

ANDREW ERSKINE

DELOS, AENEAS AND *IG* XI.4.756

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 117 (1997) 133–136

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

DELOS, AENEAS AND *IG* XI.4.756

When the Delians sent an embassy to Rome in the early years of the second century B.C., they would not have imagined it to be an easy task to persuade the Romans to grant the assistance they sought.¹ Much thought was no doubt given to the arguments that would be used at the meeting. As so often, it is a decree honouring hard-working ambassadors which illuminates the nature of the relationship between the emerging imperial power and the weaker state.² In this case the honorific decree hints at the approach taken by the Delian ambassadors in their efforts to win the support of the Romans. The Romans, they appear to have said, should help them because of the οἰκειότης that existed between the two peoples. But what could the Delians possibly be talking about here?

Little of the inscription survives, leaving the exact date of the embassy a matter of dispute and its purpose equally uncertain.³ Nevertheless it is not those issues that concern me here; rather, it is the relationship between the Delians and the Romans. It is useful to begin with the remains of the decree:

[θε]οί

ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ·
 Τηλέμνητος Ἀριστείδου εἰ-
 πεν· ἐπειδὴ ἀποστείλαντος
 τοῦ δήμου πρεσβευτὰς
 εἰς Ῥώμην τὴν τε οἰκειότη[ητα καὶ]
 τὴν φιλίαν ἀνανεω[σομένους]
 καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν συμ[φερόντων]
 τῶι τε ἱερῶι καὶ [τῶι δήμῳ, ἐν’?]
 ᾧ τὴμ πᾶσαν [σπουδὴν καὶ φι]-
 λοτιμίαν ἐ[ποίησαν? ...]

The aim of the embassy which is stated first is the renewal of οἰκειότης καὶ φιλία between the Delians and the Romans, but this would only have been a prelude to the main objective. Felix Durrbach in his commentary on this inscription suggested that the phrase οἰκειότης καὶ φιλία was a common way of expressing good relations between states (Choix [n. 3], 85). On such an interpretation the phrase is nothing more than a diplomatic nicety, but closer examination suggests that its use is not so casual. It is the purpose of the present paper to understand what the Delians had in mind.

Οἰκειότης and cognates such as οἰκεῖος are terms used to describe kinship or, if not blood kinship, then the level of closeness which might be associated with membership of the same οἶκος. Epigraphic sources may make it appear formulaic, but this should not lead us to ignore the reality of the diplomatic exchange on which it is based. Thucydides reports how the Athenians used the argument of kinship to try to win support in Sicily in the 420s: καὶ ἔπεμψαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τῆς μὲν οἰκειότητος προφάσει.⁴ Then in 188 B.C. when the people of Ilium made a request of the Romans they justified it, according to Polybius, διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκειότητα. It can hardly be doubted that this is a direct reference to

¹ For Delos in this period, G. Reger, *Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos* (Berkeley 1994), 15-47; M.F. Baslez and C. Vial, *BCH* 111 (1987) 281-312.

² A. Erskine, "Greek Embassies and the City of Rome", *Classics Ireland* 1 (1994) 47-53; "Rhodes and Augustus", *ZPE* 88 (1991) 271-75.

³ *IG* XI.4.756 (the text printed above), F. Durrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos* (Paris 1921), no. 65. M.F. Baslez and C. Vial (above, n. 1), 299, date it to 200-171 BC, but earlier writers tend to be more precise and prefer the late 190s, e.g. Th. Homolle, *BCH* 8 (1884) 87, Durrbach, *Choix*, 84, followed by E. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley 1984), 82-83, though some hesitancy is expressed on pp. 737-38.

⁴ Thuc. 3.86.4, on which S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* I (Oxford 1991), 493, who also notes Thucydides remarks about kinship between the Rhegians and the Leotines in the same chapter.

Rome's Trojan past.⁵

The role of kinship in diplomacy comes out vividly in an important series of inscriptions from Magnesia-on-the-Maeander in the late third century B.C. The Magnesians had established a festival of Artemis Leucophryene and sent embassies throughout the Greek world seeking recognition for their festival. The letters from kings and civic decrees which they received in reply were all inscribed (*Inscr. Magn.* 16-87). The decree from Same in Cephallenia is of particular interest. It records how the Magnesian ambassadors "explained about the οἰκειότης which existed between the Magnesians and the Cephallenians on the basis of the συγγένεια of Magnes and Cephalus, son of Deïon."⁶ According to Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* Magnes and Deïon were both children of Aeolus.⁷ Of the series of over sixty Magnesian inscriptions thirty-one mention kinship terms such as συγγένεια and the somewhat weaker οἰκειότης,⁸ but the decree from Same is the only one in which the arguments used by the Magnesian ambassadors survive. This extensive use of kinship terminology is a reflection of the numerous genealogical arguments which the ambassadors must have presented to the states they visited. It is also important to note that, however loose οἰκειότης might be, it is something that can be based on συγγένεια. The long-standing nature of such οἰκειότης is made clear in several of the Magnesian inscriptions; for instance, the Phocians note τὰν διὰ προγόνων ὑπάρχουσιν οἰκειότατα καὶ φιλίαν (*Inscr. Magn.* 34.6-7, cf. 25.6, 48.2), while in the decree of Gonnos the Magnesians are renewing τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχουσιν φιλίαν καὶ οἰκειότατα (*Inscr. Magn.* 33.14-15).

A term such as οἰκειότης with its connotations of kinship should be taken seriously and understood as playing a meaningful part in diplomatic exchanges. In a recent study of the role of kinship in interstate relations Sue Elwyn has argued that a kinship claim established a justification for the request that followed.⁹ It tended to be used only in circumstances in which the relationship was unequal in some way. This might be because one party was so much more powerful than the other or it might be because the request was such that it could not be reciprocated, for instance recognition of a religious festival or ἄστυλῖα. The Delian embassy, as Elwyn realises, fits well into this pattern; Delos is the weaker state and the interests of the temple of Apollo are relevant in an obscure way (lines 8-9, ὑπὲρ τῶν συμφερόντων τῷ ἱερῶι); perhaps one object of the embassy was to obtain Roman recognition of the sanctuary's ἄστυλῖα.¹⁰

If the reference to οἰκειότης in the Delian decree may actually be meaningful, what might the Delians have used to try to persuade the Romans to grant their request? Elwyn suggests that the Delians may have been 'alluding to the Greek tales of Roman descent from Odysseus or the Achaeans'.¹¹ This seems unlikely; this would put the Delians on a par with all other Greeks, and would, therefore, hardly have been considered a persuasive argument. It will be contended here that the explanation for the Delian οἰκειότης with the Romans should be sought in the myth of Rome's Trojan origins.

Aeneas' landing on Delos was well-attested in ancient authors.¹² In the first book of the *Roman Antiquities* Dionysius of Halicarnassus tells how Aeneas came to Delos in the reign of the priest-king

⁵ Polyb. 22.5.3; F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 3 (Oxford 1979), 182-83, briefly outlines the evidence for the use of the Trojan myth in Greek/Roman relations.

⁶ *Inscr. Magn.* 35.13-14: ἐμφανιζάντων δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς οἰκειότατος τῆς ὑπαρχούσας Μαγνήτοις ποτὶ Κεφαλλᾶνας κατὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τῶν Μάγνητος καὶ Κεφάλου Δηϊόνος μετὰ πάσας φιλοτιμίας.

⁷ Apoll. 1.7.3.4; 1.9.4; for Cephalus, son of Deïon as eponym of Cephallenia, see also Arist. in *Etym. Magn.* 144.26.

⁸ S. Elwyn, *TAPA* 123 (1993) 263. On terminology see next note.

⁹ Elwyn (n. 8), 261-86, who does not distinguish between the various kinship terms and consider differences in meaning. It is interesting that the Lampsacene decree in honour of Hegesias uses συγγένεια of the somewhat distant relationship between the Lampsacenes and the Romans, whereas the Massaliotes and the Lampsacenes, both colonies of Phocaea, are ἀδελφοί (*SIG³* 591.25-26, 30). This suggests consciousness of degrees of kinship. οἰκειότης may be looser still.

¹⁰ For Delian diplomatic objectives in this period, Baslez and Vial, above (n. 1), 281-312, esp. 305-12.

¹¹ Elwyn, above (n. 8), 274, citing E. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca 1992), 10-11.

¹² J. Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281-31)* (Paris 1942), 31-34.

Anius and how traces of his presence remained for centuries: "there were many signs (σημεία) on Delos of the presence of Aeneas and the Trojans while the island flourished and was occupied" (1.50.1). What these signs were is unclear; perhaps Aeneas and some Trojans were the object of cult on the island or the temple of Apollo displayed some relics allegedly left by the Trojans.¹³ These signs alone may have been enough to justify a claim of οἰκειότης, but there is no explicit kinship here.

Later in the same book Dionysius goes further and provides far stronger grounds for a kinship claim (1.59.3). The Romans, he says, tell how Lavinium was named after Lavinia, the daughter of Latinus, but he adds that there is another version of the founding of Lavinium told by some Greek mythographers. They say that the city was named after the daughter of the Delian king Anius, because she had been the first to die of illness when the city was being built. This woman, who is described as a "prophetess and a wise woman", joined the expedition after Anius had agreed to Aeneas' request for her (δοθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Αἰνεΐα δεηθέντι).¹⁴ That Aeneas asked Anius for his daughter suggests marriage and the anonymous author of the *Origo Gentis Romanae* has also heard a story in which Aeneas marries Lavinia, a daughter of Anius priest of Delian Apollo.¹⁵ Whether Lavinia was a wife of Aeneas or merely a daughter of Anius who was lucky enough to become eponym of Lavinium, in both cases she would give the Delians good grounds to claim kinship with the Romans. Indeed, a daughter of Anius priest of Apollo was an ideal choice if the purpose of the embassy to the Romans was to further the interests of the temple of Apollo. It would be a good beginning to remind the Romans of their long-standing links with the temple.

A curious variation on these stories can be found in Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*. Servius reports a version in which an unnamed daughter of Anius was secretly seduced by Aeneas and gave birth to a son: "alii dicunt huius Anii filiam occulte ab Aenea stupratam edidisse filium" (Serv. on *Aen.* 3.80). The difference between the two stories, from the consent of Anius in Dionysius to the illicit and secret seduction or even seizure in Servius, neatly symbolises the change in relations between Delos and Rome which took place during the course of the Third Macedonian War. In the 160s the Romans handed over the island to the Athenians who removed the population and replaced them with an Athenian colony.¹⁶ Whereas the stories of consent and marriage reflected Delian aspirations for good relations with Rome, the alternative version with its *stuprum* reflected the reality and resulting bitterness.

Daughter Lavinia appears in no other version, although both Vergil and Ovid do include a visit to Delos in Aeneas' itinerary.¹⁷ The *Aeneid* makes no mention of any daughters of Anius; Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, on the other hand, have a digression about the children of Anius, but in this case his daughters have been turned into snow-white doves long before Aeneas' arrival (13.640-74).

In both these Roman poets, however, Anchises is treated as an old friend of Anius. In the *Metamorphoses* Anchises, recalling his earlier visit, asks Anius how his children are (*Met.* 13.640-42) and thus learns of their unfortunate transformation. In Vergil's account Aeneas tells of his party's arrival on Delos: Anius "veterem Anchisen agnovit amicum. iungimus hospitio dextras et tecta subimus" (*Aen.* 3.82). Thus there appears to be a relationship of guest-friendship between the two men and their fami-

¹³ Cf. the cult of Aeneas at Aeneia in 2nd C. B.C., Livy 40.4; or the shield of Aeneas supposedly in the temple on Samothrace, Servius on *Aen.* 3.287.

¹⁴ This Lavinia is spelled Λαῦνα in the mss. (instead of Λαυινία as suggested by the Latin). For the most part this is also the case in the occurrences of Lavinia daughter of Latinus. On this see E. Cary in Loeb of Dionysius' *Roman Antiquities* I, p. 196 n. 2.

¹⁵ Ps. Aurelius Victor, *OGR* 9.5 (ed. J.-C. Richard, Paris 1983), on this text, A. Momigliano, *JRS* 48 (1958) 56-73; for sources on Lavinia, *LIMC* s.v. Lavinia.

¹⁶ Polyb. 30.20, 32.7; W. A. Laidlaw, *A History of Delos* (Oxford 1933), 130-34; P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Paris 1970), 419, is surely mistaken in believing that the stories about Delos and Aeneas in Dionysius date from the time of the Athenian colony. Perret, above (n. 12), 33-34, on the other hand, perhaps surprisingly, would date them to the early 2nd C. B.C.

¹⁷ Verg. *Aen.* 3.69-120, Ovid *Met.* 13.632-704, on which F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: books XII-XIII* (Heidelberg 1982), 370-73, is particularly useful.

lies. Indeed, Servius (on *Aen.* 3.80) quotes the late Roman commentator Palaephatos as claiming that Anius was a *propinquus* of Anchises. Here, then, it is Anchises and Anius who are kin. Could this have been another argument used by the Delians in their pursuit of οἰκειότης? Nevertheless, even without kinship between Anchises and Anius, the suggestion of guest-friendship may have been sufficient to establish a claim for οἰκειότης.

The origin of these stories is obscure. It would be easy to say that the Delians, in need of an argument to persuade the Romans to help them, simply invented a specious kinship (Bruneau [above, n. 16] 418-9). But it may also be that the Delians developed their claims out of local traditions which were already in existence. Anius was a purely local myth and there must have been stories about him which are now unknown to us.¹⁸ Many places in the Greek world were claiming Trojan links long before the Romans arrived in the Eastern Mediterranean. The city of Aeneia on the Thermaic Gulf had Aeneas and his family on its coins as early as the sixth century B.C.¹⁹ This is not to suggest that the Lavinia story itself already existed on Delos, but rather that the potential for it may already have been there, perhaps in the story that Anius was a friend of Anchises, or perhaps in some objects or places that local tradition claimed had Trojan associations (cf. the πολλὰ σημεῖα of DH 1.59.1). Of course, faced with the elaborate kinship claims of the Delians and their implicit obligations, a Roman who knew his mythology could reasonably point out that Anius had also provided his daughters, the so-called Oenotropoi, to aid the Greek expedition *against* Troy.²⁰

So in the early second century B.C. the Delians sent an embassy to Rome which sought to win the favour of the Romans by looking back to the heroic age of the Trojan war. In doing so they may have been exploiting older local traditions which asserted some relation between the Delians and the Trojans. The evidence is later than the embassy, but it suggests that there were various arguments that the Delians could have put forward to support their claim to οἰκειότης. The strongest would have been Aeneas' marriage to Anius' daughter and/or her role as the eponym for Lavinium. Strong, too, would have been the very late suggestion that Anius was *propinquus* of Anchises, but the weaker claim that the two men were guest-friends might have been found convincing, not least by the Delians. The weakest argument would have been the Trojan landing on Delos, but at least this demonstrated long-standing good relations between the two peoples.

In looking to the Trojan War to find a means of winning the goodwill of the Romans the Delians were not alone. Other Greek states pursued the same strategy.²¹ Already in the third century B.C. the Acarnanians are alleged to have used their non-participation in the Trojan War in support of a claim for Roman assistance against the Aetolians.²² A more direct approach was possible for states in the Troad; states such as Ilium and Lampsacus needed merely to point out that they too were descendants of the Trojans.²³ Acarnania, Lampsacus and Ilium had all made their claims by the early second century B.C. To this list should now be added the Delians.

University College Dublin

Andrew Erskine

¹⁸ Full testimonia on Anius can be found in Bruneau, above (n. 16), 413-30.

¹⁹ B.V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (Oxford 1911), 214, *LIMC* s.v. Aineias no. 92, cf. DH 1.49.2, 54.2. Perret, above (n. 12), 13-23, N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 1 (Oxford 1972), 186-88.

²⁰ Bruneau, above (n. 18), 413-18, and the scholia to Lycophron *Alex.* 570 which traces the story back to the *Cypria* of the epic cycle.

²¹ Cf. A. Momigliano, "How to reconcile Greeks and Trojans", *Settimo Contributo* (Rome 1984), 437-62.

²² Iust. 28.1.6. The authenticity of this appeal, which appears to date to the 230s, is controversial; R. M. Errington, "Rome and Greece to 205 B.C." in *CAH* 8 (Cambridge² 1989), 85, and A. Coppola, "Memorie troiane e ambasceria romana", *Hesperia: Studi sulla grecità di occidente* 4 (1994), 177-86 are favourably disposed, but it was rejected by the influential M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques au III siècle a.C (273-205)* (Paris 1921), 5-22.

²³ Ilium: Polyb. 22.5.3 (see n. 5 above); Lampsacus: *SIG*³ 591. 19-20, 24-25, 30-31, 59-62 (see n. 9 above).