history that led to the foundation of the temple of Fortuna Muliebris.[9] He relates how the senate decided that the whole expense both for the temple (*νεών*) and for the cult statue (*ξόανον*) should be defrayed from the public treasury. Since another statue (*ἕτερον δ' ἄγαλμα*) had been commissioned by the women with the money they had contributed, both *simulacra* were set up together on the first day of the dedication of the temple. Then, in narrating a magical episode that took place right after the dedication (one of the images uttered some words in a distinct and loud voice), when the two statues of Fortuna had just assumed their function, Dionysius refers to them as *ἀφιδρύματα* (*θάτερον τῶν ἀφιδρυμάτων*).

Like *ἄγαλμα* and *ξόανον*, *ἀφίδρυμα* here describes a cult statue. Unlike them, the word is employed at a crucial point of the story, the dedication, when a religious meaning is conferred on the statue and determines the start of the cult. Before that, the images of Fortuna were simply two inanimate *simulacra*; only after being set up in the temple and becoming *ἀφιδρύματα* could they reveal their peculiar magical qualities. This literary source seems to point most clearly to the difference between a cult image and an *ἀφίδρυμα*, a term that does not refer *per se* to a particular category of objects such as statues, but merely to the recipient of a function.

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa ANNA ANGUISSOLA
a.anguissola@sns.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000735

[9] K. Mustakallio, 'Some aspects of the story of Coriolanus and the women behind the cult of Fortuna Muliebris', in H. Solin and M. Kajava (edd.), *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History* (Helsinki, 1990), 125–31; S. Quilici Gigli, 'Annotazioni topografiche sul tempio della Fortuna Muliebris', *MEFRA* 93 (1981), 547–63.

NOTE ON *APHIDRUMA* 2: STRABO ON THE TRANSFER OF CULTS

οἰκεῖται δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἔρυξ λόφος ὑψηλός, ἱερὸν ἔχων Ἀφροδίτης τιμώμενον διαφερόντως, ἱεροδούλων γυναικῶν πλῆρες τὸ παλαιόν, ἃς ἀνέθεσαν κατ' εὐχὴν οἵ τ' ἐκ τῆς Σικελίας καὶ ἔξωθεν πολλοί· νυνὶ δ' ὥσπερ αὐτὴ ἡ κατοικία λειπανδρεῖ καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν σωμάτων ἐκλέλοιπε τὸ πλῆθος. ἀφίδρυμα δ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ τῆς θεοῦ ταύτης τὸ πρὸ τῆς πύλης τῆς Κολλίνης ἱερὸν Ἀφροδίτης Ἐρυκίνης λεγόμενον, ἔχον καὶ νεὼν καὶ στοὰν περικειμένην ἀξιόλογον.

Eryx, a lofty hill, is also inhabited. It has a temple of Aphrodite that is held in exceptional honour, and in early times was full of female temple-slaves, who had been dedicated in fulfilment of vows not only by the people of Sicily but also by many people abroad; but at the present time, just as the settlement itself, so the temple is in want of men, and the multitude of temple-slaves has disappeared. In Rome, also, there is a reproduction of this goddess, I mean the temple before the Colline Gate which is called that of Venus Erycina and is remarkable for its shrine and surrounding colonnade. (Strabo 6.2.6)[1]

The temple in Rome of the Venus of Mount Eryx was vowed during the Ligurian wars by L. Porcius Licinius as consul in 184 B.C., and dedicated three years later (Livy

[1] Trans. H. Leonard Jones, *The Geography of Strabo*, 8 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 1954), 3.83.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000747 Published online by Cambridge University Press

40.34.4). It stood in front of the Porta Collina, and was remarkable for the colonnade enclosing it, which probably constituted a later addition (App. *BCiv.* 1.93). The *fasti* (*CIL* I² 316), Livy (30.38.10) and Appian's account of the battle of Porta Collina make it clear that the sanctuary was outside the gate. After the Augustan period, it is mentioned only in an inscription of a *sortilegus ab Venere Erucina* (*CIL* VI 2274).[2]

Another temple of Venus Erycina already existed in Rome: it was vowed by the dictator Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus after the disaster of Lake Trasimene in 217 B.C., following consultation of the Sibylline Books (Livy 22.9.10, 10.10), and dedicated on the Capitoline Hill in 215 by Fabius as *duumvir aedis dedicandae* (Livy 23.30.13–14).[3] Why does Strabo mention, as a Roman branch of the Sicilian sanctuary, the *aedes* outside Porta Collina instead of that *in Capitolio*? Of course, he may be hinting at some resemblance between the building near the Porta Collina and that on Mount Eryx, in western Sicily. Unfortunately, the identification of the ruins of the temple in Rome is still disputed and Strabo's cursory description constitutes the only actual source as to its appearance.

A clue to understanding the reason for Strabo's choice comes from his mention of the sanctuary in Rome as an ἀφίδρυμα. In Strabo's *Geography* the word always describes the setting of an old cult in a new context, sometimes explicitly referring to the transfer of a sacred item from the main temple that made this possible, in other cases simply implying it.[4]

According to Strabo's account (4.1.4), in *c.* 600 B.C. the Phocaeans, on the point of setting sail to found the colony of Massilia, were told by an oracle to bring with them a guide (ἡγεμών) from the Ephesian Artemis. They went to Ephesus and took on board Aristarcha, a local woman who had been ordered by the goddess in a dream to leave with them and carry an ἀφίδρυμα, taken from among the sacred objects (ἀφίδρυμά τι τῶν ἱερῶν). In Massilia the settlers built a temple for Artemis and made Aristarcha a priestess. In the following centuries the inhabitants of the Iberian subcolonies founded by Massilia would retain both the features of the cult statue and all the other religious usages precisely as they existed in their mother city: τοῦ ξοάνου τὴν διάθεσιν τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τἆλλα νόμιμα φυλάττειν τὰ αὐτά, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει νενόμισται.[5]

Elsewhere, Strabo mentions the grove sacred to Diana in the mountains above the city of Aricia, ruled over by a priest-king. This sanctuary is said to be an ἀφίδρυμα of the Tauropolos, for a barbaric Scythian element predominated in the sacred usages (περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἔθος). The people in fact bestowed the priesthood upon a runaway slave who had won this position by slaying his predecessor (Strabo 5.3.12). Strabo refers to the extraordinary rite of the *rex nemorensis*, described in several literary sources: the reigning priest-king's life was dedicated to protecting the goddess's sacred

[2] F. Coarelli, 'Venus Erycina, Aedes (ad portam Collinam)', in E. M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*, 6 vols. (Rome, 1993–9²), 5 (1999), 114–16. Coarelli thinks that the temple can be identified with the ruins found in 1873 at the crossroads of Via Gaeta and Via Curtatone, south and outside Porta Collina (R. Lanciani, *Forma urbis Romae* [1893–1901; repr. 1989], pl. 10). The fragments of the epistyle suggest that this building should be dated to the imperial period.

[3] F. Coarelli, 'Venus Erycina, Aedes in Capitolio', in Steinby (n. 2), 5 (1999), 114.

[4] Strabo cursorily refers to the reproduction of a temple as an ἀφίδρυμα also in 8.4.4, 9.2.7, 12.2.6, 12.5.3, 16.4.4, and 16.4.7, without providing any additional information.

[5] This passage is carefully and convincingly examined by Irad Malkin, with a critical review of previous bibliography: I. Malkin, 'What is an *aphidruma*?', *ClAnt* 10 (1991), 77–97 at 78–86; I. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden, 1987), 19–20.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000747 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tree, and only a fugitive slave could challenge him by cutting off the golden bough. If the challenger succeeded in this, there was a mortal combat fought between them and the survivor became (or remained) the *rex nemorensis* (Ov. *Ars Am.* 1.258–62; Suet. *Calig.* 35; Paus. 2.27.4; Serv. *Aen.* 2.116 and 6.136).[6]

At Strabo 12.3.32 the city of Pontic Comana is referred to as the ἀφίδρυμα of the homonymous city in Greater Cappadocia, as a consequence of their dedication to the same goddess. In both cities the very same religious prescriptions and practices, sacrificial usages, and norms regulating the priesthood were followed.

We can now return to the mention of a temple of Venus Erycina in Rome. The worship of this *epiklēsis* of Venus was probably introduced through the ideological link with the Trojan myth (Serv. *Aen.* 1.720: *Erycina, quam Aeneas secum advexit*), given the alleged Trojan origin of the Elymi, on whose land the Sicilian temple stood. This explains the location of the first temple (the one dedicated by Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus) on the Capitoline Hill, evidence of a complete Romanization.[7] The real Erycine cult, retaining the oriental practice of the *hierodouleia* or sacred prostitution peculiar to the Sicilian model, took place in the sanctuary near the Porta Collina (Ov. *Fast.* 4.865–72), and was therefore relegated to a location outside the *pomerium*. The *dies natalis* of this temple on 23 April was also appointed as *dies meretricum* (*fast. Praen.*, Degrassi, *Inscr.It.* XIII/2, 448).[8]

No certain evidence as to the appearance of the temple near Porta Collina exists, but it may well have replicated some features of the Sicilian prototype both in shape and cult image.[9] The possibility has been suggested that the head of the so-called Ludovisi Acrolith, found in the area of the Villa Ludovisi, could belong to the cult statue worshipped in the shrine of Venus Erycina.[10] This head is probably an example of Siceliot craftsmanship dating to the second quarter of the fifth century B.C., thus strengthening the suspicion that the Roman and Sicilian sanctuaries were linked by material similarities. We know nothing about the shape of the Capitoline *aedes*, which might also have attempted a reproduction of some elements of the model.

The above discussion provides an answer to the question why Strabo designated only the temple near the Porta Collina and not the one on the Capitoline Hill as a true subsidiary branch of the sanctuary in Eryx. The reason for his choice should not be sought in a formal likeness in the layout and building, nor in a replication of the cult image, both possibilities lacking strong archaeological evidence. Investigation of the use that Strabo makes of the term ἀφίδρυμα confirms that, with this word, the author

[6] C. M. C. Green, 'The slayer and the king: *rex nemorensis* and the sanctuary of Diana', *Arion* 7.3 (1999–2000), 24–63; C. M. C. Green, 'The "necessary murder": myth, ritual, and civil war in Lucan, Book 3', *ClAnt* 13 (1994), 203–33 at 209; F.-H. Pairault, 'Diana Nemorensis: déesse latine, déesse hellénisée', *MEFRA* 81 (1969), 424–71.

[7] G. Martorana, 'I *nostoi* e la Sicilia: tra mito e storia. Troia, Roma, *imperium Romanum*', *Kokalos* 39–40 (1993–4), 363–90 at 382–6; G. K. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton, 1969), 173–8.

[8] E. Orlin, 'Why a second temple for Venus Erycina?', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 10 (Brussels, 2000), 70–90 at 83.

[9] For a discussion of the evidence concerning the temple outside the Porta Collina, see M. Castelli, 'Venus Erycina e Venus Hortorum Sallustianorum', *BA* 73.49 (1988), 53–62 at 53–4.

[10] Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. 8598. On the Ludovisi Acrolith see A. Giuliano, *Museo Nazionale Romano. Le Sculture*, 1.5: *I marmi Ludovisi nel Museo Nazionale Romano* (Rome, 1983), 130–3, no. 57 (B. Palma); W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom* 3 (Tübingen, 1969[4]), 265–6, no. 2342 (W. Fuchs); M. Guarducci, 'Due pezzi insigni del Museo Nazionale Romano: il Trono Ludivisi e l'Acrolito Ludovisi', *BA* 70.33–4 (1985), 1–20 at 14–17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000747 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is not referring to a copy of the Sicilian temple or to a replica of its cult statue, but rather that he is underlining the continuation of ritual practices peculiar to that model and retained only in the sanctuary outside the *pomerium*.

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa ANNA ANGUISSOLA
a.anguissola@sns.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000747

A TEXTUAL NOTE ON XENOPHON OF EPHESUS 3.9.4

In Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale* the male hero Habrocomes is at 3.9 once again in quest of his beloved Anthia. He has allied himself with the brigand Hippothous and eventually arrives with him and his band of robbers somewhere near the shore of Cilicia. After a fruitless excursion Habrocomes returns tired. Meanwhile Hippothous' men have prepared dinner. Habrocomes, however, is too depressed to join them and decides to rest. The following passage about the robbers' δεῖπνον contains a vexed textual problem. The manuscript reads at 3.9.4: *Προσιοῦσι δὲ τοῦ τόπου ὁ κύριος τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἱππόθοον παροῦσα καί τις πρεσβῦτις ἄρχεται διηγήματος, ᾗ ὄνομα Χρυσίον*. The first part of this sentence is manifestly corrupt. All editors made emendations in one way or another. I shall consider here only the three major ones:

1. Hercher wrote in his Teubneriana of *Erotici Scriptores Graeci* (1858–9): *Προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ πότου εὐκαίρως τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἱππόθοον παροῦσα [καί] τις πρεσβῦτις ἄρχεται διηγήματος, ᾗ ὄνομα Χρυσίον*. It may seem slightly inconsistent to speak of a 'continuation of drinking' even though drinking was not mentioned before. However, taking pleasure in a symposium after dinner is the normal course of events in a Greek banquet, and there is a close parallel for skipping the transition from eating to drinking in the description of Ach. Tat. 2.3.1–3 (δεῖπνον . . . *Τοῦ δὲ πότου προϊόντος*).[1]

2. In the Budé-edition of 1926 Dalmeyda proposed: *Προϊοῦσι δὲ τοῦ πότου [ὁ κύριος] τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἱππόθοον παροῦσα [καί] τις πρεσβῦτις ἄρχεται διηγήματος, ᾗ ὄνομα Χρυσίον*. For the unparalleled *πρόειμι πότου* compare the genitive in 4.3.5: *προῄεσαν τῆς ὁδοῦ*.

3. Papanikolaou rejects in his Teubneriana of 1973 the former suggestions for two reasons:[2] first, he doubts the possibility of a longer symposium in absence of the protagonist Habrocomes; second, he disapproves of the fact that earlier editors neglected the manuscript tradition to such an extent. His own reading is indeed very close to the manuscript: *Πρόσεισι δὲ τοῦ τόπου ὁ κύριος τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἱππόθοον· παροῦσα δέ τις πρεσβῦτις ἄρχεται διηγήματος, ᾗ ὄνομα Χρυσίον*. That, however, makes no good sense. A host (*κύριος*), with whom the men stay, is neither mentioned before nor does he appear afterwards. His entrance adds nothing to the story and

[1] Cf. P. Schmitt-Pantel, *La cité au banquet: histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques* (Rome, 1992), 4. The transition is indicated e.g. in Heliod. 5.15.3: *ἐπεὶ δὲ εὐφροσύνης τῆς ἐκ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων εἰς κόρον ᾖσαν καὶ τοῖς κρατῆρσιν αἱ τράπεζαι παρεχώρουν . . .*

[2] Cf. A. D. Papanikolaou, '*Κριτικαὶ παρατηρήσεις εἰς Ξενοφῶντα τὸν Ἐφέσιον*', *EEAth* 20 (1969–70), 360.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000747 Published online by Cambridge University Press