented as a shepherd, and whose oracle Pelops is said to have consulted.\(^{(142)}\) There may have been a temple attached to this cult, and in the 300s B.C. Nape may have minted coins with Apollo on the obverse.\(^{(143)}\) Somewhere on Lesbos there was an oracular cult of Apollo Myricaeus,\(^{(144)}\) and in view of the fact that Methymna and its environs are the only part of Lesbos for which oracles of

\(^{(135)}\) IG, XII. 2, 484=IG Röm., IV, 116. 18-21.
\(^{(136)}\) The worship of Apollo Thermius at Thermæ is known only from IG, XII. 2, 104=IG Rom., IV, 20, a dedication which was copied by Cyriac of Ancona and dates to the first century after Christ. For the cult of this god see J. H. Croon Mnemos. 9 (1956): 203-210, 217-220; for primary sources relating to Artemis Thermia at Thermæ see ibid. 197, h. 1.
\(^{(137)}\) The inscription is IG, XII. 2, 534, of unknown date; for Apollo on coins of Eresus see Head Hist. Num. 560.
\(^{(138)}\) In Ἦσχ., s.v. "Ἐρεώς," "Eresius" is defined as an epithet of Apollo, and a priest of Apollo Ereseus is honored in an inscription published by Emmanuel David in Ἀπόλλων. Ἑπιστ. 1936: Χρονικά 20. At the same time, in another inscription from Eresus (IG, XII. 2, 526b. 30-31=OGI, I, 8. 72-73, dating to between 350 and 300 B.C.) reference is made to an oath sworn in the name of Apollo Lycius.
\(^{(139)}\) BMCTroas, s.v. "Antissa," no. 9; Head Hist. Num. 560.
\(^{(140)}\) The decree is IG, XII. 2, 519; for coins of Methymna which portray Apollo see BMCTroas, s.v. "Methymna," nos. 35, 39-41 (?); Head Hist. Num. 561; Hans-Günter Buchholz Methymna: Archäologische Beiträge zur Topographie und Geschichte von Nordlesbos (Mainz am Rhein, 1975), 205, and the references cited there.
\(^{(141)}\) Myrsil. SJ.
\(^{(142)}\) Anticl. 8J, Strab. 9. 426, Macrob. Sat. 1. 17. 45, Steph. Byz., p. 469. 4, Suda, s.v. "Νάρις."
\(^{(143)}\) For a temple of Apollo Napaesus see Buchholz Methymna 207 and the references cited there; Princeton Encyclopedia, s.v. "Lesbos," by Miltis Paraskevaidis; for putative coins of Nape portraying Apollo see F. Imhoof-Blumer Monnaies grecques (Amsterdam, 1883), 280.
\(^{(144)}\) Schol. Nic. Ther. 613.
Apollo are attested, it is there that this cult would most plausibly be located. Also, the *Aethiopis* related how Achilles, after he had killed Thersites, sailed to Lesbos and there offered sacrifice to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto. On Lesbos, then, the worship of Apollo was at least as widespread as among the twelve Aeolic cities on the mainland and it is thus not surprising to find Apollo portrayed on the obverse of some of the island's electrum coins.

Beside Lesbos, the Hecatonnesi and Tenedos also had Aeolic populations. So great was the devotion to Apollo in the former, a group of some thirty islands between Lesbos and the mainland, that they were named in honor of the god, one of whose epithets was Hecatus. In addition, Apollo was worshiped at both of the two main settlements in the area: he is portrayed on the obverse of most of the extant coins of Nesus, and in front of the city of Pordoselene, on an uninhabited island, a sanctuary of his was located. As for Tenedos, Apollo Smintheus was the tutelary god of the island even before it was settled by Aeolians. By the 100s B.C. he had a sanctuary there which still existed in Strabo's day. The cult would seem to have survived into the second century after Christ, but by the twelfth century even the sanctuary had ceased to exist.

To turn, finally, to the Aeolic settlements in the Troad, evidence of the worship of Apollo there is largely numismatic. In particular, a cult of Apollo at Gargarä is implied by the fact that most, if not all, of this city's coins have Apollo on the obverse. Similarly, Apollo is portrayed on the obverse of a large proportion of the coins of Antandrus, where he would seem to have been worshiped under the epithet Schizanus or Schizaeus. At Cebren too, a high percentage of the coins

---

(145) EGF 33.
(146) For a lengthier survey of the worship of Apollo on Lesbos see Emily L. Shields *The Cults of Lesbos* (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1917), 1–12; Buchholz *Methymna* 204–207.
(150) The Apollo Smintheus of Tenedos is mentioned as early as Hom. *Il.* 1. 38; cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.516. Aristid. Mil. 32M (=Steph. Byz., p. 615. 21) implies a cult statue and hence a sanctuary, which is mentioned explicitly in Strab. 13. 604. In *IG*, XII Suppl., 144. 2, an inscription from Tenedos dating to around the A.D. 100s, the name of Apollo appears in the genitive case, but the context is extremely ambiguous. Eustathius (Dionys. Per. 536) refers to the sanctuary in the past tense.
(151) According to Walter Leaf *Strabo on the Troad* (Cambridge, 1923), 291–292, there was a temple of Apollo on the acropolis at Assos; since its excavation a century ago, however, this temple has rather been assigned to Athena (see *Princeton Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Assos," by Henry S. Robinson).
(154) Apollo has this epithet on an Antandrian coin of Imperial date. See Imhoof-Blumer *Kleinasiatische Münzen* 507; Head *Hist. Num.* 542.
have Apollo on the obverse.\textsuperscript{(155)} When we come to Neandria, however, our evidence is no longer limited to coins. To be sure, Apollo is the usual motif on the obverse of this city's coins.\textsuperscript{(156)} Beyond this, however, an Aeolic inscription establishes the early 400s B.C. as a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the worship of Apollo at Neandria, and excavations have revealed that the god also had a temple there.\textsuperscript{(157)} As for Scepsis, a decree fragment from there appears to make reference to a sanctuary of Apollo, although the god is only occasionally portrayed on the coins minted by Scepsis.\textsuperscript{(158)} Finally, in Ilium (Troy VIII and IX), though Athena Ilias was its principal deity, there was also a cult of Apollo,\textsuperscript{(159)} who was apparently worshiped under at least three epithets. Apollo Hecatus is portrayed on an Ilian coin.\textsuperscript{(160)} A cult of Apollo Smintheus is implied by Tzetzes\textsuperscript{(161)} and confirmed by the fact that games called the "Sminthia" were held at Ilium.\textsuperscript{(162)} Best attested of all, finally, is a cult of Apollo Ilieus, of which there is both literary and epigraphical evidence.\textsuperscript{(163)} To this information the publication of the inscriptions of Ilium\textsuperscript{(164)} can perhaps yield valuable additions.

Throughout Aeolis, then, there were many cults of Apollo—so many, in fact, that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{(155)} B.M.C. \textit{Troas}, s.v. "Cebren," nos. 23-36; Head \textit{Hist. Num.} 543.
\item \textsuperscript{(156)} B.M.C. \textit{Troas}, s.v. "Neandria," nos. 1-2, 4-5, 7-11; Head \textit{Hist. Num.} 547.
\item \textsuperscript{(157)} The Aeolic inscription is \textit{Schwyzer}, 639, which records the dedication by one Hermes of a statue of Apollo; for the temple of Apollo at Neandria see \textit{Princeton Encyclopedia}, s.v. "Neandria," by Nicola Bonacasa.
\item \textsuperscript{(158)} The decree fragment, not in Aeolic, was published by J. Arthur R. Munro in \textit{JHS} 21 (1901): 235-236. For Apollo on the obverse of Scepsis' coins see Imhoof-Blumer \textit{Kleinasiatische Münzen} 45, 510.
\item \textsuperscript{(159)} In \textit{OGI}, I, 219. 26, 30 (280-261 B.C.), Apollo is one of the three divinities for whom prayers and sacrifices are expressly decreed. At Byzantium there was a stele dedicated to Apollo which was supposed to have been brought there from Ilium (Zonar., p. 182. 29). Among the terracotta figures excavated at Ilium, however, there is only one representation of Apollo: Dorothy B. Thompson \textit{Troy: The Terracotta Figurines of the Hellenistic Period} (Princeton, 1963), 71-72; cf. n. 71 above.
\item \textsuperscript{(160)} Head \textit{Hist. Num.} 547; see Hans von Fritz in \textit{Wilhelm, Dörpfeld Troja und Ilion} 2 (Athens, 1902), 516-517, and Alfred R. Bellinger \textit{Troy: The Coins} (Princeton, 1961), 54-55, both of whom argue, however, that Hecatus is not a cult title.
\item \textsuperscript{(161)} Ad Lycoph. 1303.
\item \textsuperscript{(162)} See Nilsson \textit{Feste} 143.
\item \textsuperscript{(163)} Steph. Byz., p. 330. 22, \textit{IG Rom.}, IV, 224. d, where the reference to Apollo Ilieus probably has to do with his priest.
\item It is wrong to infer (as does Marcella Santoro \textit{Epitheta deorum in Asia Graeca cultorum ex auctoris Graecis et Latinis} [Milan, 1974], 123) that there was also a cult of Apollo Thymbraeus in Ilium. By at least three sources (Serv. \textit{Aen.} 3. 85, Hsch., s.v. "Θυμβραῖος," schol. A Hom. \textit{Il.} 10. 430) Thymbra is located in Ilium, even though it was 5.7 miles outside the city (Dionysodorus in schol. Eur. \textit{Rhes.} 508; cf. Strab. 13. 598, Steph. Byz., p. 319. 17). Therefore, when it is said that there were in Ilium a cult and a sanctuary of Apollo Thymbraeus (Stat. \textit{Theb.} 1. 696-699, Hsch., s.v. "παθιάνας πάλατος"), this need not be taken to indicate a cult in Ilium distinct from the one at Thymbra. For the location of Thymbra see J. M. Cook \textit{The Troad: An Archaeological and Topographical Study} (Oxford, 1973), 117-123.
\item In the same volume as the inscriptions of Cyme, for which see n. 114 above.
\end{itemize}
their sheer multitude is enough to confirm Strabo's statement that special esteem was accorded Apollo in Aeolis. The Aeolians also celebrated a festival of Apollo Pornopion,\(^{(165)}\) and if this festival was pan-Aeolic, then in addition to the mass of local cults just surveyed, it by itself will indicate Apollo's pre-eminence in Aeolis. The same conclusion is suggested by yet a third fact, which is that the Aeolic cults are notable for a distinctly indigenous and autonomous character, and for their almost complete independence from the pan-Hellenic Apollo. For example, Aeolis stands apart from the rest of Greece in showing hardly a trace of the worship of Pythian Apollo.\(^{(166)}\) Conversely, though it antedated the Aeolic migration and extended into other parts of Asia Minor as well,\(^{(167)}\) the cult of Apollo Smintheus, as we have seen

\(^{(165)}\) Strab. 13. 613, where an Aeolic month called "Pornopion" is also mentioned. The same month appears in three inscriptions from Cyme (see A. Salaé BCH 51 [1927]: 375-376), where it is called "Pornopium." Finally, "Pornopia" was the name of a place on the island of Pordoselene (OGI, I, 4. 48).

\(^{(166)}\) Farnell Cults 4: 169, though it is overstating the case to allege "the lack of any recorded connexion between Aeolis and the Pythian shrine." For example, despite its close ties to Grynium (for which see p. 74 below), Myrina is known to have sent an offering to Delphi on at least one occasion (Plut. Mor. 401 F). Likewise, the citizens of Methymna once consulted the Delphic oracle concerning the identity of a certain olive-wood image, a bronze copy of which they later sent to Delphi (Paus. 10. 19. 3). To these literary citations epigraphical evidence can be added. A Delphic inscription no older than 175 B.C., for example, proves that in each of eight Aeolic cities—Cyme, Larisa, Myrina, Pitane, Elaea, Assus, Gargara, and Antandrus—there was a θεωροδήσις responsible for welcoming the θεωρος who came from Delphi to announce the next celebration of the festival (see A. Plassart BCH 45 [1921]: 7-8, 36, 40). Inscriptions also establish that by ca. 150 B.C., relations between Delphi and Scepsis were excellent. For example, Delph.3(1), 288 (ca. 150 B.C.) contains not only a decree fragment from Scepsis which provides for sending envoys to Delphi, but also a response from Delphi which grants privileges to the citizens of Scepsis (for a commentary on this inscription see Louis Robert BCH 50 [1926]: 511-515=Opera minora 1: 75-79). Secondly, in Delph.3(1), 273, a fragment of a Delphic decree, an epic poet from Scepsis is honored (for the whole question of relations between Scepsis and Delphi see Louis Robert Études de numismatique grecque [Paris, 1951], 14-15). As for numismatic evidence, on most of the coins of Myrina which portray Apollo, the god is accompanied by the laurel (for exceptions see BMCTroas, s.v. "Myrina," nos. 35-36), and on the earliest ones (second and first centuries B.C.) by the omphalus as well (ibid., nos. 1-19; Head Hist. Num. 481). On the reverse of some Ilian coins also, Apollo is portrayed seated on the omphalus (see Bellinger Troy: The Coins 18-19). Neither the laurel nor the omphalus, however, indicates anything like the official sanction of Delphi (as is assumed of Grynium by Bouché-Leclercq Histoire 3: 260; cf. Picard Éphèse et Claros 108-109, 461); they rather represent the oracular powers of Apollo (see Louis Robert Monnaies antiques en Troade [Geneva and Paris, 1966], 43, n. 3, concerning the omphalus on a tetradrachma of Parium). Finally, various names suggest an association between Delphi and Aeolis. Grynium and Myrina, for example, were watered by the Pythicus River (for Pythian Apollo proposed as the source of this name see Pottier and Reinach Nécropole de Myrina 1: 53, n. 4). Also, proper names like Python, Pythias, Pythocrates, Pythodorus, and Pythophæus are attested for Lesbos (IG, XII. 2, 295. 2, 340. 1, 511b. 2, 533. 2, XII Suppl., 63. 11, 127. 64, 137. 56; Charitonidis Επιγραφαὶ τῆς Δέσμου 84), and Pythodorus for Scepsis (OGI, II, 444. 8).

\(^{(167)}\) Strab. 13. 605.
above, was the most widespread cult of Apollo in Aeolis, yet it is nowhere to be found in mainland Greece.\footnote{168} A third example of Aeolic Apollo’s indigenous quality is the fact that rather many of his epithets are purely local, that is, derived from the names of nearby places.\footnote{169} Thus, there are at least four such epithets in Aeolis—Gryneus, Cillaeus, Ereseus, Ilieus—as compared with none, for example, in Euboea. Finally, the Aeolic cult of Apollo Smintheus is associated in a number of ways with Crete. According to the traditional account, the cult was first established by settlers from Crete,\footnote{170} and the epithet was derived from the Cretan (and Aeolic) word for “mouse.”\footnote{171} The double-headed ax, moreover, plays a central role in the legendary account of the foundation of Tenedos by Tenes, who according to one source was the son of Apollo.\footnote{172} Similarly, the Apollo Smintheus worshiped on the island was portrayed holding a double-headed ax.\footnote{173} In conclusion, then, the Aeolic cults of Apollo are notable for both their number and their uncommon idiosyncrasies. The extreme devotion to Apollo, moreover, which these characteristics imply is evident among the Aeolians even before their migration, for the cult of Apollo Cillaeus at Colonae was supposed to have been founded by Aeolians who had sailed there from mainland Greece.\footnote{174}

To return to the question with which this digression began—what contingent of colonists is likeliest to have brought Apollo to Cumae?—on the surface of things Eretria would appear the clear favorite. Not only is the Eretrian cult of Apollo Daphnephorus far more amply documented than the cult of Apollo in either Chalcis or Aeolic Cyme, but it also played a prominent role in the religious and political life of the city, serving as a custodian of public documents and an agent in the conclusion of treaties. In fact, however, the evidence in favor of Eretria is considerably less weighty than it seems. Let us consider the nature of this evidence, for example. Being in no part literary or numismatic, but exclusively epigraphical and archaeological, it is due entirely to the arbitrary fact of excavation. In other words, had Eretria not been extensively excavated, the Eretrian cult of Apollo Daphnephorus might still be entirely unknown. As important as Apollo was in the life of the city, moreover, he was still not the principal deity, as he was at Cumae. Indeed, unlike Artemis, Eretria’s tutelary goddess, Apollo, as we have seen, is apparently never portrayed on any Eretrian coin. Also, in the vicinity of Eretria (and Carystus too) Apollo was commonly

\footnote{168} Farnell Cults 4: 165.  
\footnote{169} Ibid. 4: 163.  
\footnote{172} Tzetz. ad Lycoph. 232; see Walter Leaf Strabo on the Troad 220.  
\footnote{173} Aristid. Mil. 32M (=Steph. Byz., p. 615.21).  
\footnote{174} Strab. 13.612.  
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worshiped in conjunction with other divinities: usually with Leto and/or Artemis, but in at least one case with Demeter and Dionysus. This, then, is another way in which the Eretrian Apollo differs from the Apollo of Cumae. Finally, whatever may be said for Apollo's prestige in Eretria itself, in Euboea as a whole his status was considerably less than supreme. Therefore, for all these reasons, whatever may be the mother cult of Cumaean Apollo, the claims to this title of the Eretrian Apollo are very much weaker than they would at first appear.

At the same time, the claims of Aeolic Cyme are stronger than they seem. Whoever may have been the tutelary god of Cyme itself—and the coinage of Cyme suggests that it was not Apollo—Apollo was nevertheless the principal deity of the group of cities of which Cyme was the principal member. Indeed, throughout all the Aeolic settlements in Asia Minor taken as a whole; Apollo enjoyed the same pre-eminence as he was accorded at Cumae. Beside this, several of the distinctive features of Apollo's Aeolic cults are also to be found at Cumae. For example, only on Lesbos is there evidence of Apollo, Artemis, and in one case Leto, being worshiped together, as they commonly were in Euboea; otherwise, all the Aeolic cults of Apollo were devoted to Apollo alone, as was also the cult at Cumae. Secondly, just as the Aeolians tended to worship Apollo under such local epithets as Gryneus, Cillaeus, Ereseus, and Illeus, so was Apollo called "Cumanus" at Cumae. Finally, the Cretan appurtenances of the Apollo Smintheus of Tenedos, and the legendary account of the Cretan foundation of the same cult in the Troad—these are paralleled by the tradition of the Cretan origin of the Cumaean cult of Apollo.

In short, except for the fact that in Cyme, as in Eretria, Apollo seems not to have been the principal deity, in all other respects Cyme is likelier than Eretria to have founded the Cumaean cult of Apollo. Nevertheless, even if the claims of these two cities are judged equal, it may be that this impasse can be broken in the following way. In view of the intimate connection, both legendary and actual, between the Sibyl and Apollo, it is virtually inconceivable that the Sibyl could have been brought to Cumae by one contingent of colonists, but Apollo by another. Therefore, if one of Cumae's founding cities can be shown to have been the source of the Sibylline oracle, then it follows that that city must also have been the source of the cult of Apollo. For this reason, then, a brief inquiry is warranted into the likely provenance of the Cumaean Sibyl.

(175) See pp. 59, 63–64 above.
(176) That "Cumanus" was the epithet of the Apollo of Cumae is confirmed by CIL, X, 3683, a dedicatory inscription on an altar found at Cumae. The epithet "Zosterius" cannot be inferred from Lycoph. 1278: see PW, s.v. "Apollon," by K. Wernicke, 52. 40–47; Peterson Cults 1: 54–55.
(177) For this see Enk Mnemos. 11 (1958): 322–330.
(178) Cf. Wissowa RK 293 and the sources cited there.
Beside Cumae there are twelve places in Greece which are said by an ancient source to have had their own Sibyl.\(^{(179)}\) Of these, seven are in Asia Minor, but none in Euboea.\(^{(180)}\) Indeed, Euboea is never associated with the Sibyl in any way, not even as a stopover in the course of her extensive wanderings. These important facts eliminate entirely any possibility that the Sibyl could have been established at Cumae by one of the Euboean contingents of colonists. Thus, by a process of elimination alone it can be shown that the Sibylline oracle at Cumae must have been brought there from Asia Minor by the colonists from Aeolic Cyme.\(^{(181)}\) This conclusion, however, need not depend on negative arguments alone. Not only are rhore Sibyls attested for Asia Minor than for any other region of Greece, but it was there, probably in the immediate vicinity of Cyme, that the Greek Sibyl originated.\(^{(182)}\) It was also near Cyme, at Erythrae, that the most famous Sibyl had her oracle.\(^{(183)}\) For such reasons as these, therefore, Asia Minor is by far the likeliest provenance for the Sibyl of Cumae. Beyond mere probability, moreover, there are numerous traditions which explicitly associate the Cumaean Sibyl with either Asia Minor in general or the vicinity of Cyme in particular. For example, the Sibyl is supposed to have emigrated from Erythrae to Cumae and continued her prophesying there.\(^{(184)}\) Thus, in one source the Sibyls of Cumae and Erythrae are said to have been one and the same woman, differing only in name.\(^{(185)}\) In other sources even their names are the same: Herophile, one of seven different names attested for the Cumaean Sibyl, is also the name of the Sibyls of Marpessus and Erythrae. Taraxandra, another of these seven names, similarly connects the Sibyl of Cumae with Asia Minor, for Taraxandra is also the name of the Phrygian Sibyl.\(^{(186)}\) Thus, while the Sibyl never

\(^{(179)}\) For these twelve Sibyls and the sources for each of them see PW, s.v. “Sibyllen,” by E. Rzach, 2081. 10-2095. 10.

\(^{(180)}\) The Latin poets often call the Cumaean Sibyl or her oracle “Euboicus” or “Chalcidicus,” e.g., Ov. Fast. 4. 257, 6. 210, Mart. 9. 29. 3, Stat. Silv. 1. 2. 177, 4. 126, 4. 3. 24, 5. 3. 182. This fact, however, quite obviously does not imply a Sibyl either in Euboea or in Chalcis. Rather, the adjectives Euboicus (or Eubois) and Chalcidicus are transferred from the colony itself (as in Virg. Aen. 6. 2, 42, Ov. Met. 14. 155, Stat. Silv. 1. 2. 263, 2. 2. 94, Achil. 1. 414) to the oracle located there.

\(^{(181)}\) For the same conclusion see Peterson Cults 1: 56-57.

\(^{(182)}\) See PW, s.v. “Sibyllen,” by E. Rzach, 2073. 61-66. Marpessus and Erythrae, the two claimants to the honor of birthplace of the Sibyl, were both located near Cyme. According to Varro, moreover, “Sibylla” is an Aeolic name (Lactant. Div. inst. 1. 6. 7; cf. Serv. eq Aen. 3. 445).

\(^{(183)}\) For the pre-eminence of the Sibyl of Erythrae see PW, s.v. “Sibyllen,” by E. Rzach, 2084. 23-24.

\(^{(184)}\) Serv. Aen. 6. 321, Mart. Cap. 2. 159. In PW, s.v. “Sibyllen,” by E. Rzach, 2092. 31-33, this tradition is taken to imply that some Sibylline prophecies once came to Cumae from Erythrae.

\(^{(185)}\) [Arist.] Mir. ausc. 838a.

\(^{(186)}\) For the Cumaean Sibyl’s various names see PW, s.v. “Sibyllen,” by E. Rzach, 2091. 36-2092. 24; she is called Herophile by Varro in Lactant. Div. inst. 1. 6. 18, and Taraxandra by schol. Pl. Phdr. 244 B; for the Phrygian Sibyl named Taraxandra see Clem. Al. Strom., p. 132. 18, Suda, s.v. “Σύβυλλα Φορτία.” In the opinion of Rzach loc. cit. 2091. 52-56, “Herophile” was an invention ex post facto.
set foot in Euboea, it was in the vicinity of Cyme that she first appeared and subsequently established her most important oracle. Throughout Asia Minor in general, moreover, there were more Sibyls than anywhere else in Greece, and with two of these the Sibyl at Cumae was traditionally held to be identical. For these reasons, of the Euboeans from Chalcis and Eretria and the Aeolians from Cyme, only these last could possibly have brought the Sibyl to Cumae. Indeed, it can almost be proved that they did so. On a bronze Cymaean coin which dates to the reign of the Antonines, “the Sibyl of the Cymaeans,” wearing a fillet, is portrayed on the obverse, and on the reverse is Apollo, wearing a long robe and holding his lyre and plectrum.\(^{(187)}\) 'Petronius' Trimalchio, moreover, came to Italy from Asia,\(^{(188)}\) and hence it would follow that, as Bücheler argued, it is the Sibyl of Cyme, not Cumae, whom he claimed to have seen as a boy.\(^{(189)}\) Thus, not only was it the colonists from Cyme who brought the Sibyl to Cumae, but the Sibyl which they took there, it would seem, was their own.\(^{(190)}\)

In conclusion, then, the results of this brief inquiry into the origins of the Cumaean Sibyl fully confirm the earlier, more tentative conclusions of our survey of the Euboean and Aeolic cults of Apollo. No colonists other than the Aeolians from Cyme could conceivably have brought the Sibyl to Cumae, and hence it must also have been they who brought the cult of Apollo. Thus, the role of Cyme in the foundation of Cumae is analogous to the part played by Naxos in the foundation of its Sicilian namesake. Being the first Greek colony in Sicily, Naxos was Cumae's Sicilian counterpart. Like Cumae, Naxos had Chalcis as its metropolis, but it was named after the homeland of the Naxians in the colony, as Cumae was named after Cyme. Just as the settlers from Cyme, moreover, established at Cumae the cult of their homeland, so did the Naxians in Sicily bring Apollo and Dionysus from their homeland to their colony.\(^{(191)}\) Finally, as late as 200 years after its foundation, Sicilian Naxos was still minting coins which were similar in type to the coins of the island. It remains to be seen, however, what influence, if any, the Cymaean element had on the design of Cumae's coins.

But which of the scores of Aeolic Apollos did the Cymaeans bring to Cumae? It

\(^{(187)}\) For the coin see Imhoof-Blumer Kleinasiatische Münzen 1: 47; Head Hist. Num. 554.
\(^{(188)}\) Petron. 75. 10.
\(^{(189)}\) F. Bücheler Rh. Mus. 57 (1902): 327. In addition to the fact that Trimalchio was in Asia as a boy, the last of the Cumaean Sibyls was supposed to have died centuries before his time. For further arguments in support of Bücheler's thesis see Corssen Ath. Mitt. 38 (1913): 21–22. The famous anecdote of the Sibyl and Trimalchio is in Petron. 48. 8.
\(^{(190)}\) Obviously, the crucial (and unanswerable) question here is whether there was a Sibyl in Cyme at the time of the foundation of Cumae. Rzach (PW, s.v. "Sibyllen," 2094. 24–31) supposes that there was not, but only because he makes the unwarranted assumption mentioned on p. 26 above. For the dates of the other Sibyls of Asia Minor see ibid. 2073. 61–66, 2081. 24–26, 34–36, 2083. 3–14, 26–30, 2084. 43–46, 2086. 40–45, 2088. 14–18, 41–46, 60–62.
\(^{(191)}\) Dunbabin Western Greeks 8.
could have been the Apollo of Cyme, of course. For several reasons, however, it is likelier to have been the Apollo of Cyme's neighbor, Grynium—the very cult with which Virgil was able to link the Cumaean cult on purely literary grounds. First of all, Apollo was pre-eminent at Cumae, but his cult in Cyme, as we have already seen, had apparently only mediocre prestige. Grynium, on the other hand, was the principal shrine of the group of Aeolic cities of which Cyme was the principal member.\(^{(192)}\) Secondly, it was an oracular cult that the colonists from Cyme took to Cumae, and Grynium, as we have seen, was the only Apolline oracle of consequence in Aeolis.\(^{(193)}\) Finally, at a distance of 9.2 miles,\(^{(194)}\) Cyme was closer to Grynium than to any other shrine of Apollo outside its own walls. Conversely, except for Myrina, no city was nearer Grynium than was Cyme, and by Strabo's day Myrina and Grynium were one.\(^{(195)}\) Now it is reasonable to suppose that Cyme (or any other city) will have been most familiar with whatever shrine lay nearest it, especially if that shrine was the religious center of a group of cities, and Cyme the pre-eminent city in that group. Cyme, then, must have been more closely associated with Grynium than with any other cult of Apollo\(^{(196)}\)—so closely, in fact, that herein may lie the reason for the apparent insignificance of Cyme's own cult. Indeed, a close connection between Cyme and Grynium is further supported by the fact that in the period after Grynium had merged with Myrina, Cyme was allied with the latter by a treaty of concord\(^{(197)}\) It would thus begin to appear that the cult which Cyme exported to the West was none other than Grynean Apollo. This conclusion, moreover, is almost fully confirmed by compelling numismatic evidence.

Beginning with its earliest coins, which were minted between 490 and 485 B.C., and with the single exception of the didrachma of Neapolitan type which it issued in the 300s B.C., Cumae had the shell of the common mussel portrayed on the reverse of all the coins it ever issued.\(^{(198)}\) The coins (all of them bronze) which

\(^{(192)}\) See pp. 59, 63–64 above.
\(^{(193)}\) See p. 59 above.
\(^{(194)}\) Strab. 13. 622.
\(^{(195)}\) Ibid. The head of Grynean Apollo is frequently portrayed on the obverse of Myrina's coins (see \textit{BMCTroas}, s.v. "Myrina," nos. 1–19, 27–31, 33–36; Head \textit{Hist. Num.} 556), and a standing figure of the god on the reverse (see \textit{BMCTroas} loc. cit., nos. 1–19, 43–45; Head loc. cit.); for the temple at Grynium depicted on coins of Myrina see n. 71 above.
\(^{(196)}\) This conclusion might appear contradicted by Cyme's consultation of Didyma, not Grynium, when the Lydian Pactyes was seeking asylum there (Hdt. 1. 157–160). Conversely, however, the extant response of the Grynean oracle (see n. 69 above) was delivered to the Caunians, who lived much nearer Didyma than Grynium. Perhaps Hildebrecht Hommel's attribution of a special competence to Grynium (\textit{Philol.} 102 [1958]: 90) should be extended to Didyma as well.
\(^{(197)}\) Honored by a coin of Cyme minted in the reign of Nerva; see Imhoof-Blumer \textit{Kleinasiatische Münzen} 2: 510; Head \textit{Hist. Num.} 554.
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survive from Grynium are both rarer and later (200s B.C.) than those from Cumae, and on their obverse appears the head of Grynean Apollo. In one respect, however, the coins of Grynium and Cumae show a remarkable similarity; for on the reverse of all Grynium's coins appears the same mussel shell that is found on the reverse of Cumae's coins. Now numerous sources testify to the fact that shell fish abounded in the shallow salt lakes near Cumae, and as for Grynium, it and its neighbor Myrina serve as examples for Pliny the Elder of the sort of locale in which mussels thrive. Not unnaturally, therefore, the mussel shell on the coins of both Cyme and Grynium is almost universally assumed to be an advertisement, as it were, of a locally important product. This hypothesis, however, is seriously weakened by a fact which is never mentioned: the coins of Cumae and Grynium are the only coins from antiquity on which the mussel shell is ever depicted. And on them, let it be remembered, its depiction is almost invariable. If the design in question was meant only to publicize the abundance of mussels in either locale, then why does it not appear on the coins of other cities too? An abundance of mussels was surely not unique to Cumae and Grynium. And why did these cities cling to that design with such tenacity, allowing it to be replaced by no other?

As was mentioned at the outset of this discussion, one of Cumae's two oecists was from Cyme. From this fact alone it follows that in the creation of the new colony's institutions, the influence of Cyme must have been fully as great as that of the metropolis, Chalcis, for "in the earlier colonies, the oikists seem to have been all-responsible, even monarchical." Influential, therefore, from the beginning, the Cymaean element in the culture of Cumae must also have remained uncontaminated, for in mixed colonies like Cumae, even when there was only one official metropolis, distinctions of origin persisted even for generations after the colony's foundation. Thus we may suppose that when the colonists from Cyme brought to Cumae the Apollo of their neighbor, Grynium, they brought with them the Grynean mussel as well, and two and a half centuries later, when Cumae was minting coins, and when the mussel's connection with Grynium was perhaps no longer remembered, its emblematic significance was still so potent that it could claim for itself the reverse on almost all of Cumae's coins. This state of affairs is paralleled almost exactly in Sicilian Naxos,

(199) BMCTroas, s.v. "Grynium," nos. 1-5; Head Hist. Num. 555; Louis Robert in Études déliennes 482, n. 13 (references to various collections and the Grynean coins they contain).
(200) The same resemblance is remarked by Warwick Wroth BMCTroas liv.
(201) E.g., Hor. Sat. 2. 4. 32, Epod. 2. 49.
(202) Pliny HN 32. 6. 59.
(204) Graham Colony 39.
(205) Ibid. 16-22.
(206) For a discussion of the political and cultural significance of numismatic similarities between a colony and its metropolis see ibid. 124-128.
a Chalcidian colony which, as we have already seen, as late as 200 years after its foundation, was still minting coins similar to those of the ancestral home of the Naxian element of its population.(207)

The coinage, then, of Cumae and Grynium fairly proves what other evidence strongly suggests: Apollo Cumanus was nothing less than Apollo Gryneus transplanted to Italy.

(207) See p. 73 above.