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26. Cumae in Campania during the seventh century BC

Matteo D’Acunto

Abstract: This chapter provides an overview of early Cumae, c. 750-600 BC, through a combination of literary sources reflecting different traditions and the archaeological record which owes much to intensive fieldwork from 1994 onwards. Archaeological investigations of urban areas are starting to reveal the early town plan and the main phases of the Greek settlement. Sanctuaries on the acropolis have recently been reconsidered in a new topographical perspective, and their cults show connections with the motherland as well as important aspects of the colony. Cemeteries illustrate the links with Euboean elite burial customs established by the colonists but also their openness to the models of their new world in Italy.

The site, the native settlement, the Greek colony

Pithekoussai on the island of Ischia,1 followed probably just a few years later by Cumae on the mainland opposite,2 represents the first steps in western colonization taken by Greeks in the mid-eighth century. There has been a lively debate about the status of Pithekoussai as an emporion or a true apoikia.3 Bruno d’Agostino has suggested that Pithekoussai should be considered as the last Euboean pre-colonial experience and Cumae as the first true colonial enterprise (d’Agostino 2008a; 2011).4

Cumae was founded on the shore north of the Gulf of Naples (Figure 26.1) in territory characterized by volcanic activity and named in antiquity as now the Phlegranean Fields.5 The acropolis is a rocky spur which in antiquity protruded as a headland into the sea (Figure 26.2), although nowadays the coastline has advanced considerably (Stefaniuk and Morhange 2008). We may call it a ‘preferred’ site. Naturally defensible, with its steep sides and proximity to the sea, it was the perfect choice for a settlement to control maritime trade in this part of the Tyrrhenian Sea and especially the channel between Ischia and the mainland (Figure 26.3). From the Greek perspective, this was a good location for an early Archaic seaside settlement: ships could choose between two natural landings, one on the beach along the south side of the acropolis, and the other (which was much safer) inside a lagoon to the north of the hill.6 To the east, the acropolis overlooks a small plain which is naturally defended to north and south by low depressions, and to the east by the north-south ridge of Monte Grillo. The urban area of the settlement was established on this small plateau during the Greek and later the Roman period.

Excavations from the 19th century onwards have shown that the site was occupied by a powerful native settlement before the foundation of the Greek colony. It belonged to the people named Opicians in the literary sources (Th. 6.4.5; Plb. apud Str. 5.4.3).7 Their material culture was characterized by handmade impasto pottery. The Early Iron Age inhabitants of Campania are generally described as having a ‘Fossa Kultur’ after their most common burial ritual,


2 From the Greek perspective, this follows probably just a few years later by Cumae on the mainland opposite,2 represents the first steps in western colonization taken by Greeks in the mid-eighth century. There has been a lively debate about the status of Pithekoussai as an emporion or a true apoikia.3 Bruno d’Agostino has suggested that Pithekoussai should be considered as the last Euboean pre-colonial experience and Cumae as the first true colonial enterprise (d’Agostino 2008a; 2011).4


4 On Cumae in Campania, see (in addition to n. 1 above) Zevi et al. 2008: Cuma, with full bibliography. Large scale excavation campaigns since 1994 have been conducted by several Neapolitan institutions. The University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’ has investigated the defensive walls (d’Agostino and D’Andrea 2002; d’Agostino et al. 2005; Cuozzo et al. 2006; d’Agostino and Giglio 2012) and the urban area (D’Acunto 2008a; 2009; D’Acunto et al. forthcoming; D’Onofrio 2002). The University of Naples ‘Federico II’ investigates the Forum: Gasparri and Greco 2007; 2009; Greco and Mermati 2010-11. The Centre Jean Bérard has investigated the harbour and the northern part of the city, including the Early Iron Age cemetery, a peri-urban sanctuary and the Roman cemetery: Zevi et al. 2008 (J.-P. Brun, P. Munzi et al.); Bats et al. 2008; Brun and Munzi 2008; 2011; Stefaniuk and Morhange 2008. The Second University of Naples has started new excavations in the so-called Tempio di Giove on the summit of the acropolis: Rescigno 2012a; esp. 2012b; 2012c; Rescigno and Sirleto 2011. On the sanctuary of Apollo on the lower terrace of the acropolis, see Jannelli 1999b; Catabbci et al. 2002.


6 Stefaniuk and Morhange 2008; but see also Cuma: 556 (B. d’Agostino) and D’Acunto 2015: 188, n. 52.

7 Antiochus of Syracuse equated the Opicians with the Ausonians, whose region sensu stricto neighboured that of the Latins: FGrHist 555 F 7 (= Str. 5.4.3). However, Polybius distinguished the Ausonians from the Opicians, which better reflects the ethno-geography of Campania during the Greek period: Mele 2008b: 31.
inhumation in a pit (Figure 26.4). In the wider context of pre-colonial contacts between Greeks (mostly Euboeans) and Southern Italian, Sicilian and Etruscan groups, illustrated by significant finds of Middle Geometric pottery, pre-Hellenic Cumae provides an important exemplary case. Two MG II chevron skyphoi and a black cup, probably Euboean imports, have been found in rich female tombs (T. 3 and 29 Osta) together with imports from the eastern Mediterranean: a faience pendent of an Egyptian goddess.

\* On Early Iron Age Cumae, see: Gabrici 1913 on the necropolis; Brun and Munzi 2008; 2011: 150-2; Criscuolo 2007; Criscuolo and Pacciarelli 2008; d’Agostino 2008b; Jannelli 1999b; Johannowsky 1975; Muller-Karpe 1959: 36-43; Nizzo 2007b.
and glass beads from a necklace in T29, and in T36 glass beads from a further necklace and a faience scarab. They indicate that Euboeans established friendly relations with the powerful local community during the second quarter of the eighth century, just before the foundation of the Greek colony (Gabrici 1913: 61–211; Cerchiai 1995: 12–18; Criscuolo and Pacciarelli 2008: 325–51).

Cumae was considered in antiquity to be the earliest Greek colony in the west (Str. 5.4.4). This tradition raises the important question of its foundation date in comparison with those of Pithekoussai on one hand, and the earliest Greek colonies in Sicily (Naxos, Syracuse, Zankle, Leontini, Katane and Megara Hyblaea) on the other. The chronological comparison with Pithekoussai raises the related (and still open) questions of whether the latter should be considered a true apoikia, as Cumae, or an emporion, and of the kind of relationships which bound the two Euboean foundations during the second half of the eighth century.

Despite their different traditions, all ancient authors are unanimous in reporting that the protagonists in the establishment of the apoikia of Cumae in Opicia were Euboeans from Chalkis. Another group of colonists probably came from the homonymous Aeolian Kyme in Asia Minor, as reported by so-called Pseudo-Scymnus (Iamb. Nic. = Peripl. or Perieg. 236–40). This text is more explicit than Strabo’s report (probably taken from Ephorus) that the oikists of Cumae were Hippokles from Kyme and Megasthenes from Chalkis. According to Strabo, by mutual agreement the former gave his name to the city while the latter established the origin of the apoikia, hence Cumae was considered a Chaldician colony. Alternatively, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (7.3.1), both Chaldicians and Eretrians founded Cumae in Campania. This fits accounts of the foundation of Pithekoussai by people from both Chalkis and Eretria, as well as those literary sources (Liv. 8.22.5–6; Phleg. Trall. FGrHist II 257 F 36 X, 53–6) which report that Pithekoussai was involved in the foundation of Cumae. Indeed, as we will see, in the light of recent research Pithekoussai and Cumae appear to be more and more closely linked.

The nature of the relationship between the first colonists and the indigenous peoples is a matter of scholarly debate. In the literary sources, the question is raised by an oracle reported in the second century AD by Phlegon of Tralles (FGrHist II 257 F 36 X, 53–56), noting that the language, formulae and contents of this text seem to date back to the Archaic period (Breglia Pulci Doria 1983; d’Agostino 2011: 44–5). It reads ‘… and those who live in the islands in front, when they will occupy the territory of Cumae, not by using a trick (dolos), but violence (bia), those benevolent people raise a statue and a temple of the divine Hera, following the custom of their motherland’. The oracle must of course be a post eventum composition, but it nonetheless implies that the Euboeans living in Pithekoussai were involved in the foundation of Cumae. Indeed, as we will see, in the light of recent research Pithekoussai and Cumae appear to be more and more closely linked. Therefore, according to Alfonso Mele, reports of Eretrian participation in the foundation of Cumae together with Chaldician and Cumaean groups could be reliable, even though scholars tend to dismiss them, as could the role of Pithekoussai in the kinesis of Cumae.

Even though the archaeological picture of Cumae during the Late Geometric and Archaic periods is still slight and fragmentary, from a topographical point of view the break implied by the kinesis is at least clear (Figure 26.5). The acropolis, formerly the site of the native settlement (Jannelli 1999b), became the seat of the Greek gods after the foundation. The plain, over which the Early Iron Age native cemeteries extended, was occupied by the urban areas. The city was defended by the fortification walls which enclosed the acropolis and its southern spur, closed off the

---

8 Τάταρας δ’ ἀρχέξει ἐστι Κύμη, Χαλκίδεως καὶ Κυμαῖων παλαιότατον κτίσμα παντῶν γὰρ ἀπε τρισικλίνων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν Ἰταλικῶν. Οἱ δὲ τὸν στόλον ἔγνεντες, Ἰπποκλῆς ὁ Κυμαῖος καὶ Μεγασθένης ὁ Χαλκιδεύς, διωμολογήσαντο πρὸς σφᾶς αὐτούς, τῶν μὲν ἀποικίαν εἶναι, τῶν δὲ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἄλλην νῦν μὲν προαγορεύεται Κύμη, κτίσας δ’ αὐτὴν Χαλκίδεως δοκοῦσα. Πρότερον μὲν οὖν σύντομον καὶ τὸ Φλεγραῖον καλομένων πεδίον, ἐν τῇ πέρι τοῖς Γίγαντας μυθεύουσιν, οὐκ ἄλλοθεν, ὡς εἰκός, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ περιμάχητον τὴν γῆν εἶναι δι’ ἀρετήν·.

9 Οἱ δὲ τὸν στόλον ἄγοντες, Ἱπποκλῆς ὁ Κυμαῖος καὶ Μεγασθένης ὁ Χαλκιδεύς, διωμολογήσαντο πρὸς σφᾶς αὐτούς, τῶν μὲν ἀποικίαν εἶναι, τῶν δὲ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἄλλην νῦν μὲν προαγορεύεται Κύμη, κτίσας δ’ αὐτὴν Χαλκίδεως δοκοῦσα. Πρότερον μὲν οὖν σύντομον καὶ τὸ Φλεγραῖον καλομένων πεδίον, ἐν τῇ πέρι τοῖς Γίγαντας μυθεύουσιν, οὐκ ἄλλοθεν, ὡς εἰκός, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ περιμάχητον τὴν γῆν εἶναι δι’ ἀρετήν·.

10 Mele (2008a: 78–81) notes several other arguments.

11 Καὶ νήσων ναέται τὴν ἀντιπάλων ὅτ' ἂν αἶαν / οὐ δόλωι, ἀλλὰ βίαι Κυμαίδα πρόφρονες αὔτε / νάσσωνται, σεμνῆς βασιλείδος οἵδε τιθέντων

12 FGrHist II 257 F 36 X, 53–56.

13 Str. 5.4.9: Ἐρετρίες ὄρος καὶ Χαλκίδες, εὐτυχὴς δὲ δι᾿ εὐκαρπίας καὶ διὰ τὰ χρυσεῖα, ἐξέλιπον τὴν νῆσον κατὰ στόλον ἈΧΑΙΩΝ ἔδωκαν, ἀρχηγὸς δὲ ἐντὸς τῶν Πυλῶν καὶ τῆς Κύμης ἐκείνης.

14 For the location of old and new excavations, see Criscuolo and Pacciarelli 2008: pl. 1; D’Acunto et al. forthcoming (E. Gastaldi).
urban area to south and north (following two parallel lines), and climbed the ridge of Monte Grillo which was the natural eastern limit of the city. The city cemeteries extended outside the wall to the north.

**The urban areas**

Through the Late Geometric and Archaic periods, these various parts of the city – the sanctuaries, public square and urban areas, defensive walls, and cemeteries – developed in their own ways within its overall socio-political history. The seventh century was surely the period when the heirs of the first colonists of Cumae strengthened the socio-political structure and unity of their Greek community, emphasizing their descent from the proud horsemen of the motherland. At the same time, they also continued the trend of establishing relations with neighbouring Opician and Etruscan communities which had begun at the end of the eighth century. Although the seventh century was surely a key period, it is a very difficult one to reconstruct through the archaeological record because of the impact of the rebuilding of the Greek, Samnite and Roman city on the same site for over a thousand years. Furthermore, despite Cumae’s great historical importance, archaeological research on the site has often been unsystematic. As noted, large-scale excavations involving the main archaeological institutions in Naples began only in 1994. We will nonetheless attempt to present a synthetic picture of the archaeology of Cumae during the seventh century, noting of course that the seventh century is a historical abstraction because there is no clear break with the late eighth or early sixth centuries on either side.

**An urban quarter south of the Forum**

Excavation by the University of Naples ‘Federico II’ on the south side of the Roman Forum and in the podium of the Capitolium (Figure 26.6) revealed that the first monumental phase of the Agora dates to the last decades of the sixth

---

17 From 1994-2006, a large-scale research project on the site conceived by Professor Stefano De Caro, then Director of the Department of Antiquities of Napoli and Pompeii, was financed by the Regione Campania with funds from the European Union. Thereafter, the institutions involved continued their fieldwork but with increasing economic difficulties.
century BC (Greco 2008: 416-21). We have as yet no real evidence for the existence of any earlier Archaic public square (where we might imagine that the earliest public and sacred buildings would have been located, together with the cult of the oikists).18

Early Archaic houses were uncovered by the same mission on the south side of the Forum, to the west of the so-called Tempio con Portico, beneath Samnite and Roman buildings (Greco 2007; 2008; 2009). They include at least one rectangular building (of no less than 20 m²) plus parts of other rooms which may belong to this or other buildings, as well as open courtyards (Figure 26.7) (see especially Greco 2008: 389-404). These structures were carefully built: both the wall socles and the larger foundations on which they sat were made of stone, with two faces of small, carefully smoothed and finished blocks between which was a fill of stone flakes and earth (Greco 2008: figs 1-3 and 5). The stone socle probably supported a lost superstructure of mud brick within a wooden framework (pisé). The walls were covered with fine plaster, which was found in fragments during the excavations. The roof must have been made of perishable materials, i.e. thatched over wooden beams. This building technique is similar to that adopted in the colonists’ motherland,

18 The very slight extant evidence of possible cult activities comprises an early Archaic terracotta of a horse (Greco 2007: 36-7, fig. 18) and a poorly preserved structure of unclear function (Greco 2008: 409-11, fig. 16).
Euboea, as parallels with Eretria, Lefkandi and Oropos show (see Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 48-63; 2006-7, with bibliography). The interior and exterior floors of this building or buildings consist of a layer of earth (pozzolana). On these floors were hearths (including a well preserved example surrounded by a row of stones in the rectangular room) together with pottery vessels for the consumption, cooking and storage of food. Raw amber beads, a large bronze bar, and many pieces of iron slag were also found. The use life of this building may be established through the pottery found on the floors, which dates to the final two decades of the eighth century (LG II) and the first half of the seventh. But earlier LG I pottery uncovered in later fills suggests that the Greek establishment in this area dates back to the third quarter of the eighth century.

This area underwent a radical change in the last decades of the seventh century, with the construction of new houses or rooms with floors at a higher level. The older walls were reused or removed (Greco 2008: 405-8, fig. 14, pl. 9). Courses of square blocks larger than those used in earlier phases were a feature of the building technique employed. Here too, no elements of the roof were found, indicating that it must have been thatched over wooden beams. A rectangular room of no less than 20 m² occupied the site of the earlier building. This room had a bench along its south wall and a hearth close by. Objects such as tablewares and cooking vessels found inside the building indicate its domestic function. The corner of another room to the south of this house was too poorly preserved to establish its relationship to it (Greco 2008: 406-7, fig. 14). Two jars found on the floor again indicate a domestic function (perhaps storage). On the basis of the pottery contained within it, this building was in use from the end of the seventh until the first half of the sixth century. Even though these excavations were constrained by the overlying later buildings, they clearly show that an urban quarter was established along the south side of the Roman Forum in the early years of the Greek colony of Cumae.

The urban area north of the Forum

The urban planning of a part of Cumae and its domestic quarters are now starting to be better understood as a result of excavations conducted since 2007 by the University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’ (D’Acunto 2008a; 2009: 81-7; D’Acunto et al. 2014; 2015; 2016; and especially forthcoming). These campaigns have focused on one of the central quarters of the Greek and Roman city, between the Forum baths (the ‘Terme del Foro’) and the northern walls (Figure 26.8). They have revealed a network of Roman period streets delineating a system of insulae: east–west smaller streets (stenopoi: n, o, p, q on the map) join the main north–south road (plateia B) which ran between the Capitolium and the northern walls. This main road changed orientation from southwest–northeast to south–north at the northeast corner of the Forum baths. These baths were built at the beginning of the second century AD in an earlier urban quarter crossed by stenopoí n and o. The east–west stenopoi must have joined another main north–south road (A on the map) which ran through the middle gate of the northern walls and whose existence is implied at the latest by the earliest phase of the middle gate c. 600 BC (although it could be earlier). Finally, one might hypothesize the existence of a northern stenopos, yet to be investigated, which followed the inner perimeter of the walls, as is found in other cities in Magna Graecia (e.g. Megara Hyblaea). It is worth noting that stenopos q is not perpendicular to plateia B, while stenopos p is roughly perpendicular only in its eastern part but oblique further west. This irregular alignment of plateia B and at least stenopoi p and q may be set alongside the very variable width (north–south) of the insulae. No two insulae are the same width: they range from stenopoi e and n (c. 28.379m) to stenopoi o and p (40.275m), the trapezoidal shape of which is caused by the change in orientation of plateia B.

Figure 26.8 The northern part of the city: the Roman forum, the urban area, the Northern walls, and the cemetery. (© University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’).
It is tempting to draw general parallels with the early town-planning of the Greek colonies in North Africa (Cyrene) and in Magna Graecia, which are characterized by different systems of alignment (as at Megara Hyblaea and later Selinus), and there are indeed evident similarities (Cyrene: Stucchi 1967: 13-44; Bonacasa 2000. Megara Hyblaea: Gras et al. 2004; Mertens 2006: 63-72. Selinus: Mertens 2006: 173-190). Therefore, field investigation is required to explain the irregularities and different alignments which co-exist in such plans as well as the date(s) of their establishment.

As is well known, different explanations have been advanced for the different alignments in Megara Hyblaea and the question still remains open. In the case of Cumae, it is already clear that the alignment of the streets north of the Forum baths conformed, at least in part, to local topography which features a slope from south to north and west to east: *plateia* B in its northern section runs along the lower slopes in this area (D’Acunto et al. forthcoming [M. D’Acunto]). This may explain its change of orientation in relation to the corner of the (later) Forum Baths. Therefore, the urban plan of this sector of the city is not ‘regular’ but rather ‘regulated’ by the topography of the area. It is also clear that a main concern of the town-planners was to exploit the slopes in order to drain foul water along the streets from south to north and out of the city. Excavation on the northern walls (see below) has shown that drainage was regulated from c. 550 BC by the construction of a sewer revealed at the eastern side of the middle gate. Its efficiency was improved by the tyrant Aristodemos (c. 504-484 BC) who built a new two-channel monumental sewer west of the gate and a deep ditch outside the walls (D’Acunto 2015: 175-84; d’Agostino 2013: 215, 219-20; d’Agostino and d’Andrea 2002: 61-2, n. 204 [F. Fratta]; d’Agostino et al. 2005: 10, 35-7, 95-6).

The precise date of the urban plan of this sector of the city remains uncertain as its southern part is occupied by the Forum Baths (a *terminus ante quem* is given by second- to first-century BC houses beneath the baths which respect the alignment of *stenopoi* o and n). However, a close date may now be established for the northern sector between *stenopoi* o and the northern walls. Extensive excavations under my direction have brought to light the *insula* between *stenopoi* p and q and *plateia* B (Figure 26.9). Its western limit has still to be defined, and so we do not know if another north-south road ran between *plateiai* B and A or if the western limit of the *insula* corresponds with *plateia* A. The

Figure 26.9 The northern part of the city: *insula* between *plateia* B and *stenopoi* p and q. (© University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’).
houses underwent multiple transformations during the Classical (fifth- and fourth-century), Hellenistic and Roman periods, with intensive occupation until the third century AD and partial reoccupation until the sixth. The LG and Archaic phases have been investigated in several places (numbers 1-6 on Figure 26.9), although their exposure has been limited by the (mostly Roman) overlying structures (D’Acunto, Giglio and Iavarone forthcoming [M. D’Acunto and M. Barbato]). Despite these limitations, some general points are clear:

1. The alignment of plateia B and stenopos p, as well as the northern limit of the excavated insula, reflects a town plan established in late LG II/EPC (i.e. c. 700-690 BC), and respected throughout the city’s history. Therefore, this quarter presents an example of strong continuity in town planning from the early Greek colony until the Late Roman period.

2. The insula which has been extensively excavated included early houses (with closed areas and small open courtyards) on the same alignment as the streets. These houses were built at the same time (i.e. late in LG II) and were continuously occupied, with significant changes, until the late Archaic period.

The archaeological picture, and its related features and problems, may be illustrated via discussion of three interventions: A) a trench under stenopos p (no. 1 on Figure 26.9); B) two trenches under stenopos q (no. 2 on Figure 26.9); C) several excavations in LG II-Archaic houses and related courtyards in the insula (nos 3-6 on Figure 26.9).

A) A trench was opened beneath the Roman levels of the smaller east–west street p to verify the date of its construction (D’Acunto, Giglio and Iavarone forthcoming [M. Barbato]) (Figures 26.9:1, 26.10). The earliest phase of stenopos p (and the walls which delimit the insulae to the south and north) is securely dated to the end of LG II by finds in the layer underlying its surface. This deep layer, which is common to all LG II levels excavated in the area, shows how the ‘drawing’ of the city was also a moment of construction requiring the laying down of substantial fills to avoid the constant problem of flooding and the presence of ground water in this area (which, at the same time, made this spot attractive as an urban area).

The filling level of the earliest phase of stenopos p covered a floor with few hearths, on which lay many fallen stones, burnt animal bones, and a set of vessels for drinking and eating. These included EPC kotylai (imports and Pithekoussan-Cumaean imitation), a Thapsos-type skyphos without panel and with painted lower body, kantharoi of the so-called Ithaca type (both Corinthian imports and Pithekoussan-Cumaean imitations), a Thapsos krater, and a Red Slip Ware open vase in Pithekoussan fabric. Their date is consistent with LG II/EPC, and the coexistence in this fill of a Pithekoussan-Cumaean kotyle with soldier birds (imitating an EPC prototype) and an imported Corinthian kotyle with wire birds (as Coldstream 2008: 105) suggests a date for this closed context in the mature/advanced stages of LG II/EPC. Unfortunately, the excavation was bounded by the walls delimiting the street and so could not be extended. It was therefore not possible to test the hypothesis that the context was closed by walls, although what may be a small part of a wall (a line of stones) was found in the southwestern corner of the trench, oblique to the overlying south wall of the earliest phase of the stenopos (700-690 BC). All the evidence suggests that this context was the interior of a late eighth-century house, meaning that in this area, the early seventh-century town plan represents a completely new arrangement in comparison with the earlier occupation of the area.

This floor in turn covered layers which unfortunately lacked diagnostic sherds. But the upper fill under the early phase of the stenopos contained, together with LG II sherds, redeposited pottery dating back to LG I, with a very few sherds on the MG II/LG I transition. A few other sherds found in primary or secondary deposition elsewhere in the insula also belong to this very early phase. These include late MG II or transitional LG I chevron skyphoi characterized by the early form
of chevron, imprecisely drawn (Figure 26.13a-b; D'Acunto 2009: 82-4, fig. 20), a pendent semicircle skyphos of Kearsley’s type 6, and skyphoi with wavy lines (a Corinthian import and an imitation), found together with purely LG I types such as Aetos 666 kotylai (Corinthian imports Figure 26.13c, and Pithekoussan-Cumaean imitations [D'Acunto 2009: 82-3, figs 16 and 17]), Thapsos class skyphoi with panel and lines on the lower body, plus other types (D'Acunto et al. forthcoming [M. D’Acunto]).

The earliest phase found in the trench beneath stenopos p is that of the pre-Hellenic cemetery, which belonged to the ‘Opician’ settlement before the foundation of the colony. The secondary cremation of an adult female (an exception to the rule of inhumation in the ‘Fossa Kultur’ cemetery) dates to the Final Bronze Age/beginning of the Iron Age, i.e. to the tenth or first half of the ninth century BC.¹⁹

B) Two trenches were opened beneath stenopos q, which delimits the insula on the north side, in order to establish its date (D’Acunto, Giglio and Iavarone forthcoming [S. Napolitano]) (Figure 26.9: 2). The street was built c. 450-430 BC, much later than stenopos p, however the earliest phase of the wall which defines the north of the insula dates back to LG II (720-690 BC). This wall was then rebuilt in exactly the same position and on the same alignment at the end of LG II-MPC (c. 700-650 BC) and 450-430 BC, the latter phase then continuing in use until the Late Roman period. Evidence from these trenches too shows strong continuity in the town plan from its establishment in LG II. Before the earliest (Classical) phase of stenopos q, a series of levels contained small structures and especially concentrations of debris from bronze and iron working. Scientific analysis of these metallurgical remains has shown an advanced level of technology (D’Acunto et al. forthcoming [P. Cavaliere, C. Giardino and C. Leo; M. Tartari]) (Figure 26.11).

Unfortunately, the centre of the workshop could not be excavated due to the limited extent of the trenches, but the kind of slags found in situ – iron flake and spheroid hammerscales as well as slags from copper refinement – implies that the focus of this metallurgical activity lay immediately nearby, just north of the later wall of the stenopos (compare the archaeological evidence from Oropos [Mazarakis Ainian 2007a; Doonan and Mazarakis Ainian 2007]). It is possible that the few bronze fibulae (of Italic type) and the bronze fish hook found in these layers were products of this workshop. The date of this metallurgical activity is well established via the pottery found in these layers: it spans the period from LG II (720-690 BC) until the early fifth century BC. The earliest metallurgical activity is associated with LG II sherds, including a Thapsos class skyphos with a panel containing a series of vertical zig-zags and (probably) a painted lower body (Figure 26.13e); compare Buchner and Ridgway 1993: 203-4, T. 161.2, pl. 63 [LG I]; T. 309A.2, 366, pls CLIV, 11663 [LG II]).

This metallurgical evidence is still limited and we should be cautious about its interpretation. Future investigations may better illustrate the extent of the metalworking area and show whether there was a more or less extensive nucleus of workshops. The location of the site close to the city limits, between a domestic area to the south and the city walls to the north (at least from 600 BC), is typical of craft quarters, and especially of metalworking with its demands for very high temperatures and complex technological processes. From a chronological perspective, on one hand the establishment of metallurgical activity in LG II corresponds to an important stage in town planning and the division of space in this quarter. However, the absence of stenopos q at this time shows that the organization of the northernmost insula must have been different, at least in part, from that of the insulae to the south. On the other hand, metalworking at Cumae during LG II partly overlaps that in the well-known Mazzola workshops at Pithekoussai (Buchner 1970-1; Klein 1972; Ridgway 1992: 91-100), although it then continued after the Pithekoussai workshops had closed. This archaeological picture suggests some kind of relationship between the two workshops.

¹⁹ This tomb is being studied by P. Gastaldi and F. Spoto.
Figure 26.12 Trench dug in a room at the northern limit of the *insula* (see Figure 26.9, no.3). (© M. D’Acunto).

Figure 26.13 Geometric pottery from the urban area north of the Forum baths: a) Corinthian chevron skyphos (late MG II) from trench 3 (see Figure 26.9); b) chevron skyphos in Pithekoussan-Cumaean fabric? (late MG II or early LG I) from trench 5; c) Corinthian kotyle, Aetos 666 type (LG I) from trench 5; d) LG skyphos in Pithekoussan-Cumaean fabric from trench 4; e) Corinthian LG skyphos, Thapsos class with panel, from trench 2; f) LG II closed vessel sherd, White on Dark Style, Pithekoussan fabric; g) LG II skyphos from trench 6, probably in Pithekoussan-Cumaean fabric. (© M. D’Acunto).
sets of metalworking installations, perhaps through exchanges of raw materials and technologies, and the movement of craftsmen from the Euboean settlement on the island to the colony on the mainland.

C) The third category of evidence comes from trenches dug inside the *insula*, including those between *plateia* B and *stenopoi* p and q (numbers 3-5 as well as others not shown in Figure 26.9). Although these trenches were restricted in size by overlying Roman structures, it is clear that from LG II, the *insula* was densely occupied by houses that lay on roughly the same alignment as the streets and were characterized by alternate covered areas and open courtyards (as, e.g., at Megara Hyblaea: Gras et al. 2004: *passim*).

Part of a house excavated at the northern limit of the *insula* has an initial seventh-century phase followed by a reconstruction c. 600 BC (Figures 26.9: 3, 26.12). The eastern and western limits of the building lie outside the excavated area. The seventh-century house had an interior partition wall and in the earliest phase (c. 700-650 BC) a hearth with a clay surround. During the sixth-century phase, the partition was removed and two successive floors laid, each with a hearth in a different position. Limited excavation beneath the earliest, seventh-century floor revealed a layer containing a few sherds of the end of MG II (Figure 26.13a, a Corinthian chevron skyphos) and LG I. On the eastern side of the *insula*, the southwest corner of a Geometric-Archaic house was found only partly destroyed by several phases of Roman rebuilding (Figures 26.9: 4, 26.14-16) (D’Acunto 2008a: 498-9, 504-11, figs 13-14, 19-26). Unfortunately, it was impossible to excavate the whole room because the exterior walls continued to the north and east under Roman structures. Well-preserved Late Geometric–Archaic structures and strata were visible in the trench walls (D’Acunto 2008a: 498-9, figs 13-14). It is, however, clear that the house was large, with an area greater than the 14m² within the excavated walls. Although these walls are less well preserved than those found on the south side of the Forum, the latter illustrate their building technique. A quite high stone socle was built over a larger stone foundation, with two faces of small blocks, between which was a fill of stone flakes and earth. The technique is similar to that of the early Archaic houses excavated by the University of Naples ‘Federico II’, but the blocks are more irregularly shaped (D’Acunto 2008a: 504, fig. 19). A row of round post-holes for wooden wall supports was found along the inner side of the southern wall, again indicating that the superstructure over the stone socle was likely built of mud brick and the roof thatched over wooden beams. The presence of this row of wooden posts along the inner face of the walls is common in Euboean buildings...
Parts of the floors of this building, made of layers of earth, were found in situ in the northeast corner. They had been cut in Roman times by a pit (which reused a pithos) and another big hole, unfortunately thus breaking the continuity between the walls and the preserved floors. On the earliest floor, a post-hole surrounded by a circle of small stones must have held one of the roof supports (Figure 26.17) (D'Acunto 2008a: 505, fig. 20). This element too finds parallels in Euboean architecture: post-holes surrounded by stones were found in Oropos, for example (Mazarakis Ainian 2006-7: 86 and 88, used for outer porticos). A large part of the earliest floor was found: it was black and fatty from the cooking and eating activities practiced in this part of the house.

On the north side of the excavation lay five stratified hearths rebuilt in the same location from LG II until the seventh century. These too continued under a Roman wall and could only be partially excavated. The earliest was a burnt layer of clay covered with ash (Figure 26.18), over a base formed of sherds (Figure 26.19), which included an LG II oinochoe with close parallels at Pithekoussai (Figure 26.20). Overlying it, a second slightly later hearth was made of two clay supports and contained a micro-stratigraphy of ash layers. On this second hearth was found a Pithekoussan-Cumaean skyphos, perhaps still LG I, decorated with a panel containing a series of lozenges (Figure 26.13d). On these two hearths and their related floors lay vessels used for cooking (ovoid jars of local type), eating (lekanai and dishes of Phoenician type), pouring (oinochoae) and drinking (skyphoi and kotylai). Analysis of faunal remains associated with the hearths and floors (D’Acunto et al. forthcoming [A. Carannante and S. Chilardi]) suggests that the colonists were farmers as well as

---

20 E.g. the Protogeometric building at Toumba (Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 48-57, figs 81-9) and the so-called Daphnephoreion at Eretria (Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 58-9, fig. 105). For buildings at Mazzola, see Buchner 1970-1: fig. 5.

hunters (e.g. of deer), fishermen and gatherers. They ate mostly goats and sheep, together with pigs and oxen. Of the other three hearths which date back into the seventh century, two were made of sherds of large vases (mainly pithoi), while the third consisted only of a layer of clay. Very few vases and faunal remains were found on their surfaces and related floors.

Evidence of the LG – Archaic settlement was also found elsewhere within the *insula*. These include a small area of a beaten earth floor (perhaps from inside a house) the surface of which shows evidence of a fire kindled nearby (D’Acunto 2008a: 511-20, figs 27-33; 2009: 81-5, figs 12-23) (Figure 26.9: 5). The few drinking vessels (skyphoi and koytai) found on the floor indicate a use life from LG II until MPC (D’Acunto 2008a: 512-13, fig. 28; 2009: 81-2, figs 13-14). Under this floor were several layers rich in pottery dating back to LG I (Figure 26.13c) and LG II, together with again one chevron skyphos, probably in Pithekoussan-Cumaean fabric, of the end of MG II/beginning of LG I (Figure 26.13b; D’Acunto 2008a: 513-19, figs 29-31, 33; 2009: 82-5, figs 15-24), as well as a fragment of pendent semicircle skyphos (mentioned above).

There are close similarities between the Geometric and seventh-century pottery uncovered in these parts of the urban area and that found in contemporary contexts at Pithekoussai. Common vessel types and styles of decoration are evident in the so-called Pithekoussan-Cumaean production, while products specific to Pithekoussai have been found at both sites. The latter include so-called White on Dark pottery (imitating the Euboean Black and White Style or Bichrome Ware, Figure 26.13f) as well as imitations of Phoenician Red Slip (dishes and carinated cups: on these classes see Cuozzo et al. 2006: 21-2, 54 [M. Cuozzo and B. d’Agostino]). The same kind of imports, from Corinth, Euboea and other regions of Greece, were present at both sites. In terms of their material culture, the evidence shows that the two settlements of Pithekoussai and Cumae were closely integrated - one might say as the two sides of the same coin.

This picture is enriched by the results of excavation inside the nearby Roman room which occupied the southeastern corner of the *insula* (Figure 26.9: 6). This brought to light a massive wall delimiting the south side of the *insula* and the north of *stenopos* p: the date of its earliest phase (late in LG II) matches that of the *stenopos*. From LG II until the Archaic period, the area corresponding to the Roman room was probably a courtyard (with a small hearth during LG II) located south of the covered part of the house. This interpretation as an open area is suggested by the character of the floor soils and the low concentration of material on them (including a LG II skyphos probably of Pithekoussan-Cumaean fabric, with a panel containing floating sigmas, Figure 26.13g). Therefore, these early Greek houses (the urban lots) probably had both covered areas and small courtyards, conforming to the picture of early domestic architecture evident in Megara Hyblaea and other Greek colonies in Magna Graecia (see recently Gras et al. 2004; Mertens 2006: 63-72 et passim).

**General remarks and hypotheses about the urban areas and early Cumae**

At this point it is useful to summarize the evidence and present some working hypotheses, on the understanding that our knowledge of the urban area remains very limited.

- The available evidence for urban settlement shows that the early Greek colony was established both by the forum and in a quarter some distance to the north. The colony thus covered an extensive area from its earliest phases. However, we do not know if this area was more or less densely occupied nor in exactly which periods the urbanization of the plain proceeded.
- The fact that the sector excavated by the University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’ is very close to the northern walls suggests that the northern limit of the city was established from the very beginning and respected until the Late Roman period.
- Together with other EIA evidence found nearby, the tomb beneath *stenopos* p shows that this area, where Greek colonists later established urban settlement, had previously been part of the extensive EIA cemetery.
which ran from the Forum to an area beyond the northern walls. In long-term perspective, this shows the radical changes in site topography consequent upon the foundation of the Greek colony (compare the situation on the acropolis, discussed below). Our evidence is paralleled in the Forum area, where four EIA tombs were found on the south side of the public square (near the Roman temple of the so-called Masseria del Gigante), not far from the LG II – Archaic quarter discussed above (Greco 2008: 387–8, pls 1–2; 2009: 3–17, figs. 1–3). Furthermore, the area of the EIA cemetery excavated by the French mission just outside the middle gate of the northern walls (Brun and Munzi 2008) was later occupied by a Greek sanctuary (Bats et al. 2008; see below). Taken all together, these clear topographical/functional changes in the use of space on the plain illustrate a definite break between the pre–Hellenic settlement and the early Greek colony.

- The town plan of the quarter excavated by the University of Naples ‘L’Oriente’ was established late in LG II. This evidence matches that of the excavations of the University of Naples ‘Federico II’ in the quarter south of the Forum. Therefore, if we can rely on the still limited evidence available, LG II appears to be a turning point in the history of the colony, when the community undertook important projects to ‘build’ these quarters, planning the system of streets and assigning urban lots to the colonists. In the northern quarter, this skeleton of streets and insulae was generally respected into the Late Roman period.

- It is, however, clear that an earlier Cumae existed before this turning point. The early Greek pottery found on the site closely matches the earliest vases found at Pithekoussai, in the Scarico Gosetti on the acropolis, the cemetery and the so-called ‘stipe dei cavalli’ (Ridgway 1981: fr. 1–5; 1992: 83–91, fig. 21; Buchner and Ridgway 1993: Sp. 4/4, pl. 245; d’Agostino 1994–5: 44, n. 1, pl. 34; Coldstream 1995: 252 no. 2, 257 nos 57–8, 61–2, fig. 2, 261, pls 27, 29). These finds support Bruno d’Agostino’s hypothesis that there was an early horizon at Cumae which dates to the transition between MG II and LG I (around the middle of the eighth century BC), close in time to the foundation of Pithekoussai (d’Agostino 1999: 55–6 = d’Agostino 2010–11: 224–5, fig. 1). However, the picture of this very early phase is still very limited, and it is at present impossible to establish the nature of Greek presence at Cumae or of relationships with the local people. Was there some kind of peaceful cohabitation or cooperation between the Greek colonists and native populations during this early phase, or at least for a moment at the very beginning? Recent studies of Pithekoussai, and mostly of the cemeteries, increasingly emphasize the presence of Italic individuals living together with the Greek colonists and integrated at different socio-political levels into the community. Italic women were surely the most consistent presence and in some cases reached positions of high socio-political standing, but men could also be more or less integrated into the community (Cerchiai 1997; Cinquantaquattro 2012–13; d’Agostino 1999 = d’Agostino 2010–11: 223–30; 2011).

- An early phase predating systematic town planning (or with a different plan) has been recognized at other Greek colonies. A well-known case is, again, Megara Hyblaea, where Georges Vallet and François Villard labelled this phase as that of the ‘campements’ (see recently Gras et al. 2004: 523–6). Indeed, several cases of ‘two stage’ foundation can be found in literary descriptions of kitesis. A particularly interesting case is that of Zankle on the Strait of Messina, because its foundation involved Cumaean colonists. According to Thucydides (6.4.5), pirates (lestai) from Cumae in Opicia established the ‘first’ Zankle.22 In a second phase, when colonists from Chalkis and other parts of Euboea arrived on the site, they divided the land among themselves and established a pair of oikists, one from the first mother city (Perieres from Cumae in Opicia), and the other from the second motherland (Krataimenes from Chalkis in Euboea). Just as stated in Phlegron of Tralles’ oracle for Cumae, the foundation of Zankle had two clear moments, the second described explicitly as the division of the land and the definition of the oikists. Might Cumae be a similar case, with a ‘first’ Cumae followed by a second involving the division of the land/planning of the town, and the naming of the oikists? Might the second moment correspond to the organization or reorganization of the city in LG II? Was this second moment when people arrived from Cumae in Asia Minor (Pseudo-Scymnus states that they arrived ‘later’ than the Chaldians: see n. 10 above)? These hypotheses are tempting, but we must always keep in mind how limited and fragmentary our archaeological and topographical knowledge of early Cumae really is. They are therefore just working hypotheses for future research on the site.

- A second significant aspect of Thucydides’ description of the foundation of Zankle is his reference to the arrival of Cumaeans who were said to be pirates, a term which alludes not only to the violence that they practiced, but also to their commercial activities, since commerce and piracy were closely connected in this period (Mele 1979; 1986). If ‘pirates’ from Cumae in Opicia were protagonists in the foundation of the ‘first’ Zankle, this assigns priority to the foundation of Cumae. Thucydides’ account seems implicitly to follow the same

22 Ζάγκλη δὲ τὴν μὲν ἄρρητην ἀπὸ Κόμης τῆς ἐν Ῥωμαίᾳ Χαλκιδικῆς πόλεως ἀρρητῶν ἄφθομαν ὕπο&epsilonu...
line as Strabo’s later claim (Str. 5.4.4) that Cumae was the παλαιότατον κτίσμα· πασῶν γάρ ἐστὶ πρεσβυτάτη τῶν τε Σικελικῶν καὶ τῶν Ἰταλιωτῶν (although Thucydides does not, of course, discuss the date of Pithekoussai or its status with reference to the ‘true’ apoikiai).

Finally, I emphasize the clear, if still limited, evidence for advanced iron and bronze working at Cumae, both in the Forum quarter and close to the city limits. The economy of Archaic Cumae was not confined to exploitation of the fertile plain north of the city, even though this was certainly the colony’s main asset and the most important reason for its foundation here. Rather, the picture is enriched by the existence in Cumae of specialized bronze and ironworking, crafts which were not, therefore, the exclusive preserve of Pithekoussai, but reflect the kinship between the two Euboean foundations. This picture accords with the central importance of metallurgy in Euboea itself (see e.g. contributions to Mazarakis Ainian 2007a) and for Euboeans overseas, as a major aspect of their trade and early foundations in the west (where they sought supplies of raw materials from Italian regions such as Etruria). Precious metals as well as bronze and iron were imported as raw materials and worked into objects then sold on the local markets of rich Campanian communities.

In short, the results of recent archaeological research show clearly that many open questions still surround the turning point in western Greek history represented by the two earliest foundations at Pithekoussai and Cumae. Archaeology in the early city of Cumae has much still to contribute, and is already providing food for thought in this heated area of scholarly debate.

The northern walls and the limit of the city

The evidence presented so far fits with the important results of excavations conducted by the University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’ on the northern walls and the ‘porta mediana’ (the central gate - there were two other gates on both sides of the northern walls) which have been fully published by Bruno d’Agostino and his team.23 These defensive walls show several phases of rebuilding from the Archaic until the Late Roman period. The result was like a sandwich: when a new fortification wall was raised, the builders did not dismantle the earlier one but rather incorporated it.

The earliest phase identified dates to the end of the seventh century or the beginning of the sixth BC. It was found in just two places. On the east side of the central gate an angle of horizontal rows of blocks shows that there was already a gate here in the earliest phase of the wall (d’Agostino and Giglio 2012: 42–3, figs 10–11 [B. d’Agostino]). A larger stretch of this earliest wall was found in the western section of the northern wall, close to the podium for judges of the Hellenistic stadium. It comprised two curtain rows of horizontal blocks, the outer with a sloping profile, and a fill of small stones and earth between the curtains (Figure 26.21) (d’Agostino and Giglio 2012: 114–16, figs 61–4 [B. d’Agostino]). These earliest fortifications are c. 2.60 m wide across the upper preserved part. No earlier phases of the walls have as yet been found. This apparent gap from around the middle of the eighth century until c. 600 BC could be a simple reflection of our current state of knowledge, or it might be that the colonists of this period relied for their defences on a structure made of perishable materials.

The 600 BC defensive wall was later included within, and strengthened by, two further walls, the first built c. 550 BC and the second c. 500 BC during the tyranny of Aristodemos (d’Agostino and Giglio 2012: 43–50 and 116–17 [B. d’Agostino]; d’Agostino 2013; D’Acunto 2015: 175–84). Sherds and other items in the fill between the two curtains

---

of the Aristodemos wall date back to the end of MG II/LG I, leading Bruno d’Agostino to suggest that they derived from the destruction by the wall builders of the earliest colonial tombs (a suggestion strengthened by the discovery of burnt bones and pottery probably from cremations). This is further evidence that the northern city boundary, which corresponds to the line of the Greek and Roman walls, was roughly established when the colony was founded: the earliest tombs of the colonists would have been just outside it (d’Agostino et al. 2005: 15 [B. d’Agostino]). If these indications find further confirmation in the future, it will be safe to conclude that the foundation of the colony entailed a clear definition of an inner urban area separated from an outer space occupied by cemeteries.

Cemeteries and colonial society

Cemeteries yield rich data with the potential to give a wider spectrum of information about Cumaean society during the late eighth and seventh century, based on the ways in which social groups represent themselves metaphorically and ideologically in their choice of burial customs. Unfortunately, however, the cemeteries of Cumae were extensively and hastily excavated during the 19th and early 20th centuries. No description survives of the many tombs dug by Leopoldo di Borbone, Conte di Siracusa, in 1852-1857. Other tombs were more carefully excavated and recorded by Emilio Stevens (1878-1893, with a break from 1884-1886). A systematic presentation of Stevens’ excavations has now been published by the late Nazarena Valenza Mele and Carlo Rescigno (Valenza Mele and Rescigno 2010). Before that, Giuseppe Pellegrini published the unique tomb 104 Fondo Artiaco (Pellegrini 1903) while Ettore Gabrici undertook the systematic publication of many tombs and mapped the topography of the cemetery (Gabrici 1913; Figure 26.22). The cemetery of the Greek (and the Roman) period lies beyond the northern city limit, mainly along the road out from the middle gate. It was bounded to the west by the Licola lake, to the south by the city walls, and to the east by the lowest slopes of Monte Grillo. The largest nucleus of the cemetery in the colonial period is quite far from the northern walls. It is important to remark that the earliest tombs of the cemetery, published by Gabrici, go back no earlier than LG II (of course, with the exception of the earlier ones above mentioned, probably destroyed by the northern walls) and a good deal of the tombs and decontextualized vases found in the Conte di Siracusa’s excavations in the necropolis refer to this phase; again, this appears to be a turning point in the early history of the colony, if we rely on the archaeological picture.

The tombs of the leading colonists and their relationships with the burial customs of the motherland

The burial customs adopted at Cumae show that the leading colonists emphasized their links with the Euboean metropoleis, Chalkis and Eretria, where the oligarchies of the *hippobotai* (the ‘horse breeders’) and of the *hippeis* (the ‘horsemen’) held power. Conversely, it is clear from the earliest burials onwards that the Cumaean aristocracy was also open to connections with other communities in Campania and Etruria. This picture is clear from a well-known group of elite tombs dating to the end of the eighth century. Not only was the ritual of cremation adopted, which was common for adults in Euboea, but also a specific cinerary urn and tomb type typical of the tombs of the Euboean elite. The ashes of the dead, gathered from the pyre, were buried in a bronze lebes (Tombs 2 Maiorano, 43 Scala, 56 Scala) or in a silver vase then contained in a bronze lebes (Figure 26.23) (Tombs 1 Maiorano, 11 Maiorano, 59 Scala). The lebes was put in a stone receptacle (a block hollowed on the side where the lebes was set down), which
was closed with a stone cover (Figure 26.24).31 Six tombs of this type were found during Stevens’ excavations, and we may probably add a seventh: a North Syrian cauldron with bull protomes, which was said to have contained a silver vase, was purchased on the art market and now is in Copenhagen (Copenhagen, National Museum 4952: Boardman 1999a: 65-6, fig. 42; Cerchiai 1995: 74). The offerings in these six tombs did not include pottery, just silver and electrum fibulae buried in the cinerary urn: the ‘drago’ type in male burials (Figure 26.25),32 and the ‘navicella’ type in female (Figure 26.26).33 The cinerary urn of tomb 59 Fondo Scala also contained a silver vase described as having the rounded body of an aryballos of Corinthian type (i.e. probably of the globular Early Protocorinthian type) (Gabrici 1913: col. 264), while the cinerary urn of tomb 56 Fondo Scala held a silver dish, two silver spiral earrings, and two silver armlets the ends of which are decorated in electrum filigree (Gabrici 1913: col. 260). Part of the linen cloth used to wrap the ashes was found in tomb 2 Fondo Maiorano (Gabrici 1913: cols. 214-15). The deceased in tomb 11 Fondo Maiorano was buried with a golden lozenge-shaped diadem, richly decorated with impressions of sphinxes, rosettes and circles (Figure 26.27) (Gabrici 1913: cols. 223-4, fig. 67a-b). All of these objects were found in the cinerary urn. Only in one case, tomb 1 Fondo Maiorano, were objects also buried outside the tomb: three spearheads, points set in the earth, emphasize the warrior status of the deceased (Gabrici 1913: col. 214).

The ritual of deposition of the cremated body in the lebes, the gathering of the ashes in a linen cloth, and use of the stone receptacle, recall the well-known group of elite burials found by the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece close to the West Gate at Eretria.34 Neither the Cumae tombs nor the adult burials in the West Gate cemetery contain pottery (with the exception of two small burnt fragments in the cinerary urns of tombs 6 and 10 at Eretria),35 and grave offerings are limited to a few objects. In both cases, the funerary ritual and the offerings of weapons and a few personal ornaments show that the deceased held a very high rank. Both in the Eretria burials and in Cumae tomb 1, weapons are buried outside the tomb. At Eretria, tomb 6, set in the middle of the group, stands out from the

32 T. 1 Maiorano: Gabrici 1913: cols 215-16, fig. 65 (= here Figure 26.25). T. 43 Scala, col. 249. T. 59 Scala, cols 264-6, fig. 105.
33 T. 2 Maiorano: Gabrici 1913: col. 215. T. 11 Maiorano, cols 223-4, fig. 68 (= here Figure 26.26). T. 56 Scala, cols 260-2, fig. 102.
35 Blandin 2007: 44, T. 6.1, pl. 66, 48, T. 10.1, pl. 91.1. Some vases were found in the layer of ashes over the stone cover of tomb 9 (Blandin 2007: 46-7, pls 86-7).
Cumae in Campania during the seventh century BC

rest. Its receptacle is made of carefully assembled stone slabs; two cauldrons, larger than those in the other graves, were used as urn and cover; a set of ornaments buried in the urn comprises two rings (one gold and one silver), two fibulae (one iron bow and one gold), two fragments of gold sheet and two of copper, together with a Phoenician seal in green serpentine inlaid with gold and silver wires. The weapons set around the urn were four ‘killed’ swords and five spearheads, all in iron, and one bronze spearhead of a type which suggests that in addition to an offensive weapon, it could also have been a sceptre. Many scholars have pointed out that these burials recall the funerary customs of Homeric heroes: the ashes of Patroklos in Iliad 23 and those of Hector in Iliad 24 were gathered on the extinguished pyre, enveloped in a purple linen cloth and then put in a precious urn. As Bruno d’Agostino has shown, this ritual implies a double heroization process through the fire: the hero’s body undergoes cremation on the pyre and then the idea of boiling its remains in the lebes (d’Agostino 2003; 2011: 46; Rafanelli 2013: 24-9, 40-3 [B. d’Agostino and M. Cuozzo]; see also Cerchiai et al. 2012-13 [B. d’Agostino]).

Through their burial customs, the leaders of Cumae thus emphasized their ties with the Euboean motherland and its ‘heroic’ elite. At both Eretria and Cumae, these tombs (of men and women) contained just a few objects - the most significant status symbols in the ‘heroic’ manner. But at Cumae there are also signs of a change from Euboean models with the use of symbols of Italic princely status. In three tombs, a shield of Italic/Etruscan type was used as the lid of the lebes (T. 11 Maiorano: Gabrici 1913: col. 223; T. 56 Scala: Gabrici 1913: col. 259-60; T. 59 Scala: Gabrici 1913: col. 264). This shield was not only a warrior symbol but also a sign of prestige for the oikos: indeed, two of these tombs were characterized as those of women by other attributes (T. 11 Maiorano; T. 56 Scala; Cerchiai 1995: 76).

Tomb 104 Fondo Artiaco: elite models between the motherland and the Italic princes

Tomb 104 Fondo Artiaco, which probably dates to the beginning of the seventh century BC, shows stronger influence from Italic elite ideology. The tomb was divided into two main spaces: an outer enclosure and an inner stone receptacle made of slabs (Figures 26.28-9). Three different groups of objects were found in the outer enclosure as follows:

---

Claude Bérard suggested that this spearhead could be a Mycenaean keimelion (Bérard 1972). However, this spearhead has been recently identified as an Italic product. New suggestions emerge from consideration of a recently published spearhead, unfortunately from the market, but included among a group of materials from pre-Hellenic tombs at Cumae. Its close similarity with the Eretria spearhead leaves open the tempting possibility that the latter might have come from Cumae or another Campanian site as a gift from a native chieftain or as a spoil (Bettelli 2011). On Eretria tomb 6, see Blandin 2007: 43-5, pls 61-71; Martin Pruvot et al. 2010: 263-4, 296-7 [B. Blandin].

1. On one side of the tomb, a lebes with handles and lid on a conical stand, plus a second fragmentary lebes, all in bronze.\(^{39}\)
2. On the other side of the tomb, an Attic SOS amphora (Figure 26.30).\(^{40}\)
3. Iron spits, horse bits (Figure 26.31), a knife and weapons – two swords, spearheads and a sauroter – plus two silver sheaths.\(^{41}\)

The inner stone receptacle held one bronze lebes contained inside another.\(^{42}\) The outer lebes was covered by a bronze shield, again of Etruscan type, embossed with geometric decoration (Figure 26.32).\(^{43}\) The inner lebes was covered by a purple linen cloth, and in turn held a hemispherical silver lidded urn which contained the ashes of the deceased (Figure 26.33).\(^{44}\) Rich offerings of jewellery and silver vessels were found in the ash urn, mainly outside the outer lebes.\(^{45}\) The jewellery is spectacular: three silver or electrum large parade fibulae ("affibbiagli") of Etruscan type, decorated in filigree and granulation, one with protomes and plastic sphinxes (Figure 26.34);\(^{46}\) five silver or electrum local fibulae of the drago type;\(^{47}\) a gold band with embossed decoration (meander, rosettes and birds);\(^{48}\) and gold pendants.\(^{49}\) A set of silver vessels for the consumption of wine, some perhaps imported from the Near East, includes a palmette oinochoe,\(^{50}\) a kotyle,\(^{51}\) a Zungenphiale,\(^{52}\) two phialai\(^{53}\) and other fragments of unidentified vessels.\(^{54}\)

Tomb 104 Fondo Artiaco thus employed only the ritual aspect of ‘heroic’ Euboean burial customs (enveloping the ashes in a linen cloth and burying them in a lebes), while all other aspects imply different models. First, a ceramic vase – an Attic SOS amphora – is introduced. This could hold a range of funerary meanings: it may, for example, indicate that the deceased had been engaged in long-distance commerce, or it might reflect his ownership of land because the vessel had contained oil (or wine), and/or it could refer to some ritual involving oil or wine. A second aspect is the dichotomy between two distinct spaces, the inner receptacle (a thalamos) and the outer temenos surrounding it. As Bruno d’Agostino has shown, the careful choice of objects buried outside the receptacle shows that this temenos was the space of a symbolic construction intended to point out the relationships between the deceased, his social group and the gods, stressing the ritualized consumption of meat and wine, his warrior role, and his ownership of horses (d’Agostino 1977: 54-61). By contrast, the receptacle was meant as a thalamos to contain his personal possessions or keimelia. These emphasize his personality and prestige through the display of the dress with precious ornaments, the rich symposium set, and the shield as a sign of his personal warrior status and the rank of his oikos. The presence in the tomb of imports from Greece and probably from the Near East, together with objects of Etruscan and Ionic type, shows the wide range of elite relationships and of suitable models to be found among the ‘princes’ of the Near East and of the Italic communities, as well as the Euboean elite. Bruno d’Agostino has shown that this tomb, with its thalamos and temenos and spatially specific sets of objects, may be compared with the few tombs of Etruscan ‘princes’ at Pontecagnano.\(^{55}\)

With the exception of the burial ritual, the models adopted for the burial of the Greek deceased in tomb 104 Fondo Artiaco do not therefore refer exclusively to the ‘heroic’ world, but rather to a culture which mixed Greek, Near Eastern and Etruscan Italic ideals. Together with a few other roughly contemporary tombs of Etruscan chieftains (e.g.

\(^{39}\) Guzzo 2000: nos 26-8, fig. 8; Pellegrini 1903: cols. 250 and 253, fig. 27, XXVI-XXVIII.

\(^{40}\) Guzzo 2000: n. 52, 136 and 139; Johnston and Jones 1978: 116; Pellegrini 1903: col. 261, fig. 42, II.

\(^{41}\) Two or three iron spits (Guzzo 2000: nos 45-7, 136; Pellegrini 1903: col. 259, figs 39-40, XLV-XLVI); two iron horse bits (Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 48-9; Pellegrini 1903: col. 260, fig. 41, XLVII-XLIX); an iron knife (Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 33; Pellegrini 1903: col. 258, XXXIII); a iron sword with silver sheath (Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 31; Pellegrini 1903: col. 254, fig. 30, XXXI); a second iron sword (Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 32; Pellegrini 1903: cols. 256-7, fig. 31, XXXII); a second silver sheath (Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 50; Pellegrini 1903: col. 260, I); eight iron spearheads (four large and four small) (Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 34-41; Pellegrini 1903: col. 258, figs 32-5, XXXIV-XLII); and a sauroter (Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 42; Pellegrini 1903: col. 259, fig. 36, XLII), together with other unidentified fragments (some rusted together).

\(^{42}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, n. 23, 136, n. 24, fig. 7; Pellegrini 1903: col. 249, fig. 26, XXV; Pellegrini 1903: col. 249, fig. 25, XXIV.

\(^{43}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, n. 25; Pellegrini 1903: col. 246, fig. 24, XXIII.

\(^{44}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, n. 22, fig. 6; Pellegrini 1903: col. 240, fig. 16, XIV.

\(^{45}\) Pellegrini 1903: col. 226: ‘tutti i detti oggetti erano stati esposti al fuoco del rogo unitamente al cadavere del defunto, ed è perciò che furono rinvenuti contorti, spezzati, amalgamati fra loro, talvolta anche in parte fusì’.

\(^{46}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 6, fig. 2; Pellegrini 1903: col. 232, fig. 10, VI, and Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 7-8; Pellegrini 1903: cols. 234 and 237, figs 11-12, VII-VIII.

\(^{47}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 1, fig. 1; Pellegrini 1903: col. 228, fig. 7, I; Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 2-3; Pellegrini 1903: col. 229, fig. 8, II-III; Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 4-5; Pellegrini 1903: col. 230, fig. 9, IV-V.

\(^{48}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 9; Pellegrini 1903: col. 239, fig. 14, XII.

\(^{49}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 10; Pellegrini 1903: col. 239, fig. 15, XIV and Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 11-13; Pellegrini 1903: cols. 238-9, fig. 13, IX-XI.

\(^{50}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 14; Pellegrini 1903: col. 241, fig. 17, XV.

\(^{51}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 15; Pellegrini 1903: col. 241, fig. 18, XVI.

\(^{52}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, no. 18; Pellegrini 1903: col. 243, fig. 20, XIX.

\(^{53}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 16-17, fig. 5; Pellegrini 1903: col. 243, fig. 19, XVII-XVIII.

\(^{54}\) Guzzo 2000: 136, nos 19-21; Pellegrini 1903: col. 245, figs 21-3, XX-XXII.

\(^{55}\) Pontecagnano tombs 926 and 928 of the first half of the seventh century, and the earlier tomb 4461 (c. 700 BC): d’Agostino 1977; Cerchial 1995: 81-9, pl. 11.
tomb 4461 at Pontecagnano), our burial reflects, from the point of view of a Greek colonist of high rank, the genesis of an ideology of princes. It is important to emphasize that this was a cross-cultural connection between leaders of Greek and Italic communities; the flow of ideas was not one-way, from Greek to Italic communities, but also worked in reverse. At Cumae, if we compare the six tombs excavated by Stevens with tomb 104 Fondo Artiaco, we may suggest that some leaders of the Greek colony were more conservative and linked to the models of their mother-city, while others were more dynamic and open to their new world in Southern Italy.

In the context of this discussion, it is important to mention a different interpretation of tomb 104 Fondo Artiaco put forward by Pier Giovanni Guzzo. He argues that the 'mixed culture' evident in this burial, together with its topographical position quite apart from the Greek cemetery, implies that this tomb should not be interpreted as that of a Greek colonist

---

56 On the cemetery of Pontecagnano and princely tombs, see Cuozzo 2003; Rafanelli 2013: 40–43 (M. Cuozzo).
but rather as the burial of one of the last native chieftains (Guzzo 2000; 2009; 2011: 94-7). Although this is a tempting hypothesis, I prefer the traditional interpretation because it is difficult to accept the idea that a native chieftain could maintain his power (and weapons) after the foundation of the Greek colony and have the right to a formal burial in a colonial cemetery, even if in a marginal location. I also believe that this tomb might be slightly later than the six tombs excavated by Stevens: it is probably early seventh-century BC, although it has usually been dated to the late eighth. Obviously, this date would make it impossible for the burial to predate the foundation of the Greek colony.

The ostentatious luxury of the oligarchies of Cumae is described by Hyperochos (apud Ath., Deipn. 12, 528d): ‘the Cumaenians of Italy, according to Hyperochus or whoever wrote the History of Cumae which is ascribed to him, continually wore gold ornaments and adopted gaily-coloured clothes, and rode into the country with their wives in two-horse chariots’. Hyperochos was a local historian of the Hellenistic period, but he places this information in the past and it could easily date back to the Archaic period. The important evidence of tomb 104 Fondo Artiaco indicates that the roots of these social behaviours may be traced back to this early date.

The necropolis of Cumae: burial rituals, society and commerce

The seven tombs discussed above contained the burials of the oligarchic leaders of the colony - the heirs to the Euboean horsemen, the hippobotai of Chalkis and the hippoi of Eretria. They are differentiated from the many other LG II–early Archaic tombs in the north cemetery both by the burial ritual employed and the grave offerings. The remaining tombs show sharp differentiation between specific rituals, tomb structures and burial customs (Gabrici 1913: cols. 808-19 for a synthesis; Zevi et al. 2008: 183-6 [M. A. Cuozzo]). Thanks to Stevens’ careful descriptions and Gabrici’s mapping and corrections, we are able to appreciate these burial differences. But since we lack anthropological analyses of the bones to determine age and sex, hypotheses about them can only rest on tomb dimensions and contents, with all the uncertainties that such information entails. We cannot therefore establish how each of these differences in burial reflects specific criteria of age, rank, or sex/gender in the context of the social group: at Pithekoussai, by contrast, we have a clear picture of how age, rank and sex/gender are represented in burial (Buchner 1982; d’Agostino 1985: 52-4; Ridgway 1992: 45-54; Cerchiai 1997; Cinquantaquattro 2012-13). At Cumae, some tombs held secondary cremations where the burnt bones were buried in a coffin. In other cases of secondary cremation, the ashes and offerings were placed directly onto the ground: Giorgio Buchner suggested that these tombs could be similar to the tumulus-covered cremations at Pithekoussai. Most tombs in the Cumae cemetery were inhumations in pits lined with stone slabs, sometimes covered with a small tumulus of stones. In some cases, part of the wooden coffin painted in red was preserved (Figure 26.35). The size of the pit and the offerings seem to show that the burial ritual of inhumation in stone lined-cists was used for adults (mostly female), as well as for children.

The offerings in these tombs often show parallels with those in LG–early Archaic tombs at Pithekoussai. They consist mainly of personal ornament and Protocorinthian and Corinthian pottery, either imported or local imitations (see e.g. Zevi et al. 2008: 189-246). Imitations of Corinthian vases in local clays (with a Corinthianizing yellowish-greenish surface wash) are widespread at Pithekoussai and Cumae. The rich LG–early Archaic ceramic productions of Pithekoussai and Cumae remain a complex problem, noting the continuing difficulty of distinguishing between these two centres which created a sort of koine style. It is to be hoped that fabric analysis may be conducted in the future. Among these productions, one elegant group stands

---

60 Buchner 1977: 135-8, n. 15; see also Gabrici 1913: T. 26, cols 238-9; Zevi et al. 2008: 184 (M. Cuozzo).
62 Cuozzo et al. 2006: 22-36 (M. Cuozzo); Greco and Mermati 2007; Mermati 2012.
out. The so-called Ischia-Cuma-Tarquinia Group is distinctive for its decoration of fishes and snakes, and reflects Protocorinthian prototypes (Figure 26.36).\(^{63}\)

One oinochoe is usually considered to be a rare Cycladic import to Italy. Humfry Payne believed that this orientalizing vase, which dates c. 680-660 BC (Figure 26.37), was made on the same island (perhaps Paros) as the well-known griffin-headed jug found on Aegina.\(^{64}\) Florian Knauss (1997: 14, 74-7) put the vessel in his linear insular group, but his view is not shared by Maria Antonietta Rizzo (2000: 200 and 205, fig. 13). One must also consider the alternative possibility that this oinochoe is a product of a workshop in Magna Graecia under the influence of Cycladic and other orientalizing Greek styles. A further object for consideration – a bronze griffin protome from a cauldron – was cast in Greece, but scholars do not consider it a Samian product (Figure 26.38).\(^{65}\) Near Eastern imports include a small Phoenician amphora in a context of around 700 BC (Figure 26.39) (Gabrici 1913: cols 245-6, T. 36; Zevi et al. 2008: 198), as well as many orientalia, faience scarabs and vases of Phoenician or Egyptian production (Gabrici 1913: passim; Zevi et al. 2008: 215), which were probably traded to Cumae mainly by Greek dealers but also by Levantines established at Pithekoussai (Ridgway 1992: 111-18).

Female tombs contained a rich variety of gold, silver and electrum jewellery (Buchner 1975; Formigli and Scatozza Höricht 2010; Gabrić 1913: passim), pouring and drinking vessels (mainly oinochoae, skyphoi and kotylai), and

---

\(^{63}\) See n. 63 above. See e.g. the oinochoe published by Gabrić 1913: cols. 308 and 328, pl. 34.1; Greco and Mermati 2007: 325-6, no. 3, fig. 10; Zevi et al. 2008: 224.

\(^{64}\) Gabrić 1913: cols 272, 325-9, pls 32.1 and 33; Payne 1926: 205-11; Zevi et al. 2008: 221 (L. Petacco), with full bibliography (attributed to Naxos). On the Aegina jug and its possible Parian production, see recently Boardman 1998: 110, fig. 243.

\(^{65}\) Views include: Gabrić 1913: cols. 556-7, pl. 76.2; Gehrig 2004: s.v. Kyme – Greifen: 108-10; Zevi et al. 2008: 239 (C. Rescigno).
especially perfume flasks, likely reflecting the use of perfumed oils to anoint the body before the funeral. These comprise Protocorinthian, Corinthian and local aryballoi (Gabrici 1913: passim, pls 41-5; Zevi et al. 2008: 190-219), Rhodian (so-called 'spaghetti style') aryballoi (Gabrici 1913: pl. 49.3; Zevi et al. 2008: 214), and Argive monochrome vessels (Gabrici 1913: cols 292, 317, 331, pl. 40.3; Zevi et al. 2008: 221).

The mortuary rites of early Greek Cumae thus reveal its complex and finely articulated social structure, as well as external relationships which include a wide range of links with other regions of Italy and Greece. It is also interesting to note the handmade impasto vases and spindle whorls buried in a few tombs in the Greek cemetery (Figure 26.39), which reveal the relationships established by Greek colonists with neighbouring Italic communities, and perhaps the integration of native individuals in the Greek colony. This raises the question of the nature of the relationships established by the colonists with the native populations. Of interest here is the well-known inscription identifying Tataie as the owner of an aryballos (termed a lekythos) (Figure 26.40).

The female name Tataie is not Greek, and so the owner of the vase was likely a native or Italic girl integrated in the Greek colony at a certain level, since she had the right to formal burial in the cemetery and Greek was used in the inscription which identified a personal possession. Pier Giovanni Guzzo’s reassessment of the many fibulae of Italic type found at Pithecoussai (mainly in tombs) as markers

---

66 See e.g. Gabrici 1913: T. 36, cols 245-6 (c. 700 BC), and Gabrici 1913: T. 51, cols 254-5 (c. 600 BC); Zevi et al. 2008: 198-9.
67 London, British Museum A 1054: Jeffery 1990: 238, pl. 47 (= here fig. 39); Dubois 1995: 41-2, n. 12. The inscription on the foot of an EPC lekythos of Pithekoussan-Cumaean fabric is a different case: a Greek abcedarium adjoins an inscription by another hand. According to G. Colonna (1970: 662) the latter is ‘apparentemente in lingua non greca’, but Albio Cesare Cassio has subsequently demonstrated that it is Greek (Cassio 1991-3: 187-207); see also Dubois 1995: 36-40, n. 11; Gabrici 1913: cols 230-1; Zevi et al. 2008: 123 [P. Lombardi]).
of native dress, indicated the presence there of a significant number of native women (Guzzo 2012; also Cerchiai 1997; Cinquantaquattro 2012-13). Guzzo’s analysis is in line with the well-established view that the repertoire of Italic fibulae was shared by Greek colonies (e.g. Syracuse) and Tyrrenian settlements alike (with no differences between the Tyrrenian and the Opician world). This led Nicolas Coldstream and several others to suggest that mixed marriages took place between the colonists – Euboeans and other Greeks – and native women.

The relationships established between Greek colonists and the native populations which occupied the territory before them have become a subject of lively scholarly debate. We should always bear in mind their potential variety and complexity and the partial nature of the archaeological record. I personally do not believe in the idea of Archaic Greek Cumae (i.e. from the ‘second’ moment of foundation, if Phlegon of Tralles’ oracle is reliable) as an open city. The kttis implied an act of violence of some kind committed by the colonists against those local people who were subdued and whose territory was conquered and divided among the newcomers. This picture is clear in the radical break between the topography of the Iron Age settlement and that of the Greek city, which implies a completely different use of the same areas. Furthermore, literary sources do not mention coexistence or cooperation with the natives in the foundation of the colony (as they do, for example, at Megara Hyblaea: Th. 6.4.1). As Alfonso Mele has stressed, the constitution of Archaic Cumae before Aristodemus was oligarchic, and similar to that of other Greek cities where citizenship (i.e. political rights, together with military and economic power) was restricted to relatively few individuals (Mele 2008a: 117-20). From the political, institutional and religious perspective, the profoundly Greek character of the colony is beyond doubt.

The position of women reflects a different situation, following the widespread view (based on the specific circumstances of male colonists in their new world and on archaic forms of epigamia) that they were mostly native and able to assist in forming relationships with neighbouring Italic communities. Hence the discovery of objects of native ‘character’ related to women in early Greek contexts at Cumae - fibulae which imply native dress, vases of native shape (such as jars) used for domestic activities including the preparation of food, and spindle whorls used in the manufacture of textiles and clothing. At the same time, the imposition of the colonists over the local people implied that many of the surviving native men must have been subdued and reduced to an existence as slaves or periokoi. Literary sources on Archaic Cumae refer to the existence of such people, living in the chora and charged with agricultural work (Mele 2008a: 110-11). Yet at Pithekousai at least, it is clear from the archaeological record of the cemetery that some of them did acquire the right of formal burial and had therefore gained a certain place in colonial life (Cerchiai 1997; d’Agostino 1999 = d’Agostino 2010-11: 223-30; 2011; Cinquantaquattro 2012-13).

Sanctuaries and cults

An interconnected system of sanctuaries was established by the colonists at key points in order to guarantee the conquered territory and the functions of the polis and chora.

---

68 On the Italic fibulae see Lo Schiavo 2011.
69 Discussions include: Coldstream 1993; d’Agostino 2011, 38; Lemos 2003; Lo Schiavo 2006; Ridgway 2007: 146-7; Shepherd 1999; and recently Kelley 2012.
70 Mele 2008a: 110-11 (with the ensuing discussion at 566-76).
The cult of Apollo in Cumae and his sanctuary on the top of the acropolis?

In Greek and Roman times there were two main sanctuaries on the acropolis: that on the top of the hill, conventionally called the ‘tempio di Giove’ (Figure 26.41), and that on a lower terrace overlooking the city, traditionally identified with the sanctuary of Apollo (Figures 26.42-43). A new excavation by the Second University of Naples under the direction of Carlo Rescigno has focused on the ‘tempio di Giove’, and been the occasion for reopening the dossier on the cults of the acropolis. Rescigno has pointed out that the traditional identification of the upper temple with Jupiter has no reliable foundation (Rescigno 2012a; esp. 2012b; 2012c; Rescigno and Sirleto 2011). He suggests that it could be dedicated to Apollo: indeed, Vergil (Aen. 6.9) describes Apollo as altus and his templa as alta (Aen. 6.41).²¹

²¹ Concerning the so-called ‘tempio di Giove’, other proposals have been put forward, i.e. that it was dedicated to Demeter (Pagano 1987) – an implausible hypothesis for a cult on the top of the acropolis – or to Athena. Athena could be a good alternative to Apollo given the topographical position on the top of the hill. Note also that a sanctuary dedicated to Athena has been recently found on the acropolis of Eretria: see Huber 2007; 2008; Martin Pruvot et al. 2007: 214-16 and 244-5, nos 231-3 (S. Huber). Until now, however, there has been no evidence to support the hypothesis of a sanctuary of Athena on the top of the Cumae acropolis.

According to Servius’ commentary on this passage (ad Aen. 6.9), unlike other cities where the acropolis is given to Jupiter, in Cumae the temple in arce is dedicated to Apollo.\footnote{Serv. Ad Aen. VI, 9: *cum ubique arx Iovi detur, apud Cumas in arce Apollinis templum est.*} This hypothesis is strengthened by the findings of the new excavations in the ‘tempio di Giove’, which include inscriptions on marble slabs from the Roman phase of the temple, graffiti on wall plaster, and an intriguing late eighth- or early seventh-century bronze statuette of a naked female playing a cithara, which might well refer to the ‘functions’ of Apollo and his female followers.\footnote{Rescigno and Sirleto 2011: 9. A second LG bronze statuette of a warrior was found in the recent excavations of the temple. I owe my warmest appreciation to Carlo Rescigno for this information. By contrast, the traditional identification of Apollo’s temple with the sacred building on the lower terrace has been defended by Giuseppe Camodeca, because a Roman ara dedicated to Apollo of Cumae was found, together with fragments of friezes showing citharas, close to the sanctuary on the lower terrace at the beginning of the 19th century (Camodeca 2012: 71-4; 2001: 155-62; contra Rescigno 2012b: 24-30, figs 11-15).} The identification of the temple of Apollo, so important in the mythical revival of Cumae in book 6 of Vergil’s Aeneid, might therefore soon be resolved. Another troublesome question is the location (if any) of the antrum immane (Aen. 6.9-12) where the Sibyl gave prophecies, inspired by Apollo.\footnote{For an overview of the various hypotheses about the identification of the Sybil’s grotto, see Caputo et al. 1996: esp. 53-63, 97-8, 132-9 (P. Caputo).}

From the perspective of a discussion of early Archaic Cumae, the Apollo whose worship was established by the Greek colonists of course lay behind the Roman deity who was so important in Vergil’s description and Augustus’ propaganda.\footnote{For discussion, see Bartoněk and Buchner 1995: 204, no. C3; Rescigno 2012b: 25 and 34, n. 56, fig. 10.} Apollo in Cumae has several aspects and functions, and his traditions represent a stratigraphy of different moments in the history of the city. I confine myself to outlining general aspects, although since problems surrounding the figure of Apollo are matters of scholarly debate, it is impossible even to present a synthetic view.

A sixth-century Ionian cup bearing the fragmentary inscription -\textsc{polo}- was recovered by Giorgio Buchner on the acropolis, but we have no information about the precise context of this find. The inscription could be completed as a dedication to Apollo, but there are alternative possibilities including a personal name.\footnote{On the Greek background to Vergil’s description, see Zevi 1987; Zevi and Nuzzo 2008.}

The Latin author Velleius Paterculus (1.4.1) reports a tradition that Apollo’s cult was established at the same time as the foundation of the colony: ‘the Athenians established colonies at Chalkis and Eretria in Euboea, and the
Lacedaemonians the colony of Magnesia in Asia. Not long afterwards, the Chalcidians, who, as I have already said, were of Attic origin, founded Cumae in Italy under the leadership of Hippocles and Megasthenes. According to some accounts the voyage of this fleet was guided by the flight of a dove’ (a symbol of Apollo)98 ‘which flew before it; according to others by the sound at night of a bronze instrument like that which is beaten at the rites of Ceres’ (i.e. Demeter). ‘At a considerably later period, a portion of the citizens of Cumae founded Naples’.99

Lycophron (Alex. 1278; see also scholia ad loc.) – in the voice of Cassandra who predicts the arrival of Aeneas in Latium – mentions the acropolis of Cumae as the hill (klítēs) of Apollo Zosterios.90 In his mythological view, the cult of Apollo dates back to the most ancient times, a tradition which would be exploited by Vergil in the context of Augustan propaganda. Following this tradition, which emphasizes the ancient establishment of the god in Cumae, a passage of Caelius Antipater recalls in Apollo’s temple in Cumae his signum ligneum which was no less than 15 feet high,91 a cult statue which had the qualities of an early xoanon. Many scholars therefore believe that Apollo, together with Hera, were among the deities brought by the Euboeans from their mother cities when they founded the colony. This ancient Apollo of Cumae could be equated with the Apollo Archegetes, ‘leader of the colonists’,92 whose altar was built by the colonists of Naxos in Sicily as soon as they landed to found their city (Th. 6.3.1).

It is well known that Apollo in Cumae93 had an oracular character, inspiring the Sibyl with prophecies. The Sibyl appears as early as the Archaic period according to the tradition that either Tarquinius Priscus or Tarquinius Superbus bought the collection of her oracles, the Libri Sybillini, which were afterwards kept in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in Rome.94 Luisa Breglia (2008: 238-48) and Alfonso Mele (2008a: 89-96) have argued that the Apollo brought by the colonists was the god of Delos rather than of Delphi. Among their convincing arguments, I mention merely two: Vergil calls Apollo Delius vates (Aen. 6.12), and on a series of coins of the Greek period (c. 470-420 BC), the palm tree, which is the symbol of Delian Apollo, is associated with the mussel, the common symbol of Cumae (Cantilena 2008: 209-10, fig. 4). According to Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli, Apollo at Cumae was a fusion of two different aspects of the god brought by the two colonial contingents – his Delian/archegetes aspect brought by the Euboean group, and his chthonic, Sibylline oracular aspect brought from Aeolian Kyme in Asia Minor (Pugliese Carratelli 1977; 1978; 1986).95

A further aspect of Cumaean Apollo worthy of attention is his epithet Zosterios, reported by Lycophron; although written in the Hellenistic period, Lycophron’s Alexander likely reflects reliable Archaic information.96 The epithet Zosterios was also applied to Apollo in the dome of Halai Aixonides in southern Attica.97 However, the cults in Cumae and in Attica are clearly independent and unconnected.98 In the Attic case, the epithet originates from Cape Zoster where the cult and sanctuary were established: here the epithet Zosterios is topographic in origin, as was the case for several other epithets of Apollo in other sanctuaries (i.e. Aktios, Leukatas, Pagasaioi, Triopios and Phanaios).99 This does not seem to be the case for Apollo Zosterios in Cumae, located on the acropolis (where there is no reference to a belt either in the shape of the hill or in the tradition of the toponym). According to Alfonso Mele and Luisa Breglia,

90 Stat. 4.8.45-9 and 3.7.8-80, with the discussions of Breglia (2008: 240-1) and Cantilena (2008: 210).
92 Pars horum civilium magno post intervallo, Neapolium condidit
93 Alex. 1278-80: Ζωστηρίου τε κλιτοῦν, ἔνθα παρέθευκα / εὐνυχόν ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς, / γώγον βεβήδη συγκράτησε στήχος, Schol. ad Ioum (ed. Scheer): 1278 Ζωστηρίου τε κλίτουν Ζωστηρίου' σ' ὄρος Ταλαίας, ἐν ὧν ἱερὸν Ζωστηρίου Ἀπόλλωνος' σ', ἐπάνων ΑἈπόλλωνος' s, φιλον οὖν ἐν ἅνευθυ διήην τοιοῦ ἄσβολα. s' Ζωστηρίου Ἀπόλλων παρά θεάνοις τιμώμενος καὶ ἐν δ' ἐπαπειλήσασα Ζωστηρίῳ Ἀπόλλωνῳ (Mein. ΑΑ 122), καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μέρος τοῦ ναοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ζωστηρίου ὄνομασθεῖ καὶ τὴν ἐξοχήν. EM 414 Ζωστήρ τότες, ἐνθα' ἐ.extensions ἤ τῆς τοῦ Ζωστηρίου αὐτῆς, σ' γ' ἔστειν οὐδόλαι, Θεοῖ, ἢν καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος φασὶν αἰετάρης, θεαματικα καὶ θαυμαστῇ τ' ύπερτ... 1280 s' γρώμον δ' εἰς κοίλου βέβεβηρ δ' εἰς τοῦ σπηλαία s' s' λέγεται δ' εἰς αὐτὸς καὶ θέμβηκεν, s' ἄλλος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μέρος τοῦ ναοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ζωστηρίου ὄνομασθεῖ καὶ τὴν ἐξοχήν.
94 Aupd Serv. Aen. 6.9-11: Coelius enim de Cumano Apolline ait: ‘est in fano signum Apollinis ligneum, altum non minus pedes XV’ See Caesius Antipater, FrHist 15 56 60 (= Peter F 54, Herrmann F 61, Chassignet F 30): 215 BC
96 On the cult of Apollo in Cumae and its links with the mother cities, see: Breglia 2008, 238-48; Mele 2008a, 89-96.
97 On the tradition of the Sibyl, see Blich 1976; Mele 2008b: 39-44; Ogilvie 1965: 654-5; Parke 1992: 89-122 (although unreliable on the identification of the grotto at Cumae); as well as Hornblower 2015: 451. See also scholia ad Lyc. Alex. 1278: supra n. 80.
98 A completely different reconstruction has been suggested by Nazarena Valenza Mele, who sees no relationship between the Sibyl and Apollo before Vergil, who would have rewound traditions and figures to create something new for Augustus’ propaganda. Of course, this critical position does not solve the question of the oracle(s) in Cumae. On the Sibylline tradition and its historical background, see Mele 2008b: 38-44.
99 See the recent and fundamental commentary on Lycophron’s Alexander by Simon Hornblower (2015), and esp. 62-93 on the central role played in the poem by the many epithets/epiklesis of the gods with special reference to the world of Greek colonization in the west.

See SEG 38.124 (Halai Aixonides, c. 265 BC: in this inscription the epithet is restored, but very plausibly so in the light of the identification of the cult site); Graf 1985: 53, n. 33; Barker 2003: 177; Hornblower 2015: 80 n. 228, 451, commentary ad loc. Also scholia ad Lyc. Alex. 1278 (see n. 80 above).
100 On this point of view, see Hornblower 2015: 451.
101 On Apollo’s epithets, see Barker 2003: 177.
who follow the scholiast to Lycophron’s _Alexandra_, Apollo’s link with the _zoster_ (or belt) should be explained as a reference to his mother Leto’s act of unfastening her belt before giving birth to the god in Delos (Breglia 2008: 243; Mele 2008a: 90). Pausanias (1.31.1) reports that the Attic deme was called Zostèr because according to tradition, Leto’s act took place there, after which an altar was dedicated to the Apollonian triad.\(^90\)

Another explanation for this peculiar epithet of Apollo in Cumae is plausible and tempting: here the _zoster_ refers not to Leto but to Apollo himself, making the belt an attribute of the god evident on the cult statue of Apollo in Cumae. This possible explanation of the ephipesis is not mentioned among the _scholia_ of Lycophron’s _Alexandra_. However, it fits well with the early Archaic iconography of Apollo, where the god is depicted naked apart from a belt (the identification with Apollo is made case by case via the specific attributes held by the god – the bow and arrows, for example). I have discussed this iconography elsewhere (D’Acunto 2000; 2008b: 159–60; also Hermay 2008): here I confine myself to a few points on the Apollo _Zosterios_ of Cumae. First, the image of the naked Apollo wearing just a belt, as in general the naked youth/man wearing a belt, had a limited life in Greek iconography, current from the second half of the eighth century until the first decades of the sixth at latest.\(^91\) If the epithet _Zosterios_ truly refers to this iconography, it would confirm the high chronology of this cult statue of Apollo at Cumae. Secondly, at least two early Archaic statues of Apollo in his ‘birth’ sanctuary on Delos represent the naked god wearing a belt. The first and most important is the cult statue of Apollo made by Tektaios and Angelion, erected in the temple of Apollo and considered as the image of Apollo Delios himself. This image is known only from later reproductions and descriptions (Overbeck 1868: nos 334–7), with the most precise description appearing in a fragment of Callimachos’ _Aitia_ (114. 7, ed. Pfeiffer) which states that this statue wore only a belt on the naked body.\(^92\) Via other sources we may imagine that this was a colossal image in the chryselephantine technique which should date to the seventh century or at the latest to the early sixth (Prost 1999). Tektaios and Angelion’s cult image was probably the prototype for the famous colossal marble Apollo dedicated by the Naxians in the sanctuary of Delos, which reproduced the same iconography of the naked god wearing an elaborate bronze belt. Again this statue is very early, as it should be dated to the end of the seventh century or the beginning of the sixth.\(^93\) If the cult image of Apollo in Cumae did indeed represent this iconography, it could be an intentional reproduction of the image of Apollo at Delos, and therefore indicate direct dependence on Delian Apollo rather than the Apollo of Delphi. This interpretation should, however, be nuanced by the fact that the iconography of the naked and belted youth is widespread throughout Greece and is not exclusive to Apollo (D’Acunto 2000; Hermay 2008).

A further possible link between the Apollo _Zosterios_ of Cumae and the Cyclades, and especially the cult image at Delos, is its size. If we take into account its height of ‘more than 15 feet’ (according to Caelius Antipater), we have a cult image which was much more than twice life size. If we calculate its height using the Roman foot (0.2964 m), the result would be ‘more’ than 4.446m. Of course, this must be treated with caution because the Latin author likely exaggerated the height of the statue to give a sense of its monumentality. But one characteristic of Archaic sculpture is the phenomenon of colossal size, especially in the last decades of the seventh century and the early sixth. This is especially characteristic of the marble sculpture of Naxos in the Cyclades, and afterwards spread widely to other productions, e.g. in Attica.\(^94\) The _agalma_ of Apollo Delios made by Tektaios and Angelion was reputedly monumental/colossal in size.

In sum, my proposal is that if we take into account its hypothetic _Zosterios_ iconography\(^95\) and monumental size, the wooden xoanon or cult image of Apollo in Cumae shows its early Archaic date and its links with the Delian Apollo who probably ‘led’ the colonists in their overseas foundation.

### The two sanctuaries on the acropolis: archaeological aspects

In the sanctuary on the top of the acropolis, a temple (Figure 26.41) is built on a relatively small terrace which occupies the upper part of the hill in a dominant position overlooking the entire territory and the sea towards

---

\(^{(90)}\) Hypereid., _Delakos_, F 1 (eds. Baiter - Sauppe); Hesyc., _s. v._ _Zoster_; Steph. _Byz._ _s. v._ _Zoster_; _Kleine Pauly_ 5, 1979: col. 1565 (E. Meyer), _s. v._ _Zoster_.

\(^{(91)}\) One of the earliest known cases which links this iconography with Apollo is the early seventh-century bronze figurine, probably from Boeotia, dedicated by Mantiklos (D’Acunto 2000: 293–4 and 323, no. 91, with bibliography).


\(^{(93)}\) D’Acunto 2000: 290 and 321–2, no. 67, fig. 1; 2008b: 140–2, pl. 1.1–4, with bibliography. It is useful to recall that at least a bronze LG statue (D’Acunto 2000: 319, no. 1, with bibliography) and two ‘kouroi’ that date from around the end of the seventh or the beginning of the sixth century BC (D’Acunto 2000: 290–1 and 322, nos 68–9, figs 2–3, with bibliography; 2008b: passim, pl. 1.1–4) found in Delos reproduce the naked type wearing the belt: these figures may represent either the god or the dedicant in idealized form.

\(^{(94)}\) On these aspects see D’Acunto 2008b and D’Onofrio 2008, with previous bibliography.

\(^{(95)}\) On Athena Zosteria in Thebes see Paus. 9.17.3: according to Pausanias, ancients used the verb _zousetha_ in the sense of ‘to put on one’s armour’ and so they say that when Homer compares Agamemnon to Ares ‘in respect of his zone’, he is really saying that they were alike in the fashion of their armour. This meaning might have to do with the belt as part of the armour and its importance in the Homeric world (see Bennett 1997: 61-102; D’Acunto 2000: 305–8). As an alternative to my former hypothesis of a belted Apollo in Cumae, one could suggest, therefore, that the epithet _Zosterios_ might refer to an armoured cult image. However, this hypothesis seems implausible as the iconography of an armoured Apollo would be totally unusual (for a survey of Apolline iconography, see Lambrinoudakis 1984). See also Steph. _Byz._, _s. v._ _Zoster_, who says that Athena Zosteria was worshipped by the Epikenemidian Lokrians; Euphorion, frag. 162 _Lightfoot_ (see Hornblower 2015: 451).
Ischia (this 360° view is now barred to the visitor by the holm oaks planted after Maiuri’s excavations in order to give the area the aspect of a park). This eminent position supports the identification of the acropolis with the ‘hill of Apollo Zosterios’ in Lycophron’s *Alexandra*, as well as the uncommon position of the god in arce unlike other Greek-Roman cities.

The platform of a temple built in ashlar blocks underlies the Roman phase of the building and the Christian church which may now be seen on the site. The temple which rested on the earliest platform is now assigned on archaeological grounds to the second half of the fourth century BC by Rescigno. However, several series of architectural terracottas dating to different stages of the sixth century were found in the old excavations, and three Archaic doric capitals have been found in the new campaigns (Rescigno and Sirleto 2011: 8-9). These finds show that during the sixth century, the sanctuary was focused on sacred building(s) and that the temple underwent a process of architectural monumentalization. We may, however, conjecture that the establishment of the sanctuary dates back to the earliest phase of the colony. The new excavations are starting to find evidence of these earliest phases - the two LG bronze statuettes of a musician and of a warrior noted above, and a fragment of a closed vase in Middle Wild Goat Style imported from Miletos (dating to the last third of the seventh century or the first decades of the sixth). It is interesting to note that handmade ‘impasto’ sherds have repeatedly been found around the temple from the excavations of Vittorio Emanuele onwards (Rescigno 2012b: 23-4; Sirleto and Vollaro 2012: 36). These suggest that the native settlement spread across the top of the acropolis before it was removed and the area re-occupied by the Greek sanctuary.

The sanctuary on the lower terrace of the acropolis, the so-called ‘sanctuary of Apollo’ (Figure 26.42), is established in another crucial topographical position on the hill. It overlooks the city and from it one can see the Forum and the urban area up to the Monte Grillo ridge (Figure 26.43), and look west and south towards the sea and Ischia. Here the foundations of a temple in ashlar, preserved under the Roman temple, probably date to the late Archaic period and the tyranny of Aristodemos; an ashlar retaining wall of the end of the sixth century was likely built at the same time in order to contain the fill of the temple terrace (Fratta 2002: 27-8, figs 2-3; Sirleto and Vollaro 2012: 37-42, fig. 2). The existence of two earlier sacred buildings is shown by fragments of architectural terracottas from two distinct roofs of the end of the seventh century or the first half of the sixth; a gorgoneion antefix and a ram spout were found in the fill of the terrace together with finds of the proto-colonial phase (Rescigno 2008: 448-9; Zevi et al. 2008: 170-1 [C. Rescigno]). Among the Geometric pottery found in Gabrici’s excavations in 1910, an outstanding LG fragment of a large oinochoe, considered by Buchner to be a Pithekoussan/Cumaean product, depicts two galloping horsemen (probably part of a larger parade) (Figure 26.44). This depiction evokes the eighth-century colonial elites’ perception of themselves as the direct heirs of the *hippoboi*, the ‘horse breeders’ of Chalkis. The horse was their status symbol and *hippotrophia* their distinguishing aristocratic practice (Buchner 1953-4: 51-5, 96 For the old photographs, see Rescigno 2012b: 22, fig. 7; 2012a: 161-4, figs I.11-20. 97 On the architecture and phases of the building, see Rescigno 2012c; 2012b; Rescigno and Sirleto 2011. 98 Rescigno 2012a: 171 and 177, app. II.1 and II.7a; 2012b: 20-1, fig. 6; Sirleto and Vollaro 2012: 51-3. 99 Rescigno (2012b: 23-4 and 32-4, fig. 9) assigns the fragment to Middle Wild Goat Style II on Cook’s classification (Cook and Dupont 1998: 39-45) and South Ionian Archaic Ic-Id on Kerschner and Schlotzhauer’s classification (2005: 25-45). 100 Caputo et al. 1996: 83-101; Fratta 2002; Catucci et al. 2002: 97-119 (L. Jannelli); Zevi et al. 2008: 170-1 (C. Rescigno); Rescigno 2008: 448-9; D’Acunto 2015: 194-7.)
Fig. 3; on Euboean traditions and depictions, see now Simon and Verdan 2014). Therefore, we may suggest that this sanctuary was established very early in the Greek period. Handmade impasto pottery of domestic character, dating to the Recent101 and especially the Final Bronze Age and Early Iron Age, was found in the old excavations. Here too, the Opician settlement spread over the terrace before the arrival of the Greeks, who established there one of their main sanctuaries (Jannelli 1999b). As on the plain, this evident topographical/functional change from local village to Greek sanctuary demonstrates the clear break between the pre-Hellenic settlement and the Greek colony. It is clear that this sanctuary preserves a palimpsest of the earliest phases of Cumae. As in the ‘tempio di Giove’, it is to be hoped that in the future, renewed archaeological research may give fresh information about these important processes and their precise date.

**The cult of Zeus and Iuppiter Fulgurator/Flazus, and the Phlegraean Gigantomachy**

Four Roman period dedications to Iuppiter Fulgurator/Flazus (of a total of seven found at Cumae) come from the lower terrace of the acropolis (Camodeca 2001: 155-61; 2012: 68-71). According to Giuseppe Camodeca, even if we cannot exclude a late reuse of all of them, the concentration of these inscriptions in the same place makes it likely that they were in situ and therefore that the famous temple of Iuppiter Fulgurator/Flazus was established on the lower terrace of the acropolis. Camodeca therefore suggests, following the traditional identification of the main temple with that of Apollo, that a second temple dedicated to Iuppiter coexisted with it on this terrace.102 As an alternative in this puzzle of the cults of the acropolis, Rescigno temptingly suggests that the main temple on this terrace, the so-called ‘temple of Apollo’, was dedicated solely to Iuppiter Fulgurator/Flazus (Rescigno 2012b: 24-30).

Iuppiter Fulgurator/Flazus was a god of the Roman period but with an Oscan background (see Camodeca 2012: 70). Yet we should also recall the Archaic Greek background of Zeus in Cumae. According to a tradition reported by ancient authors, Zeus helped Herakles to defeat the Giants during the battle for possession of the fertile plain to the north of Cumae: the Kumaion pedion was named Phlegra or Phlegraion pedion after the thunderbolts thrown by Zeus in this fight.103 Alfonso Mele has suggested that the historical context for the creation or exploitation of this tradition should be found in Cumae during the second half of the sixth century BC, when the Greek colony began to be attacked byItalic peoples, and especially in the propaganda of Aristodemos. The young, future tyrant (hypothetically identified by Mele as a new Herakles) was able in 524 BC to act decisively to defeat the Etruscan and Italic peoples assailing the city, who were (according to Mele) equated with the Giants (the historical battle is described in D.H. 7.3-4; see Mele 1987: 163-7; 2008a: 143-50; 2014: 116-23).

Recently, I have underlined the problematic aspects of this historical reconstruction. I believe that the historical context of the genesis of this Gigantomachy must be much earlier than the battle of 524 and Aristodemos’ propaganda (D’Acunto 2015: 184-93). This myth should be seen as the paradigm for the conquest of the Phlegraean territory by the earliest Greek colonists to the detriment of the native peoples. In particular, the setting of this myth in the Phlegraean Fields must have had its origin in the imagery created by the Greek colonists of Cumae when they prevailed by force over the native peoples who they equated with the wild Giants (at Od. 7.206, the Giants are ἄγρια φύλα). The Olympic gods led by Zeus were drawn up on the Greek side, together with Herakles and his companions. Zeus shot down the Giants with his thunderbolts, setting the Phlegraen Fields on fire and shaking the land, according to the aetiological myth which explains the volcanic character of the region. The Phlegraen Gigantomachy appears to be the mythical-divine transposition and justification of the violent act(s) by which the colonists of Cumae asserted their authority over the local people and their territory, i.e. the chora north of the city which was so valuable for its celebrated fertility (see the bia reported in the ‘second’ moment of ktisis according Phlegon of Tralles’ oracle).

This hypothesis is also supported by the parallel version of the Gigantomachy of Herakles which was set in Pallene/Phlegra,104 i.e. in the western peninsula of the Chalkidiki (modern Kassandra). Here too, the setting of this myth should date back to the Euboean colonization of the region, reflecting the ‘rights’ of the Greek colonists against the local people (Valenza Mele 1979: 32-6; Tiverios 2008; 2013a: esp. 33-44; D’Acunto 2015: 191-2). Therefore, Iuppiter Fulgurator/Flazus – whose cult was probably set on the lower terrace of the acropolis of Cumae, perhaps in the main temple – was the successor of the Archaic Zeus who set fire to the Phlegraean Fields with his thunderbolts and

---

101 The Recent Bronze Age in Italy broadly corresponds to the Aegean Late Bronze Age. Although the precise dating of this period is contested, it ranges approximately from the mid- to late fourteenth century to the early to mid-twelfth century BC.
102 On the second temple on this terrace, the so-called ‘tempio B’, see also Pesando 2000, who suggests that it was dedicated to the Magna Mater.
103 Timae. (ForHilt 566 F 89 = Diod. 4.21); Plb. 3.91.2-7; Str. 5.4.4; 5.4.6; 6.3.5.
104 Hdt. 7.123.1; Str. 7, frr. 25, 27; Philostr., Her. 8.16; St. Byz., s. v. 'Παλλήνη'; s. v. 'Φλέγρα'; Lyc., Alex. 115-27; 1356-8; 1404-8; D.S. 4.15.1; Paus. 1.25.2; 8.29.1.
helped Herakles to establish Cumaean control over the fertile plain north of Cumae (i.e. the plain around Literno, which is crossed by the river Clanis).

**Hera and the sanctuary in the Fondo Valentino**

Along with the cults of Apollo and Demeter, the cult of Hera also appears in colonial foundation tradition as set out in the oracle reported by Phlegon of Tralles (*FGrHist* II 257 F 36 X, 53–56).\(^{105}\)

The location of the Heraion at Cumae has been much debated, but after the studies of Valenza Mele, followed by Sacco and Del Verme, it is possible to place it in the so-called Fondo Valentino. At least one inscription bearing a dedication to Hera was found there: moreover, through archival documents it can be established that an early sixth-century oinochoe now in Bonn (which bears a dedication to the goddess) was discovered in this sanctuary, and other Archaic fragments with dedications to Hera may also have been found there during the 19th-century excavations.\(^{106}\)

A rectangular platform which may be the foundation of a temple was excavated in the Fondo Valentino in the 19th century and is drawn on the old maps (Del Verme and Sacco 2002–3: 264; La Rocca *et al.* 1995; Valenza Mele 1991-2). A recent survey of the site revealed pottery dating back as early as the seventh century, plus at least two series of architectural terracottas dating to different phases of the Archaic period from the roofs of the temple and/or other sacred buildings. Reports of old excavations note many finds of (early) Archaic pottery, figurines and architectural terracottas (La Rocca *et al.* 1995).

This sanctuary occupies an important topographical position on the southern spur of the acropolis ridge just where it joined the southern line of defensive walls (*Figure 26.5*). The crucial topographical point was marked by an important sanctuary, although we do not yet know whether it was included within the defensive walls or lay just outside them in a peri-urban position. The sanctuary had a commanding view south towards the Fusaro lake, and west, over the navigation in the channel between Ischia and Cumae, as well as the beach south of the acropolis which was probably used during the Greek period as the second landing point for ships. This was a perfect location for the goddess Hera, one of the ‘leaders’ of Euboean colonization in the west. Hera was the guarantor of sea voyages, of exchanges and therefore relationships between colonists and ‘others’, and of the *oikos* (in turn implying stability and ownership of the land).\(^{107}\)

The cult of Hera at Cumae seems also to have been linked with an oracle. At the beginning of the 20th century, a small, inscribed bronze disc (*Figure 26.45*) was acquired by the noble family of Napoli Carafa D’Andria and has been in their private collection ever since. Even though its context is unknown, it has been suggested that its provenance should be Cumae for epigraphic reasons and because of its oracular content. The transcription of the inscription by Margherita Guarducci reads: ‘Ἡρη οὐκ ἐᾶι ἐπιμαντεύεσθαι’, i.e. ‘Hera forbids re-consultation of the oracle’.\(^{108}\) The disc is thus an oracular lot forbidding a second consultation. It does not relate to a mantic type of oracle, as that of Apollo who delivered his prophecies through possession of the Sibyl, but it appears to be an oracle involving the drawing of lots. The epigraphic character of this

![Figure 26.45](https://example.com/oracular-disc.jpg)

*Figure 26.45* Oracular bronze disc bearing an inscription; private collection of Carafa D’Andria, Naples (diameter 0.08m). (Guarducci 1987: fig. 30).

---

\(^{105}\) On the Archaic character of the information implied by this oracle see Breglia Pulci Doria 1983; d’Agostino 2011: 44-5.

\(^{106}\) Del Verme and Sacco 2002–3: 261–6, fig. 16 (oinochoe in the Akademisches Kunstmuseum in Bonn, found during excavations by the Prince of Sayn-Wittgenstein) and figs 15–18; Valenza Mele 1991-2; see also Zevi *et al.* 2008: 180-2 (P. Lombardi).

\(^{107}\) On Hera at Cumae, see Breglia 2008: 238-9 and 256-62. For Hera and Greek colonization, see especially Polignac 1998 and the bibliography in note 82 above.

\(^{108}\) Guarducci 1946-8; 1987: 66-7, *contra* A. Maiuri’s transcription: ‘Ἡρη οὐκ ἐᾶι Ἑρη μαντεύεσθαι’, i.e. ‘Hera forbids oracular consultations in the morning’. According to Maiuri, Hera of Cumae held a night oracle at Lake Avernus (Maiuri 1911: 1-11; on this oracle reported by literary sources see note 119 below). This proposal has been taken up again by Renehan 1974. A different reading of the inscription and interpretation of the object has recently been suggested by Mika Kajava (2010), who suggests that they did not refer to an oracle. However, I follow the traditional hypothesis that the object and the text make reference to mantic activity.
inscription shows that this oracle goes back as early as the seventh century, or the sixth at the latest. This intriguing document raises many unresolved questions, including that of the relationship between the oracles of Hera and of Apollo in Archaic Cumae. Did they function, at least in part, during the same period or was Hera’s oracle earlier? Did they give the same kind of prophecies or different ones? We should also recall Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli’s observation that the disc establishes an opposition. The inscription forbids that an oracle foretell - it implies the existence of an oracle and of a cult of Hera (probably in Cumae) during the seventh-sixth century, but it does not indicate that they worked together (or at least not explicitly) (Pugliese Carratelli 1978; see also Zevi et al. 2008: 180-1 [P. Lombardi]). The question of the oracle(s) in Cumae is further complicated by the tradition of the existence of a third one: a nekyomanteion, or oracle of the dead, discussed at the end of this chapter.

The peri-urban and extra-urban sanctuaries and the cults of the territory

As in other Greek foundations in Magna Graecia and Sicily, a network of peri-urban and extra-urban sanctuaries needed to be established in order to guarantee, through a sacred presence, the colony’s control of its territory. Our knowledge of this ‘sacred crown’ remains very limited. 109

One of the main purposes of the foundation of Cumae (and probably the most important one) was control of the territory for agriculture. The Campanian plain north of Cumae is fertile *par excellence*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (7.3.2) reports that at the time of the assault by the Etruscans and Italic peoples in 524 BC, Cumae ‘was ... celebrated throughout all Italy for its riches, power, and all the other advantages, as it possessed the most fertile part of the Campanian plain and was mistress of the most convenient havens round about Misenum’. 110 This focus on agricultural activity is mirrored in the prominence of Demeter in the pantheon of Cumae: an important sanctuary dedicated to her is recorded by the literary and epigraphic sources and her symbol, a grain of wheat, was placed side by side with the mussel on the city’s Classical coins. 111 Her main sanctuary has not been identified until now.

A peri-urban sanctuary was recently discovered during excavations conducted by the Centre Jean Bérard (directed by Jean-Pierre Brun and Priscilla Munzi) just outside the middle gate in the northern wall, close to the west side of the road which ran out from the gate from early Archaic times on. 112 Unfortunately, only a small part of this sanctuary has been revealed, and not its centre. Among the earliest evidence, a beautiful sub-daedalic antefix (Figure 26.46) 113 stands out; it implies the existence in the neighbourhood of a temple dating back to the beginning of the sixth century. Archaic and Classical terracottas were also discovered, showing that the cult was that of a female goddess or goddesses, but their iconography is not diagnostic (Zevi et al. 2008: 149-56 [M. Dewailly]). During the Classical period, the excavated area was occupied by a probable heistiorion for which the best parallels are found in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore in Corinth. On these grounds it has tentatively been suggested that the sanctuary might be dedicated to these goddesses. 114 Demeter and Kore, who were associated with the land and fertility, would thus be established just outside the city as a symbolic presence facing the northern *chora*. An alternative hypothesis may be suggested by two unpublished late Archaico-Classicai fragments found in this sanctuary, which are

109 A review of the evidence for the sanctuaries of Cumae, with bibliography, is given by Zevi et al. 2008: 163-82; and Rescigno 2012b: 14-16.
111 On Demeter in Cumae, see Breglia 2008: 262-4; Pagano 1987; on the coins, see Cantilena 2008: 216-17, fig. 11.
113 Bats et al. 2008: 530-1, fig. 3; Brun and Munzi 2011: 152-3, fig. 4; Zevi et al. 2008: 148 (M. Dewailly).
inscribed with the name of Hera.\footnote{I owe my warmest thanks to Dr Priscilla Munzi for information about these finds and permission to mention them here.} If they refer to the patron goddess of the sanctuary, then we have a duplication of Hera’s central cult in the Fondo Valentino and her crucial symbolic presence also in the northern territory of the city from the beginning. This sanctuary was also close to the main northern harbour of Cumae, i.e. the lagoon. Finally, it is important to note that this sanctuary was established in an area occupied before the foundation of the Greek colony by the Iron Age cemetery (see n. 8 above). Here too, this shows the topographical changes which intervened between the Opician settlement and the Greek colony, although in this case, in long term perspective, as the earliest available evidence from the sanctuary dates c. 600 BC.

A small part of another peri-urban sanctuary (and unfortunately not its centre) has been discovered on the other side of the city, just outside the southern walls, close to the point where according to Karl Julius Beloch there was a gate. This sanctuary is close to the Roman amphitheatre and the ‘Villa Virgiliana’ (Zevi et al. 2008: 172-9 [P. Caputo, C. Regis and C. Rescigno]). It is clear that it occupied another symbolically significant position on the city limits, at the exit from the city towards its southern territory and the Fusaro lake. The earliest evidence of this sanctuary found so far dates to the sixth century - a retaining wall of ashlar blocks, votives, architectural terracottas from the roofs of several sacred buildings, and pottery have been found at various times (Zevi et al. 2008: 172-9 [P. Caputo, C. Regis and C. Rescigno]). A fragmentary late Archaic Kylix bears an inscription which should probably be restored with the epithet Melichios. Hence the sanctuary may have been dedicated to Zeus Melichios, perhaps among other deities (Zevi et al. 2008: 175 [C. Regis]) - Dionysos has also been suggested (Rescigno 2012b: 15). Among the earliest finds are two sherds, probably from the same amphora/krater of the first quarter of the sixth century, in Aeolian Middle Wild Goat style (related to the London Dinos Group) imported from Kyme in Asia Minor (Figure 26.47) (Zevi et al. 2008: 173 [C. Regis]; Scatozza Höricht 2012: figs 3-5).

Different kinds of evidence point to the existence of other sanctuaries, but without clear indication that they were established in the earliest phase of the colony (for a review of the evidence, see Rescigno 2012b: 15-16). Through literary sources we learn of the existence of several cults in the territory of Cuma: that of Artemis-Hekate which was perhaps close to the Avernus lake (Beloch 1989: 194-6; Breglia 2008: 248-56), that of Hamae in the chor, which became the ethnos sanctuary of the Campanians and is still unidentified (Cristofani 1998; Cerchiai 2011), and the peak sanctuary of Iuno Gaura which, according to Werner Johannowsky, may be on the ridge of Monte Palombo where there is a Roman cryptoporticus (Johannowsky 1973: 151; Rescigno 2012b: 16 and 31, n. 13). Furthermore,
Cumae in Campania during the seventh century BC

a few finds, including two architectural terracottas, come from a site on the slopes of Monte Grillo (and perhaps indicate the presence of a sacred building nearby) (Caputo 2005: 42; Rescigno 2012b: 15 and 31). In the *chora*, the possible existence of a sanctuary close to the depurator of Licola is tentatively suggested by the discovery of architectural blocks and an antefix during excavation (Rescigno 2008: 456; 2012b: 16 and 31, n. 12).

In short, we know almost nothing of the extra-urban sanctuaries of the colony, even though we may suppose them to be an important and powerful symbolic projection of the city in its agricultural *chora*. Here too, we have reached an important limit of our knowledge of Cumae, revealing another possible perspective for future research.

**Cumae and its control of the sea routes**

Soon after its foundation, Cumae established control over the sea routes across the Gulf of Naples and in this part of the Tyrrhenian Sea. At the beginning of the seventh century, Pithekoussai suffered a major crisis brought about by a volcanic eruption (Buchner and Gialanella 1994: 77-83 [C. Gialanella]; see Str. 5.4.9, n. 12 above). Thereafter, during the seventh and sixth centuries, it surely came under the direct control of Cumae. Cumae extended its supremacy over the Gulf of Naples through other naval stations – strongholds on the sea – on Cape Misenum (D.H. 7.3.2), on the Rione Terra hill in Pozzuoli, and in Naples, where the settlement of Parthenope was established on the hill of Pizzofalcone. Late Geometric sherds found during excavation for the metro at the foot of the hill of Pizzofalcone raise once again the question of the foundation date of Parthenope, which may be earlier than previously supposed following the old excavations of a few tombs on the hill and of a dump at its slopes. Thus the colonists of Cumae quickly extended their maritime control over this part of the Tyrrhenian Sea. Their power and wealth was based on maritime, commercial and piratical enterprise. As noted above, according to Thucydides (6.4.5) the founders of the ‘first’ Zankle in Sicily were ‘pirates’ (*lestai*) from Chalcidian Cumae.

**Lake Avernus, the gates of Hades and the geography of the west**

One final point concerns those underworld myths which refer to the territory of Cumae: Lake Avernus as the location of the gates of Hades, and its implication in the colonial geography of the west (Figure 26.48). According to a very

---

116 For a comprehensive analysis of the territory of Greek Cumae through literary and archaeological sources, see Mele 2008a: 109-17.

117 Str. 5.4.6. On this stronghold and on the Archaic finds in the Rione Terra in Pozzuoli, see De Franciscis 1971.

118 Finds from the metro excavations will be published by a team directed by Daniela Giampaola. On the cemetery at via Nicotera in Pizzofalcone, see Napoli Antica: 99-102 (S. De Caro). On the Chiatamone dump: Giampaola and d’Agostino 2005: 50-1, 63-80.
ancient tradition there was an oracle near Lake Avernus, close to Cumae. Pseudo-Scymnus (236-43) states that it was an underground oracle called Kerberion after the infernal dog that guarded the gates of Hades (Ragone 2003: 26-52; 2008: 39-42). According to Ephorus (FGrHist F 134 = Str. 5.4.5), this oracle was a nekyomanteion or oracle of the dead. Both authors locate the episode of the nekyia in Odyssey 11 there. Ephorus says that the Cimmerians controlled the oracle and lived in grottoes where they never saw the sun. They lived on the profits of metallurgical activity and of the oracle. He also places the river Styx and the Acherousia palus (identified with the Fusaro Lake) near the Avernus.

I am not here concerned with whether a nekyomanteion truly existed at Lake Avernus, but rather with its implications for the geography of the period of Greek colonization. A solid western tradition locating the entrance to Hades close to Cumae predated the fourth century BC. In the fifth century, Sophocles (F 748 Radt = 682 Nauck) places the Psychagogoi, TGF 3, Radt: 370-4), but according to Ephorus, the nekyomanteion was moved from Lake Avernus to another place. Some aspects of this tradition rest on the nekyia in Odyssey 11, namely:

- questioning the souls of the dead about the future;
- the fact that this region is inhabited by the Cimmerians;
- the gates of Hades were located here.

The location of Odysseus’ travels was disputed by ancient authors, and a roughly similar discussion continues today: were they in the colonial Greek west, in a northern region, or a fabulous world of the imagination? A western location for these travels (Braccesi 2010) already appears in Hesiod (Th. 1011-16). If these verses are not a later interpolation (and I believe that they are not), they date to the end of the eighth or the beginning of the seventh century (Debiasi 2008: 38-75). However, even if Hesiod was not their author, they reflect an early Archaic stratum of thought.

Why, in the Greek idea of the west, should the region of Cumae and Lake Avernus be the setting for this underworld landscape and for the gates of Hades? The volcanic character of the Phlegrean Fields made a perfect location (Mele 2008a: 112-15; 2008b: 32-3). Solfatara near Pozzuoli is characterized by sulphurous fogs; the hot waters which rise from the ground at Baiae, close to Lake Avernus, recall the waters of the Styx; the swampy Lake Fusaro fits the image of the Acherousia palus; and the margins of Lake Avernus (according to Strabo, as cited above) were darkened by the wide shadows of many trees.

Another, complementary, explanation for this underworld setting lies in its proximity to Cumae as the limit of the known world for Greeks in the period of colonization. Greek geography placed the entrance to the underworld at the limits of the world, close to the river Ocean (see, e.g., Cerri 2007). If these limits were conceived as close to the most northerly Greek colony in the west at that time, they would reflect the geographical knowledge or ‘earth’ of the early Archaic period as well as the possible Greek perception of the earth at that time. This image of the region of Cumae thus reflects through underworld/oracular traditions the geographical and chronological horizon of the earliest Greek, and especially Euboean, colonization in the west (Mele 2008a: 112-17; 2008b: 32-3). If this hypothesis is true, this imaginary but symbolic ‘world’ was populated by people, as the Cimmerians, whose customs would have appeared very different to those of the Greeks.210

The complex and wide impact of the Greek colony of Cumae on Campania, Latium and Etruria goes beyond the limits of this chapter. This impact was felt at different socio-political and cultural levels and gave rise to mutual feedback (see e.g Cerchiai 1995: 69-98 et passim; d’Agostino 2006; and several contributions in Rafanelli 2013). To confine myself to one of the most famous aspects, the Euboean communities of Cumae and Pithekoussai passed on a fundamental heritage to the Italian peoples: the alphabet. With over 40 inscriptions – most dating back as early as the second half of the eighth century or the beginning of the seventh – Pithekoussai is among the most prolific sites in early Greece for literacy (Bartoněk and Buchner 1995). The inscriptions from Cumae are nearly as early (Lazzarini 2008; Zevi et al. 2008: 120-9). These communities adopted the ‘western’ or ‘red’ alphabet of their motherland Euboea (Guarducci 1987: 64-7; Jeffery 1990: 235-48). The existence of Euboeans in numbers here, together with the rich corpus of inscriptions from Eretria and from other Euboean sites and colonies, suggest that they played a basic role in the diffusion and, possibly, also the birth of the alphabet. The importance of Cumae and its close relationships with the communities of Campania, Southern Etruria and Latium made feasible the early development of both the Etruscan and the Latin alphabets (Lazzarini 2008; Zevi et al. 2008: 120-9).

Since 1994, the programme of archaeological research conceived by the Soprintendenza Archeologica della Campania, then under the direction of Stefano De Caro, has radically changed our knowledge of Cumae. This

120 On Greek colonists’ perception of the local people and the meaning of Pithekoussai, the ‘islands of the “monkeys”’ see especially Cerchiai 1996.
chapter, which has given an overview of the earliest phase of the colony, clearly shows how many gaps and open
problems remain in our knowledge of Cumae. In comparison with other Greek colonies in Sicily and Magna Graecia,
our knowledge lags behind: it is nonetheless growing year by year and we feel part of this exciting enterprise of
discovering the ‘earliest’ Greek colony in the west. We share this enterprise with our friends and colleagues in the
Ufficio Scavi di Cuma (Soprintendenza Archeologia della Campania), and in the other institutions – the University
‘Federico II’ and the Second University of Napoli as well as the Centre Jean Bérard – involved in the field research.

121 I thank the late Dr Paolo Caputo and now Dr Francesco Sirano (Soprintendenza Archeologia della Campania), those responsible for the
archaeological site of Cumae, for their constant professional advice and help, together with Dr Marzia Del Villano, Cesare Giordano and Gennaro
Carandente, and all the staff of the Ufficio Scavi di Cuma. The successive directors of this Soprintendenza – Drs Pier Giovanni Guzzo, Maria Luisa
Nava, Teresa Elena Cinquantaquattro and now Adele Campanelli, together with Professor Bruno d’Agostino – have all believed in and supported
our project: I am very grateful to them.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegina</td>
<td>112, 166, 315, 352-3; sanctuary of Aphaia 86, 203; sanctuary of Apollo 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeolis</td>
<td>Pergamon 191; Pitane 360; see also Kyme, Larisa on the Hermos, Smyrna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeotlia</td>
<td>205; Kephalovrysi Stamna 205; Naupaktos 219; see also Kalodyon, Thermon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetolia</td>
<td>205; Kephalovrysi Stamna 205; Naupaktos 219; see also Kalodyon, Thermon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetos</td>
<td>See Ithaca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrati</td>
<td>20, 376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td>207, 217, 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthos</td>
<td>57, 166, 355, 358, 360, 362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>339, 342, 344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alepochori (Bouri, anc. Pagai)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Mina</td>
<td>5, 14, 17, 22, 39, 47-59, 108; Orontes river 48; Thapsakos river 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarynthos</td>
<td>138, 148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathus</td>
<td>22, 89, 380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendolara</td>
<td>333-4, 336-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorgos</td>
<td>384; Minoa 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolia</td>
<td>56, 104; see also Ankara, Gordian, Sakçegözü</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchialos</td>
<td>See Sindos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andros</td>
<td>21, 166, 355, 361; Palaiopolis 3, 148, 174; Ypsili 148, 173-4, (temple of Demeter) 183; Zagora 3, 148, 173-4, 177, 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Mazaraki</td>
<td>175, 181-2, 206-7, 212-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiparos</td>
<td>150, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antissa</td>
<td>See Lesbos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia (Ilyria)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argilos</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argive Heraion (Prosymna)</td>
<td>81, 182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argolid</td>
<td>203, 214, 378; see also Argive Heraion, Argos, Asine, Mycenae, Tiryns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>84, 181, 187, 199, 212, 220, 261, 266, 268, 390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkadia</td>
<td>203, 212, 219, 222; see also Mantineia, Phigaleia, Tegea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arta</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashkelon</td>
<td>109-10, 375, 384-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine</td>
<td>187, 261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyria</td>
<td>56-7, 69, 272-3; see also Carchemish, Nimrud, Nineveh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astypalaia</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>6-7, 14, 47, 95, 124, 130-1, 139, 149, 160, 164-5, 173, 219, 222, 233, 235, 245-92, 321, 358, 361, 364, 378, 388; Agriiikli 249; Anagyrous 289; Anavysios 268; Halai Aionides 320; Hephaistai 191; Kephisia 283; Keratovouni 249; Keratini 237; Kiapha Thiti 249; Menidi 249, 286; Merenda 249, 268, 286; Phaleron 284; Porto Rafti 249; Rhamnous 130;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topographic Index

Aulis 130
Avernus, Lake (Acherousia palus) 324, 326-8
Azoria 177, 185

Babylon 384-5, 392
Black Sea 6, 55, 109, 112, 191; Berezan 109; Istrous 107
Boeotia 25-6, 31-7, 130-1, 221-44, 249, 361; Alalkomenion 222; Anthedon 222; Arma 222, 235; Aspera 221; Eleon 222; Euthysis 237; Itonion 222; Kastraiki 222; Keressos 222; Liatane 25; Mykalassos 222; Onchestos 222; Orchomenos 221-2, 237; Plataea 222, 237; Potion, Mt, 222; Rhitsona 233, 235; Tanagra 25, 222, 286; Thespies 222; see also Thebes

Bosporus 166
Butera 341-2, 344

Campania 293-329; see also Cumae, Ischia, Naples, Pithekoussai, Pontecagnano
Carchemish 50, 56-7
Caria Iasos 66, 117; Knidos 69; Melite 189, 191
Caucasus Krasny Majak (Suchumi), Abkhazia 277; Tlia, South Ossetia 277-8
Chalkidiki 57-8, 154, 173-4, 355-63; Akte 356; Aphytas 356-5, Athos 355; Eion 363; Mt Itamos 57; Kassandra 323; Nea Kallikrateia 358; Neapolis 154, 363; Olympos 154; Pallene 323; Potidea 355-6, 362; Pyrgadikia 360; Sithonia 355; Stageira 355; see also Akanthos, Mende, Olynyhos, Poseidi, Sane, Torone

Chalkis 13, 56, 126-8, 130, 132-4, 144, 148, 226, 295, 306, 309, 314, 319, 322, 355; Arethusa 126, 220; Hill of the Cemetery 126-7; Hill of Kallimani 126; Hill of the Quarry (Kamares Hill) 126; Machairas plot 127-8; Peri Dokou 134; Mt Vathrovounia 126; Yiftika Hill 126-7
Chios 14, 55, 58, 111, 361-2, 366, 390; Emporio 85, 89, 175, 184, 277; Kato Phana (anc. Phanai) 81, 100

Cilicia 51, 56
Corcyra 362, 364
Corinth 7, 17, 42, 54-6, 83, 96, 104-5, 112, 124, 139, 150, 166, 189-212, 214, 219-20, 233, 261, 279-80, 305, 341, 343, 345, 355, 357, 360-2, 366, 378; Temple of Apollo 179, 181-2, 193-6, 198, 201, 204, 206, 208; City wall 189-92; sanctuary of Demeter and Kore 201, 325; Great Temple 201; Heroon of the Crossroads 201; Temple Hill 201-2, 208-10
Corinthia 7, 193-212; Klenia 195; Kromna 195; Pentekoskouphia 201; Solygeia 200; Tenea 28; see also Isthmia, Perachora

Corinthian Gulf 7, 196, 203, 212-20
Cosenza Cozzo La Torre 334; Cozzo Michelichio 334-5, 337-8; Mottafollone 335, 338; San Lorenzo del Vallo 335, 338; Santa Maria del Castello 335, 338; San Mauro di Corigliano 335, 337-8; San Sosti 336; Spezzano Albanese 335-6; Torano Castello 334, 338; Torre (del) Mordillo 334, 336-8

Crete 4, 6, 11, 14-30, 34, 44-5, 67, 79, 124, 173, 186, 193, 286, 342, 344, 376; Arkhades 44; Astriti 26; Axos 15; Itanos 23, 377; Lyktos 20; Mathia 33; see also Afrati, Azoria, Dreos, Eleutherna, Gortyn, Idaean Cave, Kato Syme, Knossos, Kommos, Prinias, Sybrita
Cumae 3, 7, 79, 293-329, 363, 364, 373-4, 378, 390; Acropolis 293-5, 306, 318-23; Capitolium 296, 298; Clainis river 324; Fondo Artico 309, 311-14, Fondo Granata 315; Fondo Maiorano 309-11, 316; Fondo Meirino 315; Fondo Scala 309-10, 314; Fondo Valentino 324, 326; lake Fusaro 324, 326, 328; ‘Heroaion’ 324-5; Forum baths 298-300, 302; Forum (Roman) 296-8; Kumaion pedion (Phlegra, Philegraion pedion or Philegreek Fields) 293, 323, 328; lake Licola 309, 327; Literno 324; Monte Grillo 293, 296-7, 309, 322, 327; Monte Palombaro 326; northern walls 294, 298-9, 305-7, 309, 325, 332; Solfatara 328; see also Avernus lake, Kyme (Aeolias)

Cyclades 3, 6, 26-7, 44, 49, 104, 106, 115, 148-9, 150-72, 174, 181, 183, 321, 353, 361-2; see also Amorgos, Andros, Antiparos, Delos, Despotiko, Kimolos, Kythnos, Melos, Mykonos, Naxos, Paros, Rheneia, Siphnos, Tenos, Thera

Schistos cave 237; Souinion 28, 249, 286; Varkiza 249, 290; Voula 4; see also Athens, Eleusis, Hymettos (Mt), Lathouriza, Lavrion, Oropos, Parnes (Mt), Piraeus, Thorikos, Tourkovouni (Mt), Vari

Kumain pedion (Phlegra, Philegraion pedion or Philegreek Fields) 293, 323, 328; lake Licola 309, 327; Literno 324; Monte Grillo 293, 296-7, 309, 322, 327; Monte Palombaro 326; northern walls 294, 298-9, 305-7, 309, 325, 332; Solfatara 328; see also Avernus lake, Kyme (Aeolias).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topographic Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrenaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daskyleion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despotiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didyma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodecanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Aegean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleutherina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eretria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboean Gulf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evrytania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exochi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcyonic Gulf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymettos, Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperesia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topographic Index

Ialysos 64, 66-8, 71, 77, 162
Idaean Cave 20, 45
Incoronata 353-4
Ionía 118; Erythrai 109, 390; Lebedos 109; Magnesia 320, 384; Mycale 14; see also Didyma, Ephesos, Klaizomenai, Kolophon, Miletos, Phokaia, Teos
Ischia 177, 293, 321-2, 324, 351; Punta Chiario 177, 293; see also Pithekoussai
Isthmia Sanctuary of Poseidon 82, 85, 88-9, 179-82, 193-203, 207-11, 343
Ithaca 199, 204-5, 219
Kalapodi Sanctuary of Apollo 88, 178-81, 199-201, 203, 232, 235, 377
Kalydon 186, 191
Kamares See Thera
Kamiros 62-4, 68, 72-4, 79, 89, 100; sanctuary of Athena 81, 85
Karabournaki 67, 359, 361-3, 369
Kardamaina See Kos
Karystos 56, 144, 149; see also Plakari
Kato Phana See Chios
Kato Syme (Viannou) 15, 20, 24, 44
Kephalonia 219
Kimolos 160, 165
Kition 69, 89
Klaizomenai 58, 100, 104-7, 111, 113, 361
Knossos 15, 17, 19-20, 63, 65, 67, 280; Fortetza 118, 277
Kolophon 106, 109, 111, 386
Kommos 17, 22-3, 88-90, 180, 364, 369, 373, 376-7, 379
Kos 61, 64-7, 86; Kardamaina 64; Serraglio 66
Koukounaries See Paros
Kyme (Euboea) 295
Kythnos Vryokastro 6, 82-5, 88-9, 160-72

Larisa on the Hermos 111-12
Lathouriza 175, 182, 281, 290-2, 392
Latium 279, 320, 328; Palestrina/Praeneste 272-3, 279; Rocca di Papa 272-3; Rome 320
Lavrion 58
Lebanon 58
Lefkandi 2, 5, 17, 44, 48, 56, 123, 127, 130, 133, 148, 173, 298, 304, 351, 355-6, 364, 373; Chaliotis 144; Palla Perivolia 144; Skoubris 144; Toumba 138, 144, (heroon) 181-2, 185; Xeropolis 127, 130, 136, 144, 148, 173
Lemnos 355; Myrma 360
Leontini 233, 295, 339, 341-2
Lesbos 100, 109, 362, 366, 371, 373, 383-4, 387-9, 392; Antissa 182; Mytilene 182, 389; Pyrra 182, (Messon) 389
Libya 340; Aziris (Wadi el Chaliq) 22
Lindos 62, 90; sanctuary of Athena 68, 82, 85-6, 88-9
Lokris 33, 359; see also Mitrou
Lydia 62, 106, 112-14, 118-19, 122, 164, 166, 386, 392; Hermes river 106; Nif Daği/Karamattepe 119; see also Daskyleion, Sardis

Macedonia 1, 8, 57, 355-74; Kastanas 361; Kavala 362; Krania/Platamon 369; see also Chalkidiki, Thermaic Gulf
Malta 220
Mantineia 347
Marion 380
Maroneia 361-2
Marseille 84
Megara 278, 383-4; see also Alepochori
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Megara Hyblaea</td>
<td>162, 177, 185, 191, 295, 298-9, 303, 305-6, 317, 339-41, 343, 345-6, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megiddo</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos</td>
<td>21, 28, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mende</td>
<td>8, 57, 355-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
<td>48, 56, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messenia</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methone</td>
<td>8, 14, 57, 90, 355-74, 376, 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos</td>
<td>6, 58, 66, 69, 88, 103-12, 118-19, 177, 191, 322, 347, 361; sanctuary of Aphrodite 58, 88-9, 108, 390; sanctuary of Artemis Kithone 104, 390; Assesos, sanctuary of Athena Assesia 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoan</td>
<td>See Amorgos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrou</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounichia</td>
<td>See Piraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykonos</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>See Lemnos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilene</td>
<td>See Lesbos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Gulf of 293, 327; Cape Misenum 325, 327; Anc. Parthenope (mod. Pizzofalcone) 320, 327; Pozzuoli (Rione Terra hill) 327-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>14, 69-71, 86, 109-10, 358, 380, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos (Cyclades)</td>
<td>4, 13, 24-30, 36, 49, 155, 162, 165, 315, 321; sanctuary of Delian Apollo 30, 378; Grotta 13; Hyria 180-1, 183; Melanes 183; Metropolis 13; Naxos town 13; quarry of Apollo 30; Sangri/Gyroulas 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos (Sicily)</td>
<td>8, 115, 177, 191, 295, 320, 339, 349-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikoleika</td>
<td>See Helike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrud (Fort Shalmaneser)</td>
<td>75, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisyros</td>
<td>65, 67, 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Aegean</td>
<td>See Lemnos, Samothrace, Thasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>72, 191, 299; see also Cyrene, Tocra, Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>12, 38-9, 42, 45, 86, 118, 178, 196-7, 203, 212, 220, 274, 345-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>347, 358, 360, 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagai</td>
<td>See Alepochori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeapphos</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaiopolis</td>
<td>See Andros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnes, Mt</td>
<td>Sanctuary of Zeus 249, 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paroikia</td>
<td>See Paros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paros</td>
<td>6, 13, 150-9, 162, 165, 315, 362, 384; sanctuary of Apollo and Artemis (hill of Delion) 154; Koukounaries 148, 174-5, 184; Oikonomos 191; Paroikia 148, 150-9, 163, 173, 184, 268 (sanctuary of Apollo Pythios) 152-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peloponnese</td>
<td>27, 39, 181-2, 186, 203, 212-13, 347, 376, 386; see also Achaia, Argolid, Arkadia, Corinthia, Elis, Messenia, Sikyon, Sparta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perachora</td>
<td>42, 72, 83-7, 196, 199-200, 203, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamum</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persepolis</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanai</td>
<td>See Chios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phigaleia</td>
<td>186-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistia</td>
<td>392; see also Ashkelon, Ekron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenicia</td>
<td>57, 63, 69, 366; see also Sidon, Sukas, Tyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokaia</td>
<td>111-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokis</td>
<td>219, 359; see also Delphi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>7; Mounichia, sanctuary of Artemis 245-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithekoussai</td>
<td>8, 62, 115, 173, 293, 295, 305-7, 314-17, 327-8, 344, 352, 363-4, 369, 373, 375-6, 384, 390; Mazzola 177, 293, 301, 304; Monte di Vico 293; Pastola 141; Scarico Gosetti 306; Stipe dei Cavalli 293, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plakari (Karystos)</td>
<td>130, 137-40, 143-4, 148-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policoro</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontecagnano</td>
<td>312-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidi</td>
<td>182, 356-7; see also Mende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinias</td>
<td>15, 23, 25, 29, 44, 185, 267, 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punta Chiarito</td>
<td>See Ischia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pydna</td>
<td>365-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrra</td>
<td>See Lesbos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakita</td>
<td>See Ano Mazarak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ras el Bassit</td>
<td>22, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ras Shamra</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheneia</td>
<td>151-2, 154-5, 162-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>5, 44, 57, 60-72, 78-9, 86, 117-19, 177, 278, 358; see also Exochi, Ialysos, Kamiros, Lindos, Vroulia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabuniye</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakçegözü</td>
<td>38-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis (Cyprus)</td>
<td>69, 89, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>22, 25-6, 28-30, 38-9, 42, 50, 58, 69-70, 105, 107, 110, 117-20, 360-1, 366, 384, 386; Heraion 25, 28, 72, 77, 81, 85-6, 100, 111, 114, 116, 177-81, 199, 376, 390-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samothrace</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>57, 355-7, 361-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardis</td>
<td>105-6, 115, 118-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinus</td>
<td>299, 339-40, 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellada</td>
<td>See Thera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serraglio</td>
<td>See Kos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibaritide</td>
<td>8, 330-8; Albidona 333, 338; Broglio di Trebisacce 334; Cozzo La Torre 334; Cozzo Michelicchio 334-5, 337-8; Mottafollone 335, 338; San Lorenzo del Vallo 335, 338; Santa Maria del Castello 335, 338; San Mauro di Corigliano 335, 337-8; San Sosti 336; Spezzano Albanese 335-6; Torano Castello 334, 338; Torre (del) Mordillo 336-8; see also Amendolara, Timponella Motta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>1, 6-8, 67, 72, 110, 182, 191, 214, 220, 266, 295, 325, 329, 339-48, 349; Akrai 341; Borgo Bonsignore 340; Finocchito 342-4; Herakleia (Minoa) 340; Kamarina 375-6; Kasmenai 341; Katane 295, 341, 347; Lilybaion 340; Lipari 340; Maktorion 341; Monte Bubbonia 341; Monte San Mauro 342, 379; Mykai 14, 340; Pantaycas river 339; Pantalica 342, 344; Segesta 340; Thapsos 339-40; Trotilon 339-40; see also Akragas, Butera, Gela, Himera, Leontini, Megara Hyblaea, Naxos, Selinus, Syracuse, Zankle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>56-7, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikyon</td>
<td>196-7, 212, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindos (Ancialos)</td>
<td>355, 358-9, 361-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphnos</td>
<td>58, 88, 160, 162, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siris</td>
<td>189, 191, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyros</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skythia</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>14, 73, 105-7, 111-12, 114-22, 177, 186, 189, 191, 261, 360, 381, 384, 386, 388; sanctuary of Athena 182, 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soros</td>
<td>Sanctuary of Apollo 85, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Italy</td>
<td>Caulonia 213; Kroton 213, 340; Messapia 233; Metaponto 213, 346; Otranto, Strait of 233; Taranto 186; see also Incoronata, Policoro, Sibaritide, Siris, Sybaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>191, 212, 214, 220, 340, 384, 389; sanctuary of Artemis Orthia 31, 35, 89, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukas</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susa</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sybaris 213, 330-1, 334, 336-8, 340
Sybrita 20
Syme Viannou See Kato Syme
Syracuse 186, 293, 295, 317, 339-48; temple of Apollo 14, 346, 348; Arethusa spring 346; temple of Athena 343, 346-7; Fusco cemetery 345-6; Giardino Spagna cemetery 344, 348; Ortygia 177, 340, 342
Syria 12, 28, 38, 47, 49, 55-8, 69; see also Al Mina, Carchemish, Ras el Bassit, Ras Shamra, Sabuniye
Tamassos 267
Tarsus 51, 56
Tegea 35, 203, 212, 347
Tenos Xobourgo 5, 11, 13, 31-4, 34, 90-1, 93, 96, 98-9 (Thesmophorion) 13
Teos 58, 107-8, 111, 119, 392
Thasos 58, 104, 150, 154, 161-2, 164, 166, 184, 189, 191, 345, 355, 359, 362, 364, 374, 384
Thebes 5, 7, 31, 73, 191, 221-44, 247, 321, 351, 356, 373; sanctuary of Apollo Ismenios 221-31; sanctuaries of Demeter 221, 223, 230; Elektran Gates 223, 225-6, 229, 231; shrine of Herakles 221-44; Kadmeia 221-2, 231
Thera 21-2, 24-6, 28, 30, 66-7, 155, 165, 219, 351, 362, 378-9; sanctuary of Aphrodite 21, 66; Kamares 378; Sellada 29
Thermaic Gulf 8, 173, 355, 359, 361-6, 371; Raikelos 355, 362; see also Karabournaki, Methone, Pydna, Sindos, Toumba Thessalonikis
Thermon 181, 205-6
Thessaly 130, 186, 359; Gonnoi 182; Halieis 189, 191; Mitropolis 183; see also Soros
Thorikos 95, 185, 249
Thrace 8, 191, 220, 361, 392; see also Abdera, Argilos, Dikaia, Maroneia
Timpone della Motta 8, 330-4, 336-8; Macchiabate cemetery 330-1, 336-7
Tiryns 191, 220, 268, 378-9
Tocra 22, 154, 162, 166
Torone 57, 355, 359-63, 369, 377
Toumba Thessalonikis 90
Tourkovouni, Mt Sanctuary 175, 182, 249
Troy 119, 157, 207, 361; Troad 58
Tyre 14, 22, 47, 56-7
Ugarit See Ras Shamra
Unqi 50, 56
Urartu 272
Uruk 58
Vari 4, 7, 281-92
Vathy See Ithaca
Vitsa 289
Vroulia 68, 85, 87, 89, 117, 177-8
Vryokastro See Kythnos
Xobourgo See Tenos
Ypsili See Andros
Zagora See Andros
Zankle 295, 306, 327, 340
Zarakes 125, 132, 146-9, 181, 373; sanctuary of Apollo 132, 138, 147, 149, 181
Ziwiye 39